



THE FOUNDATION

"My anxious recollections, my sympathetic feeling, and my best wishes are irresistibly excited whensoever, in any country, I see an oppressed nation unfurl the banners of freedom." --George Washington

LIBERTY

"Hugo Chávez's coalition-building efforts suffered a setback [last week] when the Honduran military sent its president packing for abusing the nation's constitution. It seems that President Mel Zelaya miscalculated when he tried to emulate the success of his good friend Hugo in reshaping the Honduran Constitution to his liking. But Honduras is not out of the Venezuelan woods yet. ...[T]he Central American country was being pressured to restore the authoritarian Mr. Zelaya by the likes of Fidel Castro, Daniel Ortega, Hillary Clinton and, of course, Hugo himself. The Organization of American States, having ignored Mr. Zelaya's abuses, also wants him back in power. It will be a miracle if Honduran patriots can hold their ground. ... [Hillary Clinton] accused Honduras of violating 'the precepts of the Interamerican Democratic Charter' and said it 'should be condemned by all.' Fidel Castro did just that. Mr. Chávez pledged to overthrow the new government. Honduras is fighting back by strictly following the constitution. ... The struggle against *chavismo* has never been about left-right politics. It is about defending the independence of institutions that keep presidents from becoming dictators. This crisis clearly delineates the problem. In failing to come to the aid of checks and balances, Mrs. Clinton and [OAS Secretary General José Miguel] Insulza expose their true colors." --columnist Mary Anastasia O'Grady

RE: THE LEFT

"Help me out here. President Obama immediately 'meddles' in the affairs of Honduras, denouncing a military coup, the intent of which is to preserve the country's constitution, but when it comes to Iran's fraudulent election and the violent repression of demonstrators who wanted their votes counted, the president initially vacillates and equivocates. Are we expected to accept this as a consistent foreign policy? Even Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was reluctant to call the removal of President Manuel

Zelaya a coup, if for no other reason than it would stop U.S. aid flowing to the impoverished Central American nation. The fingerprints (or in this case the boot prints) of the Castro brothers, Venezuela's dictator Hugo Chavez and Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua are all over this. If one is known by the company one keeps, the specter of the Castros and their protégé dictators joining President Obama in denouncing the Honduran military coup is not reassuring. Clearly Zelaya was the choice of the dictators to help spread 'revolution' to America's back door. ... The threat by Chavez to send his troops into Honduras ought to be another signal to the Obama administration that thugs can't be made nice by talking to them. So far, the world's tyrants have been unresponsive to Obama's offer of a new start. ... They are getting the message, but it's a different one than President Obama hoped to send. The message is that Obama is weak and can be had. It is one thing for a president to be liked, but in a dangerous world with dictators who have, or wish to acquire, nuclear weapons and by these and other means destroy the United States, it is better that an American president be feared." --columnist Cal Thomas

OPINION IN BRIEF

"[I]s the U.S. at least consistent in its promises not to meddle? Not all the time. When Benjamin Netanyahu came to power in Israel, the Obama administration made its distaste clear. It also has tried to find ways to isolate Hamid Karzai's elected government in Afghanistan -- and was initially not happy about the prospects of its re-election. Most recently, the U.S. condemned the Honduran military's arrest of President Manuel Zelaya. The nation's supreme court had found his efforts to extend his presidential tenure in violation of its constitution, once Zelaya tried to finesse an illegal third term. In other words, the U.S. pressures other nations as it pleases -- though strangely now more to lean on friends than to criticize rivals and enemies. In contrast, had President Obama voiced early, con-

sistent and sharp criticism of the Iranian crackdown, the theocracy would have worried that the president's stature could have galvanized global boycotts and embargos to isolate the theocracy and aid the dissidents. And the reformers in the streets could have become even more confident with a trademark Obama 'hope and change' endorsement. Internal democratic change in Iran is the only peaceful solution to stopping an Iranian bomb, three decades of Iranian-sponsored terrorism and a Middle East arms race. When thousands risked their lives for a better Iran, a better Middle East and a better world, we, the land of the free, simply were not with them." --Hoover Institution historian Victor Davis Hanson

THE GIPPER

"Ludwig Von Mises, that great economist, once noted: 'People must fight for something they want to achieve, not simply reject an evil.' Well, the conservative movement remains in the ascendancy because we have a bold, forward-looking agenda. No longer can it be said that conservatives are just anti-Communist. We are, and proudly so, but we are also the keepers of the flame of liberty. And as such, we believe that America should be a source of support, both moral and material, for all those on God's Earth who struggle for freedom. Our cause is their cause, whether it be in Nicaragua, Afghanistan, or Angola. When I came back from Iceland I said -- and I meant it -- American foreign policy is not simply focused on the prevention of war but the expansion of freedom. Modern conservatism is an active, not a reactive philosophy. It's not just in opposition to those vices that debase character and community, but affirms values that are at the heart of civilization." --Ronald Reagan

FOR THE RECORD

"Here's how to get a dubious bill into law, or at least past the U.S. House of Representatives, which of late has deserved to be called the lower chamber: -- First, make the bill long. Very long. So long no one may actually read it, supporters or opponents. Introduce a 310-page horse-choker of an amendment at 3 in the morning on the day of the roll-call vote. So it can't be examined too closely or too long. Only after the bill passes may its true costs emerge. ... -- Make sure that the bill itself, which was already 1,200 pages long before this super-sized amendment was added, surpasseth all understanding. (Which may be the only thing it has in common with the peace of God.) ... -- Insert all kinds of exceptions into the bill so those special interests that stand to benefit by

them -- whether regional, economic or ideological -- will join the stampede. -- Coat the bill and the campaign for it with high-sounding sloganspeak, if not hysteria. Warn that The End Is Near unless this bill is passed, at least if you consider the year 2100 near. ... -- If necessary, change the subject at the last minute. Say, from climate change to creating jobs. And, hesto presto, though the vote may be close (219 to 212), a confusing bill can be on its way to becoming even more confusing law. Which is just what happened the other day in the U.S. House of Representatives. ... -- Forget the actual content of the bill, since few if any can understand it anyway. Instead, just recite talking points. It's a lot easier than actually thinking. ... Whoever said you never want to see sausage made or laws passed did a grave injustice to sausage-makers, who are surely engaged in a much more wholesome enterprise." --Arkansas Democrat-Gazette editor Paul Greenberg

INSIGHT

"The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power. Not wealth or luxury or long life or happiness: only power, pure power. ... We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means, it is an end." --English author George Orwell (1903-1950)

GOVERNMENT

"Why did the founders of our nation give us the Bill of Rights? The answer is easy. They knew Congress could not be trusted with our God-given rights. Think about it. Why in the world would they have written the First Amendment prohibiting Congress from enacting any law that abridges freedom of speech and the press? The answer is that in the absence of such a limitation Congress would abridge free speech and free press. That same distrust of Congress explains the other amendments found in our Bill of Rights protecting rights such as our rights to property, fair trial and to bear arms. The Bill of Rights should serve as a constant reminder of the deep distrust that our founders had of government. They knew that some government was necessary but they rightfully saw government as the enemy of the people and they sought to limit government and provide us with protections." --George Mason University economics professor Walter E. Williams

POLITICAL FUTURES

"[Al] Franken is an admitted clown. As such, he will be the only admitted clown in the United States Senate, though he will be seated with such clownish figures as Sen. John Kerry and Sen. Harry Reid. ... Upon hearing of the [Minnesota Supreme] court's decision, Franken joked that he was 'thrilled and honored by the faith that Minnesotans have placed in' him. That is not a very funny joke, but Franken is not funny. By 'Minnesotans,' he probably is attempting irony in referring to his supporters on vote canvassing boards in several left-leaning counties, who turned up a sufficient number of thitherto-uncounted votes to give him the edge. In the Nov. 4 election, Coleman won by 725 votes. After a recount, he still won by 215. Then Franken's 'Minnesotans' got busy canvassing. They demanded that votes once disqualified in their counties be counted. They found thousands of absentee ballots previously rejected for such indelicacies as fabricated addresses. Coleman cried foul and asked that one statewide standard be applied to all recounts. However, he got nowhere with this plea for equal protection of the law, and in the meantime, Franken's larcenous operatives picked up 1,350 more absentee votes, some bearing the names of pop singers. Ultimately, Franken's team managed a 312-vote victory from the 2.9 million votes cast. The Wall Street Journal was not alone in its judgment that 'Mr. Franken now goes to the Senate having effectively stolen an election.'" --columnist R. Emmett Tyrrell

CULTURE

"The surrealism of celebrity pop culture erupts when a major celebrity dies. The sudden, mysterious death of Michael Jackson caused a near-total eclipse of the real news. The cable-news channels blurred into 24-7 wailing walls for the so-called 'King of Pop.' Television ratings surged with a big ka-ching. So much for the 'news' business. On Friday, for example, just 24 hours after the death news broke, anchors like NBC's Brian Williams fit the 'news' of Congress and recession and Iran into a neat thimble of snippets so they could devote most of the newscast to continued mourning of the man with the glittery glove. But what, exactly, is it that Michael Jackson brought to America that was so essential? An alien arriving from space would find him celebrated for dressing in shiny socks and dancing the 'moonwalk.' His music broke sales records and sets dance floors hopping, and his videos made people say 'I want my MTV.' But all this happened a long time ago, when MTV was a music channel. That is

not how Michael Jackson dominated the pop-culture news scene for the past 15 years or so. What about Michael Jackson, the man? Was he, in the end, a good man? It seemed no one asked. Everyone wanted to celebrate the mystique of Jackson, but no one was comfortable focusing on the real Michael Jackson.... The coverage was an ocean wide -- and an inch deep." --Media Research Center president L. Brent Bozell

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

(To submit or to view reader comments visit our Letters to the Editor page.)

"Independence Day -- it stirs my mind. I am thankful for the birth of our wonderful nation and the men and women who brought it into being. But I am saddened this Independence Day because our freedoms are being taken away as we stray into fascism. I've been a God-fearing, law-abiding citizen for as long as I can remember. It appears, however, that we are fast becoming, if not already, a nation that is no longer based on the rule of law. So at what point does civil disobedience become the right thing, again? Perhaps it's time for us to return to our roots in their purest form." --Arab, Alabama

"For a long time, Honduras has been seen by the eyes of the international community as a small, impoverished country that survives on the handouts of the economic powers. To a certain extent this is true. We do depend on U.S. and European economies. We have no oil. We do not produce goods, and we do not export technology. Our main income comes from tourism. As of this moment, our country faces a challenge that may change our history for years or even decades to come. We have two choices. We can choose to bow our heads, bend our knees, be silent and let ex-president Zelaya come back to the presidential seat, and fall further down the spiral on which he has led us so far. We can let him take power and become another stronghold for Chavez's led socialism. We can choose to let Zelaya become one more dictator in the same fashion as Evo Morales, Daniel Ortega, Rafael Correa, and the masterminds behind this all -- Hugo Chavez and Fidel Castro. Our second choice is to take a stand. What we did was to defend and uphold our constitution. We said no to tyranny. That was our choice. We chose to live in freedom. To President Obama, to the UN, to the OAS, to the European Union, to The World Bank, The International Monetary Fund, to the world, we say: We are a free, sovereign and in-

dependent country, and we choose to take a stand. We take a stand, even if we have to stand alone."
--Tegucigalpa, Honduras

"Regarding the excitement in Honduras -- talk about support and defend. Perhaps someday our Constitution will be defended with equal fervor from all enemies domestic." --Yuma, Arizona

THE LAST WORD

"Capitalists don't view profits as evil or the product of greed. Their opponents -- call them Marxists, fascists, socialists, radical liberals or whatever -- do. Which brings us ... to Barack Obama. Both his father, Barack Obama Sr., and his mentor, Frank Marshall Davis, were communists. His church of choice was one of black liberation theology, whose Marxist roots are inarguable. He associated with far leftists on the 'organizing' streets of Chicago, including Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn. Mentorship and associations are one thing, but what have Obama's words and actions revealed about his attitudes toward labor, capital, profits and government control of business and industry? Well, he said that he would raise capital gains tax rates, even if it reduced revenues, as a matter of fairness. It's only fair to make everyone poorer if you believe profits are inherently evil. He told Joe the Plumber he wants to spread the wealth around. He talked about confiscating Exxon Mobil's profits and giving them to consumers, saying 'they are not going to give up those profits easily.' He called Chrysler creditors 'speculators' and castigated them for refusing to accept his extortionist reorganization plan. He berated Wall Street for making profits, saying 'now is not (the)

time' for them to 'rake in profits.' He and his wife even railed against the pursuit of profit in their respective commencement addresses. He abused the power of his office to steal money from GM and Chrysler shareholders and transfer it to the proletariat, I mean, the United Auto Workers. He redistributed taxpayer money from those who have paid their mortgages to those who have not. He is desperately trying to spread the misery and impoverish businesses and individuals through his cap and tax plan, which no proponent of economic growth and prosperity would consider supporting. And in addition to gobbling up other businesses and industries, he is trying to nationalize medicine -- to siphon off the evil surplus value charged by doctors and insurance companies -- on the flawed Marxist theory that he can reduce costs overall, when the reason health care costs have already skyrocketed is that market forces have been suppressed in the industry. You don't have to call him a Marxist, but at least understand where his heart is." --columnist David Limbaugh

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.)