

# The Republican Club of Sun City NEWSLETTER

September 2011

Everett Schmidt, Editor

Sun City Texas

## INFLUENTIAL POLITICAL PUNDIT TO ADDRESS CLUB

Michael Quinn Sullivan, an influential political pundit often quoted in the Texas press about Texas politics, will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 22 in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City.

The *Dallas Morning News* has referred to him as an “agitator, in both chambers” of the legislature. The *Fort Worth Star Telegram* says “...when the heat is on in Austin, Sullivan knows how to make it even hotter.” *Texas Monthly* has named Sullivan one of the 25 most influential people working in Texas politics. Readers of the *Austin American-Statesman* may have noted he was extensively quoted during the legislative session just concluded.

Sullivan is president and CEO of Empower Texans and its sister organization, Texans for Fiscal Responsibility.

Among the topics he will discuss are the following: the past and the coming 2013 legislative sessions, the commendable job performed by freshman Rep. Charles Schwertner, and what recent developments mean for 2012.

**The Social Hour, Dinner and Program.** A social period 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 Nemec Catering which will serve chicken and beef fajitas, rice, beans and side dishes, including salsa, guacamole and shredded cheese.

**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, September 16. 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](mailto:bimiller1@verizon.net). VISITORS ARE WELCOME!

## CONSERVATIVE TALK SHOW HOST TO ADDRESS CLUB IN OCTOBER

Lynn Woolley, conservative radio talk show host, author and columnist for the *Dallas Morning News*, the *Waco Tribune-Herald*, *NewsMax* and other media outlets will address the club during its October dinner meeting scheduled for Saturday, October 15. (Club members should note that this meeting is scheduled for a *Saturday*).

Woolley can be heard daily, M – F, over radio station KTEM, 1400 AM, on the radio dial from 8:00 AM – 11:00 AM.

## OTHER CLUB NEWS

Brenda Leisey, second vice-president, reports that 2011 membership currently stands at 276.

## SOME IMPORTANT COMING ELECTION DATES

County Party Chairman Bill Fairbrother announces some important election dates for the period November 2011 to November 2012. He cautions that the legislature has made some critical changes from previous calendars, and that the dates herein reported are still subject to pre-clearance or other approvals. Following are those dates:

November 12, 2011	First day to file for elective office
December 12, 2011	Primary Filing Deadline/Write-in Deadline
February 6, 2012	Last Day to register to vote for primary
February 20, 2012	First day of period to early vote in person
March 2, 2012	Last day of early voting
March 6, 2012	Primary Election
March 24, 2012	County Convention
April 23, 2012	Last day to register to vote for runoff
May 14, 2012	First day of period to vote early in the runoff
May 18, 2012	Last day of early voting
May 22, 2012	Runoff primary election day
June 7 – 9, 2012	Republican Party of Texas State Convention in Ft. Worth
October 9, 2012	Last day to register to vote for general election
October 22, 2012	First day of early voting in general election
November 2, 2012	Last day of early voting
November 6, 2012	General election

## TEXANS TO VOTE ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

During the General Election of November 8, 2011, Texans will have opportunity to vote on 10 proposed Amendments to the Texas Constitution. Following are very brief statements about the subject matter of those proposed Amendments:

Prop. 1	concerns tax relief for spouses of disabled veterans
Prop. 2	concerns issuance of bonds by the Texas Water Development Board
Prop. 3	concerns issuance of bonds to finance educational loans to students
Prop. 4	concerns issuance of bonds and tax relief for unproductive, underdeveloped and blighted areas
Prop. 5	concerns the authorization of cities and counties to enter into interlocal contracts
Prop. 6	concerns clarification of various provisions in laws concerning the permanent school fund and the available school fund
Prop. 7	concerns bonds issued by El Paso County
Prop. 8	concerns appraisal for tax purposes of open-space land devoted to water-stewardship
Prop. 9	concerns authorization of the governor to pardon a person who completes term of deferred adjudication
Prop. 10	concerns the length of an expired term of certain elected officials if they become candidates for another office

Complete language of the proposed Amendments can be found at the website of the Texas Secretary of State, [www.sos.state.tx.us](http://www.sos.state.tx.us)

## WILCO TEA PARTY ANNOUNCES COMING EVENTS

**September 15.** The Tea Party event is a “movie night” featuring a DVD movie titled, “A More Perfect Union” which is especially timely for Constitution Week and is especially appropriate for viewing by public and private school students.

The event is scheduled for Thursday, September 15, beginning at 7:00 PM, at the Independent Bank, 1503 Rivery Blvd., Georgetown. (Next to City Lights Theatre)

**October 1.** A Tea Party Rally is scheduled for Saturday, October 1, beginning at 3:00 PM, at the Gazebo in San Gabriel Park. The occasion is to counter some of demagoguery, hate-filled language and outright lies which can now be heard emanating from the left about the Tea Party movement.

## SEPTEMBER 17, 1787: A DATE WHICH SHOULD BE COMMEMORATED

**Foreword.** The U. S. Constitution was signed by delegates to a Constitutional Convention on September 17, 1787. This means that on September 17 of this year, the Constitution will become 224 years old.

If past experience is any indication, that date, and the importance of that document to our form of government, will go virtually unnoticed. Yet, there appears to be a common cry by an ever-growing number of citizens who have become downright fearful for the future of the nation, who are beginning to feel pangs of guilt over the prospect that, *during their watch*, they will have betrayed their parents and grandparents and their children and grandchildren by failing to perpetuate the American Dream another generation. That common cry, uttered as an impassioned plea to save the nation, is: "Follow the Constitution!"

But there have been and continue to be assaults on the Constitution and there continue to be efforts to replace the form of government protected by the Constitution with some form of leftist or socialist form of government. Those attacks on the Constitution provide the basis of this report.

### THE ASSAULTS ON THE CONSTITUTION

The assaults on the Constitution by liberals and leftists, and the failure of the citizenry in general to defend it have meant that that magnificent document has been to a great extent shredded. Three of the more successful assaults on it follow:

- **The Case Law Method.** Ten years after Charles Darwin published his *Origin of the Species*, a new president took over at Harvard University. The new president, a devoted Darwinist, believed that the "survival of the fittest" concept could not only be applied to the field of biology, but also to other academic fields – including law – as well. Consequently, he hired a lawyer, Christopher Langdell, who had similar beliefs and who would set up a curriculum based on a belief that the tenets of the Constitution should also evolve, ever upward, in accordance with changing societal needs, instead of being static as was the original concept of the framers.

Even though the entire law faculty resigned in protest, Langdell, after hiring kindred spirits on the faculty, was able to bring about what has come to be known as the case law study method, which meant that law students would study opinions of judges – some of whom were liberal – *at the expense of a study of the original documents*, including the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and Blackstone's *Commentaries*.

Judges also used the concept of the case law method as is illustrated by the following quote from a respected jurist, Oliver Wendell Holmes:

the lawyer's task . . . was to participate actively in freeing law from those archaic doctrines that prevented the law from consciously fulfilling its role of promoting social policy, [because] the justification of a law for us cannot be found in the fact our fathers always have followed it. It must be found in some help which the law brings toward reaching a social end.

- **A Misapplication of the First Amendment's Religious Clauses.** The reader is aware that courts have virtually eliminated any and all forms of religion in the "public square," i.e., in public gatherings and in schools. But the position of the courts is simply incompatible with what history, paintings, etc. tell us about the role of religion in connection with our nation's founding. The current position of the courts comes from the precedent established in the 1947 *Everson* case in which the doctrine known as "Separation of church and state" was promulgated. Former Chief Justice William Rehnquist, a critic of that doctrine, assesses the finding in that case as follows:

There is simply no historical foundation for the proposition that the framers intended to build a "wall of separation" . . . But the greatest injury of the "wall" notion is its mischievous diversion of judges from the actual intentions of the drafters of the Bill of Rights . . . The "wall of separation between church and State" is a metaphor based on bad history . . . It [the Court's finding] should be frankly and explicitly abandoned . . .

Although hardly mentioned in the mainstream press, there is strong evidence that the author of the opinion of the *Evers* case, Hugo Black, was strongly biased against the Catholic Church and decided to use his opinion to thwart the growth of that church in America. (A comprehensive analysis of that case

was presented in the May 2010 newsletter, copies of which are available from the editor upon request)

- **Infidelity to the Oath of Office.** The oath of office taken by members of all three branches of government to “preserve, protect and defend the Constitution” has largely been ignored, seemingly without serious objection on the part of a majority of the citizenry which does not wish the Constitution to interfere with the efforts of government to provide them with the largess of others.

### **EFFORTS TO DESTROY THE CURRENT FORM OF GOVERNMENT**

It may come as a shock to some readers to learn of evidence that there have been goals and/or strategies specifically designed to bring about the destruction of our present capitalist, free-enterprise form of government, and from the ensuing chaos following such destruction establish a left-wing, socialist or communist form of government. Two illustrations of this phenomenon follow:

- In his book, *Slouching Toward Gomorrah*, Judge Robert Bork explains that those individuals who drove the counter-culture of the sixties in many cases now run the universities they shut down by demonstrations during that period. While the disruptions of that era are tied to the Vietnam War, Bork contends that they represent a contempt *already in place* for the founders and the form of government they created. Bork explains:

The revolt was against the entire American culture. The United States, it was said, was engaged in an immoral war only because the United States itself was deeply immoral, being racist, sexist, authoritarian, and imperialistic. The arrangements of the liberal capitalist order were themselves illegitimate, conferring power where none was deserved and withholding power from the poor and the minorities. The bourgeois class, which sustained and benefited from these societal arrangements, was, therefore, oppressive. It followed that bourgeois morality and standards of excellence were part of the apparatus that supported the status quo and repressed the individual. Destruction was, therefore, the only legitimate response. (emphasis added)

- Another strategy designed to destroy our form of government is one known as the Cloward-Piven Strategy, described by David Horowitz as follows: “The strategy of forcing political change through *orchestrated crisis*. [It] seeks to hasten the fall of capitalism by overloading the government bureaucracy with a flood of impossible demands, thus pushing society into crisis and economic collapse.”

In addition to the two instances cited above are instances wherein the Obama administration and the Democrats appear to be deliberately harming, if not destroying, this nation's form of government. Included among such instances are out-of-control spending, a Justice Department which does not faithfully execute the laws, various executive orders, such as the quasi amnesty program, and a reliance on the tactics of Saul Alinsky. What other conclusions can there be?

### **AMERICA'S FLIRTATION WITH SOCIALISM**

**Foreword.** There are signs that many Americans are not opposed to socialism, and that, despite the present negative feelings in the nation about Obama's brand of socialism, there may be a struggle down the road for the soul of America over the question of socialism versus liberty. Note the following in that regard:

- A Rasmussen Report of two years ago found that only 53% of Americans believe capitalism is better than socialism. Adults under 30 are essentially evenly divided: 37% prefer capitalism, 33% prefer socialism and 30% were undecided. Other polls have revealed similar results.
- The great sociologist Alexis de Tocqueville warned with remarkable prescience way back in the 1830s that this nation was vulnerable to a kind of despotism that “is directly opposed to the genius of commerce and the pursuit of industry. . .it seeks to keep [mankind] in perpetual childhood. (emphasis added)
- Providing some confirmation of de Tocqueville's observation about “perpetual childhood” is black author Shelby Steele's observation of the deleterious effects of the Welfare Program on blacks: “By accepting the idea that government is somehow going to take over the responsibility that only we can take, we relinquish authority ourselves. We became childlike and our families began to fall to pieces.”

- Then there is the question as to what the attitude of the nation will be toward health care, if and when the debate shifts to what plan should replace ObamaCare. Robert Moffit of the Heritage Foundation asserts that liberals have a completely different view than do conservatives on health care issues. “Their (liberals) argument is that we should have free health care for all...that we’re all going to get sick, so we’re all in this together...it should be a public utility.. equality trumps liberty.” He then concludes: “If you don’t understand this, you don’t understand the depth of the philosophical debate and division in this country.”

**America's First Experience With Socialism.** Although not generally reported in history textbooks. America had experimented with socialism during the very early days of its founding. That experience can be very pertinent to the present debate on governance.

In 1620, one hundred two passengers, known as Pilgrims, left England on the ship “Mayflower” for the New World under a contract with their backers which said, in part: “That all persons as are of this colony have their meat, drink, apparel, and all provisions out of the *common stock and goods* . . .” In addition, all the land cleared and the structures they built belonged to the community.

This arrangement smacks of socialism if not communism. And as is typical of those forms of government, the arrangement proved hugely unsuccessful. William Bradford, Governor of the colony, after a trial period, wrote that a change was needed so that the colonists “might not languish in misery.” He said further that the arrangement “was found to breed much confusion and discontent and retard much employment that would have been to their benefit and comfort.”

By 1625, the colonists, after their unfortunate experience, decided to put an end to this “common course.” In place of the original arrangement, every family was assigned its own plot of land to work, and permitted to market its own crops and products. Bradford reported on the result: “This had very good success, for it made all hands very industrious, so that much more corn was planted than otherwise would have been by any means the Governor or any other could use . . .”

**The Food Stamp Crime Wave.** A recent issue of the *Wall Street Journal* reports on several disturbing developments – including those involving fraud – on one of the nation's premier welfare programs, the food stamp program. It may be safely assumed that the abuses reported about that program are typical of abuses found in virtually every government program.

- The number of food stamp recipients has soared from 26 million in 2007 (4 years ago) to the present 44 million; costs have gone from \$33 billion to \$77 billion.
- Thirty-five states have abolished asset tests for most food-stamp recipients, thereby enabling millionaires to be eligible for food stamps if they have no income.
- Food stamp recipients in Milwaukee routinely sell their benefit cards on Facebook.
- Food stamp recipients in Seattle were selling their cards on Craigslist or brazenly cashing them on street corners.
- Two veteran employees for New York City's Human Resources Administration were busted for concocting 1,500 fake food stamp cases that netted them \$8 million.
- Bush's food stamp chief “went on a quiet crusade to expand eligibility, increase enrollment, and reduce stigma...”
- The current Secretary of Agriculture unjustifiably contends the food stamp program is an economic stimulus, generating \$1.84 in the economy for every dollar spent.

**Should Compassion Override the Constitution?** Unless one makes the tenuous claim that the General Welfare clause of the Constitution authorizes welfare programs, there is no enumerated authority for Congress to engage in such practice. But should not compassion justify an exception to the restrictions of the Constitution? Congressman Ron Paul addresses that question:

Although those who hunger for power are small in number, it's easy to entice the masses into believing that government can provide for everyone's needs and safety. Yet the others who continue to produce are misled into believing that they must accept the system or be labeled selfish and lacking compassion. To do this, we accept the idea that a person's need, desires or demands equate to rights. Thus we hear from those who say they object to the welfare/socialist state that they nevertheless accept the fact that the truly in need deserve help from the government. They claim it's only *abuse* of the system that must be stopped. This concedes the intellectual and moral argument that a need is equal to a right now referred to as an “entitlement.” *No one should be entitled or have a right to someone else's labor.*

## AMERICA'S DEPLORABLE TAX SITUATION

**Who Pays and Who Doesn't Pay Income Taxes?** An article in a recent issue of the *Wall Street Journal* reports that, "nearly half of all American households pay no federal taxes at all," and that "60% of the income tax is paid by [only] 5% of U. S. households."

**The Cost of Government Day.** One gauge of the severity of taxes on the American taxpayer is the Cost of Government Day calculated by Americans for Tax Reform which determines the date each to which Americans must work to pay for federal, state, and local taxes, and the regulatory burden.

This year, that date is August 12. Think of it: Americans must work to that date to pay for the cost of government – some of which is needed, but most of which, as can be gleaned from the media, is rampant with fraud and waste.

In terms of days, the Americans for Tax Reform reports that, "Americans will work for 103 days to pay for federal spending, 44 days for state and local spending, and 77 days to cover the cost of the regulatory burden."

A comparison of this year's tax burden with that of other years is instructive. "Before 2009, the day never fell later than July 21 . . . The Reagan year held the cost of government steady at July 4."

**Taxes: A form of Slavery?** Columnist Walter Williams contends such a high level of taxation in America is a form of slavery, and justifies that contention via the following rationale:

[Only] a small portion of the fruits of [the worker's] labor is used to provide for the constitutional functions of government. Most of what's taken, up to two-thirds, is given to some other American in forms of farms and business subsidies, Social Security, Medicare, welfare and hundreds of other government handout programs. As in slavery, one person is being forcibly used to serve the purposes of another person.

**Income Taxes as a Moral Issue.** "The very notion of an income tax is morally debatable. On what moral grounds can the state force a citizen essentially at gun point to give away his legally and morally earned money? It is too bad that conservatives rarely take on the left on moral grounds because the left's moral foundations are as weak as their economic foundation," asserts columnist Dennis Prager. In addition to the fundamental problem of the morality of forcing people to give their money away, Prager lists some other moral problems which should be addressed:

- Having some people give at a greater percentage rate than others, a Marxist concept
- Allowing those who pay no tax to vote on how much others will be forced to pay
- At a certain level of taxation, virtually every honest person is reduced to cheating either legally or illegally
- The higher the tax rate, the lower the charity rate
- The higher the taxes, the less people are inclined to work hard. (Why should they?)

And there's more. Columnist Richard Rahn contends that when politicians inject morality by asserting the phrase "share the wealth," they really mean share the "income." That situation may explain why those Congressmen and Senators who have substantial amounts of wealth – the Feinsteins, Kerrys, Pelosies, etc. - don't mind voting for higher income taxes. Their wealth remains virtually untouched while families who must live on income are soaked. If these politicians practice what they preach about "sharing the wealth," should not their personal wealth be shared?

