



“If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretence of taking care of them, they must become happy.” --Thomas Jefferson

GOVERNMENT & POLITICS

Saturday Night Special

The Constitution took a beating Saturday night when the House passed its 2,000-page version of ObamaCare by a 220-215 vote. Only one Republican, Joseph Cao of New Orleans, voted for the \$1 trillion bill, while 39 Democrats voted against it. But Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) didn't dwell on the bipartisan opposition to this legislative disgrace, instead saying, “We're glad to take responsibility for this bill. And the credit.” Famous last words?

Perhaps. Pelosi has reportedly informed fellow Democrats that she is willing to lose seats in 2010 to get health care “reform” passed. And why not? As Wall Street Journal columnist James Taranto quipped, “At 69, Pelosi stands a good chance of facing a death panel before she leads a majority of this size again.”

ObamaCare's prospects are uncertain in the Senate, where several Democrats have announced their opposition. Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) is possibly the most vulnerable Democrat in 2010 and may not be crazy about hanging this albatross around his neck. Still, we're not hopeful that the Senate will refrain from passing something dreadful, if only less so than the House version.

As we noted Tuesday, part of the blame for passage falls on pro-life groups for forcing Republicans to vote for an amendment prohibiting funding of abortions via the “public option.” The intent was good, but ironically, the absence of the amendment might have brought the bill down to defeat. And it was likely a hollow victory anyway, as House Energy and Commerce Chairman Henry Waxman (D-CA) says there is “no guarantee” the amendment will survive.

In fact, the real “right to life” issue is that every medical decision may soon be subject to both political and budgetary considerations. What ever happened to the old liberal slogan, “Keep your laws off my body”?

Furthermore, the bill raises a tax issue. Capital gains taxes will rise from 15 percent to 20 percent when the Bush tax cuts expire in January 2011, and the Democrats' bill raises them again to 25.4 percent with a surtax. That's a 69 percent increase, the result of which will be less investment, lower stock prices, economic turmoil and a drop in tax revenue. Of course, revenue is one of the gimmicks in the bill -- the Senate bill counts on 10 years of new taxes to pay for just seven years of spending. And it includes a government-run long-term insurance program that begins collecting premiums in 2011 but waits until 2016 to pay benefits.

One other notable stinker is a tort provision that gives “incentive payments” to states that come up with “alternative medical liability law” that encourages “fair resolution” of disputes and “maintains access to affordable liability insurance.” The catch is that states can't “limit attorneys' fees or impose caps on damages.” DNC Chair Howard Dean was right: Democrats don't have the guts to stand up to their ambulance-chasing sugar daddies.

Meanwhile, some *11 amendments* requiring members of Congress to be enrolled in the public plan were rejected by Democrats. What's good for the goose is apparently not so appealing to the gander.

And so the unconstitutional attempted takeover of one-sixth of the U.S. economy marches on.

This Week's 'Braying Jenny' Award

PelosiCare includes a possible fine and jail time for those who don't abide by the mandate to buy health insurance. Is it really fair to send people to jail for choosing to pay their own way?

Pelosi thinks so: “I think the legislation is very fair in this respect. It gives people an opportunity to have health care.” If by “gives people an opportunity” you mean coerces them to have health insurance...

The BIG Dodge

Where is the constitutional authority for a federal mandate that individuals must buy health insurance?

Sen. Ben Nelson, a Democrat in red-state Nebraska,

pleaded the Fifth: “Well, you know, uh, uh, I don’t know that I’m a constitutional scholar, so, I, I’m not going to be able to answer that question.”

Sen. Daniel Akaka (D-HI) likewise dodged the question, saying, “I’m not aware of [any constitutional authority], let me put it that way. But what we’re trying to do is to provide for people who have needs and that’s where the accessibility comes in, and one of the goals that we’re trying to present here is to make it accessible.” Right. “Provide” for them by mandating they do something under penalty of massive fines and/or imprisonment -- that’s leftist “compassion” for you.

Sen. Mark Warner (D-VA) answered, “The United States Congress passed laws regarding Medicare and Medicaid that became de facto mandatory programs. States all the time require people to have driver’s licenses. I think that this is a bit of a spurious argument that’s being made by some folks.” Uh, states require licenses only for the *privilege* of driving.

Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI), a member of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee -- one of two committees that wrote and approved health care legislation -- pointed to precedent as justification: “Let me see. I would have to check the specific sections, so I’ll have to get back to you on the specific section, but it is not unusual that the Congress has required individuals to do things, like sign up for the draft, uh, uh, and do many other things too, which I don’t think are explicitly contained [in the Constitution]. It gives Congress a right to raise an army, but it doesn’t say you can take people and draft them, uh, but since that was something necessary for the functioning of the government over the past several years, the practice on the books, it’s been recognized, the authority to do that.” So because Congress has acted unconstitutionally before, they can do it again now? Our guess is he understands health care about as well as he comprehends the Constitution.

Quote of the Week

“America once made the required nod to the Constitution. When We the People wanted to make some fundamental change or expand the federal government’s reach, we did the right thing and amended the Constitution. ... If we once thought that we had to amend the Constitution to ban ‘intoxicating liquors’ and later had to again amend the Constitution to re-legalize the stuff, wouldn’t we need an amendment to allow the government to intrude even more intimately into our lives? ... If Congress were to do the right thing and initiate an amendment to enshrine the

‘individual mandate’ in the Constitution ... it would fail miserably. If America is still America, Americans will not tolerate being told they have to buy something, especially if it’s for no other reason than that they exist. ... I’m afraid Congress has not only misread the Constitution, but they’ve also misjudged the American people. Or maybe they just don’t know what country they live in.” --Jon N. Hall at American Thinker

We Need Your Help

“Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it.” --Thomas Paine

Fellow Patriots, our [2009 Annual Fund](#) campaign is underway. As you know, *The Patriot* is not sustained by any political, special interest or parent organization. Nor do we accept any online or e-mail advertising. Our operations and mission are funded by -- and depend entirely upon -- the voluntary financial support of American Patriots like YOU!

Like many mission-based organizations, we raise most of our budget in the last two months of each year. We still must raise **\$287,592** before year’s end.

The Patriot Post is distributed without a subscription fee, particularly so that our military, collegiate and mission-field readers can receive *The Patriot* at no charge.

“Dear fellow Patriots, thank you for your exposition on faith in uniform. From a Marine Battalion in Iraq that has been a beneficiary of your generous support through Operation Shield of Strength, thank you. Semper Fi and God Bless America!” --Baghdad, Iraq

If you have not already done so, please take a moment to support *The Patriot’s* 2009 Annual Fund today with a [secure online donation](#) -- however large or small. If you prefer to support The Patriot by mail, please use our [printable donor form](#).

I thank you for the honor and privilege of serving you as editor and publisher of *The Patriot Post*. On behalf of your *Patriot* staff and National Advisory Committee, thank you and may God bless you and your family.

Semper Vigilo, Fortis, Paratus, et Fidelis!

Mark Alexander
Publisher

From the Left: Bill Owens's First Hours in Congress

Democrat Bill Owens was sworn in Friday after being declared the winner of the controversial NY-23 special election, but that may have been too soon. Votes are still being counted in the district and Owens' lead continues to shrink. Stay tuned.

Once in Congress, Owens wasted no time in proving himself a true Democrat -- but that may augur his own defeat in 2010. By voting for H.R. 3962, the PelosiCare health bill, he broke no fewer than four promises he made to voters on the campaign trail. Owens said he would not support a public option, but he voted for it anyway. He also said he would not support cuts to Medicare, taxing health care benefits or increasing middle class taxes to pay for the health care bill. The bill he voted for, however, contains billions of dollars in cuts to Medicare and language that will allow the government to raise taxes on pretty much any group it chooses in order to pay for nationalized health care.

It's important to keep in mind that, if the results hold, Owens beat third-party Conservative candidate Doug Hoffman by only four percentage points. It wasn't the drubbing that the media machine would have us believe. Owens likely won by that relatively slim margin in part because of the promises he made with regard to health care legislation. Now that he's broken those promises and betrayed the trust of his constituents, he may be looking forward to a rather short career as a United States Congressman.

Hope 'n' Change: Dunn is Done

Speaking of short careers, Mao-loving, Fox News-hating interim White House Communications Director Anita Dunn has left her post, leaving room for her protégé and deputy, Dan Pfeiffer, to take over. Dunn never expected to remain in her position, but one can't help but wonder if her departure at this point had anything to do with the idiotic and cowardly White House assault on Fox News that she started.

Dunn accused Fox of being "a wing of the Republican Party," and Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel, Press Secretary Robert Gibbs and top adviser David Axelrod helped to circle the wagons. Apparently they never heard the old political truism about not picking fights with people who buy ink by the barrel. The end result here was that the administration looked petty and panicky while Fox's audience continues to grow, leaving White House certified liberal mouthpieces CNN and MSNBC in the dust.

While Dunn's day-to-day role has come to an end, she will still be on hand as a communications adviser for the Obama team. Oddly enough, though, the day after she resigned, Obama agreed to an interview with Fox's Major Garrett. Score it Free Press 1, White House 0.

New & Notable Legislation

Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-CT) introduced his 1,100-page proposal for regulating the financial markets. Dodd calls for a complete overhaul of the current regulatory structure and, wait for it ... more government control.

Essentially, the plan calls for stripping the Federal Reserve of its power to regulate banks and make emergency loans to companies, while adding greater government oversight into the Fed's emergency programs, which have been on overdrive during the financial meltdown. Furthermore, Dodd wants Congress and the White House to have greater control over the appointment of the directors of the 12 regional Fed banks. Currently, private bankers choose six of the nine directors for each bank. If Dodd has his way, all the Fed will be doing in the future is setting interest rates, and it will be completely answerable to the president and the Senate to do even that much.

We're not defending the track record of the Federal Reserve, but critics of Dodd's plan -- and there are many -- say that the Fed cannot effectively set interest rates without holding regulatory sway over private banks. Similarly, his plan to strip away the supervisory role of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will leave it a shell of its former self. It should be clear that this is yet another power grab. Dodd wants us to believe that since the regulatory structure already in place couldn't stem the current financial crisis, the federal government should have control over every aspect of the financial sector. If every member of the Federal Reserve Bank is a political appointment, imagine what additional tripe will be pedaled for truth about our economy.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Warfront With Jihadistan: Right Here at Home

First and foremost, our prayers go out for the family, friends and fellow soldiers of those killed, as well as the wounded, in the attack at Fort Hood, Texas, last week. War is an ugly thing -- particularly when it hits so close to home and violence and murder are perpetrated by a supposed comrade.

U.S. Army Maj. Nidal Malik Hasan became an enemy combatant when he murdered 12 soldiers, one civilian and

an unborn child and wounded 30 others last Thursday in what was both an act of jihad and treason. In a military court this Thursday, he was charged with 13 counts of premeditated murder, though that may change to 14 under the Unborn Victims of Violence Act. They should add treason to the charges. Prosecutors are seeking the death penalty, and rightly so.

Last week, we noted an initial indicator in the case: Hasan, a lifelong Muslim, shouted “Allahu Akbar” (“god is great”) before unloading more than 100 rounds on unarmed and unsuspecting soldiers. Hasan also spoke openly and frequently about his opposition to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, calling them unjust wars against Islam, while his business cards sported the abbreviation “SoA(SWT)” -- Soldier of Allah (glory to god). He had tried to contact al-Qa’ida, and in 2001, attended the same Great Falls, Virginia, mosque as did two 9/11 hijackers. The cleric at the time, Anwar al-Awlaki, called Hasan a “hero” and said all Muslims serving in the U.S. military should “follow the footsteps of men like Nidal.” Awlaki, who fled to Yemen in 2002, now runs a Web site promoting jihad against the U.S.

The Army was aware of many of these red flags, but rather than a discharge, Hasan received a promotion last year and continued to counsel American soldiers as a psychiatrist.

As details continue to emerge, it becomes increasingly evident that the dead and wounded were casualties not only of militant Islam but also of rampant political correctness all the way up the chain of command. Gen. George Casey, Army Chief of Staff, said that the murders were a tragedy, but worried that it “could potentially heighten backlash against some of our Muslim soldiers.” He then warned, “As horrific as this tragedy was, if our diversity becomes a casualty, I think that’s worse.” Losing “diversity” would be more tragic than this needless loss of life?

Department of Military Correctness: ‘Gun Free’ Zone

Nidal Hasan’s murderous rampage at Fort Hood stopped only when two armed civilian police officers put four rounds into him. One of those officers was shot in the leg herself. But this begs the question: Why weren’t American soldiers able to defend themselves?

Because in 1993, upon taking office, President Bill Clinton imposed regulations that forbid military personnel from carrying personal firearms on base and make it

nearly impossible for commanders to issue firearms to soldiers. Generally, only military police carry firearms on base.

In other words, as absurd as it may seem, Fort Hood, home of the heavily armed 1st Cavalry Division, is practically a “gun free” zone. The base now joins an infamous list of such “gun free” zones in which murderers were left alone with their guns, free to do their worst -- including Columbine High School, Virginia Tech University and Westroads Mall in Omaha, Nebraska, among others. According to The Washington Times, “All the public shootings in the United States in which more than three people have been killed have occurred in places where concealed handguns have been banned.”

That fact didn’t stop Chicago Mayor Richard Daley from blaming guns. “Unfortunately, America loves guns,” he said. “We love guns to a point that we see the devastation on a daily basis.” Paul Helmke, president of the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, lectured, “This latest tragedy, at a heavily fortified Army base, ought to convince more Americans to reject the argument that the solution to gun violence is to arm more people with more guns in more places.” As we already noted, that’s just plain contrary to the facts, more commonly known as lying.

Even sportswriter Peter King couldn’t avoid the topic in a column about football: “America needs to do something about idiots with handguns. How many more Fort Hoods and Orlandos do there have to be before our political leaders have the guts to severely restrict access to murderous weapons?” King should be thankful there isn’t something being done about idiots with keyboards.

The wife of one of the wounded soldiers certainly understood the implications of disarming service personnel. When asked how she felt about her husband’s upcoming deployment to Afghanistan, she replied, “At least he’s safe there and he can fire back, right?”

In Other Jihad News...

Muslim convert John Allen Muhammad, a.k.a. the DC sniper, was executed by lethal injection in Virginia Tuesday for the murder of Dean Harold Meyers in October 2002. Muhammad and his accomplice, then-17-year-old Lee Boyd Malvo, also were convicted of six murders in Maryland and suspected of three more in other states. Malvo is serving life in prison. Of the execution, Prince William County prosecutor Paul Ebert noted, “He died

very peacefully -- much more than most of his victims.”

Also, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, mastermind of the 9/11 attacks, and four others accused in the attacks will be put on trial in a civilian court in New York. Criminal trial for an act of war is part of the 9/10 mindset. That’s just natural for Democrats, though.

Obama’s Wall

Maybe his priority was strong-arming a Democrat-controlled Congress to pass health care legislation on a Saturday night, or maybe it was dealing with the latest appointee to leave his administration. It could even be that the destination wasn’t a suitable date night or shopping venue for Michelle. Whatever the reason, Barack Obama skipped the trip to the Brandenburg Gate to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Instead, Obama sent Secretary of State Hillary Clinton -- only to upstage her by appearing at the scene via video.

In his three-minute address, Obama noted, “Few would have foreseen on that day [when the Wall came down] that a united Germany would be led by a woman from Brandenburg or that their American ally would be led by a man of African descent.” But it’s not about him, is it?

Also, while Obama mentioned President John F. Kennedy’s remarks in his video he failed to note President Ronald Reagan, the leader who called on Mikhail Gorbachev to “tear down this wall” and lived to see it happen. We think that Obama stayed home because the comparison to President Reagan would have made him look small, shallow and ridiculous.

Iran: Hostages and Counterterrorism Seizures

Iran announced this week that three American “journalists” who were arrested crossing the Iraq-Iran border on July 31 would be tried as spies. In other words, they will be given a show trial, sentenced to some draconian punishment, and then magnanimously released by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in order to make Iran look good (see also North Korea v. Laura Ling and Euna Lee). While we will always promote safeguarding the lives of American citizens unjustly brought to trial or harm by foreign countries, the known facts of this case make it appear that the three got themselves arrested on purpose. To what end -- to sympathize with poor innocent Iran in its struggle against the bullying of the United States? Or simply to boost their careers? Only the three defendants know for certain. We will add their names to

the long list of “useful idiots” who have handed brutal dictatorships a public relations victory.

In other news, Israel this week released photographs documenting Iran’s latest attempt to arm the enemies of civilization, in this case several shipping containers of Iranian weapons seized by the Israelis, which were destined for Syria, and then to Hezbollah. The photographs show what Israel described as “several hundred tons” of rockets, mortar rounds and other arms -- all of which Iran is expressly forbidden to export under the terms of UN Security Council Resolution 1747. We won’t hold our breath waiting for the UN to back up UNSCR 1747 -- they’ll probably just censure Israel for an “unauthorized” boarding at sea.

Finally, Fox News reports, “Federal prosecutors have taken steps to seize four U.S. mosques and a Manhattan skyscraper owned by [the Alavi Foundation,] a nonprofit Muslim organization long suspected of being secretly controlled by the Iranian government.” The counterterrorism seizure of more than \$500 million in assets could end up being the biggest such case in U.S. history, and would be a blow to Iran.

BUSINESS & ECONOMY

Bad Publicity for Cap-n-Tax

Freedom of speech is a right of all Americans -- unless, it seems, you work for the Environmental Protection Agency and you’re critical of cap-and-trade. Seasoned EPA attorneys Laurie Williams and Allan Zabel were recently directed by the agency to un-post a self-made YouTube video outlining the “big lie” and the “big rip-off” of what we like to call cap-n-tax.

Echoing their Washington Post op-ed, the duo state that even as congressional advocates claim cap-n-tax will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the evidence says otherwise. “Cap-and-trade for climate change has been tried in Europe,” Williams says. “It produced harmful volatility in energy prices and few greenhouse gas reductions. It raised energy prices for consumers and made billions in windfall profits for utilities.”

Furthermore, when it comes to the promise of carbon offsets, Zabel insists they won’t work. Drawing upon his 20-plus years overseeing California’s cap-n-tax and carbon offset programs, he explains offsets will “make it look like we’re getting greenhouse gas reductions when we’re just getting business as usual.”

Unfortunately, the EPA has little interest in tolerating dissent, and, in its climate crusade, muzzling criticism has emerged as the agency's weapon of choice.

The Kelo Eminent Domain Case Takes a Turn

Four years ago, five judicial despots on the U.S. Supreme Court dealt a blow to property rights by ruling in *Kelo v. New London* that cities can seize private property for the "greater economic good" -- a process referred to as "eminent domain." Typical of liberal tyranny, the promise of good that launched the Kelo disaster has flopped. It seems Pfizer -- whose move to New London eight years ago was secured by the city's pledge to raze a neighborhood -- is now pulling out.

According to the Hartford Courant, the company "is now deciding what to do with its giant New London offices, and will consider selling it, leasing it and other options." The Courant doesn't mention that one option not available is restoring the homes demolished in pursuit of the "public good."

As the New London Day reports, the "development that started in conjunction with Pfizer's move into the city ... has left little but flattened buildings and eminent-domain angst in its wake." Perhaps trying to soften the blow, Tony Sheridan, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Eastern Connecticut, claims, "The facility in New London was built with the best of intentions."

Apparently, no one noticed this same material paves the proverbial road to hell.

Around the Nation: Debt Weighs on States

After driving out the producers (like Rush Limbaugh and Buffalo Sabres owner Tom Golisano) with exorbitant tax rates, it's no surprise that those remaining in the state of New York have to deal with a financial crunch. Apparently the \$131 billion state budget -- which represented a \$12 billion increase this year over last -- is turning out to be unsustainable.

Democrat Gov. David Paterson called for a special session of the state's legislature to deal with an immediate \$3.2 billion shortfall, a deficit which Paterson claimed would run the state out of cash in four-and-a-half weeks. The prospects for the next fiscal year are equally bleak, with a \$10 billion gap.

Critics scoffed that Paterson's pleas were simply a reelection ploy, while unions complained about cuts in

services should Paterson get his way. Paterson, in turn, blamed fellow Democrats in the state senate who "didn't cut a dime from anybody" in the brief special session.

New York isn't the only example of bloated and dysfunctional government. Beyond the Empire State and California, the Pew Center on the States found that Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island and Wisconsin are also at grave financial risk.

CULTURE & POLICY

Climate Change This Week: The Profit of Doom

Since leaving office in 2000, former Vice President Al Gore has been busy trying to convince the rest of us that we're on the verge of annihilation, based on the debunked junk science of global warming, and he has become wealthy in the process. Now he has released the sequel to his 2006 "An Inconvenient Truth." The new book, entitled "Our Choice: A Plan to Solve the Climate Crisis," has emerged *conveniently* ahead of the December climate change conference in Copenhagen.

Interestingly, it contains this quote: "The conversion of all questions of truth into questions of power ... has attacked the distinction between true and false." Gore credits philosopher Theodore Adorno for this lofty and nebulous jewel, but he neglects to mention that Adorno was a prominent Marxist. Perhaps Gore's book should have been titled: "My Choice: Destroy Our Capitalist System While Enriching Myself."

Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R-TN) addressed this issue last year when Gore was testifying before the House Energy and Commerce Committee in support of cap-n-tax. When Blackburn pointed out that Gore's personal wealth has grown from only \$1 to 2 million in 2000 to a whopping \$100 million nine years later, Gore smugly replied that he was "being a good businessman in a capitalist economy."

He's not the only one. While the media vilifies those on Wall Street for getting rich at the expense of the rest of us, Gore and his buddies on Capitol Hill are getting kudos for doing worse. In a recent and appallingly obsequious article in *The New York Times* entitled "Gore's Dual Role: Advocate and Investor," the *Times* notes that Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Robert F. Kennedy Jr. are also investing heavily in green ventures. Imagine the public outcry if these were Republicans.

Then again, there is always the bright side: after all, had

Gore been able to carry his home state of Tennessee in 2000, he would have been charged with protecting the nation after 9/11, and how would a pesky thing like mass-murdering Islamist fundamentalism rank alongside the scourge of climate change?

Judicial Benchmarks:

SCOTUS Considers Life Sentences

At age 16, Terrance Graham committed a violent armed burglary. After release from jail a year later, he did it again, this time putting a gun to his victim's head. In another case, after committing 17 criminal offenses in just two years, Joe Sullivan, at age 13, raped an elderly woman so savagely that she required surgery. On Monday, 20 years later, the Supreme Court heard arguments on whether Florida may imprison these minors for life (without parole) for these non-homicide crimes. The decision will turn on which distinction -- age or sentence -- will prevail.

The defendants will emphasize relying on age. The 2005 case of *Roper v. Simmons* held that the Eighth Amendment prohibits capital punishment of minors, with the Court ruling that only adults are maximally blameworthy and thus properly subject to maximum punishment. The defendants seek to extend this adult/minor distinction to life imprisonment as well.

Florida will rely on the sentencing distinction between death and imprisonment. Although the Supreme Court has developed many restrictions to capital punishment (including its prohibition for crimes like child rape), the Court has not interfered much with states' imprisonment practices. One of the reasons that the Court has long held "death is different" is that it punishes killers in a retributive sense, beyond the preventive benefit of isolating them for the protection of the public. Even if one accepts that minors are less culpable (and thus less deserving of punishment), they may be just as dangerous (and thus worth incapacitating). Even the insane, who are considered not blameworthy at all, may be confined for life to protect the public.

The sentence of life imprisonment without parole for non-homicide crimes is rare for minors -- only 111 are serving the sentence nationwide. The defense sees that as evidence of its unconstitutionality. This may simply mean that prosecutors, juries and judges are already properly exercising discretion and saving it for the "worst of the worst" criminal offenders. A decision is expected by spring.

Faith and Family:

Americans United Calls Out the Left

An organization calling itself a "watchdog for religious liberty" has called upon the Internal Revenue Service to investigate a Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, church for allegedly violating federal tax law. The liberal group, Americans United for Separation of Church and State, filed the complaint with the IRS against the Bethel Village AME Church after its pastor introduced a mayoral candidate to the congregation during his sermon.

Tax-exempt organizations, including houses of worship, are prohibited from advocating for or against political candidates by the Internal Revenue Code. However, a local radio station recorded Pastor Martin D. Odom calling Democrat Linda Thompson to the podium and referring to her as "the next mayor of the city of Harrisburg." We admit to being surprised that Americans United wasted no time in ratting him out.

Asked after the service about the pastor's comments, Thompson said, "There's the written word, and there's the prophetic word. And as a minister, he was prophesizing [sic]. And for that, you and I have no control over it."

It's about time Reverend Barry R. Lynn, Americans United's executive director, and his ilk recognized the frequency of such advocacy on the Left. For too long, they have attacked more conservative churches for doing far less. Lynn wrote in his letter to the IRS, "Hailing a candidate as 'the next mayor' is fine rhetoric for a political rally, but it has no place emanating from a pulpit." We agree -- to a point. The pulpit is for the Word of God, not for political campaigning -- but not because the IRS says so.

To Keep and Bear Arms

Cassidy Lockett and her three children were the victims of a recently attempted house robbery. The two men responsible for the crime had escaped from a local prison and were most likely aware that people were present in the house, but they continued the assault anyway. Unfortunately for them, they had no idea what was coming. Upon rushing the children to a bedroom, Cassidy proceeded to call police as she loaded her .22 pistol. The men busted a window to enter the home but Lockett was quick to respond, later saying, "I was pointing the gun at him and, you know, I used a few choice words and told him to get out or I was going to shoot." Despite fleeing the property, the suspects were apprehended by police a few minutes later. Cassidy and her husband wasted no time in further

preparation, however, as they bought a 12-gauge shotgun the next day.

And Last...

ACORN, the leftist community group infamous for advising a “pimp and a hooker” on matters of tax evasion, child prostitution and other illegal activities, filed suit against the federal government Thursday for cutting its funding. Get this -- the group called the move unconstitutional, citing Article I, Section 9, which prohibits bills of attainder, or a declaration of guilt and punishment without a trial. In September, after the videotaped scandal knocked ACORN out of its tree, Congress passed appropriations that withheld housing, education and transportation funds from the group. Given that Article 1, Section 8, which enumerates Congress’ powers, doesn’t mention “community organizing” -- or housing, education and transportation, for that matter -- we’d say ACORN is on shaky ground.

Essentially, their argument boils down to this: Because Congress unconstitutionally funded us before and we now depend on that money, it’s unconstitutional for them to stop providing for our welfare. Only in America.

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.)