



# THE VETS GROUP THAT FIGHTS **AGAINST** VETERANS

CONCERNED VETERANS FOR AMERICA ADVOCATES FOR THE KOCHS, NOT FOR VETERANS



## CONCERNED VETERANS FOR AMERICA

Just around the time VoteVets.org – the nation’s largest progressive veterans group (now with over 400,000 supporters) – was launched, a conservative counterpart called Vets for Freedom was launched. Unlike VoteVets, Vets for Freedom, headed shortly after its founding by Army Veteran Pete Hegseth, argued that the war in Iraq was necessary and that a surge of troops would win the conflict decisively. VoteVets argued that the war in Iraq was not wise to launch and that a surge of troops would merely keep the cork on the bottle until we left (something that we today know is true, with the rise of ISIS and raging sectarian violence).

Pete and I were frequently pitted against each other on television. The debates, while often very heated and with a lot of yelling over each other, were honest. Pete didn’t hide the fact that he was there to advocate for neoconservatives, and I was honest about representing those opposed to their worldview as it pertained to the use of our military.

After Vets for Freedom folded, and after having run unsuccessfully for Senate as a Republican, Pete Hegseth got bankrolled by the Koch brothers to start up a new group, Concerned Veterans for America. Behind closed doors, as you’ll see in the attached report, Pete is quite honest about the fact that the Koch organization “literally created” the group that he heads. Yet, in public, Concerned Veterans for America isn’t at all honest about who they are and who they support. They consistently represent themselves as a non-ideological group, just looking out for veterans. That’s not correct.

The group promotes proposals that are extremely conservative in nature, and indeed, often opposed by every major Veterans Service Organization (VSO). Whether it is their plan to privatize the Department of Veterans Affairs or to move Military Retirement to a private 401(k)-type system, Concerned Veterans for America stands strongly opposed to what nearly every major veterans group has worked so hard for.

In this way, Concerned Veterans for America is a piece of the movement pushing the radical conservative agenda embraced by the Kochs and others. That agenda is the dismantling of any and all government programs that help care for people (even if those people fought for us in uniform) in order to reward the richest of the rich, corporations, and Wall Street.

VoteVets is honest about being America’s largest progressive veterans group and supporting progressive policies. It’s in virtually every press release we send out and clearly stated on our website. Concerned Veterans for America should be honest about representing the people who support dismantling programs that care for our elderly, our poverty-stricken, our children, and even our veterans.

Nothing in this report should be construed as saying we cannot, and should not, have a robust debate in this nation. However, the participants in the debate should be clear about whose views they’re really representing. If they’re not, it is up to the media to make sure that people know. It is for that reason that VoteVets is releasing this report in conjunction with Bridge Project.

- Jon Soltz, co-founder and chairman of VoteVets

## **Concerned Veterans for America Claimed To Represent Veterans' Interests While Telling Koch Brothers Secret Conference That "Concerned Veterans For America Is An Organization This Network Literally Created."**

**Pete Hegseth, to Koch Brothers Freedom Partners Summit: "Concerned Veterans For America Is An Organization This Network Literally Created."** According to a speech Pete Hegseth gave at a Koch brothers' summit, "Concerned Veterans for America is an organization this network literally created." [Pete Hegseth Speech – Koch Brothers' Summit via YouTube, [6/16/14](#)]

**Hegseth Claimed That CVA Played A "Central Role" In "Driving" The VA Scandal.** According to a speech Pete Hegseth gave at a Koch brothers' summit, "What you probably don't know is the central role that Concerned Veterans for America played in exposing and driving this [VA scandal] from the very beginning." [Pete Hegseth Speech – Koch Brothers' Summit via YouTube, [6/16/14](#)]

**Hegseth: CVA Has "Broadened The Debate To Include Big Government Dysfunction," "Fortifying" AFP's Position On Healthcare.** According to a speech Pete Hegseth gave at a Koch brothers' summit, "Concerned Veterans for America, along with our network partners, have intentionally broadened the debate to include big government dysfunction generally, further fortifying a new skepticism that AFP and others have brought to what government-run healthcare does" [Pete Hegseth Speech – Koch Brothers' Summit via YouTube, [6/16/14](#)]

**Hegseth: "I Thank Charles And David" For Making CVA Possible.** According to a speech Pete Hegseth gave at a Koch brothers' summit, "I thank Charles and David [...] everyone that puts in the sweat equity that makes this possible." [Pete Hegseth Speech – Koch Brothers' Summit via YouTube, [6/16/14](#)]

## **CVA STATED IT WAS MADE UP OF VETERANS "FROM EVERY BRANCH OF UNIFORMED SERVICES"**

**CVA: "We Are Veterans From Every Branch Of Uniformed Services And Every Conflict From World War II To The Global War On Terror. We Are The Family Members Of Those Who Have Proudly Worn The Uniform."** According to the Concerned Veterans for America's website, "We are veterans from every branch of uniformed services and every conflict from World War II to the Global War on Terror. We are the family members of those who have proudly worn the uniform. We are freedom-loving citizens who value America's heroes and are concerned about the fate of our country. We come from all walks of life and live in every community across America." [CV4A.org, Accessed [5/1/15](#)]

## **CVA HELD THAT ITS MISSION WAS TO ADVOCATE FOR FREEDOM, WHICH VETERANS "FOUGHT AND SACRIFICED TO DEFEND"**

**Concerned Veterans Of America's Mission Was "To Advocate For Policies That Will Preserve The Freedom And Prosperity That We And Our Families So Proudly Fought And Sacrificed To Defend."** According to the Concerned Veterans for America's website, "Simply put, CVA's mission is to advocate for policies that will preserve the freedom and prosperity that we and our families so proudly fought and sacrificed to defend. The goal of Concerned Veterans for America is to translate the experience, concerns and hopes unique to veterans and their families into a common vision of freedom. We apply this unique perspective to speak out on issues that threaten to cripple not only our economic and national security, but the spirit of opportunity and liberty that all Americans cherish." [CV4A.org, Accessed [5/1/15](#)]

**CVA: "Throughout Our Years Of Service And Many Deployments Around The World, We Have Seen Firsthand What Happens When Freedom And Free Markets Are Interfered With And Fail."** According to the Concerned Veterans for America's website, "Throughout our years of service and many deployments around the world, we have seen firsthand what happens when freedom and free markets are interfered with and fail. We know all too well that freedoms surrendered are rarely — if ever — regained. And we watch as our elected leaders continue to shrink from challenges and betray the trust placed in them. The truth is, the ideals and freedoms that have defined America since its founding are dissolving before our eyes." [CV4A.org, Accessed [5/1/15](#)]

**CVA: “The Freedoms We Have Defended – That Our Friends And Loved Ones Suffered And Died For – Are Being Threatened By The Irresponsibility, Broken Promises, And Misguided Priorities Of Our Leaders In Washington.”**

According to the Concerned Veterans for America’s website, “We all share a strong belief that the freedoms we have defended – that our friends and loved ones suffered and died for – are being threatened by the irresponsibility, broken promises, and misguided priorities of our leaders in Washington.” [CV4A.org, Accessed [5/1/15](#)]

## **CVA And Privatizing Veterans’ Healthcare**

**CVA Executive Director Darin Selnick: “Greater Competition Has Led To Lower Costs And Better Quality In Virtually Every Other Industry, Let’s See What Private Sector Providers Can Do” For The VA.** According to an op-ed by Darin Selnick, the executive director of CVA, in The Hill, “When Congress passed the Veterans Access, Choice and Accountability Act in July, patient choice provisions were a key component to allow veterans facing long waits, or who lived far from VA facilities, to seek reimbursed care from private providers. Greater competition has led to lower costs and better quality in virtually every other industry, so let’s see what private sector providers can do.” [Darin Selnick – The Hill, [12/22/14](#)]

### **CVA’S VETERANS INDEPENDENCE ACT WOULD SUBSIDIZE PRIVATE CARE FOR VETERANS AND CONVERT THE VA INTO A NONPROFIT**

#### **CVA’s “Proposed Premium Support System” Would Force “Most Veterans To Pay Out-Of-Pocket Costs For Private Health Care”**

**Concerned Veterans For America Released Its Final VA Report, Recommending Reforms Collectively Titled “The Veterans Independence Act.”** According to a press release from Concerned Veterans for America, “Today, Concerned Veterans for America’s (CVA) Fixing Veterans Health Care Taskforce released its final policy report focusing on reforms to the delivery of veterans’ health care. The reforms, which are collectively entitled the Veterans Independence Act, will be unveiled and discussed at CVA’s Fixing Veterans Health Care summit today in Washington, D.C. The full report can be viewed here.” [Concerned Veterans For America Press Release, [2/26/15](#)]

**CVA Recommended Converting The Current “VHA Integrated Health Care System” Into A Government-Chartered Non-Profit Corporation.** According to a press release from Concerned Veterans for America, “The Veterans Independence Act would make four key reforms to the delivery of veterans health care: 1. Separate the VHA’s payor and provider functions and convert the current VHA integrated health care system into a government-chartered [sic] nonprofit corporation.” [Concerned Veterans For America Press Release, [2/26/15](#)]

**CVA Recommended Forcing “The VHA To Provide More Detailed Data On Their Medical Costs To Congress And The Public.”** According to a press release from Concerned Veterans for America, “The Veterans Independence Act would make four key reforms to the delivery of veterans health care: [...] 3. Force the VHA to provide more detailed data on their medical costs to Congress and the public.” [Concerned Veterans For America Press Release, [2/26/15](#)]

**CVA Recommended Creating “A Premium-Support Private Insurance Option For Eligible Veterans Who Want To Access Care In The Private Sector.”** According to a press release from Concerned Veterans for America, “The Veterans Independence Act would make four key reforms to the delivery of veterans health care: [...] 2. Create a premium-support private insurance option for eligible veterans who want to access care in the private sector.” [Concerned Veterans For America Press Release, [2/26/15](#)]

**WBNS-10TV Ohio: CVA’s VA Idea Was “Similar To School Vouchers.”** According to WBNS-10TV, “The idea is similar to school vouchers. Parents get public money to pay for either public or private school. The idea would be the same for the VA: allowing patients to see either public or private doctors.” [10tv.com, [3/30/15](#)]

**CVA’s “Proposed Premium Support System” Forces “Most Veterans To Pay Out-Of-Pocket Costs For Private Health Care.”** According to a FAQ on Fixing Veterans Health Care from Concerned Veterans for America, “Q: Why does the proposed premium support system force most veterans to pay out-of-pocket costs for private health care? Didn’t veterans earn free health care through their military service? A: Many veterans are already forced to pay co-pays through the current VA

health care system for certain medical services. Cost-sharing is already in effect in the current system. In fact, under the Veteran Independence Act, veterans who use the independent VACO will not have to pay any copays or deductibles.” [FAQ – cv4a.org, accessed [2/26/15](#)]

### **CVA Senior Veterans Affairs Advisor Darin Selnick: CVA’s Reform Bill Proposed A System “Through Which Eligible Veterans Would Be Able To Purchase Any Private Health Care Insurance Plan Available In Their State.”**

According to an opinion by CVA Senior Veterans Affairs Adviser Darin Selnick in the Hill, “This is why in the Veterans Independence Act we proposed a system of premium support through which eligible veterans would be able to purchase any private health care insurance plan available in their state, including one provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs. This very simple concept completely changes the incentive structure and the decision-making process with veterans’ health care. It empowers the veteran and means that they would not have to wait for a VA bureaucrat to authorize their choice. In this system, the veteran is the most important person in the process of deciding their own health care.” [Darin Selnick – The Hill, [3/19/15](#)]

### **If CVA’s Act Was Enacted Into Law, It Would Affect “22 Million Veterans Dramatically” And “One-Fifth Of Future Veterans Would Not Be Eligible For VA Care”**

**USA Today: CVA’s Proposed Reforms, “If Enacted Into Law, Would Affect America’s Roughly 22 Million Veterans Dramatically... Repercussions Would Be Even More Profound For Future Veterans.”** According to USA Today, “The reform measures, if enacted into law, would affect America’s roughly 22 million veterans dramatically, especially the 8.5 million enrolled for care through the Department of Veterans Affairs. Repercussions would be even more profound for future veterans. Concerned Veterans for America, a conservative non-profit, sponsored the study called ‘Fixing Veterans Health Care’ amid a crisis in VA health-care services.” [USA Today, [2/26/15](#)]

**One-Fifth Of Future Veterans Would Not Be Eligible For VA Care Under The CVA Plan.** According to USA Today, “Nearly one-fifth of future veterans — those in the lowest VA benefit levels, Priorities 7 and 8 — would not be eligible under the new system.” [USA Today, [2/26/15](#)]

**CVA: “All Current Enrollees Will Be Grandfathered Into The New System...However, The Veterans Independence Act Proposes Tightening Eligibility Requirements For New Enrollees”** According to a FAQ on Fixing Veterans Health Care from Concerned Veterans for America, “Q: Why is CVA advocating kicking certain veterans out of the VA health care system? A: All current enrollees will be grandfathered into new system with the same level of benefits. No veterans who are currently enrolled in the VA system will be kicked out of the system. However, the Veterans Independence Act proposes tightening eligibility requirements for new enrollees at a certain date in order to reorient the VA back towards its mission of providing care for service-connected disabled veterans.” [FAQ – cv4a.org, accessed [2/26/15](#)]

**CVA: The Plan Would Save Money “Through The Introduction Of Cost-Sharing And Tightening Enrollment Eligibility Requirements.”** According to a FAQ on Fixing Veterans Health Care from Concerned Veterans for America, “Q: Your fiscal modeling says this plan will save money for the VA. How? A: Through the introduction of cost-sharing and tightening enrollment eligibility requirements.” [FAQ – cv4a.org, accessed [2/26/15](#)]

### **VA Sec. Bob McDonald And Veterans Groups Such As The American Legion, Were Against CVA’s Privatization Plans**

**Stars And Stripes: “Most Veterans Service Organizations... Have Generally Been Cool To Privatization Plans.”** According to Stars and Stripes, “Most veterans service organizations skipped the [CVA] event and have generally been cool to privatization plans.” [Stars and Stripes, [2/26/15](#)]

**VA Sec. Bob McDonald: “Reforming VA Health Care Cannot Be Achieved By Dismantling It And Preventing Veterans From Receiving The Specialized Care And Services That Can Only Be Provided By The VA.”** According to CNN, “‘Reforming VA health care cannot be achieved by dismantling it and preventing Veterans from receiving the specialized care and services that can only be provided by VA,’ [Sec. Bob] McDonald said in a statement on Thursday.” [CNN, [2/26/15](#)]

**USA Today: “The American Legion Made Clear...That It Would Not Back The Plan, Saying It Opposes Privatization And Vouchers As A Long-Term Solution.”** According to USA Today, “The American Legion made clear in a statement Thursday that it would not back the plan, saying it opposes privatization and vouchers as a long-term solution.” [USA Today, [2/26/15](#)]

**Iraq War Veteran Jon Soltz: What CVA Wants “Is The Privatization Of Veterans’ Care: Fight For Your Country And Get A Voucher.”** According to an opinion by VoteVets’s Jon Soltz, an Iraq War Veteran, in the Huffington Post, “There is no doubt that veterans shouldn't have to rely on the VA for everything. But what Republican candidates, backed by the Koch brothers-funded Concerned Veterans for America, talk about is the beginning of the end of the pact we make with our veterans to give them the care they need. What they want is the privatization of veterans' care: Fight for your country and get a voucher.” [Jon Soltz – Huffington Post, [3/27/15](#)]

### **Paralyzed Veterans Of America: Private Sector “Is Not Prepared To Provide Specialized Services For A Deluge Of Patients With Complex Conditions.”**

**Paralyzed Veterans Of America Deputy Executive Director Sherman Gillums Jr.: “The Protections Veterans Now Have In The VA System, Particularly When Health Care Goes Awry, Do Not Exist In The Private Sector.”** According to Stars and Stripes, “‘The protections veterans now have in the VA system, particularly when health care goes awry, do not exist in the private sector,’ Paralyzed Veterans of America deputy executive director Sherman Gillums Jr. said in a statement. ‘Privatizing health care for veterans will create a cottage industry for ambulance chasers who will be the only available option for veterans with medical malpractices cases.’” [Stars and Stripes, [2/26/15](#)]

**Paralyzed Veterans Of America Press Release: “Paralyzed Veterans Of America Also Joins Experts In The Private Sector Who Point To Limited Experience In Treatment Of Veterans With Unique Needs.”** According to a press release from Paralyzed Veterans of America, “Paralyzed Veterans of America also joins experts in the private sector who point to the limited experience in treatment of veterans with unique needs related to post-traumatic stress disorder, prosthetics, conditions related to toxic exposure in war zones, or traumatic brain injury. Some providers have openly admitted the private sector is not prepared to provide specialized services for a deluge of patients with complex conditions, such as spinal cord injury and disease.” [Paralyzed Veterans of America Press Release, [2/27/15](#)]

**Paralyzed Veterans Of America: “Some Providers Have Openly Admitted The Private Sector Is Not Prepared To Provide Specialized Services For A Deluge Of Patients With Complex Conditions.”** According to a press release from Paralyzed Veterans of America, “Paralyzed Veterans of America also joins experts in the private sector who point to the limited experience in treatment of veterans with unique needs related to post-traumatic stress disorder, prosthetics, conditions related to toxic exposure in war zones, or traumatic brain injury. Some providers have openly admitted the private sector is not prepared to provide specialized services for a deluge of patients with complex conditions, such as spinal cord injury and disease.” [Paralyzed Veterans of America Press Release, [2/27/15](#)]

### **GOP 2016 White House Contenders Supported CVA’s Proposed VA Reforms**

**Jeb Bush “Voiced Support” For “The Effort To Privatize Parts Of The VA System,” Which Was “A Priority Of The Koch Brothers-Backed Group, Concerned Veterans For America.”** According to the Wall Street Journal, “Last month in New Hampshire, Mr. Bush voiced support for 2014 legislation that allows veterans to see doctors outside the VA system if they experience long wait times or live more than 40 miles from the closest VA hospital. ‘I know it has a pejorative for some, but I’m all in on the voucher thing,’ he said at a March house party in Dover. ‘No one’s suggesting we shut down the VA system. But the simple fact is the VA doesn’t look like it’s made any effort to [let] veterans know that this is available to them. And the number of people taking advantage of this is very, very low.’ The effort to privatize elements of the VA system is a priority of the Koch brothers-backed group, Concerned Veterans for America, which in February called for creating a ‘premium-support private insurance option’ for current veterans and limiting eligibility requirements for future veterans.” [Wall Street Journal, [4/8/15](#)]

**CNN: Sen. Marco Rubio Supported CVA’s Proposed Reforms.** According to CNN, “A task force organized by Concerned Veterans for America said the VA should begin offering subsidized private insurance to veterans and transform its healthcare department into a nonprofit corporation instead of a government agency. The move comes in response to the scandal involving healthcare delays and data manipulation at VA facilities first reported by CNN. Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Florida,

supported the proposed reforms, saying VA healthcare could improve by adopting the competition and flexibility of private healthcare.” [CNN, [2/26/15](#)]

**Bloomberg Politics: Rand Paul Approved Of VA Vouchers “A Policy Endorsed By Concerned Veterans For America.”** According to Bloomberg Politics, “Ninety minutes later, after another Q&A, in Exeter, I asked [Sen. Rand] Paul if he’d thought more about what privatizing the VA would look like. ‘No, I don’t really have a big plan or anything,’ he said. ‘I’m not even sure I’d use the word privatize.’ He did want vouchers—a policy endorsed by Concerned Veterans for America, which is connected to the libertarian Koch network—but he was not ready to throw the whole system into the Hayekian laboratory. ‘I’m not for eliminating the VA, or getting rid of the VA hospitals. In fact, a lot of veterans like the VA hospitals even better than the other hospitals. I’d tend more toward getting insurance vouchers to go to the community.’ [Bloomberg Politics, [3/24/15](#)]

### **Military Update Columnist Tom Philpott: Concerned Veterans For America Is “Posing As A Vet Advocacy Group And Being Rewarded For It.”**

**Military Update Columnist Tom Philpott: Veterans Issues Have Never Been “Used More Cynically Or Politicized More Thoroughly Than During The Past Several Years.”** According to an opinion by Military Update columnist Tom Philpott in Stars and Stripes, “In my 37 years covering veterans’ issues, I have never seen veteran issues used more cynically or politicized more thoroughly than during the past several years. At times the intent seems to be to shake trust in government generally rather than to address veterans’ needs.” [Tom Philpott – Stars and Stripes, [5/23/14](#)]

**Philpott: “Intent Seems To Be To Shake Trust In Government...Rather Than To Address Veterans Needs.”** According to an opinion by Military Update columnist Tom Philpott in Stars and Stripes,, “In my 37 years covering veterans’ issues, I have never seen veteran issues used more cynically or politicized more thoroughly than during the past several years. At times the intent seems to be to shake trust in government generally rather than to address veterans’ needs.” [Tom Philpott – Stars and Stripes, [5/23/14](#)]

**Philpott: Concerned Veterans For America Is “Posing As A Vet Advocacy Group.”** According to an opinion by Military Update columnist Tom Philpott in Stars and Stripes, “In the thick of this is Concerned Veterans for America, posing as a vet advocacy group and being rewarded for it. CVA press releases usually are partisan attacks. Its spokesman, Pete Hegseth, an Iraq war vet and Republican who ran for a U.S. Senate in 2012, is quoted often by major news outlets without mention of press reports associating CVA with the Koch brothers, libertarian billionaires who create public interest groups to oppose big government.” [Tom Philpott – Stars and Stripes, [5/23/14](#)]

**Philpott: Concerned Veterans For America “Hit A New Low In Purporting To Document ‘Lies’” Told By Former VA Secretary Eric Shinseki.** According to an opinion by Military Update columnist Tom Philpott in Stars and Stripes, “What should upset vets is the use of select facts about VA and its programs to reinforce fears rather than give reliable information. Last week a CVA press release hit a new low in purporting to document ‘lies’ [Former VA Secretary Eric] Shinseki told in congressional testimony, dropping any veil of respect for a decorated, combat-disabled soldier with a long and stellar career.” [Tom Philpott – Stars and Stripes, [5/23/14](#)]

**Philpott: CVA’s Goal “Seems To Be To Attack, Relentlessly, While A Democrat Holds The White House.”** According to an opinion by Military Update columnist Tom Philpott in Stars and Stripes,, “Though CVA sponsors an occasional informative forum in Washington D.C., it produces no careful analyses of what ails VA. The goal seems to be to attack, relentlessly, while a Democrat holds the White House.” [Tom Philpott – Stars and Stripes, [5/23/14](#)]

**Philpott: “Traditional Vet Groups Are Alarmed” By CVA’s “Heated Rhetoric.”** According to an opinion by Military Update columnist Tom Philpott in Stars and Stripes,, “Traditional vet groups are alarmed by the rising profile CVA has on cable news programs and in newspapers where informed opinions on chronic claim backlogs and care delays should rule. Instead, there’s heated rhetoric that stirs dissent and attempts to turns the public against a department the CVA routinely portrays always as too costly and too ineffective.” [Tom Philpott – Stars and Stripes, [5/23/14](#)]

**Philpott: Long-Time Advocates Worry That “CVA’s Arguments...Will Give Politicians Cover To Cut VA Funding Severely.”** According to an opinion by Military Update columnist Tom Philpott in Stars and Stripes,, “Long-time advocates like [Joseph] Violante [National Legislative Director for Disabled American Veterans] worry that CVA’s arguments, over time, will give politicians cover to cut VA funding severely or even to dismantle much of the VA health care system. ‘They have these people out there saying, “We’re giving VA too much. We’re giving the Defense Department too much.” Their whole

purpose is to give support to anyone who wants to cut government, particularly for veterans.” [Tom Philpott – Stars and Stripes, [5/23/14](#)]

## **CVA’S YOUTUBE CHANNEL FEATURED AN INTERVIEW WITH CVA’S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TITLED “TIME TO PRIVATIZE VETS’ HEALTHCARE?”**

**CVA’S YouTube Channel Featured An Interview With CVA’s Executive Director Titled “Time To Privatize Vets’ Healthcare?”** According to CVA’s YouTube channel, the group titled a Fox Business interview with CVA Executive Director Darin Selnick as “Willis Report | Time to privatize vets' healthcare?” [Willis Report – Fox Business via CVA YouTube Channel, [5/29/14](#)]

**CVA YouTube Video Description: “Darin Selnick Joins The Willis Report On Fox Business Network To Talk About The Possibility Of Privatizing Health Care For Vets.”** According to CVA’s YouTube channel, the group described a Fox Business interview with CVA Executive Director Darin Selnick as, “Darin Selnick joins the Willis Report on Fox Business Network to talk about the possibility of privatizing health care for vets in the midst of a Department of Veterans Affairs scandal.” [Willis Report – Fox Business via CVA YouTube Channel, [5/29/14](#)]

## **Leadership – CVA CEO Pete Hegseth**

**Pete Hegseth Is Chief Executive Officer Of Concerned Veterans For America.** According to Pete Hegseth’s biography on the Concerned Veterans for American website, “Pete Hegseth serves as Chief Executive Officer for Concerned Veterans for America and is a Fox News contributor.” [cv4a.org, Accessed [4/13/15](#)]

**Washington Post: Some See Hegseth “As A Traitor Who Is Seeking To Deprive Active-Duty Personnel And Veterans Of Well-Deserved Pay And Benefits.”** According to The Washington Post, “[Pete] Hegseth’s group [CVA] is not offering specific policy prescriptions, but it is supporting cuts of some sort — and that puts it in a unique niche in the battle over military funding. Lawmakers and their aides have been increasingly willing to meet with him in recent months, intrigued to hear his views and to gauge whether he has the members to provide the promised support if they choose to embrace positions that run counter to the large veterans organizations. Although his army still is modest — he has only 25 field organizers nationwide — his message is attracting attention among veterans. Some applaud him for taking on the established veterans lobby, which has become almost sacrosanct in Washington. Others see him as a traitor who is seeking to deprive active-duty personnel and veterans of well-deserved pay and benefits.” [Washington Post, [6/1/13](#)]

**Hegseth Was Executive Director Of Vets For Freedom From 2007-2011 And Grew The Organization “To Over 95,000 Members.”** According to Pete Hegseth’s biography on the Concerned Veterans for American website, “Prior to joining CVA, Pete was Executive Director for Vets for Freedom from 2007-2011, growing the Iraq and Afghanistan veterans organization to over 95,000 members.” [cv4a.org, Accessed [4/13/15](#)]

- **Vets For Freedom Tried To “Shore Up Support For Bush’s Iraq Policies.”** According to the Associated Press, “This month, Vets for Freedom launched political ads in five states — Minnesota, Kentucky, Connecticut, Nebraska and Virginia — in a bid to shore up support for Bush's Iraq policies among key senators. The ads feature young combat veterans urging members to fight al-Qaeda and thanking them for their support of continued military involvement in Iraq.” [Associated Press, [8/14/07](#)]

**Hegseth Joined Fox News Channel As A Contributor In 2014 To Provide Analysis And Commentary Across FNC's Daytime And Primetime Programming.** According to Pete Hegseth’s biography on FoxNews.com, “Pete Hegseth joined the network in 2014 and currently serves as a contributor for FOX News Channel (FNC), providing analysis and commentary across FNC's daytime and primetime programming. He also serves as CEO of Concerned Veterans for America.” [FoxNews.com, Accessed [4/13/15](#)]

- **Hegseth Appeared In Weekly Segments On FOX & Friends And The Kelly File.** According to Pete Hegseth’s biography on the Concerned Veterans for American website, “Pete appears regularly on Fox News Channel as a contributor—including weekly segments on FOX & Friends and The Kelly File.” [cv4a.org, Accessed [4/13/15](#)]

**Hegseth Was Named Finance Chair Of The Republican Party Of Minnesota In 2014.** According to MinnPost, “Pete Hegseth, new finance chair of the Republican Party of Minnesota, explained to a Republican seniors group Tuesday in Bloomington that he wears three hats: chief fund-raiser for the GOP, contributor to Fox News, and CEO of Concerned Veterans for America.” [MinnPost, [6/4/14](#)]

**Hegseth Was A Senior Fellow At The Center Of The American Experiment And A Term Member Of The Council On Foreign Relations.** According to Pete Hegseth’s biography on Vets for Freedom website, “He is also a Senior Fellow at the Center of the American Experiment and a Term Member of the Council on Foreign Relations.” [VetsForFreedom.org, Accessed [4/13/15](#)]

**When Not Deployed, Hegseth “Worked For Securities Trading Firm Bear Stearns Then Conservative Think Tank The Manhattan Institute For Policy Research.”** According to the Lowdown, “When not deployed he [Pete Hegseth] worked for securities trading firm Bear Stearns then conservative think tank the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, leaving in 2007 to lead Virginia-based nonprofit Vets For Freedom. He's credited for growing that small organization to one with 95,000 members and a \$9 million budget.” [Lowdown - presspubs.com, [3/24/15](#)]

**Hegseth Graduated From Princeton University In 2003 And Completed A Masters In Public Policy At Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School Of Government In 2013.** According to Pete Hegseth’s biography on the Concerned Veterans for American website, “Pete graduated from Princeton University in 2003 and completed a Masters in Public Policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government in 2013.” [cv4a.org, Accessed [4/13/15](#)]

**CVA CEO Pete Hegseth “Agreed To Write A Book To Be Published In Spring 2016... Titled ‘In The Arena,’ It Will Focus On His Strategy For ‘Keeping America Great And Free.’”** According to the Lowdown, “Most recently the former U.S. senatorial candidate [Pete Hegseth] agreed to write a book to be published in spring 2016 by Threshold Editions. Tentatively titled ‘In the Arena,’ it will focus on his strategy for ‘keeping America great and free.’ He called it ‘a call to action for our generation.’” [Lowdown - presspubs.com, [3/24/15](#)]

**Hegseth Spoke At The Family Research Council’s Witherspoon Fellowship Lecture, “Iraq: A Warrior's Perspective” In 2006.** According to The Washington Daybook, “The Family Research Council holds a Witherspoon Fellowship Lecture, ‘Iraq: A Warrior's Perspective,’ with Army Lt. Pete Hegseth.” [Washington Daybook, 11/9/06]

## **HEGSETH PUSHED FOR REFORMS TO MILITARY PAY AND BENEFITS, WHICH HE CLAIMED “WE CAN NO LONGER AFFORD”**

**2013: Washington Post: Hegseth Said He Was “In Favor Of Transforming The Current Retirement System... With A Program That More Closely Resembles A Private-Sector 401(K) Plan.”** According to The Washington Post, “[Pete] Hegseth, a Republican whose résumé includes Princeton and Harvard as well as a stint as a guard at the Guantanamo Bay prison, runs a small and scrappy group called Concerned Veterans for America. [...] Although his organization has not come up with a list of proposed cuts, he said he would be in favor of transforming the current retirement system — which provides pensions for those who stay for 20 years or more, and nothing for those who leave earlier — with a program that more closely resembles a private-sector 401(k) plan. ‘We don’t claim to have all of the solutions,’ he said. ‘We want to create the space for smart people to do the right thing.’” [Washington Post, [6/1/13](#)]

## **HEGSETH SUPPORTED RYAN BUDGETS THAT COULD HAVE CAUSED VETERANS’ PROGRAMS “TO DISAPPEAR” BY 2050 AND WOULD HAVE PRIVATIZED MEDICARE**

**Hegseth: “The Paul Ryan Budget That Passed The House Multiple Times In Previous Years... Is A Sober And Courageous Attempt To Address Our Growing Debt, And In 2014 Congress Should Advance Similar Policies.”** According to op-ed by CVA CEO Pete Hegseth in the National Review, “The Paul Ryan budget that passed the House multiple times in previous years — as opposed to the Ryan–Murray deal — is a sober and courageous attempt to address our growing debt, and in 2014 Congress should advance similar policies that encourage fiscal responsibility. Specifically, a balanced-budget amendment seems particularly well suited, politically and policy-wise, for the moment. If the president vetoes such proposals, so be it. But the efforts must continue.” [Pete Hegseth – National Review, [1/1/14](#)]

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: If It Had Passed, The FY 2013 Paul Ryan Budget Could Have Caused Veterans' Programs "To Disappear" By 2050.** According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, "The CBO report, prepared at Chairman Ryan's request, shows that Ryan's budget path would shrink federal expenditures for everything other than Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), and interest payments to just 3¾ percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) by 2050. Since, as CBO notes, 'spending for defense alone has not been lower than 3 percent of GDP in any year [since World War II]' and Ryan seeks a high level of defense spending — he increases defense funding by \$228 billion over the next ten years above the pre-sequestration baseline — the rest of government would largely have to disappear. That includes everything from veterans' programs to medical and scientific research, highways, education, nearly all programs for low-income families and individuals other than Medicaid, national parks, border patrols, protection of food safety and the water supply, law enforcement, and the like." [CBPP.org, [3/20/12](#)]

**Paul Ryan's FY 2013 Budget, When Compared With President Obama's Budget, Would Have Spent "13 Percent Less On Veterans."** According to The Washington Post's Wonkblog, "Over the next decade, Ryan plans to spend about 16 percent less than the White House on "income security" programs for the poor — that's everything from food stamps to housing assistance to the earned-income tax credit. (Ryan's budget would authorize \$4.8 trillion between 2013 and 2022; the White House's would spend \$5.7 trillion.) Compared with Obama, Ryan would spend 25 percent less on transportation and 13 percent less on veterans." [Wonkblog via Washington Post, [3/20/12](#)]

**Paul Ryan's FY 2014 Budget Would Have Privatized Medicare, Turning It Into A Voucher Program And Shifting Costs Onto Patients.** According to the Associated Press, "House Republicans unveiled their latest budget outline on Tuesday, sticking to their plans to try to repeal so-called Obamacare, cut domestic programs ranging from Medicaid to college grants and require future Medicare patients to bear more of the program's cost. [...] For his part, Ryan has resurrected a controversial Medicare proposal that replaces traditional Medicare for those currently under 55 with a government subsidy to buy health insurance on the open market." [Associated Press, [3/12/13](#)]

## **HEGSETH SUPPORTED IRAQ WAR AND CONTINUES TO DEFEND IT**

### **2002: Hegseth Supported Invading Iraq While Still In College**

**Hegseth: "I Believe, If Done Correctly, Eliminating Saddam And Liberating Iraq Could Be The 'Normandy Invasion' Or 'Fall Of The Berlin Wall' Of Our Generation."** According to an opinion written by Pete Hegseth in The Princeton Tory, "I believe, if done correctly, eliminating Saddam and liberating Iraq could be the 'Normandy Invasion' or 'fall of the Berlin Wall' of our generation. Not only will a victory in Iraq rid the world of a brutal dictator, but it will also provide an opportunity for democratic principles to gain favor in surrounding Arab polities." [Pete Hegseth – Princeton Tory, [September 2002](#)]

**Hegseth: "It Is Widely Reported That The Iraqi People Are Eager To Be Rid Of Saddam, And There Is Equally Encouraging Evidence That Republican Principles Could Thrive There."** According to an opinion written by Pete Hegseth in The Princeton Tory, "I believe, if done correctly, eliminating Saddam and liberating Iraq could be the 'Normandy Invasion' or 'fall of the Berlin Wall' of our generation. Not only will a victory in Iraq rid the world of a brutal dictator, but it will also provide an opportunity for democratic principles to gain favor in surrounding Arab polities. It is widely reported that the Iraqi people are eager to be rid of Saddam, and there is equally encouraging evidence that republican principles could thrive there." [Pete Hegseth – Princeton Tory, [September 2002](#)]

**Princeton Tory Editors: "Can We Please Go To Iraq Already? We've Established That Saddam Is Evil And That He Has Biological And Chemical Weapons Of Mass Destruction... What Further Evidence Is Needed?"** According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, "Can we please go to Iraq already? We've established that Saddam is evil and that he has biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction at his fingertips. What further evidence is needed? Lets take him out, and his crazy son with him." [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [February/March 2002](#)]

### **2005: Hegseth Defended Treatment of Detainees at Guantanamo Bay After Serving There**

**After Serving A Year At Guantanamo, Hegseth Said He "Never Saw One Treated With Violence Or Disrespect. Quite The Contrary" In 2005.** According to The Star Tribune, "Hegseth is baffled by the portrayal of Guantanamo in much of the media. He can't understand the eager focus on the base when American soldiers and innocent civilians are being blown

to bits or beheaded in Iraq. Who are the detainees at Guantanamo? According to Defense Department documents, many are members of Al-Qaida or the Taliban regime who were either planning terrorist attacks at the time of their detention or had already perpetrated them. Some are specialists in 'improvised explosive devices' or poisons. Others are terrorist recruiters or experts in funding terrorist activities. The Guantanamo detainees are clearly a dangerous and fanatical bunch. Yet during his year at the base, Hegseth never saw one treated with violence or disrespect. Quite the contrary." [Star Tribune, [6/27/05](#)]

**Hegseth "Saw Detainees On A Daily Basis And Never Witnessed Any Evidence That Interrogations Are Inhumane Or Violent."** According to The Star Tribune, "Guantanamo is an intelligence-gathering facility. Interrogators there seek to preempt future terrorist attacks by determining how groups like Al-Qaida organize, finance their operations and communicate among themselves. Hegseth himself did not participate in interrogations and has no personal knowledge of what the base was like before his arrival. However, during his tenure, he saw detainees on a daily basis and never witnessed any evidence that interrogations are inhumane or violent." [Star Tribune, [6/27/05](#)]

**Hegseth On Soldiers He Knew At Guantanamo: "I Think All Americans Would Be Proud Of These Guys."** According to The Star Tribune, "Hegseth is full of praise for the soldiers he knows at Guantanamo. 'I think all Americans would be proud of these guys,' he says." [Star Tribune, [6/27/05](#)]

**Hegseth Noted That "In Certain Respects, Life At Guantanamo Is More Comfortable For Some Detainees Than Life In Their Home Countries."** According to The Star Tribune, "'Photographers sometimes take pictures that make it look like American soldiers are putting the detainees in dog cages,' says Hegseth. 'That's very misleading.' In fact, he notes, in certain respects, life at Guantanamo is more comfortable for some detainees than life in their home countries." [Star Tribune, [6/27/05](#)]

**Hegseth Claimed One Prisoner Was So "Well-Treated" While At Guantanamo That He "Refused" To Go Home.** According to The Star Tribune, "Most Americans would be surprised to learn that some detainees don't want to leave the base. But Hegseth says that this is the case. 'My men and I once spent nine hours on a runway trying to get a detainee on a plane to take him home. He refused to get out of the van. He was being well-treated, and he knew what torture and maltreatment were like back home.'" [Star Tribune, [6/27/05](#)]

**Hegseth On His Experience Serving At Guantanamo: "We Bend Over Backwards To Conform Ourselves To The Detainees' Way Of Life... Especially When It Comes To Religion."** According to The Star Tribune, "Hegseth is baffled by the portrayal of Guantanamo in much of the media. He can't understand the eager focus on the base when American soldiers and innocent civilians are being blown to bits or beheaded in Iraq. Who are the detainees at Guantanamo? According to Defense Department documents, many are members of Al-Qaida or the Taliban regime who were either planning terrorist attacks at the time of their detention or had already perpetrated them. Some are specialists in 'improvised explosive devices' or poisons. Others are terrorist recruiters or experts in funding terrorist activities. The Guantanamo detainees are clearly a dangerous and fanatical bunch. Yet during his year at the base, Hegseth never saw one treated with violence or disrespect. Quite the contrary. 'We bend over backwards to conform ourselves to the detainees' way of life,' he says, 'especially when it comes to religion.'" [Star Tribune, [6/27/05](#)]

**Hegseth On Sen. Dick Durbin's Criticism Of Guantanamo: "Words Like Durbin's Hand Our Enemies A Propaganda Victory."** According to The Star Tribune, "Hegseth is concerned that Guantanamo's most vociferous critics don't see that their words bolster radical Islamists who want to convince the world that America is the Great Satan. 'Al Jazeera has already broadcast Durbin's statement -- comparing us to Hitler and Pol Pot in the U.S. Senate -- to the Arab world,' he points out. 'A short Newsweek story about a Qur'an can lead to the deaths of 15 people. Don't they understand that words like Durbin's hand our enemies a propaganda victory?'" [Star Tribune, [6/27/05](#)]

**Hegseth: "Laying Aside The Debate Over What Is And What Isn't 'Torture,' It's Hard To Argue With 8+ Years Of Safety Since 9/11. Yet, Somehow, The Interrogations We Used To Get Valuable Intelligence Have 'Undermined' Our Safety."** According to an op-ed by Pete Hegseth in National Review Online, "Second, Obama went to great pains to emphasize that Gitmo has created more terrorists than it has detained, has weakened American security, and the interrogation methods use there, and elsewhere, undermined our fight. This entire argument is premised on the belief that indefinite detention for unlawful combatants who ignore the rules of war — and alleged systematic mistreatment of said militants — provides overwhelming propaganda to our enemies and undermines our values (not to mention distressing the latte crowd across the pond). Laying aside the debate over what is and what isn't 'torture,' it's hard to argue with 8+ years of safety since 9/11. Yet, somehow, the interrogations we used to get valuable intelligence have 'undermined' our safety. President Obama should tell that to the special operators I served with overseas — and who are still serving — who killed and captured

truckloads of so-called jihadists on the battlefield with the intelligence from American interrogations. Or tell that to the American's who were saved through intelligence we gathered that prevented attacks on our homeland." [Pete Hegseth – [3/21/09](#)]

## **2007-2008: Hegseth Supported George W. Bush's Surge In Iraq, Continued to Defend Choice to Invade Country**

**2008: Hegseth On Iraq War: “We Believe In Finishing This Mission, We Believe In What We’re Doing. And That’s How Most Veterans And Troops On The Ground Feel.”** According to a Fox News interview with Pete Hegseth, Executive Director of Vets for Freedom, “HEGSETH: “I represent and we represent 24,000 vets at Vets for Freedom. We believe in finishing this mission [in Iraq], we believe in what we’re doing. And that’s how most veterans and troops on the ground feel.” [Fox News, [6/10/08](#)]

**Hegseth Was Executive Director Of Vets For Freedom, A National Group That “Supported Former President George W. Bush's Surge In Iraq.”** According to the Star Tribune, “[Pete] Hegseth, 31, has not run for public office before. But he is well known in Republican circles as executive director of Vets for Freedom, a now-dormant national group that supported former President George W. Bush's surge in Iraq, where Hegseth also served.” [Star Tribune, [5/2/13](#)]

**2007: Hegseth On Iraq War: “President Lincoln Chose To Fight A Bloody And Unpopular War Because He Believed The Enemy Had To Be Defeated. He Was Right. And To Me, That Sounds More Than A Bit Like The Situation Our Country Faces Today.”** According to an op-ed by Pete Hegseth for The Washington Post, “Most recently I was bothered by statements from Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), who cited three common antiwar arguments in his June 21 op-ed, ‘Lincoln's Example for Iraq,’ all of which run counter to realities on the ground in Iraq. [...] President Lincoln chose to fight a bloody and unpopular war because he believed the enemy had to be defeated. He was right. And to me, that sounds more than a bit like the situation our country faces today. What path will we choose? [Pete Hegseth – Washington Post, [6/25/07](#)]

*In 2007, Hegseth Opposed Against Legislation That Would Have Given Troops Equal Time At Home And Serving On Tour*

**Hegseth Was Against The Webb Amendment, Which Would Have Given Troops Equal Time At Home And Serving On Tour.** According to a transcript of an interview with Pete Hegseth On MSNBC’s *Hardball with Chris Matthews*, “Chris Matthews: Pete, what's wrong with this amendment to give the troops time at home equal to the time they're serving on their tours, so that they go back rested and ready for battle? Pete Hegseth: Well, it, it's just another example of Congress trying to legislate strategy in Iraq. You've got generals, all the way up to Secretary Gates, General Petraeus, General Pace, and others, have all said this would do great damage to the Army and the military's ability to deploy, deploy troops, if necessary, to different areas for emergencies or for just natural troop rotations. When the leadership of your military is saying this is something that will not only hurt our rotations, but put our troops at risk, if you read what Secretary Gates said the other day in a letter, he said, ‘This amendment will put our troops at risk, because it will not give our commanders an opportunity to deploy them in the way we may need to in a dynamic war environment.’” [Pete Hegseth Interview – MSNBC’s *Hardball*, [9/19/07](#)]

- **Hegseth Admitted Troops Would Like The Amendment And Said That “Everybody Wants To Be Home As Long As They Can.”** According to a transcript of an interview with Pete Hegseth On MSNBC’s *Hardball with Chris Matthews*, “Chris Matthews: Do you find- do you think, that this were ever passed and signed by the President, this requirement that troops get a full rotation home, a year home, a year on, like police sometimes do, an hour on, an hour off, OK? Pete Hegseth: M hm. Chris Matthews: You think they wouldn't like it? Pete Hegseth: No. It's not about that they wouldn't like it? Chris Matthews: They would- no, wouldn't that- just answer the question. Wouldn't they like to be able to get home for the amount of time they're spending over there? Pete Hegseth: Everybody wants to be home as long as they can. Chris Matthews: Well, then they would like this. Pete Hegseth: Sure.” [Pete Hegseth Interview – MSNBC’s *Hardball*, [9/19/07](#)]
- **Hegseth On Amendment: “It's About Doing What's Right, Not What You Like.”** According to a transcript of an interview with Pete Hegseth On MSNBC’s *Hardball with Chris Matthews*, “Chris Matthews: They would- no, wouldn't that- just answer the question. Wouldn't they like to be able to get home for the amount of time they're spending over there? Pete Hegseth: Everybody wants to be home a-as long as they can. Chris Matthews: Well, then they would like this. Pete Hegseth: Sure. Chris Matthews: So, who doesn't like this? Pete Hegseth: But it's- you- It's about doing what's right, not what you like. If this feels good in your heart, but you have got to think about how it

works in your head. Chris Matthews: No. I'm asking do, do, do- You're here for- Who are you speaking for, if not the troops? Pete Hegseth: Well, I'm speaking for myself and for Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who com- want to complete the mission. And they want policies from their generals and from their leadership that allow them to do so.” [Pete Hegseth Interview – MSNBC’s Hardball, [9/19/07](#)]

## **2014: Hegseth Continued to Defend Choice to Invade Iraq, Said George W. Bush “Won” The Iraq War “Decisively” With The Iraq Surge.**

**2014: Hegseth Said He “Still Believed” The Merits Of The 2003 Invasion Of Iraq Were “Justified.”** According to an opinion by Pete Hegseth for National Review, “Regardless of the merits of the 2003 invasion [of Iraq]— which I still believe to be justified — the surge of U.S. forces in 2007 and 2008 created an environment in which a multi-ethnic, mostly moderate, and quasi-stable U.S. ally could (could!) flourish in the Middle East.” [Pete Hegseth – National Review, [8/16/14](#)]

### **May 2015: Hegseth: We Should “Not Just Lay Down And Say Oh, Iraq Was Horrible, Sorry, Our Mistake.”**

According to an interview CVA President Pete Hegseth gave on Fox News radio, “HEGSETH: And step back and say, wouldn’t it be nice in the Middle East right now, where there’s only dictators or Islamists, to have a friendly country that’s stable and democratic, that recognizes Israel [*inaudible*] to Iran and would fight Al Qaeda? We could have had that with Iraq. Instead we don’t and that we should lay at the feet of Barack Obama, not just lay down and say oh, Iraq was horrible, sorry, our mistake.” [Fox News Radio, [5/15/15](#)]

**May 2015: Hegseth On Republicans’ Sudden Outbreak Of Anti-Iraq War: “I Think It’s No Good. I Think It’s Bowing To The Left’s Narrative Of Inevitable Failure In Iraq.”** According to an interview CVA President Pete Hegseth gave on Fox News radio, “HOST: What do you think about this sudden outbreak of anti-war, anti-Iraq War on the Republican side? HEGSETH: I think it’s no good. I think it’s bowing to the left’s narrative of inevitable failure in Iraq.” [Fox News Radio, [5/15/15](#)]

**May 2015: Hegseth: George W. Bush “Won” The Iraq War “Decisively” With The Iraq Surge.** According to an interview CVA President Pete Hegseth gave on Fox News radio, “HEGSETH: Whether you like the start of the [Iraq] war or not, George W. Bush won the war, then he lost it in ‘05, ‘06, and then with the Iraq surge, we won it. And we won it decisively with Al Qaeda being defeated and the central government making progress.” [Fox News Radio, [5/15/15](#)]

**May 2015: Hegseth: “Wouldn’t It Be Nice In The Middle East Right Now, Where There’s Only Dictators Or Islamists, To Have A Friendly Country That’s Stable And Democratic, That Recognizes Israel... And Would Fight Al Qaeda? We Could Have Had That With Iraq.”** According to an interview CVA President Pete Hegseth gave on Fox News radio, “HEGSETH: And step back and say, wouldn’t it be nice in the Middle East right now, where there’s only dictators or Islamists, to have a friendly country that’s stable and democratic, that recognizes Israel [*inaudible*] to Iran and would fight Al Qaeda? We could have had that with Iraq.” [Fox News Radio, [5/15/15](#)]

## **HEGSETH HAS MADE EXTREME STATEMENTS AS CEO OF CVA**

### **Hegseth Was Against Women Serving In Combat Operations**

#### **Hegseth: “If You Got A Wounded Soldier Or Marine On A Battlefield Who Needs To Be Dragged Off, Who Needs To Be Medevac, Who Needs To Be Pulled Can I Count On That Female Soldier To Do The Same Thing?”**

According to a transcript of an interview of Pete Hegseth by Bill O’Reilly on Fox News’s “The O’Reilly Factor,” “PETE HEGSETH: If you got a wounded soldier or Marine on a battlefield who needs to be dragged off, who needs to be Medevac, who needs to be pulled can I count on that female soldier to do the same thing?” [Fox News – O’Reilly Factor, [1/24/13](#)]

#### **Hegseth: “If We Were To Look At Women In Combat, We Would Have To Make Sure Standards Are Not Eroded. And I’m Not Certain... That Would Happen.”**

According to a transcript of an interview of Pete Hegseth by Bill O’Reilly on Fox News’s “The O’Reilly Factor,” “PETE HEGSETH: If you got a wounded soldier or Marine on a battlefield who needs to be dragged off, who needs to be Medevac, who needs to be pulled can I count on that female soldier to do the same thing? If we were to look at women in combat, we would have to make sure standards are not eroded. And I’m not certain -- O’REILLY: Ok. now that’s an interesting point— HEGSETH: that would happen.” [Fox News – O’Reilly Factor, [1/24/13](#)]

**Hegseth: There Are A Lot Of Ways Women Can Participate In Military, “It’s Just A Combat Role Of Sustained Offensive Combat Operations Is Something That I Think Males Together In The Dirt Are Collectively Qualified To Do.”** According to a transcript of an interview of Pete Hegseth by Bill O’Reilly on Fox News’s “The O’Reilly Factor,” “O’REILLY: -- one of the arguments is that it’s not fair to the women in the military, and any branch of service, because they don’t get promoted fast enough because they’re not in combat situation and they don’t get paid as much because you get combat pay. And those seem to be valid points. [...] So if you’re denying them combat, they’re not going to be promoted quick enough and they’re not going to make as much money. HEGSETH: Well as -- as the Colonel said -- as the Colonel said counterinsurgency, interacting with the population, a lot of ways that are pretty dynamic that women are doing it’s just a combat role of sustained offensive combat operations is something that I think males together in the dirt are collectively qualified to do.” [Fox News – O’Reilly Factor, [1/24/13](#)]

**Hegseth On Women Serving In Combat Creating “Distracting” Romances On The Battlefield: “As A Platoon Leader Or A Squad Leader, You Don’t Want To Have To Deal With ‘Matt’s’ Feelings Toward ‘Mary.’”** According to the StarTribune’s Hot Dish Politics blog, “[Pete] Hegseth, a Forest Lake native and Princeton grad who made a name for himself as head of the Iraq War era Vets for Freedom, also raised the issue of distracting battlefield romances. ‘It’s another variable that, as a platoon leader or a squad leader, you don’t want to have to deal with “Matt’s” feelings toward “Mary.”’ [Megyn] Kelly, pointing to the presence of gays in the military, shot back: “‘Matt’ may have been having feelings toward “Mike” for a long time in the foxhole, and the military has been doing okay.’ Replied Hegseth: “That may well be the case, but there are a lot more “Matts” that have feelings for “Mary.”’ [Hot Dish Politics via StarTribune.com, [1/24/13](#)]

### **Hegseth: “There’s No Reason Veterans Can’t Be The Unions Of The Right”**

**Hegseth: “There’s No Reason Veterans Can’t Be The Unions Of The Right.”** According to Politico, “Pete Hegseth, an infantry captain in the Army National Guard who is the group’s CEO, says veterans are ‘reflexively conservative, and they know how to organize.’ ‘With good data, we can target them with the right message at the right moment,’ Hegseth said. ‘They could be much more powerful than they are. There’s no reason veterans can’t be the unions of the right.’” [Politico, [12/8/14](#)]

### **Pete Hegseth Attacked First Lady Michelle Obama For Failing to Aid Homeless Veterans**

**Hegseth Attacked The First Lady For Failing To End Veteran Homelessness.** According to the Daily Caller, “Pete Hegseth, CEO of CVA, called out the first lady for her promise to end veteran’s homelessness. ‘Unfortunately, the failure of the first lady to make good on what I am sure was a well-intentioned goal to aid homeless veterans is part of a disturbingly long list of unfulfilled promises made by this administration to our nation’s veterans,’ Hegseth said in a statement to TheDCNF. ‘This administration says the right things about wanting to make sure veterans receive the care and assistance they have earned, but even six years in, its actions have yet to match its words.’” [Daily Caller, [12/4/14](#)]

### **Pete Hegseth On Climate Change: “Obama Fights Ebola, Not ISIS, Retreats On Battlefield But Wages War Against Weather.”**

**Hegseth Opinion Headline: “The Ambivalent American: Obama Fights Ebola, Not ISIS, Retreats On Battlefield But Wages War Against Weather.”** [Pete Hegseth - FoxNews.com, [10/28/14](#)]

### **Hegseth Defended Washington Redskins Team Name And Called It “A Term Of Respect”**

**Hegseth On Washington Redskins Team Name: “It’s Not Used Commonly At All As A Racial Slur. It’s Used Historically To Refer To, A Term Of Respect To People.”** According to Fox News’ *Outnumbered*, “PETE HEGSETH: 90 percent of Native Americans across the country don’t find the word ‘Redskins’ offensive. You can have all the lists you want, you can line them up, you can have their special interests, they can be outraged as all get out, doesn’t mean they represent the majority of Native Americans and the Redskins name has not been used offensively. It’s not used commonly either— FOX NEWS PANELIST: I just don’t know because I don’t have that perspective. HEGSETH: But I don’t think there’s a lot of people out—first of all, not a lot of, when’s the last time you heard someone use that as a racial slur? It’s not used commonly at all as a racial slur. It’s used historically to refer to, a term of respect to people.” [Fox News – *Outnumbered*, [5/26/14](#)]

### **Hegseth Criticized Rep. Corrine Brown For Becoming Ranking Member Of House Veterans Affairs Committee**

**Hegseth: Election Of Rep. Corrine Brown To Ranking Member Of House Veterans Affairs Committee “Shows Minority Leader Pelosi’s Failure To Grasp Seriousness Of VA Scandal.”** According to a press release from Concerned Veterans for America, “Hegseth: Move Shows Minority Leader Pelosi’s Failure to Grasp Seriousness of VA Scandal Pete Hegseth, CEO of Concerned Veterans for America, issued the following statement after the Democratic Steering Committee’s decision to name Rep. Corrine Brown (D-FL) as the next Ranking Member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee (HVAC)...” [Concerned Veterans for America Press Release, [11/19/14](#)]

**Hegseth: Rep. Corrine Brown “Has Been At Best An Apologist For The Status Quo At The VA And At Worst Totally Detached From Reality.”** According to a press release from Concerned Veterans for America, “Unfortunately, Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi chose to throw her support behind Representative Corrine Brown (D-5-FL), who has been at best an apologist for the status quo at the VA, and at worst totally detached from reality. Rep. Brown has consistently dismissed the pervasive problems at the VA in the face of overwhelming evidence of the department’s cultural and structural issues, including asserting immediately after the VA scandal that ‘we’re doing fine in Florida,’ when clinics in her district have some of the worst wait times in the nation.” [Concerned Veterans for America Press Release, [11/19/14](#)]

**Hegseth: “Rep. Brown’s Election Makes It Clear That Nancy Pelosi And The Democratic Leadership In Congress Have NO Intention Of Doing Anything But Blocking Real Reform At The Department of Veterans Affairs...”** According to a press release from Concerned Veterans for America, “Rep. Brown’s election makes it clear that Nancy Pelosi and the Democratic leadership in Congress have no intention of doing anything but blocking real reform at the Department of Veterans Affairs even as hundreds of thousands of veterans are still waiting for the care and benefits they have earned. We heard a lot of talk by both parties about caring for our nation’s veterans in the lead-up to the midterm elections. Minority Leader Pelosi just proved by the tone deaf actions of her caucus that it was exactly that—just talk.” [Concerned Veterans for America Press Release, [11/19/14](#)]

## **PETE HEGSETH: THE EARLY YEARS**

### **Hegseth Defended “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” As Being Supported By “Top Pentagon Brass And War-Fighters”**

**2010: Hegseth: ““Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’... Is Supported By Top Pentagon Brass And War-Fighters In The Field” And Repealing It “Will Cause Another Big Political Fight On Capitol Hill.”** According to an opinion by Pete Hegseth in National Review, “As for the speech, the president said very little that was new: ending the war in Iraq (nothing about ‘victory’), being ‘successful’ in Afghanistan (I was waiting for Joe Wilson to yell ‘win!’), and getting in some tough talk on Iran, that has yet to come to fruition. Also of note, the president didn’t mention closing Guantanamo Bay, or prosecuting KSM in New York City. Not sure if that’s a sign of shifting winds on those issues, but I sure hope so. The only ‘new’ item in his speech was his call for a repeal of ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.’ Attempting to change a policy, which is supported by top Pentagon brass and war-fighters in the field, will cause another big political fight on Capitol Hill. Certainly, while both sides will fight on the margins about the policy’s utility, it’s not a strong centerpiece proposal for national-security ‘change’ leading into 2010.” [Pete Hegseth – National Review, [1/28/10](#)]

**2010: Hegseth: Repealing “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” Is “Not A Strong Centerpiece Proposal For National-Security ‘Change’ Leading Into 2010.”** According to an opinion by Pete Hegseth in National Review, “The only ‘new’ item in his speech was his call for a repeal of ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.’ Attempting to change a policy, which is supported by top Pentagon brass and war-fighters in the field, will cause another big political fight on Capitol Hill. Certainly, while both sides will fight on the margins about the policy’s utility, it’s not a strong centerpiece proposal for national-security ‘change’ leading into 2010.” [Pete Hegseth – National Review, [1/28/10](#)]

### **Hegseth Unsuccessfully Ran For U.S. Senate In 2012**

**Hegseth Dropped Out Of Minnesota’s U.S. Senate Seat Race In 2012 After Failing To Receive The Republican Party’s Endorsement.** According to the StarTribune’s Hot Dish Politics blog, “Republican U.S. Senate candidate Pete Hegseth, who was trounced in a GOP endorsing contest last week, made clear Thursday that he is a former U.S. Senate candidate. ‘He will abide by the endorsement process and not run in a primary,’ spokesman Kyler Nerison said in an email Thursday.” [Hot Dish Politics via StarTribune.com, [5/24/12](#)]

**Hegseth On If He Would Have Voted Against Raising Debt Ceiling If It Meant Default: “There’s A Point Where You Can’t Just Keep Saying, ‘I’ll Up My Credit Card Limit’ Again And Again.”** According to an interview with then-Senate candidate Pete Hegseth in the MinnPost, “Would Hegseth have voted against raising the debt ceiling if it meant default? ‘Without the commensurate spending cuts, we can’t just keep raising the debt ceiling. We can’t keep borrowing 40 cents on the dollar. We are driving ourselves toward an inevitable future where those choices are made for us. Families don’t spend this way. Businesses don’t spend this way. There’s a point where you can’t just keep saying, “I’ll up my credit card limit” again and again.’” [MinnPost.com, [3/1/12](#)]

**Hegseth On Reducing The Nation’s Deficit And Debt: “Everything Is On The Table For Cuts. You’ve Got To Look At The Big Drivers Of Our Debt. You’ve Got To Look At The Defense Budget.”** According to an interview with then-Senate candidate Pete Hegseth in the MinnPost, “Since deficit and debt is a major issue, since the feds are currently spending about \$1 trillion a year more than they are collecting, how close is he to identifying a trillion dollars in annual savings? ‘Everything is on the table for cuts.’ ‘You’ve got to look at the big drivers of our debt. You’ve got to look at the Defense budget. I know you’re going to try to pin me down on specifics. And we’re in the process of developing all of that. But we will go out and have a serious conversation about the massive drivers of our deficit situation and our debt.’” [MinnPost.com, [3/1/12](#)]

**Hegseth On Medicare Reform: “A Premium Support Plan Of Some Kind, Without Pinning Myself Down To One In Particular Is The Type Of Thing That We Need To Be Looking At.”** According to an interview with then-Senate candidate Pete Hegseth in the MinnPost, “Yes, but what is this ‘reform’ that would cut costs without ending Medicare (or Social Security) as we know it? ‘If you’re talking about something like Medicare, it would be that fee-for-service is not sustainable. There’s no transparency in costs. There’s no incentive to improve the quality of care. So, a premium support plan of some kind, without pinning myself down to one in particular is the type of thing that we need to be looking at.’” [MinnPost.com, [3/1/12](#)]

**Hegseth On Medicare Reform: “As People Chose The ‘Premium Support’ Alternative, That Would Spark The Power Of Free-Market Forces To Bring Down Costs.”** According to an interview with then-Senate candidate Pete Hegseth in the MinnPost, “I asked how, if too many people stayed in traditional Medicare, that would result in big savings. He said that as people chose the ‘premium support’ alternative, that would spark the power of free-market forces to bring down costs.” [MinnPost.com, [3/1/12](#)]

**Hegseth Said The “Fee-For Service” Element Of Medicare, Which The Program Is Based On, “Is Not Sustainable.”** According to an interview with then-Senate candidate Pete Hegseth in the MinnPost, “Yes, but what is this ‘reform’ that would cut costs without ending Medicare (or Social Security) as we know it? ‘If you’re talking about something like Medicare, it would be that fee-for-service is not sustainable. There’s no transparency in costs. There’s no incentive to improve the quality of care. So, a premium support plan of some kind, without pinning myself down to one in particular is the type of thing that we need to be looking at. I would also say that there should be an option in there for the traditional Medicare system, if folks wanted to stay in it, which gets around this idea that anything we’re talking about would, quote, end Medicare as we know it.’ (I didn’t say it at the time, but the traditional Medicare system is based on fee-for-service, which Hegseth said a minute earlier is unsustainable.)” [MinnPost.com, [3/1/12](#)]

**Hegseth Opposed Obamacare And When Asked What He Would Replace It With, “Nothing Specific But These Qualities Were Mentioned: ‘Patient Centered,’ ‘Shouldn’t Have Government Mandates,’ ‘Consumer-Driven Health Care.’”** According to an interview with then-Senate candidate Pete Hegseth in the MinnPost, “Hegseth not only would have opposed the big health care legislation known as Obamacare, but he favors full repeal. After repealing Obamacare, what (if anything) would he vote to put in place to reduce the large portion of Americans who lack health insurance? Turns out there’s nothing specific but these qualities were mentioned: ‘Patient centered,’ ‘Shouldn’t have government mandates,’ ‘Consumer-driven health care’ that puts the ‘consumer in charge,’ has ‘transparency in costs,’ (patients should ‘know what they are paying and have options for what they want to pay for, as opposed to the lack of choice’ represented by Obamacare).” [MinnPost.com, [3/1/12](#)]

**Hegseth: President Obama’s Decisions To End The War In Iraq And To Set A Timetable For Withdrawal From Afghanistan Were Not Made “Out Of A Desire To Find The Best Outcome But Out Of A Desire To Get Out As Quickly As Possible.”** According to an interview with then-Senate candidate Pete Hegseth in the MinnPost, “How has Obama done on Iraq and Afghanistan? Hegseth first came to public attention as one of the founders of ‘Vets for Freedom,’ which strongly supported the troop ‘surge’ in Iraq. I asked him whether he supported the actions of President Obama to end the combat mission in Iraq and to set a timetable for withdrawal from Afghanistan. ‘In Iraq, they were wedded to a political

desire to, quote, end the war. And therefore did not show the kind of aggressive negotiations that should have been had to make sure that we were able to stand alongside, in a very limited way, the Iraqis' ability to continue to build their military and provide a stable outcome there. It's pretty hard to be successful when you're simultaneously telling the enemy when you're going to leave. I was one who disagreed with Senator Obama in 2008 on the Iraq surge, but was supportive of the decision to surge in Afghanistan in 2009, but was very wary of that deadline. And, just having gotten back from Afghanistan, I can attest to you the great damage that that deadline does to our ability to demonstrate that we're there to stand beside a floundering Afghan government. So I don't think the decisions were made on either front out of a desire to find the best outcome but out of a desire to get out as quickly as possible. But I wouldn't be painted into a box of saying that that means we're there indefinitely either." [MinnPost.com, [3/1/12](#)]

## **Hegseth Wrote Controversial Opinions As Publisher Of The Princeton Tory During College**

**Hegseth Was Publisher Of The Princeton Tory In 2002.** According to The Princeton Tory, Pete Hegseth was publisher in 2002. [Princeton Tory, [October 2002](#)]

*Hegseth's Princeton Tory Complained That Leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King Did Not Deserve More Praise Than Leadership of Lincoln*

**Princeton Tory Editors: "While Dr. King Won Civil Rights For Black Americans, Lincoln Won Them Basic HUMAN RIGHTS... Do Dr. King's Actions Deserve More Praise Than Those Of Lincoln? We Think Not."**

According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, "While Dr. King won civil rights for black Americans, Lincoln won them basic HUMAN RIGHTS. In fact, Lincoln was willing to fight the bloodiest war ever on American soil in order to maintain the Union, free from slavery; in doing this, Lincoln kept intact the ultimate integrity of our Constitutional ideals. Martin Luther King was a great man as well—winning blacks their due civil rights while staying true to American ideals. But do Dr. King's actions deserve more praise than those of Lincoln? We think not. The Tory salutes Lincoln and his eternal contributions to the greatest, and most diverse, country the world has ever known." [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [February/March 2002](#)]

*Hegseth On Diversity and Inclusion: "As The Publisher Of The Tory I Strive To Defend The Pillars Of Western Civilization Against The Distractions Of Diversity."*

**Hegseth: "In Order For An Undergraduate To Encounter The Buzzwords Of Diversity (Skin-Deep), Tolerance (One-Sided), Multiculturalism (Anti-Western), And Sexual/Gender Liberation (Anti-Family) They Must Simply Attend Lecture, Precept, Or University-Sponsored Events."** According to Notes from the Publisher by Pete Hegseth in The Princeton Tory, "The question I pose to you is: what is the philosophy of our 'schoolroom?' What educational principles are guiding our generation? Based on the topics addressed in this month's Tory, I am not encouraged. The issues of our day, and this campus, center on, among others, encouragement and support for pre-marital sex, homosexuality, abortion, and a general hostility towards faith and religion. Quite a line-up. In order for an undergraduate to encounter the buzzwords of diversity (skin-deep), tolerance (one-sided), multiculturalism (anti-Western), and sexual/gender liberation (anti-family) they must simply attend lecture, precept, or University-sponsored events." [Pete Hegseth – Princeton Tory, [October 2002](#)]

**Hegseth: "As The Publisher Of The Tory I Strive To Defend The Pillars Of Western Civilization Against The Distractions Of Diversity."** According to Notes from the Publisher by Pete Hegseth in The Princeton Tory, "As the publisher of the Tory I strive to defend the pillars of Western civilization against the distractions of diversity." [Pete Hegseth – Princeton Tory, [April 2002](#)]

**Hegseth: "The Classics Of The Western Tradition, As Well As American History, Deserve Priority Over Other Areas Of Study."** According to Notes from the Publisher by Pete Hegseth in The Princeton Tory, "I support entertaining diverse ideas, but I do not believe diversity is the holy grail of the academic experience. Diversity does have value, but it can be overstretched. While the academic curriculum has steered widely off course, excellence and truth are still sought by students. Thus, conservatives feel that the Western tradition, embodied today by America, deserves the most analysis. The classics of the Western tradition, as well as American history, deserve priority over other areas of study." [Pete Hegseth – Princeton Tory, [April 2002](#)]

**Hegseth: “All This Talk Of ‘Diversity’ Has Diverted Princeton From Its Original Academic Focus: Western Civilization.”** According to Notes from the Publisher by Pete Hegseth in The Princeton Tory, “I’ve come to the earnest conclusion that the most cherished word of the Tilghman administration, and the University in general, is DIVERSITY. Whether we are told to ‘reflect’ on our ethnicity, participate in a task force on ‘cross-cultural encounters,’ or engage in ‘dialogues’ about race, diversity is in perpetual focus. All this talk of ‘diversity’ has diverted Princeton from its original academic focus: Western civilization and the curious combination of Socrates and Christ, strength and humility, democracy and piety, Athens and Jerusalem. Diversity is a note-worthy discussion topic, yet highly overvalued at this University.” [Pete Hegseth – Princeton Tory, [April 2002](#)]

*Hegseth and Princeton Tory Editor “The Movement To Legitimize The Homosexual Lifestyle And Homosexual Marriages Is Strong And Must Be Vigorously Opposed.”*

**Hegseth Published The “Personal” Email Princeton University’s Student Government President Wrote In Reaction To An Article Written By The Tory Editors That “Characterized The Homosexual Life Style As Immoral.”**

According to The New York Times, “The president of the Princeton University’s student government, Nina Langsam, is learning a hard lesson in media relations. Ms. Langsam became upset after reading an editorial in the October issue of the Princeton Tory, a student-run conservative magazine, that characterized the homosexual life style as immoral. Infuriated, the Princeton senior fired off an e-mail message to both the publisher of the student-run magazine, Brad Simmons, and the editor in chief, Pete Hegseth. Soon afterward, her message appeared as a letter to the editor in the magazine’s November issue. Ms. Langsam maintains that the e-mail message was personal correspondence and should not have been published.” [New York Times, 12/22/02]

- **Princeton Tory Editors: “Hey, Boys Can Wear Bras And Girls Can Wear Ties Until We’re Blue In The Face, But It Won’t Change The Reality That The Homosexual Lifestyle Is Abnormal And Immoral.”** According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, “Anyone else noticed that the LGBT, along with assorted ‘allies,’ seem to be pressing extra hard this year? From ‘the joys and toys of gay sex’ lecture, to aforementioned ‘kiss-ins,’ to Gay Jeans Day, the gay community has truly shown its ‘pride.’ They even sponsored a ‘Gender-Bender Day’ in which Princetonians were encouraged to ‘challenge their gender’ and ‘dress, behave, and talk in a way they don’t usually associate with their own gender identity.’ Hey, boys can wear bras and girls can wear ties until we’re blue in the face, but it won’t change the reality that the homosexual lifestyle is abnormal and immoral.” [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [October 2002](#)]
- **Princeton University Student Government President: “I Was Offended And Compeled [*sic*] To Tell Them To Increase Their Sensitivity. I Never Considered It A Letter To The Editor.”** According to The New York Times, “[Princeton University Student Government President] Ms. Langsam maintains that the e-mail message was personal correspondence and should not have been published. In any event, she said, she never wanted to censor the Tory -- something she is powerless to do anyway. ‘It was my own personal opinion about their piece,’ Ms. Langsam said. ‘I was offended and compeled [*sic*] to tell them to increase their sensitivity. I never considered it a letter to the editor.” [New York Times, 12/22/02]
- **Hegseth On The Student Government President’s Letter: “She Wanted To Shut Down An Opinion She Clearly Did Not Agree With.”** According to The New York Times, “When the magazine notified her of its intention to publish the letter, she spoke to members of the magazine’s staff to see if they would reconsider publishing her correspondence [*sic*]. But the magazine was having no part of that. At a subsequent student government meeting, Ms. Langsam insisted that her actions did not constitute censorship. But Mr. Hesgeth disagreed, saying: ‘She wanted to shut down an opinion she clearly did not agree with. We’re her constituents, too.’” [New York Times, 12/22/02]

**Princeton Tory Editors To Princeton’s LGBT Kiss-In Participants: “You Helped To Remove More Credibility From The Homosexual Movement And Made Its Cause Seem Even More Irreverent, Illegitimate, And Irrelevant.”**

According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, “Did anybody else happen to catch the LGBT ‘Kissin’ in front of Frist the other day? If not, you didn’t miss much. Just another example of the homosexual movement using sexual shock techniques in a futile attempt to advance its supposedly worthwhile cause. And for what? Personally, we don’t see the point of having numerous gay couples kissing while others stand around and cheer as if some huge barrier had just been broken. What barrier? Why kissing? The truth is that this act does not inherently carry with it any message, and, stripped of its supposed purpose, all that is left is a ‘Hey! Look at me!’ peep show for all the University (or, as we mentioned earlier, the huge crowd present for the festivities). Participants, we hope you feel empowered.

Unfortunately, the truth is that all of you who participated in the ‘Kiss-In’ only managed to draw attention to yourselves. You didn’t change any existing stereotypes, or force people to alter their pre-existing notions of homosexuality. And, in failing so miserably, you helped to remove more credibility from the homosexual movement and made its cause seem even more irreverent, illegitimate, and irrelevant. Congratulations!” [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [October 2002](#)]

**Princeton Tory Editors: “The Movement To Legitimize The Homosexual Lifestyle And Homosexual Marriages Is Strong And Must Be Vigorously Opposed.”** According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, “The movement to legitimize the homosexual lifestyle and homosexual marriages is strong and must be vigorously opposed.” [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [April 2002](#)]

**Princeton Tory Editors: “Homosexuals Themselves Should Not Be Demonized; However, Their Lifestyle Deserves Absolutely No Special Legal Status.”** According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, “Homosexuals themselves should not be demonized; however, their lifestyle deserves absolutely no special legal status.” [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [April 2002](#)]

**Princeton Tory Editors On The New York Times’s Gay Marriage Announcements: “At What Point Does The Paper Deem A ‘Relationship’ Unfit For Publication? What If We ‘Loved’ Our Sister And Wanted To Marry Her?” Or The Family Dog?”** According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, “The New York Times recently announced that homosexual ‘marriage’ announcements would start appearing in its pages. Other regional papers have also followed suit. The basic logic is that if individuals love each other, and want to get married, then it is sufficiently newsworthy to warrant an announcement in the papers. (Last time we checked, homosexual marriage was illegal, but that’s beside the point.) The explanation sounds nice on the surface, but its logic is dangerous. At what point does the paper deem a ‘relationship’ unfit for publication? What if we ‘loved’ our sister and wanted to marry her? Or maybe two women at the same time? A 13-year-old? The family dog? Or better yet, the entire staff of the Prog?” [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [September 2002](#)]

*Princeton Tory Editors “Applaud[ed]” The Chairman Of The Augusta National Golf Club For “His Unwillingness To Admit Women As Members”*

**Princeton Tory Editors “Applaud[ed]” The Chairman Of The Augusta National Golf Club For “His Unwillingness To Admit Women As Members,” Calling It A “Steadfast Defense Of The Rights Of Private Enterprise.”** According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, “Much has been made about Hootie Johnson, the chairman of the Augusta National Golf Club, and his unwillingness to admit women as members to the prestigious Augusta National, home of The Masters. Although we applaud Hootie’s steadfast defense of the rights of private enterprise, we’re curious what the golfers think about it. Well, of the 30 players participating in the Tour Championship one month ago, the first 29 off the course said they would not boycott the upcoming Masters. The last, Vijay Singh, a Fijian of Indian descent who’s had issue with Augusta National in the past, was asked the same question. The feminists eagerly awaited his answer, until with simple elegance he replied ‘Hell no.’ The feminists shuddered. We applaud.” [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [November/December 2002](#)]

- **Princeton Tory Editors “Applaud[ed]” Golf Participants Who Said They Would Not Boycott The Masters Even Though The Golf Club Hosting It Did Not Allow Women As Members.** According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, “Much has been made about Hootie Johnson, the chairman of the Augusta National Golf Club, and his unwillingness to admit women as members to the prestigious Augusta National, home of The Masters. Although we applaud Hootie’s steadfast defense of the rights of private enterprise, we’re curious what the golfers think about it. Well, of the 30 players participating in the Tour Championship one month ago, the first 29 off the course said they would not boycott the upcoming Masters. The last, Vijay Singh, a Fijian of Indian descent who’s had issue with Augusta National in the past, was asked the same question. The feminists eagerly awaited his answer, until with simple elegance he replied ‘Hell no.’ The feminists shuddered. We applaud.” [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [November/December 2002](#)]

*Hegseth Wanted to Advocate for “Traditional Family Unit,” “A Return Of The Acceptability Of The ‘Homemaker’ Vocation”*

**Hegseth: “By Advocating Government Support Of The Traditional Family Unit, A Return Of The Acceptability Of The ‘Homemaker’ Vocation... Conservatives Provide A Working Blueprint For A Free And Prosperous Future.”** According to Notes from the Publisher by Pete Hegseth in The Princeton Tory, “As far as a philosophy, conservatives are

often accused of being narrow-minded and 'intolerant' of various groups (i.e. gays, feminists, and atheists). Far from intolerant, conservatives instead support a society in which marriage, family values, and religious faith are encouraged by the public and private sectors. While attempting to discredit the constant stream of liberal ideology spewing from the University administration and staff, the Tory also provides tangible solutions for societal ills. By advocating government support of the traditional family unit, a return of the acceptability of the 'homemaker' vocation, freedom from oppressive government oversight, moral responsibility, and the revival of religious faith, conservatives provide a working blueprint for a free and prosperous future." [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [November/December 2002](#)]

*Hegseth Said "Abortion and Infanticide" Were Not First Solutions for Children Living In Poverty In Developing Countries*

**Princeton Tory Editors: "At A Recent Lecture, Peter Singer Addressed The Topic, 'What Can We Do To Help Children In Poverty In Developing Countries?' Surprisingly, Abortion And Infanticide Were Not The First Solutions Proposed."** According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, "At a recent lecture, Peter Singer addressed the topic, 'What can we do to help children in poverty in developing countries?' Surprisingly, abortion and infanticide were not the first solutions proposed." [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [May 2002](#)]

*Hegseth Wanted to Invade Iraq In 2002*

**Hegseth: "I Believe, If Done Correctly, Eliminating Saddam And Liberating Iraq Could Be The 'Normandy Invasion' Or 'Fall Of The Berlin Wall' Of Our Generation."** According to an opinion written by Pete Hegseth in The Princeton Tory, "I believe, if done correctly, eliminating Saddam and liberating Iraq could be the 'Normandy Invasion' or 'fall of the Berlin Wall' of our generation. Not only will a victory in Iraq rid the world of a brutal dictator, but it will also provide an opportunity for democratic principles to gain favor in surrounding Arab polities." [Pete Hegseth – Princeton Tory, [September 2002](#)]

**Hegseth: "It Is Widely Reported That The Iraqi People Are Eager To Be Rid Of Saddam, And There Is Equally Encouraging Evidence That Republican Principles Could Thrive There."** According to an opinion written by Pete Hegseth in The Princeton Tory, "I believe, if done correctly, eliminating Saddam and liberating Iraq could be the 'Normandy Invasion' or 'fall of the Berlin Wall' of our generation. Not only will a victory in Iraq rid the world of a brutal dictator, but it will also provide an opportunity for democratic principles to gain favor in surrounding Arab polities. It is widely reported that the Iraqi people are eager to be rid of Saddam, and there is equally encouraging evidence that republican principles could thrive there." [Pete Hegseth – Princeton Tory, [September 2002](#)]

**Princeton Tory Editors: "Can We Please Go To Iraq Already? We've Established That Saddam Is Evil And That He Has Biological And Chemical Weapons Of Mass Destruction... What Further Evidence Is Needed?"** According to The Rant in The Princeton Tory, compiled by the Tory Editors in 2002 when Pete Hegseth was publisher, "Can we please go to Iraq already? We've established that Saddam is evil and that he has biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction at his fingertips. What further evidence is needed? Lets take him out, and his crazy son with him." [Editorial – Princeton Tory, [February/March 2002](#)]

## **A CVA Campaign During The 2014 Midterm Election Attempted To Link "Vulnerable Democrats" To The VA Scandal**

**CVA Led "A Multi-Faceted Campaign Linking Vulnerable Democrats" To The VA Scandal During The 2014 Midterm Election.** According to the Sunlight Foundation, "Instead, the organization has transferred ad contracts in Iowa and North Carolina to another politically active group under the Koch umbrella, Concerned Veterans for America (CVA), which is leading a multi-faceted campaign linking vulnerable Democrats to the Veterans Administration scandal." [SunlightFoundation.com, [8/13/14](#)]

**CVA Issues And Campaign Manager Dan Caldwell Acknowledged VA Scandal "Changed The Whole Dynamic Of Our Organization," But "Denied" That The Group's Big-Money Attacks On Democrats Are "Political."** According to CQ Roll Call, "Concerned Veterans of America is run by and champions veterans, said Dan Caldwell, the group's issues and campaign manager, a veteran himself. The group fills a void in the veterans' community, he said, by advocating VA changes,

deficit reduction and national security. Caldwell acknowledged that the VA scandal ‘changed the whole dynamic of our organization,’ but denied that the group's big-money dollar attacks on such Democrats as North Carolina incumbent Sen. Kay Hagan and Rep. Bruce Braley of Iowa are political. “These ads we consider issue advocacy,’ Caldwell said. “They are based out of our VA reform efforts. We are not just a fly-by-night 501(c)(4) trying to use the VA scandal as an election-year issue. We have a long history on these issues. We have a real agenda on VA reform.” [Roll Call, [10/5/14](#)]

**In October 2014, CVA Launched “Get Out The Veteran (GOTVets), A Multi-Million Dollar, Nationwide Get-Out-The-Vote Initiative” In “Veteran And Active-Duty, Military-Heavy States.”** According to a web post from the Concerned Veterans for America, “Concerned Veterans for America (CVA) today announced the launch of Get Out The Veteran (GOTVets), a multi-million dollar, nationwide get-out-the-vote initiative that includes direct mail, digital advertising, and grassroots activism in veteran and active-duty, military-heavy states. The mail, multimedia and on-the-ground effort will include a dedicated website and digital promotion, as well as local events, door-to-door canvassing efforts and phone banking by CVA veterans and activists in targeted states, including but not limited to, North Carolina, Louisiana, New Hampshire, Virginia, Florida, and Texas.” [Post via CV4A.org, [10/8/14](#)]