

The Republican Club of Sun City NEWSLETTER

April 2011

Everett Schmidt, Editor

Sun City Texas

CONGRESSMAN CARTER, MAYORAL CANDIDATES TO ADDRESS CLUB

Congressman John Carter and city of Georgetown mayoral candidates George Garver (incumbent) and John Marler (challenger) will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday, April 21 in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City.

Congressman Carter will discuss issues at the federal level which, literally, have the potential of destroying the nation's form of government. The mayoral candidates will make their comments in the context of the coming election day which is scheduled for Saturday, May 14. (Early voting is May 2 through May 10).

In order to provide maximum time for each of the speakers, the program will begin with addresses by Congressman Carter and the two mayoral candidates, after which there will be a question and answer segment involving the mayoral candidates and another segment involving Congressman Carter.

The Social Hour, Dinner and Program. A social hour will begin at 6:00 PM. The dinner will begin at 6:30 PM and will be followed by the program. The dinner will be catered by **Cafe on the Green** which will serve chicken parmigiano, pasta Italiana, peas and carrots, and rolls and butter.

Cost. Cost is \$16 per person. Checks, made out to **The Republican Club of Sun City**, should be mailed to **The Republican Club of Sun City, Bernie Miller, Treasurer, 1530 Sun City Blvd., Suite 120, Box 227, Georgetown, TX 78633** by no later than Friday, April 15. Bernie has also set up a special box on his front porch at 265 Trail of the Flowers for those club members wishing to hand deliver payments. For information about reservations, contact Bernie at 868-9125 or bimiller1@Verizon.net

CLUB WILL NOT MEET IN MAY; TO MEET IN JUNE INSTEAD

Because of scheduling complications, the club was not able to reserve the ballroom for its usual May meeting. Consequently, the next meeting (after the April meeting) will be held on Thursday, June 30 when the speaker will be state Representative Charles Schwertner who will provide an update about the current legislative session.

OTHER CLUB NEWS

Club president Julian Bucher announced during the club's March meeting that the club would donate \$2000 to the USO at Ft. Hood, and that additional funds may be sent after an evaluation of projected club expenses for the remainder of this year and next year (a presidential election year) has been completed.

Club vice president Brenda Leisey reports that 2011 club membership now stands at 254. Brenda, who is also editor of the 2011 Yearbook, also reports that copies of that document will be available for distribution to the membership during the April 21 and subsequent meetings.

TEA PARTY EVENT SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 15

David Schumacher reports that the third annual Tax Day Tea Party will be held on Friday, April 15, from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM in Hanger A of the Georgetown Municipal Airport. Attendees should bring folding chairs.

One of the main speakers is author Brigitte Gabriel who, as a resident of Lebanon, witnessed and suffered through the transformation of that country from a peaceful one in which everyone "got along" to a fractious one into which violence was injected as a result of the infiltration of Muslim terrorist groups. She has been a guest on various talk shows and TV programs (including Sean Hannity) when the subject of Islam was discussed. She is author of *Because They Hate* and a recent book, *They Must Be Stopped*.

For information, call 512-966-8642 or key in wilcoteapartymovement.org on the Internet.

The reader may be interested in learning that recently elected Kentucky Senator Rand Paul has written a book, *The Tea Party Goes to Washington*, which one reviewer contends “could be the Tea Party’s handbook.” In his book, Paul asserts, “Despite accusations to the contrary, the Tea Party is organized from the bottom up, decentralized and independent...No matter how much the establishment would love to control and manipulate this movement, its political narrative is dictated by the grass roots, not the other way around.”

A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT; A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Foreword. Pursuant to recommendations from some big names in Texas politics – Sen. Cornyn, Gov. Perry, Lt. Gov. Dewhurst, Sen Ogden (our state Senator) and others – the state Senate, by a vote of 24-7, passed a resolution (1) urging the U. S. Congress to take steps to bring about a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution, and (2) if Congress is unable or unwilling to take such step, to have Congress initiate a national Constitutional Convention, as authorized by the Constitution, to consider, solely, that particular matter.

While it is clear that spending at the federal level is out-of-control and something must be done, there are strongly opposing views regarding the question of whether such amendment would bring about desired results. There are also strongly opposing views as to whether a national Constitutional Convention, when used to bring about such amendment, would yield the desired objective or whether some dangerous “unintended consequences” would ensue.

Evidence of this concern is provided by the fact that beginning in Alabama and Florida in 1988, a total of 17 state legislatures have voted to rescind all previous legislation supporting a Balanced Budget Amendment. (Florida, however, has since issued a call for a national convention)

This report is presented in light of these strongly opposing views.

The Applicable Provision of the U. S. Constitution. Art. V of the Constitution states in pertinent part:

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress.

In the vast majority of instances, Amendments to the Constitution have been initiated by Congress and then voted on by the legislatures; however, in the event Congress is unable or unwilling to initiate an amendment, Article V provides an alternative in the form of a Constitutional Convention where amendments may be initiated. Once 34 state legislatures submit Applications, Congress must initiate a national convention.

But, legal scholar Joe Wolverton II points out that, “...even assuming that the Article V amendment is strictly followed, Congress could still submit amendments proposed by a convention to special state ratifying conventions – as opposed to the state legislatures – as a means of circumventing the will of state legislatures.” He notes that this procedure had been used once: when the 21st Amendment (ending prohibition) was submitted to *state ratifying conventions* out of fear that the usual procedure might not enable three fourths of the *state legislatures* to ratify an amendment ending prohibition.

Proposals at the Federal Level. There have been several Balanced Budget Amendments proposed at the federal level, including one co-sponsored by Senators Cornyn and Hatch. If passed by Congress, it would have to be ratified by three fourths of the states. It includes a provision calling for total outlays not to exceed 20% of prior year GDP, and provision for waiving balanced budget requirements in the event of wars or military conflicts, a significant provision in view of the fact that the nation has virtually been in continuous military conflict since 9/11.

Proposals in the Texas Legislature. The issue of a resolution advocating a Balanced Budget Amendment was designated an “emergency” by Gov. Perry and thus given fast-track status. As was reported above, the resolution, which passed the Senate (its status in the House is not known), also advocates (1) if Congress does not balance the budget, a Constitutional Convention be called for the purpose of requiring a balanced budget, and (2) the agenda at such convention be limited to a consideration of a balanced budget amendment. An attempt to limit the agenda items is a source of much concern.

Speaking forcefully about the need for Constitutional Convention, state Senator Ogden, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, stated: "It's the only vehicle in the U. S. Constitution afforded the states to amend the U. S. Constitution. It's the only car in the garage. Congress, left to its own devices, will never balance the budget." (emphasis added)

Legal and Scholarly Opinion. Columnist and economist Walter Williams states, "Congress would just love a balanced budget in the sense that they'd always be able to say we must raise taxes to balance the budget. Spending could just go through the roof, and then they could come back and say there's an amendment saying we have to balance the budget, so up your taxes go." He contends that "true protection requires an amendment limiting congressional spending."

While it is true that the proposal of Cornyn-Hatch contains a spending limit (20% of GDP), there is question if there would be compliance, as suggested by Wolverton who asks:

Why...propose a balanced-budget amendment when most congressional spending is in violation of the Constitution? Why would Congress bother to follow new amendments when the American people don't require them to follow the present ones? Note that most states have strict rules about balanced budgets or have passed balanced-budget amendments, yet almost none have balanced budgets.

Legal and Scholarly Opinion About a Constitutional Convention. The situation involving the nation's first and only Constitutional Convention in 1787 can be instructive with respect to conventions contemplated for the future. Columnist and Eagle Forum founder Phyllis Schlafly contends: "Just about the only thing we can predict with certainty is that the convention could not be secret from the media and the public, as was the original 1787 Constitutional Convention (which met behind closed doors and had no leaks." (emphasis added)

The circus-like atmosphere which existed in Wisconsin in the wake of that state's efforts to change laws affecting unions can provide some indication of the atmosphere which could exist at a Constitutional Convention. Schlafly speculates on the that possibility:

Outside of a [Constitutional Convention] hall, demonstrators would be demanding constitutional changes: gay activists and their opponents, pro-abortionist and pro-lifers, radical feminists, the environmentalists, gun control advocates, animal rights extremists, D. C. Statehood agitators, those who want to relax immigration and those who would restrict it, mortgage defaulters, and the unions – all demanding consideration of amendments to recognize their asserted rights.

It is tempting to conclude that such convention should and could consider only one subject. But highly respected legal opinion is to the contrary. Former Chief Justice Warren Burger wrote, "There is no effective way to limit or muzzle the action of a Constitutional Convention." Other respected jurists have expressed similar views.

Perhaps most significant are the comments of James Madison, father of the Constitution, who warned against the convening of a second Constitutional Convention. He stated: "Having witnessed the difficulties and dangers experienced by the first convention, which assembled under every propitious circumstance, I should tremble for the result of a second..."

DOES AMERICA SUFFICIENTLY UNDERSTAND ISLAM?

Foreword. Representative Peter King (R.-NY), from whose district more that 100 of his constituents perished on 9/11, is chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee which, on March 10, began a hearing titled, "The Extent of Radicalization in the American Muslim Community and That Community's Response." The primary purpose of the hearing was to investigate the inroads radical Muslims have made in America since 9/11. The reader is no doubt aware of the 9/11 attack and the killing of 14 people, including an unborn child, by Major Nidal Hasan in Ft. Hood. But there were numerous other attempts, thankfully unsuccessful, to bring violence to America; however, little attention was paid by the media to them.

There are indications that our government doesn't understand – much less know how to cope with – Muslim terrorists. Evidence of this is in the form of President Obama's banning of the term "Islam" when describing terrorist; the failure of military supervisory personnel at Ft. Hood to act on signs of radicalism on the part of Maj. Hasan, the murderer; and Gen. George Casey's unfortunate remark that if Maj. Hasan's actions caused "diversity" to suffer, it would be a greater tragedy than the murder of his troops.

The purpose of this report is to bring some understanding of Islam to readers.

The Democrat Response to the King Hearing. Despite the 9/11 attack, the murders at Fr. Hood, and other documented attempted acts of terrorism in America, the Democrats were surprisingly resistant to the committee hearings. Sen. Reid said he is “deeply concerned about these hearings, which demonize law abiding American Muslims who make important contributions to our society, as would be about congressional hearings to investigate Catholics, Jews or people of any other faith based solely on their religion.” He thus seems oblivious to the contrast of the violence perpetrated by Muslims with the behavior of members of other religions.

The reliably insipid Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee, a Texas Democrat, held up copy of the Constitution, saying it was in “pain,” and called the hearing an “effort to demonize and castigate” Muslims.

Other Democrats argued that “to focus on just one group, Muslims, amounted to an abuse of power, discrimination and propaganda for al-Qaeda.” And there were other similar comments from Democrats.

The Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR) and other such organizations lined up 55 House Democrats to insist that Mr. King reconsider the scope of the hearings.

The Number of Documented Terrorist Attempts and Attacks. Various news organizations and individuals have reported on the number of documented terrorist attacks and plots, all of which have some connection with Islam;

- According to the *Morning Bell*, a Heritage Foundation publication, “at least 36 known terrorist plots have been foiled since 9/11”.
- The *Wall Street Journal* reports that since 9/11, “there have been at least 10 attempts to bomb New York City institutions, from landmarks such as the Brooklyn Bridge to lesser known synagogues in the Bronx.”
- Author Alex Alexiev reported in 2009: “In the last six months alone, at least 20 homegrown Muslim extremists were arrested by the FBI for planning terrorist attacks in Colorado, Detroit, New York City, Dallas, and Newburgh, NY.”

Even Attorney General Eric Holder, who has questionable credentials as a law enforcer, said in regard to domestic radicalization: “It is one of the things that keeps me up at night...The threat has changed from simply worrying about foreigners coming here, to worry about people in the United States, American citizens.”

Domestic Terrorism Involving Americans. The above recitation of statistics, while helpful, may not adequately dramatize the threat of American Muslim terrorism in America; consequently, the following chart concerning the period 2002-2009, slightly edited, which appeared in *World*, is provided as a sampling:

- May 2002: **Jose Padilla**, a U. S. citizen accused of seeking a “dirty bomb,” is convicted of conspiracy.
- September 2002: Six U. S. citizens of Yemeni origin, five from Lackawanna, N. Y., are convicted of supporting al-Qaeda.
- June 2003: Eleven men from Alexandria, Va., are convicted of conspiracy and violating the Neutrality Act.
- August 2004: James Eishafay and Shahaward Siraj plan to bomb New York’s Penn Station during the Republican National Convention.
- August 2005: Los Angeles terrorists...plan attacks on the National Guard, Los Angeles International Airport, two synagogues . . .
- April 2006: Syed Haris Ahmed and Ehsanul Sadequee, both Georgia Tech students who grew up in the Atlanta area, are arrested for plotting to attack oil refineries and military bases and other U. S. sites
- June 2006: Narseal Batiste and others are accused of plotting to blow up the Sears Tower.
- July 2006: Assem Hammoud, born in Beirut, plotted to blow up train tunnels beneath the Hudson River
- May 2007: Six men are accused of plotting to attack Fort Dix Army base...The six recorded video of themselves at a state-owned shooting range firing semi-automatic weapons and shouting, “Allahu Akbar!”
- September 2007: Hamid Hayt of California, a U. S. citizen, is sentenced to 24 years in federal prison for attending an al-Qaeda terrorist training camp in Pakistan and plotting to attack targets in the U. S.
- May 2009: Four Newburgh, N. Y. men are arrested in the Bronx for attempting to bomb a Jewish community center
- June 2009: Shooting attack by Muslim convert Abjuhakim Muhammad, formerly known as Carlos Bledsoe, at a U. S. Army/Navy recruiting center in Little Rock, killing an army private and wounding another.

What is Islam? Although the current administration prohibits the term “Islam” from being used in connection with terrorism, that is the very term a number of Muslim scholars use when explaining terrorism. One typical explanation is that of author Alex Alexiev:

Simply put, radical Islam. . .is less a religious movement than a revolutionary ideology akin to 20th century totalitarian creeds like Nazism and Communism. It seeks religious legitimacy by embracing violent, reactionary, and obscurantist sharia doctrine – along with extremist interpretations of Islam, such as Wahhabism and Salafism – but it is quintessentially totalitarian in that it denies the legitimacy of Western civilization and the secular democratic order.

The Conflicting Views of the Chief Security Adviser and Gen. Petraeus. According to columnist Rowan Scarborough, President Obama's chief national security adviser for counterterrorism, John O. Brennan, laid out the White House policy of detaching any reference to Islam when referring to terrorists. The rationale for such detachment is to avoid the portrayal of the U. S. as being at war against Islam. Mr. Brennan also said: "The president's strategy is absolutely clear about the threat we face. Our enemy is not terrorism because terrorism is but a tactic. Our enemy is not terror because terror is a state of mind . . ."

But Brennan's view, notes Scarborough, runs contrary to those of Gen. Petraeus who "led the production of an extensive counterinsurgency manual in December 2006 that does, in fact, tell commanders of a link between Islam and extremists . . ." The Petraeus doctrine refers to "Islamic insurgents" and "Islamic extremists."

Europe's Experience. Within the past several weeks there were at least four of Europe's leaders who, while using the term "multiculturalism," were actually saying that the failure of Muslims to assimilate was causing major problems in their countries. Following is a summary of their views:

- Multiculturalism has "totally failed," says German Chancellor Angela Merkel
- "State multiculturalism has had disastrous results," says Britain's David Cameron
- Is multiculturalism a failure in France? "My answer is clearly yes, it is a failure," says President Nicolas Sarkozy
- Ex-Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar has declared multiculturalism a failure in Spain, saying it divides and debilitates Western societies

Lebanon's Experience. Author and former citizen of Lebanon, Brigitte Gabriel, notes that the world's fastest-growing Muslim populations are found in Europe and the U. S., and contends this is the beginning of America's and the West's war with radical Islam. "This demographic shift is an exact duplication of what happened in Lebanon and is already having a huge effect throughout Europe. People like me, who came from the Middle East and have seen how the radical Islamic agenda started and spread in Lebanon see and read the writing on the wall in America and the West today."

NOTES ON THE PASSING SCENE

(Some random observations on the crazy world in which we live)

Who Lobbies for the People? Ed Feulner, president the Heritage Foundation, reports on a study (from 1990) of the various individuals who testified before House and Senate committees in Washington. The researcher, James Payne, calculated that out of 1,060 witnesses who testified, 1,014 spoke in favor of spending proposals. Only seven spoke in opposition. The other 39 were neutral. Bottom line: Pro-spending witnesses outnumbered anti-spending witnesses 145 to 1.

And there's more: Out of all these witnesses 47% were federal administrators; 10% were state and local officials; another 33% were lobbyists. In short, 96% were government officials or lobbyists.

Who are the advocates for the tax payer?

Idaho House First to Nullify ObamaCare. On February 16, the Idaho House became the first state legislative body to pass a measure to nullify the entire ObamaCare law within a state. It was sent to the Senate, but its fate is not known at present.

According to the Associated Press: "Idaho's bill declares the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act unconstitutional and forbids enforcement of penalties against residents. It also prohibits Idaho state and local governments from enforcing the federal law and also bars them from taking federal money – or using their own resources – to put the measure into effect."

ObamaCare nullification measures have been introduced in at least 11 other states: Texas, Montana, Wyoming, Oregon, Indiana, Maine, Nebraska, Oklahoma, New Hampshire, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

(Source: The New American)

U. S. Department of Education Fines College. In an act which will (or should) raise the eye-brows of citizens who are concerned about a federal grab for power, the U. S. Department of Education has fined Virginia Tech for waiting too long to notify students during a 2007 shooting rampage. Reportedly, the fines were assessed in accordance with the Clery Act which requires timely reporting of crimes on campus.

The Education Department found in December that the law was violated when officials waited two hours to notify the campus after a gunman shot two students in a dormitory early in the morning of April 16, 2007.

The ruling will be appealed.

Supreme Court Ruling Brings Hope for Private and Parochial Schools. In a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court dismissed a lawsuit filed by the ACLU against an Arizona program that promoted school choice. The program, like others across the country, allows state residents to claim a tax credit for donations to private organizations that provide scholarships to religious and other private schools.

Columnist Terry Jeffrey notes a huge difference in the tuition costs of private and parochial schools in comparison with public schools. (typically, from less than \$6,000 to \$10,000)

In addition, he notes that private and parochial schools have a huge advantage over public schools. He explains:

In addition to being less expensive and better than public schools at teaching math and reading, Catholic schools – like any private schools – can also teach students that there is a God, that the Ten Commandments are true and must be followed, that the Founding Fathers believed in both and that, ultimately, American freedom depends on fidelity to our Judeo-Christian heritage even more than it depends on proficiency in reading and math.

QUOTATION OF THE MONTH

**God, give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking;
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land and waiting Justice sleeps.**

Josiah Gilbert Holland