

The Republican Club of Sun City NEWSLETTER

April 2014

Everett Schmidt, Editor

Sun City, Texas

FOUNDER OF THE HEIDI GROUP TO ADDRESS CLUB

Carol Everett, president and founder of The Heidi Group, will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday, April 10 in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City.

The Heidi Group is comprised of a group of mainly inner city crisis pregnancy centers named after one of Everett's own children that she aborted in 1973. She founded that group in 1955 after having been both a consumer and provider of abortion services, and after experiencing a conversion which came about when she came to know Jesus Christ as her personal savior.

Formed to address the plight of women considering abortion, The Heidi Group centers offer parenting classes, Bible studies, counseling and prenatal care.

She has appeared on a number of national broadcasting programs, and has the distinction of being summoned as an expert witness in courts of law throughout our nation, testifying in Washington, D.C., and numerous state capitals.

She has been a major contributor to the nation's slow but discernible change in the nation's attitude toward protecting the unborn as expressed in the following excerpt from the Texas GOP platform: "All innocent life must be respected and safeguarded – from fertilization to natural death . . ."

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 grilled chicken breasts with white wine glaze, jeweled wild rice with cranberries, green beans with almonds, spring salad and assorted rolls.

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 of reservations is Friday, April 4.

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

OTHER CLUB NEWS

Club treasurer John Congdon reports that the number of attendees at the March 13 dinner meeting was 145, with an additional 40 attendees as spectators.

Club vice president (for membership) Bill Chiles reports the current number of members is 236.

RELIGIOUS LEADERS SUBMIT BRIEFS REGARDING HOBBY LOBBY CASE

World reports that groups from all sides in the Hobby Lobby case had filed 82 briefs for the Supreme Court clerks to read and for the Justices to select from that number those briefs they, themselves, wished to read.

One such brief was submitted by religious organizations and religious leaders. The thoughts expressed in that brief are pertinent not only in regard to the understanding the significance of the phrase "religious liberty" as used in the First Amendment when applied to the Hobby Lobby case, but to a host of "religious liberty" cases yet to be litigated.

The brief, explaining some of the *theological* issues of that case, can be helpful in overcoming some of the limitations present when the issues are described only in terms of legalize.

It can also provide useful information to counter the deception created by President Obama, Hillary Clinton and other leftists when they say they are all for the "freedom to *worship*," when the inference of their terminology is that religion is to be carried out *withing the confines of the four walls of a church*. The brief explains that "religious liberty" has no such limitations.

Following are excerpts of the "Summary Argument" section from the brief as published by *World*.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This brief demonstrates, historically and theologically, that requiring a Protestant Christian to choose between violating the Government's regulations or violating his sincerely held religious beliefs substantially burdens his exercise of religion in violation of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

A fundamental aspect of Christian doctrine is its requirement that faith must govern every aspect of a Christian's life. As a matter of scriptural teaching, church tradition, denominational requirement, and conscience, the exercise of the Christian religion must guide and determine a Christian's decisions, choices, words, and deeds, both in private and in every aspect of life.

The holistic nature of the Christian faith extends to a believer's vocation. The Christian doctrine of vocation teaches that all work – whether overtly sacred or ostensibly secular – is spiritual activity, that Christians are called by God to specific occupations and businesses, and that Christians must conduct themselves in their vocations in accordance with their Christian beliefs. A Christian may not simply check his faith at the workplace door. Accordingly, Christian business owners, as a matter of scriptural requirement, are obligated to conduct their businesses as an expression of their faith and in accordance with the dictates of faith and conscience.

The theological requirement that Christians comply with scriptural commands in their occupation prohibits not only direct and personal wrongdoing, but also the enabling, authorizing, or aiding of another in doing what the Christian believes to be sin. Christian doctrine teaches that one who knowingly aids or abets another's wrongdoing has himself done wrong. Accordingly, a statute or regulation requiring a Christian business owner's complicity in conduct that his or her faith teaches is morally wrong forces a Christian into an impossible position and imposes a substantial burden on his or her exercise of religion.

THREE-QUARTERS OF YOUNG ADULTS NOT FIT FOR U. S. MILITARY A Result of a Liberal-Driven Culture

According to a March 2014 article in the *Austin American-Statesman*, an expert on counterinsurgency warfare, Bing West, who was commenting on the consequences of possibly reinstating the draft, stated a whopping “75 percent of young adults cannot join the military!”

Believing that figure may be high, the editors of the *PolitiFact.com* section checked on the veracity of West's contention. The editors found that the report came from a 2009 report by a group of 89 retired military officers, including a former Navy Secretary, and officers from generals to chief petty officers and sergeant majors.

The newspaper editors, after investigation, concluded, “we rate the statement [of West] as True,” and stated further that, “The Defense Department and a nongovernmental organization have both done research that supports his claim.”

Following are excerpts from the newspaper article which can provide some insight into what can account for this shocking statistic:

The report said increasing obesity among Americans ages 17 to 24, declining high school graduation rates and criminal backgrounds were severely narrowing the number of applicants who could meet then armed forces' academic and physical health standards for recruits.

One in four young Americans lacks a high school diploma, it said, and 30 percent of those who have one and try to enlist fail the military's math and reading tests.

It is estimated that 27 percent of those between 17 and 24 could not hit the armed forces' weight limits and 32 percent had other health problems, such as asthma, poor eyesight or hearing or attention deficit disorders, that ruled them out for military service.

The report also said about 10 percent of the potential military service population was ineligible because of at least one felony or serious misdemeanor.

Curtis Gilroy, from the office of the undersecretary for defense for personnel and readiness, told the U. S. House Armed Services Committee much of the same, only stating the statistics a bit differently: “We find that only 25 percent of our young people today, aged 17 to 24, are qualified for military service.”

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NATION'S NEXT LEADERS: THE MILLENNIALS

What will the nation be like when they become its leaders?

Individuals born during the period 1980-2000 are generally referred to as the "Millennial Generation." Because their ages (roughly 13 to 33) correspond with the ages of many of the potential draftees described in the above article, this report should be construed as a supplement to that article.

The purpose of these reports is to provide the reader with some insights as to the direction the nation is now moving and will likely move in the future.

The Millennials. There are currently nearly 78 million Millennials, a group just slightly larger than the Baby Boom generation, those born from 1946 to 1964.

Millennials are already having an impact on business, the workplace, churches and other organizations. They also are impacting politics, having voted for Barack Obama in the last two elections in significant numbers.

Kirby Anderson, author and talk-show host, describes some of the important characteristics of the Millennials, a sampling of which follows:

- **Of those in their twenties who are high school graduates, 30 percent have a college degree. That's the highest rate ever recorded.**
- **On the negative side, they show high rates of narcissism. Writer Jean Twenge has written about the "narcissism epidemic." She and others describe soaring rates of self-obsession.**
- **This is a generation that is also uninhibited. They are much more likely than previous generations to be open about the intimate details of their lives. After all, they post intimate details on Facebook and post videos many of us would consider embarrassing on YouTube. This also explains (in part) why they don't have much concern about privacy issues.**
- **They view marriage differently. They are marrying later, if at all. The average age for first marriage has increased approximately five years since 1970 for both men and women. A significant majority of them will cohabit at least once prior to marriage. And they are much more accepting homosexuality.**
- **They also appear to be the least religious generation in American history. They may say that they are spiritual, but only a small fraction of them say that is important in their lives. The sad reality is that most Millennials don't think about religion at all.**
- **When it comes to marriage, Millennials are still optimistic about it even though they grew up in a world where divorce was common. Surveys show that most Millennials plan to marry once or not at all.**
- **Millennials also view marriage differently in part because of the political battles concerning same-sex marriage and the definition of marriage. In one survey Millennials were asked to respond to this statement: "I see nothing wrong with two people of the same gender getting married." Six in ten agreed with the statement.**
- **The Millennial generation has been influenced by media and technology like no other generation.**
- **Millennials often have a negative view of the church. They view the church as anti-homosexual, judgmental, political and hypocritical. They see born-again Christians in a negative light.**
- **Most in this generation are lonely – because their relationships are mostly on the surface.**
- **They are also stressed out. One fourth of Millennials feel unfulfilled in life and nearly half say they are stressed out. This is twice the level of baby boomers. One very tragic result of this stress is the suicide rate. Suicide is the third leading cause of death among the 15 to 24 years olds.**
- **The Millennial generation is the least religious generation in American history. They are likely to have a syncretistic belief system. In other words, they will take portions of belief from various faiths and non-faiths and blend them together into a unique spiritual system.**

HAS THE FRAMERS' CONCEPT OF "LIBERTY" BEEN CORRUPTED?

Caveat. In this report the terms "liberty" and "freedom" are considered synonymous and are used interchangeably.

Foreword. To provide maximum focus on this report, the reader is asked to differentiate to himself or herself or to a companion - the following terms:

Liberty Ordered Liberty License

Then, after the following material is read, estimate which of the above concepts was predominate in the minds of our founders and framers, and which are predominate in today's world.

Our forefathers had access to the thoughts of two philosophers who had conflicting views about "liberty" which continue to this very day:

John Stuart Mill: "Liberty consists of doing what one desires."

Edmund Burke: "The only liberty, I mean is a liberty connected with order [ordered liberty]; that not only exists along with order and virtue, but cannot exist at all without them."

There are thoughts from contemporary writers and thinkers believe constitutes "liberty," a sampling of which follows:

MARVIN OLASKY

- Liberty means the opportunity to do what we ought to do, not the liberty to do what we might desire at the moment. If we constantly indulge ourselves, we are slaves of our wants.
- Political philosopher Michael Novak has pointed out that in the Anglo American tradition the goal has been liberty under law, not liberty from law.
- To come at it one other way: The 1904 version of "America the Beautiful" proclaims, "Confirm thy soul in self-control, thy liberty in law." . . . Two centuries ago, the antonym to "liberty" that sprang to people's lips was not "slavery" but "license."

ROBERT P. GEORGE

- A free person is enslaved neither to the sheer will of another *nor to his own appetites and passions*. A free person lives uprightly, fulfilling his obligations to family, community nation and God. By contrast, a person given over to his appetites and passions, a person who scoffs at truth and chooses to live, whether openly or secretly, in defiance of the moral law is not free. He is simply a different kind of slave.
- The so-called freedom celebrated today by so many of our opinion-shaping elites in education, entertainment and the media is simply the license to do whatever one pleases
- If freedom is to be honored and respected, it must be because human freedom is what is required by the laws of nature and nature's God; it cannot be because there are no laws of nature and there is no God.

ROBERT BORK

- Moral anarchy [a void of morality in culture] is usually discussed as favoring liberty. It should not be. As such things as incessant vulgarity, obscenity and pornography, rap music celebrating the violent abuse of women and the killing of police proliferate, persons who want to live and raise families in a decent environment are deprived of a crucial liberty – one that they have tried to preserve through laws and regulation, only to find themselves overruled by courts entranced by the liberal ethos . . . A few of the areas in which this is most clearly perceived are speech, religion, and sexuality.
- It is now clear that it is the courts that threaten our liberty – the liberty to govern ourselves – more profoundly than does any legislature.

HAVE THE COURTS ELIMINATED LEGISLATION BASED ON MORALITY?

The Fateful Ruling on a Texas Law. Today's Supreme Court, if it hears a case on morality, will have to consider the precedent of the 2003 *Lawrence v. Texas* case which involved a Texas law prohibiting sodomy. The court in that case didn't rely on "privacy" or "religion" doctrines, as may have been expected. Instead it relied on the "liberty interests" of two homosexuals and thereby overthrew the Texas law. In doing so, it reversed itself on a significant previous holding (Bowers) and spawned a new legal precedent.

Prior to the *Lawrence* case, the court was, with respect to moral issues, able to concur with state laws on the basis that they were presumed to be correct (leaving the other side the burden of proving otherwise), as long as there was a rational basis for them.

Those considerations, however, were rejected in the *Lawrence* case on grounds that a "liberty interest" should be controlling, and on what constitutes a "liberty interest" should – unbelievably – be left up to the individual. The basis of that holding was the following passage (referred to by Justice Scalia with derision as the "sweet-mystery-of-life" passage) written by Justice Kennedy for the court majority: "At the heart of liberty, is the right to define one's own concept of existence, or meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life."

Justice Scalia contends that the jurisprudence emanating from the *Lawrence* case virtually prohibits states from passing laws dealing with moral issues, including bigamy, adultery, adult incest, bestiality and obscenity." This situation can explain much of the leftward drift of the country.

The DOMA Decision. The Supreme Court, when it struck down certain aspects of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), the 5-4 majority established certain legal viewpoints which are bound to surface in future cases involving homosexuals. For example, the writer of the majority opinion, Justice Kennedy, while not *directly* interfering with a state's prerogative to regulate marriage, wrote that the only reason Congress had passed DOMA was to improperly "disparage," "injure," "degrade," "demean" and "humiliate" gay and lesbian Americans.

Apparently believing such attacks were calculated to instigate states – not the federal courts – to permit same-sex marriage, Justice Scalia responded as follows to those attacks:

As far as this Court is concerned, no one should be fooled; it is just a matter of listening and waiting for the other shoe.

By formally declaring anyone opposed to same-sex marriage an enemy of human decency, the majority arms well every challenger to a state law restricting marriage to its traditional definition.

The Hostility Toward Religion. During a February gala celebrating George Washington's birthday, Justice Scalia commented on several topics relating to courts and the federal government, including the present hostility toward religion.

First, he weighed in on the relationship between religious ideals and good government:

- Let me make clear that I am not saying that every good American must believe in God. What I am saying, however, is that it is contrary to our founding principles to insist that government be hostile to religion. Or even to insist, as my court, alas, has done, that government cannot favor religion over nonreligion.
- It is not a matter of believing that God exists, though personally I believe that. It is a matter of believing, as our founders did, that belief in God is very conducive to a successful republic.

Second, he commented on the bond between good government and the vigor of the people for a good government – this is what is often referred to as a sense of civic republicanism:

- You know what I worry most about is the decline of the republican spirit.
- It doesn't exist in our people with a vigor that used to exist. That's what I'm most worried about, that we're going to become just another, I don't know, another undemocratic, politician-run state. Which our framers would never have supported.

Lastly, what is at fault, in part, of the decline of this spirit .

- He lamented that most students in elite law school classes he speaks at have never read the Federalist Papers. It is truly appalling that they should have reached graduate school without having been exposed to that important element of their national patrimony, the work that best explains the reasons and objective of the constitution.

THE EFFORTS OF THE LEFT TO DESTROY THE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

Columnist Jeffrey Kuhner makes some pertinent observations about the ongoing effort by the left to destroy the nation's Judeo-Christian culture:

From its inception, Marxism has been in a life-death struggle with Christianity. "Religion is the opiate of the masses," Karl Marx said. For Marx, secular enlightenment and personal liberation could only be achieved if the "primitive superstitions" of Christian dogma were swept into the dustbin of history.

Capitalism, private property, the nation-state and the traditional family – all rest upon the Judeo-Christian moral order. Marxists have understood one seminal truth: destroy a religion and you destroy the culture and civilization it spawned.

This is why modern liberals relentlessly advance the sexual revolution characterized by individual gratification, abortion on demand and birth control. Sexual permissiveness – the Godless libertine society – and not the international proletariat is the true agent of radical change.

In fact, the founder of the Bolshevik Revolution, Vladimir Lenin, deliberately promoted open marriage, abortion, birth control and militant secularism as a means of social engineering. For Lenin, religion was the enemy.