



THE FOUNDATION

"The propitious smiles of Heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right, which Heaven itself has ordained." --George Washington

CULTURE

"Here's what Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said in [last] Sunday's New York Times Magazine: 'Frankly I had thought that at the time (Roe v. Wade) was decided,' Ginsburg told her interviewer, Emily Bazelon, 'there was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that we don't want to have too many of.' The comment, which bizarrely elicited no follow-up from Bazelon or any further coverage from the New York Times -- or any other major news outlet -- was in the context of Medicaid funding for abortion. Ginsburg was surprised when the Supreme Court in 1980 barred taxpayer support for abortions for poor women. After all, if poverty partly described the population you had 'too many of,' you would want to subsidize it in order to expedite the reduction of unwanted populations. Left unclear is whether Ginsburg endorses the eugenic motivation she ascribed to the passage of Roe v. Wade or whether she was merely objectively describing it. ... In 1992, Ron Weddington, co-counsel in the Roe v. Wade case, wrote a letter to President-elect Clinton, imploring him to rush RU-486 -- a.k.a. 'the abortion pill' -- to market as quickly as possible. '[Y]ou can start immediately to eliminate the barely educated, unhealthy and poor segment of our country,' Weddington insisted. All the president had to do was make abortion cheap and easy for the populations we don't want. 'It's what we all know is true, but we only whisper it. ... Think of all the poverty, crime and misery ... and then add 30 million unwanted babies to the scenario. We lost a lot of ground during the Reagan-Bush religious orgy. We don't have a lot of time left.' Weddington offered a clue about who, in particular, he had in mind: 'For every Jesse Jackson who has fought his way out of the poverty of a large family, there are millions mired in poverty, drugs and crime.' Ah, right. Jesse Jackson. Got it. Unlike Bazelon, I for one would like to know whether Ginsburg believes there were -- or are -- some populations in need of shrinking through abor-

tion and whether she thinks such considerations have any place at the Supreme Court. And while we're at it, it would be interesting to know what Supreme Court nominee Sonia Sotomayor thinks about such things." --National Review editor Jonah Goldberg

FAITH AND FAMILY

"The New York Times recently warned its readers about a wacky scientist in the Obama administration. But the fish wrap of record let the real nut job off the hook. Reporting last week on the president's choice to head the National Institutes of Health, Times writer Gardiner Harris noted that praise for Dr. Francis S. Collins 'was not universal or entirely enthusiastic.' The geneticist is causing 'unease,' according to the Times, because of 'his very public embrace of religion.' Stomachs are apparently churning over a book Collins wrote describing his conversion to Christianity. It's called -- gasp! -- 'The Language of G0d.' Harris intoned: 'Religion and genetic research have long had a fraught relationship, and some in the field complain about what they see as Dr. Collins' evangelism.' And ... that's it. Yes, the *mere profession* of Collins' faith is enough to warrant red flags and ominous declamations. A quarter of all Americans identify themselves as evangelical Christians and 'publicly embrace their religion.' But to the Times, Collins' open affiliation with 60 million American believers in Christ is headline news." --columnist Michelle Malkin

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

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

"Thank you so much for Mark Alexander's essay detailing the 'culture of death.' It is one of the finest pieces I've ever read on the topic. You and your staff continue to provide the very best information available on virtually every topic affecting average Americans. I, for one, appreciate your work and I'll

be increasing my donation to the Patriot Fund this year. Please keep up the excellent work!"
--Acworth, Georgia

"Demagogues are quick to push for terminating the life of the totally innocent unborn; quick to push for the termination of the life of the very elderly, especially if ill or infirm, given any 'acceptable' reason. Yet, when it comes to the vile and despicable elements of our society who murder, molest and torture the weak, demagogues are always at the forefront to demand that the death penalty be removed as a choice of punishment. These creatures must be permitted to live, and if possible, to procreate. What a sick mind must reside in the bodies of such demagogues." --Clinton, North Carolina

"Thank you very much for Thursday's essay. I will forward to my friends. I am a Black woman and it makes my flesh crawl every time I hear a Black person or liberal praise Margaret Sanger. It's kind of like an episode from the 'Twilight Zone' -- the deadliest person to Blacks will be the first Black president, not some Klan or Neo-Nazi group." --San Francisco, California

"I wonder what H.G. Wells' heroine, Margaret Sanger, would have thought about the pregnancy of Obama's mother? A white woman pregnant by a black man from Africa? Obama would have been an undesirable not deserving of birth and entry into society. These liberals are incapable of rational thought." --League City, Texas

"The Socialists, led by Obama, are taking giant steps toward complete government control of medical care. Obama wants to take away our freedom to decide about insurance, doctors, hospitals and treatment. If the government gains control over our own bodies, our rights enumerated in the Constitution will be academic. If the government can forbid me to obtain medical care of my own choosing, then I no longer have the right to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' What we need is less government involvement in medical care, not more. Government is the problem, not the solution. Medicare and Medicaid, along with the heavy hand of federal regulations, have driven up the cost of medical insurance and treatment for most of us. If free enterprise had been allowed to work, we would have higher quality, better access, lower prices, and more insurance and treatment choices." --Maitland, Florida

OPINION IN BRIEF

"Every time a Democrat senator has talked during the Senate hearings on Supreme Court nominee Sonia Sotomayor ... I felt lousy about my country. Not for the usual reasons when a Democrat talks, but because Democrats revel in telling us what a racist country this is. Interestingly, the Democrats' examples of ethnic prejudice did not include Clarence Thomas, whose nomination hearings began with the Democrats saying, 'You may now uncuff the defendant.' Their examples did not include Miguel Estrada, the brilliant Harvard-educated lawyer who was blocked from an appellate court judgeship by Senate Democrats expressly on the grounds that he is a Hispanic -- as stated in Democratic staff memos that became public. No, they had to go back to Roger Taney -- confirmed in 1836 -- who was allegedly attacked for being a Catholic (and who authored the Dred Scott decision), and Louis Brandeis -- confirmed in 1916 -- allegedly a victim of anti-Semitism. ... Alas, today Democrats can't really place Estrada -- James Carville confuses him with that other Hispanic, Alberto Gonzales. On MSNBC they laugh about his obscurity, asking if he was the cop on 'CHiPs.' They also can't recall the name 'Anita Hill.' Nor can anyone remember African-American Janice Rogers Brown or what the Democrats did to her. Only the indignities suffered by Justices Taney and Brandeis still burn in liberal hearts!" --columnist Ann Coulter

LIBERTY

"In the most important arenas -- foreign policy and domestic security -- nations and terrorists who mean America harm have a right to think President Obama is weak and can be challenged with few consequences. ... Terrorists in waiting mostly remained in the shadows during the Bush administration, but now think they can meet openly to plot the downfall of the United States. Hizb ut-Tahrir, an international movement that wants to re-establish a Caliphate and indoctrinate Muslims into supporting jihad, will step up its recruitment efforts at a planned meeting July 19 in a Chicago suburb, reports the Investigative Project on Terrorism. The group, whose alumni include 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and suicide bombers, will hold a conference entitled 'The Fall of Capitalism and the Rise of Islam.' Why should they fear a president who still wants to negotiate with the Iranian nuclear bomb builder Mahmoud Ahmadinejad? There is nothing worse for the world than to have a president of the United States who is perceived as

weak. Weakness can result in the deaths of innocent people, a wrecked economy (again) and new attacks on American allies and interests around the world."
--columnist Cal Thomas

THE GIPPER

"It's about time we constitutionally mandate the Federal Government to do what every American family must do, and that is balance its budget. That doesn't mean taking more out of your pocket by raising taxes. ... We the people, deserve to know that our jobs, paychecks, homes, and pensions are safe from the taxers and regulators of big government."
--Ronald Reagan

GOVERNMENT

"Americans remain intuitively distrustful of government and its promises, and they harbor doubts about the draconian level of taxes Mr. Obama and the Democrats want to inflict on the economy at large -- and small businesses in particular -- to pay for a massive big-spending agenda they intend to enact in the middle of a very severe, job-killing recession. ... But this won't just hit wealthier Americans with high salaries; it will also strike at small-business owners who pay their businesses taxes through their 1040 forms just like any other individual American. One-third of them employ anywhere from two to 100 employees. Overall, small businesses are defined as companies that can employ up to 500 workers. These businesses employ most of America's workers. They would be slapped with an onerous tax hike at a time when many of them are either closing their doors or laying off workers, and the rest are just struggling to survive. ... If you think it is the height of fiscal irresponsibility to raise taxes in a struggling economy with unemployment headed into double-digits, you're right. This is crazy. This is not a time when we should be talking about raising anyone's taxes, middle-income or upper-income. This is a time when we need all of the economy's oars in the water pulling together, especially upper-income investors the Democrats want to tax into oblivion. This economy is desperately in need of tax-cut incentives to unlock an infusion of private investment capital to help job-creating entrepreneurs and existing businesses survive what is very likely to be many months of economic anemia and turmoil." --Washington Times columnist Donald Lambro

RE: THE LEFT

"The [Left] usually presumes that if the rich and near rich get less, someone else will get more. Redistribution achieves a better social balance. Sometimes that happens. But sometimes when the rich get less, no one else gets more. Regardless of how the rich earned their money -- trading bonds, performing surgery, starting new companies, providing legal work -- it's no longer so lucrative. The rich get poorer, but no one else gets richer. Society is worse off. 'Trickle-down economics' is a despised phrase and concept to many, but it also embodies a harsh reality. The rich often play a pivotal role in U.S. economic growth, and if they are enfeebled, then the consequences are widespread." --columnist Robert J. Samuelson

POLITICAL FUTURES

"Frankly, I'm not sure if I'm just being guilty of wishful thinking, but I have a hunch that while Obama is doing his best to destroy America and capitalism, the lemming-in-chief is leading the party faithful blindly off the cliff. No matter how personally popular the president might be, and I am beginning to doubt those particular numbers, the same certainly can't be said for his colleagues and cronies. The truth is, Pelosi and Reid are about as popular as mumps and chicken pox. Even if the New York Times and Chris Matthews still get a tingle up their leg when they look at Obama, most Americans hate socialized medicine and cap and trade; they hate the idea of the feds being in bed with the unions and nationalizing banks and car companies; they hate the idea of dismantling our missile defense system at the very same time that Iran and North Korea are threatening us; they particularly hate the idea of our president going abroad and bad-mouthing America every chance he gets. Even Bill Clinton stopped doing that once he was past draft age and had gotten a haircut. Unless I'm very much mistaken, those Democrats who are going along in order to get along are likely to discover next year that the voters are going to tell them in no uncertain words to move along." --columnist Burt Prelutsky

THE LAST WORD

"As soon as a coin in the coffer rings, / A soul from purgatory springs.' So went a mantra from 16th-century Europe, when salvation -- or, so the idea went -- could be purchased by anyone willing to pay the price: sold to the sinner for cold hard cash. Sins

were absolved, sinners sanctified, offenses forgotten. Money, not the commitment to a better life, promised that debauchery and divinity could cohabit in the ledgers of the holy treasurer. By virtue of a self-promoting religiosity, these indulgences, as they were called, purported to place spiritual caps on the consequences of forbidden acts. A weekend of decadent and intemperate living brought no punishment for breaking with accepted piety. In theory, at least, a person could excuse all the depravity he wanted, as long as those indulgent acts were economically sanctioned by appropriate authorities. Contrary to the hopes of the sinner, however, financial machinations had not the power to sanctify the sinner. The sins remained even when the money did not. ... Is Cap-and-Trade just another politically indulgent Indulgence? The comparison is not without merit. ... Corporations that emitted excessively sinful emissions would be permitted to atone for their conduct by dropping punitive offerings into the governmental coffer (i.e., purchasing 'carbon credits'). Wherefore, if a corporation feels particularly righteous, it can demonstrate contrition by purchasing indulgences for its harmful conduct and/or trading with a non-offending corporation for rights to its accumulated footprints of the carbon variety.

Whether offering lucre directly to the Government or trading with non-offending corporations for rights to their unblemished credits, the offending acts still occur, however, and like the sins of that earlier version, the environmental vice remains. The only real change is that which is found in the financial ledgers of the Government, or the pockets of the ministers of financial regulation -- those who oversee the process. ... Rather than being wary of the market's ability to shepherd good energy and environmental policy, we should protect our flocks from promises of false profits made by false prophets."
--attorney Robert Kirchhoefer

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

(Please pray for our 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.)