

The Progressive Revolution



*Volume II:
2009 Writings*

*Liberal Fascism
through the Ages*

ELLIS WASHINGTON

THE PROGRESSIVE REVOLUTION

Liberal Fascism through the Ages

Volume II
2009 Writings

Ellis Washington


University Press of America,[®] Inc.
Lanham · Boulder · New York · Toronto · Plymouth, UK

**Copyright © 2013 by
University Press of America,[®] Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard
Suite 200
Lanham, Maryland 20706
UPA Acquisitions Department (301) 459-3366**

**10 Thornbury Road
Plymouth PL6 7PP
United Kingdom**

**All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
British Library Cataloging in Publication Information Available**

**Library of Congress Control Number: 2013933550
ISBN: 978-0-7618-6111-9 (clothbound : alk. paper)
eISBN: 978-0-7618-6112-6**

 **The paper used in this publication meets the minimum
requirements of American National Standard for Information
Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials,
ANSI Z39.48-1992**

DEDICATION

To Justice Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States (1991 - present)—

. . . For teaching me love, courage, and steadfastness in the midst of your “high-tech lynching” before the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings and for enduring the slanderous, unjust attacks by the propaganda press and from your former friend and employee, Anita Hill during that fateful summer of 1991.

. . . Exceeding gratitude to you Justice Thomas for standing by me 20 years ago during my intellectual emergent years when most others whom I reached out to simply ignored me; for writing me all those letters which gave me encouragement and hope.

. . . But most importantly for writing all of those law review articles, Court opinions, fatherly wisdom to our youth to never, ever give up; speeches and lectures to us adults to return to the wisdom and Natural Law of America’s Founding Fathers, and for your classic memoir *My Grandfather’s Son*.

Indeed, this is your true and enduring legacy for America, for the Ages which has served as beacons of hope and tablets of truth in a world increasingly shrouded in liberal *living* constitutionalism, evolutionary materialism, intellectual relativism, political fascism, and moral darkness.

EPIGRAPH

It "Fascist" is a modern word for "heretic," branding an individual worthy of excommunication from the [liberal] body politic.

For what we call liberalism—the refurbished edifice of American Progressivism—is in fact a descendant and manifestation of fascism

~ Jonah Goldberg, *Liberal Fascism* (2007), pp. 4, 2

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
<i>Prologue</i>	1
 Chapter One— <i>On Law</i>	 15
1. First Amendment in the Age of Obama	
2. Hate-crimes law = fascism	
3. Constitution or corruption?	
4. Obama: Follow FDR—in this case, anyway	
5. Psychopaths in black robes	
6. Dump the exclusionary rule!	
7. I spell traitor S-O-U-T-E-R	
8. Sotomayor is an anti-constitutionalist	
9. The tyranny of transnationalism	
10. SCOTUS gets one right – but . . .	
11. Frankenstein and the exclusionary rule	
 Chapter Two— <i>On Politics</i>	 47
1. GOP or GIP?	
2. Obama Inc.	
3. Liberals are liberals first	
4. Just call him ‘ <i>President Nimrod</i> ’	
5. Obama: Manchild in the promised land	
6. I can no longer remain in the Republican Party	
7. Ted Kennedy: ‘ <i>A coward beside heroes</i> ’	
8. Ted Kennedy: Reagan’s Benedict Arnold	
9. Van Jones: Obama’s alter ego	
10. Cass Sunstein: Regulating America to death	
11. Obama: a sudden catastrophe	
12. Gov. Jindal, Faust and the devil	

Chapter Three—*On Foreign Policy*

84

1. N. Korea, Russia have SDI, but America can't?
2. Ambassador John Bolton got it right
3. Israel: Fight like your forefathers
4. 10 Commandments for Israel
5. Old lessons Israel hasn't learned
6. The last statesman in Marxist Europe
7. Peace through begging
8. The pope in Israel
9. Diplomacy from our knees
10. Iran has come to America
11. Viva Honduras! ¡Viva la Revolución!
12. Obama's 'Final Solution' for Israel
13. Fighting Satan in Afghanistan
14. Here's why Obama *can't* go to Berlin
15. Mr. Obama, tear down this Gorelick Wall!

Chapter Four—*On Philosophy*

126

1. Is liberalism anti-intellectual?
2. Obama's use of controlled chaos
3. Devolving standards of indecency
4. *Symposium*—Obama's universal deathcare
5. Prometheus in Cambridge, England
6. Laura Ingraham: The lioness of talkradio
7. Rutherford Institute: Brushfire of liberty
8. Demjanjuk and KSM: Trial or a hanging?
9. Islam is *not* compatible with a republic

Chapter Five—*On Aesthetics*

152

1. Daschle in 'Da Club'? ... not
2. Lessons from *Lord of the Rings*—Part I
3. Lessons from *Lord of the Rings*—Part II

Chapter Six— <i>On the Academy</i>	161
1. Critical thinking in the Age of Obama	
2. Professor Jonathan Turley tortures reason	
3. Letter from the godfather	
Chapter Seven— <i>On Religion</i>	171
1. <i>Symposium</i> —The Trial of Isaiah the Prophet	
2. Thou shalt not covet	
3. Thou shalt have no other gods before me	
4. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image	
5. Thou shalt not take the Lord's name in vain	
6. Remember the Sabbath Day	
7. Honor thy father and thy mother	
8. Thou shall not kill	
9. Thou shall not commit adultery	
10. Thou shall not steal	
11. Thou shall not lie	
Chapter Eight— <i>On Economics</i>	203
1. Economic stimulus or Keynesianism on crack?	
2. Unionism: Freedom to be slaves	
3. The wealth of 'useful idiots'	
Chapter Nine— <i>On Science</i>	213
1. <i>Symposium</i> —Dr. Tiller: Who will mourn your casualties?	
2. Congressional AIDS in D.C.	
3. Liberal hate kills truth	
4. . . . Because liberalism is a mental disorder	
5. Climate myth: 4 corners of deceit	

Chapter Ten—*On Culture and Society* 229

1. Safire, Kristol and *The Spook Who Sat by the Door*
2. Dr. Michael Savage: Prometheus in England
3. The Savage Silence of the Lambs, Part 1
4. The Savage Silence of the Lambs, Part 2
5. *Unhappy* 100th birthday, NAACP
6. Henry Gates vs. Michael Savage
7. A critique of Walter Cronkite
8. We glorify Iran's Hitler and hate Michael Savage?
9. Why Savage's *ad hominem* attacks?
10. Why Cheney, Olson compromised Truth
11. iMichael Jackson
12. J'accuse England! J'accuse America!
13. Joseph Farah, my friend
14. My response to NAACP
15. Lockerbie bomber praised, Savage hated?
16. Vidal, Keillor: 2 infantile liberals

Epilogue—*On History* 276

1. Liberal Fascism through the Ages, Part 2

Endnotes 292

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Have you ever had an idea that you didn't share with anyone because you thought they would think it was a bad idea, or would probably mock you? Then coincidentally, someone comes up to you and suggests the very idea you tried in vain to keep to yourself? That event, in a nutshell was how this collection of approximately 230 essays were eventually published into a two volume book—*The Progressive Revolution, Vol. I* [140 essays] and *Vol. II* [90 essays]. My dear friend, Leonard McCoy, a former professor of Political Science at Savannah State University, is the person of whom I allude to here. In a subsequent essay, *Letter to Generation Y*, I wrote the following lines about Professor Leonard McCoy—"He is also an emergent scholar, a brilliant critical thinker and one of the most dispassionate, logical-minded men I've ever met. During my short tenure at SSU (2008-09) Professor McCoy and I put on eight symposiums and participated in about four or five others."¹ It was this man who singularly urged me in November 2008 to arrange the articles I write twice a week for WorldNetDaily.com into a book; an idea that I had for almost two years earlier, but fear kept me from fulfilling my destiny. It was he that also suggested that I arrange the articles in a topical fashion divided according to the primary discipline which the individual articles were about.

I have to admit in hindsight that Professor McCoy's social, moral and intellectual support of me has truly helped me to do things I probably would not have achieved on my own; at least not in this short time frame. Without his steadfast encouragement, wisdom and academic skills, I doubt that this work would have ever come to fruition. Lenny is

definitely a glass-half-full person as opposed to myself where oftentimes I love to linger longingly in the bed of despair.

Exceeding gratitude to Justice Clarence Thomas to whom I have dedicated these two volumes. Justice Thomas is a dear friend and intellectual mentor of mine whom although I've never met before personally, nor spoken to other than by letter, nevertheless I feel like I've known the man for a lifetime. Justice Thomas has been a true inspiration to me since 1988 when I first arrived as a graduate student at Harvard University in history and law with a future U.S. president, Barack Hussein Obama. It was at Harvard where I *officially* become a conservative although I trace my conservative foundations back to my earliest writings in my school newspaper at DePauw University in January and February 1983. It was Justice Clarence Thomas's pathbreaking writing, *The Higher Law Background of the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment*, a Speech to the Federalist Society for Law and Policy Studies, University of Virginia School of Law (Mar. 5, 1988), later published as a law review article in 12 HARV.J.L. & PUB. POL'Y 63, 68 (1989), which animated and developed my legal worldview. Studying that article at the law library at Harvard Law School was an epiphany experience for me which solidified my emergent conservative philosophy and forever set me on the intellectual path of reestablishing Natural Law and the original intent of the Framers as the only legitimate rule of law and proper constitutional jurisprudence in all American law and policy.

In 1991, during my first year in law school and also during the time of his infamous Supreme Court Confirmation Hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee where his judicial record and legal philosophy were perverted and disparaged by the liberal Democrats on the committee, as well as by progressives, socialists, Black activist groups and the largely White liberal media who has historically gotten a pass on being racist demagogues whenever a Black conservative like Clarence Thomas came in public view because they "made it" without the aid of Democrat social programs. A reoccurring abnormality in our political discourse is when otherwise nice, normal, gregarious, rational White progressives or liberals become unhinged lunatics on the rare occasion that a Black conservative comes into the public spotlight like Clarence Thomas. I was outraged by the merciless slandering of this conservative legal scholar by America, a man of unimpeachable character and moral resolve. Virtually no one came to his defense. The Clarence Thomas case was my most no-

table epiphany and made a profound impact on my life. It was a defining event that solidified my emergent legal and philosophical worldview. His resolute intellectual, philosophical and moral support has cemented a life-long bond between Justice Thomas and myself that exists to this day.

Throughout this work in articles like, *Justice Clarence Thomas—my friend, Clarence Thomas' 'My Grandfather's Son', Time for Revolution and Clarence Thomas: No Black 'Self-respect', and Tribe's Tribalisms*, and in other works are references either directly or indirectly inspired by the natural law jurisprudence of Justice Thomas. In these essays I endeavored to pay a small homage to this brilliant legal mind whom I consider a jurist of the highest order and one of the truly great legal minds to have ever had the honor to sit on the Supreme Court of the United States. On this point Jeffrey Toobin, a senior legal analyst for CNN and longstanding critic of Justice Thomas after 20 years of magnificent judicial opinions was literally forced to admit what conservative legal commentators as myself already knew years ago—that Justice Clarence Thomas was *the* “intellectual leader” of the Supreme Court whose uncompromising conservative jurisprudence rooted in a synthesis of law and morality, natural law and the original intent of the constitutional Framers, heroically brought the Court back from the abyss of the naked judicial activism, welfare-state liberalism, progressivism and positive law of the Warren Court (1953-69) and Berger Court (1969-86). The ship has not been righted yet, however, America can thank the singularly brilliant legal mind of Justice Thomas (a man incidentally that rarely speaks from the bench in open Court) for setting the ship U.S. Supreme Court on the right course that the constitutional Framers mandated 230 years ago.

Toobin wrote in an article on Justice Thomas in the New Yorker in August 2011 which was intended to be a severe criticism of Thomas's alleged “conflict of interest of his politically active wife, Jeanne Thomas and her criticisms of ObamaCare. Toobin and other socialists, liberals and progressives have been demanding that Thomas recues himself from the upcoming Supreme Court case to determine the constitutionality of ObamaCare, particularly the mandate that forces individuals to buy private health-care insurance. However, before he began his tortured diatribe against Thomas he surprised most legal observers by his open praise of the legal mind and jurisprudence of Justice Thomas writing:

[T]his year has . . . been, for him, a moment of triumph. In several of the most important areas of constitutional law, Thomas has emerged as an intellectual leader of the Supreme Court. Since the arrival of Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., in 2005, and Justice Samuel A. Alito, Jr., in 2006, the Court has moved to the right when it comes to the free-speech rights of corporations, the rights of gun owners, and, potentially, the powers of the federal government; in each of these areas, the majority has followed where Thomas has been leading for a decade or more. Rarely has a Supreme Court Justice enjoyed such broad or significant vindication.¹

The writer, Jeffrey Toobin, quotes New York University law professor Steve Calabresi, a co-founder of the Federalist Society: "Of the nine Justices presently on the Court, he is the one whose opinions I enjoy reading the most, [says Calabresi]. They are very scholarly, with lots of historical sources, and his views are the most principled, even among the conservatives. He has staked out some bold positions, and then the Court has set out and moved in his direction."² Ezra Greenberg, in an article in the *American Thinker* wrote regarding Toobin's article in *The New Yorker* that, "The article is ostensibly about how Justice Thomas and his wife Virginia may succeed in shutting down ObamaCare at the constitutional level. Walter Russell Mead and Rush Limbaugh have interpreted the piece as a warning to liberals that it is time to abandon the caricature of Thomas—who now poses a lethal threat to their political ends—as an unqualified intellectual lightweight."³

I remember 20 years ago some of my law professors teaching us students that conventional wisdom stated that just as the first Black member of the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Thurgood Marshall, merely mimicked the judicial philosophy and opinions of William Douglass, likewise Clarence Thomas always agreed with Scalia, but we were lead astray by exactly *who* was influencing *who*? Greenberg adds clarity to this paradox writing, "Toobin also notes that Thomas, not Scalia (as is widely thought) has been the driving force propelling the Supreme Court to an originalist approach on a host of issues, including federalism, gun rights, and election speech."⁴ To that list I would add Thomas's most important contribution a reemergence of natural law jurisprudence which was the original philosophy of the Framers of the Constitution. Nevertheless, despite eloquently and accurately describing the vast positive influence of Justice Thomas on the Court, Toobin's mind is hopelessly shackled in

his liberal/progressive ideology which forces him to disparage the entire jurisprudence of originalism which as I've written for over 20 years is indeed rooted in natural law. Toobin writes:

Thomas's approach to the Eighth Amendment underlines some of the problems with his approach to the Constitution, and with originalism generally. . . . notwithstanding Thomas's enduring certainties, it is difficult to know what the framers would have thought of any given situation. . . . It is true, too, that the framers often disagreed profoundly with each other, making a single intent behind the Constitution even more difficult to discern, and the twenty-seven amendments (all with their own framers) created another overlay of complication. For all of Thomas's conviction, originalism is just another kind of interpretation, revealing as much about Thomas as about the Constitution.⁵

Here, Toobin is dead wrong. Originalism or natural law isn't "just another kind of interpretation" but is based on the original intent of the constitutional Framers which is rooted in an inseparable synthesis of legality and morality and the morality historically has its foundations in America's Judeo-Christian traditions.

Thanks to Dr. Benn Bongang, former Chair of the Department of Political Science at Savannah State University for participating with me and Professor Leonard McCoy in several symposia to help our students reach the Parnassus of critical thinking. These intellectual symposia were co-organized with Professor Leonard McCoy, Dr. Benn Bongang and others. Subsequently I summarized the intent of these symposiums in several articles titled, *Reparations or Redemption?*; *Barackracy Hypocrisy*; *The day I took fire from Obama* and *Dialogue with a Crazy Liberal*. Our students at Savannah State really inspired all of my colleagues to endeavor to be the best professors that we could be.

Thanks also to Joseph Farah, founder and CEO of WorldNetDaily, for giving me a public voice to express my ideas and ideals and for the rare opportunity to write and publish literally hundreds of articles for this outstanding and essential internet political journal. I have been a legal and political commentator for WorldNetDaily since February 2007. Prior to Joseph accepting my unsolicited inquiry to be a commentator at WorldNetDaily, for the prior 24 years (since 1983) when I first became a published author, my writings and intellectual contributions had been virtually ignored by liberals, conservatives, independents and libertarians alike. To his credit, Farah always had a singular vision most other

media figures (of every ideological spectrum) lacked and in my case he literally plucked me out of the pit of obscurity and lifted me to a place of literary honor. For this gesture I am eternally grateful to him as I'm sure every writer that has ever written for WND.com including my esteemed colleague, former GOP presidential candidate Herman Cain, who although few people in the state-controlled media took his campaign seriously, Joseph Farah believed in his conservative ideas and gave him a forum at WorldNetDaily to express them long before the general public even knew who this man was. In the article, *Obscurity was good for me*, I paid homage to Farah and several special others who helped my intellectual development through the years. Thanks also to my primary commentary editor, Ron Strom as well as fellow news editors, Drew Zahn and Chelsea Schilling at WorldNetDaily for their exemplary editorial skills on my essays over the years.

My graduate student assistant at Savannah State University, Lemaro Thompson, read the entire manuscript cover to cover and provided valuable corrections on syntax, style, and format as did my son, Stone Washington whom I paid well-deserved tribute to in an article to be published in a later set of volumes in 2012 (*Letter to Generation Y*). Here is an excerpt from that essay:

My son, Stone Washington, is 14 and will be entering high school this fall. Since he was about 8 I've had him read the great works of literature and book summaries of the classics and write his own summary analyses of those works in addition to reading them to me, correcting his sentence structure, and most importantly making him defend his thesis and arguments.

On July 14, Stone completed writing 100 essays from an anthology called, *Book of Great Books: A Guide to 100 World Classics* by W. John Camp (2000), which is 100 literary classics from the canon of Western civilization including writers like Homer, Plato, Machiavelli, Shakespeare, Voltaire, Goethe, Shelley, Dickens, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Melville, Hemingway, Faulkner, Geo. Orwell, Winston Churchill, Zora Neal Hurston, Maya Angelou, Toni Morrison and many, many more magnificent writers.

I wanted to teach my son that in order for anyone in the world to give a damn about his opinion he needed to *first* have an informed, rational and intelligent opinion. In order to have a coherent, logical opinion he needed to read (and re-read) the great books of Western civiliza-

tion, to teach him to think in grandiose, sublime and transcendent ideas (i.e., ideas above himself).

To demonstrate how knowledge is power and character is destiny, a few months ago when Stone was in the eighth grade he was chosen to be part of a special writing group. When the essays were written and collected, the teacher (Ms. Currier) by chance chose Stone's essay to read to the entire class and was stunned at his level of clarity, sentence structure and intellectual depth. She stated his writing was at the level of a 20-year-old, a college junior.

Overnight Stone's reputation for writing and intellectualism spread across the school campus, including to the principal's office. I told Stone in addition to the bad letters in his file for being repeatedly tardy and bullying that little boy ("Jimmy") in the seventh grade, now you have a good paper in your permanent file to showcase your literary and philosophical side. Stone was visibly proud of this achievement, which made my fighting with him all that time in writing those 100 essays (772 days) worth every word, every sentence . . . every effort.⁶

The collective readership of my weekly columns has proven themselves to be both an invaluable and enduring mainstay to my intellectual growth and development as well as the evolution of the breath and scope of my writings. You are all the wind beneath my wings. My readership has always forced me to constantly revise and rethink my ideas; to never be satisfied no matter how many complimentary emails I receive; to ever improve with each subsequent article or in the words of my favorite Black conservative intellectual, Booker T. Washington who famously wrote—*Do what you can with what you have and never be satisfied.*

Exceeding gratitude to Katie Smith, customer service representative of Joe Christenson Printing Co. in Lincoln, Nebraska, for typesetting the entire text of both Volumes 1 and 2 under very constrained circumstances, and for doing this excellent work with graciousness, professionalism the Christian work ethic. Whenever I called upon her to help me in the shaping of this manuscript into a book, she was always there to provide her outstanding skills in this regard. If anyone reading this book ever has the need for a professional printer I hope that you will solicit Joe Christenson Printing and tell them Ellis Washington sent you.

To Hans Gruen my friend, creator and host of my new website: www.EllisWashingtonReport.com (beg. Feb. 2011), and for his editorial and proofreading assistance. To my friend, Josh Price who is the founder and editor of the ConservativeBeacon.net for his unwavering support

and for partnering with me to regularly appear as a guest on his wonderful video blog.

Other media entities that regularly carry my columns include: Dr. Michael Savage, a iconoclastic conservative intellectual and national radio host, RonPaul2012.net, National Writers Syndicate, BookerRising.com (Shay), BoaNow.com, Citizens for a Constitutional Republic, GreenScreen.com, David B. Shields, Editor-Publisher at Ware Op-Ed & News, WesternFrontAmerica.com, Newsvine.com, WesternJournalism.com, Clipmarks.com, BradleySmithBlog, ChristianityBoard.com, MinorityRepublican.com, FreeRepublic.com, Conservativehq.com, USA-Partisian.blogspot.com, Squidoo.com, BigFlushToilet.com, BlogCatalog.com, TownHall.com, RfcRadio.com, FaithReaders.com, TaraganaBlog.com, Sphere.com, EarlPundit.blogspot, llAmericablogger.com, AIPNews.com, David Ben-Ariel, Johnny2K.com, and last but not least my many liberal antagonists—Sensuouscurmudgeon.com, Ed Brayton of Scienceblogs.com, Terry Krepel, for Media Matters and ConWeb-Watch.com and whose work is often appears on Arianna Huffington's liberal website, HuffingtonPost.com, and many, many more citizen newspapers commonly known as "blogs."

To Dr. Levon Yuille, founder and host of Joshua's Trail, the radio show, voice of Black conservative thought in the metro-Detroit area. Exceeding gratitude to Joshua's Trail radio show, for inviting me to be a co-host on this very important voice of reason and sanity in a growing sea of moral relativism and liberal fascism. To my fellow co-hosts on the show—Milt Harris, Charles McCollough, Ron Edwards, daughter LeVonne Maxwell, Dale Marsh and Fillippo (Phil) Stargel and to WDTK AM Detroit staff, Chris MacCourtney (GM), Brad Smith (Sales Manager), Brian, our faithful engineer and to Salem Communications for supporting Joshua's Trial for seven years and counting. Many of the ideas contained in these essays came from Dr. Yuille outstanding scholarly research and monologues he delivers every week and from my fellow colleagues who always have such wonderful words of wisdom and truth to what America's constitutional Framers and Founders dreamed our nation could become.

Finally, I would like to give special thanks to my dear children whom I love exceedingly—Stone Allen (age 14) and Eden Alice (age 10), who both read small portions of the manuscript and offered their innocent, precocious, but nevertheless, profound perspectives which for even

the most jaded or seasoned writer must covet as an invaluable resource to keep one's writing interesting, pure, engaging and relevant. To help my son improve on his reasoning, research and writing skills, Stone has so far written summary analyses on over two dozen of my WND.com essays.

Prologue

[President Woodrow] Wilson's view of politics could be summarized by the word, "statolatry," or state worship . . . Wilson wrote approvingly in *The State*, "does now whatever experience permits or the times demand." ²

~ Jonah Goldberg, *Liberal Fascism*

My sixth and seventh books—*The Progressive Revolution*—was originally titled, "Statolatry and Progressivism." I changed the initial title because I was afraid it sounded too esoteric and ambiguous. I wanted to be very clear here about my intent to expose the historical significance and deconstruction that the Progressive Age or the Progressive Revolution (*circa* 1870—present) has continuously plagued society under. These volumes are a collection of selected essays and articles from the weekly columns I write for WorldNetDaily.com—an Internet independent news website of conservative thought and ideas. This opus is divided into two volumes—Vol. I (2007-08 articles), Vol. II (2009 articles) which rather than being arranged chronologically by date, are organized topically according to their subject matter as well as the primary intellectual disciplines which they cover. While invariably there were some overlap between the primary and secondary subject matter of each essay, nevertheless their categories have been arranged according to the dominate stream of thought I had for each opus at the time they were conceived. For example, an article that has both law and political aspects will fall under the law group of essays if that stream of thought predominates in the article and vice versa.

The articles are written in a variety of styles from essays in the traditions of great essayists of the past like Bacon, Franklin, Jefferson, Carlyle, C.K. Chesterton, C.S. Lewis, Allan Bloom, to present writers like: British historian Paul Johnson, P.J. O'Rourke, William Kristol, Bill Bennett, George Will, Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams and one of my earliest intellectual mentors, John Whitehead (Founder of The Rutherford Institute), a very important guardian of our civil liberties according to the original intent of America's Framers and for whose organization I clerked for during my first year of law school. Other essays hearken back to antiquity and are conceived in the dialectical style of my favorite phi-

osopher, Socrates (470-399 B.C.). The essays written as a dialogue I have euphemistically titled, *Symposium*, after Plato's opus by that same name which classically detailed the life, times, philosophy . . . and the eventual death of his beloved and iconic teacher, Socrates. Other essays are in free-style and possess an improvisational manner in style, form and substance amounting to an extemporaneous intellectual discourse on a particular literary theme, while other essays are general news columns, iconoclastic articles, or opinion-editorials of a more general and topical nature. To borrow a musical genre from the classical masters, some of my essays follow polyphonic or counterpoint styles like theme and variations, suite or prelude and fugue forms (after Johann Sebastian Bach) and the Baroque Period (1600-1750), other essays follow a deeper more complex subtleties of a *leitmotiv*, referring to a recurring musical or literary theme, associated with a particular person, place, or idea (after Richard Wagner's music dramas) or an *idée fixe*, fixed idea (after Hector Berlioz's tone poems) which emerged during the introspective, passionate, fantastic and macabre world of the Romantic Period (1820-1900), my favorite period of music and literary history. One thing all of these assorted and diverse essays, articles and Socratic dialogues have in common besides the author is a specific intent not to merely be written for a specific time and place. These essays, although separate entities were originally conceived and designed as small parts of a greater whole. They were also originally written to be timeless, literary works for the ages and would transcend the existential history, parochial politics transfixed by time and current events despite the fact that many of the issues discussed have long since passed, yet the ideas and ideals represented in these volumes are timeless and people, ideas, and motives have endured for the ages.

The phrase, "liberalism fascism," next to progressivism is the major theme of this work in addition to the subtitle of both volumes 1 and 2. My analysis of liberal fascism through the ages in these various short essays covering 11 different subject areas is the common philosophical thread that holds the entire book together. My chief inspiration came from Jonah Goldberg's outstanding book, *Liberal Fascism: The Secret History of the American Left, from Mussolini to the Politics of Meaning*, who made this singular statement of truth regarding this political philosophy who wrote, *It is my argument that American liberalism is a totalitarian political religion*. Using this thesis statement in the manner that classical music

composer Hector Berlioz used as an *idée fixe* or in Richard Wagner used as a *leitmotiv*, in virtually every essay I am either critiquing liberalism, criticizing liberal politicians (including RINOs [e.g., Republicans in name only]), moderates, Green Party, communists, communist sympathizers, socialists, socialist sympathizers, leftist intellectuals, Marxist academics, positive law judges, liberal lawyers, evolution scientists; even offering rebuttal to conventional thinking and people and society who espouse a progressive, liberal or a socialist worldview. The ideas of progressivism contained in these volumes are not new, unique, nor especially creative, but history has repeatedly demonstrated that progressive politics are excessively destructive to culture and society . . . and purposely so for it was Lord Acton who said, "The central idea of Machiavelli is that the state power is not bound by the moral law. The law is not above the state, but below it." That, in a nutshell is what I mean by "statolatry" or state worship which I contend are ideas synonymous with liberalism, progressivism, socialism, Darwinism, and liberal fascism, damnable ideologies which are all merely variations on a Marxist theme.

While I do not intend to be polemical for arguments sake, but draw my line of argumentation out of classical intellectual and philosophical traditions; particularly those paradigms in the dialectical manner of Socrates (Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Locke, Montesquieu, Blackstone, etc.) This is not my first effort at this genre. Two earlier attempts to use Socratic dialectical reasoning are in my books: *Beyond the Veil: Essays in the Dialectical Style of Socrates* (2000, 2004 [rev. ed.]). However, in this *opus* only a small percentage of articles are in Socratic dialogue style, nevertheless, Socratic logic, inductive/deductive reasoning, rationalism, anti-Gnosticism and his enduring love for *Veritas* (truth) predominates throughout these volumes.

In these books I will endeavor to raise profound and pivotal issues in a creative, multi-dimensional formats borrowing heavily from literature, history, philosophy; to scrupulously critique what I consider many of the inherent contradictions of liberalism and its related political philosophies—humanism, egalitarianism, secularism, Marxism progressivism, socialism, communism, and Keynesianism. To plumb the intellectual depths of ancillary related ideas that have sprung forth from magnificent writers of the classical liberal traditions of the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Age of Enlightenment, Romanticism into modern times of

the twentieth post-Modernism and emergent new ideas of twenty first century.

Goldberg makes the following prescient statement which will serve as a leitmotiv throughout this opus:

The militarization of society and politics was considered simply the best available means toward this end. Call it what you like—progressivism, fascism, communism, or totalitarianism—the first true enterprise of this kind was established not in Russia or Italy or Germany but in the United States, and Woodrow Wilson was the twentieth century's first fascist dictator.²

Here Goldberg succinctly summarizes political liberalism and progressivism and places it in its proper historical context; a virtual unified field theory for leftist politics whereby the classical liberalism of Adam Smith, Montesquieu, Blackstone, Locke, whose ideas and writings of politics and philosophy were of critical importance to America's Constitutional Framers of the eighteenth century, as well as America's Founding Fathers, legendary men like—Washington, Ames, Adams, Franklin, Madison, Jefferson, Mason, Adams, Witherspoon, have in many respects morphed into progressivism of the 1870s and '80s, which over time transposed into the full-blown liberal fascism of Woodrow Wilson (1913-21) of whom Goldberg dubbed "the world's first fascist dictator." (However, I believe that Theodore Roosevelt [a Republican] was actually the first Progressive U.S. president). After a 12 year hiatus during so-called "Roaring Twenties" liberalism, or as I more accurately reference throughout these volumes, "progressivism" came back with a vengeance with the four terms of Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1933-45), whose omnipresent, Leviathan welfare state he erected to provide among many things Social Security was in reality envisioned to secure Democratic Party security and power for eternity. What FDR's braintrust ubiquitously referred to as the "New Deal" and was originally designed to enslave the people to Marxism and socialist cradle-to-grave government like a crack addict is enslaved to cocaine; to so grow government by leaps and bounds so much so that it becomes a permanent part of conventional society and culture and any Republican politician that would later come along foolish enough to cut or defund any aspect of the New Deal and later LBJ's "Great Society" would be deemed to have stepped on the "third rail" of politics and will have been deemed to commit political suicide. 80 years since FDR plunged America into socialism without le-

gitimate constitutional legality such mainstay programs like Social Security, AAA, WPA, NLRB and *statolatry* (state worship or worship of the state) has almost become passé. What began under Wilson and was completed under FDR, essentially amounts to Third American Revolution and under the current president Barrack Hussein Obama (2009—), will, especially if he wins a second term in 2012, for a least a generation if not more send America into a second Great Depression and societal anarchy from which we shall probably never recover. America, the greatest nation in the history of the world has for decades been mired in the abyss of this grand, existential Marxist welfare state of which Winston Churchill prophesied in the 1930s that, *"Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery."*

Goldberg continues his historical discourse on liberalism and its comprehensive and deconstructive devastation into every aspect of culture and society, to its irrevocable roots- the evolution theory of Charles Darwin:

The progressives were the real social Darwinists as we think of the term today—though they reserved the term for their enemies . . . They believed in eugenics. They were imperialists. They were convinced that the state could, through planning and pressure, create a pure race, a society of new men. They were openly and proudly hostile to individualism. Religion was a political tool, while politics was the true religion. The progressives viewed the traditional system of constitutional checks and balances as an outdated impediment to progress because such horse-and-buggy institutions were a barrier to their own ambitions. Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws was the enemy of progress shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers.³

Of course most universities in America (or anywhere else for that matter) will not teach you this anti-consensus view of history and the indelible connection between social Darwinism—imperialism—individualism—anti-Christianity—totalitarianism—fascism and liberalism, because to do so would cause this tragic cognitive dissonance in young, impressionable college students and their leftist professors to abandoning the morality of their parents or even discard their entire intellectual worldview. Nevertheless, this entrenched, intractable Darwin zeitgeist, if one has an open mind of history, has essentially permeated every aspect of society. The Democratic Party, progressives, socialists,

and liberals who have controlled the mainstream media and the public education and the academy since the creation of the National Education Association (NEA) in 1857, have made an art form out of controlling the dialogue by using classical Freudian techniques of displacement, transference and psychological projection, a psychosis and defense mechanism whereby one ascribes to ones enemies ideas and beliefs that you yourself practice or believe to be true but are afraid to admit. Liberals control the language via the media, education, the academy, Hollywood through Orwellian newspeak, the definition and use of any word is what Goldstein says it is as demonstrated in this well-known passage from George Orwell's famous 1948 dystopian novel, 1984:

But what was strange was that although Goldstein was hated and despised by everybody, although every day and a thousand times a day, on platforms, on the telescreen, in newspapers, in books, his theories were refuted, smashed, ridiculed, held up to the general gaze for the pitiful rubbish that they were, in spite of all this, his influence never seemed to grow less. Always there were fresh dupes waiting to be seduced by him.⁴

In a tribute essay to Professor Allan Bloom (d. 1992), a great but forgotten American philosopher, classist and historian who started a reformation in the late 1980s arguing that the leftist academy had lost its moral authority as the intellectual arbiters of society by embracing liberalism, Darwinism, moral relativism, legal positivism among other pseudo philosophies which since the 1960s has lost the faith of students who look to teachers and professors as protectors of the collected wisdom of the ages. Bloom, like the ancient prophets of the Old Testament declared that the academy needed to return to teaching the classics. Inspired by Bloom's 1987 classic, *The Closing of the American Mind*, in a 2011 essay I wrote these lines:

If Lenin boasted, "Give me four years to teach the children and the seed I have sown will never be uprooted," then the 100 years the academy has incessantly labored to deconstruct the canon of Western civilization and replace it with a existential progressive revolution, a Marxist zeitgeist, Social Darwinism, Nietzschean nihilism and relativism—from the 1880s to the publication of his book in 1987—makes professor Bloom a truly heroic figure of Homeric proportions for even attempting to uproot the evil seeds this diabolical trinity had planted in American intellectual life and worldwide.⁵

Therefore, liberals, primarily through the media, the academy, and Stalinist public schools since the advent of social Darwinism in 1860s have characterized Republicans (particularly conservatives) with such enduring epithets as the "philosophy of hate," "hatemongers," "radicals," "fascists," "Nazis" "censors," "right-wing fanatics" and all the other scandalous epithets. However, a cursory reading of America history and American intellectual politics sets our current battle of ideas at the publication of Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species* (1859), but more particularly, his follow-up to that book, *The Descent of Man* (1871). Up to modern times there is an unmistakable connection Darwinism and all of its permutations (i.e., Social Darwinism, evolution, imperialism, individualism, anti-Christianity, totalitarianism, Marxism, socialism, Trotskyism, positivism, naturalism and fascism), which as I stated many times before are the primary foundations of modern liberalism.

Law professor, Herbert Hovenkamp, in his law review article, *The Mind and Heart of Progressive Legal Thought*, wrote these important lines about the much-disputed actual starting point of the Progressive Era:

The beginning and end of Progressive legal thought are difficult to locate, but dates and events help place ideas in context. For the beginning I suggest 1871, or the publication date of Charles Darwin's *The Descent of Man*, which linked the human species to the theory of evolution.⁽¹⁾ For the end the year that comes to mind is 1960, the publication date of Ronald Coase's *The Problem of Social Cost*,⁽²⁾ the text that re-invigorated the law's renewed interest in the "unregulated" market. But there are alternative choices: James M. Landis's *Report on Regulatory Agencies to the President Elect* in 1960⁽³⁾ has become a symbol of our loss of faith in the Progressive vision of government regulation.⁽⁴⁾ The critique of democratic process made by Kenneth Arrow in the late fifties and sixties,⁽⁵⁾ and of James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock in 1962⁽⁶⁾ did much the same for political decision making generally. Although these documents differed substantially from one another, each worked to convince us that government process is unstable or incoherent, or that regulation will not find the public interest, but is more likely to be captured by special interest groups. Each of these critiques represents a sharp turn from the essentially republican vision of government that dominated Progressive legal thought, to a more classical view emphasizing the efficiency and robustness of private markets, and the many imperfections of public processes.⁶

I would agree with Hovenkamp thorough historical analysis regarding the 1871 date as year one of the progressive revolution, but also the

year democratic socialism and the welfare state which as state policy first occurred in Germany under Otto von Bismarck (1862-90) who created the modern welfare state by building upon a tradition of welfare programs established in Prussia and Saxony in the 1840s. Otto von Bismarck, prime minister of Prussia (a hero of Hitler and the Nazis) originated the welfare state in actual German policies particularly from 1871 to 1878 and established a radical secularization policy as a pretext to destroy the influence of the Roman Catholic Church on society. At its foundation liberal fascism is of necessity anti-religious and anti-intellectual thus facilitating state socialism first starting in Germany and quickly spread throughout Europe, America and the world where it plagues society to this day.⁷ I differ with Hovenkamp and most consensus liberal historians like Charles Beard, Carl Becker, and Richard Hofstadter is that I don't view the Progressive Age as a singular movement occupying a specific period of time, but an existential revolution (like the French Revolution) which since the early 1870s in Bismarkian Germany continues in one form or another to this day in the openly progressive and socialist policies of President Barack Hussein Obama. I contend that progressivism (like communism and Neo-Nazism) simply went underground during periods of conservative politics in American history like the 1920s under Warren, Coolidge and Hoover (the early years) and the Reagan Revolution (1981-08) give or take a couple of years. No one could rationally argue against the fact that under President Barack Obama a new age of Progressivism has been aggressively enacted.

Another aspect of progressivism I explore in this book is liberalism's willful blindspot towards evil which has lead historically to their irrational devotion to dictators and embrace of totalitarian policy initiatives (at least until they go "too far"), which violate people's fundamental rights as a means of totalitarian morality, coercion, control and punishment. Liberals, socialists, fascists, radicals and progressives beginning with Woodrow Wilson and effecting such a diverse group of progressive intellectuals as Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw, W.E.B. Du Bois, Herbert Croly, Theodore Roosevelt, Walter Lippmann, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Charles Beard, Richard Hofstadter, Margaret Sanger, and many others, revered and coveted the power of fascist, totalitarian dictators like Lenin, Stalin, Hitler and especially Mussolini. These influential American intellectuals on the left maintained a religious-like devotion that the State could, through planning and pressure, create a Utopia, a

pure race, a society of new men. Nietzsche called this end, *Übermensch* (Superman), aristocracy paradigm, *Will to Power*, atheism and moral relativism. Of course the apotheosis of Nietzsche was concurrently manifested in 1933 in Hitler's Nazism and his Third Reich and in America's first and second socialist dictators—Woodrow Wilson, but particularly Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his "New Deal." Regarding the dystopia 1920s and 30s that ushered in a new and grotesque era of savagery and genocide, Professor Bloom wrote:

But the Weimar Republic, so attractive in its left-wing version to Americans, also contained intelligent persons, who were attracted, at least in the beginning, to fascism, for reasons very like those motivating the Left ideologues, reflections on autonomy and value creation. Once one plunges into the abyss, there is no assurance whatsoever that equality, democracy or socialism will be found on the other side. At very best, self-determination is indeterminate. . . . Both [Heidegger and Nietzsche] helped to constitute that ambiguous Weimar atmosphere in which liberals looked like simpletons and anything was possible for people who sang of the joy of the knife in cabarets.⁸

Historically, if twentieth century secularists, socialists, liberals and progressives, it appears that progressives were openly hostile to individualism and American exceptionalism. The apotheosis of liberalism in America reached its zenith in the societal collapse of the early 1960s where Democrats, particularly after the death of JFK in 1963, fully mastered the political techniques of community organization, coalition building of desperate, radical elements of society—ethnics, homosexuals, Blacks, feminists, anarchists, communists, academics, unionists, artists, leftist intellectuals, working-class Catholics, etc., which came to its inevitable apotheosis under disastrous failure of presidential candidate Walter Mondale in 1972. These diverse groups essentially made up the liberal Democratic Party even to this day and they did not go away, but like good Machiavellians, adopted their amoral tactics of the end justifies the means by hiding their true intentions and going underground. The irony of putting together this coalition is that those each group were courted to join the Democrat coalition because of their differences, liberals hate individuals and love to balkanize us into warring factions that they can then exploit for their own acquisition of political power. The transcendent guarantees of the Declaration of Independence: ". . . Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness," are meaningless rhetoric to most progressives

to today. (When was the last time you saw liberals express any real patriotism in public?) To the liberal mind we are not individuals created in the image of God, but faceless, warring groups (Blacks, Jews, gays, Hispanics, Indians, Asians, elderly, poor, rich, middle-class). To progressives we are proletariat cogs in the vast machinery of the Leviathan State, manipulated like rats chasing cheese through a maze for the "greater good" by self-appointed progressive elites . . . nothing more!

Modern liberalism is also openly hostile to religion, especially Christianity and fights to make it illegal or impotent in the marketplace of ideas at every opportunity (especially during the Christmas season). Karl Marx, an atheist, Satanist and the father of communism, called "religion the opiate of the people." Many political historians credit George Soros's money, influence and his vast media empire to be largely responsible for electing a inconspicuous senator from Illinois who voted "present" 130 times; a Marxist professor who taught social nihilism tactics of Saul Alinsky, whose first memoir was ghostwritten by Bill Ayers, co-founder of the terrorist group Weather Underground, as president of the United States in November 2008. Indeed, President Obama is singularly the triumph of the Progressive Revolution.

Liberal and progressive pressure groups like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), founded in 1930 by the communist and communist sympathizer Roger Baldwin, Planned Parenthood, a radical abortion rights group founded by the racist, Darwinist and eugenicist, Margaret Sanger, NAACP, a Black civil rights group founded in 1909 by a group of White and Black progressives including the famous Black intellectual W.E.B. Du Bois, a Harvard-trained scholar who openly disdained the lower classes of Blacks and like most progressive intellectuals of his era, openly praised Hitler's Nazism as a paradigm for America to follow even as late as Obama's Chicagoland comrade, Nation of Islam leader, Minister Louis Farrakhan, called "Hitler a very great man for Germany" in March 1984 speech.

History has borne out time and time again that Marxists, progressives and liberals have always had a love affair for fascist governments abroad as well as at home beginning with the Woodrow Wilson administration (1913-21) who among other things immediately fired all Black federal workers, imprisoned thousands who protested World War I and pushed the Sixteenth Amendment which created the Federal Reserve Act, a federal income tax and the Federal Reserve and the Seventeenth

Amendment which caused many contemporary political historians to dub "1913-The Worst Year Ever!" Wilson's fascism predated Lenin's Bolshevik revolution by 4 years (1917) and Mussolini's fascist revolution by 9 years (1922) which is why Goldberg rightly states "Woodrow Wilson was the twentieth century's first fascist dictator." Other well-respected progressives of the early 1900s who had sympathetic views towards fascist governments included: Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Norman Thomas, the head of the American Socialist Party, Rexford Guy Tugwell, an important member of FDR's braintrust, Walter Lippmann, Herbert Croly, John Dewey, and Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. Each of these progressives as well as legions of progressive and liberal pressure groups (most recently *Occupy Wall Street* [OWS]) from their beginnings have had a covert and overt hatred of free market capitalism, traditional religion, and fanatically believe that liberalism is the only legitimate religion of the left that is allowed full expression in what Holmes called the "marketplace of ideas." Goldberg characterized these sentiments this way: *It is my argument that American liberalism is a totalitarian political religion.*

America having endured eight years of yet another establishment Republican President George Bush (2001-2009) where such socialist, anti-conservative policies as printing money to spend trillions of dollars led to TARP I, and under President Obama, led to TARP II, bailouts (i.e., government welfare) of Wall Street investment banks, the mortgage industry, and big-cities across America in bankruptcy, without even making the pretense of constitutional legitimacy. Bush-43 even had the gall to admit, "You have to destroy capitalism in order to save it." ⁹ Bush-43, perhaps unwittingly, seems to make Lenin's tactics to destroy capitalism seem prophetic: "The proletariat needs state power, the centralized organization of force, the organization of violence for the purpose of crushing the resistance of the exploiters."

Starting with President Woodrow Wilson in 1913, but continuing with renewed vigor under FDR in the 1930s and 40s, Goldberg said of the progressive movement of the late nineteenth, early twentieth century that:

The progressives viewed the traditional system of constitutional checks and balances as an outdated impediment to progress because such horse-and-buggy institutions were a barrier to their own ambitions. Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and

antiquated laws was the enemy of progress shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers.¹⁰

We see the apotheosis of Leviathan liberalism in modern times with contemporary American presidents, including such openly liberal and progressive presidents as—Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Hoover, FDR, Truman, Eisenhower, LBJ, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Bush-41, Clinton, Bush-43 and Barack Obama, that the age of neo-Marxism, anti-constitutionalism and judicial activism has fully manifested itself in all its dictatorial glory that very few commentators on TV or radio or in print rarely refer to the blackletter text of the Constitution either as a point of debate or to bolster one's argument or criticism against the president, Congress and the Courts when they overtly deviate from the original intent of the Constitution's Framers. In modern parlance it's simply not good manners to quote from the Constitution when discussing the Constitution or even to publically show George Washington or religious symbolism.¹¹ To American's traditional guardians of the Constitution (e.g., judges, lawyers, law academics, politicians, think tanks), the Constitution has tragically become an existential deadletter.

Goldberg concludes his analysis of liberalism and liberal fascism with these words: "Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws was the enemy of progress shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers."¹² This brings to mind a persistent observation I and others like Justices Clarence Thomas and Antonin Scalia and conservative intellectuals, Ann Coulter and Laura Ingraham have made about liberals and liberalism for years: Liberals hate the Constitution because it reminds them too much of the Biblical precepts of the Judeo-Christian tradition and natural law which originated it. What I mean is that for anyone who has even a cursory understanding of the Constitution and the history of how America became a Republic one cannot ignore the fact that Christianity was an inseparable concept in the foundation of the Constitution which is why George Washington, the father of the American Revolution famously said that "It is impossible to rightly govern any nation without God and the Bible." Liberals aren't stupid; they know the obvious Christian history of America and therefore for the past 150 years have since Darwin's theory of evolution endeavored to obfuscate and rewrite history to remove every aspect of America's Judeo-Christian heritage and replace it

with atheism, evolution, Marxism and progressivism. Tragically, progressives have been very successful at this.

What Goldberg alludes to with language like, "Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws," is precisely what I mean by liberals 150 year war against Christianity. If they can destroy or render impotent the presuppositions of Christianity and the Constitution, what do you have left? A socialist state in the manner of what Woodrow Wilson, FDR, LBJ and now Obama are assiduously trying to resurrect since Reagan's counter socialist revolution (1981-89). One primary technique to pulling America away from its moral roots is to destroy the idea that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. If liberals are successful at achieving this, then the progressives including the socialist engineers, activist judges, Marxists academics, U.N. bureaucrats and Democratic Party socialists will fill the void. It was the Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, a progressive jurist who also ran for president of the United States in 1916 (loosing narrowly to Woodrow Wilson) who infamously said: "The constitution is what the judges say it is." ¹³ This is tantamount to treasonous. Justice Hughes might as well have added the unspoken sentiment . . . *and the Constitution and the Framers of the Constitution be damned!* This has been the original intent of the progressive revolution and the majority of intellectuals, judges, lawyers, academics and politicians on the left since the 1870s, and tragically the Age of Progressivism and continues to plague society and undermine America's Republic under President Barack Obama to this day.

Once the constitutional Framers and natural law is summarily ignored, deconstructed or perverted by Congress and the courts, socialism (which has morphed in progressivism) is virtually instantaneous then concepts like freedom, liberty, free market economy, capitalism, freedom of religion, the press and assembly will be anachronistic relics of a long-dead era of the past as liberals will treat conservatives, Republicans, independents, Jews, Christians and all those who give credence to the original intent of the Constitution's Framers in the words of Goldberg will be considered, "the enemy of progress [because they] shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers." ¹⁴

CEO Joseph Farah, my fellow colleague at WorldNetDaily.com once wrote, "Government is not your friend; it is the enemy of freedom. Government is not Santa Claus; it is the Grinch. Government is not your servant; it tends, all too often, to be our master. Government seldom

helps people; it often enslaves them.”¹⁵ Farah is absolutely right, but due to the Stalinist public education in America over the past 150 years, fewer Americans have the historical understanding or intellectual capacity to realize these self-evident truths through deductive reasoning.

Indeed, Sir Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of England, echoed similar sentiments as Hitler’s dreaded Nazi’s unleashed their blitzkrieg (lightning war) across Europe in World War II, said that “Socialism [liberalism] is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery.”¹⁶ Another great English Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher who said, “The cry for freedom dwells within the heart of each person and is divinely inspired.” Would to God that President Barack Obama would heed the wise words of these conservative intellectuals, but he won’t for his allegiance is toward a more sinister and diabolical lineage of political leaders—not the laudable intellectual tradition St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Montesquieu, Blackstone, Burke, Locke, Washington, Madison, Jefferson, but the Progressive’s political genealogy follows the more ignoble and damnable ideas of Hobbes, Descartes, Voltaire, Rousseau, Napoleon, Marx, Darwin, Wilson, Margaret Sanger, Mussolini, Hitler, FDR, LBJ, Saul Alinsky, Laurence Tribe, William Ayers and Bernadine Dohrn . . . culminating in the apotheosis of Barack Hussein Obama.

As you are reading the articles and essays of this book remember the profound words of America’s third president, Thomas Jefferson—*A government big enough to give you everything you want is strong enough to take away everything you have.* To that prophetic statement I would only add . . . including your liberty.

Every morning I make it a habit to listen to the transcendent music of Johann Sebastian Bach (1685-1750), in my opinion the greatest musical genius in the history of music. I do this to cleanse my mind of the cares of this world, the evil ideas and anti-intellectual poisons that vexes everyone who loves *Veritas* (truth). Bach would often write this inscription at the end of his most ambitious works—*Soli Deo Gloria* (To God alone be the glory) . . . and so do I . . .

Soli Deo Gloria.

CHAPTER

~1~

ON LAW

ON LAW—ESSAY 1

FIRST AMENDMENT IN THE AGE OF OBAMA

October 24, 2009

Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.

~ John Adams

The opening five words of the First Amendment, “*Congress shall make no law . . .*” represents the central tenets of what the Bill of Rights stands for: limits on government power to limit or compel religious beliefs, the right to hold political opinions and express them, protections for a free press, the right to assemble peaceably, and the right to petition the government, through protest or the ballot, for a redress of political grievances. Let’s take a look at how the First Amendment is viciously and relentlessly attacked in the Age of Obama:

❖ *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;*

George Washington, perhaps the greatest figure of American history, once said, "It is impossible to rightly govern a nation without God and the Bible." John Adams, our second president said, "Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." Religion to the framers of the Constitution, not just any religion, but religion out of the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought, was indispensable to the success of America as well as to the continuing survival of our republic. If Christianity is so important, why did Congress allow the Supreme Court, in the 1947 case of *Everson v. Board of Education* to unilaterally remove funding to parochial schools through the judge-created doctrine "separation of church and state"? Such judicial tyranny as *Everson* over the past 62 years has denigrated American society and culture more than anything else

❖ *Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech.*

When conservative Rush Limbaugh, became part of a group of investors interested in buying the NFL's St. Louis Rams, he was prevented by the racial demagoguery of the Rev. Al "Tawana Brawley" Sharpton and Rev. Jesse "Hymietown" Jackson. How?—Based on unfounded racist remarks planted on Wikipedia purportedly by a New York law firm with ties to Rudy Giuliani. The Stalinist-controlled media was delighted that Limbaugh's freedom of speech rights were violated because they have an irrational hatred of conservatives and conservative ideas, including free-market capitalism and morality.

❖ *Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of the press;*

On May 5, when conservative intellectual and radio host Dr. Michael Savage was unjustly singled out by England and his name placed on a banned list with Muslim terrorists, Hamas murders, neo-Nazis and Russian mobsters, the government-controlled media in America was utterly indifferent. Now that the Obama administration has launched a full frontal attack against Fox News, Rush Limbaugh and Glenn Beck, the GOP is finally waking up to notice that Obama is reviving Nixonian tactics, including an "enemies list." ¹

❖ *Congress shall make no law prohibiting the right of people to assemble nor prohibiting petitioning the government for a redress of grievances.*

The Justice Department, under Attorney General Eric Holder, has been aggressive against recent acts of Americans exercising their First Amendment rights to peaceably assemble, e.g., the tea party movement, the Birther movement, the anti-Obama-health-care movement. However, this same Justice Department recently ordered the dismissal of a voting-rights case against members of the New Black Panther Party in Philadelphia who were caught on camera blocking voters from entering the polls.

If you think I write from hyperbole, just a few days ago in the small town of Kinston, N.C., the people there had a ballot initiative to remove all political designations from the ballots. Here is an excerpt from that story:

Voters in this small city decided overwhelmingly last year to do away with the party affiliation of candidates in local elections, but the Obama administration recently overruled the electorate and decided that equal rights for black voters cannot be achieved without the Democratic Party. The Justice Department's ruling, which affects races for City Council and mayor, went so far as to say partisan elections are needed so that black voters can elect their "candidates of choice"—identified by the department as those who are Democrats and almost exclusively black.

The department ruled that white voters in Kinston will vote for blacks only if they are Democrats and that therefore the city cannot get rid of party affiliations for local elections because that would violate black voters' right to elect the candidates they want.²

Obama's fascist tactics against a valid voting initiative essentially is saying that black people are too stupid to vote for the people they want, despite the fact that Kinston, N.C., has a population that is 65 percent black. In the Age of Obama, America is internationally mocked, defenseless, bankrupted and on our knees. Since Jan. 20, America has been in the midst of a bloodless *coup d'état* fueled by chaos theory, never allowing a good crisis go to waste, and the genocidal ideas of Marx, Mao and Alinsky. To America's Narcissist-in-Chief, Barack Obama and his legions of fascist minions, *We the People* are the enemy. When Obama says, "I'm just getting started," he is deadly serious. What this means is that

every cog of the multi-trillion-dollar machinery we call the federal government will be used to achieve the supreme will of President Obama. The passage of socialist health care and the ratification of the Copenhagen climate-change treaty Dec. 7-18 must be signed into law before the 2010 elections—otherwise Obama will become a one-term wonder.

On this bogus climate-change treaty Lord Christopher Mockton,³ a respected British scientist and former adviser in the conservative administration of Margaret Thatcher, said: “If President Obama signs the Copenhagen climate-change treaty, he “will sign your freedom, your democracy and your prosperity away forever—and neither you nor any subsequent government you may elect would have any power whatsoever to take it back again.” America, the choice is simple—will it be the constitutional *framers* or the unconstitutional *fascists*?

ON LAW—ESSAY 2

HATE-CRIMES LAW = FASCISM

October 31, 2009

All violent crimes are hate crimes, and all crime victims deserve equal justice. This law [Hate Crimes Prevention Act] is a grave threat to the First Amendment because it provides special penalties based on what people think, feel, or believe.

~ Eric Stanley, Alliance Defense Fund

Chelsea Schilling, my colleague at WorldNetDaily.com, I thought did an excellent job in her recent article on this administration's latest act against America, “Obama signs ‘hate-crimes’ bill into law.”⁴ Hate-crimes bill, but how can this be? I thought the Constitution said that *Congress shall make no law* against religious freedom or the right to hold political opinions and express them. The Democrats were Machiavellian enough to link this hate-crimes bill to their new \$680 billion bill called the 2010 National Defense Authorization Act which many Republicans felt compelled to support to stand behind our troops fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Why the urgency for a hate-crimes bill?

President Obama said, "After more than a decade, we've passed inclusive hate-crimes legislation to help protect our citizens from violence based on what they look like, who they love, how they pray or who they are." Obama, by the passage of this hate-crimes bill, has succeeded in fulfilling the 1960s countercultural dream of normalizing the abnormal and morally perverse while concurrently denigrating the normal, the good and the godly. This hate-crimes bill should have been named the ACA—*Anti-Christian Act*—for this legislation in essence will put a muzzle on ministers and rabbis and forbid them from preaching against the homosexual, lesbian, bisexual and transgender lifestyles dominating our culture at pain of civil rights lawsuits, fines, arrests and even imprisonment. Are we living in America or in Communist Russia under Lenin and Stalin? Of the many constitutional problems with hate-crime laws, one of the most venal, surreptitious and reminiscent of George Orwell's 1984 is the fact that these fascist laws punish our very thoughts. It is not so much a hate-crimes law, but in reality a *thought-crimes* law, for (absent an invalidation by the Supreme Court) people, particularly Christians, will be severely punished for speaking out against what they consider to be immoral behavior expressly prohibited in the Bible.

The great Austrian economist and writer Friedrich Hayek, in his book *The Road to Serfdom*, said, "Wherever liberty as we understand it has been destroyed, this has almost always been done in the name of some new freedom promised to the people. . . . The collective freedom (the Tyrant) offers us is not freedom of the members of society but the unlimited freedom of the planner to do with society what he pleases."⁵ Hayek was right, and though this book was first published 65 years ago he could have easily been speaking about President Obama today, for with these new, expansive powers Obama will have under the hate-crimes laws, like tyrannical regimes of the past, he can go after his No. 1 enemies—the Christian right and conservative media, including Fox News, alternative media like WorldNetDaily.com and talk radio like Michael Savage.

Once he has silenced ministers, rabbis and conservative media from speaking out against immorality, and once Obama passes the health-care reform bill and the Copenhagen Climate Change Treaty in December 2009, he will have *de jure* (legal) and *de facto* (unofficial) control over eve-

ry American from cradle to grave. Remember, America's enduring symbol of the rule of law, Lady Justice, wears a blindfold. Why? To demonstrate that Lady Justice is no respecter of persons; Lady Justice cares nothing about wealth, race, creed, color, gender or sexual orientation. All that Lady Justice cares about is *Veritas*—truth. There can be no truth in law without morality. There can be no morality in the law without God and the Bible.

On Oct. 27-8, 2008, Ann Fishman, an attorney and founder of the Liberty Legal Project International, put on a timely two-day legal conference at the Congressional Auditorium in Washington, D.C., on Freedom of Speech and Religion at which I was one of the invited speakers. After the conference, one of the politicians who spoke, Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-TX, the *de facto* House historian, was magnanimous enough to offer a group of my colleagues a personal tour of Capitol Hill. In the House of Representatives stands a famous life-size painting of our first president, George Washington, who once said, "It is impossible to rightly govern a nation without God and the Bible." Obama recently remarked with uncharacteristic clarity about the role of government. He said, "It's an argument that's gone on for the history of this republic, and that is, what's the right role of government? *How do we balance freedom with our need to look out for one another?*"

America! When Obama says, "Our need to look out for one another," he is speaking with the voice of Marxism and ideas of communism. Obama has forced on us diabolical policy initiatives that violate our freedom-of-speech rights by enshrining into the law under the cap-and-trade bill the Marxist aphorism, *from each according to his ability, to each according to his need*. The \$787 billion stimulus bill amounts to the redistribution of wealth from We the People to Obama's Wall Street buddies at AIG and Goldman Sachs. Now, under the recent hate-crimes legislation, America's sacred First Amendment rights will in essence become a dead letter. I consider that a gross perversion of the rule of law, the Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

Hate crimes or thought crimes?—Either answers amounts to fascism. The essence of Obama's fascist policies pushes America into the abyss of the New World Order or WORLD Management System (WORMS). Obama and his dozens of unelected czars believe in management by social engineers, rather than government based in Natural Law and a writ-

ten Constitution. Only God and the Supreme Court can save us now. Will they act before it is too late for America?

ON LAW—ESSAY 3

CONSTITUTION OR CORRUPTION?

January 14, 2009

We start with first principles. The Constitution creates a Federal Government of enumerated powers.

Chief Justice William Rehnquist, *United States v. Lopez* (1995)

The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation and foreign commerce.

~ James Madison, *Federalist Papers*, No. 45

At the ascendancy of our 44th president of the United States and a new administration, I have one simple question to ask: Constitution or corruption? The latter principle of governance has dominated politics beginning with the liberal Theodore Roosevelt (1901-09) and his *Fair Deal*. Next came the socialist junta of Woodrow Wilson (1913-21) followed by FDR (1933-45) where the apotheosis of leviathan government over every aspect of our lives was ubiquitously called "The New Deal." Nevertheless, I truly believe that we can reform our decadent ways and return to the original intent of the Constitution's framers. How?

First of all, "We the People" must demand that all of our elected leaders and judges explicitly follow the black-letter text of the Constitution. Here is the oath every one of the 535 members of Congress must take:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

A similar oath is mandated by every Supreme Court justice, federal, circuit and district court judge—even the president of the United States and his entire Cabinet must obey this sacred oath. Nevertheless, few of these “public servants” care one whit about the Constitution. Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution explicitly outlines the only legitimate duties that Congress has:

1. Collect taxes
2. Borrow money on the credit of the U.S.
3. Regulate commerce among the states
4. Establish and regulate naturalization (immigration)
5. Coin and print money
6. Punish counterfeiters
7. Establish post offices and post roads
8. Record patents and copyrights
9. Establish federal and lower courts
10. Punish pirates
11. Declare war
12. Raise an army
13. Provide a navy
14. Call up and regulate the militia
15. Organize the militia to repel invasions
16. Appointment of officers for the military
17. Makes laws for Washington, D.C.
18. Make all laws necessary and proper to carry out all laws contained in the Constitution.⁶

The Constitution’s framers had the prescience to foresee those corrupt politicians that would come down through history who craved and lusted after power and who wanted to expand their supremacy over We the People for their own totalitarian ends. Therefore, the framers added the Ninth Amendment, which reads: “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

The 10th Amendment reads: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” Because the powers contained in Article I, Section 8 are delegated from the people, they are the *only* constitutional powers Congress has. But our Founding Fathers went further than simply listing what Congress *could* do. They also listed

in the Bill of Rights many specific things the government *could not* do. Note to whom the Bill of Rights is addressed: "Congress shall make no law . . . " Rep. John Shadegg, R, Ariz., has since 1995 proposed an "Enumerated Powers Act," or EPA (H.R. 1359 in the 110th Congress).⁷ If this important bill were passed, it would force all 535 members of Congress to literally cite chapter and verse of *how* their proposed legislation lines up with the Constitution. The implication being if they could not clearly show the constitutionality of their legislation, *ipso facto* it would be deemed unconstitutional and summarily rejected from even given the respect of a vote by Congress, because the proposed bill would have to first pass constitutional muster to even be considered.

Can you imagine how many welfare programs and multi-trillion dollar spending plans America is currently entangled in would be stopped dead in their tracks if Congress simply followed the original intent of the Constitution's framers and enacted Rep. Shadegg's Enumerated Powers Act? Government by definition and necessity would become smaller and decentralized. The people would have more of their own money to do with it what they will, and lazy bums who have lived all their lives off other people's money would be compelled to get off their butts and get a job. It would be tantamount to a third American Revolution. In the early 1930s, FDR used the pretext of the Great Depression to take Theodore Roosevelt's and Wilson's experiments in socialism to a more comprehensive level with his blatantly unconstitutional New Deal programs, including Social Security, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Works Progress Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission and Fannie Mae, just to name a few leviathan federal programs that have denigrated the liberty and freedom of every American citizen. America is essentially a welfare state where almost daily more of our liberties are confiscated by the government. President-elect Barack Obama has promised to give America FDR, part II. God help us all.

In conclusion, I appeal to every American out there who loves this country and hasn't fallen prey to our Stalinist public schools to demand that every politician pledge to sign on to Rep. John Shadegg's Enumerated Powers Act. Let's return government back to the people who created it and gave a measure of power to the Executive, the Judiciary and Congress over *We the People* as part of a sacred social contract. Those politi-

cians that refuse to support the EPA should not be elected, or if already in office, should summarily be impeached for violating their oath of office. Admittedly, that last statement is Pollyannaish. At the end of the 110th Congress last year, Rep. Shadegg's bill only had 53 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives and no support in the Senate from the likes of that great "maverick" Sen. John McCain, former Sen. Barack Obama or Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton. And you wonder why op-ed had the caption: *Congress just spent \$621 million on a Visitor's Center—why?* "You could literally smell the tourists coming into the Capitol," said Majority Leader Sen. Harry Reid, D-Nev., in his remarks at the opening ceremonies. "That's no longer the case," he added.⁸ Translation: Like the talking barnyard animals of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, We the People stink!

ON LAW—ESSAY 4

OBAMA: FOLLOW FDR—IN THIS CASE, ANYWAY

January 31, 2009

The decision will make the war harder on us. It will almost certainly cause more Americans to be killed.

~ Justice Antonin Scalia, "The Guantanamo Bay Cases" (2008)

If not Guantanamo, where?

One of Obama's first acts as president was to fulfill his campaign pledge to shut down Guantanamo Bay prison camp for foreign terrorists who fought against, wounded or killed American soldiers. This prison camp was established in 1898 and has been under the control the U.S. since 1903. Since 2002 this base has housed the worst of the worst enemy combatants. All of the 270 men currently held there are Muslims who have waged jihad against America and the West on battlefields in Iraq, Afghanistan and throughout the world. To date, 62 prisoners from this camp have been set free, and 100 percent of them have returned to the battlefield to continue their murderous campaign to kill as many Americans as possible. These are the irredeemable people Obama wants to set free.

The quote by Justice Scalia above concerned several consolidated cases including *Boumediene v. Bush*, *Al-Odah v. U.S.* and several others. In a contentiously argued 5-4 vote, the Court rejected the Bush administra-

tion's war on terrorism in these Guantanamo Bay cases, cavalierly striking down the will of We the People who through our representatives in Congress in 2006 passed comprehensive, anti-terrorism legislation specifically designed to thwart earlier mischievous opinions by the Court (the *Rasul* and *Hamdan* decisions, respectively) and to affirm America's 232-year constitutional tradition of treating foreign terrorists ("enemy combatants") as a distinct class of defendants not worthy of or eligible to receive the same constitutional rights and due process guaranteed to American citizens. The *Boumediene* and *Al-Odah* cases gave full constitutional rights to enemy combatants, setting the stage for the Justice Department to be forced to set many of these evil men free. This decision tragically puts foreign terrorists' rights above the safety of the American people. Now, in 2009, with the ascension of President Obama, one of his first executive orders was to close down Guantanamo Bay prison camp within a year and resettle or release all of the existing prisoners. Of course, this act by Obama is blatantly unconstitutional and overrules over 200 years of constitutional jurisprudence and over 400 years of America's common law traditions dating back to the Pilgrims and Puritans.

Justice Anthony Kennedy, a Republican appointee to the Court and the "swing vote" on many of the contentious issues facing the panel, wrote the majority opinion in this case. Kennedy said, in part, "The laws and Constitution are designed to survive, and remain in force, in extraordinary times. Liberty and security can be reconciled; and in our system they are reconciled within the framework of the law." Justice Ginsburg, Stevens, Souter, Breyer and Kennedy's liberal activist view of the Constitution comports very well with Obama's socialist, "living" view of the Constitution and can be summarized in three words, "F--- the Framers!" (Forget the Framers). It is a perverted and incoherent understanding of the moral/legal paradigm of the Constitution and its policy foundations based on the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought. Regarding the shameful jurisprudence exemplified in the Guantanamo Bay case and Obama's unwise policy to close down this important prison camp within a year, this appalling executive decision will only create more unnecessary deaths of Americans, both here at home and against our brave soldiers fighting in defense of our liberty abroad.

FDR and the Nazi saboteur case

I only wish President Bush and now President Obama would have taken the approach FDR took in the Nazi saboteur case, *Ex parte Quirin* (1942), where in the midst of World War II eight Nazi terrorists were captured on the coasts of New York and Florida. After a summary trial in July 1942, six were summarily executed one month later after the Supreme Court upheld the jurisdiction of a U.S. military tribunal. FDR, though a liberal socialist, was decisive in quickly and summarily punishing Nazi spies. Hitler did not try that stunt again.

Regarding the Guantanamo Bay decision, President Bush eight years ago should have followed FDR's lead in the *Quirin* Nazi saboteur case and dispatched these Muslim terrorists with a prompt military trial and a public hanging. I guarantee you that if he had acted decisively like FDR and the four great statesmen of Mount Rushmore acted during their presidencies that his name would have been regarded in as laudatory a manner as Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, instead of associated with the legendary incompetence of a Jimmy Carter. Chief Justice John Roberts in dissent wrote that the American people "lost a bit more control over the conduct of this nation's foreign policy to unelected, politically unaccountable judges." And Justice Antonin Scalia wrote of the ruling, "Most tragically it sets our military commanders the impossible task of proving in a civilian court ... that evidence supports the confinement of each and every prisoner."

Of course, the liberal pressure group Amnesty International, which has been a long-time enemy of Bush's war against terrorism, was elated over the ruling. "The Supreme Court did the right thing. Everyone has the right to challenge why they're being thrown in prison, to hear the charges against them and to answer to that," said Dalia Hashad, the group's domestic human rights program director. Likewise, the communist, anarchist front group the American Civil Liberties Union was euphoric about the Court's decision on the Guantanamo Bay cases. The ACLU's Steven Shapiro said on the day the case was decided, "Today's decision forcefully repudiates the essential lawlessness of the Bush administration's failed Guantanamo policy."

President Obama has promised to give America "FDR, part II." Regarding FDR's decisive treatment of the Nazi saboteurs in the *Quirin* case, we can only hope that Obama will follow his political mentor.

However, his first acts as president are giving Muslim terrorists hope and Americans and our ally Israel despair—closing down Guantanamo Bay, his first call as president not to Israel, but to the terrorist leader of Fatah, Mahmoud Abbas, and Obama's first TV interview as president with the Dubai-based Al-Arabiya; indeed these are not good signs of hope for America.

If we only had some audacious men with a bit of testosterone, a few intelligent men not infected by our Stalinist public school system who actually read and understood the U.S. Constitution, not in the perverted manner of the five liberal activist justices on the Court who only see the Constitution as tool of Darwinian principle, "change" or the socialist mantra, "social justice." We need a president, a Congress and a judiciary that will protect and defend Americans based on the original intent of the Constitution's framers. Anything short of this objective is tyranny. Justice Scalia was prophetic and right in his passionate and sober dissent in the Guantanamo Bay cases: *The decision [full constitutional rights for terrorists] will make the war harder on us. It will almost certainly cause more Americans to be killed.*

ON LAW—ESSAY 5

PSYCHOPATHS IN BLACK ROBES

February 14, 2009

John Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it.

~ President Andrew Jackson (*circa* 1832)

The appeals court in California has done it again, or as Rush Limbaugh calls this entity, "The Ninth Circus Court of Appeals." An entry posted on Wall Street Journal blog, *Ruling on California Prison Overcrowding: Cut 57,000 Prisoners*,⁹ narrates an outrageous judicial opinion. These lunatics in black robes want to release over 57,000 murders, gang-bangers, drug addicts, drug dealers, rapists, child molesters and other assorted dregs upon Californians over a three-year period.

Why do these august jurists want to release such irredeemable people upon society?—allegedly due to prison overcrowding and the fact that "some inmates die regularly of suicides or lack of proper care." Well, boo-freakin'-hoo! That's why they call it prison. It's supposed to be

a bad place so that other potential criminals will think twice before they do something stupid to get sent to prison in the first place. This news story reminded me of several cases I read in law school and others that I am teaching now to my classes on Constitutional Law and Administrative Law. Namely, *Cherokee Nations v. Georgia* (1831) and *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832) where Chief Justice John Marshall upheld the Cherokee Indians' rights to lands within Georgia and held in part: "The Indians were "domestic dependant nations" under the sovereignty and dominion of the United States, and that they had unquestionable right to the lands they occupied until title should be extinguished by voluntary cession to the United States."

The following year, Justice Marshall extended his opinion: "In this case [*Worcester v. Georgia*] Chief Justice John Marshall went further and opined that the Cherokee nation was a distinct political community having territorial boundaries within which the State of Georgia had no right to enter except with the permission of the Cherokees. Georgia refused to recognize the court in this matter by not even appearing at the bar of the court and refusing to release Worcester." Where is President Andrew Jackson when we really need him? Jackson, a man admittedly of a combative and controversial nature, stood for principles that he was willing to die for even jeopardizing his career by not obeying every decree from the Supreme Court.

Jackson's words above were in essence throwing down the gauntlet to the Supreme Court. As president, he was plainly stating that (in part due to the separation of powers) the court had no real power nor any constitutional position to force President Jackson to stop the state of Georgia from acquiring Indian lands and that if Marshall wanted to do this he would have to do it himself, of course fully realizing that the court had no such power. In the early 1830s, President Jackson was following the Jeffersonian tradition of Anti-federalism. He believed in strong states rights, for he feared that if the federal government got too strong, the precious "unalienable rights" of the people would be trampled under the boot of the omnipotent state, or by an oligarchy of judges legislating from the bench. Like James Madison, "the father of the Constitution," Jackson believed, "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are *few and defined*. Those which are to remain in the State governments are *numerous and indefinite*."

Fast forward to 2009: We have a panel of three judges who through the doctrine of judicial review have given themselves the omnipotent power to determine what the prison population of the state of California should be, holding that "evidence offered at trial was overwhelmingly to the effect that overcrowding is the primary cause of the *unconstitutional conditions* that have been found to exist in the California prisons."

The psychopathology of these judges gets worse: The proposed targets would require the state to reduce the prison population by between 36,200 and 57,000 inmates. Attorneys representing inmates had sought a reduction of about 52,000 inmates. The state can change parole and other policies to cut the population of its 33 adult prisons without endangering the public, the judges said. Reducing the number of inmates might have a positive effect as well, they said. "This is particularly true considering that California's overcrowded prison system is itself ... a public safety hazard," the panel said in its order.

If you think that the overcrowded California prison system is a "public safety hazard," just think of the untold mayhem, rape, murder, abuse and societal terrorism the residents of California and throughout America will suffer once these irredeemable criminals are unleashed upon society. Also, what about the young criminals in training? The legions of young girls and boys who haven't risen to the prison level yet? What will these borderline criminals or criminals-in-training think of the rule of law, the meaning of justice and the aphorism "crime doesn't pay" when all their "homies" and "sistergirls" are being let out of prison for free? Where is President Andrew Jackson when you really need him?

Here are some suggestions to stem the tide of crazy judicial opinions coming out of our judicial system from the Supreme Court on down. Let's start with the proverb: "The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom." We the People, through our elected representatives, have got to put the fear of God back into these judges. They work for us; we don't work for them. The minute one of these crazy, immoral, unconstitutional opinions is published, we must demand that our politicians immediately file articles of impeachment and hold these radical judges as traitors. This is part of the system of checks and balances so vital to health of our republic. Second, all of these bankrupt states, like New York, Michigan, Arizona, New Mexico and California with their bloated welfare state budgets, also have large illegal-alien populations, costing their states tens of billions of dollars per year in education, incarceration, medical,

social security, welfare and ancillary costs that these governors and their legislatures are too ignorant or afraid to directly address in their budgets for fear of being called a racist. Impeach all of these bums.

Finally, if you really want to stop psychopathic judicial opinions like the California case cited above, which will unleash 57,000 prisoners back into society while doing nothing to address the unconstitutionality of the welfare state and the mayhem caused by illegal immigration annually costing Americans \$346 billion, prison officials should make sure some of these irredeemable criminals are put in halfway houses in the same neighborhood of these judges, defense attorneys and liberal politicians who aided in releasing those prisoners.¹⁰ Only then will this perversion of the Constitution and the rule of law will come to an end, because all rational people will clearly see these foolish judicial opinions have moved from "theory" into actual policy practice—a policy that will adversely and directly affect these judicial psychopaths in black robes in a way they never intended.

ON LAW—ESSAY 6

DUMP THE EXCLUSIONARY RULE!

April 29, 2009

The criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered.

~ Justice Benjamin Cardozo

Last week the Supreme Court handed down a decision further narrowing the limits of warrantless car searches. In a 5-4 split decision, the Court ruled that a warrantless search of a car incident to an arrest is legal provided that the police officer is within reaching distance of the vehicle, or the officers have reasonable belief that "evidence of the offense of arrest might be found in the vehicle."

The decision in *Arizona v. Gant* overturned a 30-year rule established in *New York v. Belton* (1980), where the Court held that "when a policeman has made a lawful custodial arrest of the occupant of an automobile, he may, as a contemporaneous incident to that arrest, search the passenger compartment." The Court upheld the Arizona Supreme Court ruling for the defendant, Rodney Gant, on whom police found cocaine in his

jacket pocket in the back seat of his car during an arrest for driving with a suspended license. The state court held that Gant could not have reached his car during the search and posed no safety threat to the officers, making a vehicle search unreasonable under the “reaching-distance rule” of *Chimel v. California* (1969), as applied to Belton. When I viewed the names of the majority justices—Stevens, Ginsburg, Souter, Scalia and Thomas, a rare and bizarre mix of strict constructionist with liberal social activist jurisprudence—it appeared to me like the fix was in against the police as the sentinels against societal anarchy, against the original intent of the Constitution’s framers and against a rational judicial decision-making that will protect law-abiding citizens from being preyed upon by criminals cunning enough to get off on a technicality.

The dissenting justices—Breyer, Alito, Chief Justice Roberts and Kennedy—would have strongly followed *stare decisis* (judicial precedent) principles to maintain Belton’s “bright-line rule.” Nevertheless, the dissenters predicted that the Court’s decision will lead to the unnecessary suppression of evidence and confusion by law enforcement officers, but here I think they missed the point. Let’s return to first principles.

Black’s Law Dictionary contains the following definition of the exclusionary rule:

The rule command that where evidence has been obtained in violation of the search and seizure protections guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, the illegally obtained evidence cannot be used at that trial of the defendant. Under this rule evidence which is obtained by an unreasonable search and seizure is excluded from admissibility under the Fourth Amendment, and this rule has been held applicable to the States. *Mapp v. Ohio* (1961).

The key word here is “reason.” What happens to a society where over time through politicians, legislative mandates, shyster lawyers and humanist judges, the public is led to the abandonment of Reason and the original intent of the Constitution’s framers in exchange for perversity correctness and egalitarianism? What happens to a culture where law becomes disconnected from morality? I believe that socialism, anarchy, nihilism and ultimately national suicide will fill the void.

In a 2005 law review article, *Excluding the Exclusionary Rule: Natural Law vs. Judicial Personal Policy Preferences*,¹¹ my thesis followed Justice Cardozo’s critique against linking overt criminal behavior to bureaucratic red tape or procedural errors by the police, for this will inevitably lead

to criminals being set free and the safety of the public jeopardized. Cardozo rightly prophesied the devolution of American constitutional law since the Court first started legislating from the bench and writing police codes of conduct.—The case at bar, *Arizona v. Gant*, simply follows that long, shameful, and illegitimate line of judicial precedent. What is my solution to this entire lineage of jurisprudence since the exclusionary rule was created by the Court out of whole cloth almost 100 years ago in *U.S. v. Weeks* (1914)? Exclude the exclusionary rule! It is the only way.

Even Justice Scalia, a stalwart of the original intent jurisprudence, said so much when he wrote in *Arizona v. Gant*:

In a concurring opinion, Justice Scalia disparaged that line of cases as “badly reasoned” with a “fanciful reliance” upon the officer safety rule. Justice Scalia was clearly the swing vote in the case, explaining that a “4-to-1-to-4 opinion that leaves the governing rule uncertain” would be “unacceptable.” In his view, the “charade of officer safety” in *Belton*, *Chimel* and *Thornton v. United States* (extending *Belton* to all “recent occupants” of a vehicle) *should be abandoned* in favor of the rule that the majority ultimately adopts in its opinion.

I believe that Scalia, as usual, has put his finger on the problem of the exclusionary rule: “badly reasoned,” but his solutions admittedly are nuanced, vague and inadequate. Here is what I proposed in my law review article on the exclusionary rule at p. 793:

Bluntly speaking, the exclusionary rule is insane jurisprudence as well as a patent example of liberal judicial activism of the most outrageous kind. What the Courts and the police departments should do when confronted by improper police conduct is not to let the guilty go free, which makes a mockery of justice and endangers the public, but as a separate issue, duly punish, reprimand, or fine the errant police officer(s).

Justice Cardozo was right that the essence of the exclusionary rule is that, *the criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered*. Surely it can be understood that no rational society that follows the rule of law can continue to exist where criminals (through the aiding and abetting of judges) are essentially given the key to their own jail cell via the exclusionary rule. This is sheer madness. I do not celebrate the bipartisan decision of *Arizona v. Gant* because it has given credence to this diabolical, unconstitutional exclusionary rule. Let us return to electing faithful and wise presidents and governors who will appoint judges that will inter-

pret the law according to the black letter text of the Constitution and the original intent of the framers, rather than legislating from the bench by aborting Reason and morality and deifying their own judicial personal policy preferences.

ON LAW—ESSAY 7

I SPELL TRAITOR S-O-U-T-E-R

May 06, 2009

I, [David Souter], do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic...

~ Oath of the Supreme Court Justice

The past 10 days brought to the fore two well-known traitors of the Republican Party; two proud enemies against America's most sacred and enduring principles like truth, loyalty, justice, godliness and respect for the original intent of the Constitution's framers—Pennsylvania Sen. Arlen Specter, who last week switched from being a Republican to a Democrat, and Justice David Souter, who last weekend announced his intended retirement from the Supreme Court effective at the end of this term. When Souter ascended to the Supreme Court 20 years ago I was a young graduate student getting ready to attend law school. Although I had only been a conservative for less than two years, even then I understood that Bush-41 had made two grave errors in nominating David Souter to the high court:

1. Bush did not have a list of several exemplary conservative candidates that he personally knew to nominate to the Supreme Court when arch-liberal William Brennan's seat became open in 1990;
2. Bush was gullible and seemingly indifferent to the extreme gravity of this position to allow his chief of staff and former New Hampshire governor, John Sununu, a well-known RINO (Republican in name only) to pick some unknown, unproven, unremarkable jurist who lived with his mother and didn't have his own wife and children.

I am one of the few writers today to openly speculate that Souter's cloistered, monastic existence with mother dearest ostensibly gave this man a bitter resentment toward the American people, which impaired his ability to rightly judge on the weighty issues that hundreds of millions of people would be compelled by law to follow. Bush-41's nomina-

tion of Souter to the high court was beyond the pale. That the Republicans approved this man—the vote was 14 to 3 in the Senate Judiciary Committee and 90 to 9 in the full Senate—shows how politically lazy and naive the Republicans were in 1990. With the ascension of Souter, along with Sandra Day O'Connor (1981) and Anthony Kennedy (1988), history has judged that the GOP foolishly frittered away their only chance in a generation to have a solid conservative majority on the Supreme Court, which is one of the major reasons why today Republicans are in the minority in all three branches of government.

When Obama referred to Souter as “a fair-minded, independent judge who defied labels,” that is a Big Lie. Souter is a liberal activist judge who believes that the Constitution is a “living document” that can be manipulated at-will to fit a radical, secular, socialist agenda. As far as relying on the constitutional text for judicial guidance is concerned, Souter’s 19-year legacy on the Court showed him to be a modern-day Benedict Arnold. There is not one judicial opinion that I’ve read of the hundreds Souter authored, concurred in, or dissented that is in any manner respectful of the original intent of the Constitution’s framers. By failing in this, his only lawful duty as a judge, Justice Souter has repeatedly and grievously violated his oath of office to: . . . *support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic*. Chairman Maobama continued his propaganda screed praising Souter: “I will seek someone who understands that justice isn’t about some abstract legal theory or footnote in a casebook; it is also about how our laws affect the daily realities of people’s lives, whether they can make a living and care for their families, whether they feel safe in their homes and welcome in their own nation.” This “social justice” requirement by Obama is a patent violation of the judge’s oath: . . . *that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich*.

In conclusion, Obama said, “I view that quality of empathy . . . as an essential ingredient for arriving at just decisions and outcomes.” “Empathy” is not the job of a judge and violates the oath’s provision: . . . *that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me*. On this point I am convinced that two of Obama’s past law professors at Harvard, Laurence Tribe and Charles Ogeltree, as well as Elena Kagan, past dean of Harvard Law School and Obama’s current solicitor general, are deeply involved in advising him on whom he should appoint to the Supreme Court. I cannot definitively prove this

assertion, but having studied the writings of Tribe and Ogeltree in detail for over 20 years, Obama, the sophist and Manchurian Candidate, is mimicking the conventional thinking of the secular humanist law academy. Trust me.

Sen. Arlen Specter is a treacherous RINO Republican of the lowest ilk. Likewise, Justice David Souter never was a conservative jurist, but a stealth liberal activist judge that used Machiavellian tactics to ascend to the high court, treacherously allied with the liberal wing for 19 years and cunningly waited until George W. Bush left office to retire so that the son of the father that nominated him wouldn't have the opportunity to replace him with a real conservative justice. That's why I knew the fix was in when the Republican dupes led by "Benedict" Arlen voted Souter into office with more votes (90 to 9) than Clarence Thomas, Bush-41's next nominee, who received a 52 to 48 vote the following year! For almost 20 years, Souter reveled and delighted in ramming his radical liberal activist opinions down the throats of the conservatives, the Christian right and the majority of American citizens who still believed that a judge's only legitimate duty is to interpret the Constitution according to the original intent of the Constitution's framers, not to show "empathy" and legislate from the bench as Souter has done. Justice Souter's entire judicial legacy on the Supreme Court amounts to the cold, duplicitous kiss of a Judas . . . And that's why I spell traitor S-O-U-T-E-R.

ON LAW—ESSAY 8

SOTOMAYOR IS AN ANTI-CONSTITUTIONALIST

June 10, 2009

Court of Appeals is where policy is made.

~ Judge Sonya Sotomayor, 2005 conference at Duke Law School

America! Be not deceived by President's Obama's first nominee to the Supreme Court. The singular, relevant question regarding her fitness to serve on the high court is quite simple: Is Judge Sonia Sotomayor a constitutionalist or an anti-constitutionalist? First, let's define the terms: A *constitutionalist* is a judge that conscientiously follows the black-letter text of the U.S. Constitution as their *only* consideration to both determine

the applicable rule of law, as well as complying with the original intent of the Constitution's framers. On the contrary, an *anti-constitutionalist* is a judge that cares little to nothing about the black-letter text of the Constitution or the original intent of the Constitution's framers. What standard, then, do anti-constitutionalist judges use to determine the rule of law? These "activist" or "progressive" judges place their own personal policy preferences as the supreme law of the land. That's the kind of sophism liberal jurists propagate with phrases like, "incorporation doctrine," "evolving standards of decency," "living Constitution" or idiocy about the inherent wisdom of Latina judges. America, that's treason!

In 2005, I wrote a law review article on this very subject, critiquing liberal activism and judicial fascism.¹² George Will presented an excellent synopsis of the conventional view shared by most legal academics: "Her ethnicity aside, Sotomayor is a conventional choice. The Court will remain composed entirely of former appellate court judges. And like conventional liberals, she embraces identity politics, including the idea of categorical representation: A person is what his or her race, ethnicity, gender or sexual preference is, and members of a particular category can be represented—understood, empathized with—*only* by persons of the same identity." Although George Will's analysis gets us closer to the core of the *real* Judge Sotomayor, historically, the law academy did not extend these racist considerations in 1991 during the nomination of Clarence Thomas, a black man and an appellate judge. Why wasn't his compelling Horatio Alger, up-by-your-bootstraps background given credence during his Supreme Court confirmation hearings? Democrats and liberals of every racial cant were united to destroy this upstanding man by any means necessary. Why? Because he was a black man *and* a conservative—a despised combination that liberals have a reflexive hatred of even to this day.

Yes, Sotomayor graduated from Princeton and from Yale Law with honors, yet I find her body of work both unremarkable and lacking in the requisite intellectual substance one would expect from an appellate court judge, let alone a justice of the Supreme Court. The government-controlled media (e.g., ABC, CBS, NBC, MSNBC, Washington Post, New York Times, Time Magazine, Newsweek) like the lap dogs they've been for over 70 years, all give her a pass and refuse to offer a substantive critique of her entire judicial *oeuvre*. Even a cursory examination of the public statements, speeches and judicial opinions of Judge Sotomayor

based on the little information we already have characterizes her as a shameless, anti-constitutionalist judge.

Why did Obama nominate her over all the other great judges and legal minds in the nation? Obama is many things, but above all he is an irredeemable socialist, narcissist, and a fascist. Like his predecessor Bill Clinton, Obama subsumes everything and everybody for his own self-aggrandizement. So it is with his nominee, Sonia Sotomayor. This woman is merely Obama in a skirt, Obama with a Spanish accent. Sotomayor possesses the perverse socialist worldview he has in constitutional law and political philosophy. She is a macabre reflection of Obama's alter ego; his fascist conception of the Constitution where "redistributive change" and overcoming of the Constitution's "negative rights" (Obama-speak for his utter contempt of the Constitution's framers) will be obeyed to the letter by Sotomayor, especially on the abortion question.

Sotomayor, as Obama's Cassandra-figure (despite her judicial "madness") will demand that her oracles be believed. Her judicial opinions will move the court away from the strict constructionist constitutionalism of Justices Thomas, Scalia, Roberts and Alito to the judicial fascism and liberal activism of Justices Stevens, Souter, Ginsburg, Breyer and Kennedy—the legitimate text of the Constitution replaced with the judge's own personal policy preferences or reliance on foreign legal precedents or extra-constitutional sources like the constitutions of Jamaica, India, Zimbabwe and the European Court of Human Rights. These are the legal authorities Justice Stephen Breyer suggested that the Court follow, particularly in death penalty and gay rights cases.¹³

In an article on judicial review I wrote a year ago titled, *An American oligarchy of 5*, I made the following prediction, which could apply to any renegade, narcissist judge who favors placing his or her own views over the framers of the Constitution:

The tyranny of the judicial branch was realized by Thomas Jefferson shortly after the original sin of *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) was handed down, where the Supreme Court seized the right to be the final authority on *all* constitutional questions—not Congress, not "We the People," but an unelected cartel of five justices can now with Stalin-esque efficiency control every aspect of our lives. That judge-created doctrine of law is called *judicial review*. In 1820, just 17 years after the *Marbury* decision, Jefferson lamented to a friend in a letter—*To consider*

*the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy.*¹⁴

Unless and until “We the People” collectively say enough is enough, throw all the bums out of office and begin to elect members to Congress with the intestinal fortitude to obey the Constitution, until we demand that every appellate judge interprets the rule of law according to the black-letter text of the Constitution, or be immediately impeached, then unremarkable, fascist presidents like B. Hussein Obama will continue to try to enshrine their legacy in the anti-constitutional opinions of racist, activist and “peeking” judges like Sonia Sotomayor.¹⁵

ON LAW—ESSAY 9

THE TYRANNY OF TRANSNATIONALISM

July 11, 2009

Once we sign our rights over to international law, the Constitution is officially dead.

~ Glenn Beck

I am rare among law academics in that I consider international law to be essentially a legal fiction. For the sake of argument assume that my thesis is correct. This enigma then begs the question: How can international law, which by definition is made up of the laws of many sovereign nations, be applicable to *all* nations on an equal basis? Answer: It can't. Modern international law had its origins concurrent with the inauguration of the United Nations at the San Francisco Conference (April, 1945) and its first international trial, the Nuremberg Trials (1945-48). Since the end of World War II international law has evolved to create and integrate other aspects of law, namely transnational law which in essence is a form of supranational law, which contends that laws of nation states are held inapplicable when conflicting with a supranational legal system.

On March 29th, the Obama Administration nominated Harold Koh (on leave as the Dean of Yale Law School), as the senior legal adviser to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. On June 25, 2009, Koh was confirmed by the Senate in a 62-35 vote. Koh is one of the foremost experts in the field of transnational law and has written extensively on this subject both in books and in law journals. While his nomination has been generally

supported in the Senate and by most law academics, Koh's nomination did have some criticism from some conservative commentators for his views on international law and its use in American legal analysis and jurisprudence. Surprisingly, other conservatives such as former Bush 41 Solicitor General, Ted Olsen, former Whitewater Special Counsel, Kenneth Starr and even generally conservative publications such as *Forbes Magazine*, have all supported Koh's nomination.

In a recent article, a student-editor at Pepperdine said of Obama's nominee: "Koh has defined his academic career by arguing for the mandatory authority of international law in domestic realm of American jurisprudence." Koh's arguments for "transnational jurisprudence" as being essential to maintaining a well ordered international legal system is compelling. Koh's contention that "concepts like liberty, equality and privacy are not exclusively American constitutional ideas but, rather, part and parcel of the global human rights movement," is in line with the conventional thinking of the legal community. Unfortunately, Koh's legal theories are from a decidedly secular humanist and positive law worldview which glorifies the power of the State, versus a natural law worldview that integrates law and morality by placing moral law above the State not below it.

Conservatives on the Supreme Court, particularly Thomas and Scalia, have criticized transnational jurisprudence as not being amenable with legitimate judicial precedent as Koh maintains, but argue that citing foreign decisions as legal precedents threatens American sovereignty. Other commentators like *Forbes* and the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank, have contended that the "use of such nonbinding sources to bolster legal arguments is a central and uncontroversial tenet of the American judicial process." While Koh's transnational jurisprudence is interesting, what does American constitutional history have to say about it? According to an exhaustive study by Lutz and Hyneman that took them over 10 years to bring together, they amassed over 15,000 items, including 2,200 books, newspaper articles, pamphlets and monographs of political materials written between 1760-1805. The three most quoted legal philosophers by the Constitution's framers were:

1. Baron Charles Montesquieu, "The Spirit of the Laws" (1748);
2. Sir William Blackstone, "Commentaries on the Laws of England" (1765-69);
3. John Locke, "Two Treatises of Government" (1689)

All three men were Natural Law philosophers to the core and their ideas thoroughly influenced America's Founding Fathers. The only other source quoted more than these three political philosophers was the Bible which, according to the Lutz/Hyneman study, accounted for 96 percent of the ideas that formed America's republic.

Here is where I strongly disagree with Forbes Magazine and the America Enterprise Institute. Yes, America's constitutional framers and the Supreme Court advocated reliance on extra-constitutional sources including continental and common law traditions, but it was always done under a paradigm that integrated law and morality, *not* a segregation of legality and morality as Koh, most contemporary law academics and even some conservatives believe. Koh, like most liberal law academics and socialists are proponents of international law, transnational law and supranational law being equal to or superior to America's Constitution. They achieve this interpretation through a revisionist reading of constitutional law. Kelsey Stapler writes that Koh and others "draws from a few phrases of the American Constitution to support this claim: the Supremacy Clause (Article 6, section 2), defining treaties as the "supreme law of the land," and Article I, section 8, clause 10, giving the Congress the power to define and punish "offenses against law of nations."

Koh is sophistic here because the framers mandated that the Constitution be interpreted under a natural law paradigm ("the law of Nature and of Nature's God"). Once you remove moral constraints from law, the law becomes open to humanist, egalitarian and even nihilist considerations like positivism, naturalism, international law and transnational law. In my opinion, Koh's supremacy view of international law contradicts natural law, the sovereignty of nation states and the primacy of the Constitution as the "supreme law of the land."

When Fox News TV host Glenn Beck said, "Once we sign our rights over to international law, the Constitution is officially dead," he is following a strong natural law tradition of the Constitution's Framers. On the other hand, Koh's international and transnational conception of law argues "that American values are no longer the sole measure of our rights" and places judicial bodies such as the International Criminal Court or the European Court of Human Rights above the black letter text of the U.S. Constitution. America, this is a philosophy of treason! In the end, transnationalism in essence makes bureaucrats like Koh, Hillary,

Obama and liberal activist judges like Justices' Stevens, Ginsburg, Breyer, Souter, Kennedy and Sotomayor a tyrannical oligarchy and "We the People" their despised serfs.

ON LAW—ESSAY 10

SCOTUS GETS ONE RIGHT—BUT . . .

February 28, 2009

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech . . .

~ Bill of Rights, First Amendment (1789)

The Christian has no rights that liberals and Democrats are bound to respect.

~ Ellis Washington, a paraphrase of Justice Taney's *Dred Scott* opinion

If it has been 61 years, it has been a day—61 years since the Supreme Court of the United States enshrined into constitutional law and into society the judge-created doctrine "separation of church and state" in the landmark case *McCullum v. Board of Education* (1948). American law, politics, culture and society haven't been the same since. In my humble opinion, the *McCullum* case is so diabolical and so sophistic an opinion that it rivals the notorious *Dred Scott v. Sandford* (1857) decision, which upheld the continued slavery of my people. Chief Justice Roger B. Taney infamously held in that case: *The Negro has no rights that the white man is bound to respect.*

For the six decades since the *McCullum* decision, the wickedness and arrogance of the *Dred Scott* opinion has been exemplified in the continued legacy of Supreme Court cases that hate, not black people in these cases but America's rich Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought:

❖ *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947) was the leading Supreme Court case in the United States in regards to Establishment Clause law. Furthermore this case was one of the earliest examples of the judge-created incorporation doctrine (applying it to the States through the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment).

❖ *Board of Education of Kiryas Joel Village School District v. Grumet* (1994), the majority of the court joined Justice David Souter's opinion, which stated that "government should not prefer one religion to another, or religion to irreligion."

❖ In 2001, Roy Moore, formerly the chief justice of Alabama, installed a monument of the Ten Commandments in the state judicial building. In 2003, in the case of *Glassroth v. Moore* he was ordered by a federal judge to remove the monument, but he refused to comply, ultimately leading to his removal from office. The Supreme Court refused to hear the case, allowing the lower court's decision to stand.

Humanists, atheists, socialists and liberals' war against America's Judeo-Christian traditions began in earnest in the late 1940s and can be summarized with a paraphrase of Justice Taney's sentiments against black Americans and slaves—*The Christian has no rights that liberals and Democrats are bound to respect* . . . until today. Just when I thought that the Supreme Court was irredeemably broken, we have come full circle from the anti-Christian cases, *Everson* and *McCullum* in the 1940s. As a matter of fact, SCOTUS on Wednesday handed down a rare unanimous 9-0 decision *in favor* of Christian organizations having the First Amendment freedom of speech right to place a religious monument like the Ten Commandments on public or private property. Justice Samuel A. Alito Jr. wrote for the Court in *Pleasant Grove City v. Summum*, saying that such a monument, whether government-financed or privately donated, must be considered "government speech," conveying a message that it wishes to get out about "esthetics, history and local culture." (Note that this case was not decided on freedom of religion grounds.)

On the Court's blog, www.scotusblog.com, a summary of the case reads as follows:

The ruling turned solely on the Constitution's Free Speech Clause. A religious sect, the Summum, contended that its free speech rights were violated when the city of Pleasant Grove City, Utah, accepted a Ten Commandments monument in its public park but refused to accept a monument displaying tenets of the Summum faith. The "Seven Aphorisms" of that faith represent what believers view as the contents of the original tablets handed down by God to Moses on Mount Sinai.

Justice Alito's opinion noted that, when acceptance of a Ten Commandments or other religious monument is treated as conveying the *message of the government*, the free speech clause does not apply, since that clause only restricts government regulation of private speech. Even

if the government speaks through a display provided by some private person or group, the opinion added, that does not take away from its character as government speech.

Alito added that the government, however, is not free to utter a message that violates the Constitution's ban on official "establishment" of religion. That, however, was not at issue in the *Summum* case at this point.¹⁶

Despite the 9-0 ruling, it should be noted that "four justices filed concurring opinions, representing the views of six justices, thus requiring their views to be taken into account in determining just when governments may put up such monuments on public property." Despite the Court's disunity, nevertheless, I am elated that after 61 years, multiple social movements and moral revolutions later, the Court got a case right protecting free speech. Yet, rather than a unified judicial theory of freedom of speech, the Court had to have five different opinions out of nine justices regarding one "unanimous" opinion. Yes, on one level I believe that the Court got one right by allowing a Ten Commandments monument erected on state property without a blasphemous anti-Ten Commandments monument from some cult next to it. Yet, on another level, if "We the People" are the creators of the state, the courts, the government, the republic, the Constitution, then why should we have to beg the Court to defend freedom of religion allegedly protected by the Bill of Rights? *Ipso facto*—the thing speaks for itself!

In conclusion, if a Christian who was a sitting chief justice of the Alabama Supreme Court like Roy Moore, a man of impeccable character, can be impeached for placing a Christian monument on state property, now that SCOTUS has called this act constitutional, can Judge Moore be reinstated on the bench? On second thought, perhaps our freedoms are not that free after all.

ON LAW—ESSAY 11

FRANKENSTEIN AND THE EXCLUSIONARY RULE

May 02, 2009

Oh what a tangled web we weave,
When first we practice to deceive!

~ Sir Walter Scott, *Marmion*, Canto vi, Stanza 17

On Wednesday the Supreme Court handed down an opinion slightly expanding evidence obtained by the police that may be used against a defendant in court. With the decision in *Kansas v. Ventris*, the Supreme Court ruled that the government may impeach a defendant's testimony using statements obtained during an interrogation that violated his Sixth Amendment right to counsel, even though the prosecution would be barred from using such tainted evidence as part of its case in chief.¹⁷ Here are the facts: After a confrontation in the home of Ernest Hicks between respondent Donnie Ray Ventris and his companion, Rhonda Theel, Hicks was shot and killed, and Ventris and Theel escaped with several hundred dollars in cash and other possessions. Ventris and Theel were arrested and charged with murder, aggravated robbery and several lesser offenses. Both defendants claimed that the other was responsible for pulling the trigger and killing Hicks. A jailhouse informant in a prison cell revealed to the police that when he asked Ventris what was "weighing in on his mind," Ventris admitted to being the shooter. When Ventris took the stand at trial and blamed the shooting on Theel, the state called the informant to testify about this prior conflicting statement.

In an opinion by Justice Scalia, the Court held that evidence obtained in violation of the Sixth Amendment right to counsel is admissible for purposes of impeachment, despite the fact it would not be admissible if presented in court as part of the prosecution's main case. Because the constitutional violation at issue involves pretrial conduct rather than a trial right, admissibility is determined by "an exclusionary-rule balancing test," which compares the benefits from deterring police misconduct against the costs of excluding potentially truthful and relevant evidence.

In a rational society, defendant's Ventris and Theel would have been tried, convicted and hanged in front of the courthouse steps as a warning to other would-be criminals. In an insane society, Ventris and Theel are treated as outsider celebrities and their unremarkable case taken all the way to the Supreme Court. This is sheer madness! Rather than giving a point-by-point legal analysis of *Kansas v. Ventris*, here I wish to look at this case as a patent example of how needlessly complicated and convoluted putting a criminal in jail has become since the advent of liberal judicial activism and legislating from the bench. In modern times, the omnipotent judge dispenses an endless litany of "new" constitutional rights for criminals at the expense of Reason, common sense and the safety of the general public, which was the primary reason why "We the People" created the Constitution, the Congress, the Executive, the Courts and the government in the first place.

To explain how far the Court has descended from *Veritas* (truth), allow me to use the metaphor found in the literary classic "Frankenstein" (1818), by Mary Shelley. The modern version of this narrative concerns the mad genius scientist (Dr. Victor Frankenstein) and his narcissistic obsession to create human life. With the help of his faithful assistant (Igor), bodies were stolen from the graveyard and various body parts were ghoulishly cobbled together to complete his diabolical experiment. Frankenstein was a warning against the "overreaching" of modern man at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, implied in the novel's subtitle, "The Modern Prometheus." The moral of the story, at least in the modern conception of "Frankenstein," is that catastrophe is the inevitable end where secular man seeks to supplant his will for Natural Law or God's will.

That said, let's look at the shameful, idiotic and unconstitutional legacy of the Supreme Court in the field of criminal law and criminal procedure surrounding the exclusionary rule. It is a veritable Dr. Frankenstein's monster of disjointed case law. In a previous article, *Dump the exclusionary rule*, I argued that the Court was violating the separation of powers doctrine by legislating from the bench and writing police criminal codes of conduct, which, after nearly 100 years since the advent of the exclusionary rule in *U.S. v. Weeks* (1914), the Court is clearly incompetent to do. Instead, I suggested that in *all* legal cases the Court simply follow *Veritas* (truth), forsake a slavish obsession with procedure and kill this Frankenstein monster they created called the exclusionary rule,

which, as Justice Cardozo rightly divined in the 1920s, amounts to the legal catastrophe: *The criminal is to go free because the constable [police] has blundered.*

Why won't the Court simply abandon the exclusionary rule instead of tinkering with it like Dr. Frankenstein's monster? The answer is found in the writings of Sir Walter Scott who in his great poetical work, "*Marmion*," famously wrote: *Oh what a tangled web we weave, When first we practice to deceive!* Yes, pride and deceit are partly to blame. Yes, reliance on illegitimate *stare decisis* (judicial precedent) is partly to blame. Yes, educational ignorance by politicians, lawyers, judges and the general public is partly to blame, but I give the most blame to *Egalitarianism*—a grotesque perversion of equality where instead of justice, activist judges follow a false "living constitution" jurisprudence that mandates an equality of *outcomes*; where the criminal is placed on an equal plane with Justice while *Veritas* becomes relative or irrelevant.

For the Court not to allow the truth into evidence (in any case) is tantamount to giving the criminal the key to his own jail cell while putting the public under the control of deviants, sociopaths and psychopaths. One of my most faithful readers (Henry Barnes of *TheConservativeBeacon.net*) presciently foreshadowed that under the Obama administration, societal chaos is surely by design when he wrote: "In totalitarian states criminals are given the run of prisons over the more docile political prisoners. In the general population criminals are allowed to control private individuals. The government understands that it is easier, and cheaper, to control the population by criminals." . . . And Frankenstein is freed from his prison by the exclusionary rule.

CHAPTER

~ 2 ~

ON POLITICS

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 1

GOP OR GIP?

July 15, 2009

All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.
~ Sir Edmund Burke

The Republican Party used to be called the "GOP" — *Grand Old Party*. Implicit in that name is the storied history of being the "Party of Abraham Lincoln"—the party that ended slavery, instilled liberty, freedom, God, morality and fidelity to the Constitution. In the Age of Obama, all of that is gone. In an earlier article, I referred to the GOP as the GIP—the "Grand Irrelevant Party." Why? Since Ronald Reagan left office the Republicans for the past 20 years have been operating from a position of weakness, ineptitude and fear; where polls, positivism, political posturing and platitudes mean more to these craven pols than God, principle, constitutionalism and *Veritas* (truth).

When I read a recent link on the DrudgeReport.com, *Palin to stump for conservative Democrats?* I almost fell into despair: Why are Republi-

cans campaigning for Democrats while Obama is campaigning for Democrats? Who's standing up for conservatives? Where's Edmund Burke? Where's Lincoln? Where's Churchill? Where's Reagan? We need a real leader of the conservative movement to reform and organize the GOP and craft a coherent message of hope for a brighter future during these Orwellian times of despair and angst. I realize that the Republicans lost the presidency and are in the minority in both Houses of Congress as well as on all of the influential committees; nevertheless, why on the first day of the confirmation hearings did that Quisling, Sen. Lindsay Graham, proudly exclaim that absent a complete meltdown Judge Sonia Sotomayor will be confirmed to the Supreme Court? Remember the confirmation hearings of Kennedy, Souter, Ginsburg and Breyer? The GOP seems most comfortable grabbing the ole ankles and allowing the president to ramrod yet another radical liberal activist judge to the Supreme Court without even a pretense of a fight.

GOP or GIP?

Obama's socialist power grabs and the overreaching of liberal Democrats installing FDR's New Deal, Part II have provided the GOP with a golden opportunity to regain the Congress in the 2010 elections, but instead of solidifying their powerbase and streamlining their platform to distinguish themselves from President Obama, what is the GOP doing? They are mired in dumb ethics scandals. The most notable being Gov. Mark Sanford of South Carolina and his mistress from Argentina that he is apparently still in love with. What about Sen. John Ensign of Nevada who has spent almost \$100,000 in bribes and hush money to his mistress and her husband, both former members of his staff?

Then there is the irrepressible Sarah Palin, who outdid the two GOP politicians cited above in shock value. On the day before America's 233rd birthday, Palin dropped a bombshell announcement that she would resign before completing her first term as governor of Alaska effective July 31, to "do other things" and "to help conservatives win." I'm just glad Ronald Reagan isn't around to see the party he spent so much of his life almost singlehandedly reforming descend into the flames of self-immolation.

GOP or GIP?

Where do we go from here? If economic projections and unemployment rates remain depressed a year from now, I think the GOP will be poised to retake both houses of Congress, rendering Obama a lame duck president into the 2012 election and almost assuring that a Republican will become the nation's next leader. That's why Obama is so desperately trying to pass his FDR welfare state legislation before the August recess.

Here's what the GOP must do:

- ❖ Like Reagan did 30 years ago when he ran against the bumbling socialist Jimmy Carter, get three or four policy platforms on economics, domestic policy, foreign policy and health care, and get behind a person who can best articulate this focused vision.

- ❖ We need candidates not intimidated by Obama's radical racialism. Any GOP candidate will be relentlessly demonized as racist, sexist, homophobic Nazi. Here is the GOP platform in a statement: *Obama is a certified socialist with fascist tendencies. The welfare State he erected has destroyed our civil liberties and has made us all slaves of the federal government. The Democrats have ruined this country economically and made America a joke internationally. If elected, I vow to return America back to the Constitution.*

- ❖ Any politician running on the GOP ticket that doesn't have the guts to spend 15 minutes in the crucible of "The Savage Nation" radio show in my opinion cannot and should not represent my country, because I would consider them cowards and duplicitous and therefore untrustworthy when it comes to zealously defending America's vested domestic and foreign interests.

- ❖ We need GOP candidates that can speak in the authentic voice of the American people –freedom, liberty, Natural Law, constitutionalism, limited government, anti-socialism, anti-welfare and an America-first foreign and domestic policy.

In conclusion, whether the GOP *wins* in 2010 and 2012, or the GIP *loses* in 2010 and 2012 will be a simple matter of determining which candidates can stand flat-footed without a teleprompter, without a deer-in-the-headlights look, without saying "uuuhhh," "aaahhh" or "you know," without vacuous rhetoric of bipartisanship or "my friends across the aisle." We don't need another Benedict Arnold, another Neville Chamberlain, another "Maverick"; no more Nelson Rockefellers, Gerald Fords, John McCains, George Bushes, Bob Doles, or Upper Eastside, country club Republicans. This is war! Therefore, we need a wartime

consigliere in the GOP to stop Obama's ruination of America, not an empty suit or a ventriloquist doll with lipstick, a tight skirt and a convoluted sports metaphor to explain simple questions. Enough is enough!

The great English writer and Christian apologist C.S. Lewis wrote, *All that is not eternal is eternally forgotten*. My paraphrase of Lewis is this: *All that is not eternal is eternally irrelevant*. Republicans, what will you be: the GOP, the Grand Old Party, or the GIP, the Grand Irrelevant Party? If you continue to forsake the eternal truths America was founded upon, you will continue to be the Grand Irrelevant Party with the tombstone inscription of your Whig Party predecessor . . . R.I.P.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 2

OBAMA INC.

May 09, 2009

Obama, the transcendent, messianic, FDResque figure is more akin to Goldstein, the minister of propaganda [in George Orwell's, 1984] who with the help of his fascist legions spent day and night following one credo: Your liberty, your money, your property, your soul all belong to the State (federal government).

~ From *Thou shall not lie* ¹

What do you call a man, a leader, a president of the greatest country in the history of the world that daily ignores constitutional strictures like separation of powers, which limits executive power? What do you call a pathological narcissist that daily creates vast, new totalitarian powers for himself by executive decree while the slavish Democrats, the irrelevant Republicans and the servile liberal media bow to his every will? How would you characterize Wall Street, private corporations, education, medicine, housing and energy who collectively tremble in fear if they don't obey his latest unconstitutional commands, that they will be the next recipient of his vengeful wrath?

The recent headlines on DrudgeReport told the grim tale of Big Brother 2009, aka *Obama Inc.*:

- ❖ "Number of unemployed getting benefits climbs to record 8.9%"
- ❖ "Obama vows to retrain"
- ❖ BIG BUDGET BLOWOUT: \$3,400,000,000,000.00 SPENDS \$11,300 FOR EACH AMERICAN"
- ❖ "Massachusetts welfare recipients provided cars at taxpayers expense"
- ❖ "GM post \$6 billion loss for first quarter"
- ❖ "National bailout agency for U.S. cities"
- ❖ "Computer sold on eBay 'had details of top secret missile defense system'"
- ❖ "Chinese and U.S. ships clash--for fifth time"

To a rational person who loves America and respects the traditions of the Founding Fathers, anti-federalism and executive restraint, the headlines are gut-wrenching, but to a proud fascist like President B. Hussein Obama, those dire headlines above read like the soothing, euphonious strains of a Wagnerian opera. And like Wagner's *primo uomo*, "Siegfried," a man who literally went to hell and back to learn how to fear, only more socialism, anarchy and nihilism can set the proper pretext for this Grand Finale. Only in Chaos Theory can the stage be adequately prepared for Obama Inc. to appear stage left to save America. Yet there is no salvation, no redemption—only a hellish, eternal nightmare that he himself created!

What is Obama Inc. (incorporated)? Like the title suggests, it is our president's systematic, comprehensive plan to takeover and dominate every conceivable aspect of our lives from the cradle to the grave. But more diabolically, Obama Inc. seeks to have omnipotent, irrevocable dictatorial power over every American citizen. I call this aspect of Obama Inc. the Democrat Eternity Act (DEA). Obama is utterly a revolutionary figure following a long, ignoble tradition of former great tyrants like Nebuchadnezzar, Caesar, Muhammad, Henry VIII, Napoleon, Mussolini, Woodrow Wilson, FDR, LBJ, Putin, Chavez and others. Obama Inc. thinks in grand, over-arching, totalizing themes rather than simply single programs as Clinton did with gays in the military or national health care in 1993. No, no, no—one program, even one-seventh of America's entire multi-trillion dollar economy, is much too small for Obama Inc. to be bothered with.

In an earlier article I wrote last year titled, *How Thomas Hobbes is helping destroy America*, I predicted that through the natural development of ideas over time, society, culture, law, politics, economics, philosophy

and all disciplines of knowledge would soon be exploited by a future demagogue that would transform America into a dictatorship. Here is the excerpt on Hobbes:

After War World II, the Supreme Court's liberal view of a "living Constitution" and "evolving standards of decency" led to radical judicial activist opinions in the areas of racial segregation, civil rights, separation of church and state and the so-called "right to privacy"—in cases like *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947), *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), *Gideon v. Wainwright* (1963), *Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965) and *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966)—leading to an entire cottage industry of new rights like the Court's abortion finding in *Roe v. Wade* (1973) and 30 years later to the constitutional right to homosexual sodomy in *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003).

You can thank Thomas Hobbes for elevating our racist, humanist, childish, sexual and vulgar desires to the legitimate level of constitutional rights.²

According to a recent Supreme Court opinion in California, homosexual marriage has once again been raised to the standard of a constitutional "right" by this overtly activist court over the explicit will of the people. It will be interesting where this and numerous other hot button issues takes society as courts grapple with "rights" vs. "privileges," "property rights" vs. "liberty interests," etc. Has this "due process explosion" of the 1950s, '60s and '70s, as federal judge Henry Friendly opined, fundamentally altered the ability of government to manage schools, bureaucracy, agencies, culture, society ... ourselves? I think it has.

One hundred ten days after taken the oath as president of the United States, who would have thought that Obama Inc., led by this unremarkable pol, this intellectually vacuous fascist from Harvard, could have achieved so much, so soon, yet here we are in the midst of a burgeoning totalitarian State equal in every respect but the year of George Orwell's 1984—nevertheless we appear too stupid to realize where we are. Ignorance (*I don't know*) and apathy (*I don't care*) are the twin narcotic drugs Obama Inc. has used to lobotomize America over the past 100 days, but his Machiavellian tactics go further back 100 years to Woodrow Wilson, who, according to Jonah Goldberg's excellent book, *Liberal Fascism*, was America's first fascist president. Interestingly, Wilson's fascism (1913) predated Lenin's Bolshevik Revolution (1917) by four years and Mussolini's fascism (1922) by nine years.

Finally, precursors of Obama Inc. could be heard 330 years ago in the writings of the great English political philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) who prophesied a tyrannical political figure like Obama in his *magnum opus*, *Leviathan* (1651) and summarized his entire *oeuvre* in one telling, succinct last utterance from his deathbed—*A great leap into the dark*. Unless this narcissist, Manchurian Candidate is stopped, America will soon be plunged into a new Dark Age called Obama Inc.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 3

LIBERALS ARE LIBERALS FIRST

January 28, 2009

Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it and polarize it.

~ Saul Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals*, No. 13

We have all heard about how crazy liberals are. Conservative intellectual and radio host Michael Savage even wrote a book about this phenomenon, his 2005 New York Times best-seller, *Liberalism is a Mental Disorder*. Likewise, in 2008, Dr. Lyle H. Rossiter Jr., M.D., wrote in his best-seller, *The Liberal Mind: The Psychological Causes of Political Madness*, the following:

The roots of liberalism—and its associated madness—can be clearly identified by understanding how children develop from infancy to adulthood and how distorted development produces the irrational beliefs of the liberal mind.

Liberals are liberals *first*. Am I being polemical? Yes, to a degree, but I am not being personal. I'm not contending that all liberals are crazy, but I will say, along with Dr. Savage and Dr. Rossiter, that a logical, legal and medical case can be made that *liberalism* (i.e., socialism, progressivism, and egalitarianism) is not a rational political belief system.³

On this point, last Friday, President Obama chided Republican leaders for being stupid enough to listen to conservative stalwart Rush Limbaugh. Obama said, "You can't just listen to Rush Limbaugh and get things done." With a hushed silence over the room, the messiah went further saying, "If we don't get this done we (the Democrats) could lose

seats and I could lose re-election. But we can't let people like Rush Limbaugh stall this. That's how things don't get done in this town."

Rush was clicking on all cylinders over the weekend when he remarked about Obama's criticism of him in this manner: "Obama's plan would buy votes for the Democrat Party in the same way FDR's New Deal established majority power for 50 years of Democrat rule, and it would also simultaneously seriously damage any hope of future tax cuts. . . . Put simply, I believe [economic] stimulus is aimed at re-establishing "eternal" power for the Democrat Party rather than stimulating the economy, because anyone with a brain knows this is NOT how you stimulate the economy."

When President Obama promised America "FDR, part II," few of the political pundits took notice because ideologically they are elitists, liberals and socialists like Obama.—The propaganda press, the professors of the academy, judges, the Democrats and most Republicans all have fallen prey to the siren song of socialism and leviathan government taking over more and more of the private enterprise. Wall Street, the investment banks, Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae, the home mortgage industry, the auto industry, states like California, Arizona and Michigan on the verge of bankruptcy, even the porn industry, is just the beginning. They all want "bailouts" i.e., "welfare," i.e., unearned, undeserved, unconstitutional confiscation of money belonging to We the People and given to others who didn't earn it and don't deserve it to secure Democrat Party votes *in perpetuity*. It's legalized thievery. It is Mafia tactics on a grand scale.

What the GOP seems oblivious to knowing and what I am trying to teach my students at Savannah State University is politics through a historical lens. That means we study politics (or any other subject for that matter) through the lens and judgment of history and through the non-partisan philosophy of *Veritas*—truth. All else is irrelevant propaganda. That said, history has definitively demonstrated that since President Theodore Roosevelt, liberals (or "progressives," which was what socialists and liberals were called 100 years ago) made policy proposals *not* with the intent of solving real social, economic, education, legal, race, class, gender problems, but to solidify their power over the people forever. Just look at some of the political philosophy, policy and legislation passed by presidential executive order or by illegal collusion with Congress over the past 100 years:

❖ *Theodore Roosevelt* (1901-09)—the first true “progressive” president, though a Republican, invented the “imperial presidency” and used the “bully pulpit” and his “Fair Deal” policies to concoct all sorts of policies and programs that had no correlation with free-market capitalism (i.e., “trust busting”) or respect for private property. (Roosevelt set aside more land for national parks and nature preserves than all of his predecessors combined, 194 million acres.)

❖ *Woodrow Wilson* (1913-21)—Jonah Goldberg, in his important book, *Liberal Fascism*, quoted this president: “True leaders” uses the masses like “tools”; “All progressives ask or desire is permission—in an era when ‘development,’ ‘evolution,’ is the scientific word—to interpret the Constitution according to the Darwinian principle.”

❖ *Franklin Delano Roosevelt* [FDR] (1933-45)—Used the stock market crash of October 1929 and the Great Depression as a pretext to enact his “New Deal” to grow the government in gargantuan proportions over the people and to use the socialist welfare state as the “power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe. . . .”

❖ *Lyndon B. Johnson* [LBJ] (1963-69)—“The Great Society” and “War on Poverty” programs including AFDC, Food Stamp Act, Medicare, Medicaid; greatly expanded FDR’s welfare state to connect every conceivable aspect of the American citizen to the tentacles of leviathan government. (Remember LBJ was a protégé of FDR.)

❖ *Richard Nixon* (1969-74)—Although a Progressive “Republican,” Nixon gave America socialist wage and price controls, the Environmental Protection Agency and affirmative action. He also gave us two unremarkable liberal justices on the Supreme Court: Chief Justice Warren Burger and Harry Blackmun. Blackmun authored the *Roe v. Wade* decision in 1972, arguably (after *Dred Scott v. Sandford* [1854] upholding slavery) the most murderous, infamous decision in the history of American constitutional law.

❖ *George W. Bush* (2001-09)—singlehandedly deconstructed the Reagan Revolution by his “Compassionate conservatism,” bungling, incoherent, incompetent domestic policies (amnesty for illegal aliens, No Child Left Behind), foreign policy (the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan) and reinstituting a Bob Michael-esque GOP Progressivise irrelevance that will probably mimic the wilderness years of 1954-94.

❖ *Barack Obama* (2009-)—His first call as president was to Mahmoud Abbas, Yasser Arafat’s protégé and the leader of the “former” Palestinian terrorist group Fatah. His first public interview as president was with the Dubai-based Al-Arabiya. Obama’s first executive order was to limit lobbyist influence in Washington, D.C., while at the same time

granting Deputy Secretary of Defense William Lynn an exemption because Lynn was a lobbyist for the defense contractor Raytheon. Other early policies that seem critical to Obama's legacy and the Democrat majority in Congress can be summarized in three words—abortion, abortion and abortion.

Rush Limbaugh was right—"Liberals are liberals first." Liberal Democrats create policies not to solve problems, but to win elections and make more and more people dependent on the government welfare programs they provide. Since FDR, liberals have used every Machiavellian tactic to create a Leninist groupthink mentality; a slavish and addictive dependence on government that Democrats hope will keep them in power in perpetuity. This is what Rush meant he said, "Obama's plan would buy votes for the Democrat Party in the same way FDR's New Deal established majority power for 50 years of Democrat rule."

When I see the GOP sitting politely with President Obama before the cameras—neutered, compliant and irrelevant—I start shouting at my TV set: "WHERE ARE THE REAL MEN IN THE GOP!?" Then Rush helped me to remember: Don't think Obama, think Saul Alinsky, Obama's community organizer mentor, who said in Rule 13 of Alinsky's *Rules for Radicals*—*Pick the target* [Rush Limbaugh, the conservative base], *freeze it, personalize it and polarize it*. This is what President Obama masterfully executed at last Friday's press conference with the GOP. Why don't the Republicans understand that they are playing checkers while Obama and the Democrats are playing chess? The GOP is *trying* to win an election in the next two years, and the Democrats are using Machiavellian tactics to win elections for the next 40 years. Perhaps that's why the GOP doesn't stand for the "Grand Old Party" anymore. The more appropriate acronym is "GIP" . . . the "Grand Irrelevant Party."

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 4

JUST CALL HIM 'PRESIDENT NIMROD'

January 17, 2009

The more things change, the more things stay the same.

~ George Bernard Shaw, *Revolutionist's Handbook* (1903)

Prologue

As I view all of the cataclysmic world events of today and how society lurches towards Perdition, I am reminded of the august words of that magnificent playwright George Bernard Shaw who, quoting the French writer Alphonse Karr, said, "The more things change, the more things stay the same."

Obama's modern lineage

"Change" was a mantra of President-elect Barack Obama, and "change" is what propelled him into the White House as the first black president of the United States by defeating a sitting senior senator from New York and the wife of the original "first black president," Bill Clinton. Yet, I don't see real change with Obama; I see Presidents Woodrow Wilson, FDR, Jimmy Carter and William Clinton, *redux* (part II)—but also LBJ and George W. Bush. I see Barack Obama mimicking the fascist and socialist policies of President Wilson (1913-21), father of the League of Nations (1919), precursor to the United Nations (1945), whom conservative writer Jonah Goldberg called "the first president to speak disparagingly of the Constitution." Goldberg continued on Wilson: "Wilson's view of politics could be summarized by the word *statolatry*, or state worship. . . . Wilson believed that the state was a natural, organic and spiritual expression of the people themselves. . . . Constitutional democracy, as the founders understood it, was a momentary phase in this progression. . . . *The State* does now whatever experience permits or the times demand."

I see Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1933-45) as a precedent figure to Obama because he himself in his own words has promised Americans FDR, part II. FDR fulfilled Wilson's League of Nations' dream by helping to create the United Nations. I see Jimmy Carter (1976-81) as a precedent figure to Obama. Despite all his vaunted rhetoric of "Yes we can," now that Obama has been elected, his tone is much more somber, grave, almost depressing regarding the economy. President Carter called his economic times "malaise" and constantly chided Americans to "conserve energy," put on sweaters, bicycle to work and turn your thermostat down. Now that's a leader you can follow.

Finally, there are the Clinton retreads Obama is putting into key upper-level Cabinet positions. Why? Did not Obama defeat Hillary? Why is he kowtowing to the political hacks of the Clinton administration who

squatted in the Reagan revolution of a great economy and took credit for it despite the fact that it was the Gingrich Congress and his "Contract with America" that held the Clintons' (Bill and Hilary) socialist tendencies in check. Ironically, it wasn't the liberal Bill Clinton that ended the 20 fat years of Ronald Reagan, but thanks to the so-called "conservative" George W. Bush who single-handedly destroyed the conservative movement, derailing the Reagan Revolution and establishing a rejuvenated Bob Michelesque "loyal minority" for another 40 years of political irrelevance for the GOP.

Obama's ancient lineage

Speaking of utopia, this brings me to perhaps Obama's most interesting and least talked about precedent figure, the biblical Nimrod of the book of Genesis. Nimrod was the first great world leader mentioned in the Bible after the flood in the land presently known as Babylon (Iraq). Was Nimrod good or evil? The Bible says little of Nimrod the man, but what it does reveal is very significant: "Cush was the father of Nimrod, who grew to be a mighty warrior on the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the LORD; that is why it is said, 'Like Nimrod, a mighty hunter before the LORD.'" The centers of his kingdom were Babylon, Erech, Akkad and Calneh in Shinar." (Genesis 10:8-10). Without getting too detailed about biblical history, how does Nimrod relate to the United Nations and Obama? All three were one-world-government utopians, meaning their worldview and political philosophy is predicated on man being the alpha and omega of all things, the sole master of his own destiny, and that mankind has the capacity through his own efforts (apart from God and morality) of establishing a perfect society here on earth. These pagan, humanist assumptions are repeatedly condemned throughout the Bible as heretical and diabolical.

What policies or ideas did Nimrod establish that are similar to the U.N. and Obama? Nimrod was a very significant man in ancient times, the grandson of Ham and great-grandson of Noah. Nimrod started his kingdom at Babylon. He arrogantly violated an expressed commandment of God for mankind after the flood to disperse throughout the earth ("Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it," Gen. 1:28) and consolidated his lust for one-world globalism and centralized power at his stronghold of "the plains of Shinar" in present-day Iraq. As a monument to his narcissistic power and deification of his di-

vinity, Nimrod ordered built a giant “ziggurat”; an astrological tower, not to climb to heaven, as some biblical scholars contend, but as an observation tower to view the movements of the planets. Nimrod and ancient society at that time worshipped the stars and planets of heaven, another blasphemous violation of the Bible.

Epilogue

We clearly see though the fascist and socialist legacy of Wilson, FDR, LBJ, Carter, and even through the utopian tendencies George W. Bush, that Obama will enact statist policies designed to confiscate more of our constitutional rights and give them to the federal government. This is bad for all Americans and will only further denigrate our natural rights, or what Jefferson referred to as “Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” We see in the biblical figure, Nimrod, an ancient precedent figure for Obama who was utterly narcissistic, pagan and utopian in that Nimrod was the first person to try to establish a one-world government. God was so against this idea that he “confounded their languages” so that the people who were originally of one language couldn’t understand one another, and work on the “Tower of Babel” was discontinued. Likewise, Obama’s early Cabinet picks have been characterized by the propaganda media as “centrists,” though they are not. These careerist politicians, appointees and ideologues—from Hillary Clinton to Carol Browner, Eric Holder, Tom Daschle, Michelle Obama, Leon Panetta, and Rahm Emmanuel, are dyed-in-the-wool socialists with overtly fascist tendencies. They are utopians in that their sole objective is to continue the FDR revolution of making We the People foreswear more and more of our inalienable rights to become voluntary slaves of the leviathan State.

Let me end with a quote on the Declaration of Independence from President Woodrow Wilson, who wrote that “a lot of nonsense has been talked about the inalienable rights of the individual, and a great deal that was mere vague sentiment and pleasing speculation has been put forward as fundamental principle.” According to Wilson, “if a law couldn’t be executed, it wasn’t a real law, and that ‘abstract rights’ were vexingly difficult to execute.” With these two utopians controlling the most powerful nation in the history of civilization—George W. Bush on the right and Barack Hussein Obama on the left, Jefferson’s “law of nature and of Nature’s God” has been perverted into Wilson’s “[law of] whatever experience permits or the times demand.”

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 5

OBAMA: MANCHILD IN THE PROMISED LAND

March 04, 2009

You never want a serious crisis to go to waste. What I mean by that is it's an opportunity to do things that you think you could not do before.

~ Rahm Emanuel, President Obama's Chief of Staff (now Mayor of Chicago)

When I judge the Obama presidency I find it almost impossible to view Obama as a fully developed man. While this statement may be polemical to some, it isn't an original idea. It has been repeatedly stated by that great conservative intellectual, Dr. Michael Savage, who said regarding Obama, "The most important word a man can tell a boy he is trying to help become a man is, 'No.' All of Obama's life nobody has ever told him no."

In a UK Telegraph article by editor, Toby Harnden, titled, *Top 10 anti-Barack Obama conservatives*: "Savage on Obama: No one has ever said no to Obama. From his childhood, through his early career, until now, no authority figure has said, "Stop, you can't do that." So he has developed a sense of self-righteousness and political invincibility . . . until someone is willing to stand up to him and say, "Stop! Enough! You will not drain the Treasury! You will not socialize this country," he will continue to steamroll our freedoms." ⁴ We are hearing now from economic experts that President Obama has spent more taxpayer money in just *five weeks* than George W. Bush did during his entire *eight years* of freewheeling domestic spending, \$2 trillion Wall Street bailout fiasco, as well as the exorbitant costs of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

Obama's actions are not by accident but by systematic design. Not only has Obama waged war on America's most sacred institutions—Christianity, free market capitalism, federalism and pro-life policies, he has waged war on the conservative movement and intends to make the Republican Party become the Whig Party of the 21st century. As part of his Machiavellian strategy, Obama's first cabinet pick was Rahm "dead fish" Emanuel as his chief of staff. In November, 2008 Emanuel was ra-

ther candid in describing Obama's grandiose designs to remake America in his own Marxist image saying:

You never want a serious crisis to go to waste. What I mean by that is it's an opportunity to do things that you think you could not do before. This is an opportunity. What used to be long-term problems—be they in the health care area, energy area, education area, fiscal area, tax area, regulatory reform area—things that we had postponed for too long that were long-term are now immediate and must be dealt with. And this crisis provides the opportunity for us . . . the opportunity to do things that you could not do before.

Emanuel's ideas above mimic FDR's utopian pretext of the Great Depression as a means to shove his leviathan government "New Deal" down America's throat. I have often stated in my own writings on law, politics and philosophy that before theory, before practice, there *must* be a pretext. Rahm Emanuel has clearly stated this shameless political pretext above. What is the "serious crisis" Emanuel doesn't want "to go to waste"? Well it's the downward spiral of economy. To a certified socialist like Obama who is a self-confessed admirer of FDR, a crisis, any crisis is like pure gold: misery = power.

Listen to Obama's speeches since he has become president. He is literally talking down the economy at every opportunity as a pretext to launch more government programs. If you doubt me, do a Google search of the phrases: "Obama, crisis" or "Obama, economic crisis" and you will literally get hundreds of thousands of hits: words from his own mouth. If you do a similar search of President Ronald Reagan and economic crisis, you'll get a lot of hits, but upon closer scrutiny few if any relate to Reagan running down the economy (or the country) *from his own mouth*. Reagan, unlike Obama, was a man who championed personal responsibility, economic freedom, boundless vision and optimism; not economic Marxism, and policies promoting pessimism, envy and legalized thievery.

Back to Obama being an undeveloped man. You can see it in the manner he governs. You see this deficiency in his body language when confronted by men that disagree with him. Just beneath that suave, JFK demeanor lies an insecure, selfish, diminutive manchild who was never told "no." Like a spoiled brat child, Obama takes every *policy* disagreement as a *personal* insult. Obama loves to give dictates, orders and commands. He doesn't want to hear the other side of the arguments or roll

up his sleeves to do the necessary down and dirty work with his political opponents for real consensus building. No, no, no. Remember Obama's childish rant a few weeks before GOP leaders to negotiate the passage of his \$1 trillion dollar economic stimulus plan, while the cameras were rolling Obama arrogantly shouted: "I won!" In other words negotiations are over. I am the man-child whom everybody loves and voted for. Do what I say, or I'm going to take my basketball and go home. While I would expect this attitude from a little 12 or 13-year-old boy raised by a doting single mother in the ghetto or the Upper Eastside of Manhattan, I would not expect this childish view from the leader of the free world, yet the more we see and hear from this president the more we see that Obama is less a developed, secure man and more a manchild; a very myopic, immature little boy who hates to have his ideas challenged by any man.

In one of my first critiques of Obama, written six months before his inauguration, I expressed the following:

To me, Obama is intellectually vacuous (despite his Columbia and Harvard pedigree). He seems incapable of putting two sentences together without excessively stuttering or saying "uuuhhh." Because he is so wedded to radical, racist, socialist ideas and is so comfortable around people who promote policies that I and most reasonable Americans find contemptible, I cannot in good faith devote an *entire* column exclusively on this mental midget.

Like Obama, my father left me when I was very young (18 months), and I only saw him twice during my first 30 years of life. That said, I had read through enough biographies of great men and seen personally what happens to young boys who make the wrong life choices to realize that I had better seek out men in the community that could mentor me and teach me how to become a *real* man.⁵

Like millions of young black boys who grew up either without a father, or a father who was there in body, but due to a number of variables, failed to contribute meaningfully in the child's development, the boy-child is forced to collect *de facto* (unofficial, substitute) fathers as they grow up. Some of these associations may have been good and nurturing, but in Obama's case they were one of the following—*negative or absent* (Barack Obama Sr., grandfather Stanley Dunham), *communist* (Frank Marshall Davis), *radical or anarchistic* (Karl Marx, Saul Alinsky, Woodrow Wilson, FDR, LBJ, Bill Ayers, Father Pfleger, Rev. Jeremiah Wright) and

humanist academic (Professors Lawrence Tribe and Charles Ogeltree). I clearly saw Obama, the candidate as Obama, the man-child in the promise land and wrote: "His ipso facto acceptance of radical ideas from the law academy (and Pastor Wright) without question thus causes me to view Obama not as a fully developed man, but as a Manchurian Candidate who seems incapable of having an independent thought apart from Marxist, socialist, liberal dogma. Such a person in my opinion is unworthy of the presidency (at least in America)."

In conclusion, I truly believe Obama can become a failed one-term Jimmy Carter-figure only if a strong conservative man of moral, charismatic, intellectual and rhetorical skills can rise up and challenge Obama *as a man*. If that person can sustain this challenge to reveal Obama's false messiah façade and expose Obama the Manchild as the political fraud tens of millions of American citizens know him to be, then I believe like David brought down the imposing giant, Goliath, Obama the Manchild, along with his cradle-to-grave government controls over our lives can be exposed and defeated in the arena of ideas.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 6

I CAN NO LONGER REMAIN IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

May 23, 2009

Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?

~ Jesus

And said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him [Jesus] unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver.

~ Judas

From this point forward I will no longer refer to myself as a Republican. Why?

To paraphrase Ronald Reagan regarding why he left the Democratic Party, *I didn't leave the Republican Party, the Republican Party left me!* I became a conservative 21 years ago in the early autumn of 1988 while a graduate student at Harvard. Coincidentally, a young Barack Obama had that same year also matriculated to Harvard, being formerly educated by such communist and socialist luminaries as Frank Marshall Davis, Saul Alinsky and the Rev. Jeremiah Wright in the fundamental rudiments of

nation annihilation. The narrative of how I became a conservative can be found in this previous column.⁶

Twenty years ago as a neophyte conservative, I had an inexplicable feeling of unease as I entered the polling booth to cast my first Republican vote for Bush 41. Something in the air was amiss ... but what? Now I know through maturity and hindsight that Bush 41 wasn't a true conservative, neither was Clinton that followed him, nor Bush 41's son, Bush 43, that followed him. All of these American presidents over the past 20 years who frequently imitated the style, words and rhetoric of Ronald Reagan were in effect impostors. Today, America is paying a terrible price for electing such inept, phony leaders. My ideological mentor and conservative intellectual Michael Savage often says on his radio program summarizing the past election that Bush 43, the GOP leadership, the RNC and John McCain all "greased the skids for Obama to win the election. Not one of them ever came on my program because they are all cowards!" The words of Savage are true, painfully true. Since Reagan retired there isn't a dime's worth of difference between the Democrat Party, made up of proud socialists, and the Republican Party, who are socialists-lite. Obama didn't drive America to the brink of the Great Depression, Part II alone; he had 20 years of socialism-lite from Bush 41, Clinton and Bush 43 as a foundation.

Twenty years ago when Bush 41 assumed the presidency, virtually all of America had hoped that this leader would continue the "Reagan Revolution," where Reagan's comprehensive sweep of the electorate won him 43 states in 1980 and 49 states in 1984. The American people arguably wanted Reagan's successor to even sharpen the anti-federalist mandate and do many more great things Reagan didn't have the time or the vision to accomplish, like bringing black people back into the party of Abraham Lincoln and further dismantling the bloated government bureaucracy and welfare state that his predecessors, like Carter, Nixon, LBJ, FDR and Woodrow Wilson, had previously erected. Twenty years ago I knew the fix was in with the GOP, as seemingly every Republican *mimicked* the words of Reagan, but virtually none of them *followed* his words or consistently defended his policies and political ideology. This shameless duplicity by the GOP brought to mind the words of Jesus who 2,000 years ago likewise castigated the corrupt, phony religious and civic leaders of his day—the Sadducees, Pharisees, Herodians, scribes and

lawyers, condemning them all as hell-bound hypocrites, saying, *Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?*

Like Jesus, so it was with Reagan. Today we have one craven, incompetent, unremarkable politician after another ascend to the Parthenon of power only to quickly become corrupt and devolve into a pathetic, me-too Democrat socialism. The other day I even heard the incredible assertion by Republican National Committee Chairman Michael Steele in a major address: "The era of apologizing for Republican mistakes of the past is now officially over. It is done. The time for trying to fix or focus on the past [i.e., Reaganism] has ended."

Enter Judas the traitor, Judas the opportunist, Judas the craven, careerist politician that would sell his own grandmother's wig if it would give him a two-point spike in the polls. Since Bush 41 succeeded Reagan in January 1989 these 20 years have more or less been the Golden Age of the Judas in the GOP and RNC politics, which is why Americans have elected that greatest Judas in modern politics, B. Hussein Obama, who at the time of this writing has nationalized Wall Street, private corporations, banks, the home mortgage industry, plans to nationalize health care and will soon become the *de facto* CEO of Chrysler and GM (General Motors) which in essence should be renamed "OM" (Obama Motors).

Remember during the election the throngs of people who cheered for Obama, adored Obama, obeyed Obama, and worshipped Obama? People the communist dictator Vladimir Lenin about 100 years ago derisively called "useful idiots." If we didn't live in a lobotomized society dominated by propaganda newspeak and political doublespeak, the GOP (Grand Old Party) would more accurately be called the GIP (Grand Irrelevant Party). If the Republicans don't want to become the Whig Party of the 21st century, they had better stop mouthing and aping the words of President Reagan and begin to promote real leaders who earnestly *live* the words of Reagan in thought, word and deed. Let's look at the voting public from a logical perspective. It is human nature for people to vote for an authentic leader (Obama) versus an inauthentic me-too socialist party like the Republican Party. In other words, people will always vote for real leader rather than a "moderate" or pretender.

Jesus, Reagan or Judas—Which precedent figure would be most appropriate in defining the GOP's legacy over the past 20 years? The answer is obvious. Reagan said, "Trust, but verify." Therefore, let all Americans who earnestly love this country arise and purge the Republican

Party of every Judas and Neville Chamberlain and eventually return America to be what Reagan poignantly called *a shining city on a hill*.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 7

TED KENNEDY: 'A COWARD BESIDE HEROES'

August 29, 2009

Such desecration of hallowed ground.

A weed beside the rose.

Assured, not he with them would die,

Yet, worthy, thought he, with them to lie,

A coward beside heroes.

~ Anonymous

At the time of this writing, the cortege of limousines is traveling from the Kennedy compound in Hyannisport to the JFK library in Boston behind the hearse bearing the remains of Sen. Ted Kennedy who died of brain cancer Aug. 25. Nevertheless, during this solemn occasion I do not join the legions of sycophantic TV hosts of the government-controlled media and their guests to laud this man, for I find absolutely nothing praiseworthy in him. Ted Kennedy began his political career 47 years ago. I was just 14 months old. I understand that Kennedy actually began his career on the same day that liberal doyen Eleanor Roosevelt died. How fitting is it that the two patron saints of liberalism had their careers begin and end on that same fateful day of Nov. 7, 1962. JFK had a similar coincidence occur at his death on Nov. 22, 1963.⁷ Two thousand years ago, at the trial of Jesus, Roman Procurator Pontius Pilate asked the Socratic question: "What is truth?" I echo Pilate's query in the context of Kennedy: Was Sen. Ted Kennedy a man of truth?

For 47 years, Sen. Kennedy made his bones on one singular premise—*Take money from people who earned it and give it to those who didn't earn it*. That has been the *modus operandi* not only of Kennedy, but the entire Liberal-Progressive Axis of the Democratic/Republican Party going back over 100 years. For example, the first progressive national leader was President Theodore Roosevelt (1901-09) who in a speech titled "The New Nationalism," used the curious phrase "human welfare" and further

said, "Personal property is subject to the general right of the community to regulate its use to *whatever degree the public welfare may require it.*" Later President Woodrow Wilson (1913-21), another unabashed progressive, said that "a true leader" uses the masses like "tools" and that "men are as clay in the hands of the consummate leader." These overtly fascist conceptions of power demonstrated 100 years ago were the seeds of the modern-day liberalism of FDR, LBJ, Ted Kennedy, Bill and Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama. Furthermore, these Machiavellian ideas are a gross perversion of the U.S. Constitution and the original intent of the Founding Fathers to any person who has learned to think logically and understand history and law from an intellectual as opposed to a socialist point of view.

In the comments section of a Washington Times article, "Senate's liberal lion falls to cancer at 77," by Stephen Dinan,⁸ there were these interesting lines that summed up the true legacy of Ted Kennedy and the behind-the-scenes machinations of the old patriarch, Joseph Kennedy ("Mr. Fix"): "A memorial to Edward "Ted" M. Kennedy, who enlisted for a two-year term in the army in 1950. To Ted Kennedy, whose father used personal influence to get Ted an assignment as a guard to Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers, Europe (SHAPE) in Paris; which kept him out of the Korean War, in which thousands of brave American young men were dying." Yet this fraudulent soldier of the Korean War was not alone among the Kennedy clan for dubious service in the war. There was the PT-109 incident where the boat JFK captained during World War II was sliced in half by a Japanese destroyer, killing two of his crew members on Aug. 2, 1943. Even JFK privately called that event "a botched military operation." Not to be outdone by his younger brother, Joe Jr. volunteered for a dangerous mission to bomb German V-Rocket factories in France (Operation Aphrodite), which tragically backfired when his plane mysteriously exploded in mid-air on Aug. 12, 1944—some say due to stray jamming or electrical frequencies Joe Jr. was warned of the day before his fateful flight.

No problem. Mr. Fix, Joe Kennedy (Ted's father), used his military connections to make sure that his son, JFK received the Marine Navy Corps Medal for valor. It's all part of the Kennedy mythology—the family fortune built in the old days on bootlegging, selling short in the stock market during the Great Depression, Joe Kennedy's support of Hitler, JFK and RFK wiretapping MLK, the murder of Marilyn Monroe and

Mary Jo Kopechne, welfare, abortion, amnesty, socialist health care, Camelot and all the rest of the Kennedy propaganda so shamefully displayed since Ted's death.

In another Washington Times article, a wonderfully insightful comment about the death of Ted Kennedy was made by one of the readers, with larger implications to the impotent and irrelevant Republican Party: "All I see here is the ease with which Sen. Kennedy was able to seduce the Republicans into compromising their principles so as to enact into law many of his—one reason that the Republicans lost their congressional majority in 2006 and lost yet again in 2008." Makes me wonder if George Wallace was right when he remarked that, "There's not a dime's bit of difference between the two political parties." Indeed, George Wallace was right, which is why the GOP will join the Democrats to give Ted Kennedy a burial fit for a war hero like Gen. George Patton and a requiem mass fit for a Christian saint like Mother Teresa. What a galling spectacle indeed! The final outrage is that these legions of bona fide brave American soldiers who fought so valiantly to keep the totalitarian menace of Nazism from Europe and Communism from Korea and Vietnam, their bones will never rest in the sacred ground at Arlington Cemetery. Yet Sen. Ted Kennedy, the fraudulent, cowardly Korean War vet who for 47 years as the senator from Massachusetts made an art form out of stealing money from those who earned it and giving it to his partners in crime who didn't earn it just to buy votes and amass power, will this day have his bloated carcass rest among true men of valor.

On this solemn occasion, I praise not Sen. Kennedy, nor the Kennedy legacy, but I praise the *real* war heroes at Arlington and at cemeteries throughout America and Europe. May they all have eternal rest in heaven. To Sen. Ted Kennedy, this is your legacy:

Such desecration of hallowed ground.

A weed beside the rose.

Assured, not he with them would die,

Yet, worthy, thought he, with them to lie,

A coward beside heroes.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 8

TED KENNEDY: REAGAN'S BENEDICT ARNOLD

September 02, 2009

[Sen. Ted] Kennedy is very impressed with the activities of Y. V. Andropov and other Soviet leaders.

~ May 14, 1983 Memo of KGB Chief, Victor Chebrikov

The death of any famous or infamous person brings out an assortment of skeletons from their proverbial closet. One skeleton that caught my attention last week was the astonishing claim, based on KGB documents released under the *Glasnost* policies, of Russian President Boris Yeltsin on Sen. Ted Kennedy. Kennedy's treason first came to public attention in a Feb. 2, 1992, article in the London Times, titled, "Teddy, the KGB and the top secret file," by reporter Tim Sebastian. The seditious events were also published in Human Events in 2003, which read in part:

One of the documents, a KGB report to bosses in the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, revealed that "In 1978, American Sen. Edward Kennedy requested the assistance of the KGB to establish a relationship" between the Soviet apparatus and a firm owned by former Sen. John Tunney, D-Ca. KGB recommended that they be permitted to do this because Tunney's firm was already connected with a KGB agent in France named David Karr. This document was found by the knowledgeable Russian journalist Yevgenia Albats and published in Moscow's *Izvestia* in June 1992.⁹

Another even more disturbing KGB memo was analyzed in detail by writer Paul Kengor in his 2006 book, "The Crusader: Ronald Reagan and the Fall of Communism."¹⁰

The memo, dated May 14, 1983, is from the head of the KGB, Victor Chebrikov, to his boss, the sinister Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov. The highly confidential document was in regards to a clandestine offer to the Soviet leadership by none other than Sen. Ted Kennedy. What was the *quid pro quo*? If the Soviet Union would help Sen. Kennedy and the Democratic Party defeat President Ronald Reagan in the upcoming 1984 elections, then Sen. Kennedy would use the American media to exploit existential tensions between the U.S. and the Soviet Union over

the issue of peaceful co-existence and nuclear proliferation. Ted Kennedy wanted to show that Reagan was a greater enemy of U.S.-Soviet relations than Yuri Andropov (former head of the KGB and the architect of such brutal military campaigns as *Prague Spring* in 1968, Kabul, Afghanistan, in 1979 and Warsaw, Poland, in 1981). To the Democratic Party and Sen. Ted Kennedy *one* stalwart Republican was more of a danger to world peace than the entire Soviet government, which by 1983 had seized power and established communist dictatorships in dozens of countries throughout the world.

Does this latest old revelation forever make Sen. Kennedy President Reagan's Benedict Arnold? I think it does; here's why. JFK said at his Inaugural Address in January 1961: "History, the final judge of our deeds." That said, history has repeatedly affirmed that President Reagan, during his eight years as president (1981-89), put the death nail in the coffin of the old Soviet empire by outspending them on military hardware and by exposing the "evil empire." Reagan believed in American exceptionalism, that America was that "shining city on a hill." On the other hand, Sen. Ted Kennedy, for almost 50 years as a U.S. Senator, including the eight years Reagan was president, used every Machiavellian tactic learned from his father, Joe Kennedy Sr. to undermine and destroy the vaunted "Reagan Revolution," even as those transcendent ideas eventually smashed Soviet communism to its foundations and granted freedom to tens of millions of people. Indeed, Sen. Ted Kennedy was President Reagan's Benedict Arnold.

Regarding some of the ugly details of Sen. Ted Kennedy's treachery against President Reagan and America, Kengor wrote:

According to the memo, Senator Kennedy was "very troubled" by U.S.-Soviet relations, which Kennedy attributed not to the murderous tyrant running the USSR but to President Reagan. The problem was Reagan's "belligerence." . . .

Chebrikov's memo got to the thrust of Kennedy's offer: The senator was apparently clinging to hope that President Reagan's 1984 reelection bid could be thwarted. Of course, this seemed unlikely, given Reagan's undeniable popularity. . . . The only real threats to Reagan are problems of war and peace and Soviet-American relations. These issues, according to the senator, will without a doubt become the most important of the election campaign.¹¹

It gets much worse. Kennedy's duplicity and treachery was even more shameless, detailed and complete than other famous traitors in history like: Judas Iscariot, Lady Macbeth, Benedict Arnold, the French Vichy government and Vidkun Quisling, who opened up his country (Norway) to Hitler's Nazis. An interesting excerpt from the 1983 Chebrikov memo was the part where Kennedy promised favorable media treatment for Premiere Andropov and all Soviet officials looking to come to America to bolster USSR public approval, while condemning Reagan's aggressive stance to rebuild America's military as a buffer against Soviet communism. Kengor wrote of Kennedy: "The media savvy Massachusetts senator recommended to the Soviet dictator that he seek a 'direct appeal' to the American people. And, on that, 'Kennedy and his friends,' explained Chebrikov, were willing to help, listing Walter Cronkite and Barbara Walters (both listed by name in the memo) as good candidates for sit-down interviews with the dictator." This section confirms conservative's profound suspicions of the government-controlled media, particularly Walter Cronkite, whom I chronicled in an earlier [article](#).

I apologize for such a cursory analysis on the detailed and comprehensive treachery by Sen. Ted Kennedy against Carter and Reagan by literally stabbing our presidents and the American people in the back during one of the most dangerous periods of American history—the Cold War. Ted Kennedy's insatiable lust for power and notoriety drove him to Faustian alliances with the most murderous communist dictatorship the world has ever known. Who could be against America, the last great hope for civilization and the only buffer against a worldwide communist dictatorship? We can now clearly see from a number of declassified KGB memos and other documents from the Kremlin archives that indeed it was the Democratic Party led by Sen. Ted Kennedy . . . the Benedict Arnold of our time.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 9

VAN JONES: OBAMA'S ALTER EGO

September 09, 2009

They are using lies and distortions to distract and divide.

~ Van Jones

President Obama and Van Jones are using lies and distortions to deceive and divide the American people.

~ Ellis Washington (a paraphrase of Van Jones)

By now most of you have heard that late Saturday President Obama's outspoken "green czar," Van Jones, was forced to resign due to his repeated racist, communist and idiotic statements against American society and past presidents like George W. Bush, whom Van Jones called "a crackhead." ¹² Apparently, Van Jones was a highly touted recommendation from Valerie Jarrett, one of Barack's (and Michelle's) closet friends and senior adviser from Chicagoland. Surely the self-appointed "most transparent administration" in the history of the U.S. presidency would have done their proper due diligence in vetting this self-avowed communist and radical community organizer from the streets of Oakland, Calif., who has a law degree from an Ivy League school. . . . Sounds a little bit like Saul Alinsky, Barack and Michelle Obama, doesn't it?

Just what did Obama and Jarrett know, and when did they know it? Surely Obama and his legions of socialist bureaucrats knew and approved this green czar and sanctioned his offensive, arrogant worldview that was expressed in his many political speeches. For example, in one speech, Jones said: "Give them [Native Americans] the wealth! Give them the dignity! Give them the respect!" What caused Van Jones to get fired was that he wasn't as sufficiently adept at concealing his radical intentions as Obama, Rahm Emmanuel, David Axelrod and Valerie Jarrett have been so far. Indeed, Jones' entire career is Karl Marx revisited and is contained in Marx's famous aphorism: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." In ridding himself of Van Jones, Obama also borrowed a policy from the Mexican drug cartels when they have a problem person in their way—*plata o ploma*, silver or lead? The bribe or the bullet? I believe that Jones was pulled aside over the weekend and told in no uncertain terms:

Obama to Van Jones: By signing the 9/11 *Truther Manifesto* claiming that America committed genocide against 3,000 of its own citizens, you've gone too far, and now you must resign. Van Jones, here are your choices: you can go back to Clinton's chief of staff, John Podesta's think tank, "Center for American Progress" and quietly write positions papers and give harmless speeches, or you can be forced out and have your career made dead—*plata o plomo?*—The name is a phrase in Spanish when

translated means "silver or lead", meaning "accept a bribe or face assassination." ¹³

Jones may act and talk crazy, but he isn't crazy. He's is a shrewd demagogue, a vulgar political opportunist no different than Obama whose racialism, community organizing past and the street thug tactics of "The Chicago Way" make Van Jones merely President Obama's alter ego. Jones just took his Marxist ideology too far, too fast and too obvious. For example, in a radio interview in April 2008 Van Jones gleefully and repeatedly condemned America and capitalism while praising Marxism, tying it all together into a perverse, civil rights continuum:

Right after Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat if the civil rights leaders had jumped out and said, "OK now we want reparations for slavery, we want redistribution of all the wealth, and we want to legalize mixed marriages." If we'd come out with a maximum program the very next day, they'd been laughed at. Instead they came out with a very minimum "We just want to integrate these buses."

But, inside that minimum demand was a very radical kernel that eventually meant that from 1964 to 1968 complete revolution was on the table for this country. And, I think that this green movement has to pursue those same steps and stages. Right now we say we want to move from suicidal gray capitalism to something eco-capitalism where at least we're not fast-tracking the destruction of the whole planet. Will that be enough? No, it won't be enough. We want to go beyond the systems of exploitation and oppression altogether. . . . So the green economy will start off as a small subset, and we are going to push it and push it and push it until it becomes the engine for transforming the whole society. ¹⁴

Aside from Jones' reactionary, revisionist view of history, this is right out of the Karl Marx/Saul Alinsky playbook. For at least 20 years since the fall of Soviet communism, the environmentalist movement of the left has shifted strategy to hijack civil rights tactics and language to further their cause, as demonstrated by the Van Jones speech above. Now "being green" is a civil right equal to MLK and the civil rights movement of the 1960s. This is a vile distortion of all that MLK gave his life for. We should not allow Jones, Obama or any political demagogue to get away with co-opting the hard fought moral gains of true equality paid for with the blood of black people with radical environmentalism, feminism, welfare, gay rights, unionism or other socialist movements of the left. Saul Alinsky, an avowed communist, liberal icon of the 1940s-60s and the father of community organizing, said in rule 13 of his 1971

book, *Rules for Radicals—Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it and polarize it*. Van Jones tried to polarize the American people, but we pushed back and Obama was forced to fire this useful idiot to save himself from further embarrassment.

America, let us use the momentum gleaned from the Van Jones resignation to purge this administration of all Obama's alter egos—the communists, the communist sympathizers, the socialists, the fascists. Let us start with his science czar, John Holdren, who in his 1977 book, *Ecoscience* proposed: Women could be forced to abort their pregnancies, whether they wanted to or not, and the population at large could be sterilized by infertility drugs intentionally put into the nation's drinking water or in food. We the People have the power to reclaim our republic from the political Regressives of the Obama administration if we would only use it.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 10

CASS SUNSTEIN: REGULATING AMERICA TO DEATH

September 12, 2009

Animals should be allowed to sue their owners.

~ Cass Sunstein

Because people ascribe a degree of respectability to academics, intellectuals, philosophers and scholars, they can disregard the rights of the people much easier than a naked tyrant. In fact, Rousseau, Darwin and Nietzsche can go places Hitler, Stalin, Chavez and Obama could never dream. As I have written many times, the Obama administration are the masters of misdirection and chaos theory; therefore, while the America people last week were transfixed on the resignation of "Green Czar" Van Jones, another even more dangerous fascist from the academy quietly slipped through the portals of power.

Last Thursday Cass Sunstein, a former colleague and mentor of Obama's at the University of Chicago Law School, was confirmed by a Senate vote of 57-40 as the new director of regulatory affairs and information, an obscure but powerful agency within the Office of Management and Budget. Here is what the "regulatory czar" does: He regulates laws—past, present and future. Sunstein is a friendly fascist who only

"nudges" people to bow to his will. TV host Glenn Beck says of Cass Sunstein that he is "the most powerful invisible man you'll ever see."¹⁵

Judge Richard A. Posner, an intellectual mentor of mine and former colleague with Sunstein and Obama at the University of Chicago Law School, said the following about Peter Singer, a Princeton professor and a leading scholar on animal rights with whom Sunstein is often associated:

Since the publication of "Animal Liberation" [1975], Singer has received a wide range of philosophical challenges to his formulation of animal rights. . . . Richard Posner challenged that Singer failed to see the "radicalism of the ethical vision that powers [his] view on animals, an ethical vision that finds greater value in a healthy pig than in a profoundly retarded child, that commands inflicting a lesser pain on a human being to avert a greater pain to a dog, and that, provided only that a chimpanzee has 1 percent of the mental ability of a normal human being, would require the sacrifice of the human being to save 101 chimpanzees.

While Sunstein spent his entire career inventing rights for rats, dogs and pigs that would make the Constitution's framers spin in their graves, he is even more despicable in casting aspersions against constitutional rights plainly delineated in the Bill of Rights. For example, here is Sunstein views on the Second Amendment right to bear arms: "My coming view is that the individual right to bear arms reflects the success of an extremely aggressive and resourceful social movement and has much less to do with good standard legal arguments than [it] appears."

In 2008, Sunstein co-authored *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness* with economist Richard Thaler of the University of Chicago. "Nudge" discusses how public and private organizations can "help people to make better choices in their daily lives" since apparently Sunstein and his busybody socialist colleagues of the academy think that We the People are too stupid to live our own lives our own way and accept the consequences. Thaler and Sunstein argue that: "People often make poor choices—and look back at them with bafflement! We do this because as human beings, we all are susceptible to a wide array of routine biases that can lead to an equally wide array of embarrassing blunders in education, personal finance, health care, mortgages and credit cards, happiness, and even the planet itself." Space will not allow me to adequately detail the utter tyranny and naked assault on our constitutional rights Sunstein plans to launch against American capital-

ism in his new role as regulatory czar. Here is a summary of the autocracy Americans can expect from a Czar Sunstein:

- ❖ Sunstein advocates a "Second Bill of Rights" even more totalizing and all-consuming than initially proposed by Franklin D. Roosevelt's "New Deal" in the 1930s. Among these rights are a right to an education, a right to a home, a right to health care and a right to protection against monopolies.
- ❖ Sunstein notes that personhood need not be conferred upon an animal in order to grant it legal standing for suit.
- ❖ Sunstein has argued that "we should celebrate tax day."
- ❖ Rumor has it that Obama is grooming Sunstein as a future Supreme Court justice. Last week Fox News legal analyst Judge Andrew Napolitano said, "[Sunstein] is to the left of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg."

The *leitmotiv* of Sunstein's entire legal philosophy and worldview is encapsulated in two very evil and failed philosophies of the past: 1) Social Darwinism [evolution], and 2) Moral Relativism---*a theory, especially in ethics or aesthetics, that conceptions of truth and moral values are not absolute but are relative to the persons or groups holding them.* In other words, nothing has more intrinsic value than anything else. Sunstein's ideas on judicial minimalism and behavioral economics belie the fact that for almost 30 years he has assaulted the Judeo-Christian traditions of Natural Law so venerated by the Constitution's framers to preserve America's republic. To Sunstein ideas like "truth," "morality," "liberty," "freedom" and "Natural Law" are irrelevant and counterproductive to his grand, socialist view of law rooted in moral relativism and social Darwinism. That's how Sunstein can have a scholarship named after his dead dog while concurrently mandating environmental policies that will put tens of thousands of American farmers out of business by fostering ever expanding environmental, land and water regulations that will *de facto* make farming too cost-prohibitive.

What Mussolini, Stalin and Mao did in the light to harm their citizens and deny them their fundamental human rights, Cass Sunstein, as Obama's regulatory czar, will do in the night by slowly, irrevocably regulating America to death. Sunstein reminds me of Shakespeare's "Othello" when the sinister Iago repeatedly whispered his verbal venom into the receptive ear of Othello (Obama), which lead to his demise. Indeed, Sunstein said it best: "There is no liberty without dependency."

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 10

OBAMA: A SUDDEN CATASTROPHE

December 26, 2009

If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper; but if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury all our glory in profound obscurity.

~ Daniel Webster

During this Christmas Season America should be reminded that President Barack Obama has perpetrated more vicious attacks against the Christian faith than any other president in the history of America. Therefore, I ask: Is Obama's ascendancy a sudden catastrophe? Even many of Obama's most ardent supporters agree that his first year in office has been a catastrophe:

- ❖ Increasing the national debt from \$10 trillion in eight years under GWB to over \$14 trillion;
- ❖ Nationalizing private corporations like GM, Chrysler, AIG, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac;
- ❖ Bowing before murderous dictator nations like Saudi Arabia and China;
- ❖ Undeservedly receiving the Nobel Peace Prize after only *two* weeks in office, and;
- ❖ Appointing the basest of men (and women) to Cabinet-level positions and as czars to propagate the most anti-constitutional and hurtful policies against America.

One of America's greatest statesmen, Daniel Webster, a congressman, a senator and the secretary of state under three different presidents, said almost 200 years ago, "If there is anything in my thoughts or style to commend, the credit is due to my parents for instilling in me an early love of the Scriptures." Webster warned us that a "sudden catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury all our glory in profound obscurity" if we didn't "abide by the principles taught in the Bible." Even America 150 years ago, during her most wicked and notorious period of slavery, does not compare with where we are today with abortion on demand, with

the corpses of 50 million innocent babies *we* collectively killed, without even a tombstone memorial. How dare we send a charge to former generations for their sins of slavery, lynchings, *de jure* and *de facto* discrimination—with our hands stained with the blood of the innocents by our willful acquiesce to this savagery?

Daniel Webster continued his prophetic warnings to *this* generation, saying: "There is no nation on earth powerful enough to accomplish our overthrow. Our destruction, should it come at all, will be from another quarter; from the inattention of the people to the concerns of their government, from their carelessness and negligence. . . . [T]hat in this way they may be made the dupes of designing men, and become the instruments of their own undoing." This prescient statement by Webster begs the question: Is President Obama our "public servant" or are We the People his slaves? I believe that the Obama administration and his puppet masters, like billionaire George Soros, the unions, the Hollywood movie moguls, militant gay and feminist activists, as well as legal organizations like the ACLU and the American Trial Lawyers Association, have nothing but utter disdain for the Constitution and the inalienable rights of the people founded under Natural Law.

How did we get here so fast? In 1980 candidate Reagan failed to pick a bona fide conservative as vice president, which led to Bush 41 becoming a one-term irrelevancy in 1992. This opened the door to the moral degenerate and demagogue Bill Clinton. Bush-43 won two terms faking as a Ronald Reagan conservative and spending like a drunken Democrat. America got closer to the truth about Bush-43 when his speechwriter, Matt Latimer, got the assignment to write Bush's speech for a CPAC conference. Bush was decidedly unenthusiastic: "What is this movement you keep talking about in the speech?" the president asked Latimer. Latimer explained that he meant the conservative movement—the movement that gave rise to groups like CPAC. "Let me tell you something," the president said. "I whupped Gary Bauer's a-- in 2000. *So take out all this movement stuff. There is no [conservative] movement!*"¹⁶

How did we get Obama? We got this catastrophe because the GOP nominated an empty suit who denigrated the 20-year Reagan Revolution, that's why. We have sown the wind of political hacks unworthy of the presidency for 20 years since Reagan left office, electing Bush 41, Clinton, Bush 43 and Obama—and now America is tragically reaping the whirlwind with economic, cultural and societal collapse as the world

mocks us at every opportunity. Russia, China and Iran are currently plotting to overthrow America from our long-held position as the world's greatest and strongest empire. Obama and his socialist minions have always hated American exceptionalism and since the advent of the progressive movement in the 1890s for over 120 years have worked ceaselessly to replace the Judeo-Christian traditions that have made America the greatest nation in the history of humanity, making it the greatest *debtor* nation in the history of humanity.

Obama did not cause this sudden catastrophe alone. It was caused by many so-called progressives, intellectuals, academics, social engineers, lawyers, judges, liberal special-interest groups and Machiavellian politicians of both political parties. Would to God we had a statesman in Congress like Daniel Webster who said: "I regard it [the Constitution] as the work of the purest patriots and wisest statesman that ever existed, aided by the smiles of a benign Providence; it almost appears a Divine interposition in our behalf . . . the hand that destroys our Constitution rends our Union asunder forever."

President Obama is not a patriot. Obama and his socialist legions are arrogant, deceitful political thugs who, along with the corrupt hacks of the Democratic Party, have defiled the austere grandeur of the White House and Congress. As a black man and American, I am insulted by these people who wants to give Miranda rights to terrorists and try them in our courts in New York while court marshaling our heroic soldiers for roughing up the perpetrator who murdered, burned and hung over a bridge several of our soldiers in Fallujah, Iraq.¹⁷ America, let us arise in righteous fury like Daniel Webster to defeat our present rulers, to impeach this "sudden catastrophe" who has usurped the magnificent power and authority of the presidency of the United States of America and restore the Reagan Revolution.

ON POLITICS—ESSAY 11

GOV. JINDAL, FAUST AND THE DEVIL

February 25, 2009

Let's plunge ourselves into the roar of time, the whirl of accident; may pain and pleasure, success and failure, shift as they will—it's only action that can make a man.

~ Goethe, *Faust*, Part I

[T]his will result in a permanent obligation on the state of Louisiana. It would be like spending \$1 to get a dime.

~ Gov. Bobby Jindal

During these perilous times we live in, I often find solace by retreating to my classical music background and the literature that sustained the classical masters for hundreds of years. In particular during America's current economic recession/depression and the recently passed economic stimulus plan of approximately \$787 billion (\$3.27 trillion in actual spending costs over three years),¹⁸ my mind hearkens back to that magnificent German playwright from the Romantic Era, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832), particularly his dramatic epic poem in two volumes, *Faust* (1808, 1833). In an earlier article, *Faust, Greenspan and America's economic collapse*, I drew an analogy between the folly of Alan Greenspan's "irrational exuberance" speech, where he continued to lower interest rates leading in part to the collapse of America's home mortgage industry, with the folly of Goethe's *Faust*.¹⁹

- ❖ Faust equals "We the People"
- ❖ Mephisto (the devil) is Congress, the Executive, the Supreme Court and the Federal Reserve

To a large extent, America has guaranteed her own destruction by allowing these four branches of government to expand way beyond her enumerated powers, thus denigrating the original intent of the Constitution's framers (e.g. prohibiting the integration of legality and morality, diminished separation of powers, federalism and taxation without representation).

In that earlier article, I wrote: The narrative of “Faust” in brief was about an aging professor (Faust) toiling in his study, surrounded by books but painfully aware of the vanity of life—that he is running out of time. According to Michael Cumming’s synopsis of *Faust*, Part I, “Faust laments that though he has studied philosophy, medicine, law and theology he really knows nothing about the inner workings of the universe. Even his magic—powerful as it is—fails to lift the veil of mystery. On the brink of despair, he considers suicide.” Enter Mephistopheles (Mephisto), that suave, sophistic angel from the underworld (Satan) who eagerly offers to grant the hapless professor Faust his one last wish, but as usual when dealing with an irredeemable, evil figure like Satan, there is a catch: Mephisto “offers to show Faust the secrets of the world and let him experience the profoundest pleasures,” but when his life is over he must relinquish his immortal soul to him and do his bidding forever in hell.

How does the legend of Faust apply to Gov. Jindal’s refusal to accept all of the \$100 million dollars Obama is offering the state of Louisiana as part of its share of stimulus package money? President Obama, like the suave, cosmopolitan Mephistopheles, has not only crafted and passed one of the largest wealth confiscations, or “redistributions,” in the history of the world all in less than a month, but upon closer examination of the 1,000-plus pages of this bloated, complex and convoluted bill, more and more people are beginning to realize that the devil is truly in the details. Last Sunday on *Meet the Press*, Jindal made public some of those diabolical details that Obama, the Democrats and the propaganda press have been so scrupulously trying to hide over the past month:

❖ I don’t think the best way to do that [stimulating the economy] is for the government to tax and borrow more money. I think the best thing they could’ve done, for example, was to cut taxes on things like capital gains, the lower tax brackets, to get the private sector spending again.

❖ The word permanent is in the bill. It requires the state to make a permanent change in our law. Law B—our employer group agrees with me. They say, “Yes, this will result an increase in taxes on our businesses, this will result in a permanent obligation on the state of Louisiana.” It would be like spending \$1 to get a dime. Why would we take temporary federal dollars if we’re going to end up having a permanent program?

❖ In Louisiana, we made midyear reductions, \$241 million. We're going to have to do more with less. What would be more helpful from Washington is less unnecessary spending. How does \$300 million for federal cars, \$50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, how is spending like that going to help our economy? How's that stimulus?²⁰

Jindal's rhetorical question, "How's that stimulus?" was the critical question professor Faust in retrospect should have asked Mephistopheles (the devil). If he had been patient, spiritual and circumspect instead of shortsighted, greedy and lustful, Faust would not have made that tragic deal with the devil in the first place. Nevertheless, Faust foolishly lived for the moment. Goethe writes of Faust's worldview as conveyed to his fated lover, Marguerite: *Let us plunge ourselves into the roar of time, the whirl of accident; may pain and pleasure, success and failure, shift as they will—it's only action that can make a man . . .* In other words, live for the moment and consequences be damned.

Thank God Gov. Jindal and a few other stalwart Republican governors like Haley Barbour of Mississippi, Tim Pawlenty of Minnesota, and Alaska's Sarah Palin refused to take *all* of the economic stimulus that President Barack "Corleone" Obama is thrusting upon them, for Jindal understands that taking this contaminated money from the federal government will eventually lead to the bankrupting of his state. This federal money will only last for three years as an "unfunded mandate" that the states will be required to pick up when the federal money runs out. How? By raising taxes, of course which is political suicide for a Republican?

Even more diabolical is that the programs funded by the economic stimulus package are "permanent," meaning once they accept the money, these states must literally rewrite their laws to accommodate the new mandates of the federal requirements. Jindal asked a critical question: "How does \$300 million for federal cars, \$50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts, how is spending like that going to help our economy? How's that stimulus?" Jindal is right. It has nothing to do with economic stimulus at all. I call this sham bill, "DEA" or the Democrat Eternity Act, for Obama's economic stimulus bill's ultimate purpose with its entire ancillary spending is to keep Democrats in power for eternity.

In conclusion, recall the opening wedding scene of *The Godfather, Part I*, where Michael Corleone recalled his father (Vito Corleone) doing business through his muscleman, Luca Brasi declared a Hobson's

choice—"Either your signature on this contract, or your brains on this contract." These are the mafia tactics Americans are facing. It is evident that President Barack Corleone's so-called \$787 billion economic stimulus package has offered America a deal with the devil. Let us therefore hope that more governors will refuse to accept this tainted money, or I fear America will be plunged into an economic abyss that will devastate the sovereignty of states' rights, our children, our grandchildren and our collective future.

CHAPTER

~ 3 ~

ON FOREIGN POLICY

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 1

N. KOREA, RUSSIA HAVE SDI, BUT AMERICA CAN'T?

September 05, 2009

I call upon the scientific community who gave us nuclear weapons to turn their great talents to the cause of mankind and world peace: to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

~ President Reagan's "Star Wars" speech, March 23, 1983

Those magnificent words by an equally magnificent leader uttered 26 years ago ushered in Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program whereby nuclear missiles launched against the United States by the Soviets or any other enemy of America could be shot down from the sky. It was a logical, revolutionary and a bold proposal during a time when Sen. Ted Kennedy and the Democratic Party were actively undermining America by seeking clandestine alliances with Soviet communist leaders against their own country. ¹ I first wrote about Reagan's rational and vi-

sionary SDI program in a March 2008 article titled, *Reagan vindicated: SDI works.*"² My thesis: If SDI were *Star Wars* or some insignificant boondoggle by Reagan, then why did the Soviets and the liberals here in America fight the advancement so vociferously for over 25 years?

While America was beguiled by the cacophony of our government-controlled media with irrelevant stories like the death of Sen. Kennedy or Obama's 100th speech on why we need universal health care, we ignored an important news item picked up by Breitbart.com on Aug. 26—"Russia deploys air defense on North Korea missile test."

The short blurb in its entirety reads:

Russia is worried about North Korean missile and nuclear tests and has deployed sophisticated air defenses in its Far East region to protect against any potential test mishap, Russia's top general said here Wednesday.

"We have an S-400 division there," said Gen. Nikolai Makarov, chief of staff of the Russian armed forces, confirming that Russia had deployed its most advanced anti-missile defense system near the border with North Korea.³

Amazing! Not so much as a peep from any of the government-controlled media on this crucial story, including right-leaning Fox News, yet for over 25 years since President Reagan first launched the idea of SDI to make nuclear missiles of our avowed enemy, the Soviet Union, obsolete, the idea was constantly fought against by liberal Democrats, communists and communist sympathizers with the same passion as they battled to defame communist foes Whittaker Chambers in the 1940s and Sen. Joe McCarthy in the 1950s. To the government-controlled media, it's fine if our enemies like North Korea can have SDI supplied to them by the Russians in broad daylight, while our president is golfing on Martha's Vineyard or giving a nauseating eulogy over Sen. Ted Kennedy who, according to declassified KGB memos going back to the 1970s, actively and repeatedly solicited the Soviets to weaken our president in order to bring more power and notoriety to himself.

North Korea is openly allied with Russia to not only build and test nuclear missiles, but to have the SDI technology to shoot down their missiles (and ours) while America is self-immolating our own military. Where is President Barack Obama? He's hiding at Camp David. Where is Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton? Oh, she's launching a major internal investigation against U.S. guards at our embassy in Afghanistan

who were caught on camera partying too hard. Where is Secretary of Defense Dr. Robert M. Gates, the token RINOs (Republicans in name only) from the Bush administration? He's not answering my calls.

Who's defending America? Who's protecting America's vital national interests? As President Obama's approval ratings plunge to their lowest levels at 42 percent, and unemployment is at a 26 year high of 9.7 percent, more and more Americans are waking up from their eight-month slumber to the horrible realization that they have elected a certified Marxist with fascist tendencies as president of the United States—a man well tutored in the thug tactics of community organizing and “The Chicago Way.” Obama isn't interested in protecting America with SDI because he was schooled by such infamous America-haters as Saul Alinsky and his “Rules for Radicals,” Frank Marshall Davis, Obama's communist mentor during his Hawaii years, professors Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn, the unrepentant, murderous radicals who attacked the U.S. Capitol, the Pentagon, the State Department and New York Police Headquarters, among other buildings and innocent people.

Let us not forget Obama's racist minister of 20 years, Rev. Jeremiah Wright, and his vile brand of Marxist liberation theology (“U.S. of KKK.A.”), and socialist Harvard law professors Laurence Tribe and Charles Ogeltree, who together spent over 75 years collectively perverting the original intent of the Constitution's framers. Look at Obama's Cabinet from top to bottom; they all hate America and want to see her begging from her knees as Obama did before the King of Saudi Arabia the day after April Fool's Day. Are we Americans the fools? Conservative intellectual Michael Savage, in his 2003 New York Times best-seller, called these regressive fascists *The Enemy Within*.

Even if the progressives and regressives of the Democratic and Republican parties didn't always appreciate the leadership of Ronald Reagan and the wisdom of his SDI, surely Chairman Gorbachev and the Soviets did. For example, Gennady Gerasimov, a senior Soviet foreign ministry spokesman knew that SDI would soon break the back of communism when he wrote: “Reagan's SDI was a very successful blackmail. . . . The Soviet Union tried to keep up pace with the U.S. military buildup, but the Soviet economy couldn't endure such competition.” If ancient Israel was commanded by God Himself to build walls in defense of their cities (and *He* was on their side); if Richard the Lionhearted, Charlemagne, King Alfred the Great, William of Orange, Henry VIII,

James I, Elizabeth I—some of the greatest monarchs in history—all foresaw the military necessity of strong, high, thick stone walls to protect their cities and castles, then why in modern times have we elected a cabal of traitors, communist sympathizers and fascists to weaken and destroy America, a once great republic? . . . In the meantime North Korea and Russia have SDI, but America can't.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 2

AMBASSADOR JOHN BOLTON GOT IT RIGHT

August 05, 2009

There is no such thing as the United Nations. There is only the international community, which can only be led by the only remaining superpower, which is the United States.

~ John Bolton

Prologue to an honorable man

John Bolton was appointed by President George W. Bush as the interim ambassador to the United Nations. Unable to have his nomination overcome a veto-proof majority of 60 votes in the Senate, Bolton served his ambassadorship as a recess appointment from August 2005 to December 2006. Shortly thereafter, Bush and the Republicans saw the Democrats regain both houses of Congress, which effectively forced Bolton to resign his position in December 2006. Presently, Bolton is a writer and a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank in Washington, D.C. His latest book, *Surrender Is Not an Option: Defending America at the United Nations and Abroad* (2007), is an excellent and informative memoir of his U.N. years. In my opinion, Bolton is a man of honor. He is one of the few conservatives that place principle above politics. Bolton's America-first foreign policy worldview can be summarized by this quote: "There is no such thing as the United Nations. There is only the international community, which can only be led by the only remaining superpower, which is the United States."

In my 2008 book, *The Nuremberg Trials: Last Tragedy of the Holocaust*, I was equally emphatic in my disdain and derision of the U.N. I even called the United Nations a “legal fiction”—postulating: how can one have a group of 192 member states under the control of the U.N., yet each country considers itself a “sovereign nation”? It doesn’t make any sense. The U.N. is indeed a legal fiction that, combined with its ever-growing power, makes this globalist international community essentially a cabal of totalitarian states and an enemy to freedom lovers everywhere.

Bolton’s brief tenure as ambassador to the U.N. was best summarized in a 2006 Wall Street Journal op-ed by Claudia Rossett who said, in part, “Bolton has been valiant in his efforts to clean up U.N. corruption and malfeasance, and follow U.N. procedure in dealing with such threats as a nuclear North Korea, a Hezbollah bid to take over Lebanon and the nuclearization of Hezbollah’s terror-masters in Iran. But it has been like watching one man trying to move a tsunami of mud.” It is this Lincoln-esque aspect of John Bolton I admire most. Bolton doesn’t care what anyone thinks about him. He doesn’t cry on his pillow at night because corrupt U.N. bureaucrats, communist Democrats and socialist Republicans don’t share his ideas that the U.N. is a fatally flawed, anti-Semitic organization that must be obliterated to be adequately reformed. Indeed, Bolton proved he can see the forest for the trees when he once remarked, “The Secretariat Building in New York has 38 stories. If you lost 10 stories today, it wouldn’t make a bit of difference.” Bolton was right on point in that statement, but I would add if we could lose 10 stories, why not all 38? Would to God we had more members of Congress with the gonads to padlock the U.N. building and send all those corrupt, socialist diplomats to the liberal Valhalla at The Hague where they belong.

The shameful legacy of the U.N.

I believe the humanist cancer was there at the origins of the League of Nations founded at the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. This group morphed into the United Nations, which was founded at the San Francisco Conference in April 1945. The cancer of globalism and socialism had already metastasized at the Nuremberg Trials seven months later in November 1945, yet the exalted U.N. Tribunal could only bring to trial 177 people—the so-called “plotters and planners” of the Nazi genocide. Historians estimate as many as 50-62 million people were killed directly or indirectly by Hitler’s Nazi madness during World War II. To this day justice has

been tragically deferred toward the Jews and others, which make the Nuremberg Trials one of the biggest cover-ups in history.

Is there a man, an organization, a politician, a Congress, a nation with enough vision, clout and resources to bring down the U.N. and place America on the road to become the first nation in the history of the U.N. to voluntarily renounce its membership in this Machiavellian organization—a globalist Leviathan monster whose deadly tentacles reach all the way back to Nimrod?

The United Nations: Nimrod revisited

There are some interesting dichotomies regarding the United Nations and the biblical Nimrod, the world's first ruler and king of the ancient nation of Babylon where archeologists postulate was the location of both the Garden of Eden and Nimrod's Tower of Babel. It was a subsequent Nimrod, Saddam Hussein, the dictator of Iraq, who had meticulously excavated and preserved the Tower of Babel ruins, though ironically he spent most of his life trying to destroy many other nations and ethnic groups. King Solomon once wrote: "There is nothing new under the sun." The Tower of Babel, just like the U.N. today, was based on the totally fraudulent premises of secularism, humanism, progressivism and socialism; sophistic and inimical ideas that lead directly to rebellion against God and societal chaos like that reigning in the Age of Obama.

Epilogue

I don't know if John Bolton fully understands the indelible connection of Bible prophecy with U.N. policy in modern times, yet it is self-evident that the globalist, Leviathan U.N. from its origins has been a complete and utter disaster. The U.N. is a veritable clearinghouse for corrupt, Third World, banana republic, communist and socialist bureaucrats. It is an utterly irredeemable international entity that must be totally annihilated or removed to The Hague before it destroys what little sovereignty, freedoms and liberties America still has left. Will John Bolton use some of his great stature and amassed political capital to take America one step away from the slave chains of the United Nations? We must wait and see.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 3

ISRAEL: FIGHT LIKE YOUR FOREFATHERS

January 03, 2009

The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.

~ Sir Edmund Burke

God willing, Hamas will win.

~ Nizar Rayan (a Hamas leader the day before his death)

As I look at tiny Israel finally get the courage to start defending herself decisively against the evil and intractable Hamas, the *de facto* leadership of the Palestinians living in Gaza, I had a troublesome sense of unease for several reasons:

1. As detestable as watching sausage being made, war is something that has always been very difficult for me to view in real time because of the carnage, the slaughter of innocent women and children, but even worse, the geopolitical posturing by corrupt politicians.
2. I am not convinced that Israel has a prudent, efficient war plan replete with post-war policy contingencies already in place.
3. Now that Hamas has the technological capabilities to launch rockets to Israel's nuclear plant, can Israel any longer afford the political self-delusion to tolerate what conservative intellectual Michael Savage called "the enemy within"?

If just one of those stray Hamas rockets hits Israel's nuclear plant in Dimona (pop. 186,000), the fallout in that city and throughout Israel could rival Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan (1945), or at least be comparable to the nuclear disaster at the Chernobyl facility in the Soviet Union (1986).

As a Christian, I am inextricably joined at the hip with my Israeli brothers, but like many lovers of Israel, I am dismayed as I witness them possess such a magnificent army, yet because of reliance on secular humanist presuppositions, instead of exacting a decisive blow to Hamas, their politicians are mired in liberalism, socialism and egalitarianism. For now, Israel seems content to allow hundreds of billions of dollars worth of military equipment to remain idle, encamped on the border of Gaza.

This is an untenable situation for me. As wicked and utterly evil as I find Hamas to be, I do not blame them exclusively for this war in Gaza. Why? Hamas is what they are. They are a fanatical Muslim terrorist group like Fatah and the old Palestine Liberation Organization of Yasser Arafat, which Hamas seeks to utterly usurp. Hamas was not voted into power in a democratic election by the Palestinian people, but in January 2006 took the election by force, killing Fatah candidates and their supporters and forcing Mahmoud Abbas, the leader of Fatah, to flee to the West Bank. Because this treasonous act was tolerated by the Palestinian people of Gaza without revolt, in my mind, there are no innocent Palestinians in Gaza or the West Bank.

Remember the wise words of Lady Margaret Thatcher, the former prime minister of England, who repeatedly warned, "Never appease an aggressor," for to do so only emboldens them to your destruction. Israel, if she is to survive, must strike out on her own and fight like her forefathers in the Torah gallantly fought wars—men and women like Abraham, Moses, Joshua, Gideon, Samson, Jephthah, Deborah, Jael, Mordecai, Esther and David. Israel must destroy the enemy, drive them out of the occupied territories and annex all of Israel. That means Hamas in Gaza, Fatah in the West Bank and the Palestinians in Jerusalem including the Temple Mount. Yes, the world will hate you, Israel, but that's OK because the Arabs and the gentile nations have hated you from antiquity and with increasing venality since you became a nation reborn on May 14, 1948.

Israel, you have nothing to lose if you fight fearlessly, comprehensively and gallantly like boy David did against Goliath. (Recall that David gathered five stones, one for Goliath *and his four brothers*; David left nothing to chance.) Israel, you have always defied the odds because the God Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are on your side. Israel, like many Americans, Christians and Jews throughout the world, I believe that you are God's chosen people, that one day the Jewish Temple will be rebuilt on the Temple Mount without any other Muslim edifice there to defile the true worship of God. Indeed, multitudes of Christians and Jews throughout the world long to see that day. Hamas leader, Nizar Rayan, arguably the most zealous proponent of homicide attacks against Israel, has thankfully made his transition to hell along with his four wives and 10 of his 11 children (a 12th child he sent to die as a homicide bomber in October 2001, killing two Israelis). It didn't have to be this way for Sheik

Rayan and his family, because Israel follows an irrational, self-imposed set of rules of war that no other nation on earth would pursue and had warned this murderous Hamas leader that the bombs were coming—and he ignored the warnings.

I don't worry about Hamas, Fatah, Hezbollah, the Taliban, al-Qaida, and the 44 Muslim nations of the world or the psychopaths in the U.N. Why?—Because these evil people and hateful, jealous nations were predicted by the Jewish prophets from antiquity. Sir Edmund Burke paraphrased the Torah in this way: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." And herein is my reason to fear. I see very few "good men" as leaders of the civilized nations of the world that possess the courage, vision and moral authority to be a bulwark against the ever-growing Muslim menace. What I also fear is Israel's irrational love affair with liberalism, socialism and egalitarianism. I fear Israel's litany of foolish and delusional policy choices that make Israeli leaders impotent to act decisively in the face of a sworn fanatical enemy like Hamas and Fatah. These terrorist groups' Muslim financiers, like Syria, Egypt, Iraq, Iran Jordan, Saudi Arabia and many others, have for decades surreptitiously provided the Palestinians millions of dollars ostensibly for food and humanitarian aid, but Hamas and Fatah have instead used this money for mortars, weapons and homicide (not suicide) bombers to kill Jews. Hamas isn't the problem, but a symptom of Israel's more insidious, intractable problem. Liberalism and the Alignment-Labour-Kadima Party in Israeli politics is the problem. Socialist liberal leaders of Israel like Rabin, Peres, Barak, Sharon, Olmert, Livni, even conservative Netanyahu (Hebron), in order to curry favor from America and the U.N., for decades treacherously gave away their holy birthright for the promise of peace by their sworn enemies, the Muslims, and yet Israel has no peace.

Israel, I implore you to ignore the political madness of the Bush/Condi Rice/Obama "Two-State Solution," the genocidal policy of land-for-peace of the United Nations and the Arab nation states, as well as the anti-Semitic vitriol from all of the other corrupt gentile nations of the world that are jealous of you, that hate you and don't think that the Torah is the word of God, nor that the Jews are God chosen people. Be assured that the Arabs and the Muslim and gentile nations will lose if they are foolish enough to war against you . . . for they are warring against God, whom the Torah repeatedly calls the "Lord of Hosts." Isra-

el, listen only to the rabbis and Israeli leaders whose religious and political policies comply with the words of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, for that is where your redemption will be found.

Shalom, Israel!

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 4

10 COMMANDMENTS FOR ISRAEL

January 07, 2009

But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you; then it shall come to pass, that those which ye let remain of them shall be pricks in your eyes, and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land wherein ye dwell.

~ Numbers 33:55

As I watch the “experts” on TV prattle on about what Israel must do to *stop* the war in Gaza, because of their humanist and liberal bias, most of them are totally missing the point. Here is a primer of what Israel must do, not to “win the war against terror,” which is a gutless, meaningless phrase used by U.N. bureaucrats, President Bush, Democrats, Republicans and craven, uninformed “experts.” Instead, if Israel is to win her liberty, she must first defeat all of her enemies—internal enemies *and* external enemies.

Here are my 10 commandments for Israel in modern times:

1. Victory before peace: I believe it was President Ronald Reagan who famously said and practiced a similar wartime policy of “peace through strength”—a tried and true strategy that helped America defeat communism and the evil Soviet empire. Israel must achieve victory over Hamas and against other terrorists groups like Fatah, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade, the Muslim Brotherhood operating in Israel, *before* the Palestinians will negotiate with Israel for peace in good faith.

2. Israel for Israelis: Israel must declare martial law and remove all of its enemies, both internal enemies, including socialist, self-hating Jews who collaborate and sympathize with the Palestinians, as well as external enemies, the Muslim and Arab member states in the United Nations who send financial aid to terrorist groups operating in Israel (i.e., “the Palestinians”). Of course, those Palestinians, particularly the

Christian Arabs, that love or at least respects Israel's right to exist and defend herself, as well as other Christian groups that are allied with Israel, should be permitted to stay.

3. Defrock the rabbis who follow the dead religious traditions of the Pharisees and Sadducees and lift up the rabbis who obey the righteous traditions of the prophets, priests and teachers of the Torah: Several of my well-informed readers living in Israel have told me that the Orthodox Jews have been the Kadima (or liberal) Party's biggest supporters. These rabbis are on the public dole; most don't even serve in the Israeli army and are essentially mired in the delusion of liberalism, socialism and egalitarianism. These Orthodox rabbis connected to the Interior Ministry oftentimes set up many road blocks to certain Jews desiring to immigrate to Israel despite the fact of Israel's Law of Return, a liberal policy for Jews all over the world to immigrate to Israel.⁴ Ironically, it is Christian evangelicals, conservative Republicans and Christian Jews who are some of the most pro-Israel, pro-Jewish people in the world.

4. Demand that all Israeli politicians justify any policy decision according to the black-letter text of the Torah: I am told by my Jewish friends, many whom have lived in Israel for decades, that most politicians there are secular and have little interest or concern of Israel's critical place in biblical history or in end time events as the nations of the world, like tectonic plates, shift menacingly against tiny Israel. On this point, to me one definition of a fool is a politician (Israeli, Arab or gentile) that is so arrogant and delusional to think that his vain, secular or Quran-based policies will stand against the flaming fire of God's holy word regarding Israel's ultimate destiny.

5. 'Land for peace' is a vile lie from the pit of hell: At the behest of America, Europe, the 44 Arab and Muslim nations and the corrupt, jealous bureaucrats of the U.N., Israel keeps giving land to the Palestinians under the vain and foolish belief that she will obtain peace. In return for giving the Muslims Gaza, Hebron, Bethlehem, the West Bank (greater Judea and Samaria) and half of Jerusalem, including the Jews' holiest site, the Temple Mount, the Jewish people in Israel have not been granted one day of peace, but instead have been rewarded with over 3,000 rocket attacks and over 2,500 mortar attacks from Hamas just since 2001.

6. The "Two State Solution" cannot work: America, the Arab member states of the U.N. and the socialist states of Europe notwithstanding, I challenge anyone reading this article to name *any* nation, from tiny Togo in West Africa to the land behemoth, Russia, with its 11 time zones, that would tolerate a terrorist group to freely practice wanton and daily destruction against their population? Furthermore, what rational nation would allow the U.N. to tell a nation under daily terrorist

attacks not to retaliate and protect their country or to follow such U.N. mandates as "bilateral diplomacy," "hear the Palestinian side of the argument" or a "Two-State Solution"? Only the secular, socialist Jewish leaders in Israel seem delusional enough to allow others that utterly hate them to dictate to Israel how they must handle an internal enemy. Outrageous!

7. In 2009, Israel must launch a pre-emptive strike against Iran before they achieve full nuclear capacity: As I stated in an earlier article, "Iran is putting the final touches on her nuclear missiles conceived for the singular purpose of the annihilation of Israel."⁵ Note that the Iranian mullahs are quiet as Israel goes through Gaza like a hot knife through butter. Why? That wicked regime fully understands that they are next.

8. Israel, act like God's chosen people! Not even Christians were chosen by God as a group as were the Jews. You have a unique and honored position within the nations of the world. You don't have to say "Mother may I" to anybody when it comes to defending the sovereign, holy land of Israel.

9. Find a philosopher-king to raise Israel from her knees: When I read the magnificent and poignant history of the Jews in the Torah, I am struck by the fact that repeatedly when she fell into idolatry or some other grievous sin that after 40 years God would anoint a judge, a champion to deliver Israel from her enemies. Well, Israel, it has been just over 40 years since your last definitive victory in the Six Day War (1967). My advice: Get a philosopher-king, a wartime *consigliere* like Abraham, Deborah, the prophet Samuel, boy David, Judas Maccabeus, Richard the Lionhearted, Gen. George Patton or Ronald Reagan to run the country under martial law and drive out all of the enemies of Israel.

10. Withdraw membership from the anti-Semitic United Nations: Finally, Israel you must immediately withdraw your membership from the diabolical, corrupt, jealous, anti-Semitic United Nations. The U.N. has been in the tank for the Arab member states since they mistakenly allowed Israel to become a sovereign nation on May 14, 1948. The very next day an Arab coalition consisting of Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Northern Palestine (Samaria), backed by Saudi Arabia and Yemen, launched a comprehensive frontal assault to try to kill Israel reborn in her cradle, but God fought with you that day and gave Israel a miraculous victory. That day Ezekiel's dry bones prophecy of chapter 37:1-14 was fulfilled.

Israel, remember the Ten Commandments of the Torah that you may learn to live in the land that God has given to you and your posterity to dwell in, without fear, without apology . . . and without compromise.

Shalom, Israel!

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 5

OLD LESSONS ISRAEL HASN'T LEARNED

January 10, 2009

Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

~ Santayana, "The Life of Reason," Vol. 1

Although the great Spanish philosopher Santayana wrote these sublime words many years ago about different historical events, today, as I watch Israel attacked by Hamas from the south in Gaza and now in a recent series of savage rocket attacks raining down on Israel out of Lebanon from the north, I hear the visionary words of Santayana ringing in my ears like one of the ancient prophets of Israel: *Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.*

All nations and people of goodwill certainly knew that when Israel kicked their own people out of Gaza in 2005 and gave the land totally to the Palestinians that this policy by Olmert's Kadima Party would only solidify Hamas' dictatorial power over that area and make it easier for them to launch unmitigated terrorist attacks against Israeli citizens in neighboring cities. I deem Olmert's policy tantamount to an act of treason by the Israeli government against their own people. Surely no rational person should be surprised by the new war front Israel no doubt will soon fight again to the north as rockets out of Lebanon, sent by Hezbollah after two years of "peace," rain down on innocent Jewish civilians in neighboring cities and even inside the kitchen of a senior citizens home.

Where is the rage from the United Nations about these unprovoked atrocities against tiny Israel by Hamas and Hezbollah? There is no mercy or empathy for the Jews, only resentment, jealousy and malediction. All Israel desires is to live in peace, to fulfill the words of the prophet Micah — "But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the LORD of hosts hath spoken it." ~ Micah 4:4. Yet, for all of her gestures of peace, conciliation and compromise, the Jewish people in Israel are rewarded with almost incessant rocket and mortar attacks. No other civilized nation on earth would tolerate for one week what Israel has tolerated for eight years

since Hamas began to dominate Gaza—over 10,000 rocket attacks against innocent men, women, children and elderly Israeli citizens while the world watches almost in total indifference or gleeful joy regarding the plight of the Jews. Yet, I hear the words of Santayana ringing in my ears: *Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.*

Both my people (black Americans) and Jews share an ignominious legacy of slavery, racism, racial hatred and racial discrimination, but we also share in the transcendent redemption of God over our oppressors. It was in this wise that the great civil rights leader Dr. Martin Luther King, at what would be his final sermon on civil rights, on the night of April 3, 1968, said these profound, prophetic words no doubt inspired by Moses and the Jews in Egypt:

Like anybody, I would like to live a long life. Longevity has its place. But I'm not concerned about that now. I just want to do God's will. And He's allowed me to go up to the mountain. And I've looked over. And I've seen the Promised Land. I may not get there with you. But I want you to know tonight, that we, as a people, will get to the Promised Land!"⁶

Black ministers before and after MLK repeatedly borrowed from the Jews poignant and oftentimes tragic experiences chronicled in the Torah. A favorite Torah story that had striking parallels to the history of black slavery and racial discrimination in America was Israel's 430 years of slavery to the Pharaohs of Egypt. Yes, in a sense MLK was black people's modern-day Moses who on the night before his death, with clarity and resolve, stared at his grim destiny and did not flinch. He knew that one of his many assassins would soon find their mark, yet courageously like Moses, who stood pensively at the mountaintop to view the Promised Land, MLK figuratively ascended to the mountaintop and peered off into the great distance. Indeed, MLK, like his Old Testament counterpart, would not have the honor of getting to the "promised land," but because of his singular courage, moral authority and faith in God, MLK saw ahead to a better time that my fellow black Americans and I are now blessed to enjoy these 41 years after his untimely death—freedom, liberty, peace, the pursuit of happiness and the possibility to be whatever our minds can conceive . . . even president of the United States. Only in America!

Regrettably, like Israel, my people have not fully realized King's dream (or Moses' dream, for that matter), but many of my people are

instead mired in pathology, promiscuity, ignorance, crime and Kafkaesque groupthink. Therefore, I hear the words of Santayana ringing in my ears: *Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.* Returning to my subject of Israel and the conflict with Hamas and Gaza in the south and Hezbollah and Lebanon in the north, here is the conclusion of the matter:

- ❖ Israel must annex Gaza, the West Bank, Jerusalem and all of Israel. This isn't "occupied territory," but land given to the Jews by God, paid for by Jewish martyrs going back to antiquity;
- ❖ Israel must then reoccupy Lebanon and drive Hezbollah into Syria to have a buffer against these renewed terrorist attacks from her northern flank.

Of course, this will take much time and effort by Israel. In the meantime, liberals here in America, corrupt, anti-Semitic bureaucrats of the United Nations and the Muslim nation states all clamor to draft a suitable cease-fire treaty for Gaza. Politics aside, in my view there will *never* be an adequate and enduring cease-fire treaty for Israel until Israel withdraws its membership from the anti-Semitic United Nations so that they won't feel obligated to obey any more of their illogical mandates. Yes, since my unequivocal stand with Israel, I have received a lot of hate mail from Jews, Muslims and gentiles alike all over the world. Nevertheless, this is a small price to pay for the courageous Jews that fall prey to the merciless attacks from Hamas, Fatah and all of the other Palestinian terrorist groups, and yes, with a tinge of irony, Jews who are victims of the secular, socialist policies of their elected Israeli leaders. My final sentiment to you, Israel, my friend is *hesed* (hear with the idea of obedience): Hear the words of the philosopher, Santayana: *Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.*

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 6

THE LAST STATESMAN IN MARXIST EUROPE

February 21, 2009

Not so long ago, in our part of Europe we lived in a political system that permitted no alternatives and therefore also no parliamentary opposi-

tion. We learned the bitter lesson that with no opposition, there is no freedom.

~ Vaclav Klaus, address before the European Parliament, Feb. 19, 2009

Although my memory of Czech leader Vaclav Klaus (president since 2003, re-elected 2008) goes back to his days as prime minister (1992-1997), and to the time of Czechoslovakia's first president, the famous playwright and philosopher Vaclav Havel (1989-1992), I really didn't start actively following the career of this free-market iconoclast until radio host Michael Savage would have him on his show from time to time. This made me think to myself—as much as Savage hates Marxism, liberalism and European-style socialism, for him to have President Klaus on his program for an extended interview meant that Klaus had to be a man of stalwart principles and transcendent intellect. Indeed he is. On Jan. 1, 2009, Klaus was appointed president of the European Union. Although this position is largely ceremonial, the EU is a very important economic cooperative represented by 27 nations and over 470 million people. Since President Klaus has a well-known aversion to European-style socialism and statist controls over the free market, he is set on a collision course with the leaders of the socialist welfare states of Europe now under his authority.

Journalist Dan Bilefsky in a recent article on President Klaus wrote: "An economist by training and a free marketer by ideology, Klaus has criticized the course set by the union's departing leader, President Nicolas Sarkozy of France. The ambitious Sarkozy has used France's European Union presidency to push an agenda that includes broader and more coordinated regulation by the largest economies to tame the worst of the market's excesses." Last Thursday in Brussels, at a major address before the European Parliament, Klaus told the assembly, "The European Union has turned into an undemocratic and elitist project comparable to the Communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe that forbade alternative thinking." Wow! Why don't we hear that kind of passion and clarity of thought here in America? If Klaus were an American politician, he would definitely be considered a Ronald Reagan conservative. As a matter of fact, Klaus' European mentor is Lady Margaret Thatcher, the former prime minister of Great Britain, a great conservative and unfailing ally with President Reagan in their battles against the tyranny of Marxism and Soviet communism, which eventually lead to the end of the 40-

year Cold War as well as the dissolution of the Soviet empire in 1989-90. (Aides even admit that Klaus has a photo of the former British prime minister in his office near his desk.)

President Vaclav Klaus is a man after my own heart and makes me and other conservatives here in America yearn for a politician to rise up and become a real statesman in the tradition of Burke, Churchill, Thatcher and Reagan. For example, although he's president of the EU, a conspicuous socialist economic entity, Klaus refuses to sell out his principles and is a tireless advocate of *laissez faire* free-market capitalism in the tradition of his intellectual mentors, the Austrian-British economist Friedrich Hayek and the American economist and public philosopher Milton Friedman, whose free-market capitalist ideas Reagan used to build 20 years of sustained economic growth here in America.

The "Reagan Revolution" was seen to cause a political realignment both within and beyond the U.S. in furtherance of his political philosophy of American conservatism, lower taxes, smaller government and free markets. However, Klaus, unlike Reagan, has no Thatcher by his side and is literally waging a one-man crusade to continue the free-market economic and political reforms Reagan and Thatcher championed in the 1980s and 1990s. Klaus once said, "If you lived under communism [and socialism], then you are very sensitive to forces that try to control or limit human liberty." This is a sober warning to all of the Quislings, the Neville Chamberlains and Vichy governments amongst the leaders in Europe (and America) who foolishly think that you can fight a 40 year Cold War with one of the most brutal and merciless regimes like the Soviet Union only to repackage and champion their failed economic and political theories years later as something "new."

There is nothing new about liberalism, egalitarianism, Marxism, communism or European-style socialism. All of those philosophies and economic theories were failures then and are failures now. Sir Winston Churchill understood the perils of socialism and once remarked about this diabolical political theory: "Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy; its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery." Unfortunately Churchill's successors, like Tony Blair and Gordon Brown, don't seem to understand or appreciate their own recent economic and political history regarding the dangers of embracing Marxism and socialism.

Other European leaders also are not guiltless—Sarkozy of France, Merkel of Germany, Berlusconi of Italy, Balkenende of Holland, Reinfeldt of Sweden, Putin of Russia and every other country in Europe have seemingly failed to take heed to Churchill's prescient words. These leaders are without excuse, for today we have history as the final judge of our deeds and she has spoken with clarity: Every society that's tried socialism or state control of all aspects of government, business, education, private property, private industry and the means of production has lead to utter political, intellectual and economic catastrophe. The equitable "redistribution" of resources sought by these naïve utopians and petit bureaucrat has only led, in the words of Churchill, to "the equal sharing of misery."

Czech President Vaclav Klaus is the only man I see in Europe today that has learned from recent history not to model his country after European-style Marxism. I admire him for his courageous stand against all of the Quislings and Neville Chamberlains he is forced to debate in the marketplace of ideas. His reward?—Klaus' numerous critics sputter and fret in mocking cacophony, calling him a "cynical populist," a "hard-headed pragmatist," a "rejected genius," "a provocateur." He is none of these epithets. In my opinion, Klaus is a visionary leader and a statesman amongst small-minded little European socialists who have no memory of totalitarian leaders like Napoleon, Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, Franco, Mao, Hirohito and Hitler. Therefore, to paraphrase the great Spanish philosopher, George Santayana, these European leaders (and their citizens) will be condemned to repeat history and suffer yet again under these tyrannical political systems. Thank God President Klaus refuses to compromise his established and moral principles; he refuses to be numbered with the legions of FDRs, LBJs, Jimmy Carters, Barack Obama and those whom Soviet dictator Vladimir Lenin called the ground troops of the socialist and communist revolution . . . "useful idiots." . . . Godspeed, President Vaclav Klaus! ⁶

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 7

PEACE THROUGH BEGGING

March 07, 2009

Peace through strength.

~ President Ronald Reagan

If President Reagan's foreign policy with communist nations, Muslim dictatorships and other various evil empires like North Korea, Cuba, Iran, Libya, China and the old Soviet Union was characterized by the philosophy "Peace through strength," then surely it can be argued that Obama's foreign policy philosophy is "Peace through begging." Let's start with the recent trips Obama's secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, made to key countries in an effort to differentiate his policy from Bush's foreign policy, but also to show these intractable nations, "I'm not George Bush." What were the results? Secretary's Clinton's recent trip to China was not as a representative of the leader of the free world or of the most powerful nation in the history of the world, but was, with hat-in-hand, essentially our chief diplomat begging Chinese General Secretary Hu Jintao to please buy more of America's debt before we descend into a Great Depression. China balked and did not seem to accede to nor respect Hillary's urgent request for economic aid.

The irony of this trip is irresistible. Recall that it was Secretary Clinton's husband, President Bill Clinton, who essentially allowed to be stolen, sold or outright gave to China billions of dollars in sensitive nuclear technology that enabled this communist nation to take a "new" "Great Leap Forward" (1958-63) as it tried to become America's No. 1 nuclear power rival in the world, surpassing even Russia. ⁷

Let's look at the Middle East and the Muslim terrorist group Hamas, which rules over the Gaza Strip as a fanatical regime. Obama and Hillary want to give "the Palestinians" \$900 million to rebuild Gaza. This is beyond the pale. Even the most faithful Kool-Aid drinkers of the left took pause at this astonishing announcement, for they rightly understood that Israel had just fought another bloody war with Hamas, which is still firing rockets at Israel right now. In a BBC article on Hamas' attacks against Israel, one writer said, "Since 2001, when the rockets were first fired, more than 8,600 have hit southern Israel, nearly 6,000 of them since

Israel withdrew from Gaza in August 2005. The rockets have killed 28 people [Israelis] and injured hundreds more." Of course most reasonable people understand that virtually every dollar of the \$900 million in foreign assistance Obama wants to give the Palestinians will go directly to the coffers of Hamas, which will then buy new and better rockets and WMDs from Egypt, Syria and Iran to terrorize our "friend and ally" Israel. The election of conservative Benjamin Netanyahu as Israel's new prime minister hopefully will be an obstruction in Obama's Hitler-like plans to reward Hamas for killing Jews.

Finally, let's examine Obama's policy to deal with perhaps America's most intractable enemy—Iran. U.S. officials told us earlier this week that Obama sent a secret letter to Russia's President Medvedev last month suggesting that he would back off deploying a new missile defense system in Eastern Europe *if* Moscow would help stop Iran from developing long-range weapons.

New York Times columnist Peter Baker wrote the following incredible statement regarding Obama's foreign policy strategy: "The plan to build a high-tech radar facility in the Czech Republic and deploy 10 interceptor missiles in Poland—a part of the world that Russia once considered its sphere of influence—was a top priority for President George W. Bush to deter Iran in case it developed a nuclear warhead to fit atop its long-range missiles. *Mr. Bush never accepted a Moscow proposal to install part of the missile defense system on its territory and jointly operate it so it could not be used against Russia.*" Now the Obama administration appears to be reconsidering that idea, although it is not clear if it would want to put part of the system on Russian soil where it could be flipped on or off by Russians. Mr. Obama has been lukewarm on missile defense, saying he supports it only if it can be proved technically effective and affordable.

Obama's *peace through begging* foreign policy has transmuted into *peace through treachery*. Not only is our president willing to be a traitor to the Czech Republic and Poland, two historical and faithful allies of America, by leaving them defenseless should Russia becomes aggressive against them again, but, to add insult to insanity, Obama is even contemplating building a missile system on Russian territory that would be jointly run with the United States, "where it [the missile defense system] could be flipped on or off by Russians." For a sitting president of the United States to even consider such treachery as allowing Russia veto

power over the defense of our historical allies like the Czech Republic and Poland should motivate Congress to write articles of impeachment to remove Obama from the presidency immediately. This naïve and dangerous policy is truly beyond the pale. Yet Congress does not act. These 535 dolts are too busy exploring deep, profound issues like "Oh, my God, it's Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie! May I have your autograph?" "Is Rush Limbaugh the *real* leader of the Republican Party?" or "The rich have a moral duty to pay more taxes" (Tim Geithner).

"Madam, we have given you a republic, if you can keep it," was Benjamin Franklin's prescient reply to an anonymous lady who asked him after the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, Sept. 17, 1787, "Dr. Franklin, what have you given us today?" Well, America, with the ascent of the neo-Marxist Barack Obama and all of his socialist minions like Hillary Clinton, Rahm Emanuel, Joe Biden, Larry Summers, Tim Geithner, Holder, Salazar, Napolitano and a trillion dollars in new taxes and spending in six weeks, have we "kept" this sacred republic bequeathed to us by the Constitution's framers? . . . No! Vladimir Putin views Obama as Lenin viewed the legions of fools who believed in communism, referring to them as "useful idiots." Putin couldn't have picked a better president of America himself. Obama's first forays into foreign policy has him clearly outclassed and in way over his head. Strongman Putin wants no less than a hegemonic revival of Lenin and Stalin's communist empire on a global scale.

Reagan constantly exclaimed, "Peace through strength," as the only logical, moral and pragmatic means to deal with an evil, intractable enemy like North Korea, China, Iran or Russia. Obama has seemingly taken an opposite approach based not on strength but weakness; not only with Russia, but with an even more dangerous enemy of America, Iran, whom we now know for years Russia has been surreptitiously supplying with scientists, technology and materials to build their very own nuclear weapons—WMDs Iran's president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has repeatedly promised he will use to "wipe Israel off the map." And now we reach the apotheosis "the enemy (Russia) of my enemy (Iran) is my friend" as America under President Obama practices foreign policy like slaves on our knees. Peace through strength? or Peace through begging? You decide which foreign policy will best serve America and her vital national interests.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 8

THE POPE IN ISRAEL

May 16, 2009

So it's the work that needs to be done over the next couple of months that has a regional answer to this—that is not a two-state solution; it is a 57-state solution.

~ King Abdullah, Jordan

Regarding the seemingly perpetual, intractable Israel-Palestinian wars, Pope Benedict XVI, who yesterday wrapped up a tour of the Middle East, has proposed a two-state solution along with most of Israel's European allies, including the United States. However, now Jordan's King Abdullah, in a recent interview, has raised the ante and put more pressure on President Obama to prove that he is an honest broker between the Muslims and the Jews by agreeing to a 57-state solution as the road to peace.

Dr. David Meltz, former dean of the John Marshall Law School, once told our constitutional law class: *If Israel doesn't own the land explicitly and repeatedly decreed to them by God in the Torah, then no nation can ever claim better title to any land on earth.* If that statement is true, then how can one logically or morally square that aphorism with the tautology among the nations of the world demanding a two-state solution or a 57-state solution as a viable means to secure an Israeli-Muslim peace? One-state solution? Two-state solution? 57-state solution? Any choice will amount to Hitler's "Final Solution" to kill all the Jews in Israel and eventually throughout the entire world.

On this point Richard Beeston, in a recent interview with King Abdullah for the Times of London, quoted the king of Jordan regarding his 57-state solution peace process:

If you consider that a third of the world does not recognize Israel—57 nations of the United Nations do not recognize Israel, a third of the world—their international relationships can't be all that good. More countries recognize North Korea than Israel. That is a very strong statement when we are offering a third of the world to meet them with open arms. The future is not the Jordan River or the Golan Heights or

Sinai, the future is Morocco in the Atlantic to Indonesia in the Pacific. I think that's the prize . . . that is not a two-state solution; it is a 57-state solution.⁸

If a two-state solution is *national* genocide of Israel, then a 57-state solution is *total* genocide of Israel to the 57th power.

Why wouldn't Pope Benedict visit Israel's Holocaust Museum? I'm told because it contains the following controversial inscription criticizing Pope Pius XII (1939-58), who was pope during the World War II period. The caption in the museum reads: *He [Pope Pius XII] maintained a neutral position during the years of mass extermination of Europe's Jews.* That said, wouldn't it have been a magnanimous gesture by Pope Benedict XVI, born of German extraction, to extend the olive branch of peace to the Jewish people by apologizing for the genocide against the Jewish people at the hands of Germany, Hitler and the Nazis during World War II? Instead, as described by one Israeli newspaper columnist, all the Jewish people received was a "restrained, almost cold speech" about the pope's hopes that the Catholic Church can be instrumental in eventually bringing peace in the Middle East through the policy of the two-state solution. May God forbid.

If Pope Benedict, President B. Hussein Obama, King Abdullah, the Palestinian people or those 57 nations that hate the Jewish state truly desires peace, then I only ask them to lead by example and divide their own countries in half (or in 57 parts) and give those divided lands to the poor, to the disenfranchised, to the indigenous people *before* they arrogantly lecture the Jews and the nation of Israel about any two-state solution. For example, King Abdullah's Jordan has the largest number of Palestinians in the world (2,700,000), which amounts to between 75-80 percent of Jordan's total population. However, in 1987 when the Palestinians started the *Intifada* for a homeland in Jordan, Abdullah's father, King Hussein, brutally crushed the revolt, killing thousands of his own countrymen—yet the Jews are universally condemned for defending their country against the entire Muslim world? As a neighbor to the 21 Muslim countries in the Middle East, Israel has only one-sixth of 1 percent of the total landmass, yet the pope, Obama and most nations of the world want to take much of this tiny sliver of land from them. I read on WorldNetDaily.com earlier this week that Obama has broken off America's long-standing foreign policy to keep our ally Israel briefed on all

Middle East concerns.⁹ If this is true, then can it be argued that perhaps Israel has lost its last friend and ally on the planet. May God forbid.

If the choice is between Obama, Pope Benedict XVI, King Abdullah, the 44 Arab states and the Palestinians verses the Jewish people and the nation of Israel, I choose to go with God who through King David said in Psalm 137:5-6:

If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.
If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY

DIPLOMACY FROM OUR KNEES

June 23, 2009

Peace through strength.

~ Ronald Reagan

Peace through strength are words uttered by President Reagan for the ages. They were the foundation of his foreign policy against communism and “the evil empire”—the Soviet Union. Enduring words that dismantled tyrannical nations, yet those words would amount to meaningless rhetoric and vacuous platitudes if Reagan didn’t back them up with a credible threat of punishment to those nations who would threaten America and her national interests. In October 1986, at the Reykjavik nuclear-arms-control summit, Reagan backed up those words when nuclear non-proliferation talks broke down with Soviet Premier Mikhail Gorbachev in Iceland and at Geneva the year before because the Soviets insisted that we stop developing SDI—the Strategic Defense Initiative. Reagan considered SDI, or the ability to develop a missile defense system where a defensive rocket is used to shoot down a hostile rocket in mid-air, to be non-negotiable. Rather than jeopardize America’s right to self-defense, Reagan walked out of the talks.

As the state-run media in 2009 praises Obama’s tepid remarks on the Iranian election as designed not to anger the mullahs, in 1985-87 America’s state-run media howled that Reagan’s actions would anger the Soviets and cause a greater escalation of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, history has proven Reagan right, and the Intermediate-Range Nuclear

Forces Treaty was signed by Reagan and Gorbachev in Washington, D.C., Dec. 8, 1987. The great Spanish philosopher Santayana, in his book, *The Life of Reason*, famously said, "Those who forget history are condemned to repeat it." The Soviet Empire began to crumble 20 years ago under the strong, moral, unyielding leadership of Reagan, Margaret Thatcher and Pope John Paul II. Twenty years later America is tragically repeating history by appeasing aggressors under the neo-Marxist, B. Hussein Obama. No one fears or respects the United States anymore—and why should they?

Kim Jong-il, the North Korean communist dictator, violates international law and U.N. resolutions with impunity by shooting off rockets with a range to hit Alaska and Hawaii, and Obama does nothing. As a matter of fact, Kim's next scheduled rocket launch will help America celebrate her 233 birthday, for he plans to launch it on the Fourth of July. Obama's response?—The USS John McCain, one of our newest Navy destroyers, is tracking a North Korean ship, the Kang Nam, a vessel suspected of transporting illegal nuclear weapons and nuclear materials. Don't get your hopes up that Obama finally has some steel in his spine. The Navy admiral is under explicit orders not to provoke the North Koreans by boarding this vessel. America has shackled itself under the "hail and query" principle: "Do you have any nuclear weapons or nuclear components on board this ship?" "No." "Thank you, sir. Sorry to bother you. Have a nice day." How can we find out what is aboard the Kang Nam under these conditions? If we wait for the ship to run out of gas around Burma and put pressure on that dictatorship to allow our military destroyer to search this ship, what will be their answer? That's not peace through strength. Obama's foreign policy is reminiscent of the craven duplicity of Neville Chamberlain with Hitler at the Munich Treaty of 1938. It amounts to diplomacy from our knees, and I guarantee you that these convoluted appeasement measures by the U.S. will only embolden our enemies in tyrannical nations across the world.

In the meantime, the world is becoming a much more dangerous place to live as tyrants, socialists and Muslim fanatics across the globe mobilize under the Liberal-Muslim Axis and seek to destroy or weaken capitalism and representative democracies wherever they find them—in Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, India, Lebanon, Gaza, Afghanistan and beyond. I am convinced the more I observe our president that Obama and his fascist legions are actually pleased with the mounting chaos destabilizing

the civilized world. The simmering revolution in Iran is just the most recent incarnation. It's all Chaos Theory, baby!—and the more chaos the better, because it gives Obama the pretext to "do something" to "fix" the problems. In the meantime, Obama's remedies only exacerbate existential, domestic, and geopolitical problems, which only start the Chaos Theory cycle anew.

Peace through strength, or diplomacy from our knees? To any rational observer of politics it is obvious that Obama made the latter choice, and America is paying exceedingly for his treachery. The galling irony of it all is that in defense of the inevitable rocket attacks by North Korea upon American soil, what are we hastily moving to the coasts of Hawaii? That's right, a missile defense system (SDI). The same Quislings and Neville Chamberlains of the Democrat Party who for years lambasted Reagan as a "warmonger," "stupid" and "naïve" now cower behind his legacy of SDI. This is the same SDI program that a few weeks ago Obama bragged that he wanted to dismantle because in his perverted worldview, protecting America means destabilizing the world and antagonizing Russia and China. The communist regime of Kim Jong-il has made it explicitly clear to America: If we board his ship, North Korea will consider that provocation an act of war. Let us hope that Obama will find the courage to be a man rather than a man-child when dealing with rogue nations like North Korea and Iran.

I think that conservative intellectual Ann Coulter summed up the limits of diplomacy best when she wrote that there are only two choices with savages: Fight or run. Democrats always want to run, but they dress it up in meaningless catchphrases like "diplomacy," "détente," "engagement," "multilateral engagement," "multilateral diplomacy," "containment" and "going to the U.N." America, which policy will you choose? Obama's diplomacy from our knees, or Reagan's peace through strength? The survival of the civilized world hinges upon that choice.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 10

IRAN HAS COME TO AMERICA

June 27, 2009

The first time someone shows you who they are, believe them.

~ Maya Angelou, poet laureate

The nation of Iran is presently balanced on the precipice of civil war over the recent stolen elections returning Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to a second term as president. And what do we hear from the leader of the free world, President Obama? Nothing but weak, tepid words amounting to acquiescence to mass slaughter by the autocratic mullahs who acutely feel their power slipping by the day. As millions of Iranians march in the streets of Tehran and throughout other cities, I am struck by the dichotomies between their righteous indignation over the sham elections versus America's indifference and apathy concerning our own stolen elections six months ago by Obama (who's most likely not even a natural born citizen), the Democrat Party and the government-controlled media. Other than hundreds of "tea parties" that broke out in cities and towns across America to memorialize the Boston Tea Party of Dec. 16, 1773, there have been no mass demonstrations in Washington, D.C., in front of the White House expressing outrage that 62.7 million voters, 54 percent of the voting population willfully elected a neo-Marxist with fascist tendencies as president of the United States.

Iran has come to America. In my home state of Michigan, a federal judge has recently upheld a decision by festival organizers in Dearborn, which is about 30 percent Muslim, to ban a Christian ministry from handing out religious tracts on public sidewalks. If America wasn't already a benign dictatorship, Congress would have immediately drawn up articles of impeachment against this renegade judge for so blatantly abridging freedom of religion and freedom of association protected by the First Amendment. If Christians, which 83 percent of Americans consider themselves, cannot worship and proselytize freely in America, then are we any better than China, Russia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, Cuba or any other autocratic regime? At least in Iran the people are finally fed up with 30 years of Muslim fanaticism and have taken their revolution to

the streets. When will Christians and conservatives wake up and take the revolution to the streets here in America?

"He's got a very delicate path to walk here," said Sen. Chris Dodd, D-Conn. "You don't want to take ownership of this," defending Obama's effeminate stance against Iran's brutal political repression. That's not Reagan's "Peace through strength"; that's not inspired leadership; that's licking your finger, holding it up in the air and seeing which way the wind blows. Leaders lead! It's time for Obama to stop being a man-child in the Promised Land and be a Man. But he can't—why? Obama is enslaved by his neo-Marxist, socialist ideology, which hates American exceptionalism, or the idea that America, by her unique history, religious traditions and Constitution is better than other countries possessing inferior historical and political traditions. Even if Iran cuts off the world to their rich oil fields, Obama is in the midst of a Hobson's choice. He must appease one of his major special interest groups—the radical environmentalists, who detest nuclear, coal, gas and oil energy. Therefore, he won't exploit America's huge oil reserves we have in Alaska, Utah, Colorado and reserves off the coast of Florida, Louisiana and California. Obama's green energy bill currently before Congress is merely a Machiavellian tax increase.

Iranian dichotomies and American ironies; what's the difference between Iran and America? Both are ruled by narcissistic, fascist dictators, a *de facto* one-party system dominated by cronyism, corruption, political commissars and a state-run press that justifies perverting the Constitution to "help the poor" and crush all political dissent. Remember that Ahmadinejad's biggest demographic are the lower classes from the southern regions of Iran. Now it has come out the Obama used back-channel communications with Iran's supreme leader, the Ayatollah Khamenei. The letter was sent between May 4 and May 10 and laid out the prospect of "cooperation in regional and bilateral relations" and a resolution of the dispute over Iran's nuclear program. A Mid-eastwire.com article broke the story: "

The American president was quoted as saying that he expected the people of Iran to take to the streets," Ayatollah Khamenei misquoted Mr. Obama as saying, according to a translation."

On the one hand, they [the Obama administration] write a letter to us to express their respect for the Islamic Republic and for re-establishment of ties, and on the other hand they make these remarks.

Which one of these remarks are we supposed to believe? Inside the country, their agents were activated. . . . The violators are not the public or the supporters of the candidates. They are the ill-wishers, mercenaries and agents of the Western intelligence services and the Zionists.¹⁰

These Iranian/American dichotomies are incredible. They show the utterly duplicitous, craven nature of Obama and how comfortable he is with coddling fascist Muslim dictators while bringing the iron fist to Israel and Bibi Netanyahu, demanding that they trade “land for peace” with the Palestinians despite the fact that Israel is a very tiny nation possessing only one-sixth of 1 percent of the total land mass of the Middle East.

After this letter Obama sent to the ayatollah is fully vetted, I’m sure it will become clear that much in the same way as the 1938 Munich Treaty between Neville Chamberlain and Hitler lit the fuse for World War II and the Nazi genocide of 6 million Jews in the Holocaust, so we will soon learn that Obama’s appeasement letter to the ayatollah gave Iran the green light to steal the presidential election, brutally crush all political dissent and develop nuclear weapons with impunity to “wipe Israel off the map.” Obama has disappointed no one but the tens of millions of besieged Iranians who honestly believed in representative democracy and the billions of people throughout the world oppressed under totalitarian regimes whose one light for freedom and liberty, America, was extinguished by the words and letters of appeasement by president Obama.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 11

VIVA HONDURAS! VIVA LA REVOLUCIÓN!

July 01, 2009

It was a “coup” in Honduras in a way, but it was really a coup for democracy.

~ Dr. Michael Savage (June 29, 2009 show)

The Machiavellian plots of a would-be dictator were unexpectedly thwarted by the Honduran military last Sunday. President Manuel Zelaya, a Marxist socialist who is the protégé of his Venezuelan neighbor,

President Hugo Chavez, unsuccessfully tried to turn his country into a banana republic to extend his term in office indefinitely by executive decree. (Can you say Mayor Michael Bloomberg of New York?) The report from Reuters said, in part, "Zelaya, who took office in 2006 and is limited by the constitution to a four-year term that ends in early 2010, had angered the army, courts and Congress by pushing for an unofficial public vote on Sunday to gauge support for his plan to hold a November referendum on allowing presidential re-election." Of course, *Musolini-lite*, Hugo Chavez is very angry by this recent "coup" in Honduras. Why? Chavez is worried that his people in Venezuela will get dangerous ideas of liberty and freedom. Coincidentally, Chavez escaped his own coup in 2002; perhaps this time he won't be so lucky. Indeed, dictators *can* be kicked out of office by force when they contravene the constitution.

Honduran ex-President Zelaya was allowed asylum in Costa Rica. "If holding a poll provokes a coup, the abduction of the president and expulsion from his country, then what kind of democracy are we living in?" Zelaya said in Costa Rica. I answer him in this wise: "Mr. Zelaya, the kind of democracy Hondurans are living in is the very kind that Thomas Jefferson dreamed of for America and eventually for the entire world to enjoy—*Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness*."

Here are the opening words of Jefferson's Declaration of Independence:

When, in the course of human events, *it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another*, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

The key phrase here is: ". . . it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another." I call that passage the exclusionary clause that any healthy representative democracy or republic must maintain as a last resort when any of its branches of government—executive, legislature or judicial—become unresponsive or even tyrannical to the will of the people. We see these despotic regimes in evidence with Chavez in Venezuela, Mahmoud Ahmad-

inejad in Iran, Zelaya in Honduras and Obama in America. Therefore, it is the sworn duty of We the People, as a civilized body under this social contract, to overthrow any unconstitutional government by force if necessary and re-establish a constitutional one based on the rule of law, liberty and *Veritas* (truth). When you really boil these leaders down to their component parts, there isn't much difference in tone, style or substance. They are all neo-Marxist dictators with fascist tendencies. They all hate democratic strictures like freedom, separation of powers, bipartisanship and fidelity to the Constitution.

George Orwell once said, "During times of universal deceit, telling the truth becomes a revolutionary act." It is so refreshing to see the Honduran military provoke truth by ushering in essence a counterrevolution to oust the would-be tyrant, President Zelaya, and prevent his sham referendum for making him "El Presidente" for life. The unfolding events in Honduras remind me of a German proverb—*Der Mensch denkt, Gott lenkt*—Man proposes, God disposes. In other words, no matter the wicked designs of man plotted in secret places to oppress, disenfranchise and kill his fellow man, in time God will always arise, show Himself to be strong and frustrate and depose the evil intent of tyrants like Zelaya, Chavez, Ahmadinejad, Kim Jong-il and Obama.

It is really a beautiful exercise of the doctrine of separation of powers the way Zelaya was summarily and quickly removed from office. The Reuter's story read: "The Supreme Court, which last week came out against Zelaya and ordered him to reinstate fired military chief Vasquez, said on Sunday it had told the army to remove the president. It acted to defend the rule of law," the court said in a statement read on Honduran radio. For my socialist, progressive and liberal friends who characterize the military action of the Honduran army to be a coup establishing a Cuban-style junta, Reuters wrote: "An opposition deputy said Congress would chose Roberto Micheletti, the head of Congress, as acting president later on Sunday, and Honduras' top electoral court said a presidential election would be held as planned on Nov. 29."

Michael Savage was right; the revolution in Honduras isn't a "coup" *against* democracy—it is a coup *for* democracy. Moreover the actions of the Honduran army amount to a counterrevolution to stop president Zelaya's attempted coup. While I prefer peaceful means to effect political change, history has repeatedly shown us that because of mankind's irredeemable nature, absolute power corrupts absolutely. In the face of

utter evil and tyranny, We the People are sometimes left with few options other than overt revolution. Once again, Thomas Jefferson said it best: *The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants.* Viva Honduras! Viva la revolución!

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 12

OBAMA'S 'FINAL SOLUTION' FOR ISRAEL

September 26, 2009

President Obama gave the worst anti-Israel speech of any American president I can remember.

~ John Bolton, Former U.S. ambassador to the U.N.

The speech was good and positive for Israel and for moving the peace process forward.

~ Benjamin Netanyahu, prime minister of Israel

How can Bolton and Netanyahu, two seemingly rational, educated and intellectual men hear President Obama's U.N. speech Wednesday and come to such diametrical opposite conclusions? Both men proudly claim that they are conservatives; both men claim that they believe in a strong, independent, defensible Israel with an indivisible capital at Jerusalem. *Answer:* One man is a statesman like Sir Winston Churchill; the other is a politician, an appeaser like Neville Chamberlain.

Obama's speech was delivered with the dispassionate indifference of a man who was handed a speech others wrote for him and loaded into his teleprompter for him to read like a robot, yet the devil is always in the details. Here are some of the highlights of Obama's U.N. speech: "The time has come to relaunch negotiations—without preconditions—that address the permanent-status issues: security for Israelis and Palestinians; borders, refugees and Jerusalem. . . ." ¹¹ This paragraph could just as easily have been written by Col. Moammar Gadhafi who ranted and raved for 100 minutes before the U.N. assembly and affectionately called President Obama "my brother." Obama's U.N. speech could have been written by a whole host of enemies of Israel—Mahmoud Abbas, the president of the Palestinians; Khaled Mashal, the Gaza leader of the ter-

rorist organization Hamas; Nasrallah, the leader of Hezbollah terrorist group occupying Lebanon.

What does Obama mean by "the time has come to relaunch negotiations"? This guy is such a narcissist that he thinks whenever he does something, like trying to broker a peace deal between the Israelis and the Palestinians, that *he* is the first leader to attempt it. Every U.S. president since Harry Truman in the late 1940s has in one way or another tried and failed to "relaunch" peace in the Middle East. Obama wants there to be "negotiations without preconditions." That statement is oxymoronic. All legitimate negotiations between parties done in good faith *must* set reasonable preconditions. For example, the Palestinians (and all Arab and Muslim nations) must accept the irrevocable fact that Israel is a legitimate nation-state with the right to exist in peace. The Palestinians and the 44 Muslim nations have been fighting against that simple precondition for 65 years.

President Obama further stated: "The goal is clear: two states living side by side in peace and security—a Jewish state of Israel, with true security for all Israelis. . . ." ¹²

Can anyone name any place on the planet where a nation has a divided capital and is living in peace and security?—Washington, D.C., London, Paris, Moscow, Beijing, Berlin, Riyadh, Tehran, Baghdad? To demand that any of these countries divide their capital in half and give one half to their largest ethnic minority group would be tantamount to that country committing genocide against itself, yet for over 40 years this is the untenable position the world has placed on the backs of the Israelis. Obama further emphasized his anti-sovereignty point when he arrogantly declared in his U.N. speech that "America does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements."

When Obama says, ". . . and a viable, independent Palestinian state with contiguous territory that ends the occupation that began in 1967 and realizes the potential of the Palestinian people," he is using perhaps the most evil, anti-Semitic language I've ever heard from any American president against Israel. ("Contiguous" = unbroken "territory"; "occupation" = unlawful seizure of land). ¹³ Obama seems to be demanding that Israel give back the land the Jews *won* in the 1967 war, a war fought and paid for by the blood of thousands of courageous Israeli soldiers and Jewish civilians. Following Obama's perverse view of history, what nation on earth could lay legitimate claim to the land they presently have?

There is not a place on earth where lands were not taken from another people but by force or war.

Obama wasn't finished with his screed when he said: "As we pursue this goal, we will also pursue peace between Israel and Lebanon, Israel and Syria, and a broader peace between Israel and its many neighbors. In pursuit of that goal, we will develop regional initiatives with multilateral participation, alongside bilateral negotiations." ¹⁴ What "goal" does Obama wish to pursue for God's chosen people? Is Obama's "goal" tantamount to Hitler's "Final Solution" regarding the nation of Israel? Not to be histrionic here, but what other result would happen to America's most faithful ally if Obama throws her into the clutches of Lebanon (controlled by Hezbollah and Iran), or Gaza (controlled by Hamas and Iran) and Syria, who two years ago was on the fast track to develop nuclear weapons to "wipe Israel off the map" until Israel tactically executed a pre-emptive strike against Syria's secret nuclear facilities Sept. 6, 2007—nuclear technology and weapons of mass destruction Syria bought from Iran. ¹⁵

President Obama's perverse worldview (not just regarding Israel) stems from the fact that virtually all of the people who mentored him during his early formative years were communists, terrorists, fanatical anti-Semites or haters of America. The most conspicuous example being Rev. Jeremiah Wright whose church propagated "liberation theology"—a racist, Marxist brand of religious hatred Barack and Michelle Obama dutifully enjoyed for 20 years. That bad seed of anti-Semitism planted in the heart of Barack Obama by Rev. Wright was in full bloom during Obama's speech at the U.N. Ambassador Bolton wisely stated that President Obama's U.N. address just put "Israel on the chopping block." Let me be clear: A divided Israel is an Israel that will be quickly and utterly destroyed by the Islamic countries surrounding her who are sworn by their Muslim religion to "kill the Jew where you find him." The Muslim world has dreamed of this day when a weak, Quisling leader in America like Obama would seek to curry favor of the Muslim nations to bolster his own universal reputation. The price?—A revival of Hitler's "Final Solution" and the genocide of the independent nation-state of Israel. May God forbid.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 13

FIGHTING SATAN IN AFGHANISTAN

October 17, 2009

Afghanistan: The place where empires go to die.

~ Ancient proverb

I wish you could have sat with me in my Sunday School class last week. My teacher, Deacon Naomi Hughey, is one of the best Bible teachers I've ever had. The lesson was from Mark 5:1-20 and was about the story of Jesus and his 12 disciples visiting a Roman province near the Sea of Galilee. Here is the narrative:

They came to the other side of the lake, to the country of the Gerasenes. And when he had stepped out of the boat, immediately a man out of the tombs with an unclean spirit met him. He lived among the tombs; and no one could restrain him anymore, even with a chain; . . . When he saw Jesus from a distance, he ran and bowed down before him; . . . Jesus asked him, "What is your name?" He replied, "My name is Legion; for we are many." . . . And the unclean spirits came out and entered the swine; and the herds, numbering about two thousand, rushed down the steep bank into the lake, and were drowned in the lake.

Deacon Hughey did an amazing job explaining the power of Satan along with the excellent research materials she gave us tracing the origins of Satan's power, his legendary beauty and his ultimate moral decline and spiritual madness in trying to overthrow the very throne of God as chronicled in Isaiah 14:12-23 and Ezekiel 28:1-10. While she spoke I trembled inside. I began to wonder about the cataclysmic events of today, which many biblical scholars consider the "Last Days." Unlike Jesus' metaphysical approach to warfare in Mark 5, America, in our present wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, relies too much on *visible* weaponry.

Therefore, I asked this Socratic question to the class: *Can America fight demonic forces with bullets, guns and bombs?* Jesus' battle with the Gerasenes demoniac in Mark 5 demonstrates that you *cannot* fight satanic forces merely with bullets, guns and bombs. However, America's present wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have been fought that way for the past

eight years, yet we have little to show for the over \$1 trillion spent to wage war in Afghanistan and Iraq to date.¹⁶ You mean to tell me that 150,000 American soldiers cannot defeat the Taliban, a small guerrilla force numbering no more than 300-500 fighters in Afghanistan and Pakistan? I thought that America is supposed to have the best military of any nation in the world. Yes, but the military has had their hands tied in Washington, D.C.

With mere words, "Come out of the man thou unclean spirit," Jesus cast out a "Legion" of demons numbering 6,000 from one possessed man and sent those evil spirits into a herd of 2,000 swine, which caused the animals to immediately run violently down a steep hill and drown.

In Afghanistan, we are dealing with a vile form of human swine called the Taliban, a zealous branch of Muslim fanatics hell-bent on imposing their murderous version of Islam upon the entire world. Where is Richard the Lionhearted (1157-99) when we really need him? Since the Korean War (1950-53) and especially since the Vietnam War (1959-75), Neville Chamberlain socialists in Congress and every president of the past 65 years (except Ronald Reagan) have fought wars not to win, but to make the corrupt bureaucrats of the United Nations happy with us. Those are two very diametrical war objectives—peace through victory vs. compromise through appeasement.

Why do you think Obama just won the Nobel Peace Prize after only 10 days in office? (Nominations for the Nobel Prize had to be in by Feb. 1). The prize was used to defame Bush-43's "War on Terror" policies developed since 9/11. The United Nations has always had ideas and policies antithetical to America's long Natural Law traditions rooted in liberty, morality, the rule of law and *Veritas* (truth). The U.N. and the corrupt politician in Congress all believe in Positive Law (legal fascism), humanism and moral relativism—that no one country or people are any better than another, that one's morality is predicated upon one's own culture, which should not be imposed on others. Therefore, all these imbedded socialists, fascists and communists believe in an impotent America that negotiates with other world powers not from a position of strength, but from our knees!

So, can we fight Satan in Afghanistan? What about in other theaters like Iraq, in Iran, in North Korea, in Venezuela, in China, in Russia, where evil reigns supreme—can we fight merely with bullets, guns, bombs and "bilateral diplomacy"? No. The Apostle Paul said: *For our*

struggle is not against human opponents, but against rulers, authorities, cosmic powers in the darkness around us, and evil spiritual forces in the heavenly realm. When we have a president championing the overturning of “Don’t Ask Don’t Tell,” a Clinton-era policy that forbade the military from investigating homosexuals within its ranks; when military chaplains are forbidden to pray in the name of Jesus and “Muslim chaplains” with ties to Islamic terrorist groups are given free rein; when the military isn’t “unleashed” but instead micromanaged by duplicitous presidents and incompetent bureaucrats at the Pentagon and the State Department; then all the bombs, guns and bullets in the world will not win a war whose opponent is filled with the demonic forces so vividly described in Mark 5.

I told my Sunday School class if we insist on fighting a poorly planned war like we did in Korea in the 1950s, or a futile and protracted war like Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia in the 1960s and ‘70s, then we have already conceded defeat in 2009 and should instead bring our brave soldiers home immediately. I’d be happy if we do the best we can to defend this little piece of earth we still have left called America against a determined cabal of Muslim fanatics, Russian and Chinese communists and our own homegrown traitors occupying the halls of the federal government, the courts, the public schools, Hollywood and the government-controlled media complex.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 14

HERE’S WHY OBAMA CAN’T GO TO BERLIN

November 07, 2009

Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!

~ Ronald Reagan

Three American statesmen made trips to deliver historical speeches in Berlin: 1) JFK’s *Ich bin ein Berliner* speech in 1963, 2) Ronald Reagan’s “Tear down this wall!” speech in 1987, and 3) Barack Obama’s 2009 non-speech speech which in a revelatory article by National Review’s Rich Lowry could be titled, *Ich bin beschäftigt*—i.e., I’m busy. Although Barack Obama, after only one year in office, has visited more countries than any

other U.S. president in history, he does not have time to accept German Chancellor Angela Merkel's invitation to speak in Berlin next week in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, which Nikita Khrushchev built in 1961 to keep East German citizens separate from the West and mired in the hopeless abyss of communism.

What was Obama doing the night the election returns were coming in? According to his press secretary, Robert Gibbs, Obama was enjoying a sycophantic HBO documentary about himself and his presidential campaign rather than watching the election returns. If the Roman despot Nero fiddled while Rome burned, then surely it can be said that Obama watched TV while the Democrat Party crashed and burned in the special elections Nov. 3. Most political experts think that the devastating losses in Virginia and New Jersey are omens of even more galling losses to come for the Democratic Party in the 2010 and 2012 elections. Why can't Obama go to Berlin?

President Obama is Machiavellian to the core, and like Machiavelli, who said in his infamous book *The Prince* (1513) *the end justifies the means*, likewise Obama will do nothing that won't further his political agenda to "remake America" in his own Marxist image. Going to Berlin won't *deify* Obama, it will *reveal* him. Furthermore, he knows that whatever words he would say in Berlin would pale in comparison to the words JFK said in Berlin in June 1963 and especially Ronald Reagan's prophetic rhetoric uttered before the Brandenburg Gate on June 12, 1987—"Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!"—just two years before the fall of the evil Soviet Empire. Moreover, the dirty little secret about the Democratic Party, Barack Obama and his fascist minions in the White House is that they were on the wrong side of history. Liberals did not cheer when the Berlin Wall fell. Obama and his socialist colleagues in the academy, in the media, in Hollywood did not have a party of jubilee as the people did in East Berlin, in Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Lithuania, Georgia, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia and in numerous other former Soviet-bloc countries. Reagan's words, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!" literally freed hundreds of millions of people from the bondage of communist dictatorships all over the world.

Regarding the artistic and Hollywood community, I read an interesting story about the Wende Museum in Los Angeles and its failed efforts to erect a portion of Berlin wall as an art exhibit. Here is an excerpt of the narrative from the article: "The concrete wall that divided the city of

Berlin for 28 years is suddenly splitting a segment of Los Angeles' art community just as the 20th anniversary of the wall's falling nears." The trouble began earlier this month when the Wende Museum installed several segments of the original Berlin Wall on Wilshire Boulevard.

Kent Twitchell, whose larger-than-life paintings cover entire walls and sides of freeways, said he planned to "bookend" two sections of the wall with portraits of President John F. Kennedy, who denounced the barrier in a Berlin speech in 1963, and President Ronald Reagan, who famously demanded, "Tear down this wall!" shortly before it came down in 1989. But as he rushed to finish the portraits, Twitchell said he was told by organizers that he could leave one of the paintings in his studio: There was no room for both. "They said there would only be room for one and they just assumed it would be Kennedy," the disappointed artist said this week as he continued to work at putting the final touches on the Reagan one. Stalin would be proud of the censorship tactics by the commissars of art and the useful idiots of the Hollywood left, for they are continuing his ignoble legacy 56 years after his death by "disappearing" the great President Ronald Reagan from our national memory at the Wende Museum.

Returning to why Obama *can't* go to Berlin, his only concern is puffing up his own massive ego. A trip to Berlin to celebrate the fall of communism in Eastern Europe simply does not fit the template of what motivates our Narcissist-in-Chief, which can be encapsulated in this phrase—How can I be praised? On Nov. 9, 1989, the torch of liberty was lit for more than a billion people (one-third of the world's population) when they started their path toward freedom with the fall of the Berlin Wall; a seemingly impregnable symbol of imprisonment that Khrushchev erected in 1961 to stop the exodus of East German citizens fleeing the slavery of communism for the freedom and liberty of democracy in West Germany.

Twenty years later, President Obama, as the anti-Reagan, is trying to rebuild the Berlin Wall brick by brick with fascist policies designed to undermine freedom of all Americas and the liberties of those people around the world yearning for a republic founded on the rule of law. Obama wants to place those same shackles Stalin put on the Soviet-bloc countries on America with his socialist health-care bill, which, if passed, would place government in our lives from cradle to grave. Furthermore, if Obama signs the upcoming Copenhagen climate-change treaty at the

United Nations conference Dec. 7-18, he will, with the stroke of a pen, concurrently destroy America's Constitution and make the U.S. a servile client state of the United Nations into perpetuity. May God forbid.

ON FOREIGN POLICY—ESSAY 15

MR. OBAMA, TEAR DOWN THIS GORELICK WALL!

November 14, 2009

Although you understand the debilitating impact of the [Gorelick] wall, I cannot imagine that the commission knew about this [1995] memorandum, so I have declassified it for you and the public to review.

~ John Ashcroft, attorney general, before the 9/11 commission, April 13, 2004

The tragic murder of 14 people (I include the preborn baby) at Fort Hood last week by Maj. Nidal Malik Hasan was the first terrorist attack on U.S. soil since 9/11. This terrible act has brought to the fore all the usual suspects, recriminations and rationalizations. Each day brings new revelations or "red flags" concerning this Muslim fanatic that military officials, the FBI, CIA, NSA, Homeland Security and even Hasan's medical colleagues knew about for years, but did nothing. Two things shielded America's enemies from swift justice: 1) *Political correctness*, which I call "perversity correctness," or what conservative intellectual Michael Savage calls "political cowardice"; and 2) the Gorelick Wall.

Let's take the first shield Maj. Hasan (and technically untold millions of Muslims) have protecting him—PC, political cowardice. Our military brass and Congress are so cowed by even the appearance of singling out Muslims to prevent terrorist attacks in America that they literally looked at every other thing in the room but the 800-pound gorilla sitting in the corner shouting *Allahu akbar!*—until it was too late. This insane PC policy of American cowardice toward Muslims is evidenced by the Obama administration refusing to use the phrases "war on terror," "Islamic terrorism," "terrorists" or "Muslim," preferring the less judgmental terms, "manmade disaster" and "overseas contingency operation."

The second policy America has launched against itself is the infamous "Gorelick Wall." What is the Gorelick Wall? It is a policy devel-

oped by Clinton appointee and former Deputy Attorney General Jamie Gorelick, who after the first terrorist bombings of the World Trade Center of Feb. 26, 1993, was placed as the head of a blue-ribbon commission to find the causes in our internal security that allowed these bombings to occur. In March 1995, Gorelick co-wrote a radical and treasonous memo that, in the words of Attorney General John Ashcroft, goes "beyond what is legally required . . . [to] prevent any risk of creating an unwarranted appearance that FISA [the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act] is being used to avoid procedural safeguards which would apply in a criminal investigation." ¹⁷ What does this mean? It means that the FBI cannot share intelligence with the CIA, the NSA, the DEA, ATF, the military or any other security agency in America. It is a unilateral, self-binding policy reminiscent of the proverbial saying, *the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing*.

In his opening statement before the 9/11 commission on April 13, 2004, Attorney General Ashcroft was outraged to learn that the commission had not investigated or been told of Gorelick's memo and her role regarding the "wall." To show the utter duplicity and incompetence by politicians of both parties, Ashcroft's assertion was disputed by former Sen. Slade Gorton, R-Wash., a member of the commission, who said, "Nothing Jamie Gorelick wrote had the slightest impact on the Department of Defense or its willingness or ability to share intelligence information with other intelligence agencies." Furthermore, after almost 15 years since Gorelick's memo, it is now beyond question that the Gorelick Wall led to barred anti-terror investigators from accessing the computer of Zacarias Moussaoui, the 20th hijacker, already in custody on an immigration violation on 9/11. The Gorelick Wall also caused protracted, internecine struggles between the Janet Reno Justice Department and FBI Director Louie Freeh because Reno (and President Bill Clinton) viewed terrorist attacks as police matters rather than issues of counterterrorism.

How did the Gorelick Wall prevent our security agencies from discovering and expelling Maj. Hasan from the military before he could commit his murderous acts against our brave soldiers? The treachery of Gorelick's Wall was that it kept all of our security agencies in the dark. It prevented security agencies' access to the common-sense tactics of the past in sharing intelligence with one another to stop terrorist attacks and future terrorist plots on American soil. Of course, I realize that we can't put all the blame on poor Ms. Gorelick, for the Gorelick Wall extended

back in one form or another to the treasonous "Church Committee" of Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, in 1975. Church was one of the many *enemies within* that virtually destroyed the CIA, FBI and other intelligence agencies under the pretext of protecting Americans from being spied on, forcing the agencies to comply with the restrictive strictures of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. Thanks, President Carter!

I lay Maj. Hasan's murderous treachery directly at the feet of the Church Committee, for leading to FISA in 1978, the 1995 Gorelick Wall memo and, finally, to the "manmade disaster" policies of Obama in 2009. Thanks to progressives, Democrats and Republicans for being such political cowards and fearful of a "Muslim backlash" post-9/11 that they created policies and allowed harmful policies to stand for decades that in essence allowed murderers like Maj. Hasan easy access to our great military.

Even a socialist like President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 67 years ago in the throes of World War II, had the leadership and fortitude to immediately hang six of the eight Nazi saboteurs in the 1942 case, *In Re Quirin*. What will Obama, the Stalinist media, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party do to protect us against the evils of Muslim-inspired terrorism? These PC bureaucrats will continue to drone on and on about Hasan's "constitutional rights," fear of a Muslim backlash, that Christianity has nut jobs too, and how we should not "jump to conclusions." Jump to conclusions? It is common sense for America's security to prevent a murderous Muslim fanatic like Maj. Nidal Malik Hasan from even being admitted into our military; however, if we continue on this PC road of political cowardice, then America will jump not to conclusions, but jump into the abyss of self-genocide. To paraphrase President Ronald Reagan's 1987 speech at Berlin . . . "Mr. Obama tear down this *Gorelick Wall*!"

CHAPTER

~4~

ON PHILOSOPHY

ON *PHILOSOPHY*—ESSAY 1

IS LIBERALISM ANTI-INTELLECTUAL?

March 14, 2009

Liberalism is wrong because it doesn't work.

If a company is too big to fail, it's too big to exist.

~ George Will

On Thursday, radio host and conservative intellectual Laura Ingraham had writer George Will on her program discussing the Obama administration, the economy and society. As usual with Laura, the conversation was spirited, substantive and serious. In my opinion, Laura Ingraham is one of the finest interviewers in modern times, because in a few minutes she can with laser-like efficiency discern how to cut through all the cognitive dissonance and sophism to get at the important root issues she wishes to expose to her audience. When the conversation shifted to the political philosophy of liberalism, George Will said something I

thought was both simple and profound—*Liberalism is wrong because it doesn't work*. As the subject moved to the dismal state of Wall Street, the American economy, rising unemployment and mega-corporations like AIG, Citigroup, Freddie Mac, Fannie Mae, GM, Ford and Chrysler on the verge of bankruptcy, George Will said, *If a company is too big to fail, it is too big to exist*.

I've always admired and learned from George Will and his intellectual brand of conservatism. As a matter of fact, he is responsible for my modest makeover 20 years ago when I shaved my mustache, cut my hair and started wearing bowties. The two quotes above are quintessential George Will where he, better than most intellectuals, has the unique gift of synthesizing complex ideas with a seemingly simple phrase. When Will told Laura, "Liberalism is wrong because it doesn't work," I screamed in my heart, "Yes! Why can't those *dummkopfs* in Congress prop up someone in front of a TV camera that can say this phrase with a degree of credibility?" Instead we have the new Republican National Committee chairman, Michael Steele, running around trying to "reach out" to the hip-hop community, to the Hollywood community, to blacks, Hispanics, Asians, young voters and to feminists (via his recent clumsy comments on abortion). Here is some unsolicited advice for you, Mr. Steele, Why don't you reach out to the damn conservatives!

Back to George Will and the ultimate question regarding liberals and liberalism: Is liberalism based on intellectualism, emotion or nihilism? Most conservative intellectuals like Ingraham and Will would contend that liberalism is anti-intellectual and is a political philosophy based on envy, emotionalism and nihilism. While I agree, I would add a fascism element to this characterization of liberalism that I gleaned from reading Jonah Goldberg's book, *Liberal Fascism*—a marvelous book that elegantly chronicles the history of liberals' love affair with fascism, which in its myriad incarnations in 20th century dictators like Mussolini, Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Franco, Mao, Pol Pot, Kim Il-sung, Idi Amin and others demanded both total obeisance to the will of "the Leader" and an education system based on propaganda rather than truth. As a case in point, look at how the Obama administration is handling America's present economic collapse. Both Obama, his economic advisers, particularly his clueless treasury secretary, Tim Geithner, are clearly in over their heads and are doing everything they can but address the central issues that brought our economy into the catastrophic state we find ourselves. In-

stead, we hear talk of pouring more billions to keep mortgage insurer AIG from bankruptcy. Why would you pour more bad money after bad money?—Because AIG is too big to fail. George Will shot back and said: *If a company is too big to fail, it is too big to exist.* Will, like most conservatives, doesn't want government intervention into business no matter how well intentioned, because he knows that it will only delay the inevitable economic catastrophe and depression. Let the market cleanse itself. Yes, in the short term it will be painful because many companies will be forced into bankruptcy, but the arrogance and anti-intellectualism of liberalism demands that, "We've got to do something."

Enter stage left, President Obama the messiah and all of his little Marxist minions with their statistics, programs, spending plans, corporate statism and Italian and German-style fascism to save corporate America. Liberals and socialists in Congress can't run Medicare, Amtrak, the public schools, the post office or the city of Washington, D.C., efficiently; why would any rational person think that these 535 *dummkopfs* can effectively run corporate America? That's why I believe that liberalism is anti-intellectualism. Every policy created from its presumptions either have failed (Marxism, Keynesianism, Wilson-FDR-LBJ socialism), is failing (unionism, American exceptionalism, the Obama administration) or will soon fail (government welfare from Watts to Wall Street). Obama, a Harvard Law graduate isn't stupid. He and his army of Ivy-Leaguers realize that his economic policies are failing spectacularly. Here is where his Machiavellian side comes to the fore. I believe that Obama is *purposely* stimulating economic chaos rather than seriously trying to fix the economy. Why?

In a recent article, *Obama: Manchild in the promised land*, I wrote the following:

I have often stated in my own writings on law, politics and philosophy that before theory, before practice, there *must* be a pretext. Rahm Emanuel has clearly stated this shameless political pretext. . . . ["You never want a serious crisis to go to waste."] What is the "serious crisis" Emanuel doesn't want "to go to waste"? Well, it's the downward spiral of economy. To a certified socialist like Obama who is a self-confessed admirer of FDR, a crisis, any crisis, is like pure gold—misery = power.

Morals were first separated from politics in the writings of that infamous Italian political philosopher Niccolo Machiavelli, in his treatise on statecraft, "The Prince" (1513). One of the most famous quotes from that work is: "The end justifies the means." The Obama administration

is playing Machiavelli like a Stradivarius violin against America's most sacred, vested interests. Anti-intellectualism, anarchy, nihilism and societal instability are Obama's *means*; an Orwellian police state where the Bible, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are treated as toilet paper will be *the end*.¹

America, be not deceived. Under the pretext of an imminent economic depression, Obama will use the machinery of government to repress our God-given natural rights of the people on an unprecedented scale. Unless Obama's anti-intellectual, Marxist moves are stopped; this country will no longer be called USA but USSA—the United Socialist States of America.

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 2

OBAMA'S USE OF CONTROLLED CHAOS

March 18, 2009

Men are so simple and so much inclined to obey immediate needs that a deceiver will never lack victims for his deceptions.

~ Machiavelli

In the 1998 movie *Enemy of the State*, Robert Clayton Dean (Will Smith) and "Brill" (Gene Hackman) have their lives turned upside down by excessive surveillance activity from a sinister top NSA official, "Thomas Reynolds" (Jon Voight). Reynolds and a rogue group of NSA agents killed a congressman in a political-related murder, which was caught on tape, and for the rest of the movie they try to cover up the murder through deceit, misdirection and chaos theory—destroying evidence and intimidating witnesses, including Dean and Brill. In a climactic scene between Dean and Brill, the tables are turned when Brill, a former career NSA agent himself who went "rogue" when his best friend was killed 18 years ago (the result of a covert mission overseas gone bad), decides to team up with Dean, a labor lawyer who stumbled upon the congressman's murder by accident. He teaches his young protégé the rudiments of war strategy reminiscent of the military and political classics—Sun Tzu's *The Art of War*, Machiavelli's *The Prince*, Saul Alinsky's *Rules for Radicals* and chaos theory. Here is an excerpt from the movie:

Brill: In guerrilla warfare, you try to use your weaknesses as strengths. (Here Brill shows Dean several listening devices NSA agents had planted on him, which up to that point allowed them to make his life a living hell.)

Dean: Such as?

Brill: Well, if they're big and you're small, then you're mobile and they're slow. You're hidden and they're exposed. Only fight battles you know you can win. That's the way the Vietcong did it. You capture their weapons and you use them against them the next time.

That scene from a popular 1998 movie reminds me of the Machiavelian tactics President Obama and his advisers are using today. These people, most of them Ivy-League graduates and diehard socialists, are very intelligent people. They realize that their policy remedies to fix the economy have no historical or rational basis and are only causing more economic uncertainty and chaos on Wall Street and on economic indicators throughout the world. Therefore, the salient question becomes: *Why* is the Obama administration causing such chaos against his own nation, his own people who just elected him as the first black man to serve as president of United States? It's chaos theory.

In 1890, Henri Poincare, a French mathematician, physicist and philosopher of science, was the first discoverer of chaos theory. He applied it to mathematics and described this new phenomenon in this manner:

Chaos theory—the behavior of certain dynamical systems—that is, systems whose states evolve with time—that may exhibit dynamics that are highly sensitive to initial conditions (popularly referred to as *the butterfly effect*). As a result of this sensitivity, which manifests itself as an exponential growth of perturbations in the initial conditions, the behavior of chaotic systems appears to be random. This happens even though these systems are deterministic, meaning that their future dynamics are fully defined by their initial conditions, with no random elements involved. This behavior is known as deterministic chaos, or simply *chaos*.

Applied to politics, chaos theory is reminiscent of several derivative military, political and philosophy treatises of the past, including "*The Art of War*" (circa 500 B.C.)—*All war is deception; victorious warriors win first and then go to war, while defeated warriors go to war first and then seek to win*; *The Prince* (1513)—*Politics have no relation to morals; the end justifies the means*; and *Rules for Radicals* (1971)—Rule No. 13, *Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it and polarize it*.

Obama is a master at using his enemies' strengths (Christianity, free-market capitalism, Reagan conservatism) as a weakness (moral and economic collapse, multi-billion dollar bailouts, George W. Bush). Obama, along with his socialists and fascist minions, believes the best way to dominate a society is by always having a certain degree of controlled ("determined") chaos to supply the means to achieve their long-term ends of womb-to-tomb socialist controls over the people. The president has masterfully manipulated chaos theory to exacerbate existing societal problems by acting like he is somehow above it all or disassociated from the plethora of existing problems. ("I inherited this economy" and "not on my watch" are favorite Obama mantras.) Furthermore, Obama has purposely refrained from seriously focusing on fixing these pressing problems facing America, whether it's the economy, Wall Street, the home mortgage industry, the auto industry, the multi-trillion dollar debt we have with China or the numerous geopolitical catastrophes across the world.

In *Enemy of the State*, Brill's dialogue with Dean concluded, "You grow stronger as they grow weaker. Learn to use your enemy's own weapons against him." Obama and his minions have been taught by radical professors at the Ivy-League schools they attended to utterly hate America and all of her wonderful attributes like Natural Law, Christianity, liberty, integration of law and morality, free markets, the Bible, the Constitution, separation of powers, federalism—qualities that made America the greatest nation in this history of the world in less than 200 years. Instead, we are literally watching the Obama administration wage a *coup d'état* against his own country and wage a full frontal assault against her most sacred and vested interests.

I truly believe that Obama and the radicals in his administration will stop at nothing to achieve their nefarious ends, because they have the one characteristic Conservatives and Republicans with all their God talk and reliance on the Constitution's framers could never champion ... self-righteousness. Using pride, arrogance and self-righteousness combined with the political and legal application of chaos theory, the Obama administration should collapse upon the vanity of its own failed ideas, *but for* the media and our own self-delusion as products of the Stalinist public schools. The result?—In the manner that Obama's mentor, FDR, used the Great Depression as a pretext for the New Deal, Obama will likewise exploit societal instability, the collapse of Wall Street and the brink of a

worldwide great depression, which under chaos theory is determinism and chaos, as a *means* to achieve his diabolical *ends* of transforming America from the USA to the USSA (the United Socialist States of America).

Obama's tactics are not new. As I delineated above, they have precedence in Sun Tzu, Machiavelli, Alinsky and chaos theory. President Obama, the prep school/Ivy-League/ community organizer, is banking on the fact that as a public school educated citizen you have never read any of those authors and theories. If that is so, please rent the movie, "Enemy of the State" to understand that your precious natural rights are virtually extinct, and let's turn chaos theory against the Obama administration instead of being unwitting victims of his vast, Machiavellian conspiracy where in the name of affirmative action, bipartisanship and civility We the People have become willing accomplices to our own demise. May God forbid.

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 3

DEVOLVING STANDARDS OF INDECENCY

July 18, 2009

[T]he words of the [Eighth] Amendment are not precise, and . . . their scope is not static. The Amendment must draw its meaning from the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society.

~ *Trop v. Dulles* (1958)

One of the holiest scriptures of the totalitarian religion of *liberalism* is the legal aphorism, "evolving standards of decency." For decades progressives, Democrat legislators, activist judges and humanist law academics have proclaimed their spiritual devotion to this sacred verse of the so-called *Living Constitution* doctrine. That ubiquitous phrase sounds so clinical, so egalitarian, so nice and caring, which belies its surreptitious meaning and evil intent in American law over the past 100 years. This brings me to the corollary of that phrase, which ironically defines its real meaning—not evolving standards of decency, but *devolving standards of indecency*.

Living Constitutionalism is based on the idea that society changes, evolves and requires that constitutional controversies comply with evolving societal changes. An early exponent of the Living Constitution jurisprudence was Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., who as early as 1914 wrote, "The provisions of the Constitution are not mathematical formulas. . . . They are organic, living institutions." In a 1987 speech, Justice Thurgood Marshall likewise evoked the Living Constitution doctrine when he said that the law "must be considered in the light of our whole experience and not merely in that of what was said a hundred years ago." One of the most popular applications of Living Constitution jurisprudence was the Supreme Court's reference to "evolving standards of decency" in the 1958 case *Trop v. Dulles*, a 5-4 decision that held it was unconstitutional for the federal government to cancel the citizenship of a U.S. citizen as a punishment. The ruling's reference to "evolving standards of decency" is frequently cited precedent in the court's interpretation of the Eighth Amendment's prohibition on "cruel and unusual punishment." The Court wrote: *[T]he words of the [Eighth] Amendment are not precise, and . . . their scope is not static. The Amendment must draw its meaning from the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society.*

Since the *Trop* case, liberal activist judges have used the phrase "evolving standards of decency" repeatedly to either rewrite, pervert or marginalize the Constitution, rendering this sacred document into a meaningless litany of words. Judge Robert Bork made a compelling critique against Laurence Tribe, a leading exponent of Living Constitution jurisprudence and professor of Constitutional Law at Harvard, when Bork rightly deduced that the Living Constitution doctrine has a protean meaning. *Protean* denotes that the Constitution can become whatever the person (e.g., legislator, bureaucrat, academic, lawyer or judge) wills it to be in order to reach a desired policy outcome. America, that's treason. I am persuaded that the Living Constitution doctrine is a Machiavellian Trojan horse utilized by Democrat lawmakers and liberal activist judges from its creation in the early 1900s through the protean "incorporation doctrine." In the 1940s this treasonous incorporation doctrine greatly expanded with broad interpretations of the equal protection and due process clauses of the Fifth and 14th Amendments, which expanded these amendments' application beyond their original intent of checking

and balancing Congress, to almost exclusively be applied to the states. Radical federalism now trumps states' rights.

Here is where the devil is indeed in the details. Liberals love to feign themselves as champions of the poor, women, minorities and the "disenfranchised." Those who disagree with them are castigated by the government-controlled media as idiots, haters and racists. Public Enemy No. 1 to liberals are America's Founding Fathers whom they consider the lowest hypocrites for having slaves and demeaning women while placing themselves in the most favored positions in society. According to the liberal revisionist view of history, racial minorities and women were not entitled to liberty or equal protection at the time of the Constitution's ratification in 1791, therefore originalism or original intent is an inadequate remedy for these and associated desperate groups to achieve justice. Progressives and liberal Democrats believe that the Constitution therefore must be more proactive to address existential societal needs and that judges are at the vanguard to address these societal concerns and to dispense justice, opportunities and reparations equitably to all citizens.

On the other hand, economist Thomas Sowell, in his 1996 book, *Knowledge and Decisions*, contends that since the original makers of the Constitution allowed for the process of changing it, they never intended for their original words to change meaning. Sowell also uses original sources to contradict the conventional thinking of today that propose there were cases where arguments were never considered from the Constitution's framers, when the historical record would prove otherwise. In other words, there is nothing new under the sun. Justice Antonin Scalia is perhaps one of the most well-known and vociferous foes of *judicial activism*, whereby the judge sitting in the legislator's chair substitutes his own personal policy views in place of the rule of law. This perverts the entire separation of powers structure of the Constitution and replaces it with an individual's ability to influence his government, thus transferring that decision-making power from "We the People" to an oligarchy of unelected and unaccountable judges.

Devolving standards of indecency is perverting the moral rectitude of the rule of law for lawlessness and immorality. Fascists like Obama don't have time to rely on antiquated notions of Congress passing laws under a representative democracy, so he dons his Mussolini hat and becomes the CEO of GM by executive fiat and champions the totalitarian desires

of Marxists like Chavez of Venezuela and Zelaya of Honduras, while turning a blind eye to pseudo-democratic nations like China, Russia, North Korea, Sudan, Gaza and Iran. Devolving standards of indecency presently has Chairman Obama's eyes set on taking over the U.S. banking system, Wall Street, the home mortgage industry, health care and beyond. To give his fascist decrees the color of law, activist judges like Sonia Sotomayor will be there with the rubberstamp of approval.

Evolving standards of decency in constitutional law *always* produces devolving standards of indecency in the Supreme Court, in Congress, in culture and society, unless We the People return to the black-letter text of the U.S. Constitution and throw all of the poverty pimps, political hacks and liberal activist judges out of office.

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 4

SYMPOSIUM—OBAMA'S UNIVERSAL DEATHCARE

July 22, 2009

The greatest achievement of any fascist or tyrannical dictator is to convince you he is a champion of the people, of freedom and liberty while simultaneously he puts the shackles on your wrists, on your ankles . . . and on your mind.

~ Ellis Washington, "Epistemology" (unpublished manuscript)

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher from Athens who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle, and Aristotle taught Alexander the Great. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form "dialectic"—starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review, with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

Characters

- ❖ Socrates
- ❖ President Barack Obama
- ❖ Sen. Teddy Kennedy, the lion of liberalism
- ❖ Sen. RINO (= Republican in name only)
- ❖ We the People (*mute part*)

{Setting: Heaven; Date: the future}

Prologue

Socrates: We are gathered here at this Symposium to discuss the eternal security of health care policy. God has allowed me this unusual dialogue to ask you a few questions, President Obama regarding your universal health care for all Americans and to fully examine this policy in the light of *Veritas* (Truth).

Dialogue

Socrates: President Obama, you are desperately trying to get Congress to pass a universal health care bill for you to sign before the August recess. We all understand that universal health care is socialism. Sir Winston Churchill, about the evil intent of socialism, wrote: "Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance and the gospel of envy. . . . The inherent vice of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries."

Tell me, sir, when in the history of humanity has socialism ever worked to improve the plight of any people or the plight of any nation?

Obama: {*arrogantly*} Well, Socrates, you must understand that the medical experts whose opinions I respect are all in agreement that universal health care is a HUMAN RIGHT. To save health care costs, to improve the patient's health is our main goals. Our plan will ensure that every American will receive quality health care at an affordable price.

Socrates: Apparently, President Obama, you think that this Symposium is a political advertisement. It is not. I am not in your domain; you are in mine. Since you refuse to answer, or are incapable of answering a simple historical question about socialism in light of your proposed health care system, I will go to the next participant.

Sen. Teddy Kennedy, you have left a long, shameful legacy in America, the capstone of which is universal health care. For all of your convoluted words of the necessity to "help the poor," would you and your fellow colleagues in Congress make the passage of this universal health care program retroactive in exchange for your own gold-plated health care plans? In other words, will Congress agree to wait in line like ordinary Americans for the seizure and brain cancer operations you had in 2007 or Obama's grandmother's hip operation she had only two weeks before she died, Sen. Kennedy?

Sen. Teddy Kennedy: "My fellow Americans . . ." (The good senator lapses off into a rhetorical flourish of incoherence, euphemisms, platitudes and doublespeak.)

Socrates: You have heard the words for the ages of that great conservative British parliamentarian Sir Edmund Burke: *All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing?*

Sen. RINO: Yes, Socrates I've have heard those words of Burke before.

Socrates: Then obviously you either don't understand Burke's words or you are not a "good man." Which is it? . . . By the clueless expression on your face, I contend that it is both, which brings me to the original intent of the Founding Fathers of America. What did they and We the People want for this republic, which has stood for 233 years?—A philosophy of failure, a creed of ignorance, a gospel of envy, the equal sharing of miseries, to quote Sir Winston Churchill?

Sen. RINO, We the People: *{profound silence}*

Epilogue

Socrates: *{soliloquy}* President Obama, you are so supremely enamored with your own abilities, your own words. Like a demigod, you think: if I speak it to the masses, it must be true. To believe that socialized medicine will improve the existentially best health care system in the world is indeed a big lie Goebbels would be envious of.

Government is a necessary evil; nothing more. We the People decide through representative government and freedom what health-care system is wanted, not a narcissistic demagogue or a faceless bureaucrat. This original social contract, this liberty interest of free citizens contracting with the doctor of their choice for medical care will be dead. This is not universal health care, but universal death care.

We know that Democrats have long ago sold their souls to the devil on all issues of life, but will the loyal opposition on the right, the RINOs, now have the political courage to stop this socialized health care disaster by Obama, which will only lead to the untimely death of millions of elderly Americans deemed not worthy to prolong their life?

America, We the People, since *Roe v. Wade* (1973), have allowed the killing of 50 million innocent babies. Now, in the name of universal health care, you will kill another 50 million elderly Americans whom you will decide medically are just too expensive to bother with keeping

alive any longer. Who then will be left to save you when the bell tolls for thee?

Will your feeble life be worth saving in the eyes of a faceless bureaucrat whose death care policies will be measured by how many people he can force off health care? Indeed, Obama and his death care plan will destroy the last liberties of America's republic. Therefore, I urge you to hearken to the words of one of your Founding Fathers, Thomas Jefferson: *Let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.*

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 5

PROMETHEUS IN CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

September 16, 2009

For those of you following the virtually ignored story about the blacklisting of Michael Savage by the Britain on May 5, 2009 and the unjust libel and slander committed by a Western democracy against an American patriot without a peep from the government-controlled media here, about two weeks ago my friend and intellectual mentor, who is the host of *The Savage Nation* radio program, received an unexpected letter inviting him to Cambridge University to debate on the subject of "political correctness." Savage was both intrigued by this unique invitation, but suspicious. His fertile mind was going 100 mph. Was this a trick by the Labour Party of Prime Minister Gordon Brown? Were the socialist academics at Cambridge University setting Michael up for a big fall? Were clandestine forces trying to weaken or destroy the civil defamation suit Savage had brought against Jacqui Smith, the former home secretary, and Brown's administration? And most importantly to Savage: Would he be allowed to debate the team at Cambridge Union Society alone, or would he be paired up with an assortment of radicals, racists and demagogues?

For those who don't realize the monumental importance of being invited to Cambridge University, to the world's oldest and most prestigious debating society, founded in 1815, ask yourself: How many American intellectuals, academics, presidents, justices of the Supreme Court,

congressmen, senators, big shots in the Stalinist media or commissars of the conservative right have received an invitation from the Cambridge University Union? Three people: Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan and Nobel Prize winner and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Michael, that puts you (and your ignored cause) in good company.

Below is the correspondence I immediately sent to my friend after I heard this wonderful news on Sept. 2:

Dear Prometheus,

This invitation by Cambridge is a godsend. You will have a world stage to present your case just as 113 years ago in 1896, the French writer and intellectual, Emile Zola, a Jew, passionately and adroitly defended the cause of Capt. Alfred Dreyfus in his front-page editorial that shook the world—"J' accuse!"

Capt. Dreyfus, although a decorated war hero and artillery officer was sent to Devil's Island by the French government, his own country, based on trumped up charges of treason when in reality everyone knew it was because of vulgar anti-Semitism of the French, which goes back even before the French Revolution.

Even the esteemed scholars at Cambridge said it best: "We think that you are more qualified than anyone to talk about the subject of political correctness in America and Britain."

Go to Cambridge University. . . . Go and bring sanity and Reason back to England and America!

~ Ellis

Later that same evening I sent the following missive to my friend:

Instead of speaking via a live video uplink from America, travel to Europe with your family if they will go. Make a mini vacation out of it. Get as close to England as you can. Do it from the shores of Normandy if you can work out the logistics. (The irony and metaphors from that location alone will fill volumes of books!)—If not Normandy, then Paris, or some other noteworthy location in France. Go to Ireland and do your debate with the Cambridge Union Society from there. I'm busting with joy for you, Michael. This is just the beginning. God will indeed have his revenge against all the Nazis, communists, Marxists and socialists . . . and YOU will be his weapon. I hope Michael Savage does go to the debate at Cambridge for the reasons stated above, but also because he would not be going there for himself, but for the 10 million weekly listeners to "The

Savage Nation." Savage will be our voice, our representative in a foreign land, our Prometheus . . . our gladiator in the arena of ideas who will wage intellectual battle against the socialist barbarians who have prevented him from stepping foot on their land.

We love England: The land that gave us the *Magna Carta* (1215), John Locke's *Two Treatises on Government* (1689) and William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1765-69)—transcendent documents of liberty, freedom, Natural Law and morality that became the foundational materials that the framers of America's Constitution used to write the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. An irony of ironies: Although America fought a brutal and vicious war with England called the American Revolution (1775-83), had we won the war but failed in our duty to establish our republic upon transcendent ideas of legality, morality and Natural Law, which are out of the Judeo-Christian tradition of intellectual thought, no doubt our revolution would have devolved into chaos, tyranny and genocide as all revolutions before and afterwards have done throughout history. For example, the French Revolution (1789-99) was a revolution based on positive law, the secular Enlightenment and humanism, not God. The result: the French Revolution gave France the Reign of Terror, the Committee on Public Safety, the Jacobins and their bloodlust leader, Maximilien Robespierre, as approximately 40,000 heads fell to the guillotine without trial, without due process . . . without justice.

I don't want to be unduly melodramatic here. Michael Savage isn't dead; he still has his head and a measure of liberty, so to speak—but does he have his freedom? The freedom to visit the land of England, which bequeathed to America's Founding Fathers the sacred, inalienable rights—*Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness*. Michael, the entire audience of *The Savage Nation* and I beseech thee to go to Cambridge, England. Go to the land of the King James Bible, the land of the *Magna Carta*, the land of Sir Winston Churchill and present your petition of Due Process, Justice, Liberty, Reason, Freedom and *Veritas* (truth). Tell our cousins across the pond that PC doesn't mean political correctness, but "perversity correctness," that true freedom of speech means the obligation and willingness to hear those you may passionately disagree with, for to do otherwise makes us all either slave masters or slaves to tyranny.

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 6

LAURA INGRAHAM: THE LIONESSE OF TALK RADIO

September 19, 2009

On liberal elites: Terrorists, and their facilitators and friends, aren't jealous at all. Like our own self-hating elites, they genuinely detest democracy and the principles enshrined in the Constitution.

~ Laura Ingraham, *Shut Up and Sing* (2003)

I have been with conservative intellectual Laura Ingraham ever since 2001, when the maiden voyage of *The Laura Ingraham Show* set sail. I am never disappointed when listening to Laura, for she is first a quintessential American. She has a forceful personality and has the intellectual gravitas to delineate her views on a wide variety of subjects (not just politics), without coming off as overbearing or doctrinaire. Indeed, I call Laura the lioness of talk radio. Laura has a very impressive biography—her most noteworthy experience is having clerked for Justice Clarence Thomas, about whose pivotal moral support of me I have chronicled—particularly 20 years ago when I was a young conservative attending graduate school and law school at Harvard during the same time as Barack Obama.²

Her *magnum opus*, *Shut Up & Sing, How the Elites in Hollywood, Politics and the U.N. are Subverting America* (2006), was deservedly a best-seller on Amazon.com. In her trademark blunt style, Laura, like a seasoned trial lawyer, presents her case point-by-point, exhibit-by-exhibit until she has convinced all but the most brainwashed of the verity of her arguments—that the useful idiots of Hollywood, in politics, the academy, the courts and the U.N., for the past 75 years, have increasingly undermined American society and culture. She also offers the strategies to stop these people. Ms. Ingraham's most recent contribution to the marketplace of ideas has been the launching of the project *Ten for 10: Winning Washington by Empowering Americans*. This project is a list of 10 principles We the People can start to implement now to take back our country from the radical socialists dominating government before the 2010 elections.

1. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights (TABOR): Limit federal spending growth to the percentage in population growth plus the rate of inflation; provide taxpayers the option of filing a post-card sized return using a low, flat

tax rate of 25 percent. The Bible only required the Jews to give 10 percent—why can't the government be satisfied with two and a half times more? Because over the past 100 years since the advent of the Progressive movement and the imperial presidency under Theodore Roosevelt (1901-09), William Howard Taft (1909-13), Woodrow Wilson (1913-21), FDR (1933-45) and LBJ (1963-69), these presidents have progressively taken more and more of America's constitutional freedoms and liberties in exchange for a larger, more totalizing and fascist government. Obama is merely the latest in a long, ignominious line of presidents who consider themselves kings and We the People their powerless serfs or servants.

2. End tax-funded abortions: Stop federal payments to Planned Parenthood and prohibit any taxpayer-subsidized health-insurance plan from covering abortion. A recent cover of Newsweek magazine told the grim tale: "We are all Socialists Now." Newsweek could have easily stated: "We are all Abortionists Now." Liberals and progressives love to soil the innocent with their perverse policies, much like a gang initiation demands that you beat up or even murder someone to join the gang.

3. Defend American borders: Complete America's border-protection initiatives using remaining funds from the so-called stimulus bill;

4. King dollar: Preserve a strong dollar so that Americans' savings aren't wiped out by inflation and the U.S. dollar remains the world's reserve currency;

In 1971, President Nixon foolishly took America off the gold standard to try to please the radicals of the Democrat Party and stop rampant inflation. It did neither. Therefore, let America return to sane, sound economic policy going back to Adam Smith, the father of economics, by restoring the gold standard, which will overnight strengthen the U.S. dollar.

5. Empower American business: Immediately slash corporate tax rates to 15 percent and scrap the corporate capital-gains tax altogether;

6. Defend America: Strengthen America to defend our homeland and fully fund an operational, layered missile-defense system;

Front-page news on the DrudgeReport Thursday had these ominous headlines: "Secret Report: Nuke Agency Says Iran Can Make Bomb"; "Obama Kills Missile Defense for Poland, Czech," exactly 70 years to the day when the Soviet Union invaded Poland.

7. Statism exit plan: De-fund czars; immediately cease bailout payments to failed companies; ban future bailouts;

8. End generational theft: As few believe America's entitlement programs will be able to pay benefits to future generations, provide younger workers the choice of diverting payroll—Social Security taxes into personal retirement accounts;

Welfare, or legalized thievery, is when the government steals money from producers through confiscatory taxation and gives it to citizens who didn't earn it. It must be deconstructed; otherwise our republic will fail.

9. Restore America's system of justice: Introduce British-style penalties for frivolous lawsuits, where those who launch unsuccessful lawsuits are liable for the defendants' legal bills;

Real tort reform is an absolute necessity. Judges must place a \$250,000 limit on punitive damages, including "loser pays" as the only way to stop the legions of shyster lawyers of the trial lawyers lobby from further destroying America's health-care system and private industry.

10. American energy independence: All-of-the-above strategy that embraces alternatives, expands and accelerates exploration and production of oil and natural gas, and jump starts dramatic increases in nuclear power.

America! Let us support the yeoman's work of Laura Ingraham. Indeed, this woman is a *real* conservative, an American patriot, a God-fearing Christian and the adoptive mother to two beautiful children—Maria (from Guatemala) and Dmitri (from Russia). Please visit her website at www.LauraIngraham.com and perhaps become a "Laura365" member, or at least sign her "Ten for 10" petition. Ms. Laura Ingraham, indeed you are the lioness of talk radio. You have that beautiful lion's mane of blond hair and a radiant visage. Roar for the conservative movement, roar for the Constitution, roar against the fascist administration of President Obama, and by all means, Laura . . . continue to roar for America!

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 7

RUTHERFORD INSTITUTE: BRUSHFIRE OF LIBERTY

September 23, 2009

It doesn't matter whether you're protesting the economy, the war, the environment or something else altogether. What matters is that you do your part.

~ John Whitehead, *The Change Manifesto* (2008)

John Whitehead is a constitutional law attorney, an author and the founder and president of the civil-liberties organization the Rutherford Institute, based in Charlottesville, Virginia. This institution provides free legal services in constitutional and human-rights lawsuits. Its focus is on religious and free-speech cases, and also on educating the public on the original intent of the Constitution's framers. Whitehead named the institute after Samuel Rutherford, a 17th century Scottish theologian who argued in a 1644 pamphlet titled *Lex, Rex* (Law and the King) that kings must be subordinate to the law, because the rule of kings is derived from men, whereas the rule of law is derived from God. Rutherford's arguments about the authority of kings influenced the development of the concept of the "social contract" advanced by later philosophers such as Hobbes, John Locke, Rousseau and America's Founding Fathers.

John Whitehead's most famous case he tried was *Paula Jones v. Bill Clinton* in 1997; this pivotal case led directly to perjury and obstruction of justice charges against President Clinton in the Monica Lewinsky case when he stated on national TV: "I did not have sexual relations with that woman. . . ." Although we try very hard, who can forget that stained blue dress of Ms. Lewinsky?

My relationship with John Whitehead extends back to the mid-1980s, when I was a graduate student at the University of Michigan, my worldview started to shift from liberalism to conservatism. One evening I attended a dinner party with some friends at a gentleman's house in Bloomfield Hills, Mich. I was very impressed by this man's library and started reading some books he had by John Whitehead, whom he personally knew. I was utterly captivated by the clarity, style and substance of John's writing. He has that rare gift of taking a complex subject like

the history of American constitutional jurisprudence, and synthesizing and simplifying it for the layman to understand. That evening, I knew that my life would never be the same. As I was leaving this man's home—and his name escapes me—this connected lawyer must have seen my youthful enthusiasm and graciously gave me three of John Whitehead's books right off his library bookshelf. I recall one was on parenthood and the other was titled, *The Second American Revolution* (which is my favorite work of his). Perhaps no man other than Justice Clarence Thomas has done more to shape my ideas on constitutional law, political philosophy and jurisprudence than John Whitehead. In January 1992, during my first year of law school, I had the honor of clerking for the Rutherford Institute after I had met a good friend of John who gave a lecture at the Federalist Society chapter at our law school. His name was David Melton, an excellent family law attorney who was also the president of the Rutherford Chapter in Michigan. David taught me so much about constitutional law and the necessity that Congress, judges and law scholars should always follow the original intent of the Constitution's framers.

John Whitehead's latest book, *The Change Manifesto*, is essentially a reference book on how We the People of all political ideologies must get together, to organize, to effect substantive change in government and in public policy.³ Whitehead's work primarily focuses on citizenship and civic responsibility as being essential to building an engaged, intelligent and independent-minded citizenry. Whitehead argues that America's media-driven, materialist society, together with a gullible public, has created an electorate that is easily deceived, easily intimidated by propaganda, easily separated by politicians and easily cowed by narcissistic government leaders. "The Change Manifesto" is a call back to what America's constitutional framers originally intended: a nation whose ultimate authority is vested entirely in the will of We the People. The Manifesto uncovers the different ways Americans are being manipulated by unscrupulous politicians. Furthermore, it provides a systematic guide for average citizens to get active, educate themselves and take their nation back from the radicals, neo-Marxists and socialists dominating American government today.

Coincidentally, there are several contemporary political movements that are utilizing the principles of *The Change Manifesto*, including 1) the Tea Party movement; 2) the Birther movement; and 3) the anti-socialist

health care movement. These populist political uprisings are revolutionizing town hall meetings across the nation as citizens are becoming less passive, more engaged, less reactive and more proactive, less ignorant of their rights and more knowledgeable about their constitutional rights and the limits on Congress and government action contained in the Bill of Rights. Whitehead covers today's most controversial topics with compelling insight and clarity, including:

- ❖ post-9/11 national security and the sacrifice of civil liberties;
- ❖ the trend toward a surveillance culture;
- ❖ national ID cards;
- ❖ pharmaceutical interests and the Ritalin Nation;
- ❖ government, the do-nothing Congress and "creative" tax dollar scams;
- ❖ government welfare from cradle to grave;
- ❖ the great rights of mankind . . . and much, much more!

About a week ago, WorldNetDaily linked to one of the very interesting and timely articles Whitehead writes on the Rutherford Institute's website, a column entitled, *Celebrate becoming an activist*. I look forward to future articles by this great constitutional scholar. Please visit his website and buy his books. I am a living witness that each dollar you spend in support of the Rutherford Institute will be multiplied one hundredfold in positively affecting the marketplace of ideas. The great revolutionary firebrand Samuel Adams seemingly echoed a major thesis of Whitehead's "The Change Manifesto" when he said, "It does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an irate, tireless minority keen to set brushfires in people's minds." ⁴ Please start your brushfire today by supporting John Whitehead and the Rutherford Institute.org.

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 8

DEMJANJUK AND KSM: TRIAL OR A HANGING?

December 05, 2009

When the state is most corrupt, then the laws are most multiplied.

~ Tacitus

Are some criminal acts so unconscionable, so evil that they shouldn't even merit a trial? Are some people so irredeemable and diabolical that to try those in a court of law would only bring a mockery of the rule of law and justice? Under a Positive Law paradigm, no, but under Natural Law jurisprudence, the answer would be a resounding YES! Regrettably, it was under a Positive Law worldview the United Nations was created—adopted by FDR at the San Francisco Conference in April 1945, thus fulfilling President Woodrow Wilson's dream of an internationalist organization he began in 1919 as the founder of the League of Nations. Positive Law, or legal positivism, holds to a strict separation of law and morality, that manmade law *must* be promulgated without reliance on the Bible, morals or God.

In the 1700s, about 150 years before the apotheosis of Positive Law in 1900, America's Founding Fathers followed Natural Law when they created the U.S. Constitution. Natural Law, according to David Adams' book, *Philosophical Problems in the Law*, consists of "principles and standards not simply made up by humans but rather part of an objective moral order, present in the universe and accessible to human reason." Thomas Jefferson, in his Declaration of Independence, summarized Natural Law philosophy of the Constitution as "the law of Nature and of Nature's God." The original intent of the Constitution's framers was that law and morality be forever integrated as the foundation of the rule of law.

On Monday, Nov. 30, a German court put John Demjanjuk on trial to face charges of being an accessory to the murder of 27,900 Jews at the Sobibor Nazi death camp during World War II, and his lawyer immediately accused the court of bias. Demjanjuk, a former Soviet Red Army soldier, is now accused of volunteering to serve as a guard under the SS after being taken prisoner by the Nazis in 1942. This case has been going on for decades. I remember reading about the Demjanjuk case in my jurisprudence class in law school in the early 1990s. Why is it taking so long to try this murderous Nazi guard before a military tribunal, march his decrepit old carcass to the nearest scaffold and hang this evil man in public view as an example to tyrants throughout the world? Oh yeah, that's right—we no longer have summary execution in the West, like what FDR did to the Nazi saboteurs caught off the coasts of New York and Florida in the case *Ex Parte Quirin* (1942). Sixty-seven years ago, German Nazi spies didn't have a chance to appear on the Joe Scar-

borough, Oprah or Larry King show to promote their books and movie deals about how unjust America was. No, no, no—the only deal these wicked men rightly got was the merciless bullets from the firing squad.

A lot of history has transpired in America over the past 70 years since FDR gave a speedy trial and summary execution to the Nazi saboteurs. Remember, this was during wartime and three years prior to the Nuremberg Trials. In my 2008 book, *The Nuremberg Trials: Last Tragedy of the Holocaust*, I gave a scathing critique that the Nuremberg Trials were the biggest legal scam and conspiracy of diabolical war crimes in the history of warfare. The Allied Powers of America, Russia, France and England, in the name of the socialist-loving United Nations and Positive Law, perpetrated these sham trials upon the world, setting the stage for future war criminals like Adolf Eichmann, Peter Enger, Iraq's Saddam Hussein and many others to make a mockery of the international justice system. For example, under the Nuremberg Trials, which consisted of about 12 separate trials held after World War II from 1945-1949, why were only 177 Germans and Austrians charged out of the tens of millions of Nazi combatants and their supporters, enablers and willing participants in the business and civilian arena? And what about collaborators in other countries like the Vichy government of France and the fascist government of Mussolini's Italy?

Indeed, the Jews truly got a raw deal at the Nuremberg Trials. It was a cover-up of biblical proportions. Let's examine some of the defenses the Nazis used: *Nullum crimen* is a Latin principle of law that holds no crime should follow unless there was an existing law. The "Superior Order Doctrine" holds that in the throes of war soldiers should not be punished for merely following the orders of their superiors. "Sovereign Nation Doctrine" holds that one sovereign nation (America) cannot try another sovereign (Germany) under international law, for example, during the reign of Hitler (1933-45), because by definition a sovereign nation has the singular power to make and enforce its own laws. Because the framers of the United Nations and the Nuremberg Tribunal foolishly ignored Natural Law considerations in their legal investigation and judgment of the Nazi defendants, attaining justice for the Jews who suffered under Hitler's unbridled, savage genocide was a missed opportunity, which is why the subtitle of my book is called, *The Last Tragedy of the Holocaust*.

The tragedy of the Nuremberg Trials philosophy is evident in modern times when Obama and his attorney general, Eric Holder, bring five of the plotters and planners of terrorist acts against America, including 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, from the military prison at Guantanamo Bay to be tried in our federal criminal courts just blocks from Ground Zero in New York. The Nuremberg Trial philosophy has thoroughly perverted international criminal trials in modern times (Demjanjuk, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, et al.), which I guarantee will make America and the West under the new Hitlers of our time—militant Islam—to be an existential menace to all civilized nations. America, you choose—either we hang the Nazi Demjanjuk and the militant Muslims who are causing anarchy in America and around the world or they will continue to hang us.

ON PHILOSOPHY—ESSAY 9

ISLAM IS *NOT* COMPATIBLE WITH A REPUBLIC

November 21, 2009

Every Muslim is not a terrorist, but every terrorist is a Muslim.

~ Dr. Zakir Naik, President, Islamic Research Foundation

When I first started writing for WorldNetDaily, almost three years ago, I wrote “Is Islam compatible with a republic?” My thesis then was to use the Constitution, reason, history and philosophy out of the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought, including Natural Law, to state authoritatively why Islam is *not* compatible with a republic. Why? Because Islam contains none of the essential components of what philosopher Booker T. Washington called the “fundamentals of civilization.” What are some of the fundamentals of civilization?

- ❖ Belief in God (the moon god, Allah, is a very different entity);
- ❖ veneration of the intrinsic value of all life;
- ❖ the rule of law;
- ❖ a written constitution based on truth, equity, liberty and morality;
- ❖ laws that don’t discriminate based on race, creed, wealth, gender or national origin;
- ❖ freedom of religion.

These are just a few of the fundamentals of civilization Islam under Shariah law has no conception of and utter contempt for. Islam is not compatible with a republic. Last Monday I drove down to Columbus, Ohio, to attend a rally for the 17-year-old Christian convert, Rifqa Bary, who was tricked to come back from Florida where she had fled in mortal fear. She returned to her native Ohio to attend a juvenile court hearing that may force her to move back with her family, who are devout Muslims from Sri Lanka. Rifqa fears that her father will perform an honor killing upon her for "blasphemy against Islam" because of her conversion to Christianity. The event was organized by my friend, Florida radio host and publisher Pamela Geller. One of the speakers, Nonie Darwish, also a Christian convert from Islam, made this profound statement: "This [Islam] is not religion. It has nothing to do with religion. Religion is a relationship with God. . . . Islam is a relationship with the State. Islam is a one-party, totalitarian system. It's a one-party State that will not allow you to speak. And it will kill anybody who challenges or questions."

Islam is not compatible with a republic. Last Tuesday the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals in Manhattan ordered Lynne Stewart, a convicted terror-coddling civil-rights lawyer, to begin serving her prison sentence.⁵ Stewart, 69, was convicted over four years ago, in February 2005, of conspiracy and providing and concealing material support of terrorism for her actions in smuggling messages from "blind sheik" Omar Abdel-Rahman to his followers in the Islamic terror group Gama'a al-Islamiyya. As irony would have it, last week President Obama and his attorney general, Eric Holder, brought five terrorists from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to be tried in a criminal court in New York. This act is tantamount to treason and is essentially overturning 230 years of American constitutional law and over 400 years of common-law traditions by permitting enemy combatants caught on foreign territory waging war against American soldiers to have full constitutional rights rather than being speedily tried by a military tribunal.

In 2008 I wrote a book, *The Nuremberg Trials: Last Tragedy of the Holocaust*, on this very issue of coddling extreme war criminals and clogging up our criminal courts with people as irredeemably wicked as the Nazis, who, after World War II, should have all been tried by a military (not an international) tribunal and summarily hanged in the public square as a lesson to future would-be dictators that the civilized world means busi-

ness.⁶ They didn't. Instead, in November 1945 the civilized world at the Nuremberg Trials miserably failed to dispense swift, comprehensive justice against Hitler's Nazis. Now, their anti-Semitic allies then and now, the Muslims, seek to finish what Hitler started.

Obama and Holder's decision to bring these religious fanatics to New York is an insane policy that no constitutional lawyer worth his salt could tolerate, but instead of a unified front against this double-crossing policy from the American Bar Association, the National Trial Lawyers Association and the ACLU, all I hear is the sound of shekels jingling in moneybag of Judas as legions of shyster lawyers from NYU, Columbia and Harvard are lining up to become the next Lynne Stewart—the next traitorous terrorist lawyer who will get 24/7 media coverage and a king's ransom for defending these murderers. Islam is not compatible with a republic.

The Obama administration at every opportunity is bending over frontwards and backwards to convince the world that America is a nice country since GWB left office and Obama is in charge. Conversely, this Neville Chamberlain policy of appeasement has only demonstrated to the world our societal decadence, our duplicity and our utter lack of moral resolve to fight an avowed enemy like radical Islam with the same passion and merciless tactics they have leveled against the civilized world. As Nonie Darwish said, Islam is a totalitarian political ideology feigning as a religion; indeed, Islam is anti-religion. It has no belief in a God of love, but in Allah, the pagan moon god that predates the prophet Muhammad and the Quran. Islam has no respect for the intrinsic value of all life, but is a cult of death that celebrates death by promoting homicide bombers and "killing the infidel where you find him."

America's republic respects a written Constitution based on God, Natural Law, liberty and truth; therefore, truly just laws should not discriminate based on race, creed, gender or wealth (within biblical traditions, of course). However, Shariah law under Islam openly discriminates against others based on every conceivable difference. In other words, according to the Quran, *everyone* not a Muslim is considered a second-class citizen or worse, can be abused, sold into slavery or even summarily killed. The Quran commands: "A Muslim must not enslave another Muslim but is free to do so with a non-Muslim." And that's why, in my opinion, Islam is *not* compatible with a republic.

CHAPTER

~ 5 ~

ON AESTHETICS

ON AESTHETICS—ESSAY 1

DASCHLE IN 'DA CLUB'? . . . NOT

February 04, 2009

*N.B.: For this essay, I suggest that you visit the website: www.YouTube.com and listen to rapper 50 Cent, "In Da Club" (2003)

Laura Ingraham, conservative intellectual and radio host, was literally beside herself Monday morning in her opening monologue. She was livid about Tom Daschle as President Obama's initial appointee for secretary of health and human services apparently on his way to Senate approval despite failing to report some \$255,000 in income from 2005 through 2007 for a car and driver supplied to him for personal use. Like Tim Geithner, Obama's secretary of treasury, Daschle only admitted to Congress his tax omissions *after* the issue became public. Daschle also failed to report to the IRS \$80,000 in consulting fees. Ms. Ingraham and

most conservatives like me were pleasantly surprised when yesterday afternoon the news came down that Daschle would not get a pass from the Senate and was forced to withdraw his name from consideration. Yes, Daschle is in the Senate club, but his elite pedigree will not be enough this time. Daschle was the subject of last Monday's op-ed in the Wall Street Journal titled, *Driving Tom Daschle*.¹ When pressed by committee personnel, Daschle was bold and rather flippant in his answer: "He told committee staff he had grown used to having a car and driver as majority leader and did not think to report the perk on his taxes, according to staff members." Needless to say, if this were a Republican that failed to pay his taxes, the propaganda press would be giving 24/7 coverage and howling for that GOP hypocrite to withdraw his nomination immediately.

Before his retraction yesterday afternoon, why the double standard with Daschle?—Because he's a liberal in the (Senate) club. The alternative media—WND, Michael Savage, Laura Ingraham, Ann Coulter, Hannity, Rush, the conservative blogs, et al., take a bow, because you sounded the trumpet and I believe forced Obama to withdraw Daschle's nomination before next week's congressional hearings. Don't believe Daschle's explanation: that the he woke up Tuesday morning and while drinking his coffee and reading the New York Times editorial page calling for him to step down decided to bow out. If you believe that load of propaganda, I would love to sell you the Brooklyn Bridge.

Who is Tom Daschle? He served as senator from South Dakota from 1987-2005. As Senate majority leader, Daschle was perhaps one of the most partisan, activist senators of his generation. His political extremism, arrogance and penchant to try to cram radical legislation down the GOP's throat over time led to his failure to win re-election in his own state at the height of his powers in Washington, D.C. Nevertheless, like his lobbyist wife, he is still sucking from the teat of leviathan government. For example Daschle's chauffeur service cited above was provided by Leo Hindery, a big Democratic donor who also made Mr. Daschle millions by making him a limited partner in InterMedia Partners, a private equity company. Apparently, the inevitable conflicts of interest with Daschle heading a major federal department while only a few weeks before actively lobbying corporations and businesses that have direct ties to federal government contracts under his authority was even too much for this pol to overcome. The Wall Street Journal editors were

incensed at his possible nomination: "In appointing Mr. Daschle, Mr. Obama is showing that lobbying is fine as long as it is done by people who agree with him."

The arrogant fascism with which most Democrat politicians rule over We the People reminds me of the sexual bravado and misogynist domination over women rappers like 50 Cent write in their "lyrics"; a music industry making tens of billions of dollars writing lyrics to what is essentially music pornography. Many times in other articles I have likened certain scoundrels in the presidency, judiciary and Congress to Medieval English landlords' oppressive rule over landless serfs, Mafia dons extortion of honest businesses, or music pornographers like hardcore rappers' lucrative exploitation of black culture. While on one level I and most people that appreciate real artistic expression are repulsed by the lyrics of hip-hop artists like 50 Cent and other rappers, on another level these people are what they are—not hypocrites, but hardcore rappers, music pornographers, misogynists, thugs and crooks.

On the other hand, politicians like Daschle and the Democrats in Congress are shameless hypocrites in the tradition of Jezebel. These pols have made an art form out of stealing increasing amounts of taxpayers' funds and having the nerve to call *you* a "Benedict Arnold" or traitor for not being willing to give these politicians even more of your hard-earned money for yet another welfare program or economic stimulus package that history has repeatedly demonstrated and most reasonable people already know will not work. Rapper 50 Cent, in his platinum hit song *In Da Club*, showed unmitigated hubris when he boasted what sensual activities with women 50 Cent is into and what sensual activities with women he is not into? Likewise, Sen. Daschle told Senate staff he did not think to report the perk on his taxes. Both Daschle and 50 Cent seem to imply this is the way business is done. While the opening lyrics by 50 Cent are admittedly vulgar and misogynist, they are also created out of ignorance of both history and cultural mores. Daschle's IRS excuse before the media, on the other hand, is one borne out of premeditated fascism—an entitlement mentality that as a past member of the exclusive 100-member "Senate Club" shouts in the extreme: I am above the law. Realizing that most of the 535 members of Congress more or less hold these same views is infinitely more disturbing to me as a citizen seeking to maintain the verity of America's republic, than are the song stylings of some nitwit, thuggish rapper.

In conclusion, while I'm elated that the Daschle nomination has failed, what I really hope for is that Obama's economic stimulus package doesn't get one GOP vote in the Senate, as was the case in the House of Representatives. In reality, Obama's stimulus plan should be called the "Democrat Eternity Act," because it has little to do with economic stimulus (being loaded with numerous pork bills, earmarks, slush funds, union kickback scams) and everything to do with getting Democrats elected for eternity. All Americans of good will can only pray that this bill, like the Daschle nomination, will go down in flames of defeat.

ON AESTHETICS—ESSAY 2

LESSONS FROM *LORD OF THE RINGS*—PART I

August 15, 2009

One of my favorite movies of the past 10 years was that great epic trilogy by J.R.R. Tolkien, *The Lord of the Rings*, directed by Peter Jackson. Here, I will endeavor to just randomly cite some of the poignant scenes and episodes that were meaningful to me and draw an analogy or two about lessons we might learn as Americans as we struggle through our own battles with forces of evil: Sauron, Saruman and the ever-present Orcs in the Age of Obama. The passage in question is from Part 2, subtitled, *The Two Towers*. In this scene the battle for Middle Earth has come to the outpost Kingdom of Rohan. King Théoden, realizing that his position is exposed against the massive overwhelming forces Sauron and his puppet, the corrupt wizard Saruman, will unleash, he feels compelled to move his people to the mountain fortress of Helms Deep.

Prior to their departure, the king's niece, Princess Eowyn, is practicing her swordplay when our hero and future king of Rohan and Gondor, Aragorn, sneaks up to her from behind. Our Valkyrie-like princess (who secretly is in love with Aragorn) is not amused as her sword strikes his with force. In a very moving passage, a dialogue between our hero Aragorn and Eowyn, he is very impressed with Eowyn's skill with a sword where the conversation shifts imperceptibly and masterfully between who would be the conquered and who would be the conqueror.

Before I continue, allow me to pause and state emphatically that all lovers of classical literature should thank God that Tolkien wrote this great epic, *Lord of the Rings*, in the 1930s, 40s and 50s before the misera-

ble, anti-intellectual hags of the feminist movement got their claws into this literary genius. Eowyn isn't some myopic, shrill, angry caricature of a woman like Hillary Rodham Clinton, Michelle Obama, Sen. Barbara Mikulski, Rep. Maxine Waters, or Bella Abzug. Eowyn is stunningly beautiful, yet not a shrinking violet. She needs no government program to affirm her gender. She earns her respect on the battlefield and through years of grueling military training. In Part 3 she will use subterfuge and cunning to disguise herself as a man so that she and her hobbit friend, Merry, will fight a pivotal battle while performing many valiant acts.

Eowyn tells Aragorn of bitter lessons that the women of her country learned in ages past; that in the face of savage foes, all people, even the women, can die upon the merciless blade of their enemies, therefore contrary to aspiring to be some great feminist heroine, it was out of necessity and for the survival of her people that women had to learn to fight, to defend themselves against a hated foe who could not be reasoned with. That one sublime line should put to shame any so-called pacifist or "conscientious objector." History has repeatedly shown that when the savages have breached the wall they will not care about your race, gender, age, or if your conscientious objector status is current. Eowyn knew from experience in past wars that women, children and the elderly all die upon swords just as easily as men do. She would *not* become a hapless victim. Sensing to delve more deeply into Eowyn's psyche, Aragorn queries: What do you fear, my lady? Eowyn retorts that what she fears most is a prison, a cage where one has been so long locked up inside of for so many years, that one has gotten used to it. The epitaph, the end of living inside of this miserable, voluntary cage is that all courage and gallantry has become a distant, forgotten memory... a vanishing dream.

I wonder if we could turn back the clock on the World War II generation, could someone have convinced those brave Americans not to buy into the welfare slavery of FDR's *New Deal* programs, including Social Security and LBJ's *Great Society* programs; particularly Medicare? Am I beyond to pale to suggest that reliance on the government for anything outside of Congress' 18 enumerated powers contained in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution destroys our precious freedoms? Everyone who accepts "welfare" casts away a measure of their liberty forever and places himself inside the "cage" Eowyn spoke against, "until use and old age accept them and all chance of valor has gone beyond recall or de-

sire." When I view the passion, anger and fury of the town hall meetings currently taking place all over America, I cannot help but hearken back 80 years ago to the advent of FDR's *New Deal*, which turned out to be a Faustian deal with the devil. More and more of our God-given rights and liberties our forefathers bravely gave their lives to protect are laid at the feet of Big Brother government like nickels and dimes at the feet of a whore. Is this what the Founding Fathers gave their lives and sacred honor to protect—universal death care, where some government hack can pull the plug on grandma?

Aragorn presses Eowyn even more asking her what are her deepest, darkest fears? Eowyn responds that what she fears most the acceptance of a cage, a prison as the normal part of life which inexorably leads to the loss of "valor" the death of honour. In other words, Eowyn posits that without dignity, valor, honor, or truth one is as good as dead anyway.

America, I truly believe that the World War II generation was one of the greatest generations of American history, yet their acceptance of FDR's and LBJ's Faustian bargains have led America to voluntary slavery; to the precipice of bankruptcy and societal chaos. Their Achilles' heel was fear. Fear and insecurity in part drove this generation. Fear of the bread lines of the Great Depression. Progressives like Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, FDR, LBJ, Bush-41, Clinton, Bush-43 and Chairman Obama will always prey upon the primal fears of the people. Nevertheless, let us all be valiant like Eowyn; break free from the cages of welfare, universal health care, government-controlled Social Security, policies advocating the stealing of money from one group and giving it to another group who didn't earn it, and let all Americans boldly face our destiny with courage, individual effort and the power of God.

ON AESTHETICS — ESSAY 3

LESSONS FROM 'LORD OF THE RINGS' — PART II

August 22, 2009

The Lord of the Rings is one of my all-time favorite movies. It was part of that great epic trilogy of fantasy novels by J.R.R. Tolkien, which he wrote between 1937-1955. The movie version was directed by Peter Jackson in 2001. Here, I will endeavor to cite randomly some of the poignant

episodes that were meaningful to me and draw an analogy about some lessons we might learn as Americans, as we struggle through our own battles with the forces of evil—Sauron, Saruman and the ever-present Orcs in the Age of Barack Obama. The passage in question is from Part 1 of *Lord of the Rings*, subtitled, *The Fellowship of the Ring*. In this tender scene we see our reluctant hero-ringbearer, Frodo, confessing his fears over bearing such a great burden of the ring. His friend, the wise and good wizard Gandalf has come to The Shire to visit his hobbit companion and to further explain to him the awesome responsibility of which the carrier of the ring must be constantly aware.

In this sublime passage where the elderly and wise wizard, Gandalf tenderly, but firmly counsels his precocious protégée, Frodo regarding the Odysseus-like rigors he will face, thus revealing the true literary genius of Tolkien's books, *Lord of the Rings*, which he wrote to show the tyrannical times he lived in 1930s England witnessing the rise of Hitler and Nazism move like an evil shadow across Europe and the world.

First, Gandalf, the omniscient wizard, is perhaps the only one in the story that truly realizes the awesome power of the ring and the cataclysmic destructive force it can wield in the wrong hands, which is why Gandalf, though an old man, literally died battling the forces of evil in hell where Gandalf boldly commanded the towering, flaming demonic figure, Balrog, that he shall not pass across the subterranean bridge in order to prevent the ring from falling under Sauron's evil control. Gandalf's words delve into the treacherous abyss of the nature of evil, which Tolkien skillfully delineates so fully in so few words. For example, take Gandalf's admonition to Frodo that always after a reprieve in the existential battles between the forces of good and the forces of even, even in a definitive victory by men, Sauron takes another shape and grows again in another form. Just like Gandalf had to wage constant battles with the forces of evil in his day—Sauron, the equivalent of Satan, Saruman, a corrupt puppet of Sauron, the former mentor of Gandalf, and the legions of Sauron's foot soldiers, useful idiots Tolkien calls Orcs—so do we battle the fascist tactics of President Barack Obama in modern times.

Gandalf just as easily could have been discussing the decline of Western Civilization and America in the Age of Obama. It amazes me that just 20 years after the great Ronald Reagan brought peace, economic stability and record prosperity to the United States as the tyrannical evil empire of Soviet communism began to crumble throughout the world,

Barack Obama, this diminutive Marxist professor, is not only systematically deconstructing the fabled *Reagan Revolution* brick by brick, policy by policy, but he has arrogantly proclaimed FDR's *New Deal, Part 2*. Recall that it was these unconstitutional programs like Social Security, WPA and AFDC that first addicted Americans to the destructive narcotic of socialism as it plunged the United States, Europe and most of the civilized world into a self-destructive love affair with the welfare state.

Frodo replied to Gandalf that he wish it would not occur in our time. Frodo is like most Americans today—good, hard-working people who want to believe that their president will not willfully lie to them, yet are they so willfully naïve to believe that a government that will soon control their entire lives from cradle to grave will not decide who lives and who dies? That's delusional thinking. The Jewish people believed the Big Lie of the Nazis during the 1930s and '40s, and Hitler took their gold teeth from their mouths, cut the hair from their heads and made soap out of their body fat and lampshades out of their flesh for profit!

This human depravity reminds me of a passage from Lord of the Rings where Gandalf tenderly agreed with Frodo's wish these wicked events did not happen in our times, but added that in perilous times like these where we are witnesses to diabolical evil, treachery and demonic forces of biblical proportions, in such times as these, it is not for us to decide. All we have to decide is what to do with the time that is given us. Gandalf understood Frodo's longing for "peace in our time," like Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and most British citizens foolishly believed after he signed the Munich Treaty with Hitler in 1938, yet all men of good will must be wise, vigilant and constantly aware that the fascists, the political Quislings and the social engineers will never slumber nor sleep. Always they will seek to take away more and more and more of your precious freedoms and liberties and rationalize their legalized thievery in the name of giving you something for free.

The only free thing a government can give its people are the chains on their wrists, the chains on their ankles and the chains on their minds to enslave them. President Obama's only desire is a socialist health care bill, any pretext to destroy the private health care and health insurance industries once and for all. Like it was in days of old with Sauron and his demonic lust for power and control, so it is in modern times with Chairman Obama who just the other day had the arrogance to proclaim before about 1,000 rabbis on a conference call: "We [the U.S. government] are

God's partners in matters of life and death." ² Outrageous!—What can all red-blooded Americans of good will do to fight these overwhelming forces of deceit, fascism, Marxism and tyranny? Hear the words of the wise wizard Gandalf who asked the question of ultimate concern for all humanity—What will you decide to do with the time that is given us?

CHAPTER

~ 6 ~

ON THE ACADEMY

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY 1

CRITICAL THINKING IN THE AGE OF OBAMA

January 24, 2009

If Dr. Bongang can come all the way from Cameroon, West Africa, get his Ph.D. and rise to the chair of the political science department, then surely you who were born here in America should be able to maintain a 3.0 GPA.

~ Professor Leonard McCoy, charge to the students at Savannah State University at a symposium

Reason obeys itself: ignorance submits to what is dictated to it.

~ Thomas Paine

For several months I wanted to organize a symposium on critical thinking, which is a major aspect of the core curriculum here at Savannah State University where I teach law and political science. Since I saw no designated activities to commemorate the historic presidency of Barack Obama, I decided to relate our symposium on critical thinking

with the inauguration of the new president. We had about 400 students in total that attended (about 14 percent of the entire SSU student body). The moderator, Professor Leonard McCoy, like the great jazz impresario Miles Davis, set an intelligent tone for the event and kept the symposium running very orderly. After a succinct analysis of the importance of critical thinking techniques in the academy and throughout every aspect of life, citing examples of Buddhist monks as well as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and their followers, professor McCoy asked the panelists to give their own synopsis of critical thinking as a point of discussion and debate with the student audience.

Rather than giving a long discourse on Socratic dialectical reasoning, my opening statement focused on critical thinking techniques I used to celebrate my son Stone's birthday, but also to teach subtle lessons on manhood—lessons I hoped would be learned by some of my male SSU students who perhaps grew up without a strong father figure. Since students love hearing something about the personal lives of their professors, I would present a synopsis of my son's birthday. Sometimes my son's birthday falls on MLK Day; this year it was on Inauguration Day. First I woke him up, gave him a hug and a kiss and wished him a happy birthday. The hug and kiss is not some perfunctory gesture, but something I do every day and is designed to instill in my son that he is loved and also that he does not need to run out into the street to look for hugs, kisses and love from some girl, drug dealer, gangbanger or anyone else. I told my son that I expect great things from him; that I got his name out of the Bible and that it is one of the names of Christ: "The stone that the builders rejected has become the head cornerstone." Finally, I told Stone that he has a duty to be a blessing to God, his family and to all humanity.

Regarding Obama, I put him in a historical context going back to FDR, one of his models, and told the students each president from Wilson forward tried to use the power of the presidency to either make "We the People" one of two entities—*victims* or *victors*. FDR, with the apotheosis of the welfare state, saw Americans as pitiful victims where the State would become their god, parent and undertaker. On the other hand, Ronald Reagan's boundless optimism saw Americans yearning to be unshackled from socialist government programs and set free to fulfill their ultimate destiny. The next symposium panelist was a 30-year-old sophomore from the Commonwealth of Dominica, Johann Yorke, a marketing major at SSU. His opening statement on critical thinking retold his rural

upbringing in an all-black country, the importance of strong family ties, the necessity of each generation striving to have a better education and quality of life than the previous one.

Johann next discussed the necessity of student preparedness. He chided his fellow students for not coming to class prepared, having undisciplined lives and mixed-up priorities like placing a higher value on spending the Christmas break buying new clothes rather than buying books for the upcoming semester. He also mentioned taking detailed notes ahead of time. Johann asked: "Am I engaging myself?" "Are students prepared to learn?" "Am I using President Obama as a catalyst for personal improvement?" The next symposium panelist was Dr. Nat Hardy, professor of Humanities, who spoke poignantly of his ascent out of poverty in Canada, the son of a boilermaker and the first in his family to attend college. He is an immigrant married to a black woman who is pregnant with a biracial girl that will arrive in May. Dr. Hardy used critical thinking techniques to examine his unenviable background and to reform his destiny through dogged and persistent discipline, assiduous work and critical thinking. Dr. Hardy, being a Canadian citizen, favored the parliamentary system over America's federal system because in theory it allows all dissenting and minority voices to be heard. He thought that "corporatism" has so infected America's "democracy" that the two-party system was essentially "broken" and "inadequate" to fully address to complex needs of contemporary society. Quoting the socialist historian Howard Zinn, Dr. Hardy said, "Dissent is the highest form of patriotism." Ending his opening discourse by quoting King Solomon and the book of Ecclesiastes, Hardy cautioned students about the severe responsibility of those who seek to master critical thinking: "He who increases knowledge increases sorrows."

Several of my colleagues attended this symposium and some even gave extra credit to their classes to attend. Dr. Johnnie Myers, quoting Rev. Dr. Robert Schuler's *Peek to Peek Experience*, challenged the students to use critical thinking to find their niche in life, to transcend all of the pathologies of family background and achieve great things. Dr. Silverman, an expert on the United Nations and a former official with the World Bank, continued Mr. Yorke's responsibility paradigm as a foundation for critical thinking. He spoke of "two realities" one being that, "Leadership [of President Obama] provides opportunities for people to take advantage of." A second reality is that "critical thinking starts with

us." Silverman suggests that students read Obama's first autobiography, *Dreams from my Father*, to get a better understanding of Obama, the man and his worldview and how he used critical thinking throughout his life to better understand himself, his family and how these connections affected the evolution of his political worldview.

Finally, Dr. Benn Bongang, the Chair of the Political Science Department at SSU and the person cited in the opening epigraph, challenged the conventional thinking of the students saying that, "There is nothing that you can sacrifice that you cannot also use to achieve another goal." Critical thinking requires deep introspection. "Reading books (not only those books that are part of your curriculum) is very important." He stated, "Always go beyond what is expected of you" and "seizing the opportunities presented to you." Dr. Bongang concluded his remarks with an emotional story of his long journey from the shores of West Africa to America. In Cameroon, Bongang enjoyed a very successful career as a print and radio journalist. He had a loving, supportive family, money, nice clothes, a car, a servant and social status, but he yearned for more. Through a series of propitious events, he met key people who would help him move to America to continue his education where he eventually obtained his Ph.D. and in time rose to the rank of chair of the political science department.

Bongang's Horatio Alger story prompted symposium moderator professor Leonard McCoy to make this prescient remark to the assembled students of Savannah State University: "If Dr. Bongang can come all the way from Cameroon, West Africa, get his Ph.D. and rise to the Chair of the Political Science Department, then *surely* you who were born here in America should be able to maintain a 3.0 GPA."

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY 2

PROFESSOR JONATHAN TURLEY TORTURES REASON

February 18, 2009

Reason obeys itself: ignorance submits to what is dictated to it.

~ Thomas Paine

Jonathan Turley is the Shapiro professor of public interest law at George Washington University and a member of USA Today's board of

contributors. Turley is a media doyen and perhaps one of the most singular voices against America's so-called "torture" policy of enemy combatants and Muslim fanatics imprisoned at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Turley's one-man crusade against "torture" in my view has little to do with sober legal reasoning, but in essence tortures reasoning, common sense and America's judicial traditions regarding prisoners of war going back over 400 years to common-law times. Turley not only accuses former President George W. Bush of multiple war crimes for the torture of Muslim terrorists at Guantanamo Bay, but makes a critical point in an interview on the Rachel Maddow show on MSNBC—namely, "that the moral burden of torture is on the backs of *each one of us* until these people are brought to justice. And it will be profoundly immoral to let them go."¹

Turley further states: "We have Third World countries that when they have found that their leaders committed torture war crimes, they prosecuted them. But the most successful democracy in history . . . [does] nothing about it. And that's an indictment not just of George Bush and his administration. *It's the indictment of all of us if we walk away from a clear war crime and say it's time for another commission.*"² Liberal and secular law academics like Turley and his compatriots in the Democrat Party and in groups like the ACLU and CAIR (Council on American-Islamic Relations) seem not to understand that the Third Geneva Convention of 1949 has made it clear that the "enemy combatant" class of war criminals have none of the liberal protections of regular prisoners of war, let alone access to full constitutional rights enjoyed by every American citizen—yet Turley continues his rants against George Bush and his so-called crimes against humanity for torturing innocent people imprisoned at Guantanamo Bay.

That professor Turley is a respected lawyer and scholar of constitutional law makes his legal views on torture particularly outrageous. Note the landmark United States Supreme Court decision *Rasul v. Bush* (2004), where the majority established that the U.S. court system has the authority to decide whether foreign nationals (non-U.S. citizens) held in Guantanamo Bay were wrongfully imprisoned. Also, the 2008 Supreme Court decisions in the *Boumediene* and *Al-Odah* cases, which now gives full constitutional rights to enemy combatants, has set the stage for the Justice Department to be forced to free many if not all of the 300-plus irredeemable foreign combatants. If this is done, the American public will be ex-

tremely endangered. The war on terrorism will suffer irreparable harm. Therefore, the issue here is, can the president, under his broad investigatory powers and war powers, prosecute any and all wrongdoing against American citizens, even using harsh interrogation techniques, or are these techniques considered torture? Ms. Maddow opened up the interview with Turley on this very subject of torture, and Turley responded in his usual adroit, affable but sophistic manner: "This is not a close legal question. Waterboarding is torture. It has been defined as a war crime by U.S. courts and foreign courts. There's no ambiguity in it. That's exactly why they [the Bush administration] have repeatedly tried to stop any court from reviewing any of this."³

Time and space will not permit me to do a point-by-point analysis of Turley's twisted legal reasoning, if you can even call it reasoning. What Turley is essentially trying to do is use his coveted position as a respected constitutional law attorney and legal scholar in effect to make GOP interrogation policy unconstitutional. Turley is trying to make being a Republican, or, more precisely, a conservative, illegal . . . even a war crime. His perverse logic is subtle, convincing, but very Machiavellian and ultimately unconstitutional. Because of his secular humanist jurisprudence, Turley doesn't seem to understand or appreciate that he is championing the rights of fanatical Muslim terrorists that would gladly slit his throat while chanting, *Allah Akbar!* That he favors the rights of murders and terrorists over our brave American soldiers whom these defendants have either killed, wounded, maimed or attempted to kill is particularly galling to me. That Turley is allowed to get away with this sophistry virtually unchallenged is like Newspeak propaganda in George Orwell's *1984* in 2009 writ large.

Turley is admittedly a very affable man, a scholar well-versed in the Constitution. He is a master of making sweeping generalizations about the Constitution, the illegality of torture and the limits of executive privilege, particularly on the question of the president's war-making powers. Now that Turley has a certified socialist in the Oval Office in Obama, let's see if the good professor will make the rounds on the news networks with an impassioned critique of Obama's enemy combatant policy—a policy that I predict—despite his call to close down Guantanamo Bay in one year—will either be exactly the same as Bush's policy or even more draconian than his predecessor. Nevertheless, professor Turley, in an article written Jan. 29 for USA Today and reposted on his blog,

www.jonathanturley.org, gave us a clue to how neutered and compliant his rhetoric will be in favor of Obama: "... [I]t is becoming increasingly clear what is not going to change (at least for the better) in the Obama administration. With all of the euphoria of the inauguration, many supporters fought back a strange and long-lingering sensation: doubt. ... Yet, given his tendency to avoid fights on issues like war crimes and unlawful surveillance, Obama seems to view "change" in terms of social programs rather than legal principles." ⁴

Wow! That's it? Turley's rhetoric above on President Obama is a far cry from his previous and frequent calls to have President Bush, members of the Justice Department and an assorted cadre of CIA, FBI and military operatives handling the terrorists at Guantanamo Bay prison to be brought up on war crimes and torture allegations. Is it the Constitution Turley is advocating in favor of, or is he cloaking his own myopic, perverse and ultimately irrelevant personal policy preferences as legitimate constitutional jurisprudence? You be the judge.

ON THE ACADEMY—ESSAY

LETTER FROM THE GODFATHER

December 12, 2009

What is the best government?—That which teaches us to govern ourselves.

~ Goethe

Recently, a dear friend I went to graduate school with many years ago reconnected with me and reminded me that I was her son's godfather. When I last saw him he was just a little toddler, but now he is a tall, strong, good-looking young man; a college freshman at a school in Indiana. I thought to myself: What could I do for him at this point in his life? Isn't the die cast, his destiny fixed? On Nov. 17, I wrote my godson this message:

Hello, Godson,

Thanks for sending me your e-mail. How's school going? I hope that you are getting adjusted to campus life well. Are you living in a dorm? I remember about 20 years ago going to your school when I was a grad student at Harvard to do some recruiting. I remember the stu-

dents being very nice to me there. Well, keep in touch, and let me know if I can ever be of help to you in your classes, particularly history, politics and philosophy. Those are my strong areas. Tell your mother, "Hello!"

Peace, Ellis

My godson is a fabulous and conscientious young man. I believe that he can become successful in any endeavor he chooses; yet at 18, he realizes that to be successful in anything, you need a plan, a blueprint, if you will, that will systematically guide you through all the trials, tribulations and challenges of life. My godson sent me this reply the following day, Nov. 18:

Dear Professor Washington:

Well, school is going pretty well. I'm still getting used to the work load and prioritizing that are essential to success. I'm having trouble disciplining myself to do what needs to be done in a timely fashion. I have a list of goals I want to accomplish, but I am clueless as to how to pursue the goals. When I sit down and attempt to map it out, I often end up vexed. Can you give me some tips that you used to discipline yourself and prioritize?

~ Godson

Here are my six suggestions I sent my godson to help him better prioritize his college studies, but more importantly, to more effectively prioritize his life:

Hello, Godson,

I thought long and hard about your questions to me. Here are a few things you should consider to help you not only with college . . . but with LIFE:

1. Put God first in all things. Before I started school, I remember going through the neighborhood to find a good church. I found one and those wonderful people provided the spiritual foundation for me to be successful not only in college, but to make better life choices. When I went to college in autumn of 1980, I set out walking around campus, observing people, finding out all the important buildings. I remember discovering where the local church was in town and made Sunday school, church and Bible study my weekly rituals. I knew that education without a strong spiritual foundation would only make me an educated, amoral fool.

2. Major in the minors and minor in the majors. In other words, take care of big things first (college, spirituality) and put little things (i.e., friends, hanging out, partying, etc.) as secondary issues. Work hard and play hard, but *never* mix the two. I can't tell you how many of my friends started off good in college only to be sidelined by the first or second semester because they didn't know (or refused) to prioritize things; they foolishly mixed business (college) with pleasure (being popular and partying).

3. If you are having trouble in a class, set up times to speak with your professors to find out the areas you need help in. Don't be shy. You are paying these people a lot of money to help you, and you have every right to use all of the university facilities (including tutors) to help your college experience be beneficial and successful to you. The few years I taught as a professor I was always most impressed not with the smartest students in my class, but those who may have started off a step or two slower, but set aside their pride to regularly see me during office hours. Over time those students, through dogged, assiduous work, eventually became my best students.

4. Become well acquainted with the library. I used to shut that place down all the time. Let books and learning become your closest friends (for now). Ninety-nine percent of those people you're with in college now you won't be in touch with 10 years from now. The famous saying, *When in Rome do as the Romans do*, can, if observed, yield good things at college. If an analogy can be made of college as a church, then its inner temple of learning is the library. Learn about every nook and cranny of that place and you will be successful in college.

5. Keep girls at arm's length. Remember—one mistake, a few seconds of pleasure, can mess up your entire college career and the rest of your life. For further information on this point see the ongoing tragic saga of golfer Tiger Woods.⁵

6. Try new things; meet new people you normally wouldn't be associated with. Go to the symphony, the opera and the museum, to intellectual and conservative political events. Stretch your mind, develop a comprehensive worldview and philosophy—and discover that man deep inside your heart who has been waiting to come out so that you can fulfill your God-ordained destiny. My WorldNetDaily articles can help you apply Nos. 1-6 if you take the time to read

and study my ideas. Start with "Why I became a conservative" and *Safire*, Kristol and *The Spook Who Sat by the Door*.⁶

My dear godson, enjoy these care-free years in college. They will be some of the fondest memories of your life. Keep me posted on your progress, godson. I believe in you!
Peace,

Your Godfather

CHAPTER

~ 7 ~

ON RELIGION

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 1

SYMPOSIUM—THE TRIAL OF ISAIAH THE PROPHET

December 19, 2009

N.B.: Premier given at Hartford Memorial Baptist Church, Sunday School Class of Deacon Naomi Hughey, Dec. 13, 2009

Characters:

- ❖ Isaiah, the Prophet
- ❖ Judge {God the Father, Son & Holy Spirit}
- ❖ Prosecutor {Satan, the Accuser}
- ❖ Angelic Host
- ❖ Bailiff

{Setting: Heaven on Judgment Day}

Bailiff: Hear Ye! Hear Ye! Hear Ye! The Trial of Isaiah the Prophet will now begin.

Judge God, Son & Holy Spirit: You have heard the bailiff. Prosecutor Satan, the accuser of the brethren, will present his case against my servant, Isaiah the Prophet. Are you prepared, Prosecutor Satan?

Prosecutor Satan: Yes, my lord. The charges against Isaiah the prophet are as follows:

❖ Count 1: *Discrimination*—His prophecies are politically incorrect and discriminate against all the other philosophies, religions and cults in the world;

❖ Count 2: *Impossible Prophecies*—Isaiah couldn't have prophesied about things 200, 500, 700 years later, and even prophecies thousands of years in the future yet to come to pass;

❖ Count 3: *Perjury*—Therefore, Isaiah should be condemned as a false prophet, a perjurer, a liar and condemned to spend eternity in the lake of fire and brimstone. Send him to my realm, god. Send him to my domain, lord!

Judge God, Son & Holy Spirit: Prosecutor Satan, if your charges are true, then I will send him to your domain; however, if Isaiah the Prophet has spoken my words to my people the Jews and only my words that I put in his mouth did he speak, then he shall spend eternity with me in Paradise.

Stand up, Isaiah the Prophet. Tell the Court who you are!

Isaiah: My name is Isaiah. I was born into an influential, upper-class family and associated with royalty, and gave advice concerning the foreign affairs of the nation. I was commissioned by the God of Heaven to prophesy to the tribe of Judah in the Southern Kingdom of Israel. I fulfilled my charge for 60 years—from 740-680 B.C. Though most of my prophecies were mocked at and ignored by the people, I faithfully and zealously warned the Jews against foreign alliances and urged Judah to trust the Lord. I also attacked the social ills of the day . . .

Prosecutor Satan: {interrupting, mocking} I-sai-ah!! Who do you think you are? You are *not* a prophet of god. You are a fake, a fraud and a phony. Do you think you were some great social reformer like Noah, Abraham and Moses?

Isaiah: No, Satan, I was no social reformer, but I saw those social ills and spiritual abuses of the Jewish nation as symptoms of a deeper spiritual decline.

Prosecutor Satan: My "friend" and my servant King Manasseh (696-642 B.C.) certainly took care of you, didn't he, I-sai-ah, the prophet? {Ha Ha Ha!}

Isaiah: Indeed, Prosecutor Satan, after living most of my life in the holy city of Jerusalem, I was martyred during the reign of King Manasseh for preaching the uncompromised word of God. I was sawed asunder inside a hollow log.

Judge God, Son & Holy Spirit: Tell us, Isaiah the Prophet, of your ministry to my people, Israel.

Isaiah: During the latter half of the eighth century, Judah seemingly was about to follow the example of apostasy of the 10 northern tribes of Israel (who were captured by Assyria in 722 B.C.). King Ahaz foolishly looked to Assyria for protection, even though Isaiah told him the Northern Kingdom would shortly fall at the hands of the Assyrians (Isaiah 8:3-4). Hezekiah, Ahaz's God-fearing son, instituted spiritual reforms but sought the help of Egypt in foreign affairs. Egypt fell before Sennacherib of Assyria and only through divine intervention was Judah saved from the same fate (Isaiah 37:36-37). During the reign of Manasseh, Judah fell into idol worship, and I warned the Jews of the inevitability of the Babylonian captivity. As God's prophet, I also gave assurance of the preservation of the people and restoration of the nation.

Prosecutor Satan: Didn't my King Manasseh call you "That old false prophet whom I hate"?

Isaiah: Perhaps, but the God of Heaven, as well as later theologians, have called me "the evangelical prophet," because I say so much about the salvation and redemptive work of Messiah. In fact, more is said in my book about the person and work of the Messiah than in any other Old Testament book.

Prosecutor Satan: Now I've got you, Isaiah. Who is this "messiah" ye speak of?!

The Angelic Host: {each standing with a loud voice}

Angel No. 1—Isaiah 1:18

❖ Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.

Angel No 2—Isaiah 7:14

❖ Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel, meaning God with us.

Angel No. 3—Isaiah 40:3-5

❖ *The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.*

❖ *Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain:*

❖ *And the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.*

Angel No. 4—Isaiah 53:3

❖ *He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.*

Angel No. 5—Isaiah 2:4

❖ *And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.*

Angel No. 6—Isaiah 52:14

❖ *As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men:*

Angel No. 7—Luke 4:16-21 (quoting Isaiah 61:1-2a)

❖ *And he {Messiah} came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read.*

❖ *And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written,*

❖ *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised,*

❖ *To preach the acceptable year of the Lord.*

❖ *And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him.*

❖ *And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.*

Angelic Host: {standing, in unison}—Isaiah 9:6

❖ *For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.*

Judge God, Son & Holy Spirit: {to Prosecutor Satan} Now hear ye the judgment of the Lord: Satan, Oh Satan, thou art a liar and the Father of

all Lies. Get thee hence to the underworld where thou and thy fallen angels will be banished forever!

As for my servant Isaiah the Prophet, enter into the joy of the Lord, thou good and faithful servant.

Prosecutor Satan (the Accuser): {leaves in disgrace with his hands covering his face, saying . . . }

Jesus is Lord! . . .

Jesus is Lord!! . . . JESUS - IS - LORD!!!

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 2

THOU SHALT NOT COVET

March 25, 2009

. . . I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts;
and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

~ Jeremiah 31:33

God, through the prophet Jeremiah, used those sublime words for the ages to teach the Jewish people the real meaning behind the Ten Commandments. Yes, the Jews understood that these were the rules God wanted to be obeyed as part of their sacred covenant with his chosen people, but on a more profound level God eventually wanted to transcend the Ten Commandments chiseled in stone for tablets of the Ten Commandments written in the hearts of the people. Think about it. How far would humanity be if lawyers, politicians, businesses, government and society stopped coveting and self-regulated themselves? For example, would we need an SEC (Securities and Exchange Commission) and countless numbers of “watchdog” organizations to stop thieves—from a Bernie Madoff who coveted \$65 billion to your common thief who steals your laptop?

If Jesus were asked today to summarize the Ten Commandments into one, I’d like to think he would say, “Thou shalt not covet.” Why? Look at the headlines of your local, national, international and Internet news sources:

❖ “Owned by China: Beijing agrees to buy more U.S. debt”;

- ❖ "Obama to the rescue!"—as Wall Street lost 50 percent of its value just since August 2008;
- ❖ "Schenectady, N.Y., considers martial law over police woes";
- ❖ "New York governor's' secret plot to tax the rich";
- ❖ "Congress' 'hypocrisy' on corporate trips ban angers hotel industry";
- ❖ "Mexico offers \$2 million bounty for top drug lords";
- ❖ "Another trillion dollar stimulus plan";
- ❖ "We'll give it back: 9 out of top 10 AIG bonus recipients return money."

Society has devolved so far from not only the original intent of the Constitution's framers and Natural Law, but from what the framers—from George Washington on down—considered paramount to maintaining our republic: Christianity, a religion that came out of Judaism. Washington once famously uttered that, "It is impossible to rightly govern a nation without God and the Bible." Was America's first and arguably greatest president some lowbrow Bible-thumper or some right-wing religious fanatic for saying such words? Did he and the framers actually believe that We the People, could create a republic based on the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought? Indeed they did.

Not only did the framers believe in God, the Bible and Natural Law, they sincerely believed in infusing Judeo-Christian principles into all of our founding documents, including The Mayflower Compact (1620), The Declaration of Independence (1776), The *Articles of Confederation* (1781), *U.S. Constitution* (1789) and *Bill of Rights* (1791). Even the constitutions of all 50 states are permeated with biblical admonitions and overt modeling of moral laws and righteous government directly from the Scriptures. Come, my friends, let us reason together. Do you think that in 1609, 1709, 1809 or 1909 we would be carrying a national debt of over \$11 trillion, which we have presently in 2009? Economic experts estimate that the *actual* U.S. debt is much higher being between \$53 trillion and \$56 trillion.¹ Could we not have turned that \$11 trillion dollar national debt into a \$11 trillion surplus if we had crafted policy based upon those four sublime words?—*Thou shalt not covet.*

Before we can change external stimuli like the economy, societal morality, Wall Street, the Supreme Court, Congress, the president, Social Security, Medicare, abortion, or any part of our leviathan government apparatus, we have got to change our heart. Since this is in the meta-

physical domain, this "change" cannot occur by media propaganda, political sloganeering, positive thinking or some other artifice of man. This is a job for God. We have got to allow God to change our thinking, repent and return to following the Ten Commandments, beginning with the last commandment—*Thou shalt not covet*. By obeying this profound aphorism, I believe that American society could comprehensively improve on an exponential level. JFK once said, "A rising tide lifts all boats." This means that through free-market capitalism the rich can become richer, the poor can become middle-class and if they work hard enough, eventually become rich themselves. The only barrier to what Jefferson called "the pursuit of happiness" would be the limits placed on our own selves. Obama's socialist remedies are rooted in coveting the possessions of another and are therefore antithetical to the pursuit of happiness.

For example, I love to watch the forensic detective shows and learn how these talented people are able to capture the most surreptitious and devious criminals. The *leitmotiv* I see with virtually all of these criminal cases is that the crimes are rooted in covetousness: 1) A man kills his wife because he wants to marry his lover, and the scoundrel is too cheap to pay child support—that's coveting another woman who is not your wife; 2) A woman opens up her home to take care of the elderly and systematically poisons them with arsenic so she can collect the insurance and secure a new warm body for her ghastly philanthropy—that's coveting the money of another; 3) A boy was told he was a golden child and would eventually become a doctor by his family and friends. Later he develops a diabolical resentment when his plans don't materialize. He blames his parents and viciously kills them, his wife, children and his rich lover who enabled his charade before he is caught by the police—that is coveting a career and the praise of men.

The assorted cabal of lobbying firms, shyster lawyers, careerists, incompetents and political hacks in Washington, D.C., who are presently "murdering" America's economy should seriously consider the last commandment, *Thou shalt not covet*. If only Obama's mantra, "change" meant repentance and he as our leader followed the Scripture found in 2 *Chronicles* 7:14: "If my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land." But it is not to be because Obama is a political hack. He has but

one design, absolute POWER. So far, his stealing of \$7 trillion from America, together with his vice president, Joe Biden, saying, "It's our patriotic duty to pay taxes," raises coveting to an art form. Obama's policies aren't about change (repentance) but adhere to the anti-commandment, *Thou shalt covet*.

Obama can't repent because he is self-righteous, a narcissist, the prince of covetousness and a purveyor of socialism, or what Churchill called, "the gospel of envy." This Manchurian Candidate will continue the ruination of this country that he, his wife and his administration utterly hate until he has bankrupted it. Only divine intervention can save us now, since Reaganism and Reason have long been abandoned.

ON RELIGION — ESSAY 3

THOU SHALT HAVE NO OTHER GODS BEFORE ME

March 28, 2009

. . . Because my strategy has to be tragedy, catastrophe and after this you'll call me "Your Majesty."

~ Eric B. & Rakim, "My Melody" (circa 1984)

Baal, Molech, Ashtoreth, Aphrodite, Tammuz, Dagon—these are some of the false, pagan gods of antiquity God mandated that his chosen people, the Jews, utterly destroy before they could lay claim to the Promised Land—Israel. While the biblical narrative of the Kingdom Period (circa 1050-587 B.C.) was horrible (the Northern Kingdom had not one godly king), it was mixed regarding the Jews and the idolatry question in the Southern Kingdom (Judah), for they had several kings (David, Solomon, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Uzziah, Josiah) who at least tried to obey the first commandment—*Thou shalt have no other gods before me*. In America, we are currently witnessing a modern version of political idolatry with President Barack Obama, or as I like to call him, "Obama the messiah." So gargantuan is this man's ego and his insatiable lust for absolute power that in just two months the Obama administration is already projected to spend over the next 10 years more money than all 43 of his predecessors combined. As if this weren't outrageous enough, Obama and his socialist minions aren't finished with constructing his grand utopian agenda,

which I predict will even eclipse FDR's "New Deal" in the 1930s or LBJ's "Great Society" in the 1960s.

Recall an earlier article I wrote, *Obama: Manchild in the Promised Land*, where I quoted a great man whom I consider the true intellectual voice of the conservative movement, Dr. Michael Savage.² He did a masterful Freudian analysis of the motives behind Obama's naked power grabs and his narcissistic desire to be deified. Dr. Savage wrote: "No one has ever said no to Obama. From his childhood, through his early career, until now, no authority figure has said, "Stop, you can't do that." So he has developed a sense of self-righteousness and political invincibility . . . until someone is willing to stand up to him and say, "Stop! Enough! You will not drain the Treasury! You will not socialize this country," he will continue to steamroll our freedoms."

The prophet Daniel, confronting another megalomaniac during the sixth century B.C., the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar, refused to bow down to this tyrant, but instead glorified God with a magnificent apologetic condemning man-worship and ending with a rhetorical question worthy of Socrates: "And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?"

It is impossible to understand Barack Obama unless you understand that he is indelibly shaped by his pampered and perverted childhood. Since no one ever told the Manchild, "No!" Obama has developed an infantile, overarching and all-consuming sense of entitlement. It's like Obama is saying, "I am the president of the United States. I can do whatever I want, whenever I want, to whomever I want," and paraphrasing the words of the prophet Daniel, *and none can stay MY hand, or say unto ME, What doest thou?* The first commandment demands we put all faith in God. This frees humanity from pursuing lesser gods—wealth, sex, power, popularity. In the 20th century, we have repeatedly seen naked tyranny, shameless power grabs and unconstitutional behavior from a Lenin, a Stalin, a Mussolini, a Robert Mugabe, an Idi Amin, an Ayatollah Khomeini, or some tin-pot dictator from a banana republic in South America, but would we have expected these totalitarian acts (e.g., taxation without representation) from a president of the United States?

For President Obama, admittedly a certified socialist with fascist tendencies, to have arisen so far, so fast, so meteorically in just over two

years is simply amazing to me. However, I cannot overstate the fact that Obama could not have achieved what he has done without being enabled by his following co-conspirators:

- ❖ A slavish, propaganda media whose fawning coverage (and obfuscation) belies any pretense of journalistic ethics;
- ❖ The Democratic majorities in both the House and Senate, overruling bipartisanship and constitutional checks and balances while bowing to Obama the messiah's every unlawful whim;
- ❖ A Supreme Court that, despite overwhelming evidence that Obama isn't a "natural born" U.S. citizen according to Article 2, Section 1 of the Constitution, so far has refused to grant *certiorari* to any of the dozens of cases that have come before it on this most vital issue of our Republic;
- ❖ An uninformed, uneducated, apathetic public who have for decades been beguiled by fascist leaders and the cult of celebrity (JFK, Oprah, Hollywood). It's difficult to live as a liberated thinker when most of us are products of the Stalinist public schools that have for decades taught us to hate America and to believe in an educational system that forbids God, the Bible and morality in favor of Marxist "social studies," teaching "Daddy's Roommate" and putting condoms on cucumbers.

Now we return to our initial inquiry—Why does America treat President Obama like a demigod and worship him as god? As Dr. Savage told us, no one ever told Obama no, combined with his own megalomania, acute narcissism and radical political background rooted in infantile entitlement liberalism, Marxism, the racist rhetoric of liberation theology (Rev. Jeremiah Wright, Father Pfleger), the Marxist community activism (Saul Alinsky, Bill Ayers, ACORN) and his most diabolical subterfuge, *Statolatry*—the worship of the State. National Review commentator Jonah Goldberg, in his timely book "Liberal Fascism," wrote eloquently of statism, saying, "[President Woodrow] Wilson's view of politics could be summarized by the word, 'statolatry,' or state worship. . . . Wilson wrote approvingly in 'The State,' [that it] 'does now whatever experience permits or the times demand.'"

Goldberg continued his apologetic analyzing America's growing love affair with fascism. Starting with President Wilson (1913-21) and continuing in earnest with Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1933-45), Goldberg said of the progressive movement of the late 19th and early 20th century that: "The progressives viewed the traditional system of constitutional checks and balances as an outdated impediment to progress be-

cause such horse-and-buggy institutions were a barrier to their own ambitions. Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws was the enemy of progress. . . ." America, whom will you choose? Obama, whose worldview appears to follow an old school hip hop lyric by Eric B. & Rakim—*Cause my strategy has to be tragedy, catastrophe and after this you'll call me "Your Majesty."* Or will America throw all the bums out, repent and return to God who plainly mandated in the first commandment . . . *Thou shalt have no other gods before me.*

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 4

THOU SHALT NOT MAKE UNTO THEE ANY GRAVEN IMAGE

April 01, 2009

Shew me the tribute money. . . . Whose is this image and superscription? . . . Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's.

~ Jesus Christ

The second commandment, *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image*, addresses issues of respect, loyalty and holiness. According to theologian Charles Ryrie, "A graven image is a figure of wood or stone that is an object of worship." How is the second commandment violated in today's idolatrous political culture? Let's look at Obama the messiah who even before he had secured the presidency had the arrogance and self-deification to invent out of whole cloth the Office of the President-Elect, replete with his own graven image (seal) signifying his transcendent power, authority and divinity.

Even some of Obama's most loyal admirers cannot any longer rationalize or defend his totalitarian tactics—for example, confiscating AIG, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, Chrysler and GM with future designs on virtually every private business in America, to promoting universal health care, plans to create a "voluntary" civilian security force of millions of youth, installing devices in your home that "monitor" and control your energy usage, and the recent dramatic firing of GM's CEO Rick Wagoner, just to name a few. I don't know what is more shocking, that Obama had the hubris to fire Rick Wagoner, or that Wagoner didn't stand up like a man and sue the Obama administration on separation of

powers and due process grounds. Instead, Wagoner allowed Obama that power over him, while most American citizens seem to be in a catatonic state during this benign revolution in our midst where Obama's fascist tactics daily crescendo without challenge.

When we read the second commandment, *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image*, we must read that mandate broadly. True, there are no statues of Obama around America that people are bowing to, burning incense to, or creating a shrine for. However, there are many more subtle ways people are making graven images to what I consider an exceedingly Machiavellian, arrogant, narcissistic and dangerous politician. Earlier I cited the example of the "President-Elect" seal, which after universal outrage, Obama quietly took off the front of his lectern. Nevertheless, he did not take down the image deifying himself inside his dark heart—a perverse idolatry that compels Obama to believe in his own megalomania, that he is some kind of transcendent messianic figure. Don't believe me? Observe Obama's daily actions as president. It is a case study of infantile entitlement liberalism writ large. Other examples of graven images of Obama the messiah are the following:

- ❖ His trusty teleprompter goes wherever Obama goes. I wonder whose words are spoken into his ear for him to parrot. Words that are "engraved" on that conspicuous electronic device that has such control over our president and over our nation. For example, Obama recently thanked himself for hosting a leader from Ireland. Why? Because the teleprompter told him to. Who is this invisible, mysterious, diabolical voice We the People did not elect to any office?

- ❖ Obama's multi-billion-dollar bailouts are a form of graven image to the almighty dollar. These unconstitutional acts are similar to the fascist totalitarian tactics of Mussolini. Obama has all but dispensed with any pretext of a company having to take money from the federal government for him to usurp control.

- ❖ Under Obama "Corleone," all private enterprise is vulnerable to his seemingly insatiable lust for power and control. Monday's action against GM's CEO was just his most blatant deification of himself.

- ❖ Obama sees himself as a demigod, a living breathing graven image to be worshiped through the bureaucracy of the State, like Wilson, FDR and LBJ before him. Constitutional strictures are irrelevant to him.

We the People are not innocent bystanders nor victims of Obama's treachery, but like the German people during Hitler's rise to power (1925-33) due in large part to our own secular, Marxist public school ed-

ucation most of us received, we are willing accomplices to our own demise. This treachery did not start with Obama, Bush, Clinton, Carter, Nixon, LBJ or even FDR, but goes all the way back to President Woodrow Wilson (1913-21) who was the first president in history to openly denigrate original intent and defame the veracity of the Constitution's framers. It was Wilson who gave us World War I, the Federal Reserve Bank, unilaterally fired all blacks from federal employment, did a laudatory White House screening of the racist Klu Klux Klan propaganda film, *Birth of a Nation* (1915) and was quoted as saying, "It is like writing history with lightning. And my only regret is that it is all so terribly true." Most infamously, Wilson institutionalized liberal fascism under a dizzying array of bureaucratic agencies that spied on, harassed and even arrested American citizens under the guise of "national security." Wilson was America's first fascist president predating Lenin and the communist Bolshevik Revolution by four years (1917), predating Mussolini's fascist government in Italy by nine years (1922) and foreshadowed Hitler's totalitarian Nazi empire in Germany by 20 years (1933). In this instance, Wilson is a closer model to Obama than FDR, JFK or LBJ.

God said to the children of Israel, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." Our Constitution is based on the Scriptures and a social contract between We the People, our government (whom we loaned some of our natural rights to) and God. Therefore, has America violated this sacred commandment regarding Obama? Sadly, we have, but do not despair. As long as We the People are in fear of our government, then tyrants and demigods like Obama, Pelosi, Reid, Barney Frank, Congress and the Supreme Court will continue to craft unconstitutional laws that will eventually enslave us all. Let us therefore begin by removing all of the graven images from American politics starting first with this usurper, Obama the messiah—both his actual deification in media images as well as his graven images throughout cyberspace. Let us then return to God and to the original intent of the Constitution's framers, for herein is America's only salvation.

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 5

THOU SHALT NOT TAKE THE LORD'S NAME IN VAIN

April 04, 2009

But know this, that in the last days perilous times will come: For men will be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, unloving, unforgiving, slanderers, without self-control . . . Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.

~ 2 Timothy 3:1-2, 5

The third commandment, *Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord in vain*, addresses issues of respect and holiness. Respect for God and the things of God like prayer, worship and *true* religion. While many people narrowly interpret the third commandment as relating to using God's name as a curse word or in blasphemous manner, it goes much deeper than that. In this article I would like to discuss how the third commandment, Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord in vain, relates to America's modern political culture. *Exhibit One*: President Barack Obama and his wife, Michelle, are virtual case studies of people who have a veneer of religiosity (spending 20 years in the church of hatemonger Rev. Jeremiah Wright), yet their lifestyles and especially their political philosophy and worldviews are diametrically opposed to Jefferson's desire for all Americans to have the freedom to seek after *Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness*.

Life—Obama's pro-abortion stand was the most extremist view out of all 535 members of Congress. He concedes no restrictions, regulations, laws or linkage of federal dollars to limit abortions . . . nothing! Three times during his brief tenure as an Illinois state representative Obama voted against the *Born Alive Infant Protection Act* (2002), which would have provided medical assistance to babies who were lucky enough to survive an abortion. Obama's genocidal stance against these innocent pre-born and post-born babies is both unconscionable and hypocritical. I rank Obama's uncompromising political stance against life to the most irredeemable slaveholders in the American South who sacrificed over 600,000 American citizens during the Civil War in their vain efforts to allow one man the right to own another as a slave and to kill that slave if

he was disobedient. For Obama, Congress, pro-abortion groups and the courts to willfully and wantonly kill the most innocent members of humanity through abortion is our modern version of slavery. In my view policies that wantonly harm innocent life is taking the Lord's name in vain.

Liberty—While Obama's merciless disregard for life is well-chronicled, his perverse views regarding liberty is less well-known. Earlier in his presidential term, Obama made a big announcement that he was shutting down America's prison camp at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The logical question became, where will you put these irredeemable Muslim terrorists? We got that answer a few weeks ago when Obama announced that he actually plans on releasing many of these prisoners back into society. Allowing fanatical Muslim terrorists to live free among us will drastically reduce the liberty interests of all Americans. I predict that as outrageous as this policy is, Obama's self-deification and infantile narcissism will push him ever further to denigrate our liberties and give these murderous terrorists housing arrangements, food stipends, jobs and college scholarships. Obama's perverse liberty policy allowing the genocide of innocent babies while setting international terrorists free is a galling example of taking the Lord's name in vain.

The pursuit of Happiness—One of the elements of a sociopath is deriving pleasure from the suffering of others. Obama definitely has sociopathic tendencies, for in just over two months as president his draconian spending binges has raised the level of suffering of the American people to Third World levels (8.5 percent unemployment, \$12.8 trillion debt) while at the same time maintaining high approval numbers that hovers around 60 percent.³ Obama seems to be oblivious to the historical fact that socialism or government control over the means, production and distribution of goods is antithetical to the pursuit of happiness. Sir Winston Churchill 75 years ago foresaw the coming of a demigod like Obama when he stated, "Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy. . . . The inherent vice of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries." Government control over our churches, our schools, our medical system, and over every aspect of the free-market capitalist system is classical socialism.

This diabolical philosophy will not allow people the power to pursue happiness, but will make us all equally miserable by pitting man against woman, blacks against whites, Jews against Gentiles, poor against rich,

bums against producers, Democrats against Republicans, bureaucrats against businessmen, and on and on until *all* Americans are forced to live on the government plantation and take our daily bread from Masser Obama at the Big House (e.g., the White House). Whatever happened to liberty, freedom and reliance on God for all our needs? Following Obama and his Neo-Marxist socialism is a form of taking the Lord's name in vain, because taking the hard-earned money from one American and putting it in the pocket of another American who didn't earn it is legalized thievery. Socialism diminishes the God-given dignity of our fellow Americans, reducing them to the status of lazy bums receiving stolen goods. Neo-Marxism, socialism and the liberal welfare state is not a political philosophy that glorifies God.

President Obama, a man I believe isn't even a legitimate "natural born" American citizen according to Article 2, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, may think that he is a demigod, a messiah; that he can trample over the rights of We the People without fear of consequences or retribution; that his policies can continuously take the Lord's name in vain—however, I prefer to believe in the words of Churchill who said, "The truth is incontrovertible, malice may attack it, ignorance may deride it, but in the end; there it is." *Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord in vain.*

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 6

REMEMBER THE SABBATH DAY

April 08, 2009

Two things only the people anxiously desire—bread and circuses.

~ Juvenal (*circa* second century A.D.)

The fourth commandment, "Remember the Sabbath Day," addresses issues of renewal, contemplation and holiness—respect for God and the things of God like rest, setting aside time for prayer, good recreation and quiet reflection. The human body is finite. It cannot operate indefinitely at maximum efficiency. Even the strongest of us must have a regular time set aside to rest, to renew our mind, body and spirit. To forget this natural law is to invite an early grave. God, who is omniscient, knew we needed time for contemplation; that's why he wanted us weekly to set

aside a special day of rest, reflection and worship so that we never forget how good God has been to us. I see a connection between the fourth commandment and the famous words of the ancient Roman poet and satirist Juvenal. His legendary words on the limited desires of the Roman populace in only a few words captured how the rich and politically connected ruling class (senators and emperors) frequently beguiled the citizens by providing gladiator games. In other words, the emperors could steal the Roman citizens' blind through oppressive taxation as long as he provided the people a steady diet of "bread and circuses." Rather than enjoying bread and circuses, let us remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy.

Last Sunday, President Obama made the following remarks before the president of Turkey, a 99 percent Muslim nation: ". . . [W]e have a very large Christian population. We do not consider ourselves a Christian nation or a Jewish nation or a Muslim nation; we consider ourselves a nation of citizens who are bound by ideals and a set of values." None of Obama's 42 predecessors would have dreamed of making such a treasonous statement as that on two grounds: 1) The statement isn't factually or historically true; 2) The statement essentially makes America look weak and afraid to embrace her moral and cultural heritage out of the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought.

Apparently neither Obama nor any of his foreign policy advisers ever heard of the Constitution's framers or the founders of America, including the Pilgrims and the Puritans, who were all very religious people—authentic American heroes who purposely sought to infuse America's republic with Christian precepts. This historical fact about America is incontrovertible except to a historical revisionist or a Marxist. For example, the Supreme Court, in the case *United States v. Macintosh* (1931), held, *We are a Christian nation*; in *Zorach v. Clauson* (1952), the Court ruled, *We are a religious people and our institutions presuppose a Supreme Being*. Five years later, in 1957, President Eisenhower and Congress even enshrined into perpetuity our national motto, *In God We Trust*, on all of our currency. They did not write, *In Allah We Trust*. Therefore, what *nation* is Obama talking about when he states before the nations of the world that America isn't a Christian nation? If you look at past history, recent history, constitutional law and the words, ideas and ideals of the Constitution's framers, he certainly could not be talking about Amer-

ica. Rather than enjoying bread and circuses let us *Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy*.

Will America return to honoring God by remembering the Sabbath Day and keeping it holy? Don't get me wrong. I don't want another national holiday to achieve this, but a Sabbath Day commemoration by each American that truly loves God to separate one day per week for special prayer, quiet recreation, quiet reflection and sincere worship in gratitude to the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Israel who has blessed America more than virtually any other nation in the history of the world. America, let us have more Sabbath Day commemoration and less Obama worship, less concern about Michelle's muscular arms she loves to show off, less news articles about her sweater, whether she should have hugged the queen of England, or how stylish first lady Obama is in her latest fashion ensemble from J. Crew. America, let us have more celebration of the Sabbath Day rather than giving credence to propaganda about President Obama being a rock star on the international stage, a stage where perhaps more than any president in U.S. history he is exploiting by selling out America's most sacred principles to our enemies. Obama has just finished traveling around the world practicing diplomacy from our knees and apologizing in a most obsequious manner to the world we saved in World War I, World War II and the Cold War. Why? . . . for being Americans. I do not apologize for being an American! I love this country.

I remember an interesting scene in the movie *Gladiator* (2000) starting Russell Crowe, where the gladiatorial games ("circuses") were traveling throughout the desolate backside of the Roman Empire. Just before the bloodletting began between the gladiators, the people were literally pelted with loaves of wheat ("bread"). What a disgusting spectacle indeed. The legendary great citizens of Rome were fighting for every little morsel of "free food" as they fell to their knees and scurried around in the dirt like dogs. In the meantime, the local governor looked at the masses with an imperious glare of contempt. Every time I watch this movie I can literally hear the words of Juvenal ringing in my ears: *Two things only the people anxiously desire—bread and circuses*. In conclusion, let us have less offerings of vanity, less fanaticism of sports and entertainment figures. Do not be beguiled by Obama's "listening tour," which is intended to placate the discontent of the citizens and distract attention from his radical, Marxist policies, which will inevitably lead to a worldwide economic

depression and geopolitical chaos. In other words, let us have less "bread and circuses" that Juvenal spoke of, and let us endeavor to have on a personal level regular worship of God on His Sabbath Day to keep it holy.

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 7

HONOR THY FATHER AND THY MOTHER

April 11, 2009

Excessive separation, in the absence of a father [and mother], has led to a pattern of idealized control that Obama has not only imposed on himself, but now wants to impose on the United States of America.

~ Dr. Michael Savage, from *Obama on the couch*

The fifth commandment, *Honor thy father and thy mother*, is God's call to family. It mandates loving care and respect for all family members. Hierarchy, unity, tradition and respect are the mortar that holds the building blocks of the family together, which in turn builds a strong nation. As the foundation of the family goes, so goes a nation. Regarding the family, theologian Charles Ryrie said, "Proper order in the family becomes the basis for a solid social structure." How does family relate to the character development of our commander in chief, President Barack Obama? In welcoming our newest commentator to the WorldNetDaily family, conservative intellectual and radio host, Dr. Michael Savage, I came across an interesting item on this very subject that he wrote last year, "Obama on the couch."

Savage, in his singularly unique way, captured the essence of Obama's psyche, his insecurities, his childhood, his mother, his father and in a few eloquent words set forth a magnificent case study into this tragic manchild that would grow up to be president of the United States. Savage wrote:

What exactly is Obama's problem with women? . . . In 1961, Obama's mother, Ann Dunham, married Obama's father, a man from Kenya [Barack Obama Sr.]. Less than three years later, they were divorced. In 1967, his mother married another man, this time an Indonesian. A few years later she was divorced again. How many were between and after these is unknown. Through all this time, Obama's

mother went globetrotting: from Hawaii, [to Kenya], to Indonesia, to Pakistan. Sometimes she took her young son. Sometimes she left him behind.

Don't get me wrong. I'm sure Obama loves his mother and father, but it would be naïve to assume without mitigating evidence to the contrary that the absence of his parents during Obama's critical formative years is an intractable void, a Sisyphus-like existentialism that would cause a negative psychic effect even upon the strongest of us. Therefore, a salient question to ask at this juncture would be to what degree would abandonment by ones' mother and father affect the parent/child relationship?

Savage answers with a convincing psychiatric analysis in his own inimitable manner:

What appears to have happened to Obama as a result is he developed symptoms of what psychologists refer to as an Oedipal Complex. In an Oedipal Complex, a male child is fixated on his mother and competes with his father for maternal attention. In such cases, a critical point of awakening occurs where the child realizes that the mother has affections for others besides himself. In this case, Obama had to compete with multiple paternal stand-ins and was never fully able to bond with his mother. The result seems to have been resentment toward women that he has never been able to get beyond.

It is impossible for a young, impressionable, vulnerable child to bond with his mother while she is out gallivanting with Muslim men and chasing them all over the world to seek the love she craved from her own father. With each new relationship, Obama's mother always chose someone other than him.

Savage concludes: "Furthermore, excessive separation within an Oedipal Complex leads to a sense of helplessness that can in turn lead to patterns of idealized control and self-sufficiency. Obama's mother sent him to live away from her when he was 10 and again when he was 14." Savage is right on point as if he were Freud himself with Obama the Manchild on Freud's couch when he attests that: "It seems clear that this excessive separation, in the absence of a father, has led to a pattern of idealized control that Obama has not only imposed on himself, but now wants to impose on the United States of America." That last sentence is quintessential Savage . . . pure genius and inspiration.

Honor thy father and thy mother are such utterly sublime words for the ages. How can one truly honor his father and mother if, as in

Obama's case, they repeatedly abandoned the manchild and left him to the care of others? The mother, named "Stanley" by Obama's maternal grandfather, had to grapple with the rejection and psychic trauma of not being loved as a little girl because her father, Stanley Durham Sr., so desperately coveted having a boy child. Obama's mother, a tragic modern Cassandra-figure (Stanley) transmuted into the omnipresent Michelle, the strong mother-figure who would never leave him. Next was the Rev. Jeremiah Wright who married them, a racist, and hate-monger minister—not a father to honor. As a matter of fact, throughout Obama's entire 47 years there were dishonorable mother and father figures who, though they indelibly shaped the manchild, could not receive his honor, including Karl Marx, Saul Alinsky, Woodrow Wilson, FDR, LBJ, Bill Ayers, Bernardine Dohrn, Louis Farrakhan, Father Pfleger, professor Laurence Tribe, professor Charles Ogeltree, Rahm Emmanuel and the communist Frank Marshall Davis, just to name a few.

How can you honor your father and your mother when there is little to honor? When throughout your life there has been only a dishonorable mother and mother figures, a dishonorable father and father figures? In the meantime, America is descending into the paroxysm of economic depression, diabolical neo-Marxism and toward the Orwellian nightmare of a one-world government under his authority. What is driving Obama to this madness? Savage says, "The absence of a father has led to a pattern of idealized control that Obama has not only imposed on himself, but now wants to impose on the United States of America." Dear God, please help us to honor our fathers and mothers.

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 8

THOU SHALL NOT KILL

April 15, 2009

Does loving your enemy mean not punishing him? No, for loving myself does not mean that I ought not to subject myself to punishment—even to death.

~ C. S. Lewis

The sixth commandment, *Thou shall not kill*, is God's call to national order and veneration of the rule of law. The original Hebrew and Greek

words meant, "Thou shall not *murder*." As applied under the rule of law, it mandates that culprits of the most heinous acts must be quickly identified, tried in a court of law and killed. Regarding the sixth commandment, Christian apologist and Renaissance scholar C.S. Lewis, in his book, *Mere Christianity*, said the following:

Does loving your enemy mean not punishing him? No, for loving myself does not mean that I ought not to subject myself to punishment—even to death. If one committed a murder, the right Christian thing to do would be to give yourself up to the police and be hanged. It is, therefore, in my opinion, perfectly right for a Christian judge to sentence a man to death or a Christian soldier to kill an enemy. I always have thought so, ever since I became a Christian, and long before the war, and I still think so now that we are at peace.

Presently, there is an open controversy at the famous Catholic university Notre Dame because President Obama has accepted an invitation to be the commencement speaker and to receive an honorary degree. Normally this wouldn't be a big deal, but Obama, perhaps more so than all of his 42 predecessors combined, appears to be hell-bent on following an uncompromising pro-abortion position. In fact many of the earliest acts of his administration were brazenly perpetrated to promote more abortions both here in the U.S. and throughout the world. The most recent example of this tyranny, according to published reports, occurred in late February where Obama began the process to rescind a regulation that enforces federal laws protecting the conscience rights of doctors and health care providers. Under Obama, we are all abortionists now.

But why would such a prestigious, pro-life Catholic institution as Notre Dame invite such a virulent, uncompromising foe of the pro-life movement as President Obama? It is a sign of the times. There seems to be a lack of courage from any of our leaders and venerated institutions to stand on principle rather than popularity. This dearth of honor regarding the Obama/Notre Dame controversy is in stark contrast with Sunday's dramatic rescue from Somali pirates by Navy SEALs of Capt. Richard Phillips and the crew of the Maersk Alabama. Why? I truly believe that all Americans and the world are hungering for authentic heroes.

Returning to C.S. Lewis on the sixth commandment, *Thou shall not kill*, he said:

All killing is not murder any more than all sexual intercourse is adultery. When soldiers came to St. John the Baptist asking what to do,

he never remotely suggested that they ought to leave the army: nor did Christ when he met a Roman sergeant-major—what they call a centurion. The idea of the knight—the Christian in arms for defense of a good cause—is one of the great Christian ideas. War is a dreadful thing, and I can respect an honest pacifist, though I think he is entirely mistaken.

Liberals love to use the sophism of moral equivalence to equate the Catholic Church's prohibition against capital punishment to disparage the fact that America still has the death penalty in most states, which (in their minds) makes Christians appear to be hypocrites on the abortion issue. Because most liberals have long ago abandoned reason, common sense and the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought in exchange for Machiavelli's "The end justifies the means," it is now self-evident why in America and throughout the world there is no longer a *Politics of Life*. During this existential Progressive Age, there appears only to be a *Politics of Death*.

How can Obama, a man of such a singularly pro-death position, accede to the highest office while America's churches ignore or celebrate the genocide that his policies and the abortion industry profit from? As I stated many times before, I believe abortion to be a modern form of slavery.⁴ It is therefore galling to me that our most venerated educational institutions like Notre Dame, Harvard, Columbia and other Ivy League schools (all originally Christian-originated schools) can only bow the knee to these pro-death demagogues, whether it is an Al Gore and Jesse Jackson at Harvard, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad at Columbia (twice), Noam Chomsky at MIT, Cornel West at Princeton, or unrepentant terrorists Bernardine Dohrn at Northwestern Law School and Bill Ayers at University of Chicago, just to name a few.

C.S. Lewis said, "All killing is not murder." He was right. The Bible, the Constitution's framers and settled judicial precedent codified this natural law in the Constitution and Bill of Rights. On this point during an especially dark period of Supreme Court history (1972-76) the Court overruled the death penalty as a violation of the Eighth Amendment's "cruel and unusual punishment" clause in the infamous case *Furman v. Georgia* (1972). What happened during that four-year window when the Court violated God's sixth commandment by outlawing the death penalty? One of America's most savage serial murders, Charles Manson (and his gang of cultists), were all tried in California and given life sentences at taxpayers' expense to this day. Also, in 1973, Justice Harry

Blackmun, writing for the majority in *Roe v. Wade*, began a legacy that gave the death penalty to over 50 million innocent babies while Charles Manson and his murderous cohorts got free cable TV, health care, fawning media coverage, book deals and possible parole.

America, please let us stop the insanity of killing our future doctors, lawyers, scientists, philosophers, teachers, engineers and ordinary people while elevating the vilest people in America to offices of great honor and respect. Let us remember God's sixth commandment, "Thou shall not kill," by giving murders and terrorists swift justice, while extolling Reason and giving innocent babies, in the words of Jefferson, the freedom to have *Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness*.

ON RELIGION — ESSAY 9

THOU SHALL NOT COMMIT ADULTERY

April 18, 2009

Pleasure after all is God's invention, not Satan's.

~ C. S. Lewis

The seventh commandment, *Thou shall not commit adultery*, is God's call to chastity, faithfulness and fidelity. Beyond merely just abstaining from sexual contact outside of marriage, this commandment mandates both respect for sex and marriage as well as faithful motives and actions *in all things*. Regarding the seventh commandment, in his sermon notes, Rick Bartosik, pastor of Mililani Community Church, wrote the following:

God intended human sexuality not just so that married couples might populate the earth but also that they might enjoy the riches of the deepest and most intimate level of personal and pleasurable communication possible. . . .

❖ Song of Solomon (a graphic description in the Bible of uninhibited delight of married lovers).

❖ Hebrews 13:4 ("*the marriage bed is undefiled*" — meaning there should be no shame in the expression of our sexuality within marriage. Sex is not bad; it is good! But the verse goes on to say, "but fornicators and adulterers God will judge").

❖ 1 Corinthians 7:3-5 (Here God commands husbands and wives to be responsive to each others sexual needs).

While the above analysis is informative and biblical, it is unremarkable. Let's go deeper. *Exhibit 1: President Barack Obama.* During my entire series on the Ten Commandments, I have used Obama and his policies as a case study not to judge the man. (God knows you couldn't pay me enough to be president during these perilous times.) However, I use Obama as a metaphor for us to turn the mirror upon ourselves to critically analyze the aphorism, *People get the leaders they deserve.* As painful as it is to admit it, nevertheless it is true. In other words, if we want better leaders, we've got to return to God and become better citizens.

Because we live in an Orwellian Age of newspeak and tyranny where perverse demagogues, with the help of the propaganda media, can manipulate the masses at will to believe virtually anything they wish them to believe, it is becoming difficult for Christians, conservatives, critical thinkers and patriots to have freedom of speech without being maligned by the government. A case in point is the thousands of tea parties that took place across America on Tax Day (April 15). Virtually every news account of this event except from the alternative media like WND, conservative talk radio and Fox News, characterized these peaceful political demonstrations of free speech rights as lawless, treasonous mobs. When red-blooded Americans cannot exercise their First Amendment rights which part says: "The right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances," then the government is prohibiting lawful and faithful actions. In my opinion, the government is committing political adultery.

Radio host and conservative intellectual Michael Savage, on his very informative website, a year ago cited what he saw as the first 10 of Obama's executive orders should he be elected, based on the Democrat's campaign website:

- ❖ Obama enacts stronger "federal hate crimes legislation" to "reinvigorate enforcement at the Department of Justice's Criminal Section."
- ❖ Obama creates "a fund to help people refinance their mortgages and provide comprehensive supports to innocent homeowners."
- ❖ Obama, following through on his pledge to "meet with the leaders of all nations, friend and foe," signs a non-aggression pact with the Hitler of Iran [Mahmoud Ahmadinejad].
- ❖ Obama doubles foreign aid to \$50 billion to cut "poverty around the world in half by 2015."
- ❖ Obama removes our troops from Iraq, leaving a power vacuum filled by Iran.

- ❖ Obama enacts socialized medicine, destroying small businesses with taxes to pay for illegal-alien health care.
- ❖ Obama enacts amnesty for illegal aliens.
- ❖ Obama enacts legislation demanding carbon-friendly cars, hammering the final nail in the coffin of the U.S. car industry.
- ❖ Obama enacts laws to reinforce affirmative action by funneling money to “women and minority-owned businesses.”
- ❖ Obama repeals the Bush tax cuts.
- ❖ Obama enacts the Employment Non-Discrimination Act to entrench the power of the homosexual lobby.

These are the 10 commandments of political adultery. If you look at the magnificent legacy the Constitution’s framers bequeathed to all Americans 232 years ago, on Sept. 17, 1787, when the Constitution was drafted, it was purposely infused with a Judeo-Christian foundation from beginning to end. Secondly, the Constitution was viewed as a sacred covenant, a suzerainty treaty, if you will, modeled after the biblical covenants between God and Adam, God and Noah, God and Abraham, God and David, etc. America’s Constitution was, according to Thomas Hobbes, a *social contract*—a covenant between God, We the People and our government. The essence of the Constitution was captured in the words of one of the great Founding Fathers, John Adams, our second president—*Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.*

To many readers it may be a stretch to equate Obama’s goals with political adultery, but I hope to convince some when you look at the original intent of the Constitution’s framers and their insistence on an inseparability of law and morality. It is naked treason when you compare the framers’ Natural law paradigm to the neo-Marxism of Obama. Moreover, Obama and his fascist minion’s intent is to provoke a socialist revolution in the image of the father of communism, Karl Marx; to bring to its apotheosis his diabolical vision including the abolition of Christianity, private property, the free market, separation of powers and individual liberty. Let us expand our understanding of God’s seventh commandment, *Thou shall not commit adultery*, to include a strong prohibition not only against sex outside of marriage, but on a deeper level to forsake all political polices outside of the original intent of the Constitution’s framers founded under God, the Bible and Natural Law, for to abandon

this constitutional commandment is to commit the sin of political adultery.

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 10

THOU SHALL NOT STEAL

April 22, 2009

The American Republic will endure, until politicians realize they can bribe the people with their own money.

~ Alexis de Tocqueville (1835)

The eighth commandment, *Thou shall not steal*, is God's call to justice and honesty. This commandment mandates respect for the rights of others, especially when they get in the way of what we desire, as well as a loyalty to the rule of law, fairness and a willingness to endure loss rather than depriving another. Regarding America's tragic love affair with socialism, which in my opinion is legalized stealing, Economist M. Stanton Evans writes:

The principle beneficiaries of the money absorbed and dispensed by government are not poor blacks in ghettos or Appalachian whites or elderly pensioners receiving Social Security checks. . . . The major beneficiaries, instead, are the employees of government itself—people engaged in administering some real or imagined service to the underprivileged or, as the case may be, the overprivileged. . . . The gross effect of increased government spending is to transfer money away from relatively low-income people—average taxpayers who must pay the bills—to relatively high-income people—federal functionaries who are being paid out of the taxpayer's pocket.

Exhibit 1: President Barack Obama. A few weeks ago when our president bowed before the king of Saudi Arabia, there was outrage both in England and here in America. Few of the news reports mentioned that a possible reason for Obama's prostrating himself before the Saudi king was because he is a closet Muslim, or that Obama received hundreds of millions in campaign contributions from Middle East countries like Saudi Arabia, Dubai and Hamas in Gaza, some of which were illegally bundled together to avoid compliance with federal campaign finance laws. Obama is perhaps the most unabashed socialist in the history of the U.S. presidency. He got to where he is by strictly following one credo: *Your*

liberty, your money and your property all belongs to the government. Why? Economist Evans answers this pivotal question in part when he wrote: "The principle beneficiaries of the money absorbed and dispensed by government are not poor blacks in ghettos or Appalachian whites or elderly pensioners receiving Social Security checks . . . [but] relatively high income people—federal functionaries who are being paid out of the taxpayer's pocket."

In other words, Obama's neo-Marxism is a systematic, comprehensive grand strategy to destroy the moral, economic and intellectual foundations of America. Every speech, every domestic policy, every foreign policy, every executive order and every political appointee are designed for a singular, diabolical result I called in an earlier article: the *Democrat Eternity Act* (DEA). If Obama's is successful with his nefarious plan to transform the Republican Party into the Whig Party of the 21st century, then by attrition this will make the Democrats become the *de facto* party of America for the next 100 years. Beginning around the passage of the 16th Amendment (1913), which allowed the government to collect income taxes, America has been on the road to socialism where, except for a few years here and there, the government has taken more of your money, property and liberty in the name of the "common good." The only entity this is good for is leviathan government, as its power only grows exponentially concurrent with our liberty, freedoms and natural rights diminishing exponentially.

The Bible has a strong prohibition against taking the money or property of another, and this precept has been codified into federal, state and local statutes going back long before the founding of America, to the Common Law of England and to the Natural Law of the ancient Greeks and Roman philosophers, as well as the Higher Law of the ancient Israelites; that said, why would we in the 21st century embrace a political philosophy like Obama's neo-Marxism? A philosophy that so brazenly takes money from *Group A* (producers) and gives it to *Group B* (takers). This is legalized thievery writ large, a tragic violation enshrined in public policy and a gross violation of God's eighth commandment, Thou shall not steal. Grandpa Simpson, the senior citizen from the cartoon TV show *The Simpsons* had a singular statement of fact regarding the thievery and hypocrisy of socialism or the idea that government will take care of you from cradle to grave. Regarding his Social Security, Medicare and free prescription drug allowances, Grandpa Simpson said, "I didn't earn it, I

don't deserve it, but if the government misses one of my payments, I'll raise hell!" While I appreciate Grandpa Simpson's honesty about his dishonesty, there is a part of me that resents the fact that we are living in perverted times where America's once vaunted free-market capitalist system is being replaced by a diabolical economic system of legalized thievery called socialism.

Thou shall not steal: four simple but profound words that most people either cannot keep or will not keep. Either way, I argue here that the world would be a much better, more tolerable place to live if our existential way of life would follow this biblical aphorism as well as the words of the prophet Micah, who said, "But they shall sit every man under his [own] vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the LORD of hosts hath spoken it." The choice is simple, dear reader: Will we keep electing presidents, politicians and judges that are ignorant of or hostile to the original intent of the Constitution's framers, or will America have a real revolution of the mind, body, spirit and nation to reconnect our laws with the immutable precepts of the Bible? I pray that we choose the latter, for if we follow our current path under the neo-Marxist Obama, then in the words of that great French philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville might come to pass: "The American Republic will endure, until politicians realize they can bribe the people with their own money." I choose to follow God. *Thou shall not steal*.

ON RELIGION—ESSAY 11

THOU SHALL NOT LIE

April 25, 2009

I end my series on the Ten Commandments with the ninth commandment—*Thou shall not lie*. It is God's call to *Veritas* (truth). Moreover, this commandment mandates a dedication to what is good and real, even if that reality is against our own self-interests. George Orwell (1903-1950), that magnificent literary prophet from a bygone era, eloquently warned us that demagogues, dictators and tyrants would arise as wolves in sheep's clothing. *Big Brother*, the State, if you will, was the invisible, ubiquitous, omnipresent figure that followed you everywhere you went,

even into the deep recesses of your mind. It told you *what* to think, *how* to think and *when* to think (which wasn't very often).

Another sinister figure from Orwell's 1984 was Goldstein. Although not as prolific as Big Brother, nevertheless Goldstein was a salient figure in Orwell's work and in his futuristic society called *Oceania*. If Big Brother was the equivalent of *Die Fuhrer* (The Leader) as in Germany's dictator, Adolf Hitler, then surely Goldstein would be the counterpart to Hitler's minister of propaganda (Josef Goebbels). I cite Hitler's Third Reich only as a point of reference, for I believe Goldstein to be such an evil, diabolical figure as to be beyond the sphere of mere men, but is in the realm of ideas much like Rousseau (a return to a savage state of nature); Karl Marx (*From each according to his ability, to each according to his need*), or Nietzsche (*God is Dead; Will to Power; Aristocracy Paradigm*).

All of these infamous men are liars, and their philosophies are lies and damn lies—yet these men and their ideas are lionized even to this day. Why? *Exhibit 1*: President B. Hussein Obama. No, Obama is not a Hitler, but he is utilizing many of the techniques Hitler outlined in his treatise, *Mein Kampf*. For example, once power is secured, move quickly to take more and more of the liberty and natural rights of the people in exchange for an ever-expanding, nationalist, socialist State. This is the Big Lie Orwell wrote about. To demonstrate how vast and acceptable lying has become in public discourse, when was the last time you heard one journalist in the propaganda media refer to a politician, a political appointee, a judge, or a CEO of a corporation as a liar (unless he is a conservative)? Yet Washington, D.C., and the halls of power throughout America are teeming with liars like maggots over a fresh corpse.

Why is there not a single Republican with the courage and the intellect to call a weekly 5 p.m. press conference in the alcove of the U.S. Capitol and, line by line, precept by precept, lie by lie, state what Obama has promised—transparency, bipartisanship, reasonable policies, truth—versus what Obama has delivered in his first 100 days in office—obstructionism, Saul Alinsky partisanship, Marxist economic policy, genocidal abortion policy and giving away for free our most sensitive interrogation techniques to Osama bin Laden. Indeed, Obama is a pathological liar. Every speech, every domestic and foreign policy, every executive order, every economic policy, every political appointee and every future Supreme Court nominee . . . all LIES! If the Supreme Court ever gets the guts to grant *certiorari* (allow a full appeal) of one of the

dozens of pending cases that have brought a constitutional challenge regarding Obama's "natural born citizen" status according to Article II, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, then my statement in the previous paragraph will become more than a literary flourish. In other words, if B. Hussein Obama isn't a legitimate American citizen according to the Constitution, then every executive order, policy, appointment and treaty will become null and void because Obama has treasonously violated God's ninth commandment, *Thou shall not lie*.

Returning to Orwell's 1984, which character would Obama be if instead of 1984 Orwell wrote "2009" or even "2012"? While most would probably answer *Big Brother*, I would disagree, for Big Brother was the omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent machinery of the State. Obama, the transcendent, messianic, FDResque figure is more akin to *Goldstein*, the Minister of Propaganda who with the help of his puppetmasters like George Soros and his fascist legions in the streets, spent day and night following one credo—*Thoughtcrime* which was sure to be punished by the Thought police. The slogans of Newspeak are *War is Peace—Freedom is Slavery—Ignorance is Strength*. Meaning: *Your liberty, your money, your property, your soul all belong to the State* (federal government). This is the Big Lie Orwell so eloquently wrote against in his books, *1984* and *Animal Farm*. What is different about 2009 versus 1949 when these literary works were conceived? The major difference is that 60 years ago the Stalinist state-run public schools hadn't taken *full* control over the education of all citizens. However, in modern times tens of millions of people here in America gleefully accept the propaganda and lies of the State (Big Brother) as delineated by Obama (Goldstein) because, in the words of Orwell, "Always there were fresh dupes waiting to be seduced by him."

Since the ideal of a universal *Veritas* (truth) is viewed by many as a relic of a bygone Christian past, it is therefore both irrelevant and inconsequential to societies' march toward utopia. Obama's willing accomplices in Congress, the secular academy, the propaganda media, Wall Street, corporations, unions and the anti-Christian courts across America slavishly bow to his will. Why? One of my many intelligent readers ('K. Klosterhaus') recently answered this question when he wrote: "Obama is trying to destroy the U.S. as soon as possible, and when he is done by 2012, there will be no law, no regulation left that will allow a fair opponent to compete against him—and the constituency will be so beholden to Big Government they wouldn't dare vote against their jobs." America,

choose *Veritas* over liberalism, morality and justice over job security, doublespeak, propaganda and treason. Go with God! — *Thou shall not lie.*

CHAPTER

~ 8 ~

ON ECONOMICS

ON ECONOMICS — ESSAY 1

ECONOMIC STIMULUS OR KEYNESIANISM ON CRACK?

February 11, 2009

Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

~ Santayana, "The Life of Reason," Vol. 1

Prologue to a catastrophe

As President Obama's now \$1.2 trillion dollar economic stimulus plan goes from the House to the Senate and now back to the House for final ratification, a growing chorus of critics and people of good will of all political stripes have arisen and are wondering out loud—*Is Obama's economic stimulus plan America's salvation or Keynesianism on crack?* I think it is the latter. Yesterday the latest person in the media to make this obvious metaphor to Keynes and crack was former GOP congressman and

host of his own morning show on MSNBC, *The Joe Scarborough Show*. I don't always agree with Joe because being on a radically liberal TV network, he often sells out his conservative principles to get along with his co-host, the outspoken Mika Brzezinski, daughter of Jimmy Carter's National Security adviser, Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski. Dr. Brzezinski is also a frequent guest on the show. However, here Joe is right to characterize Obama's economic stimulus plan as Keynesianism on crack.

Who is this Keynes fellow?

John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946) was a controversial and colorful Cambridge-trained British economist and Cambridge professor whose progressive and socialist ideas Obama's mentor, FDR scrupulously followed during the 1930s, prolonging the Great Depression. Keynes was the person who came up with the then-radical notion that a government can bring a country out of a deep depression by excessive spending. That's right—no savings, no economic discipline, no fiscal responsibility. Bankruptcy and foreclosure under a Keynesian model encourages government to spend, spend, spend and spend itself back to prosperity. Last month on National Public Radio Keynesian economics was featured in a program by Adam Davidson and Alex Blumberg, relating Keynes' theories to Obama's economic stimulus plan:

Many would argue that Keynes' 73-year-old theory is being tested, right now, for the very first time. One Keynes biographer, Lord Robert Skidelsky, portrays Keynes as a fascinating figure, equal parts genius and jerk. Keynes ran with the Bloomsbury Group, which included painters and writers such as Virginia Woolf. The Bloomsbury crowd was known for free love and raunchy language, but even they complained in letters to each other that Keynes was too dirty for them.

Keynes could be just as shocking when it came to academic theory, sounding like a socialist one moment and fanatically defending free markets the next.

The one constant was Keynes' faith in the elite. He generally believed that almost any problem could be solved by getting together young men who had been schooled at Cambridge and asking them to take over. He even wanted Cambridge men to run America, because he didn't think anyone in the U.S. was smart enough. He also didn't like Jews, the French or the working class.¹

And herein America finds herself in the apotheosis of FDR with President Obama who calls himself FDR, part II—If FDR was John the

Baptist then surely Barack Obama is the Messiah? Can Obama achieve economic redemption in 2009 under a Keynesian model where FDR failed to achieve it in seven years of record-breaking domestic spending (1933-40)? It is a fact that none of Keynesian economic theories, FDRs make-work programs, welfare, bank insurance, Social Security, nor any elements of the *New Deal* brought America out of the Great Depression. What did?

History trumps elitism and theory every time

History has made her verdict and has determined that it was the outbreak of World War II, Sept. 1, 1939, and all of the ancillary war making machinery required to fight the Nazis, Mussolini and the Japanese Axis Powers that put Americans back to work. Obama, like most socialist elites, thinks like Wilson, FDR, Keynes, LBJ, socialist intellectuals and the academy, that if you have a problem, any problem, all that is needed are very smart people working together to solve the problem. The dilemma with that worldview is that it conflicts with history; most of the world's problems have not been fixed by "smart" people, but "wise" people. On Keynes' elitism, NPR hosts Davidson and Blumberg continued their thesis:

The one constant was Keynes' faith in the elite. He generally believed that almost any problem could be solved by getting together young men who had been schooled at Cambridge and asking them to take over. He even wanted Cambridge men to run America, because he didn't think anyone in the U.S. was smart enough. He also didn't like Jews, the French or the working class.

Keynes wrote that these Cambridge-led government boards should do everything from running individual companies to determining how many babies should be born and, cryptically, of what quality. Keynes was, after all, on the board of directors of the British Eugenics Society.²

Space will not permit me to further analogize between Obama's connections to Keynes and FDR; for arguments sake history has told us that Keynesianism and FDR's *New Deal* were a catastrophic failure. Using deductive reasoning, what makes any rational person think that Keynesianism will work in 2009 if it didn't work in 1939?

Epilogue: 1933, 2009 or oblivion?

How did we get here? Under classical economic theory going back to the Age of Enlightenment and Adam Smith, economists held that when the economy went into recession or depression, then free market capitalism (*laissez faire*) would eventually correct itself, and over time people would spend money again once prices had dropped low enough to give the average consumer confidence. Waiting, in the middle of an economic catastrophe, isn't an acceptable strategy for a bunch of Ivy-League trained socialists and progressives like FDR and his advisers. They wanted people to start spending money *now* and thought that using the power of leviathan government to do it seemed to them like a good idea—then came the progressive demigod, John Maynard Keynes.

Princeton professor of economics and former Clinton economic adviser Alan Blinder called this crisis "a failure of effective demand." "The Keynesian prescription is if all else fails, the government can spend the money," Blinder says. Normally, in a free-market economy, the public doesn't look to the government to prop up spending. Blinder further noted, "But Keynes' idea, which was revolutionary at the time, is if the private sector won't do it, then the public sector can do it as a fill-in stopgap." Here is the crux of Davidson and Blumberg's argument and analogy of FDR, Keynes and Obama's approach to getting America out of our depression: "Prescribing Keynesianism to some politicians is like prescribing crack to a coke addict. In the 1970s, the patient hit rock bottom. The U.S. had high unemployment, and the Keynesian solution stopped working. The national government spent and spent, but unemployment only got worse—then came inflation, something Keynesians had no answer for."³

In conclusion, Theodore Roosevelt's *Square Deal* and Woodrow Wilson's *Statolatry*, (i.e., state worship or government "experimentation,") didn't work. FDR's *New Deal*, LBJ's *Great Society*, George W. Bush's Prescription Drug program, *No Child Left Behind* and his \$2 trillion Wall Street bailout plan were all abject failures. Past presidents are dead, well-intentioned politicians and bureaucrats are in nursing homes; Nobel Prize-winning economists and academics, despite their theories destroying nations, still collect their pensions without reprisals ... and "We the People" are leaving our children and our grandchildren an immoral in-

heritance to pay the multi-trillion dollar bill when it comes due. Economic stimulus plan, or Keynesianism on crack?

ON ECONOMICS—ESSAY 2

UNIONISM: FREEDOM TO BE SLAVES

March 11, 2009

Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?

~ Matthew 20:15

Recently, an article caught my attention in the Detroit Free Press regarding the auto industry.⁴ Apparently, “The Big 3” has transmuted into “The Little 1/2.” The article stated that Ford Motor Co. has just reached an agreement on a restructuring contract with the labor unions and that the unions have reluctantly agreed to *give back* some of their coveted health and pension benefits so that Ford won’t go bankrupt. Coincidentally, we have been discussing FDR, the Supreme Court and early union cases in my administrative law and constitutional law classes that I teach at Savannah State University, particularly, *West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish* (1937), which upheld the constitutionality of the minimum wage, and *National Labor Relations Board v. Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp.* (1937). The latter case was a landmark decision that declared that the *National Labor Relations Act of 1935* (commonly known as the Wagner Act) was constitutional. Historically, it spelled the end to the conservative Court’s striking down of New Deal economic legislation and dramatically increased Congress’ power under the Commerce Clause, an illegitimate congressional power that has been growing exponentially to this day.

From a constitutional law point of view, 1937 was a very interesting year because FDR had just secured his second term and desperately wanted to solidify his power base as he aggressively moved toward establishing socialism in America. Dating back to the 1880s, unions were always a key ally for the Democratic Party and were critical to solidifying FDR’s socialist dreams. There was only one obstacle—the Supreme Court, which still had four solid conservatives on the bench (aka *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse*). By 1937, these conservative jurists refused either to retire or bow to FDR’s fascist-like tactics to remake Amer-

ica into a socialist slave state. From 1933-37 FDR's New Deal programs were repeatedly ruled unconstitutional in cases like:

- ❖ *A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States*, 295 U.S. 495 (1935)—the Court invalidated regulations of the poultry industry according to the nondelegation doctrine and as an invalid use of Congress' power under the Commerce Clause;
- ❖ *Railroad Retirement Bd. v. Alton R. Co.* (1935)—Railroad Retirement Act unconstitutional;
- ❖ *United States v. Butler* (1936) —Agricultural Adjustment Act unconstitutional;
- ❖ *Jones v. SEC* (1936)—Securities Exchange Commission rebuked for Star Chamber abuses;
- ❖ *Carter v. Carter Coal* (1936)—Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935 unconstitutional;
- ❖ *Morehead v. New York ex rel. Tipaldo* (1936)—New York's minimum wage law unconstitutional.

Increasingly outflanked and frustrated, FDR in 1937 threatened the Supreme Court with FDR's court packing bill, also called the *Judiciary Reorganization Bill*. This piece of legislation would have increased the number of justices on the Supreme Court from 9 to 15 members. Of course, the six extra justices would be hand-picked by FDR himself and would have complied with his leviathan government philosophy. The Court blinked, and two justices acceded that they would vote to approve FDR's New Deal policies. What was one of the first cases they undertook? You guessed it—*NLRB v. Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp.*, where instead of Benedict Arnold, we got two existing justices bought and paid for by FDR himself—Justice Owen Roberts and Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes—changing their votes and ruling FDR's New Deal programs as constitutional. Historically, this event was called, "A switch in time saves nine."

Fast forward from 1937 to 2009—The Big-3 automakers, together with over 120 years of unionism, are dutifully rearranging the deck chairs on the doomed ship *Titanic*. Despite tens of billions of dollars in stimulus money the Obama administration has flushed down the toilet to GM and Chrysler, be not deceived; these companies will fail and Ford, despite their eleventh-hour restructuring deal with the unions, will not be enough to save these once fabled American companies. Why? Recall one of the giants of the Age of Enlightenment, Adam Smith (1723-90), the

father of modern economics. It was Smith's capitalist economic theories, (*The Wealth of Nations* [1776]) a natural law-based economics rooted in biblical theism that threw off the repressive shackles of mercantilism, which had hindered business for centuries. Under a capitalist paradigm, a businessman can do whatever he wills under certain limited rules of the free market. Practically all that constrained him were the limits of his own imagination and business creativity. The government played practically no role whatsoever. Remember Adam Smith's most famous quote: "It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages."⁵

Speaking in purely philosophical and pragmatic terms, is America still under a free-market capitalist economy when entrepreneurs and businessmen aren't free to run their business as they will based on classical natural law principles of freedom, creativity and sound business practices like supply and demand? I answer, No! How can an outside entity who owns nothing (workers, the union, Congress, community organizers) tell the owners of a private or publicly owned company, "You have to allow us to unionize your company (card check policy), pay us whatever we demand—to hell with what the free market will allow—acceded to our every capricious and anti-business demands, and if you don't we will go on strike."

Unionism is a horrible idea, especially if you want a thriving, growing, productive economy. Jesus once asked a Socratic question in a parable related to economics and the sacredness of property rights: *Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?* What has 120 years of unionism in America done to the greatest economy known to mankind? Has unionism made America more competitive or less competitive? Put another way, has unionism produced a liberated, responsible, independent people to freely engage their labors in the marketplace, or has unionism produced what Lenin called a generation of "useful idiots," slaves to socialism, and cradle-to-grave leviathan government remedies leading ultimately to an economic Great Depression, part II? If you aren't convinced by looking at the present declining state of the auto industry that unionism equals economic slavery, then you will probably be a good candidate to join the Obama administration. They could really use a secretary of treasury right about now.

ON ECONOMICS — ESSAY 3

THE WEALTH OF 'USEFUL IDIOTS'

May 30, 2009

I remember 30 years ago as a senior in high school being at the Detroit Public Library struggling to read a reference copy of Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*. While I didn't understand much of Smith's *opus*, I learned a valuable lesson in perseverance. I didn't give up and got a good grade in my economics class. About a year earlier in my American history class I learned that the Constitution's framers considered Smith's treatise on economics as their bible in deriving the fundamental precepts of national wealth-building and economic policy in America. Alexander Hamilton, America's first and greatest secretary of the treasury, put in place critical financial structures like a free-market economy, a stable currency based on the gold standard and an economic system based on supply and demand.

Like our government, America's early philosophies of economics were under the paradigm of Natural Law—An inseparability of law and morality. People provide goods and services to each other not by government altruism (welfare) or legislative mandate, but out of their own self-interests, natural rights and the law of human nature where people naturally seek to better themselves. Adam Smith summarized these ideas with this famous aphorism from his book: "The Butcher, the Baker, and the Brewer provide goods and services to each other out of self-interest; the unplanned result of this division of labor is a better standard of living for all three."⁶ Because the Constitution's framers embraced the capitalist principles of Adam Smith, a financial revolution was inaugurated that transformed and moved America's economic system away from the backward feudalism and mercantilism systems of Enlightenment Europe and toward becoming the greatest, richest economy in the history of the world. All that came from Adam Smith's economic capitalism, yet at present we have forgotten this singular genius and the principles of economic liberty he championed. In modern times, under the fascist President B. Hussein Obama, who scrupulously followed the lineage of several unremarkable predecessors over the past century—

Woodrow Wilson, Hoover, FDR, LBJ, Carter, Bush 41, Clinton and most infamously, Bush 43—under whom America's economy has been driven to the brink of the Great Depression, Part II.

Last week I read an interesting article in the New York Post titled, "World's richest hold secret meeting." The article discussed a curious meeting of America's billionaire moguls in New York on May 20 ostensibly to discuss "philanthropy." Below are excerpts from comments by two New Yorkers:

Steph wrote:

They might have kicked around the philanthropy football at the podium, but the backroom whispers were all about how to protect their precious behinds once the banks fail and the masses start to get outta control. Can you say "wealth transfer" and "secret hideaway"? ⁷

While the writing admittedly isn't Emily Dickinson, the passion of her words comes straight from the rational, gritty, unforgiving streets of New York. I love the bluntness of New Yorkers. "Steph" cuts through all the bull to explain *why* America's billionaires clandestinely met. Later she theorized, "It was a when-the-SHTF-session." Another New Yorker, "JWV," commenting on the story, wrote the following:

Funny that all of these people supported Barack Obama; afterall, why would rich people support a Democrat since the Republicans are supposed to be the party of the rich? The answer is simple. Barack Obama supports higher taxes on income, not wealth. Since these people are already rich just like Ted Kennedy, Nancy Pelosi, Harry Reid, etc., an income tax increase would only affect their future earning. It would not affect the money that they already have. In other words, *an income tax increase would not have an affect on their wealth, but it would make it more difficult for others to become wealthy.* The real beauty of their plan is that the Democrats then use the money that they have taken from the productive and give it to the slackers, freeloaders, parasites and [the] corrupt in exchange for their votes. That is why the Democrats control our federal government. ⁸

JWV nailed it! It has been almost 100 years since President Woodrow Wilson instituted the Federal Reserve in 1913. Eighty years later G. Edward Griffin published *The Creature from Jekyll Island* (1994), a book that systematically explained the unconstitutional creation of the Federal Reserve and uncovered the tragic folly of putting America's economic health under the control of an unelected, unaccountable oligarchy of men

whose clandestine *modus operandi* is more analogous to socialist globalism rather than defending America's constitutional and economic interests.

What is the state of America's economic health 233 years after the writing of Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*? America is perhaps a few months away from losing its AAA Standard and Poors bond credit rating.⁹ Since the passage of the *America Recovery Investment Act* (February 2009) Obama claims that the U.S. has created over 150,000 new jobs. Yet new *jobless* claims for this week alone are at 632,000. Rather than the boom times Obama promised, economic experts estimate that since February, America is losing over 16,000 jobs PER DAY!¹⁰ In the 233 years since the Declaration of Independence and Adam Smith's economic treatise, we've moved from the genius of the Constitution's framers—men like Madison, Franklin, Jefferson, Witherspoon and Hamilton—to a singular village idiot with totalitarian control, supported by the 63.7 million voters who put this man in power: people who communist dictator, Vladimir Lenin, 100 years ago derisively referred to as "useful idiots." America, you decide which economic principles you will follow to return our once magnificent republic to her envied place of greatness—Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* or President B. Hussein Obama's economic manifesto he is daily writing with our blood—The Wealth of Useful Idiots?

CHAPTER

~ 9 ~

ON SCIENCE

ON SCIENCE—ESSAY 1

SYMPOSIUM—DR. TILLER:
WHO WILL MOURN YOUR CASUALTIES?

June 03, 2009

The unexamined life is not worth living.

~ Socrates

Socrates (470-399 B.C.) was a famous Greek philosopher from Athens, who taught Plato, and Plato taught Aristotle, and Aristotle taught Alexander the Great. Socrates used a method of teaching by asking questions. The Greeks called this form *dialectic*—starting from a thesis or question, then discussing ideas and moving back and forth between points of view to determine how well ideas stand up to critical review with the ultimate principle of the dialogue being *Veritas*—Truth.

Characters

- ❖ Socrates
- ❖ Dr. George Tiller, recently murdered abortion doctor
- ❖ Guardian Angels (mute part)
- ❖ Aborted Souls (mute part)

{*Setting: Heaven*}

Prelude

Socrates: We are gathered here at this Symposium this day before your eternal destiny will be determined. God has allowed me this unusual dialogue to ask you a few questions, Dr. Tiller; to fully examine this life you lived in the light of *Veritas* (Truth).

Dialogue

Dr. Tiller: {*confident*} Yes, Socrates, I fully understand that abortion was as socially divisive as slavery or prohibition, but my sole reason for providing abortions services was about giving women a choice when dealing with technology that can diagnose severe fetal abnormalities before a baby is born.

Socrates: So you disparaged the solemn Hippocratic Oath that all doctors must take? — *First do no harm.*

Dr. Tiller: {*robotic tone, defensive*} I have many respected members of society that will vouch for me, people who have said many honorable things on my behalf:

- ❖ Tiller's killing is "an unspeakable tragedy," my widow, four children and 10 grandchildren said in statement issued by my attorney, Dan Monnat.
- ❖ The family said its loss "is also a loss for the city of Wichita and women across America. George dedicated his life to providing women with high-quality health care despite frequent threats and violence."¹

Socrates: How is it, Dr. Tiller that you willfully and wantonly mocked the Holy Scriptures of your God and brought infamy to your church where you and your family worshipped on the very day you were murdered?

Dr. Tiller: {*robotic tone*} I have many respected members of society that will vouch for me, people who have said many honorable things on my behalf:

❖ New York University Professor Jacob Appel described Tiller as “a genuine hero who ranks alongside Susan B. Anthony and Martin Luther King Jr. in the pantheon of defenders of human liberty.”

Socrates: A hero? Dr. Tiller, you willfully and wantonly disregarded the sacred promise Thomas Jefferson and the Constitution’s framers immortalized for all Americans, even the preborn—*Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness*.

Dr. Tiller: {robotic tone} I have many respected members of society that will vouch for me, people who have said many honorable things on my behalf:

❖ “Dr. Tiller’s murder will send a chill down the spines of the brave and courageous providers and other professionals who are part of reproductive-health centers that serve women across this country,” said Nancy Keenan, president of abortion-rights group NARAL Pro-Choice America. “We want them to know that they have our support as they move forward in providing these essential services in the aftermath of the shocking news from Wichita,” Keenan said.²

❖ “Anti-abortion groups denounced the shooting and stressed that they support only nonviolent protest. The movement’s leaders fear the killing could create a backlash just as they are scrutinizing U.S. Supreme Court nominee Sonia Sotomayor, whose views on abortion rights are not publicly known.”³

Socrates: Dr. Tiller, on your way to the judgment throne of God, it would be most prudent if you would be more concerned about the destiny of your eternal soul and the innocent 72,000 babies you murdered, a number which I deduced from your own estimate of 2,000 abortions per year over 36 years—from *Roe v. Wade* (1973), when abortion was legalized, to 2009.⁴

Leave to us your concern about whether or not your death will adversely affect the nomination to the Supreme Court of Judge Sotomayor.

Dr. Tiller: {resignation, utter despair, profound silence}

Socrates: *The unexamined life is not worth living* is one of my most famous aphorisms. Dr. Tiller, here at the eve of the eternal destiny of your soul, we have done a systematic examination of your worldview, your career and all that you dedicated your life to. On earth you may call yourself a doctor and possess all of the requisite degrees and certifications from prestigious universities, medical schools and medical associa-

tions, but here in heaven, the totality of your body of work is summed up in the words of the prophet Isaiah:

But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousness are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away.

Dr. Tiller: Oh, God! I'm sorry, so very, very sorry. Is there no redemption for me!?

Socrates: Why should I answer your question, Dr. Tiller, when during the entire course of this Symposium you arrogantly answered my questions with robotic, sycophantic platitudes? While millions indeed will mourn your death, Dr. George Tiller: *Who will mourn your casualties?*

Dr. Tiller: *{resignation, utter despair, profound silence}*

Postlude

Guardian Angels: This host of angels numbering 72,000, are the vigilant Guardian Angels, one for each of Dr. Tiller's casualties. These holy and powerful Angels desire nothing more than to visit due justice and unspeakable retribution upon Dr. Tiller for his numerous crimes against humanity, but instead are commanded by God to stay their swords in their sheaths, to sit in profound silence.

Therefore, these Guardian Angels only stare at Dr. Tiller with a mixed expression of righteous indignation and exceeding lachrymose.

Aborted Souls: These are the innocent preborn babies, the 72,000 casualties who sit here in heaven in profound silence, who gaze inquisitively at their zealous tormentor. Their solitary, unspoken expression is fixed for eternity inside the intense sadness of their black, brown, blue and green eyes—eyes that begs an answer to this singular question . . . Why, Dr. George Tiller? . . . Why?

ON SCIENCE—ESSAY 2

CONGRESSIONAL AIDS IN D.C.

March 21, 2009

It turns out that the 'best and the brightest' are the dumbest bastards in the room.

~ Don Imus, radio host

When I heard about the horrific statistics regarding the stunning rise in AIDS cases in Washington, D.C., I thought to myself, *how curious*. The AIDS rate should be the lowest in the country. Why? Because residing in that city is Obama, the Messiah, as well as 535 members of Congress, who are our representatives in charge of every functioning aspect of America. Dr. Shannon Hader, D.C.'s HIV/AIDS Administration director, told the grim tale in a report picked up by Reuters: "An official report this week showed that 3 percent of the city's residents are infected with HIV. Officials believe the true figure is even higher. . . . I think the true prevalence rate could be 30 to 50 percent higher. *Many people are likely infected without knowing it.*"

Congress has a constitutional mandate to govern America's capital, Washington, D.C. How did this AIDS catastrophe in our capital come to pass? Aren't these 535 members of Congress the "best and the brightest"? Aren't they always trying to inject more and more government over our lives? Why didn't they prevent this epidemic? Herein is the dirty little secret about Congress: Virtually every one of them doesn't have a clue about solving real problems. Congress is like the AIDS virus itself: only good at mutating, replicating itself, finding a new host to leech off and consolidating its power by destroying everything good in America.

My mind harkened back to ancient Israel and how they dealt with the AIDS disease of their day, leprosy. Here is an excerpt from Leviticus on how ancient Israel dealt with a health-care crisis through the direction of the greatest physician of all time, God: "Then the priest shall look upon it: and, behold, if the rising of the sore be white reddish in his bald head, or in his bald forehead, as the leprosy appeareth in the skin of the flesh; He is a leprous man, he is unclean: the priest shall pronounce him utterly unclean; his plague is in his head." I love the Bible. Unlike the egalitarianism and perversity correctness of today, the Jewish leaders, Moses and Aaron, obeyed the common sense rationalism of God when treating diseases. The good of the nation took priority over the malady of a single minority group, here lepers.

During *The Black Plague* or *The Black Death* (1347-50) historians estimate at least one third of Europe (50 million people) was wiped out due to a tiny flea carried by infected rats. What did the "best and brightest" of Europe do to combat this menace? They killed all the cats and dogs. That's where we got the aphorism—*Raining cats and dogs*. When a torren-

tial rain came to town during the bubonic plague, all of these hapless animals would be washed down the streets, looking like it was literally raining cats and dogs. The lowly kitty, the key animal to save tens of millions of lives, was foolishly obliterated, the rat population and their parasitic flea carrying the bubonic plague mutated exponentially . . . along with the corpses of over 25 million people.

The experts of that day analyzed the wrong problem; therefore they picked the wrong solution. In just three short years the body count in Europe reached biblical proportions: entire villages, towns and cities were wiped out. This was how the gentiles dealt with disease during the rampant ignorance and superstition of the Dark Ages. There was another group of people, however, living medieval Europe who did not ascribe to the conventional hygiene practices of the day.

Enter the Jewish people. Yes, those despised, eternal scapegoats of society; those curious "People of the Book" with all of their bizarre religious ceremonies. Records show that the Jews escaped the Black Death virtually unscathed. How? These largely Orthodox Jews strictly followed the ceremonial cleansing laws of the Levitical priesthood. They washed their food and themselves repeatedly just to be allowed to worship at Synagogue. Cats, dogs and especially rats—with that inconspicuous flea carrying the plague—had a difficult time entering into a Jewish community in medieval Europe. So the Jews prospered and lived, while all around them was death, disease and ignorance of the Black Death's true origins, the tiny flea.

Since the times of the Constitution's framers, Washington, D.C., has been a city under congressional mandate according to Article 1, Sec. 8 of the U.S. Constitution. I return to my original question: Why is the AIDS rate in Washington, D.C., a place where the "best and the brightest" are supposed to reside, the highest in America? I got my answer last Thursday while listening to *The Laura Ingraham Show*. She was interviewing fellow radio host, Don Imus, who said: "We heard all that nonsense about the 'best and the brightest' from the Kennedy Administration. Then we found out it was [Secretary of Defense] Robert McNamara and all those eggheads from the Ivy League schools that got us into Vietnam in the first place. It turns out that the 'best and the brightest' were the dumbest bastards in the room." ⁵ Nobody can tell the brutal truth like Don Imus.

Let's further examine the incompetence of the beltway crowd in Washington, D.C. Remember that 76 percent of all AIDS cases here are black people. Blacks in D.C. comprise only 53 percent of the total population. The mayor of D.C. is black, as are virtually all of the elected officials on the city council, from the school board to the dog catcher. The liberal Democrats in Congress who sit as overseers in D.C. will do nothing to upset this key voting bloc. Unlike ancient Israel, there are no real men or intelligent leaders in D.C., no Moses and Aaron to create a viable public health policy with the help of God. We don't need God today, for we have Whitman-Walker Clinic CEO Donald Blanchon, who said of the genocide in D.C. being worse than the AIDS rate in West Africa: "It's an epidemic across all aspects of District life. It's not an epidemic of one group. It's not just gay or black."

Congress, not to be outdone in combating a serious health-care crisis with perversity correctness in 2007, lifted a ban on a needle-exchange program, now under way. Dr. Hader added, "We want to make condoms widely available for free at a lot of easy-access points around the city, including beauty parlors, barber shops, liquor stores and bars." America, let's be real. Giving a crackhead a clean needle or a moron a fresh supply of condoms is tantamount to Moses mandating all Israelites attend weekly leprosy boil-scratching duty; or Jewish Priests during the Black Death asking his fellow Jews to participate in the Rat Exchange Program—one "clean" rat would be exchanged for every plague rat, to prove to the gentiles that the Jews did not put a curse upon them.

Liberals are slaves to their own anti-intellectual, irrational ideology and appear devoid of reason, accountability and common sense—its intellectual nihilism writ large. If you like how Congress is dealing with the exploding AIDS epidemic in D.C. by enabling promiscuous people to infect the innocent or uninformed in the name of perversity correctness, then you will love how Obama and Congress plan to take over corporate America like rapacious Mafia dons by printing trillions of dollars in new money, driving *down* the value of the dollar and driving *up* inflation. I predict that Obama and the Democrats will not stop until they make us all mindless slaves of a socialist welfare state. Welcome to the USSA—the United States of Socialist America.

ON SCIENCE—ESSAY 3

LIBERAL HATE KILLS TRUTH

June 17, 2009

. . . [F]or some liberals, the state is in fact a substitute for God and a form of political religion as imagined by Rousseau and Robespierre, the fathers of liberal fascism.

~ Jonah Goldberg, "Liberal Fascism" (2007)

Psychiatrists define *displacement* as "the transfer of an emotion from its original focus to another object, person, or situation." Displacement is a common defense mechanism used by narcissistic, insecure and deceitful people to obscure or "change" the truth to conform with a new reality more acceptable to their psychological delusions. In modern times we see this Freudian psychosis of displacement or what Freud called *psychological projection* conjoined with the Orwellian government-controlled media during the reporting of three recent murders:

Scenario 1: On May 31, the infamous abortion doctor George Tiller was murdered by a gunman as he worshipped at church in Wichita, Kan. The government-controlled media for over two weeks characterized the event as the result of right-wing talk radio that daily spews hate over the public airwaves.

Scenario 2: On June 1, two soldiers standing outside a recruitment facility in Arkansas were shot by Abdulhakim Mujahid Muhammad, a black man who was said to be angry about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. A recent convert to Islam, he was expected to have been further radicalized by his recent trip to Yemen on a Somali passport. Media consensus of the event implied that Muhammad had a legitimate political grievance against America, rather than characterizing him as a Muslim fanatic intent on bringing jihad to America.

Scenario 3: On June 10, James von Brunn, an 88-year-old white supremacist and Neo-Nazi, shot two guards, killing one of them, at the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. The government-controlled media in unison characterized Brunn as a typical "right-wing conservative Christian" driven by hate, yet in actuality von Brunn was a Darwin-lover who hated the Bible and Christians, a man who advocated

the Democrat socialist policies espoused by Adolf Hitler and used Darwinian theory to support his anti-Semitism. Do you notice a pattern here? The liberal lies of “conservative hate” regarding these three tragic murders reminds me of the aftermath of the JFK assassination and how it was thoroughly perverted by Democrats and the government-controlled media to achieve two concurrent objectives: 1) Marginalize the GOP by characterizing them as “the hate that killed JFK,” and 2) Create the Camelot myth that JFK was a champion of FDR’s welfare state, but for the assassin’s bullet.

National Review writer Jonah Goldberg, in his best-seller *Liberal Fascism: The Secret History of the American Left, From Mussolini to the Politics of Change*, devoted an entire chapter on the myth of JFK. Here are a few highlights:

- ❖ Shortly after the JFK assassination on Nov. 22, 1963, a very young news correspondent named Dan Rather picked up on the gossip of the time calling Dallas, “the city of hate.”
- ❖ “Kennedy’s aides blamed deranged and unnamed right-wingers.” “He didn’t even have the satisfaction of being killed for civil rights,” Jackie lamented to Bobby Kennedy when he told her the news. “It had to be some silly little Communist.”
- ❖ “Camelot” or the Kennedy-media-created myth that JFK died battling “hate”—established code, then and now, for the political right.
- ❖ Supreme Court justice Earl Warren, who LBJ tapped to write the official report on the JFK assassination, remarked on the “climate of hatred” in Dallas, due to the heavy concentration of Republicans in that city, that drove Lee Harvey Oswald to kill the president.

How does the psychosis of “displacement” apply to the JFK assassination? Goldberg wrote, “Amid the fog of denial, remorse, and confusion over the Kennedy assassination, an informal strategic response developed that would serve the purposes of the burgeoning New Left as well as assuage the consciences of liberals generally: transform Kennedy into an all-purpose martyr for causes he didn’t take up and for a politics he didn’t subscribe to.”

Displacement psychosis and liberal deceit continues in modern times. Remember Obama, Hillary and Rahm Emmanuel’s mantra—*You never want a good crisis to go to waste*. Implicit in this Machiavellian aphorism is the political rationalization “The end justifies the means.” Liberals are viewed as inherently good, and all the good works they intend for

"the poor" must be allowed by divine right whether We the People are smart enough to vote for them or not. On the other hand, Republicans, particularly conservatives, are considered evil incarnate by conventional liberalism. Conservatives like Sen. Joe McCarthy, Ronald Reagan, Michael Savage, Justice Clarence Thomas, Newt Gingrich, Tom DeLay and Sarah Palin are considered worst than Osama bin Laden, Hitler, Iran and North Korea by the government-controlled media. Why? Because they integrate law and morality and they are effective exponents of conservative ideas. This is blasphemous to liberals because liberals view Obama as "sort of God," as recently demonstrated by Newsweek's Evan Thomas, and liberalism and politics the only true religion.⁶

How did liberals transfer *their* hate to conservatives to kill the truth? Liberals got away with hate displacement under Woodrow Wilson (1913-21), America's first fascist president whose fascism predated other noted fascist by years—Lenin (1917), Mussolini (1922), Hitler (1933), and Franco (1939). Liberals got away with hate and psychological displacement on a grand under the socialist Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1933-45), electing him to a record four terms. Liberals got away with hate displacement under LBJ (1963-69) who seized the Kennedy Camelot myth and exploited it for his own purposes, which he called *The Great Society*. Today President Obama has wholeheartedly assumed the JFK mantle and the myth, complicit with Hollywood and the state-run media in America, the rival to Hitler's chief movie propagandist, Leni Riefenstahl. They have helped Obama secure the presidential nomination through a complex pyramid of lies that support his naked fascism including innumerable separation of power violations.

Whether you call it psychological displacement, liberal fascism, propaganda, socialism, Islam, government totalitarianism, communism, or the Liberal-Muslim Axis, all of it amounts to the liberal hate that kills truth. Thomas Jefferson said it best: *When the people fear their government, there is tyranny; when the government fears the people, there is liberty.*

ON SCIENCE—ESSAY 4

... BECAUSE LIBERALISM IS A MENTAL DISORDER

October 07, 2009

I believe it's time for the heads of left-wing agitation groups [ACLU, National Lawyers Guild, and MoveOn.org] who are using the courts to impose their will on the sheeple to be prosecuted under the federal RICO statutes.

~ Michael Savage, *Liberalism is a Mental Disorder* (2005)

The theme of this picture is whether men ought to be ruled by God's law or whether they are to be ruled by the whims of a dictator.

~ Cecil B. DeMille, on his 1956 movie, "The Ten Commandments"

Prologue to a mental disorder

In 1615 the great scientist Galileo put his life on the line against the supreme political power in Italy and boldly told the Catholic Church that the earth was *not* the center of the universe (geocentrism), but that the earth and all the planets revolved around the sun (heliocentrism). Einstein tolled for years in obscurity as a lowly patent clerk while working on his experiments from 1895-1905. He was marginalized by his professors as a "dreamer" and a "C student," scorned by his fellow scientists as an oddity, yet his theory of relativity changed the world and ushered in the Nuclear Age. What did these men have in common? Both were intellectual giants who dwelt among the legions of mental midgets of their day, yet they ignored the cacophony of lesser men with duplicitous agendas and fulfilled the transcendent calling of their singular genius.

Why blacklist Michael Savage? The great French philosopher Voltaire, one of the founding fathers of classical liberalism, is credited with saying, I may not believe in what you say, but I will die for your right to do so—yet, where are these sentiments regarding the blacklisting of Michael Savage? Why has not one member of Congress, not one person in the Stalinist-controlled media complex, the ACLU, or free-speech activists of the academy willing to lay aside their own cowardice and indifference and defend this American patriot?—*Because liberalism is a mental disorder*. On May 5, 2009, conservative intellectual and radio host Michael Savage was banned from entering Britain, his name blacklisted by

a Western democracy for two reasons: 1) He was a Jew, and Britain, using egalitarianism (equality of results), wanted to balance their list of Muslim terrorists with other people who were not Muslim; and 2) For 15 years Michael Savage has been *the* most eloquent and vociferous voice in the media chronicling how liberalism has perverted America, Western Civilization and the world. Why would Britain (and America by *de facto* silence) stifle this man's freedom of speech, freedom of expression and freedom of movement?—*Because liberalism is a mental disorder.*

Mr. Paul Yaw, a "Savage Nation" fan, sent me this provocative mis-sive: "On the issue of abortion, why is it that if tomorrow the Mars Explorer found a single-cell amoeba, the mainstream media would be all agog at the discovery of life on Mars? Yet, a multi-celled fetus here on Earth receives not an iota of respect as a microbe or germ on Mars?" — *Because liberalism is a mental disorder.* Why did the American Psychiatric Association categorize homosexuality as a mental disorder in 1968, but by 1973 homosexuality was *per se* removed and in 1986 entirely removed from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) and re-categorized as a normal lifestyle choice?⁷

Did God add an 11th Commandment or apologize for destroying Sodom and Gomorrah? Did Jefferson's "pursuit of Happiness" include same-sex marriage and sex with children? In 1973 did all of the little Sigmund Freuds, Carl Jungs and Alfred Adlers of the American Psychiatric Association have an epiphany regarding homosexuality? No, it's *because liberalism is a mental disorder.* What slavery couldn't do in 400 years to the black family, liberalism has done in just 40 years: single-handedly destroyed it—yet this evil philosophy is the basis of the Democratic Party, the party that sacrificed over 600,000 soldiers in the Civil War to keep black people forever in slavery's bondage. Then why is the Democratic Party as beloved by my people as to vote 96 percent for President Barack Obama and his minions in 2008?—*Because liberalism is a mental disorder.*

Epilogue to a mental disorder

The Greeks have Socrates, Plato and Aristotle; the Italians have Michelangelo and Pavarotti; the Jews have Moses and Einstein; the Germans have Beethoven and Leibnitz; the Danes the Vikings; the Dutch Spinoza, Rembrandt and Van Gogh; the French have Napoleon and Montesquieu; the English have Richard the Lionhearted and Winston Churchill—but

who does Black America have? Double zeros . . . Oprah and Obama. Why?—*Because liberalism is a mental disorder.* On Sept. 11 a blogger on *Liberty News Forum* wrote: “I don’t know about a mental disorder, but somehow our country got a bit twisted. In my research, I’ve learned that our founders believed in collective rights and individual responsibility; today, those 535 idiots in Washington focus on individual rights and collective responsibility. Ergo, a village idiot [Hillary Rodham Clinton] wrote a book titled *It Takes a Village*. Why?—*Because liberalism is a mental disorder.*”

All people of rational intelligence, despite your political ideology, must agree with the premise of Michael’s 2005 book, “Liberalism is a Mental Disorder,” for it is thoroughly based on reason, logic, morality and truth—in contrasts to every aspect of liberalism—from abortion to separation of church and state, from the IRS, NEA, SEC, ACORN, Federal Reserve, to lawyers for dogs, pigs and rats, welfare for freeloaders, activist judges gone wild, the Stalinist-controlled media who refuse to accurately report about our fascist president, etc. The Cecil B. DeMille epigraph demonstrates that 50 years ago Hollywood still tried to create a media that glorified God and uplifted humanity. Why, then, in modern times has Hollywood in virtual unison defended movie director Roman Polanski, who has been a fugitive from justice for 32 years and a convicted pedophile who drugged and sexually abused a 13-year-old little girl? . . . *Because liberalism is a mental disorder.*

ON SCIENCE — ESSAY

CLIMATE MYTH: 4 CORNERS OF DECEIT

November 28, 2009

The fact is that we can’t account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can’t . . . Our observing system is inadequate.

~ Scientist at University of East Anglia’s Climate Research Unit

On Thursday, Nov. 19, a hacker broke into the computers at the University of East Anglia’s Climate Research Unit (CRU) and released 160 megabytes of confidential files onto the Internet—including 1,079 emails

and 72 documents. Over the past 10 days, those materials have now been posted all over the Internet and reveal what most rational people have thought all along—that anthropogenic (man-caused) global warming is perhaps the biggest scientific hoax in the past 150 years, or since publication of Charles Darwin's treatise on evolution, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. (1859). Last Tuesday, radio host Rush Limbaugh, in his commentary on the recent climate-change scandal, put this outrage in a bigger context he referred to as the "four corners of deceit" which consist of: *government, academia, science and media*. This theory is placed in the paradigm of two worldviews that have warred against each other since antiquity—*Veritas vs. Infidus*—a worldview based on Truth vs. a worldview based on the Big Lie. Liberalism with its multiplicity of manifestations—paganism, humanism, Enlightenment, Darwinism, progressivism, Marxism, socialism, fascism, communism, naturalism, Nazism, Statism, and Obamaism—is all part of the same existential Big Lie.

Writer James Delingpole said of the climate-change hoax: "Conspiracy, collusion in exaggerating warming data, possibly illegal destruction of embarrassing information, organized resistance to disclosure, manipulation of data, private admissions of flaws in their public claims and much more." ⁸ One of the alleged e-mails has a gentle gloat over the death in 2004 of John L. Daly (one of the first climate-change skeptics and founder of the Still Waiting For Greenhouse site), commenting: "In an odd way this is cheering news." But perhaps the most damaging revelations—the scientific equivalent of the Telegraph's MP expense scandal—are those concerning the way climate change scientists may variously have manipulated or suppressed evidence in order to support their cause.

Just as 150 years ago the academic world replaced scientific skepticism with cult devotion, holding naturalist Charles Darwin's work as the greatest scientific discovery since Newton, and deified his suppositions as beyond questioning, so have we in modern times through the New World Order and socialism worshiped at the pagan altar of global warming ("climate change"). We allow this Groupthink, despite the existence of irrefutable proof from these phony scientists' own e-mails that all of their scientific data was a fraud perpetrated to get government grants, to further the *Green movement* and to *Save the Planet*. With this voluminous amount of materials now public regarding this climate-change scam,

what has the Stalinist-controlled media done over the past 10 days since this story broke? — Absolutely nothing.

The New York Times is reluctant to give any substantive coverage because the hackers violated the scientists' "privacy" in obtaining the incriminating materials.⁹ The only substantive analysis about this story to date has been on Fox News, as well as on the New media, and on conservative talk radio. Socialists, liberals and progressives feel entitled to lie, steal, cheat and even kill to further their agenda at all costs. Why? Because it is done all in the name of a moral cause greater than ourselves; whether we are talking about saving the polar bear, the spotted owl, snail darter, saving the planet, reducing greenhouse-gas emissions, or upholding the unchallengeable secular principles of science, as Machiavelli stated, *The end justifies the means*.

And what does our exalted leader, President Barack Obama, have to say about this? Well, Obama boldly proclaimed that the world has moved "one step closer" to a "strong operational agreement" on climate change at next month's Copenhagen summit. Countries must "reach a strong operational agreement that will confront the threat of climate change while serving as a stepping-stone to a legally binding treaty," he told a press conference with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh. I thought to myself, is this guy crazy? Is Obama on drugs? Is Obama that insulated from reality that 5 days after the greatest international scandal in science was exposed since Darwinian evolution 150 years ago, Obama doesn't express outrage that the scientists and scientific data behind the climate-change-green movement is all a Big Lie? Moreover, he displays his arrogance even more by redoubling his efforts to cram this climate-change fascism down the throats of the American people. Efforts the anti-climate-change scientists have shown will return our technology use to the year "1867"!

Remember the infamous words of Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's minister of propaganda, who said, "If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it." Indeed, we believed in the Big Lie of Darwinian evolution and got separation of law from morality, eugenics, Nazism, scientific mythology dominating the academy and influencing law, policy and culture. We believe man-made climate change and have already spent billions on policies related to the "green movement" which is a contrived hoax. These modern-day fascists in government, in the academy, in science and in the media are so narcissis-

tic in their zeal to save the world they will do so even if it means destroying the world. Liberalism is so sick and delusional that these people think they have the power to affect the temperature of the earth, which most scientists realize is predicated not on man, but primarily on the sun.

The four deceptions, government, academia, science and media, are all dominated by Machiavellian hacks in Washington, D.C., in Hollywood, in the academy, in corporate America, in science and at the United Nations. Now that we know the truth behind this climate-change scandal from the e-mails at the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit, any person in a position of power to effect energy policy who believes in man-made or anthropogenic climate-change nonsense should all be given a nice straitjacket and put inside a padded cell at the insane asylum.

CHAPTER

~ 10 ~

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY

ON CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 1

SAFIRE, KRISTOL AND *‘THE SPOOK WHO SAT BY THE DOOR’*

September 30, 2009

The purpose of the [1973] film was to encourage blacks to create an action plan to “survive in the belly of the beast” rather than always reacting as victims of a racist society.

~ Sam Greenlee, on the movie adaption, “The Spook Who Sat by the Door”

When I heard the news about the recent deaths of two great conservative icons, Irving Kristol and William Safire, I honestly had mixed emotions. On the one hand, I am saddened when anyone dies, especially two titans of the conservative movement who helped lay the intellectual and literary foundation of conservatism in the 1960s and 1970s, leading to the Reagan Revolution of the 1980s. These two men in a sense were

my intellectual godfathers 21 years ago when I first became a conservative at Harvard during the same time Barack Obama was there being nurtured by ideological opposites of Kristol and Safire.

I remember going to my mailbox to get my weekly copy of the *Conservative Chronicle* and William Buckley's *National Review*. I remember going through used bookstores in Cambridge, in Ann Arbor, in Detroit, looking for books by William Safire, Irving Kristol and his equally intellectual wife, the enigmatic Gertrude Himmelfarb, a scholar of 19th-century Victorian England, but also a leading voice of conservative thought in her own right. Yet, as a young black intellectual I was considered crazy by my friends at Harvard graduate school and at Harvard Law School, where I studied in the late 1980s. They would say, "Man, those racist white folks in the Republican Party don't give a damn about you!" I wanted to prove them wrong, so I reached out to all of the leading conservative writers and intellectuals including Irving Kristol and William Safire.

Well, I got a real big surprise. I wrote hundreds of letters and, later when the Internet came into prominence, literally sent thousands of e-mails with essays, law review articles and books I had written with inquiries (including to Kristol and Safire) pleading to these conservative men and women to accept me into their ranks at the *Conservative Chronicle*, *Commentary Magazine*, the *National Review*, the *Weekly Standard* and with conservative think tanks like the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Hoover Institute, the Cato Institute and the Goldwater Institute.

Their reply to this day?—Silence or form letters stating that they have no openings for me. I was devastated. I felt like CIA agent Dan Freeman, the protagonist of Sam Greenlee's iconic 1969 novel, *The Spook Who Sat by the Door*—a provocative book that critiqued the bad faith of liberalism (and in my case, conservatism). Dan Freeman is chosen to be the token CIA agent so the government can feign racial diversity. Unbeknownst to the government, Freeman is a double agent and planned to learn all the combat secrets he could, to take that training back to his hometown of Chicago and train all the local gangs in guerrilla warfare tactics. As the "freedom fighters," the newly trained former gang bangers under the helm of Freeman become revolutionaries. Sounds precisely like the background of President Obama, doesn't it?

I wasn't asking the GOP and conservatives for a handout or for welfare. All I wanted was a chance. *Is there no room for an intellectual, for a black man in the GOP . . . ? Is there no room in the conservative movement for a spook like me?* Recently, a young man named Kyle wrote me a series of letters expressing his admiration of my WorldNetDaily columns. He said just like I called Justice Clarence Thomas, Walter Williams, Thomas Sowell, Joseph Farah, Michael Savage and others my "intellectual mentors," he considers me his intellectual mentor. I said to myself, "Whoa! I had never had anybody consider me their intellectual mentor before." He also sent me one of his essays for me to critique. Here was my reply:

Dear Kyle,

Nice to hear from you. Thanks so much for your kind words. I am honored and I hope to continue to earn your respect in future articles.

I don't get many e-mails from young people like you. Please keep in touch. If you want to be a good writer, read good writers and over time you will develop your own unique style. Don't let your friends discourage you. Stay independent. Read my articles: "Why I became a conservative" and "Obscurity was good for me." These works will give you strength during the dark days, my friend. . . .

Peace,

Ellis Washington

Long story short, I recommended Kyle's essay to my friend Josh Price, founder and editor of TheConservativeBeacon.com. Josh was very impressed with this young writer and the authenticity and rigor of his ideas. TheConservativeBeacon.com became the first media entity to publish Kyle's work. My youthful charge was so overjoyed that he sent me the following letter:

Professor Washington,

I just want to let you know that my first article was published on The Conservative Beacon today. I can't thank you enough for pointing me in Josh's direction. I hope to do the Beacon justice and keep the conservative movement alive and growing.

Regards,

Kyle Gayman

Indeed, Kyle was published on my 48th birthday (Sept. 22). What a gift *he* gave to me! Who knows where Kyle Gayman will go with his political, literary and intellectual gifts? One day he could become the next

Ronald Reagan, William Buckley, William Safire or Irving Kristol. At least I didn't ignore him. I didn't treat this 17-year-old high school student with arrogant contempt, but respected him as my son. In other words, I didn't treat Kyle as the Spook who sat by the door—ignored, marginalized as a token and starved by a lack of encouragement by those in a position to help. Likewise, three years ago WorldNetDaily.com founder and Editor Joseph Farah, like his biblical namesake "Joseph," took me from the bondage of intellectual obscurity in Egypt and delivered me to the literary Promised Land by making me a legal commentator at WND. Farah's magnanimity led directly to the conservative intellectual Michael Savage recruiting me in July 2009 to be his authorized biographer.

I hope that William Safire and Irving Kristol enjoy perpetual peace in the afterlife. Even so, I must thank them for unwittingly teaching me not to ignore the next generation of conservatives coming up, for *they*, not I, will write our final epitaph. What will they say of us? Did we treat them as the spook who sat by the door? Or did we open the doors of opportunity, encouragement and employment and usher them in?

ON CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 2

DR. MICHAEL SAVAGE: PROMETHEUS IN ENGLAND

June 13, 2009

Prometheus caused blind hopes to live in the hearts of men.

~ Aeschylus' "Prometheus" (fifth century B.C.)

The ancient Greek myth of Prometheus is the tragic and enduring narrative of a heroic figure who many publicly despised but secretly venerated, because he did feats of strength that others had neither the vision, intellect nor the heart to achieve. Prometheus, renown for his clever intelligence, became a champion of humanity when he stole fire from Zeus and gave it to mortals. For this crime Prometheus was bound to a rock by Zeus while a giant eagle ate his liver every day only to have it grow back to be eaten again the next day for eternity. In the earliest treatment of Prometheus found in the epic poet Hesiod's *Theogony* (700

B.C.), Prometheus is introduced as a lowly challenger to Zeus' omniscience and omnipotence. Likewise, 15 years ago Michael Savage began his unheralded radio career bound with the self-appointed mandate to return America, a once great republic, to her founding principles bequeathed to us by the Constitution's framers—*Borders, Language and Culture*.

Prometheus challenged the awesome authority of Zeus by stealing fire from heaven, which gave warmth to the earth thus saving all humanity. Likewise, Savage has put his reputation on the line daily for 15 years as a Ph.D. trained scientist, autodidactic philosopher and historian, zealously defending America's national heritage and waging battle in the arena of ideas against the Zeus's of our time—like Jacqui Smith, the recently deposed home secretary of England who on May 5 libelously and slanderously placed Savage on a blacklist of 16 people banned from England, a list of infamy that included Muslim terrorists, homosexual hate-mongers, neo-Nazis and Russian mobsters.

Zeus meted out unjust and sadistic punishment to Prometheus by chaining him to a rock and commanding an eagle to eat his liver every day, only to have the liver grow back anew each day. Likewise, a similar Sisyphus-like torture was heaped upon Savage by Great Britain whose unprovoked defamation of his name and reputation has *daily* caused Savage's life and the physical security of his entire family to be brought into mortal danger. When Savage pleaded with the Obama administration and sent a personal letter to the president and his secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, to intervene on his behalf as an American citizen, all he received in return was the tormenting cacophony of crickets ringing in his ears. Another famous treatment of the heroism of Prometheus was Percy Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* (1820). Shelley reworks the lost play of Aeschylus so that Prometheus refuses to bow to Zeus (Jupiter), but instead defeats him in a victory of the human heart and intellect over oppressive religion. Likewise, Savage's iconoclastic, defiant nature would never allow him to compromise his moral principles by kowtowing to Zeus (e.g., Obama, England, the GOP, socialism, censorship) even as his fellow conservatives (Rush, Hannity, O'Reilly, Glenn Beck, Mark Levin, Joe Scarborough, Fox News, New York Post, Wall Street Journal, American Enterprise Institute, National Review), as well as the government-controlled media, all stand in silent acquiescence as the eagle (the

literal symbol of the U.S. government) daily seeks to devour Savage's singular voice.

Lord Byron's poem *Prometheus* characterizes the Titan as rebellious. For the Romantics, Prometheus was an irresistible paradigm of *The Man*, alone in the arena who refuses to be corrupted by any form of institutional tyranny as personified by Zeus—church, monarch and patriarch. Romantics like Shelley, Byron and others compared Prometheus with the spirit of the French Revolution, Christ, Milton's Satan and the creative inspiration of poets and artists. Likewise, Savage is indeed a Titan, a man's man who due to his fiery nature at times hurls *ad hominem* attacks at his conservative colleagues and enemies of *Veritas* (truth) and liberty. However, I do not begrudge him. For why is it acceptable for progressives, liberals and Democrats to relentlessly attack conservatives and conservative ideas, yet Rush, Hannity, O'Reilly, Scarborough and the other conservative oligarchs don't seem too offended by these insults? On the contrary, these conservative commissars constantly mention liberals by name, promote their books and even frequently invite them on their programs while concurrently ignoring Dr. Savage. I consider that rank hypocrisy! If they have an argument against Savage, then have the courage to appear on his show to debate him man to man in the arena of ideas.

In a BBC Radio interview Savage had with host Victoria Derbyshire the day before his false accuser, Home Secretary Jacqui Smith, was fired by Prime Minister Gordon Brown in part because the defamation against Savage backfired, Savage was asked if he would ever consider coming back to visit England.² Savage said as soon as the socialist Labour Party is swept out of power, he would accept an invitation to return to England to tell his side of the story before the British Parliament. Prometheus, brother of Atlas, risked all to steal fire from heaven to heat the earth and save humanity. Likewise, with superlative credentials, including a Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley, transcendent ideas codified in over 25 books, five of them New York Times best-sellers, for over 30 years Dr. Michael Savage risked all to speak truth to power, to relentlessly attack the hydra tentacles of the government-controlled media complex. His reward?—Little men are content only to gawk at our modern-day Prometheus as he wages battle in the crucible of the gladiatorial arena . . . alone.

I end this intimate tribute of my friend and intellectual mentor the same way I began, with the enduring words of that magnificent Greek tragedian, Aeschylus, who in his *Prometheus* said: *Prometheus caused blind hopes to live in the hearts of men*. Consequently, who can argue with any level of credibility against Dr. Michael Savage's "blind hopes" in valiantly defending freedom of speech and freedom of expression for all mankind? Surely, in England and in America this man should be memorialized as our modern-day Prometheus. Thank you, Prometheus. . . . Thank you, Dr. Michael Savage.

ON CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 3

THE SAVAGE SILENCE OF THE LAMBS, PART I

May 20, 2009

I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

~ Voltaire (via attribution)

First Principles, Clarice. Simplicity; read Marcus Aurelius. Of each particular thing ask: What is it in itself? What is its nature? What does he do, this man you seek?

~ Hannibal Lecter, Movie: "Silence of the Lambs" (1991)

The enduring words of French Enlightenment philosopher Voltaire—I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it—have stood as a salient sentinel of free speech for over two centuries, yet why do I hear these crickets ringing in my ears? Why aren't the so-called conservative media coming to the rescue of their fellow ideological colleague, radio host and conservative intellectual Dr. Michael Savage? It is the Savage silence of the lambs. In the 1991 movie *Silence of the Lambs*, based on a novel by Thomas Harris, Lecter (Anthony Hopkins), a brilliant but evil psychiatrist, begins a game of quid pro quo with Clarice Starling (Jodie Foster), a young FBI trainee seeking the advice of the imprisoned Lecter on capturing a serial murder with the alias, "Buffalo Bill." In one telling scene Starling tells of how she was orphaned, relocated to an uncle's farm, discovered the horror of the lambs going to

the slaughterhouse and unsuccessfully tried to save one of the little lambs. That horrific, indelible scene that haunted her all those years was the lambs' seeming indifference and silence in the face of utter slaughter.

How does the silence of the lambs apply to Michael Savage? On May 5, Jacqui Smith, the British home secretary, published a list of 16 individuals banned from entering the United Kingdom. Savage was justifiably outraged that his name was placed on the list along with the names of radical Muslims who call for the overthrow of the British government, Hamas murderers, neo-Nazi skinheads and Russian mobsters. Where is the outrage from all the big-named conservative media giants like Fox News, Rush, Hannity, Mike Gallagher, Scarborough, Laura Ingraham, Monica Crowley, Dr. Laura Schlessinger, O'Reilly, Cavuto, Glenn Beck, Greta, National Review, Weekly Standard, Human Events, American Enterprise Institute and The Hoover Institute? Other than one unremarkable short TV segment by O'Reilly and two excellent short stories by Bret Baier at Fox News, there is only the vexing sound of crickets chirping. With the exception of Joseph Farah's WorldNetDaily, I cannot cite a single media entity, think tank or radio host in America that has dedicated themselves to preserving this vital story and keeping it alive with rigorous and trenchant analysis. It is the Savage silence of the lambs.

Jacqui Smith's naked assault on free speech has sparked universal public outrage in England where Savage enjoys 80/20 favorable ratings, but the deafening silence by those conservative voices in America who have built their own careers lamenting and complaining about Clinton, Obama, the "liberal media" and the Democratic Party treating them badly seems akin to crocodile tears or even worse, to the duplicitous treachery of a Benedict Arnold or a Judas . . . but why? Savage answered this question on his radio show last week. Quoting the words of Martin Niemoller, the great German protestant minister who for years suffered in Nazi concentration camps for his outspoken Christian beliefs in the face of Hitler's genocidal mania, Niemoller wrote these famous, poignant lines:

*When the Nazis came for the communists,
I remained silent;
I was not a communist.*

Then they locked up the social democrats,
 I remained silent;
 I was not a social democrat.

Then they came for the trade unionists,
 I did not speak out; I was not a trade unionist.

Then they came for the Jews,
 I did not speak out;
 I was not a Jew.

When they came for me,
 there was no one left to speak out for me.¹

Niemoller was very self-critical and prophetic. In modern times Democrats, through their majorities in Congress, have once again attempted to resurrect the unconstitutional assault on free speech called, the *Fairness Doctrine*. Obama and his fascist legions will undoubtedly come after Rush, Hannity, Scarborough, O'Reilly, Ingraham, Cavuto and Fox News in the near future. Who, then, will fight for them? Who will be their advocate? . . . The GOP?, Themselves? Why have virtually the entire conservative and liberal media so hardened their hearts and closed their bowels of compassion against this magnificent conservative intellectual? Michael Savage, in my opinion, is a singular genius, the rival in his genre to other famous iconoclasts in world history, including Jeremiah, Elijah, Socrates, Montesquieu, Beethoven, van Gogh, Einstein, Hanna Arendt, Churchill, Gen. Patton and Reagan—yet why is he ignored at home and vilified in Great Britain for dedicating his entire life to *Veritas* (truth)? It is the Savage silence of the lambs.

The galling irony of Britain's home secretary's libelous and slanderous attacks on Savage is that this is the land where the Magna Charta was born, where the right to freedom of expression protected by international law and treaties so essential to democracies originated. For years I wondered why the GOP, the Republican National Committee, Hannity, O'Reilly, Joe Scarborough and others in the conservative politics and media regularly invite the most reactionary, radical liberal Democrats and socialists on their programs (to be "fair and balanced") while for 15 years disregarding the comprehensive genius of Michael Savage by rarely or never inviting him on their shows or ignoring him summarily. Intellectuals, conservative talk radio, the GOP and the RNC must understand that Savage's *oeuvre* and worldview transcends mere men, personality, politics, philosophy or emotion, but is in the Parthenon of

godliness, principle, ideas, righteousness and *Veritas*. It is my prayer that conservative talkradio set aside their fears, jealousies and silent acquiescence to the fascist blacklisting tactics of Britain and unite with Savage's righteous cause, defending freedom of speech and freedom of expression in England, in America and throughout the world . . . For to do otherwise, is the Savage silence of the lambs.

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 4

THE SAVAGE SILENCE OF THE LAMBS, PART 2

August 08, 2009

And they were offended in him. But Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house.

~ Matthew 13:57

Hoover Institution fellow Robert Conquest, in a fascinating article, *Inside Stalin's Darkroom*, detailed the extent of communist tyranny of the Soviet Union under Stalin, whereby people who fell out of Stalin's capricious favor could literally be "disappeared" from life, as well as from history. Mr. Conquest writes: "Two groups of people were removed from the visual record. Members of the first group had their revolutionary pasts destroyed (and were murdered) but were remade in Soviet history as terrorist agents of Hitler. Members of the second group simply disappeared and were not heard of again." Regarding the Stalinist tactics used in the May 5 blacklisting of Michael Savage by the United Kingdom in collusion with America and the Obama administration, must we add a third category of the *disappeared*—those unmentioned souls who are left alive but are treated as though they were dead? It is the Savage silence of the lambs.

In an earlier article titled, *The Savage Silence of the Lambs*, I compared the Machiavellian and unjust blacklisting of Savage by our strongest ally, England, to the movie *Silence of the Lambs*. Here is Part 2 of that offering. As a reference, I quote in part from my original article of May 20: "In the 1991 movie *Silence of the Lambs*, based on a novel by Thomas Harris, Lecter (Anthony Hopkins), a brilliant but evil psychiatrist, begins a game of quid pro quo with Clarice Starling (Jodie Foster), a young FBI trainee

seeking the advice of the imprisoned Lecter on capturing a serial murder with the alias, "Buffalo Bill." In one telling scene, Starling tells of how she was orphaned, relocated to an uncle's farm, discovered the horror of the lambs going to the slaughterhouse and unsuccessfully tried to save one of the little lambs." That horrific, indelible scene that haunted her all those years was the lambs' seeming indifference and silence in the face of utter slaughter.

Do you hear that sound, America? It is the tormenting sound of crickets chirping. It is the sound of Prometheus groaning in utter agony as his liver is daily eaten by a giant eagle commanded by Zeus. . . . It is the sound of the Savage silence of the lambs. Why, after two weeks since the release of a major profile of Michael Savage by the venerable liberal magazine *The New Yorker*, has not one TV network, not one major newspaper, not one conservative, libertarian or independent think tank, not one liberal or conservative talk show host invited Michael on their show to interview him regarding this unique and monumental achievement? It is the Savage silence of the lambs.

New Yorker magazine writer Kelefa Sanneh did an excellent job in profiling my friend and intellectual mentor, Michael Savage, not because he was complimentary or unduly fawning of his subject, but because he was fair, honest and introspective in his psychological treatment of this authentic American conservative intellectual.³ Kelefa effectively moved himself out of the way and allowed the reader to use his own intelligence to understand Dr. Michael Savage, the man. Regarding the Michael Savage affair, I would like to echo the comments by Jeff Kuhner who frequently hosts *The Savage Nation Show* in Michael's absence, particularly his revelatory monologue on Aug. 5. Jeff eloquently voiced the passions and frustrations of Michael and *The Savage Nation* audience, pointing out that normally when someone is profiled in the revered *New Yorker* magazine, they are granted instant celebrity status and given entree to all of the major network news, cable, newspapers and radio media.

Note: Past *New Yorker* profiles are a virtual Who's Who of literature, intellectualism, society and culture: Ernest Hemingway, John Updyke, Truman Capote, Rachael Carson, Martha Nussbaum, Vaclav Havel, Barack and Michelle Obama, and the iconic profiles of President George W. Bush by the curmudgeon Seymour Hersh. In other words, everyone knows that a profile in the *New Yorker* is usually a career maker, not a career breaker. However, with the conservative nationalist Michael Sav-

age, all one has heard over the past two weeks since the publication of his New Yorker magazine profile was the deafening Savage silence of the lambs.

The aspect of the Michael Savage affair I find most paradoxical is watching how these normally talkative media demigods daily rail against Democrats and the liberal media (who utterly hate them), yet are all so very silent regarding their fellow conservative presenter, Michael Savage. It makes no logical sense to me. Another example of the Stalinist blacklisting tactics by Sir Winston Churchill's once Great Britain and America can be found in Glen Owen's article on the Michael Savage affair ("US shock jock Savage targeted 'to balance least wanted list'") published in the London Daily Mail:

❖ One message, sent by an unidentified Home Office official on Nov. 27 last year, said that "with Weiner [Savage], I can understand that disclosure of the decision would help provide a balance of types of exclusion cases."

❖ The documents include a draft recommendation, marked "Restricted," saying: "We will want to ensure that the names disclosed reflect the broad range of cases and are not all Islamic extremists."

❖ A further email confirmed the decision was approved at the highest level of Government, saying: "HO [Home Office] intend to include Weiner in their quarterly stats. . . . Both the FS [foreign secretary] and PM [prime minister] are firmly behind listing and naming such people."

❖ One civil servant, again unnamed, counseled caution, saying: "I think we could be accused of duplicity in naming him"—without explaining why—and even added that "the fact that he is homophobic does help."

❖ "We will want to ensure that the names disclosed reflect the broad range of cases and are not all Islamic extremists. Otherwise the exercise could play into the hands of radicals who allege falsely that the unacceptable behaviours policy is targeted specially at the Muslim community."⁴

On the other hand, Michael has repeatedly said on air, "This story is bigger than me, bigger than any single individual or cause." Yet when emails expressing anti-Semitism and evil intent like: ". . . *the Home Office chose him to balance the list of Muslim extremists because he is Jewish*," are slanderously and libelously leveled against Michael's reputation without just cause, what can any man do but zealously seek to redeem his name?

Where is the Nobel Prize laureate and Holocaust activist Elie Wiesel? Why the silence from the Anti-defamation League, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, The America Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), American Jewish Committee, B'nai B'rith International, Rabbinical Council of America, Zionist Organizations of America, Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs? Will the nation of Israel lift a finger to help a fellow Jew who is suffering national and international condemnation without just cause? It is the Savage silence of the lambs.

These people, organizations and nations don't seem to understand that speaking up for the cause of Michael Savage will help themselves and their causes infinitely more. It is self-evident from the information now available through legal discovery and the yeoman efforts of Savage's legal teams in America and England that the administration of British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and America's Obama administration, both working in collusion with each other, singled out and remade Michael Savage as a terrorist agent who should be banned from Britain for "fostering extremism and hatred." Michael isn't fostering extremism and hatred; he is a singular champion of liberty and a tireless advocate of defending America's *borders, language and culture*.

In conclusion, compare the Michael Savage affair to Josef Stalin's redacting of history. Look at the pictures above: If Stalin's own personal assassin and chief of his notorious secret police, the NKVD, wasn't safe from Stalin's "purges," what makes the GOP, the RNC, conservative radio hosts, National Review, the Weekly Standard, Fox News and the rest of the state-controlled media think they will be safe from President Obama's fascist and censorship tactics? Surely these people and organizations must know they will be next. What, therefore, is the response from all the champions defending freedom of speech and freedom of expression regarding the case of Michael Savage, this modern-day Alfred Dreyfus affair? . . . All I can hear is the hypocritical, unconsoling Savage silence of the lambs!

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 5

UNHAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY, NAALCP

July 25, 2009

Prologue to a new hope?

Last week, President Obama was the keynote speaker at the NAACP's 100th anniversary celebration. The NAACP is the premier black civil rights organization founded by Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois and other progressives, including several whites, in 1909. Its storied history boasts of a who's who among black civil rights activists including: civil rights attorneys Thurgood Marshall, Charles Hamilton Houston, Spotswood Robinson, journalists Ida B. Wells and William E. Walling, social workers Mary White Ovington and Henry Moskowitz, just to name a few. Conservative talk-radio host Rush Limbaugh coined the phrase "NAALCP" — National Association for the Advancement of LIBERAL Colored People." He is right. The NAALCP isn't the least bit concerned with black Republicans and has nothing but loathing and an abnormally irrational contempt for black conservatives. If you doubt me, just ask Justice Clarence Thomas how much love the NAALCP showed him during his Supreme Court nomination hearings in 1991. Or ask Judge Janice Rogers Brown who during her 2005 confirmation hearing to the 2nd Court of Appeals received only hatred and derision from the NAALCP. Both jurists refused to fashion their jurisprudence on the totalitarian cult of liberalism. This blatant prejudice against their own people on ideological grounds belies their civil rights moniker as a nonprofit, non-partisan civil rights organization protected by its 501c3 status. In my view, the NAALCP is one of the most radical socialist organizations in America.

Shutting the NAALCP door forever

My relationship with the NAALCP goes back over 35 years ago through my stepfather (Jack Folson), who was one of the ministers of music at Greater New Mount Moriah Baptist Church in Detroit. Who was the pastor?—None other than the legendary Judge Benjamin L. Hooks. He was also president of the NAALCP from 1977-92. In the early 1980s, prior to my becoming a conservative, I was about 20 and in need of a summer

job. Although Rev. Hooks turned me down from a job I wanted at the NAALCP, I hold no grudges, for I learned long ago from Bishop T.D. Jakes that not only must we thank God when He opens doors, but we need to thank God the more for *shutting* some doors in our life. Being rejected by Rev. Hooks and the NAALCP was one of those doors that to this day I thank God for shutting, for where would my life be right now if I were merely one of the 96 percent of my people who mindlessly voted for Barack Obama? What manner of man would I be today if I allowed my heart, mind and soul to be poisoned by the false religion of liberalism? Thank you, God, for shutting some doors in my life.

The NAALCP: 100 years of infamy?

The NAALCP was born out of the progressive movement of the late 19th century. Progressivism favors a statist or egalitarian direction for economic policies (Marxism, socialism) and liberal direction for social policies (welfare state). Progressivism is a radical political and cultural movement in American history whose proponents had a fanatical belief in the verity of science and the will of secular man as having the answers to all tribulations that have plagued humanity. Certainly, the NAACP was needed in the midst of Jim Crow discrimination and institutional racism that exists to this day, but the *means* they went about achieving egalitarian (as opposed to equal) rights for black people in many ways have had a diametrical, catastrophic effect on the black family that lingers to this day.

From its genesis, the NAALCP feigned itself as a civil rights organization, but in reality it is a radical socialist organization that only supports leftist politicians, socialist politics and radical liberal causes, even to the detriment of its own membership. Inimical ideas like eugenics, partial-birth abortion, welfare, anti-death penalty, anti-Second Amendment, closing down Guantanamo Bay, pro-radical environmentalism, and amnesty and health care for 30 million illegal aliens are just a sampling of their radical agenda for America. The NAALCP is virulently anti-conservative and over time increasingly anti-Christian, although ironically, most of the NAALCP membership and leaders are churchgoers and consider themselves "Christians." Nothing in the NAALCP philosophy provides for self-help, pulling ones' self up by the bootstraps or being responsible for one's own life choices and dealing with the consequences as a responsible adult, as Du Bois' contemporary and intellectu-

al foe, Booker T. Washington, constantly preached until his untimely death in 1915.

Epilogue to an existential despair

Two ago weeks, Obama visited slave castles of Ghana, West Africa, historically one of the most infamous places of torture and abuse on earth. Visitors say that spirits can be felt there in those dark, dank dungeons where millions of Africans over many centuries were sold into chattel slavery, in many cases by their own people. Yet in modern times, those same spirits are still imprisoned in self-imposed dungeons of dependency, ignorance and a ghetto mentality; black minds who for generations have been poisoned by the lies of liberalism and the nihilism of envy and excessive complaining—all the while shepherded by today's highly educated oligarchy of black race merchants and poverty pimps.

The cult of liberalism is indeed a deceiving spirit, an invisible slave master whereby 96 percent of black voters, by the tens of millions, willfully chose a man who is presently shackling them in chains of a new slavery of socialism, ignorance, lies, despair and a addiction to government remedies. This insidious connection is made by many others, including a revelatory offering by Judge Janice Rogers Brown who sees the institution of slavery connected to political liberalism bequeathed to us by the civil rights movement.⁵—And that is why I wish you an *UnHappy* 100th birthday, NAALCP!

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 6

HENRY GATES VS. MICHAEL SAVAGE

July 29, 2009

If you want to squelch my free speech, go ahead and try it. By doing so, you'll reveal your true colors. You'll be acting exactly like the [Nazi] Brownshirts that you really are.

~ Michael Savage, *The Enemy Within*

The case of Henry Louis Gates, chair of the Department of African-American Studies at Harvard, and his conflict with the local police with virulent charges of racism and racial profiling brings to the surface some interesting dichotomies with my friend and mentor, Michael Savage, and

his present blacklisting by England and its recently uncovered collusion with America. Let's examine a few of them. Gates is a very well-respected black academic at an elite educational institution, yet his *oeuvre*, in my opinion, is amateurish at best, partisan at worst. For example, in 2000 he and fellow race baiter Cornel West (now at Princeton) collaborated on a book, *The African American Century: 100 Black Americans Who Shaped America*. Of course, I like many other academics was shocked to see that the most influential and intellectually affluent black man and black woman in America, Justice Clarence Thomas and Judge Janice Rogers Brown, were not even listed as part of the 100 most influential blacks, let alone even mentioned in a footnote by these two "scholars."

Michael Savage has two master's degrees and a doctorate from the University of California at Berkeley in the hard sciences. His doctoral thesis was published by Harvard. He has written more than 25 books, five New York Times best-sellers. His radio show, *The Savage Nation* has between 8-10 million listeners per week. Rush, Hannity, O'Reilly, Glenn Beck notwithstanding, Dr. Savage is the most intellectually astute and interesting radio host in America. The Gates affair took place on July 21 when one of his neighbors called the police because she was concerned that two men appeared to be trying to break into professor's Gates house by repeatedly hitting against the front door. What turned out to be an innocent mistake on the neighbor's part could have been diffused by Gates when the white police officer came to investigate, but the good professor instantly visualized a race card and played it with all the skill of an Al "Tawana Brawley" Sharpton or Jesse "Hymietown" Jackson. The Michael Savage affair occurred on May 5 when, completely unprovoked, Britain Home Secretary Jacqui Smith placed Savage's name on a list of infamy along with Hamas baby killers, Muslim fanatics, homosexual hatemongers and Russian Neo-Nazis just to name a few. Of course, Michael and most right-thinking Americans who love freedom of speech and freedom of expression were outraged at these Stalinist tactics against a bona fide conservative intellectual, American patriot and an unabashed Anglophile.

Rush Limbaugh, Hannity, O'Reilly, Glenn Beck, Fox News, conservative think tanks, the government-controlled media and President Barack Obama all were seemingly in rare agreement that the blacklisting of Savage was a good thing. They were happy about his dire plight, and they uttered not a mumbling word of support even when Savage plead-

ed with them daily for help and even sent letters asking that the Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and President Obama use diplomatic backchannels on his behalf as an America citizen, despite their political differences, since they are bound by the Constitution to "protect and defend" Savage's constitutional rights "against all enemies foreign and domestic." This week Rush played extended excerpts of a TV interview of the Gates affair that featured the outspoken demagogue Michael Eric Dyson of the University of Pennsylvania. The good professor skillfully baited Rush by associating him with the Gates affair, knowing that Rush the next day would give this liberal hack primetime air time on his show. It worked like a charm, and the next day Rush spent half of his show giving Tyson expensive air time, yet for 21 years on the radio and in two books, I have yet to hear Rush utter Michael Savage's name once.

In the Bible, Moses had Hur and Aaron to hold up his arms in the pivotal *Battle of Amalek* (Exodus 18:12); Capt. Alfred Dreyfus had the celebrated French intellectual and writer Émile Zola to plead his case in *J'accuse*, but who does Michael Savage have on his side while his good name is viciously slandered and libeled as he is daily blacklisted by our number one ally, England? WND notwithstanding, virtually no other media entity has the courage to champion his cause. In conclusion, I believe in the comforting words of Martin Luther King that, "Truth crushed to the earth will rise again." Therefore, I know that the Savage affair similar to the Dreyfus affair I wrote about a few weeks ago, will one day vindicate Michael Savage's name and reputation. We are already getting glimpses of truth rising up to expose the tangled web of conspiracy, duplicity, lies, deceit and treachery perpetrated against this innocent man. Where an official British document stated these chilling words: . . . *the Home Office chose him to balance the list of Muslim extremists because he is Jewish*. It is the Michael Savage case, not the case of the racial demagogue Henry Louis Gates, that will determine the scope of freedom of speech and freedom of expression in England and here in America.

Gates or Savage?—This is the choice that every American and lover of freedom must make. Will you follow a man who continues to play the race card even as mounting evidence is presented that it was *he* who was guilty of racialism, race baiting and racial profiling? In a just world Henry Louis Gates would be summarily fired for his naked racism and Michael Savage given his position at Harvard. However, in an unjust world Gates is invited to the White House by the president to use as "a teach-

ble moment," while Michael Savage is treated as a pariah. I truly believe that one day Henry Louis Gates' racial demagoguery will be exposed and Michael Savage will be rewarded 100 fold for the unjust pain and suffering he has endured by the hands of England and his own country, who like Hitler's Brownshirts seeks to silence all dissenting voices of reason and *veritas* (truth).

ON CULTURE AND SOCIETY—ESSAY 7

A CRITIQUE OF WALTER CRONKITE

August 01, 2009

It seems to many of us that if we are to avoid the eventual catastrophic world conflict we must strengthen the United Nations as a first step toward a [one] world government patterned after our own government with a legislature, executive and judiciary, and police to enforce its international laws and keep the peace.

~ Walter Cronkite

Walter Cronkite, the legendary TV anchorman, died on July 17, 2009. To most Americans over the age of 50, Cronkite was the always-invited guest at the dinner table as the family sat down to eat in the 1960s and 1970s, the heyday of CBS News. As a young boy, I remember watching Walter Cronkite with my father every evening at 6 p.m. I remember his silver mane, his deep, gruff baritone voice and his trademark authoritative mannerisms that commanded respect. He seemed to me like the General George Patton of network news. The American public believed that if Cronkite reported it, it must be true. If it wasn't true, then when Cronkite reported it, it became the truth. That was how a 10-year-old kid viewed Cronkite. Multitudes of politicians, activists, journalists, academics and ordinary Americans who mourned his death expressed that same singular belief in Cronkite's omniscience regarding any news event he reported on. Yet, can we separate the man from the myth?

Regarding Cronkite's coverage and overt criticisms of the Vietnam War during its waning days, who can forget the normally unflappable President Lyndon Johnson's lament—"If I've lost Walter, I've lost middle America." It was Cronkite who first told us of the Kennedy assassination on that fateful day, Nov. 22, 1963, as he choked back his tears and

removed his glasses to compose himself. Yet, older Americans can remember the storied early years of Cronkite's career: Pearl Harbor, D-Day, the Nuremberg Trials and his work as an embedded news correspondent during the celebrated D-Day invasion on the shores of Normandy, France. Also, it was Cronkite who interviewed the legendary World War II general Dwight Eisenhower right there in his jeep. This brings me to a profound irony.

How did the venerable Walter Cronkite, the sagacious and grandfatherly "voice of America" descend from the jeep of the supreme commander of the Allied forces at Normandy, France in June 1945 to shuttling around Bill and Hillary Clinton on the back of his boat off the coast of Maine in August 1998? Was Cronkite indeed the "most trusted man in America" when he read the news, or was he merely a propagandist, a closeted radical liberal underneath that affable, all-American facade? I believe he was the latter. There is an old saying: *The devil's greatest trick is to make people believe that he doesn't exist*. In my opinion, Cronkite's greatest (or most infamous) legacy during his storied 50-year career as a journalist was to make most Americans believe he was a blue-blooded patriot; a political *progressive* who represented the best ideas of what it was to be an American—liberty, freedom, intelligence, respectability, trustworthiness, unimpeachable character.

Yes, I believe that Cronkite in the early days represented many of the virtuous ideals of Americanism; nevertheless, I believe Cronkite was a hardcore liberal even then. Not the kind of radical liberal, socialist or Marxist hell bent on nihilism and revolution, but like a huge number of Americans born after 1900 who were raised on the egalitarian sophistry of the progressive movement including FDR's *New Deal* and LBJ's *Great Society*. Cronkite was intellectually and politically a progressive. On this point the father of American Progressivism, President Theodore Roosevelt (1901-09) in a speech titled, *The New Nationalism*, used the curious phrase, "human welfare" and further said, "Personal property is subject to the general right of the community to regulate its use *to whatever degree the public welfare may require it*." Although these are the words of Roosevelt, a Republican, they could just have easily been uttered by a Mussolini, Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, or by progressives like Herbert Croly, Walter Lippmann or Walter Cronkite.

The hydra tentacles of progressivism are long, intricate and omnipresent. Recall that it was Theodore Roosevelt who later ran on the *Bull*

Moose or *Progressive Party* ticket against Howard Taft in 1912. For more than a century Progressivism was, and continues to be, the major political philosophy of Congress, which makes *Progressive Candidate A* (a Democrat) vs. *Progressive Candidate B* (a Republican) virtually indistinguishable in a typical election campaign. Indeed, Cronkite exemplifies progressive ideals of egalitarianism (equality of results, not access), statism, radical liberalism and *statolatry*—the worship of the state or the idea that all laws, policies, ideas, legislation and programs must be generated in furtherance not of individual rights and liberties, but toward the predominance of the state being superior to the will of We the People.

In conclusion, one can see Cronkite's socialist and progressive philosophy encapsulated in his famous statement—*The failure to give free airtime for our political campaigns endangers our democracy*. Campaign egalitarianism was Cronkite's *cause célèbre* and he spent many years and much political capital trying to achieve it. Alas, thankfully he failed in this endeavor. In a free society based on individual choice, to demand that privately owned news networks which are publicly traded corporations with board of directors and shareholders, *must* give free airtime to political campaigns sounds good and equitable, but just below the surface are despicable anti-capitalist and anti-freedom of speech suppositions. The evil intent is that Cronkite and his fellow journalist commissars will dictate who is a "viable" political candidate and how much air time they will get. Indeed Stalin called his state-controlled media entity *Pravda*, liberal Democrats call theirs—ABC, CBS, NBC, MSNBC, the New York Times, Time Magazine, Newsweek, "equal time" or the *Fairness Doctrine*.

While I think there was much to admire in the journalist career of Walter Cronkite, overall his liberal legacy of progressivism and the anti-freedom socialist ideas he bequeathed to America are definitely not the actions of a beloved, venerable journalist, but the Machiavellian tactics of a wolf in sheep's clothing.

ON CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 8

WE GLORIFY IRAN'S HITLER AND HATE MICHAEL SAVAGE?

June 20, 2009

I think if it were possible during World War II, that CNN foreign correspondent Christiane Amanpour would have interviewed Hitler in the Fuhrer Bunker just to have his side of the story.

~ Dr. Michael Savage, Monologue, *The Savage Nation* (June 17, 2009)

The banality of evil.

~ Hannah Arendt (1963)

For the rational person who still holds out any hope for an independent press dedicated to reporting the truth, one has only to consider the 24/7 servile press of the presidential elections in Iran. The coverage by the government-controlled media here in America of Iranian politics demonstrates to me that liberals really do have a love affair for fascist dictators. Yet radio host Michael Savage, an authentic American patriot and conservative intellectual with a Ph.D. in the hard sciences from the University of California at Berkeley, is ignored; a modern-day Prometheus, who alone has been waging a protracted war with England since May 5 to clear his name, is vilified when unjustly blacklisted by America's closest ally.

We glorify the Hitler of Iran, yet we hate Michael Savage? While millions of Iranians daily risk death by rioting in the streets of Tehran over the election farce that elevated Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to a second term as president, the government-controlled media here in America, even Fox News, are sycophantic in their obsequious coverage of the Iranian election despite glaring examples of voter disenfranchisement and now a bloody, mounting death toll. But for some tepid, perfunctory remarks by President Obama, his press secretary and State Department officials being "deeply troubled by the level of violence," the Obama administration's apparent complicity with the government-controlled media exhibits a smug and disturbing sense of self-satisfaction regarding the cataclysmic events in Iran.

Whether discussing a nation of millions like Iran or a singular man battling alone in the gladiatorial arena of ideas as Savage has done for

over 15 years, there are some irresistible dichotomies between these two entities I wish to explore:

❖ Iran is a fanatical Muslim nation under the iron fist control of the mullahs. These religious fascists believe that women are second-class citizens, that Israel is “little Satan,” that America is the “great Satan” and that in order to usher the arrival of the 12th Imam, Iran must ignite Armageddon by “wiping Israel off the map” just as soon as they equip their rockets with nuclear warheads.

❖ Savage is a champion of the nation of Israel. He both admires and is very knowledgeable of the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought that brought Israel to her Golden Age under Kings David and Solomon; transcendent ideas that once made America a great republic.

❖ Since the ayatollah’s *coup d’état* drove the shah of Iran from power 30 years ago, Iran has been the world’s greatest exporter of Islamic terrorism. Their litany of crimes against humanity is well-documented—from the 52 American hostages held for 444 days in 1979, to the 241 American soldiers killed by an Iranian truck bomb in Lebanon in 1983, to Iran’s involvement with the 19 Muslim terrorists that killed 3,000 Americans on 9/11.

❖ Iran is currently giving safe haven to wanted terrorist leaders. Iran is the insidious hand behind Syria, which wields *de facto* control of Lebanon under Hezbollah, and Gaza under Hamas, making these nations Iran’s proxies. These are anti-Semitic rogue nations that for decades have committed thousands of terrorist attacks against the nation of Israel.

❖ Savage has never killed anyone. Savage has never called for the death or overthrow of any democratically elected government. In contrast, Savage is America’s modern-day Samuel Adams, a true patriot. I called him Prometheus, yet to this day Savage is treated like the Hitler of Iran while the *real* Hitler of Iran is enjoying universal celebrity and slavish media obeisance.

Don’t let the “protests” in Iran deceive you. The autocratic Iranian government can stop those political demonstrations as easy as China did in 1989 when the communist government brutally crushed the student protests for democracy in Tiananmen Square. In both cases America and the world displayed weakness as evil grew. We glorify the Hitler of Iran, yet we hate Michael Savage?

I believe most neo-Marxists like Obama truly admires the omnipotent power of totalitarian regimes like Venezuela, Cuba, North Korea and Iran and that he and his fascist legions covet such power here in

America for themselves. Obama is the *de facto* dictator of America right now. Newsweek's Evan Thomas last week deified him as "sort of God." In the early 1960s, during the trial of the notorious Nazi Adolph Eichmann, Jewish intellectual and writer Hannah Arendt, reporting for the New Yorker, first coined the aphorism, "the banality of evil." She postulated whether evil is essential to radicalism or merely a function of banality—the propensity of ordinary people to follow commands and conform to mass opinion without critical thought of the moral consequences.

Likewise, are Obama and his government-controlled media accomplices *really* outraged over the Iranian mullah's stealing the election? I think not, because they are both part of the same Liberal-Muslim Axis. Michael Savage, together with Joseph Farah's WorldNetDaily.com, have been shouting from the roof tops that here in America just seven short months ago we elected an unremarkable, untested senator who *to this day* has not revealed to Congress or the American people the following records: Obama's passport records, other travel records, kindergarten records, Punahou school records, Occidental College records, Columbia University records, Columbia thesis, Harvard Law School records, Harvard Law Review articles, University of Chicago articles, Illinois State Bar Association records, Illinois State Senate records and schedules, medical records, Obama/Dunham marriage license, Obama/Dunham divorce documents, Soetoro/Dunham marriage license and adoption records. These grave and numerous omissions by the U.S. government begs the question if Obama is even a *natural born citizen* according to Article 2, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution? On this last point there are currently only five House members out of 535 members of Congress who have signed on to support proposed legislation mandating that all future presidential nominees prove U.S. citizenship . . . *after* Obama. This political cowardice is both deficient and outrageous!

In the end, what is the difference between the mullahs stealing the election in Iran versus President Obama and the Democratic Party stealing the election here in America? . . . which is why we glorify the Hitler of Iran and hate Michael Savage.

ON CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 9

WHY SAVAGE'S *AD HOMINEM* ATTACKS?

May 27, 2009

Truth is the best defense.

~ Legal aphorism

Out of the 250-plus replies I received regarding my recent article, *The Savage Silence of the Lambs*, and the radio interview Dr. Savage did of me, about half of the respondents took up my challenge to answer the rhetorical question—"Why have virtually the entire conservative and liberal media so hardened their hearts and closed their bowels of compassion against this magnificent conservative intellectual, Michael Savage?" Here is a summary of their various replies to my challenge:

- ❖ The reason why Fox News, Rush, Hannity, conservative talk radio and the mainstream media daily ignores the work of Michael Savage is because he calls them names all the time.
- ❖ Savage has mocking epithets for all the big-named conservative talk show hosts: "Hush Bimbo," "the golfer" (Rush Limbaugh), "the wall-banger" (Sean Hannity), "the leprechaun" (Bill O'Reilly), "the hemorrhoid with ears" (Glenn Beck), etc.
- ❖ Because of Savage's *ad hominem* attacks against the GOP, the liberal mainstream media and conservative talk-show hosts, they are having their revenge by ignoring him during his hour of need. Michael is now reaping what he sowed.

While admittedly these criticisms hold some merit, in the main I consider all these arguments to be ultimately illogical and sophistic. Here's why. One of my many erudite readers, Chris Provenzano of Chicago, offered his rationale regarding Jacqui Smith, the British home secretary, having slanderously and libelously attacked Michael Savage in early May when England blacklisted Savage and placed him on a banned list with 16 of the most murderous terrorists in the world.

Mr. Provenzano wrote: "All of those other so-called conservative commentators you listed are "bought and paid for," and they all sing off the same sheet of music. On many occasions, Michael has called these people out for doing so, and obviously he bruised their egos. Since they

lack the intellectual capacity to take on Michael when he does challenge them, what better satisfaction for them than to see him under attack from a foreign government?" I agree. These conservative commentators realize that Savage is head and shoulders above them intellectually, philosophically and spiritually. Because of their lack of inner truth and intellectual honesty, rather than learning from Dr. Savage or taking his criticisms of them to heart, they take the intellectually dishonest approach, put on their hypocrite's hat and do the *very* things against Savage that they for 20 years have so incessantly and bitterly complained that the Democratic Party and the liberal mainstream media did to them—ignoring them, slandering them, libeling them, mocking them. It is shameless hypocrisy writ large! Savage was specifically chosen for crucifixion over Rush, Hannity and O'Reilly because he, more than any other philosopher, politician, intellectual or media figure, gives America the brutal truth about the hijacking of their country by the fascist Manchurian Candidate, President B. Hussein Obama. Furthermore Savage, more effectively than anyone else I know passionately delineates what America must do to regain her "borders, language and culture."

George Orwell once said, "During times of universal deceit, telling the truth becomes a revolutionary act." Because Savage tells the truth during times of universal deceit, he is considered a revolutionary—an epithet he embraces with delight. Furthermore, unlike Fox News, Rush, Hannity and O'Reilly, Savage was never in the tank for the Republican Party or the one-world socialism of Bush 41, Clinton or Bush 43, leading to the apotheosis of Obama. Neither did Savage behave as a *de facto* mouthpiece for the GOP as most conservative commentators did until the Bush recession of 2008 made that position untenable. On the contrary, since he first appeared on the radio 15 years ago, Savage raised hell against the corrupt, incompetent political class of Washington, D.C., writing five New York Times best-sellers as well.

I love the enduring words of Jesus Christ who wasn't always a "man of peace." Jesus, both at the beginning *and* the end of his ministry on earth, literally raised hell by going into the seat of Judaism, the Temple at Jerusalem, attacked the false religious leaders with a whip, overturned tables and drove the moneychangers from the holy Temple of God. In Luke 13:32, Jesus even called King Herod "that fox," and in Matthew 16:22-23 told his best friend, his chief disciple, the Apostle Peter to "Get thee behind me, Satan." Those certainly sound like *ad hominem* attacks to

me. Like it was with the iconoclast Jesus Christ 2,000 years ago, so it is with the iconoclast Dr. Michael Savage in modern times; Savage lives by *Veritas* (truth) and he will die by *Veritas*. Yes, Jesus called names and wrecked the Temple to purify it. Yes, Savage oftentimes uses *ad hominem* attacks against other conservative radio hosts, against his ideological detractors and against the mainstream media and the political power-brokers in Washington, D.C. In my book, that makes him a truly heroic figure in the tradition of an Elijah, Socrates, Richard the Lionhearted, Ronald Reagan or a Sen. Joseph McCarthy, not merely a bomb thrower.

I believe that history will one day judge this man, Michael Savage, and his entire *oeuvre* over the past 30 years, to be the singular genius that he is. My suggestion to the GOP, the RNC, Fox News, Rush, Hannity, O'Reilly, Beck, Scarborough, conservative think tanks and any member of the mainstream media that has a beef against Savage is to contact him, set up a time to appear on his show and air out your grievances—man to man, point by point, line by line, precept by precept. If you are able to prove Savage's *ad hominem* attacks against you to be spurious or wrong, I assure you that Dr. Savage is a big enough man to apologize to your face and to his 10 million listeners. In conclusion, regarding Savage's *ad hominem* attacks, the great Greek philosopher Socrates would perhaps ask this dialectical question: *Do these people or media entities have the courage and intellectual honesty to enter the crucible of the Savage Nation?* I answer with the ancient legal rule of law—*Res Ipsa Loquitur*, the thing speaks for itself.

ON CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 10

WHY CHENEY, OLSON COMPROMISED TRUTH

June 06, 2009

Reason obeys itself; and ignorance submits to whatever is dictated to it.

~ Thomas Paine

Does *Veritas* (truth) transcend philosophy, politics, religion, family loyalty, economics, society, culture? I believe it does, although admittedly one will sometimes have to make difficult choices. In recent times two standard bearers of the Republican Party have created controversy by

going against their conservative principles. Former Vice President Dick Cheney, in a well-publicized speech last week, used states' rights and egalitarian arguments speaking in favor of same-sex marriage: "I think, you know, freedom means freedom for everyone," Cheney said in a speech at the National Press Club. "I think people ought to be free to enter into any kind of union they wish, any kind of arrangement they wish. "And I think that's the way it ought to be handled today, that is, on a state-by-state basis. Different states will make different decisions. But I don't have any problem with that. I think people ought to get a shot at that," he said.

Ted Olson, the former solicitor general under Bush 41, was also the lead counsel before the Supreme Court that essentially won the presidency for Bush 43 in the pivotal case, *Bush v. Gore* (2000). Now, Olson is part of a legal team including co-counsel and Bill Clinton crony David Boies that has filed suit in California federal court seeking to overturn Proposition 8 and re-establish the right of same-sex couples to marry. The suit contends that the state's marriage prohibition, upheld Tuesday by the California Supreme Court, violates the federal constitutional right for same-sex couples to marry. "I personally think it is time that we as a nation get past distinguishing people on the basis of sexual orientation, and that a grave injustice is being done to people by making these distinctions," Olson recently remarked. "The Constitution protects individuals' basic rights that cannot be taken away by a vote," Olson said.

I must state unequivocally that I am shocked by the anti-constitutionalism of these two giants of the GOP. Why are these men on such a public crusade promoting perverse liberal ideas? Thomas Paine, a champion in the early days of the American Revolution, answers my question in this wise—*Reason obeys itself. Ignorance submits to whatever is dictated to it.* Cheney and Olson have dedicated their careers to promoting reason, conservative principles and conservative moral values. Both men have also suffered great criticism from the state media and liberal Democrats for their seemingly incorruptible stance on conservatism. Yet we have the antecedent of Paine's sublime words. Like all men, Cheney and Olson are merely men of flesh and blood. One of the most obstinate human weaknesses is the desire to fit in, to be wanted, to be part of the "in crowd." Even President Ronald Reagan bowed to feminist pressure groups to nominate the first woman to sit on the Supreme Court: Sandra Day O'Connor, whose 25 year tenure (1981-2006) was a bitter disap-

pointment to Reagan and his conservative legacy that sought to promote strict constructionist constitutional jurisprudence.

Reagan wanted to fit in, and the Constitution suffered reproach. So it is with Cheney and Olson today. Nobody likes to be a pariah all the time. Cheney and Olson are quintessential conservative Americans. They have feelings. I theorize that their public pronouncements in favor of gay marriage stem deeper than Cheney's lesbian daughter, Mary Cheney, and Olson's *mea culpa* for "stealing" the 2000 election from Al Gore. That would be too simplistic an argument. No, these men have a longing that all men have above virtually all else—the yearning to be loved. Sometimes this desire for love can be so compelling that it can lead one to places of infamy.

In a recent article on the Israel/Iran crisis titled, "Israelis growing increasingly anxious about Obama policies," one comment by "Gabriel" seemed to voice the frustrations of the treacherous duplicity of Republicans here in America during the Age of Obama, writing that: "The takeover of GM has been primarily engineered by Democrats, although Republicans aren't offering much resistance. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were regulated into failure by Democrats (forcing them to give loans to unworthy applicants). The collapse of Enron was brought about by loopholes put in there by Republicans, but supported by Democrats. The huge military industry which takes such a huge portion of taxpayer money is championed by Republicans, but supported by Democrats as well. The failing education system is run by Democrats, but Republicans want to infect private schools with the same conditions of failure that have infected the public schools."⁶ Everywhere you look, Republicans and Democrats are working together to hasten the demise of our country. How many Republicans have spoke out against Obama's hollow demands for a halt to the illegal settlements?—None. Gabriel speaks like the great Israel prophets of old. Republicans stand for nothing. They have virtually morphed into the Democrat Socialist Party.

I conclude where I began, with the enduring words of Thomas Paine: *Reason obeys itself. Ignorance follows what is dictated to it.* America, will you compromise *Veritas* even for expedience's sake, for historical revisionism's sake (Olson)?—Or to maintain the fragile love of your daughter or endeavor to get liberals to like you (Cheney)? Truth must never be compromised even for short-term gain, for to do so is the commit the folly of Goethe's *Faust*, who made a deal with the devil and in the end, lost his

soul. Compromising on truth for whatever good reason will cause the eventual destruction of all that you love and hold in reverence. It is impossible for rational men who declare to venerate the Constitution's framers to support a constitutional right to same-sex marriage unless you first make the fascist, anti-intellectual leap to separate legality from morality. While I admire you, Vice President Cheney and Solicitor General Ted Olson, I love America and its immutable principles founded on *Veritas*, liberty, Natural Law and the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought, eternally the more!

CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 11

iMICHAEL JACKSON

July 04, 2009

A huge talent is gone . . . by his own doing.

~ Billbrady (blogger on Breitbart.com, June 27)

iMichael at Motown, Detroit, MI *circa* 1970

I was 8 years old when "The Jackson 5" hit the airwaves. The new hit song *A-B-C* was blaring outside storefront record stores. I can still remember listening to that song over and over and struggling to do the dance steps that iMichael did so effortlessly on TV. That record was cut at Barry Gordy's Motown Records, in the basement of a converted home on W. Grand Blvd., about five miles from where I was born in Detroit, Mich.

For an 8-year-old boy born in the ghettos of Detroit, surrounded by blight, ignorance and despair, the Jackson 5 were like euphonious angels descended from heaven. We couldn't get enough of these boys and their wonderful new music. However, as I matured and started learning things at the library independent of my peers, popular culture, or conventional thinking, I soon became bored with mere pop music entertainers and only found intellectual stimulation in the works of the classical masters. Indeed, the Jackson 5 and other Motown groups made millions from poor black people in cities and towns across America, but what happened after the music stopped? I (we) had to "look at the man in the mirror." I came to the painful, Sisyphus realization that I was still in the

ghetto, still surrounded by a dysfunctional community and still mired in debilitating pathology, or what conservative scholar Dinesh D'Souza in his book, *The End of Racism*, referred to as "promiscuity, ignorance and crime." How could I get my *body* out of the ghettos of Detroit? More importantly, how could I transcend a ghetto mentality and get my *mind* out of the ghetto . . . forever?

The public library: Segregation & salvation

After the 1967 riots in Detroit, one of the worst in American history, to protect us my mother made us spend Saturdays at the local library, starting at age 5. This epiphany experience taught me two profound things: 1) The library taught me that knowledge is power; and 2) The library taught me not to automatically accept the opinion of others (even adults) without first confirming it with other sources, preferably original sources. Indeed, for a time I was beguiled by the cult of iMichael and the Jackson 5, but even as a little kid of 8, 9, 10 years old, I began to see that the world of entertainment was a world of delusions and psychosis: "The Ed Sullivan Show," tens of thousands of hysterical girls who didn't even know you jostling to touch the hem of your garment, trips around the world, TV commercials, radio appearances, limos, big mansions in California; a surreal, existential pathology that I wanted nothing to do with. I wanted to live, move, thrive and operate *in reality*, in the here and now; therefore, the older I got, the less enamored I was of iMichael. By the time his *Thriller* album came out in 1982, I was 21, a college graduate. iMichael was irrelevant to me.

The legacy of iMichael—vanity

What is the legacy of iMichael? Yes, on one level it is excitement, fame, fortune and the cult of celebrity. Yet, despite a billion dollars in record sales, I can hear the words of the ancient king of Israel, Solomon, ringing in my ears: *Vanity of vanities all is vanity saith the preacher!* Although King Solomon never met iMichael, he prophesied the narcissism, futility and worthlessness of his entire body of work in those sublime words for the ages: "Vanity of vanities . . ." If you doubt my analysis of iMichael, look dispassionately at his *oeuvre*. What really has he left the world? What substantively has iMichael contributed to humanity to make this world a better, safer place for children, a godlier planet? This infantile socialist

utopianism reminds me of the chorus to one of Michael Jackson's most iconic songs; a lyric glorifying secular humanism, *We are the World*.

Ask yourself has that song, which netted hundreds of millions of dollars, brought world peace or an end to poverty since 1985 when the song was written? Has iMichael and his cadre of the world's most noted entertainers (Quincy Jones, Lionel Richie, Diana Ross, Steve Wonder, et al.) that created, produced and sang that song, filled one hungry belly of a child so that they would never hunger again? Did that song stop one dictator from plunging yet another nation into chaos and civil war? . . . Absolutely not! What, then, is the true legacy of iMichael separate and apart from titillating the masses and sycophantic Hollywood propaganda? The answer is found in a revelatory comment posted on Breitbart.com by "Afuel":

[The] Hollywood freak show continues. Jackson succumbs to his problems with life, all the usual suspects surround him: lawyers, doctors, agents and many so-called friends and acquaintances, all looking for a score. The sick fans, living their fantasies through him, caring less about him even when they say they love him; all the time bleeding Jackson's very life away and pushing him further into the depths of his psychosis. The real truth will come out now that he is dead, while the real money is now going to be made with a larger cut for all with Jackson not sharing in loot. . . . Another Hollyweird archive story.⁷

Requiem in 'C' (for Circus)

In the late first century A.D., the great Roman poet and satirist Juvenal once famously wrote—*Two things only the people anxiously desire: bread and circuses*. Two-thousand years later the people haven't changed. President Obama has promised America the bread of welfare, union care and health care. A commentator on Breitbart.com regarding the death of Jackson gave us the circus, saying we now have "one less freak in this circus called Life." RIP, iMichael . . . yet the circus continues.

CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 12

J'ACCUSE ENGLAND! J'ACCUSE AMERICA!

July 08, 2009

J'accuse! (I accuse!)

~ Émile Zola

On Jan. 13, 1898, the celebrated French writer and intellectual Émile Zola risked his career and endangered his life when his letter *J'accuse!* was published on the front page of the Paris daily *L'Aurore*.⁸ This famous letter was a scathing indictment against the French government for unjustly condemning a war hero, Capt. Alfred Dreyfus, to Devil's Island and covering up evidence of his innocence. This passionate letter *J'accuse* has stood through the ages as a singular expression of indignation and accusation against corrupt powerful persons, organizations and nations.

Now, 100 years later, the Dreyfus Affair has now crossed the English Channel in the case of Michael Savage. After several weeks of relative quiet regarding the May 5 blacklisting of radio host Michael Savage, Jim Meyers of Newsmax dropped a bombshell article on July 1 that chronicles the recent admission by the British government that it *did not* consult with the U.S. and the Obama administration regarding the exclusion of Michael Savage from England.⁹ As remarkable as that statement is, it made an even more incredible admission that England *is* now presently speaking with ranking members of the Obama administration about the blacklisting of Michael Savage.

The May 5 blacklisting of Savage is suspiciously close to—and I believe connected with—a lawsuit Savage filed in mid-April against Department of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano over a DHS report suggesting U.S. military veterans could be targeted as right-wing extremists. Furthermore, Savage has been the most vociferous critic of the socialist policies of the Obama administration, and we know how defensive and petulant President Obama can get when he is criticized.¹⁰ Britain's defensive and convoluted reply on the case of Michael Savage amounts to a non-denial denial. It smacks of conspiracy, cover-up, lies and collusion at the highest levels of the world's two most powerful governments.

Here is my theory on how the Obama administration colluded with Britain to blacklist Michael Savage:

- ❖ Let us float a "Fairness Doctrine" trial balloon with our ally across the pond before we bring it home to America.
- ❖ Let us pick a sacrificial lamb: a conservative of some notoriety, yet controversial with few friends in the state-run media or among his conservative peers.
- ❖ Let us associate him with the most evil, irredeemable criminals on the planet.
- ❖ And let us wait and watch with glee as his fellow conservatives lurch back into the shadows, shut their normally big yaps on this case and not come to Michael Savage's defense.

Why? Because big shot conservatives like Rush, Hannity, O'Reilly, Beck, Scarborough, Fox News and conservative think tanks are deathly afraid that they will be next to be blacklisted.

The Machiavellian plot of the British and U.S. government against Michael Savage, an American patriot and self-confessed Anglophile is really appalling. Their scheme would have worked, but they only made one mistake: They picked the wrong man to blacklist. They underestimated this man. Michael Savage is a Promethean figure who has the courage and fortitude to take his case all the way before the British Parliament if necessary. If Prime Minister Gordon Brown's administration put Michael Savage's name on this list of infamy, then surely it had to be approved by or at least made aware of to the prime minister himself. There is no plausible deniability here. Also, since Savage's radio program isn't broadcast in England, *how* did it learn of him? Who ratted him out?—Perhaps some useful idiot in the bowels of the Obama administration?

How can England so conspicuously try to postdate its collusion with America to ban Savage two months *after the fact*, or until conservative MP Nigel Evans sent his letter of inquiry regarding the Michael Savage case to the secretary of state for the Home Department, asking "what discussions his department has had with the U.S. administration on the creation of the list of foreign nationals barred from entry to the U.K., with particular reference to the inclusion of Michael Savage on that list." A reply came from Phil Woolas, minister of state in the Home Office and a member of the Labour Party: "The Home Office did not consult the U.S. administration about the creation of the list of foreign nationals who are

excluded from the United Kingdom on unacceptable behavior grounds, which included U.S. citizen, Michael Savage. "However, following publication of the list, Home Office and FCO (Foreign and Commonwealth Office) officials have discussed the Government's policy on exclusion with American officials."

Who are these unnamed American officials? This British-American axis amounts to collusion to exclude Savage. Furthermore, it is a modern-day metaphor of the *Dreyfus Affair* regarding the unjust conviction, imprisonment and cover-up of Capt. Alfred Dreyfus, a decorated war hero, a French citizen of Jewish extraction who was falsely accused of treason by France in 1894. At least Capt. Dreyfus had the celebrated writer and intellectual, Émile Zola, to defend his cause, but who does Michael Savage have on his side? England and America can no longer ignore the public outcry against Savage's freedom of speech and freedom of expression being egregiously violated. This was evident when Home Secretary Jacqui Smith resigned on June 5, one month to the day after she published England's blacklist which defamed Michael Savage.

Justice Louis Brandeis was right: *Sunlight is the best disinfectant*. England, America: Tell us what you knew and when you knew it. Michael Savage only wants his name taken off that list of infamy and given an apology by the British government. If Capt. Alfred Dreyfus had to wait 12 years—from his arrest in 1894, to his conviction the following year, to his pardon in 1899 and official exoneration and annulment of all charges by the military in 1906—then how long must Dr. Michael Savage wait to get justice? *J'accuse* England! . . . *J'accuse* America!

CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 13

JOSEPH FARAH, MY FRIEND

August 11, 2009

[The natural born citizenship issue will] plague Obama throughout his presidency. It'll be a nagging issue and a sore on his administration, much like Monica Lewinsky was on Bill Clinton's presidency. . . . It's not going to go away, and it will drive a wedge in an already divided public.

~ Joseph Farah (Aug. 2009)

This is a tribute article to my boss and my friend, Joseph Farah, who is the founder and CEO of WorldNetDaily.com, the leading independent news source on the Net. Although I have never formally met Joseph Farah, I am intimately acquainted with the man through reading his daily columns, whose intellectual depth makes me feel like I am having a marvelous dialogue with a long lost friend who is now found. Although personally I have never spoken one word to this man, I feel that I know him better than many of my own relatives, people I attend church with, or even those with whom I grew up back in the day. "Ellis, if you never have met or spoken to Joseph Farah, how can you call him your friend?" I'm glad you asked.

In a 2007 article, *Obscurity was good for me*, I recalled my first encounter with Joseph, which had occurred 10 years earlier in 1997, during the maiden voyage of WorldNetDaily.com:

Ten years ago, Joseph Farah, founder of WorldNetDaily, had the vision, courage and intellect to start WND, and it has flourished exceedingly and abundantly. For 10 years, it was my daily bread as I wrote books nobody purchased or read.

A few weeks ago, at this most commendable milestone of WorldNetDaily's 10th anniversary, I received a note from Joseph Farah asking me to join the publication as a commentator. I did not give him time to change his mind, and I promptly accepted.

Joseph recently told me that for years he had watched my career grow from afar and had admired my work. (His unwritten words were that he knew that I had potential, but it wasn't time yet). My weekly column is called: —the same title God put in my heart exactly 25 years ago!¹¹

While I don't want this tribute article to become unduly fawning, I really want the reader to understand how grateful I am to Joseph Farah and to WND for giving me, a unknown black American, a chance to be a weekly commentator for this invaluable news source after being in Sisyphus obscurity as an unknown writer and thinker since 1983, when I wrote my first serious articles on aesthetics and political philosophy. It was February 2007 when Farah by chance saw some sample articles I had sent to editors at WND as part of my application to be a commentator there and decided to publish them.

It was Farah working years as a professional journalist and editor at the Los Angeles Herald Examiner and the Sacramento Union that gave

him the discerning eye to recognize new, untapped talent. Without Farah's support, I think I would still be unknown to the state-controlled media, the law academy, the GOP, the RNC and conservative writers who claim they want to "help the disenfranchised." Before I had met Joseph, I literally sent thousands of e-mails and hundreds of letters with my articles and books attached literally begging managing editors, think tanks, TV executives, Christian ministers, academics, scholars, intellectuals, the GOP and conservative media demigods to give me a chance; to interview me, print some of my work or mention my books on politics, the Supreme Court, constitutional law, culture and society. Their response over the past 26 years . . . NOTHING!

Joseph Farah and WND have been on the cutting edge of many stories that other media entities either are too afraid to report or too apathetic to be interested in. Farah has distinguished himself through WND to go where no media entity has gone before (to paraphrase the intro to the "Star Trek" TV show). If you doubt me, pick any controversial story possessing substantive news interest, gravitas, constitutional or cultural issues, and chances are WND has either broken the story wide open or has been the lone wolf to continue the story long after other media entities have moved on:

- ❖ The story of conservative radio host Michael Savage being black-listed on May 5 by Great Britain in collusion with America and the Obama administration;
- ❖ President Obama's failure to provide definitive proof of his natural born citizenship according to Article 2, Section 1, Clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution;
- ❖ President George W. Bush bankrupting the country years before he ruined the U.S. economy;
- ❖ Muslim fanatics committing genocide against Christians, Jews, churches and synagogues across the world;
- ❖ WND derailed the amnesty-for-illegal-aliens bill;
- ❖ WND exposed the cap-and-trade and the global warming hoaxes;
- ❖ WND consistently exposed RINOs (Republicans in name only);
- ❖ WND championed the tea party movement;
- ❖ WND led the detailed exposure of Obama's universal *death care* bill and the public backlash currently taking place at town hall meetings throughout the United States;
- ❖ Farah alone continues defending himself against universal black-listing and vicious libel and slander leveled against his name by social-

ist radicals and the state-controlled media for 12 years since his co-founding of WorldNetDaily with his dear wife, Elizabeth.

These are just a few examples of the many important news stories the Stalinist news media are too gutless to tell the truth about to the American public.

In conclusion, Joseph Farah is a man's man. He is fearless and is loyal only to God, America and the truth. His indefatigable spirit and prolific output in writing an original and interesting column every day, as well as path-breaking books such as *Taking America Back: A Radical Plan to Revive Freedom, Morality and Justice*, his informative online intelligence newsletter, *Joseph Farah's G2 Bulletin*, and many news articles from a career as a professional journalist spanning over 30 years, is an achievement that even conservative icon Bill Buckley would be envious of.¹² Exceeding gratitude to you, Joseph Farah, and to all the editors, writers and staff at WorldNetDaily.com for being a clarion voice of *Veritas* (truth), when all other voices have either been silenced or compromised.

CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 14

MY RESPONSE TO NAACP

August 19, 2009

Prologue to a dialogue

Dear Ellis:

John Matthews—*Aug. 13*: I am the editor for my NAACP branch's newsletter and I found your article "Unhappy 100th birthday, NAACP" curious and interesting. I look forward to hearing from you and hope you would grant me permission to print your article and answers to the above questions in our branch newsletter. If you grant me permission to print your article and comments, I would not make any changes and acknowledge article was originally posted on WorldNetDaily on 7/25/09. However, I have some questions . . . /s/ John

Ellis Washington—*Aug. 14*: I must say I am surprised to get correspondence from a NAACP member. Although I have been writing on law, race, cultural and societal issues for 26 years, you are the first official from any civil rights organization that has written me.

I'm right in the middle of a deadline for a biography I'm writing on Michael Savage.

You seem to be a rational and honorable man. I promise to respond to your questions by this weekend.

Peace,
Ellis Washington

Letter to South Carolina member of the NAACP

Dear John Matthews:

Here are my answers to the intelligent and thoughtful questions you posed to me last week. You have my permission to publish this article and use it in the manner you deem best to educate those who wish to become enlightened on *real* systemic solutions to the race question:

1. *What are the "lies of liberalism" that are poisoning black minds?*

While I and many other political philosophers and conservative intellectuals have written for decades about the many "lies of liberalism," most notably, Thomas Sowell, Walter Williams and Shelby Steele, allow me to put your question in a historical context.

Beginning in the 1890s, a new cultural and philosophical movement was launched in America called the "progressive" movement. It was designed to distance itself from the former term, "liberalism" because it had become too associated with socialism and Marxism, particularly after the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

Leading intellectuals like Herbert Croly, Walter Lippmann, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, John Dewey, Margaret Sanger and Emma Goldman worked tirelessly to infuse progressive ideas into public policy. NAACP founder W.E.B. Du Bois was one of the first to bring progressive ideals into the civil rights movement. Progressivism brought secular humanism into mainstream society by, in essence, removing legality from morality and public policy. It popularized moral relativism and further theorized that man can be good without God and that the equality of outcomes (egalitarianism) was better than the equality of opportunities.

These and many other Machiavellian suppositions of progressivism led directly to the eugenics movement and the academy's perverse infatuation with fascist dictators, including Lenin, Mussolini and Hitler. Social Darwinism; group rights over individual rights and responsibilities;

litigation and protest in the streets over morality and character development; the "right" to receive government-controlled welfare encapsulated in FDR's *New Deal*; LBJ's *Great Society*; and Obama's universal health care bill are just a few of the "liberal lies" I speak of.

2. Who are the "highly educated oligarchy of black race merchants and poverty pimps" your article refers to?

The people I refer to in my article as "black race merchants" and "poverty pimps" come from an elite, silver-tongued, highly educated oligarchy of liberal black leaders, most notably: Rev. Jeremiah Wright, Rev. Al Sharpton, Rev. Jesse Jackson, Rev. Joseph Lowery, Julian Bond, John Lewis, Drs. Marian Wright Edelman, Henry Louis Gates, Cornel West, Michael Eric Dyson and the rest of the leadership of the civil rights establishment who, especially since the death of MLK in 1968, have made a fabulous living not solving systemic problems of black racism, discrimination and economic disenfranchisement, but by purposely exacerbating all of these problems affecting the black community. In my humble opinion, Matthews, these people (and their ilk) are the real traitors, Uncle Toms and "sell-outs" of the black community.

3. Regarding the NAACP not supporting and opposing Justice Thomas or Appellate Court Judge Janice Rogers Brown, it's not "hatred" to disagree with their selection, and the NAACP was joined by other civil rights and nonpartisan groups who opposed these two judges. The NAACP should be applauded for taking a stand on their tenets even though it put them against members of the ethnic group they look after.

Any black person or any American who would take the time to turn off the liberal government-controlled media to research and educate themselves on the complete *oeuvre* of Justice Clarence Thomas and Judge Janice Rogers Brown will discover a stellar jurisprudence biography that any American should be proud of. These jurists have for their entire careers refused to legislate from the bench or make policy decisions that, according to the separation of power doctrine of the U.S. Constitution, rest in the domain of Congress. Unlike Justices Thurgood Marshall, William Brennan, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Stephen Breyer, David Souter and the newest justice, Sonia Sotomayor, Clarence Thomas and Janice Rogers Brown are not so narcissistic as to try to achieve some amorphous notions of "social justice" when they deliver their opinions from the bench. How could the NAACP rationally be against these two praiseworthy jurists?

4. How would you reply to the questions: What has the NAACP done to make America a better place for African-Americans, and is the NAACP still relevant?

Historically, the NAACP has been at the vanguard of the civil rights movement; nevertheless, as I alluded to in my answer to question No. 1, from its beginnings it made a fatal error in following the secular humanism of the progressive movement whereby, using the language of liberty, black people received chains; instead of freedom black people are stuck on the white plantation of Democrat liberalism having voted 96 percent for a certified Marxist, Barack Obama, in 2008.

Yes, the NAACP can be relevant to help black people move forward once they begin to follow the words of the forgotten prophet to black America, Booker T. Washington (1856-1915), whom W.E.B. Du Bois called, "the first Uncle Tom." How much further would the black race have gotten in America and throughout the world if we had forsaken liberalism, progressivism, Marxism, socialism and the Democratic Party, and clung to BTW's immortal words: *No greater injury can be done to any youth than to let him feel that because he belongs to this or that race he will be advanced in life regardless of his own merits or efforts.*

How far would the black race be if we had forsaken the Faustian bargain of FDR's "New Deal" in the 1930s, LBJ's "Great Society" of the 1960s and the naked Marxism of Obama's universal health care of 2009 for these words for the ages: "The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremist folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us *must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing.*"

John Matthews, if a man like you were the president of the NAACP, perhaps Booker T. Washington's dream for true equality for all Americans could be realized.

Peace,
Ellis Washington
Commentator, WorldNetDaily.com

CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 15

LOCKERBIE BOMBER PRAISED, SAVAGE HATED?

August 26, 2009

The opposite of love is not hate, it's indifference. The opposite of art is not ugliness, it's indifference. The opposite of faith is not heresy, it's indifference. And the opposite of life is not death, it's indifference.

~ Elie Wiesel

Anybody that can enlighten the people, motivate the people is a danger to the New World Order.

~ Michael Savage, Aug. 24, 2009

The enduring words of Elie Wiesel, a Holocaust survivor of Hitler's death camps at Auschwitz and Buchenwald, are a poignant reminder that bombs, bullets, tanks, torture and gas chambers are not the most demonstrative examples of hatred of man against humanity. It is, after those ghastly, terroristic acts are perpetrated against the innocent, that those who are in a position to say something, to do something to stop such senseless genocide, are all too quiet . . . too indifferent of the plight of another. *The opposite of love is not hate, its indifference.*

Scotland has recently received tepid condemnation by President Obama and many world leaders for releasing Lockerbie bomber Abdulbaset al-Megrahi, a Muslim fanatic responsible for the deaths of 270 innocent people in the bombing of Pan AM flight 103 which ignited as the plane flew over Lockerbie, Scotland, just before Christmas 1988. The international controversy was due to Libyan dictator Muammar Gaddafi giving the Lockerbie bomber a hero's welcome much to the chagrin of America, Britain and Scotland. In a U.K. Guardian article, it was reported that "the Scottish government . . . responded defiantly, insisting the U.S. had made clear in discussions that, while it opposed Megrahi's release, it regarded freeing him on compassionate grounds because of his terminal cancer as "far preferable" to a prisoner transfer deal that would have seen him in custody."¹³ *The opposite of love is not hate, its indifference.*

Last week my friend and intellectual mentor, Michael Savage, at hearing news of the egregious insult Scotland and Britain did against the families of the Lockerbie bombing victims, as well as against all Ameri-

cans by releasing this murderous terrorist, rightfully drew the parallel on his radio show between the secrecy and duplicitous treachery of the governments of Scotland and Britain for what appears to be a *quid pro quo* for oil contracts with Libya, and how Michael Savage was unjustly banned in Britain and essentially put on an enemies list because of his conservative ideology and his Jewish heritage. Perhaps we will later learn through legal discovery that ranking members of the Obama administration thought blacklisting Savage would be a Machiavellian pretext for their real objective—the official banning of conservative talk radio in America via the so-called “Fairness Doctrine.” *The opposite of love is not hate, its indifference.*

If the Obama administration is anything, these Chicago thugs are Machiavellian to the core. Putting Michael Savage’s name on an enemies list was not by accident. He was specifically singled out because he is the most effective, singular voice against the fascist tactics of *The Chicago Way* in American media. Savage is an existential threat to Obama’s power which this arrogant, political opportunist cannot abide. The Obama administration knew that professional jealousy, divide-and-conquer tactics and what the Germans call *Schadenfreude* would continue to isolate and marginalize Savage. Philosopher and sociologist, Theodor Adorno, defined *Schadenfreude* as “largely unanticipated delight in the suffering of another which is cognized as trivial and/or appropriate.” Obama’s minions knew that the GOP, the RNC, Rush, Fox News, et al., would take delight in the plight of Michael Savage’s suffering at this vile international attack upon his character because his conservative colleagues on talk radio, like *effete* harlequins or the tragic figure, Dorian Gray, are transfixed by their own outward reflection even as they rot from inside by their hypocritical silence.

As it was with the Michael Savage affair, so it was with the Lockerbie bombing affair: utmost secrecy and treachery from the Prime Minister Gordon Brown’s administration as evidence mounts that Brown had “discussed with Colonel Gaddafi detailed conditions for the Lockerbie bomber’s return nearly six weeks ago” during the G-8 Summit in Italy. That “when we met [there] I stressed that, should the Scottish executive decide that Megrahi can return to Libya, this should be a purely private family occasion” rather than a public celebration. And that those conditions centered around giving Britain access to Libya’s lucrative oil reserves. Where is the left on this issue? Where is Cindy Sheehan and the

useful idiots of the environmental movement with their "No blood for oil" signs? *The opposite of love is not hate, its indifference.*

The article continues: "Tonight the shadow foreign secretary, William Hague, redoubled calls for the government to release official records of conversations about the release, as Gaddafi increased the embarrassment by publicly thanking "my friend Brown, his government, the Queen of Britain, Elizabeth, and Prince Andrew who all contributed to encouraging the Scottish government to take this historic and courageous decision." Can you appreciate the bitter irony of the once great British Empire of Queen Elizabeth I and Sir Winston Churchill has devolved down to the buffoonery of Prime Minister Gordon Brown, Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Andrew colluding with her puppet government, Scotland, to release an unrepentant Muslim murder with the blood of 270 Americans still on his hands, so that England can get oil contracts from Libya, while the Jew, Michael Savage, an American patriot and self-confessed Anglophile is on England's enemies list demanding that *he* recants statements and ideas he never espoused?

While Chairman Obama and Prime Minister Gordon Brown beg for legitimacy and approval by wishing one billion Muslims Happy Ramadan, can you imagine in 1940 Winston Churchill wishing Hitler and the Nazi empire Happy Kristallnacht during the Battle of Britain? America! We are at war with the liberal-Muslim axis powers of the Obama administration, the ACLU, CAIR and these fascists want to silence our strongest voice of truth. Why is the Lockerbie bomber praised while Michael Savage is hated and unjustly put on an enemies list while the conservative and state-controlled media are silent? . . . Because the opposite of love is not hate, it's indifference.

ON CULTURE & SOCIETY—ESSAY 16

VIDAL, KEILLOR: 2 INFANTILE LIBERALS

October 03, 2009

Essays are what he is good at . . . [h]e is learned, funny and exceptionally clear-sighted. Even his blind spots are illuminating.

~ Martin Amis, literary critic, on Gore Vidal

Prologue

Two doyens of liberalism were recently in the news. One was the octogenarian icon of the secular left who first appeared in the late 1940s with *The City and the Pillar* (1948), a sexual tome that infuriated mainstream critics in that this was one of the first major American novels to feature conspicuous homosexuality. My second critique is of Garrison Keillor, the outspoken liberal radio host and popular author whose essays have appeared in the *New Yorker*, the *Atlantic Monthly* and *Salon.com*.

Gore Vidal: a petite Leni Riefenstahl¹⁴

Gore Vidal, in an article published in the *London Times* online last week, was lamenting that America had *just* elected a "dictatorship," referring to the administration of Barack Obama. Vidal must have been in a coma for the past 9 months *since* King Obama's coronation. When asked how Obama is doing, Vidal snapped back: "Dreadfully. I was hopeful. He was the most intelligent person we've had in that position for a long time. But he's inexperienced. He has a total inability to understand military matters. He's acting as if Afghanistan is the magic talisman: solve that and you solve terrorism." . . . The "War on Terror" was "made up," Vidal says. "The whole thing was PR, just like 'weapons of mass destruction.'" Vidal could not see that 2008 was in reality 1938, when all the liberals, socialists and anti-war peaceniks of that day groveled beneath the feet of Hitler at the Berlin Olympics in 1936 and tried in vain to placate this megalomaniac's insatiable lust for power and adulation by selling out our religious allies, the Jews, and our military allies, Czechoslovakia and Poland—a shameless cowardice that came to a crescendo when British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, as the king of the appeasers, proudly waved in the air the Munich Treaty he and Hitler just signed, saying, *We have peace in our time*. Peace in our time? Did we then, Neville Chamberlain? Do we now, Gore Vidal?

For 83 long years, Vidal has been in a time warp of liberalism and perversity and has gleefully helped take American culture to the brink of the abyss. In a sane, rational society, Vidal's writings and ideas would be ignored, and Vidal the old man made comfortable at a nice asylum with padded walls—not published on the front pages of the *New York Times* whose "imagination" is lauded as "so powerful as to compel awe!" In-

deed, these are not very sane and rational times we are living in during the Age of Obama.

Garrison Keillor: a petite Walter Duranty

My second critique is of the affable Garrison Keillor, a fixture of contemporary liberalism whose folksy mannerisms belie the absolutely hideous liberal ideas he has given America during his long, unremarkable career as the host of *The Prairie Home Companion* and *Lake Wobegon* on National Public Radio. In a provocative article in the Chicago Tribune, Keillor is lamenting over the endless culture wars that are going on between the left and the right and in exasperation says: "The sheer waste of time—years, decades, spent on thrilling public issues in which the unconservative right fights tooth-and-nail against the regressive left and nothing is gained. It's like a tug-of-war between two trees."¹⁵

While the advent of the progressive movement of 1890s witnessed the decline of classical liberalism, humanism and the Age of Enlightenment, it ushered in the age of anti-intellectualism, anti-industrialism, statism, fascism and the culture of death, climaxed by *Roe v. Wade* (1973), a case that sanctioned the murder of 50 million innocent babies under the color of law. If the intellectual cache of international recognition so lavished upon Vidal can be measured by the body count of one's ideas, then we must not only venerate the progressivism of Gore Vidal and Keillor, but at least give Marx, Nietzsche, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Hitler and Pol Pot an honorable mention, right?

About the only useful idea in that quote by Keillor is the word "regressive." Liberals for the past 120 years have called themselves "progressives." This is a lie, for there is not one progressive idea in liberalism. It's all regressive and fixated on the idea of perverting the Constitution so that the negative rights extolled in the Bill of Rights are not rightly directed at Congress and the courts, but *against* We the People. Welfare, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, a *Fair Deal*, a *New Deal*, the *Great Society*, *No Child Left Behind*, *Change We Can Believe In*, *Cash for Clunkers*, *Universal Healthcare Reform* . . . is just the same putrid corpse lying in a different colored coffin.

Epilogue to 'The Embalmer's Art'

Vidal, Keillor and the legions of useful idiots of the socialist left will never understand that above all human nature yearns to be free; that 222 years ago the American republic was the first successful experiment in government to unleash that spirit so that our citizenry would one day be free to fulfill Jefferson's eternal promise—*Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness*. Government cannot provide happiness. Government can only defend its citizens or enslave its citizens with yet another addictive welfare program, class-warfare scheme, tax and in the end . . . a coffin.

While Vidal ridiculed the 1980 election of President Ronald Reagan as the "triumph of the embalmer's art," Keillor prophetically said, "Old men shouldn't be allowed to doze off at the switch and muck up the works for the young who will have to repair the damage. Get over yourselves. Your replacements have arrived." Indeed, Mr. Gore Vidal, Mr. Garrison Keillor and President Barack Obama, your replacements have arrived and they are—God, America's Founding Fathers and We the People. Society will only get better when we stop listening to fascist, perverted ideas of liberalism that have taken America to the brink of ruination. We must look to God, the Founding Fathers and to our better angels within to remake America's republic based on *Veritas* (truth), law, morality and the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought.

EPILOGUE

Liberalism and Progressivism will always fail because it will always collapse upon the weight of its own immorality.

~ Anonymous

How does one bring to a satisfying conclusion a book of such vast scope and historical reach? I found the answer on a video blog campaign speech of Elizabeth Warren, former law professor of commerce and Obama's failed nominee to head his newly created Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Warren's controversial remarks on the campaign trail went viral on the internet in which she made an eloquent and singularly passionate case for Progressive economic policies as evidence that the recently minted Democratic candidate possibly will give incumbent Republican Senator Scott Brown a very competitive race for the chair of that old 'liberal lion' Teddy Kennedy held for 47 years.

In the video which was filmed at an event in Andover, Mass., Warren rebuts the GOP-touted notion that raising taxes on the wealthy amounts to "class warfare," contending that "there is nobody in this country who got rich on his own. Nobody." Warren rejects the idea that it is possible for Americans to become self-sufficient or even wealthy apart from Leviathan government largess. Warren was adamant on this point saying:

There is nobody in this country who got rich on his own. Nobody. You built a factory out there? Good for you. But I want to be clear: you moved your goods to market on the roads the rest of us paid for; you hired workers the rest of us paid to educate; you were safe in your factory because of police forces and fire forces that the rest of us paid for. You didn't have to worry that marauding bands would come and seize everything at your factory, and hire someone to protect against this, because of the work the rest of us did. Now look, you built a factory and it turned into something terrific, or a great idea? God bless. Keep a big hunk of it. But part of the underlying social contract is you take a hunk of that and pay forward for the next kid who comes along.¹

To most Americans who hold strong views about God, the Bible, American exceptionalism, natural law and the Constitution, little needs to be added to explain the arrogant and ignorant rant by Professor Warren. In a word it is an undiluted utterance of liberal fascism. The utter contempt Professor Warren and all Progressive elites have towards the American people and their important traditions like Christianity, American exceptionalism and market capitalism demonstrate how irredeemable, dangerous and destructive progressive ideas truly are and the great imperative that the Progressive Revolution be stopped. For over 140 years Progressives through their lens and cudgel of liberal fascism views America as a profoundly illegitimate and unjust country and through a legion of Machiavellian policy initiatives will endeavor to do everything in their power to deconstruct all of her foundational institutions and from the ashes erect a new, grand utopian society that will join the socialist states of the United Nations as part of the global community. It was David Horowitz a writer and reconstructed 60's radical wrote about Saul Alinsky—Obama's and Hillary Clinton's ideological mentor said, "Alinsky devoted his entire life to organizing a revolution in America to destroy a system he regarded as oppressive and unjust."

Candidate Warren's statement above models classical Marxism rhetoric that all success of any capitalist country is illegitimate and unfair and that it is up to the government guided by socialist, progressive elites as Obama, the Democratic Party and herself, to see that government gets its revenge, makes all things fair for everybody and makes the rich "pay their fair share" even if it is by force of law because as she said, "There is nobody in this country who got rich on his own."

Rich Lowry, editor of *National Review*, in a commentary about Professor Warren's ill-informed rant against American capitalism which in

progressive terms places social justice above rational and just economic policy, made this interesting observation:

Focusing on infrastructure as the crucial support of entrepreneurial activity is like crediting the guy who built young Bill Gates' garage with the start of Microsoft. Yes, Gates needed a roof over his head, and garages are useful. But it was Gates who had the ambition to do more in his garage than store his car and lawn-care products. Incalculably more important than his physical surroundings were his imagination and business sense.²

Indeed, every time liberals, socialists and progressives drone on about "fair share" or "social justice" just remember that history eventually returns to truth and the "social justice" they speak about has little to do with real equality and more to do with egalitarianism—not the equality of opportunity (Jefferson's *pursuit of Happiness*), but the equality of results (socialism). Karl Marx, the father of socialism and communism in 1875 said it this way: *From each according to his ability, to each according to his need*. Well, *Liberté, Égalité, and Fraternité* didn't work out too well during the French Revolution (1789-99) and its infamous dechristianization campaign where the church was savagely attacked, ransacked and converted into "Temples of Reason." Tens of thousands of priests, nuns, clergy and Christians were drown, beheaded and viciously murdered just for being Christians. This so-called equality, this "social justice" was the precursor to rancid atheism of Marx and Hegel. This egalitarianism which isn't equality but an evil bastardization of the word which has descended through history since the French Revolution is not the equality of opportunity, but the equality of results. A genocidal madness justified the murder of 170,000 people in the Vendee alone to achieve their grotesque, utopian paradise. Therefore, social justice to President Obama, Professor Warren and their progressive legions in the Democratic Party dictate that utopian must be achieved by any means necessary.

In conclusion, below is an essay I wrote in 2011 which not only is derivative of the subtitle of these two volume—*Writings on Liberal Fascism through the Ages*—but possesses the historical extent of just how liberal fascism has so utterly infected, perverted and deconstructed every aspect of Western culture and modern society essentially turning America's Constitution which gave life to liberty into a suicide pact against We the People.

It is my earnest prayer and hope that all men and women of good will join with me to reclaim the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of government; to recover our culture and society back from liberal fascists, Progressives and Progressive policies which every American president from Theodore Roosevelt to Barack Obama has with exceeding delight perpetrated this political nihilism and destructive assault on America's established moral order and our economic and legal structures all in the name of the "common good."

ON HISTORY—ESSAY 1

LIBERAL FASCISM THROUGH THE AGES, PART 2

Oct. 5, 2011

"Fascist" is a modern word for "heretic," branding an individual worthy of excommunication from the [liberal] body politic.

For what we call liberalism—the refurbished edifice of American Progressivism—is in fact a descendant and manifestation of fascism.

~ Jonah Goldberg, "Liberal Fascism," pp. 2-4

Prologue

The first United Nations wasn't under President Woodrow Wilson in 1919 or FDR in April of 1945, but during ancient times under King Nimrod, his cult of Semiramis and the monument he built to his pagan deities, to the glory of mankind and in the face of God—The Tower of Babel according to the book of Genesis 11:1-9. After the flood, Nimrod didn't want the people to spread across the earth. He wanted them to remain in Mesopotamia under his allegiance and his control. In a similar manner the apotheosis of globalism and worldwide socialism occurred at the San Francisco Conference in April 1945 where the United Nations was established.

Under the biblical progenitor, Abraham, who God would choose to become the father of tiny Israel, the sodomites in Sodom and Gomorrah so blinded by lust as to attempt to rape the angels of God would try to

kill that dream in the crib where the angels had to forcibly deliver Lot and his family from those wicked lands before His judgment would fall. These rebels in Sodom and Gomorrah as well as all of the pagans, sorcerers, witches, Baal worshippers, Gnostics and idolaters in the Bible were the forefathers of liberal fascism in modern times.

During the 1700s, America called them Loyalists, humanists, the Enlightened, Jacobins. During the 1880s-1930s, America called them Darwinists, Marxists, populists, secularists, socialists, atheists, progressives. During the red scare of the 1940s and '50s, America called them socialists, unionists, communists and communist sympathizers. During the 1960s, America called them liberals, baby boomers, hippies, yippies, radicals, anarchists, community organizers and red diaper doper babies. During the '70s, America called them Black Panthers, terrorists, bra-burners, gays, green anarchists, secularists, or simply traitors. Whatever one calls members of the Democratic Party coalition, one enduring leitmotiv is crystal clear—those who embraced Marxism, socialism, communism were all fascists, or at least fascist sympathizers, and their progeny rules today in both parties in all three branches of government—legislative, executive, judiciary.

What is fascism? Fascism is a governmental system led by a dictator having complete power, forcibly suppressing opposition and criticism, regimenting all industry, commerce, etc., and emphasizing a totalitarian nationalism, state socialism and often racism. I can't think of a definition more opposite to true conservatism or America's Judeo-Christian traditions than fascism. When the propaganda media call any doctrinaire conservative like Reagan or his policies fascist, know for sure you are witnessing liberal fascism via insipid propaganda whose major tactic is psychological projection—a defense mechanism and psychosis ascribing the evil motives or bad acts you believe in to your enemies.

Below is a short summary of classical philosophers, ideas, and books through the ages that have had an enduringly destructive impact upon history, politics, science, law, politics, economics, culture and society:

Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527)¹

My friend and colleague, Dr. Benjamin Wiker, is one of the most revelatory and profound writers of our time and makes many insightful connections of Machiavelli's work to the ancients, but also eloquently presents a cogent analysis of how Machiavelli's ideas affect us in modern

times in two excellent books: 1) *10 Books that Screwed up the World: And 5 Others That Didn't Help*; 2) *10 Books that Every Conservative Must Read: Plus Four Not to Miss and One Imposter*. In his first book, Wiker writes: "Socrates argues that human beings must strive above all to be good. Cicero's *On the Republic* argues much of the same as Plato [in his *Republic*]. Machiavelli's most important rejection of republics real and imagined was the Christian notion of heaven. This idea is further developed in his *Discourse on Livy* where he argues that the prospect of heaven ruins our attempts to make this life—our only real life—better." From this passage above, Wiker's analysis of Machiavelli's *The Prince* (1513) gets directly to the precursors of modern liberalism and their humanist, man-centered worldview, particularly the environmentalist movement. I always wondered why liberals put such a high premium on making *this world* the be-all and end-all for humanity. Their obsession with creating a utopia on earth has its intellectual roots in Machiavelli.

Furthermore, Wiker tells the reader that Machiavelli sets up the grand conflict between modern secularism and Christianity that mainly delineates the next 500 years of Western history. Machiavelli contended that belief in metaphysical entities is a waste of time because such pursuits focuses our energies on a fantasy kingdom in the sky and thus prevents humanity from establishing real world peace, making earth a comfortable, even reasonably satisfying home, yea, even a utopia. What does this tell us? Liberals, progressives, socialists, intellectuals, academics and others adopting Machiavelli's separation of morality from politics and the end justifies the means—both atheistic notions—have no other choice than to create a paradigm where metaphysical concerns are unconnected to public policy, and the only real and relevant heaven one needs to be concerned with is right here on earth. We can thank Machiavelli for separating politics from morality, which turned the rule of law into tyranny—also for deifying cruel, perverse, unconscious leaders, denigrating heaven and transforming it into a utopia on earth . . . thus making earth a living hell.

Rene Descartes (1596-1650)²

The very influential French philosopher, René Descartes (1596-1650) and his famous treatise, *Discourse on Method* (1637) which is rightly subtitled, ". . . of Rightly Conducting the Reason, and Searching for Truth in the Sciences," Wiker wrote: "Descartes attacked skepticism, but only by

denying reality. He confirmed the idea of the immaterial soul against the pronouncements of the crass materialists of the day, but only by recreating us as insubstantial ghosts trapped in clattering machines. *He proved God's existence, but only by making it depend on our thinking Him into existence.* By his good intentions—if indeed they really were good—he fathered every flavor of self-congratulatory solipsism, led us to believe we are no different from robots, and made religion a creation of our own ego."

Wiker attacks Descartes' singular statement of faith, *cogito ergo sum* [I think, therefore I am] and turns it on its head: "So we should say, 'I am, therefore I can think,' rather than, 'I think, therefore I am.'" The common sense point is this: reality exists *before* our thinking, so that our thinking depends on reality . . . First, our thinking depends on the reality of our own existence. If we don't exist, we cannot think. Second, our thinking correctly depends on our properly conforming our minds to what really exists." In the end, Descartes, like many narcissists, so-called "intellectuals," academics and scholars, doubted everything *but* his own method. Descartes deified subjectivism (perception is reality) and made it alone the standard of truth. Therefore, I think Descartes stole our humanity and reduced all civilization to an accidental conglomeration of cogs, springs, pistons, nuts, bolts, wheels—nothing more than machinery. Man was merely a ghost trapped inside this dreadful machine we call a human body. This was a precursor to Darwin's evolution theory that would plague and pervert the world of subjective truth and rational thought a little more than two centuries after Descartes.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679)³

In *Leviathan*, Enlightenment political philosopher and atheist Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) sets out his doctrine of the foundation of societies and governments of men. *Leviathan*, written in 1651 just after the *Thirty Years War* (1618-48) and during the *English Civil War* (1642-51), argues for the necessity of a strong central government as a balance against man's predilections toward anarchy and civil war. Starting with a mechanistic understanding of human nature and their passions, Hobbes theorizes what life would be like without government, a condition of humanity later philosophers called a *state of nature*. In that state, each person would have a right, an entitlement to everything in the world. However, Hobbes realizes that this state of nature, this Sisyphus-like life of despair,

inevitably devolves into anarchy—a “war of all against all” (*bellum omnium contra omnes*), an existential existence where life is “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.” To avoid this state of perpetual war, men in the state of nature agree to a social contract, whereby society as a collective entity under a sovereign authority voluntarily cedes to this sovereign (the State or the monarchy, as Hobbes preferred) certain natural rights for the sake of protection.

The catastrophic legacy of Hobbes’ *Natural Man* is this evil aphorism—*Good simply means getting whatever you want, and evil is anything that might stand in your way of getting it.* Hobbes, on his own death bed, spoke his depressing epitaph of his entire *oeuvre* as, “A great leap into the dark.” This tragic view, born of utter despair and fatalism, should give all modern governments pause, including America. Why? Hobbes’ sovereign would have total control over all civil, military, judicial and ecclesiastical powers—a diabolical model written in blood over the corpses of untold hundreds of millions by every subsequent despot and totalitarian regime up to modern times. If Hobbes judged himself and his ideas as “a great leap into the dark,” wherefore is humanity 357 years after the publication of *Leviathan*, whose legacy is this—Do unto others, so they won’t do unto you; Pleasure = good, pain = evil; Morality is a private matter of personal taste; Every man has a right to everything, even another’s body; Rights = Human desires (however sordid)? I contend that unless we change course, America and the world will soon be headlong into the abyss.

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-78) ⁴

Rousseau infamously said that *Savages are not evil precisely because they do not know what it is to be good.* Wiker concludes his chapter on Rousseau with this prescient observation in the context of his place in the history of political philosophy: “As with Hobbes, we see again the power of fiction. Rousseau’s account of natural man was no more real than Hobbes’, but following the same pattern, once it became the accepted story of human origins, it thereby exercised the power of a self-fulfilling prophecy. In imagining Rousseau to be right, *we have become what Rousseau imagined.*”

Rousseau, was a brilliant, self-taught philosopher whose ideas for good or evil (mostly evil) have had an indelible impact on future philosophers, intellectuals and political movements, including the American Revolution (which rejected Rousseau), the French Revolution (which

embraced Rousseau in part), Darwin, Marx, Hegel, Freud, Lenin, Heidegger, Nietzsche, Mead, Jean-Paul Sartre, the Counter-Cultural Revolution, the Feminist Movement and beyond. Once at a dinner party, Scottish novelist, historian and sometime philosopher Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), replying to one of the guests who chided Carlyle for thinking about ideas too much, had this succinct response, "There was once a man called Rousseau who wrote a book containing nothing but ideas. The second edition was bound in the skins of those who laughed at the first." Although Rousseau championed the idea of the natural goodness of humanity, in my humble opinion his books and philosophy in total have lead to a rebirth of neo-barbarism and the utter savageness of humanity.

Karl Marx (1818-83)⁵

Wiker notes: "According to Marx, the fulfillment of the communist dream requires the disappearance of an entirely corrupt class. There is no moral blame attached to the revolutionaries who exterminate this class, and there is certainly no God to keep accounts. So it's no surprise that communism advanced by epic brutality. Such is the danger of a bad idea." The most evil, pernicious, diabolical, tyrannical governments of men and the philosophies they ruled by were primarily the ones whose leaders were atheist, materialist and who didn't believe in sin or Judgment Day.

Free from the civilizational restraints that for over 2,500 were codified in the Judeo-Christian traditions of intellectual thought and culture, tyrannous despots were free to build their communist empires upon the corpses of those who not only disagreed with them, but paradoxically upon the corpses of the tens of millions of "useful idiots" that foolishly believed in Marxist communism propaganda and who were disposed of when their usefulness to their totalitarian masters expired. Such is the endless, ignominious and predictable refrain of despair, tragedy and genocide humanity has been subjected to as a litany of Marxist dictators entered the world's stage at the dawn of the 20th century—Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Beria, Mussolini, Mao, Hitler, Kim Il-Sung, Che Guevara, Castro, Ho Chi Minh, Pol Pot, Suharto and many others who skillfully exploited Marx and Engel's communist ideology to give intellectual legitimacy to their totalitarian regimes.

Some Western intellectuals sympathetic to Marxist thought have argued that Marx and Engels' "Communist Party Manifesto" is a purely theoretical work whose ideas were birthed in the quiet, monastic solitude of Europe's libraries; however, ideas are not stagnant. These were given birth, developed and ruthlessly applied in the perverted, wicked minds of the irredeemable tyrants cited above. That many socialists, liberals, progressives, academics, leftist intellectuals and communist sympathizers to this day continue to defend the general suppositions of communist thought as espoused by Marx and Engels (Cornel West's "non-Marxist socialism," for example) is to foolishly ignore the substantive aspects of Marxist communism—one of the most murderous and diabolical ideas of the 20th century.

One of the memorable quotes by that great literary titan and a courageous foe of communism, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn (1918-2008), who left this mortal plain, last Aug. 3, 2008, uttered these prescient words regarding the intrinsic qualities of Marxist communism: *Communism will always be totalitarian and violent, wherever it is practiced. There was nothing special in the Russian conditions which affected the outcome.*

John Stuart Mill (1806-73)⁶

Mill, the father of the nineteenth century philosophy utilitarianism, once wrote, *The ultimate end [of utilitarianism] . . . is an existence exempt as far as possible from pain, and as rich as possible in enjoyments.* "If morality is reduced to pleasure and pain," Wiker noted, "anything that experiences pleasure and pain must be included in the moral calculation. But here's the contradiction in logic. Once we add the entire sentient population of every fish, fowl, reptile, amoeba, gorilla and so forth, the task of ranking and balancing pleasures and pains becomes impossible." (Can you say radical environmentalism and animal rights?)

Wiker ended his analysis of Mill in this manner: "The problem is that Mill, being an atheist, did not see how deep evil runs. He believed his declaration of war on merely *natural* evils was enough to rid the world of all evil. Preventing heart attacks is all well and good, but there is more that ails the human heart." This characterization created a foreseeable dilemma that Mill seemed oblivious to but which Wiker skillfully delineated in this manner: "Mill, however, was too short-sighted to see it [the nature of evil]. He could not envision, for example, the most likely outcome of utilitarianism: that it would lead to a society addicted to ever

more intense, barbaric and self-destructive pleasures, and that its members would be gibbering cowards in the face of even the smallest pains."

Mill's obscure little book with the funny title has done much harm to society in modern times by reviving the ancient Greek philosophy of Epicureanism. While I am not a prude and I enjoy pleasurable pursuits just like any normal person, obsessively seeking pleasure above God, above family, above rational impulses has and will continue to lead to the destruction of once-great nations. I hope America will return from the precipice of the abyss before it is too late.

Mill admits that utilitarianism was not unique. It originally came from the Greek Sophist philosopher Epicurus (341-270 B.C.). Of this Greek philosopher from classical antiquity Wiker commented, "Epicurus was an atheist convinced that all the world's evils were caused by religion, and therefore religion needed to be swept like rubbish off the historical stage." (Can you say separation of church and state?) Epicurus believed that since the world existed from eternity, there is no need for gods to create it. All is material, which was due to random forces—thus Epicurus was the real father of evolution, not Darwin. Epicurus synthesized his philosophy with this double equation Wiker cited: Good = Pleasure, Evil = Pain.

Charles Darwin (1809-82)⁷

Darwin's two books, *On the Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man* are the two most evil and destructive books to have ever been penned by a single author. The subtitle of the first book had this racist and eugenic theme: *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. As if presaging liberal irrationalism decades from the time the book was written, in his second book he left no room of what the main intent of his evolutionary theory would unleash: "At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout the world the savage races. . . ." In the opening chapter on Darwin, Wiker wrote: "Reading Charles Darwin's *The Descent of Man* forces one to face an unpleasant truth: that if everything he said in his more famous *Origin of Species* is true, then it quite logically follows that human beings ought to ensure that the fit breed with abandon and that the unfit are weeded out." Woodrow Wilson, a former president of Princeton University, and America's second progressive president (after

Theodore Roosevelt) was a diehard Darwinist and was so devoted to evolutionary theory so much he actively campaigned on applying evolutionary principles in all of America's laws and public policy, saying: "[L]iving political constitutions must be Darwinian in structure and in practice."

Darwin's conclusions in *The Descent of Man* are not very optimistic for humanity, especially for my people, as evident from the passage below:

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout the world the savage races. At the same time the anthropomorphous [i.e., most human-looking] apes . . . will no doubt be exterminated. The break will then be rendered wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as at present between the negro or Australian and the gorilla.

Darwin made the unscientific and tragic leap in *The Descent of Man* that external differences among the world's racial and ethnic groups necessitated a hierarchy that numerous dictators in the 20th century—Lenin, Stalin, Mussolini, Franco, Hitler, Mao, Pol Pot, et al.—would later to one degree or another exploit to diabolical ends. Applying Darwin's ideas on human evolution, sexual selection, evolutionary psychology and evolutionary ethics to government policies encouraged these tyrants to attack the basic human and natural rights of the people. With revolution, war, famine, disease and economic collapse raging throughout the 20th century, mass genocide was inevitable. That the delusion of social Darwinism (or as I prefer to call Darwin's ideas, scientific racism or scientific mythology) is still regarded as science orthodoxy today is beyond the pale. That Darwin's racist and unscientific ideas are still taught as authentic science in public schools, colleges, universities as well as codified in public policy and judicial rulings is a terrible vulgarity, a travesty of justice and a betrayal to the academy's sworn allegiance to *Veritas*—Truth.

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900)⁸

"For Heidegger and Nietzsche alike," wrote Jonah Goldberg, "good and evil were childish notions. What matters is will and choice. Self-assertion was the highest value." Goldberg continued that "Nietzsche's *Beyond*

Good and Evil issued the call for a world ruled solely by the *Will to Power*. This self-asserting philosophy has come to us in modern times most egregiously in the Holocaust, but also subsequent social upheavals, including the pro-abortion, pro-euthanasia and anti-senior citizen movements popular in America and throughout Europe and Asia, particularly China's "One Child" policy. Regarding Darwin's survival of the fittest theory, Wiker rightly noted that if Darwin emphasized *survival*, then Nietzsche emphasized *the fittest*. Nietzsche believed in an *Übermensch*—a superman, a master race that would ruthlessly rule over all the other inferior races. This theory contains a master/slave paradigm. Nietzsche called one part *master morality*—whatever is strong and great is good, whatever is weak and trivial is bad. And the other part was called *slave morality*—the attempt by the weaker to protect themselves as comfortably as possible. "Nietzsche considered Christianity to be (at least in certain respects) a species for slave morality and hence a cause of the West's degradation. . . . Christian charity has worked . . . to worsen the European race," according to Wiker.

Do ideas have consequences? Do damnable, evil ideas have damnable and evil consequences? If so, then an unbiased view of 20th century history would have to link Nietzsche's *Will to Power* directly to World War I, but more directly to Hitler's Third Reich, World War II and the Holocaust. Hitler, Hess, Rohm, Goering, Bormann, Himmler, Heydrich and all of the top Nazi officers venerated Nietzsche's radical ideas of *Übermensch* and modeled their Third Reich on his grim philosophical speculations.

Adolf Hitler (1889-1945)⁹

On this point, Wiker writes: "Given the epic scale of their inhumanity, we need to remember that the Nazi regime did not purport to do evil. It claimed to be scientific and *progressive*, to do what hard reason demanded for the ultimate benefit of the human race. The superhuman acts of inhumanity were carried out for the sake of humanity."

Let's not forget Nazis' connection to the ideas of Darwin, evolutionary theory and eugenics. Wiker writes, "One cannot help but be reminded of Darwin's 'Descent of Man.' 'National Socialism is nothing but applied biology,' said the deputy party leader of the Nazis, Rudolf Hess." In my opinion, the best part of Wiker's analysis of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*

was that he placed the man and his work in its proper historical context with other intellectuals, writers, political leaders and social movements that influenced and shaped his ideas. Wiker writes:

That struggle is the *kampf* of Hitler's title. Hitler took himself to be that rarest of things, the union of philosopher and king, political philosopher and practical political leader, program-maker and politician in one. Put this way, Hitler seems almost noble, until we realize that the philosophy to which he ascribed was an amalgam of Machiavelli, Darwin, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche (as mixed with the racial theories of the Frenchman Joseph-Arthur, comte de Gobineau). We might say that whatever hesitations to action one finds in Darwin, Schopenhauer, or even Nietzsche, Hitler casts aside with the ruthlessness of Machiavelli.

Even before Hitler came to power his brand of fascism, first perpetrated in Italy by Mussolini, was admired by W.E.B. Du Bois, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, FDR, John Dewey, Margaret Sanger, Walter Lippmann, Herbert Croly and many, many other liberal intellectuals, artists, academics and politicians. Hitler, like many big-government progressives and social engineers in America, began his grand vision with the commendable desire to eradicate poverty. However, shortly thereafter he soon formulated a utopian plan to fix *all* social problems.

By the early 1930s, as Hitler secured comprehensive, dictatorial powers, his grand vision for Germany devolved into the diabolical abyss of his *Final Solution*—the systematic extermination of everyone whom he believed stood in the way of him ruling the world. Therefore, Hitler is a case study in the pure evil and immoderate lengths good intentions can lead a man, a people, a nation that scrupulously separates morality from legality to create a society that perverted the social contract of Hobbes and Locke into a Faustian bargain with the devil.

In conclusion, Wiker made an astute observation that placed Hitler in his proper place in history—not as a fringe, fascist lunatic, but as a serious man of ideas who was admired and respected for a time by a diverse, notable array of journalists, intellectuals, social engineers and politicians. Wiker writes:

But the significant influence on Hitler of thinkers such as Darwin and Nietzsche should bring us to the recognition that we can't hold Hitler up as some kind of singular exemplar of evil. He was a man of his times, a 19th- and 20th-century man who owed as much as Margaret Sanger to the Darwinian eugenic theories in circulation and shared the

same reaction as Nietzsche to the Epicurean diminution of man brought about by the liberalism of Hobbes and Mill.

The early 20th century witnessed the classical age of Progressivism besides Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (1925) with books like Lenin's *The State and Revolution* (1917), Margaret Sanger's *The Pivot of Civilization* (1922), Freud's *The Future of an Illusion* (1927), Margaret Mead's *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928), Alfred Kinsey's *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and Betty Friedan's classic, *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), among many others. The common objective in these diabolical books is promoting the ideals of the progressive revolution. Whether it is the end justifies the means, for the greater good, survival of the fittest, God is dead, a New World Order, first brown, then red, "is" (legality) over "ought" (morality)—all end in death for the individual and genocide for most of society.¹⁰

American Loyalists

Mr. Milt Harris, one of my radio colleagues on *Joshua's Trail*, had these profound words regarding the history of liberal Democrats, which from its beginnings was confederate with treason. In his monologue Milt said:

On the political front ever since George Washington defeated the British in 1781 at the Battle of Yorktown, Americans loyal to Britain, known as Loyalists, rather than accept defeat, began a siege to undermine the new nation. Later, in order to clandestinely expand their siege, they founded the Democrat Party so they could enact politically damaging anti-Constitution legislation.

Now, 230 years later, the political descendants of the Loyalists (the Democratic Party) still dominate politics in all of the New England States including from Maine to as far south as Virginia.¹¹

Obama as FDR II

One will never understand *who* President Obama is, the man, unless you have a rudimentary understanding of history, politics, philosophy and economics. Obama is the liberal establishment's dream: the apotheosis and embodiment of all the fascist, atheist, anti-intellectual, nitwit liberal ideas pontificated in college lecture halls, spoken in university faculty lounges and written in books and academic journals few people have ever read. Socialists like Barack and Michelle Obama, Rahm Emmanuel,

David Axelrod, Hillary Clinton, Tim Geithner, Lawrence Summers, Wasserman-Schultz, Cornel West, Melissa Harris-Perry, and Obama's Supreme Court nominees, Sonya Sotomayor and Elena Kagan, despite their Ivy League pedigree, show virtually no moral understanding of law, history, politics, economics or philosophy, no critical thinking or logic skills and appear to have accepted utterly the vile, myopic propaganda of their Marxist professors without question. This groupthink mentality reminds me of Woodrow Wilson's and Franklin Delano Roosevelt's adoption of Mussolini's aphorism—*Everything in the State, nothing outside the State, nothing against the State*. If I had to pick a singular statement which is demonstrative of American progressivism and the globalist Progressive Revolution it would be those words by the Italian fascist, Benito Mussolini.

Conclusion

The French Revolution (1789-99) was an overt war by liberal intellectuals in France against Christianity, the church, the clergy, and came at the end of the Age of Enlightenment (1650-1800) and before the latter radical social movements of Darwinian evolution, Marxist socialism, and Nietzsche's relativism and atheism which appeared during the Victorian Age and in nineteenth century Romanticism all leading irrevocably to the decline of Western civilization, Christianity and Natural Law which plagues the world in modern times during the Age of Obama. The previous intellectual trinity of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, was replaced with the imposter trinity—Marx, Darwin and Nietzsche (with Sigmund Freud thrown in for good measure).¹²

Long before the Pilgrims, the Puritans and the founding of America in 1607, liberalism in all of its myriad of permutations, shadows and disguises infected the history of humanity—from Nimrod's Tower of Babel (precursor to the United Nations), Baal worship, idolatry, materialism, paganism, witchcraft, doctrine of Jezebel (pagan worship of god through sex), doctrine of Molech (child sacrifice [i.e., abortion]), to slavery, secular humanism, democracy, Darwinism, communism, socialism, unionism, progressivism, living constitutionalism, Jesus Seminar, Liberation Theology and social justice—it's all liberal fascism, it's all anti-God, it's all anti-intellectual and Obama is using these pernicious ideas to purposely destroy America and deconstruct the U.S. Constitution so that he, the Democratic Party and its globalist allies can rule into perpetuity.¹³

ENDNOTES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

1. Jeffrey Toobin, *Will Clarence and Virginia Thomas succeed in killing Obama's health-care plan?* http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2011/08/29/110829fa_fact_toobin (posted by August 29, 2011).
2. Blithe Spirit blog, *Clarence Thomas Praised in the New Yorker*, <http://blithespirit.wordpress.com/2011/08/26/clarence-thomas-praised-in-new-yorker/> (posted Aug. 26, 2011).
3. Ezra Greenberg, *Jeffrey Toobin dismisses Originalism with usual Clichés*, http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2011/09/jeffrey_toobin_dismisses_originalism_with_usual_cliches.html (posted Sept. 1, 2011).
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.

6. Ellis Washington, *Letter to Generation Y*, <http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=322429#ixzz1Vrr1yNgX> (posted July 16, 2011).

PROLOGUE

1. Jonah Goldberg, *Liberal Fascism* (New York: Doubleday, 2007), p. 86.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., at 80.
4. George Orwell, 1984, (The Complete Works of George Orwell Online), Chapter 1, Part 1, <http://www.george-orwell.org/1984/0.html>, as quoted in Ellis Washington, *Thou shall not lie*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=96042#ixzz1Yzy2eOge> (posted April 25, 2009).
5. Ellis Washington, *I remember Allan Bloom, Part 2*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=312457#ixzz1VuTPEbVz> (posted June 18, 2011).
6. Herbert Hovenkamp, *The Mind and Heart of Progressive Legal Thought*, 81 *Iowa L. Rev.* 149 (October, 1995): [n.1]; Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man, or Selection in Relation to Sex* (1871); [n.2] 3 *Journal of Law & Economics* 1 (1960); [n.3] G.P.O. 1960; [n.4] See Thomas K. McCraw, *Prophets of Regulation* 210, 215, 219-220, 234-235 (1984); Stewart, *The Reformation of American Administrative Law*, 88 *Harvard Law Review* 1667 (1975). Landis had been the author in 1938 of the much more optimistic *The Administrative Process* (1938); [n.5] Kenneth J. Arrow, *Social Choice and Individual Value* (2d ed. 1963); [n.6] James M. Buchanan and Gordon Tullock, *The Calculus of Consent* (1962).
7. Ellis Washington, *The Molech paradigm, Part 2*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=276749#ixzz1YgnDfMt7> (posted March 19, 2011).
8. Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), p. 154; also quoted in Ellis Washington, *An American Weimar Republic*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=315133#ixzz1VuVXLsom> (posted June 27, 2011).
9. Ibid., at 81.

10. Len Hart, *Bush Proves Karl Marx Right*, <http://www.opednews.com/articles/Bush-Proves-Karl-Marx-Righ-by-Len-Hart-081002-923.html> (posted October 2, 2008).
11. By David Emery, *NAACP Covers George Washington Statue at MLK Day Event*, <http://urbanlegends.about.com/od/government/ss/naacp-boxes-george-washington.htm> (posted Jan. 18, 2011). The reason? The NAACP was worried that a statue of George Washington might offend the audience. *See also*, *Jesus Missing From Obama's Georgetown Speech*, <http://www.nbcwashington.com/news/local/Jesus-Missing-From-Obamas-Georgetown-Speech.html> (posted April 17, 2009). President Obama speaking in Gaston Hall at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., one of America's most venerated Catholic universities, had the audacity to cover up the beloved and enduring monogram symbolizing the name Jesus Christ: *IHS*.
12. See Goldberg, *supra* note 1, at 81: "Dogmatic attachment to constitutions, democratic practices, and antiquated laws was the enemy of progress shared the same intellectual heroes and quoted the same philosophers."
13. Associate Justice (1910-16); Chief Justice Charles Evan Hughes (1930-41), a progressive jurists who also ran for president of the United States 1916, demonstrated his utter contempt of not only the Consitution, but also *stare decisis* (judicial precedent), natural law and the rule of law. Justice Hughes said: "The constitution is what the judges say it is." *As quoted in* Ellis Washington, *The Inseperability of Law and Morality: The Constitution, Natural Law and the Rule of Law* (Maryland: University Press of America, 2002), p. 421, n. 8.
14. Goldberg, *supra* note 1, at 81.
15. Joseph Farah, *The long march to Bethlehem*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGEview&pageId=119991> (posted Dec. 24, 2009).
16. Ellis Washington, *Why does the left so hate America?*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.printable&pageId=41877> (posted June 2, 2007).

CHAPTER 1

1. Perry Bacon, Jr., *Sen. Alexander accuses Obama of building an 'enemies list'*, http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2009/10/21/sen_alexander_accuses_obama_of.html (posted Oct. 21, 2009).

2. Ben Conery, *Justice concludes black votes need Democratic Party*, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/oct/20/justice-dept-blocks-ncs-nonpartisan-vote/?page=all> (posted Oct. 20, 2009).
3. Christopher Monckton, *British climate-change skeptic says Copenhagen treaty threatens "democracy, "freedom,"* <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2009/oct/20/christopher-monckton/british-climate-skeptic-says-copenhagen-treaty-thr/> (posted Oct. 20, 2009).
4. Chelsea Shilling, *Obama signs 'hate-crimes' bill into law*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=114305> (posted Oct. 28, 2009).
5. Friedrich August Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (New York: Routledge, 2005, 1944), p. 162.
6. Andrew P. Napolitano, *The Constitution in Exile* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2006), pp. 10-16.
7. Rep. John B. Shadegg (AZ-3), *Enumerated Powers Act*, H.R. 1359, <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d110:h.r.01359>: (introduced March 6, 2007).
8. Sarah Abruzzese, *Congress just spent \$621 million on a Visitor's Center*, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1108/15488.html> (posted Oct. 8, 2009).
9. Ashby Jones, *Ruling on California Prison Overcrowding: Cut 57,000 Prisoners*, <http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2009/02/10/ruling-on-california-prison-overcrowding-cut-57000-prisoners/> (posted Feb. 10, 2009).
10. Frosty Wooldridge, *Illegal immigration annually costing Americans \$346 billion*, <http://www.rense.com/general81/dtli.htm> (posted April 10, 2008).
11. Ellis Washington, "Excluding the Exclusionary Rule: Natural Law vs. Judicial Personal Policy Preferences," 10 *Deakins L. REV.* 772 (2005). Benjamin Cardozo, later Justice of the Supreme Court (1932-38) famously said showing his contempt of the exclusionary rule: "The criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered." See also, *People v. Defore*, 242 N.Y. 13, 21, 150 N.E. 585, 587 (1926) (the criminal will go free because the constable has blundered); and Dean Wigmore, *A Treatise on the Anglo-American System of Evidence*, 2183-84 (3d ed. 1940). For extensive discussion of criticism and support, with citation to the literature, see Wayne R. Lafave, *Search and Seizure: A Treatise on the Fourth Amendment*, Sec. 1.2 (2d ed. 1987). In contrast to Justice Cardozo's prophetic

remarks on the foolishness of the exclusionary rule, and its detrimental effects on the rule of law, Justice Clark, writing for the majority in 1961, in *Mapp v. Ohio*, held that: There are those who say, as did Justice Cardozo, that under our constitutional exclusionary doctrine "the criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered." . . . In some cases this will undoubtedly be the result. But, . . . there is another consideration—the imperative of judicial integrity. The criminal goes free, if he must, but it is the law that sets him free. Nothing can destroy a government more quickly than its failure to observe its own laws, or worse, its disregard of the charter of its own existence.

Here, Justice Clark begs the question by his phrase "failure to observe its own laws." What legitimate law is he speaking of?—The judge-made exclusionary rule beginning with *Weeks v. U.S.*? A rule or legal doctrine that was unknown to the constitutional Framers. A law with no legitimate constitutional origins. It is ironic and paradoxical for a Justice to both criticize the Court for not upholding the "law" by failing to give legal credence to the exclusionary rule—a blatant distortion of the Constitution and an affront to the original Framers of the Constitution.

12. My opening paragraph is illustrative of the liberal fascism that essentially created the unconstitutional exclusionary rule in addition to many other judicial legislation. See *id.*, Washington, *Exclusionary Rule*:

"The judge-made doctrine called, the "exclusionary rule", prohibits the introduction at a criminal trial of evidence obtained in violation of a defendant's Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable searches and seizures, the Fifth Amendment right to due process and the right against self incrimination, or the Sixth Amendment right to an attorney. As we shall see in this Article, the exclusionary rule is a perfect example of the type of pseudo-constitutional doctrine that can evolve from a judicial activist Supreme Court with a radical political agenda. A radical political agenda that activist judges can impose into the marketplace of ideas not via the democratic process or by "We the People", but by judges that cavalierly substitute constitutional jurisprudence with their own personal policy preferences. Proponents of the exclusionary rule claim that its rationale is to deter the government (primarily the police) from using illegally obtained evidence in securing an arrest which is in violation of a person's constitutional rights. Interestingly, this reasoning was not offered in the opinion of the Court when they first invented this rule."

Notes omitted.

13. Tom Curry, *A flap over foreign matter at the Supreme Court House members protests use of non-U.S. rulings in big cases*, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/4506232> (posted March 11, 2004).
14. As quoted in, Ellis Washington, *An American oligarchy of 5*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=67636> (posted June 21, 2008). Originally taken from, Albert J. Beveridge, 111, *The Life of John Marshall: Conflict and Construction* 1800-1815, 101, 144, n.3 (1980). Thomas Jefferson, America's third President stated these sentiments regarding the first example of judicial activism by the Court in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803).
15. For picture of Lady Justice peeking, see Ellis Washington, *Sotomayor is an anti-constitutionalist*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=100684> (posted 10 June 2009).
16. *Pleasant Grove City v. Summum*, 555 U.S. 460 (2009), cited on the SCOTUS's blog, www.scotusblog.com.
17. *Kansas v. Ventris*, 556 U.S. ____ (2009), <http://supreme.justia.com/us/556/07-1356/>.

CHAPTER 2

1. Ellis Washington, *Thou shall not lie*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php/index.php?pageId=96042> (posted April 25, 2009).
2. Ellis Washington, *How Thomas Hobbes is helping destroy America*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=65756> (posted May 31, 2008).
3. Ellis Washington, *The Liberal Mind: The Psychological Causes of Political Madness*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=56494> (posted Nov. 12, 2008).
4. Toby Harnden, *Top 10 anti-Barack Obama Conservatives*, http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/tobyharnden/8740337/Top_10_antiBarack_Obama_conservatives/ (posted Feb. 27, 2009).
5. Ellis Washington, *Obama, me and our pastors*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=66397> (posted June 7, 2008).

6. Ellis Washington, *Why I became an conservative*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=59569> (posted March 22, 2008).
7. Ellis Washington, *3 legends face Judgment Day*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php/index.php?pageId=44498> (posted Nov. 24, 2007).
8. Stephen Dinan, *Senate's liberal lion falls to cancer at 77*, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/aug/27/senates-liberal-lion-falls-to-cancer-at-77/?page=4> (posted Aug. 27, 2009).
9. Original Feb. 2, 1992 article published in The London Times by Tim Sebastian, *Teddy, the KGB and the top secret file*, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/19401082/Teddy-the-KGB-and-the-Top-Secret-File-Tim-Sabastian-the-Sunday-Times-Feb-2-1992> (posted Feb. 2, 1992).
10. Paul Kengor, *The Crusader: Ronald Reagan and the Fall of Communism*, (New York: Harper, 2006).
11. *Supra* note 9.
12. WorldNetDaily.com, Obama Watch Central, *President Obama's outspoken "green czar," Van Jones, was forced to resign*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=109041> (posted Sept. 6, 2009).
13. See Wikipedia article, *Plata O Plomo*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plata_O_Plomo (posted Dec. 2009).
14. April 2008 radio interview excerpt, "Van Jones Exposed by his Own Words," http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fi5NX_Y0cow (posted Sept. 3, 2009).
15. Regarding President Obama's regulatory czar, Cass Sunstein, who I call a "friendly fascist" see, Ellis Washington, *Harvard's propaganda for Obama*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=75718> (posted Sept. 20, 2008).
16. Hot Air News—Bush, 2008: *There is no [conservative] movement!* <http://hotair.com/archives/2009/09/15/bush-2008-there-is-no-conservative-movement/> (posted Sept. 15, 2009).
17. BBC News—Bodies mutilated in Iraq attack, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3585765.stm (posted March 31, 2004).

18. Con Carroll, *True Cost of Stimulus: \$3.27 Trillion*, <http://blog.heritage.org/2009/02/12/true-cost-of-stimulus-327-trillion/> (posted Feb. 12, 2009).
19. Quote from Goethe's *Faust* cited in: Ellis Washington, *Faust, Greenspan and America's economic collapse*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=76725> (posted Oct. 2, 2008).
20. Jan Moller, *Gov. Bobby Jindal takes stimulus plan opposition to NBC's "Meet the Press,"* http://www.nola.com/news/index.ssf/2009/02/gov_bobby_jindal_takes_stimulu.html (posted Feb. 23, 2009).

CHAPTER 3

1. Ellis Washington, *Ted Kennedy: Reagan's Benedict Arnold*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php/index.php?pageId=108649> (posted Sept. 2, 2009).
2. Ellis Washington, *Reagan vindicated: SDI works*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=58297> (posted March 8, 2008).
3. Breitbart.com News — *Russia deploys air defense on North Korea missile test*, <http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=CNG.eeb3bfab74220523b8b7f76f5c704355.9f1> (posted Aug. 26, 2010).
4. Jonathan Schanzer, *The Talibanization of Gaza: A Liability for the Muslim Brotherhood*, <http://www.currenttrends.org/research/detail/the-talibanization-of-gaza-a-liability-for-the-muslim-brotherhood> (posted Aug. 19, 2009).
5. Ellis Washington, *The canary in the mine*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=84945> (Dec. 31, 2008).
6. Ibid.
7. AEI OUTLOOKS & ON THE ISSUES—James R. Lilley, *Blame Clinton, Not China, for the Lapse at Los Alamos*, <http://www.aei.org/issue/10211> (posted March 17, 1999).
8. Richard Beeston, *King Abdullah: This is not a two-state solution, it is a 57-state solution*, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle_east/article6260385.ece (posted May 11, 2009).

9. Aaron Klein, *Has Obama cut off information to Israel?*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=97693> (posted May 10, 2009).
10. Israel Matzav Blog, *The day Ayatollah Khameni laughed*, <http://israelmatzav.blogspot.com/2009/06/day-ayatollah-khameni-laughed.html> (posted June 24, 2009).
11. Michael D. Shear and Dan Balz, *At United Nations, Obama Makes Appeal for World's Cooperation*, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/23/AR2009092300796.html> (posted Sept. 24, 2009).
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. GlobalSecurity.org News—06 September 2007 Airstrike, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/070906-airstrike.htm>.
16. A rolling calculator regarding the cost of America's wars in Iraq and Afghanistan can be found at, <http://costofwar.com/en/>.
17. Primary Document: Direct from the Source—*Destined to Fail The attorney general on the fatal pre-9/11 intel wall*.<http://old.nationalreview.com/document/ashcroft200404131644.asp> (posted April 13, 2004).

CHAPTER 4

1. Ellis Washington, *Obama: Manchild in the promised land*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=90710> (posted March 4, 2009).
2. Ellis Washington, *Justice Thomas... my friend*, http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=56322 (posted June 23, 2007).
3. John Whitehead, *The Change Manifesto* (Naperville: Sourebooks, 2008).

4. John Whitehead, *Celebrate becoming an activist*. http://www.rutherford.org/articles_db/commentary.asp?record_id=612 (posted Sept. 14, 2009).
5. By Bruce Golding; Clemente Lisi, *Terror lawyer Lynne Stewart ordered to prison after conviction upheld*, http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/lawyer_ordered_to_prison_after_sentence_m1zuT4Vn7r0QuQQtt2nVmI#ixzz0X9gB1ZWT (posted Nov. 17, 2009).
6. See generally, Ellis Washington, *The Nuremberg Trials: Last Tragedy of the Holocaust* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2008).

CHAPTER 5

1. Review & Outlook—*Driving Tom Daschle*, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123353200827537439.html> (Feb. 2, 2009).
2. Blog by AllahPundit, *Obama to rabbis on health care: "We are God's partners in matters of life and death,"* <http://hotair.com/archives/2009/08/19/obama-to-rabbis-on-health-care-we-are-gods-partners-in-matters-of-life-and-death/> (posted Aug. 19, 2009).

CHAPTER 6

1. Blog by SilentPatriot, "Jonathan Turley on The Rachel Maddow Show: We're all complicit in Bush's war crimes if we ignore them," <http://crooksandliars.com/taxonomy/term/949,771,126,224> (posted Nov. 27, 2008).
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Jonathan Turley' blog— <http://jonathanturley.org/category/supreme-court/page/2/> (posted Jan. 29, 2009).
5. Joslyn James Pictures: Photos on Another Alleged Tiger Woods Porn Star Mistress (NSFW, Video) http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/12/08/joslyn-james-pictures-pho_n_384290.html (posted Dec. 8, 2009).
6. Ellis Washington, *Why I became a conservative*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=59569> (posted March 22, 2008); Ellis Washington, *Safire, Kristol and*

'*The Spook Who Sat by the Door*,' <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=111408> (posted Sept. 30, 2009).

CHAPTER 7

1. David M. Walker, Commentary: *America's \$53 trillion debt problem*, http://articles.cnn.com/2008-10-06/politics/walker.bailout_1_credit-crunch-trillion-bailout?_s=PM:POLITICS (posted Oct. 6, 2008).
2. Ellis Washington, *Obama: Manchild in the Promised Land*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=90710> (posted March 4, 2009).
3. Mark Pittman and Bob Ivry, *Financial Rescue Nears GDP as Pledges Top \$12.8 Trillion* (Update1), <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=armOzfkwtCA4&refer=worldwide> (posted March 31, 2009).
4. Ellis Washington, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=57676> (posted March 1, 2008).

CHAPTER 8

1. Adam Davidson and Alex Blumberg, *Obama Gives Keynes His First Real-World Test*, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=100018973> (posted Jan. 29, 2009).
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Metro Detroit Staff—*Metro Detroiters Ask for Respect*, <http://www.freep.com/article/20090309/BUSINESS01/903090332/Metro-Detroiters-ask-respect>, (posted March 9, 2009).
5. Editors—*The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics*, Article on Adam Smith (1723-90), <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/bios/Smith.html>.
6. Ibid.
7. NY Post Staff Report—*World's richest hold secret meeting*, http://www.nypost.com/p/news/regional/item_0jWJyqQ88wBNWDI5fNLxpJj;sessionid=A6142D6EF17860D5B2D8C1451B47E1F4 (posted May 20, 2009).

8. Ibid.

9. My economic prediction made on May 30, 2009 was fulfilled on Aug. 6, 2011, about 2 years, 2 months premature, but none the less an accurate prophecy than any of the legions of Keynesian economists President Obama surrounds himself with whose one-note symphony is always the same failed song: Spend, Spend, Spend!

10. GatewayPundit—*After Losing 16,000 Jobs Each Day-- Obama Tells Dems "Not to Rest On Our Laurels,"* <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-bloggers/2260252/posts> (posted May 28, 2009).

CHAPTER 9

1. New York Post [Associated Press] News—*Abortion Doctor Tiller Gunned Down at Church*, http://www.nypost.com/p/news/national/item_Qvr8I7zphKh8Kf8pnfSTMK (posted May 31, 2009).

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Friends for Life, Fact and Figures, *72,000 babies you murdered*, <http://www.ashcofriendsforlife.org/Abortion-Facts.php>.

5. *Imus on the new Washington crowd*—In March 2009, conservative radio host, Laura Ingraham interviewed fellow curmudgeon radio host, Don Imus, when Imus remarked true to form regarding the administration of President Barack Obama: "I'm tired of hearing about how smart they all are, Best and the brightest are the dumbest bastards in the room!" See, <http://imustimes.wordpress.com/2009/03/19/imus-guests-on-laura-ingraham/>.

6. Hot Air News—*More bowing from the media*, <http://hotair.com/archives/2009/06/06/more-bowing-from-the-media/> (June 6, 2009).

7. *American Psychiatric Association categorize homosexuality as a mental disorder in 1968*, in Richard Green, *Is pedophilia a mental disorder?*, <http://www.springerlink.com/content/r3n76k01026v7j58/fulltext.pdf?page=1>. Note that the APA has begun an aggressive effort to normalize pedophilia. See Judith Reisman, *They're main-*

streaming pedophilia, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=336741> (posted Aug. 22, 2011); John Rossomando, Conference aims to normalize pedophilia, <http://dailycaller.com/2011/08/15/conference-aims-to-normalize-pedophilia/#ixzz1WRcRFjvX> (posted Aug. 15, 2011).

8. James Delingpole, *Climategate: the final nail in the coffin of 'Anthropogenic Global Warming'?*

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100017393/climategate-the-final-nail-in-the-coffin-of-anthropogenic-global-warming/> (posted Nov. 2009).

9. Allie Duzette, *Media Ignore Climate Science*, <http://www.aim.org/aim-column/media-ignore-climate-science-scandal/> (posted Nov. 23, 2009).

CHAPTER 10

1. Martin Niemoller, *Why the Church is Not Pacifist: Christianity and Power Politics* (1940) at: <http://www.billnourse.com/QUOTES.HTM>. I first heard of Pastor Niemoller's words while listening to my favorite radio talk show host, intellectual, and prolific cultural and political commentator, Dr. Michael Savage. (See www.Michaelsavage.com). He quoted Niemoller in the context of that contemporary societies modern-day Hitler and Minister of Propaganda and hatred of the Martin Goebbels (= Mahmoud Ahmadinejad) and his patron country who holds the distinction of being the largest supplier of world-wide terrorism (= Iran).

2. Michael Savage BBC Radio Interview, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lrXqyNARjV0> (May 6, 2009).

3. The New Yorker. Profile—*Party of One, Michael Savage expurgated*, Kalefa Sanneh, http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2009/08/03/090803fa_fact_sanneh (posted Aug. 8, 2009).

4. Glen Owen, *US shock jock Savage targeted 'to balance least wanted list'*, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1202169/US-shock-jock-Savage-targeted-balance-wanted-list.html> (posted July 25, 2009).

5. David Kirkparick, *Judge sees slavery in liberalism*, <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/06/09/politics/09brown.html> (June 5, 2009).

6. Cliff Churgin, *Israelis growing increasingly anxious about Obama policies*, <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2009/06/02/69296/israelis-growing-increasingly.html> (June 2, 2009).
7. Ali Akbar Dareini, *Iran warns West it will make its own nuclear fuel*, http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=CNG.3929d43c4bd28b369ad24922341efe.e61&show_article=1 (Jan. 1, 2009).
8. Wikipedia article, *J'accuse!*, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J%27accuse_\(letter\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J%27accuse_(letter)) (last modified Sept. 13, 2011).
9. Video link—Michael Savage Gets Pissed Off at Government Scandals and United Kingdom Banning News - (7/1/09) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WvUET70TMKI> (posted July 1, 2009), cited article regarding same by Jim Meyers of Newsmax dropped a bombshell article on July 1, 2009.
10. U.S. Department of Homeland Security Report—(U//FOUO) *Rightwing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment*, <http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/rightwing.pdf> (April 7, 2009).
11. Ellis Washington, *Obscurity was good for me*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=41431> (posted May 3, 2007).
12. See generally, Joseph Farah, *"Taking America Back: A Radical Plan to Revive Freedom, Morality and Justice,"* <http://superstore.wnd.com/Taking-America-Back-Autographed-Paperback> and his informative online intelligence newsletter, Joseph Farah's *G2 Bulletin*, and many news articles from a career as a professional journalist spanning over 30 years, is an achievement that even conservative icon Bill Buckley would be envious of.
13. Gaby Hinsliff, *Gordon Brown in new storm over freed Lockerbie bomber*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2009/aug/23/gordon-brown-letter-gaddafi-lockerbie> (posted Aug. 22, 2009).
14. Wikipedia article on Leni Riefenstahl, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leni_Riefenstahl (last modified Sept. 28, 2011).

15. Garrison Keillor, *Cut Republicans out of healthcare!* http://www.salon.com/news/opinion/garrison_keillor/2009/09/30/the_shallows/print.html (posted Sept. 30, 2009).

EPILOGUE

1. Ellis Washington, *Machiavelli in the house*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=69957#ixzz1a1vPpuZs> (posted July 19, 2008).
2. Ellis Washington, *I think, therefore I am*, <http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=69347> (posted July 12, 2008).
3. Ellis Washington, *How Thomas Hobbes is helping destroy America*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=65756> (posted May 31, 2008).
4. Ellis Washington, *Rousseau and the savageness of humanity*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=68166> (posted June 28, 2008).
5. Ellis Washington, *Communism then and now*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=71853> (posted Aug. 9, 2008).
6. Ellis Washington, *It's all about pleasure?*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=72463> (posted Aug. 16, 2008).
7. Ellis Washington, *Darwin's deadly delusions*, <http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=71222> (posted Aug. 2, 2008).
8. Ellis Washington, *Nietzsche and the damnation of ideas*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=67007> (posted June 14, 2008).
9. Ellis Washington, *Hitler's ideology, 'right wing'?*, <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=73141> (posted Aug. 23, 2008).
10. Ellis Washington, *The Ten Commandments of the Antichrist*, <http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=265265> (posted Feb. 19, 2011).
11. Ellis Washington, *Liberal fascism through the Ages*, <http://www.elliswashingtonreport.com/2011/07/30/liberal-fascism-ages/> (posted July 30, 2011).
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.