

The Republican Club of Sun City NEWSLETTER

October 2010

Everett Schmidt, Editor

Sun City Texas

SIX REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES TO ADDRESS CLUB

Six prominent Republican candidates for office—Steve Ogden, Charles Schwertner, Marsha Farney, Suzanne Brooks, Doug Arnold and Nancy Rister—will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 21. Because the Sun City ballroom was not available during October, the meeting has been scheduled for the ballroom of the **Berry Creek County Club**.

Each of the candidates will be given an allotment of time when each may state reasons why he or she should be elected to the office sought. In addition, each candidate may, optionally, during the allotted time period, discuss (1) ways to persuade citizens to vote Republican during the remaining days of the voting period, and/or (2) discuss whether the Republican party will be going in the right direction via the “Pledge to America” and via the grass roots movements, such as those of the Tea Party movement. (Note related reports below) There will be some time allotted for questions from the audience.

The Social Hour, Dinner and Program. The dinner will begin at 6:30 PM and will be preceded by a social hour which begins at 6:00 PM. The dinner will be catered by the Berry Creek Country Club and will consist of a house salad, baked ham with brown sugar glaze, new potatoes roasted, broccoli and carrots, and iced tea and water.

Cost. Attendees should note that the cost of the dinner is higher than before, but that that situation is a “one time” event; i. e., next year, all club meetings will be held in the Sun City ballroom. Cost of the dinner is **\$18.00 per person**. (Note: The cost listed in *Sun Rays* is not correct) Attendees should also note that no *complimentary* wine will be served; however, a wine bar will be set up by the Country Club in the upstairs foyer where glasses of Chardonnay or Cabernet Sauvignon may be purchased for **\$5.00** per glass.

Payment 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, October 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 members are advised that the Berry Creek ballroom has a capacity of 150 which cannot be exceeded. Consequently, they are urged to make payments as soon as possible.

STATE PARTY CHAIRMAN TO ADDRESS CLUB IN NOVEMBER

Chairman of the Republican Party of Texas, Steve Munisteri, will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday, November 11 in the Sun City ballroom of the Social Center. Information concerning his background will be provided in the November newsletter.

The club is fortunate in having the state's highest ranking party official to address the club.

OTHER CLUB NEWS

Membership chairman Brenda Leisey reports that 2010 club membership currently stands at 347. She also reports she has a new e-mail address: havenspt@suddenlink.net

According to club bylaws, the Nominating Committee shall recommend one nominee for each office at the October meeting. Elections will be held during the November meeting when nominations from the floor can be submitted, provided the consent of the nominee has been obtained, and provided written information on the nominee is furnished to the president before the meeting.

SAMPLE BALLOTS AVAILABLE FROM INTERNET

Sample ballots for the coming election are available from the county by keying the following words into a computer: (1) www.Wilco.org, (2) ELECTIONS, and (3) SAMPLE BALLOT. Then follow the cue.

The sample ballots are "individualized" in the sense that residents of the city of Georgetown will have two propositions concerning only Georgetown shown on the ballot. Residents of the Georgetown ISD will have two propositions concerning issuance of bonds shown on the ballot. The sample ballot will also identify those "Unopposed Candidate Declared Elected" who, having no opponents, do not need a vote in the election.

"RULING CLASS," "POLITICAL CLASS": TERMS NOW IN VERNACULAR

Columnist Arnold Ahlert notes certain establishment-backed candidates—specifically Crist (Florida), Murkowski (Alaska) and Castle (Delaware)—who were defeated in the Republican primary by tea-party-backed candidates have not only refused to support the victors, they are now running as independents. He then contends such behavior not only indicates a void of party loyalty, it also translates into a "contempt" for the average American. "Such contempt," he continues, "has become so transparent and pervasive that the term 'ruling class' resonates like it never has before."

A similar observation is made by Scott Rasmussen, a pollster who, more accurately than his competitors, predicted the outcome of the 2004 and 2008 presidential races, Scott Brown's recent Senate race, and the New Jersey governor's race. His comments should therefore be given credence.

Rasmussen contends there is now a significant division in the American public, a division between what he, using similar terminology to Ahlert's, calls the "Mainstream Public" and the "Political Class." "The major division in this country is no longer between parties but between political elites and the people." His recent polls show huge gaps between the two groups. "While 67% of the *political class* believes the U. S. is moving in the *right* direction, a full 84% of the *mainstream voters* believe the nation is moving in the *wrong* direction."

PRESIDENTS OF THE PAST SPEAK TO REPUBLICANS OF TODAY

As was indicted in the above report, the rejection by a grassroots voting block of moderate Republicans when those candidates had been supported by the party "establishment" on grounds they were more electable illustrates a philosophical clash now identifiable in the Republican party. At issue is the question of whether the party should sacrifice its core principles on the theory that its candidates will become more electable because the party's base will have become broadened.

That issue is not new. Indeed, it was addressed by Ronald Reagan in 1975 following a disastrous previous election:

We have been through a disastrous election. It is easy for us to be discouraged, as pundits hail that election as a repudiation of our philosophy and even as a mandate of some kind or other. But the significance of the election was not registered by those who voted, but by those who stayed home...

It is possible we have been persuasive to a greater degree than we had ever realized. Few, if any Democratic Party candidates in the last election ran as liberals...Bureaucracy is assailed and fiscal responsibility hailed...Make no mistake, the leadership of the Democratic Party is still out of step with the majority of Americans...

I don't know about you, but I am impatient with those Republicans who after the last election rushed into print saying, "We must broaden the base of our party"--when what they meant was to fuzz up and blur even more the differences between ourselves and our opponents.

It was a feeling that there was not a sufficient difference now between the parties that kept a majority of the voters away from the polls. When have we ever advocated a closed-door policy? Who has ever been barred from participating?

Our people look for a cause to believe in. Is it a third party we need, or is it a new and revitalized second party, raising a banner of no pale pastels, but bold colors which make it unmistakably clear where we stand on all of the issues troubling the people?

Let us show that we stand for fiscal integrity and sound money and above all for an end to deficit spending, with ultimate retirement of the national debt. Let us also include a permanent limit on the percentage of people's earnings government can take without their consent...Let us explore ways to ward off socialism.

A political party cannot be all things to all people. It must represent certain fundamental beliefs which must not be compromised to political expediency, or simply to swell its numbers. I do not believe I have proposed anything that is contrary to what has been considered Republican principle. It is at the same time the very basis of conservatism.

It is time to reassert that principle and raise it to full view. And if there are those who cannot subscribe to these principles, then let them go their way.

In view of the funding of the "War on Poverty" with its resulting destruction of the black family, an illegitimacy rate of 70%, and widespread and uncontrollable fraud and abuse, and funding for other unconstitutional purposes, consideration of the views of President Franklin Pierce (1804-1869) may be worthwhile. He made the following observation about the propriety or constitutionality of the federal government confiscating financial resources of some citizens for the benefit of some other citizens:

The constitutionality and propriety of the Federal Government assuming to enter into a novel and vast field of legislation, namely, that of providing for the care and support of all those...who by any form of calamity become fit objects of public philanthropy... I cannot find any authority in the Constitution for making the Federal Government the great almoner of public charity throughout the United States. To do so would, in my judgment, be contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution and subversive of the whole theory upon which the Union of these States is founded.

In view of the report of the Americans for Tax Reform Foundation that working people must toil 231 days of the year (to August 19) to meet his or her share of the tax and regulatory burden, the following quote from President Calvin Coolidge (1872-1933) seems pertinent:

I want the people of America to be able to work less for the government and more for themselves. I want them to have the rewards of their own industry. This is the chief meaning of freedom. Until we can re-establish a condition under which the earnings of the people can be kept by the people, we are bound to suffer a very severe and distinct curtailment of our liberty.

WHAT WILL BE THE SEQUEL TO OBAMACARE?

Foreword. Currently, a clear and continuing majority of Americans oppose ObamaCare, primarily because of its requirement which mandates Americans to purchase health insurance. But other reasons have emerged—and continue to emerge—to cause Americans to resist implementation of that law, a prime reason being the sheer volume of the legislation—over 2700 pages—with more than 159 new bureaucracies, programs, commissions, boards, and other agencies. In addition, there is concern about its financial viability.

Clearly, attempts will be made to repeal or modify that law. This report illustrates some of those attempts.

The Mandatory Insurance Issue. A district federal judge recently enabled opponents of ObamaCare to overcome a significant hurdle when he denied an Obama administration motion to dismiss the state of Virginia's lawsuit against ObamaCare. He indicated in regard to the central issue that it is far from certain that Congress has the authority to compel Americans to buy insurance and penalize those who don't.

The judge's decision paves the way for a trial on the substance of the issue to begin in Virginia on October 18, just a few days hence. At least 20 other states are a part of a suit to overturn ObamaCare.

In a nutshell, the states claim that if the federal government can require people to buy insurance, it could force them to buy any product: a new Chevrolet, Wall Street stock, etc.

Author Betsy McCaughey contends: "If mandatory health insurance is ruled unconstitutional, the entire health care law could fall apart. Most complex legislation states that if one part of a law is struck down, other parts remain enforceable. But the authors of the Obama health law removed that clause, suggesting it won't work without compulsion."

The Medicaid Issue. Citing federalism, the 20 states reported above are also challenging the "massive expansion of Medicaid." McCaughey observes, "The chief way the law increases coverage is by adding 18 million more people to Medicaid, nearly doubling it. State taxpayers eventually will have to pay," although there has been some federal reimbursement. States have always decided who is eligible for Medicaid and what benefits they can get, but "ObamaCare strips them of Medicaid."

The Takings and Due Process Clauses. Physician/author Scott Atlas contends that Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius “already has confirmed that the exchanges..will actually bar private insurers from participating unless prices are fixed at government-dictated rates.” This could be the basis of a lawsuit involving the Fifth Amendment's Takings and Due Process clauses.

Other Issues. Author Charles Kesler observes that ObamaCare is “rife with unconstitutional delegations to legislative agencies and, most flagrantly, the Secretary of HHS.” ObamaCare may be attacked on other legal grounds.

Federal Legislation. The cleanest and most efficient means of repealing ObamaCare is through the passage of legislation, but that would, no doubt, result in a presidential veto, which means repeal cannot take place until 2012.

Another device is for Congress to withhold funds needed by federal officials to administrate and enforce the law. Indeed, House Republican leader John Boehner has already asserted, “They'll not get a dime from us.”

Yet another option is for Congress to disapprove regulations. The Congressional Review Act gives Congress such authority, but the president would likely veto such action.

State Legislation. McCaughey reports that Virginia has enacted a state law that makes it illegal to require any resident to purchase health insurance. Other states may have similar laws.

One of the most important developments in recent times is the reassertion by the states of their sovereign powers against federal usurpation. That development is known as *State Nullification*, and has recent precedents.

Author William Jasper contends, “The states have the right (and duty) to resist unconstitutional arrogations by Washington of powers constitutionally reserved to the states. A principal form of resistance in this regard is for the state government simply to declare the offending federal law, regulation, or edict null and void and to refuse to enforce or implement it.”

This is what happened with regard to the REAL ID Act that was passed by a Republican Congress in 2005. More than two dozen states passed laws or resolutions denouncing the act or refusing to comply with it. As a result, the federal government has been forced to retreat from this unconstitutional grab for power.

Similarly, around 25 states have introduced some version of the Firearms Freedom Act to nullify federal firearms within their states for guns manufactured, sold and used in that state. Similar laws could be enacted in regard to ObamaCare.

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF KOREAN WAR APPROACHES Have Lessons About Communism, Other Forms of Totalitarian Government, and “National Emergency” Been Learned?

On June 25, 1950, North Korean troops crossed the 38th parallel to invade South Korea. On June 27 of that year, the United Nations Security Council adopted a U. S. resolution approving armed intervention on behalf of that nation.

On December 16, 1950, President Truman issued a proclamation pointing out the dangers of imperial communism to the world and to our nation. He also declared that a “national emergency” exists. This Emergency Proclamation was used to authorize the American military to be used in Korea. It is interesting to note that such proclamation—including the one issued in 1933 by President Roosevelt when he confiscated gold of citizens—has not been revoked and is still in existence. (See related report on gold below)

According to the Church Report, in 1973, such proclamations give force to some 470 provisions of federal law. In other words, while there may be formidable political barriers to overcome, a president (including Barack Obama) could, in effect, become a dictator—legally.

Some experiences stemming from the Korean and Viet Nam wars, from President Reagan's pronouncement that the Soviet Union was an “evil empire,” and from the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union may be relevant to our nation in the year 2010. After all, communism is still a major factor in world affairs.

Columnist Walter Williams wonders why there has not been built some museum or structure to commemorate the victims of communism. He points out that “The former USSR is the world's premier murderer: Between 1917 and 1987, the USSR murdered 65 million people. Red China comes in second place with a murder count of 35 million. If we were to include Cambodia, North Korea, Viet Nam and other socialist/communist countries, *the murder toll exceeds 97 million people.*”

What accounts for the brutality of the communists? Alexander Solzhenitsyn may have an answer. He states: “Within the philosophical system of Marx and Lenin and at the heart of their psychology, hatred of God is the principal driving force, *more fundamental than all their political and economic pretensions...*To achieve its diabolical ends, communism needs to control a population devoid of religious and national feelings, and this

entails a destruction of faith and nationhood.”

Continues columnist Charley Reese: “A truly religious person will always place loyalty to God ahead of loyalty to state. Those who lust to control your life for their benefit do not want you to have loyalty except to the government they control. That's why you see so much hostility toward religion from the Establishment news media and entertainment industry, not to mention the federal judiciary.”

In stark contrast to the philosophy of the communists were the beliefs of our nation's founders. Legal scholar John Eidsmoe points out the the Constitution was based largely on Biblical principles. He also points out something especially relevant today in view of the ever-increasing centralization of power at the federal level. The framers believed that “man was sinful, self-interested, corruptible, as the Bible describes him.” That is why the Constitution has such intricate checks and balances. That is why Jefferson stated: “In questions of power, let no more be heard of confidence in men, but, bind them down from mischief with the chains of the Constitution.”

It is significant to note that President Obama has disdain for Jefferson's concept of government in that he has expressed criticism of our founders for establishing a Constitution so restrictive that it interferes with his announced scheme of redistributing wealth.

There is another troubling report about President Obama based on the fact that, during a recent address before the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, he deliberately or inadvertently omitted the reference in the Declaration of Independence to a “Creator” endowing mankind with certain rights. (The phrase in question is: “that all men...are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable Rights...”)

While there have been staggering changes in the world since the nation's founding some 223 years ago, has the nature of man changed? Has the need to “bind [man] down from mischief with the chains of the Constitution” been reduced?

WHAT IS LIBERATION THEOLOGY? WHAT IS BLACK LIBERATION THEOLOGY?

Largely as a result of questions concerning President Obama's faith, the terms “liberation theology” and “black liberation theology” have surfaced. The reader who is not familiar with such terms may find the following descriptions to be of some help, although they are not likely to be sufficiently comprehensive for those readers desiring a greater depth of understanding.

Speaking in theological terms, author Dave Reese says liberation theology:

is the view that holds that Christ came into the world to be our economic liberator. It asserts that His first purpose was to free the poor and the oppressed from the shackles of economic constriction.

In actuality, liberation theology redefines sin. In liberation theology sin is to possess wealth in the face of the world's poverty. *Righteousness* is therefore to redistribute that wealth, giving it to the poor.

Speaking in more general terms, *Got Questions Ministries* provided the following description:

Simply put, Liberation Theology is an attempt to interpret Scripture through the plight of the poor. It is largely a humanistic doctrine. It started in South America in the turbulent 1950s when Marxism was making great gains among the poor because of its emphasis on the redistribution of wealth, allowing poor peasants to share in the wealth of the colonial elite and thus upgrade their economic status in life. As a theology, it has very strong Roman Catholic roots.

“Liberation theology” has moved from the poor peasants in South America to the poor blacks in America to become “black liberation theology,” according to *Got Questions Ministries*. “We now have Black Liberation Theology being preached in the black community. It is the same Marxist, revolutionary, humanistic philosophy found in South American Liberation Theology and has no more claim for a scriptural basis than the South American model has.”

Rev. James Cone is generally acknowledged to be the founder of black liberation theology in America. According to Wikipedia, “he felt that Black Christians in North America should not follow the ‘white church’ on grounds that it was a willing part of the system that had oppressed black people. Accordingly, his theology was heavily influenced by Malcolm X and the Black Power movement.”

NOTES ON THE PASSING SCENE

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

France Bans Burqa; Switzerland Bans Minarets. Tensions involving Muslims are not only present in the U. S. as in the case of the proposed mosque to be built near the site of the 9/11 attack, they are also present in European countries.

France, for example, has recently voted to ban burqas and other full-body robes worn by Muslim women. French President Nicolas Sarkozy explained that the burqa is “a sign of enslavement and debasement.” France previously banned headscarves, yarmulkes and other religious symbols from being worn in public schools in the name of separation of state and religion.

Switzerland has banned the construction of minarets. Belgium and Spain are discussing measures to outlaw full body cloaks, similar to France's prohibition. (Source: Wall Street Journal)

ObamaCare Law Gives Gold Dealers and Owners the Jitters. Columnist David Patten reports that a little noticed provision in Section 9006 of the ObamaCare law “requires small businesses to issue 1099 forms tracking all miscellaneous income paid to every vendor doing more than \$600 in business each calendar year.” These forms would create a trackable database of gold ownership when the provision goes into effect in 2012.

One good reason many gold collectors are uneasy is that they haven't forgotten Executive Order 6102 issued by President Roosevelt in 1933. President Roosevelt's stated objective of such order is, in certain respects, eerily similar to the stated objective of the Obama administration, both objectives being to “stimulate the economy.” According to Patten, Roosevelt's stated objective, more completely stated, was “to stimulate the economy. Not allowing people to 'hoard' gold would keep more money in circulation.” The order required people to sell, with some exceptions, all of their gold at a rate set by the government, \$20.67 per ounce. Under terms stated in this order—one promulgated by a president, not Congress—citizens who do not comply are subject to fine and/or imprisonment.

Roosevelt issued his order under the Trading With the Enemy Act and contains the following language—interesting in terms of tone and substance—in the first paragraph:

Executive Order: By virtue of the authority vested in me by Section 5(B) of The Act of Oct. 6, 1917, as amended by section 2 of the Act of March 9, 1933, in which Congress declared that a serious emergency exists, I as President, do declare that the national emergency still exists; that the continued private hoarding of gold and silver by subjects of the United States poses a grave threat to the peace, equal justice, and well-being of the United States; and that appropriate measures must be taken immediately to protect the interests of our people.

Rep. Ron Paul said that he urged the Gold Commission of the House of Representatives to repeal the power to confiscate gold, but by a vote of 15-1 his motion was defeated. He concludes: “The power to confiscate gold is still on the books as the law of the land.” And think of it: That power stems way back to the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended in 1933.

Justice Kagan's Recusal Can Impact Court Rulings. Recently confirmed Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan has recused herself from 25 of the 51 cases that court has accepted for review so far this term, all as a result of her 14-month tenure as solicitor general, the government's chief legal representative to the Supreme Court.

Her recusal can be significant as evidenced by the fact that some lawyers are waiting to bring their issues to that court until they are sure Kagan can hear them.

According to the *Washington Post*, “an eight-member court creates an advantage for the party that won at the lower level: It needs to convince only four Justices in order to win because an evenly divided court keeps the lower-court ruling in place...”

The outcome of several cases involving state's rights can be affected by Kagan's recusal. One of them involves a state having authority to yank a business's license for hiring illegal aliens, a state law which had been upheld by the 9th U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

Kagan's absence may be felt in two cases that asked if *federal* regulations protects companies from lawsuits brought under *state* consumer protection laws. Lower courts have ruled that state laws should prevail in those cases, one involving seat belts while the other involves vaccine.

