

# The Republican Club of Sun City NEWSLETTER

March 2014

Everett Schmidt, Editor

Sun City Texas

## MAYORAL CANDIDATE FORUM SCHEDULED FOR MARCH MEETING

A mayoral candidate's forum featuring the individuals who have filed as candidates for the position of mayor, City of Georgetown will be held during the club's dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday, March 13 in the ballroom of the social center in Sun City.

As of this writing, two individuals – Marlene McMichael and Dale Ross – have filed for that position, and have agreed to be participants in a forum; however, it should be noted that the filing period for mayor has not yet ended, that period extending through Friday, February 28. The election is scheduled for Saturday, May 10.

Each of the candidates has rich experiences – described in their campaign literature – which should serve him or her well as mayor in one of the fastest growing cities in the nation.

**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.

**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, March 7.

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!

## OTHER CLUB NEWS

Club treasurer John Congdon reports that the number of attendees at the club's February meeting was 196, with an estimated additional 20 attendees present for the program only.

Club vice president (for membership) Bill Chiles reports that current 2014 club membership stands at 194.

Individuals wishing to re-new membership or to enroll as new 2014 members should access the club's web site at [www.rcsctx.com](http://www.rcsctx.com) for information.

## NEWS OF THE COUNTY PARTY

Currently, office hours at the party headquarters located at 716 Rock Street in Georgetown are:

Tuesdays: 10:00 AM - 2:00 PM

Thursdays: 10:00 AM - 6:00 PM

Fridays: 10:00 AM - 2:00 PM

Help is needed at the party headquarters. If interested, contact Donna Johnson at 512-863-8481

## NOTICE OF CORRECTIONS TO FEBRUARY NEWSLETTER

Two significant errors were made in the first transmission of the February 2014 club newsletter:

>On page 2, the address of the club's web site was incorrectly reported. The correct address is:

[www.rcsctx.com](http://www.rcsctx.com)

>On page 3, the precinct number and address of the March 4 precinct convention chaired by Meredith Chiles were incorrectly reported. The correct information pertaining to her precinct, plus information pertaining to the other precincts meeting that day in Sun City, follows:

<u>Precinct</u>	<u>Precinct Chairman</u>	<u>Meeting Site</u>	<u>Address</u>
381	Barbara Mabray	The Oaks	301 Del Web Blvd.
394	Meredith Chiles	Cowan Creek Amenity Cntr.	1433 Cool Spring
396	Everett Schmidt	The Worship Place	811 Sun City Blvd.

The above corrections were included in subsequent transmissions of the February newsletter

# TEA PARTIES BEGAN 5 YEARS AGO IN RESPONSE TO OVERSPENDING

## Need for Response Continues

**The Beginning.** According to writer Julia Seymour, five years ago, on February 19, 2009, CNBC's Rick Santelli reacted to the possibility of a mortgage bailout with frustration on live television. His speech on the trading floor became known as the "rant heard around the world." The Tea Party Movement began.

It was during that morning discussion when Santelli let loose on a potential bailout of homeowners, arguing the "the government is promoting bad behavior" and proposing that capitalists gather in Chicago for a "Tea Party." The traders present whistled, cheered and applauded to the notion of organizing.

But it wasn't only the trading floor Santelli riled up. It was average Americans of all kinds who were outraged by Washington's fiscal irresponsibility and bailout culture. Soon Tea Parties were popping up in cities across the country. Suddenly there was a political movement centered around fiscal responsibility and against politicians who choose the opposite, at least in part – thanks to Santelli.

As for his reaction to the Tea Party, Santelli said he thinks it is a "philosophy" rather than an actual political party. "It's a philosophy that 'We, the People' – it's about us, that if the Americans want to do something, they have the power to try to put leaders in place to carry out whatever their notions are. It's the land of opportunity, not the land of entitlement and I think all of that is at the foundation of what caused the Tea Party movement to gain such traction," he said.

He went on to praise the decentralized nature of the Tea Party calling it "a big strength." Santelli embraced his part in the movement saying, "If they write on my tombstone that I was the catalyst in the forming of the Tea Party movement, they could bury me with a smile."

**Some General Observations.** From Wikipedia, the online encyclopedia, are the following observations:

- **National Tea Party organizations, such as Tea Party Patriots and Freedom Works, have . . .sought to have activists focus their efforts away from social issues [on grounds they would be too divisive] and focus on economic and limited government issues. (Some Tea Parties, those more localized, do act on certain social issues such as abortion, gun control, prayer in schools, and illegal immigration)**
- **The Tea Party generally focuses on government reform. Among its goals are limiting the size of the federal government, reducing government spending, lowering the national debt and opposing tax increases.**
- **The Tea Party places the Constitution at the center of its reform agenda.**

**Opponents of the Tea Party Movement.** The reader is aware that at both the national and state levels, there are certain factions which are resistant to the Tea Party Movement. One such faction is known as the "establishment," generally considered to be elected officials who wish to maintain the status quo. Another faction is one associated with trade groups and certain political groups - such as Karl Rove's American Crossroads and the national Chamber of Commerce – who seek to gain certain political or monetary advantage.

Given the adverse publicity given by media to the Tea Party, one might suspect that politicians involved in election or re-election campaigns might shy away from any connection with the Tea Party. But that is not always the case, witness Texas' Lt. Governor's race in which, according to the *American-Statesman*, "All four candidates, including Dewhurst, are touting tea party endorsements – some from members of the same tea party groups." The record crowds and record standing ovations Sen. Cruz has generated provide some justification for the actions of those candidates.

**Some Practical Insights.** The reader, having been exposed not only to the bias of the media but also to the bias of establishment politicians, may have difficulty in accurately and sufficiently comprehending what the Tea Party Movement stands for; however, Stephen Moore, a *Wall Street Journal* writer who is not a Tea Party supporter, wrote a recent op-ed piece – one based on interviews with 3 of the most prominent Tea Party leaders – in which he provides on a practical level information about that movement. Following are some of the highlights from that writing:

- **The three most prominent leaders and their respective organizations are: Matt Kibbe of Freedom Works, Amy Klemer of Tea Party Express and Jenny Beth Martin of Tea Party Patriots.**
- **Moore states, "Like many local tea party activists I have spoken with, they generally view the government shutdown {of last fall} not as a tactical blunder but as an example of weak-kneed Republicans muffing an opportunity to roll back ObamaCare.**
- **Kremer and Kibbe are unrepentant about the shutdown. Asked what went wrong, Kibbe replies: "We just didn't anticipate the Republican circular firing squad in the Senate or the vicious attacks directed at Mike Lee and Ted Cruz." Kibbe still thinks the GOP could have won.**
- **Were their members demoralized by sinking poll numbers and the GOP cave in? Kibbe says "no." He also says Freedom Works fund raising has soared in recent weeks . . ." Other tea party organizations report similar surges.**

- Republicans blame the defeats [of candidates Sharron Angle, Todd Akin and Richard Mourdock] for preventing a GOP takeover of the Senate in 2010 and 2012. Its members are adamant that they aren't an appendage of the Republican Party." How do those critics think Republicans won their landslide election in 2008?" Kibble says, "It was because of us."
- Kremer says, "It doesn't do us any good to have more Republicans if they don't stand for our principles . . ." She adds that when George W. Bush was president and Republicans controlled Congress, Washington big-spending ways never changed.
- The animus from the business wing of the GOP doesn't scare the tea party leaders. Martin scoffs: "We're not surprised big businesses are opposing us. These are mostly crony capitalists who want something from government."

**The Suspension of the Debt Ceiling Episode.** On February 12, 2014 the Senate voted 55 – 43 along party lines to approve a suspension of the federal debt limit through March 2015, thereby allowing the U. S. Treasury to sell debt as necessary. In a major retreat by conservative Republicans, the legislation contains no spending cuts or other conservative policy riders, marking the first time since 2009 Congress has passed a "clean" debt limit.

The thinking of conservative Republicans may be discerned in the behavior of a conservative House Republican, Raul Labrador, who offered an unexpected proposal: "Let's extend the federal borrowing limit with no strings attached and make the Democrats muster the votes." This lawmaker said he opposed raising the debt ceiling, but wanted his party to skip a protracted fight it was unlikely to win.

The reader may recall that last fall, after a protracted fight, there was an unpleasant shutdown for which Sen. Cruz was blamed by many. It was with recollection of that shutdown that the Senate, during the recent showdown on the debt ceiling, realized it was facing a huge problem: Sen. Cruz was engaging in a filibuster which needed 60 votes to overcome while Democrats could only muster 55 votes. This meant at least 5 Republicans must vote with the Democrats.

No doubt fearing the adverse effects of another shutdown, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell led a parade of 12 Republicans to successfully close down the filibuster by a 67 – 31 vote.

Sen. John Cornyn, who followed McConnell's lead, justified his action by saying, "I think it would have been bad for the economy, bad for the American people, and I don't think it would have been good politics."

Mr. Cruz had a different justification for his action, saying he demanded the 60-vote majority [needed to end the filibuster] because it gave the GOP caucus a chance to block the bill – if they remained united – and force the debate on possible spending cuts."

Oddly, Republicans who voted "yes" to end the filibuster voted "no" against the debt ceiling raise, thus suggesting to many observers that those two votes were specifically engineered for the voters back home.

**A Response of a Tea Party Supporter.** Following are some observations of Andrew McCarthy, a former prosecutor who successfully prosecuted the terrorist known as the "blind sheik" and who currently is a writer for *National Review*:

- It was just three months ago that Sen. McConnell was telling us - when the Democrats were about to overthrow a long stand tradition - how critical the 60-vote standard was to making the Senate the world's most deliberative body.
- Republicans use Senate rules to play a con game on the folks back home. In a nutshell, they first arrange things to ensure that Obama gets his way, then formally vote against him once they are certain that opposition is futile.
- Cloture is the only vehicle for stopping Democrats. They cannot get to 60 votes without Republican help . . . The ballgame is the cloture vote: the only one in which republicans, by sticking together, have the power to shelve any bill.
- Contrary to the common perception that cloture is procedural in nature, it is, in this instance, a vote on substance because it determines whether a bill will pass. Once the 60-vote hurdle is cleared it is the final vote that becomes a mere procedural formality.

**Conclusions.** There are some ironies in the Senate passing on February 12 of this year a bill which gives Obama, now known for lawlessness in regard to spending and other matters, a blank check on borrowing and spending for a full year, until March 2015. Ironically, it was the same subject, government spending, some 5 years previous, almost to the day (February 19, 2009), which triggered the beginning of the Tea Party Movement. Writer Stephen Moore contends "the Tea Party sees the federal debt itself as the main threat to national security." That would explain a lot about the behavior of the Movement through the years.

Currently, the federal debt stands at \$17.3 trillion, and is destined to rise – perhaps out of control. But who can comprehend such number? Consequently, published in a separate article in this newsletter is a chart comparing the federal debt with the finances of a family also dealing with debt.

## UNDERSTANDING THE NATIONAL DEBT

In view of the recent action by Congress to give Obama a blank check on borrowing and spending for a full year, until March of 2015, the consequences of that action may not be fully understood. Hence, this article.

Currently, the federal debt stands at 17.3 trillion dollars, and is destined to rise. But the lay person is probably not able to comprehend such a large amount; it will have virtually no meaning to him or her.

Luckily, several years ago, an economist, Chuck Bentley, translated the federal budget of the time to that of a family's struggle with debt, thereby enabling the viewer to almost immediately gain an understanding of economic factors not otherwise possible.

That translation was published in the January 2012 club newsletter and is published below. It is important that the reader know that at the time the translation was prepared, the federal debt was 15 trillion dollars, more than 2 trillion dollars less than the current debt. But the translation, because it maintains the economic dynamics and relates to something the lay person can understand, a family budget, is still helpful.

If you remove some zeros from a listing of figures from a federal budget, as Bentley suggests, and then pretend you were looking at your family budget, with the ratios continuing at the same rate, the family budget would look something like the following:

Your annual income:	\$21,500
Your household spending:	\$38,000
New debt this year:	\$16,500
Your credit card debt:	\$150,000
Recent budget cut:	385

Summary: Your annual income is \$21,500. Your household spending is \$38,000. That means your new debt this year is \$16,500. And your credit card debt is \$150,000. Finally, your recent budget cut is \$385.

When you put these numbers into a family budget, you can see the problem. Any household that spends \$38,000 each year when the family income is only \$21,000 is going to be in trouble. And if your credit card debt is \$150,000, you know you are really in trouble, especially if you were only willing to cut \$385 from your family budget.

## NEWS OF THE STATE PARTY

State party chairman Steve Munisteri reports that, "because it is expected that the 2016 Republican National Convention will be moved up to late June or mid-July, the 2016 Republican state convention, which is now planned to take place in June in Houston, has to be moved to an earlier date in May; however, "because of some conflicts currently noted about Dallas and Houston, Austin is now considered an alternative."

Munisteri also notes that the Republican Party of Texas (RPT) has been able to expand staff from six full-time, permanent employees in the Fall of 2010 to 24 full time employees today, with the possibility of adding another nine field staff should funds become available.

Munisteri also reports that, "The rules changes we enacted at the RNC [Republican National Convention] should make Texas a big player in the 2016 presidential primary process." He explains that the number of delegates allocated to the Texas GOP at the national convention is based on a formula that awards bonuses for electoral success, as, for example, a Republican Governor, a majority in the congressional delegation, and control of the legislature.

## THE CONTRASTING VALUES OF REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

The perceptive reader will note that the Propositions which appear on the primary ballot of both the Republican and Democrat parties provide some insight into the values each of those parties promotes. As expected, these values are widely different.

For example, on the Republican ballot are Propositions which can easily be alienated with Republican values and include the following: Religious Freedom, Second Amendment, Franchise Tax, Welfare Reform, No Lawmaker Exception [law makers are to follow laws they promulgate], and ObamaCare repeal.

In sharp contrast to those Republican values are those values suggested by the following Propositions which appear on the Democrat primary ballot:

### ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

**The United States Congress must pass immigration reform; including an earned path to citizenship for those individuals contributing to the economy and the dependents of those individuals.**

### A LIVING WAGE FOR ALL TEXANS

**Congress should pass legislation raising the federal minimum wage to at least 110% of the federal poverty level for a family of four without exception.**

## **MEDICAID EXPANSION**

The Governor and the Texas Legislature should accept federal funds; as provided in the Patient Protection & Affordable Care Act of 2010; for the expansion of Medicaid to provide coverage to millions of uninsured and underinsured Texans.

## **ON NON-DISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION**

The Congress and the Texas Legislature should adopt legislation that expands protections against discriminations in employment; housing, and public accommodations based upon sexual orientation and gender identity.

Elaborating on the values of the Democrats as suggested by the Propositions on the Democrat primary ballot are the observations of Lyle Rossiter, Jr., M.D., a board certified psychiatrist who has diagnosed and treated mental disorders for more than 40 years, and who has been retained as an expert in more than 2,700 civil and criminal cases as reported in *Whistle Blower*. He starts out by identifying various matters about which the modern liberal mind is not passionate. But then, in contrast, he discusses those values about which the modern liberal mind is passionate:

**What the liberal mind *is* passionate about is a world filled with pity, sorrow, neediness, misfortune, poverty, victimization, alienation and injustice. Those who occupy his world are . . . poor, weak, sick, wronged, cheated, oppressed, disenfranchised, exploited and victimized. They bear no responsibility for their problems. None of their agonies are attributable to faults or failings of their own: not to poor choices, bad habits, faulty judgment, wishful thinking, lack of ambition, low frustration tolerance, mental illness or defects in character. None of the victims' plights caused by failure to plan for the future or learn from experience.**

**Instead, the "root causes" of all this pain lie in faulty social conditions: poverty, disease, war, ignorance, unemployment, racial prejudice, ethnic and gender discrimination, modern technology, capitalism, globalization and imperialism. In the radical liberal mind, this suffering is inflicted on the innocent by various predators and persecutors: "big business," "big corporations," "greedy capitalists," "U. S. imperialists," "the oppressors," "the rich," "the powerful" and "the selfish."**

## **AT LAST: SOME GOP CONGRESSMEN BEGIN TO PUSH BACK**

Following are 3 instances wherein members of Congress are beginning to push back via legal means to some of the excesses now evident in government. While these efforts are commendable, they hardly seem adequate for the many problems easily visible in today's world.

**Sen. Ron Johnson's Lawsuit.** Sen. Ron Johnson (R.-Wis.) announced he was filing suit to make Congress live by the letter of the health-care law it imposed on the rest of America. "By arranging for me and other members of Congress and their staffs to receive benefits intentionally ruled out by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act [ObamaCare], the administration has exceeded its legal authority."

The situation described by Johnson means that there is one set of rules for citizens and another set of rules for government personnel. That situation came about via a ruling by the president and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

**House Members Join Lawsuit Over ObamaCare's Failure to Comply With Origination Clause.** Led by Rep. Trent Franks (R.Az), at least 40 members of the House have signed on to a lawsuit challenging the ObamaCare law on grounds that it is in violation of the Origination Clause of the Constitution because the law, being a tax (so said the Supreme Court), should have originated in the House but didn't do so.

Possible revealing the lawsuits fate, the issue was lost at the district court level by an Obama-appointed district judge who held that the ACA's revenue-raising, taxation aspect was "incidental" to its main purpose and thus was not a "bill for raising revenue" as described in the Origination Clause.

**House Members Introduce Article of Impeachment Against Holder.** With 19 members as co-sponsors, Rep. Pete Olson (R.-Tx) introduced an Articles of Impeachment resolution against Attorney General Eric Holder (who is currently held in "Contempt of Congress) for his role in the Operation Fast and Furious (involving gun smuggling) and other scandals of the Obama administration, including his withholding of information and documents subpoenaed by a House committee.

## **STIRRINGS OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE BECOMING APPARENT**

There are now stirrings in the form of civil disobedience on the part of some citizens responding to what they see as a lawless and overbearing federal government so out of step with traditional American values as to constitute a "war against America."

And this view of government extends to more than the administration; it extends to the court system and to the Congress which, although it has considerable authority, has not brought about relief to the citizenry and seems to be deserving its present approval rating of only 13%!

It may be significant that the media has begun reporting clashes between citizens and government authorities as "civil disobedience." Following are a few examples of incidents reported in the media:

The *New York Times* reports on one instance involving ObamaCare which is likely to be replicated by the millions – literally. The *Times* reports that the owner of a pottery shop in Georgia, finding that health insurance as mandated by ObamaCare was too expensive, purchased insurance for her son (only) while she and her husband have consciously decided not to purchase health care as required by law. She and her husband believe their course of action was *the right thing to do*.

Pollster Scott Rasmussen contends that, “Breaking the law intentionally to do the right thing is an *act of civil disobedience*, and it's possible millions of Americans will pursue this path.” He also observes that, “There were tens of millions of uninsured before the law was implemented, and there are tens of millions after. The only difference the law has made so far is to make those tens of millions of people live as lawbreakers.”

Then there are stirrings of what the media terms “civil disobedience” involving gun control laws enacted in the wake of the shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School, in Connecticut, an event one might think would promote compliance with gun control laws.

But instead of complying with the law which requires residents to register all military-style rifles, many residents refused to do so. One estimate is that only about 15% of the residents has registered their weapons.

By owning unregistered guns defined as assault weapons, citizens are committing Class D felonies. One observer contends that this means, as of January 1, “Connecticut has very likely created tens of thousands of newly minted criminals . . . who have broken no other laws.”

The stage is now set for other acts of civil disobedience – depending in large part on how courts rule on matters of religious liberty. One particular stage was set in November of 2009 when over 150 Orthodox, Catholic and evangelical leaders signed the *Manhattan Declaration*, which is a pledge to defend (1) sanctity of human life, (2) the dignity of traditional marriage, and (3) the rights of conscience and religious liberty.

Explaining what the *Declaration* means in terms of the consequences which the signers – now numbering in the multi-thousands – must endure when defending the standards spelled out in that document, the late Chuck Colson, one of its authors, stated: “arrest,” “prison,” “loss of tax exemption.” Adverse court rulings could trigger those consequences.

James Dobson, founder of Focus on the Family, reacting to the deleterious effects the proposed health care bill can have on families, made an impassioned public commitment from which retreat is virtually impossible:

**“Now, I don't know where all of this is leading or what the implications are and where it will end. But if we have to pay ruinous fines, or we have to go to prison, or even if we have to leave this beloved country and spend the rest of our lives in exile, that is what we are prepared to do.”**

In response to the notion that civil disobedience is a form of lawlessness, feisty columnist Ann Coulter says: “The conservative argument for enforcing inane court rulings [and laws] is that the only option is anarchy. But we are already living in anarchy. It's a one-sided, Alice-in-Wonderland anarchy in which the liberals always win and the conservatives always lose.”

## **DID THE FOUNDERS AND FRAMERS LEAVE THE NATION HELPLESS IN DEALING WITH DYSFUNCTIONAL GOVERNMENT?**

The Founders, in that magnificent document, The Declaration of Independence, provided a philosophical basis for dealing with abusive government when it states:

- “. . . whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends [government securing rights endowed by the Creator], it is the right of people to alter or abolish it . . .”
- “. . . when a long train of abuses and usurpation [indicate a design to bring about despotism] it is [man's] right, it is [man's] duty to throw off such government.”

However, the framers did provide in the Constitution certain provisions short of throwing off an oppressive government is dealing with dysfunctional government, some which are listed below.

**The Power of the Purse.** In theory, nothing in government can happen unless the House, with its ultimate power of the purse, agrees to fund it. If a corrupt administration, for example, uses the IRS as a partisan weapon and harasses its detractors, the House can refuse to fund the IRS – or other parts of the executive branch – to quell executive overreach.

**Congress' Ability to Control Wayward Courts.** A Constitutional provision useful for curbing usurpations or excesses by courts is found in Article III, Section 2 wherein there is first a statement about certain matters over which the court has jurisdiction consistent with certain constitutional provisions. That statement is then followed by “In all the other cases . . . the Supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, *with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as Congress shall make.*” (emphasis added)

In other words, the foregoing emphasized language authorizes Congress to stipulate certain matters over which the courts may *not* have jurisdiction.

Former Majority Leader Tom Daschle provides an illustration as to how easily this can be done. To keep environmentalists from contesting in courts certain language he sponsored for his state concerning forestation, he simply added to that legislation the following statement: “Any action authorized by this Section shall not be subject to judicial review by any court in the United States.”

**Impeachment.** Writer Andres McCarthy notes that “High crimes and misdemeanors,” the Constitutional standard for impeachment, are the misdeeds of high officials . . . [and are] violations of a “*political*” nature . . . Impeachment is a political remedy, not a legal one.”

McCarthy analyzes Obama's performance:

So, as one would expect, President Obama is intentionally and sweepingly violating his oath of office. He is not faithfully executing federal law – he picks, chooses, “waives,” and generally makes up law as he goes along. He has willfully and materially misled the American people – his ObamaCare and Benghazi lies being only the most notorious examples. . .

**The Cold, Harsh Reality About Impeachment.** McCarthy analyzes the impeachment process in relation to the performance of the current president:

But here is the important thing: High crimes and misdemeanors are a subordinate consideration. In an impeachment case, they are necessary but they are not close to being sufficient. Because impeachment is a political remedy, its most essential component is the popular political will to remove a president from power.

The charges against Bill Clinton plainly satisfied the “high crimes and misdemeanors” threshold, and he was clearly guilty of them. But the American people obviously did not want Clinton removed over them. *That* is the lesson of the Clinton impeachment . . . The question is how convinced the public is that a president's continued hold on power profoundly threatens their safety, prosperity, and sense of what kind of country we should be.

As things now stand, the public is not convinced. There is not political will to remove the president.

## THE CONVERSION OF CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER

Charles Krauthammer, a former psychiatrist, a current author of widely-read columns, and a frequent guest or panelist on a variety of TV shows, said, “My political inclination [during his early 20's] was to be a Great Society liberal on domestic issues.” He explains his political views of that day: “It was sort of lazily socially Democratic, meaning, government wants to do good, government's got to engage itself to help the poor, etc. So there I was, by habit, a social Democrat.”

Krauthammer comments on the change in the Democrats of today with, say, the Democrats of the John F. Kennedy era. It was Kennedy who had beliefs in tune with today's conservatives and out-of-tune with today's leftist/Democrats. Two examples: (1) Kennedy advocated reducing taxes as a means of making the economy grow, and (2) counter to the entitlement philosophy promoted today, admonished citizens “ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country.”

Krauthammer then explains the basis of his conversion:

So, I know it seems strange to young people today, but the Democratic Party had a very powerful wing that was quite anti-communist. So that's where I located myself, and then when I began to write in the early '80s, the empirical evidence on the Great Society started to come in. I'm a doctor by training, and I'm open to empirical evidence, and it was overwhelming. The Great Society was a failure. It made things worse.

So that was the beginning of my turn politically. It wasn't a philosophical turn, it was more empirical. You know, you have a good heart, you give money away, lo and behold, it creates dependency. Now, I will grant you that's not a great discovery, but for me it was. And that began my turn.

## NOTES ON THE PASSING SCENE

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

**In Liberal New York, More Black Babies Die Via Abortion Than Are Born.** The New York City Department of Health reports that in 2012, there were more black babies killed by abortions (31,328) in New York City than were born there (27,758), and the black children comprised 42.4% of the total number of abortions. For years, New York has had the highest abortion rate of any city in the nation.

**More on New York City.** Columnist Pat Buchanan reveals that a *New York Times* article reports the following:

Only eight percent of the cab and rental car drivers in New York City are native-born Americans. Three times as many yellow cabdrivers in New York were born in Bangladesh than in the USA.

What is happening in America is that the vast cohort of working men and women, immigrants, illegal and legal, who have come in recent decades, 30 to 40 million, have displaced, have dispossessed the native-born.