



WOMEN FOR THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION NEWSLETTER

JUNE 2024

VOLUME 5, #4



President CJ's Letter:

Dear Colleagues,

If you wish to gain an understanding of the American ideals of freedom and liberty, the Founding Fathers are the most important people to study. They were able to do what had only been dreamed of in Europe. How they accomplished what they did is essential in the study of American history and in understanding the global and timeless impacts of their work.

The Founding Fathers left an unparalleled legacy in world history. Perhaps more than any other group of people, this small group of men distilled years of enlightenment thought into a form of government that sought to restrict central power, protect the rights of the citizens, and ensure the consent of the governed. To achieve this, they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Those ideals they put into action we still practice to this day.

George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison are considered by most as the Founding Fathers of our country. They all played key roles in the securing of American independence from Great Britain and in the creation of the government of the United States of America. There are dozens of others who played smaller but valuable roles. George Mason, Patrick Henry, John Hancock, John Marshall, and Samuel Adams are some of those, just to name a few. There were 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence and 39 signers of the United States Constitution.

Each Founding Father offered unique contributions to the creation of the republic. While the Founding Fathers are often viewed as largely in agreement and often referred to as a single entity that all worked together to create one American nation. In reality, they had extremely different views on all sorts of issues, including the role of the federal government, the issue of slavery, and how radical or moderate the American Revolution should be. At times,

these differences of opinion destroyed friendships and threatened progress.

Though they are often viewed as old men with white wigs and false teeth, most were young men. George Washington was 43 years old when he accepted command of the American Army during the war. Thomas Jefferson was 33 years old when he wrote the Declaration of Independence. John Adams was 40 years old when he argued for American independence. James Madison was 36 years old at the Constitutional Convention. John Jay was 43 years old when he became the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Alexander Hamilton was 33 years old when he was made Secretary of the Treasury. The oldest was Benjamin Franklin who was 70 years old at the Second Continental Congress.

Some of the Founders feared following generations might not be capable of maintaining American liberty. They were unsure if succeeding generations would be up to the task of protecting the liberty they had successfully secured. When Benjamin Franklin was asked after signing the Constitution if they had created a monarchy or a republic, Franklin replied: "A republic, if you can keep it."

While the Founders created a form of government unlike any other in the world at that time, they were far from perfect people. The time in which they lived dictated the standards they applied. It would take almost 200 years to ensure that all Americans were provided those same protections. Yet, they created the structure allowing for liberty, freedom, and justice, and a form of government of the people, by the people, and (eventually) for ALL the people. A system admired and envied the world over.

As more and more younger generations are seldom taught the sacrifice and significance of our Nation's founding, will we be capable of maintaining American liberty? In this progressive environment, it seems to be slipping away.

C. J. Hatcher, W.A.C. President

INSIDE CONTENTS

WAC's May/June Luncheon Review.....	2
WAC's Election Integrity Committee Chair Letter.....	3
Donald Trump's Conviction is Nothing More than a Thrill Kill, by Jonathan Turley, New York Post.....	3
Yale Law Professor Outlines Potential Trump Legal Strategy Following Guilty Verdict: What the Nation Needs, By Kyle Morris, Fox News.....	5
Statesmanship in a Post-Constitutional Moment, By Russell Vought, American Mind.....	6
A Flagging Campaign Against Justice Alito, By Kimberly Strassel, Wall Street Journal.....	9
DEI Programs Could Soon Face Supreme Court, By Eric Lendrum, American Greatness.....	10
A Golden Opportunity to Rebuild Christendom, By Andrew Torba, Gab Inc.....	10
Point of Interest.....	12
Board Members/Upcoming Events.....	12

In May, WAC Heard from Member Nancy Koenig about Efforts Underway to Establish a Constitutional Convention; In June, We Heard from Several U.S. Senate Primary Candidates

Nancy Koenig spoke to WAC in May about efforts underway in Virginia to support a constitutional convention under the U.S. Constitution's Article V, which allows two-thirds of the states to call a convention. Reasons for such a convention range from balancing the federal budget to establishing term limits to overhauling federal powers. A constitutional convention has not been convened since the original one in 1787.

In June, WAC heard from Eddie Garcia, Scott Parkinson, and Chuck Smith who are running in the June primary to be the GOP nominee to unseat Tim Kaine in the November. Each candidate described in detail his background and platform. Some of the platform topics discussed included: faith, family, right to life, veterans, education, parental rights in education, separation of powers, restoring public safety, senior citizens, gun rights, illegal immigration, and how to stop the shredding of the U.S. Constitution. It was a very informative luncheon and members left feeling very proud to have such impressive candidates in the race.





Note from Our Election Integrity Committee Chair Karen Juul-Nielsen:

WE NEED YOU!

Greetings from your very busy Election Integrity Committee as we prepare for the upcoming June 18 primary election. Early voting is open through June 15 at 1600 5th Street Extended. Be sure to vote!!

We are making an extraordinary effort to have tents and greeters at each precinct for the full 6am-7pm day of voting. That's a lot of coverage for 30 precincts. We still have lots of time slots available. Please search your heart to see how you can help us out - you will make a difference!

Text or e-mail me and let me know what time and what precinct you would like to serve. Thank you for your commitment!

Karen Juul-Nielsen

713-806-8385

Kjuulnielsen@yahoo.com



Donald Trump's Conviction is Nothing More than a Thrill Kill



By Jonathan Turley, New York Post

After years of trying — in the words of the judge — “to get the damned rascal in this court,” it was a conviction that many welcomed.

But those words were not from Manhattan Supreme Court Justice Juan Merchan, and the conviction was not that of former President Donald Trump.

Rather they were from US Supreme Court Justice Samuel Chase, at the end of the 18th century, when America embraced political prosecutions to target critics and opponents.

The man on trial then was James T. Callender, a muckraking writer critical of President John Adams.

For accusing politicians of corruption, Callender was charged with sedition, fined \$200 and put in prison.

It was one of the many political prosecutions carried out by the Adams administration.

Undeniable reality

Political prosecutions are something most citizens associate with dictatorships.

But the Trump prosecution has forced many to confront the undeniable reality of the politicization of our legal system.

In many respects, President Biden and Democrats have re-created the Adams era.

Biden has led calls for censorship of political critics and his administration has coordinated the silencing and the blacklisting of those with opposing views.

Democratic politicians have pressured social-media companies to serve as surrogates for the government in banning, throttling and defunding individuals and groups.

Indeed, I have previously written that Biden is now the most anti-free-speech president since Adams.

The Adams era also reflected the same blind loyalty of many media outlets.

Federalist publications supported the crackdowns while echoing charges against political opponents as seditionists and insurrectionists.

Jeffersonian publications, like Callender's, attacked Adams for his "unbounded thirst for ridiculous pomp, foolish adulation, and selfish avarice."

The nation was divided down the middle as both sides accused each other of being traitors and insurrectionists. Sound familiar?

A chilling return

Yet, it is the politicization of the legal system that is the most chilling return to the Adams era.

Even liberal legal analysts have admitted that the case against Trump was unprecedented and would not have been brought against anyone other than Trump.

CNN legal analyst Elie Honig recently wrote that there should be concern over a judge being appointed (not randomly selected) who is not just a Biden donor but someone who "has earmarked donations for 'resisting the Republican Party and Donald Trump's radical right-wing legacy.' "

Adding to these concerns is the movement of the third-highest official in the Biden Justice Department to the staff of Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg to build the case against Trump.

Before joining the case, Matthew Colangelo was also paid by the Democratic National Committee for "political consulting."

So Trump was convicted in a trial with a Biden donor judge, who has a daughter who is a major Democratic operative, a lead prosecutor previously paid as a DNC political consultant and a jury selected in a district that voted roughly 90% against Trump.

The trial itself was a travesty.

Even after sitting in the courtroom watching the trial and the verdict, I still have no idea what Trump was convicted of in the case.

The charges were built on a dead misdemeanor barred with the passage of the statute of limitations.

It was zapped back into life by alleging that the falsification of business records occurred to unlawfully influence the 2016 presidential election.

Merchan told the jury members that they did not have to agree on what those unlawful means may have been.

Specifically, he allowed them to base their verdict on any one of three vaguely defined crimes of a federal election violation, falsification of business records or taxation violations.

Thus, the jury could have divided 4-4-4 on what actually occurred but the verdict was still treated as unanimous by Merchan to convict Trump.

Repulsive and chilling

Like much else in the case, that didn't matter in deep-blue Manhattan.

Legal analysts and commentators openly celebrated on MSNBC and CNN — joining many in the streets.

This was a thrill-kill conviction, and the response of many in the media bordered on the indecent.

For many outside of Manhattan, the scene was repulsive and chilling.

You can hate Donald Trump but still be repelled by the use of the criminal justice system for political purposes.

There is, however, one silver lining. We went through political prosecutions under Adams and, to a lesser extent, Thomas Jefferson.

Yet, we survived. Our system corrected such abuses over time.

The Alien and Sedition Acts used to prosecute Callender expired.

Justice Samuel Chase was impeached for his partisanship (though not convicted).

With this case, you feel the weight of history in the conviction of a former president, but also a historical awakening.

Sometimes it takes a great abuse to shock the public into recognizing the need to act.

In the faces of ecstasy of demonstrators and commentators alike this week, we see the same joyful release from the bounds of legal process. The addictive quality of rage.

For them, it was a cathartic moment that was described by one commentator as a reason to celebrate and a "majestic" moment.

For the rest of us, it was more menacing than majestic.

It could prove to be the moment that galvanized many outside of Manhattan; the moment when citizens saw where our rage has taken us.

Sometimes we have to be forced to see what we have become to better understand who we are.

We are better than this.



Yale Law Professor Outlines Potential Trump Legal Strategy Following Guilty Verdict: What the Nation Needs

By Kyle Morris, Fox News, condensed

A Yale Law professor suggests there is another strategy former President Donald Trump's legal team could pursue to limit the impact of Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg's case on the 2024 presidential election, after a New York jury found the former president guilty of 34 felony counts of falsified business records.

In a newly-created podcast, titled Straight Down the Middle, Yale Law Professor Jed Rubenfeld took a look at what legal options Trump's defense team have been left with

following the jury's verdict, as well as the appeal process that is slated to soon take place.

The most obvious path for Trump's legal team to take in an effort to challenge the conviction is that of an appeal through the New York Appeals Court system in hopes of ending up at the [Supreme Court](#) – a process that Rubenfeld argued will take years to complete and could result in "irreparable harm."

"Of course that would take years, and that's a problem here. Why is it a problem? It's a problem because the election will have taken place and if this conviction is unlawful and unconstitutional, it could have an effect on that election," Rubenfeld, a Constitutional law professor, said on his podcast.

Pointing to surveys that show a "substantial number" of voters from the American electorate who say they will still vote for Trump in the upcoming presidential election if he is a convicted felon, Rubenfeld said, "If that's true, an unlawful conviction in this case could interfere with, and in fact decide the outcome of, the next election of the next President of the United States."

"Even if the conviction were reversed on appeal years later, that effect could not be undone. In legal terms, that's called irreparable harm," Rubenfeld said.

If the conviction were to be reversed on appeal down the road, Rubenfeld suggested that Bragg and Judge Juan Merchan would have "unlawfully interfered with the election and decided the outcome of the next election through unconstitutional means."

"And no years-long appeal could have any effect on that," he added.

Despite media reports, Rubenfeld insisted that it's "not true" that Trump is already a "convicted felon," arguing that one is "not a convicted felon because of a jury verdict."

"You are not convicted until the judge enters that judgment of guilt. Now, in New York, it's very likely that Judge Merchan will enter that judgment of guilt against Trump on the same day that he issues sentencing. That'd be July 11th." Rubenfeld insisted there's "one other avenue" Trump's attorneys could take in combating the conviction — to sue in federal court and "ask for an emergency, temporary restraining order."

Outlining what that effort would look like, Rubenfeld said: "In this federal action, Trump would sue District Attorney Bragg and other state actors and ask the judge, the federal judge, for an emergency temporary restraining order halting Judge Merchan from entering that judgment of guilt until

the federal courts have had an opportunity to review and rule out the serious constitutional arguments that exist here."

Rubinfeld, expressing concern over how it's a "bad look for this country" to criminally target former presidents for "unclear" crimes, also outlined what he believed to be problems with the case surrounding Trump.

"Going after, criminally, a former president of the United States and somebody who is running for president now, that's a very bad look for this country," he said. "It's an especially bad look when the folks bringing the case and the judge deciding it are members of the opposing political party. And it's an even worse look when the crime is so unclear that the state is hiding the ball about what the actual charges are right up through the trial and indeed into the trial."

"Even now, we don't know exactly what the jury found Trump guilty of," Rubinfeld added.

Rubinfeld said those who criminally target members of opposing political parties, in this case Trump, the "poll-leading candidate," then they "better have the goods."

"You better not be pursuing some novel legal theory where you have to hide the ball [and] it's not even clear what the charges are," he said. "That could be a very dangerous precedent for this country. A very bad and dangerous precedent."

"That's why it's so important for a federal court to review the constitutionality of this prosecution and decide was it constitutional or was it not," he added. "The only way to achieve that before the election takes place is for the Trump team to file an action in federal court and ask the federal court to temporarily hold off the entry of the judgment of guilt until the federal courts, and maybe the Supreme Court itself, can, on an emergency basis, adjudicate the likelihood of success of these constitutional arguments."

If that doesn't happen, Rubinfeld said, then "that 'irreparable harm' danger that I mentioned before, well, that's where we are."

"But if it does happen, the nation could get a ruling from the federal courts, even the Supreme Court of the United States, before the election takes place," he said. "Maybe that's what the nation needs, and maybe that's what the law requires here."

Last week, at his trial in Manhattan, Trump was found guilty by the jury on all 34 counts of falsifying business records related to the hush money payment to adult film

actress Stormy Daniels in the lead up to the 2016 presidential election.

Trump is scheduled to be sentenced on July 11 and could be sent to prison, just days before the Republican National Convention is slated to take place in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.



Statesmanship in a Post-Constitutional Moment

By Russell Vought, *The American Mind*, condensed (Russ Vought is President Trump's former Director of Management and Budget, one of the most influential positions in any Administration. He is likely to have an important position in the next Trump Administration as well. The Washington Post wrote a "hit piece" on him last week entitled "*Trump loyalist pushes 'post-constitutional' vision for second term*" after he published the piece below. Brief comments on the hit piece written by Russ follow the piece.)

We are in a post constitutional moment in our country. Our constitutional institutions, understandings, and practices have all been transformed, over decades, away from the words on the paper into a new arrangement—a new regime if you will—that pays only lip service to the old Constitution. Our system is now much more like an unwritten constitution which operates based on precedents, like the English system. No constitutional amendments have been passed to enact this, but new legal paradigms have been introduced—a "living constitution," independent agencies, permanent, "expert" civil servants—that have changed the underlying separation of powers at the core of our system.

How did this come to be? The Left at the turn of the nineteenth century were loud critics of the Constitution. Woodrow Wilson wanted an efficient, modern administrative state run by experts that could not be slowed by the Constitution's separations of powers. He complained that the trouble with the theory of checks and balances, "is that government is not machine, but a living thing. . . . No living thing can have its organs offset against each other, as checks, and live." But these complaints largely stopped during the historical developments of the twentieth century, and there is rarely any talk of a constitutional amendment on the Left. Why is that? Because the Left quietly adopted a strategy of *institutional* change that left the constitutional system of separate powers in place but radically perverted how they operated, their incentive

structures, and their responsiveness to the American people.

The Left's legal theorists adopted an approach to interpreting the Constitution based on it being a "living" document, meaning that its provisions should be understood to be malleable, keeping up with a modernizing nation. This was married with increased power assumed by courts, and the notion that nine supreme court justices would make all final decisions without any response from the other branches. Congress created so-called "independent agencies" such as the Federal Reserve or the SEC, meant to be independent from the direction of an elected president, but this principle impacted all the agencies, with career civil servants protected from at-will employment.

Personnel is policy

We see this now with the notion that the DOJ and the FBI are meant to be independent from a president's priorities. The Centers for Disease Control only has a handful of policy officials appointed by a president—the rest, thousands, are all career officials, making it utterly impossible to manage even in normal times, let alone in a pandemic. And Congress increasingly delegated its authority to make law to the executive branch, evading the responsibility to their voters to make democratic tradeoffs, empowering experts to provide input, but also retaining control at the upper echelons of Congress—congressional leadership, committee chairmen, or senators who can block nominees—to put their thumbs on the scale toward their preferred policy approach. For example, in the Trump Administration there were titanic struggles, involving three or four different cabinet departments, with a constant parade of participating senators, over determining the right blend of ethanol in gasoline, pitting ethanol producers against oil refiners. Making law, away from the floor of the House and Senate, because that is what we were mandated to faithfully execute.

All of this so far is fairly well known, but it gets more complicated the more you study and experience it. Michael Glennon has done us a service by pointing to the concept of "double government" and the work of Walter Bagehot, who Wilson certainly drew on, in describing how the English constitutional system developed from the monarchy holding most power to it holding virtually none. Bagehot drew a distinction between what he called the "dignified institutions"—the monarchy and the House of Lords—that needed to retain its "emotional hold" on the public through its history and theatre, and the so-called "efficient

institutions," such as the House of Commons and the Cabinet, where real power resides.

Glennon writes that, in our system, the same phenomenon has developed. "Together these institutions make up a 'disguised republic' that obscures the massive shift in power that has occurred, which if widely understood would create a crisis of public confidence. This crisis has been averted *because the efficient institutions have been careful to hide where they begin and where the dignified institutions end....* This promotes continued public deference to the efficient institutions' decisions and continued belief that the dignified institutions retain real power." This is double government and describes what we have in the United States. The president and the vast supermajority of the House and Senate are the "dignified" in our system, and the congressional leadership, the committee barons, and the entirety of the administrative state, are the "efficient."

Grasping the center

What makes it so hard to discern is that the center of gravity of power is spread over the lines of demarcation separating the branches themselves within the Constitution. Yes, power has been delegated to the executive, but the president and the executive branch are no longer quite the same thing, in practice. The agencies care more about the congressional appropriations committees than they do about their president. They draft rules according to the authorizing committees' interests. And they are all influenced by the values and milieu of a permanent ruling class in a capital city divorced from the everyday concerns and wishes of the American people themselves.

This is the new Constitution. It has been a slow-moving revolution for over a hundred years, but the Constitution we live under is not the one that our Founders gave us, and the Left understands this. They just never say the quiet part out loud. Have you ever wondered why their justices or legislators never get hung up on whether the Constitution allows their preferred policy or strategic approach? Ever. It's not that they just give lip service to the real one, but it's because they understand and live and swear allegiance to the new one. Anything they want to do is just new precedent. Whereas conservatives find themselves interpreting a revered document that is no longer in effect, lacking the tools to save their country, and therefore conserving not the Constitution but the new regime. It's like a marriage that ended over two decades ago, in which one party didn't tell the other, and the other still thinks the marriage is in effect and operates as such. At some point, reality needs to set in.

So where do we go from here?

Part of the answer is to become *radical* constitutionalists. What I mean by that is the Founders designed our system for titanic struggle between the branches horizontally and between the states and the federal government vertically. They gave us a separation of powers which was absolutely essential to protect our freedoms and way of life. In fact, James Madison wrote that, “The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.”

And the way to prevent such an accumulation was to give each branch, “the necessary constitutional means and personnel motives to resist encroachments of the others...ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place.” The branches had a healthy fear of each other. It caused them to pause before encroaching.

The Right needs to throw off the precedents and legal paradigms that have wrongly developed over the last two hundred years and to study carefully the words of the Constitution and how the Founders would have responded in modern situations to the encroachments of other branches. Originalism should not just be interpreting the words in their original meaning. It should be to understand the logic of the original Constitution and how these authorities should be used unencumbered by the scar tissue resulting from decades of bad cases and bad statesmen.

Devolving power

The death of Queen Elizabeth II has given us a vivid picture of where the Left is trying to go. An executive in a monarch with massive historic grandeur and symbolism and no remaining authority. A parliament where a Cabinet of MPs head the departments of state, staffed by career civil servants with purported expertise. The Left in the U.S. doesn’t want an energetic president with the power to bend the executive branch to the will of the American people. They don’t want a vibrant Congress where great questions are debated and decided in front of the American people and the tradeoffs made there. They don’t want empowered members. They want discouraged and bored back benchers. They want all-empowered career “experts” like Tony Fauci to wield power behind the curtains.

And in America, the scary part is that this regime is now increasingly arrayed against the American people. It is

both woke and weaponized. The national security state, with organs like the FBI, NSA, and CIA, are aligned against the American people, who are outraged by this revolution they never assented to. The FBI is investigating concerned parents attending open school board meetings as domestic terrorists. They are putting political opponents in jail. The NSA is surveilling the conversations of citizens. Therefore, the hour is late and time is of the essence to expose the charade, rally the country against it toward self-government once again, and seize every leverage point to arrest the damage.

The good news is that it’s not too late. We have 75 million voting citizens and more each day. We have nearly 30 Republican governors where red state sanctuaries can be created. We are on the cusp of Republican majorities in the House and Senate. We have institutions like the Center for Renewing America fighting every day to break the political cartels, while providing an ark for those exercising courageous leadership. And we have the reality revealed by the Left’s fight against Donald Trump and his movement. They know it is an existential threat to their regime. If it wasn’t a threat, they would not care. And the lengths they are going to even now shows we have some remaining time.

But the long, difficult road ahead of returning to our beloved Constitution starts with being honest with ourselves. It starts by recognizing that we are living in a post-Constitutional time. Our need is not just to win congressional majorities that blame the other side or fill seats on court benches to meddle at the margins. It is to cast ourselves as dissidents of the current regime and to put on our shoulders the full weight of envisioning, articulating, and defending what a Radical Constitutionalism requires in the late hour that our country finds itself in, and then to do it. That and only that will be how American statesmanship can be defined in the years ahead.

(Note: In response to the Washington Post ‘hit piece’ about Russ’ article, Russ wrote:

“The irony, of course, is once you read past the usual slander and scurrilous insinuations about me, the narrative simply becomes – *he’s serious about helping President Trump implement his America First vision for our country* and that frightens them more than anything. From the Washington Post piece:

“Vought wants to gut the FBI and give the President more oversight over the Justice Department.” **Correct.**

“Vought favors boosting White House control over other federal agencies that operate somewhat independently.” **Correct.**

“Vought has called for “mass deportation” of illegal immigrants.” **Correct.**

“The media, liberal elites, academia, and bureaucratic class in Washington are apoplectic over what could unfold in the coming months.

“Keep fighting and stay focused.”)

A Flagging Campaign Against Justice Alito



The ‘ethics’ attack having failed, the left turns to flag etiquette.

By Kimberly Strassel, *Wall Street Journal*, condensed

The British know the risk of over-egging a pudding, but the partisan left has yet to learn the culinary art of politics. The growing absurdity of its campaign against the conservative majority on the Supreme Court is providing Americans all the excuse they now need to tune out this debate.

At least until recently, the attacks on Justices Clarence Thomas and Samuel Alito were loosely—if laughably—moored in common definitions of “ethics.” Sensible people might struggle to understand how a long-ago fishing trip, or a few days in the Adirondacks, would play any role in the long and consistent jurisprudence of the two justices, but at least the accusers were able to lob flashy terms like “disclosure” or “gifts” or “lavish vacation.”

Any pretense of seriousness evaporated [recently] with the New York Time’s exposé of the Alitos’ breach of flag etiquette. Justice Alito’s wife, Martha-Ann, after enduring ugly verbal attacks from neighbors, broadcast her distress by briefly flying the American flag upside down in her yard in January 2021. While Justice Alito has stated that he had nothing to do with this flag hoisting, the incident, we are told, somehow amounts to evidence that the Alitos supported Donald Trump’s “stop the steal” campaign. Where does that connection come from? A search of the Factiva news database turns up no articles containing the phrases “stop the steal” and “upside down flag” before the Times report on May 16.

Rather than retreat in humiliation, the Times doubled down with a follow-up report of yet another flag—this one right-side up—spotted at the Alitos’ vacation home in New Jersey. The left tells us that the 1775 Pine Tree flag was

spotted among Jan. 6 protesters! And moreover, that its catch phrase, “an appeal to heaven,” derives from a radical character—John Locke.

The Times somehow fails to let readers know that the flag is a longtime symbol of independence; that it was designed by George Washington’s secretary; was flown on ships commissioned by Washington; has been honored, commemorated and flown over state capitols; and is the official maritime flag of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It is currently displayed outside the office of the speaker of the House. Dozens of historic flags were toted to the Capitol on Jan. 6, as were copies of the Constitution and pictures of the American eagle. Are they all now symbols of “insurrection”?

It might seem that nothing could top such silliness, but never underestimate an obsessive. We are now also told—in ominous tones—that Justice Alito in August 2023 sold a small holding of shares in Anheuser-Busch some four months after the company’s decision to broadcast its wokeness by forming a public partnership with a transgender social influencer. Investors had for months been fleeing a stock that was near bottom, so if anything, Justice Alito was behind the trend. Yet this act of portfolio management is now presented as proof that the justice supported an anti-transgender “boycott.”

Democratic politicians and activists are racing to translate these meritless stories into futile actions. Nearly 50 House Democrats [recently] signed a letter demanding Justice Alito recuse himself from any Jan. 6-related litigation and for Justice Thomas to join him because his wife works in politics. Tennessee Rep. Steve Cohen introduced a resolution of censure against Justice Alito, for not having *already* recused himself from Jan. 6 cases.

Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer suggested he may call for a vote on a Democratic bill that would dictate recusal standards for the justices—a challenge to the separation of powers. The activist group Demand Justice says it will spend “six figures” on ads calling on Justice Alito to recuse himself. The group began its effort by unimaginatively projecting an upside-down flag onto the Supreme Court building.

This desperation belies any claim that the left’s interest is in ethics at the high court. The nonstop attacks—week after week—are aimed at altering the outcome of high-profile cases currently in front of the court, including Donald Trump’s claim that presidential immunity shields him from criminal charges related to the Jan. 6 riot. If the activists could force a recusal or two, they might sway a decision. If they fail, as they almost certainly will, they will continue smearing the court and casting doubt on the legitimacy of its decisions, with the longer-term aim of enacting

legislation to pack the court by adding new justices when the Democrats control the White House and Congress.

The activists see a potential bonus. They hope to use these vapid attacks to turn the election narrative back to Donald Trump and Jan. 6, to suggest chaos and disintegration should Republicans win this fall. Joe Biden's campaign doesn't have much else, and the fear tactic has worked in the past.

But the current effort is so obviously a smear job that it could have the opposite of the intended effect. The justices will ignore the demands for recusal, and the public will mark all this down as politics as usual, only nastier.



DEI Programs Could Soon Face Supreme Court

By Eric Lendrum, American Greatness

The controversial business practice known as “diversity, equity, and inclusion” (DEI) could soon see its legal challenges make it all the way to the Supreme Court.

According to *Axios*, the case that could spark supreme Court action was filed by the same group that successfully saw the practice of affirmative action overturned by the court last year. The current case saw an appeals court ultimately rule that a venture capital firm had to shut down its grant program that was exclusively for black women.

The American Alliance for Equal Rights (AAER) filed a lawsuit against Fearless Fund in 2023, arguing that the Black-only and women-only grant program was discriminatory. The group initially tried to have the program halted while that case played out in the courts, but a district judge ruled in favor of the company and allowed the program to continue.

Then, [last week], a three-judge panel in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit overturned the district judge's ruling, thus ordering Fearless Fund to cease its grant program. . The two judges in the majority were appointed by former President Donald Trump, while the lone dissenter was an Obama appointee.

The appeals court's ruling noted that the challenge by AAER “is likely to succeed on the merits” of its claims that the program is a violation of civil rights and anti-discrimination laws. As a result of this ruling, there is now a “circuit split” on the matter, increasing the likelihood that

the subsequent challenge by Fearless Fund will ultimately lead to the Supreme Court for a final decision.

Similar cases against DEI programs have faced more difficult challenges. In March, a lawsuit was filed against Pfizer over its fellowship program that only applied to black, Hispanic, or Native American applicants. But the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ruled against the plaintiffs, an advocacy from called Do No Harm, arguing that they lacked standing to sue.

DEI has long been criticized as not only discriminatory, but a means by which companies may hire people who are unqualified for certain positions, overlooking qualified and competent candidates in favor of diversity picks. Challenges against such programs have increased following the decision last year in *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*, the case which ultimately saw affirmative action declared unconstitutional nationwide.



A Golden Opportunity to Rebuild Christendom

By Andrew Torba, CEO Gab, Inc., condensed

The world is witnessing a rapid and unprecedented erosion of institutional trust at every layer of society. From politics to media, from academia to science, and from healthcare to technology, the foundations of our institutions are crumbling. This widespread loss of faith in our established systems is not only a crisis of confidence but also a unique opportunity for Christians to rebuild Christendom.

- According to the 2023 Edelman Trust Barometer, a majority of the countries surveyed (24 out of 28) are now “distrusters” of societal institutions like government, media, business, and NGOs. This represents a significant increase from just 16 distruster countries in 2022.
- A Pew Research study found that public trust in the federal government in the U.S. remains near historic lows, with only 16% expressing trust in the government to do the right thing always or most of the time.
- A Gallop poll revealed that Americans' trust in the media to report the news fully, accurately, and fairly has plummeted to just 32%, down from 68% in 1972.

The postwar secular world order, once hailed as the pinnacle of human progress, is now falling to pieces, revealing itself to be a house of cards built on a foundation of lies. This

crumbling edifice, characterized by moral decay, political corruption, and spiritual emptiness, is a stark reminder of the inherent weaknesses of secularism and the need for a return to a society grounded in Biblical principles.

The postwar secular world order emerged in the aftermath of World War II, as the victorious Allied powers sought to create a new international system that would prevent the recurrence of global conflict. This system was characterized by a commitment to secularism, democracy, free markets, and human rights, and was underpinned by a series of international institutions, such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank.

The architects of this new world order believed that by removing religion and tradition from the public sphere, they could create a more just and peaceful society. However, this vision was fundamentally flawed, as it ignored the essential role that religion and tradition play in shaping human identity and values.

The postwar secular world order was built on a house of cards, held together by a series of lies that were propagated by its proponents. These lies include:

1. The lie of moral neutrality: Secularism claims to offer a moral framework that is neutral and universally applicable. However, this framework is ultimately based on a rejection of objective moral truths, leading to moral relativism and the erosion of traditional moral values.
2. The lie of human autonomy: Secularism elevates the individual above all else, promoting a vision of society in which the individual is free to define their own truth and meaning. However, this vision is ultimately self-destructive, as it leads to social fragmentation, moral decay, and the collapse of community.
3. The lie of scientism: Secularism elevates science as the ultimate authority on all matters, dismissing religious and philosophical perspectives as irrelevant. However, this scientism is ultimately reductionist and fails to account for the complexities of human experience and the transcendent nature of reality.

The postwar secular world order is now crumbling, as the lies that underpin it are exposed and the weaknesses of secularism become increasingly apparent. This collapse is manifested in a variety of ways, including:

1. The rise of populism and nationalism: As people become disillusioned with the failures of secularism, they are increasingly turning to

alternative political movements that promise to restore traditional values and national identity.

2. The resurgence of religious orthodoxy and tradition: As secularism fails to provide a compelling moral framework, people are increasingly turning to religious orthodoxy and tradition as a source of meaning and purpose.
3. The erosion of social cohesion: As secularism promotes individualism and moral relativism, it undermines the shared values and beliefs that are essential for social cohesion, leading to the collapse of community and the rise of social unrest.

The reasons behind this widespread erosion of institutional trust are manifold. On one hand, we have seen a series of scandals and failures that have exposed the corruption and incompetence of our institutions. The bottom line is that the credibility of our institutions has been severely and irreversibly compromised.

Amidst this crisis of institutional trust, Christians have a unique opportunity to rebuild Christendom by offering an alternative vision of society that is grounded in Biblical principles of justice, compassion, and truth. This vision is not one of withdrawal from the world but rather one of engagement and transformation.

The first step in rebuilding Christendom is to recognize that the erosion of institutional trust is not a crisis of institutions per se but rather a crisis of faith. The root cause of this crisis is the abandonment of the Christian worldview that once formed the bedrock of our civilization. As a result, our institutions have become secularized and have lost their moral compass.

To rebuild Christendom, we must rebuild and re-evangelize our institutions to restore the Christian worldview as the foundation of our society. This requires a multi-faceted, multi-generational strategy that includes the following:

1. Education: We must invest in Christian education that teaches the Biblical worldview and equips the next generation with the knowledge and skills to engage the culture and transform our institutions.
2. Media: We must build alternative media platforms that are grounded in Christian principles and offer a counter-narrative to the secularist worldview that dominates the mainstream media.
3. Politics: We must engage in the political process and advocate for policies that reflect the Biblical worldview and promote the common good.
4. Community: We must build strong Christian communities that serve as models of the alternative society we seek to create and provide a sense of belonging and support for those who are seeking to live out their faith in the public square.

The erosion of institutional trust in every layer of society is a crisis of faith that presents a golden opportunity for rebuilding Christendom. By re-evangelizing and rebuilding our institutions to restore the Christian worldview as the foundation of our society, we can transform our culture and create a more just, compassionate, and truth-oriented society that reflects the glory of God.

Let's get to work.

Point of Interest

- Abe Greenwald of Commentary Magazine wrote an interesting article entitled "The Woke Jihad" on the connection between woke causes, their funding, and the purposes behind their existence. The link to the article is here: <https://www.commentary.org/articles/abe-greenwald/woke-jihad/>

Below are a few quotes from the article to give a glimpse into its content for those readers who may be interested:

- "If you still find it strange that people nominally committed to the defense of minorities, women, and the transgendered are supporting a racist, male-supremacist, anti-gay terrorist regime, you've missed the purpose of social justice: to "finally shake off this noxious ruling order all together." This necessarily means destroying the Jewish state, laying waste to the U.S. as we know it, and deifying the enemies of both."
- "... financial stream comes from well-known, big money Democrat donors.... George Soros, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and Susan and Nick Pritzker."
- "It is on the rotting foundations of Western academia itself that the woke jihad built its home. Dominant academic trends such as intersectionality, critical race theory, anti-racism, and anti-colonialism have turned millions of young minds into a moral fun-house mirror in which racists are reflected back as angels, colorblindness as racism, one sex as the other, democracy as tyranny, tyranny as paradise, freedom as bondage, refugees as colonialists, Jews as white oppressors, and terrorists as saints."

- "In joining forces, the woke and the Islamists may have compounded their resources, but they've also compounded the disgust that the public already harbored for each group individually. The spectacle of their blended pathologies will be, and already is, their discrediting and their undoing. Not ours."

Board Members:

President, C.J. Hatcher:
cj@cjhatcher.net

Vice President & Newsletter Editor, Tamara Thies
tamaramct@yahoo.com

Secretary, Judy Shiffler
Judydydy@yahoo.com

Treasurer, Madeleine Chandler:
mbc4z@earthlink.net

Bylaws Chair, Tanya Skeen:
tanyaskeen@yahoo.com

Membership Chair, Rena Snow
renasnow@hotmail.com

Fundraising Chair, Christy Lloyd:
Christy_n_lloyd@comcast.net

Election Integrity Chair, Karen Juul-Nielsen
kjuulnielsen@yahoo.com

Upcoming Events:

June Pizza Event – Please mark your calendars and join us for our June Pizza Event on Monday, June 24, 2024, at First Free Coffee Bar (Hollymead). Registration begins at 11:30 am, Pizza at 12:00 noon. Our speaker is Maggie Cleary, Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney, Culpeper County.

July Ice Cream Social – Thursday, July 18, 2024 @ Kohr's on 29 N @ 2:00 pm. Treat yourself to ice cream, networking, and great conversation.

August Family BBQ (ACRC, CRC, WAC) – Sunday, August 4 – Meet Lt. Governor Winsome Sears!

September Luncheon – Thursday, September 19, 2024, Greencroft Club, 11:30 am, Lunch @ 12 noon.

October Luncheon – Thursday, October 17, 2024 @ Greencroft Club, 11:30 am, Lunch @ 12 noon.

Women for the American Constitution

Membership Form 2024

Name: _____ Date of Application or Renewal: _____

Check Applicable: _____ Renewal Member; _____ New Member;

Check One: _____ **Active Member (\$40.00) Women**; Will be eligible to make motions and vote; to hold office and to serve on committees.

_____ **Associate Member (\$20.00) Men**; Will be eligible to serve on committees but are ineligible to vote.

_____ **Student (\$10.00) College/HS**; Will be eligible to serve on committees but are ineligible to vote.

Mailing Address: _____

City, State, Zip Code: _____

Birthday (Month & Day): _____ Email Address: _____

Phone: _____ Cell: _____ Your Voting Place: _____

Please make checks payable to "Women for the American Constitution"
Mail to: WAC Membership; C/O Treasurer; P.O. Box 5727; Charlottesville, VA 22905

Working together we can do great things! Volunteer for at least ONE Standing Committee:

_____ By-Laws	_____ Newsletter / Issues Education
_____ Elections / Poll Watching	_____ Secretary / Outreach
_____ Finance / Reservations	_____ Website Creation
_____ Membership / Marketing	_____ Programs / Speakers
_____ Fundraising	_____ Social Media / Club Photographer

