

October 9, 1996

Brian Lamb  
C-Span  
400 Capitol St., NW  
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. Lamb:

I watched a show having William Kristol and Andrew Sullivan as guests. This prompted me to compose several comments, which follow.

Sullivan was upset by literature and/or comments by the "Christian Right" which characterized gays and lesbians in a negative manner. Sullivan said the Christian Right attempted to demonize gays and lesbians. Sullivan then characterized these comments as "hate speech." Was not Sullivan "demonizing" the Christian Right and engaging in "hate speech", at this point?

Sullivan further said that if the Republican party did not distance themselves from the Christian Right, this would tend to delegitimize the Republican party. So here is another example of a leftist telling the Republicans how they should define themselves.

Two comments about what Sullivan said. One, he allows himself the right to characterize the Christian Right. However, he is upset when the Christian Right characterizes gays and lesbians. Secondly, he labels what the Christian Right said as being "hate speech." However, anything the liberals say, no matter how negative and/or demeaning, is not "hate speech." How can this be?

Sullivan is an editor of The New Republic, which is a liberal or leftist leaning publication. The liberals have said the Republicans, especially the conservative Republicans, want to "starve our children, throw older citizens out of their homes and prevent them from having adequate medical care, as well as poisoning the air and water. So he, or people of his ilk, can say these things about conservative Republicans and it is not "hate speech." If not hate speech, what is it?

Just to show how ridiculous these statements are; Conservatives also have children about which they are

o-wj

concerned. In many cases, they have elderly parents and relatives about whom they care. They certainly have to drink the water and breathe the air. It is obvious, these indictments do not make any sense whatsoever. Are these statements ever challenged by the main-stream media? Not often, if at all.

If conservatives condemn gays and lesbians as pursuing an unhealthy way of life and not wanting to legitimize it and/or equate it with traditional, opposite sex marriages and life style, they are demonizing gays and lesbians or it is "hate speech."

Conservatives are not saying, "punish gays and/or lesbians." Conservatives do not want anything done to harm gays and lesbians. However, neither do they want anything done to enhance gays and lesbians as coequals in our society. Conservatives cannot prevent gays and lesbians from pursuing their preferred life styles. However, what they are saying is, "we do not think gays and lesbians should be made completely and fully equal to conventional, traditional families in a legal sense, especially for benefits that traditionally have been reserved for opposite sex marriages.

Is there no difference between traditional families and gay and lesbian coupling? If there is no difference, why do they insist on labeling themselves to distinguish their differences from the traditional family?

Traditionally oriented conservatives do not want the line between what is considered "normal" and what is considered "abnormal" blurred. Liberals say; "Who are you to determine what is normal and what is abnormal?"

While liberals condemn conservatives for moralizing concerning sexual behavior, they (liberals) moralize concerning who is making too much money and who should be taken care of, at the expense of those making "too much money."

Liberals said the Viet Nam war was "immoral." However, liberals feel it absolutely moral to intervene in another country's affairs if they (the liberals) feel there have been "human rights" violations. i.e. Angola, Haiti, Bosnia,

etc. Of course, there were no human rights violations committed by the North Vietnamese against the South Vietnamese. Liberals would dismiss this by saying: "The South Vietnamese government was corrupt, which evades the issue of human rights violations."

Liberals change the subject when they do not want to answer directly, especially if in answering directly, it would tend to embarrass them or compromise their position. Liberals also redefine key words so as to confuse their opponents and make it sound as if they have the moral high ground. Sort of like when the Soviets used to say; "We Soviets have a 'true' democratic government, not you Americans."

If everything is subjective and there are no moral absolutes, as liberals would like one to believe, then murder, rape, incest, stealing, etc. should not be condemned. Liberals tend to say; "One cannot moralize concerning sexual behavior or abortion. However, one should moralize concerning which wars to fight and which social engineering issues the country should embark upon." Liberals exercise "selective" moralism. They reserve the right to select which attitudes and behaviors they feel should be judged morally. These are generally at odds with the judgements that would be rendered by traditionally oriented conservatives.

Sullivan's arguments and/or statements exhibit an incredible double standard, which is typical of the manner in which liberals think. Liberals think the Constitution was written expressly for them. Certainly not for conservatives.

Liberals love to point to a literal translation of the Constitution, when it suits them. When it does not suit them to be literal, they claim the Constitution is not a "static" document but a "living, evolving document" re-interpreting it in a manner more favorable to their social engineering and egalitarian intentions.

Liberals take the First Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment literally. They want to re-interpret the Second Amendment. Liberals claim that the Constitutional statement that citizens have a right to bear arms means the government has a right to bear arms, not ordinary, individual citizens.

Now there is a startling statement. Where has there ever been a government that could not bear arms? This is the first time there has ever been felt a need to state it in a written document, This statement, as interpreted by liberals, of course, protects the people against a potentially overbearing and abusive government by giving the government the power to impose it's will upon the individual citizens by force of arms. This convoluted reasoning goes unnoticed and/or unchallenged by observers and commentators in the media and even the courts. Liberals want to re-define citizen so that it means citizens in a "collective" sense not an "individual" sense. "Collectively" interpreted by liberals, means the government.

The separation of church and state was previously interpreted to mean there should be no formal government endorsement of a particular religion. There should be no state church, as was the case in England at the time of the drafting of the Constitution. This has been re-interpreted by liberals to mean no government agency or body, at any level, can do, say or support anything of a religious nature. This is really consistent with the original intent. Truly amazing, no one objects to there being a Senate Chaplain, which includes a Rabbi. Of course, it is also permissible to say, "in God we trust" on our money.

Well now, I think I have been unfair to liberals. Liberals really do believe in equal rights for all. They believe they have the right to access conservative's assets, through taxation, in order to fund their social agenda. They also believe that conservatives have rights. Conservatives have the right to pay for the rights and perceived needs of liberals.

If one has strong beliefs or does not want to compromise in relation to one's moral standards, one is an extremists. This label of extremism seem to be reserved for conservatives only.

Non-conservatives who hold strong beliefs are not labeled extremists, they are just "passionate" about their beliefs. They are given full approval if they act upon those beliefs. They are just exercising their constitutional rights to free speech and right of assembly. These rights are championed

even though they may intrude upon or prevent the opportunity of conservatives to express their free speech rights in assembly.

An example of the contradiction and/or double standard follows: Liberals feel that when pro-life supporters demonstrate around an abortion clinic they are intruding upon the rights of those who favor abortion. I agree that, sometimes, the demonstrators over-step good taste in the manner in which they demonstrate. However, during the Viet Nam war, when anti-war demonstrators trespassed upon and destroyed private property, even killing people upon occasion, that was their right as guaranteed by the constitution and fully supported by the vast majority of the press and other media. It certainly was never condemned by the press and other media.

Why was it all right to demonstrate, disrupt, destroy and kill for their cause but it is not all right for anti-abortionists to do the same? I, personally, do not like demonstrations of any kind, for any reason. To me, they appear to be orchestrated and mindless. But that is just my personal preference. However, if one group is to be tolerated or indulged, then the other group should be afforded the same consideration, if one is attempting to be fair and treat people equally.

C-Span appears to have a bias for, or at least, favor a moderate or centrist position most of the time. You seem to condemn or at least place those with strong, uncompromising, especially conservative, opinions in an unfavorable light by labeling them "ideologues" and "extremists." When was the last time C-Span labeled an environmentalist or animal rights activist an extremist or an ideologue? I cannot remember one instance and I watch you all the time.

You tend to say; "These are not our opinions. They are the opinions of our guests." Well it is fairly obvious how one gets others to state certain preferred positions. If I want to say something against NAFTA, I do not have to say it myself. All I have to do is invite and ask Pat Buchanan how he feels about NAFTA. If I am in favor of NAFTA, I will invite and ask O'Leary how she feels about NAFTA.

[REDACTED]  
Page 6

Ideologue implies an unwillingness to compromise on one's basic position. When was the last time environmentalists, animal rights activists or affirmative action proponents compromised willingly? Does Rangle compromise on his favored positions? Does Gore? Does Daschle? I do not think so. Why aren't they labeled "extremists" and/or "ideologues?" I'll answer my own question. It is because the media and other commentators have a liberal bias. This is always denied. However, it is painfully apparent. All one has to do is analyze the positions and comments that are made and printed.

If people on welfare petition and demonstrate for sustaining their benefits or increasing them, that is because they not only have a right to free speech and freedom of assembly but they also have a right to those benefits. When these same people say the "rich" are selfish and/or insensitive when they object to having their taxes raised, That is not hate speech.

However, if the people who have to pay for their benefits call them parasites or leeches, they are engaging in "hate speech", lacking in compassion and are attempting to prevent these parasites from having a fuller, happier life. Almost like saying, if one does not allow leeches to suck most of one's blood out of one's body, then one is selfish and uncaring of the condition of leeches. After all, leeches have needs. Don't they have a "right" to exist and/or the right to thrive? Don't be "mean spirited", share your blood.

If one compromises on everything, then one believes in nothing.

Why is it the obligation of productive people to be responsible for unproductive people? And further, why should the issue be decided by the unproductive?

Sincerely, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Framingham, MA 01701-3419  
[REDACTED]