



THE FOUNDATION

“Nothing is more essential to the establishment of manners in a State than that all persons employed in places of power and trust must be men of unexceptionable characters.” --Samuel Adams

MARTIN LUTHER KING JR.

“I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.’ ... I have a dream that my four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. ... And if America is to be a great nation this must become true.”
--Martin Luther King Jr.

Historian Shelby Steele observed, “There is an awful lot of conservative sentiment in black America, but at the moment, the party line is ruthlessly enforced.” Indeed, some of King’s chief lieutenants, like Jesse Jackson, tolerate no dissension from their liberal ranks now. They have abandoned King’s dream, and aligned themselves with political and social agendas obsessed with color at the expense of character.

Black conservatives of national stature, such as Clarence Thomas, Ward Connerly, Michael Steele, Jesse Lee Peterson, Alan Keyes, Don Scoggins, Alvin Williams, Ken Blackwell, Thomas Sowell, Star Parker and Walter Williams are routinely castigated by the Black Supremacists, as “Uncle Toms” and “puppets.” Yet these are the men and women who really understand King’s central message about character.

Today, Barack Obama will be waxing eloquently about King’s legacy. But it is worth noting that prior to his murder in 1968, Martin King went to Obama’s hometown of Chicago to meet with Mayor Richard Daley, father of the current Windy City Don. Chicago was a hotbed of racial hatred under Daley, and not much has changed.

King observed of that enmity, “This is the most tragic picture of man’s inhumanity to man. I’ve been to Mississippi and Alabama and I can tell you that the hatred and hostility in Chicago are really deeper than in Alabama and Mississippi.”

Chicago was not only a denizen of racial hatred but the violent black supremacist movement was born there. King said, “Those who are associated with ‘Black Power’ and black supremacy are wrong.”

It is that very racial hatred and hostility in which Obama has been steeped, particularly by mentors such as Jeremiah Wright.

At King’s funeral, one Bible passage, Matthew 5:9, summed up his life’s mission: “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called sons of God.”

Obama was not stewarded by peacemakers.

Finally, irrespective of one’s conclusion about Martin Luther King’s proper place in history (given the historical account of his sometimes-lacking personal integrity and character), the two texts cited below (from The Patriot’s Historic Documents section) are well worth reading -- for each of them proclaim truth.

[“I have a dream”](#)

[Letter from a Birmingham jail](#)

THE GIPPER

“In 1968 Martin Luther King was gunned down by a brutal assassin, his life cut short at the age of 39. But those 39 short years had changed America forever. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 had guaranteed all Americans equal use of public accommodations, equal access to programs financed by federal funds, and the right to compete for employment on the sole basis of individual merit. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 had made certain that from then on black Americans would get to vote. But most important, there was not just a change of law; there was a change of heart. The conscience of America had been touched. Across the land, people had begun to treat each other not as blacks and whites, but as fellow Americans. ... Now our nation has decided to honor Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. by setting aside a day each year to remember him and the just cause he stood for. We’ve made historic strides since Rosa Parks refused to go to the back of the bus. As a democratic people, we can take pride in the

knowledge that we Americans recognized a grave injustice and took action to correct it. And we should remember that in far too many countries, people like Dr. King never have the opportunity to speak out at all.” --Ronald Reagan

CHARACTER: LEE AND JACKSON

“Let each man resolve to be victorious, and that the right of self-government, liberty, and peace shall find him a defender.” --Robert E. Lee

“[M]y religious belief teaches me to feel as safe in battle as in bed. God has fixed the time for my death. I do not concern myself about that, but to be always ready, no matter when it may overtake me. That is the way all men should live, and then all would be equally brave.” --Thomas J. “Stonewall” Jackson

Today we take a moment to remember the birth anniversaries of Robert E. Lee (Jan. 19) and Stonewall Jackson (Jan. 21), two of the greatest military commanders in American history. They also were great men of faith who gave their all (Jackson his life) for the cause of liberty and states’ rights, which we at The Patriot hold so dear. Some may question our decision to honor men of the Confederate States of America, but we encourage those readers to consider our [correction of the record](#). The honor we give these men has its roots in the founding of this great nation.

Mark Alexander notes in his essay, “[Lincoln’s Legacy at 200](#),” that “the causal case for states’ rights is most aptly demonstrated by the words and actions of Gen. Lee, who detested slavery and opposed secession. In 1860, however, Gen. Lee declined Lincoln’s request that he take command of the Army of the Potomac, saying that his first allegiance was to his home state of Virginia: ‘I have, therefore, resigned my commission in the army, and save in defense of my native state... I hope I may never be called on to draw my sword.’ He would, soon thereafter, take command of the Army of Northern Virginia, rallying his officers with these words: ‘Let each man resolve to be victorious, and that the right of self-government, liberty, and peace shall find him a defender.’”

RE: THE LEFT

“[W]hen you look back over the surges of enthusiasm in the politics of the last two years, you see something like this: The Obama enthusiasts who dominated so much of the 2008 campaign cycle were motivated by style. The tea party protesters who dominated so much of 2009

were motivated by substance. Remember those rapturous crowds that swooned at Barack Obama’s rhetoric. ‘We are the change we are seeking,’ he proclaimed. ‘We will be able to look back and tell our children’ that ‘this was the moment when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal.’ A lot of style there, but not very much substance. ... In retrospect, the Obama enthusiasts seem to have been motivated by a yearning for a rapturous, nuanced leader. Send that terrible tyrant with his tortured sentences and moral certitude back to Texas and install The One in the White House, and all would be well. The Obama enthusiasts have achieved that goal, and perhaps it’s not surprising that, as polls show, they’re not much engaged in the details of the health care bills or cap-and-trade legislation or looming tax increases and the like. They, or at least most of them, were never much interested in those things anyway. In contrast, the tea party protesters ... are interested in substantive political issues. They decry the dangers of expanding the national debt, increasing government spending and putting government in command of the health care sector. Their concerns have basis in fact. The national debt is on a trajectory to double as a percentage of the economy over 10 years, and the Democrats’ health care bills threaten to bend the cost curve up. Higher taxes could choke off economic recovery and keep unemployment up near double-digit rates for years. Last year’s stimulus bill surreptitiously raised the budget baseline for many domestic spending programs and sent money to state and local governments -- a payoff to the public employee unions who spent more than \$100 million to elect Democrats in 2008. Agree with the tea party folk or not, these are substantive public policy issues of fundamental importance.” --political analyst Michael Barone

FOR THE RECORD

“The word ‘capitalism’ is used in two contradictory ways. Sometimes it’s used to mean the free market, or *laissez faire*. Other times it’s used to mean today’s government-guided economy. Logically, ‘capitalism’ can’t be both things. Either markets are free or government controls them. We can’t have it both ways. The truth is that we don’t have a free market -- government regulation and management are pervasive -- so it’s misleading to say that ‘capitalism’ caused today’s problems. The free market is innocent. But it’s fair to say that crony capitalism created the economic mess. ... What is crony capitalism? It’s the economic system in which the marketplace is substantially shaped by a cozy relationship among government, big business and big labor. Under crony capitalism, government bestows a variety of privileges that are simply unat-

tainable in the free market, including import restrictions, bailouts, subsidies and loan guarantees. ... Crony capitalism, better known as government bailouts, saved General Motors and Chrysler from extinction, with Barack Obama cronies the United Auto Workers getting preferential treatment over other creditors and generous stock holdings (especially outrageous considering that the union helped bankrupt the companies in the first place with fat pensions and wasteful work rules). Banks and insurance companies (like AIG) are bailed out because they are deemed too big to fail. Favored farmers get crop subsidies. If free-market capitalism is a private profit-and-loss system, crony capitalism is a private-profit and public-loss system. Companies keep their profits when they succeed but use government to stick the taxpayer with the losses when they fail. Nice work if you can get it. ... It's time we acknowledged the difference between the free market, which is based on freedom and competition, and crony capitalism, which is based on privilege." --columnist John Stossel

GOVERNMENT

"[Last Wednesday], President Barack Obama, Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and nine other lawmakers met face-to-face for seven hours to resolve differences between the House and Senate health care bills. At the same time these talks were going on, AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka, Service Employees International Union President Andy Stern and United Auto Workers President Ron Gettelfinger met with other Obama administration officials in a separate room in the White House. This all comes after these same labor leaders met personally with Speaker Pelosi yesterday, and after they met face-to-face with President Obama in the White House on Monday. Despite then-candidate Barack Obama's explicit promises to the American people, absolutely none of these meetings were open to the public or televised on C-SPAN. In fact, Politico reports: 'Those involved in the talks sought to keep details of their progress under wraps.' And just what deals were Big Labor, the leftist majorities in Congress and the Obama administration making behind closed doors? How to pay for President Obama's likely \$1 trillion health care plan without raising taxes on one of the President's most loyal constituencies: labor unions. Specifically, Big Labor reportedly has struck a deal with health care negotiators to exempt union members from the 40% excise tax on high-priced health insurance premiums. By some estimates, the tax would hit one in four union members. Now Big Labor will get all of the big government health care spending they always wanted, but they will not have to pay for it. ...

So where does the White House and Congress propose to regain the revenue lost from exempting unions from the health care excise tax? The people who fund job creation: investors. The Obama administration wants to apply the Medicare payroll tax not just to wages but to capital gains, and for the first time ever, to dividends and other forms of investment income." --The Heritage Foundation's Morning Bell

LIBERTY

"Although Democrats think their health care legislation faces smooth sailing to implementation, there is a rock dead ahead -- a constitutional challenge to the legislation's core. Democrats who assume it is constitutional to make it mandatory for Americans to purchase health insurance should answer some questions: Would it be constitutional for the government to legislate compulsory calisthenics for all Americans? If not, why not? If it would be, in what sense does the nation still have constitutional, meaning limited, government? Supporters of the mandate say Congress can impose it under the enumerated power to regulate interstate commerce. Since the New Deal, courts have made this power capacious enough to include regulating intrastate activity that 'substantially affects' interstate commerce. Hence Congress could constitutionally ban racial discrimination in 'public accommodations' -- restaurants, motels, etc. -- as an impediment to interstate commercial activity. Opponents of the mandate say: Unless the Commerce Clause is infinitely elastic -- in which case, Congress can do anything -- it does not authorize Congress to forbid the inactivity of not making a commercial transaction, of not purchasing a product (health insurance) from a private provider. ... [I]f any activity, or inactivity, can be declared to have economic consequences, then anything can be regulated -- or required. Furthermore, judicial review, and the Constitution itself, is largely nullified by a doctrine of virtually unlimited judicial deference to Congress' estimates of what is 'necessary and proper' for the regulation of commerce. If Congress does something beyond its constitutional powers, that something does not become constitutional merely by Congress saying it is necessary for this or that. ... [G]overnment's primary purpose is not to organize the fulfillment of majority preferences but to protect pre-existing rights of the individual -- basically, liberty." --columnist George Will

READER COMMENTS

"Once again, Mark Alexander has written an outstanding essay on global warming and the loss of liberty facing

our country. His statement that the Obama administration has ‘usurped the banking, investment, insurance, and auto industries and is attempting to slice up the national health care sector and enact CO2 legislation to take over the industry sector’ hit the nail right on the head! The people in this country need to wake up before it is too late.” --Phillip

“Good article with the exception of the fact that you apparently accept the theory of evolution. That’s your mistake. Genesis 1:1-- ‘In the beginning...’ In six 24-hour days, God created the heavens and the earth and all they contain. That answers all the questions. God is in control, always has been and always will be. There is no global warming/cooling other than what God allows. The problem is mankind turning its back on God.” --Roy

Editor’s Reply: Believing that the earth is old isn’t the same thing as believing evolution. Many Christians believe, with good reason, that the earth really is as old as it appears to be, and that God, who is timeless, created it a really long time ago.

“Although I am one of your biggest fans, I take issue with your condemnation of Pat Robertson’s remarks concerning the fact that some Haitians had made a pact with the devil at some point in history. In fact, voodoo has a long history in Haiti and is still a considerable influence there today. I was not sure whether you were challenging the authenticity of Robertson’s statement or simply regretting that he made such a comment at an inappropriate time. As you well know, God will not be mocked. Keep up the good work.” --Mac

Editor’s Reply: We were taking Robertson to task for saying something seemingly foolish at a very inappropriate time. We understand, too, that the number of self-identified Christians in Haiti is a number to be taken with a grain of salt. Voodoo is certainly prevalent and God does, we believe, still work in this world to counter evil.

THE LAST WORD

“I’ve been out of the country for a couple of days, so let me see if I’ve got this right: America’s preparing to celebrate the first anniversary of Good King Barack the Hopechanger’s reign by electing a Republican? In Massachusetts? In what the tin-eared plonkers of the Democrat machine still insist on calling ‘Ted Kennedy’s seat’? Remember the good old days when the glossy magazine covers competed for the most worshipful image of the new global colossus? If you were at the Hopechange inaugural ball on Jan. 20, 2009, when Barney Frank dived

into the mosh pit, and you chanced to be underneath when he landed, and you’ve spent the past year in a coma, until suddenly coming to in time for the poll showing some unexotically monikered nobody called Scott Brown, whose only glossy magazine appearance was a Cosmopolitan pictorial 30 years ago (true), four points ahead in Kennedy country, you must surely wonder if you’ve woken up in an alternative universe. The last thing you remember before Barney came flying down is Harry Reid waltzing you round the floor while murmuring sweet nothings about America being ready for a light-skinned brown man with no trace of a Negro dialect. And now you’re in some dystopian nightmare where Massachusetts is ready for a nude-skinned Brown man with no trace of a Kennedy dialect. How can this be happening?” --columnist Mark Steyn

Veritas vos Liberabit -- Semper Vigilo, Fortis, Paratus, et Fidelis! Mark Alexander, Publisher, for *The Patriot Post*’s editors and staff. Read online at <http://patriotpost.us>

(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.)