

**WHAT IS AT STAKE IN 2004:
THE GAP BETWEEN THE KERRY-EDWARDS TICKET AND THE VALUES OF THE
AMERICAN PEOPLE**

**Newt Gingrich
July 22, 2004**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>PAGE:</u>	<u>TOPIC:</u>
2	Overview
2-3	Summary
4	The Left Versus the Rest of America
5-8	Leftworld: The Coalition Which Backs Kerry-Edwards
8	The Natural American Majority
8-11	Test One: Will We Survive as a Nation? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Combating Terrorism• Good Judgment and Clear Thinking: Kerry on Arafat and Israel
11-14	Test Two: What Kind of Country Will We Be? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Centrality of Our Creator For Most Americans: The Case of the Pledge of Allegiance• God, Values, History, and the Public Arena: How Left-wing Judges are Trying to Create a Secular America with the Elite Media's Support• The Left's Hysteria About Conservative Federal Judges
14-18	Test Three: Will Our Children and New Americans Learn the Values and History of Being American? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Education Reform• The Coming Clash Between the American People and the Left-Liberal Education Establishment• The Work Ethic as Part of American Culture• Patriotic Education: Protecting the American Flag
18-20	Test Four: How Will We Be Able to Create Prosperity and Jobs in the 21 st Century? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Taxes• Science, Technology, Jobs and the Environment• The Cost of Personal Injury Lawyers• Health for Those Still Working
20-21	Test Five: How Will We Make Sure That the Baby <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Boomers and Their Children Have Good Retirements and Good Health?

This paper is available electronically along with an audio companion of two speeches at www.newt.org

WHAT IS AT STAKE IN 2004: THE GAP BETWEEN THE KERRY-EDWARDS TICKET AND THE VALUES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Newt Gingrich
July 22, 2004

OVERVIEW

The 2004 campaign is actually very simple:

1. Define the Kerry-Edwards ticket as the left and prove that its values and its history make it unacceptable to the vast majority of Americans;
2. Communicate what President Bush and the Republicans have accomplished for the American people despite the bitter opposition of the left;
3. Explain the nature of the terrorist threat against America and the historic and moral importance of President Bush's strategy to defend America, including the decision to liberate Iraq;
4. Communicate what President Bush and the Republicans will accomplish in 2005 for the American people if they are given the opportunity;
5. Use September and October in Congress to demonstrate vividly the difference on core values between the Senate based Kerry-Edwards left and the Republicans and therefore the difference in the future they would create;
6. Focus on this clear choice so the Presidential and Vice Presidential debates will be acts of repeating the clear differences and the historic record;
7. Slow the campaign down to emphasize the big difference, focus on the facts and allow the American people to realize how big their choice is.

This paper outlines the gap between most Americans and the Kerry-Edwards ticket. Other papers will cover the rest of the campaign.

SUMMARY

The facts are very clear:

1. A work requirement for welfare: 87% of Americans say yes, John Kerry and the Senate Democrats have blocked the bill for 3 years.

2. Government should help faith-based initiatives help the poor: 72% of Americans agree, 26% disagree; Kerry is with the 26%.
3. U.S. interests are more important than international organizations: 73-24; Kerry's positions favor the 24%.
4. Violent attackers of pregnant women who kill the baby should be prosecuted for killing the baby: 84% of Americans say yes; Kerry voted no.
5. Children should be allowed to pray at school: 78% of Americans agree; Kerry is against it.

On these five large questions the American people average 79% to 16% and Kerry is on the side of the 16%.

There is a temporary narrow partisan division among Americans but there is no narrow values division. On a wide number of issues Americans average about four to one in favor of Center-Right values. In one set of 34 issues the American people averaged 77% on one side and 17% on the other side.

Only the continued overwhelming bias of the news media (amounting to a culture of the left which simply cannot imagine any other value set being legitimate) and the deliberate deception and denial of the Democratic ticket combined with a Republican failure to focus the campaign on the big choices has allowed the myth of a narrowly divided country to survive.

If Republicans focus on asserting "there is a big difference" and slowing the campaign down to emphasize "the facts", this could be a surprisingly one-sided race by late October.

The Democrats have already cast their lot on the far left.

Since the Democrats know they cannot win a clear choice election, they and their allies (including much of the news media) will do everything possible to clutter the campaign with trivia.

The question is whether the Republicans will accept the challenge and insist on a campaign that focuses on the remarkably wide differences in ideology, in the values of the two coalitions, in the historic record of the two parties, and in actual votes.

If Republicans slow the campaign down and emphasize the facts, the Democrats are almost certain to lose badly.

THE LEFT VERSUS THE REST OF AMERICA

The Kerry-Edwards ticket is the most leftwing ticket since George McGovern ran in 1972. This is not rhetoric. The leftwing nature of the Kerry Edwards ticket is a statistical fact.

Senator Kerry was rated by *National Journal* as the most liberal Senator in 2003. Senator Edwards came in fourth. If you are to the left of Ted Kennedy and Hillary Clinton, you are not merely a liberal, you are on the left.

The 'most leftwing' rating is not merely a one year fluke.

John Kerry has a lifetime ADA voting record rated more liberal than Walter Mondale (92 to 90). John Edwards has a lifetime ADA voting record rated more liberal than Geraldine Ferraro (81 to 79). Therefore, literally, the Kerry-Edwards ticket is the most leftwing since George McGovern in 1972.

The leftwing nature of the Kerry-Edwards ticket can be seen in specific votes, in the ideology of their allies, and in their own policy statements.

This leftwing nature of the Kerry-Edwards ticket puts them far to the left of the vast majority of Americans.

Consider one specific vote -- the issue of protecting a pregnant mother and her unborn child from a violent attacker. The American people by 79 to 10 believe prosecutors should be able to charge the attacker with murder for killing the fetus. By an even larger margin, 84 to 9 the American people believe the prosecutors should be able to bring separate murder charges against someone who kills a viable baby (some 56% think the killing of any baby, no matter how young, by a violent attack should be murder while another 28% think it should be murder only if the child was viable which was the Laci Peterson case). Only 9 per cent of the country is opposed.

On this issue, which has been driven home by the Laci Peterson murder case, the nation is 8 to 1 against the violent criminal.

John Kerry and John Edwards BOTH voted with the 9%, in favor of protecting the violent criminal and against protecting the baby from a violent attacker (vote on S 1019, March 25, 2004).

This is a position so indefensible and so alien from most Americans it should be a standard part of every explanation of the campaign and every stump speech.

“If an expectant mother is violently attacked Republicans will fight to protect her baby. John Kerry and John Edwards will vote to protect the criminal attacker.” It can't get much clearer than that.

LEFTWORLD; THE COALITION WHICH BACKS KERRY-EDWARDS

The nature of the left's coalition is even more decisively alien to most Americans.

The Democrats hope to use the resources, intensity, and energy of their allies without having to be responsible for them.

It is the Republicans' job to make sure the American people understand how radically left the Kerry-Edwards coalition really is and how much parallel there is between the left and its candidates despite the evasiveness of their rhetoric.

Begin with the biggest funder of pro-Kerry-Edwards causes.

George Soros is a leftwing billionaire who supports legalizing heroin (*Washington Post* 2/2/97) and was described by Lyndon Johnson's Secretary of Health and Human Services as "The Daddy Warbucks of drug legalization" (*Washington Post* 12/4/96). He has given more than \$15 million to at least 19 drug legalization initiatives (*Washington Times* 1/12/03).

Soros pledged a similar amount (\$15.5 million) to beat President George W. Bush (*Washington Post* "Soros's Deep Pockets Vs Bush" 11/11/03).

Soros is a major funder of 527 special interest activities on behalf of Kerry and the Democrats. Soros is a strong advocate of felons voting and his organizations reflect that goal. In one of their projects, "America Coming Together" (ACT) to which Soros has given at least \$10 million, they have been hiring convicted criminals to go door to door and register voters. In one state they have hired a convicted murderer and a convicted rapist to go door to door for Kerry. In another state they have been hiring convicted burglars who can in effect get paid for doing political work on the left while casing potential burglary sites.

It is a sign of how out of touch the hard left is with most Americans that they apparently think it is reasonable to pay convicted murderers, rapists, drug dealers, and burglars door to door to help the Kerry-Edwards ticket. In some cases the criminals are still serving time and on Federal Election Committee Reports listing paid employees they have actually listed the jail as their residence. In a perfect example of the left-liberal establishment closing ranks the New York Times editorialized "Recently, Republicans and election officials in Missouri and South Dakota have raised questions about voter registration groups' employment of ex-felons, although they have every right to be involved in political activity." (*New York Times* editorial 7/11/04)

These values are not unrelated to the candidates the left supports.

In 1987 Kerry opposed mandatory drug testing for "safety related personnel in transportation." Kerry asserted "regardless of whether or not they have displayed any

record of impaired performance, judgment, or other work or personality disorders which may indicate a substance abuse problem,” he was opposed to mandatory testing. (S 15427 *Congressional Record*, 10/29/87)

Kerry’s concern for the convicted over their victims is clear. In 1994 he asserted there are “people in jail today...who are barely culpable.” (*Congressional Record* S12453).

The left’s drive to have felons vote even while serving time in prison is gaining ground within the federal courts. In a 2003 Washington State case the Ninth Circuit AGAIN found a method for pushing the country in directions the American people oppose. As a dissenting judge noted (KOZINSKI) (2/24/04) “the panel’s interpretation of the VRA [Voting Rights Amendment] will require states to erect voting booths in prisons. This result is inevitable, as there is no stopping point to the panel’s rationale. If states can’t exclude felons formerly incarcerated from the franchise, then they surely can’t exclude felons currently behind bars. Once felons have a right to vote, someone will bring suit to require the states to bring the polls to them, since they can’t go to the polls themselves. Yet every state in our circuit—indeed, every state in the country save Maine and Vermont—does not allow imprisoned felons to vote.”

Clearly a bill should be introduced to affirm that nothing in the Voting Rights Act requires states to allow felons to vote while still serving time in prison. If Congress does not act we should not be surprised to wake up one morning and find the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has created a new class of criminal voters who could easily swing close elections. Even in Massachusetts a referendum on allowing convicted felons to vote in prison rejected the concept by 65 to 35 in November 2000.

The notion of the left once again using the federal courts to achieve what they cannot achieve with elected legislatures and elected governors was openly advocated in the *New York Times* editorial: “The best hope of reform may lie in the courts. The Atlanta-based United States Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit and the San Francisco-based Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit have ruled recently that disenfranchising felons may violate equal protection or the Voting Rights Act.” (7/11/04)

In 1985 Kerry introduced three amendments to provide tax paid subsidies for alcoholics and drug abusers (9/8/95).

In 1992 (9/17) Kerry favored a federally funded needle exchange program for drug users.

In 1998 (6/9) Kerry voted against cutting off federal dollars for needle exchanges.

Along exactly the same lines George Soros gave \$1 million to privately finance needle exchange programs for drug users.

Soros is not just committed to leftwing domestic policies on drugs, crime and other issues. He is also committed to a very leftwing vision of how the world should work. He wrote that to preserve “our global open society,” the world needs “some global system of

political decision-making” so that “the sovereignty of states must be subordinated to international law and international institutions.” (quoted in Matthew Rees “Saving Capitalism from Soros,” *The Ottawa Citizen*, 12/9/98).

This view of subordinating America to an international organization is rejected by the American people 73 to 24 (Gallup March 2004) in favor of America being able to pursue its own policies. Yet, as noted below under the question of our survival John Kerry has consistently talked about subordinating the United States to the United Nations and to the World Court in a manner very consistent with George Soros.

Michael Moore is another member of the Leftworld anti-Bush elite. Moore’s comments in Europe have been so viciously and consistently anti-American that it is amazing Senator Tom Daschle would go to the premier of Moore’s anti-Bush propaganda film. The relationship between Moore’s movie and the anti-Bush movement is clear. *Time Magazine* compared the fervor of the left for Fahrenheit 9/11 with the intensity of fundamentalist Christians going to see Mel Gibson’s *The Passion of the Christ*. That may say something about the degree to which for some on the secular left politics is the equivalent of a religious experience.

Democrats certainly expect Moore to help them defeat President Bush. As Cliff May reported, “Terry McAuliffe, the affable chairman of the Democratic National Committee, pronounced the film, ‘very powerful, much more powerful than I thought it would be... there are a lot of interesting facts that he [Moore] brought out today that none of us knew about.’ That most of those ‘facts’ have proven to be lies and distortions ought to be taken into consideration. Mr. McAuliffe added: ‘I think anyone who goes to this movie will come out en masse and vote for John Kerry.’”

Cliff May went on to assert in a July 8, 2004 Scripps Howard article that "Fahrenheit 9/11" is making mega-bucks in American theaters and -- with some help from terrorists ... -- it could prove a blockbuster in the Middle East too...”

“In terms of marketing,” *Screendaily.com* announces, Mr. Moore “is getting a boost from organizations related to Hezbollah.”

Yes, that Hezbollah: the Syrian and Iranian-backed terrorist group that pioneered suicide bombings against Americans more than 20 years ago ... the terrorist group second only to al Qaeda in number of Americans murdered, the terrorist group that now operates against the US in Iraq.

“We can't go against these organizations,” explains Gianluca Chacra, the managing director of Front Row Entertainment, the UAE-based firm releasing Moore's flick in the Middle East. ... “Having the support of such an entity in Lebanon is quite significant ... and not at all controversial. I think it's quite natural.”

Yes, of course. And it's not as if Mr. Moore's views of America differ dramatically from those of Hezbollah.” (end of May’s article)

Clearly this represents an enormous gap between the views of the left and the rest of America.

THE NATURAL AMERICAN MAJORITY

There is an amazing majority among most Americans but it is a distinct minority among the news media, the academic elites and the Hollywood crowd. Consider the key questions which will define America's future and how the natural majority would answer them.

The key question can be summarized as: Who can best protect our safety and secure our future?

That question can be broken into five key tests:

1. Will we survive as a nation?
2. What kind of Country will we be?
3. Will our children and new Americans learn the values and history of being American?
4. How will we be able to create prosperity and jobs in the 21st century?
5. How will we make sure that the baby boomers and their children have good retirements and good health?

In answering these five key tests, it is possible to appeal to a vast majority of Americans who do not share the assumptions and the values of the left.

TEST ONE: WILL WE SURVIVE AS A NATION?

By almost 3 to 1 (74% to 25%), Americans want America to play a leading or major role in world affairs. (Gallup Poll February 2004)

Americans know the world is dangerous. Better than eight out of every ten Americans (82%) believe international terrorism is a critical threat. Three out of four Americans (75%) believe the spread of weapons of mass destruction to unfriendly nations is a major threat. (Gallup Poll February 2004)

By contrast, John Kerry ran as an anti-defense liberal in 1984 and proposed cutting \$45 to \$54 billion from the Reagan defense budget in one year and cutting \$200 billion in defense over four years.

Kerry opposed President Reagan's strategy of building up American strength to defeat the Soviet Union.

While serving under Governor Michael Dukakis as Lieutenant Governor, Kerry wrote and spoke for Executive Order 242 (June 28, 1984) in which the state of Massachusetts refused to think about or plan for any effort to survive a nuclear attack. In effect, this

repudiated the very concept of Homeland Security. Under Kerry's leadership, they deliberately left Massachusetts defenseless against a weapon of mass destruction.

Kerry's first Senate speech as a Freshman was against defense spending.

Kerry proposed killing 27 weapons systems (including B-1, Apache helicopter, F-14, F-15 Patriot missile, etc) and reducing 18 others.

Kerry would have killed or cut virtually every weapons system used in the two Iraq wars.

Kerry was for a one sided nuclear freeze in which the United States would do nothing while the Soviets could continue to build up their arms. He opposed putting Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe to match the Soviet Union's SS-20 missiles.

Kerry opposed Reagan's strategy of defeating communism in Central America: "I stood up and fought against Ronald Reagan's illegal war in Central America." (CNN 1/21/04)

Kerry consistently voted against sanctions on Fidel Castro's communist dictatorship.

It is reasonable to assert that had we followed Kerry's policies instead of Reagan's there would still be a Soviet Union and we would still be in a cold war.

For over thirty years Kerry has been committed to putting America within the shackles of international organizations and limiting America's ability to act in its own defense.

In 1970, as a congressional candidate Kerry said "the United Nations should have control over most of our foreign military operations. I'm an internationalist. I'd like to see our troops dispersed through the world only at the direction of the United Nations." (*Harvard Crimson* 1/18/70)

As a Senator in 1985, Kerry was for the United States accepting compulsory jurisdiction under the World Court (which at that time had both the Soviet Union and one Soviet captive nation on the Court, as well as China and several other dictatorships).

Kerry went on to say in 1986 that he thought Reagan was too unilateral in asserting freedom of the seas by crossing what Qaddafi had called 'the line of death' in the Gulf of Sidra, where the Libyans attacked US naval aircraft and we shot down two Libyan planes. Kerry wrote, "there would have been more prudent means to test Qaddafi's claim in the World Court...one has to question the reasoning which was behind such a unilateral action."

In 1986 Kerry indicated he was against Reagan's bombing of Libya after the Libyan bombing of a Berlin disco had killed two American servicemen. "Our response was not proportional...the fact that the bombing resulted in the deaths of at least 17 civilians certainly undermined the administration's own justification for the raid...The fact that we are not going to solve the problem of terrorism with this kind of retaliation." He called

for diplomatic and economic steps. The French apparently had the same position as Kerry and blocked the United States from flying over French air space thus forcing our pilots to fly several additional hours and hundreds of extra miles.

While the left has a fixation with multilateral consultation, international approval and limiting American action to those others approve is actually a distinct minority viewpoint. By better than three to one (70% to 20%) Americans believe a pro-American point of view is good (Pew Research Center 2003).

COMBATTING TERRORISM

Kerry's position on international terrorism has historically been to treat it as a crime problem and a problem of hunting down individuals rather than an issue of war and one requiring defeating a worldwide insurgency.

Kerry has always opposed the death penalty for domestic crime and in 1988 he extended that opposition to the death penalty to protecting cop killers and drug dealers (October 1988).

When Leon Klinghoffer was killed in his wheelchair during the Achille Lauro hijacking by Abu Nidal (who then went to Baghdad and survived for over a decade as a guest of Saddam Hussein), Kerry opposed efforts to apply the death penalty to terrorists (October 26, 1989).

Kerry again opposed the death penalty for terrorists on February 20, 1991.

Kerry again voted against the death penalty for terrorists on July 28, 1993.

Even after 9/11 Kerry has emphasized the law enforcement over the war aspects of the Al Qaeda insurgency: "Kerry characterized the war on terror as predominantly an intelligence gathering and law enforcement operation. "It's basically a manhunt." (*Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, 2/12/04).

Even though Kerry asserts terrorism is an intelligence and law enforcement problem, his record has been one of being anti-intelligence and anti-law enforcement as well as anti-defense.

He has voted to cut the FBI (9/29/95).

He proposed a five year cut in the intelligence budget (9/29/95) after the World Trade Center bombing.

Kerry proposed Intelligence spending cuts totaling \$7.5 billion. Even Democrats opposed him.

Sen. Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ) said Kerry's 1994 amendment to cut intelligence would "close our eyes and ears" to gathering threats. "We have to stay ready. It makes no sense

for us to close our eyes and ears to developments around the world which could ultimately save U.S. lives and resources." (Sen. Dennis DeConcini [D-AZ], *Congressional Record*, 2/10/94, p. S1360)

Sen. Daniel Inouye (D-HI) said Kerry's proposed cut "would severely hamper" intelligence efforts. "Madam President, the intelligence budget has already been cut by almost 18 percent over the past 2 years. An additional reduction of \$1 billion would severely hamper the intelligence community's ability to provide decision makers and policymakers with information on matters of vital concern to this country." (Sen. Daniel Inouye [D-HI], *Congressional Record*, 2/10/94, pp. S1330-S1332)

Inouye also said Kerry's amendment would leave our troops vulnerable to attack. "Madam President, if we expect the 1 percent of our nation to risk their lives and stand in harm's way, the least we can do is to provide them with all of the resources necessary so that they can carry out their mission and get home to their loved ones. We cannot do any less. This amendment would take away their protection, and I am not prepared to do that." (Sen. Daniel Inouye [D-HI], *Congressional Record*, 2/10/94, pp. S1330-S1332)

Kerry has been for weakness and American timidity whether you define terrorism as a military problem, an intelligence problem, or a law enforcement problem.

GOOD JUDGEMENT AND CLEAR THINKING; KERRY ON ARAFAT AND ISRAEL

One of the best examples of Kerry's leftwing view of the world is his description of Arafat in his 1997 book, *The New War*. He described Arafat's "transformation from outlaw to statesman" as a model for other terrorist leaders to follow.

After six more years of Arafat's support of terrorism and 1,000 dead Israelis from terrorist attacks (the equivalent of over 40,000 dead Americans in comparative population terms), the Israelis decided to build a fence separating themselves from the terrorists.

Kerry has had two precisely opposite reactions to the Israeli fence.

In October 2003 Kerry said the fence "is a barrier to peace."

In February 2004 Kerry said the fence is "a legitimate act of self defense."

This is typical of the unreliable and uncertain policies of weakness and submission to international organizations which have characterized three decades of Kerry's statements about international relations.

TEST TWO: WHAT KIND OF COUNTRY WILL WE BE?

This topic breaks into several components. The first is the centrality of our Creator to defining rights in America (to use the language of the Declaration of Independence's "we

are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”).

THE CENTRALITY OF OUR CREATOR FOR MOST AMERICANS THE CASE OF THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

More than nine out of every ten Americans (91%) want to keep “under God” in the Pledge of Allegiance. Less than one in ten (8%) do not want to say “under God” (Gallup Poll April 2004).

If America is a free country then there should be (and are) constitutional mechanisms for stopping appointed lawyers from outlawing the Pledge of Allegiance in what would be an act of Judicial tyranny. In fact, as Larry Kramer’s *The People Themselves: Popular Constitutionalism and Judicial Review* states, there is clear historic precedent for the Legislative and Executive branches to impose on the Judicial branch the people’s views of the Constitution. Kramer is the Dean at Stanford Law School and his book is a thorough refutation of the theory of Judicial Supremacy. Kramer asserts the Warren Court beginning in 1958 was trying to “manufacture” judicial supremacy when clearly *Marbury v. Madison* asserted no such power.

Kramer notes that the Federalists tried to dominate the Courts after the Jeffersonians won the election of 1800. The new President would not be sworn in until March in that era and so the Federalists more than doubled the number of Federal Circuit Court judges (from 17 to 35), appointed and got Senate approval of their 18 new Judges between the election and the inauguration of Thomas Jefferson.

The Jeffersonians were totally unimpressed with this effort to thwart the popular will by hiding power in the Judicial branch. Jefferson warned that judicial supremacy would be rule by an oligarchy. The Jeffersonians promptly abolished the new judgeships and 18 Federalist federal judges found themselves without a job.

Thomas Jefferson was quite clear about the unacceptability of the judges claiming to be the final, supreme interpreters of the Constitution: "You seem...to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions; a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy... The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal."

It is the duty of those who would represent the American people to find mechanisms for our generation which block appointed lawyers from stripping from the American people freedoms and values they believe in. In no area have the Courts gone further astray than in attacking the right of the American people to have their Creator in the public arena.

GOD, VALUES, HISTORY, AND THE PUBLIC ARENA:
HOW LEFTWING JUDGES ARE TRYING TO CREATE
A SECULAR AMERICA WITH THE ELITE MEDIA'S SUPPORT

To understand how big the gap is between the overwhelming majority of Americans and the leftwing elites (a point overwhelmingly made by Samuel Huntington in his new book, *Who Are We?*) consider the following examples:

Belief in God: 92% yes, 8% no (Gallup poll, February 2003).

A belief in God is very important or extremely important issue for a true American: 68% believe so (Huntington).

By nearly three to one (74%), Americans oppose removing all references to God from oaths of public office (Huntington).

Nearly three out of four (73%) approve of school prayer before athletic games (Huntington).

More than three out of four (78%) favor allowing children to pray on school grounds (Huntington). Kerry opposed a voluntary school prayer amendment (9/10/85) saying it was "a first step" to "establish an official religion in this country." And he went on to say that it would "tear down the wall of separation and attack the principles which Jefferson espoused" (*Congressional Record* S11148, 9/10/85).

In direct contrast to Kerry's stated views, by 71 to 24 Americans believe that the Constitution promises freedom OF religion, not freedom FROM religion (Pew July 2003).

By 85 to 15 Americans say religion is very or fairly important in their lives. Only 15% say it is unimportant (Gallup June, 2004).

Clearly the leftwing elites in the news media, in the Judiciary, and in academe, have been advocating an America which is far more secular and far more hostile to religion than the beliefs of most Americans.

This 50 year process of lawyer-imposed change further explains why a handful of lawyers changing the definition of marriage is so resented by a majority of Americans. While there is some doubt about the right solution, it is a fact that by a large margin Americans favor preserving traditional marriage between a man and a woman even if some would accept a legal union for partnerships outside traditional marriage. The hostility is deepened by the sense that once again a handful of lawyers (in this case four in Massachusetts) have overruled the American people. They have bypassed the Constitutional process of elections, legislatures, and Presidents or Governors having to resolve issues of the popular will in favor of a handful of leftwing elitists imposing change against the values of the American people.

As Larry Kramer outlines in *The People Themselves*, this new leftwing elitist judicial supremacy is entirely a product of the last 50 years and is an aberration from the American historic tradition. Americans are overwhelmingly opposed to the most anti-religious decisions of the Courts but up until now neither political party has been willing to represent the popular majority against the elitist left on the bench.

The bills to block any judicial review of the Pledge of Allegiance that Senator John Kyl and Congressman Todd Akin have introduced in the Senate and House may be the first big step toward breaking the Judicial Supremacy theory and returning to a more popular constitutionalism.

THE LEFT'S HYSTERIA ABOUT CONSERVATIVE FEDERAL JUDGES

Precisely because the left knows it cannot win an honest, open debate about values among the American people, it has withdrawn more and more into two anti-democratic institutions. It has relied on filing lawsuits and getting leftwing judgments to move the system in directions it knows the American people would never approve in an election. It has also used the 60 vote requirement of the Senate to block the President and the majority from appointing the kind of conservative judges who would reject the left's elitist claims to redefine America against the values of the American people.

The American people have to insist on their right to have judges who reflect their values and to have the Congress and the President take whatever steps are necessary to protect them from leftwing judges who would abuse their position to impose antidemocratic ideas and anti-American values.

If the Left is determined to block judges who reflect the values of most Americans then this has to become a defining crisis both of the Senate and of the election process.

The current position of the Kerry-Edwards team and their leftwing allies is that no Catholic, Orthodox Jewish, or fundamentalist Protestant nominee for judge who would follow their religious beliefs should be confirmed to serve on the Federal Appeals Court or Supreme Court.

This is a position of such stunning anti-religious bias that if the American people understood it they would virtually eliminate the Senate Democrats as a party as the Jeffersonians decisively defeated the Federalists.

TEST THREE: WILL OUR CHILDREN AND NEW AMERICANS LEARN THE VALUES AND HISTORY OF BEING AMERICAN?

This is actually a key test in the survival of America as a free society.

America's DNA is not geographic nor racial. America is defined by a cultural-historical pattern that has allowed more people or more ethnic and linguistic backgrounds to work together and govern themselves than any other society in history.

The American system of self government, creativity, and productivity is actually very complex and takes a while to learn.

For the last three generations there has been a growing bias in the academic community, the news media and the Hollywood elite against teaching America as a civilization and ensuring that new Americans—whether children or immigrants—have an opportunity to learn to be effective.

This left bias against America is a very important and deeply under-noticed weakness of the left. The majorities who disagree with this anti-American, politically correct, multicultural approach are massive. However, the viciousness of the left's leadership and the intensity of academic and news media pressure to intimidate those who would speak up for American history, American values, and American traditions has left the American people with very few leaders willing to fight what should be an overwhelmingly popular fight.

Consider the following examples.

First, most Americans are very proud of their country. By 45 to 1 Americans are either extremely or very proud to be an American (91%) while 2% are not proud (ABC/Washington Post poll, September 2002). Obviously Michael Moore and many of his 'contempt for America' friends fit into the 2%. Moore asserted that the U.S. "is known for bringing sadness and misery to places around the globe. ... It's all part of the same ball of wax, right? The oil companies, Israel, Halliburton." They get a lot of press from admiring elite media but they do not get much agreement from the country.

Second, the public believes "schools should make a special effort to teach new immigrants about American values" (88% agree) (Public Agenda September 21, 1998).

Third, parents agree that schools should focus on teaching students how to be American. When asked "what should be a bigger priority: teaching students to be proud of being part of this country and learning the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, or focusing on instilling pride in their ethnic group's identity and heritage?" (Public Agenda September 21, 1998):

79% of all parents chose pride and learning in America. 18% chose their group.

80% of Hispanic parents chose focusing on America. 17% chose their group.

73% of all foreign born parents chose learning about America. 23% chose their group.

66% of African American parents chose learning about America. 29% chose their group.

Thus even in the weakest group the support for emphasizing America was better than two to one.

Americans are so concerned about teaching America's language and culture that by 65 to 26 they believe schools should help new immigrants absorb America's language and culture even if their native language and culture are neglected (Public Agenda September 21, 1998).

English is still seen as essential and 81% of all Americans believe immigrants should learn English (Huntington).

EDUCATION REFORM

Americans not only favor their schools teaching American history, culture and language, they also favor the schools being much tougher. By 66 to 13 Americans favor increasing by 50% the number of hours children spend in school on education basics such as math, science, history and English (Public Opinion Strategies 1998/1999).

Americans are also prepared to insist that teachers be adequately prepared and be held accountable. By 82 to 14 Americans would require teachers to pass a standard test before they could be allowed to teach. By 81 to 9 Americans would require teachers to be retested and certified every five years. By 71 to 16 Americans would give principals power to fire bad teachers without a long wait. By 85 to 8 Americans favor an education reform package that includes tougher teacher standards and more local control over schools and expands the use of computers and new technology in the classroom. By 80 to 12 Americans favor tougher teacher standards and more local control over schools (same as the previous but without the computers and new technology). (All of these are Public Opinion Strategies 1998/1999).

Americans really want education focused in the classroom. By 80% to 10% Americans favor requiring 90% of all state education spending to go into the classroom (Public Opinion Strategies 1998/99). This strategy, even if only partially implemented, would increase teachers' salaries at no cost to the taxpayer.

Many Americans would go even further in expanding educational opportunity. By 64% to 33% Americans would expand charter schools and school choice programs to give parents and their children more options to attend a high quality school that best meets their need (Public Opinion Strategies February, 2004). This would clearly be deeply opposed by most of the left-liberal establishment.

Americans are also willing to pay more for a better education system. By 79% to 20% they would increase state funding for elementary and secondary education to continue to

improve student performance and give schools the resources they need (Public Opinion Strategies February 2004).

Republicans have done some very popular things in education reform but do not talk about them. For example, 82% of all Americans favor a savings account similar to an IRA that would allow parents to save tax-free for their children's college education ((% oppose) (public Opinion Strategies 1998/99). Republicans already passed this and it is now law but no one gives President Bush and the congressional Republicans credit and they do not remind people of their achievement.

THE COMING CLASH BETWEEN THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND THE LEFT-LIBERAL EDUCATION ESTABLISHMENT

It is clear that in virtually all of these areas of American history, American culture, English as a language, and the need for dramatic reforms in the education system, the left-liberal establishment will bitterly oppose these changes.

What is needed is a willingness to arouse, focus and organize the 2 to 1 and up to 9 to 1 majorities that exist for Patriotic Education and effective education.

THE WORK ETHIC AS PART OF AMERICAN CULTURE

To a degree, the left-liberal establishment has never understood that the vast majority of Americans believe in work and understand we are endowed with the right to 'pursue' happiness -- but that there are no guarantees we will find it.

By more than 17 to 1 (87% to 5%) Americans believe we should limit the benefits for able-bodied welfare recipients to two years and require them to do community work, attend school, and participate in a job training program (Public Opinion Strategies 1998/1999).

By 4 to 1 (69% to 19%) Americans believe able bodied people on welfare should be required to work in community and would allow cities to pay them slightly less than minimum wage because they continue to receive other benefits (Public Opinion Strategies 1998/1999).

Americans also believe faith based efforts might be effective in helping the poor. By 72% to 26% Americans support expanding state financial support of faith based charitable organizations to help provide critical services to children, seniors, battered women, the disabled, the homeless and other at risk groups (Public Opinion Strategies February 2004).

John Kerry is opposed to the vast majority of Americans on work requirements. Kerry opposed work requirements for welfare in June 1988, June 1993, September 1995 and July 1996. Americans who favor a work requirement outnumber leftists like Kerry who oppose work requirements by 17 to 1.

For the last three years the left-liberal establishment in the Senate has bottled up welfare reform.

When 87% of the American people are with you and only 5% are opposed it is worth a week or more of the Senate's time to make the Democrats prove they oppose work requirements. This should be a major priority for September and would put Tom Daschle in an extraordinarily difficult position.

PATRIOTIC EDUCATION: PROTECTING THE AMERICAN FLAG

Americans generally are proud of their flag. By 69% to 29% Americans display a flag.

A majority of Americans are deeply offended by actions which disgrace, demean and destroy the flag. 79% think it should be illegal to burn it (ABC/Washington Post July 12, 1998).

That majority of Americans strongly supports an amendment to protect the flag (63% in 1999 according to Gallup) and would support a motion to simply strip the Court of the ability to protect flag burners.

John Kerry has not only voted three times against an amendment to protect the American flag but he has gone a step even further to the left and viciously attacked those who would protect the flag.

In what one reporter described as "perhaps the strongest speech against the amendment" Kerry compared those protecting the flag to "Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, China, Cuba, Syria, and Sudan." Kerry went on to assert that with a flag burning amendment "we could join this list of dictatorial, authoritarian, and discredited regimes."

The gap between traditional Americans and a presidential candidate of the left could hardly be wider.

TEST FOUR: HOW WILL WE BE ABLE TO CREATE PROSPERITY AND JOBS IN THE 21ST CENTURY?

Americans know that it is very important to continue developing better jobs and to insource better jobs for America. Keeping American jobs is very or fairly important to 85% of all Americans. Only 14% say keeping American jobs is not too important.

Burdened by their personal injury lawyer allies, their labor union work rules focused allies, their high tax ideology, their support for bureaucrats over entrepreneurs, the left focuses on hiding from the competition in the world market through economic isolationism and stopping outsourcing rather than on economic growth and maximizing insourcing and the creation of new jobs.

Historically, the left's strategy of economic isolationism has been a disaster for Europe. The level of structural unemployment has been high in countries like Germany. The growth rate in productivity, jobs and income have all lagged the United States.

There is a strategy of lower taxes, more entrepreneurial creativity, favoring small businesses, and focusing on creating new jobs which could have a very broad base of popular support. John Kerry and John Edwards are wrong on many of the key elements of this strategy.

People have a deep sense that Union leaders have unfair power and 69% of the American people favor stopping unions from automatically deducting money for political contributions and forcing unions to use only voluntary donations while only 12% disagree (Public Opinion Strategies 1998/99).

TAXES

Americans instinctively believe that lower taxes can help increase economic growth. In 2004 by better than two to one (67% to 26%) Americans favored reducing their state income taxes so they could keep more of what they earned and have more money to boost the state economy (Public Opinion Strategies February 2004).

By better than two to one (65% to 27%), Americans favor the complete elimination of the estate tax (National Annenberg Election Survey 2004).

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, JOBS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Overwhelmingly (83% to 16%), Americans believe there is an opportunity to use science and technology to invest in clean energy technologies both to protect the environment and to create new jobs through the development of these new technologies. Much of this strategy is being implemented in President Bush's hydrogen program and in the Energy bill which is stalled by the left in the Senate. Republicans have understated and underemphasized how much of this they are committed to and how big an opportunity this is in the environment, in jobs, and in national security.

The American people's commitment to the environment is deep and powerful. It is the major areas in which Republicans have failed to communicate the programs and ideas which are responsive to the American people.

By better than 4 to 1 (81% to 18%), the American people favor toughening environmental regulations and protections to protect against polluters and preserve the water we drink and the air we breathe (Public Opinion Strategies February 2004).

By better than 7 to 1 (88% to 12%), Americans want to develop clean, renewable energy resources to protect the environment (Public Opinion Strategies February 2004).

The Bush Administration and Congressional Republicans actually have a number of programs and ideas which are responsive to this demand but Republicans have simply not been in the habit of talking about the environment. They clearly should address it at every opportunity.

Americans really believe science and technology are keys to a better future. By 72% to 27%, Americans favor providing tax benefits to research and biotechnology companies to entice these companies to their state to create more high paying jobs (Public Opinion Strategies February 2004).

THE COST OF PERSONAL INJURY LAWYERS

There is a substantial consensus that personal injury lawyers sue too much and make too much.

By nearly 7 to 1 (75% to 11%), Americans would limit the amount of money personal injury lawyers can claim to no more than 15% of money awarded (Public Opinion Strategies 1998/99).

Americans also see a relationship between too many personal injury lawsuits and doctors being driven out of the practice of medicine. By almost 3 to 1 (71% to 26%), Americans would limit monetary damages in medical malpractice cases to keep doctors from leaving the state (Public Opinion Strategies February 2004).

HEALTH FOR THOSE STILL WORKING

Americans want the uninsured to have access to insurance but they prefer a private sector tax credit approach.

By almost 7 to 1 (85% to 13%), Americans would cut taxes on employers who offer health care benefits to their employees to reduce the problem for the uninsured (Public Opinion Strategies February 2004).

If you add in the issue of helping small businesses stay competitive by giving them tax breaks for insuring their employees, the support improves slightly to 87% to 12% (Public Opinion Strategies February 2004).

TEST FIVE:

HOW WILL WE MAKE SURE THAT THE BABY BOOMERS AND THEIR CHILDREN HAVE GOOD RETIREMENTS AND GOOD HEALTH?

This is a topic where the country is far ahead of the politicians. Americans know the baby boomers are heading toward retirement. Americans instinctively understand the challenges of Social Security and Medicare. They are ready for much more change than the politicians are prepared to discuss.

Despite the end of the 'dot com' bubble and several years of weak stock markets, the American people favor allowing workers to invest in some Social Security contributions in the stock market by 57% to 36%. Considering the scale of change involved and the historic sense that the topic could not even be discussed, this is an extraordinary number. All the evidence is that the supporters will increase every year and the opponents will decline.

These numbers in the face of the stock market of the last four years is a real vindication of President Bush's decision in 1999 to campaign on personal Social Security accounts. This is not a topic Republicans should hide from. This is a significant part of their future.

On Medicare the country is overwhelmingly committed to helping seniors. By 9 to 1 (81% to 7%) Americans want to provide funds for poorer seniors to help pay for prescription drug costs (Public Opinion Strategies 1998/1999).

Ironically the Republicans actually delivered on this goal in 2003 but they are so unused to taking credit for improving a social program that the liberals have done a better job lying about the Medicare drug bill than the Republicans have done telling the truth.

If Republicans communicate accurately what they have done for seniors they stand to gain significant support and to further isolate the left.