



Volume 1 Number 13

June 30, 2005

In Today's Report

1. ADL Objects to Prayers At Naval Academy
2. Florida County Say No To "Gay Pride"
3. Businessman Wants to Build A Hotel On Site of Souter's Home

ADL OBJECTS TO PRAYERS AT THE NAVAL ACADEMY

Abraham Foxman, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League, has written a letter to the superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy insisting that it end the practice of having a chaplain say grace before lunch for 4,000 midshipmen. I'm saddened that an organization which once devoted itself to fighting bigotry now exists primarily to promote the liberal agenda.

In a June 17th letter, Foxman claims the prayers constitute an unconstitutional government endorsement of religion.

But the prayers (led by one of the school's Protestant, Catholic or Jewish chaplains) are completely voluntary. How is this different from the practice of opening sessions of Congress with a prayer? Based on the ADL's logic, one would have to conclude that military chaplains themselves constitute a

government endorsement of religion (after all, the government pays them to perform religious functions).

Midshipmen are among the future leaders who will defend this nation on foreign fronts. It is in the public interest to have these young men and women armed with faith. Rather than denying them the opportunity to pray, devotionals should be encouraged. It's a pity the ADL can't see this.

FLORIDA COUNTY SAYS NO TO "GAY PRIDE"

We commend the Hillsborough County Commission for having the courage and integrity to get the county out of the business of celebrating perversion.

Recently, by a vote of 5 to 2, the commissioners directed county government to "abstain from acknowledging, promoting or participating in" so-called gay pride recognition or events.

Residents were outraged by a Gay Pride Month exhibit at a local library. Among the literature distributed by library employees to children, were pamphlets on how adolescents could "explore their sexuality."

As would be expected, gay militants and their allies are up in arms. The American Civil Liberties Union says it is shocked that a governmental entity would actually reflect the views of the public on promoting the homosexual lifestyle.

A New York Times story about this quotes Linda Alexander, who teaches a "diversity" class at the University of South Florida. "My thing is the intellectual freedom part," Alexander says. "Libraries are supposed to be a place (sic.) to learn and explore things."

Would Alexander endorse an exhibit sponsored by Exodus Ministries - staffed by former homosexuals who were delivered from homosexuality by the transforming power of Jesus Christ? I doubt it. Among the professorial elite, diversity is a code word for "my way of thinking."

If government can't promote morality, at least it shouldn't endorse immorality. Would that other public officials had the courage of the Hillsborough County Commissioners.

BUSINESSMAN WANTS TO BUILD A HOTEL ON THE SITE OF SOUTER'S HOME

As they say, turnabout is fair play. Supreme Court Justice David Souter is the author of a decision last week which allows government to take your home or business and give it to someone who ostensibly will make better use of it (i.e., provide more tax revenue or jobs).

This is a frightening expansion of the powers of government. As Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, who only occasionally gets it right, explained in her dissent, it will benefit the rich and influential at the expense of the poor and middle class.

Now a businessman is proposing to give David Souter the Souter treatment.

Logan Darrow Clements is petitioning the Board of Selectmen of Weare, New Hampshire to take the property at 34 Cilley Hill Road (is that pronounced, "silly"? if so, how appropriate!) and give it to him to build a hotel. The proposed development would be called "The Lost Liberty Hotel," which will feature a "Just Deserts Café" and a permanent exhibit on the decline of freedom in America.

Based on Souter's reasoning, Clement's argument is irrefutable. I can put the land to much better use than the current owner (Souter), the businessman says.

My hotel will provide jobs for residents and increased tax revenue for the town.

Whether the proposal is serious or a clever publicity stunt, the point is well taken.

When the principle of confiscation for private gain is established, no man's property is safe.
