

# The Republican Club of Sun City

## NEWSLETTER

January 2014

Everett Schmidt, Editor

Sun City Texas

### CANDIDATES FOR LT. GOVERNOR TO ADDRESS CLUB

Three of the 4 GOP candidates for the Lieutenant Governor position – State Senator Dan Patrick, Land Commissioner Jerry Patterson and Agriculture Commissioner Todd Staples - will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday, January 9 in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City. (Incumbent Lt. Governor David Dewhurst will not be a participant.) The event will be conducted as a candidates forum.

In comparison with the Lt. Governor positions of other states, the Texas position is both unique and powerful. According to *Wikipedia*, that position:

**is the second most powerful post in Texas government because its occupant controls the work of the Texas Senate and controls the budgeting process as a leader of the Legislative Budget Board.**

**Under the provisions of the Texas Constitution, the Lieutenant Governor is President of the Texas Senate. By the rules of the Senate, he establishes all special and standing committees, appoints all chairpersons and members, and assigns all Senate legislation to the committee of his choice. He decides all questions of parliamentary procedure in the Senate.**

In addition, he serves as chairman of the Legislative Budget Board (which provides the Legislature with a recommended budget at the beginning of each session), and the Legislative Council.

Although the holder of that office is a member of the executive branch, he is, according to *Texas Politics (a UT web site)*, ironically, “The most powerful *legislator* in Texas.” Given the almost unparalleled power of that office, it is important that Republicans have some insight into the values of the candidates, something the January 9 meeting can provide.

**The Social Period, 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 consist of chicken fried steak, garlic mashed potatoes with gravy, green beans and salad.

**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, 1530 Sun City Blvd., Suite 120, Box 227, Georgetown, TX 78633.** The deadline for payment or reservations is Friday, January 3, 2014.

Club treasurer John Congdon has set up a special collection box on his front porch at 610 Farm Hill Drive for individuals wishing to hand-deliver payments, this being said with the proviso that the Friday deadline has been met. For information about reservations, contact John at 512-686-1676 or [johnsctx@gmail.com](mailto:johnsctx@gmail.com)

**VISITORS ARE WELCOME!**

### CLUB ELECTS OFFICERS FOR 2014

During its November meeting, the club elected the following individuals as officers for the year 2014:

President	Robert Fears	512-868-9306	<a href="mailto:robertfears@earthlink.net">robertfears@earthlink.net</a>
1st Vice President (for programs)	John Graves	512-863-7715	<a href="mailto:johnbgraves@verizon.net">johnbgraves@verizon.net</a>
2nd Vice President (for membership)	Bill Chiles	512-868-1391	<a href="mailto:wachiles@gmail.com">wachiles@gmail.com</a>
Treasurer	John Congdon	512-686-1676	<a href="mailto:johnsctx@gmail.com">johnsctx@gmail.com</a>
Secretary	Bernie Miller	512-868-9125	<a href="mailto:bimiller1@verizon.net">bimiller1@verizon.net</a>

(June Phillips has been appointed Hospitality Director; Gary Preston has been appointed wine steward)

### REAGAN DINNER SCHEDULED FOR SUN CITY

**Ted Cruz is Keynote Speaker**

The county party's major fund raiser, The Reagan Dinner, will be held in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City on Monday, February 17, 2014. Keynote speaker for the event is Texas Senator Ted Cruz.

Information about purchasing of tickets for a table or for individuals will be forthcoming. For information, call the county party headquarters at 512-863-8481.

## OTHER CLUB NEWS

**Schedule of Meetings for 2014 Announced.** Ten meetings – instead of the usual 8 meetings – have been scheduled as follows for 2014, some of which it should be noted, are on nights other than Thursday:

Thursday, January 9	Thursday, May 8	Wednesday, September 10
Thursday, February 20	Thursday, July 10	Wednesday, October 1
Thursday, March 13	Tuesday, August 12	Thursday, November 6
Thursday, April 10		

**Club Establishes Own Web Site.** Thanks to the efforts of club vice president (for membership) Bill Chiles, the club now has its own web site where various types of information will be available. The address of that web site is: [www.rcsctx.com](http://www.rcsctx.com)

Among the types of information which are now or soon will be available are the following: purpose of the club, calendar of meetings, club officers, club bylaws, various events, and current and past newsletters.

**Names of Candidates.** For names of Republicans and Democrats who filed for office, contact the Office of the Secretary of State at [www.sos.state.tx.us](http://www.sos.state.tx.us)

## MEMBERSHIP DRIVE FOR 2014 NOW UNDERWAY

Both residents and non-residents of Sun City who “believe in the philosophy of the Republican Party” may join the club for the year 2014 upon payment of the \$15 per person membership fee. To be listed on the official membership roster, individuals must submit membership dues by February 28.

The purposes of the club are (1) to promote an informed electorate, (2) to foster loyalty to the Republican Party, (3) to promote its principles, and (4) to work for the election of Republican Party nominees.

The renewal process has been made simpler for 2013 members who wish to renew. If they have had no changes in the address during the past year, they need simply submit the \$15 per person dues payment. They do not need to submit an Application for Membership.

However, renewing member who wish to update address information, and new 2014 members must submit an Application along with dues payments. Current plans call for members to be e-mailed an Application in case that document is needed. Applications will also be available at the club's web site, [www.rcsctx.com](http://www.rcsctx.com)

Payments and Applications (when needed) should be mailed to the address shown in the first news article (above) in this newsletter, or they may be hand-delivered during a meeting.

Visitors are welcome to attend meetings; however, they should understand that the maximum number of meetings they may attend without joining the club is two. Elected officials are exempt from this requirement.

Simply being a club member makes a contribution to the cause of the Republican Party, this being said because the more members the club has, the greater is its stature and “clout.”

This is especially significant in view of the efforts of Texas Democrats, functioning with the financial help of the Democratic National Committee, to make Texas a “battleground” state in coming elections. Local Democrats have already attained some success in that regard. A November news article reported that the Sun City Democrat club had (at that time) 370 dues-paying members, with prospects of 500 members by 2014. A November poll released by the Texas Tribune/University of Texas showed super liberal gubernatorial Democrat Wendy Davis trailing Republican candidate Greg Abbott by only 6 points!

The determination of Democrats to turn Texas into a “blue” state and their thus far successful efforts toward bringing about that goal means that the past perennially strong Republican base in Williamson County can no longer be taken for granted with respect to future elections. The stakes, which could involve a “transformation” of the American form of government into possibly a socialist one, could not be higher.

## SOME PROFESSIONAL COMMENT ABOUT LIARS AND NARCISSISTS

President Obama's famous line, “If you like your health insurance, you can keep it. Period.” not only triggered a firestorm of questions about ObamaCare, it led to accusations, uttered from both sides of the aisle, that the president had been lying. The quoted passage was not only stated a time or two, it was stated, according to PolitiFact, a whopping 37 times! The president also stated a similar phrase about “keeping your doctor” numerous times. And these promises were stated with information made known to the president more than 3 years ago that millions of Americans would lose their insurance, so says former U. S. Attorney Andrew McCarthy.

There have also been numerous instances of apparent lying on the part of the president about other subjects. Indeed, these instances have been so numerous that there are questions as to whether or not Obama's behavior is pathological. This report is to examine the comments of professionals on that very question.

More specifically, this report will examine professional comment on the following issues:

- What evidence of pathology exists?
- Does the statement he made about keeping one's insurance constitute legal fraud?
- What do professionals have to say about Obama's pattern of lying?
- What do professionals have to say about narcissism, its characteristics and its causes?

**Lies of Consequence or Lies of No Consequence?** Columnist/Eagle Forum Founder Phyllis Schlafley acknowledges that former president George H. W. Bush said, "Read my lips. No new taxes," that former president Bill Clinton stated, "I did not have sexual relations with that woman," and that both statements were not true. Columnist Victor Hanson Davis points out some fibbing by other presidents: Franklin Roosevelt swore that he would never send American boys to fight in a foreign war, yet in just a little over a year, he did just that. Lyndon Johnson, before his election, said he would not send troops to Vietnam, yet by the time he left office, over a half-million Americans were deployed in Vietnam. Are Obama's assertions any different?

Schlafley contrasts those assertions with Obama's by pointing out that Obama's assertions constitute a "gross lie" about something that matters to millions of Americans and costs them lots of money, by pointing out that his assertions were repeated numerous times (reportedly, 37), and by pointing out that his staff knew they were lies when they placed them in the form of announcements he was to read.

There has been extensive exposure of Obama's tendency to lie. The entire July 2012 issue of *Whistleblower* is devoted to such exposure. That publication cites 72 selected lies he uttered during and immediately preceding his tenure and then states a correction to each of the lies. Following is a sampling of those published lies and corrections so that the reader can make a judgment if the lying is pathological:

**STATEMENT**

"They wanted a fence. Well, that fence is now basically complete"

**REALITY**

Legislation was passed in 2006 to build a 700-mile double-layer fence across the southwest border, but at the time Obama made the statement in May 2011, only 5% had been completed.

"Under our (health care) plan, no federal dollars will be used to fund abortions, and federal conscience laws will remain in place."

HHS Secretary Sibelius announced [in 2010] a ruling which requires many millions of Americans to pay a minimum surcharge for abortion services, whether or not they receive or want them. The minimum amount will be \$12 per year.

"My new fuel mandate will save the average family \$8,000 in gas annually."

The average family spends only \$3,000 a year on gas.

"I had an uncle who was part of the first American troops to go into Auschwitz and liberate the concentration camp."

Auschwitz was liberated by Soviet troops. Obama's mother was an only child.

"My father served in World War II."

His Kenyan father was 9 years old when the war ended.

"The health care bill negotiations will be broadcast by C-Span, so that the American people can see what the choices are, because part of what we have to do is enlist the American people in the process."

Although Obama made this promise repeatedly, major negotiations on health reform were held behind closed doors, including agreements with the drug industry.

"Then you've got the [GOP] plan, which is let's have dirtier air, dirtier water, less people with health insurance."

There is no evidence of any Republican plan to make the air or water dirtier.

(Source: Whistleblower)

**Do Obama's Statements Constitute Fraud?** Former Assistant U. S. Attorney and current writer for *National Review* Andrew McCarthy makes the following categorical charge regarding Obama's repeated assertions about keeping one's insurance and doctor: "Barack Obama is guilty of fraud – serial fraud – that is orders of magnitude more serious than frauds the Justice Department routinely prosecutes, and that courts punish harshly."

The reader may recall McCarthy's name and reputation from the 90s when, as an Assistant U. S. Attorney, he led the successful prosecution of the "Blind Sheikh," Omar Rahman, and his jihadist cell for waging a terrorist war against the U. S. - a war that included the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and a plot to bomb New York City landmarks.

McCarthy, in justifying his charge of "fraud," hangs his hat on certain Justice Department guidelines which recommend prosecution for fraud-

in situations involving "any scheme which in its nature is directed to defrauding a class of persons, or the general public, with a substantial pattern of conduct." So, for example, if a schemer were intentionally to deceive all Americans, or a class of Americans (e.g., people who had health insurance purchased on the individual market), by repeating numerous times - over the airwaves, in mailings, and in electronic announcements - an assertion the schemer knew to be false and misleading, that would constitute an actionable fraud - particularly if the statements induced the victims to take action to their detriment, or lulled the victims into a false sense of security.

Providing additional evidence of fraud is the fact that Obama knew *three years ago* - as revealed by internal analysis - that millions of Americans would eventually lose their health care insurance.

But, alas, McCarthy concedes, "The president will not be prosecuted." McCarthy contends the remedy for such corruption is a political one - specifically, the impeachment/removal process. In this context, it is interesting to recall that Bill Clinton had been impeached for various charges by the House, but was cleared by the Senate. He did, however, have to give up his law license as a consequence of the inaccurate responses he gave under oath to questions about his relationship with a White House intern.

**Narcissism and Lying as Mental Disorders.** A survey of comments made by professionals in the psychiatric community reveals there are varying classifications or degrees of narcissism. One such professional is Lyle Rossiter, Jr., MD, who is a board-certified psychiatrist with more than 45 year's experience in treating mental illness, and who has served as an expert in *thousands* of civil and criminal cases. He states:

**the sociopath, and often the narcissist, who lies as a way of life has not acquired a normal conscience that prohibits lying . . . Much lying is an expression of the persistence into adulthood of childhood demandingness . . . Childhood demandingness is demagogued by politicians always ready to lie to voters about what they [the voters] can have at another's expense, what they "need."**

Writer David Kupelian synthesizes his interviews with psychiatrists on the subject of narcissism:

**For a super-ambitious and vainglorious person such as Obama, lying is a vital and creative process. Lies open doors that would otherwise remain shut. . . Ordinary people don't possess this power, as they are constrained from such brazen lying by their conscience and/or the fear of being caught. But a highly narcissistic person like Obama feels he has freedom . . . to lie, and thereby impose his will upon us.**

Psychiatrist M. Scott Peck, MD, explains in his book, "People of the Lie," that what he terms "malignant" narcissism is characterized by an *unsubmitted* will. He reports that, "All adults who are mentally *healthy* submit themselves one way or another to something higher than themselves, be it God or truth or love or some other ideal," but not the mentally *unhealthy* adults.

Kupelian reports that, "many mainstream analysts, including Pulitzer-winning columnist and former psychiatrist Charles Krauthammer, have repeatedly pointed out Obama's "extreme" narcissism.

Rossiter reports on some of the more significant aspects related to narcissism of Obama's childhood:

**His developmental history may easily evoke sympathy for a biracial little boy raised in a white family and repeatedly subjected to varying degrees of prejudice, rejection and neglect at the hands of those on whom he was most dependent.**

**His duplicitous biological father deserted him early; his self-involved mother pursued her interests at length to her son's neglect, contaminating his early social and spiritual life with her marriage to an Indonesian Muslim, immersing him in an authoritarian religion whose radical fringe celebrates destructiveness, and eventually rejecting him by assigning his care to his grandparents, whose collectivist politics taught him to despise capitalism.**

**With indoctrination in the principles of *injustice-collecting* by a radical black communist during his adolescence, Obama was well on his way, by early adulthood, to a political philosophy ultimately founded on anger at the world of his formative years, and on envy of all those who had a better life than his.**

**Obama's personal tragedy is now becoming manifest, as it must, in the unfolding failures of his domestic and foreign policies; they are inevitable consequences of the irrational foundations on which his own political principles and those of modern liberalism rest.**

Rossiter offers the following conclusions about Obama's childhood:

**there appears to be a consensus among those who have studied his life that he did in fact suffer repeated separations, loses and changes of caretakers during his formative years, and this fact raises the question as to whether his dishonesty and other troubling aspects of his character are the consequences, at least in part, of those early experiences.**

## **WHERE DO TEACHERS AND POLITICIANS SEND THEIR KIDS?**

Public schools are having to deal with a variety of problems – students behavior problems, poor academic standards, poor graduation rates and others – which have, thus far, defied solution. There is now a division of thought as to the purpose of a public school education: Should it be for admission to college? What role should vocational education have? Should morality and patriotism be taught?

Compounding the above considerations is the fact that, because public schools are government schools, they are subject to provisions of the Constitution and to rulings by federal judges, thus adding complications.

It would appear that school choice – including choices of non-governmental schools – could bring about some improvement in school programs and could enable the preferences of parents to more easily be met. It is significant to note that on the 2012 Republican primary ballot of voter preferences Republicans approved by a vote of 1,176,965 to 219,127 – that's an 84% difference – the following proposition: “The state should fund education by allowing dollars to follow the child instead of the bureaucracy, through a program which allows parents the freedom to choose their child's school, public or private, while also saving significant dollars.”

But despite such public support, other than in the area of Charter schools (which are public schools), the Texas Legislature has had difficulty in providing Texas parents an alternative in the form of school vouchers to the public schools. The main obstacle to vouchers has come from the National Education Association (NEA), the nation's largest – and perhaps most influential – union. A number politicians, perhaps responding to union demands, have also resisted a voucher plan.

But teachers and politicians, ironically and hypocritically, show their support for private school by where they send their own children to school. Columnist Larry Elder reports some stunning statistics in this regard:

**About 11 percent of all parents – nationwide, rural and urban – send their children to private schools. The numbers are much higher in urban areas. One study found that in Philadelphia a staggering 44 percent of public school teachers send their own kids to private schools. In Cincinnati and Chicago, 41 and 39 percent of public school teachers, respectively, pay for a private school education. In Rochester, New York, it's 38 percent. In Baltimore, it's 35 percent . . .**

With respect to members of Congress, Elder reports that, “A 2007 Heritage Foundation study found that 37 percent of representatives and 45 percent of senators with school age children sent their own kids to private schools. Of the members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus with school-age children, 38 percent sent them to private school. Of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus with school-age children, 52 percent sent them to private schools.”

## **THE INFLUENCE OF SAUL ALINSKY ON BARACH OBAMA**

**Foreword.** One of the most influential political personages affecting the ideology and behavior of the left was Saul Alinsky, who was born in Chicago in 1909 and died in California in 1972. His influence – which continues to this day – manifests itself in two ways: (1) by developing methods of organizing communities – particularly the “have-nots,” as he called them – for political gain, and (2) by writing a book, Rules for Radicals, copyrighted in 1971, which not only provided concepts of organizing masses of people for political power, it also provided an ideology for the advancement of a political agenda useful to the left to this very day.

One of the individuals influenced by Alinsky was today's *most politically powerful leftist*, Barach Obama, who, by his own admission, said that Alinsky's “community organizing” methods provided an education “that was seared into my brain [and] was the best education I ever had, better than anything I got at Harvard Law School.”

Obama became an adept practitioner of Alinsky's methods. In 1986, at the age of 23 and only 3 years out of Columbia University, Obama was hired by the Alinsky team to organize residents on the South Side of Chicago while learning and applying Alinsky's philosophy of street-level democracy.

Other evidence that Alinsky was unusually powerful among leftists is the fact that potential Democrat presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, while a college student, thought so much of Alinsky's ideas that she wrote her master's thesis about those ideas, the title of her thesis being, “There is Only the Fight: An Analysis of the Alinsky Model.” It was based on a series of personal interviews with Alinsky.

Talk-show host Rush Limbaugh, who has the nation's largest audience of talk-show listeners, acknowledges the influence of Alinsky when he says of the ideology of the Democrat Party and Barach Obama that, “It's not just liberal ideology; it's a socialist Alinskyism.” Columnist Phyllis Schlafley says in regard to the studying of Alinsky that, “Americans

who care about our nation and its future should study Saul Alinsky and what is known today as the Alinsky ideology and Alinsky concepts of mass organization for power.”

Shown in brackets (below) is the writer's attempt to relate current behavior of Obama and the Democrats to the particular Alinsky rule(s) discussed.

**Interpreting Alinsky's Stated Beliefs.** While this report includes a number of statements direct from Alinsky's book, it also includes a generous number of quotes by present-day writers who can provide valuable insights into Alinsky's thinking. The reader may find – as did this writer – that some help from external sources may provide some help in understanding Alinsky. Those writers include the following:

- **Phyllis Schlafley**, a constitutional attorney, author, political activist and founder of the Eagle Forum.
- **David Kupelian**, editor of *Whistleblower*, author of *How Evil Works* and other publications.
- **David Horowitz**, a son of parents who were active in the American Communist Party, he was, himself, a communist during his earlier years, until he completely rejected all forms of leftism. He is currently president of the conservative-leaning “Freedom Center” and editor of *Front Page Magazine*. His exposure to communists and Alinsky enables him to provide valuable insight into the Alinsky ideology.

**An Overview of Alinsky's Worldview.** Phyllis Schlafley describes Alinsky's worldview as follows:

Alinsky's worldview was that mankind is divided into three parts: “the Haves, the Have-Nots and the Have-a - Little, Want Mores.” His purpose was to teach the Have-Nots how to take power and money away from the Haves by creating mass organizations to seize power, and he frankly admitted that “this means revolution.”

He wanted a radical change of America's social and economic structure, and he planned to achieve that through creating public discontent and moral confusion. Alinsky developed strategies to achieve power through mass organization, and organizing was his word for revolution.

He wanted to move the United States from capitalism to socialism, where the means of production would be owned by all the people (i.e., the government). A believer in economic determinism, he viewed unemployment, disease, crime and bigotry as byproducts of capitalism. [Think class warfare, income distribution, socialism]

**Alinsky's Concept of Revolution.** Horowitz contends that Alinsky's preferred self-description was “rebel” and that his entire life was devoted to organizing a *revolution* in America to destroy a system he regarded as oppressive and unjust. The Alinsky radical has a single principle – to take power from the Haves and give it to the Have-Nots.

“Alinsky and his followers organize their power without naming the end game . . . the revolutionary's purpose is to undermine the system and then see what happens.” This describes nihilism. That strategy appears to be identical to the Cloward-Piven Strategy advocated by two university sociology professors. That strategy “seeks to hasten the fall of capitalism by overloading the government bureaucracy with a flood of impossible demands, thus pushing society into crises and economic collapse.” [Think of the chaos of ObamaCare]

**The Intimidation Factor.** According to David Kupelian-

The single most important operating principle behind Alinsky's methods, the one that makes the rest of them work – namely, intimidation – is increasingly the modus operandi of today's government.

To put it bluntly, for Alinsky's “community organizing” rules - which Obama says were “seared into my brain” - to really work, the general public must be made to feel intimidated, upset, frustrated and hopeless. Alinsky explains:

“Any revolutionary change must be preceded by a passive, affirmative, non-challenging attitude toward change among the mass of our people. They must feel so frustrated, so defeated, so lost, so futureless in the prevailing system that they are willing to let go of the past and change the future. This acceptance is the reformation essential to any revolution.”

[If there is pushback] here's Alinsky Rule #5: “Ridicule is man's most potent weapon.”

[Think ObamaCare insurance, TRS harassment of conservatives, vile comment about Tea Party members]

**War as an Analogy and Metaphor.** Reports Horowitz: “For Alinsky, politics is a zero sum exercise, because it is war . . . When you are in a war – when you think of yourself as in a war – there is no middle ground. Radicals perceive opponents of their causes as enemies on a battlefield, and they set out to destroy them by demonizing and discrediting them.”

Continues Horowitz: “Conservatives think of war as a metaphor when applied to politics. For radicals, the war is real. That is why when partisans of the left go into battle, they set out to destroy their opponents by stigmatizing them as 'racists,' 'sexists,' 'homophobes,' and 'Islamophobes.’”

[Think of *ad hominem* attacks on conservatives by Democrats and media]

**Truth.** On pp. 10-11 of his book, Alinsky states: the organizer “does not have a fixed truth – truth to him is relative and changing . . .” Could this Rule account for the behavior of Democrats? [Think Obama and Hillary]

**Conservatives as Combatants.** Horowitz contends: “In my experience, conservatives are generally too decent and too civilized to match up adequately with their radical adversaries, at least in the initial stages of battle...One side is fighting with

a no-holds-barred, take-no-prisoners battle plan, while the other is trying to enforce its rules of fairness and pluralism.” [Think of *ad hominem attacks on Republicans with no push back*]

**Communism.** Finding some difficulty in accepting Communism's belief in having an “end game,” Alinsky never formally became a communist; however, he viewed communists as political allies, and never questioned Marx' contentions that society was engaged in a “class struggle,” that there is a war between the Haves and the Have-Nots, and that there should wealth distribution.

Horowitz wonders why the term “communist” is not used to describe ObamaCare and other leftist views. In response, Rush Limbaugh cites his own experience by reporting that, “whenever I've used the word 'communism' to describe, say, typical modern-day liberals, people say, 'O, come on, Rush! They're not communists! It ends up being counterproductive.”

## THE GAP BETWEEN THE RICH AND POOR: A POLITICAL HOT POTATO

Recently, President Obama stated that he deplored the reported increasing gap between the nation's wealthy and poor, and suggests an increase in the minimum wage. And also just recently, Pope Francis made similar comments which suggested that he, too, deplored such gap.

These subjects are political hot potatoes, are easily demagogued, and are nothing new here or in other countries. Margaret Thatcher, when she was Prime Minister of England, had to face similar comment. She was not intimidated and responded with both facts and push back as is evidenced by the following transcript:

A socialist asked her how she could defend policies which resulted in an increasing gap between the rich and the poor. The poor were relatively less better off than the rich. How could she justify that? Her response:

**All levels of income are better off than they were in 1979. But what the honorable member is saying is that he would rather the poor were poorer provided the rich were less rich. That way you will never create the wealth for better social services as we have. And what a policy. Yes, he would rather have the poor poorer provided the rich were less rich. That is the Liberal (British Socialist) policy. Yes it came out. He didn't intend it to but it did.**

A second speaker attacked her by saying: “The Prime Minister is aware that I detest every single one of her domestic policies . . .” Her response:

**I think the honorable gentleman knows that I have the same contempt for his Socialist policies as the people of East Europe who have experienced it (rest of sentence drowned out by cheers). I think I must have hit the right nail on the head when I pointed out that the logic of those policies are they'd rather have the poor poorer.**

## NOTES ON THE PASSING SCENE (Some random observations on this crazy world in which we live)

**Wendy Davis Sued Paper.** According to Erick Erickson, editor of *Red State*, back in 1996, Wendy Davis, a current Democrat gubernatorial candidate, lost an election for the Fort Worth city council. Her main motive for running was to oppose the expansion of the Fort Worth zoo.

She lost the race. But shortly after that loss, she filed suit against the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, claiming that the paper's negative editorial not only infringed on her “right to pursue public office,” it also damaged her “physical and mental health.”

The district court dismissed her case; but four years later, she appealed her case before the Texas Supreme Court which also dismissed her case.

**More ObamaCare Shenanigans.** According to the *Patriot Post*, “ObamaCare is proving to be the biggest voter registration fraud scheme in our country's history.” Under the ObamaCare application process, if you apply for Medicaid, you are automatically registered to vote unless you opt out by completing a form.

**California Pushes Back Against Transgender Law.** The reader may recall from the September newsletter the report that at least 3 states – Colorado, California and Massachusetts – have legislation which allows children in the bathroom, shower and other facilities of the opposite sex if they identify themselves as a member of the opposite sex. Californians, however, have obtained enough signatures on a petition to place that law on “hold” and to have a vote by the people in November of 2014 as to whether that law should take effect