

July, 2010 Vol.I No.18

*A New Generation of Conservative Thought*

A photograph of Michael Savage, a man with a goatee and dark hair, wearing a light-colored suit jacket over a white shirt. He is seated in a dark chair and speaking into a professional microphone on a stand. The background is a solid light blue color.

# Who's afraid of Michael Savage?

McChrystal's exit strategy • African American genocide • Hispanic power play

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org)  
[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)



The conservative movement is in crisis. Modern conservatism was born in 1955 with the founding of *National Review*. Its editor, William F. Buckley Jr., said the publication's mission was to "stand athwart history, yelling stop!" But history has kept rolling along, smashing every traditional institution in its path. Family, faith, capitalism, our constitutional republic—they have all been shattered by modern liberalism. In the face of this ideological juggernaut, conservatives have offered sporadic and weak resistance. Their ideas have become stale. Too many prefer power to principles. The movement has become corrupt, lazy and ineffective. Having come to Washington to confront the political rot and moral decay, conservatives have become part of the establishment. In other words, they have become part of the problem.

The mission of *Reflections Magazine* is to launch a conservative moral and intellectual revival. We will bring together the finest minds and writers to defend the eternal principles of God, country and family. We seek to forge a reinvigorated conservative movement for the 21st century—one that champions a new nationalism, rooted in a culture of life, small government, a restoration of federalism and victory over Islamist terrorism. Capitol BuildingThe time has come for a one-nation conservatism that reaches out to minorities and women, the unborn and the poor, workers and students. The movement must go beyond its traditional base or else suffer a slow, agonizing death. Our goal is unabashedly counter-revolutionary: to roll back the forces of progressivism. Since the 1960s, a destructive liberal revolution has swept across our land. Characterized by radical secular humanism, sexual permissiveness and milk-toast socialism, it is transforming America into something our Founding Fathers would not only find unrecognizable but repugnant. We stand for the real America, the historic America, the eternal America—an America based on moral traditionalism, an America of limited government, self-reliance and entrepreneurship, an America that won its independence from imperial British rule, triumphed over Nazi Germany and Communist Russia, and has shed precious blood and treasure to liberate hundreds of millions of people around the world, and an America that champions human rights and freedom, in which every individual—regardless of race, color, gender or religion—possesses innate dignity and equal value in the eyes of our creator. We ask like-minded Americans to join us in this struggle for the heart and soul of America.

Edmund Burke, the great philosopher and godfather of Western conservatism, once said: "All that's necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing." We refuse to do nothing. We will fight for what is right, true and good. This is the rock upon which we take our stand.

# Content

July, 2010 Vol.I, No.18

## Cover Story

6 Who's afraid of Michael Savage?

*By Dr. Grace Vuoto*

## Foreign Affairs

9 Who lost Afghanistan?

*By Jeffrey T. Kuhner*

11 Gen. McChrystal's hot potato

*By Joseph Beaudoin*

13 Oliver Stone embraces Hugo Chavez

*By Herbert London*

## Minority Report

15 Abortion: The real African American killer

*By Loredana Vuoto*

17 The Democrat's Hispanic power play

*By Clint Condra*

## Culture

19 Gagging the Catholic Church

*By Robyn Wethington*

## Public Policy

21 America's education morass

*By Kelly Kathryn Llobet*

## Mission:

The Edmund Burke Institute for American Renewal was founded in June, 2005 in the nation's capital, Washington, D.C. We are a non-partisan, non-profit, education and outreach organization which aspires to engage and mobilize the millions of African Americans, Hispanics, women and other minorities in this country who share conservative values. We will inform conservative leaders about the needs and aspirations of minorities in order to make the latter feel welcome amongst us. Also, we want minorities to appreciate fully how conservatism is congruent with their values and goals. In short, we will build a steadfast alliance between conservative leaders and minority groups. We hope to preserve all those elements in the American republic that render us a strong and vibrant nation. Simultaneously, we are open to new ideas that will allow more citizens to enjoy the blessings of freedom, prosperity and moral renewal.



## How We Differ From Other Conservative Organizations:

1. We seek to update conservative thought. We want to find original ideas on how to bolster timeless principles.
2. We are attentive to the needs of women and minorities. These are not peripheral but are a primary focus of our institute. We want the conservative movement to make adjustments in order to accommodate the unique aspirations of previously marginalized groups. We also want minorities to learn how the conservative movement can benefit them.
3. We are devoted to cultural issues, not just politics. The main battle of our time is to seize the initiative in the cultural arena.
4. We hope to foster a broad alliance with those who adhere to traditional moral principles. We seek to build brigades with individuals of all faiths in order to combat assaults on human dignity.
5. We write policy initiatives, opinion articles and monographs as well as organize symposiums and conferences that appeal to our audience. Hence we do not just think and write: we take action!
6. We do not focus exclusively on one group or on one issue. There are excellent minority conservative organizations across the United States that are currently working in isolation from one another. Instead, we bring these groups together on a variety of issues in order to find common ground and, thus, to be effective in achieving political and cultural change.

## Who's afraid of Michael Savage?

By Dr. Grace Vuoto

Freedom of speech is under assault. Neither from America nor from Britain is the torch of liberty steadfastly raised high above the heads of the real enemies of freedom: the Islamist jihadists who are in a death-struggle with Western civilization. Instead, from both nations, the whimpering policy of mollification emerges. Leaders in America and the United Kingdom are bent on a path of moral equivocation and are offering a sacrificial lamb to quiet the angry Muslim gods: conservative radio talk-show host Michael Savage must be slain on the altar of appeasement in order to quell the violent Islamist storms on the horizon.

Since May 2009, the feisty, combative and often irreverent conservative commentator has been placed on a list that bans him from traveling to the United Kingdom. What was his crime? He spoke—on the air, in America, to the 8 million listeners who are the devoted fans of his daily show, *The Savage Nation*. According to then-British Home Secretary Jacqui Smith some of Mr. Savage's statements are so heinous that he deserves the same treatment that the British government bestows on terrorists, members of the Ku Klux Klan and Neo-Nazis: no entry onto British soil. Mr. Savage's comments are a threat to public security; his words might lead others to commit violent acts, foster hatred and could spark "inter-community violence," according to a press release by the British government. Even the newly-elected coalition government led by Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron is upholding the ban.

Mr. Savage has been vociferously challenging this: he has embarked on a legal battle against Ms. Smith and the British government; he is willing to take the case to the European Court of Human Rights. In Mr. Savage's book, *Banned in Britain*, he reveals British government records that show he is targeted because the home office sought to create "balance" to an enemies list that consisted mostly of Muslim extremists. "We will want to ensure that the names disclosed reflect the broad range of cases and are not all Islamic extremists," said a restricted draft obtained by Mr. Savage in the course of his legal proceedings.

Hence, the real reason Mr. Savage is being vilified has very little to do with anything he said or did. In fact, the British government has not identified which specific statements he made that they find so objectionable. This is akin to the *lettres de cachet* used for centuries in the French legal system whereby individuals could be denounced and imprisoned for serious crimes on flimsy grounds and without the full details of their crimes being disclosed



to the accused. Even an elementary school student in Britain knows that the British pioneered a legal system that was once the envy of the world precisely because it was based on higher standards of proof and prosecution. This begets the fact that the case is not ultimately about speech; it is about appeasing the Muslim community. This is the politics of jihad, stupid.

This new politics of jihad is predicated on the notion that Muslim terrorists are not all wrong—that is, their grievances are rooted in legitimate, historical Anglo-American foreign policy errors. Thus, by picking on Mr. Savage, the British are trying to demonstrate that their concern over Islamist terrorists entering their nation is not a form of ethnic profiling but is an adherence to a larger, impartial justice that can even assail a well-known American personality.

In so doing, the Brits are following the lead of the world superpower under the direction of Barack Obama. Mr. Obama's presidency has been marked by a meandering, inchoate foreign policy consisting of appeasing America's Islamist enemies and alienating our traditional allies. His foreign policy regarding the Muslim world is based on the false notion that if only America apologizes for past errors and shows great humility and respect for Islamic traditions, the scourge of terrorism will be defeated. Thus, in the larger scheme of things, Mr. Savage's individual liberties are merely a casualty of war.

The case of Mr. Savage marks a low point in the history of the English-speaking peoples. Throughout the latter half of the twentieth century, the Anglo-American alliance defended democracy, liberty and free markets against communists and fascists. Yet in the upside down world of 2010, the Anglo-American alliance is in tatters and individual liberty is imperiled.

Winston Churchill, the formidable, ever-eloquent British war-time leader and President Franklin D. Roosevelt taught the European dictators, Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler, that they were no match for Anglo might. After World War II, the Anglo-American alliance even drew a line in the sand against the grasping Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin, halting his grab for territory at the "Iron Curtain" that would divide Eastern and Western Europe until the early 1990s. And following the attack on American soil on September 11, 2001, then-President George

W. Bush and then-Prime Minister Tony Blair again showed the world that America and Britain would act in concert to defend Western civilization from the tyrannical Islamist terrorist organizations around the globe that despise democracy and freedom.

Yet, since he assumed office Mr. Obama has done all he can to render asunder the "special relationship" between the two nations—despite the fact that more British young men and women have died in Iraq and Afghanistan alongside American forces than any other allied nation. In the early days of his presidency, Mr. Obama, resenting the British imperial legacy, returned a bust of Winston Churchill to the British government that had been given to America as a gift; he offended then-Prime Minister Gordon Brown with his inconsiderate gifts and snubs and he angered the British public by incessantly demonizing British Petroleum during the gulf oil spill. A June 9 report in *The London Times* included a poll indicating that 22 percent of respondents in Britain and America said Mr. Obama is anti-British; 64 percent of British respondents and 47 percent of Americans surveyed said he has damaged relations between the two nations. It is no wonder Mr. Cameron recently announced that his country will pull British troops out of Afghanistan in 2015—essentially signaling this will be done, whether America likes it or not.

In war, there is always the danger that in fighting our enemies we become just like them and eventually blur all distinctions. The British are demonstrating that in combating Islamist jihadists, they have lost their moral compass. This ban on Mr. Savage is essentially more akin to the action of a Muslim theocracy than a freedom-loving pioneer of democracy, individual liberty and free speech. In fighting the war on terror, the Brits are now mirroring the policies of their sworn enemy. And in refusing to stand for the right of a free man to speak and travel freely, the Obama administration is endorsing this foolhardy appeasement. Thus, Mr. Savage now stands for liberty against the British jihadists. Their American partners in conciliation are choosing to turn a blind eye to the plight of a law-abiding American citizen instead of using this as a test case to show the world that the traditional Anglo-American way is the more enlightened and noble path.

*-Dr. Grace Vuoto is the Executive Director of The Edmund Burke Institute for American Renewal.*

# Premier Speechwriting and Writing Services



*Eloquence*

Our words captivate and inspire.

At Eloquence, we know the value of the written and spoken word. Words are not simply vowels and consonants strung together randomly. Rather, words are powerful: they are full of life. They can bridge the gap between people of different classes, races and nationalities. They can expand our horizon and lift our spirit. They can unite us, move us and inspire us to action.

At Eloquence, we know that words have the power to make a presentation, speech, Op-Ed or press release a resounding success. Our professional, seasoned writers will help you present your best public self. Whether you are making a corporate or political speech, writing an Op-Ed or creating a brochure, we can craft the perfect communication vessel for you. We tailor every written assignment to your specific needs.

Our skills are varied and unique.

Our imagination is boundless.

And our eloquence will captivate  
your audience...



## Who lost Afghanistan?

By Jeffrey T. Kuhner

America is heading toward a colossal defeat in Afghanistan. Unless there is a dramatic change in policy and leadership, the United States will suffer the most calamitous military setback in its history—one that will mark the end of the American moment, the loss of superpower status in the eyes of the world.

President Obama was correct to dismiss Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal as the top U.S. commander in Afghanistan. No military officer—no matter how capable or high-ranking—should be allowed to publicly disrespect his civilian bosses, especially the commander in chief and vice president. This demoralizes our troops in the field and fosters confusion between the civilian and military sectors of government.

Gen. McChrystal exhibited extremely poor judgment in allowing a reporter from Rolling Stone magazine to gain almost unfettered access to his inner circle. He allowed his aides to shoot their mouths off to an antiwar reporter from a counter-cultural, antiwar magazine. He should have known he was setting himself up for a public-relations fiasco—a showdown with Mr. Obama's national security team.

Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. is mocked. U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan Karl W. Eikenberry is derided as a back-stabbing opportunist. The U.S. special envoy to the region, Richard Holbrooke, is viewed as incompetent. National Security Adviser James L. Jones is called a "clown." Aides close to Gen. McChrystal even admit that he was disappointed with his early meetings with Mr. Obama. Gen. McChrystal's first encounter with the new president was simply a "10-minute photo-op." He is described as saying the president was "disengaged" as well as "awkward and intimidated" in front of military brass in another meeting.

This all may be true. But going public with it put Gen. McChrystal in an untenable position. He had to go. The norms of military culture dictate that one cannot openly criticize—never mind ridicule—superiors.

Yet the dismissal of Gen. McChrystal reveals the profound failure of Mr. Obama's wartime leadership. Gen. McChrystal voted for Mr. Obama. He was the president's handpicked successor to lead the military campaign in Afghanistan. Along with Mr. Obama, it was Gen. McChrystal who formulated—and signed off on—the counterinsurgency strategy



now being implemented. He agreed to the strict rules of engagement, which prevent our soldiers from effectively fighting the Taliban for fear of hurting civilians.

In short, Gen. McChrystal was the president's man: the liberal warrior who was eager to implement nation-building and win the hearts and minds of the population in Afghanistan. He was to execute the post-modern, Obama way of war—transforming American troops into an armed Peace Corps. U.S. soldiers are not to kill terrorists and bomb their sanctuaries. Instead, they are engaged in building roads, ditches and water plants, helping with economic development projects and bonding with the locals. Call it war through social work.

Meanwhile, the key battle for Marjah remains inconclusive. The major offensive of the war—to capture the Taliban stronghold of Kandahar—has been delayed (again). U.S. and NATO casualties are soaring. Afghan President Hamid Karzai no longer believes U.S. forces have the will and staying power to see the war to its end; he has lost trust in America. He is looking to cut power-sharing deals with Taliban factions. U.S. power and prestige is waning not only in Afghanistan, but throughout the region. Gen. McChrystal's frustration is a symptom of gross incompetence—his and, more important, that of the president. Mr. Obama and his team are incapable of winning the war.

Having Gen. David H. Petraeus replace his former deputy as the commander in Afghanistan is an act of desperation. It is Mr. Obama's last stand, a desperate gambit to salvage the war effort by turning to the man who reversed the tide of defeat in Iraq. It is doomed to fail. Mr. Obama is changing the deck chairs on the Titanic—no matter what he does, however, the jihadist iceberg is about to sink the American juggernaut.

Afghanistan is not Iraq. It is the graveyard of empires—a nation whose rugged terrain and collection of disparate warlords and tribes is ideally suited for guerrilla warfare. The vaunted Soviet Red Army was crushed in the 1980s. Imperial Britain was defeated—not once, but twice—during the 19th century. The reason: They got dragged into protracted wars of attrition. Eventually, the fierce, primitive mountains, caves and fighters of Afghanistan wore down much superior forces, slowly bleeding them to death

America is repeating the mistakes of the past. The problem in Afghanistan is not one of personnel. It is one of strategy. Whether it is Gen. McChrystal or Gen. Petraeus overseeing the war is irrelevant. A deeply flawed strategy will fail no matter who is in charge.

Mr. Obama's decision to announce the start of a troop withdrawal in July 2011 has guaranteed the war cannot be won. The Taliban is simply waiting America out; their forces are escalating attacks, knowing that by killing more U.S. troops they will encourage an even quicker pullout. Moreover, the Afghan people have no incentive to cooperate with American and NATO forces because they know once the West is gone, they will be left in the lurch. The Taliban and al Qaeda are not going anywhere, while the Yanks are leaving; thus, Islamist retribution for collaboration with the infidels will be swift, brutal and merciless.

Also, the decision not to deploy massive U.S. airpower and ground troops in neighboring Pakistan—especially the porous border areas along the North West Frontier Provinces—has assured the Taliban a safe haven from which to launch a sustained guerrilla campaign against the West. Until the Islamist insurgents are wiped out in Pakistan, the conflict in Afghanistan will grind on—senselessly, aimlessly, tragically.

Mr. Biden has announced that “many troops” will be “leaving” Afghanistan in the summer of 2011. The administration already has, in essence, waved the white flag of surrender. The United States will leave Afghanistan in defeat—humiliated on the world stage as a paper tiger, a feckless and self-indulgent nation unable to carry the burden of global leadership. This will represent a historic victory for the forces of Islamic fascism; radical Islam will have brought the American giant to its knees—and in the very place, Afghanistan, where the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks were imagined and planned. It will signify the death of American pre-eminence.

*-Jeffrey T. Kuhner is a columnist at The Washington Times and president of the Edmund Burke Institute, a Washington think tank. He is the daily host of “The Kuhner Show” on WTNT 570-AM (www.talk570.com) from 5 p.m. until 7 p.m.*

*-This article was first published in The Washington Times on June 24, 2010. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jun/24/who-lost-afghanistan/>*

## Gen. McChrystal's hot potato

By Joseph Beaudoin

Are we winning the war in Afghanistan?

On June 15, 2009, the Obama administration removed Gen. David McKiernan as Commander of U.S. Forces in Afghanistan and appointed Gen. Stanley McChrystal. On June 23, 2010, President Barack Obama “removed” Gen. McChrystal from that position and appointed Gen. David Petraeus. Hence, in just over 12 months, the United States has had three different Commanders in Afghanistan. Yet, we are told Afghanistan is improving. That simply cannot be the case.

In a recent *Rolling Stone* interview, Gen. McChrystal displayed uncommon disdain for the administration's competence and allowed his subordinates to ridicule key administration figures both in Afghanistan and Washington. In the interview, Gen. McChrystal irreverently asked, “Who is that?” in reference to Vice President Joe Biden and referred to him as “Bite me.” He called National Security Advisor Jim Jones a “clown” who is “stuck in 1985”; said Richard Holbrooke is a “wounded animal” and that Ambassador to Afghanistan Karl Eikenberry is “one that covers his flanks.” The article also notes that Gen. McChrystal's staff criticized the president as being “unprepared” and “intimidated” during key meetings.

Gen. McChrystal thus violated a fundamental duty of all soldiers: to treat superiors respectfully at all times. Everyone, in the media, the Obama administration and the GOP, expressed surprise and profound dissatisfaction with the general's attitude. It is clear to most that Gen. McChrystal had to go, if only to reinforce the chain of command. What is less clear, however, is why Gen. McChrystal was so openly and flagrantly critical of the Obama administration.

Why did a general with 34 years of exemplary military service, a proven warrior who had respected the chain of command all his life, a general who was hand-picked by Mr. Obama suddenly speak out? Why did he do so with his subordinates in the presence of a *Rolling Stone* reporter who was recording their words to write an article about the general? Why did Gen. McChrystal somehow lose his grasp

on reality and allow outbursts of pent-up anti-administration emotions to flow freely in the presence of a reporter for a leftist publication? That simply cannot be the case.

Gen. McChrystal was fully aware that his comments and those of his staff would cause Washington to remove him or give him the opportunity to resign. Either way, Gen. McChrystal was looking for a personal exit from Afghanistan. The hurried departure of a top commander in the midst of combat operations is never good news. We can only conclude that Gen. McChrystal believed that Mr. Obama's Afghanistan war strategy is doomed—that the situation in Afghanistan is much worse than the administration cares to admit and that it is about to deteriorate further.

The unpleasant reality is that Afghanistan has become unwinnable in the way Americans conceive of victory. Indeed, the Taliban will never surrender; there will be no capitulation ceremony and no victory parade. This war has been and will continue—assuming NATO remains—to be a long-term engagement that will go on for at least a generation. Under this scenario, beginning withdrawal in July 2011 is a ludicrous political ploy that is militarily untenable. War, by its very nature, is a messy business that does not neatly fit into schedules—even ones thought up and imposed by Washington.

How then can a general ethically ask his troops to put their lives on the line daily for a noble cause knowing that in July 2011 that cause will cease to be and that troops' sacrifices may be all in vain? The simple answer is that no general can ethically do that. And generals tend to be a lot more ethical than politicians. Unlike most politicians, generals know the cost of war in blood and experienced the sheer horror of combat. Generals, thus, are less likely than politicians to engage in political wars.

It makes no military sense to withdraw before victory unless you want defeat on the field of battle. And it makes even less sense to announce your withdrawal plans over a year in advance. Gen. McChrystal knew that July 2011 will not constitute victory. At best, it will be a milestone of endurance akin to the 10th mile in a 26 mile marathon—sure, it is significant but the race is neither won, nor is it over.

Gen. McChrystal, it seems, concluded that, under

this president, the Afghan mission is less a military operation than it is a political hot potato. Many would have simply resigned. But simple resignation does not come easily to battle-hardened soldiers. A man of duty would need to tell the American people what the administration wanted him to keep quiet, namely, that the current Afghan strategy has already failed.

It seems Gen. McChrystal chose to do just that, at the expense of his military career. The administration is of so many minds on Afghanistan that Mr. Obama does not really have an Afghan strategy. Instead, the administration is just muddling through in Afghanistan as it is with the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico.

Americans have witnessed Mr. Obama's leadership at work close to home, in U.S. territorial waters. They are not impressed with the leadership vacuum

in the Gulf of Mexico, with the absence of an organized response, and with the mantra which Mr. Obama continues to repeat: "I am in charge."

Was it any different in Afghanistan for Gen. McChrystal? And, most importantly, will it be the same for Gen. Petraeus?

Democrats repeatedly accused President George W. Bush of weakening the military by "spreading it too thin" around the world. Those Democrats ought to look into what the confused Obama administration is doing to U.S. military leadership: digging a grave for its own generals.

*-Joseph Beaudoin holds degrees in economics and finance. He has worked in the banking and investment industries for 20 years. He is a contributor to Reflections.*

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org)

[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

## Oliver Stone embraces Hugo Chavez

By Herbert London

In what can only be considered the view of a misguided dupe, Oliver Stone has released his pro-Hugo Chavez film, "South of the Border." The Socialist International (SI), the worldwide organization of social democratic, socialist and labor parties, reports that the oil-rich Chavez is suppressing dissent, interfering with press freedom, mismanaging the economy and destabilizing the region.

One might assume that SI would defend the Venezuelan ruler, but instead this organization argues Chavez is hurting the very poor people he has vowed to represent. Chavez does have his American supporters, such as Mark Floyd, diversity czar at the Federal Communications Commission and Mark Weisbrot, co-director of the George Soros-supported Center for Economic and Policy Studies who also co-wrote Mr. Stone's screenplay. None, however, are as devoted to Chavez as Mr. Stone.

Mr. Stone has directed a festschrift that has only a passing relationship to the truth. He relies on the husband of a Chavez government employee who misrepresents many of the facts surrounding the Chavez government. Mr. Stone neglects to point out the 30 percent inflation rate, the highest on the continent, or the deepening recession brought about by his incompetent management. Chavez has even abandoned thousands of tons of food in shipping containers despite widespread food scarcity. Most noteworthy is the suppression of dissent and the intimidation of minorities such as the centuries-old Jewish community.

Caracas is characterized by a climate of insecurity and fear, conditions that Mr. Stone has chosen to ignore. Chavez has subverted democratic procedures while seizing control of the oil industry, electrical production, steel and construction industries, agriculture, telecommunications and banking. He exercises his power through the take-over of private businesses and manipulation of the election laws, unaffected by modulated criticism.



On the foreign policy front, Chavez is just as confrontational. He has been a leading supporter of FARC, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, and has signed several pacts for the exchange of military material with Iran. At an event for Syrian President Bashar al Assad, Chavez denounced Israel as a genocidal government that is "a common enemy," a murderous arm of the Yankee empire. Statements of this kind and continual harassment forced the head of the Jewish community, Rabbi Brenner, to leave Venezuela.

Yet despite the evidence and the arguments of eyewitnesses, Mr. Stone and Mr. Weisbrot insist the charges against Chavez are "nonsense." They contend that U.S. media have unfairly depicted Chavez as a dictator; oligarch and friend of terrorists, even though Chavez himself defended ties to FARC and military agreements with Iran.

Asked by the *New York Times* to explain factual inconsistencies in the film and the failure to acknowledge fair criticism of Chavez's human rights record, Tariq Ali, another scriptwriter, said, "It's hardly a secret that we support the other side. It's an opinionated documentary." Of course, he could have said it is a propaganda vehicle designed to sanitize the actions of the dictatorial Chavez regime.

This new Stone feature comes on the heels of Mr. Stone's usual anti-American refrain in film after film. According to Mr. Stone, Wall Street is filled with amoral, greedy entrepreneurs, the CIA plotted to kill President John F. Kennedy and the United States deserves to be defeated in war. Never mind that Mr.

Stone has enjoyed wealth beyond the imagination of Croesus, undeserved fame and status for his obsessive conspiracy theories. He is an exemplar of a new breed: the critic who achieves fame and fortune for attacking the government that affords him freedom to attack.

If Mr. Stone were ever successful in achieving his goals, he would put himself in the position of irrelevance. It is a good thing for him that America remains resilient. If that weren't the case, Mr. Stone would soon be out of work.

*-Herbert London is President of the Hudson Institute and the author of the newly published book "Decline and Revival in Higher Education."*

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org)  
[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

## Abortion: The real African American killer

By Loredana Vuoto

The Obama administration would like African Americans to believe that childhood obesity is killing them, literally.

On July 12, 2010, First Lady Michelle Obama spoke about childhood obesity at the NAACP's Kansas City, Mo. national convention. According to Mrs. Obama, childhood obesity must be stopped and is as pernicious to American society as slavery and Jim Crow. Mrs. Obama is so concerned about this gnawing problem afflicting America's youth that she is launching a new initiative, "Let's Move," to help fight this growing disease. The initiative will encourage children to eat healthier by providing nutritious snacks in school and to lead active lifestyles. Invoking the memory of civil rights activists Thurgood Marshall and Daisy Bates, Mrs. Obama implores the nation to stand behind this effort.

Although it may be true that one in three children in the United States is overweight or obese—putting them at greater risk of diabetes, cancer, heart disease and asthma—the epidemic of childhood obesity in America, however, is not what is really killing African Americans: abortion is. Put bluntly, for every three black babies born, two are aborted.

According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), since 1973, the year the Supreme Court decision *Roe v. Wade* legalized abortion, 13 million African American babies have been aborted. The CDC reports that of the approximately 4,000 abortions that are performed daily in the United States, 1,452 of them are performed on African American women. Thus, this accounts for more than one-third of the abortions (35 percent) committed in the United States. But this is rarely addressed in the mass media.

Planned Parenthood (PP) paved the way for the demise of innocent life—notably African American life. PP Founder Margaret Sanger convinced black



ministers, doctors and teachers, including NAACP co-founder W.E.B. DuBois, that family planning, including abortion, would be socially and economically beneficial. Ms. Sanger forgot to mention that her real goal was eugenics and the extinction of the black race. Dating from 1932, *The Birth Control Review*, a PP magazine, had numerous articles by prominent black leaders on the "Negro" problem and the need for birth control among blacks. According to Ms. Sanger, "Colored people are like human weeds and are to be exterminated." In 1929, PP established the Negro Project to "help" African Americans with family planning and other health services. Ms. Sanger believed that the only way to end the "negro problem," as she put it, was to "secure a representative of

colored birth control committee of leading negroes.” In other words, she wanted a “steering committee adapted to the negro psychology.”

PP is the largest abortion provider in the United States, and is not subtle in its goal to destroy the black population. In fact, seventy-eight percent of all abortion clinics are located in or near predominantly minority neighborhoods. This makes it easier for blacks to have abortions; 13 percent of American women are black and submit to 35 percent of all abortions in America.

Since 1973, abortion has reduced the black population by over 25 percent. Twice as many African Americans have died from abortion than from AIDS, accidents, violent crimes, cancer and heart disease combined. In fact, every three days, more African Americans are killed by abortion than have been killed by the Ku Klux Klan in its entire history. Obesity is not killing African Americans, abortion is.

Ironically, African Americans who fought so hard for equality and their civil rights are overwhelmingly pro-choice. Currently in Congress, every member of the Congressional Black Caucus identifies himself or herself as pro-choice. Pro-life African Americans are also absent from our nation’s legislative branch. Among the preeminent charlatans peddling abortion are Reverend Jesse Jackson and Reverend Al Sharpton. Leading African American organiza-

tions such as the NAACP and even religious outfits like the Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice and Clergy for Choice all promote a woman’s right to choose. Unfortunately, African Americans, who historically have led the fight for equality, have abandoned the rights of black infants in the womb. It is these helpless creatures who need their help the most.

A new campaign is needed. African Americans must take a stand against this atrocity that is destroying their own. As abortions continue to callously sweep our nation, ravaging innocent life, African Americans must act to save the vulnerable black babies on the extermination block.

As Mrs. Obama eloquently reminds us, the NAACP was established “to secure those blessings of liberty, to fulfill that promise of equality.” These blessings can only be achieved when the sanctity of life from its inception is respected and the killing of innocent babies ceases. So then, the next time three African American babies are about to be born, let’s pray all three live long enough to have the privilege and right to become obese, if they so choose. Only then will Martin Luther King Jr.’s dream become a reality.

*-Loredana Vuoto is President of Eloquence, LLC, a speechwriting and writing services firm in Washington, DC. She is also the Managing Editor of Reflections.*

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org)

[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

## The Democrat's Hispanic power play

By Clint Condra

Democrats continue to court the Hispanic vote in a desperate gambit to forestall a massive defeat in the mid-term elections. President Barack Obama is attempting to generate energy and enthusiasm among the electoral coalition that brought him to power in 2008 in order to prevent losing the Democratic majorities in the House and Senate when voters go to the polls in November.

In that context, on July 1, Mr. Obama delivered his first major speech on immigration since he assumed the presidency. “We’ve always defined ourselves as a nation of immigrants—a nation that welcomes those willing to embrace America’s precepts,” he said at American University. According to Mr. Obama, there are two categories of immigrants that America has always welcomed: on one hand, there have been those entrepreneurs whose energies have significantly contributed to the national welfare; on the other hand, there have been “the countless names...that never

made the history books but were no less consequential in building this country,” who came here looking for “a place where they could be, at long last, free to work and worship and live their lives in peace.”

Throughout his speech, Mr. Obama implied that to this latter category—the “huddled masses yearning to be free”—belong also the approximately 12 million “undocumented immigrants” currently in the country. He failed, of course, to point out that the huddled masses of generations past were “documented” as soon as they set foot upon Ellis Island. They, unlike today’s “undocumented” masses immigrated in accordance with the rule of law.

What, then, are we to do about these millions? After all, as Mr. Obama mentioned repeatedly throughout this speech, the “overwhelming majority” of them have come here “simply to find work.” In fact, in the view of these desperate migrants, the best hope for them is to risk their lives by illegally crossing the border. Should not the securing of our southern border be our first order of business, then? But according to Mr. Obama, this just “won’t work.”



Instead, Mr. Obama declared that “we have to demand responsibility from people living here illegally.” That is fair enough. But of what does this “responsibility” consist? “They should be required,” he specified, “to register, pay their taxes, pay a fine, and learn English,” all as prerequisites for the granting of citizenship. Yet, given the low-wage labor they perform, the “undocumented,” taken as a whole, would surely receive more from taxpayer-funded entitlement programs than they would pay in taxes. Even more importantly, though, consider what comes first on Mr. Obama’s itemized list of “responsibilities:” they must *register*-i.e., to *vote*. Therefore, behind all the apparent concern for the plight of the “undocumented” lies an effort on the part of Democrats to bring millions of new voters into the voting booths across the land.

In light of this, we must ask *for* whom would these millions most likely vote? Mr. Obama is taking a page from another Democrat who secured a durable Democratic majority: President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He was long remembered as “the great man” who led our nation through the Great Depression, forged the New Deal and paved the way toward victory in World War II, thus branding the Democratic Party as both competent on the world stage and compassionate to the people. Likewise, so would these countless millions remember Mr. Obama as “the great man” who, to use the president’s own language, would lead them out of “the shadows” and into the light of American citizenship. They would surely vote, for generations to come, for the beloved Democrats who helped get them there.

American Hispanics, however, are not monolithic on the issue of immigration, according to The Center for Immigration Studies (CIS), a Washington-based non-partisan, non-profit research organization. A February report titled “An Examination of Minority Voters’ views on Immigration” by Steven A. Camarota, director of Research at CIS, reveals that 56 percent of Hispanics consider current levels of immigration to be too high, 61 percent said that illegal immigration is due to inadequate enforcement, 65

percent said there are many Americans who can do the jobs illegals are doing and 52 percent said enforcement of the laws will encourage illegals to go home. Hence, the legal Hispanics in this nation hold views that are far more complex than the zealous amnesty advocates would lead us to believe.

The mainstream media are trying to portray all Hispanic Americans in favor of amnesty in some form or other. In fact, many Hispanic Americans oppose illegal immigration on the basis of a due respect for the rule of law. *The Americano*, for instance, a bilingual online journal to which prominent Hispanic and non-Hispanic Americans contribute, maintains the following position on the issue:

“*The Americano* believes that the United States can and should have a generous legal and documented immigration policy based on the needs of free markets and quality: a more effective approach in which free markets dictate the kind of professions and the skills our country needs. ...We need to insist on respecting the rule of law, meaning total control of the border and the punishment of employers hiring people illegally. ...*The Americano* believes that no political party should dangle the welfare state as a bribe in an attempt to buy immigrant votes.”

There is much sense in this. The answer to the question what sorts of immigrants with what sorts of skills we seek should depend upon the current national need. How prudent would it be for any country, not less than 10 percent of whose own huddled masses yearn for jobs, to add another 12 million people to its labor force-let alone to its unemployment rolls? But, alas, along the border between logic and contemporary liberalism there stands a great, impenetrable wall.

In essence, this is an attempt by Mr. Obama and the Democrats at a political power play which, if accomplished, would benefit the Democratic Party at the expense of the national welfare.

*-Clint Condra is a graduate student at St. John's College in Santa Fe, NM and a researcher at The Edmund Burke Institute for American Renewal.*

## Gagging the Catholic Church

By Robyn Wethington

Lady Gaga is the latest pop star to seduce her way to fame through sexual “shock and awe” similar to Madonna in the nineties. Lady Gaga’s new “Alejandro” video juxtaposes graphic lewd sexual acts with Catholic imagery to produce a sadistic, sexual video. In the controversial video, Lady Gaga, a Catholic, is dressed in a latex nun habit, swallows rosary beads and then strips to her undergarments, simulating sex with various partners.

Offensive? Absolutely. Sacrilegious? Without a doubt it defames the Catholic Church and the values it holds dear.

The Catholic Church has taken hard hits in the entertainment industry for the sake of “art.” Yet, “Alejandro” is over the top. Why is this video accepted by the greater public? Simply put, Americans don’t feel threatened by the Catholic Church like they are, for instance, by the Muslim community. *South Park*, for example, the infamous animated television series on Comedy Central is best known for its raw, satirical humor that lampoons celebrities, ethnicities and religious groups. Jesus Christ is the latest target of the series’ wrath.

Jesus appears on *South Park* as a supporting character. He appears as a television call-in show host and even fights Satan, where the whole town of South Park bets against Jesus. In season six, Jesus is killed off the show by a Muslim extremist. *South Park* does not fear offending Christians—despite portraying Jesus sacrilegiously. “We can do whatever we want to Jesus, and we have. We’ve had him say bad words. We’ve had him shoot a gun. We’ve had him kill people. We can do whatever we want,” said Matt Stone, co-creator and writer of the Jesus character.

*South Park* does not show Jesus the same courtesy



it does to Muslims. After Islamic threats, the show bleeped out all references to the Prophet Muhammad and covered him up with a black censor block to protect an Islamic tradition that forbids visual representations of Muhammad.

But the fear of offending Muslims does not transfer to Christians—despite the fact that America was founded on Christian values and the majority of Americans are Christians. The double standard continues throughout the industry: *Comedy Central* plans to release a show called “JC,” short for Jesus Christ. According to a June 3 article titled “Comedy Central’s Jesus Show Draws Protest From Religious Groups,” published in the *Huffington Post*, a left-wing American news Web site, “Comedy Central said last month that ‘JC’ is one of two dozen series it has in development. The concept is to depict Christ as a ‘regular guy’ who moves to New York to ‘escape his father’s enormous shadow.’”

“The reason this is considered to be OK is because the Catholic Church is the most visible and powerful, single religious institution on the planet. There is no comparable, unifying force in Islam or in any other religious faith or tradition. [The media] make fun of rich, white, businessmen all the time because no one thinks of them as underdogs,” said conservative commentator and film critic Michael Medved in a recent Fox News article titled “Lady Gaga is Latest Celeb to Abuse Catholic imagery in Hollywood’s ‘War on Religion.’” The article chronicles Hollywood’s trend in abusing Catholic imagery to make provocatively progressive statements. Unfortunately, it is precisely the Catholic Church’s powerful authority—spiritual and moral—that makes it an on-going target for Hollywood.

“Everyone assumes that because I went to such a religious school perhaps they [the nuns] don’t appreciate what I’m doing now. But it is quite the opposite,” says Lady Gaga, suggesting the nuns at the Catholic school she attended approve of her work. It is hard to believe that Lady Gaga believes her own propaganda and that the nuns she is referring to would be in favor of her portrayal of them in her video.

“Alejandro” director Steven Klein told MTV that the video was not meant to “denote anything negative, but represents the character’s battle between the dark forces of this world and the spiritual salvation of the soul.” Regardless, the Catholic Church’s traditions and religious imagery are sacred to Christians. They should not be manipulated or taken out of context in the name of art.

Lady Gaga prides herself on pushing boundaries. But as she pushes the envelope and gains notoriety,

she becomes a very poor role model—especially for those in the entertainment industry. Young stars will look to her success and will feel pressured to partake in obscenity to stay relevant. In an industry where bigger is better, stars will sacrifice purity for fame.

Teen pop star Miley Cyrus is currently the best and most recent example of this trend. She began her career as the wholesome star of Walt Disney’s *Hannah Montana*. Yet she now has a distasteful stage presence, as is evidenced by her video where she portrays a caged, “untamable” bird on exhibit. Also, former Christian singer, Katy Perry, shot to mainstream fame with a song titled, “I Kissed a Girl.” Both of these young girls come from Christian families. In fact, Ms. Perry’s parents are both pastors; Ms. Perry even released a gospel album in 2001 under the name Katy Hudson. Her current raunchy antics are a far cry from her Christian roots.

Artists should be mindful of their heritage, especially if they are Christians. And regardless of their faith, entertainers should not trample on Christianity and mock the very values America was founded on. Artists are becoming increasingly selfish and treating the industry as an outlet for their own commercial gain rather than using their talents for good. Lady Gaga’s tactics are being egged on by record sales; hence the public is ultimately responsible. Consumers have the power to say enough is enough. Let’s make our voice heard and not support such crass artists who trample on the true, good and beautiful.

*-Robyn Wethington is an outreach coordinator for The Edmund Burke Institute. She is also a student at the University of Missouri’s School of Journalism where she is majoring in Strategic Communications with a minor in Political Science.*

## America's education morass

*By Kelly Kathryn Llobet*

The progressive teaching philosophy used in America's education system has damaged our national level of knowledge and thwarted our identity for too long.

A well-publicized textbook battle has been brewing in Austin, Texas and conservatives have finally won. In May 2010, Texas Education Agency (TEA)-composed of 10 Republicans and five Democrats-ratified a more conservative set of guidelines that will be used to educate 4.8 million Texan students. The vote was 10 to 5 along party lines, with all the Republicans on the board voting in favor of the amended guidelines.

For the past few years, board members of TEA have been caught in an ideological debate about what should be taught to American students: conservatives question Darwin's theory of evolution and believe students should learn that the Founding Fathers were guided by Christian principles; a handful of Democrats and moderate Republicans have fought to preserve the teaching of Darwinism and want to uphold stricter barriers regarding the discussion of Christian topics in the curriculum.

Traditionalists laud the ruling and the guidelines after what they say had been an overtly liberal bias in the curriculum during the previous decade. These amended guidelines include for 8th grade U.S. History students, the analysis of Abraham Lincoln's ideas about liberty, equality, union and government as contained in his first and second inaugural addresses and the Gettysburg Address, contrasted with the ideas contained in Jefferson Davis's inaugural address. In middle school, in Government class, students will now examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America and guaranteed its free exercise by saying that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; in addition, this will be contrasted to the oft-quoted phrase "separation of church and state." In high school, Sociology pupils will explain instances of institutional racism

in American society. American History classes will include discussions about the solvency of long-term entitlements such as Social Security and Medicare.

TEA's decision will have far-reaching consequences. Due to the large size of the Texas textbook market, the teaching standards in the Lone Star State are often used by textbook publishers to produce instructional materials for other school jurisdictions throughout the United States. Since California-the other massive market for publishers-will be unable to purchase new textbooks until at least 2014 due to state budget woes, publishers are likely to incorporate TEA's decisions in producing textbooks for the broader American market.

This is a welcome development for conservative-leaning parents and teachers who have seen a progressive socio-political agenda creep into the schooling of America's youngsters since the 1960s. This progressive education is eroding the precious learning time of students which was previously dedicated to essential skills such as reading, writing, mathematics, science and history.

Progressive education has become rampant. In June 2010, the Provincetown, Massachusetts school committee ruled to provide condoms to students as young as six years of age. In that same month, parents in Shenandoah, Iowa were outraged after a mixed-gender room of pupils was instructed on graphic sexual acts during a Planned Parenthood sexual education class. And in Texan textbooks, gender neutral preferences had preempted words like 'man' and 'mankind,' or substituted 'Founding Fathers' for 'Founding Framers.'

Tangential priorities similar to these have left U.S. students ranking 14th in science, 15th in reading and 19th in mathematical literacy, according to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Program for International Student Assessment 2000. For more than 40 years, OECD has been one of the world's largest sources of com-

parable statistics and economic and social data. Additionally, “only 31 percent of college graduates can read a complex book and extrapolate from it,” said Michael Gorman, president of the American Library Association, the oldest and largest library association in the world.

Recently, the National Association of Scholars (NAS) found that 70 percent of summer reading books for incoming U.S. college freshmen showed a liberal bias and are not academically challenging based on the level of complexity of the prose or the density of argument. NAS recommended that colleges choose books that challenge students intellectually and books that are important from earlier eras that have endured for many generations.

John Dewey (1859-1952), considered the father of progressive education, became famous in the 1920s and 1930s for pointing out that “the authoritarian, strict, pre-ordained knowledge approach” of modern traditional education was too concerned with deliv-

ering knowledge and not enough with understanding students’ actual experiences. It was teacher-centered and not sufficiently concerned with the needs of the individual student. Dewey was not a proponent of amorphous education because students often do not know how to structure their own learning experiences. Nonetheless, his classic book “Experience & Education” (1938) did pave the way for generalized vocation training rather than a theory-oriented interpretation of his ideas.

In 1945, one such formal movement, Life Adjustment, began as a result of a resolution offered at a conference of vocational educators. They envisioned a curriculum full of practical pointers on how to get along with others instead of urging college attendance or acquisition of specialized skills. While the ‘Adjusters’ disappeared by the mid-1950s, they and others with similar ideas left effects that echoed throughout other progressive academic movements of the 1960s. This led to a student-centered approach to education and away from the traditional teacher-centered format.

In addition, as a result of feminist ideas, many women in the 1960s and thereafter delayed marriage and became career-oriented; thus women were “freed” from the bonds of the household and were led away from focusing on their children. As a result of the assault on the traditional nuclear family, children spend less time in the arms of their primary educators, their parents, and more time learning about the world at the hands of others. America’s children have thus fallen into the net of the most expansive federal education bill ever passed, titled the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The bill was enacted on April 9, 1965 as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty and was designed to address the problem of inequality in education exposed by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. ESEA funded a progressive education machine that has allowed student-centered instruction to gain momentum. More children are now formed by people other than their parents and often in non-tradition-



al methods.

This has led to an erosion of standards. As a result, America is faltering while China and India advance. Schools in China and India produce four times the number of high school graduates as the United States, and educate these students to a much higher level according to Robert Compton, creator of the 2007 documentary “2 Million Minutes - A Global Examination.” Compared to the United States, China now produces eight times more scientists and engineers, while India produces up to three times as many as the United States. In addition, given the affordability of their wages, China and India are now preferred destinations for increasing numbers of multinational high-tech corporations.

The response to this decline in our educational standards is taking many forms. The United States has seen a veritable explosion in homeschooling, voucher programs and charter schools. According to the National Home Education Research Institute, in 2007-2008 2.0 to 2.5 million students K-12 were home educated, with an increase of five to 12 percent per year. In 2006, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, the three most important reasons for homeschooling were the environment of other schools (31 percent), moral/religious (30 percent) and dissatisfaction with academic instruction at other schools (16 percent). Charter schools have grown in number from 1,297 in 1999 to 5,043 in 2009, according to The Center for Education Reform. Also, a virtual scavenger hunt for conserva-

tive colleges has ensued. In March, Young America’s Foundation, whose mission it is to introduce traditional American ideas to high schoolers, released its sixth annual “Top Conservative College” list to assist students seeking a conventional higher education experience.

Sadly, for our children and our country, the results of progressive schooling have been disastrous. The staple of education for centuries, known as the 3R’s—reading, writing, and arithmetic—have been replaced by the 3 SE’s of self esteem, sexual enlightenment and social engineering. It is time to reduce the emphasis on student-led discovery and social development and focus more hours on direct instruction, written assignments and lectures. We must allow students to succeed or fail based on individual performance instead of engaging in social promotion. We must encourage competition in academics rooted in the 3R’s to develop self-esteem naturally. And we must use class time to cultivate scholarly pursuits and vocations, not condom lessons.

Progressive education has failed. In order for America to retain its remarkable heritage and to remain competitive internationally, we must return immediately to traditional teaching methods. Our nation’s future is at stake.

*-Kelly Kathryn Llobet is a writer living in Baltimore, a veteran Navy spouse and a proud mother of five.*

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org)

[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org)  
[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org)  
[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)

[www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org](http://www.EdmundBurkeInstitute.org)  
[www.EBIReflections.com](http://www.EBIReflections.com)