



## THE FOUNDATION

"A well regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed." --Second Amendment, United States Constitution

## PATRIOT PERSPECTIVE

### Sixty million armed Patriots ... and counting

By Mark Alexander

By now, you've probably heard that large sectors of the U.S. economy have collapsed, consumer confidence is at a historic low, Democrats control the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, and they're poised to print "bailout and infrastructure" money on the theory of "trickle up poverty" -- risking a prolonged recession followed by hyperinflation.

If there is an economic recovery any time soon, it will be the result of private sector initiatives and a consumer confidence recovery, not the redistribution of a few trillion dollars among friends. Never fear, there is a "community organizer" at the helm.

And that's the good news.

The bad news is that Barack Hussein Obama and his congressional cadre may well use the current crisis as cover to further undermine our constitutional rule of law.

Yes, Obama and his Demo colleagues in the Senate and House have taken a sacred oath to "support and defend" our Constitution, but they have no history of honoring their oaths.

So where does that leave "The People"? Well, if the politicians don't honor their oath, why should we honor their office? That is a question for another day.

At no time in our history has the future of American liberty been secure without a vigorous defense of the plain language of our Constitution, opposed to the adulterated interpretation of the so-called "Living Constitution" promoted by Barack Obama and his gang of judicial activists.

And there is no more important place to start at this moment in our history than with the Second Amendment to our Constitution.

In 1833, Justice Joseph Story, appointed to the Supreme Court by our Constitution's principal author, James Madison, wrote the following in his "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States": "The right of the citizens to keep and bear arms has justly been considered, as the palladium of the liberties of the republic; since it offers a strong moral check against usurpation and arbitrary power of the rulers; and will generally, even if these are successful in the first instance, enable the people to resist and triumph over them."

That was never more true than today.

Obama claims: "I believe in the Second Amendment. Lawful gun owners have nothing to fear. I said that throughout the campaign. I haven't indicated anything different during the transition. ... We can have reasonable, thoughtful gun control measures that I think respect the Second Amendment and people's traditions. I think there's a lot of room before bumping against a constitutional barrier."

However, Obama's nominee for attorney general, Eric Holder (formerly Janet Reno's Deputy Attorney General), who faces Senate confirmation next week, reaffirmed in the recent *DC v. Heller* Supreme Court case his long-held position that the Second Amendment affirms no right of individual gun possession by private citizens.

Holder insists that the Second Amendment "does not protect firearms possession or use that is unrelated to participation in a well-regulated militia," which he interprets as a military unit. Of course, our Founders understood "militia" to be synonymous with "the people," but Holder must have skipped his law school's elective on "original intent."

Holder's remarks seem to conflict with his boss's statements about gun ownership, but Obama *is not* referring to the rights assured by the Second Amendment: "I'm a strong believer in the rights of hunters and sportsmen to have firearms." That's the same subterfuge his mentor John Kerry propagated back in '04.

Wyoming Sen. John Barrasso understands what's at stake: "Given Holder's career of attacks on the Second Amendment, his nomination continues to be of great concern to me. ... Our nation's highest law enforcement officer must be committed to protecting and defending our individual rights to keep and bear arms."

Other conservatives also get it, like Louisiana Sen. David Vitter: "[Holder has] clearly advocated near-universal licensing and registration, and he joined and filed an amicus brief in the District of Columbia v. Heller U.S. Supreme Court case arguing that the Second Amendment was *not* an individual right. That's deeply disturbing."

Statistically, those who are not "deeply disturbed" by the implications of Holder's appointment are likely residing in one of those blue urban centers which typically elect liberals to national office.

I came across an essay from one such misguided urbanite this week -- Fred Lebrun, who writes for the Albany (NY) Times-Union.

Fred wrote of the unprecedented number of gun sales since Obama's election: "Otherwise sensible people seem to completely lose their marbles when it comes to the loaded question of handgun ownership, and what rules ought to apply. I'm not sure why that is. The latest example of mass paranoia at work for no discernable reason is a rush to gun shops across the country to buy sidearms. The rationale, or vague impetus, is that with the election of Barack Obama as president, we're heading for the confiscation of our guns, for sure. ... Well, if it's true, why in the world would you go out and buy something the government is going to take away from you anyway?"

Fred, those of us who still uphold our Constitution and honor our oaths, as have generations of Patriots before, understand that, in the words of James Madison, "The ultimate authority ... resides in the people alone. ... The advantage of being armed,

which the Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation ... forms a barrier against the enterprises of ambition."

Madison's words are truer today than when he wrote them in 1787. (Our adversaries at the time of that writing, the British, are learning that gun confiscation leaves one defenseless against tyranny -- and they are now protesting ... with cardboard placards.)

As for why some folks "go out and buy something the government is going to take away from you anyway," well, the only guns that will ever be taken from my hands, or those of tens of millions of like-minded gun owners, will be seized posthumously, and with empty magazines -- which is the only reason Obama and his congressional Leftists have not completely discarded that venerable old Constitution.

Fred concludes: "For the first time since 1935, with an all-Democratic national government, we are in a position to finally institute some meaningful and sensible gun control measures that will help mightily in regaining our cities from gun terror, street by street. Gun control doesn't have to be a dirty word."

What Fred doesn't seem to understand is that there are already some 20,000 -- *TWENTY THOUSAND* -- gun laws on the books. The argument that more laws will make America safer is ludicrous at every level, and to suggest that somehow such laws justify undermining the Second Amendment's clear intent is to undermine the strongest pillar of our Constitution.

Y'know, Fred, old Ben Franklin had a word of advice for folks like you: "They that can give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

And to those for whom such a struggle proves too much an encroachment on their comfort zone, Sam Adams said, "If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude better than the animating contest of freedom, go from us in peace. May your chains sit lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen!"

Currently, some 80 million Americans are gun owners, and it is estimated that 60 million of them own guns for purposes other than hunting. If you are not among them, you might thank God for the ranks of

us who are, because as our Founders knew, we are the vanguard between liberty and tyranny.

(Visit PatriotShop.US for 2A products, and take a stand.)

### Quote of the week

"No freeman shall ever be debarred the use of arms." --Thomas Jefferson

### On cross-examination

"It ought to be a law that people must have a gun in their homes. I know many fine police officers. But we can't depend on the police to protect us anymore. The value of human life means nothing to [criminals]. If it had been my house [this thug] came in on, he would have wound up at Coulter Funeral Home." --General Sessions Court Judge Bob Moon (Chattanooga, TN) advising a female victim of a home invasion to buy a gun

*When seconds count, the police are only minutes away...*

### Open query

"What is a left-wing socialist but a Marxist without a gun?"

--Don Feder

### The BIG lie

"I am not in favor of concealed weapons. There has not been any evidence that allowing people to carry a concealed weapon is going to make anybody safer." --Barack Obama

## GOVERNMENT & POLITICS

### News from the Swamp:

#### Prepare to be stimulated

The House passed the Democrats' economic "stimulus" package Wednesday without a single Republican vote, despite Barack Obama's best efforts to woo the GOP in a meeting with the entire Republican conference. The stimulus bill is \$819 billion worth of non-stimulating pork that mainly benefits Democrat constituency groups, such as unions. The bill includes \$545 billion in domestic spending on everything from highways to education. There is also \$275 billion in tax cuts largely for people who don't pay much in income taxes and a \$500 payroll tax holiday for all workers. Part of the domestic spending also includes \$650 million for digital TV transition coupons and \$400 million for a new So-

cial Security Administration computer system. Just sit back and watch Wall Street boom now that Hope is in high gear. At least Democrats dropped the \$200 million to refurbish the National Mall. It's not as if the inauguration crowd left the Mall in bad shape or anything.

The Senate is expected to take up the bill on Monday, but after various committees finish their work on it, the total cost is closing in on \$900 billion. Obviously, after the economy contracted by 3.8 percent in the fourth quarter in 2008 (5.1 percent excluding inventory buildup from last sales), Democrats feel empowered to do anything. Yet, as Wall Street Journal columnist Peggy Noonan points out, "The Congressional Budget Office says only 25% of the money will even go out in the first year. [The Wall Street Journal], in its analysis, argues that only 12 cents of every dollar is for something that could plausibly be called stimulus."

President Obama continued campaigning for his plan, saying, "There are many numbers in this plan. But out of all these numbers, there is one that matters most to me: This recovery plan will save or create more than three million new jobs over the next few years." And at a measly \$275,000 per job, that's a government bargain.

Obama let slip the real stimulus behind the stimulus: retaining power. "If we don't get this done, we [the Democrats] could lose seats, and I could lose reelection. But we can't let people like Rush Limbaugh stall this. That's how things don't get done in this town." He later said, "I'll be judged by the legacy I leave behind on the economy."

James Madison, the author of our Constitution had it right when he said, "I cannot undertake to lay my finger on that article of the Constitution which granted a right to Congress of expending, on the objects of benevolence, the money of their constituents."

### Re: The Left

"Our nation is facing a serious economic crisis, but the Democrats in Congress have offered a purely partisan bill that does not incorporate bipartisan recommendations. The American people deserve to know that the president's call for a compromise has been completely ignored by House Democrats who would use a time of national economic crisis to fund their big government priorities under the guise of

stimulating the economy. ... The Democrat bill won't stimulate anything but more government and more debt." --Rep. Mike Pence (R-IN)

### **This week's 'Braying Jackass' award**

"The fact that we are talking about this very large, by traditional standards, recovery package is an acknowledgment that the -- the -- the right-wing philosophy of 'leave the market alone,' it hasn't worked. Now, it's a mistake sometimes politically to accept your basic victory and then get too bitterly embroiled over the details. This is a repudiation of the Republican conservative philosophy and an affirmation of what's traditionally been Democratic philosophy, which is private and public sectors can work together constructively." --Rep. Barney Frank (S-MA)

### **Hope 'n' Change:**

#### **Kick the automakers while they're down**

Changes in our environmental policies began this week when President Obama issued a directive to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to allow California and other states the power to raise their regulations on automobile emissions. Additionally, fuel efficiency standards will be raised steeply beginning with the 2011 model year, which means American automakers must begin making changes immediately. For an industry that only a few weeks ago was begging for billions of dollars just to keep its doors open, this move couldn't come at a worse time.

The California incentive is not some federalist move by The One, either; it is a clever trick to please environmental zealots without taking the political responsibility for sinking our fragile auto industry and losing tens of thousands of jobs. After all, it's not as if Detroit has the capacity to make one set of cars for some states and another set of cars for other states. They are going to have to comply with the highest common denominator, and it is going to cost them plenty.

As the push to create a brave new environmentally friendly country races forward like a runaway freight train, cracks are starting to appear in the Democrat caucus. Legislation and executive proposals for environmental improvements have been crafted almost entirely by Democrat legislators and policy wonks from California and the East Coast, where the greatest concentrations of environmental supporters are found. The Democrats of the "flyo-

ver" states are concerned that these changes will harm industry and are trying to put the brakes on the flurry of changes. But for Obama and his fellow regulatory commissars, history won't wait, meaning our economic prosperity and common sense will have to take a back seat.

Lest you think it was all about multi-billion-dollar stimulus packages and economy-crushing environmental legislation this week, President Obama found time to give his first official television interview as president not to the American people, but to Al Arabiya television. His goal, ostensibly, was to communicate the following to the Muslim world: "America is not your enemy." Obama noted his own upbringing in Indonesia and the fact that he has Muslim relatives. He claimed that the U.S. made mistakes in the past, but "that the same respect and partnership that America had with the Muslim world as recently as 20 or 30 years ago, there's no reason why we can't restore that."

Remember America's relations with the Muslim world 20 or 30 years ago? The late 1970s and early 1980s was the time of a series of plane hijackings, suicide attacks on Americans in European discos, and the killing of 241 sleeping Marines in their barracks in Beirut, Lebanon. That's what Obama wants to restore?

### **New & notable legislation**

"All U.S. taxpayers would enjoy the same immunity from IRS penalties and interest as Rep. Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.) and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner under a bill introduced Wednesday by Republican Rep. John Carter of Texas," reports CNSNews.com. "If we don't hold our highest elected officials to the same standards as regular working folks, we owe it to our constituents to change those standards so everyone is abiding by the same law," said Carter, a former Texas judge, who realizes his bill stands no chance of passing. The bill, called the "Rangel Rule Act of 2009," would allow any taxpayer paying back taxes to write "Rangel Rule" on their return in order to be immune from penalties and interest.

Speaking of Charlie Rangel (D-NY), the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee is supposed to be preparing to dole out hundreds of billions of dollars from the upcoming stimulus package. Instead he is under the shadow of a growing ethics inquiry that could embarrass him and House

Speaker Nancy Pelosi, who refused his earlier offer to step down from his post. Rangel was already under investigation for failing to pay \$10,000 in taxes on a rental villa he owns in the Dominican Republic. Now he's under investigation for allegedly accepting a \$1 million donation from a local businessman for his eponymous Harlem public policy center in exchange for his favorable vote on a tax bill that protected the donor's offshore accounts. Culture of corruption, anyone?

The Senate voted this week to postpone the conversion to digital television, scheduled for 17 February. President Obama urged the four-month delay because of evidence by the Nielsen Co. that indicates some 6.5 million households are not prepared for the switch. However, the House failed to reach the required two-thirds vote to override the original law. House leaders plan to bring it back for a simple majority vote next week. A delay would cost broadcasters millions of dollars.

The State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) is back, and headed to Barack Obama's desk for his signature. Both the House and the Senate passed the bill this week. This time around, though, SCHIP has two items conspicuously absent from the legislation. The first is a requirement to provide a photo ID and proof of legal residency or citizenship; the second is a cap that would deny benefits to families earning more than 300 percent of the federal poverty level. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-WV) would not give straight answers when asked about the wisdom of removing these provisions, which would greatly reduce the opportunity for abuse of the program. That was probably because they knew that the truth -- removing these provisions takes us one step closer to universal taxpayer-abusing health care -- might not fly with the public. Yet.

Barack Obama signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act on Thursday, which makes it easier to sue employers for pay discrimination. "It is a story of women across this country still earning just 78 cents for every \$1 men earn, women of color even less, which means that today in the year 2009, countless women are still losing thousands of dollars in salary, income, and retirement savings over the course of a lifetime." Oddly enough, Obama's female Senate staffers earned 78 cents for every \$1 his male staffers earned.

Reps. Cliff Stearns (R-FL) and Rick Boucher (D-VA) introduced HR 197, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2009, which would provide national recognition for all valid state right-to-carry licenses. In other words, states would be required to recognize other states' permits as they do drivers' licenses.

### **This week's 'Alpha Jackass' award**

"The heart and soul of this has been a struggle of me against the system. Under these rules, I'm not even getting a fair trial; they're just hanging me. And when they hang me under these rules that prevent due process, they're hanging the 12 million people of Illinois who twice have elected a governor. I took that system on. I challenged that system." --former Illinois Gov. Rod "F." Blagojevich

Blagojevich was removed from office Thursday by the Illinois senate, which voted 59-0 to oust the "devious, cynical, crass and corrupt" governor. He derided the verdict as "un-American." Lt. Gov. Pat Quinn became Illinois' 41st governor.

## **NATIONAL SECURITY**

### **Warfront with Jihadistan:**

#### **EU may take Gitmo residents**

Just as Barack Obama thought he had won a victory by ordering the closure of the Guantanamo Bay detention facility and the cessation of tribunals for its residents, a military judge ruled Thursday that the administration could not delay the case of one particular detainee. Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri faces charges related to the al-Qa'ida strike on the USS Cole in 2000, which killed 17 U.S. service members. Army Col. James Pohl, the chief military judge at Gitmo, said that he found the government's arguments "unpersuasive" and that the case will go ahead because "the public interest in a speedy trial will be harmed by the delay in the arraignment."

Meanwhile, the European Union has offered to take detainees released from Guantanamo -- maybe. Various nations are still haggling over specifics, particularly the risks of some of the detainees. Perhaps they noticed the story of another jihadi who was freed and now heads an al-Qa'ida cell in Yemen. Maybe they could relay that message to Obama.

In better news from the warfront, Iraq is holding elections Saturday, with 14,500 candidates running for 440 seats on 14 provincial councils. Even the Sunnis are taking part this time, unlike 2005. In the words of political analyst Rich Galen, "Wait. What? There are elections going on in Iraq? And each of the three major groups -- Sunnis, Shiites and Kurds are participating? And this hasn't been front page news?" And noting the "long history of corruption" in Barack Obama's home state of Illinois coming to a head this week, Galen quipped, "Things are going better in Iraq than they are in Illinois." No wonder it's not news.

### **Department of Military Readiness: Barack Obama, space cadet**

Ever since one man picked up a rock and hurled it in anger at another, the strategic value of controlling the high ground has been obvious. Well, obvious to those who think instead of feel. Yet we are less than two weeks into the Obama regime, and noises are already being made that U.S. access to and control of space, the ultimate high ground, are open to negotiation with our enemies. Just moments after Obama took the oath of office last week, the official White House Web site was updated with an "Ensure Freedom of Space" policy statement, which included a generic pledge to restore U.S. space leadership (when did we lose it?) while also seeking that leftist nirvana of a universal ban on space weapons. How, then, do we lead?

As U.S. military forces, and many civilians, are dependent upon U.S. space assets, the proposed ban on space weapons raises some critical questions. First and foremost, can we trust the word of our enemies without our critical space assets? History indicates that the answer is a resounding no. And what is a "space weapon," anyway? Is it only a satellite designed to attack another satellite? Or could weather satellites, used to plan military strikes, or GPS satellites, used to guide bombs to the target, be considered space weapons and, therefore, fall under a ban? Are we willing to leave that interpretation up to some anti-U.S. World Court? For the sake of national security, the Obama regime needs to get over its kumbaya view of the world and realize that, if it wants to "Ensure Freedom of Space," the only thing that has ever ensured freedom anywhere is superior weaponry in the right hands, at the right place, at the right time.

### **Profiles of valor:**

#### **U.S. Marine Corps Sgt. Montoya**

During the Battle for Baghdad in April 2003, United States Marine Corps Sgt. Scott Montoya was serving as a Scout Sniper, Scout Sniper Platoon, 2d Battalion, 23d Marines, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, in Support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. At one point, enemy fire had Montoya's sniper team pinned down, and he directed his team to return fire while he ran into an open roadway to rescue an Iraqi civilian trapped in a vehicle. Montoya spotted a wounded Marine on the same roadway and led him to safety, and then another wounded Marine, and then another, who was unconscious, and then a fourth, all while shooting at the enemy with his free hand. Later, when Montoya was asked how many bullets went by him as he rescued four fellow Marines, he answered, "About 300." He added, "I saw a hurt Marine and all my training came into play. It wasn't a cognitive thing; I just saw the situation and cared for my Marines." For his "extraordinary heroism," Sgt. Montoya was awarded the U.S. military's second-highest honor, the Navy Cross.

### **BUSINESS & ECONOMY**

#### **'Nationalization' is such a harsh word**

Like a page torn from Ayn Rand's "Atlas Shrugged," Obamacrats tendered two vignettes this week to explain the alarm bells in our heads, reminding us why we should be very worried about the power government is currently amassing. First, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi revealed her true Stalinist colors during ABC's "This Week." Having been questioned about whether she would sanction further nationalization of U.S. banks in the wake of continued economic trouble, Pelosi downplayed the term "nationalization," stating, "Well, whatever you want to call it... If we are going to put money into the banks, we certainly want equity for the American people. In other words, if we are strengthening [the banks], then the American people should get some of the upside of that strengthening. Some people call that nationalization." We typically parse through such equivocations under a "Duck Theory" analysis: if it walks, quacks and has feathers like a duck... In Leftspeak, however, "equity for the American people" means increased *state* ownership of American financial institutions.

Not to be outdone by her own doublespeak, Pelosi then demonstrated her keen economic acumen by

assuring host George Stephanopoulos that "investing" in food stamps and unemployment insurance would provide more effective economic stimuli than any tax cut. We think this suggestion is very timely and welcomed, considering Pelosi's intended course of "economic reform" will undoubtedly put us all on food stamps just in time for her program to help out.

Meanwhile, incredibly, Tim Geithner was confirmed as Treasury secretary, despite being scrutinized during hearings before the Senate Finance Panel for his failure to pay \$34,000 in taxes between 2001 and 2004. The confirmation vote, which historically had been a slam-dunk for the position, was the closest post-WWII margin for a Treasury secretary -- it was 60-34. Geithner's mouthpieces would have us believe that the man -- nominated on the basis of his economic brilliance -- was just too stupid to figure out his own taxes, but nonetheless possesses the uncanny synaptic aptitude to manage the financial affairs of a nation. No less than Sen. Robert Byrd (D-WV) noticed the dots failing to line up in that logic train, stating bluntly, "Had [Geithner] not been nominated for Treasury secretary, it's doubtful that he would have ever paid these taxes."

Furthermore, Geithner's nomination required a waiver of Obama's own new ethics rules which prohibit lobbyists from service in the White House. Geithner is a former lobbyist for Goldman Sachs. Even CNN's Campbell Brown dissented, saying, "Unfortunately, we are again asking the president to explain why exactly he announced, with great fanfare, new ethics rules if he had no intention of abiding by them."

### **Income Redistribution: No tax refunds for Californians**

The Golden State is in such desperate need of gold that residents will have to wait to receive their own money back this year. ABC News reports that "tax refunds are now on hold in California for the first time in state history, according to the state controller's office." California has had no money in the general fund for 17 months and has been borrowing from Wall Street and special interest funds. Even that borrowed money will be gone by the end of February. The state controller's office has called for a 30-day delay in tax refunds beginning 1 February because it needs the extra \$1.99 billion to pay for "education, debt service, and other payments that legally have first claim to state funds." Now, color

us confused, but if tax refunds are due to individuals, are they really part of "state funds"?

### **What not to do: The British example**

Americans are increasingly being caught between two irreconcilable schools of economics. The Keynesian-European Socialist school of thought that believes in government regulation, massive transfers of wealth via burdensome taxation, and a command-and-control economy dictated by politicians and bureaucrats; and the Friedrich Hayek-Capitalist school, which favors decreased regulation and taxation, incentives for markets and businesses, and leaving consumers to choose how they will spend (or save) their hard-earned money. The recent election of Barack Obama and large congressional majorities of Democrats has ushered in a new, and we hope short-lived, era of Keynesian thought whereby the government should stimulate economic growth and improve stability in the private sector (that was originally built through capitalism) by increasing government spending.

Britain, a follower of the Keynesian school of economics, experienced its first-ever economic contraction in 2008 (even considering the Great Depression) despite massive public spending. Indeed, in a thorough repudiation of Keynesian economics, the British government has *outspent* that of the United States and yet Britain still faces national bankruptcy, roiling unemployment and devastated commercial industries. Is it surprising, then, that no country has ever, in more than a century, successfully followed the Keynesian model and remained solvent?

Former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher once pithily noted that the primary problem with Keynesian Socialism is that eventually you run out of other people's money. The Keynesian Socialism that American Democrats are so eager to bring to our shores only hastens the depletion of funds and brings us closer to national bankruptcy. More telling still, when Thatcher came to power in 1979, she employed the Hayek model and dragged Britain out of an extended economic malaise that the Keynesians were unable to stop.

### **What the Bush tax cuts really did**

Chalk it up to another history lesson ignored -- House Democrats on Wednesday passed an \$819 billion rebate-centric stimulus package consisting of the same government expenditures which history has shown actually stimulate little. The bill's sup-

porters argued that rebates, by injecting money into the economy, will catalyze consumer spending and, hence, economic growth. History, however, has proved otherwise.

In a report titled "Why Tax Rate Reductions Are More Stimulative Than Rebates: Lessons from 2001 and 2003," the Heritage Foundation analyzes the numbers. The 2001 tax "cuts," for example, centered on rebates. Yet, despite Washington's sending billions to Americans via \$600 rebate checks, consumer spending grew only artificially, reaching seven percent in the fourth quarter of that year before dropping to 1.4 percent the following quarter. Meanwhile, fourth-quarter investment spending plummeted 23 percent, and economic growth measured just 1.6 percent.

The 2003 tax cuts, conversely, focused on structural cuts by reducing income, capital gains and dividend tax rates. In the six quarters following the cuts, GDP grew at an annual rate of 4.1 percent while the S&P 500 shot up 32 percent. Additionally, in the 13 post-cut quarters, non-residential fixed investment grew each quarter, and the economy added 5.3 million jobs.

Real tax cuts, not rebate-branded wealth distribution, stimulate economic growth and recovery. History is clearly the teacher, but most of the class isn't paying attention.

## CULTURE & POLICY

### Faith and Family:

#### 'Stimulating' family planning

One of Barak Obama's first actions as president was to lift the ban on U.S. funding of abortions in other countries. The policy banned the use of federal dollars to overseas organizations providing abortions, providing information on them, or lobbying to make them legal. Obama said that the ban "undermines family planning in developing countries." Since when is abortion considered family "planning"?

While Obama concerns himself with developing nations, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi hatched her own plan to solve the economic crisis in this one: population reduction. Pelosi recently defended her support of the Democrats' \$819 billion stimulus package, in which she hoped to include a sizeable set-aside for contraception (fortunately, it was stripped from the bill before passage). In a recent interview with ABC's George Stephanopoulos, the

illustrious Speaker spoke of the burdensome cost of providing children's health and education. Her solution: fewer children. Stephanopoulos, possibly unsure of what he heard, asked if she had any apologies for this theory. "No apologies." Pelosi replied. "No, we have to deal with the consequences of the downturn in our economy." The stimulus package does, however, include \$335 million for STD education and prevention.

Besides the fact that Pelosi is once again directly contradicting the Catholic Church she claims to be a part of, she is also ignoring a basic economic principle that Europe and Asia are dealing with now: Robbing a nation of a future labor force is never good for its economic health. For example, Japanese corporations, which usually expect their employees to work 12-hour days, are now telling them to leave early two days a week so that they can "be fruitful and multiply." At its current death-spiral birthrate of 1.34, Japan will lose 21 percent of its population by 2050.

Eighteenth-century economist Thomas Malthus hypothesized that a smaller population allows for a higher standard of living. Later, Malthus himself acknowledged that he had been wrong, and Japan and Europe, with their dwindling labor forces, are proof of his mistake. Analysts are saying that the greatest threats to Japan's society are from within, and, if Nancy Pelosi and her ilk have their way, the same will be true for the U.S.

### Climate change this week:

#### Gore plus climate hearing equals snow

Some weeks, it just seems like the news is nothing but déjà vu. Congress is spending ridiculous amounts of money, leftists around the world are trying to lose the war against Islamofascism, and Al Gore is warning about how global warming "would bring a screeching halt to human civilization and threaten the fiber of life everywhere on the earth." Gore, the comedic gift who just keeps on giving, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Wednesday while a winter storm walloped the Beltway. He said that if immediate government action is not taken to combat greenhouse gas emissions, the world would end in a giant fireball. "If we stopped global greenhouse gas emissions today, according to some scientists ... we would [still] see an increase in temperatures that many scientists believe would be extremely challenging for civilization," Gore testified. "If we continue at today's lev-

els, some scientists have said it can be an increase of up to 11 degrees Fahrenheit." Gore further warned of "climate refugees" if nothing is done.

We assume that Gore missed the survey by the Pew Research Center showing that out of 20 domestic issues facing America today, global warming is dead last. Now, we don't follow the polls, but this does lead us to believe that many Americans reject Al Gore's calls for more money to be spent, more government control and more damage to the economy to combat something that is, we believe, entirely out of human hands.

### **And last...**

Speaking of heat, Barack Obama is feeling it in the Oval Office. But that's just because the thermostat is cranked up. "He's from Hawaii, O.K.?" said his senior adviser, David Axelrod. (Wait, we thought he was from Indonesia. Er, Chicago. Oh, never mind.) "He likes it warm. You could grow orchids in there." So what about Obama's admonition in May? "We can't drive our SUVs and eat as much as we want and keep our homes on 72 degrees at all times," he

said, "and then just expect that other countries are going to say OK." Obviously, he didn't mean that he couldn't keep *his* home at 72 during the winter.

The warmth in the White House has prompted another change: No longer are coat and tie required in the West Wing. The New York Times described the change this way: "Thus did an ironclad rule of the George W. Bush administration ... fall by the wayside, only the first of many signs that a more informal culture is growing up in the White House under new management." Perhaps The Times forgot what happened the last time certain clothing was optional in the Oval Office...

Veritas vos Liberabit -- Semper Vigilo, Fortis, Paratus, et Fidelis! Mark Alexander, Publisher, for *The Patriot's* editors and staff.

(Please pray for our Patriot Armed Forces standing in harm's way around the world, and for their families -- especially families of those fallen Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines and Coast Guardsmen, who granted their lives in defense of American liberty.)