

The Republican Club of Sun City

NEWSLETTER

August 2017

Everett Schmidt, Editor
(Subjects in this newsletter: ObamaCare Rules, Impeachment Process, Lying as Virtue)

Sun City Texas

CONGRESSMAN CARTER TO ADDRESS CLUB

Congressman John Carter, representing Congressional District 31, will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for **Thursday, August 24** in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City.

According to Wikipedia, Carter was appointed a judge of the 277th District Court of Williamson County in 1981. He was elected to that post a year later – the first Republican elected to a countywide position in Williamson County.

He retired from the bench in 2001 in order to run for Congress in the newly created (at that time) 31st Congressional District. He was successful in that endeavor and has won the subsequent elections. Now in his 8th term, he is an announced candidate for another term.

Congressman Carter is Chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations, and is in his fourth term as Co-Chairman of the bipartisan House Army Caucus. He also serves on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and Science. He has been a member of the House Appropriations Committee since 2004. He also serves on the House Republican Steering Committee which determines what committees in the House Republican members will be placed on.

He and his wife Erica have four adult children, six grandchildren and live in Round Rock.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE MEETING OF AUGUST 24

BEGINNING TIMES: Doors Open – 5:45 pm; Social Period – 6:00 pm; Dinner – 6:30 pm; Program – 7:00 pm

MENU: King ranch casserole, caesar salad, corn casserole, green bean casserole, garlic cheese bread

COST: Dinner fee is \$18 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**, or left in special drop box located on the front porch of the home of club treasurer Gene Edwards at 202 Duck Creek Lane. For information, contact Gene at 520-990-1159 or geneedwards@earthlink.net The deadline for payment or reservations is Friday, August 18.

Attendees are reminded of the request made by the Executive Committee that advanced payments for the dinner be submitted by the payment deadline so the proper amount of food can be ordered, and that attendees who have made reservations in advance make payments prior to the meeting, when possible, so that a “boggling down” of the line at the ballroom entrance can be avoided.

VISITORS ARE WELCOME! (Non-members may attend a maximum of two meetings per year – as attendees for the dinner or as observers for the program – without having to pay membership dues.)

EXPERT ON POLITICS AND RULERS OF MID-EASTERN COUNTRIES TO ADDRESS CLUB IN SEPTEMBER

Robert W. Jordan, former ambassador to Saudi Arabia, author and TV commentator, will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for **Thursday, September 7** in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City. His address is expected to center on the politics and rulers of mid-eastern countries and Islam as a factor in American and world affairs, all timely topics given the uncertainties in America and the world today.

Details of that meeting and the speaker's background will be provided in the September newsletter.

OTHER CLUB NEWS

Election of Next Year's Officers. Pursuant to Article VIII of club bylaws President Chiles appointed a Nominating Committee consisting of Meredith Chiles and Cathy Cody (as Executive Committee members), and Bill Harron, Brian Olson and Jan Whitlow (as non-officers) which will submit a list of nominees for each of the club's officer positions at the October meeting. Members of the club are invited to contact a member of this committee if they wish to be considered for a nominee position or to submit the name of another club member for consideration. The first meeting of the committee is scheduled for September 8.

The election will be held during the November meeting.

Statistics. Vice president (for membership) Cathy Cody reports that membership for 2017 currently stands at 381. Club treasurer Gene Edwards reports there were 134 attendees at the July dinner meeting, plus an additional 9 individuals attending as observers.

Procedure to Join Club. To join the club, simply fill out and submit an application available at the club's web site, rcsctx.com, or complete the membership procedure at a club meeting.

August Meeting. Club president Chiles will be out of town during the August 24 club meeting; consequently, vice president Cody will preside at that meeting.

HEALTHCARE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THEIR STAFFS: SHOULD CONGRESS LIVE UNDER THE RULES IT IMPOSES ON US?

Foreword. According to Fred Lucas of the Daily Signal, Congress has exempted 535 lawmakers and their more than 13,000 staffers from the requirements of ObamaCare imposed upon citizens, done by treating themselves "as is they were a small business employing fewer than 50 workers!"

How this situation came about is complicated; however, reports reveal the following entities, in addition to Congress, were involved: Office of Personnel Management, President Obama the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program, and the District of Columbia. A term in the current vernacular may describe this situation. That term: "Collusion."

A *Wall Street Journal* editorial appearing in the August 2 issue appeared to provide the easiest to understand and most comprehensive description of this situation. Consequently, excerpts from that editorial follow in order that the reader may have information on this timely subject:

A 2009 amendment from Chuck Grassley (R., Iowa) forced congressional employees to obtain coverage from the Affordable Care Act exchanges. The Senate Finance Committee adopted it unanimously.

This meant Members and their staffs would no longer enjoy coverage from the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, which subsidizes up to 75% of the cost of the plan. The text of the Affordable Care Act says that staffers may "only" be offered plans created by the law or on the exchanges.

The law did not specify what would happen to the employer contributions, though Democrats claim this was merely a copy-editing mistake. A meltdown ensued as Members feared that staffers would be exposed to thousands of dollars more in annual health-care costs, replete with predictions that junior aides would clean out their desks en masse.

Mr. Obama intervened in 2013 and the Office of Personnel Management issued a rule that would allow employer contributions to exchange plans, not that OPM had such legal authority. One hilarious detail is that OPM certified the House and Senate as "small businesses" with fewer than 50 full-time employees . . . This invention allowed Members to purchase plans on the District of Columbia exchange for small businesses, where employers can make contributions to premiums. This is a farce and maybe a fraud.

Mr. Trump could direct OPM to scrap the rule for Members, which is reversible because Mr. Obama reworked his own law through regulation that can be undone by a successor.

"HIGH CRIMES & MISDEMEANORS" AS GROUNDS FOR IMPEACHMENT

Foreword. It is abundantly clear that not only Democrats, but also a number of Republicans, the media, universities, and a host of other groups and individuals want to drive President Trump from office. Indeed, that may be the primary objective of the present Mueller investigation.

The primary – and perhaps the only – device available to remove a sitting president is impeachment. Consequently, what follows are comments, now timely, made on that subject by Andrew McCarthy, widely known as the successful prosecutor of a Muslim terrorist who carried out a bombing in New York in the 1990s. McCarthy is currently a writer for *National Review*.

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." He continues: "Because impeachment is a political remedy, its most essential component is the popular 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 . . . 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. To be noted is that the driving subject in the Clinton impeachment was his sexual misbehavior, which did not particularly affect his approval ratings.

The Impeachment of President Clinton. In January of 1999 the Senate considered and then declined to convict President Clinton on two articles of impeachment sent to it by the House. One of the articles was for perjury in a trial involving the sexual harassment of Paula Jones. The other was for evading the House Judiciary Committee's questions regarding his sexual shenanigans with White House aide Monica Lewinsky.

The failure to convict was entirely predictable. One indicator was polling data. Chief Counsel David Shippers reports in his book that exit polls of the day showed that two out of every three Americans opposed the impeachment of the President. "It was obvious from the outset that the Republican leadership was totally at the mercy of the polls. As long as the president's approval rating remained high, the Republican leaders were not about to rock the boat."

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott said to Henry Hyde, House Judiciary Committee chairman, "Henry, you're not going to dump that garbage on us."

According to Schippers, "In short, a trial, in the normal sense of the word, never even took place in the Senate. We were left to present three relatively short and harmless depositions." There would be no live testimony on evidence, all because the Republicans wanted so badly to look "fair." Had there been a real trial [with live witnesses] in the Senate, the American people would have heard all about this [alleged rapes of Juanita Broaddrick and Kathleen Willey]"

If there is to be an effort in the House to impeach a president, the controlling phrase used in that effort will come from Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution where the grounds for impeachment can be found. Those stated grounds are "treason," "bribery," or "other high crimes and misdemeanors."

Even the lay person will have at least some conception of the definition of the terms "treason" and "bribery," but what does the phrase, "other high crimes and misdemeanors" mean?

McCarthy provides some help when he points out the phrase does not pertain to the ordinary crimes and misdemeanors like he used when he was a prosecutor. Quoting founder Alexander Hamilton, McCarthy contends the phrase refers to "political wrongs of public men." More specifically, it refers to "breaches of the fiduciary duty, of the immense trust that's reposed in the President."

There are historical reasons for the current confusion about the meaning of that phrase. Legal scholar Charles L. Black, Jr. explains that the phrase "comes to us out of English law and practice; starting (as far as we know) in 1386, it frequently figured in impeachment of officers. (Think of it: Its use began more than 600 years ago!) It seems within the realm of possibilities that the phrase would have had some meaning to the framers of the Constitution, but that its meaning, by now, has been seriously clouded or even lost.

Nevertheless, there appears to be no reason why that phrase could not be used in connection with any impeachment proceedings which may begin in the future.

IS LYING NOW ACCEPTED AS VIRTUE? (Are Democrats and Republicans Equally Guilty of Lying?)

Foreword. There have been verbal attacks on elected officials and candidates for office, by both individuals and the media, which have no basis in fact. They are lies! Yet lying seems to be accepted – if not praised – in much of today's culture.

Why is that? This report attempts to provide some answers to that question.

The Sullivan Rule. One of the first requirements to understand the answers to that question is to have some understanding of the "Sullivan Rule" - at least as it pertains to public figures, such as elected officials. Veteran reporter Charley Reese, shortly before he died, made the following observations in an op-ed piece in 2004:

When I was a young reporter, there was only one defense against a charge of libel: the truth. Before you accused anyone of any wrongdoing, you had to have evidence that would stand up in court. Even if you "knew" the party was guilty, if you couldn't prove it, then you wrote nothing.

During the 1960s, however, the Supreme Court changed the rules. The so-called Sullivan rule set up two unequal classes of people: public figures and private people. The old rule, that the only defense against libel was the truth, still applied to private people. However, if you were a public figure, you had to prove not only that the libelous statement was false, but also that it was published with malice. Since malice is a state of mind, that is very difficult to do.

This one Supreme Court decision – which has, like so many of the court's decisions, no basis in the Constitution – ushered in what I call the era of cheap-shop journalism.

This made it open season on celebrities and public officials. It is one reason, I believe, that it has become increasingly difficult to persuade decent and honest people to run for public office. They know their privacy can be invaded and that they can be pilloried by the press with no real recourse.

Importance of This Report. Columnist David Limbaugh probably reflects the sentiments of virtually all conservative Republicans when he says in regard to the claim that both parties equally lie. Concerned about the deleterious effect of lying by elected officials on the best interests of the nation, he says, "This is an insidious path we're on, for when you effectively glorify lying in politics, you are disenfranchising the people."

Do Democrats and Republicans Equally Lie? A rhetorical question for the reader: Can he or she cite any incidents of lying on the part of Republicans equal in number or in seriousness to the following partial list of some of the more notorious acts of lying or deception by Democrats of rank:

- The primary election of 1948 when Lyndon Johnson – who was complicit in the coverup of fraud – won his race by 87 votes which suddenly appeared several days after the conclusion of the election.
- Bill Clinton lying under oath in a court proceeding about his affair with an intern.
- Obama's lies too numerous to mention, including lies about Americans being able to keep their insurance and their doctors, and many other lies suggesting he is a pathological liar.
- Hillary Clinton's lies – also too numerous and well-publicized to mention here.
- Harry Reid, while Senate majority leader, lying about Romney not paying taxes.
- Four of Illinois' last 7 governors were convicted and sent to prison.

Why the Seeming Toleration of Hillary Clinton's Lies? *Wall Street Journal* columnist Bret Stephens, in an op-ed piece titled “Hillary and the Liberal Way of Lying,” offers the following rationale to the question just posed: “For you and me, the Clinton lies were statements demonstrably at variance with the truth . . . But to the “initiated” [those smart enough to see through it all] . . . lying was for the greater good, usually to fend off some form of Republican malevolence . . . Why moralize when they [her supporters] could collude?”

Perception v. Truth Regarding Racial Matters. Columnist Dennis Praeger submits some observations regarding the damage which follows when perception is substituted for truth: “Many blacks see racism almost everywhere – especially in arrest, conviction, incarceration rates, and in white police interactions with blacks. On the other hand, whites (especially whites who are not on the left) think that white racism has largely been conquered.”

Continues Praeger: “It is difficult to overstate how damaging [the reliance upon perception alone] is. It denies the very existence of the two pillars of civilization – objective truth and moral truth.” With the left, neither truth nor morality exists. Like truth, morality is just perception. Consequently, in the aftermath of the riots which followed Ferguson's grand just decision, there is only black perception and white perception.

The Application of Alinsky's Rules for Radicals by Leftists. Alinsky's book has been and continues to be the “Bible” for much of the left, including Obama, Hillary Clinton and other leftists. Consistent with much of the foregoing, Alinsky states that the organizer or politician “does not have a fixed truth – truth to him is relative and changing.” Is it possible that Alinsky's teaching accounts for much of the lying at or approaching a pathological level by Obama and Clinton?

But Alinsky's advice extends beyond merely defining truth; it extends to aggressive tactics which have been used by leftists for their purposes. Columnist Pete Peterson, writing in the *Wall Street Journal*, describes some of the tactics he had noted:

Arizona Rep. Raul Grijalva, the ranking Democrat on the House Natural Resources Committee, sent letters to seven university presidents, ostensibly seeking information on their professors who had given congressional testimony that failed to endorse the left's wisdom about climate change, a favorite agenda item for leftists. But the inquiry was not for information; it was for the purpose of intimidating, as Alinsky advocated. This tactic of targeting institutions and their leaders (the presidents) – *instead of the professors* – is pure Alinsky.

And so are the scare tactics . . . such as asking, without a basis for doing so, if the professors had accepted funding from oil companies, and then following the initial inquiry with phone calls. A relevant Alinsky rule now comes into play: “Power is not only what you have but what the enemy thinks you have.”

An yet another Alinsky rule comes into play. Alinsky recommended irreverence, ridicule and deception, saying, “Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, polarize it.”

How did Alinsky's tactics gain such traction specifically with the left? To understand the answer, one must be aware that when there is a fair debate forum, the conservatives, being more realistic and logical and less emotional, may have the stronger argument. The left, not always able to respond to intellectual challenge, is forced to employ Alinsky tactics.

Conclusions. Limbaugh contends, “It's inevitable that the side that believes in moral relativism and the end-justifies-the-means would lie more often.” Currently, one side exhibits more and more hostility toward the Judeo-Christian tenets, while the other side is aware of and can feel pangs of conscience by the Commandment, “Do Not Bear False Witness,” which Praeger contends should be controlling in all situations, saying:

The most important ingredient to building a moral society is truth, both inside and outside the courtroom. The prohibition against “bearing false witness” does not only demand that truth reign supreme in a trial, but that it is a societal value throughout the culture. Bad things happen when people believe lies. With truth, we can build a decent society. Without it, even the other nine commandments won't help.