



The Conservative Underground



Vol. 4 Issue 18

“Printing what they don’t want you to see,
Teaching what they don’t want you to know”

30 August 2011

© Copyright 2011 Individual authors retain copyright to their own submissions

In This Issue:

| | |
|--|-------|
| Why the West Is Dead and America is Dying | p. 1 |
| Worry about China for the Right Reasons | p. 3 |
| America’s “Broadband Miracle” and the Law of Unintended Consequences | p. 5 |
| Economic Suicide | p. 6 |
| Warren Buffett and Ben Stein Speaking in Tongues | p. 7 |
| New York Mayor Bloomberg: “No Prayer on 9-11,” What about Hurricane Irene? | p. 9 |
| Homosexual “Marriage” Is Not a Natural Right | p. 10 |
| Hot Links | p. 15 |

In this issue, Linda Kimball shows how we are fast selling ourselves back into slavery to a new “elite,” while Frank Roche explains what the real dangers are that China represents. Robert Maynard demonstrates yet another way that innovation and free-market capitalism are doing what big-government “solutions” can’t, and G. Bray calls for the government to get out of the economy business altogether. Carla Garrison dismisses class warfare, even when it comes from the self-hating rich, while Joe Clarke wonders what has to happen New York before Mayor Bloomberg figures put what his priorities ought to be. Lastly, Tim Dunkin explains why sodomite “marriage” doesn’t qualify for protection as a natural liberty, and *CU* brings you the best of the web for the last two weeks in our Hot Links section.

Why the West Is Dead and America Is Dying

By Linda Kimball

The death knell sounded for the dollar forty years ago when President Nixon ended the last remnants of the gold standard said Lew Rockwell, chairman of the Ludwig Von Mises Institute. What we need is a free-market gold standard rather than a government gold standard because politicians can’t be trusted. (Lew Rockwell, “[Death of the Dollar](#),” *The Daily Bell*, 8/17/2011)

In other words, without an unchanging gold standard anchoring and certifying a fixed-dollar amount, the value of the dollar is changeable and becomes worth whatever corrupt politicians and the Fed say it is worth. So removal of the gold standard inevitably leads to the devaluation and eventual death of the dollar. The same logic applies as well to basketball, for example. If the foundations (definitive ideas, unchanging meaning and rules) are destroyed, then basketball will eventually die as well.

So the moral of the story is: when the foundations are destroyed, everything built upon

the foundations will eventually wither away and die as well.

The West’s Foundations

The Western civilized world arose to greatness on the wings of Christian theism. For example, the ideal of equality, or “all men are created equal,” is firmly grounded in the Genesis account of creation where it speaks of God the Father creating all men in His own spiritual image, meaning that the living souls of all men, not just some chosen few, are in the spiritual image of God.

In Biblical thought, man is a three-part being comprised of body, soul, and spirit. The soul is embedded within the body, which as inert matter is unthinkable without the soul. The soul both informs the body and is its life source. Man’s third part, spirit, is his noblest part. In Biblical parlance, spirit is the part of man that enables him to enter into relationship with God the Father. Spirit is linked to intelligence, creativity, and sensitivity, and animals do not have this, for being genetically programmed for certain behaviors they have no liberty, no freedom to reflect or be objective.



www.teamlaw.net - "Dedicated to inspiring people to study the actual Law, its History and Language; so we can together save our nation."

The key here is liberty. Man's liberty contrasted against a pre-programmed animal-orientation. It is because man's spirit allows him to access another dimension, which is God's Spirit, that all men - not just some - are free, as affirmed by Paul:

"Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." (II Corinthians 3:17)

In Greek natural philosophy and with pre-Christian Gnostics, and then much later with progressive thinkers like Descartes and Kant, we find the idea that the soul is the divine and eternal principle in opposition to the body, which is bad matter. The pure divine soul finds itself imprisoned within bad matter, alienated from its divine origin. The fall is not into sin but into evil matter, and the methodology of liberation takes many forms. In the words of evolutionary Gnostic materialist Karl Marx, liberation means the destruction of everything (all property) that exists. For occult New Age spiritists, liberation is achieved through successive evolutionary reincarnations. For contemporary Transhumanists, whose lament is that their "patterns of information" are alienated within short-lived structures (bodies), liberation means technological transference of the "patterns of information" into immortal structures such as robots.

In ancient Greece, three-fourths of the population was slaves. In the Roman Empire, half of the population was slaves. According to ancient deities, the majority of humans were subhuman, thus slaves had no rights, no relation to society, none to the state, and none to the deities. Slaves were in most cases accorded less worth than animals.

In this light, it can be seen that the Gospel message was truly radical, and when it began to take root in the hearts of people, ancient pagan "elites" complained bitterly that Christians were turning their world upside-down. How so? Because slaves - the millions of subhuman beasts of burden, human tools, gladiators (entertainment

slaves), and sex slaves who had lived and died in utter despair, anonymity, and grinding misery from the time of Nimrod - were suddenly made equal to pagan "elites;" divine kings, aristocracy, natural philosophers, and privileged citizens. This is the meaning of Paul's letter to Philemon concerning his runaway slave, Onesimus,

"Not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord?" (Philemon 16)

That slaves were brothers was bad enough, but when "elites" discovered that they themselves were sinners who would stand before the Divine Judge upon the death of their bodies, they were both profoundly offended and horrified.

In sum, the living souls of all men, everywhere and over time, are created in the spiritual image of the living, personal God the Father Almighty, and this is both the only foundation of equality, human dignity, and individual freedom, and the reason why the Western civilized world and America in particular, were the freest, most enlightened societies the long-suffering world has ever known. Because there is no other foundation, this means that the death knell sounded for the West as soon as it began turning away from its traditional Christian-based worldview and embracing the progressive canon and evolutionary concepts.

The German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche foresaw this eventuality, and as one with all of the West's totalitarian-minded Progressive God-haters, was jubilant. With the death of God the Father Almighty, the Ultimate Foundation of the West, everything built upon Him will die the death, said Nietzsche. From original sin to judgment, heaven, hell, the equality of human souls, the two sexes, moral absolutes, sexual ethics (i.e., monogamy, fidelity), individual freedoms, property ownership, and the right to self-defense, all will eventually die, once the Foundation has been conceptually destroyed.

In the contemporary West, God the Father has been displaced by divinized global Progressives who imagine themselves as *Homo Noeticus*...the new Olympians. Replacing moral absolutes, norms, and unchanging truths are insanity-inducing political correctness, sexual anarchy, and moral relativism. Displacing equality of souls is “natural selection,” meaning that Progressive souls are more highly evolved than those of Tea Partiers, the middle class, and Christians, which in turn means that “unevolved souls” are subhuman and can therefore be eradicated (aborted, euthanized, starved), used for scientific experimentation, or made use of in other ways by privileged Progressives. In place of the two sexes are polymorphous “gays,” “transsexuals,” and an ever-increasing number of rapacious libidinous appetites. And elevated above “we the people” are barbaric “proles” known today as “special rights groups,” the weapon of mass terror and chaos created and wielded by the Olympians against all dissenters.

We cannot understand what has gone so wrong here in the West unless we see it in this context,

"When the foundation has been destroyed, everything built upon it will eventually wither away and die as well."

Linda Kimball is a writer and author of numerous published articles and essays on culture, politics, and worldview. She is a member of the New Media Alliance, Grassroots.org, and MoveOff.

Would you like to read more of Linda Kimball's essays on liberty and tradition?
Visit <http://patriotsandliberty.com/>



Would you like to sound off on something you've read in Conservative Underground? If so, then send the editor your thoughts or comments at editor@conservativesunderground.us!

Worry about China for the Right Reasons

By Frank Roche

There is a good deal of angst among ordinary Americans when it comes to China: they're hearing a lot about China financing the US government, the strength of the Chinese economy, and impressive growth rates three times that of the US. Americans hear about ongoing outsourcing of American manufacturing jobs, and an increasingly stronger Chinese military.

There is little doubt that China does present a challenge for the American economy and America's dominant role in the world. We have legitimate concerns to address relating to China.

However, it is important that these concerns are put in some perspective that can help Americans sleep a bit better. First, China financing the US government, and second, the size and strength of the Chinese economy.

If you're only source of economic information is the television or *USA Today*, by now you've been sufficiently convinced that China funds the lion's share of US government borrowing, and China's economy is bigger and stronger than ours.

“Without China, America collapses” is about the tone right now among the MSM.

It's not true. The data is available for all to look at. Visit www.treasury.gov/tic, you can see for yourself.

Total US Treasury debt outstanding is approximately \$14.56 trillion (*\$9.9t held by public, \$4.66t US intra-governmental*). China (including Hong Kong), is the largest foreign holder of US Treasury securities at approximately \$1.284 trillion. Doing some simple math reveals China owns 8.8% of total debt outstanding, and 12.9% of debt held by the public.

These are not small numbers, to be sure. But, they do not at all suggest that the US government is uniquely dependent on China to finance our on-going indebtedness. Total foreign holdings account for 30 percent of US debt outstanding. The top ten foreign holders of treasury securities are China, Japan (6%), United Kingdom (2.4%), Brazil (1.4%), Taiwan (1%),

Russia (.7%), Switzerland (.7%), Canada (.6%), Luxembourg (.5%), and Thailand (.4%).

Most US debt is held domestically, with the Federal Reserve being the largest holder.

If China unexpectedly decided to dump their holdings of US Treasury securities tomorrow, assuming no exogenous event, there would be some panic, interest rates would spike, the media would go into a frenzy, though it would not come close to collapsing the US government. There is sufficient demand to buy up China's Treasury holdings.

Why do foreign nationals own our debt? Because we are the United States of America. While we have problems and our system has flaws, it is still the best organizing system for a society compared to all others. US Treasury securities are the safest place to have big chunks of money, and will be for a long time to come.

As for the size of China's economy, don't believe the hype. Last year it was announced that China overcame Japan to become the 2nd largest economy in the world. Some simple math, assuming constant growth rates, indicates Chinese economic output for 2011 could reach \$5.78 trillion, just 38 percent of total US output for 2011 (\$15 trillion). Assuming a constant growth rate of 2 percent per year for the US economy, and 8 percent per year for the Chinese economy, it will take China another 17 years to surpass the size of the US in economic output. Of course, that simple analysis assumes many important things, and extrapolation is a dangerous science. We can rest assured; growth rates for both countries will not be constant for 18 years.

To view the competition on a per capita basis, America shines even brighter. Per capita GDP for the US in 2011 is approximately \$48,231.00. Per capita GDP for China in 2011 is approximately \$5,254.00, just 10.8 percent of the US. China would need annual output to reach \$53 trillion dollars to match US per capita GDP for 2011. If all went perfectly for China, assuming no growth in population, that wouldn't be until 2041.

China could overtake the US, or perhaps not. China has bigger internal problems than we do, not to mention they're a Communist nation.

So, don't worry about Chinese purchases of US debt or the size of the Chinese economy... for now.

You want to worry about China?

Worry about the daily manipulation of their currency to the detriment of the US exporter and worker. Worry about the trade deal Bill Clinton signed with the Chinese in 2000 and the resulting US trade deficit with the Communist nation going from \$83 billion in 2001 to \$240 billion in 2011. Worry about their "mercantilist" trading ways.

Worry about China's ongoing military buildup across the Taiwan Straits for the purpose of assuring that Taiwan is brought back under the control of China when they're ready. Worry about China's massive military buildup and the impact on the balance of power in the South China Sea in an effort to push America out. Worry about China's control of both ends of the Panama Canal. Worry about China's lack of willingness to stop the nuclear ambitions of North Korea and Iran.

You can worry about American elites who look to China as the model for how government can control a society - Communism with a touch of market economics. Worry that China is a Communist country, and the increasing likelihood that the plan by American elites to redistribute our wealth to China so her citizens will throw off the shackles of Communism is going to fail.

As a country, we need to put China in the proper perspective, for she is rising up to challenge America, and she is being helped along by Americans in government and the boardrooms of US multi-nationals. With the right American citizens making policy decisions in DC, we can still assure American dominance for generations to come. It starts with an end to the daily manipulation of the Yuan, trade re-negotiations, and some hard geopolitical decisions.



America's "Broadband Miracle" and the Law of Unintended Consequences

By Robert Maynard

In the midst of politicians clamoring for yet more government-backed stimulus money to be spent on infrastructure projects, it is time once again to consider what economists call "the law of unintended consequences." Often great breakthroughs are totally unforeseen and therefore very hard to plan for. This is one of the biggest reasons why a centrally planned economy does not work. Earlier this year I wrote an [article](#) suggesting that we leave the implementation of "Smart Meters" up to the free market.

In that article, I noted the panic back in the early 1980s when Japan jumped out to a lead in an analog version of High Definition Television. The suggestion was that the government needed to get behind a similar effort if it hoped to catch up. Instead, the American-led digital revolution ended up making the analog version of HDTV obsolete. Fortunately we did not go down the road of subsidizing an approach that new technological developments rendered obsolete.

Our current debate about the need to upgrade our broadband infrastructure is leaving me with a sense of déjà-vu. This time, instead of high definition television, other countries jumped out ahead of America in the adoption of a broadband infrastructure. That America lags behind in this area was seen as an obstacle to competitiveness in an Information Age economy. Once again, the finger was pointed at our relatively less centrally-planned approach to our economy as the culprit (regulations inhibiting such projects did not get much of the blame). The proposed answer in some circles was to have the government get behind more broadband projects. The futility behind this approach was the subject of an article I wrote for [True North](#) last year.

Once again, the development of unforeseen technological developments may be making the proposed government-supported infrastructure projects obsolete. In an [interview](#) with Steve Forbes, economist and hi-tech guru George Gilder had some interesting observations on this subject,

"STEVE FORBES: With all this pessimism around, at least give us one good thing that's happened in the last ten years. You've talked about the broadband miracle.

"GEORGE GILDER: Well, we sure did. The irony about it is this broadband miracle that's happened in the U.S. over the last five years or so was totally unanticipated by the people who wanted massive government programs to lay fiber to every remote farmhouse.

"Instead we had a 553-fold increase in wireless bandwidth deployed over this period — completely unexpected — that thrust the U.S. into the world lead again in communications. It shows these upside surprises that are the essence of capital creativity. Creativity always comes as a surprise to us. If it didn't, we wouldn't need it, and socialism would work. You could plan these great new technologies."

What kind of technologies is he talking about?

"SF: You called them "teleputers" years ago. Now we call them smartphones, tablets, iPads.

"GG: I always said that your computer would not be a desktop machine; it would be as mobile as your watch, as personal as your wallet. It would recognize speech. It would navigate streets. It might not do windows, but it would do doors — open doors to your future. And these teleputers are really the force driving this massive global rollout of wireless bandwidth, which was pioneered in the U.S."

Of course all of this is part of a paradigm shift to what has been referred to as "Network Centric Computing," which some refer to as "Cloud Computing." The focus is moving from the end user device to the network and computing is increasingly becoming more mobile with a significant rise in wireless communication,

"SF: Let's start with the thing called cloud computing, which I guess you've pointed out as Bell's corollary to Moore's Law.

"GG: Yeah. Gordon Bell, who was one of the great figures of Digital Equipment and is now at Microsoft, propounded Bell's Law, which is sort of a corollary of Moore's Law that the number of transistors on a chip doubles every 18 months or so. And he projected this into

Bell's Law: Every ten years you get a hundredfold increase in computing capabilities. And this enables and requires a fundamental change in computer architectures. We're seeing it today in the rise of cloud computing. As Eric Schmidt said, when the back plane of your computer runs more slowly than the network, the computer hollows out and distributes itself across the network. And that's essentially what is under way today, where the actual computing is almost never done or rarely done in the device that you have in your hand or on your desk. . . .

"What it means is that computing power gravitates to its optimal point geographically. And that's the advent of cloud computing. And it's resulted in an efflorescence of creativity and computer architectures, because everything now has to run at the speed of fiber optics, which is the speed of light."

Perhaps it is time for government bureaucrats and politicians at all levels to step back and let the free market work its magic once again.

Economic Suicide

By G. Bray

"And to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake. And be at peace among yourselves." (1 Thessalonians 5:13)

So Premier Hussein says Americans have to stop buying pickups and full-size cars and begin buying his two-seated lawnmowers. Just like his hero Joseph Stalin, he wants to make everybody buy any car they want as long as it is an underpowered black box. If he knew the first thing about economics, it would double his knowledge, since his idea of "supply and demand" is that he demands and we supply. The reason we are in the mess we are in is we have no fuel to put in our cars, thanks to the eco-nazis who dominate our gummit. When you don't have cheap and abundant fuel, you can have no real economy and certainly not an auto industry, and Detroit is the perfect example of this folly.

How many millions of jobs have our liberal extremists cost Americans? When you punish one industry like those evil oil execs flying

in their corporate jets, part of the back draft the rest of Americans are going to feel is the destruction of the auto industry and Detroit. When the exploration and production of our oil reserves are shut off and gas goes to \$4/gallon, that causes people to stop buying new cars. When people stop buying new cars, this leads to the elimination of jobs in Detroit and soon after that you have the mass foreclosures of houses and exodus from the Detroit area. When people lose their jobs and move, this leads to the lowering of tax receipts going into the Detroit city coffers and the collapse of city services. But don't you feel so good punishing those oil executives?

When Obozo came into office, his first objective was to punish the auto execs because of his hatred for them and the auto industry in general. He managed to destroy the auto industry with their usual "hate the rich" routine they have successfully used over the past hundred years. How stupid can one group be to hate the rich so much that they are willing to lose their jobs to hurt the owners of our companies? Now they want to do to the oil industry what they have done to the auto companies, which will actually put the nails in the coffin of our transportation industry.

When the auto industry went down, it helped take the housing industry with it due to the massive bailouts, as well as the layoffs. These layoffs helped speed up the downfall of the housing and mortgage industries, leading to the total collapse of our entire economy. Liberals have no idea how interconnected the different economies are; rather, they believe the industries they hate are independent of the industries they approve. They act like a bunch of gorillas in a china shop destroying everything that gets in their way and leaving a trail of destruction everywhere they go.



[The Liberty Foundation](#) - an investigation into American history to learn what prepared America for our 200 year experiment in Liberty

Now these liberal extremists have destroyed so many industries that they are running out of industries to ruin. Could somebody please tell them, government is damaging their precious earth? It is time to kick them to the curb and get them out of the way so we can rebuild the industries that are still on life support. We need to support all the leaders of our businesses to keep them producing products and profits to add to the economy in any way they can. It is critical that our businesses survive until we can clean the commies out of our elected offices and begin the chore of identifying and eliminating the same in the administrative offices. This will be a tough slog to get through the next 18-36 months until we can turn the entire structure over to a more user friendly, freedom-loving gummit.

Our first step is to educate all of America that every industry is interconnected economically with every other business in America. Even the brain-dead lib radio host on NPR is interconnected to an oil executive, and his salary is directly affected by how successful that oil executive makes his oil company. "This program is funded by a generous grant from Exxon-Mobile." That company's success may add to the amount of grant he gives or taxes he pays so that this brain-dead commie lib can be paid to spew his anti-American rants. He may never figure this out, but hopefully more and more thinking people will begin to understand that we are all connected in a giant mosaic of economic activity so that when one piece of the economy improves it will automatically improve another section and so on. Economically, a butterfly wing flapping in Texas will be felt in New York and vice versa, which is how capitalism works.

Government regulation and taxation is what stops this giant economic square dance. When you have academic idiots like Ohbummer and his clowns who believe in central control, they stop the giant mosaic from interconnecting or affecting industry to industry. They stop oil exploration and low cost fuel development and even worse, they divert funds to boondoggle "green" projects. They stop people from buying the cars or houses they want, and replace these with low profit, overpriced four-wheeled motorcycles or overpriced pigtail light bulbs. They pass regulations that stop the ability to take new ideas to the marketplace or expand established businesses. The number one thing standing between America and recovery is gummit.

Ronald Reagan once said, "Obama isn't the solution to our economic problems, Obama is the problem." To compare him to Jimmy Carter is an insult to Carter, since Mr. Peanut was simply an educated dolt, while Premier Hussein is someone who hates America with every fiber of his being and will do whatever it takes to destroy it. If he left today and we had capitalists replace the entire lot, it will take five to fifteen years to restore the damage he has caused. That said, it is our job and mission to do just that.

We need to remove as much gummit as possible and eliminate the baffles and restrictors the various agencies have put on our once great economy and let this engine breathe. Force the America-haters out and replace them with the majority who love this country and capitalism. Only then will we begin to bring back jobs and vitality to the point we were during the first six years of George Bush or the last four of Ronald Reagan. If we continue on that path of developing our resources and freeing business of the shackles of gummit, we will once again be the "Shining City on the Hill."

Pray for America.



Warren Buffett and Ben Stein Speaking in Tongues

By Carla Garrison

Warren Buffett and Ben Stein, two rich Americans, have recently said "the rich" are not taxed enough. Does this mean they agree with the *New York Times* statement that "There is no economically sensible or politically honest way to

address the deficit without also increasing revenues and reforming the tax code"?

Barack Obama has said, "We are told that the market will correct all of our problems. And that there is no problem that cannot be solved by another tax break that the wealthy didn't need, and half the time didn't ask for. We have tried that way for the last six years - we are ready to try something new."

Buffett, Stein, and Obama may as well be speaking in tongues because to most Americans, taxes (that's what "revenue" means in political speak) are plenty high on everything from consumer goods to income. The issue is whether or not tax increases are the solution to reducing the national debt and a return to prosperity.

Underlying the debate around taxes is the question: is everyone paying their "fair share" toward the fine government benefits we all receive?

The Tax Foundation says that roughly 50 percent of American households pay no income tax at all, but the IRS will give out roughly \$110 billion in "refundable" tax credits this year to households that pay no income taxes.

IRS data compiled by the Tax Foundation for 2009 shows that taxpayers earning over \$200,000 paid 50 percent of the \$866 billion in total income taxes paid that year, or \$434 billion. These taxpayers earned 25 percent of the \$7.6 trillion in total adjusted gross income in the country that year.

In 2009 a great deal of "revenue" was distributed: 21 million households who paid zero taxes received \$27.5 billion in refundable credits from the child credit; Obama's Making Work Pay program gave out \$12.8 billion in refundable credits to 32 million filers; The Earned Income

Tax Credit program doled out \$54 billion in refundable credits to 24.9 million filers; and, nearly 5 million filers received \$3.9 billion in refundable Education Credits and roughly 1 million filers got \$4.65 billion in refundable credits under the First Time Homebuyers credit program.

Buffett feels he and his friends are not paying enough in taxes and in his August 14 opinion editorial in the *New York Times*, "Stop Coddling the Super-Rich," Buffett said,

"Last year my federal tax bill - the income tax I paid, as well as payroll taxes paid by me and on my behalf - was \$6,938,744... But what I paid was only 17.4 percent of my taxable income - and that's actually a lower percentage than was paid by any of the other 20 people in our office. Their tax burdens ranged from 33 percent to 41 percent and averaged 36 percent."

Buffett believes that taxes should be raised immediately for those making more than \$1 million (236,883 households), including dividends and capital gains, as well as those who made in excess of \$10 million (8,274 households) for 2009.

That sounds reasonable, but how to write such precision tax laws?

Mr. Buffett didn't mention the fact that capital gains and dividends taxes are a double tax on corporate income. Before dividends are distributed, U.S. corporations must first pay a 35 percent federal corporate income tax.

Then, shareholders pay the individual tax rate of 15 percent on their dividend income or the gains from appreciated stock. As a result, the combined tax rate of 50 percent is the 4th-highest combined dividend rate in the industrialized world, argues the Tax Foundation.



Renew America (<http://www.renewamerica.com/>) is a grassroots organization that supports the self-evident truths found in the Declaration of Independence, and their faithful application through upholding the U.S. Constitution, as written. Its purpose, therefore, is to thoughtfully and courageously advance the cause of our nation's Founders.

Additionally, in 2008, the roughly 1,900 largest corporations paid \$152 billion in income taxes. This amounted to 67 percent of the \$227 billion in total corporate income taxes paid that year.

Reagan tax cuts helped the economy through the George H. Bush and Clinton years. When Reagan took office in 1981, the top marginal income tax rate was 70 percent and the rich paid 20 percent of all income taxes. He got it cut in half to a 35 percent marginal rate and now the rich pay twice that percent of all income tax.

In 1980 the economy was described in terms of the "misery index" and the mantra was "anybody but Carter."

According to Russ Paielli,

"Reagan eliminated many tax shelters that the rich routinely relied on to avoid paying taxes altogether, forcing them to invest in the free market and actually pay taxes. Shortly after the tax cuts were enacted, the economy took off for an unprecedented period of peacetime growth. The misery index plummeted as unemployment fell, inflation slowed, and interest rates dropped, leading to a seven-year boom that the liberal media cynically dubbed 'the decade of greed.'"

Will more taxes help the deficit?

According to a Congressional Budget Office memo, "if all of the President's budgetary proposals were enacted, they would add \$26 billion to the baseline deficit for 2011. As a result, the 2011 deficit would total \$1.43 trillion, or 9.5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP)."

In August of 2010, The *New York Times* said that extending the tax cuts passed during 2001 and 2003 for another ten years and renewed by the Obama administration "would add about \$3.8 trillion to a growing national debt that is already the largest since World War II. About \$700 billion of that reflects the projected costs of tax cuts for those in the top 2 percent of income-earners."

Even assuming that you agreed that the money other people are expected to earn, even rich people, belongs to the government, the \$700 billion "lost" is only about 0.3 percent of GDP, or one out of fifteen dollars in deficit spending.

Remembering who we are

While we all should in fact pay our fair share of what it takes to reasonably run the country that has been a blessing to not only her citizens but to the world, this argument about more taxes on the proverbial rich always prompts a reminder of a Margaret Thatcher quote,

"The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money."

The *New York Times* writers, Barack Obama, and others may be well-meaning in their attempts to redistribute wealth, but it still looks, smells, and tastes a lot like socialism. That is not who we are.

Most Americans would rather let Buffett give his billions to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation than to the U.S. Treasury, if that's what he wants to do with it.

New York Mayor Bloomberg: "No Prayer on 9-11," What about Hurricane Irene?

By Joe Clarke

On September 24, 2001, The *Hartford Courant* headline read: "Chorus of Prayer in New York – Thousands Converge on Yankee Stadium for an Emotional Interfaith Service; Terror in America: Searching for Answers."

Just two weeks after the deadly attack on the Twin Towers, as I remember, there were people of all faiths and political stripe praying, crying, remembering, and trying to disremember the most devastating attack by an enemy on the shores of the continental United States.

The prayerful patriotism soon wore off shortly after President Bush invaded Iraq. George W. Bush became the liberal media's chief enemy - over and above the insatiable Islamic terrorists - and even more so after it was discovered that then President Bush could not only not stop Hurricane Katrina, he also was powerless in forcing the inhabitants of New Orleans to evacuate, antediluvian.



Now we have Mayor Michael Bloomberg and other east coasters facing another monstrous Hurricane Irene, and they better get it right or they will be as viciously attacked by the mainstream media for ill-preparedness as Bush was. No, they won't. Bloomberg could mess it up royal, yet he will not suffer the wrath of cable or network news folk, especially not Bloomberg News Inc.

Michael Bloomberg has unfortunately announced that, "There will be no prayer" at the 9/11 Memorial scheduled in New York on September 11. You see, Mike Bloomberg is quite wealthy, not that there is anything wrong with that, but typically it is harder with such wealth to *enter the kingdom of heaven*. But, why should that matter when you have the Keys to The City of New York and more money than you know what to do with - but not more than God?

Bloomberg, like many raised in the traditionally conservative Jewish tradition, became uber-wealthy, and then, very lib. He is a fine business and city manager, although a bit on the authoritarian side. He is pro-abortion, pro-gay marriage, and anti-gun. Bloomberg is sort of an Anti-Perry in many ways. He has been very charitable with the billions he has made over the years (one of the few people to make huge profits during the 2008 collapse) and worked his way up from parking lot attendance, which financed his college education. He has some conservative attributes, and he believes in himself, so much, that he engineered the legislation that permitted him to run for an unprecedented (unlawful) third term as mayor of New York.

So, has Bloomberg gained the world and lost his soul? I am not to judge, for Bloomberg has reluctantly confessed in very general terms as being sort of associated with Reform Judaism which believes the Old Testament and Torah are

pretty much irrelevant. I would think that Bloomberg does have a religious edge over George Soros, who has been quoted as saying he is god, as well as the world's richest atheist, Warren Buffett. "If you do not believe Moses, then you will not believe Me." Paraphrased.

It doesn't matter what Michael Bloomberg has been, but will he come to a place where he realizes that he, as well we, as a group, should not be ashamed to identify ourselves as people in need of the mighty arm of the Lord in times of trouble?

As Hurricane Irene bears down on New York City, maybe Mayor Mike and other Eastern seaboard intellectuals will reconsider their proud disassociation from God, and allow for some sort of recognition of the Most High this coming September 11.

Homosexual "Marriage" Is Not a Natural Right

By Tim Dunkin

One of the fundamental truths about the founding tenets of this nation is that our ordering principles – the basis of our laws, our conception of rights, the purposes to which government is supposed to obtain – are built upon the acknowledgement of and respect for natural law. Natural law presupposes that there are absolute standards of right and wrong, and carries with it the necessary understanding that this natural law, far from being the product of random happenstance or social consensus, is instead instituted by the Divine authority of a Creator God who formed the world in which we live, and who ordered its function along certain design that operate at all times. The analog to this in human civilization is that if a society is to be in accord with natural law and its Creator, then society must recognize and order itself along lines that are in accord with the character and nature of the Creator and the "design features" He has inserted into His handiwork, and which are further accessible through the reasoned and reasonable revelation that He has given to us, specifically in the Judeo-Christian scriptures.

This nation was indubitably founded upon such an understanding. It is apparent in the very Declaration of our independence from Great Britain, in which it was declared that our

separation from England and our taking our place among the nations of the world as an independent and equal participant were in accord with the laws of nature and of nature's God. The further declaration, framed as a proposition of fact, that all men are endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights further demonstrates that even at the inception of this nation, respect for the order established by God was foundational to what our nation's political and social system were intended to be.

Some have erroneously tried to argue that Jefferson's phrase "nature and nature's God" is deistic, that the God he had in mind was of the "wind it up, let it go, and forget about it" variety, and that revelation from a rational, reasonable God who instituted the laws of nature was out of the question. This is a silly argument. A deistic God would not be concerned about the just ordering of government among men, or the maintenance of their unalienable rights, if He were retired from the scene and not concerning Himself with the affairs of men, as Deism generally maintains. No, Jefferson's conception of God, while not always orthodox, was not deistic, and his arguments in the Declaration are similarly not so. Instead, Jefferson and the other Founders well knew that God had ordered both a natural world that operated under physical laws accessible to man's intellect, as well as a spiritual basis for man, his nature, and the nature of his societies that also operate under "common sense" rules, affirmed in written revelation, that help to draw distinctions between things like "justice or tyranny," "prosperity or poverty," and "freedom or slavery."

The sense of unalienable rights that our Founders had, and which they affirmed and reiterated in our Constitution, especially the Bill of Rights, was based upon this natural law conception.

For instance, the right of a person to defend his or herself from harm is both naturally reasonable and affirmed in the revelation God has

given to us. It is simply "common sense" that a human being should have the right to protect their own person and family from harm. Such protection is inherent in their unalienable, God-given right to life. It would be unreasonable to try to restrain someone from protecting himself from a criminal or some other mortal or bodily threat. The Scripture, given by the same God who established the natural order of the world, likewise affirms this right to self-protection (Exodus 22:2, Luke 22:36).

Another example would be the right to be secure in one's property and possessions. It is, again, simply common sense to suppose that somebody who has invested their own time, their own sweat and effort, into creating or improving or earning the money to buy something should then be free to use and dispose of it as they see fit. That property becomes an extension of them, since their own efforts were translated into it. Revelation equally bears this out with the Scriptural prohibitions against theft, extortion, fraud, and even the demand for restitution should you damage somebody else's property (Exodus 20:15, 22:1; Leviticus 19:13, Deuteronomy 19:14, Romans 13:9, Ephesians 4:28, etc.) Scripture, given by a reasonable God (and, in fact, a God who gets to *determine* what is and is not "reasonable"), affirms that what seems like common sense to us is in fact also the rational will of this Creator.

Our 8th amendment protections against cruel and unusual punishment affirm both natural law and revelation in that, while there may be crimes that are rightly punishable by the death penalty, even in that the punishments of torture and the sadism that often goes with it are not to have a role in punishing crimes committed by people who still yet bear the image of God upon them. Even the vilest criminal still bears the stamp, however marred by sin, of his Creator – and that is to be respected. A man is not an animal, and is not to be treated like one.



Worth Reading

Motto: The bigger the government, the smaller the citizen...



And so on. When we affirm that our nation was founded upon a Judeo-Christian basis, this is necessarily true, because that is the only tradition which really and truly concerns itself with the tenets of natural law. Eastern religions do not do so, because they reject the personal Creator, subsuming His work into a pantheistic or panentheistic morass. Islam does not do so – Allah is an arbitrary and capricious god whose actions do not follow any self-imposed standards of holiness, and therefore the societies in which Islam rules are arbitrary and capricious in their ordering and nature. Radically secular, humanist societies reject natural law for the subjective rule of man – and have shown that when man becomes the measure of all things, man becomes a monster. Only in the Judeo-Christian tradition has there been the respect for the individual that comes with viewing each of us as beings made in the image of a rational God who gave us rational minds to understand and do His will by the various means which He has used to reveal it. It is only in nations where that tradition has been influential and pervasive that we have seen concepts such as “freedom,” “individualism,” “the rule of law,” and “ordered liberty” take root as integral parts of the culture of the people.

As our society has drifted from these founding bases, however, we have seen a differing view of “rights” begin to take root. The “long march” of the Left through our institutions has resulted in social chaos, largely because the concept of natural rights is being replaced by the subjective concept of rights as originating from the consensus of society. Ultimately based upon the “general will,” a political idea developed by Diderot and expanded by Rousseau, the belief of those who understand rights to exist by social consensus is that these rights are not inherent to human beings by any natural law, but exist only because they are expedient to society as a whole. The natural corollary to that is that something that becomes “inexpedient” to society can cease being a right, and when society decides to “expand” its conception of “rights” to something not previously considered as such, then it becomes a right. “Social justice” becomes the expression of liberty, and “positive liberty” (the idea that you have a right TO certain things such as, for instance, health care or affordable housing) replaces natural law as the means by which society is to be ordered.

Because “social rights” theorists and believers *want* society’s ideas about rights to be malleable so as to fit the proclivities of those who

take control, they completely reject the notion of natural rights originating from a Creator God who established absolutes of right and wrong, and Who did so prior to the institution of governments and societies. For the Left, government – the “theoretical” expression of the “general will” of the people, even though in practice this is never the case (how many of those “people’s republics” actually were built upon what “the people” wanted?) – becomes the giver and taker of rights. Unfortunately, there are even some on the Right, especially among the more stridently secularist versions of libertarianism, who also reject the natural rights idea and replace it with a belief that rights are granted within and only by society, though these do not take the idea to the extremes that the Left does. One example of this would be Robert Bork, who rejects natural rights as a basis for unalienable liberties.

It is from this angle, then, that we find the institution of marriage under attack by the radical homosexual agenda and its purveyors. For nearly a decade, the homosexualist movement has been at work foisting off their agenda onto a largely unwilling populace. Their efforts to codify homosexual marriage via the ballot box have been defeated in numerous states, including Blue states like California and Maine. They have waged campaigns of violence and intimidation against their political opponents. Until New York earlier this month, the only success they had in enforcing their version of marriage was by using sympathetic judges to impose it on states that had already rejected it. Even in New York, one questions whether the crossover Republicans who switched their votes at the eleventh hour were really representing the wishes of their constituents back home, or were instead representing the interests of the leftist “ruling class” types who use money and power to intimidate politicians into toeing their line. Now, even our erstwhile “pro-marriage” President, who told us that he was against homosexual marriage (even though we all knew he wasn’t) has come out in favor of repealing the Defense of Marriage Act.

Some effort has been made by the homosexual lobby to find a “natural” basis for their perversion. There has been the often-remarked-but-never-seen “gay gene” hypothesis which continues to be floated in public discourse, despite having zero scientific backing whatsoever. Attempts have been made to find physiological difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals, but once these were peer-reviewed

by actual science, no differences could be maintained. So, the default position is to simply argue that because society is “evolving” (perhaps “degrading” would be a more accurate term), we need to evolve with it and recognize that homosexuals should have a right to marry each other.

No. Natural law is natural law, not subject to change by human “ingenuity.” Trying to do so will merely result in chaos and destruction.

Homosexual marriage is not a natural right. It cannot be, first of all, for the simple fact that it is not natural. It is “common sense” that men and women would engage in sexual relationships with each other. The regulation of these relationships within the bonds of marriage is established by the revelation of Scripture, and is affirmed by the reasonableness of the natural order. When the passions of mankind are constrained within an institution that directs these passions into positive, constructive ends – building a home, raising and providing for a family, training up the next generation – and away from negative, destructive ends – wildcatting around, no financial or emotional stability, disorder caused by sexual competition and jealousy – then stable social systems can be maintained, along with all the good things like education, prosperity, technology, and the rest that come about as a result of social stability. To see this in action, just look at the differences within our own nation. Which tends to produce more stable and productive

citizens who contribute to our society in a positive way – the stereotypical “nuclear families” where there is a father and mother in the home, raising the children with love and discipline, or the situation we see in our urban areas where the large majority of children being born do not even know who their fathers are, and who grow up wild and uncontrolled except by an increasingly heavy-handed criminal justice system? The answer is obvious.

So, marriage is a right because it is natural. Society benefits when men and women bond monogamously to raise children and devote themselves to each other. The obvious naturalness of heterosexual marriage is even testified to by the simple facts of anatomy. Men and women can procreate. Men and men, or women and women, cannot. If you take fifty men and fifty women, drop them on a desert isle, and come back a hundred years later, you will find thousands of their descendants filling the land. If you take one hundred homosexual men or one hundred lesbians and do the same, you will come back and find nobody there, because they all died of old age and had no means of reproducing themselves. Heterosexual marriage fits the natural and Scriptural order. Homosexual “marriage” does not.

Homosexual marriage is also not a natural right because it is intrinsically not “right.” Nobody has the right to harm others. Yet, homosexuality is a harmful behavior. It is obviously harmful to its practitioners – the clinical evidence for all manner of psychological and physical problems created by acting on homosexual impulses is well established. Homosexuality is destructive to self because it uses the human body in ways that it simple was not intended to be used by nature and nature’s God. Homosexuality is also, however, more likely to be harmful to others who do not practice it. Let’s not forget that the threat to our blood supply presented by AIDS largely exists because of the tendency within the homosexual community to practice unsafe, unprotected sex with multiple partners (one study reported up to 53 different partners a year, *on average*). Despite the cries of outrage that usually accompany when pointed out, homosexuals are statistically much more likely to be involved in pedophilia and child abuse. Historically, some of the most violent societies, both internally and externally, were also practitioners of adult male homosexuality, especially. Simply put, it is a lifestyle choice that

TEN MYTHS ABOUT ISLAM

Learn the Truth About Islam

- How did the Qur’an *really* come to be?
- Is Allah *really* the God of the Bible?
- Is violence in Islam *really* just for fringe groups?
- Was Mohammed *really* a prophet?

Find the answers to these questions and more! To read this book online, visit

http://www.studytoanswer.net/islam_myths.html

lends itself to violence, degradation, disease, selfishness, and exploitation. As a result, those who practice it may not only harm themselves, but are more likely to also harm others. One does not have the right to that. Yet, if a homosexual keeps his degradation to himself, then it remains only his business and the business of those he participates with consensually – as I’ve said before [elsewhere](#), freedom includes the right to do things that harm yourself so long as you don’t harm someone else in the process.

However, when we’re talking about marriage, we’re talking about a God-ordained and socially beneficial institution that serves to corral in mankind’s destructive tendencies to the degree that it is respected and held sacrosanct. That makes it more than just a private act between two people. That makes it of social interest, as well. And therefore, we have the prerogative to choose not to allow homosexuals to abuse this institution that fills the natural order. Some might argue to the contrary that homosexual marriage is no worse an abuse of marriage than are the many ways in which heterosexuals have degraded the institution. That’s no argument for homosexual marriage, however. If Britney Spears and those like her make a mockery of marriage by treating it flippantly and getting a divorce 48 hours after a sham marriage, then the answer is not to allow homosexuals to also mock marriage. The answer is to delete the various methods available, such as no-fault divorce and the like, that serve to denigrate it. If nothing else, people will realize that they need to exercise a little personal responsibility to maintain a marriage they now can’t nullify at the drop of a hat.

The homosexual movement cannot claim to simply be asking for freedom, given the way they have conducted themselves over the past decade. They’ve stalked, vandalized property, and physically assaulted people who disagree with

their agenda. They’ve threatened to come after people who contributed to pro-marriage groups. They’ve used unelected judges to impose their agenda onto states and localities that wouldn’t go along with it by the usual democratic methods. They’ve used these same judges to overturn the will of the people numerous times after the people voted “the wrong way.” They’ve have used and are using the courts to overturn the private property and freedom of association rights of private business owners, such as the staunchly Catholic owners of the Wildflower Inn in Vermont, who [are being sued by the ACLU on behalf of a couple of lesbians](#) for whom the inn refused to rent space to for a “wedding.” So much for those “freedom of conscience” clauses that the lefties are always assuring us will be included in the next pro-homosexual agenda legislation, eh? This isn’t the first time that homosexuals have used the courts to force unwilling business owners to cater to their proclivities, either.

Sorry, but you can’t do all this, and still claim to simply be “wanting freedom.” No. You’re forcing your agenda down everybody else’s throats – and everybody else has a right to push back on it.

In summary, homosexual marriage, along with a great many other things that the Left has and continued to try to impose onto us, cannot be considered a “right” under the system of natural law that our Founders believed in and based this nation upon. This is, of course, why the Left has made such a concerted effort to remove that underpinning, by attacking the Judeo-Christian heritage of this nation, and by trying to shift us over to a social justice/positive rights/subjective social rights framework. If this nation is to return to what it was and become what it should be, then the homosexual agenda, like the rest of the broader revolutionary socialist agenda, must be fought, defeated, and thrown back.



“Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery.”

Hot Links

[Yes, It Is a Ponzi Scheme](#), by Michael Tanner – Do you ever get the feeling that if it wasn't a government agency, the people running the Social Security Administration would be sitting in a cell next to Bernie Madoff? Rick Perry was absolutely right – Social Security is one big, giant Ponzi scheme that the government *forces* us to participate in, and Tanner shows us exactly how this is the case. Seriously, some of the numbers he cites are truly scary, and are entirely unsustainable in the long run.

[God Truly Has Shed His Grace on Thee America](#), by Felicia Benamon – A great article that really cuts to the spiritual heart of the matter regarding America's woes. What she has to say won't be popular – even with a lot of “conservatives” who are of the “fiscal issues only” persuasion. God is still on the throne, and America is not bigger than He is, and if Americans don't get themselves right with Him, we can expect our country to continue to collapse, regardless of who gets elected. And whether a lot of the more libertarian types like it or not, *God* cares about gay “marriage” and abortion, even if they don't.

[Race and Economics](#), by Walter E. Williams – Written by one of the smartest Americans alive

today, this article details the reasons why unemployment and other economic problems so disproportionately affect black Americans. As you might have guessed, big government meddling, going all the way back to the first New Deal-era minimum wage laws, is a huge contributing factor. It's eye-opening to think that there was a time, back before big government intervention and economic “help,” when black Americans had a higher overall employment rate than whites, and were generally out of a job for shorter periods of time than whites were. Yet another way in which the Democrat Party has been the unrecognized bane of blacks in this country.

[Feeling Green? Obama Approved Solar Company to Declare Bankruptcy](#), by Katie Pavlich – Remember how Obama and the Democrats told us that “green” jobs were the wave of the future, that the economy was going to be saved by these millions upon millions of jobs that were going to be created to make solar panels and electric cars and geothermal-powered robotic unicorns and whatnot? Well, it looks like one of Obama's showpiece solar panels plants has become the next shovel-ready project, as in, “bury it and move on.” It ain't easy bein' green – even when you're receiving millions in taxpayer-funded subsidies apparently.

| |
|--|
| <p>“Every friend of freedom must be as revolted as I am by the prospect of turning the United States into an armed camp, by the vision of jails filled with casual drug users and of an army of enforcers empowered to invade the liberty of citizens on slight evidence.” - Milton Friedman</p> |
|--|