

★★★ *In the News* ★★★

THE NATIONAL CENTER



FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH

Winter 2011/2012

Message from David and Amy Ridenour

With the year drawing to a close, we hope you're giving serious consideration to including The National Center for Public Policy Research in your year-end giving plans.

Year-end gifts are crucial to our fight for American liberty as they represent a significant portion of our annual operating budget.

And with next year shaping up to be one of the most challenging years we've ever faced, your year-end gift has never been more important.

The liberals' days in power are numbered and they know it, so they'll do whatever it takes over the next 12 months to ram through more of their agenda.



David with Reagan biographer Lee Edwards outside Reagan's ranch home.

Figuratively speaking, our biggest job will be preventing them from taking all the towels and linens before they check out. And we're not just talking about money, but our constitutional rights as well.

You know that no organization is better equipped for this challenge than your National Center for Public Policy Research.

Our programs – your programs – have achieved incredible results for liberty, including...

- ✓ Educating millions of Americans about the benefits of freedom and free markets through an average of two TV appearances per week, two radio appearances per day, and two published op/eds per day;
- ✓ Stopping millions in corporate dollars from flowing to the big-government liberals, making it more difficult for them to advance their agenda;
- ✓ Exposing programs hidden deep inside massive legislation (such as the lobbying slush fund we found buried in ObamaCare) that threaten our liberty;
- ✓ Keeping conservative allies and initiatives moving forward by defending them when the left inevitably cries "racism";
- ✓ Influencing government policy through expert testimony to federal agencies and Congress;
- ✓ And much, much more.

We've detailed these and other successes in the following pages. They were achieved despite the liberals' dominance of government and the media, thanks to the help of friends such as you.

We're very grateful and honored by the faith you've shown in us through your continued support.

All our very best wishes for a happy, healthy holiday season.

Sincerely,

David and Amy Ridenour



Steven Crowder Blacklisted for Exposing Liberal Blacklisting

“We Never Book Conservative Pundits,” Show Producer Says

Comedy Central’s Daily Show host Jon Stewart has long cultivated a politically-moderate image as a means of increasing his credibility and making himself a more effective advocate of the left’s agenda.

His “Rally to Restore Sanity” held in Washington, D.C. last fall, for example, was billed as a means for ordinary Americans to make their voices heard over those of extremists from both the left and the right.

But our Steven Crowder stripped away this veneer of moderation when he quoted one of Stewart’s senior producers saying “we never book conservative pundits” in one of Steven’s weekly videos for The National Center.



Steven Crowder provides proof of Daily Show host Jon Stewart’s liberal bias during an interview on Fox’s “Huckabee.”

The video, which focuses on the entertainment industry’s tacit blacklisting of conservatives, has been viewed close to 90,000 times and received coverage on Fox’s “Fox & Friends” and “Huckabee,” among others.

Stewart wasn’t pleased that Steven had blown his cover, to say the least.

“It caused quite a stir, enough for Mr. Stewart himself to be upset and for said producer to furiously call my manager,” said Steven. “[My manager] made it known that he had mouths to feed, and he would have to put some distance between [us] in order to maintain a viable career.”

Being dumped by his manager was no small thing. It means Steven – a stand up comic and actor in addition to being host of our “Louder with Crowder” – will likely receive

many fewer bookings and that’s money right out of his pocket.

Steven set out to show that television and Hollywood discriminate against conservatives and proved it by becoming a victim of it himself.

Steven has created quite a stir in other quarters, too.

His videos for us, over 30 so far, are routinely viewed more than 50,000 times on YouTube and are covered by such leading blogs as Glenn Beck’s “The Blaze,” Breitbart, Instapundit, RedState, MichelleMalkin.com, Big Journalism, HotAir and Moonbattery.

Even Steven’s videos on complicated topics, such as one he produced on net neutrality, are viewed tens of thousands of

Continued on next page...



Deneen Borelli testifies to the U.S. House Natural Resources Committee that Obama’s resistance to domestic energy production is harming minorities.

THE NATIONAL CENTER



FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH

In the News is published by The National Center for Public Policy Research. The National Center is a communications and research foundation dedicated to providing free market solutions to today’s public policy challenges.

Amy Ridenour, Chairman
David A. Ridenour, President
David Almasi, Executive Director

Board of Directors

Horace Cooper
Edmund F. Haislmaier, Treasurer
Victor Porlier
Amy Ridenour
David A. Ridenour
Ron Robinson
Peter Schweizer

The National Center for Public Policy Research, founded in 1982, is a non-profit organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Donations are tax-deductible.

501 Capitol Court, NE Suite 200
Washington, DC 20002

Tel. (202)543-4110 • Fax (202)543-5975
www.nationalcenter.org • info@nationalcenter.org

Inquiries about how to support our work:
dridenour@nationalcenter.org



Tom Borelli discusses Obama's war on fossil fuels during the last full week of Glenn Beck's show on the Fox News Channel.

times. This shows that our "Louder with Crowder" video series is a very effective tool for educating the public about liberty.

Although

Steven's been blacklisted by some in the entertainment field, you can still see his "Louder with Crowder" videos on our website every week, thanks to your generous support.



Free Enterprise Project Reducing Crony Capitalism

"There has been a lot of talk lately about GE and what some call crony capitalism," General Electric acknowledged in the September issue of its online newsletter, GEReports.

GE was talking about us.



Dana Gattuso jokes with U.S. Circuit Court of Claims Judge Loren Smith following his speech at one of our periodic policy luncheons for opinion leaders and congressional staff.

No one has done more to expose corporate crony capitalism nor fought it more strenuously than your National Center for Public Policy Research through its Free Enterprise Project.

At GE's annual shareholder meeting this year, for example, our Free Enterprise Project sponsored a number of high-profile activities to draw attention to GE's crony capitalism: its

support of greenhouse gas regulation; its lobbying for and acceptance of millions in federal stimulus money; and its tapping of a \$139 billion FDIC credit line for its financial arm, GE Capital.

Our Tom Borelli kicked off our activities by giving a barn-burner speech at a "Fire Jeff Immelt Rally," held just outside the meeting, in which he called out GE CEO Jeff Immelt for cynically using concern over global warming as a means of raising fossil fuel prices in the hope of increasing demand for GE wind turbines and other renewable energy products.



Deneen Borelli criticizes White House Council of Economic Advisors Chairman-designate Alan Krueger's tax plan on "Your World with Neil Cavuto."

Inside the meeting, National Center President David Ridenour chastised Immelt directly for ingratiating himself to President Obama to secure favors for GE and challenged him to disclose whose interests he represents as chairman of the President's Council on Competitiveness and Jobs – GE's or the American people's.

Immelt refused to give David a direct answer, but GE is taking note of our criticism and that of others. According to the Wall Street Journal, "the constant attacks are raising worries inside the company... and some executives have said privately that they would like Mr. Immelt to step down from the council."

Tom followed up on David's remarks by warning Immelt that his close association with the big-government left could harm GE's reputation among conservatives, hurt sales and, consequently, the company's bottom line. And he came armed with proof: Tom presented the results of a poll we commissioned showing GE's

favorability rating among conservatives dropping from 51% to just 20% once respondents were informed that GE had lobbied for the regulation of greenhouse gases and President Obama's stimulus program.

Deneen Borelli then presented a shareholder resolution that would have required GE to calculate the risks to GE's busi-

Continued on next page...

Continued from previous page...

ness of the global warming regulations for which Immelt had lobbied – information that would create a shareholder backlash to GE’s left-wing advocacy.

It was our second resolution of the year. Our first, a proposal requiring GE to be more transparent in its lobbying, was adopted by GE in advance of the shareholder meeting to avoid a vote of shareholders.

These efforts and others earned substantial media coverage, including in the Wall Street Journal, Reuters, the O’Reilly Factor and the Fox Business Channel.

Within a week of our shareholder meeting activism, Immelt signaled his retreat on global warming and other green initiatives, saying, “If I had one thing to do over again, I would not have talked so much about green... I’m kind of over the stage of arguing for [greenhouse gas regulation].”



Risk Analysis Division Director Jeff Stier (right) disputes junk science through regular appearances on WPBR Radio’s Craig Henne Show.

GE is just one of many corporations that our Free Enterprise Project has convinced to rethink their liberal advocacy.

Five corporations – Caterpillar, John Deere, GM, BP and ConocoPhillips – dropped their support for a green lobbying group after we pressured them to do so. We expect more corporations to follow their lead.

We’re also forcing companies that backed ObamaCare into retreat, with the lobbyist of one pharmaceutical company telling us, “What you’re doing is very effective... now what will it take to make you stop?” They’ve already committed to lobbying for changes to the President’s health care plan. Stopping crony capitalism is the key to restoring fiscal sanity in Washington, as it has been the driver for many of the government programs – ObamaCare, the 2003 expansion of Medicare, tens of thousands of pages of new federal

regulations and green boondoggles such as Solyndra – that together have added trillions of dollars to our nation’s debt.



Steven Crowder dispels the media’s negative myths about marriage on “Fox & Friends.”

Our Free Enterprise Project is doing just that, thanks to your support.



Risk Analysis Division Blows the Lid Off ObamaCare Slush Fund

A once little-known provision of ObamaCare that creates a multi-billion dollar slush fund used by Obama Administration to promote policies it favors locally is now a lot better known, thanks to our Risk Analysis Division.

Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) is a Centers for Disease Control program funded under ObamaCare ostensibly to underwrite local programs that “reduce risk factors and prevent/delay chronic disease and promote wellness.”

What it is in reality is a program that enables the Obama Administration to use taxpayer dollars to get local governments to adopt health and environmental policies of its liking.

The program had been slated to receive \$500 million in funding this year and \$2 billion in perpetuity beginning in 2015. But RAD Director Jeff Stier exposed the program buried deep within the ObamaCare legislation in an article in The Hill, a publication widely read by congressmen and their staffs, and, just a few days later, the U.S. House of Representatives voted to rescind funding for the program.

“Federal law forbids any funds to be used for ‘lobbying,’ yet hundreds of



Project 21 spokesman Charles Butler chastises Obama for attempting to blame America’s economic woes on others on “Fox & Friends.”

Continued on Page 8...

We Must Ban the Light Bulb Ban

By AMY RIDENOUR, CHAIRMAN

When General Electric blamed “a variety of energy regulations that establish lighting efficiency standards” for the closing of bulb factories in Virginia, Ohio and Kentucky, it ignored a critical detail: It and fellow light bulb manufacturers Phillips and Osram Sylvania had lobbied for those restrictions.



Amy Ridenour

Ignore claims about global warming. The motive behind the bulb ban was money: Incandescents have a low profit margin.

Let's shatter a few myths.

Myth 1: “There is no light bulb ban.” The most effective lie is one with a kernel of truth, and this example of that maxim is based on the fact that not *all* incandescent light bulbs are banned, just the ones Americans buy most.

Standard 100-watt incandescent bulbs will be phased out next year, 75-watt bulbs will be phased out in 2013 and 60- and 40-watt incandescent bulbs will be phased out in 2014.

By 2020, Halogen incandescent bulbs will also be gone. These bulbs have

been cited as proof there is no light bulb ban because the public will be able to buy them after January 1, 2012 – but only temporarily.

Myth 2: “Alternative bulbs are better.” Alternative bulbs are *different*, but whether they are better depends on what the consumer needs.

People prone to seizures should avoid exposure to CFLs as their constant flickering can trigger an episode. Those with Lupus and other autoimmune diseases should also avoid them because the bulbs' ultraviolet light can cause them to break out in a rash.

Seniors may not want to use CFLs as their narrower beam makes reading more difficult for those with diminished sight.

CFL and LED lighting can also be inappropriate in certain business settings as their cooler light can alter perceptions of color. When Europe banned incandescent bulbs, owners of both art galleries and restaurants complained. Under CFL and LED lighting, the artwork just didn't look right... nor did people's dinner dates.

Myth 3: “Alternatives to incandescents are just as safe.” CFLs contain sufficient mercury for the EPA to recommend a tedious 10-to-11-step process for cleanup of broken CFLs. Consumers also are supposed to take discarded bulbs to a special disposal center, but few likely do so. This means more mercury in the air as bulbs inevitably break in trash cans and garbage trucks.

LED bulbs contain lead and nickel, long-term exposure to which can present health risks.

Myth 4: “You'll save money.” Although most incandescent alternatives use less energy, they cost considerably more

up-front and often don't last as long as advertised. CFLs, for example, wear out sooner if they're turned on frequently, used in freezing weather or used with dimmers.

LEDs aren't very economical, having very high upfront costs. Manufacturers claim prices will come down as the incandescent ban increases sales of LEDs, creating economies of scale. Others say banning low cost alternatives isn't the way to push prices down.

“Defenders of the light bulb ban claim people are better off... but if the public agreed, Congress wouldn't need a ban to get us to switch.”

Myth 5: “The bulb ban creates jobs.” In China, sure: 75% of CFLs are made in China and no major CFL brand is made in America. Incandescent bulbs were manufactured in the U.S., but when the last remaining U.S. plant closed in 2010 even the Washington Post conceded it was due to the bulb ban.

Defenders of the light bulb ban claim people are better off with alternatives to incandescents, but if the public agreed, Congress wouldn't need a ban to get us to switch.

Who knows the needs of your household better: You, or Congress?

(A version of this article appeared in at least 35 newspapers, including the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, the Sacramento Bee, Kansas City Star, and the Portland Oregonian.)



Donor Profile: Velma L. Richardson *In Memoriam*



I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Velma L. Richardson, a dear friend and long-time supporter of The National Center for Public Policy Research.

Velma was born on October 15, 1915 to D.M. and Effie Richardson, owner-operators of a small hotel with a restaurant in Aldus, Oklahoma.

Everyone in the Richardson family did something to help out with the business and Velma often ended up preparing the meals for hotel guests. That's what she told me sparked her life-long interest in nutrition.

She spent her entire career as a dietitian, first as a civilian, and then, after the start of World War II, as a U.S. Army officer.

During the war, she was stationed in Wales. Afterward, she served at Fitzsimmons General Hospital in Colorado and in Japan and Germany.

Given the importance of proper nutrition to combat readiness and to the recovery of wounded troops, the Army elevated its dieticians to regular Army status in 1947.

It wasn't an easy transition. The split in authority between hospital mess administrators and dieticians was a constant source of friction.

In response, the U.S. Surgeon General established a committee in 1949 to advise him on how to reorganize the hospital food service to reduce conflict, establish consistent procedures and improve standards. Velma was one of nine officers he chose to serve on the committee.

Velma and her colleagues completed their work in September 1949 and, as a result, the hospital food services division was established the following year. The organizational structure that Velma helped create is still largely with us today.

During her time in the military, Velma had the opportunity to organize cocktail and coffee receptions for Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman. She was especially proud of a photo she had picturing her serving coffee to President Truman.

Her last posting was at Walter Reed Army Medical Hospital in Washington, D.C. and she retired with a rank of Major.

Velma got to know us through her younger sister, Maxine, who was for many years a generous National Center donor. I got to know Velma through numerous lunches with her to discuss our work and politics in general at her residence in San Antonio, Texas.

She was especially fond of and kind to my kids, frequently sending me home with small gifts for them: battery-operated toothbrushes, crayons or watercolor sets. In return, my kids would send her drawings and paintings.

I've got to be honest: Their artwork wasn't very good, but Velma said it was "precious."

I'll not only miss our long talks and our friendship... I'll also miss her diplomacy.

By David A. Ridenour

The New Year Could Be Difficult... *Without Your Year-End Gift*

Next year is shaping up to be one of the most difficult years we've faced in our 30-year history.

The left sees the writing on the wall. Its leaders see the opinion polls showing that their grip on power will erode even further next fall. And they know that next year may be their last, best chance to advance their agenda, perhaps for many years.



They'll do whatever it takes to make the most of their limited-time opportunity, whether it means intimidating Congress into yielding to its will through faux grassroots groups such as Occupy Wall Street or by bypassing Congress altogether.

We must do whatever it takes to stop them.

Your year-end gift is vital to our efforts to defend and extend American liberty in 2012, as such gifts represent a significant portion of our annual revenue.

Here are a number of the best ways to make a year-end gift...

Gifts of Cash

The easiest way to make a year-end donation is by cash, check or credit card. You can take a charitable deduction up to 50% of your adjusted gross income for such gifts and amounts over that can be carried over up to five years. Credit card donations may take a day or two to process, so you should consider sending such gifts earlier to ensure they'll be counted in 2011.

Gifts of IRAs

The IRA charitable rollover was extended by Congress through the end of this year, allowing you to donate up to \$100,000 directly from your IRA to The National Center for Public Policy Research without taking a distribution that ordinarily would incur a tax liability. To qualify, you must be at least 70½ years of age, the donations must be transferred directly from your IRA trustee (bank or brokerage firm), and the transaction must be completed by December 31 of this year.

Gifts of Appreciated Stock

Gifts of appreciated stock require a little more advance planning, but can yield substantial tax advantages. By transferring stocks you've owned for at least one year to The National Center, you can completely avoid federal and state capital gains taxes AND still be eligible for a charitable deduction for the full current market value of such stocks.

To take advantage of this giving option, please provide your broker with our broker's contact information and our account information:

**Scott Wilson, UBS Financial Services,
Tel. (202) 585-5419
email scott.a.wilson@ubs.com
Account #: WS-39878; DTC#: 0221 FBO.**

Please also indicate the security or securities and the number of shares you plan to donate on the envelope attached to this publication, so we can keep an eye out for it. The transaction must be completed by December 31, 2011 to qualify for a deduction for this tax year.

Insurance Policies

Donating life insurance policies you no longer need is a great way to make a year-end gift and earn a generous tax deduction. To qualify for a charitable deduction, you must name The National Center as your beneficiary and transfer ownership of the policy.

If you have any questions or need help planning your year-end gift, please call David Ridenour anytime at (202) 543-4110 ext. 16 or send him an email at dridenour@nationalcenter.org.

Continued from page 4...

millions of dollars are currently being sent [through CPPW] to advance a wide range of specifically enumerated policy changes that... [Obama's Center for Disease Control] would like implemented locally," Jeff wrote.

Jeff found that the CPPW funded a whole host of programs the Obama Administration wants, including the imposition of additional soda and junk food taxes; the promotion of food cooperatives; removal of food deemed "unhealthy" from schools; the adoption of smoking bans, both indoors and outdoor; and more.

Our RAD program is fast becoming one of the nation's leading voices for sound science in public policy. Jeff recently testified before the FDA hearing, "Scientific Evaluation of Modified Risk Tobacco Products," where he took the FDA to task for preventing manufacturers of lower-risk nicotine and tobacco products, such as e-cigarettes and snuff, from advertising that their products pose lower health risks. This roadblock, he testified, unnecessarily puts lives at risk.



Board member Horace Cooper debunks the left's comparison of voter identification laws to Jim Crow laws on Russian RT-TV.

He also recently took on U.S. Surgeon General Regina Benjamin over her widely-publicized and scientifically-baseless claim that African-American women are getting fat because they don't want to exercise for fear that it will mess up their hair.

Jeff similarly disputed the left's overblown claims that public health is endangered by PCBs, fast food, Chromium-6 and World Trade Center dust.

RAD's work has generated hundreds of media citations and interviews this year, including 84 published op-eds. Among those using our materials or interviewing RAD personnel: The Atlanta Journal Constitution, the G. Gordon Liddy Show, WebMD, San Jose Mercury News, Miami Herald, Forbes, Politico, the Jim Bohannon Show, Sacramento Bee, the Minneapolis Star Tribune, National Public Radio, the New York Post and many others.

Your generous support allows RAD to show the difference between science fact and science fiction, saving the American



Tom Borelli speaks at the "Fire Jeff Immelt" rally outside the 2011 GE shareholder meeting in Salt Lake City.

people from excessive regulation that raise prices, slows the economy and sometimes even endangers lives.



GroupSnoop Launched to Expose Non-Profit Bias, Counter Disinformation

Punch the name of any conservative or free-market group into the search engine Google and you'll likely find the most prominent results are left-wing hatchet jobs. Two of the top five Google results for your National Center for Public Policy Research, for example, are left-wing nonsense. Three of the four top results for the Heartland Institute and three of the top five results for FreedomWorks are similarly inaccurate.

Conservative groups that work on energy and environmental issues have been especially hard-hit as global warming alarmists have paid full-time staff to monitor and provide hostile edits to Wikipedia entries about every group and individual remotely skeptical of their forecasts of global calamity. Such disinformation can adversely affect the reputation of right-of-center organizations, harming their credibility with the news media, grassroots activists and even donors.

In response, we launched GroupSnoop.org, which contains profiles of left-wing organizations in a Google-friendly format.

Our first goal in launching this new reference website is to get liberal group profiles – which we carefully write and footnote with an emphasis on accuracy – high up in Google results, providing much-needed balance.

Our second goal, which we will complete on a rolling basis throughout the rest of this year and 2012, is to post fair profiles about right-of-center organizations. We'll work to get these profiles as high up in Google rankings as possible, too, so journalists, activists and potential donors to a broad array of conservative and free-market organizations get a much more complete, fair, and accurate picture of these organizations than they presently do.

“GroupSnoop.org fills an information void by providing carefully documented facts about some of the nation’s most influential public policy-oriented non-profits,” said Amy Ridenour. “Other websites that purport to provide such information instead offer disinformation. Yet, people continue to use them as their source for information about key



Chris Ridenour shows his methodology for predicting hurricanes. As part of a National Center educational effort demonstrating that climate science is still in its infancy, he and his sister Kate, then both fifth-graders, challenged government hurricane experts to a contest to see who is “smarter.”

players in important policy battles because of a lack of a reliable alternative. GroupSnoop is providing that alternative.”

Spearheaded by General Counsel Justin Danhof, GroupSnoop already has profiles on two dozen liberal groups, with more in the pipeline.

This enormous undertaking and important defense of allied groups is only possible thanks to the generosity of friends such as you.

she asserted, will result in a wealth transfer from the poor to corporate special interests.

“The winners in President Obama’s energy policy are the well-connected corporate and social elite while the losers are the hardworking Americans who will have to suffer the economic consequences of higher energy prices, slower economic growth and jobs moving overseas,” she testified. “It’s fundamentally a wealth transfer mechanism from the middle- and lower-income households to the pockets... of those who want to profit from renewable energy.”

Deneen’s testimony and other Project 21 programs, including its ongoing defense of the Tea Parties and conservative initiatives against unfounded charges of racism, generated significant media coverage. Its spokesmen have been interviewed on television once every three to four days so

far this year, including on such programs as “Hannity,” PBS’s “To the Contrary,” “Your World With Neil Cavuto,” “Fox and Friends,” “Lou Dobbs Tonight,” and RT TV’s “The Big Picture,” among others.

Project 21 is critical to our effort to bring more minorities into our movement and build tomorrow’s majority for liberty...

...and your continued support is critical to Project 21.



Project 21 Tells Congress Obama’s Energy Policy is Hurting the Poor

Deneen Borelli testified before the U.S. House of Representatives’ Natural Resources Committee on May 25, telling Members of Congress that President Obama’s efforts to slow development of America’s oil resources is hurting the poor, including minorities.

“Lower income Americans are hardest hit by soaring energy policies,” Deneen testified. “...Lower-income households are now paying nearly a quarter of their incomes for energy...”

Deneen went on to accuse the Obama Administration of deliberately waging a war on fossil fuels to increase their cost to make alternative energy more economically-viable. This,

Federal Employees Now Have a Choice



Conservatives fighting for American liberty from inside the federal government can now donate through the

Combined Federal Campaign (CFC) to a group that shares their values... The National Center for Public Policy Research.

If you’re a federal employee, please consider us for a CFC gift this year. If you have family members who work for the federal government, encourage them to donate to us through the campaign, too.

Our five digit CFC code is 27733.

Thanks for your support!



Book Review: “Obama, Tea Parties and God”

To say Lisa Fritsch was a reluctant Tea Party movement spokesman would be an understatement.

Although Lisa shared the Tea Party movement’s belief in limited constitutional government, mainstream media coverage of it had left her with the impression that the movement was too extreme.

“I was put off by so many signs,” Lisa explains. “There was Obama in the Hitler mustache and one where he is the tail end of a donkey... To me they were a crass display of disrespect, not only for our President, but for the proper way to dissent.”

Lisa, a member-spokesman of The National Center for Public Policy Research’s black leadership network Project 21, a talk radio host, and frequent Fox television guest, chronicles her transformation from Tea Party skeptic to Tea Party spokesman in her new book, “Obama, Tea Parties and God.”

It wasn’t a single event, but a series of events that led Lisa to gradually change her mind about the Tea Parties.

What got the ball rolling was the tremendous outpouring of positive response she received from Tea Party activists after she appeared on the Glenn Beck show.

“It wasn’t a single event, but a series of events that led Lisa to gradually change her mind about the Tea Parties. ”

“I suppose from my comments many just assumed I was a Tea Partier,” she writes. “Some were kind and invited me to dinner and to speak... People said they would pray for me... Some prompted me to think further about my role...”

Tea Party activists from all over the country had shown

themselves to kind, inclusive and caring: In other words, not at all as they had been portrayed in the media.

One of the media’s favorite descriptions for Tea Party activists at the time was “redneck.”

“Tea Party activists from all over the country had shown themselves to kind, inclusive and caring: In other words, not at all as they had been portrayed in the media.”

“Growing up my grandfather explained to me that the term ‘redneck’ came about from men who worked outside on the farm all day... because their shirt collar left their neck exposed,” Lisa recounts.

“Hearing this explanation, I thought, ‘what is wrong with someone being a redneck,’ seeing as they got that way from hard work?”

Not a thing.

Later, after she started speaking at Tea Party events, she saw first-hand how the media deliberately ignores stories that don’t fit with its narrative that the Tea Parties are about “hating a black man in the White House.”

“After a rousing speech [at a Tea Party event in Austin], several attendees came up to thank me and tell me how much they enjoyed the speech. We hugged, laughed and took pictures,” Lisa writes. “News stations were there... [but didn’t] dare have any footage of... [a] black Tea Party speaker hugging and loving... a bunch of rednecks.”

“Obama, Tea Parties and God,” is about more than one black conservative woman’s involvement with Tea Party movement. It is also about how she came to embrace, against the odds, its limited government objectives in the first place.

We highly recommend it.

Copies may be purchased online at either Amazon.com or at LisaFritsch.com.



Muslim Brotherhood's Goals Incompatible With Democracy

By DAVID A. RIDENOUR, PRESIDENT

One person, one vote, one time doesn't make a country democratic. But if the Muslim Brotherhood's Freedom and Justice Party emerges as the biggest winner in Egypt's upcoming parliamentary elections, one election may be all Egyptians ever see.



David A. Ridenour

Former President Jimmy Carter has assured us that the Brotherhood need not be feared because it will be "subsumed in the overwhelming demonstration of desire for freedom and democracy."

Forgive me if I'm not comforted by words from a man known for his spectacular foreign policy miscalculations. Surely, he also believed democratic forces would prevail in Iran and Nicaragua when he allowed U.S. allies in both countries to be overthrown by fanatics in 1979.

Popular uprisings can be hijacked by organized and committed ideologues.

The ideologue-filled Brotherhood is Egypt's best-organized political group and its objectives are incompatible with democracy, as it seeks an Islamic empire and to govern by Sharia law.

In 2008, Muhammad Madhi Akef, then-Brotherhood Supreme Guide, said his organization supports democracy, but only the "right kind... one that honors Sharia."

Whenever democracy and Sharia law conflict, the Brotherhood eschews democracy. Its Palestinian branch, Hamas, says in its charter: "Any procedure in contradiction of Islamic Sharia... is null and void."

Although the Muslim Brotherhood claims to have renounced violence, its words and deeds suggest otherwise. One of its most infamous members, Abdurahman Alamoudi, is in U.S. federal prison for, among other things, planning with Libya to assassinate Saudi King Abdullah when he was crown prince.

The Brotherhood was also implicated in the 1981 assassination of Anwar Sadat. Sadat was killed by members of the Islamic Jihad, an offshoot of the Brotherhood, after Brotherhood-linked Sheikh Omar Abdel Rahman, the so-called "Blind Sheikh" who would later be convicted for planning the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, issued a fatwa ordering that Sadat be killed.

When Sadat died, so too did much of Egypt's liberalization.

Yusuf al-Quaradawi, arguably the Brotherhood's most influential cleric, has repeatedly called for violence, saying homosexuals should be stoned and Israeli children murdered, lest they grow up to become soldiers.

Muhammad Mahdi Akef, who made international headlines a few years ago by labeling the Nazi holocaust a myth, said the Brotherhood "...will send fighters to join the resistance in Iraq and Palestine," if permitted to do so by the Egyptian government. Now, the

Brotherhood is edging closer to taking over Egypt's government and the power to grant itself permission to send its fighters to Iraq — fighters who could kill Americans.

The organization's current Supreme Guide, Muhammad Badie, said just last October that Islamists must raise a "jihadi generation that pursues death just as the enemies pursue life."

How the Muslim Brotherhood would govern in Egypt is no mystery. We see how it's governed in Gaza.

"Whenever democracy and Sharia law conflict, the Brotherhood eschews democracy."

After winning a majority in the Palestinian Legislative Council in 2006, Hamas took, according to Human Rights Watch, "extraordinary steps to control, intimidate, punish and at times eliminate their internal rivals." Last year, the group charged Hamas with "egregious crimes" for ordering attacks on Israeli civilians.

Believing the Brotherhood to be a peaceful, democratic, civic organization reminds me of what Samuel Johnson once said about remarriage: The triumph of hope over experience.

(A version of this article was carried by 56 newspapers, including the Atlanta Journal Constitution, the Sacramento Bee, USA Today, the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette and the Times of India, the world's most widely-read English-language newspaper, with over 7 million readers.)

THE NATIONAL CENTER



FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH

501 Capitol Court, NE Suite 200
Washington, DC 20002

The Salt Lake Tribune

“Tom Borelli... said GE is using the ‘Tony Soprano’ approach to business... GE ‘wants to use government to break the legs of the fossil-fuel industry to sell the products it wants.’”

Los Angeles Times

“...[The] Obama administration is spending not just on the essentials of governance but... on social engineering to promote its liberal inclinations.”—*RAD Director Jeff Stier and Dr. Henry Miller*



“Why have we not heard of [Project 21’s] Cherylyn Harley LeBon until today? ...She’s like a political ninja. What a phenomenal guest!” —*Mindy Paul, Richard Dixon Show*

Mother Jones

“[Tom Borelli] has turned the traditional progressive tactic of shareholder activism... into a tool to harass companies for seeking to curb global warming.”

Deseret News

“Alternative energy may very well play a part... but it can only succeed through competition and innovation — not... taxpayer subsidies.” —*General Counsel Justin Danhof*

The Guardian

“...[T]hey have to make good on their mandate. Otherwise, they’ll get kicked out too.” —*President David Ridenour on the likely public response, should politicians promising fiscal restraint fail to deliver.*