



# Palin for president?

[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)  
[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.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.

# Content

November 2009 • Vol.I • No.10

A photograph of Michele Bachmann, a Republican politician, speaking at a podium. She is wearing a red jacket and glasses, and has a small American flag pin on her lapel. The background is dark and out of focus.

## 6 Palin for president?

*By Loredana Vuoto*

### Politics

#### 10 The shackles of Obamacare

*By Steve Malzberg*

#### 11 Marxist health care

*By Kerry W. and Peggy McCarthy*

#### 13 Too far to the left

*By Grace Vuoto*

### Culture

#### 19 A call to spiritual arms

*By Michelle Laque Johnson*

### Foreign Affairs

#### 16 The wolf of appeasement

*By Michael Fowler*

### Public Policy

#### 23 Plundered justice in Copenhagen

*By Mary Jo Anderson*

## 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.

## Palin for president?

By Loredana Vuoto

Is Sarah Palin fit to lead? As the former Alaska governor and 2008 Republican vice-presidential candidate launches her book this month, *Going Rogue: An American Life*, questions abound regarding her competence: Can she lead the GOP to victory in 2012?

With appearances on the Oprah Winfrey Show and Good Morning America with Barbara Walters, the former beauty queen is attempting to polish her tarnished image: She is trying to whitewash her numerous gaffes on the campaign trail, including the oft-cited Katie Couric interview that aired on CBS on September 24 and 25, 2008, in which she was unable to answer which magazines and newspapers she reads—and in which she appeared uninformed on key economic and foreign policy issues. More embarrassing was how Mrs. Palin unwittingly took a prank call on November 1, 2008 from a well-known Canadian comedian posing as French President Nicolas Sarkozy. In the infamous six-minute call, Mrs. Palin discussed politics and the dangers of hunting with Vice President Dick Cheney, all the while being clueless she was not indeed speaking with the French president.

But the public has not forgotten. According to a CNN/Opinion Research Corporation survey, only 28 percent of voters think Mrs. Palin is qualified to be president. Among five presidential hopefuls for 2012, Mrs. Palin comes in last



place. She takes a back seat to leader of the pack, Secretary of State Hilary Clinton with 67 percent, and other GOP rivals, former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney with about 50 percent and former Arkansas Governor Mike Huckabee with 43 percent.

A Washington Post-ABC news poll also found

that 60 percent of all voters think Mrs. Palin is unqualified to be commander-in-chief. However, Republicans have more confidence in Mrs. Palin, with 61 percent of voters believing she is fit to lead, as do 37 percent of independents. The same poll also found the former governor to have a 52 percent unfavorable rating compared to a 76 favorable rating among the GOP.

So how do we square the discrepancy among voters at large and the Republican Party?

It is clear that the hockey mom with five children who is raising a baby with Down syndrome resonates with American conservatives. Mrs. Palin is a refreshing conservative voice that holds dear to the traditional values of the GOP. She is God-fearing and pro-life; she has a staunch record of tax cuts and fighting government corruption while governor of Alaska. She has also been leading the charge against President Barack Obama's health care overhaul, making the public aware of the "death panels" inherent in the proposed legislation.

However, despite her modest accomplishments while governor of Alaska, Mrs. Palin lacks the necessary experience to be commander-in-chief. She has no foreign-policy credentials. Her clumsy explanation to ABC's Charles Gibson on September 11, 2008 that Alaska borders Russia and thus, she has international bona fides is ludicrous. Mrs. Palin claimed she was qualified to be a heart-beat away from the presidency because, "It is from Alaska that we send those out to make sure that an eye is being kept on this very powerful nation, Russia, because they are right there, next to our state." Moreover, Mrs. Palin only received her passport in July 2007 before she visited members of the Alaska National Guard

stationed in Kuwait. She had not traveled outside of the United States prior to this. She also only met foreign dignitaries for the first time shortly after being selected as the vice-presidential nominee for John McCain.

Mrs. Palin's wherewithal and resolve to stay the course were also cast in doubt when she resigned from her position as governor of Alaska on July 26, 2009. Leaving office eighteen months before the end of her first term shows her interests supersede those of Alaskans and the public at large. She claimed that if she remained at her job she would be a "lame duck" governor due to the 21 ethics complaints launched against her. According to Mrs. Palin, these "frivolous" attacks have cost the state government "millions" and were diverting the necessary money, staff and resources needed to address the more pressing issues of Alaska such as education, fish research and investing in troopers. Among the suits she has been charged with are: abusing her position to solicit personal legal donations, misusing state funds and staff while traveling and failing to submit documents disclosing gifts received. But the majority of these claims were dismissed.

Mr. Palin's explanation is flimsy: She will be unable to shake the charge of having quit under pressure. By contrast, Ronald Reagan finished both his terms while he was governor of California from 1967 to 1975, despite being harangued by his critics and the media. Why could not Mrs. Palin finish one term as governor?

Many speculate that Mrs. Palin's true motivation for resigning as governor of Alaska is so she can lay the groundwork for a bid for the White House in 2012. Let's hope this is not the

case.

During the past 10 months, America has seen the effects of lack of experience in the Oval Office. Before running for president, Mr. Obama only served two years in the U.S. Senate and seven years in the Illinois Senate. He was best known previously as a community organizer in Chicago who led voter-registration drives. His only foreign-policy credential before being elected as president, unlike his fellow Democratic presidential candidates, was that he opposed the war in Iraq from the start. He argued this demonstrated that he had “the judgment” to lead. Yet judgment and experience cannot be so neatly separated since experience is an indispensable prerequisite for good foreign-policy judgments.

Since becoming president, Mr. Obama has tripled the size of government with his massive bail-out plan and is systematically taking the

country far left with legislation such as cap and trade and health care. He threatens national security by advancing policies that seek to appease our enemies at all cost. More importantly, he continues to remain paralyzed in making a decision as to whether he should send more troops to Afghanistan as recommended by the U.S. Commander in Afghanistan Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal. Mr. Obama’s inexperience is resulting in economic decline at home and weakness abroad.

The nation cannot gamble once again on another novice. Mrs. Palin told Oprah November 16, 2009 that running for president in 2012 is “not on her radar.” Let’s hope for the future of the GOP and the fate of our nation it stays that way.

*-Loredana Vuoto is president of Eloquence, LLC, a speechwriting and writing services firm in Washington, DC. She is also the associate editor of Reflections.*

[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com)

# 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 shackles of Obamacare

By Steve Malzberg



So President Barack Obama and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi managed to twist enough arms and bribe enough House members to gain a five vote margin of victory (220-

215) on their healthcare bill.

I'd love to be able to inform you of all of the troubling aspects of the 2,000-page bill, fill you in on all of the ways the bill will kill our quality of health care, let you in on how many of our freedoms will be trampled on because of the provisions in the bill, but I am unable to do so. You see, just as candidate Obama lied when he promised that all of the health care negotiations in Congress would be broadcast on C-Span and streamed live on the Internet, Mrs. Pelosi's nose should have been growing when she promised to post the entire bill online for all to see, for a full 72 hours prior to a vote. What do they say about birds of a feather? One thing I can tell you is that, under the House bill, if you don't buy the healthcare coverage that the government tells you to buy, you could be headed for jail.

The non-partisan Joint Committee on Taxation took a look at some of H.R. 3962 and found that Americans who do not maintain "acceptable health insurance coverage" and who

choose not to pay the bill's new mandate tax (about 2.5% of income) are subject to numerous civil and criminal penalties including fines of up to \$250,000 and up to five years in prison.

They found that possible criminal penalties include Section 7203 which says, "misdemeanor or willful failure to pay is punishable by a fee of up to \$25,000 and for imprisonment up to one year." Section 7201, for you really bad folks, says, "felony willful evasion is punishable by a fee of up to \$250,000 and for imprisonment up to five years." Understand that this is Mrs. Pelosi's bill. She wants the refusniks thrown in jail. That's who she is. The Senate version so far has language shielding Americans from civil and criminal penalties for choosing to opt out.

So what else will the House bill do? Let me tell you what it won't do. "It won't offer most Americans any appreciable decline in the cost of their health insurance nor clear improvement in the efficiency or quality of the health care they receive." Furthermore, the bill will result in "extra costs that will be borne by the Americans who will be required to buy insurance but won't qualify for federal assistance, along with Medicare beneficiaries who will be paying more and receiving less." These are not my opinions, they are the words of non other than former Bill Clinton Labor Secretary and Obama advisor Robert Reich.

Now let me tell you what Mr. Obama, Mrs. Pelosi and Mr. Reid healthcare reform will do. Again, I source Mr. Reich. He was speaking at the University of California Berkeley back in September of 2007. The presidential race was in full swing. Mr. Reich told his audience that no candidate could be truthful about what healthcare reform would actually entail, or he or she would never get elected. So he decided to make up a speech, as if he were a presidential candidate who didn't care about winning the election, but just wanted to tell the truth about healthcare reform.

"In other words, this is what the truth is and a candidate will never say, but what a candidate should say," Mr. Reich said. He began, "Look, we have the only health care system in the world that is designed to avoid sick people. And that's true and what I'm going to do is that I am going to try to reorganize it to be more amenable to treating sick people but that means you, particularly you young people, particularly you young healthy people...you're going to have to pay more."

It gets better. Mr. Reich continues, "And by the way we're going to have to, if you're very old, we're not going to give you all that technology and all those drugs for the last couple

of years of your life to keep you maybe going for another couple of months. It's too expensive. So we're going to let you die." Can you say death panel?

And what about for the rest of us who are not that young or that old? Mr. Reich says, "Also I'm going to use the bargaining leverage of the federal government in terms of Medicare and Medicaid...to force drug companies and insurance companies and medical suppliers to reduce their costs. What that means, less innovation and that means less new products and less new drugs on the market which means you are probably not going to live much longer than your parents." (This view is backed up by Jeff Stier, associate director of the American Council on Science and Health and Henry Miller, a physician and Hoover Institute fellow who was an FDA official from 1979-1994, among others)

It looks like the only thing Mr. Reich left out of his mock speech on healthcare reform was that some of us would be eating a lot more bread and water behind bars as a result.

*-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](http://www.worradionet.com).*

## Marxist health care

*By Kerry W. and Peggy McCarthy*

In a 1961 speech, "Ronald Reagan Speaks Out Against Socialized Medicine," Reagan defined why medicine is an obvious entry point from which statists can begin the transformation of a society from free to collectivist: "One of the traditional methods of imposing statism or socialism on a people

has been by way of medicine.... Most people are a little reluctant to oppose anything that suggests medical care for people who possibly can't afford it." Reagan warned that even a modest nationalized healthcare program would be considered by proponents of socialization a breakthrough--that the plan was to get a foot in the door and then expand socialistic control over the whole country.

Reagan didn't explain why socialists perceive that a highly successful individual effort such as the practice of medicine must be stripped of free choice and then collectivized. Any individualistic endeavor that promotes the well-being of mankind must be discredited in order to dissuade people from seeking individualistic solutions to problems. Such programs then must be taken over by collectivists in order to prove that they can perform the task. For example, governments bent on collectivization seek to undermine and destroy free markets in order to control the economy themselves.

Republicans in Congress who speak out against socialized medicine are satisfied to argue against excessive cost or other sticky details such as how many would be covered or what procedures would be allowed. They argue minor points while ceding the larger argument to the statists. Rather than having the confidence and the strength of conviction to explain what is truly in store for the public should the government be given the power to deprive people of individual choice, representatives acquiesce by not resisting the further collectivization of our medical system. They neglect to uphold the principal of free choice that is the essence of human nature.

New government programs are often pro-

posed to supersede old, bankrupted ones, especially after existing programs give people a certain comfort level with government involvement in their lives. A case in point: Republicans proposed and passed a prescription drug benefit to Medicare at a time when Wal-mart had begun to offer prescriptions for four dollars, and it was obvious that Medicare was going broke even faster than Social Security.

The true believer in statism has reason to believe the world has moved toward his belief that people should act in the interest of the collective rather than selfishly. An increased percentage of Americans are ready for a collectivized society that offers socialized medicine, heavy government involvement in the economy and implementation of measures such as Cap and Trade.

In the history of collectivist thought, Karl Marx believed an advanced capitalist state is a final stage before the advent of socialism. Vladimir Lenin realized Russia was not an advanced capitalist state but theorized that its vast natural resources could be utilized to advance the country to socialism. Mao Zedong believed that the vast labor force in China could be harnessed to reach the same end. These theories caused the death of tens of millions. Those who accuse our leaders of being Marxists believe that America is the current experiment in the establishment of Marxism.

The practice of medicine is an example of successful individualist interaction between people. Doctors and nurses decide for themselves to enter the medical profession. They apply themselves through study and hard work and either succeed or fail and then choose for themselves where they will practice. The

public enters the picture as patients needing to be cared for as individuals. A relationship is formed--people refer to a doctor as, "my doctor." The doctor-patient relationship—the trust that builds between patient and doctor—has always been considered vital to good health and well-being.

Conservatives offer solutions such as allowing people to buy insurance across state lines in order to take advantage of the lower cost of coverage in states with fewer mandates: procedures some would argue are elective, such as sex change operations and cosmetic surgery. They also propose solutions such as health saving accounts and promote the idea that individuals rather than companies should receive tax credits for buying insurance. This would promote portability, which means people could keep their insurance regardless of where they work. These simple, individualist solutions could be easily implemented if they didn't meet

resistance.

No matter what issue is discussed, it should be examined through the prism of collectivism versus individualism. Government takeover of health care is a collectivist measure. Collectivists must wage war on individualism in order to impose their own vision of a utopian world where human happiness is achieved through concerted action to replace man's instinct to act in his own self-interest with a willingness to work hard in the interest of a collective.

The fight for control of the medical system is actually a war for men's minds. Perhaps the American spirit of independence has not changed so much that it will be an easy victory.

A people resistant to statism will cause the failure of the current experiment with Marxism.

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

## Too far to the left

*By Grace Vuoto*

Candidate Barack Obama was wiser than President Barack Obama. The president has abandoned his carefully-crafted consensus and has governed exclusively to satisfy the far-left fringe of the Democratic Party. He has fractured his winning coalition—possibly irredeemably.

When candidate Barack Obama conducted his brilliant political campaign in 2008, he declared that he wanted to be a "transformational" president, much like Republican President Ronald Reagan or Demo-



cratic President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In this pursuit, he cobbled together a coalition of African Americans, Hispanics, Jews, women, independents and many moderate Democrats and Republicans who believed he could bring about sensible change.

He was able to achieve victory into the Oval Office because he convinced enough Americans that he was in tap with mainstream sentiments on the war in Iraq, skyrocketing budget deficits, corruption on Wall Street and reform of health care. He promised accountable and transparent government and that he would revive the economy without resorting merely to tax-and-spend liberalism. He also convinced Americans that he had the judgment to craft an effective foreign policy based on multilateralism in combination with a vigorous campaign on the war on terror, especially in Afghanistan.

In **sum**, he won the presidency because he promised something new yet reasonable. The Ivy-League educated candidate appeared to be brainy and innovative—one who might bring a breath of fresh air in the stagnant corridors of Washington; one who just might be able to engender generational change by advancing original ideas and programs based on compromise. This would be a “bipartisan” administration with all the energy, vigor, and dynamism of a youthful man with an original vision.

Yet, ten months into his presidency, Mr. Obama’s approval rating has plummeted and the goodwill he generated is evaporating. A **November 20** Gallup poll **shows** that 49 percent approve of the president’s performance while 44 percent disapprove. By contrast, Mr. Obama had a 68 percent approval rating in January. The decline in his fortunes is stagger-

ing.

The sharp drop is not merely the result of a faltering economy and a double-digit unemployment rate. It is mostly due to the growing public perception that Mr. Obama is not the populist, moderate and savvy politician he claimed he would be. Rather, he now appears to be elitist, radical and incapable—one who is inexperienced and in over his head. He is therefore quickly losing the confidence of the American people.

Instead of giving us a new political era, he has reverted to an old formula: the failed, bankrupt liberalism of President Jimmy Carter; the failed tax-and-spend liberalism of the Democratic Party that led to the 1994 Republican victory in the House and Senate. He has forgotten that both **Presidents** Reagan and FDR did not bring about dramatic change by appealing exclusively to the base of their party. Reagan carefully wooed the conservative Democrats throughout his presidency and FDR courted African Americans and urban ethnic groups as part of the realignment of his party. These transformational leaders balanced the nation’s conflicting interests while nonetheless pursuing a steady course. Both leaders towered on the world stage with hawkish foreign policies.

Mr. Obama is instead not following in their footsteps and has abandoned those who brought him to the dance. His grotesque \$787 billion economic stimulus bill has done little to revive the economy and has only resulted in augmenting the debt and raising charges of wasteful government spending. Moreover, the specter of higher taxes is being raised. In foreign affairs, his multilateral efforts have failed, resulting now in a policy of mere appeasement

of Iran and Russia. **He has also not** been able to convince NATO to step up its efforts on the war on terror. In Afghanistan, his comprehensive March review was upheld for only a few months as the nation awaits his newer new assessment.

Debt, appeasement and dithering are not what America voted for with such enthusiasm in 2008.

Perhaps the worst blunder the president has made is to sanction Attorney General Eric Holder's decision to bring **September** 11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and four other terrorists to trial in civil court in New York City rather than by military commissions. This now exposes America to a security threat on the homeland that had largely been addressed by President George W. Bush's tough security measures. Instead of leading the nation towards more tranquil times as he had promised, Mr. Obama's latest decision is **directing** us towards more troubled times: He is exacerbating the fears of civilians who rightly worry about renewed terrorist attacks in America.

The key to transformational leadership is hawkish policies abroad and coalition-building

at home. This was the Reagan and Roosevelt formula. In addition, Democratic President Bill Clinton, who was elected twice, quickly learned his lesson not to go too far to the left after the Democrats lost control of both houses of Congress in 1994; he thereafter ruled mostly as a centrist Democrat, combining social liberalism with economic restraint.

Mr. Obama would be wise to learn the lessons of the past. The people did not vote for his charm, good looks and winning smile; his charisma will take him no further. **Rather**, they voted for a centrist Democrat who would give them security abroad and prosperity based on fiscal restraint at home. If he seeks to transform America, he needs to return to the very formula of success that gave him such a resounding victory in November 2008. This means he cannot be beholden to the far-left fringe in all his decisions and must stand up to them.

**If he does not**, Mr. Obama's presidency will soon appear as little more than that of a young man **whose reach exceeds his grasp**.

*-Grace Vuoto is the executive director of The Edmund Burke Institute for American Renewal.*

## The wolf of appeasement

By Michael Fowler

War is about killing. It is not about acting strong; it is not about scaring the enemy: It is about destroying their ability to make war until they surrender. It is a brutal and ugly business that requires rough men—the kind of men I knew while serving in the U.S. Marines where I was taught the methods of war by the very best.

In Ganjgal, Afghanistan September 7, 2009, four U.S. Marines were killed. The Marines were assisting Afghan forces in searching for weapons and then meeting village elders to plan police patrols. They were ambushed by rebel forces during the operation.

While it was the bullets of the “insurgents” that ended their lives, it was political correctness that killed them. U.S. commanders, citing new rules to avoid civilian casualties, rejected repeated calls by the Marines to unleash fire at insurgents despite being told repeatedly that they were not near the village or civilians. These new rules are politically correct and were issued to avoid civilian casualties which risk alienating the Afghan population and jeopardizing the war effort. But General Stanley A. McChrystal and other top military officials have insisted air support and fire power would not be restricted when U.S. troops were under direct threat. Unfortunately, those warriors died because they were sent into a known hostile area and promised air support that never came.



## Foreign Affairs

Those brave Marines would be alive today if not for President Barack Obama's support of these politically-correct military rules. These rules prevented the Marines from receiving the military back-up they needed for survival. Their pleas, "We are pinned down. We are running low on ammo..." were ignored.



Gen. McChrystal has requested 40,000 more troops in Afghanistan. Again our soldiers are contending with half-measures and lack of support. After months of receiving Gen. McChrystal's recommendation, Mr. Obama has yet to make a decision and is wary of upsetting his far-left, anti-war proponents. Mr. Obama has signaled that he might send half the number of troops that were requested. Such a decision would be folly. Mr. Obama is not better equipped to make such a decision than Gen. McChrystal. The president has never so much as worn a pair of combat boots while the distinguished general has served in the military since he was 18-years-old. If Mr. Obama does indeed decide to send in only 20,000 troops, our enemy will be emboldened and our troops demoralized. The result will be more unnecessary deaths of our men in arms.

War is made by a state with laws. It is an act of imposing that will upon others who in turn resist. Al Qaeda and the Taliban are fiercely resisting that imposition of will which can only be stopped with sudden violence. So long as we are willing to impose our will upon those forces of terror, we will be at war. When at war, it is imperative to allow the military to do their job and destroy the enemy as quickly as possible. No war has ever been won by using less force than its opposition.

Half-measures cannot win wars. Half-measures were seen in Vietnam, which resulted not in a "bloodless war" but fully bloodied troops. President Lyndon Johnson's micro-managed plan was to risk the lives of troops by using a "slow squeeze" play as recommended by his civilian advisors. This was in direct conflict with the senior military advisors' "fast attack." President Jimmy Carter used half-measures in

## Foreign Affairs

the Iran Hostage Crisis that lasted 444 days, with a failed micro-managed rescue disaster in the sand, Operation Eagle Claw. President Bill Clinton thought he could fight war with missiles, letting them destroy “baby-milk factories” in Iraq and hospitals in Serbia. Mr. Clinton denied Gen. Thomas Montgomery’s request for reinforcements, air support and armored vehicles in Mogadishu, where 18 American soldiers were killed and 77 wounded. Half-measures do not work.

Now, Mr. Obama thinks he can micro-manage the war in Afghanistan while also preventing the left-wing base from revolting. But according to Gen. George S. Patton Jr., “There is only one tactical principle which is not subject to change. It is to use the means at hand to inflict the maximum amount of wound, death and destruction on the enemy in the minimum amount of time.” This is a formula for success.

President George W. Bush’s War on Terror was one of the most successful wars in the long history of war: more land was taken in less time, with the lowest loss of life. This result was due to Mr. Bush allowing the troops to destroy the enemy swiftly. The invasion of Iraq in 2003 was over in a few months; it is the occupation that has lasted for years, which is to be expected. The occupation of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan, likewise, took years.

Mr. Obama is more interested in protecting his image than saving the lives of our brave

men and women who face death. The best way to get the troops out of Afghanistan is to trust Gen. McChrystal and comply with his recommendation. Those men are risking their lives, the least Mr. Obama can do is risk his reputation.

Other Democratic leaders such as President Harry Truman and President Franklin D. Roosevelt understood how to conduct a war. They were willing to wage even total war when necessary, such as the bombing of Dresden and Hiroshima. Full measures brought about full surrender. But, that was when Democrats were still fully committed to the founding principles of America. The modern Democratic Party is no longer loyal to America or its values. It is loyal only to political ambition and will sacrifice troops at its altar.

If al Qaeda and the Taliban are worth killing, then the United States must fight. If they are not, then our troops should return home and Afghanistan should suffer its fate under the Taliban. When the president knowingly sends troops into known hostile areas without the necessary support and they die, their blood is on his hands. Our American soldiers should not be sacrificed to satiate the wolf of appeasement.

*-Michael Fowler is the director of Veterans for Academic Freedom, a former Force Recon Marine, instructor of Christian apologetics, author and talk-radio host.*

## A call to spiritual arms

*By Michelle Laque Johnson*

Before the fall of the Iron Curtain, I took one of those, “If it’s Tuesday, it must be Belgium” tours through Europe. I’ll never forget traveling through Checkpoint Charlie to visit East Berlin.

Our tour guide, who was with us at all times, was pretty, pleasant and spoke good English. She presented all sorts of “facts” in an attempt to convince us Westerners of the glories of the Communist regime. What she—and the regime itself—didn’t realize was that what we were seeing had a far greater impact on us than what we were hearing.

A traveler to West Berlin was overwhelmed with vitality, noise, color, people, shops, restaurants and theater—life. A traveler to East Berlin was overwhelmed by silence, deserted streets, gray buildings and static monuments—death. The stark contrast between the divided cities spoke to Westerners louder than any textbook of the oppressiveness of life under a Communist regime.

In the '60s and '70s, most Americans learned that communism and its cousin socialism are wrong. We read about the horrors going on behind the Iron Curtain; we heard accounts about it from survivors; and many of us watched and cheered as the Iron Curtain fell.

Today, however, our government is peopled by czars who are quite open about their ties to communism, socialism and unsavory organizations like the North American Man-Boy Love Association, supported by the “Safe School” czar. Policies are being pro-



posed and implemented which are clearly anti-democratic. Many Americans feel in their hearts that such policies are wrong, but they are not sure why. More importantly, they are not sure where to turn for answers.

How have we come to this? Try this on for size:

“The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of Communism. The majority instead succumb to its deception, skillfully concealed by the most extravagant promises. By pretending to desire only the betterment of the condition of the working classes, by urging the removal of the very real abuses chargeable to the liberalistic economic order, and by demanding a more equitable distribution of the world’s goods (objectives entirely and undoubtedly legitimate), the Communist takes advantage of the present world-wide economic crisis to draw into the sphere of its influence even those sections of the populace which on principle reject all forms of materialism and terrorism”

As we will discuss, these are the pillars on which communism is based.

The above quote, which sounds like it is ripped from the headlines, is actually excerpted from an encyclical written by Pope Pius XI in 1937. Surprised?

Among other things, he talks about the vast financial resources behind the spread of communism and their use of cinema, theater, radio, schools and universities to spread their errors. Guess who else gets blamed for communism’s spread? “[T]he conspiracy of silence on the part of a large section of the non-Catholic press of the world. We say conspiracy, because it is

impossible otherwise to explain how a press, usually so eager to exploit even the little daily incidents of life, has been able to remain silent for so long about the horrors perpetrated in Russia, in Mexico and even in a great part of Spain...”

Sound familiar?

To fundamentally change a nation, a would-be dictator needs to co-opt a lot of things: the educational system, the media and the military come easily to mind. Although in a superpower, taking over the economic system may be more important than the military. However, even with all of this, a dictator cannot hope to capture the hearts and minds of the populace without co-opting the most important sector of all: religious leaders and institutions.

While secular society does its best to denigrate the religious as weak-minded – following the axiom of Karl Marx who famously declared that “religion is the opiate of the people” – the truth is that it is popes and missionaries, priests and pastors who have historically stood against tyranny of all kinds. You may be surprised to learn that during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, more Christians were martyred for their faith than at any other time in the history of the world, according to Robert Royal’s book, “The Catholic Martyrs of the Twentieth Century.”

So why have so many people been willing to die? What exactly is wrong with communism? Here is a brief primer, courtesy of Pope Pius XI. His encyclical, “On Atheistic Communism,” quoted above, lays out the principles of communism so well that communists themselves reportedly use its definitions (minus its counter-arguments, of course) in their own literature.

Communists believe:

- There is only one reality in this world: matter, which evolves into plants, animals and man in a random way. “By a law of inexorable necessity and through a perpetual conflict of forces, matter moves towards the final synthesis of a classless society.”
- We can hasten our rush towards this utopia by encouraging class warfare. (Explains a lot, doesn't it?)
- Individual rights don't matter; neither does individual personality. Everything is subordinated to the collective. The system has no regard for personal welfare. “[V]iolence could be legitimately exercised to dragoon the recalcitrant against their wills,” says the pope.
- All forms of private property must be eradicated since property rights are a major source of wealth and could give one man power over another.
- Marriage and family are subordinate to the state. They reject the idea of an “indissoluble marriage tie” and “any link that binds woman to the family and the home. ... The care of home and children then devolves upon the collectivity.”
- Education of children is the “exclusive prerogative of the community, in whose name and by whose mandate alone parents may exercise this right.”
- All authority is rejected, including authority of parents over children or God over man.

The Christian idea that we were created by a loving God (not “random matter”) who cares about each of us individually (and not as a collective), who has prepared a place for us in heaven (and not a classless society here on earth), which we can get to by loving God and our neighbor (rather than through violence and destruction) is anathema to a communist. So is the institution of marriage, parental rights over children and personal rights when they conflict with the collective will.

Knowing this, is it any wonder that religion—especially the Christian religion and, in particular, the Catholic Church—is under attack? President Barack Obama may claim we are not “just” a Christian nation, but he is wrong. America proudly supports the free exercise of religion, but our nation was founded upon Christian principles and it is Christian principles which people on both sides of the aisle are using even now to prevent us from devolving into one of the “isms.”

Some disagree that we are sliding into communism. They think it ridiculous to worry that newly-enacted “hate speech” laws may eventually be used to prevent the free exercise of religion and abridge First Amendment rights. They are not concerned when a crucifix is covered up before a president will give a speech. They refuse to see that the mass murder of babies under the guise of healthcare reform or healthcare rationing based on age or disability undermines the importance of each individual no matter how small or old or crippled; or that revocation of parental notification laws abridges a par-

## Culture

ent's rights over his or her child—to name only a few of this year's headlines.

But to Christian America, this matters.

In 1937, Pope Pius XI spoke about saving the world, not by class-struggle and violence, but by infusing social justice and the sentiment of Christian love into the social order. His encyclical, "Divini Redemptoris," is worth reading today (<http://bit.ly/PBa0N>). Americans need to remember that there is a reason that Christians and their churches have been targeted by dictators through the ages. There is a reason that

Mr. Obama sought to align himself with Christians before the election.

For the sake of our country, let us pray that Christians remember who and Whose they are; that they stand up and stand strong.

God bless America.

*-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.*

[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com)

## Plundered justice in Copenhagen

By Mary Jo Anderson

World leaders continue to wrangle off stage in the lead up to Copenhagen for the Climate Change Summit (COP15), December 7-9.

A dismal pre-summit gathering just concluded in Barcelona was given a quick spray of gloss before its reports were released to the media. "What we will need after Copenhagen is a little time," declared Yvo de Boer, director of the United Nations climate change office.

The treaty will require more than time. A major consensus on the principles for plunder has yet to be hammered into shape. The sticking point for the climate treaty is who will pick up the estimated \$100 billion U.S. tab just for the next few years? When the G-20 finance ministers met in September, the German minister, Wolfgang Schaeuble, admitted that their working agreement was tossed because "emerging nations" refused to contribute. "Basically a group of emerging nations made it clear that they were unwilling to invest their own funds in the fight against climate change," said Mr. Schaeuble.

Alongside the newspeak of "climate justice" there is "climate debt," a multi-trillion dollar



transfer of wealth from productive nations to UN authorities whose task it is to distribute the plunder. One need only recall the United Nation's sordid grab of millions during the Oil-for-Food scam to have second thoughts about the United Nation's ability to administer trillions of dollars. That is one "morality debt" the United Nations has yet to pay.

Proponents of the treaty, led by the United Nations, heave heavy claims for "climate justice" and "climate debt" into the debate. (Shall we expect the meaning of justice to be plundered for any number of grievances such as "housing justice" or "water justice," or even a "computer justice"? Yes, already such UN are underway.) But a sober analysis reveals no scientific consensus exists that the planet is in

## Public Policy

peril from CO2 emissions—so-called “greenhouse gasses.” Hundreds of eminent scientists and climatologists have debunked the claims put forth by Al Gore and his merry band. Yet, millions of private and public dollars are poured into “climate justice” promotions in order to froth up the masses.

People the world over are urged to “demand” justice, but none so much as those citizens who live in what remains of free nations. Hapless citizens are prodded into a guilty fervor to pay a “climate debt” as expiation for the sins of consumerism. Are we soon to see demands for “housing justice”? The remedy proposed is the largest transfer of wealth and freedom the world has ever seen.

Who is to administer the plundered wealth of the productive nations? The draft treaty proposes a governing body with sweeping powers to monitor, tax and enforce the demands of the treaty. Enforcement requires force. UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon wrote of the Copenhagen Summit and its new governing entity in the October 25 issue of the New York Times. His phrase was “an equitable global governance structure.” How much sovereignty is forfeited to this “governing structure”? Who determines what is “equitable”? What world “force” will be used to ensure that non-compliant nations submit?

The fizzled preparatory meetings are a major opportunity for those who still believe in freedom and sovereignty. It affords thinking leaders time to make the better case for care of the environment based on science, not totalitarian ideology. What is sorely needed at this juncture is a return to intellectual integrity. That is, science should not be kept hostage to the will of

globalist politicians.

A little known history of the entire climate control movement is that it is an outgrowth of billionaire Maurice Strong’s push to institute a global mandate for his program of “Sustainable Development.” Mr. Strong, architect of the UN’s Agenda 21 and the UN’s Environmental Program (1972), urged world leaders to find a common enemy that all mankind could recognize (climate peril, sustainability\*) in order to form a world governing body that would structure man’s common future.

Among other initiatives derived from Agenda 21 is the Earth Charter. This charter is a deliberate secular substitution for the Ten Commandments. To reinforce the “new commandments,” the earth charter is enclosed in an “ark of hope” built to house the earth’s commandments, as well as the UN’s Millennium Development Goals. In 2003, the ark of hope, carried on four poles (as was the Jewish Ark of the Covenant), was received by Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands in a grand ceremony. A new-ageism has been cultivated in recognition of the public need for some sense of transcendence to give meaning to their sacrifices in favor of “earthology.”

Where the masses might be persuaded to submit to a soft totalitarianism as their contribution to save the planet, self-styled “citizens of the world” yearn for a harmonized world devoid of political differences. Richard Haas, current president of the Council on Foreign Relations, who served as special advisor to Colin Powell, exemplifies a growing cadre of intellectuals who believe the time has come for an end to state sovereignty. Mr. Haas wrote:

## Public Policy

“State sovereignty must be altered in globalized era...Moreover, states must be prepared to cede some sovereignty to world bodies if the international system is to function...Globalization thus implies that sovereignty is not only becoming weaker in reality, but that it needs to become weaker.”

The stalled Climate Change Treaty is an open moment for conservative leaders to advance a fresh argument for the relationship between freedom and national sovereignty. At no time in recent history have the distinctions between the structure of submission and the structure of freedom been so clear.

*-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.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com)

[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com)

[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)  
[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.com)

