

# The Republican Club of Sun City NEWSLETTER

November 2018

Everett Schmidt, Editor  
(Website: rcsctx.com)

Sun City Texas

(Topics in this newsletter: Sullivan Rule, Ten Commandments, Gosnell movie)

## AUTHOR, HISTORIAN, FORMER VP OF TEXAS REPUBLICAN PARTY TO ADDRESS CLUB NOVEMBER 29

David Barton, a widely-read author, historian and lecturer on subjects relating to the founding of this country, a former vice president of the Texas Republican party, and founder of Wallbuilders, a national organization that spotlights via media devices America's Judeo-Christian foundation and heritage, and an individual who, in 2005, was identified by *Time* magazine as being in America among "The 25 Most Influential Evangelicals," will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for **Thursday, November 29 in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City.**

Barton's address, titled "Keeping Truth in History," is expected to illustrate how an honest appraisal of the history of America can be helpful in understanding the clash of worldviews, the resistance to the tenets of America's founding, the secularization, and other such issues with which the nation must now deal.

While one can hear highly credentialed individuals pontificate about the recent election, their backgrounds may reveal a bias or lack of understanding about the tenets of the nation's founding – especially as they relate to the Judeo-Christian influence – and their backgrounds may not include contacts with the "real world," their contacts being primarily with colleagues in the media or in academe. Barton, however, in addition to having a solid background in the history of America, also has vast experience with the "real world," as evidenced by the following experiences:

- Barton addresses well over 400 groups each year. During a court proceeding involving a defamation law suit he initiated, he testified that for two decades since 1991, he gave some 8,000 speeches!
- He is author of numerous books on timely matters, such as "Original Intent," "Restraining Judicial Activism," "Separation of Church and State," and a host of other books on timely topics.
- Through Wallbuilders, he a producer and supplier of numerous DVDs and other media products on such topics as "America's Godly Heritage," "Common Core," "A Nation Adrift," and other timely topics.
- He presents via Wallbuilders a live daily radio program, co-hosted by former state Representative Rick Green, on current events.
- He served for several terms on the Textbook Adoption Committee established by the Texas State Board of Education. He was frequently reported in the press to have taken issue with the Texas Freedom Network and other leftist groups and individuals about various historical matters to appear in textbooks.

Barton and his wife Cheryl reside in Aledo, Texas. They have three married children and three grandchildren. (For information about the various products mentioned above, access [Wallbuilders.com](http://Wallbuilders.com) or call 800-873-2845. To contact the radio show, which can be heard on 89.9FM, access [WallbuildersLive.com](http://WallbuildersLive.com))

### INFORMATION ABOUT THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 29

**BEGINNING TIMES: Doors Open – 5:45 pm; Social Period – 6:00 pm; Dinner – 6:30 pm; Program – 7:00 pm**  
**MENU:** Lasagna with meat marinara, caesar salad and garlic toast. Option is grilled chicken with choice of two dressings.

**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, PMB 227, Georgetown, TX 78633**, or left in a 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](mailto:geneedwards@earthlink.net) [The deadline for payment or reservations is Friday, November 23](#), but note the post office will not deliver mail on November 22.

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.

## CLUB WILL NOT MEET IN DECEMBER

Following a practice of many years standing, the club will not meet in December. The next meeting (after the November meeting) is scheduled for **Thursday, January 17, 2019, in the ballroom of the Social Center** when the speaker will be William J. Federer, nationally-known speaker, author and frequent guest on nationally-broadcast TV and radio programs.

Information about the January meeting will be provided in the January 2019 newsletter tentatively scheduled to be distributed the last week of December 2018. A calendar of 2019 meetings is provided below.

## MEMBERSHIP DRIVE FOR 2019 CONTINUES

Current 2018 members wishing to renew their memberships for 2019 or individuals wishing to become new members for 2019 are asked to submit a completed membership forms along with their payments of the \$20 per person membership fee to the club at the address shown above under "COST" or to Brian Olson, VP – membership, at a club meeting, or as otherwise indicated. Membership forms are available at the club's website, rcscctx.com, at club meetings and otherwise.

Individuals who were club members in 2018 will have their names kept on the communications list (to receive newsletter and other communications) until February 28, 2019. If they have not renewed by that date, their names will be removed from that list. They can, of course, renew their memberships any time during 2019.

**Membership Requirements.** Any resident or non-resident of Sun City "who believes in the philosophy of the Republican Party and in the objectives of this [club] is eligible for membership as an Active Member (if a resident of Sun City) or as an Associate Member (if a non-resident of Sun City) upon payment of membership dues which are now payable for the year 2019.

**Club Objectives.** According to club bylaws, the objectives of this club include the following: "(1) to promote an informed electorate . . . through political education, (2) to foster loyalty to the Republican Party and to promote its principles and candidates in all elections, including non-partisan elections, and (3) to work for the election of Republican Party nominees."

## SCHEDULE OF CLUB MEETINGS IN 2019 ANNOUNCED

Following is the schedule of club meetings for 2019. While there are some differences concerning the nights of the week the club meets and the time between meetings, it should be noted that all of the meetings are scheduled for the ballroom of the Social Center.

<u>MONTH</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>DAY</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
January	17	Thursday	Ballroom	
February	22	Friday	Ballroom	
March	28	Thursday	Ballroom	
April	18	Thursday	Ballroom	
May	8	Wednesday	Ballroom	"An Evening With Lt. Col. Allen B. West"*
June	5	Wednesday	Ballroom	
July	18	Thursday	Ballroom	
August	14	Wednesday	Ballroom	
September	11	Wednesday	Ballroom	
October	16	Wednesday	Ballroom	
November	20	Wednesday	Ballroom	
December	No Meeting			

\*This meeting is a special event sponsored by the club and will feature an address by Col. West , a popular and dynamic speaker who promotes the traditional values of America. Tentative plans call for tickets to this event to be sold to local club members, to members of area Republican clubs and organizations, and to other interested individuals,

## OTHER CLUB NEWS

**Club to Elect Officers for 2019.** The Nominating Committee – consisting of Linda McDaniel (chairman), Carolyn Killebrew, Pam Olson, and Cathy Cody – in accordance with Article VIII of the bylaws, announced during the October 14 meeting its nominations for club officers for the year 2019 as follows:

President – Cathy Cody	Secretary – Carol Robertson
1 <sup>st</sup> Vice President (for programs) – Susie Johnson	Publicity Manager – Anne Marshall
2 <sup>nd</sup> Vice President (for membership) – Kathy Sweeney	Hospitality Director – Mary O'Hearn
Treasurer – Gene Edwards	

Voting will take place during the November 29 meeting. After the voting, a brief installation ceremony will be held. Nominations from the floor can be submitted, provided they are submitted in accordance with the requirements of Article VIII, Section 2 of the bylaws.

**Statistics.** Brian Olson, VP for membership, reports that 2018 membership reached 433.

Gene Edwards, Treasurer, reports there were 150 attendees at the October meeting.

## IN MEMORIAM

The following 2018 club member is now deceased:

**Kathy Sanders**

May she rest in peace

# THE SULLIVAN RULE: WHAT IS IT? IS IT COUNTERPRODUCTIVE IN TODAY'S CULTURE? DOES IT DISCOURAGE CITIZENS FROM RUNNING FOR OFFICE?

**Foreword.** In 1964, in a case styled *New York Times v. Sullivan*, the Supreme Court promulgated a rule, one which came to be known as the "Sullivan Rule," which established a higher standard of malice which must be shown by public officials than the standard - known as the "Actual Malice Standard" - of malice which must be shown by private individuals in defamation cases. Those terms will be explained later, after some background.

Prior to that case, matters of libel (involving written material) and slander (involving spoken communications) were the province of states. However, there were indications that some Southern states were using defamation law suits, not as an effort to gain relief from defamation abuse, but, instead, as an effort to delay integration.

That case began when the *New York Times* published a full-page ad that suspected the arrest of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., for perjury in Alabama was part of a concerted effort to tear down King's efforts to integrate public facilities and encourage blacks to vote. The ad soon arouses the ire of a public official named L. B. Sullivan, the Montgomery city commissioner who filed a libel action against the *Times*.

Under the auspices of the Alabama laws, Sullivan won the case and received \$500,000 – and under the state's law did not even have to prove he had been harmed. Wikipedia reports, "Before this decision, there were nearly \$300,000,000 in libel actions from Southern states outstanding against news organizations, as part of a focused effort by Southern officials to use defamation lawsuits as a means of preventing critical coverage of civil rights issues in out-of-state publications."

Given this resistance by some of the Southern states, the intervention of the Supreme Court may have been unavoidable. That intervention led to the Court establishing what has come to be referred to as the "Actual Malice Standard" or the "Sullivan Rule" which is to be applied to public officials if they are to be successful in defamation law suits against publishers.

**The "Actual Malice Standard."** Legal author Steven Emmanuel describes that standard as follows: "The First Amendment prohibits a **public official** from recovering damages for a defamatory falsehood **relating to his official conduct** unless he proves that the statement was made with "**actual malice**" - that is, **with knowledge that it was false** or with **reckless disregard of whether it was false or not.**" (How can one "prove" an offending person had, as the dictionary defines it, "a desire to cause pain . . .")?

**The Sullivan Rule in Today's World.** While the Sullivan Rule may have been at one time justified in connection with the efforts of the nation to bring about complete integration of society, that rule may not now be effective - and even counterproductive – in light of very significant changes which have come about since the 1960s, such as:

- Responsible individuals may now be deterred from running for public office because of the experience of Justice Kavanaugh who had to face – apparently without recourse – uncorroborated charges which could have ruined his reputation and adversely affected his family. (And note that just recently, one of his accusers, Judy Munro-Leighton, now concedes she was not assaulted, contrary to her claim, reports Senate Judiciary Chairman Charles Grassley, who also reports that at least 4 requests for investigations about similar matters have been made to the Justice Department. It is not known if Kavanaugh could or should, under the circumstances, pursue a defamation lawsuit.
- With the severe erosion of the Judeo-Christian culture, the admonition "Do not bear false witness" of the Ten Commandments, which was promoted in 1960s, is seldom, if ever, publicly promoted today.
- In its place arise – at least among leftists – Alinsky's *Rules for Radicals* which include such admonitions as "truth is relative and changing," and "pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, polarize it," admonitions which purveyors of fake news on CNN and MSNBC and the like seem to be following when they assert charges of racist, homophobia, sexist, etc.
- From the *StudyMoose* website is the contention that the "actual malice standard" rule, at a minimum, encourages newspapers to take the risks then would not otherwise take of defaming people."

In the aftermath of the more than 50 years which have ensued since the Sullivan decision, there has been some variance of opinion on the question if there should be some adjustment of the holding in that case. Kenneth Paulson, Dean of the College of Mass Communication at Middle Tennessee State University, states the rule "changed American journalism. It set the stage for the boom in investigative reporting and truly invigorated the watchdog role of the press."

But a number of jurists have advocated a reconsideration of the Sullivan rule. Among them is one of the Justices who participated in the Sullivan decision, Justice Byron White, who notes "the public official's complaint will be dismissed unless he alleges and makes out a jury case of a knowing or reckless falsehood. Absent such

proof, there will be no jury verdict or judgment of any kind . . . The lie will stand . . . the public is left to conclude that the challenged statement was true after all . . . the rule plainly leaves the public official without a remedy for the damage to his reputation.” Chief Justice Warren Burger concurred with that view.

Veteran reporter Charley Reese made the following critical statement in an op-ed piece in 2004, shortly before he died:

*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 a 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.*

**Leftist Organizations.** The role of one leftist organization in attempting to influence education policy at the state level should be noted. One such organization, The Texas Freedom Network, has for years been a perennial combatant in hearings involving the content of books considered for adoption by a textbook committee appointed by the State Board of Education. The purpose of that organization is to indoctrinate school children with leftist ideology and eliminate or minimize the promotion of Judeo-Christian values. For example, the September 12, 2018 issue of the *Austin American-Statesman* contains mention of The Texas Freedom Network applauding an effort to “delete ‘Judeo-Christian’ and ‘Moses’ from standards that asked students to identify factors that influenced the founding of America.” A successful effort in that regard would have been tantamount to denying the language in the Declaration of Independence and the host of depictions of Moses and Biblical sayings which appear in the Supreme Court building and other government buildings.

In 2010, David Barton, a former member of the textbook adoption committee, initiated a defamation lawsuit against two Democrat candidates running for positions on the State Board of Education in Texas. Textbook committee meetings are often contentious because, as noted above, they often involve conflicting ideologies such as evolution, LGBT, religion and other matters of special interest to leftists, and particularly The Texas Freedom Network.

It was in connection with a race for positions on the State Board in 2010 that two Democrat candidates made charges that Barton was a white supremacist and otherwise biased. Barton, however, pushed back. He claimed in a court of law that such charges defamed him and should result in a one million dollar settlement. He was successful in that effort and, according to the American Family Association, donated that one million dollar settlement.

In addition to making the payment, the two Democrats issued an apology which, because it is so instructive and revealing, is reproduced in its entirety below:

**During our respective campaigns in 2010 for separate positions on the Texas State Board of Education, we published a video entitled: “A True Tale From Texas,” that created a false impression about David Barton. The purpose of that video was to discredit our Republican Party political opponents on the State Board of Education, and those on whom they relied, by depicting their position as politically extreme and detrimental to education. Thus, the video stated that David Barton, who advised the State Board of Education, is known for speaking at white supremacist rallies. We believed that statement had been fact-checked by our political consultant, Scott Garrison, who relied for confirmation solely on information provided him from The Texas Freedom Network. As professionals in education and the proper use of language, we understand that this statement suggested that David Barton is a white supremacist, and that the two organizations he is affiliated with, Wallbuilder Presentations, Inc. and WallBuilders L.L.C., were associated with or supportive of white supremacists. After learning more about Mr. Barton, we realize this statement was false. We separately and jointly apologize to Mr. Barton for damage to him individually and to his organizations as a result of that statement. (Source:L Warren Throckmorton, pantheos. Com)**

In a report appearing on the WorldNetDaily website in 2014, Barton explains some of the considerations he weighed before deciding to initiate a defamation lawsuit. Those considerations, some of which follow in italics, are instructive:

*A favored target of the secular left for decades, Barton considered a lawsuit 20 years ago “on some very easy to disprove lies.” However, as a public figure, he needed to do more than show that truth was on his side. He also had to demonstrate economic harm to prevail in court. And that, he said, meant hiring an economist for \$100,000 to document financial damage.*

*“We dropped pursuing anything at that time,” Barton recalled, “but over the last 20 years, it has continued to grow and snowball and one unrebutted, uncontested lie – because nothing happened – became bigger and greater, so people added more as they repeated themselves.”*

*“There were concerted efforts on Amazon book reviews and elsewhere to repeat those types of things, and that hurt sales,” Barton said.*

*When the real financial impact of his over-the-top- critics became clear, “We said, OK, it's time to put our foot down. This is something that does have economic consequences, not to mention character, reputation. And so that's where we decided to make the move and go after the lawsuit.”*

*While being able to show economic harm made it possible to go to court with a defamation claim, Barton said his real motive for bringing suit was to clear his name. “There's nothing greater than your reputation,” he said, adding that the biblical proverb, “a good name is to be chosen rather than great riches (Proverbs 22:1NKVJ) guided his decision to sue.”*

## **ALABAMA VOTERS APPROVE AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING POSTING OF TEN COMMANDMENTS**

**Foreword.** In June of 2005 the Supreme Court issued two rulings regarding the display of the Ten Commandments. In one case, *McCreary County v. ACLU*, involving the display of the Ten Commandments in two Kentucky court houses, the court said the displays violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment which, according to court interpretation, prohibits government from endorsing or supporting one religion above others. Consequently, those displays had to be removed.

The other Ten Commandments case, *Van Orden v. Perry*, involved a statute containing the Ten Commandments donated to the Texas government and placed on the 22 acre grounds outside the state capitol. A Texas court had ruled that the replica, given by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in 1961 and placed among more than a dozen non-religious monuments, did not violate the Establishment clause. The Supreme Court agreed with that conclusion.

In other words, the Ten Commandments and even biblical verses could be displayed if they are in a historical context as they are in the Supreme Court and other federal buildings. Consequently, the Commandments on the Texas capitol grounds did not have to be removed.

**Alabama's Constitutional Amendment.** On November 6, 2018, Alabama voters went to the polls to vote not only on various state and national candidates for office, but also on a Constitutional Amendment authorizing the display of the Ten Commandments on state property and property owned or administered by a public school or public body. As should be expected, the Amendment specifies certain of the characteristic of the display on the Texas grounds be included with Alabama display, as can be noted in the following description:

**Amendment 1 does two things. First, it provides that a person is free to worship God as he or she chooses, and that a person's religious beliefs will have no effect on his or her civil or political rights. Second, it makes clear that the Ten Commandments may be displayed on public property so long as the display meets constitutional requirements, such as being displayed along with historical or educational items. Amendment 1 also provides that no public funds may be used to defend this amendment in court.**

**Court Involvement in Display Issues.** Lower courts have issued a number of rulings regarding various displays of the Ten Commandment; however, according to Austin Cline in a 2017 article, the Supreme Court, “in their only actual ruling on this issue [the religious nature of the Commandments] prior to 2005 was the 1980 case of *Stone v. Graham* in which it “announced a three-part test for determining whether a statue is permissible under the Establishment Clause of the Constitution.” That test – which came to be known as the “Lemon Test” because the name of one of the litigants was “Lemon” - is as follows:

**First, the statute must have a secular legislative purpose; second, its principal or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion . . . ; finally, the statute must not foster ‘an excessive government entanglement with religion.’** *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (citations omitted). If a statute violates any of these three principles, it must be struck down under the Establishment Clause.

Constitutional law professor John Eidsmoe contends that if Alabama voters approve the proposed Amendment (which they did), there will likely be a court challenge based on contentions (1) that the Ten Commandments display constitutes a religious document that has no place in the public arena, and (2) that the state's Amendment singles out the Ten Commandments for legal protection, thus illegally preferring the Commandments over other religious documents. But Eidsmoe also contends there are valid ground for defending and upholding the Ten Commandments Amendment on non-religious grounds, citing the following points which, it should be noted, show the Commandments to be something other than – or in addition to – pure religion. His points follow:

- Martin Luther contended the Commandments summarized natural law principles that were written on the heart at the time of creation, hence is non-denominational. (This would be consistent with language in the Declaration)
- The Ten Commandments are not exclusively religious . . . they “have an undeniable historical meaning” contend both Justice Rehnquist and Justice Breyer.
- The Ten Commandments are a moral, civil and criminal code, as well as a religious document
- They are the basic principles of Western law
- The Ten Commandments do not belong to any single religion. They are sometimes identified with Christianity, but Moses received them on behalf of the Hebrews, and even Muslims and other religions accept them.

**Religious Reasons to Justify Posting.** In addition to the non-religious justifications for posting, are a number reasons based on religion; however, those reasons, to be successful, will necessitate a reversal of several holdings of the court, including the Everson case whence came the ruling based in large part on Jefferson's letter to the Danbury Baptists, familiar to most club members. Following are some related points:

- The Constitution states in part: “Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . .” Author David Lowenthal contends that to understand the meaning of “Establishment” one should be aware that at the time the Constitution was being drafted, several states actually had “religious establishments,” i.e., denominations. The framers wanted to be sure those state establishments would not be subject to modification or removal. Virtually all states – even today - have in their constitutions a reference to “God.”
- The late Chief Justice William Rehnquist made the following explanation about the Establishment Clause: “It forbade the establishment of a national religion and forbade preference among religious sects or denominations. [The Clause] did not require government neutrality between religion and irreligion . . . There is simply no historical foundation for the proposition that the framers intended to build the “wall of separation” that was constitutionalized in Everson...The “wall of separation between church and state’ is a metaphor based on bad history . . .It should be frankly and explicitly abandoned.”
- Judge Robert Bork observed, “The framers and ratifiers could not conceivably have anticipated that the Supreme Court, sitting in a courtroom with a painting of Moses and the Ten Commandments, would hold it an unconstitutional establishment of religion for a high school to have a copy of the Ten Commandments on a wall.”

It should be noted that the extent to which traditional Judeo-Christian religion is removed from the public square and the public schools, it is, ironically, replaced (at least informally) by other religions, including Secular Humanism – with its atheism, open borders and moral values based on “human experience” - which is specifically recognized as a religion by the Supreme Court.

#### EPILOG

The reader, as he or she reflects on this report, is asked to reflect on two questions: (1) Does the void created by the removal of the Ten Commandments from public display or even their recognition contribute to the present disintegration of families and society, to the increasing immorality, lawlessness, violence and lack of civility, and to other such problems? and (2) In the absence of the Ten Commandments, from what source do our legislators, citizens and school children develop a sense of good behavior and moral values?

### “GOSNELL: THE TRIAL OF AMERICA'S BIGGEST SERIAL KILLER”

#### A film revealing the horrors of abortion and the division of America on “life”

Differences among Americans on the issue of abortion and “life” are illustrated on the following chart provided by AFA which is based on statements in the Democrat and Republican platforms:

##### DEMOCRAT PARTY

Democrats are committed to protecting and advancing reproductive health, rights, and justice. We believe unequivocally that every woman should have access to quality reproductive services, including safe and legal abortion – regardless of where she lives, how much money she makes, or how she is insured. We believe that reproductive health is core to women's, men's, and young people's health and wellbeing . . . We will continue to oppose - and seek to overturn – federal and state laws and policies that impede a woman's access to abortion, including by repealing the Hyde Amendment.

##### REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Constitution's guarantee that no one can “be deprived of life, liberty or property” deliberately echoes the Declaration of Independence's proclamation that “all” are “endowed by their Creator” with the inalienable right to life. Accordingly, we assert the sanctity of human life and affirm that the unborn child has a fundamental right to life which cannot be infringed. We support a human life amendment to the Constitution and legislation to make clear that the Fourteenth Amendment's protections apply to children before birth.

The differences reported above are illustrated and given special meaning by the movie, “Gosnell:The Trial

of America's Biggest Serial Killer," which was released this past October. According to one movie reviewer the movie tells the chilling story of the monstrosities that took place in Gosnell's abortion clinic.

*Wall Street Journal* writer Jason Riley reports that the co-producers of the film, Ann McElkinney and Phelim McAleer, in a book they wrote about Gosnell, said, "The toilets were clogged with fetal remains. Cupboards contained jars with the severed feet of infants inside." Movie reviewer Lisa Shaw states, "Although images of babies' feet that Gosnell kept in jars are briefly shown – revealing the perverseness of the man – the movie audience is spared the graphic images." (An audio of an interview of the co-producers by Dr. James Dobson is available at Family Talk App)

A trial in 2013 ended with Kermit Gosnell being sentenced to "three life sentences [which he is now serving] for first-degree murder of babies born alive and killed by inserting a pair of scissors into the back of their necks and severing their spinal cords."

The reference to "severing their spinal cords" is probably in reference to "partial birth abortions" described by Robert Bork as follows:

**The baby is delivered feet first until only the head remains within the mother. The aborting physician inserts scissors into the back of the infant's skull and opens the blades to produce a hole. The child's brains are then vacuumed out, the skull collapses, and the rest of the newly-made corpse is removed. If the head had been allowed to come out of the mother, killing the baby then would be the criminal act of infanticide.**

Apparently Gosnell did not follow this procedure, electing to let the infants die on their own, a decision causing reviewer Megan Basham, writing in *World*, to conclude, "had Gosnell first removed the babies brains before removing them from the womb . . . the murders he carried out might not have been crimes." Author Selwyn Duke observes that had Gosnell followed procedure, "He'd be called a medical provider."

Basham points out that in the movie, during cross-examination, the "inherent irrationality of our nation's approach to abortion stands out in stark, neon relief." Following are some examples of irrationality:

- One example involves Barack Obama when he was an Illinois Senator in 2001 when he was the only Illinois Senator to speak against a bill that would have protected babies who survive late-term labor-induced abortions. His rationale was that if the law deemed a child who survived a late-term labor-induced abortion had a right to live, "then this would be an anti-abortion statute." Not wanting to be the only Illinois Senator to vote against the bill, he voted "Present." (Source: Jerome Corsi)
- A person who kills pregnant woman can be charged in some states with double homicide. The National Conference of State Legislatures reports that "at least 38 states have fetal homicide laws."
- Shaw offers these insightful conclusions: "Gosnell was not put on trial for performing abortions, which are "legal" in Philadelphia and elsewhere in the United States. For this reason, both the police investigation and the trial of Gosnell, in real life as well as in the movie depiction, are not about abortion. Yet anyone who examines the facts – or for that matter, watches the movie – should be able to connect the dots between illegally killing babies after being born alive via botched abortions, and legally killing babies while they are still in the womb. After all, the physical location of the baby – inside or outside the mother's womb – does not change the nature of the baby"

## NOTES ON THE PASSING SCENE

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

Anne Marshall, the club's Publicity Director, provides the following story about two Sun City residents who are Republicans. The story should make us "proud to be American and Republican," she asserts.

Prior to election day, Sun City resident Glenda Dennison, who has been battling brain cancer, told her best friend, Betty Schleder, that she did not want to miss an election, which she has never done since she was first eligible to vote and she wanted to vote one last time for Judge Bill Gravell. Betty could not let her friend down, so on November 6<sup>th</sup> Betty got her pickup truck and trailer, was able to get Glenda in her wheelchair, and placed it on the trailer for the drive to the polls at Cowan Creek so that Glenda could make her last vote. Glenda's husband, Charlie, who accompanied the ladies to the polls, said that Glenda told him three months ago that she "just wanted to be able to vote one more time."

