



September, 2009 Vol. I No. 8

Reflections

A New Generation of Conservative Thought



The truth about Obamacare

Obama's death panels • The Globo threat • Smearing Reagan

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.

Contents

September, 2009 Vol I, No. 8



Cover Story

7 The truth about Obamacare

By Michelle Laque Johnson

Politics

10 Obama's Death Panels

By Steve Malzberg

12 Defaming Reagan in the name of socialism

by Michael Fowler

Foreign Affairs

15 The Globo threatens national sovereignty

By Mary Jo Anderson

Culture

18 The Guns of August

By Kerry McCarthy and Peggy McCarthy

Public Policy

20 More healthcare deceptions

by Joseph Beaudoin



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 bridges 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.

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...



The truth about Obamacare

By Michelle Laque Johnson

Anyone who takes the time to do even a cursory review of liberal and conservative Web sites, blogs, tweets, and other forms of social media will quickly see that each side has accused the other of lying. President Barack Obama recently told a group of religious leaders that the major criticisms of his plan are “fabrications” constructed by “people who are bearing false witness.”

As the debate over health care—some might even say the future of America—deepens, I would like to think we could agree on two principles—principles that are being called for by both sides; principles that would solve this mess, but which seem to be in short supply.

Principle #1: Legislation must be written clearly so that there is absolutely no ambiguity about what Congress intends.

Principle #2: Those who are writing the legislation and/or explaining it to the American people must tell the truth about what is in the bill.

That sound reasonable, doesn't it? Let's consider how this might be applied to current events.

Principle #1 Applied: Kathleen Sebelius, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, told ABC News (<http://bit.ly/bdCBP>) that Section 1233 of HR 3200, which calls for end-of-life counseling



every five years, will probably be dropped because of opponents' “scare tactics”—even though she says the only reason for its insertion into the plan is to ensure that doctors are reimbursed for this important end-of-life consultation. That purpose certainly sounds reasonable.

So why the objections?

Connie Hair, former speechwriter for Rep. Trent Franks, Arizona Republican, explains at least one of the fears (<http://bit.ly/4nQtm>). She notes that Rep. Earl Blumenauer, Oregon Democrat, who claims credit for drafting this section, not only “filed an amicus brief with the U.S. Supreme Court in *Gonzales v. Oregon* defending the ‘assisted suicide’ law,” but if you go to his Web site www.earlblumenauer.com, you'll find a link to a “ghastly 1960s Harper's Magazine special supplemental entitled “The Crisis in American Medicine” which promotes

euthanasia— both voluntary and involuntary.”

The article advocates leaving the choice to euthanize a patient to doctors, saying: “This is probably the wisest policy provided the doctors do not take a rigid or idolatrous view of their role as ‘life savers.’”

Whether or not one believes there is something to fear here, there is an easy way for advocates of the president’s plan to resolve the impasse—and it has been used by Congress before.

Wesley J. Smith of *First Things* magazine, who has been covering this debate extensively, notes that last year the Kennedy/Brownback bill was amended “to prevent genetic counseling of pregnant women carrying a Down baby from being directed toward abortion.” So, he asks, why can’t lawmakers simply put in language that clarifies that this provision will not be used to direct people toward refusing or accepting care.

Mr. Smith also suggests that it be clearly stated that the counseling is entirely voluntary; that patients will not lose benefits if they refuse counseling or do not sign an advance directive; and that no service provider will lose compensation for not providing counseling. (<http://bit.ly/lguEM>)

If the intent of lawmakers really is to provide compensation for doctors who provide end-of-life counseling for those who want it, make the language clear and we can all move on. If this is not our lawmakers’ intent, then may I suggest that they clearly state their intention. Then we can at least fight over an actual

issue rather than over who’s telling the truth.

Principle #2 Applied: Now let’s turn to the marketing of health care to the American people. In a recent phone call with religious leaders, Mr. Obama said: “You’ve heard that this (healthcare legislation) is all going to mean government funding of abortion. Not true.” (<http://bit.ly/2fRqWx>) He made a similar statement in his recent address to Congress.

I want to believe the president. But what if I told you that the legislation calls for the mandatory “premiums,” which the government will collect from you, to be put into a separate fund from the “taxes” the government will collect from you to pay for this health care—and that the dollars in the “premium” pile rather than the “tax” pile will be used to fund abortions? Would you feel misled?

White House Correspondent Michael Scherer who writes for *Time* magazine, hardly a bastion of conservatism, says that while the statement that Mr. Obama made about no taxes being used to fund abortions is “technically correct,” it certainly “does not tell the whole story.” (<http://bit.ly/bdCBP>)

“The problem is that all those who sign up for the public option would have to pay into the account for abortion coverage, an amount ‘not less than \$1 per month,’ according to the legislation,” he writes in the August 24 issue. “So in effect, anyone who wanted to sign up for the public option, a federally funded and administered program, would find themselves paying for abortion coverage. [T]he new system differs markedly from

the old federal policy of not involving the government in abortion services unless issues of rape, incest or the life of the mother are at play.”

Factcheck.org puts it even more bluntly: “As for the House bill as it stands now, it’s a matter of fact that it would allow both a ‘public plan’ and newly subsidized private plans to cover all abortions.” <http://bit.ly/2fRqWx>)

Even a member of Mr. Obama’s own party, Rep. Bart Stupak, a Democrat from Michigan, told Mr. Scherer in a *Time* article that Mr. Obama doesn’t understand the bill or “if he is aware of it, and he is making these statements, then he is misleading people.”

Here’s a case in which we have a “fact”—and then we have the “truth.”

If Mr. Obama wants his healthcare plan to include a provision that taxpayers fund abortions, then let’s state that upfront and argue over the issue—rather than over who’s telling the truth. As I said earlier, I want to believe the president, but how can I when he makes a statement like this?

Mr. Obama and some Congressional leaders have said that those who oppose his healthcare plan are selfish and morally irresponsible, even racist. They say that those who oppose the plan don’t want to provide their fellow Americans with the same health care they enjoy.

I know this to be untrue. This has long been a basic principle of the social teaching of Catholics and other Christians—and it’s a principle I myself hold dear. For the past 10 years—I remember because it was the result of a specific event in

my life – I have said the following prayer: “Lord, I pray that everyone in the world will have food to eat, clothes to wear, a good house, good neighbors, someone to love them and access to health care.”

But by health care, I mean I want everyone to have access to a doctor when they are sick—not access to unlimited abortion, assisted suicide, and rationing based on age and disability—and I have to add that I also don’t want to bankrupt our country in the process. If Democrats mean the same thing, then I ask you to please make this clear so I can support your plan—cheerfully!

Let us not be like Pontius Pilate who famously asked Jesus Christ before crucifying Him, “What is truth?” That is a question we *should* be able to answer.

It is not impossible for Americans to agree about universal health care. What remains to be seen is whether lawmakers are willing to explain to the American people—both in their legislation and in their public statements— what they *really* mean.

-Michelle Laque Johnson is director of communications for EWTN, the largest religious media network in the world. The views expressed are solely her own and do not necessarily reflect those of EWTN.

Obama's Death Panels

By Steve Malzberg



"They can't stop us." Those are the words of President Barack Obama as he concluded his recent health care pep rally in Minneapolis. And he may be right. I believe

that Mr. Obama and the Democrats will stop at nothing to push through their massive takeover of our precious health care and that includes using the nuclear option in the Senate.

Reconciliation is what it's called, and what it means is that debate on the healthcare bill will end after 20 hours. Then a vote will take place and just 51 votes will be needed to ram it through. Usually 60 votes are required to cut off debate on a given bill, then the roll call vote takes place. But Mr. Obama knows that he doesn't have 60 votes, so he'll do it any way he can. So when all is said and done, what will be the worst part of it all? Mr. Obama's death panels. That's right, I said, "death panels."

Let me share with you the facts that have convinced me that Mr. Obama will be setting up a panel that will decide just who gets what medical treatment, who gets which medicines and yes, whether the plug should be pulled on grandma.

It is Mr. Obama's own words and actions that have convinced me beyond a

reasonable doubt—and if the mainstream press had an ounce of self respect left—we'd all know it.

In an interview with David Leonhardt of the New York Times which ran on April 28 of this year, Mr. Obama revealed himself. So much so that Ben Smith of Politico.com was prompted to write in an April 29 review of the Times piece that, "...in it Obama touches--in unusually personal terms--on one of the hardest-to-discuss realities of searching for healthcare savings: That many are to be found in end-of-life-care."

Indeed Mr. Obama actually brings up the question, "What do you do around things like end of life care?" It came up in the context of saving money. Mr. Obama talked about how he would have paid for his late grandmother's hip replacement out of his own pocket, but expresses doubt over whether or not the state will pay for that in the future for someone who is already elderly and sick.

"So that's where I think you get into some very difficult moral issues," Obama added. Now, before I proceed, ask yourself when you have heard Mr. Obama tell the American people that we will need to tackle some difficult moral issues that will present themselves as a result of healthcare reform? Well he doesn't anymore, but read on.

Stunningly, Mr. Obama says, "I mean

the chronically ill and those toward the end of their lives are accounting for potentially 80 percent of the total health care bill out here.” Think about it folks, if we can just find a way to get rid of these leeches, we’d all be home free! Read on.

When Mr. Obama is then asked how we should deal with it, more of Mr. Obama the radical is exposed. “Well I think there is going to have to be a conversation that is guided by doctors, scientists, ethicists.” (Can you say death panel?) “And then there is going to have to be a very difficult democratic conversation that takes place,” he says. In sum, who is worth treating? Who is worth saving? Who shall live and who shall die?

“It is very difficult to imagine the country making those decisions just through the normal political channels,” says Mr. Obama. (We can’t let the people have a say in this, they will be too emotional and want to help their parents and grandparents and spouses as much as possible.) “And that’s part of why you have to have some independent group that can give you guidance.” Can you say death panel?

Now, maybe you still aren’t convinced that this death panel is coming. After all, we are told that there is nothing like it in any of the healthcare bills. That may in fact be true. However, the panel is already in place and fully funded to the tune of \$1.1 billion.

It’s officially known as the Federal Coordinating Council for Comparative Effectiveness Research. As pointed out by Joseph Ashby in *American Thinker*,

the funding was secured in the so-called Stimulus Bill and was cooked up by Tom Daschle. Mr. Daschle was the man who Mr. Obama had wanted to run the whole thing when he nominated him for Health and Human Services Secretary. Of course, he turned out to be a tax cheat, and didn’t get the position, but it doesn’t matter.

Betsy McCaughey, the former Lt. Governor of New York State, has been doing wonderful work in exposing what is really going on. She notes that the purpose for the creation of this Council is to allow the unelected to make the decisions on who gets what when it comes to end of life health care because elected politicians will not have the “courage” to make these decisions.

“And that’s part of why you have to have some independent group that can give you guidance.”

This is exactly what Mr. Obama was talking about when he said to the N.Y. Times, “It is very difficult to imagine the country making those decisions through the normal political channels.”

Ms. McCaughey also points out that Mr. Daschle’s philosophy is that health care reform will not be “pain free” and that seniors should be more willing to live with their conditions instead of treating them.

Convinced yet? How can you not be? Now you may ask yourself how is it that

you have never ever heard Mr. Obama asked about any of this? How is it that no one in the mainstream media has asked Robert Gibbs, the White House Press Secretary, about any of this at his daily press briefings?

The answer is that we no longer have an operational objective inquisitive media.

But we will be having a death panel. In the words of Mr. Obama, “They can’t stop us.”

-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.

Defaming Reagan in the name of socialism

by Michael Fowler

If you do not like socialism then you’re a racist. This is what Matthew Dallek is saying—and saying about Ronald Reagan. I have read hundreds, if not thousands of pages on Reagan. I have reviewed his speeches, radio addresses and remember most of the events during his time as president. A racist Reagan was not. Senator Robert Byrd, West Virginia Democrat, was indeed a member of the Ku Klux Klan, so you are on good ground calling him a racist, but not Reagan. Give me a minute to tie in the socialism part.

Mr. Dallek of the University of California, Washington Center, is asserting “states rights” equates racism in his malignant attack on Ronald Reagan—surprising even from a former speechwriter for Missouri Democrat Congressman Richard Gephardt. He recently penned an article in the August 2009 issue of *The American Scholar* titled, “*Not Ready for Mt. Rushmore: Reconciling the myth of Ronald Reagan,*” in reference to those who are appealing for Reagan to be added to this monument. However, Mr. Dallek is not just trashing Reagan with an insipid assertion of racism, nor is he running interference during Mr. Obama’s plunge

in the polls. Rather, he is attempting to pave the way for Mr. Obama’s socialism.

First, Mr. Dallek is aware of Mr. Obama’s inability to perform as expected. He is currently losing many disgruntled voters who are looking for a new set of ideas and it won’t take the politically curious long to trip over Reagan’s incredible legacy. Most of Mr. Dallek’s attack is an economic one. He starts his affront on Reagan’s legacy by calling him an “angrier, more divisive figure than he is remembered.” He says that George W. Bush’s “economic failures” were a product of “Reagan’s controversial approach to tax cuts.” He then turns to Reagan’s Cold War success by referring to Rutgers historian David Greenberg who says that “[historians have] given him some credit for the end of the Cold War. While most historians would give far more credit to Gorbachev...” From the Cold War he moves to racism, “His social policies were not designed to advance civil rights, [or] promote social equality,” and “he fanned the embers of discontentment.” It is a rather brutal assault, the kind that reminds me of the vandals in France, angered by the U.S. invasion of Iraq,

painting swastika's on my great uncle's tombstone in March of 2003 where he died liberating them in World War I.

When Mr. Dallek makes the charge of racism, he truly exposes himself as a politico. He cites a speech by Reagan given in Neshobas County, Mississippi in 1980. Mr. Dallek quips, "He struck a note of racial defiance, praising, 'states' rights' as a worthy cause in the place where three civil rights workers were murdered." The very idea of racism in this speech is as fallacious as a crooked cop's speed trap. Deroy Murdock of National Review Online exposed this in the November 20, 2007 issue titled "Reagan, No Racist." Mr. Murdock reveals that columnists Paul Krugman and Bob Herbert propagated the idea that Reagan was stirring the fires of racism by invoking "states rights," as if the merest acknowledgment *ipso facto* means racism. However, Mr. Murdock cites the context of the speech, found by columnist David Brooks who likewise defended Reagan. In context Reagan is promoting empowerment of the local government rather than omnipotence of the Federal Government—that does sound like the Reagan.

"I believe in states' rights. I believe in people doing as much as they can for themselves at the community level and at the private level. And I believe that we've distorted the balance of our government today by giving powers that were never intended in the Constitution to that federal establishment."

States have rights and because someone is willing to stand against big government it does not follow that he is a racist. I'm rather good at playing *Where's*

Waldo, and that paragraph is devoid of any racist sentiments—just as Reagan was. "States' rights" are part of the vital system of checks and balances of the United States. They can be likened to the so-called "separation of church and state" for those on the Left. Mr. Murdock also cites Reagan's own defense, "Because I said I believed states should be allowed to regain the rights and powers granted to them in the Constitution, he [President Carter] implied I was a racist pandering to Southern voters."

But, Mr. Dallek is not interested in facts, "If history is written by the winners, then the conservative environment of the Bush years was a logical time for the burnishing of Reagan's reputation, and the new era of Obama is a logical time for a reassessment." Such an unveiled appeal to politicization of history is shocking, but laying that aside, I want to touch upon his motive.

States' rights have been the red-headed stepchild of constitutional law since they were erroneously used to defend slavery by Southern-democrats. However the rights of states were a strong force against slavery and were used by Northern states to nullify Southern states claims over "run away" slaves. Northern Republicans would claim that one state's claim is not binding on another state. Then the Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision ruled that slaves had no claim to freedom; they were property and not citizens. In contrast, for Mr. Dallek's charge of racism to be cogent, he must believe that if states have rights, then this always means slavery is allowed. If not, then he must allow that "states' rights" were misused by slavers, and Reagan

has not committed an error. Moreover, who would make the claim that states *never* have any rights? Only those who would say states are property of the U.S. Federal Government and following in kind her citizens.

Mr. Dallek destroys his credibility when he twists Reagan's words out of context, implies states are without rights, fails to disclose his political background and ignores sound refutes to Mr. Krugman and Mr. Herbert's claims by Mr. Murdock. From this point, we can say something quite disappointing: Mr. Dallek is willing to put political hubris over honesty and his professional integrity as a professor of history and political science. It is also disappointing that the Phi Beta Kappa Society allowed

The American Scholar to stoop to such levels as accepting political mudslinging as scholarship.

Reagan and conservative thought were Mr. Dallek's first victims, but he is really after something much bigger, and something current. States' rights are the single biggest obstacle to socialism, Mr. Dallek knows this, and by falsely joining racism to states' rights he hopes to prevent the use of this appeal from interfering with Obama's incredible grab for power. States' rights can stop Mr. Obama's neo-slavery called democratic socialism.

-Michael Fowler is an instructor of Christian apologetics, author and talk-radio host.

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com

The Globo threatens national sovereignty

By Mary Jo Anderson

Look for your neighborhood ATM to spit out Globos, not dollars, if the United Nations has its way.

Many Americans will be stunned to learn that the United Nations has called for a single, global currency. Similar mumbles have been made by Russia, China and India. Russian president Dimtry Medvedev tossed a prototype “united future world currency” to leaders at this summer’s G-8 meeting in Italy. The supranational coin bore the motto “Unity in diversity.” Though economists agree such a prospect is at least a decade away, Americans have an opportunity to think deeply about the relationship of national sovereignty and national currency.

The premise is that the U.S. dollar is weak and unstable--too unstable to continue as the world’s reserve currency. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) meeting in Geneva proposed a new system of globally managed exchange rates. UNCTAD’s annual Trade and Development Report represents the first time that a multinational entity has suggested that nations abandon the declining dollar. Under a single, global currency system, nations would be forced to balance their exchange rates or “central banks would have to intervene and if not they would have to be told to do so by a multilateral institution such as the International Monetary Fund,” said Detlef



Kotte, an economist with UNCTAD. The U.N. report is introduced with Keynesian propositions and is distinctly anti-free market.

The intricacies of economic theories aside, the question looms: Is American sovereignty at risk if we sign on to a single

global monetary authority?

Let us grant that fast growing economies like China, Brazil and India are weary of being held hostage to the U.S. Federal Reserve. After World War II, oil selling nations wanted to be paid in U.S. dollars. The rise of the dollar as a monetary standard was due in part to a fast developing global economy that needed a ready and stable means of exchange. If today that exchange is strained, is the best answer a single, global monetary authority? A more worrisome question is what governing authority will provide the enforcement power behind global monetary control?

It is naive to assume that the Globo will be immune to political manipulation or corruption. Once mandatory monetary policy is set from outside, how independent is any nation? It is a nearly inhuman feat to design a means to regulate regulators such that they cannot favor one industrial nation over another. If a single global authority controls world economic policy, there is little to prevent the use of that sweeping authority to achieve political power and ideological control over our citizens. Imagine a nation's fiscal future held hostage to compliance with the Kyoto Protocols or submission to the U.N.'s vision for the Global Commons? In fact, the report outlined this specific strategy in the section on climate change. "Emissions regulation and control have to be made more stringent" to achieve the U.N.'s vision of good growth. Furthermore, "climate-friendly" efforts must not be "left to market forces alone; they also require strong and internationally coordinated government action," including a reduction of emissions

achieved by "strict regulations." National sovereignty will have little meaning when a nation is shackled by monetary control from beyond its borders.

Mr. Medvedev, speaking at the June World Economic Forum in St. Petersburg said, "We need brand new financial institutions which will not be dominated by specific political interests and scenarios." The Russian president is acutely aware of how political interests are aligned with monetary control. The goal of UNCTAD is to harmonize the world market in order to prevent any new economic crisis. But to ensure that level of harmony necessitates a move toward totalitarian measures. As if to illustrate this point the UNCTAD report suggests that "special drawing rights" (against the global reserves) of nations "should be made according to the needs of countries." But who is to determine which nations have priority needs? This is a clear precursor to a global central planning authority. In short, it is a back door to Marxism.

Pressure mounts against the dollar from rapidly expanding nations and multinational corporations. The lust for a crisis-proof monetary system blinds many to the reality that no central authority is free of corruption, much less of ideology. Some suggest that China and India, allied with Brazil, are not true proponents of a Globo. Rather, they see the formation of a global monetary system as the vehicle to divest the world of the dollar standard. This summer the newly formed BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China) axis gathered for their initial roundtable. The primary motive for this group is its shared weight as a wedge against the dollar. After

the dollar is unseated via a globalized monetary system, these nations will reestablish a national (or at least regional) currency. Brazil has already signaled its desire to conduct trade with China in their respective currencies.

Heretofore, the history of nations has resisted a global monetary unit as it is inherently opposed to sovereignty. The very purpose of the BRIC alliance is to ensure that its member nations retain more sovereignty over their country's economic future. The right to issue a national currency has always been understood as a function of states and a symbol of national identity. Currency is a pillar of national sovereignty.

The recent wrangling over the Euro is a lesson in the currency-sovereignty relationship. Some governments and their citizens are unwilling to shelve their national currency in exchange for imagined stability and efficiency. The Euro, as a regional currency, has not been an equally felicitous arrangement for all. It's not unforeseen that nations would be censored culturally as well. Some Latin nations were "softly" bribed by the World Bank and IMF to institute national birth control policies as part of development loan packages. The bribe took the form of partial debt forgiveness when nations

met specified goals.

If a country is held hostage to an international system of control, it forfeits more than can be gained by an artificially controlled and enforced "stability." Eventually, market forces will find an outlet--perhaps an immense "back-market" exchange. The world economic crisis also plays into the hands of those whose vision for a globalized governing system has become tangible with the development of space-age monitoring capabilities. A single global monetary unit is a giant step toward "world governance" that many promote as the ultimate vehicle for world peace. But peace is not synonymous with freedom. A managed, Stepford wife-like "peace" is very far from the freedom Americans now enjoy.

Freedom comes at a price. Part of the price is the development of virtue. On this Socrates offers an important reminder: "I tell you that virtue does not come from money: but from virtue comes money and all other good things to man, both to the individual and to the state."

-Mary Jo Anderson is a journalist and coauthor of "Male and Female He Made Them: Questions and Answers on Marriage and Same-Sex Union."

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org

www.EBIReflections.com

The Guns of August

By Kerry McCarthy and Peggy McCarthy

Barbara Tuchman's book, "The Guns of August," describes the outbreak of World War I. Yet, it also seems an apt characterization of the voter anger that has erupted at Town Hall meetings last month.

Democratic politicians who had not read the health care bill (following a custom whereby only some read these bills and then direct the votes of others), were armed with "cue cards" to supply answers to anyone with the temerity to ask a difficult question. Meanwhile, concerned citizens took the initiative to inform themselves, and so it was that, with complete surprise which quickly devolved into victim hood, these politicians found themselves faced with people who knew more about the bill than they did.

Liberals had an uprising on their hands. In response, they resorted to the juvenile tactic of name-calling. Concerned people, both Republicans and Democrats, who exercised their duties as citizens of a democracy, were labeled Brown shirts, carriers of Nazi symbols, an unruly mob and political terrorists.

This defensive tactic by liberal politicians harkens back to this spring when liberal commentators derided Tea Party participants as malcontents, Republican losers, and people upset that a black man occupies the White House. Moreover, liberals scoffed that the original Tea

Party was driven by colonists protesting a tax—and pointed out that the Bush tax cuts were still in effect.

But today's Tea Party patriots are not motivated by the issue of taxes—and in some ways, neither were the original Tea Party colonists. Their dissatisfaction was not solely about taxes. The tax on tea was small, but it represented yet another encroachment on the autonomy the colonies had enjoyed.

The tea tax was the perfect issue to galvanize public outrage. Manipulation of the tea trade highlighted the already-rankling controls England asserted, and alerted colonists that King George III meant to subject them to the rule of an absolute monarch over his subjects. The colonists saw that they would no longer benefit from the system of Benign Neglect which had worked well for generations during the evolution of liberty under a limited monarch. The reaction by the protesters of heaving tea overboard was symbolic, cathartic and decisive.

King George understandably resented the fact that royal sovereignty had been diluted by the role of parliament. It was unthinkable that he could change this relationship. Nevertheless, he intended to reassert in the colonies the "proper" order of a sovereign over his subjects. Actions to assert more direct control over peoples' lives discarded the protections

that either Parliament or the colonial legislatures afforded as buffers between the king and his subjects.

This ratcheting-up of government control in people's lives constituted an undeclared revolution, which was recognized by perceptive members of Parliament. Edmund Burke warned of the folly of this course of action. Despite the rallying cry of "no taxation without representation," the colonists had been satisfied as unrepresented British subjects. They realized that the few members seated to represent them in Parliament would be difficult to communicate with and easily out-voted. Burke understood that a major shift in the balance between liberty and royal power could not be acceptable to the colonists.

The Boston Tea Party was the opening

shot of what became the American Revolution or, more accurately, the War of Independence. It was a conservative struggle to maintain the colonists' God-given liberties, which had evolved—and that a revolutionary George III sought to overturn. As Burke asserted, it was "a revolution not made but prevented."

People may not understand that today's resistance and anger echoes the feelings that led to the American Revolution. Still, just as the "guns of August" signaled the onset of World War I which led to earth-changing events, it may be that the protests at town hall meetings and Tea Parties signal the awakening of an underlying American spirit that will once again resist statist revolution.

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

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com

More healthcare deceptions

by Joseph Beaudoin

President Barack Obama's new approach to health care, following the August recess, must be taken with a grain of salt. In their assessment of "Obamacare New and Improved," Americans ought to keep in mind the administration's earlier ethical failures. Obamacare, after all, has been deeply rooted in deceptions, omissions and fact avoidance.

While accusing conservatives of "wild misrepresentations" of his healthcare plan, Mr. Obama has tried to fool the public—including, apparently, himself. Indeed, before his vacation, Mr. Obama assured the American people that AARP endorsed his healthcare plan. The problem is, Mr. Obama did not have a plan and the AARP denied endorsing it. This is but one of many inconsistencies.

Mr. Obama also assured Americans that the government option would not change their current healthcare plans. Yet, Mr. Obama knew that the government option would cause many employers to cancel their current plans which would result in forced changes to their employees' plans. Consequently, in insisting that the government option would not affect those who want to keep their private plans, Mr. Obama was less than candid; one might even say he was deceptive.

The government option is symptomatic of the president's confusion. At first it was the bedrock of his reform plan. Then



it was only "a sliver" of the plan. Then, after Speaker Nancy Pelosi, California Democrat, made some noise, the White House re-embraced the government option as the foundation of the president's plan. It looks like Mr. Obama's leadership

has a lot in common with a wind sock.

While Mr. Obama and liberal Democrats continue to insist that a government option will lower health costs and improve health care, they have provided no reliable support for these gratuitous assertions. The government option is nothing more than a liberal mantra and, just like all mantras, the faithful repeat it thoughtlessly and believe in it in the same fashion. Mr. Obama prefers mantras to empirical studies, perhaps because he finds it easier to repeat mantras than to craft policies based on facts.

The president's confusion has not been limited to the government option. For instance, he assured Americans that private companies will be able to compete with his government option just as FedEx is able to compete with the Post Office. This is a fallacy—like stating that a luxury automobile competes with a bicycle because both are means of transportation. More worrisome though, Mr. Obama's fallacious comparison could be a Freudian slip. He, in essence, may have warned Americans that the government option will replace FedEx-quality health care with Post Office-quality health care. Going postal will acquire quite a new meaning.

The administration and its congressional allies will continue to push the government option as a panacea while ignoring independent cost studies. The White House has ignored reports from the Congressional Budget Office because these reports contradict the mantra. For the same reason, the administration has disregarded healthcare studies by PriceWaterhouse Coopers and the New

England Healthcare Institute. These studies identified areas where large cost reductions can be achieved quickly.

Unnecessary medical tests and inefficient claims processing produce \$210 billion each in yearly waste, i.e. 18 percent of the \$2.3 trillion America spends on health care. In budget terms, this represents \$4.1 trillion over 10 years. They ought to be priorities.

Unfortunately, eliminating unnecessary tests would hurt tort lawyers, a major Democrat interest group, who pockets 30 percent of malpractice settlements. Indeed, unnecessary test results mostly from doctors' pre-emptive efforts to defend themselves in case of malpractice litigation. In other words, about nine percent of U.S. healthcare costs are attributable to defensive medicine. That is why real healthcare reform must include legal reform. But under Mr. Obama, it will not.

Inefficient processing of health claims relates to the 700 different health plans available in the United States and to the fact that insurance companies have different claim forms. Standardization of basic plans and claim forms would reduce health care expenses by another nine percent per year. Mr. Obama will not pursue this course of action because it runs contrary to his cherished government option.

Regardless of what Mr. Obama and the liberal Democrats say, the government option remains their ultimate objective. They will try to push it through openly or covertly. Expect to see a healthcare bill with a Trojan horse clause, i.e. a clause

that will include a government option under certain conditions some time in the future.

As the Trojans painfully found out, it is better to steer clear of Trojan horses.

-Joseph Beaudoin holds degrees in economics and finance. He has worked in the banking and investment industries for 20 years. He is a regular contributor of Reflections.

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com



www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com