

The Republican Club of Sun City NEWSLETTER

April 2010

Everett Schmidt, Editor

Sun City Texas

CLUB WILL NOT MEET IN APRIL Next Meeting is Scheduled for May 13

As was previously reported, the club will not meet during the month of April because the ballroom was not available on a satisfactory date.

The next club meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 13 when the speaker will be Hal Talton who, as a long-time Republican activist, a member of the State Republican Executive Committee, and an individual with many contacts with political leaders, will provide an informed analysis of the present state of the Republican party, the upcoming fall elections, the upcoming session of the Texas Legislature and address other topics.

Details of the May meeting will be provided in the May newsletter.

OTHER CLUB NEWS

Brenda Leisey, club membership chairman, reports that 2010 membership now stands at 336. She is the person to contact at 868-6552 or brendaleisey@suddenlink.net if there is question about whether or not current dues have been paid. Dues payments (\$10) should be mailed to the club treasurer, Bernie Miller, at 265 Trail of the Flowers.

Club president Julian Bucher reported during the club's March meeting that no meetings can be held this summer because there are no open dates available in the ballroom.

Some of the present scheduling difficulties may be alleviated with the opening of the Cowan Creek Activities Center. Indeed, Ed Konetchy, club vice-president, reports that the club's October meeting has already been scheduled for the Georgetown and Florence rooms in that soon-to-be completed facility.

STRATFOR ANALYST TO ADDRESS G. A. R. W.

Alex Posey, Technical Analyst for Stratfor, an organization specializing in global intelligence, will address the G. A. R. W. during its luncheon meeting scheduled for Wednesday, April 14 at the Berry Creek Country Club. Mr. Posey specializes in Latin American security issues, with special attention given to matters relating to Mexico and the current cartel war, the primary topic of his discussion.

The luncheon begins at 11:30 am and is preceded by a social hour beginning at 11:00 am.

Cost of the luncheon is \$15. Make checks payable to GARW-PAC and mail to 4500 Williams Dr., Ste. 212 PMB 267, Georgetown, TX 78633. Reservations can be made at 869-5685 or garwpac@yahoo.com. The deadline for payment or reservations is noon, April 9.

COUNTY CONVENTION APPROVES PARTY PLATFORM PLANKS

The County Convention, during its meeting held on Saturday, March 20 at the Taylor High School, approved 26 but rejected 2 of the resolutions recommended to it by the Platform Committee. Approved resolutions are forwarded to the State Convention meeting in June for further consideration and possible adoption in the State Platform.

An analysis of the resolutions considered Saturday provides insight into currents and cross-currents of political thought now in the country. Those resolutions also provide testimony that Williamson County Republicans are solidly conservative and solidly pro-Constitution.

Following is a sampling of the planks approved at that convention:

- **Abolish Unconstitutional "Czars."** Condemns President Obama and other presidents for appointing "Czars" without Senate approval.
- **Congressional Equality.** Passed in light of reports that Congress does not have to follow the laws it passes for the people, as in the case of health care.
- **Pledge of Allegiance in Public Schools.** Provides that the Pledge should be recited in English, and not in Spanish (only), as reports have indicated was the case.

- **Climate Change.** Urges Congress to vote NO on proposed cap-and-trade legislation, and to block the EPA from imposing regulations limiting “greenhouse gas” emissions.
- **Limited Federal Powers.** Calls on the Legislature to pass resolutions clearly demanding Texas' right of sovereignty under the Tenth Amendment.
- **End the FED.** Calls for the repeal of the Federal Reserve Act, the abolishment of the Federal Reserve System, and a return to commodity-backed currency.
- **Endangered Species Act.** Calls for repeal of the Endangered Species Act of 1972 on grounds it is not authorized by the Constitution.
- **Re-Districting.** Calls for the adoption of an “apolitical” process of redistricting congressional districts.
- **Open Carry of Firearms.** Calls upon the legislature to authorize the peaceful open possession of firearms.
- **Audit the Federal Government.** Contends that an audit of the federal government and Federal Reserve is a legitimate demand of the states and the people.

One of the recommendations of the Platform Committee which was rejected by the convention was one which urged the repeal of the Seventeenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution. That Amendment changed the method of selecting U. S. Senators from being chosen by their respective state legislatures, as was provided by the framers, to the present method which provides that selection is made by the popular vote of the people in a given state.

Providing indication that that issue has surprising and widespread interest is the fact that at the convention the will of the assembly could not be determined by voice vote; a time-consuming division of the house had to determine final vote of the convention.

Because of the interest now shown in the Seventeenth Amendment throughout the state and nation, this newsletter contains a brief report (below) on that subject.

SHOULD THE SEVENTEENTH AMENDMENT BE REPEALED?

Foreword. The framers of the Constitution had certain philosophical considerations in mind when they adopted Article 1, Section 3 of the Constitution which provided that “The Senate...shall be composed of two Senators from each State, *chosen by the Legislature thereof...*”

As is explained in greater detail later in this report, that method of selecting Senators began, then continued, a process of disintegration until it was replaced by the Seventeenth Amendment, ratified in 1913, which provided that Senators are elected by a popular vote of the people in their respective states, as is the case now.

This report will discuss some of the philosophical considerations which impelled the framers to adopt the original method, some of the problems which caused a breakdown of that method, and some of the problems which exist under the present arrangement.

The Framers Concept of Federalism. Author Matthew Spalding notes that during the Constitutional Convention there was, in the wake of the unfortunate experiences stemming from the Articles of Confederation, a clear recognition of the need for additional *national* authority. But there was also great concern that an overreaction might produce an all-powerful national government. “The solution,” states Spalding, “*was a unique American innovation: a federal government with strong but limited national powers that respected and protected the vitality of states.*”

James Madison, regarded as father of the Constitution, being concerned that the federal legislature could predominate over the other branches of government, proposed in Federalist 51 that the remedy for this predominance was to divide the legislature into different houses and make them, *by different modes of election*, as little connected with each other as the nature of their common functions will allow. Thus the Constitution provides that Representatives are chosen by one mode, while Senators are chosen by another.

The Framers Concept of Democracy. The framers were wary of the passions of direct democracy, and wanted to encourage a politics of thoughtful opinion through a *representative* process. An analysis found in *The U. S. Constitution Online* illustrates how the framers applied their wariness to government:

One of the most common critiques of the Framers is that the government that they created was, in many ways, undemocratic. There is little doubt of this, and it is so by design. The Electoral College, by which we choose our President, is one example. The appointment of judges is another. And the selection of

Senators not by the people but by the state legislatures, is yet another.

Spalding notes also that the process by which the Constitution is amended is ultimately based on *state* approval. He then concludes: "It is striking that in this powerful national government, *there is not a single official chosen by a national constituency.*"

Concepts Applied. A practical illustration of the application of the framers philosophy concerning the selection of Senators by state legislatures can be noted in the following passage from *Wikipedia*:

Originally, a Senator was elected by the legislature of a state, and was expected to represent the state government within the Federal government. This was expected to help keep the balance between Federal and state authority. Also it was believed that while an unqualified candidate might win a popular-vote majority through demagoguery or superficial qualities, whereas the legislature, which could deliberate on its choice, and whose members had been selected by their constituents and had experience in politics, would be safe from such folly. Finally, election by the legislature was expected to insulate Senators from the distraction of public campaigning for election or re-election, leaving them free to concentrate on the great business of the Federal government.

The Emergence of Problems. According to *Wikipedia*, the election of Senators by legislatures generally occurred without major problems up to the mid-1850s when the sectional crisis over slavery led to increasing partisanship and strife. Some states—such as Indiana, California and Delaware—were unable to elect Senators for periods of around two years. And there were other problems. Nine bribery cases were brought before the Senate between 1866 and 1906, and 45 deadlocks occurred in 20 states between 1891 and 1905.

To cope with these problems, several states, prior to ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment, had resorted to using unofficial referenda for the people to use to express to their legislatures their choices of Senators. Indications are that legislatures complied accordingly.

Contemporary Problems. Today's problems in selecting Senators under the Seventeenth Amendment are like those noted under the original concept. *FindLaw*, an online legal service, notes that the unintended consequences of each of the selection methods were the same: "the influencing of legislative selection by corrupt political organizations and special interest groups."

In view of the present wide-spread and obvious corruption in a federal government which appears to be more and more dysfunctional, people are becoming increasingly restive, hence the rising interest in the Seventeenth Amendment.

There have been public calls for its repeal. Former Democrat Senator Zell Miller of Georgia, in speaking against the present arrangement, stated: "Direct election of Senators...allowed Washington's special interests to call the shots, whether it is filling vacancies, passing laws, or issuing regulations."

Libertarian author and economist Thomas DiLorenzo has characterized the Seventeenth Amendment as "one of the last nails to be pounded into the coffin of federalism in America."

Columnist Steve Helber explains some of the contemporary problems in the context of the fraud, bribery, and corruption which surfaced during the recent passage of the health care bill":

Many of you have watched, perhaps in disgust, many of our senators being "bought off" so they could pass the health care bill. This is the result of changing how our bicameral system works designed by our founders. *Had those senators been representing their states, had they been looking at how this bill will affect their state budget; we would be looking at an entirely different outcome.* I know, I know, the Senator from Louisiana will bring home \$300 million to her state to help with the aftermath of Katrina. This payoff does not even come close to the actual costs of the health care bill to the states. I would say corruption has increased in large part because we ratified the 17th Amendment. I would say this was but another power grab by the progressives to move us closer to a social democracy. It's time to repeal this amendment. (emphasis added)

Conclusions. The brief discussion above seems to indicate that each of the two methods of selecting Senators is fraught with unfortunate and unintended consequences. With respect to a repeal, it's "we're damned if we do, but damned if we don't."

Given the present unrest in the country and the rising interest in repealing the Seventeenth Amendment, the reader may well be advised to consider in a depth greater than is provided in this article this issue which is so relevant to the very character of our form of government.

WHAT IS “AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM?”

Is America—or more specifically, its form of government—exceptional or not? We have learned of President Obama's reaction to that question when, several months ago, he was asked by a European reporter if he believes in American exceptionalism. The president's response: “I believe in American exceptionalism, just as I suspect that the Brits believe in British exceptionalism and the Greeks believe in Greek exceptionalism.” In other words, he is either clueless about American exceptionalism or he rejects it.

But so too are many Americans either clueless or they reject the notion of exceptionalism—a conclusion which should not be surprising in view of an absence in the promotion of the values of our Declaration and our Constitution by our educational establishment, our media and our federal courts.

Happily, there is beginning to emerge a promotion of American exceptionalism by some writers (Matthew Spalding, quoted in this newsletter, is one) and political columnists. One such columnist is Dennis Prager who, in a recent op-ed column, makes the charge that “the Democratic party—alone—is ending a key factor in America's uniqueness and greatness: individualism, which is possible only when there is limited government.”

Prager explains the sources of America's uniqueness and greatness: “America's uniqueness and greatness have come from a number of sources, two of which are its moral and social value system, which is a unique combination of Enlightenment and Judeo-Christian values, and its emphasis on individual liberty and responsibility. Just as the left has waged war on America's Judeo-Christian roots, it has waged war on individual liberty and responsibility.”

While that statement may be expressed in the abstract, Prager then explains what it means in practical terms:

It means that before anything else, the human being must first take care of himself. When people who are capable of taking care of themselves start relying on the state to do so, they can easily become morally inferior beings. When people who could take care of their family start relying on the state to do so, they can easily become morally inferior. And when people who could help take care of fellow citizens start relying on the state to do so, the morally coarsening process continues.

Prager, like many Americans, is fearful that passage of the health care bill will eventually lead to the total nationalization of health care, and perhaps inevitably to the undoing of America's standing as—to quote Lincoln—the “Last Best Hope on Earth.” Concludes Prager: “Lincoln weeps.”

CONTROL OF THE PEOPLE: CONGRESS' MOTIVATING FACTOR

Congress' Motives Now Exposed. Representative John Dingle (D.-Mich), when attempting to explain why many of the benefits of the Democrat-sponsored health care bill are delayed until 2014 while tax increases for that program will begin next year, responded by saying: “It takes a long time to do the necessary administrative steps that have to be taken to put the legislation together to *control the people*.” (emphasis added)

Later, he attempted to mitigate that response by saying he was fatigued in the wake of the protracted battle of the health care bill.

But gaining control of the people under the guise of health care is actually nothing new. In fact, author Matthew Spalding notes that, in this country, health care was first proposed in 1904 modeled on German social insurance. It was in the Progressive Party's platform in 1912, and then came back under FDR and Truman, then Johnson, then Clinton, and now Obama. Then Spalding makes this stark assertion: “And the goal all along has had little to do with the quality of health care. The objective is rather to remove about a sixth of the economy from private control and bring it under the thumb of the state...”

And the “control of the people”—to use Rep. Dingle's phrase—may well explain Democrats' motives and bizarre behavior not only in regard to the passing of a health care bill (in the face of overwhelming public opposition), but also explain their behavior in regard to other legislative matters. Consider, for example, their support for not only the present “stimulus” package, but other similar packages, when the evidence is that those packages impede, rather than stimulate, the economy. Consider also their support for Cap and Trade legislation which, if passed, would clearly dampen economic growth.

The Social Security System as a Scheme. How the now virtually bankrupt entitlement programs came into existence can be better understood by examining the beginnings of the Social Security system. In addition to

social security being based upon a Ponzi-like scheme of one group of citizens having their wealth confiscated for the benefit of another group of citizens, and of reporting there is a “trust fund” when there is no such fund, comes the following report from *The New American* revealing possible sinister motives for establishing that system:

Not known at the time [when President Roosevelt sent a proposal for a Social Security program to Congress] was that FDR sought to emulate Germany's Otto von Bismark, who had candidly admitted employing a welfare scheme to force the people into *dependency on government*. The Iron Chancellor actually boasted, “Whoever has a pension for his old age is...far easier to handle [and will become] a servant in the chancellery or at court. (emphasis added)

The American Enterprise reports that the earliest attempts in this country to establish a tax-funded pension system were rejected as being “un-American and socialistic.” President Roosevelt, however, prevailed. His idea was to force the entire nation—poor, middle class, and wealth—into a comprehensive national pension system. His cynical reasoning was that once everybody depended on these government transfers, there would be no going back. This tactic, as he famously said, guaranteed that “no damn politicians can ever scrap my Social Security system.”

How did President Roosevelt turn around the initial rejection of the country to his Social Security plan? The answer is through a tactic similar to that used by the Obama administration in regard to the health care bill: obfuscation. With respect to Roosevelt's success, it was largely through word obfuscation: (1) The new wage tax, said to be specifically marked to pay pensions, wasn't called a “tax,” but a “contribution;” (2) the funds that came in from the wage tax were said to be “trust funds,” a deceitful claim; and (3) to further the illusion that workers have a contractual right to benefits, the SS Administration keeps records of each worker's “contribution,” as if these tax payments establish a legal right to specific benefits, while, in practice, Congress can lower or raise benefits at will.

And once a people-controlling program is in place, all competition with the program must be eliminated—as may be the case with the recently-adopted health care bill. The “Galveston Plan” is instructive with regard to the elimination of competition for the Social Security program. The reader may recall that in 1980, local governments could opt out of the Social Security system if they provided another retirement plan. The “Galveston Plan,” based on an alternate retirement plan, was successful and was so touted by then-president Bush. But in 1983, that option was suddenly closed to “save” the Social Security system.

NOTES ON THE PASSING SCENCE

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

Political Water-Boarding. *Wall Street Journal* columnist Kimberly Strassel reports that when the Senate took up its “reconciliation” health care bill in the version signed by the president, the Democrats had to endure the political equivalent of water-boarding. The reason? Reconciliation allowed Republicans to bring up unlimited amendments, but Majority Leader Harry Reid could not allow the reconciliation bill to be changed in any way because to do would send the bill back to the House and to an unknown fate. His party was therefore obliged to vote down every one of those amendments. To illustrate the difficulty of doing that, the reader is asked if he or she would like to have been forced to vote “no” on the following submitted amendments:

- Tom Coburn (R., Okla.) offered language to bar the government from subsidizing erectile dysfunction drugs for convicted pedophiles and rapists.
- Oren Hatch (R., Utah) proposed exempting wounded soldiers from the new taxes on medical devices.
- Pat Roberts (R., Kan.) wanted to exempt critical access rural hospitals from funding cuts.

Obama Makes “In Your Face” Recess Appointments. Continuing what appears to be a strategy of deliberately bringing divisiveness in the nation, President Obama recently made two highly controversial recess appointments of individuals who were not able to obtain Senate confirmation. (These recess appointments are in effect only through the end of the Senate's next session) Those two appointments are:

- Craig Becker, who was appointed to the National Labor Relations Board, and, in that capacity, is expected to push for implementation of the “card check” which would replace the secret ballot on votes involving mandatory union membership.
- Chai Feldblum, who was appointed Commissioner on the Equal Opportunity Commission. She is author of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA), which Obama is expected to sign if it passes Congress. Currently, 38 states do not make “gender identity” into a protected minority under law. But

once Obama signs ENDA, this will change. Every state will be forced to make cross-dressers, transsexuals, and she-males into protected classes.

Some Coming Events.

- **The Second Annual Tax Day TEA Party** will be held on Thursday, April 15, from 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm, on the Williamson County Courthouse steps. Confirmed speakers include Alan Hill – FairTax; Stephen Casey – Constitutional lawyer; Lynn Woolley – conservative radio personality; Randy Staudt – monetary issues; Barbara Mabry – immigration issues; Valerie Covey – county commissioner. Visit their facebook, or contact David Schumacher at 512-966-8642 for information.
- **Senate District 5 Grassroots Meeting** will be held on Saturday, April 17, from 10:00 am – 2:00 pm at the Burleson County Expo Center in Caldwell. Registration begins at 9:30 am.