

This section set aside for opinion pieces. The views expressed here are not necessarily those of the staff of The Prospect Pages. Submissions to this section will be printed at the discretion of the Editor.



Community Voices

Inconvenient Truths ... For Liberals

by Paul R. Vallillo

I am sure you have all read how wonderful former Vice-President Al Gore's documentary film *An Inconvenient Truth* is at exposing how President George W. Bush has single-handedly caused global warming. In fact, prior to January 20, 2001, as you remember, we all walked around in parkas well into June.

The fact that Mr. Gore gets a pass is appalling. President Clinton and he held the reigns of power for eight years. Has anyone asked him what he did during his tenure to affect the global warming issue? The answer is: nothing. While we all, liberals and conservatives alike, should be concerned by the rising temperatures, we should take an honest look at the science behind the doomsday predictions. More often than not, a liberal anti-corporation/anti-Bush/anti-Cheney/ anti-Haliburton agenda drives the most dire forecasts. They may ultimately be proven correct, but they have not withstood the rigorous scientific scrutiny required to be considered a legitimate scientific truth. Inconvenient indeed, Mr. Gore.

Speaking of truths, current events in the Middle East have once again proven how wrong liberals are at gauging international danger. That we are expected to believe that global warming is a greater danger than terrorist threats are is ridiculous. Are you more worried that the polar ice cap may shrink 5 percent over the next 100 years or that terrorists may release a dirty bomb in New York at any moment?

The Hezbollah attacks on Israel have exposed the fallacy of appeasing terrorists. Israel showed restraint and good faith by relinquishing territory in Gaza to the Palestinians - they were rewarded by the Palestinians electing Hamas terrorists, those whose sole purpose is to eradicate Israel, into their government. They also pulled out of southern Lebanon - only to have the Lebanese government allow Hezbollah to headquarter there and stage rocket attacks from the affected territory.

What is also appalling is the world-wide response to Israeli self-defense measures, especially from Europe. Europeans, especially the French, always loath to confront a dangerous enemy, quickly condemning Israel's "disproportionate" military response. What?!? While the Russian response is expected because of their back-door dealings with terrorist regimes replete with oil and other goodies, the mainland Europeans once again disappoint. The American liberal media, taking their cue from European intelligentsia, have also quickly come to the aid of Hezbollah and Hamas, flooding the press with stories of how they are "misunderstood" and "oppressed."

Give me a break. Both are terrorist organizations whose strategies include the killing of innocents. We paid a heavy price on 9/11. Eight years of Clinton/Gore's "do-nothing" policies resulted in the death of over 3,000 innocent Americans. That is an inconvenient truth, Mr. Gore. The Israeli's live with this threat everyday. These organizations cannot be appeased or negotiated with. They have and continue to profess their deadly mantra - death to Israel and death to the United States. We must do all we can to eliminate them wherever they are found.

The basis of liberal appeasement policy is arrogance. Once you believe that you are more intelligent than your adversary you think that you can talk your way out of any situation. It occurred prior to World War II - the European powers, lead by Neville Chamberlain, thought Hitler to be an unsophisticated fool. They gave up a fellow European country (Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia) to appease Hitler's unquenchable thirst for power. We all know the result. To this day, the European powers, save Great Britain, cling to this failed ideology. They consider themselves far too superior to any dictator to allow him to take advantage of them. Yet they have failed to reign in Iran despite given every opportunity to do so, as well as North Korea.

Meanwhile, the American liberal press, just as arrogant, champions the European appeasement strategy at every turn.

Time magazine has just published a piece trumpeting the end of "Cowboy Diplomacy" in another attempt to politically harm the President as he wades through the minefield that is the Middle East on our behalf. Perhaps they are premature. Just as the liberal press vociferously attacked President Reagan as he confronted the evil empire that was the Soviet Union (and were wrong) they attack President Bush because he does not buy into their touchy-feely appeasement approach. He chooses to confront evil where it exists and defeat it.

President Bush will be judged by history as to whether his strategy to fight terrorism is the right one. The opposition has a dearth of ideas except to criticize and appease. It is no accident, in my estimation, that the homeland has not been hit again since 9/11. Should it happen he will surely be blamed immediately, yet no credit is given for the terrorist plots that have been foiled. Not a very equitable situation, is it?

Challenging times call for leadership. Liberals are not up to the task. Now that, my friends, is the inconvenient truth.

[Paul R. Vallillo is a father, husband, lawyer and aspiring writer.]

Preparing for August Primary Election *By Dana P. R. Schultze*

It's pretty funny how certain publications have claimed that voter response in the 2006 electoral primaries has been lame, unenthusiastic, or just plain low. Most of these publications, such as USA Today, have a noticeable leftward leaning or liberal philosophy. These liberal publications would like to see voters rioting at the polls against incumbent Republicans. At the very least they want to see voter turnout high enough from Democrats and former Independents that they can extrapolate the right numbers to guarantee Republican defeats in November. Unfortunately, most folks just don't think about voting during the summertime. Unfortunately for liberals, the lies they spoon-feed themselves about polls showing Republicans going down in flames, may not be quite the truth.

Connecticut's primaries are being held on August 8. Much of the nation is watching CT's Democratic Primary because it pits Joe Lieberman (who is running for a 4th term) vs. Ned Lamont (who is running a very strong campaign against a popular incumbent).

Lieberman has been CT's Senator for 18 years and a victory in November would guarantee he holds that seat for 24 years (that's almost a quarter century!). While others and I have written about legislating term limits for such important federal positions as Lieberman and CT's other Senator Christopher Dodd (25 years and counting!), the alternative to a deeply entrenched incumbent could be worse.

Now, one could say, why worry about Lieberman's primary battle if you're a Republican? What about Alan Schlesinger, the Republican candidate for Lieberman's seat? Don't hold your breath waiting for Schlesinger to be Connecticut's Senator. Even if the ticket ends up being split three ways between Lamont, Schlesinger, and an independent Lieberman; because of past lawsuits regarding his gambling and the revelation that he used an alias on a casino rewards program I believe voters are turned off to Schlesinger before he even gets a chance to really run his campaign. When the most popular governor in CT's history asks you to drop out of the race as M. Jodi Rell asked Schlesinger to do, that doesn't bode well for the rest of your campaign.

Early on in this political season I had contemplated briefly registering as a Democrat so I could vote for Lamont. My thought process was, we get rid of Lieberman in the primary, and then Lamont and Schlesinger could square off in an incumbent-free election. CT law only allows you to switch parties up to three months before a primary however, so this was never really feasible. I also had to do a ritual purification just for even thinking of registering as a Democrat.

Another issue that will keep me from voting for Lamont was listening to him speak about anything. Lamont oozes this quality that I can't stand. It's as if the millionaire Lamont is sure his money can buy him anything, even a seat in the U.S. Senate. It's pretty amusing to watch certain Liberals praise and endorse Lamont. These are the same Liberals whose political philosophies are closer to that of socialism/communism and here they are gushing for Lamont, a dirty capitalist whose net worth "may be" (Lamont won't disclose his total net worth) close to half-a-billion dollars.

Lamont is really just a single-issue candidate who is betting his whole campaign on poll numbers being correct. Lamont believes most Nutmeggers are as against the Iraq war as he is and therefore they will vote for an anti-Iraq candidate such as himself. This is where the hypocrisy of the Democratic Party really rears its ugly head. Every time George W. Bush has beaten a Democrat in his last two elections the liberal mantra has been: complain about the election a lot, call for a recount, get denied a recount, sue for a recount, lose the election in the end (no matter what), and then plead for "bipartisanship"!

The liberal standard for bipartisanship however is: "we get what we want or you aren't bipartisan enough for us." Because Lieberman is a good politician and is willing to work with Republicans in a truly bipartisan manner, members of his own party have ostracized him for this.

If CT Democrats were fully behind Lieberman, then he would have received a majority of the delegate's votes at their nominating convention. Because Lamont was able to capture the votes of quite a few liberal ideologues at their convention, he is able to wage this primary battle that will be decided August 8.

Because Lamont did manage to split his party along ultra-liberal/regular-liberal lines I have erected a monument to him in my front lawn. I have hung one of his political signs upside-down to honor this divisive politician. I hope people will see this sign and think, does Ned Lamont really care about CT's voice in Washington, or is his campaign one driven of pure ego?

Ego has reared its ugly head in our state elections here in Prospect. Roger Kergaravat is the Republican-endorsed candidate for the 89th District race against incumbent Vickie Orsini Nardello. Ten delegates from Prospect and Bethany nominated Kergaravat. Tim White from Cheshire, his challenger for the nomination, garnered only the 5 votes allotted to the Cheshire delegates. Because of those five delegate votes, White is able to challenge Kergaravat in the August 8 primary.

How White obtained the five delegate votes from Cheshire seems to be a source of controversy for him. According to Sandy Dudarevitch from Cheshire ("Tim White: Exposed" July *Prospect Pages*), only three official delegates showed up for White at the May 16 nominating convention (one of whom was his father). None of Cheshire's official "alternate" delegates were in attendance either. Dudarevitch goes on to say that five minutes before the convention was to convene, White submitted the names of "substitute alternate" delegates. Those two "substitute alternate" delegates were Tim White's mother and a childhood friend.

A candidate needs three delegate votes to primary. That White felt the need to stack the deck with his mother, father, and a childhood friend shows White didn't even trust the other two delegates from Cheshire to vote for him. White seems more concerned about his political aspirations than the big picture of defeating the six-term incumbent Nardello. White thinks Kergaravat's victory against Nardello in Prospect in the 2004 election somehow guarantees him a win in Prospect, and he also thinks he can take his heavily democratic-leaning district in Cheshire.

If Tim White thinks he can beat Nardello in Prospect, he doesn't realize how much we treasure our incumbents here in Prospect. Roger Kergaravat won Prospect based on the strength of his campaign, he positioned himself as a viable alternative to Nardello and he convinced a majority of Prospect voters of the same. But some of his success in Prospect has to be that he is also from Prospect.

White's own website claims that 38 percent of the voters in the 89th District live in Prospect, 36 percent live in Cheshire, 25 percent live in Bethany. Since Kergaravat has proven he can win in Prospect, and since he came really close in 2004 to beating Nardello in Bethany, I can't believe White's ego won't let him see that Kergaravat is really Prospect's best hope for having a Republican representative for Prospect, Cheshire, and Bethany once again.

Maybe White will come to his senses and withdraw from the August 8 primary before it occurs. If not, voters should keep in mind his shenanigans that got him in the primary in the first place, and also keep in mind which candidate is best positioned to beat Nardello in November. Vote for Roger Kergaravat August 8.