



My Thoughts On...

The GOP's Hypocrisy on Immigration, Defining "Conservatism," A Middle East "Settlement," and Andrea Yates and the "Drug Culture"

...The GOP's Hypocrisy on Immigration

I just received a "personal" letter from Congressman J.C. Watts (R-Okla.) on behalf of the National Republican Congressional Committee. The letter was naturally asking for money; more than that, though, it contained a survey for me to fill out. The impression one is intended to get from these kinds of mailings, of course, is that the political party/celebrity in question actually gives a rat's rear end about what you have to think.

I suggest they don't.

In fact – and not to pick unduly on the Republicans, since the Democrat Party regularly sends out similar mailings – the mailing I just received from Congressman Watts and the NRCC shocked and angered me. Conspicuously, the survey's first four questions asked my opinion on four specific questions relating to immigration. They were:

1. "Should immigration controls be tightened to prevent suspected or known terrorists and their associates from entering the United States?"
2. "Broadly speaking, should the level of all immigration into the United States be reduced?"
3. "In your opinion, would increasing the number of border agents help improve security of America's homeland?"
4. "Would you oppose a plan to legalize the eight million immigrants currently in the United States illegally?"

Most of you have seen surveys like this. The questions are clearly intended to elicit "me too"-type answers from the target audience; in this case, the NRCC's questions cunningly lead one to believe that the Republican-controlled Congress (and White House) are pushing for just the kinds of immigration control they imply.

But the questions and slant are disingenuous; the GOP-led Congress and the White House have already undermined their purported survey positions.

With strong backing from President Bush, the House on March 12 passed H.R. 1885, the "Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002." When you get underneath the title, the bill contains an effective amnesty for the millions of illegal aliens already in the U.S.

About the only good thing I can say in the defense of individual GOP members of the House is that more than half voted against this measure. Ninety-two Republicans, though, voted in favor; including virtually all of the House leadership. And including J.C. Watts, who is now asking me to believe that he's opposed to an amnesty for illegal aliens.

...Defining "Conservatism"

The term "conservative" has evolved in recent years to mean something considerably different than it used to. Even over the slightly more than two decades of my adult life, I have witnessed many positions taken by conservatives of my youth abandoned, and new policies and positions embraced that the conservatives of two decades ago would (and have) recoil at.

Conservatives used to stand up for American sovereignty; now, many openly embrace the surrender of our destiny to supranational trade and other bodies. Conservatives used to be the ones defending most vociferously America's Christian and Western heritage and values; now, most are pushing for millions more non-Western immigrants to be added to our population.

Even recently, conservative Republicans who swept to victory in 1994 and enabled their party to control Congress for the first time in *five*

decades promised to rid us of the Internal Revenue Service and the Marxist income and inheritance taxes. Since then, many of those who made that promise – and their new conservative president – have not only gone back on that pledge, but have made the Internal Revenue Code more convoluted than ever.

Elsewhere in this issue is a commentary by radio talk show host Chuck Baldwin which some may think a bit too hard-hitting. Those who do are probably life-long Republicans, as is Yours Truly. They likely think that, although George Bush Junior might not be as "pure" as we'd like, he's a damn sight better than Al Gore. And for the most part, that's true.

Heck, I'll even go so far as to say that Bush is a very likable individual. I also think he's sincere and, at heart, considerably more conservative than his father. I also believe he's genuine; the few times I've seen tears in his eyes as you may also have seen, I haven't had to wonder whether they were the "crocodile" variety shed a time or two by his predecessor.

Having said that, though, I feel we must all demand that our leaders – whatever they call themselves – stay true to America, and to our values. It wouldn't hurt, too, for leaders such as Bush to stick to their guns even at times that their political gurus (such as Karl Rove) tell them not to. A case in point is the unconstitutional "campaign finance reform bill" Bush just signed. Candidate Bush correctly campaigned against this pet project of his rival Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) as being violative of the First Amendment, among other reasons. Even in signing it, Bush expressed doubts about whether the new law would stand up to judicial scrutiny. Yet he signed it. How many conservatives are calling him on the carpet and

demanding to know why the president would sign *any* bill he claims to believe is unconstitutional?

It's time for all of us to throw away labels of "right" vs. "left" and "liberal" vs. "conservative" once and for all, and use one underlying principle as a litmus test: is something good for America and her (legal) citizens, and is it in pursuant to the Constitution? No longer can conservatives give President Bush or Republicans in Congress a free pass due merely to a word or party initial preceding their names, any more than *true liberals* cared for or trusted the Clinton/Gore team, which was just as phony to them.

...A Middle East "Settlement"

Under rapidly growing pressure for "doing nothing" in recent months as the Jewish/Palestinian war has intensified, President Bush has finally decided to dispatch Secretary of State Colin Powell to the Middle East to try to broker some sort of "settlement." After all, we all want "peace" for that part of the world, right?

I have actually complimented Bush in the past for not trying to micro-manage the Middle East as did former President Clinton. I think he had at least some sense that he was no more likely to bring a lasting peace to the Middle East than any of his predecessors.

In fact, if there is to be a settlement of some kind, Bush seems to realize that it must involve the defining and recognition of a Palestinian state. This epiphany (to some) has been taken in different ways by different constituencies. Most other nations and their citizens seem to be relieved that, for the first time, the U.S. government has *formally* called for a separate, independent Palestinian state. Here in the U.S., though, opinions are mixed. Most notably, religious conservatives among Christians and some of the more high-profile Jewish lobbies are horrified that Bush made such an announcement, even as he simultaneously demands an end to Palestinian "terrorism." To these folks, it seems that a total Israeli annihilation of Palestinians is the only acceptable result.

Outside these constituencies, the behavior of the Israeli military has not helped the Jewish cause. When Bush envoy Anthony Zinni recently met with PLO leader Yasser Arafat, members of the Jewish armed forces fired stun grenades and tear gas at the media try-

ing to get in closer to cover the event. This isn't exactly the kind of attitude that would endear one with those you want to get your message to the world as well. Not even the FBI and BATF exhibited this kind of behavior against the American (and other) news media trying to figure out what was going on at Ruby Ridge and Waco.

To some, the Palestinians who are sacrificing their lives in the only way they feel they can fight for their own people are "terrorists." To many, however, they are freedom fighters who for more than 50 years have been trying to regain *their* homeland and sovereignty that was wrested away from them by foreign politicians.

On a recent episode of CNN's "Crossfire," Pat Buchanan went so far as to compare the Palestinians trying to rid their land of what they consider an occupying force to the colonists in the late 18th Century using guerilla tactics (what would today be called terrorism) to drive the British from America. As you might imagine, his hosts went hysterical over the comparison; but the lesson was not lost on many viewers.

I could talk much more about this issue; for the moment, though, I'd like to add that I hope Bush realizes that even he is swimming upstream. Before any war – and make no mistake, to both sides that's what this is – can be ended by a "settlement" or by a "peace plan," something is a prerequisite. That something is that one side must either surrender, or be militarily vanquished. Any talk of a settlement without one or both of these prerequisites probably won't get any further than those others since 1948.

...Andrea Yates and the "Drug Culture"

Andrea Yates, the Texas mother recently sentenced to life in prison for the methodical, cold-blooded murders of her children, has stirred considerable debate. Why would a mother do such a thing to her own children?

Much of debate over the answer(s) to that question centered on her alleged brand of evangelical Christianity. An establishment media disdainful of Christians seized every opportunity to portray Mrs. Yates as a fanatic who made a conscious decision to murder her children in order to save them from sin and Hell.

That same establishment, however, has given little attention to some claims

that Mrs. Yates – though she must certainly pay for her crimes – was nevertheless influenced by a powerful force beyond her purported religious views.

Much has been written over the years about the sorry "drug culture" that has permeated much of American society, as the demand for illegal drugs remains uncomfortably high. What doesn't get as much ink is the "legal drug culture" and its effects on peoples' lives. A Houston, Texas-based group known as the Citizens Commission on Human Rights is trying to change that by bringing out facts about the Andrea Yates case that have been bottled up by the establishment media.

The CCHR recently filed a fraud complaint with the Texas Board of Medical Examiners, as well as with the Inspector General of the federal Department of Health and Human Services. At issue is the group's claim – based on information they have obtained from Yates' relatives and medical records – that psychiatrists and others "treating" her over many months before she killed her children should also have to answer for their deeds.

Those included, according to a March 14 press release from the group, alleged violations of federal and state laws and regulations by Yates' doctors. According to the CCHR, Mrs. Yates was prescribed more than the recommended dosage of at least one major psychotropic (mind- or mood-altering) drug. Further, simultaneous prescriptions of several kinds of these drugs caused her small, slender body to build highly toxic levels of at least some of them; these drugs have known side effects including "exacerbation of psychotic symptoms" in the case of one, and "impaired judgement, impaired thinking and aggressive reaction" in another.

Some of you are aware that in a great many of the reported cases of school shootings in recent years (with Colorado's Columbine High School being perhaps the best-known example) psychotropic drugs were involved. Here again, this does not absolve individuals of criminal acts; but can we say that the wanton dispensing of one kind of *drug* after another was *not* a factor? Can the establishment media keep the Yates story bottled up, and again absolve the drug companies of any responsibility when their products help produce the kind of horrible outcome we witnessed? ■

