

## Misunderstanding Both Lincoln and Basic Economics

By David Gordon

Mises.org

February 24, 2024

TCMC PACKET

MARCH 25, 2024 (1)

*Our Ancient Faith: Lincoln, Democracy, and the American Experiment*

by Allen C. Guelzo

Alfred A. Knopf, 2024; 247 pp.

Allen Guelzo has been carried away by Abraham Lincoln's magniloquent rhetoric. Guelzo, a historian who has written a number of books about Lincoln, would like very much to believe that his hero was a champion of individual rights and economic freedom. Lincoln's ideal for America was of a nation with a large number of small businesses, allowing people to work independently of domination by others. Slavery was the supreme denial of this ideal and, as such, abhorrent to him. In a phrase Guelzo often repeats, Lincoln wanted an America with "neither slaves, nor masters." In this America, blacks would have the same citizenship rights as whites.

Further, Guelzo claims, the complaints against Lincoln from his detractors are wrong. During the War between the States, he did not act as a dictator, ruthlessly suppressing opposition; to the contrary, he acted with caution, anxious to avoid violating the Constitution. Guelzo has done me the honor of quoting me, but I was wrong to draw a parallel between Lincoln and his slightly younger contemporary, Otto von Bismarck. Unlike the great German Chancellor, Lincoln was not a "ruthless manufacturer of a modern *Wohlfahrtsstaat* (welfare state)." He did, however, realize that secession was a principle of anarchy: constitutional democracy could not survive if it was allowed. Moreover, his military action against the South was a response to its violent insurrection and rebellion. One suspects that he would agree with Edward Everett, who in his oration at Gettysburg in 1863 spoke of the secessionist leaders as "bold, bad men."

Guelzo has the merit of raising a fundamental issue, but it is one about which he is mistaken. He thinks that a "democratic order cannot survive if large parts of society conclude that they will walk away whenever they are displeased with the result—or, in this case, not even walk away, but assault federal property (namely, Fort Sumter)." The obvious question to ask Guelzo is "Why can't it survive?" Wouldn't the "democratic order" remain as it was before the secession but with less territory? If the response is that people could secede from the smaller state, what is wrong with that? If Guelzo thinks that it's bad that states fall below a minimum size, and—as I don't believe—he's right, why wouldn't those who contemplate secession be deterred from doing so by its bad consequences?

So far as Lincoln's devotion to freedom is concerned, Guelzo is constrained to admit:

What Lincoln seemed to find most objectionable about Southern demands to admit slavery to the rest of the western territories was not their racial tyranny, but the likelihood that legalizing slavery would cut off access to those territories . . . for white farmers who would not be able to rival the economies of scale enjoyed by slave-gang labor. . . . He certainly had no desire in the 1850s to tamper with slavery in the existing slave states. Although Lincoln had often repeated his hope for the "ultimate extinction of the institution," he clarified "ultimate" to mean somewhere off in the far, far distance.

So far as the reference to the 1850s is concerned, it should be noted that, as Thomas DiLorenzo has shown, Lincoln not only endorsed but was a behind-the-scenes promoter of the Corwin Amendment, which would have locked into the Constitution a guarantee against interference with slavery in the states where it already existed.

② Guelzo also agrees with DiLorenzo that Lincoln was a devoted disciple of Henry Clay and his "American System," though the two authors look upon this from very different perspectives. Lincoln sought to build up industry through supporting "internal improvements" and tariff protection for products he favored; this "support" was frequently characterized by corruption. Guelzo notes that the Jeffersonians opposed these measures, but he presents the clash between them and the supporters of the American System in a misleading way. As he sees it, the Jeffersonians hated industry and cities, preferring "neo-feudal agrarianism" to the urban democratic culture, where every man had a chance to get ahead. The real contrast lies elsewhere, between those who thought that economic development—whether industrial or agricultural—took place better through the free decisions of individuals and those who thought it took place better through control by the state.

Guelzo fails to see that answering the question of economic development requires the study of economic principles, such as the law of comparative advantage, which are the discoveries of a value-free science. He instead looks at the tariff issue as a contrast between the agricultural and industrial "interests." America needed tariffs to build up its nascent industries until they could fend for themselves. Britain, which had already built up its industrial might, rightly repealed the Corn Laws. "In both cases, the strategy was aimed at a hostile and reactionary agrarianism." Our confidence in Guelzo's knowledge of the history of economic thought does not increase when we read, "Herndon identifies John Ramsay McCulloch, rather than [Adam] Smith, as one of Lincoln's models, which is odd, since McCulloch followed the lead of David Ricardo and particularly questioned any labor theory of value." Both Ricardo and McCulloch were strong proponents of the labor theory of value.

Although Guelzo has read very widely, his knowledge of philosophy is often deficient and his arguments unsound. For example, he says:

The Enlightenment began as a scientific revolt against the hierarchical notions of the physical universe as taught by Aristotelian scholastics. Rather than seeing all objects imbedded in a "great chain" of occult relationships that stretched from the base earth to the spotless heavens, all those relationships now appeared in the testimony of Galileo and Newton as individual entities, in no necessary order or relationship to each other, and moved only by measurable and predictable natural forces.

What is supposed to be the inconsistency in believing both that objects are governed by occult relationships and that individual entities are governed by measurable and predictable laws? Newton believed both. Far from thinking that individual entities are governed "only" by mechanical relationships, he thought that God needed to intervene in the solar system from time to time and that absolute space was God's sensorium. It's quite true that later physicists don't hold these views, but nevertheless Newton did, and this did not prevent him from being rather good at science.

Immanuel Kant is a notoriously difficult writer, and there are many conflicting interpretations of his thought. For this reason, we should judge what Guelzo says about him charitably, but even if we do so, we cannot avoid the conclusion that he does not know what he is talking about. He says:

Reason had no greater admirer than Immanuel Kant, and yet even Kant warned that reason made mistakes that experience did little to correct. The reasoning mind could deal only with the appearances of things, not the things-in-themselves, which required an entirely different way of knowing, apart from reason. . . . However, Kant believed, tools did exist with which to penetrate and apprehend those underlying realities; one was criticism, another was intuition.

Kant most assuredly does not believe that human beings can obtain knowledge of things-in-themselves. He does think that the moral law, the product of "pure practical

reason," makes it rational to postulate God, freedom, and immortality, but this does not amount to knowledge, which for human beings is limited to the phenomenal world. I don't know what Guelzo could mean by saying that "criticism" enables us "to penetrate and apprehend these underlying realities"; a main project of the *Critique of Pure Reason* is to show that human beings do not have such knowledge. Human beings do not know things-in-themselves by intuition; only God has an intellectual intuition of things-in-themselves.

3

If anything, Guelzo's account of John Rawls is even worse. He says that Lincoln's second inaugural address "was not Rawlsian relativism. He [Lincoln] was inviting, not the descent of a veil of ignorance about the right or wrong of slavery, but a pure confession of guilt from the limited, stumbling, blind, and wrong-headed folly of all parties." Later in the book, Guelzo says that "Rawls believed that 'deeply opposed though reasonable comprehensive doctrines may live together and all affirm the political conception of a constitutional regime' because no questions of that nature were really of compelling significance . . . he [Lincoln] could not tolerate indifference to slavery itself."

This is risibly inept. Rawls wouldn't count a comprehensive doctrine that accepted slavery as reasonable. All of the reasonable doctrines are supposed to converge on accepting Rawls's two principles of justice—the first of which, the liberty principle, excludes slavery. There are many excellent reasons to reject Rawls's theory, but Guelzo's ludicrous misrepresentations of it aren't among them.

Let us return from philosophy to Lincoln bashing. Our principal grievance against Lincoln is that he was responsible for a horrendous and destructive war that could have been averted had he accepted peaceful separation. Lincoln spoke of "malice toward none" and "charity for all," but his actions belied his words.

**Note:** The views expressed on [Mises.org](http://Mises.org) are not necessarily those of the Mises Institute.

---

## A Palm Sunday poem

In Slavic lands the willows grow  
By streams and bogs and waters low.  
The ancient Slavic peoples saw  
That willows bloom before the thaw,  
When warm winds end the frigid cold,  
And break at last the winter's hold  
To greet the spring and celebrate  
The vernal advent's advocate  
Of growth renewal life and light  
And set the cosmic order right.  
  
The Slavic peoples gathered in  
The flowering willow branches in  
Their homes to decorate anew  
To cure their ills their lives renew.  
Then one day there came from far,  
A new religion which would bar  
The grasp of ancient evils' hold  
Upon the Slavic souls as told  
By True Glory's saving creeds  
To grant men life and serve their needs.

The Word Made Flesh who lived and died  
And rose again as verified  
By Holy Writ and voices old  
Who testified as was foretold.  
  
Christ is risen from the dead  
And by His death as truly said  
He trampled death and life He gave  
To those who lie within the grave.  
  
And thus the lowly willow came  
The Resurrection to proclaim  
Bear witness to the Great Event  
For which the Holy One was sent.  
  
So when the cold of winter ends  
The message that the willow sends  
And that the flow'ry branches say:  
NEXT WEEK IS RESURRECTION DAY!

# “Where Are We Going To Get The Money?”

March 7, 2024

THE WANDERER

One of my first introductions to politics was the story of Rep. Robert Fleming Rich, a Pennsylvania Republican of whom my father, a Democrat, was very fond.

Mr. Rich, who served several terms in the House of Representatives both before and after World War II, became famous — and wildly popular — during the years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal due to a simple question, which he insisted on asking on the floor of the House of Representatives every time a new spending bill was taken up.

“Where are we going to get the money,” he would roar. It was such a constant refrain that the other members of the House would often join in like a chorus — alas, in jest: They knew where they were going to get the money, they were going to print it. The people would be none the wiser when the bill came due, in terms of the inflation that made the suffering of the Depression even harder on the poorest of the poor.

After all, hadn't FDR seized all the gold held in private hands and reduced the value of the dollar by 40 percent, raising the price of gold from \$20 to \$35 dollars, by executive fiat? Heck, by that measure, Joe Biden is a piker: he's only reduced the value of the dollar by 20 percent since he took office three years ago. Let's give him four more years so he can cut it twenty percent more, so Catholic Joe can go for the gold!

[Note: the spot price of an ounce of gold today is \$2043.70, in case you're wondering. The dollar today is worth less than one cent was 100 years ago.]

In the 1930s, Rep. Rich had a colleague in the House whose name many of us still remember: He was Everett McKinley Dirksen, the Republican from Illinois whose career in the House and the Senate spanned the early 1930s through the late 1960s. Dirksen was quite a word-smith as well as a savvy observer of reality, including economic reality. He served through the Depression and the New Deal, three wars, the Kennedy assassination, and the adoption of Lyndon Johnson's “Great Society” (which he opposed vigorously, warning that it would bring on inflation and social chaos — which it did, of course).

Dirksen's wisdom resonates that of Mr. Rich: observing the continual growth of the federal budget, and the corresponding rise in the national debt and its burden not only on taxpayers, but all Americans, he quipped, “A billion here, a billion there, and pretty soon you're talking about real money.”

“Ev” Dirksen died in office in 1969. For the next ten years, the country was a mess.

By CHRISTOPHER MANION

## Enter Ronald Reagan

In 1981, President Ronald Reagan aimed to restore responsible government economic policy at home and win the Cold War abroad. He had a strong mandate and broad public support, but he ran into an obstacle that was dead-set against him.

That obstacle was the Democrat Party, personified by Tip O'Neill, Speaker of the House of Representatives. O'Neill was an old timer, having succeeded Rep. John F. Kennedy in Massachusetts' 11th house district in 1953. He was elected as the speaker of the House of Representatives in 1977, and was as wily and corrupt as Lyndon Johnson ever was.

Learning from LBJ, O'Neill's Democrats had reigned supreme, first under LBJ and then under the disastrous debacles of the 1970s. O'Neill had power and he wasn't afraid to use it. Power was his focus, and Reagan and the Americans he represented were the enemy.

Moreover, O'Neill had the solid support of the permanent bureaucracy that had been exploding since the mid-1960s, as well as the Democrats and liberal Republicans whose tax hikes and spending were feeding it. The nourishing and expanding of that bureaucracy was the highest priority of Tip O'Neill.

Ronald Reagan's highest priority was freedom, its preservation at home and its victory abroad. His goal in the Cold War was simple: “We win.”

In the 1970s, O'Neill had become increasingly antiwar; for him, an ultimate victory over Communism was an illusion. So, when he met with Reagan, he agreed that yes, his Democrat majority would agree to fund the revitalization of America's defenses in this confrontation with the Soviet Union, but it would cost him.

Reagan had been elected on a platform that would have renewed the principles of self-reliance and liberty at home, but O'Neill's Democrats would have none of it. LBJ's welfare state had just begun to bloom, and the growth of government and the budgets that it required bloomed alongside. No matter that those programs bred indolence, entitlement, and resentment: The poor must be kept poor and the bureaucracy most grow.

Reagan's plan for victory would get its money, but the Democrats wanted theirs.

And they got it. I was in the room with a handful of conservative senators when word came that Reagan had agreed to authorize a budget that would raise the national debt to over \$1 billion for the first time in history. Dismay prevailed

among conservatives, but O'Neill's Democrats gloated. They didn't care whether the Soviets won or lost — they had gotten their payola.

As if that weren't bad enough, Reagan faced another challenge: His own government's defense, intelligence, and diplomatic communities had already written off the possibility of American victory. Too many lifetime bureaucrats considered the former actor to be a “political appointee” who needed to, in the words of one state department bureaucrat, be “educated in the intricacies of foreign policy.”

Educated by whom?

The career bureaucracy, of course. Better known today as the “Deep State.”

Today Reagan's winning policy of “Peace Through Strength” lies abandoned by the side of the road. Now it's the government's strength that must grow, through the raw and unconstitutional exercise of power endorsed not only by Democrats, but by the neoconservatives whose party affiliation is routinely sold to the highest bidder.

And today it's the Democrats who use war, this time not to win but to plunder. “Peace Through Strength” has given way to “War Through Weakness,” with the helping hand of Dick Cheney's Surveillance State that Democrats now employ to spy on Americans “legally.”

And meanwhile, the Military-Industrial Complex, so aptly named by Dwight D. Eisenhower, has made its move: recognizing that Republicans have become increasingly opposed to illegal (but very profitable) wars, they have changed the targets of their political donation accordingly.

## George Strake, RIP

On February 9, we lost a great man, a great Catholic, a great American, and a dear friend. George William Strake, Jr., was a businessman, a public servant, and a generous friend of Catholic institutions and programs, among them the Sycamore Trust and the *Irish Rover*, groups striving to restore and preserve the Catholic character of Notre Dame.

I was blessed to meet George seventy years ago. A student at Notre Dame, he visited our farm often. He was a true gentleman, and loved to ride horseback along the Saint Joe River, just five miles from campus. He never mentioned it then, but told me years later that he had been Paul Hornung's roommate, which might explain why I once saw the future Heisman Trophy winner kicking a football across the mare's pasture and playing catch with my brother.

May he rest in peace.

# What Is a Christian Nationalist Anyway?



S.A. McCarthy

Christian nationalists are simply trying to be a moral and religious people and ensure the success of the American experiment in so doing.

5

**I**t's an election year in America, which means that the political Left is trotting out its favorite fearmongering apparatuses again. For the past few years, politicians and pundits alike have leaned heavily on terms like "far right," "bigoted," racist," "transphobic," and "extremist"; but topping the list of late has been "Christian nationalist." But what is a Christian nationalist?

Just last week, *Politico* propagandist and self-described reporter Heidi Przybyla **appeared on MSNBC** to offer her definition of a Christian nationalist: "They believe that our rights as Americans and as all human beings do not come from any earthly authority. They don't come from Congress, from the Supreme Court, they come from God." Her comments followed a *Politico* article she authored in which she wrote, "Christian nationalists in America believe that the country was founded as a Christian nation and that Christian values should be prioritized throughout government and public life."

Of Przybyla's two assessments, the latter is nearer the truth than the former. If the defining characteristic of a Christian nationalist were a belief that "our rights as Americans and as all human beings do not come from any earthly authority" but "from God," then the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution would be tantamount to Christian nationalist manifestos.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness," Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1776. Of course, even though Przybyla and her comrades don't outright declare such men as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and the legendary George Washington "Christian nationalists," their political counterparts **work tirelessly** to suppress the admiration of such men and the principles they championed, right down to removing monuments to the founders of America across the country.

Why? Przybyla answers that, and rather candidly: because "the country has become less religious and more diverse..." Indeed, the nation has become more diverse than it was at its inception—it is difficult to imagine the Founding Fathers discussing Sharia law and satanic idols when drafting the First Amendment. But it has not become less religious. In fact, the growing Muslim rebellion against such projects as gender ideology and sex education, and the popularity and platform of the pagan former Republican presidential primary candidate Vivek Ramaswamy, are evidence that non-Christians also embrace (at least for the most part) the American vision articulated by the Founders almost two-and-a-half centuries ago.

No, the country is not less religious than it once was, only less Christian. Certainly, a majority (**about 63 percent, according to the Pew Research Center**) of Americans identify as Christian, but that share has been declining for decades (already down from nearly 90 percent in the early 1990s). Even among those who identify as Christian today, Christian principles and morality are not always advocated and are sometimes even undermined—either in the name of some modernist, Marxist, all-mercy-no-justice revisioning of Christ or for the sake of some misconstrued, misunderstood notion of a "separation of church and state." A clear example of this would be the incumbent president, Joe Biden, who identifies as a Catholic and even erroneously touts his faith, all while vociferously endorsing, promoting, and funding such evils as abortion, homosexuality, transgenderism, and socialism.

While Christianity has suffered a drastic decrease in recent years, a new religion has risen to take its place: Leftism. Yes, Leftism is a religion. Much like Catholicism, it even boasts a clergy, sacraments, and dogmas. Its clergy are elite power brokers: media personalities are its preachers while politicians serve as priests, legislating sacrifice to their gods. Its sacraments are multitudinous: from transgendering children and stocking school libraries with pornographic picture books all the way to its highest (or, rather, lowest) form of unholy prayer, abortion.

Peter Kreeft once wrote, "Abortion is the Antichrist's demonic parody of the eucharist. That's why it uses the same holy words, 'This is my body,' with the blasphemous opposite meaning." Leftism also has its own dogmas and doctrines, rigorously enforced by its own office of the inquisition. Those who dare

Do not ship liquids, blood, or clinical specimens in this packaging.

6

question transgenderism, diversity and equity, drag queen story hours, or the sudden appearance of ten million illegal immigrants are swiftly dealt with and forced to recant their heresies or be excommunicated and labeled “extremists” and “bigots.” Which brings us back to those intolerant, extremist, Christian nationalists.

Every lie, they say, contains at least a seed of truth, but Przybyla (perhaps unwittingly) offered a whole seedcake’s worth: “Christian nationalists in America believe that the country was founded as a Christian nation and that Christian values should be prioritized throughout government and public life.” This assessment is very close to being spot-on.

Despite all the hyperinflated fearmongering, those derided by the White House and its media mouthpieces as “Christian nationalists” are not trying to force all Americans to attend Mass weekly; we are not endeavoring to install altar rails in the Capitol building; nor are we attempting to replace the Star-Spangled Banner’s stars with rosary beads.

**So, what are we doing?** John Adams, a Framers of the Constitution and George Washington’s successor as president, wrote in 1798, “Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.” Christian nationalists are simply trying to be a moral and religious people and ensure the success of the American experiment in so doing.

Certainly, we want to legislate Christian morality—to end the slaughter of unborn children, to ban the scourge of pornography, to keep little boys and little girls from having their sex organs hacked off or hacked open. These are measures which the Founding Fathers might have called “the basics” had they ever lived to see the horrors of the modern age. In his prescient book *The Abolition of Man*, C.S. Lewis called the set of principles compelling such commonsense measures “the Tao,” which is simply objective truth, Natural Law, the pursuit of inerrant virtue. One could easily argue that Christian nationalists are simply upholding the Tao, whether at the dinner table or in the voting booth.

Lewis prophesies what will come about if the Tao (the tenets of today’s Christian nationalism) are forgotten: the emergence of an elite class of “Conditioners.” He predicts, “The ultimate springs of human action are no longer, for them, something given. They have surrendered—like electricity: it is the function of the Conditioners to control, not obey them. ... They are the motivators, the creators of motive.” He then asks, “But how are they going to be motivated themselves?”

*When I said just now that all motives fail them, I should have said all motives except one. All motives that claim any validity other than that of their felt emotional weight at a given moment have failed them. Everything except the sic volo, sic jubeo has been explained away. But what never claimed objectivity cannot be destroyed by subjectivism. ... When all that says “it is good” has been debunked, what says “I want” remains. It cannot be exploded or “seen through” because it never had any pretensions. The Conditioners, therefore, must come to be motivated simply by their own pleasure.*

**This is the end result of Leftism**, the god that it worships: complete, unbridled abandon to self. This is also why “Christian nationalism” poses such a threat—indeed, an existential threat—to Leftism: because Christianity is dedicated to complete, unbridled abandon of self to Christ. Where Leftism declares that every man can be a god, Christianity teaches that every man ought to be a slave to Christ. The catch, of course, is that by being slaves to Christ, we also become sons of God (Galatians 4:7).

Leftism cannot abide the threat of Christian morality, nor even of the profession that all men “are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights,” because this would admit the existence of a Creator, a God, who not only demands but deserves worship. The fever dream of every man being god would be broken. In the end, that is what it means to be a Christian nationalist: to boldly declare that God is Law and that the laws penned by man must be in accord with Law Himself. Leftism declares the perverse inverse: that man is god, and thus any law penned by man is, by its nature, in accord with the law of the gods. With liberalism and relativism as the chief ideologies of the day, the only remaining threat to the Leftist’s state of self-worship is Christian nationalism.

Do not ship liquids, blood, or clinical specimens in this packaging.

## What Are Bombs Made For?

By Fr. Emmanuel Charles McCarthy

LEW ROCKWELL.COM

7

March 18, 2024

The ultimate purpose for which a bomb exists is to kill people, to maim people, to cause people great suffering. Over the last twenty years the U.S. Catholic Bishops have unanimously taught as a canonical unit, National Conference, that it was morally in conformity with the Gospel of Jesus Christ for U.S. Catholics to be members of the chain of murder that was required to bomb, kill and maim millions of civilian men, women and children in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya and Ukraine. The American Catholic Bishops as a tight-knit corporate unit presently teach, in a fashion that the simplest Catholic soul can clearly understand, that it is in conformity with the Gospel of Jesus Christ for Catholics to be members of the chain of evil required to mow down, mutilate and mangle tens of thousands of unarmed non-combatant men, women and children in Gaza.

The U.S. has sent approximately 70,000 tons of bombs to Israel since it initiated the genocidal slaughter of Palestinians *en masse* in October 2023. The ultimate purpose of each shipment and of each bomb is to kill or maim a Palestinian man, woman or child, combatant or non-combatant. This is beyond question or doubt. A significant amount, however, of the labor required to move a bomb from its place of manufacture in Indiana into the hands of an Israeli in Rafah, who is going to use it to kill Palestinian men, women and children, is being done by U.S. Catholics. This has been the case in all the post-911 USA human slaughterhouse operations in the Middle East.

We are not talking here about the U.S. Bishops missing a single My Lai-like incident of murder of the innocent where Catholics have been involved, we are talking about twenty consecutive years of a million My Lai-like victims where Catholics have been involved at every level on a grand scale. It should make one ask what these fellows who “worked the room and climbed the ladder” to be a Bishop wanted the job for, if they can’t even see the need to tell those in their spiritual jurisdiction that they morally cannot be links in a known chain created to slaughter the innocent and be a faithful follower of Jesus Christ or a member in good standing in the Catholic Church.

This moral principle of non-cooperation with intrinsically grave evil absolutely holds whether the chain of evil is meant to lead to murder by abortion or murder by war is not a matter of moral dispute in Catholicism. Murder is murder and is absolutely forbidden under all circumstances, whether it is legal or illegal, private or corporate, romantic or sordid, mass murder or a one-off.

Please, Bishops in the U.S., at this point do not mollify your episcopal consciousness by claiming that to participate in the killing of abortion is always the unjustified killing of an innocent human being and is therefore always the intrinsically grave evil (mortal sin) of murder, but, the killing of war is morally neutral and depends on the circumstance whether it is the grave evil of murder or justified, e.g. the designated homicide victim is in the act of trying to kill you. When thousands or tens of thousands or millions of people, who are killed are unarmed, non-combatant, innocent children, women and men, and the Bishops of the Catholic Church—in their fear of losing the good graces and largess of the government and economic elites—play along with the nationalistic and military think tanks and corporate mass media propaganda and pretend overtly or by stealthy silence that the murder of thousands or millions of innocent human beings can be justified by some silly putty application of Catholic Just War Theory, are they not radical anti-magnetic witnesses to Jesus and betrayers of the ministry bestowed on them by Christ?

Ask your bishop and priest can you morally assist someone in participating in murder by abortion? Can you morally assist someone in participating in murder by war?

What are Jesus’ standards in the Gospels for determining if an act of homicidal violence is justified or is unjustified, and therefore murder? What are the Catholic Church’s

(2)

traditional standards in its Just War Theory for determining if an act of homicidal violence is justified or unjustified, and therefore murder?

Is there any evidence, any evidence at all, that the American Catholic Bishops as a unit are abiding by either set of standards or leading their people to abide by either set of standards?

*"Nothing is better or more necessary than love.  
God is pleased with nothing but love.  
One act of pure love is more precious in the eyes of God  
and of the soul, and more profitable to the Church,  
than all the good works together,  
though it may seem as nothing."*

– St. John of the Cross

## **Mark Twain on Private and Public Christianity**

LRC

Charles Goyette

"The present Christianity makes an excellent private Christian, but its endeavors to make an excellent public one go for nothing, substantially.

"This is an honest nation—in private life. The American Christian is a straight and clean and honest man, and in his private commerce with his fellows can be trusted to stand faithfully by the principles of honor and honesty imposed upon him by his religion. But the moment he comes forward to exercise a public trust he can be confidently counted upon to betray that trust in nine cases out of ten, if "party loyalty" shall require it.

"If there are two tickets in the field in his city, one composed of honest men and the other of notorious blatherskites and criminals, he will not hesitate to lay his private Christian honor aside and vote for the blatherskites if his "party honor" shall exact it. His Christianity is of no use to him and has no influence upon him when he is acting in a public capacity. He has sound and sturdy private morals, but he has no public ones. In the last great municipal election in New York, almost a complete one-half of the votes representing 3,500,000 Christians were cast for a ticket that had hardly a man on it whose earned and proper place was outside of a jail. But that vote was present at church next Sunday the same as ever, and as unconscious of its perfidy as if nothing had happened.

"Our Congresses consist of Christians. In their private life they are true to every obligation of honor; yet in every session they violate them all, and do it without shame; because honor to party is above honor to themselves. It is an accepted law of public life that in it a man may soil his honor in the interest of party expediency—must do it when party expediency requires it. In private life those men would bitterly resent—and justly—any insinuation that it would not be safe to leave unwatched money within their reach; yet you could not wound their feelings by reminding them that every time they vote ten dollars to the pension appropriation nine of it is stolen money and they the marauders. They have filched the money to take care of the party; they believe it was right to do it; they do not see how their private honor is affected; therefore their consciences are clear and at rest. By vote they do wrongful things every day, in the party interest, which they could not be persuaded to do in private life. In the interest of party expediency they give solemn pledges, they make solemn compacts; in the interest of party expediency they repudiate them without a blush. They would not dream of committing these strange crimes in private life."

– from Twain's Christian Science, 1907.

12:39 pm on January 4, 2024

**The Best of Charles Goyette**

# In 1920, the NAACP Worried the US Marine Occupation of Haiti Meant the Collapse of the Black-Run Nation Would Prove Blacks Were Incapable of Self-Government; 104 Years, Cannibalism Is Rampant in the Collapsing Black-Run Nation

PAUL KERSEY • MARCH 14, 2024 • 2,100 WORDS • 46 COMMENTS

9

## THE TRUTH ABOUT HAITI

AN N. A. A. C. P. INVESTIGATION



JAMES WELDON JOHNSON



IN writing of my visit to Haiti for *Crisis* readers, I should like to tell all that I learned about political, economic and social conditions there, and to give, as well, the information and impressions I gained about the country and the Haitian people themselves. This, of course, will not be possible, for either of these phases of the subject, fully treated, would make a complete article. I have decided that something about each phase will be more interesting and more comprehensive than all about

one. Therefore, what I say will of necessity be rather sketchy.

### THE HISTORIC BACKGROUND

I SHOULD like the reader, first of all, to take a swift glance at the historical and cultural background of the Haitian people. In order to fully understand present and actual conditions, it is necessary to be familiar with the fact that the Haitian people have a glorious history behind them. Haiti was the first of the American Republics, after the United States, to gain its

Back before the United States of America entry into The Great War, the US Marines engaged in an occupation of Haiti. This started in 1915. By 1920, black leaders in America were particularly worried about what this occupation by an unapologetically white nation (recall, *Birth of a Nation* had been released in 1915 and was a monumental success) symbolically meant, since Haiti was birthed in the blood of the white French that black slaves had murdered as they created the first black republic.

Yes, the Constitution of 1805 explicitly made Haiti a black republic.

Thus, the collapse of Haiti and white people from America emerging as a force for order – whereas explicit black power had been the primary mover of the government since black slaves revolted and killed all the white people on the island – was of grave concern to the nascent NAACP. Enter a historic document forever demonstrating that blacks in America knew what the collapse of Haiti meant for black people worldwide (hint: the confirmation of every stereotype of the unfitness for blacks to govern independently of colonial masters). Yes, this is the conclusion of James Weldon Johnson, a black man who visited Haiti early on into the US Marine occupation of the island. [James Weldon Johnson, “The Truth about Haiti. An N.A.A.C.P. Investigation.” *Crisis* 5 (September 1920): 217–224.]:

U.S. marines occupied Haiti from 1915 to 1934. By 1919, Haitian Charlemagne Peralte had organized more than a thousand *cacos*, or armed guerrillas, to militarily oppose the marine occupation. The marines responded to the resistance with a counterinsurgency campaign that razed villages, killed thousands of Haitians, and destroyed the livelihoods of even more. American organizations such as the NAACP opposed the U.S. occupation of Haiti. They sent delegations that investigated conditions and protested the blatant racism and imperialism of U.S. policy in Haiti in the early 20th century. An article from 1920, by NAACP leader James Weldon Johnson, countered the standard justifications for U.S. occupation of Haiti.

In writing of my visit to Haiti for *Crisis* readers, I should like to tell all that I learned about political, economic and social conditions there, and to give, as well, the information and impressions I gained about the country and the Haitian people themselves. This, of course, will not be possible, for either of these phases of the subject, fully treated, would make a complete article. I have decided that something about each phase will be more interesting and more comprehensive than all about one. Therefore, what I say will of necessity be rather sketchy.

## The Historic Background

I should like the reader, first of all, to take a swift glance at the historical and cultural background of the Haitian people. In order to fully understand present and actual conditions, it is necessary to be familiar with the fact that the Haitian people have a glorious history behind them. Haiti was the first of the American Republics, after the United States, to gain its independence. The story of the war for Haitian independence is one of the most thrilling chapters in the history of the world. If one reads only what alien historians have written, he gains the idea that the Haitian struggle was nothing more than the massacre of outnumbered whites by hordes of semi-savage blacks. There was massacre and savagery but it was on both sides. But the war itself was one which suffers very little in magnitude by comparison with the American Revolution. There were times when the French troops and the Haitian troops engaged, aggregated more than 80,000 men. The French troops were the best that Napoleon could send. The Haitian troops were not a band of lawless guerrillas but were well drilled and well officered. There were battles in which these troops compelled the admiration of the French for their valor, and their commanders, for their military ability and gallantry.

It should also be borne in mind that the Haitian Revolution was not merely a political revolution. It was also a social revolution. There was a complete overturn of both the political and social organization of the country. The man who had been the chattel became the ruler. The great estates of the colonial slave holders were cut up into small parcels and allotted among the former slaves. This last fact has a direct bearing on present conditions in Haiti, to which I shall refer later.

Haiti gained her independence 116 years ago and maintained her complete sovereignty down to 1915, the year of American intervention. None of the Latin-American Republics had the difficulties in maintaining their independence that Haiti encountered. The Black Republic did not receive from the United States the support which it had a right to expect. Haiti had fought France, England and Spain, but the United States was the last of all the strong nations to recognize her independence, when, indeed, she should have been the first.

### Fitness To Rule

The unfitness of the Haitian people to govern themselves has been the subject of propaganda for the last century. Books and pamphlets and articles have been written, and lectures have been delivered many times over to prove that the Haitians not only were incapable of advancement, but were steadily retrograding into barbarism. An observation of the city of Port-au-Prince is sufficient to refute this oft made assertion. Port-au-Prince is a clean, well paved, well lighted city. Its newer business buildings are constructed of concrete and brick. The wooden shanties which one so often sees in magazines and books illustrating the business section of the town are relics of the old French régime. The residential section of Port-au-Prince is built on the slopes of the hills that rise back of the city. The homes of the well-to-do people are beautiful villas with well kept grounds, and there are hundreds of them.

This section of Port-au-Prince is superior to the residential section in any of the cities of the Central American republics. In fact, Port-au-Prince is one of the most beautiful of the tropical cities which I have seen. Haiti has been independent for more than a century and if the people had been steadily retrograding into barbarism during all of that time, Port-au-Prince today would be an aggregation of filth and decay instead of the city that it is. In Port-au-Prince one will meet Americans

who, in response to the exclamation, "Why I am surprised to see what a fine city Port-au-Prince is!" will answer, "Yes, but you should have seen it before the Occupation." The implication here is that the American Occupation is responsible for making Port-au-Prince a paved and well kept city. It is true that only one or two of the principal streets of Port-au-Prince were paved at the time of the intervention—five years ago—but the work had already been begun and contracts for paving the whole city had already been let by the Haitian Government. The American Occupation did not pave, and had nothing to do with the paving of a single street in Port-au-Prince. The regulations instituted by the American Health Officer may have something to do with the regularity with which the streets are swept, but my observation showed me that the Haitians have a "sweeping habit" which they must have acquired long years before the American Occupation.

(11)

The Americans have carried American prejudice to Haiti. Before their advent, there was no such thing in social circles as race prejudice. Social affairs were attended on the same footing by natives and white foreigners. The men in the American Occupation, when they first went down, also attended Haitian social affairs, but now they have set up their own social circle and established their own club to which no Haitian is invited, no matter what his social standing is. The Haitians now retaliate by never inviting Americans to their social affairs or their clubs. Of course, there are some semi-social affairs at which Haitians and Occupation officials meet, but there is a uniform rule among Haitian ladies not to dance with any American official.

A great deal of this prejudice has been brought about because the Administration has seen fit to send southern white men to Haiti. For instance, the man at the head of the customs service is a man who was formerly a parish clerk in Louisiana. The man who is second in charge of the customs service is a man who was formerly Deputy Collector of Customs at Pascagoula, Miss. The man who is Superintendent of Public Instruction was formerly a school teacher in Louisiana. It seems like a practical joke to send a man from Louisiana where they have not good schools even for white children down to Haiti to organize schools for black children. And the mere idea of white Mississippians going down to civilize Haitians and teach them law and order would be laughable except for the fact that the attempt is actually being made to put the idea into execution. These Southerners have found Haiti to be the veritable promised land of "jobs for deserving democrats". Many of these men, both military and civilian officials, have moved their families to Haiti. In Port-au-Prince many of them live in fine villas. Many of them who could not keep a hired girl in the United States have a half-dozen servants. All of the civilian heads of departments have automobiles furnished at the expense of the Haitian Government. These automobiles seem to be used chiefly to take the women and children out for an airing each afternoon. It is interesting to see with what disdain, as they ride around, they look down upon the people who pay for the cars. It is also interesting to note that the Haitian officials and even the cabinet officers who are officially the superiors of these various heads have no cars. For example, the Louisiana superintendent has a car, but the Haitian Minister of Public Instruction has none. What the Washington Administration should have known was that in order to do anything worth while for Haiti, it was necessary to send men there who were able and willing to treat Negroes as men, and not because of their ability to speak poor French, or their knowledge of "handling niggers".

(12)

The United States has failed in Haiti. It should get out as well and as quickly as it can and restore to the Haitian people their independence and sovereignty. The colored people of the United States should be interested in seeing that this is done, for Haiti is the one best chance that the Negro has in the world to prove that he is capable of the highest self-government. If Haiti should ultimately lose her independence, that one best chance will be lost.

Read the last paragraph again, penned by a black leader upon his return from white-occupied Haiti in 1920:

The United States has failed in Haiti. It should get out as well and as quickly as it can and restore to the Haitian people their independence and sovereignty. The colored people of the United States should be interested in seeing that this is done, for Haiti is the one best chance that the Negro has in the world to prove that he is capable of the highest self-government. If Haiti should ultimately lose her independence, that one best chance will be lost.

Haitian people did have their independence restored, and 124 years later, black rule in Haiti has seen the island nation collapse into cannibalism, riots and ruin. The Negro, to paraphrase James Weldon Johnson, has thus proven in Haiti that he is not capable of the highest self-government, and the Haiti – a country born out of white genocide and black power – will once again lose her independence, unless cannibalism is allowed to spread in a manner causing the ghost of George Romero to find racially unbecoming.

For the island nation that gave us the concept of the zombie has now definitely offered us a glimpse of what the future of Baltimore, Jackson (MS), Memphis, Birmingham, Montgomery, Gary (IN), Newark, Camden, New Orleans, and Atlanta will look under black rule.

James Weldon Johnson knew eventually white people would realize what the collapse of Haiti meant in 1920, and he worried what conclusions white people might take to ensure nothing like it ever happened again for their posterity. And as Haiti collapses in 2024, we must now make decisions on what this means for not just our posterity, but our present as well.

There should not be one Haitian in the USA. They have an island which has been powered by the belief in black supremacy/black power since 1805.

## **Disarm the State: You Are Now Considered Criminals While the Real Criminals Are Protected**

By Gary D. Barnett

March 18, 2024

*"Whether the mask is labeled fascism, democracy, or dictatorship of the proletariat, our great adversary remains the apparatus—the bureaucracy, the police, the military. Not the one facing us across the frontier of the battle lines, which is not so much our enemy as our brothers' enemy, but the one that calls itself our protector and makes us its slaves. No matter what the circumstances, the worst betrayal will always be to subordinate ourselves to this apparatus and to trample underfoot, in its service, all human values in ourselves and in others."*

~ Simone Weil

# What Do Justin Trudeau and Kristi Noem Have in Common?

(13)

They Both Want To Put You In Jail For Having Unpopular Opinions

By Chuck Baldwin

Chuck Baldwin Live

March 22, 2024

LRC

The left and right sides of an ellipse are descriptive of Left and Right politics. At the top of the ellipse is Liberty. At the bottom of the ellipse is Tyranny. Republicans and Democrats spend most of their time arguing over things that fall in the middle of the ellipse.

I define Tyranny as anything that promotes the power of the state to control people's lives and liberties beyond the Natural Laws of our Creator. I define Liberty as anything that constrains the power of the state to control people's lives and liberties beyond the Natural Laws of our Creator.

The problem with so many people from both the political Left and the political Right is that, regardless of their differences over middle elliptical issues, they meet in unison at the bottom of the ellipse. Both Trump and Biden, Republicans and Democrats, want to use the power of government to coerce, intimidate or force the American citizenry to do what THEY want us to do. Whether we agree or not with either side is irrelevant. The fact that we would allow them to exercise governmental power to enforce THEIR personal opinions upon us should be anathema to any true freedomist.

And there are no God-ordained liberties more precious to free men and women than the freedom of speech and the freedom of religion (conscience).

And there is currently a perfect depiction of what I said above being played out before our very eyes with the Leftist Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and South Dakota's conservative governor, Kristi Noem.

## The Liberal Justin Trudeau

The Canadian government is rapidly advancing plans to usher in full-blown tyranny and will soon begin sentencing citizens to life in prison if they are found guilty of committing the "crime" of so-called "hate."

Many are likening the new laws to George Orwell's dystopian novel "1984" as Canada will soon start handing out severe penalties for wrongthink.

The push for life sentences is part of "liberal" Prime Minister Justin Trudeau's "anti-hate" legislation.

The shocking new law, buried in bill C-6, states:

*Everyone who commits an offense under this act or any other act of Parliament, if the commission of the offense is motivated by hatred based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, color, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or gender identity or expression, is guilty of an indictable offense and liable to **imprisonment for life**.*

The new law from Canada comes as Trudeau's World Economic Forum-controlled administration seeks to rapidly advance the nation's descent into globalist tyranny.

The government has been pushing several new laws that seek to strip the public of their freedoms.

As Slay News reported, among the draconian new laws are powers that allow authorities to begin jailing citizens who “might” commit a crime.

74) Trudeau’s government is pushing for the new “pre-crime” authority which officials claim will help to tackle so-called “hate crimes.”

(Source).

Naturally, conservatives on the right side of the ellipse are aghast and angry at such a tyrannical proposal—and justifiably so. There is no question that Fidel Castro’s Canadian son wants to turn our northern neighbor into a cold-climate communist state like the balmy prison island of Cuba.

But now let’s visit the other side of the ellipse, the right side, the conservative side.

### **The Conservative Kristi Noem**

In signing a draconian, tyrannical “hate” law of her own in South Dakota, USA, Governor Kristi Noem (on the short list to be Trump’s running mate) said the following (reported by Chris Menahan at InfoWars):

When I was growing up, my dad would always gather our family together and we would pray for Israel. It was instilled in me from a very young age that the Jews were Gods [sic] chosen people, that Israel was the Holy Land, and that we should always pray for them.

I brought those fundamental ideals with me when I was in the State Legislature, when I served in Congress, and now as Governor of South Dakota. Supporting the State of Israel and our Jewish community has always been extremely important to me. It’s important to support Israel for spiritual, historical, and national security reasons. I am continuing to stand with the Jewish people by signing historic legislation to protect them from antisemitism.

I was very proud to sign HB 1076, a very important bill to combat antisemitism. This bill defines antisemitism and makes it easier to prove when discriminatory conduct is motivated by antisemitism. It is an impactful piece of legislation that will ensure the safety of Jewish people and strengthen South Dakota’s anti-discrimination laws.

We held a beautiful, moving signing ceremony for this bill in the Rotunda of our State Capitol in Pierre. Many prominent Jewish leaders attended, including Elan Carr, the CEO of the Israeli-American Council for Action, nationally renowned Jewish leader and founder of the Jacobson Society Dan Rosen, Rabbi and Director of the National Jewish Advocacy Center Dr. Mark Goldfeder, Rabbi Mendel Alperowitz of the Chabad Jewish Center of South Dakota, Renie Schreiber on behalf of Yinam Cohen, Consul General of Israel to the Midwest, and Jordan Cope from Stand With Us. A few of our special guests said some words about the impact this legislation will have for the Jewish people.

This bill puts the gold standard International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance [IHRA] definition of antisemitism into state law.

I hope that more states across our great nation will follow this example that we are setting here in South Dakota. It is more important now than ever for our nation’s leaders to stand up and fight against antisemitism. We must always work to ensure the security of God’s chosen people.

Menahan writes:

The IHRA’s definition of anti-Semitism is completely antithetical to the First

Amendment.

The IHRA defines anti-Semitism as:

15

- Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.
- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.
- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).
- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.
- Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.
- Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor.
- Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.

No other ethnic or religious group in America is afforded any such privileges.

Notice that virtually everything in this list defining “antisemitism” focuses on speech, attitudes or thoughts. “Allegations.” “Accusing.” “Denying.” “Accusing.” “Accusing.” “Denying.” “Applying.” “Using.” All of this refers to speech, attitudes or thoughts.

Kristi Noem is abusing the power of government in an attempt to deny people their First Amendment freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

If Noem wants to believe that the Ashkenazi Jews in the Middle East are “God’s Chosen People,” it is her religious right to believe that. And if she wants to publicly say she believes that, the freedom of speech gives her the right to do so.

**BUT . . .**

1. That doesn’t mean she is right; in fact, she is NOT right. The Ashkenazi Jews in Palestine today are no more God’s Chosen People and the blood descendants of Abraham than you or me or the man in the moon.

2. That doesn’t give her the right or authority to force people to believe as she does, to share her religious persuasion or to use the power of government to punish them for taking a contrary position.

For your information, Kristi,

I DO believe that the popular scope ascribed to the German Holocaust IS “exaggerated.”

I DO believe that Jewish Zionism IS a radical racist ideology—and so do many Israelis,  
by the way.

by the way.

I DO believe that Zionist Jews DO have an extraordinary influence over our media, Federal Reserve, government and societal institutions—and it appears that by signing this bill, Kristi, you are proving my assertion.

16

And, yes, I also believe that the Jews who coerced and manipulated Pontius Pilate to crucify Jesus ARE blood libel for His death. As a matter of fact, Kristi, the Pharisees and Jews that murdered Jesus admitted their liability for Christ's death when they shouted, "His blood be on us, and on our children." (Matthew 27:25)

If I lived in South Dakota, I suppose I would be guilty of a "hate" crime and open to government reprisal.

So, how are Noem and Trudeau any different? Both of them want to use the power and force of government to punish people for exercising their God-ordained freedom of religion and freedom of speech in a manner that doesn't comport with theirs.

Noem's tyrannical "hate" bill is not motivated by greed and ambition, using this bill as a means of holding her hand out to the Israeli lobbyists for more campaign cash, is it?

Ditto Trudeau's tyrannical "hate" bill?

Naw!

Left. Right. Liberal. Conservative. Secularist. Religious. It all spells **tyranny** if they are meeting at the bottom of the ellipse, as Justin Trudeau and Kristi Noem are doing right now.

## Teaching America To Fear Christians

By PHIL LAWLER

THE WANDERER

Are you terrified by "the peril of the theocratic future toward which the country has been hurtling"?

Neither am I. But Linda Greenhouse is. That fear is the latest fashion on the radical left.

In a remarkable piece of alarmist propaganda, responding to the Alabama court decision that ruled a frozen embryo has legal rights, *The New York Times* columnist lamented that the U.S. today "is awash in religiosity when it comes to human reproduction." I confess that I hadn't noticed. The public debate – at least as conducted in outlets like *The New York Times* tends to begin and end with the invocation of the word "choice." If religion is mentioned, it is only to claim that all arguments against abortion are based on sectarian belief and therefore must be suppressed.

Greenhouse tells us: "Rhetoric about the 'sanctity of unborn life,' in the words of Alabama's constitution, has for too long been cost-free, a politician's cheap thrill." You'll notice here the implicit message that a politician who uses that rhetoric should pay a cost. If a pro-life columnist said the same sort of thing, it would immediately be cited as an invitation to violence.

Greenhouse does briefly acknowledge that the court's decision was based on an amendment to Alabama's constitution, ratified by the state's voters, which designates any fertilized human embryo as a human being. (This by the way is an elementary biological

fact, but Greenhouse & Co. have been successful over the years in their campaign to classify it as a religious belief.) If an embryo is a human being, then the embryos stored in IVF facilities are by definition human beings. Regardless of the judges' personal beliefs, the Alabama court had no real choice; the decision was based on the clear language of the state's constitution.

The Greenhouse column, however, is only one example of a new leftist rhetorical initiative: an effort to portray Christians as a danger to democracy. The phrase "Christian nationalism" has been tossed around constantly in the past few weeks, often in reference to the Alabama decision. Once the goal of the radical left was to push Christians out of the public debate on abortion. Now the more ambitious goal is to shove Christians out of the public debate altogether.

Sadly, politicians in Alabama seem to have been spooked by this artificial uproar, and so have rushed to pass new legislation barring prosecution of anyone who destroys an embryo in the course of IVF treatment. Such legislation would appear to conflict with the same pro-life amendment to the state constitution. It would also provide carte blanche to unscrupulous practitioners of the extremely lucrative IVF business. Abortionists have grown rich in large part because their political defenders have ensured that they are not subject to the same sort of government oversight that regulates the work of, say,

dentists – or for that matter hairdressers. Now we can expect a concerted effort to provide the same legal immunity for those engaged in various forms of assisted reproduction.

But back to Linda Greenhouse. It takes a special sort of perspective to look at a cut-and-dried court decision – a decision required by a constitutional amendment – an amendment backed by the populace of the state – and see in that decision a danger of "theocratic" rule. You might wonder how Greenhouse acquired that perspective. What is her background?

Well, before she became a *Times* columnist, Greenhouse was a *Times* reporter. Her particular beat? The Supreme Court. For years, in what was then regarded as America's most authoritative newspaper, Linda Greenhouse offered analysis of what the U.S. Constitution says, and how it might be interpreted, on issues such as abortion. Now, seeing how she reasons when she is no longer inhibited by any pretense of objectivity, you can see more clearly how her work in the trenches as a reporter prepared the ground for her campaign today as a propagandist.

+ + +

(Phil Lawler has been a Catholic journalist for more than 30 years. He has edited several Catholic magazines and written eight books. Founder of *Catholic World News*, he is the news director and lead analyst at CatholicCulture.org.)