

Yankee Steve's Column

for the Week of April 2, 2009

Will the Real Bill Moyers Stand Up or Shut Up?

Is television journalist Bill Moyers, a man who seemly is determined to set us on the right path, is a *carte blanche* liberal?

Liberals almost always live by a double standard. What keeps you up at nights doesn't bother them at all. Liberals are masters in the art of rationalization.

Files kept closed by the FBI have recently been made public. They expose the real Moyers. What some conservatives suspected has now been proven. The halo doesn't shine as brightly as it once did, if it ever did.

What do those FBI files reveal? Peter Wehner [2/19/09] citing a *Washington Post* article tells us. Apparently Moyers has been unprincipled, not some of the time but throughout his career. Wehner says that while J. Edgar Hoover was running the FBI, Moyers sought information on the sexual preferences of members of the White House staff during the time he served as an aid to President Lyndon Johnson. This was not just a case of his curiosity; the information was intended for use against them. But it gets worse.

Columnist Stephen Hayes takes us further into the sunless world of Bill Moyers. In a 2003 article in *The Weekly Standard*, Hayes wrote that **Moyers "flagrantly indulges in conflicts of interest, Washington logrolling, and mutual back-scratching that he finds deeply objectionable in, well, everyone other than Bill Moyers"** and that there are "piles of documents - from IRS filings to internal records from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting - that supported this conclusion."

It is the Principle of the Thing

Make no mistake about it Moyers is what he is because he is a liberal. The liberal promises that if you trust him he will rid society, and especially government, of any and all who are not as principled as he is. The liberal is the quintessential crusader.

The emphasis falls on the liberal himself who will do just about anything in order to present himself in a favorable light. However most of the time, he does this by audaciously uncovering the sins and foibles of those who sit on the right. At the same time he is noticeably quiet when those on the left are exposed.

Unlike the conservative, the liberal does not attempt to convince you that his ideology is the correct one. And **if that you elect him, you should do so because his ideology is sound.**

The liberal bases his appeal on how good and noble he is, and he should be elected because he is the touchy-feely type, while his conservative opponent is cold, dry-eyed, and insensitive. Can you believe there have been Marxists who have tried to convince us that Karl Marx cared for people?

So Moyers looks out at his followers who watch his weekly TV journal with the hope that they will believe that there is a news program that is going to follow the truth no matter where it leads because it is being run by a person of repute. All the while viewers will assume that that if someone talks about ethics then he or she is ethical, but such is not always the case.

A liberal will always demand that an elected official stand on principle and that they dare not talk the talk unless they walk the walk. They do this because they know that this is what we want to hear. Jimmy Carter knew that people wanted to hear the words I'll never lie to you, so that is exactly what he said, "I'll never lie to you." Are we surprised to discover that Carter prevaricated?

What we find is that liberals do not walk the walk. Barack Obama may yet become the greatest liar in modern political history. It has become a contest between Obama and Hillary Clinton. Bay Buchanan said that Hillary has even lied about her lying. Obama does the same thing. Who is teaching whom?

We simply must understand that the one principle that liberals never violate – that the principle itself can be sacrificed if and when the situation calls for it. And somehow the situation always seems to call for it.

Therefore a real liberal can never be a conservative. The conservative would rather lose an election, a position, or a pay raise than sacrifice his principles. This makes him or her the geek of the political world, absurdly transparent, defiantly inflexible, and always committed to an approach to economics that is not what the people seem to want; that is until they find out that Socialism always leads to insolvency.

The conservative wears his principles on his forehead like a phylactery. They mean more to him than any code of expediency that allows liberals to set aside ethics when necessary. This is why a lot of conservatives refused to vote for Senator John McCain. They wanted a real conservative, not a look-alike. Obama did not win the election; McCain lost it.

Give Me that Old Time Religion

It seems that whenever Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) has to do something religious it calls on Bill Moyers. I guess he is their token theist.

One of the things that I first noticed about Moyers was that he seems to have started out as a Christian. However the liberals in Washington have gotten to him. Somewhere along the way his love for that old time religion was deracinated. This became apparent when Moyers

interviewed Joseph Campbell [1904-87]. Giving Moyers the benefit of the doubt I would suggest that the smoke and mirrors may have confused him.

The PBS series called “The Power of Myth” in which Campbell was interviewed became an instant success with the liberal crowd that feeds on PBS gibberish. Its acceptance was due mainly to the fact that it lent credence to an idea that sits well with the network’s multiculturalism.

Campbell believed that no one religion really contains within it objective truth. There was no place in his thinking for the counter-claim that says the Bible contains revelation.

Interestingly, I have found that the liberals who believe that have a tendency to mix their own brand of atheistic Socialism with Oriental mysticism. Sixties radicals meditated. This might mean that instead of saying the mantra “ohm,” their spiritual descendents will now chant “**Obamaaaahhh.**” Good bye, Hare Krishna! Their yellow robes in airports will have to be dyed red to fit in with Obama’s Bolshevism.

Campbell’s opinion that all religions emanate from the same urge has a two-pronged effect. To some it means that religion is nothing more than an urge common to people, and if that is the case, religion is not so important after all and that America could have become what it is without Puritan Christianity. Does any one really believe that who has looked at our history; who knows that the Puritans adopted an approach to Christianity that paved the way for capitalism and unequalled prosperity?

To others Campbell’s idea that all religions stem from the same urge means that God is not a self with whom we must reckon. God is nothing more than an abstraction or a wish if you like. If that is the case, then God may be referred to as consciousness or something nebulous. This is significant. Those who reduce God to an abstraction eventually do the same thing for themselves. Is this not the true source of modern man’s neurosis? **We have no I, we are no I, unless God is and is a Thou.**

Needless to say, if Campbell had preached Christianity instead of his gobbledygook the geological plates would have collided under the studio in which the interviews were conducted - a ten on the Richter scale. Liberals would have burned Billy Graham in effigy.

I find it interesting that tax-supported PBS caters to secular visionaries and New Ager. Isn’t secularism or New Age a religion? Would anyone deny that Hinduism is a religion? PBS regularly presents us with Hinduism which one very clever fellow has packaged as self-help. Every time PBS has a fund-raiser he appears on stage with an answer for everything.

Campbell’s thoughts in the TV series and in his writings are couched in a Darwinian format. See for example his book *Primitive Mythology: Masks of God*. Instead of using Darwin to promote atheism, which is what usually happens, Campbell hints at the possibility that we are returning to the original idea about God that for a time remained without a rival on the Indian subcontinent where it was believed that you could not say anything definite about God. All you could say is that “God is not this and not that.”

So Campbell opines, “**Every religion is true one way or another. It is true when understood metaphorically. But when it gets stuck in its own metaphors, interpreting them as facts, then you are in trouble.**”

Mr. Moyers was unwilling to challenge Campbell about his idea that we are all on to something that should not be taken too literally. So that if you took off one of the masks of God you would not be face to face with a fact about God, a fact that could be written down and passed along to the next generation. It is all just a bunch of metaphors. Bear in mind that this diatribe against what Jews and Christians believe was paid for with taxpayer money!

Ever since the days of Theodore Parker [1810-60] and Ralph Waldo Emerson [1803-82], two men determined to scuttle historic Christianity, Americans have increasingly looked eastward. Their friend Henry David Thoreau [1817-62] of Walden Pond even fancied that he was a yogi of one sort or another. Increasingly on every side we are faced with New Age devotees who cannot accept the Christian idea that says, “God is this and that.”

A Lesson to be Learned

Campbell’s religion has been unmasked, but so has Moyers’ ethical life which is apparently in default.

What can we take away from this?

We learn that ambition undercuts the ethical life, and if Moyers is anything at all he is ambitious. His underhanded tactics could not be explained apart from his drive for recognition. Liberals like Moyers suffer from what the Greeks called *philautia* or inordinate self-love. This we believe is the root of their tendency to set up standards for others which they do not keep for themselves. Inordinate self-love will excuse any kind of wrong-doing. When they do wrong it is for a good reason so in consequence it is not wrong. This is how they rationalize.

We also realize that liberals present themselves not their ideology, which is just what Obama did when he ran for office. This is usually accompanied by attempts to look as if liberals will know what to do when entrusted with power. However they always fail to remember that America reached its highest economic levels when liberalism/Socialism was virtually unknown. The standard of living for American workers was elevated seven times during the 19th century.

Interestingly, we must note that Obama has been unmasked in less time than it took to unmask Moyers. That took years and the opening of FBI files, not so with Obama. We now know that the man in the oval office is a liar and an incompetent. That good man Alan Keyes just recently said, “**Obama is a radical Communist,**” and it is only two months into his presidency. As a matter of fact Keyes has been saying that all along, but now we have proof. We now know that we are face-to-face with a determined Socialist whose ethics because of his Socialism cannot be aligned with ours.

Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com