

June, 2009 Vol. I No. 5

Reflections

A New Generation of Conservative Thought



AGAIN?

Malzberg on Sotomayor • How Putin buys influence in Washington • Was Jesus a socialist?

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.

CONTENT

JUNE, 2009 VOL. I, NO.5



AGAIN? 6 ANOTHER HOLOCAUST?

BY JEFFREY KUHNER

POLITICS

10 SOTOMAYOR IN CONTEXT

BY STEVE MALZBERG

12 DIME STORE DEMOCRATS MAKE COMEBACK

BY KERRY MCCARTHY

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

14 HOW PUTIN BUYS INFLUENCE IN WASHINGTON

BY ANDREI PIONTKOVSKY

16 RETURNING TO REAGANISM

BY NATASHA SRDOC AND JOEL ANAND SAMY

CULTURE

19 WAS JESUS A SOCIALIST?

BY MICHELLE LAQUE JOHNSON

22 AMERICA'S PAGAN RITUAL

BY JOSEPH BEAUDOIN

PUBLIC POLICY

24 GOP MUST REJECT JUDICIAL ACTIVISM

BY CHRIS GACEK

25 OBAMA'S ABORTION DOUBLE-TALK

BY LOREDANA VUOTO

The Edmund Burke Institute for American Renewal

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.

**Join us as we forge a new conservative movement for
the 21st century!**

www.edmundburkeinstitute.org

Another Holocaust?

By Jeffrey Kuhner

Pity the Jews. The world is about to abandon them—again. They are staring at another Holocaust. And the West, led by President Barack Obama, is willing to sacrifice them at the altar of appeasement.

This is the real meaning of Mr. Obama's address to the Muslim world at Cairo University. In his speech, Mr. Obama called for a "new beginning" in relations between America and Islamic civilization. He praised the Muslim faith for its historic commitment to "tolerance" and "religious equality." Moreover, he played to the Arab street, demanding Israel halt the construction of Jewish settlements in the West Bank. His Middle East foreign policy is based on the core illusion propounded by the Left for the past several decades: the root cause of the region's turmoil is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

In fact, the very opposite is the case. Arab autocracies have used—and manipulated—the Palestinian issue to divert their long-suffering populations from the real sources of regional instability, backwardness and extremism: the lack of democracy and political accountability, poor education, the denial of basic rights for women, the reluctance to embrace Enlightenment modernity and a virulent strain in Islam that glorifies jihadism and the imposition of Sharia law. Yet, instead of speaking out against these pathologies that



afflict Muslim civilization, Mr. Obama turned on America's only reliable, democratic ally: Israel.

Since the 1917 Balfour Declaration, the Zionist movement has sought to create a Middle East based on peaceful coexistence and mutual acceptance between Jews and Arabs. By calling for an independent Palestine, the so-called two-state solution, Mr. Obama's speech should have thrilled Israelis. It didn't. In fact, it has convinced many that Mr. Obama is another Neville Chamberlain: a cynical, amoral opportunist, who is willing to betray a small ally in the false pursuit of peace. Cairo has become the new Munich—a term that will be synonymous with moral cowardice. Blaming Israeli settlements is easy and politically correct; as is falsifying Islam's dismal record on religious minorities. Yet, what has right-

COVER STORY

ly angered many Israelis is that Mr. Obama never addressed Palestinian—or for that matter, Arab—incitement to anti-Semitic holy war. In schools, classrooms, madrassas and textbooks, Palestinian children are systematically indoctrinated to despise Jews, the state of Israel and the United States. Rather than being taught non-violence and peaceful coexistence, students are urged to hate Israel and call for its destruction. Without fundamental reform in education, no Israeli-Palestinian peace deal can be permanent. Even Israel's doves recognize this.



Moreover, the creation of an independent Palestine will result in a terror state on Israel's borders—one that will be a geopolitical dagger aimed at the heart of the Jewish state. Jerusalem's 2005 withdrawal from Gaza did not lead to peace. The Palestinian authorities could have focused on economic development and nation building. Instead, Hamas was elected to power and the territorial strip was transformed into a giant Islamist terrorist base, from which Israeli towns are bombarded by rockets on an almost daily basis. Pulling out of the West Bank will not buy Israel security. Rather, it will only consolidate the Palestinian territories into Hamastan. In effect, Mr. Obama is demanding Israel commit national suicide.

Yet, the most revealing—and disturbing—aspect of Mr. Obama's speech was his discussion of the basis of Israel's legitimacy. For Mr. Obama, the rationale for the Jewish state lies in the Holocaust. It does not rest on the birthplace of Jewish civilization, reflected through the relentless struggle by the Jews over 2,000 years to reestablish their own homeland. "The aspiration for a Jewish

homeland," Mr. Obama said, "is rooted in a tragic history that cannot be denied." This is also the argument of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (as well as most Arab regimes). Iran's mullocracy stresses that Israel is a foreign entity in the region; an artificial creation erected after World War II to assuage the European powers' guilt over the Holocaust. According to Ahmadinejad, Israel was erected upon the blood and real estate of Palestinians. It is a state founded upon mass ethnic cleansing. This view is shared by many academic leftists in America as well—of which Mr. Obama is a product.

Israel's claim to existence goes much deeper than the Holocaust. It stems from its historical right to a sovereign state anchored in the cradle of Jewish civilization. This forms the very essence of Israel's national identity. By not mentioning Israel's historical right to exist, Mr. Obama not only slapped Israeli Jews in the face, but he played right into the ideological hands of Muslim rejectionists. No wonder so many Islamists loved his speech.

The dirty little secret is that Mr. Obama is prepared to cut the Jews loose. Israeli intelligence officials have confirmed that Washington has privately told Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu Iran will soon have the bomb. Mr. Obama—backed by the liberal internationalists at the State Department—believes that nothing can or should be done to stop the mullahs from going nuclear. It is only a matter of time. Moreover, should Israel's hawkish government strike Iran's nuclear sites, the Obama administration will blame Jerusalem—not Tehran—for any ensuing military conflict.

Mr. Obama believes in the sheer force of his personality and charisma; that direct talks

COVER STORY

with Ahmadinejad will result in a new regional order. The president is the victim of his own hubris. Mr. Obama believes he can do the impossible: convince the mullahs to abandon their genocidal dreams, and make Iran a stable, respectable member of the international community. The administration is convinced that Israel's nuclear arsenal will act as a strategic deterrent against any possible Iranian attack, compelling Tehran to become a rational state similar to Stalin's Russia or Mao's China. In Mr. Obama's world, diplomacy trumps war; stability trumps democracy; and enemies trump allies.

Mr. Obama's Mideast utopia, however, will turn into a nightmare—especially, for the Jews. Iran is not a modern-day Persian Empire with a Shiite scowl; rather, it is a messianic, apocalyptic theocracy bent on forging a global Islamic caliphate. Ahmadinejad, along with Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, is an Islamist fanatic. They are convinced their divinely ordained mission is to bring about the coming of the Muslim messiah—also known as the “Hidden Imam” or the Mahdi. They believe the end of the world, and the final victory of political Islam over its enemies, is at hand. This is why Ahmadinejad has called for Israel to be “wiped off the map.” Tehran's Islamofascists want to eradicate both the Jewish state and its chief sponsor, America. For them, the nuclear bomb is not some defensive weapon to protect the regime from external threats. It is the means by which to achieve world revolutionary Shiitism.

Ahmadinejad has repeatedly said—in private and public—that Israel's “days are numbered,” and the “stinking, rotten Zionist entity” is destined for the dustbin of history. He is seeking to finish what Adolf Hitler began:

The Final Solution of the “Jewish Question.”

Ayatollah Hashemi Rafsanjani, a so-called “moderate” and a predecessor of Ahmadinejad, has vowed that Tehran will not be deterred by the fear of Israeli nuclear retaliation. “If the day comes when the world of Islam is duly equipped with the arms Israel has in its possession,” he said, “. . . application of an atomic bomb would not leave anything in Israel, but the same thing would just produce damages in the Muslim world.” In other words, the mullahs believe Iran can survive a nuclear exchange, while Israel can't.

History is repeating itself; another 6 million Jews are facing the very real prospect of annihilation. During the 1930s, Hitler's odious, evil regime marched to power. Confused, war weary and preoccupied with the economic crisis, most Americans and Europeans turned a blind eye to the mortal danger of Nazism. Moreover, anti-Semitism spread across large parts of Europe and the Middle East (and to a lesser extent, America). Like a cancer eating away at the body politic, it laid the groundwork for Hitler's Holocaust.

Today, there is a resurgence of anti-Semitism in Europe and the Arab world. From Liverpool to Paris to Hamburg, radicalized, seething Muslim youths routinely target Jewish businesses, cemeteries and synagogues. A global poll several years ago reported that 59 percent of Europeans regard Israel—not Iran, North Korea, Russia or China—as the greatest threat to world peace. In Germany, the figure was 65 percent; in Austria, it was nearly 70 percent; and in the Netherlands almost 75 percent. In supposedly “moderate” Muslim countries, such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Lebanon, the United Arab Emirates and Morocco, 79 percent of respondents believe

COVER STORY

Israel poses the greatest threat to international peace. Jew-baiting is back in fashion.

In other words, confronted by a determined, ruthless and fanatical enemy in Tehran, surrounded and besieged by hostile neighbors, facing a growing wave of animosity and hatred on the European continent and around the globe, and increasingly abandoned by the president of the United States, Israel is now living through the most perilous moment in its troubled history. Following the discovery of Auschwitz and other Nazi death camps, the world vowed to “never again” allow a Holocaust to take place. That was then; this is now. The Jews know more than anyone that fate is fickle, and the tide of destiny is against them.

As a Catholic traditionalist, my ultimate allegiance is not to Jerusalem (nor despite all of my love for America, to Washington), but to Rome. Still, as the late Pope John Paul II stressed, the Catholic Church’s covenant with the Jews is eternal. Both Christians and Jews are spiritual Semites; together—for all their historic tensions and animosities—they have built Western civilization. The destruction of Israel will not only be a death blow to the Jews. It will be a death blow to Christendom, fatally severing it from its Jewish roots. Only unity can save the Jews.

-Jeffrey T. Kuhner is president of the Edmund Burke Institute and a columnist at The Washington Times.

Sotomayor in context

By Steve Malzberg



“For the first time in my adult life I am proud of my country because it feels like hope is finally making a comeback.” That one statement made by Michelle Obama on February 18, 2008 made headlines. Eventually, she explained it away and all was forgiven. The problem is that it was looked at in a vacuum by the media and even by many on the Right. There were many companion statements uttered over time by Mrs. Obama that were consistent with a person who didn’t think very highly of America, but she received a pass.

Now we find ourselves with another highlighted quote, one of many that show a very strong pattern and system of beliefs. Only this time the words have come out of the mouth of the woman who would be our next United States Supreme Court Justice, Sonia Sotomayor, who currently serves on the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. But to ignore the rest of what she said would subject us to much more serious consequences than resulted from ignoring the remarks of the woman who is now our First Lady. It would result in a lifetime appointment for a woman, who in my view is obsessed with race and is, in fact, a racist.

Here’s the part we have all heard about. “I would hope that a wise Latina woman with

the richness of her experiences would more often than not reach a better conclusion than a white male who hasn’t lived that life.” She made that statement in September of 2001 in a speech to the University of California-Berkley, School of Law. The speech was also published in the Spring 2002 issue of Berkeley La Raza Law Journal, a symposium issue entitled, “Raising the Bar: Latino and Latina Presence in the Judiciary and the Struggle for Representation.” That is a blatantly racist remark. She touts the superiority of her race over that of whites. Open and closed. But New York Senator Charles Schumer chooses to misread the entire remark. He says that, “The specific sentence is simply saying that people’s experiences matter and we ought to have more diversity on the courts.”

But what’s worse, is that Mr. Schumer implies that he has read Ms. Sotomayor’s entire speech, and he has no problem with it. “I think she’ll stand by the entire speech,” he said. Let’s hope she does, and let’s hope she’s challenged big time on what she said.

So what else was in that address? Sotomayor told her audience that she intended to, “Talk about her Latina identity, where it came from and the influence I perceive it has on my presence on the bench.” She said her parents taught her to love being a “Puerto Riquena, and to love America,” then added, “But achieving success here is no easy accomplishment for Latinos or Latinas, and although that struggle did not and does not create a Latina

POLITICS

identity, it does inspire how I live my life.”

“The focus of my speech however is not about the struggle to get us where we are and where we need to go but instead to discuss with you what it all will mean to have more women and people of color on the bench,” she said. And here it comes.

She references her former colleague from the Southern district, Judge Miriam Cedarbaum, who she says believes, “That judges must transcend their personal sympathies and prejudices and aspire to achieve a greater degree of fairness and integrity based on the reason of law.” Sounds like the only judicial philosophy to have, but it’s not necessarily Ms. Sotomayor’s philosophy.

“Although I agree with and attempt to work toward Judge Cedarbaum’s aspiration, I wonder whether achieving that goal is possible in all or even most cases. And I wonder whether by ignoring our differences as women or men of color we do a disservice both to the law and society.” This is as red a flag as one can have. She is giving us fair warning that if she’s confirmed, she will rule as a “Latina.” Want more evidence?

“I further accept that our experiences as women and people of color affect our decisions. The aspiration to impartiality is just that, it’s an aspiration because it denies the fact that we are by our experiences making different choices than others.” So it should come as no surprise that her lead-in to the “Latina woman /white male” com-

ment was, “Justice [Sandra Day] O’Connor has often been cited as saying that a wise old man and a wise old woman will reach the same conclusion in deciding cases. I am not so sure I agree with that statement.”

Yes, it seems pretty obvious that Sonia Sotomayor has a very serious race issue going on. But let’s remember who nominated her for the Supreme Court: The man who once called his mother’s mother a “typical white person.”

Now President Obama says that he’s sure that Ms. Sotomayor would have “restated” the one line now under scrutiny. I guess he didn’t read the rest of the speech. Mr. Obama also ridicules those who would dare to question his choice claiming, “some in Washington who are attempting to draw old battle lines and playing the usual political games pulling a few comments out of context to paint a distorted picture of Judge Sotomayor’s record.” This comes from the man who voted to filibuster Justice Alito’s nomination.

And Mr. Obama, looking to turn the racist tables went on, “I think all this nonsense that is being spewed out will be revealed for what it is.” Yes, how dare we look at racism and call it what it is. Let’s pray very hard that the U.S. Senate will not be intimidated, but don’t hold your breath.

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

Dime Store Democrats make comeback

By Kerry McCarthy

“Why vote for a ‘Dime Store Democrat’ when you can vote for the real thing?” President Harry Truman famously said. He was speaking about Republicans who drift away from conservative core values in an attempt to curry favor with the public by being slightly less radical than popular Democrats. General Colin Powell has become the latest high-profile spokesman for Dime Store Democrats. His predecessors include President Herbert Hoover, presidential candidate Wendell Wilkie and Vice President Nelson Rockefeller.

Hoover, despite his good intentions, set in motion the trend toward big government. He laid the groundwork for the New Deal, implementing measures which Roosevelt scorned but then expanded once he was in office (not unlike President Barack Obama’s amplification of bailouts started during President George W. Bush’s administration). Wilkie was a Roosevelt delegate at the 1932 Democratic convention, but in 1940, he effectively cleared the path for Roosevelt’s unprecedented third term when vocal spectators swayed delegates on the floor of the Republican convention, defeating legitimate, viable conservatives. Wilkie then presented no real alternative to Roosevelt. Rockefeller acted as a spoiler in the 1964 election.

None of these men spoke out against the party. Hoover remained a loyal Republican, but to this day, his name is used to excoriate conservatives even though he was more liberal than all other Republican presidents who preceded him. Democrats and the media still point to Hoover as someone Republicans need

to live down. Wilkie died in 1944. Rockefeller seemed unaffected by his role as spoiler and eventually became Vice President under President Gerald Ford. The most important effect of these men’s political actions was to muddy the waters, making the differences between Democrats and Republicans less evident.

Mr. Powell presents a new twist to the scenario of Dime Store Democrats. In the last election Mr. Powell spurned Sen. John McCain, Arizona Republican, despite him being the kind of Republican nominee Mr. Powell has always called for. By endorsing and publicly announcing his intent to vote for Barack Obama, Mr. Powell effectively left the Republican Party. Having defected, he now presumes to lecture the party on how to be Republican. He enjoys the support of the media, who do not examine his actions, but instead question the rest of the Republican Party for not following Mr. Powell’s lead.

Then there is the matter of Mr. Powell’s questionable political character. During the media-hyped controversy about who leaked Valerie Plame’s name to the press (which was not actually a crime), Mr. Powell knew that Richard Armitage, his protégé and a top aide in the State Department, was the leaker. He remained quiet as the press attacked Mr. Bush’s handling of the affair and poisoned the jury pool, contributing to the conviction of Lewis “Scooter” Libby for the crime of lying to investigators about a conversation he had with Tim Russert of NBC News.

Libby’s defense was that he had thou-

POLITICS

sands of conversations with many journalists and couldn't remember precisely what he said to whom. Russert, initially also not sure what was said, testified against Libby after Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald pressured him to "become sure" of what was said after all. (Russert, a Catholic, later died of a heart attack). Mr. Powell's conduct in this matter does not inspire loyalty.

Dime Store Democrats are welcomed by the Democratic Party because Democrats continued success depends on the diminution of Republicans as an opposition party. Democrats often lose against a true alternative to liberalism and big government solutions because, while safety nets and entitlements offer a certain appeal, most Americans still have an independent spirit. They do not want big government. They understand the loss of independence and self-reliance these programs pres-

ent. Also, when Republicans offer something less than a true alternative to liberalism, they are easily defeated, as in 1940 and in 2008.

A well-known, respected public figure who ostensibly remains Republican but actually undermines the core values that have identified the Republican Party as a true alternative to Democrats may serve as an internal Fifth Column, working secretly for one party while maintaining the appearance of loyalty to the other. Mr. Powell wants it both ways: he wants to be considered a Republican, but to ally himself with the Democrats.

It remains to be seen how Dime Store Democrats will react to and influence upcoming issues such as the nomination and confirmation process of Judge Sonia Sotomayor.

-Kerry W. McCarthy is a writer living in Indiana.

How Putin buys influence in Washington

By *Andrei Piontkovsky*

Hand over a trillion dollars, or else.

Germany's ex-Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder has long been something of a legend. He serves at Vladimir Putin's filling station for a measly couple of million euros a year, sits at sessions of the Russian Academy of Sciences like a latter-day Euler, and writes books about his staunch Eurasian friendship with Genosse Wladimir who, in the not so distant past, earned himself the well-deserved nickname of Stasi among business circles in gangster-ridden St. Petersburg.

It is not actually immediately obvious whether it is Mr. Schroeder licking Mr. Putin's boots or vice versa. The two of them are building, or trying to, the Nord Stream gas pipeline, an exceptionally costly project which satisfies twin strategic objectives. Demonstratively hostile to both Belarus and Ukraine, it ensures these countries will remain alienated from Russia irrespective of what governments may be installed in Minsk and Kiev in the next decade. As a bonus, it consolidates the Russian economy's status as an appendage supplying natural resources to Germany.

These do appear to be the very objectives certain historical predecessors of Chancellor Schroeder attempted to attain by rather different means.

Russian diplomacy's achievements in respect of America are even more impressive.

The present Russia policy of the Obama administration is formulated, abundantly nurtured with advice from, and implemented by people who have no official position in the administration: Henry Kissinger, James A. Baker, Thomas Graham, and Dimitri Simes. The first two enjoy a reputation as major geopoliticians, and Mr. Graham and Mr. Simes are respected as outstanding Russia specialists. They write key reports for the administration, and shuttle between Moscow and Washington coordinating the parameters of America's "reset" diplomacy.

What these people have in common is that, like Mr. Schroeder, they have serious business interests in Russia. Mr. Baker is a consultant of such companies, closely associated with the highest in the land, as Gazprom and Rosneft. The Kissinger Associates lobby group, whose Russian section is headed up by Mr. Graham, feeds in to the Kissinger-Primakov working group.

It is highly instructive to read their recommendations to the American government. As is only to be expected of top-flight lobbyists, they unobtrusively render the objectives of their Kremlin clients, into conceptual language familiar and comprehensible to the American political establishment.

Mr. Graham's latest contribution, "Resurgent Russia and U.S. Purposes," has caused a stir and is very revealing in this respect. The author finds the government of a "Rus-

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

sia getting up off its knees” to consist of progressive modernizers fully aware of the challenges facing their country as it attempts to “return to the great powers club.” He sees a document they put out last year titled “Strategy 2020” as testifying to the seriousness of their intentions. (Mr. Graham tactfully passes over the fact that this declarative document has already been consigned to the waste paper basket.)

“But in order to become a genuinely developed and modern country,” Mr. Graham continues, “in the coming decade Russia will need to invest at least one trillion dollars in modernizing its infrastructure. America and the West in general have a vital interest in seeing the modernization of Russia succeed. The lion’s share of the technologies, know-how, and a substantial proportion of the investment, needs to come from Europe and the USA.”

In addition to the technology and investments, Mr. Graham, who, as an experienced psychoanalyst, has a fine understanding of the patient’s adolescent complexes, proposes also shoving a geopolitical dummy in his mouth by “Finlandizing” Ukraine.

Otherwise, he warns in melancholy tones, Russia will continue to dump on us “wherever and whenever it can,” and in the end will completely go to the dogs together with its nuclear potential. “At the extreme, a weak Russia, with its vast resources and sparse population east of the Urals, could become the object of competition among the great powers, notably China and the United States.”

“Hand over a trillion dollars, or else...” It is an organic and logical development of Mr. Putin’s homily at Davos, when he advocated

decisive action to end the world economic crisis by writing off half a trillion dollars’ worth of debt owed to Western banks by the state corporations run by his pals from the Dresden KGB residency and the Ozero dacha cooperative.

Mr. Graham is no fool and is, of course, well aware that no trillions of dollars in the next decade will succeed any better than the trillions squandered in the last one in modernizing Mr. Putin’s kleptocratic regime, which is institutionally, intellectually, and aesthetically antithetical to the task of modernization.

There is, however, a lot of work to be done, and very professionally Mr. Graham does it too. His only slip is in trying to bug his readers with a hypothetical confrontation between the United States and China. This is not his area of specialization. His boss works personally with the Chinese account, jointly propounding with his eternal rival Zbigniew Brzezinski the notion, so seductive for an America wearying of its imperial burden, of a Big Two. Here is a recent sample of his geopolitical arts:

“The role of China in a new world order is crucial. A relationship that started on both sides as essentially a strategic design to constrain a common adversary has evolved over the decades into a pillar of the international system... The Sino-American relationship needs to be taken to a new level. This generation of leaders has the opportunity to shape relations into a design for a common destiny, much as was done with trans-Atlantic relations in the post-war period.”

Feel the difference, as they say. Our concern, however, is not to compare the literary merits of these golden, in every sense of the

word, pens of Messrs. Kissinger and Graham. Both these highly venerable gentlemen are conscientiously and honestly articulating the aspirations closest to the hearts of their customers.

It's just that not all customers are the same. One wants to get his hooks into a further tril-

lion dollars, while another wants to become "a central construct of the system of international relations."

- Andrei Piontkovsky is the executive director of the Strategic Studies Center in Moscow and a well-known political analyst in Russia.

Returning to Reaganism

By Natasha Srdoc and Joel Anand Samy

On June 3, 2009, we witnessed the unveiling of a 7-foot bronze statue of Ronald Reagan, the 40th president of the United States in the packed room of the spacious Capitol Rotunda filled with former Reagan administration officials, a bipartisan representation from both houses of Congress, supporters and admirers of Reagan. Notably, embedded in the 500 pound sculpture are a few pieces of the Berlin Wall which was torn down 20 years ago.

"It will stand forever as a silent sentry in these hallowed halls, to teach our children and our grandchildren about that which once was and to inspire them with visions of that which can be again - today, tomorrow and unto the generations," said James Baker III, Reagan's close aide and treasury secretary.

Reagan's belief, "Concentrated power has always been the enemy of liberty," affirmed the call for liberating hopeful Europeans who lived behind the Iron Curtain. President Ronald Reagan's strategic vision of liberty for all the peoples, peace through strength and bold foreign policy initiatives transformed their world. In 1989, the Berlin Wall was brought

down and Reagan's principled leadership in confronting the "evil empire" with trusted allies yielded historic results.

Americans came to realize that a formidable adversary led by the communist elite and based on a command and control system that deprived individuals of liberty lay in destroyed form. The Cold War as we knew it came to an end. And, liberty prevailed over tyranny and oppressive communist governments in Eastern Europe.

The American citizens' clear stance on liberty born out of its Founding Fathers' vision in upholding the first principles made America emerge as a defender of liberty during the turbulent 20th century.

More than 420,000 American lives were lost fighting Nazi Germany during World War II in a prolonged campaign to seizing victory over tyranny and liberating millions of Europeans. In a sobering reflection, over six million European Jews were sent to their deaths.

Through its leadership in advancing liberty, the United States contributed to rebuilding

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Europe. America's long-term commitment to Europe's peace and prosperity is an extraordinary achievement.

During the last decade of the 20th century when the Balkan conflicts erupted, deep cracks were revealed within Europe's leadership ranks. Europe's leaders lacked decisive leadership in resolving post-World War II's most horrific act whereby genocide took the lives of 200,000 civilians and led to 4 million individuals fleeing their homes.

Yet, once again, through America's leadership which was supported by Lady Thatcher's call for just intervention in the region brought an end to the bloodshed in the Balkans with the direct engagement of NATO's forces.

History clearly reveals that Western and Eastern Europeans are beneficiaries of liberty that was borne by American citizens through extraordinary efforts of fielding American troops and military hardware and technology on European soil.

On September 11, 2001, the frontal attack on liberty came to America's soil. We all witnessed the vivid manifestation of the real threat to liberty when a group of terrorists recruited and motivated by Islamic Jihadists killed thousands of innocent civilians by using commercial airplanes as missiles to attack New York City and Washington, DC.

Regrettably, liberty continues to be under attack by corrupt authoritarian regimes and extremist terrorist groups who are both driven by self-interests to preserve their oppressive rule over individuals. What these groups have in common is no different from former communist regimes that discarded the rule of law, protection of property rights and free-

dom of speech.

Yet, in a post-September 11 world, some political elitists in European nations began to question America's leadership and criticize the legitimacy of advancing liberty. Instead, they should remember the positive changes that America's initiatives and its long-term commitment brought to the European continent.

America's call to combat global terror around the world and the extended engagements in Afghanistan and Iraq should give no reason for some in European quarters to doubt America's resolve in advancing liberty.

Stalwarts in the American conservative arena began questioning then presidential candidate Barack Obama's statements about America's leadership in the global arena. And since he took office, conservative leaders have further pointed out that President Obama's statements and actions are creating confusion and weakening America's leadership position when making apologies on behalf of America.

In a timely and relevant book titled "Liberty's Best Hope," Vice President of Foreign and Defense Policy at the Heritage Foundation and former Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Dr. Kim Holmes clearly articulates real concerns about the future of America's leadership in the 21st century and provides a clear blueprint to guide policymakers and elected officials for American leadership in a turbulent world.

Dr. Holmes believes that "the vision of a tamed America following the rest of the world is our future unless we restore Reagan's faith in America."

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Dr. Holmes moved on more strategic ground when he questioned the speech that President Obama delivered in Cairo, Egypt addressing the Muslim world. In a recent statement, Dr. Holmes said, “He [President Obama] could have been more explicit about Islamist extremism of the non-violent kind and the dangers it poses to the ideals of individual freedom and religious liberty. He addressed it indirectly by expressing the U.S. commitment to democratic values but he should have been more direct in order to provide moral support for Muslims around the world who are themselves fighting against such ideologies. By avoiding using the word ‘Islamist,’ he is downplaying the ideological underpinnings for terrorism. Obama is right that we should not equate terrorism with the religion of Islam, but we also need to be ready to engage in the battle of ideas and be clear when political Islam contradicts the ideals of individual freedom and religious liberty.”

In his intriguing and applicable book, Dr. Holmes concludes by stating, “Above all, we need to revive the idea that standing for and spreading liberty is the central idea of our foreign policy. It is not only our idea – like any other nation, we have security interests – but it is the central and unique idea of our leadership. We strive for an international system of nation-states that respect liberty, self government, the rule of law, property rights and equal justice under law.”

Terrorist groups and organized crime are parasites that can only survive in environments where there is an absence of the rule of law and significant political corruption.

For the sake of people living under oppressive regimes as well as for the security of the American people at home, liberty has to prevail. America’s long-established moral authority in defending liberty around the world is very much needed in today’s tumultuous world. American foreign policy should reflect the American people’s quest and its exceptional generosity to bringing the building blocks of liberty based on first principles to the rest of the world.

President Ronald Reagan’s words are timeless, “America’s foreign policy supports freedom, democracy, and human dignity for all mankind, and we make no apologies for it. The opportunity society that we want for ourselves we also want for others, not because we’re imposing our system on others but because those opportunities belong to all people as God-given birthrights and because by promoting democracy and economic opportunity we make peace more secure.”

- Natasha Srdoc and Joel Anand Samy are co-Founders of the Adriatic Institute for Public Policy the International Leaders Summit.

Was Jesus a socialist?

By Michelle Laque Johnson

As President Obama continues on his course to redistribute the nation's wealth, his supporters are trying to co-op Christians by contending that this concept is inherently biblical. So it's worth asking: Were the early Christians socialists? Does the Bible support socialism?

The Bible passage used most often to support this belief is Acts 4: 34-35. Here's the sentence: "There was no needy person among them, for those who owned property or houses would sell them, bring the proceeds of the sale, and put them at the feet of the apostles, and they were distributed to each according to need."

Throwing out a quote from Scripture without any context is typical of the depth of analysis done by those who are least familiar with it. Let's begin by acknowledging that the Bible does encourage us to give generously to others.

Surveys repeatedly demonstrate that it is religious people who give the most – and, despite recent rhetoric, Christians represent, by far, the majority of the religious people in this country.

In an August 2007 article on the subject of

American generosity, reporter Ruth Ann Dailey of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette cited two highly visible studies on the issue. The first was a 2006 special on ABC's "20/20" entitled "Cheap in America: Who Gives and Who Doesn't?"

She highlighted host John Stossel's finding that "the single biggest predictor of giving is religious participation." In fact, she says that religious people in America are not only more likely to give to both religious and secular charities, but in making these contributions, they give four times more than others. "They are even 18 percent more likely to give blood."



Ms. Dailey also references what some might call the definitive book on the subject of giving in America, "Who Really Cares: The Surprising Truth About Compassionate Conservatism," by Arthur Brooks. The publisher notes that Mr. Brooks' research "demonstrates conclusively that conservatives really are compassionate – far more compassionate than their liberal foes. Strong families, church attendance, earned income (as opposed to state-subsidized income), and the belief that individuals, not government, offer the best solution to social ills – all of these factors

CULTURE

determine how likely one is to give.”

Former President George W. Bush built on the generosity of this base when he founded the Office for Faith-Based Initiatives “to enlist, equip, enable, empower and expand the heroic works of faith-based and community groups across America.”

In the aforementioned biblical quote from the Acts of the Apostles, please note that the apostles didn’t command the early Christians to sell their homes and give them the proceeds. Instead, the people, out of their love for God, chose to sell their homes and give the proceeds to the Apostles.

Why?

First, because they loved the Apostles, whom they rightly saw as representatives of Jesus Christ. Second, because they shared the Apostles’ belief system and knew their money would be used to support the things in which they deeply believed. Love and shared values were the basis of their generosity, not coercion.

I don’t think any rational person sees the U.S. government or President Barack Obama as a representative of God. (Note: I said, rational person.) Rather, most Christians choose to give money to a church or organization in which they believe, or directly to a needy person – especially persons who fall between the cracks and do not qualify for government aid.

An example of the latter is an elderly diabetic woman I know who could not continue to live in her mobile home on her meager Social Security check if not for the generosity of those in her church. Another example is the young mother of two whose husband had

a mental breakdown and walked out on the family. She moved into a small town-home in a not-so-nice area, but still had trouble paying for food, and the children could no longer afford to participate in any extracurricular activities – at least until they received help from a very religious friend.

Given all of this, wouldn’t it make sense for the government to encourage, rather than discourage, faith in God – which research demonstrates leads people to voluntarily help their fellow man – rather than to impose coercive programs and onerous taxes on its citizens?

Why is it that liberals feel people must be coerced? Is it because that is the only way they give to others? Or is it because liberals are afraid that no one will want to give to the causes they hold dear? Is it because they want us all to give to global warming initiatives rather than collections of warm blankets, to help those “unfortunates” who want abortions rather than couples who can’t afford to adopt, to help illegal aliens rather than blue collar workers get jobs in this country?

Christians – indeed, most religious people – are encouraged to see themselves as stewards of the money they earn. They thank God for everything they have. Therefore, they give as their faith and their consciences, which have been formed by their faith, dictate – not as the government dictates. In fact, I believe that most Americans do not want Uncle Sam telling them to whom or to what they should give the money they earn.

Don’t tax me so you can fund policies that are anathema to most Christians; such as clinics, hospitals or nursing homes who perform “merciful acts” of abortion, euthanasia

CULTURE

or embryonic stem cell research, (which has cured no one), rather than adult stem cell research (which has cured many). Don't subject me to Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi's rants about raising my taxes to pay for forced abortions in China (which just goes to prove that calling oneself a Christian and actually being a Christian are two separate things. But I digress.).

Final point: Let's put that passage from Acts about giving to the needy in context. What context? How about the context of work? The Bible actually has quite a lot to say about this subject – none of which would give aid and comfort to those who would redistribute our wealth according to government dictates.

In 2 Thessalonians 3, the Apostles say they have striven to be good role models and have never eaten food received free from anyone. "In fact, when we were with you, we instructed you that if anyone was unwilling to work, neither should that one eat." They urge people "to work quietly and eat their own food" and not to act in a "disorderly" way or as "busybodies."

The Bible does not encourage people to be dissolute freeloaders any more than it encourages immoral living or government redistri-

bution of wealth. The Bible does encourage its adherents to love one another, to help one another, to exhort one another to live a good life and to do it all out of a love for One who is Love – that is, Jesus Christ, and not the government.

Don't tell me it's biblical for the government, or anyone in the government, to play God. It's not. Don't tell me it's biblical for the government to take my money and give it to the causes it deems worthy of support – causes most Christians do not support. It's not. And don't tell me it's biblical to give to those who choose not to contribute to society even when they are clearly able. It's not.

As Jesus told the Sadducees in Mark 12:24 and 12:27: "Are you ... misled because you do not know the Scriptures...? ... You are greatly misled."

To that, I have one thing to say: Amen.

-Michelle Laque Johnson has spent more than 20 years working for publications as diverse as Investor's Business Daily, where she was a reporter, and The Catholic Standard & Times, where she was editor-in-chief. She currently serves as director of communications for EWTN, the largest religious media network in the world.

America's pagan ritual

By Joseph Beaudoin

Pro-choice advocates regard “a woman’s right to choose” as a civil right. To them, *Roe v. Wade* is an expression of the separation of church and state. The history of the Roman Empire shows that “a woman’s right to choose” is simply America’s version of an inhuman pagan ritual.

In ancient Rome, fathers had the legal right to kill their offspring before or after birth. That right was called the *patria potestas*, the supreme jurisdiction of the father. At the time, the punishment for a mother who killed her child was death.

Romans practiced infanticide – the killing of infants – on a large scale. In addition to the *patria potestas*, the Twelve Tables of Roman Law literally stated that deformed infants had to be killed. As there was no Roman Surgeon General, one can assume that the term, “deformed,” was loosely defined to fit any circumstances.

In the ancient world, infanticide was not limited to Rome. It was a generally accepted practice for all pagan cultures from Greece to Carthage to Asian civilizations. Alone, among ancient people, were the Jews whose law prohibited infanticide, although it did permit abortion.

It is clear that Romans did not have, for human life, the respect we claim to have for it today. They, however, understood murder and usually punished it by death. Yet, they permitted the killing of newborn babies on an industrial scale. How did they legally recon-



cile the conflict between punishing murderers with death while letting parents kill their babies with total impunity?

The legal foundation of infanticide was the pagan belief that infants were not human beings until some time after their birth. In Rome, that period of time was seven days. In other words, Romans defined human life in such way as to legally permit the continued practice of their only full-proof birth control method: the killing of infants.

The rise of Christianity began a pro-life revolution within the Roman Empire. From its earliest days, Christianity regarded abortion and infanticide as murder and prohibited them without reservation. Christianity’s challenge of Roman law did not go unpunished. Christians were persecuted.

By the 5th century, with the majority of the population of the Roman Empire converted

CULTURE

to Christianity, infanticide became less common. It did not disappear, however, but it was no longer legally permitted. Following the fall of Rome, as ecclesiastical law became the foundation of European legal systems, the Christian notion of the sanctity of human life was established in law throughout Christendom. This was one of Christianity's greatest contribution to humanity as absolute respect for human life was a *sine qua non* requirement for the development of democracy.

To be fair to the Romans, there were extenuating circumstances for infanticide. Birth control methods were limited in availability and effectiveness. Poverty, famine, pestilence, wars, etc. often made it quite hard for a family to feed an additional mouth. And, most significantly, the high rate of infant mortality from natural causes played a role in the belief that infants were not human beings until they had proven their ability to survive long enough outside the womb.

Regardless, the scale of the carnage was staggering. Historians estimate that 20% to 40% of pagan infants were victims of infanticide. As horrific as these numbers may be to Americans, these numbers show that infanticides were no more common in Rome than abortions are today in America.

In 2005, there were 1,370,000 abortions and 4,138,349 births in the United States. Based on that year, American women abort about 25% of pregnancies. Romans, who did not have access to current birth control methods, killed 20% to 40% of infants. In addition, Romans did not know that a fetus could survive outside the womb several weeks prior to birth

and grow to be an adult human being. Romans did not have the medical equipment to assess the extent to which, at a certain stage, a fetus meets virtually all the characteristics of a newborn. Perhaps Roman infanticides resulted from poverty and ignorance.

Unlike Romans, Americans have access to a plethora of birth control technologies and Americans know that a fetus can survive as an infant several weeks before birth. Yet, Americans practice their own brand of infanticide at about the same rate as the Romans did, and for the same reason, namely, the destruction of unwanted children. Indeed, over 90% of American abortions are performed for birth control purposes.

Finally, Roman infanticides and American abortions are based on the same legal premise. Roman law did not recognize the humanity of infants and American law does not recognize the humanity of the unborn.

Roe v. Wade has simply replaced the *patria potestas* with the *matria potestas* — the supreme power of the mother. While Romans felt the father had the right to kill his newborn, the Supreme Court of the United States feel the mother has the right to kill her unborn child.

Roe v. Wade, by legalizing a pagan principle, violates the separation of church and state.

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

GOP must reject judicial activism

By Chris Gacek

Arlen Specter's defection to the Democratic Party in late April triggered another wave of teeth gnashing by liberal Republicans like Colin Powell and the mainstream media about the GOP's political viability. The same press corps that cannot bestir themselves to cover the White House, sprang to life ready to dispense political advice to conservatives. Both the liberal Republicans and the establishment's pundit class seemed to agree that social conservatives must be expelled from the big tent and then thrown under the bus.

Unfortunately, this strategy for GOP revival will not succeed. There are numerous reasons why, but one is less well recognized. That is, an absolutely non-negotiable plank of conservatism circa 2009 is the total rejection of judicial activism and policy-making from the bench. A direct consequence of this political development is that disengagement from the culture war is not possible because the Left has made the judiciary its handmaiden in forcing social change on America. A conservative judiciary will be very highly disposed to hand such policy decisions back to the people.

The Bush administration's Harriet Miers debacle proved that stealth judicial candidates or lukewarm judicial activists will no longer pass muster with the GOP base. An outsider to conservatism might think I am exaggerating because calm was restored after Ms. Miers withdrew her nomination and Judge Samuel Alito was confirmed. Those

points are true, but had Ms. Miers' nomination been approved, the GOP risked blowing apart at the seams.

Concern over the judiciary is now central to conservative politics. Talk show hosts Laura Ingraham and Mark Levin have made judicial appointments one of their top concerns. In fact, Mr. Levin's book denouncing judicial activism, *Men in Black*, was a best seller. A "must-read" for conservatives is *National Review Online's Bench Memos* blog which tracks judiciary-related news.

Another sign of this issue's importance could be seen recently when the conservative Bradley Foundation awarded the Federalist Society's founders lifetime achievement awards. The Federalist Society was created by a group of young, Reaganite lawyers in the 1980s for the express purpose of combating judicial activism and placing judicial conservatives on the federal bench.

Each branch of conservatism—social, economic, and national security—can list constitutional judicial decisions it abhors. Social conservatives loathe various opinions on abortion, pornography, prayer, and same-sex marriage. Economic conservatives and libertarians feel this way about the *Kelo v. City of New London* decision which eviscerated the constitutional protection against governments taking private property. They also fear the Second Amendment will be sabotaged. Moreover, national security conserva-

tives have been stunned that the courts are now running our wars. Finally, all of them become apoplectic at the mere thought of foreign legal sources being used to trump the U.S. Constitution.

So, when Rudy Giuliani tells the GOP that he supports *Roe v. Wade* and equivocates on appointing judges who regard *Roe v. Wade* as illegitimate, he has shot himself in the foot twice. First, he has offended the pro-life community on the merits of the abortion issue. Second, and perhaps more importantly, he has offended those Republicans—including pro-lifers—who care deeply about judicial activism on a wide array of issues. They know that support for *Roe v. Wade* indicates that the speaker is not really serious about reigning in the judiciary because a politician could support legislative permission for abortion while rejecting the legal reasoning of *Roe v. Wade*.

Thus, the liberal Republican dream of abandoning social-cultural issues is not really fea-

sible. Republicans have learned the hard way that being a judicial activist in one area is an excellent predictor that a judge will be an activist in all areas. One might think that opposing judicial activism on abortion should not necessarily predict whether a judge will overturn precedent regarding Guantanamo detainees, for example, but it has.

It is this realization that makes it unacceptable now for a Republican president to appoint judges outside the William Rehnquist and Mr. Alito philosophical lineage—even if it means that tremendous battles over social issues will erupt. Thus, surrendering to liberal judges on cultural issues would also mean abandoning the fight over the courts, constitutionalism and the rule of law. In short order, such a move would devastate the GOP's electoral prospects.

-Chris Gacek is senior fellow for regulatory affairs at the Family Research Council.

Obama's abortion double-talk

By Loredana Vuoto

When it comes to abortion, President Barack Obama talks the talk, but doesn't walk the walk.

At the controversial commencement address at Notre Dame, the nation's premier Catholic university, Mr. Obama unwittingly gave an eloquent defense of the pro-life position. In Obamesque fashion, he spoke of finding common ground and invoked the memory of Cardinal Joseph Bernardin who was "congenial and gentle" and was always trying to

find unity among those on opposite sides. In speaking of stem-cell research, he cited how "the conviction about the sacredness of life" unites both pro-lifers and the parents of a child with juvenile diabetes.

As Mr. Obama continued his speech, he talked about how it is man's ego that thwarts unity. In seeing the world as a "zero-sum game" where we often "seek advantage over others," the strong too often "dominate the weak." Part of the problem, he said, "lies in



the imperfections of man—our selfishness, our pride, our stubbornness, our acquisitiveness, our insecurities, our egos; all the cruelties large and small that those of us in the Christian tradition understand to be rooted in Original Sin.”

In hearing these words, one would think they were being uttered by a pro-lifer. But in reality, they are Mr. Obama’s words used to disarm pro-lifers. In attempting to reframe the debate, Mr. Obama was unwittingly making a strong case for the pro-life position, appealing to the sacredness of life from inception to death. Is it not man’s selfishness and pride that make him want to destroy life to save his own—to avoid the sacrifices of bringing new life into this world?

Mr. Obama’s strong appeal to civility further reinforces all people’s equality and how their rights must be protected—whether they are for or against abortion. This argument must also be applied to the unborn baby waiting to have his or her voice heard. Do not all human beings have the same right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? Is not this the true civil rights issue of our time?

But is Mr. Obama a real pro-life leader who wants to find “common ground”?

In attempting to redefine Catholicism, Mr. Obama failed to mention that the late Cardinal Bernardin was a stalwart for the pro-life movement and would have been appalled at

PUBLIC POLICY

Notre Dame's decision to award Mr. Obama an honorary doctorate degree and give a commencement address.

Despite Mr. Obama's rhetoric, his record speaks volumes in favor of a culture of death. Within his short period in office, Mr. Obama has provided taxpayer dollars for overseas abortions and promised to support the Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA). FOCA is consistent with Mr. Obama's voting record against any kind of restrictions on abortion—including those for late-term abortions. FOCA will codify *Roe v. Wade* by eliminating all federal, state and local restrictions to abortion. States will have easier access to government funding with the removal of previous limitations. Parental notification will be waived. State laws protecting doctors and nurses, who, in good conscience, refuse to participate in the procedure, will be abolished as well. Mr. Obama has also funded stem-cell research which consists in the destruction of human embryos.

For all of Mr. Obama's musings to reduce

the number of abortions, he has a funny way of showing it. Many key positions within his administration are occupied by pro-choicers, including Vice President Joe Biden, Chief of Staff Rahm Emmanuel and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. He has even nominated Sonia Sotomayor, a staunch liberal and *Roe v. Wade* supporter, to replace David Souter on the Supreme Court.

Mr. Obama's "fair-minded words" aimed at "opening hearts and minds" only serve to bolster his true pro-abortion agenda. As God warns, we must beware of wolves in sheep's clothing. Abortion is the great evil of this generation. It must be stopped or else millions of innocent unborn babies will continue to be slaughtered. The "fair-minded" society that Mr. Obama speaks of should demand no less.

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

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...



www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com



THE HOLOCAUST 1933-1945
L'HOLOCAUSTE

www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org
www.EBIReflections.com



THE HOLOCAUST 1933-1945
L'HOLOCAUSTE