

April, 2010 Vol.I No.15



Reflections

A New Generation of Conservative Thought

Christophobia



Obamacare Manifesto • Cuba's ploy • Sexualizing girls

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com



The conservative movement is in crisis. Modern conservatism was born in 1955 with the founding of *National Review*. Its editor, William F. Buckley Jr., said the publication's mission was to "stand athwart history, yelling stop!" But history has kept rolling along, smashing every traditional institution in its path. Family, faith, capitalism, our constitutional republic—they have all been shattered by modern liberalism. In the face of this ideological juggernaut, conservatives have offered sporadic and weak resistance. Their ideas have become stale. Too many prefer power to principles. The movement has become corrupt, lazy and ineffective. Having come to Washington to confront the political rot and moral decay, conservatives have become part of the establishment. In other words, they have become part of the problem.

The mission of *Reflections Magazine* is to launch a conservative moral and intellectual revival. We will bring together the finest minds and writers to defend the eternal principles of God, country and family. We seek to forge a reinvigorated conservative movement for the 21st century—one that champions a new nationalism, rooted in a culture of life, small government, a restoration of federalism and victory over Islamist terrorism. Capitol BuildingThe time has come for a one-nation conservatism that reaches out to minorities and women, the unborn and the poor, workers and students. The movement must go beyond its traditional base or else suffer a slow, agonizing death. Our goal is unabashedly counter-revolutionary: to roll back the forces of progressivism. Since the 1960s, a destructive liberal revolution has swept across our land. Characterized by radical secular humanism, sexual permissiveness and milk-toast socialism, it is transforming America into something our Founding Fathers would not only find unrecognizable but repugnant. We stand for the real America, the historic America, the eternal America—an America based on moral traditionalism, an America of limited government, self-reliance and entrepreneurship, an America that won its independence from imperial British rule, triumphed over Nazi Germany and Communist Russia, and has shed precious blood and treasure to liberate hundreds of millions of people around the world, and an America that champions human rights and freedom, in which every individual—regardless of race, color, gender or religion—possesses innate dignity and equal value in the eyes of our creator. We ask like-minded Americans to join us in this struggle for the heart and soul of America.

Edmund Burke, the great philosopher and godfather of Western conservatism, once said: "All that's necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing." We refuse to do nothing. We will fight for what is right, true and good. This is the rock upon which we take our stand.

Cover

6 Christophobia

By Jeffrey T. Kuhner

Content

April, 2010 Vol.I, No.15

Politics

9 American tyranny? *By Herbert London*

10 Attempting to silence conservative talk radio *By Steve Malzberg*

11 The misguided historicism of liberals *By Kerry W. and Peggy McCarthy*

Foreign Affairs

13 Cuba: The tourist gulag *By Anthony Rainone*

Culture

15 Nine minutes of hate: The endless double standards of the left

By Grace Vuoto

16 The sexual subversion of girls *By Kelly Kathryn Llobet*

Public Policy

18 The States vs. Obamacare *By Joe Vigliotti*

19 Freedom of speech runs wild *By Gayle S. Fixler*

Mission:

The Edmund Burke Institute for American Renewal was founded in June, 2005 in the nation's capital, Washington, D.C. We are a non-partisan, non-profit, education and outreach organization which aspires to engage and mobilize the millions of African Americans, Hispanics, women and other minorities in this country who share conservative values. We will inform conservative leaders about the needs and aspirations of minorities in order to make the latter feel welcome amongst us. Also, we want minorities to appreciate fully how conservatism is congruent with their values and goals. In short, we will build a steadfast alliance between conservative leaders and minority groups. We hope to preserve all those elements in the American republic that render us a strong and vibrant nation. Simultaneously, we are open to new ideas that will allow more citizens to enjoy the blessings of freedom, prosperity and moral renewal.



How We Differ From Other Conservative Organizations:

1. We seek to update conservative thought. We want to find original ideas on how to bolster timeless principles.
2. We are attentive to the needs of women and minorities. These are not peripheral but are a primary focus of our institute. We want the conservative movement to make adjustments in order to accommodate the unique aspirations of previously marginalized groups. We also want minorities to learn how the conservative movement can benefit them.
3. We are devoted to cultural issues, not just politics. The main battle of our time is to seize the initiative in the cultural arena.
4. We hope to foster a broad alliance with those who adhere to traditional moral principles. We seek to build brigades with individuals of all faiths in order to combat assaults on human dignity.
5. We write policy initiatives, opinion articles and monographs as well as organize symposiums and conferences that appeal to our audience. Hence we do not just think and write: we take action!
6. We do not focus exclusively on one group or on one issue. There are excellent minority conservative organizations across the United States that are currently working in isolation from one another. Instead, we bring these groups together on a variety of issues in order to find common ground and, thus, to be effective in achieving political and cultural change.

Christophobia

By Jeffrey T. Kuhner

Christianity is dying. It was once the bastion of Western civilization. Now, Christianity is a pitiful remnant of its former greatness. Across the West, it is in full retreat.

The sex-abuse scandal is ravaging the Catholic Church - tarring Pope Benedict XVI himself. The Anglican Church has been eviscerated, losing members as it succumbs to the liberal winds of female ordination and gay rights. Many Protestant denominations are abandoning their beliefs and fervent missionary zeal, embracing chic environmentalism and watered-down socialism as a cheap substitute for the traditional Gospel. Europe, the ancient stronghold of Christendom, has been transformed into a secular neo-pagan culture. For Europeans, God is dead; He has been replaced by materialist man.

The secular tidal wave has also hit and overwhelmed America. Since the 1960s, the United States has been the victim of the sexual revolution that glorifies hedonism and personal liberation. Pornography, abortion, homosexuality, promiscuity, the AIDS epidemic, soaring out-of-wedlock births, skyrocketing divorce rates and the breakdown of the family - these are the poisoned fruits of the Playboy philosophy. MTV morality is in; Jesus is out.

The war waged by liberals on Christianity, however, has gone to a new, more dangerous level - one bordering on soft totalitarianism. Recently, the city of Davenport, Iowa, removed Good Friday from its municipal calendar. The Davenport Civil Rights Commission sought to change the name of the holiday to one that is less "divisive" and more ecumenical. Hence, a memo was sent to municipal employees stating Good Friday would be officially known as "Spring Holiday." City administrators stressed that celebrating Good Friday violates the separation of church and state.

"We merely made a recommendation that the name be changed to something other than Good Friday," said Tim Hart, the commission's chairman. "Our Constitution calls for separation of church and state. Davenport touts itself as a diverse city and given all the different types of religious and ethnic backgrounds we represent, we suggested the change."

After an uproar by outraged Christians, the city council decided to resurrect the name Good Friday. The multicultural secularists in Davenport have been defeated - for now.



Yet, the controversy is an ominous sign: The left is determined to extirpate Christian holidays and symbols from our society. Liberals are determined to smash traditional values and drive Christians underground. The American left is following in the shameful - and much more bloody - footsteps of Marxist regimes. Instead of eradicating religious faith through the barrel of a gun, leftists use bureaucratic dictates and mass propaganda.

The result is the same. Christianity is gradually being purged from the public square. Christmas celebrations have become offensive. "Merry Christmas" is now considered to be politically incorrect; the proper greeting is "happy holidays." The Ten Commandments cannot be displayed in courtrooms or classes. Prayer has been banished from public schools. Christians are regularly mocked in movies and TV. Taxpayer dollars are used to subsidize "art" that depicts Christ in unflattering ways. Hollywood makes films - such as "Angels and Demons" - portraying the Catholic Church as a repressive, sinister and primitive institution.

Anti-Christian bigotry is the last fashionable hatred. It is easy for Davenport's Christophobes to pick on Good Friday. What's the worst that could happen? Angry phone calls and e-mails? Town-hall meetings? Maybe public protests? But, in the end, progressive commissars realize they will not pay much of a price - in fact, they will be celebrated by liberal elites for their "enlightened ideals."

The same standards do not apply to Islam. Davenport's multiculturalists would never dare to remove say, Ramadan, from the calendar and rename it "Fasting Month" for fear of offending Muslims - and possibly triggering a fatwa. Self-preservation - and cowardice - dissuades them from attacking certain religions.

Christians, however, are an easy target. They do not believe in jihad or suicide bombing. Unlike radical Islamists, they espouse the rule of law and human rights. They accept persecution - even state-sanctioned persecution - as part of their religious burden. Liberals realize that Christianity is a genuine "religion of peace." This is why they do not fear systematically smearing it.

The Founding Fathers emphasized that the constitutional republic depended upon a vigorous religious

society.

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

The Founding Fathers were not secularists. On the contrary, they were devout Christians (with the exception of some Enlightenment deists like Thomas Jefferson), who feared an established church - especially, the Church of England - which persecuted dissenters. They would regard it as bizarre and repulsive were they to witness how the concept of the separation of church and state would be twisted in our time into a form of radical secularism and anti-Christian bias.

Our Judeo-Christian heritage provides the underpinnings to our constitutional government for one simple reason: It acknowledges the transcendental nature of man. Our fundamental liberties flow from God almighty - not the state. This is why individual rights - to life, liberty and property - are the essential bulwarks against government power: What God has given, no man - or regime - can take away. Once America loses its Christian identity, it will inevitably lose its freedoms.

Christophobia forms the basis of modern liberalism. Leftist progressives are determined to destroy traditional America and its seminal institutions - the Constitution, capitalism, national sovereignty and the family. This is why they have declared war on Christianity. If Christians do not rise from their apathy and man the ideological barricades, they will be driven into the catacombs once again. And with their defeat comes the end of our great republic.

We must boldly stand against any who attempt to degrade our Christian heritage. We must identify them as practicing one of the last acceptable forms of bigotry and hatred: Christophobia. Our right to embrace Christ is no less than their right to embrace a perverse lifestyle.

-Jeffrey T. Kuhner is a columnist at The Washington Times and president of the Edmund Burke Institute, a Washington think tank. He is the daily host of the "Kuhner Show" on WTNT 570-AM (www.talk570.com) from noon until 3 p.m.

This article was first published in The Washington Times on April 2, 2010. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/02/christophobia/>

Premier Speechwriting and Writing Services



Eloquence

Our words captivate and inspire.

At Eloquence, we know the value of the written and spoken word. Words are not simply vowels and consonants strung together randomly. Rather, words are powerful: they are full of life. They can bridge the gap between people of different classes, races and nationalities. They can expand our horizon and lift our spirit. They can unite us, move us and inspire us to action.

At Eloquence, we know that words have the power to make a presentation, speech, Op-Ed or press release a resounding success. Our professional, seasoned writers will help you present your best public self. Whether you are making a corporate or political speech, writing an Op-Ed or creating a brochure, we can craft the perfect communication vessel for you. We tailor every written assignment to your specific needs.

Our skills are varied and unique.

Our imagination is boundless.

And our eloquence will captivate
your audience...



American tyranny?

By Herbert London

The beginning of Spring 2010 marks an historic moment in American history: A nation organized as a republic is being transformed into a tyranny. The healthcare bill that has been bruited over for months is the law of the land, giving Washington, D.C. control of one-sixth of the national economy.

More significantly, this act violates the Constitution in several critical ways. All Americans will have to obtain healthcare insurance whether they want it or not. The act also forbids repeal even if the Republicans recapture control of one of the houses of Congress in the next election.

By any measure, this is a *coup d'etat* with President Barack Obama employing a combination of threats and blandishments to achieve his revolutionary goals.

Supporters will argue, of course, that this act universalizes healthcare and that detractors are exaggerating its effect. But it should be noted that the cost will be at least a trillion dollars and perhaps twice that sum if Congressional Budget Office estimates are accurate. These costs are on top of the accumulated debt that has reached unparalleled proportions in the last year.

Moreover, this bill is being imposed on the American people who oppose the legislation by margins between 60-70 percent. It would seem that proponents are driven by an ideological fervor that is resistant to public opinion. If the Tea Partiers have any traction, it is largely because of the president's overreaching. The public seemingly understands what many in Congress do not. Personal freedom—the ability to choose a physician and select appropriate treatment if it is needed—will be imperiled. A bureaucrat will have the latitude to determine the fate of patients, which means rationing is the inevitable outcome.

Charles Eliot Norton, nineteenth century author, sounded the clarion call for our own time when he wrote in *True Patriotism*, “The voice of protest, of

warning, of appeal is never more needed than when the clamor of fife and drum, echoed by the press and too often by the pulpit, is bidding all men fall in and keep step and obey in silence the tyrannous word of command. Then, more than ever, it is the duty of the good citizen not to be silent.”

Should Americans awaken from their slumber they will realize that their most valuable possession, the liberty the Founders conferred, has been taken away from them in a coercive effort to make citizens slaves of the state or, at the very least, dependent on the state. This is the time to shout from the rooftops, “We won't take it anymore.”

The very fabric of society is being shattered with legislation that materially changes the way we live. Walt Whitman wrote, “If the people lose their roughness and spirit of defiance—Tyranny may always enter—there is no charm, no bar against it—the only bar against it is a large resolute breed of men.” Moreover, a state so expansive it cannot recognize its natural and constitutional limits ultimately transforms freedom into tyranny even if this is not the initial intent. That explains why the Founding Fathers constructed a limited government based on the recognized fallibility of human nature. They realized that the tyranny they opposed and fought against can emerge from within through an emboldened government that believes only *it* knows what is best for the governed.

It would appear that Mr. Obama does not appreciate the fact that unlimited power invariably corrupts the mind of those who possess it. This is the place where the rule of law succumbs to the pressure of despotism. And whether recognized by all or not, healthcare is the wedge that is altering America.

In 1776 Thomas Paine wrote, “These are the times that try men's souls.” Alas, 2010 is a time, not unlike the American Revolution, when our national soul is on trial and the very liberty we were enjoined to defend is slipping away from our grasp. Mr. Obama argues healthcare is a calamity, a crisis of unusual

depth, but as history notes, “necessity” is usually the justification for every infringement of liberty. Necessity is the argument of tyrants; the creed of the despondent.

How the nation responds to this government tyranny remains to be seen. Our Republic’s future depends on this response.

-Herbert London is president of Hudson Institute and professor emeritus of New York University. He is the author of Decade of Denial and America’s Secular Challenge.

Attempting to silence conservative talk radio

By Steve Malzberg



On June 13, 2008, vice presidential candidate Sarah Palin was campaigning in the city of brotherly love, Philadelphia. She was speaking to a group of supporters and was speculating on just how rough things could get in the race for the

White House against then-candidate Barack Obama and the Democrats. “If they bring a knife to the fight, we bring a gun,” she roared. Months later, on February 12, 2010 at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, Amy Bishop, a neurobiology professor, gunned down three biology professors at a faculty meeting and injured three other school employees. She committed this atrocity after being denied tenure. According to the Boston Herald, Bishop is a “far right political extremist who is obsessed with Governor Palin.”

If these events had actually occurred this way, we would surely have been told by many in the mainstream media that Mrs. Palin’s language was taken literally by a deranged right-winger who viewed her denial of tenure as the “knife,” and thus decided to take Mrs. Palin’s advice and bring a “gun” to her own personal fight. There would have been countless shows on CNN and MSNBC and columns written by the left demanding that Mrs. Palin be held morally, if not legally responsible, for the murder of three people.

But it didn’t happen this way—not quite. Instead, it was Illinois Senator Barack Obama who spoke in Philadelphia on that day in June. Mr. Obama made the remark about bringing a gun to the fight. Amy

Bishop does indeed stand accused of murder but she was not a right-wing Palin follower. The Boston Herald in fact called her “a far-left political extremist who was obsessed with President Obama.”

So why is it that not one member of the left denounced Mr. Obama’s rhetoric and addressed how it might have been taken literally by a severely troubled individual who is obsessed with him?

Consider also the case of Joe Stack. He flew a small plane into a building targeting and hitting the Internal Revenue Services’ offices in Texas on February 18, 2010. At first, the media tried to paint him as a member of the Tea Party movement. Yet he turned out to be anti-George Bush, anti-big corporations, anti-religion and anti-capitalist. He ended the rambling manifesto that he left behind on the Internet with the following: “The communist creed: From each according to his ability to each according to his need. The capitalist creed: From each according to his gullibility to each according to his greed.” So why is it that not one member of the left tried to find out if this murderer listened to MSNBC or left-wing talk radio?

There is also the case of Norman Leboon. He was arrested in late March for threatening to kill Virginia Congressman Eric Cantor and his family. In fact, despite all the recently-reported threats against members of Congress who voted for the health care bill, Leboon is the only person to be identified and taken into custody. And he had contributed twice to Mr. Obama’s campaign.

Imagine the hell that would be breaking loose if Leboon had threatened a Democratic congressman and had been a John McCain contributor. We need

only listen to the hysterics that have been taking place from the crazed left wing as they attack talk radio for being responsible for the threats that have been made against Democrats who voted for the health care bill.

Congressmen and women who voted against the bill have also received threats—yet this is hardly noted. Also, there is not one shred of evidence that any person threatening politicians listens to talk radio. But these facts do not matter, because we, on the right, who speak the truth about the health care bill will be held responsible by leftists and the mainstream media for driving some deranged individual to make threats. We, on the right with a microphone who speak the truth about the current Marxist president in the White House, are going to be held responsible if some unstable individual commits a crime against him or any other Democrat. It will not matter that the culprit never heard of me, Jeff Kuhner, Rush Limbaugh or Glenn Beck. Regardless, we will be deemed guilty by the crazed left and they will come after us like Hugo Chavez has gone after his media critics in Venezuela.

Radical leftists will continue to attack conservative talk radio and attempt to silence us. They will not succeed because the truth always prevails.

-Steve Malzberg is a nationally syndicated talk show host on the WOR Radio Network and a frequent guest on many television cable shows. He can be reached through www.worradionet.com.

The misguided historicism of liberals

By Kerry W. and Peggy McCarthy

Conservatives wonder at liberals' audacity in the face of fierce resistance to President Barack Obama's socialist health care bill. Rush Limbaugh characterizes liberalism as "appealing to emotion, not thinking rationally." Michael Savage wrote a book entitled, *Liberalism is a Mental Disorder*. Liberals are rational—their actions may be partly explained by their tendency to view the world through the prism of historicism.

Historicism is a conviction that human nature and human thought are evolutionary; they change as history progresses, and so ideas are more or less bound to the historical times in which they appear. In short, a historicist believes that what was true before is not necessarily true now.

Historicist revisionism questions commonly-held perceptions of past events. President Abraham Lincoln is a magnet for historicists. Those who say Lincoln was wrong—that there is no justifiable reason for war—use historicist thinking selectively, excusing slave-holders as products of their time while faulting Lincoln for "whipping up war frenzy." This selective use of historicism makes it a very powerful tool.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who collaborated in writing *The German Ideology* and *The Communist*

Manifesto, employed historicism, declaring: "We reject every attempt to impose on us any moral dogma whatsoever as an eternal, ultimate and forever immutable ethical law." Engels denied "that the moral world has...permanent principles that stand above history."

Liberals employ historicism to deny evidence of the failures and negative consequences of their policy preferences and to convince casual thinkers to accept and support positive-sounding policies. For example, historicism has been applied to the current debate on health care. Since not many American citizens know precisely whether state-run health systems have improved peoples' lives in other nations, they can believe that it will work here through use of a liberal form of American Exceptionalism that claims if anyone can make it work, we can.

To be fair, it is easy to be persuaded that a universal health-care system might work in America, because the successes of such systems in other nations are amplified by its champions and their failures disregarded as irrelevant. Recently in England, a frustrated hospital administrator was quoted as saying that her job "is to see to it that the government is re-elected. In return the government sees to it that I remain an administrator." In France, doctors and

nurses have waged strikes, demanding fewer hours and more pay. Canadian Newfoundland Premier Danny Williams recognized that he would receive better care in the United States and elected to travel to Florida for heart treatment. But historicism allows champions of state-run health care to disregard this evidence.

Uncanny similarities exist between the new health-care bill and Prohibition, which was made law by progressives who imagined that the time was right to outlaw the drinking of alcohol. Advocates of both these restrictive mandates persuaded casual thinkers to overlook their inherent problems. Historicism allows people in charge to declare an idea is “in its prime,” while obstacles to its accomplishment (like the fact that it is unconstitutional for our government to force its citizens to purchase health insurance or that people will not quit drinking because they are ordered to) are disregarded as important in the past but now irrelevant.

Liberals, viewing foreign policy through the prism of historicism, often advocate appeasement. It matters little that appeasement has failed time and again for liberals tend to believe that under their guidance, the panacea of negotiation will solve major conflicts. Their faith in historicism allows liberals to believe that there is no such thing as an irreconcilable difference, that all problems can be talked out—if only

they are in charge.

Mr. Obama has lamented that the Constitution “does not do enough; it is a document of negative rights to government and does not tell us what we can do for you but instead tells what we can’t do for you.” Mr. Obama correctly identifies the intent of the Constitution to limit government. Historicists view the Constitution as a “living, breathing document.” Any living, breathing entity can sicken and die. Mr. Obama’s assumption of responsibility, power and authority for the federal government has crossed the line into direct violation of individual liberty and threatens the “life” of our constitution.

“Our popular government has often been called an experiment. Two points in it our people have already settled—the successful establishment and the successful administering of it. One still remains—its successful maintenance against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it,” said Lincoln in a July 4th message to a special session of Congress in 1861. Lincoln, of course, referred to the internal rebellion attempted by secessionists. One-hundred-and-fifty years later, our government of the people faces another formidable internal attempted overthrow—this time by people occupying powerful positions within.

-Kerry W. and Peggy McCarthy are writers living in Indiana.

Cuba: The tourist gulag

By Anthony Rainone

The communist Cuban dictatorship is attempting to lure American tourists to explore Cuba and take advantage of its natural beauty, courtesy of a misinformed U.S. Congress.

Recently, Congressman Collin Peterson, Minnesota Democrat, along with 30 co-sponsors, introduced the “Travel Restriction Reform and Export Enhancement Act,” a bill that would remove restrictions on U.S. agricultural sales and travel to Cuba. There is currently no Republican support for this proposal.

The Obama administration seeks “a new beginning” with Cuba, despite the regime’s continued mistreatment of political prisoners and human rights abuses. Some members of Congress are currently being duped by a regime that desperately needs convertible foreign currency so that its economy will not collapse due to failed Marxist economic policies instituted by ruling brothers Fidel and Raul Castro. Cuba is an economic basket case now dependent on foreign government handouts from Venezuela, Russia and China. The regime uses the remittances from prosperous Cuban Americans for political and economic gain of its elites rather than for the benefit of the Cuban people.

The nearly 50-year-old political and economic embargo must remain in place because the Castro regime will not change its authoritarian nature: The embargo, along with diplomatic pressure is needed to bring about real reform after the deaths of the Castros. A viable reform movement cannot take place unless the autocratic Castros pass from the scene and a

new, younger generation of leaders implement democratic reforms. Advocates for lifting the sanctions maintain that tourism will somehow lead to a more open regime. This is foolish and wishful thinking: As long as the Castro brothers remain alive any true and honest political opening will be met with contempt by this despotic regime that seeks to hold onto power, whatever the cost. As in the past with Canadian and European tourism currency, the funds do not go to the long-suffering Cuban people who work in the tourist industry but to Castro’s inner circle and the military, thereby prolonging and not hastening the demise of this despotic regime.



Foreign Affairs

Cuba remains a threat to America and to other nations. There are many historic examples of Cuba's aggressive nature, including the 1962 missile crisis that almost led to the near nuclear annihilation of human civilization; the Soviets placed nuclear-tipped missiles on Cuban soil with the full backing of the Castro regime. From 1975 to 1991 Cuba was engaged in military adventurism in Angola in support of Soviet expansionism in Sub Saharan Africa. Those acts still scar the region today. In addition, the Cuban regime has fanned radical Marxism in Central America since the 1980s.

Extreme Marxist-Leninist regimes in Venezuela, Bolivia, Nicaragua and to a lesser extent, Ecuador, hold the Castro regime as a role model to repress, silence and corrupt democratic institutions in their countries, mostly for the sole purpose of staying in power indefinitely. These regimes are now grave threats to peace and security in the Western Hemisphere. The Castro regime also supports terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), The Army of National Liberation (ELN) and the Shining Path which threatens the survival of the robust democracies of Colombia and Peru.

Also, America's national security remains at grave risk due to Cuba's desire to weaken the intelligence capabilities of our Armed Forces. Consider the case of Ana Montes, a senior Cuban intelligence analyst working for the Defense Intelligence agency. She passed vital intelligence information to Cuban intelligence agents and was captured on September 21, 2001. Yet her actions severely weakened our intelligence gathering capabilities worldwide.

America must demand a full accounting of human rights abuses by the Castro regime and real political and economic reforms. The human rights record of Cuba's long-oppressed people is appalling, as witnessed by the recent hunger-strike death of political prisoner Orlando Zapata in February. The free world

also watched in horror as a pro-democracy blogger, Yoani Sanchez, was savagely attacked in November, 2009 by supporters of the Castro dictatorship. In response to these and many other repressive attacks on free speech and freedom of expression, the U.S. State Department talks tough by issuing "statements of concern." But without effective and coordinated diplomatic, economic and political actions, these threats become hollow and lose their well-intentioned meaning.

One million American tourists coming to Cuba's sun-splashed beaches, playing golf and spending money in the Cuban economy will do little to foster meaningful change in Cuba. Tourism will not change a regime that has imprisoned over 10 million people that desperately want to leave this gulag in quest of liberty.

Washington would be wise to dissuade the Hollywood left, the media elite and members of Congress (travelling at U.S. taxpayer expense) from visiting Cuba and extolling the virtues and benefits of the Cuban healthcare system. The true reality is that the Cuban healthcare system is a nightmare for the average Cuban and mismanaged by an inefficient communist bureaucracy.

Members of Congress and the current administration must take a clear and moral stand against the Castro brothers and deprive them of any additional tourism revenues. The Castros are using their openness to tourism to soften their international image and deflect criticism. This aging dynastic dictatorship is moribund and needs a gentle shove into the grave. Rather than playing into their hands, Congress should retain the tourist embargo and expose the Cuban tourism scheme as a desperate attempt to preserve a tyrannical regime that has for too long brutalized and enslaved its people.

-Anthony Rainone is a retired Army intelligence officer

Nine minutes of hate: The endless double standards of the left

By Grace Vuoto

Media leftists are becoming consumed with hatred. On April 14, MSNBC host Chris Matthews sunk to an all-time low by conducting an interview with commentator and comedian Bill Maher that reeked of chauvinism, racism, elitism and was full of double standards. In a nine-minute segment on *Hardball with Chris Matthews*, they both insulted women, Republicans, conservatives, Alaskans and millions of Tea Party participants—all with a tone of self-righteous indignation.

Both men used language regarding former Alaskan Gov. Sarah Palin and Minnesota Republican Rep. Michele Bachmann that would be roundly denounced by feminists if used by a conservative. In describing Mrs. Palin's voice, Mr. Matthews said she speaks in a "different octave" to which Mr. Maher replied it was akin to "fingernails on a chalkboard." Both brought attention to the fact that the women are attractive: Mr. Matthews said the women add the "glamor edge" to the Republican Party; Mr. Maher called them "MILFS," which he defined as "morons I want to forget." He deliberately used a colloquial sexual acronym, changed its meaning for humor—but still with the intent of demeaning the two female political leaders and conjuring images of them as sexual objects. Together, the two commentators were akin to two schoolboys gawking at the girls. Where were the "progressive" sensibilities of these middle-aged men?

Both analysts mocked the credentials, knowledge and intellectual ability of Mrs. Palin—which has some merit given the abysmal interviews she has conducted and her thin level of knowledge. Yet, why lump Mrs. Bachmann in the same category? Are the mistakes of one woman naturally transferred onto another; are women to be judged as a "collective"—which is exactly what feminists have railed against for several decades? Mr. Maher said he would love to see them both on the quiz show *Jeopardy*, smirking that they would fare ill. He also said there is a "deficit" of female role models. Does he believe that only

men are worthy of admiration and emulation?

Mr. Maher continued to tar whole groups with sweeping, sophomoric statements. He referred to Mrs. Palin as the former governor of "a state with no people." Alaska does indeed have a small population of approximately 700,000 yet they are worthy of representation and duly elected Mrs. Palin. Mr. Maher's condescending tone implied that the achievements or needs of Alaskans are not as vital as those of states inhabited by more people. It is unlikely Mr. Maher would address President Barack Obama's previous work as a community organizer, evidently also with a relatively small population, with the same derision. Mr. Obama's work as a community organizer was hailed by many liberals throughout the 2008 campaign as an example of his great humility and his selfless service to the people.

Yet the most appalling and deliberate slurs were launched at the so-called "birthers"—the term used by Mr. Matthews to belittle the growing number of concerned citizens who are demanding that Mr. Obama reveal his birth certificate. Mr. Maher said these "birthers" are little more than "sore losers" who are trying to find a way to remove the president from office; he compared this to the Republican use of the Paula Jones sexual harassment case to impeach then-President Bill Clinton in the 1990s. The analyst said the movement is fundamentally a racist one: "If there's one thing they absolutely cannot stand, it is being called racist. If there's another thing they absolutely cannot stand, of course, it's black people."

Mr. Maher failed to observe that in both cases, the American people have the right to protect themselves from any unlawful behavior from their leaders. Mr. Clinton was impeached in 1998 by the House for perjury and obstruction of justice—actions that he brought upon himself. Similarly, Mr. Obama's legitimacy is being questioned due to his failure to comply with the requirements of the Constitution and demonstrate his birth certificate; he is bringing this

upon himself. Hence, the “birthers” are not racists; they are exercising their rights to hold leaders accountable under the laws of the land. When Mr. Gore contested the results of the 2000 election, the left by and large applauded the attempt to challenge the legitimacy of the presidency of George W. Bush. Yet when conservatives do the same, they are denounced as pathological, provincial racists.

Mr. Matthews and Mr. Maher attempted to further tar the conservative movement and Tea Party as racist. Mr. Matthews said that we have to “connect the dots” and observe that some of the language being used against the Obama administration is reminiscent of the pre-Civil War era: “A lot of pre-Civil War antebellum lingo coming out, dripping from the lips of these Southern Republicans. I think there is a connection, myself.”

Mr. Maher said categorically that the conservative movement and its Tea Party incarnation are full of “religious lunatics, flat-earthers and Civil War reenactors.” He said the Civil War period cannot be recast as simply about states rights or economic issues—as the central issue was slavery: “...when you are nostalgic for a period in history that was very bad to a certain group of people, it’s sort of insulting to that group of people...” By that standard, most of human history is insulting to the vast majority of the human race—including white men—for prosperity, peace and freedom are the exception in world history not the rule.

Yet, the Tea Party movement and conservatives are mostly using the language of the Revolutionary period of the late 1700s rather than the language of the mid 1800s. Even the secessionist sentiments emanating from some contemporary conservatives have their origin in the doctrine of states rights established

by the Founding Fathers.

The upshot is that Mr. Matthews and Mr. Maher want to create a straw man Confederate Tea Party Movement rather than acknowledge that the current Tea Party is rooted in a traditional form of American protest and revolt inspired by the American Revolution.

This segment on national television was nine minutes of pure hate. It should be used in American textbooks as an example of how the left flagrantly violates its own ideals. The two liberal cohorts ignored their ideology’s vaunted regard for women; they forgot about their customary celebration of individual merit; they trampled on the liberal invocation to respect different groups and regions by belittling Alaska; they dismissed their usual faith in the people and respect for public protests as legitimate dissent; and they suddenly had little recollection of the courageous revolutionary furor that led to the founding of the nation—the very sentiment often used by liberals to justify their revolts against authority and tradition. By impugning a hidden racism to a movement that has nothing to do with race, they completely ignored their usual pleas for a colorblind analysis. In nine minutes, all of these ballyhooed liberal ideals were overthrown in the very name of an incoherent, contradictory liberalism.

And it is precisely because of shocking moments like these that there is ever-growing anger, rebellion and mistrust of liberal elites across the nation. Mr. Matthews and Mr. Maher little understand how they fuel the very movement they despise.

-Dr. Grace Vuoto is the Executive Director of The Edmund Burke Institute for American Renewal.

The sexual subversion of girls

By Kelly Kathryn Llobet

A covert war is being waged against America’s daughters. This war is the sexualization of our youth: The most recent battlefield is the Girl Scouts of America. The fight to sexually subvert our young women is undercover, insidious and cloaked in the sweet euphemisms of progressivism.

Recently, Sharon Slater, president of Family Watch International, an international non-profit organization that

promotes the family, based on marriage between a man and a woman, reported participating in the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) which is dedicated exclusively to gender equality and the advancement of women. It is the principal global policy-making body at the United Nations. She was asked to leave a closed-door “girls only” meeting sponsored by the Girl Scouts of the USA (GSUSA). As soon as the meeting ended, she entered the room, and found a stack of booklets titled, “Healthy, Happy, and Hot,” produced by the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), a leading global advocate of sexual and reproductive health and rights for all.



This offensive booklet promotes sexual pleasure to teens. “Many people think sex is just about vaginal or anal intercourse. But, there are lots of different ways to have sex and lots of different types of sex,” states the pamphlet. The booklet encourages masturbation, talking “dirty,” and depicts both same-sex and opposite-sex couples. It also tells HIV-infected teens that they do not have to inform their sexual partners they are infected.

GSA stated that they did not actively pass out the pamphlets. However, they have not disavowed the material. In fact, for 14 years, GSA and Planned Parenthood have had a relationship. In 2004 at a co-sponsored event in Waco, Texas, a book entitled, *It's Perfectly Normal*, was doled out to 700 girls with explicit drawings of masturbation and couples having sexual intercourse.

American Life League's STOPP International (whose aim is to STOP Planned Parenthood) conducted a study of Girl Scout councils throughout the United States in an effort to identify which councils had a relationship with Planned Parenthood. The study was opposed by the national office of the GSUSA. After several months, they were able to get data on over half the Girl Scout Councils in the country and found that about 20 percent had some type of relationship with Planned Parenthood. Subsequently, GSUSA CEO Kathy Cloninger admitted, “We partner with many organizations. We have relationships with our church communities, with YWCAs, and with Planned Parenthood organizations across the country, to bring information-based sex education programs to girls.”

How far the Girl Scouts have fallen. In 1911, Juliette Low, founder of GSUSA, made a telephone call to a distant cousin, saying, “I've got something for the girls of Savannah, and all of America, and all the world, and we're going to start it tonight!” On March 12, 1912, she gathered 18 girls to register the first troop of American Girl Guides which was changed to the Girl Scouts the following year. The Girl Scouts brought girls of all backgrounds into the outdoors, giving them the opportunity to develop self-reliance and resourcefulness. Ms. Low encouraged girls to prepare not only for traditional homemaking, but also for roles as professional women.

Yet today, GSUSA has vast connections to sexually progressive groups. Many of these organizations maintain that liberal sexual education is for the good of the girls. This is a far cry from the initial vision of Ms. Low when she founded the Girl Scouts.

Parents must therefore be proactive in preventing their girls from being sexually subverted. They can compel the troop to change: Some mothers intend to ask the St. Louis Girl Scouts to pull out of the national organization. Parents can also put their girls in a different club altogether, such as the Little Flowers and American Heritage Girls. In essence, the pamphlet incident reveals that parents must be ever-vigilant: They cannot abdicate their role as their child's primary educator of virtue and morals. Their future depends on it.

-Kelly Kathryn Llobet is a writer living in Baltimore, a veteran Navy spouse and a proud mother of five.

The States vs. Obamacare

By Joe Vigliotti

On March 21 in the dead of night, the United States House of Representatives passed President Barack Obama's coveted healthcare legislation – the “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act” – without a single Republican vote and with 34 dissenting Democrats.

On March 23 when Mr. Obama signed the bill into law, Florida Attorney General Bill McCollum delivered his legal challenge. He filed on behalf of 12 states (South Carolina, Nebraska, Texas, Utah, Louisiana, Alabama, Colorado, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Washington, Idaho and South Dakota), while Virginia filed its own challenge. The actions are the first in a series of moves undertaken by states, citizens and other groups to challenge the constitutionality of Mr. Obama's healthcare legislation. They have set the stage for a power struggle between the overreaching federal government and the people of the states.

Idaho and Virginia were the first states to announce, prior to the passing of healthcare legislation, that they would seek to legally challenge the bill if it became law. South Carolina and Florida also followed suit. Walgreens Pharmacy in Washington state announced it would not accept any new Medicaid patients. With the signing of the legislation, all 13 states filed their challenges.

As of the end of March, 13 states are seeking to change state law to pre-empt Mr. Obama's healthcare legislation, and 29 other states are calling for ballot measures to amend their constitutions.

On April 7, five other states joined the group of states headed up by Florida to bring litigation against the federal government. Those new states include Indiana, North Dakota, Mississippi, Nevada and Arizona.

The attorneys general filing the suits have stated that their pursuit of legal action is a matter of constitutional



Public Policy

justice. Among the issues the states are seeking to challenge are Nebraska's Medicaid exemption which forces people to buy a good or a service (healthcare) subject to the federal government's approval, and the violation of state sovereignty by the legislation. The federal government also mandates that states raise taxes to collect revenue to be handed over to the federal government for healthcare.

Some proponents are stating that the healthcare bill is protected by the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution that allows Congress to regulate commerce among foreign Nations and among states within the Union. Former House Majority Leader Tom DeLay and others have noted that the commerce clause does not apply to the bill as Democrats claim because the Democrats did not allow interstate healthcare insurance competition. Therefore, the Commerce Clause is violated by the legislation. Furthermore, the clause was meant to keep trade between states free, not to regulate parochial services such as visiting one's doctor.

In the meantime, Republicans have begun to coalesce around the idea of repealing and replacing the Democrat-concocted healthcare overhaul. They are preparing to fight for the long haul, running on the campaign promise of repealing Obamacare. Republicans, political analysts and commentators have noted that with power in Congress, the Republicans, although not being able to repeal outright the healthcare legislation, can indeed repeal it once they have retaken the White House. If Republicans retake both houses of Congress in November, they can vote to defund the legislation, halting its spread and stopping its power.

Mr. Obama has responded in turn. He has essen-

tially dared the Republican Party to attempt to repeal his healthcare project: "Go for it," he said. Critics of the Republican opposition to healthcare have attempted to paint the Republicans as uncaring and acting solely out of partisan interests. Yet, a CBS poll conducted the week of the legislation's signing found that 62 percent of American people want the Republican Party to fight to repeal the bill. A staggering 41percent of Democrats even want Republicans to thwart the bill.

Republicans like Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli note that it is not political partisanship which drives them to challenge the legislation; it is their constitutional duty as attorney generals. They have a duty to protect the American people, and they are not hesitating to do so within constitutional means.

The role of the litigation against the federal government is to have the federal courts declare the healthcare legislation unconstitutional. The states are not seeking money. Now that litigation has been filed, the United States has 60 days during which it must file an answer to declare why the healthcare legislation is constitutional. For Florida and the 16 other states under the joint effort, a scheduling hearing has been set for April 14 in Pensacola.

It is plausible that over time, more states will join the effort spearheaded by Florida and Virginia. The outcome of the legal challenges filed will determine the future of the balance of power between the states and the federal government.

-Joe Vigliotti is a writer and essayist residing in Maryland. His work can be found at: www.traditiontomorrow.blogspot.com.

Freedom of speech runs wild

By Gayle S. Fixler

Can the grieving family of a fallen Marine bury their son without being harassed by crusaders who oppose the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq? The Supreme Court will arbitrate a dispute which pits free speech against a family's right to have a dignified burial.

Freedom of speech is indeed guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution. It is one of the privileges that distinguishes America from many other nations. Our forefathers fought—literally to the death—to secure their

Public Policy

and future generations, the right to any act of seeking, receiving and conveying information and ideas without limitation or censorship. Yet, the founders of the Constitution could not predict the far-reaching implications of this civil right, nor accurately foresee the abuse of this freedom and immeasurable pain that it can incur when freedom of speech collides with another right – that of familial privacy and religious ritual.

This is highlighted in the case of Marine Lance Cpl. Matthew Snyder who died on March 3, 2006 while deployed in Iraq. He was 20 years old. On the day his body was returned to his family for burial in Westminster, MD, members of the Kansas-based Westboro Baptist Church (WBC) announced their intent to protest at the funeral. According to church founder Pastor Fred Phelps, the group protests the funerals of dead soldiers “because they are God’s punishment for America’s sins, including tolerance of gay men and lesbians.”

Established in 1955 as an Old School Baptist Church, the group “adheres to the teachings of the Bible, preaches against all form of sin and insists that the sovereignty of God and the doctrines of grace be taught and expounded publicly to all men.” Members have conducted hundreds of contentious demonstrations nationwide including those at military funerals such as Cpl. Snyder’s. The fallen have been killed by God “in Iraq/Afghanistan in righteous judgment against an evil nation,” according to the group’s Web site.

WBC members traveled from Kansas to Cpl. Snyder’s Maryland funeral and carried signs that read: God Hates Fags, Thank God for dead soldiers, God hates the USA/Thank God for September 11 and Thank God for IEDs (improvised explosive devices). Jeers and shouting compounded the harassment.

WBC’s actions were so offensive that Cpl. Snyder’s father Albert filed a civil lawsuit citing invasion of privacy and intentional infliction of emotional pain. In 2007, a jury found in favor of the Snyders, awarding them \$5 million. The WBC appealed and last September, the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals overturned the decision, citing freedom of speech which protected the use of the protest signs found to be “imaginative and hyperbolic rhetoric.”

The reversal stunned the Snyders. “Basically,

what this court has done is taken away our right to bury anybody. They didn’t even consider any of my rights. It was all about free speech for them,” Mr. Snyder said.

In March, that same court ordered Mr. Snyder to pay \$16,510 of the almost \$100,000 in legal fees incurred by the WBC during this legal battle – a sum that Mr. Snyder, with a reported \$43,000 annual salary, can ill afford. Conservative political commentator Bill O’Reilly has pledged to cover that cost.

This case should not and cannot be about American reaction to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is about the rights of a family burying their son with dignity—an American soldier deployed to Iraq to protect among other things ironically, the freedom of speech that WBC members invoke as their own.

The WBC’s use of a funeral to spew hateful tirades is unconscionable. By targeting a grieving family during its darkest moments and aftermath, WBC abuses free speech and violates the sanctity of others’ rituals and beliefs.

We should be morally outraged yet refrain from defining WBC members as crazy or sick because by doing so, we imply that they are not cognizant of and cannot be held accountable for their abhorrent actions. Although church members appear to be protected under Maryland law requiring protesters to stay 1,000 feet away from a funeral (WBC protestors reportedly complied)—does exercising their freedom supersede that of a family’s to bury its dead with dignity and without disruption?

By bringing suit, Mr. Snyder hopes “to bring an end to the reign of terror and abuse that WBC members inflicted upon the grieving families of U.S. service members killed in defense of our nation...the defendants (WBC) in this suit have sought to attack the memory of our departed heroes, to strip their loved ones of their dignity, and to use abuse and intimidation as a tool for preventing surviving family members from reaching closure over their loss,” according to the matthewsnyder.org Web site.

Mr. Phelps’s daughter, Shirley Phelps Roper, an attorney, wrote in an e-mail to Pennsylvania’s WGAL-TV News 8, “We look forward to preaching to the Supreme Court...There is one reason that we are engaged in litigation with that dead child’s father. That child was raised for the devil and we plainly,

according to the requirements of our God, said that. It is not unlawful in doomed American to do what we did and the 4th Circuit said just that.”

The U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to hear the case in the fall and rule on whether the WBC’s message is protected under the First Amendment or limited by religious rights, privacy of the bereaved and respect for the deceased.

If the court’s interpretation of the law fails to find in his favor, it is signaling the American public that “you have no rights to bury anyone with dignity and respect,” Mr. Snyder said in an interview with News 8 reporter Jere Gish.

-Gayle S. Fixler is a freelance writer in Washington, DC, a member of Soldiers’ Angels, the USO of Metropolitan Washington and a volunteer visitor at The Washington DC Veterans’ Administration Medical Center Nursing Home.

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com

