



WOMEN FOR THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION NEWSLETTER

MAY 2021

VOLUME 2, #5



President CJ's Letter:

Dear Colleagues,

As we embark on the Memorial Day weekend, it is important to reflect on the importance of this holiday in the context of today. One common thread unites us as a nation and holds us under the same tent even in tumultuous times. That thread is the Constitution. That which makes us a nation has given meaning to loss of life on the battlefield. Those who fought and died for this nation did so out of allegiance to a set of principles: liberty and equality. Those principles, defined first in the Declaration of Independence (1776) and cemented by the Constitution, give protection to individual citizens and guarantee their freedom. For almost 250 years on countless battlefields, in small towns and large cities, across the rural plains and majestic mountains, that which defines us has (thus far) united us.

Hopefully, we will continue to survive as a nation and overcome those elements today which seek to divide us. As a former educator, I am worried. In most K-12 social studies and civics classes, serious study of the principles of equality and liberty has vanished. The result has been a rising generation of young citizens who know little about the origins and stories of their country, and less about the true standards of equality and liberty. This trend is neither new nor unreported, but it is leaving a terrible and growing void as students suffer from both the ignorance of not realizing what they lack, and a certain arrogance that they have no need to find out.

This has made it easy for Critical Race Theory (CRT) and programs like the 1619 Project to find a footing in our schools. Slavery, as "the founding principle upon which this country was built" (1619 Project), is simply NOT true. Yes, we must study the history of slavery and its impact on the development of our country, because otherwise, we can't understand our country. But it is wrong to think of history

by itself as the standard for judgment. The standard is set by unchanging principles that transcend history. Our founders called these "self-evident truths" and published these truths for all the world to see in the Declaration of Independence: there are "Laws of Nature and of Nature's God" that inform human interactions, all human beings are created equal, and all human beings have fundamental rights that are inherently theirs, not the gift of government.

The CRT curriculum completely contradicts the foundational creed that Americans are created with equal dignity and with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. CRT teaches that all of society is "racial-ized" and viewed through a prism of identity groups based on race and color, with minorities being the oppressed, while white people and the systems associated with "white culture" (Capitalism, rule of law, Judeo-Christianity, representative form of government) serve as the oppressor. School districts should reject any curriculum that promotes factional ideologies that deny the core American principles outlined in our founding documents. Such a theory is unconstitutional.

As we honor our military fallen on Memorial Day, we should resolve to teach future generations why they died with valor and gratitude for this nation – by teaching our history and the founding principles, that which unites us and defines us as one people, one nation. And we should vow to reject that which does not. *- C. J. Hatcher*



INSIDE CONTENTS

Defending the Constitution: Limits on Federal Authority, by Robert Natelson.....	2
Sorry Professor, We Are Cutting You Off, by John Ellis..	3
PRIMER: Ending State-Sanctioned Racism, by Russ Vought.....	5
Ending the Tyranny of Cancel Culture and Building an Agenda that Will Win Back America, by Mike Pence.....	6
How Apportionment is Defrauding American Citizens, by Hans A. von Spakovsky.....	7
Two Americas, by Bob Lonsberry.....	8
Points of Interest.....	10
Board Members/Upcoming Events.....	10



Defending the Constitution: Limits on Federal Authority

By **Robert Natelson, The Independent Institute**

One of the Constitution's most important features—limits on the central government—has been the target of a propaganda campaign for many decades.

"Progressive" commentators in politics, academia, and the media claim these limits impede creative and effective solutions to social problems. Over the years, they've enlisted many issues to promote their cause:

"We can end poverty only through bold federal initiatives!"

"To save the planet, we need more federal regulation!"

"The path to college affordability is for the federal government to pay full tuition!"

"The way to jump-start the economy is through massive federal stimulus spending!"

Other issues on the list have included civil rights, consumer protection, inequality, K-12 education, climate change, racism, and "crumbling infrastructure." Whatever the malady, the prescription—federal action beyond what the Constitution authorizes—is always the same.

Just for once, I'd like to hear one of the propagandists admit that, in retrospect, too much federal intervention made a problem worse. They would have a lot of examples to choose from, but I don't ever expect to hear it.

Unfortunately, the campaign to persuade Americans that the federal government is and should be omnipotent has enjoyed great success. One reason is that public school civics education often misrepresents the Constitution's meaning and the reasons behind that meaning. This essay helps fill the

gap by explaining how the Constitution confines federal power and why it does so.

The Constitution limits the federal government in four general ways:

First: The Constitution is the legal document by which the American people granted authority to certain public officials, mostly (but not exclusively) federal officials. The Constitution specifically enumerates (lists) all powers granted. The list is long but finite. The items enumerated include, among others, national defense, coining money, creating and operating the post office, building and maintaining post roads (intercity highways), regulating foreign and interstate trade and some activities associated with trade, and control of immigration.

A longstanding legal rule tells us that because the Constitution lists the federal government's powers, any power not on the list is denied.

Second: The Constitution specifically prohibits some federal activities. The prohibitions appear mostly, but not entirely, in the first eight amendments of the Bill of Rights. For example, the government is barred from discriminating among religions, restricting freedom of speech, infringing the right to keep and bear arms, or adopting those retroactive measures called ex post facto laws. We often refer to prohibitions on government action as creating or recognizing "rights."

Third: The 10th Amendment reinforces the rule that the only powers granted to the federal government are those the Constitution enumerates.

Fourth: The enumeration of exceptions to federal power ("rights") might suggest that the government has authority over everything outside the exceptions. So the Ninth Amendment rules out any such suggestion. It reinforces the rule that federal powers stop when enumerated powers stop. As one of my law students once remarked, the Ninth Amendment is an exclamation point.

All these constitutional restrictions are anathema to "progressives." So they alternate frontal attacks on the Constitution with claims that the document doesn't mean what the document clearly says. They also launched the decades-long propaganda campaign to convince us that all power should flow from the center.

But why shouldn't it? Why didn't the Founders establish an omnipotent central authority?

History provides part of the answer. Before 1763, the founding generation lived happily within the British Empire. The empire was governed as an informal federation, leaving individual colonies with a great deal of local control. But when British political functionaries decided to centralize power in London, the founding generation rebelled. Once independence was achieved, Americans were disinclined to

adopt a constitution granting the national government the omnipotence they had denied to the imperial government.

On a broader level, the Founders understood that limits on the federal government, especially when checked by potent states, would help preserve human freedom. In *New York v. United States* (1992) the Supreme Court explained it this way:

“The Constitution does not protect the sovereignty of States for the benefit of the States or state governments as abstract political entities, or even for the benefit of the public officials governing the States. To the contrary, the Constitution divides authority between federal and state governments for the protection of individuals. State sovereignty is not just an end in itself: ‘Rather, federalism secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of sovereign power.’ ... ‘Just as the separation and independence of the coordinate branches of the Federal Government serve to prevent the accumulation of excessive power in anyone branch, a healthy balance of power between the States and the Federal Government will reduce the risk of tyranny and abuse from either front.’”

Moreover, the Founders understood that decentralization usually improves governance. A decentralized system allows states to tailor local policies to local preferences, local culture, and local needs. For example, one reason the COVID-19/CCP virus response should be executed at the state and local levels is that health restrictions that make sense in densely populated New York City would be ridiculous in the wide-open spaces of Montana or South Dakota.

A final reason for decentralization is much less widely understood: Political decentralization promotes human progress.

Recall some of the greatest moments in the advance of civilization: The awakening of human intellect in ancient Greece. The quickening of trade and culture, rule of law, and rise in living standards in the early Roman Empire. The flowering of arts and commerce in Renaissance Italy and Germany, the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution in England, and the economic and technological takeoffs in 19th-century Europe and America.

You may have been taught about these events in school, but you almost certainly weren’t taught what they all have in common: They all occurred in environments of political decentralization. Sometimes, the decentralization was so extreme that the central authorities (if, indeed, there were any) couldn’t even keep the peace. Yet society leaped ahead anyway.

Decentralization permitted the Aristotles and Galileos to move to neighboring jurisdictions more hospitable to their work. It permitted ethnic and religious groups, such as the Jews and Huguenots, to escape persecution and continue productive lives in relatively tolerant Holland and England. It allowed the Ptolemies, Bacons, and Edisons to carry out scientific and technological research in comparative freedom.

Decentralization also encouraged competition among sovereignties and semi-sovereignties for people and for talent. The most welcoming places were rewarded with the most progress.

Political centralizers call themselves “progressives.” But the name embodies a falsehood. Decentralization, not centralization, is more consistent with rapid human progress.

Americans built modern society in an explosion of progress during the period when the Constitution’s constraints on federal authority were still honored. During that period, Americans, along with those living in a politically fragmented Europe, tamed electricity, developed modern medicine, and invented the telegraph, telephone, radio, television, railroad, automobile, and airplane. We still depend heavily on basic technology created during the era of decentralization.

Certainly, progress has continued since that time, but the rate is slower. If you doubt it, ask yourself this: If two bicycle shop owners tried to invent the airplane in the current regulatory state, how far do you think they would get?

Or weigh the issue from another perspective: Automobiles, then called “road locomotives,” were invented more than 200 years ago. They were first mass-produced more than a century ago. Why are we still driving them instead of using more exotic modes of personal transportation—such as household flying vehicles? Why have so many of the advances predicted by 20th-century science authors failed to come true? In 1940, speculative writers thought we’d have colonies on the moon by now. Based on the pace of progress over the preceding 150 years, they had every reason to think so. But under government pressure, progress slows.

Centralized power, not the Constitution, impedes creative and effective solutions to social problems. The propagandists are wrong. The Founders were right.



Sorry Professor, We Are Cutting You Off

Funding Higher Education Now Means Subsidizing the Political Activists Who Have Hijacked It

By John Ellis, Wall Street Journal

An advanced society functions by creating a series of institutions, telling them what it wants them to do, and

funding them to do it. Institutions like the police, fire departments, courts and schools do the jobs society creates them to do. But one American institution—higher education—has decided to repurpose itself. It has set aside the job given to it by society and substituted a different one.

Higher education had a cluster of related purposes in society. Everyone benefited from the new knowledge it developed and the well-informed, thoughtful citizenry it produced. Individual students benefited from the preparation they received for careers in a developed economy. Yet these days, academia has decided that its primary purpose is the promotion of a radical political ideology, to which it gives the sunny label “social justice.”

That’s an enormous detour from the institutional mission granted to higher education by society—and a problem of grave consequence. For the purpose that academia has now given itself happens to be the only one that the founding documents of virtually all colleges and universities take care to forbid pre-emptively. The framers of those documents understood that using the campuses to promote political ideologies would destroy their institutions, because ideologies would always be rigid enough to prevent the exploration of new ideas and the free exercise of thought. They knew that the two purposes—academic and political—aren’t simply different, but polar opposites. They can’t coexist because the one erases the other.

The current political uniformity of college faculty illustrates the point. It meets the needs of the substitute purpose very well, but only by annihilating the authorized one. Analytical thinking requires exploring a range of alternatives, but political crusades require the opposite: exclusive belief and commitment. That’s how far off course academia has gone in its capricious self-repurposing.

Though most Americans aren’t happy about this, academia has no qualms. No matter how many times the lack of intellectual diversity on politicized, one-party campuses is decried as unhealthy and educationally ruinous, the campuses won’t listen. There was once internal debate about higher education’s direction between traditional academic scholars and radical political activists, but that debate is long over. The activists, now firmly in control, have no interest in what the dwindling ranks of scholars have to say.

The only remaining disputes about this illicit repurposing are therefore not among campus people, but between academia and the society it supposedly serves. And that should concern everyone. What can we do when a social institution is created for a particular purpose but abandons it? What should we do when an institution decides that it, not the society that created it, will determine its own purpose? What shall we do with an institution that has decided all these things but also expects to hang on to the funding that was provided for the original purpose?

The obvious thing to do is to take back the money and redirect it to its proper use. That will be more easily done with some institutions than others.

The radicals of the Minneapolis City Council voted to repurpose their police department—transforming cops into social workers—because only one funding source was involved and they controlled it. By contrast, higher education gets its funding from a great many sources: federal and state governments (a.k.a. taxpayers), students, parents of students, alumni, donors and endowments. Defunding academia would involve millions of individual as well as institutional decisions. Yet large numbers of those decisions have already been made and are still being made.

In fall 2011 the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center found that higher education enrollment was slightly more than 20.5 million students. By fall 2019 that figure had dropped to about 18.2 million, a decline of slightly over 11%. During those eight years the number of 18- to 24-year-olds remained roughly constant.

We have long had a social consensus that it’s worth four years of our children’s lives and very large sums of their parents’ money to see their knowledge, mental capacity, and career prospects greatly expanded by going to college. Attitudes and habits formed by this consensus were bound to lag behind the reality of academia as it now is. Yet the NSCRC numbers show that already about 1 in 9 have mustered the courage and independence of thought to face reality and stop wasting time and money.

This illicit conversion of a vital social institution to an alien use deprives all Americans of the benefits of a properly functioning system of higher education. It also means that a destructive and long since discredited political ideology is now using colleges and universities to gain a degree of influence over society that it could never have achieved at the ballot box. That’s election interference on a scale not remotely matched by anything that was alleged in the 2020 election.

When academia’s astonishing message to society is, “We’ll take your money, but we’ll do with it what we want, not what you want,” the response ought to be simple: “No you won’t.” The question is, can the millions of people who make up that wonderful abstraction called “society” act in a way that is sufficiently concerted and organized to deliver the message effectively? Many have already made a good start. But the rest need to join if we are ever again to have college campuses that aren’t as academically incompetent as they are politically malevolent.





PRIMER: Ending State-Sanctioned Racism

Banning the spread of critical race theory in our institutions

**By Russ Vought, President,
Center for Renewing America**

Summary

Critical Race Theory (CRT) is a theory espousing that all of society is racialized and properly viewed through a prism of identity groups based on race and color, with minorities being the oppressed while white people serve as the oppressor. In this ideology's framing, all of society's ills are ultimately caused by white people and the various "systems" that CRT adherents associate with "white culture." This includes Christianity, capitalism, traditional marriage, rule of law, traditional family structures, and a republican form of government. CRT teaches that white people are inherently and irredeemably racist and benefit from various systemically racist power structures that white people have put in place and perpetuate. Similarly, America and its founding are taught to be systemically racist. The purpose of CRT is to sow division among Americans under the guise of "equity" and "diversity." CRT completely contradicts the foundational American creed that Americans are created with equal dignity and with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Discussion

Critical Race Theory has swiftly become unquestioned dogma among political, administrative, military, cultural, corporate, educational, and financial leaders in our society. The activists and proponents of this ideology seek to impose this Marxist worldview on America through institutions (schools, churches, government, HR departments, etc.), explicitly sowing new racial divisions, reviving old divisions, destroying national unity, and undermining the American way of life.

Critical Race Theory stems from a foundation in Marxism, departing from the historic economic-based distinctions in favor of militant identity politics. CRT's baseline philosophy divides society into the "haves" and the "have nots," asserting that if you are white or a part of so-called white "power structures," you are inherently racist and part of an oppressing class. By operating under this framework, CRT argues the only way to establish "justice" is to completely revolutionize society by overthrowing the oppressor's institutions. This necessitates destroying purported "white" cultural values such as the nuclear family, delayed gratification, and objectivity; enforcing equal outcomes based *only* on the characteristics of race, gender, and sexuality; and forcing white people to continually and publicly confess their collective and individual "sins" with no hope of forgiveness, redemption,

or acceptance in the new revolutionary society. Often this dangerous ideology is advanced using taxpayer dollars.

In addition to flying in the face of the core American principle that all human beings are created equal and that someone's skin color should never be a substitute for their character, CRT has intentionally inflamed issues around race. A theory that blanketly condemns one group based on skin color and blanketly absolves other groups based on skin color is not designed to achieve any notion of justice and equality, but rather to destroy such virtues completely.

Examples

- The Smithsonian Institution published and promoted materials claiming, "Whiteness and the normalization of white racial identity throughout America's history have created a culture where nonwhite persons are seen as inferior or abnormal.... Whiteness (and its accepted normality) also exist as everyday microaggressions toward people of color." To the Smithsonian Institution, common characteristics of white people include "master and control nature," "aggressiveness and extroversion," "objective, rational linear thinking," "delayed gratification," and believing "hard work is the key to success."
- Coca-Cola is one of many major corporations that has adopted CRT. Coca-Cola instituted "diversity" training that taught, "In the U.S. and other Western nations, white people are socialized to feel that they are inherently superior because they are white," and that employees need to be "less white."
- Cigna, one of America's largest health insurance providers, was recently exposed as forcing its employees to undergo CRT training that includes "checking their privilege." In a slide, privilege is defined as being white, heterosexual, or Christian. Additionally, the company is alleged to actively discourage white men from consideration when it comes to hiring.
- The Arizona Department of Education has an infographic pushing parents to adopt CRT and raise "race-conscious children," citing studies alleging children as young as three months prefer to "look at faces of their own race" and that racial prejudice "often peaks" in kids when they are four or five years old.
- Paul Rossi, a math teacher at the prestigious Grace Church High School in Manhattan, was recently let go by the school after writing a public account of the radical CRT indoctrination being imposed on students by the administration. Among many alarming elements, Rossi revealed that a faculty email chain recommended "flagging" students "who appear resistant" to the "culture we are trying to establish." Audio suggests the head teacher admitted that students are being taught white people are inherently evil.

- The U.S. Navy released a recommended reading list of books in March 2021 for its sailors that included noted CRT provocateur Ibram X. Kendi, who not only embraces CRT, but also advocates for a Department of Anti-Racism to police citizens' thoughts and discriminate against white Americans. Kendi explicitly advocates for racial discrimination:

"If racial discrimination is defined as treating, considering, or making a distinction in favor or against an individual based on that person's race, then racial discrimination is not inherently racist. The defining question is whether the discrimination is creating equity or inequity. If discrimination is creating equity, then it is antiracist.... The only remedy to racist discrimination is antiracist discrimination. The only remedy to past discrimination is present discrimination."

- Concerned cadets and soldiers at West Point privately revealed that America's foremost military institution is pushing radical CRT material from Dr. Carol Anderson on cadets. Among many of Anderson's radical views is the claim that "white rage" is triggered by "black advancement" and that Republicans "yearn for a white republic."

Conclusion

Racism should at every turn be condemned—regardless of what race is the subject of discrimination. In the short 230-year history of our nation, America has made incredible progress to live up to its ideals as laid out in the Declaration of Independence, furthering human rights, freedom, and prosperity for people of every race, sex, religion, and creed. With every generation, America is closer to creating a society that treats all people with dignity and equality.

Proponents may dishonestly assert that CRT is necessary for institutions to have honest discussions about the racial problems our country has historically encountered. This is not true. Opposition to racism in American institutions or in our culture is entirely appropriate and teaching history accurately is essential, without the sort of indoctrination inherent in the CRT framework.

Ultimately, CRT is not about educating or healing communities or establishing justice. It is state-sanctioned racism and used as a tool of fear and authoritarian coercion by the most powerful people and institutions in our society to keep Americans divided against each other in order to further enrich and empower those sowing the division. Communities must not be afraid to forcefully reject CRT wherever it manifests—whether in the workplace, at school, in popular culture, or in the halls of government—and Americans must strongly defend the self-evident truth that all men are created equal.



Ending the Tyranny of Cancel Culture and Building an Agenda that Will Win Back America

By Mike Pence, Washington Times

It's only been 100 days. But after 100 days of open borders, runaway spending, plans for higher taxes, a bigger welfare state, more government, defunding the police, abandoning the right to life, canceling our most cherished liberties, I've had enough.

The time has come for Americans devoted to faith and family and freedom and limited government to stand up and unite behind a positive agenda and win back America.

In 48 months, the Trump-Pence administration achieved the lowest unemployment, the highest household incomes, the most energy production, the most pro-American trade deals, the most secure border and the strongest military in the history of our country. In our first three years, we revived our economy, created seven million good paying jobs by cutting taxes, rolling back regulations at a record pace. Becoming a net exporter of energy for the first time in 70 years. We held China accountable for years of trade abuses, and we brought jobs back to the USA.

We also stood up for our values. We appointed almost 300 conservatives to our federal courts at every level, including Justice Neil Gorsuch, Justice Brett Kavanaugh and Justice Amy Coney-Barrett.

From Day One we defended religious liberty, we ended the assault on the Little Sisters of the Poor and every single day, our administration stood without apology for the sanctity of human life.

It was perhaps my highest honor when as the president of the Senate, I was able to cast the tie-breaking vote to defund Planned Parenthood in states across America.

But how times have changed. In just 100 days, the Biden-Harris administration has launched an avalanche of liberal policies that threaten to derail all the progress that we made for a safer, more prosperous, more secure America. As Americans heard in the joint session address, President Biden has launched an explosion of runaway spending to the tune of \$6 trillion and counting.

And after our administration worked in a bipartisan way with Congress on every single COVID bill, the Biden administration passed their COVID bill on a partisan basis and actually used COVID relief to fund a massive expansion of the welfare state. They propose trillions of dollars in expanding the federal role of government in every area of our life, literally from cradle to grave and they're

using an infrastructure bill to advance a radical climate change agenda.

And just as our economy is getting back on its feet across America, they plan to pay for all of it by cutting planned increases in military spending and passing the largest tax increase in 50 years. But it doesn't stop there. After inheriting the most secure border in American history, the Biden administration ended construction of the wall and canceled policies that had reduced illegal immigration at our border by 90% and they've unleashed the worst border crisis in our history.

They've capitulated to international bureaucrats, rejoining the Paris Climate Accord and planning to rejoin the Iran Nuclear Deal. They formed a commission to pack the Supreme Court, supporting gun control they've joined the woke chorus accusing law enforcement agencies across America of systemic racism. You know, I don't think I can say it better than Sen. Tim Scott when he said, "Brave police officers and Black neighborhoods are not adversaries, we are family." And let me join Tim Scott in saying, from my heart, traveling this nation coast to coast as your vice president, America is not a racist country.

Democrats have been so busy advancing their liberal agenda that sometimes I feel like the left hand doesn't know what the far left hand is doing because on top of everything else in the last 100 days, there's been a wholehearted embrace of the radical left's all-encompassing rapidly escalating war on American traditional values. They abolished the 1776 Commission, they authorized teaching critical race theory in federal agencies and public schools and they restored Title 10 funding to Planned Parenthood of America.

Even AOC said the Biden administration, "Exceeded progressive's expectations."

Had enough? I have.

I mean, in 2020, the American people did not vote for that agenda. They did not vote for the agenda of the radical left. And the time has come for freedom-loving Americans to stand up to the far-left agenda of the Biden-Harris administration and say, "Enough is enough!"

It's time to unite behind a positive agenda built on our highest ideals and win back America. And we have the winning agenda, I have no doubt about it. Built on American values and on our confidence in the American people.

The First Amendment, freedom of speech, freedom of religion. The Second Amendment, right to keep and bear arms. The Tenth Amendment, limited government and letting states lead on the issues most important to our families. And it's been our movement, in the spirit of the Tenth Amendment that has led the fight to give parents the right to choose where their children go to school, public, private, parochial, or home school.

And it's our movement that recognizes that election integrity is a national imperative, and election integrity and reform belongs at the state level.

Elections are a state responsibility. Founders of our Constitution crafted it that way. We need to reject any Democratic attempts to nationalize our elections, as you heard President Biden speak about. We need to defend state-based reforms, support voter ID, and work every day to restore the confidence of every American in every vote.

And with our agenda and our movement, we will always stand by the men and women who serve on the thin blue line of law enforcement.

We'll give them resources for training, and we'll also always defend the right of Americans to keep and bear arms under the Second Amendment.

We'll defend religious liberty and the sanctity of life. And it will be our movement that's the vanguard of the freedom of expression. A movement that cherishes our heritage, our history, and our steady march toward a more perfect union. We will stand with the right of every American of every faith to live, to work, to speak, and to worship according to the dictates of their conscience.

We will reject critical race theory in our schools, in our public universities, and we will cancel "cancel culture" wherever it arises.

That's an agenda that'll win. That's an agenda that'll win back America. And it's a positive agenda in these divided times that each and every one of us needs to take to our neighbors and friends.



How Apportionment is Defrauding American Citizens

By Hans A. von Spakovsky, The Heritage Foundation

The news that six states will gain seats in the House of Representatives and another seven will lose seats, thanks to new Census numbers, was widely reported. What was missed is that the inclusion of non-citizens, including illegal aliens, in the population used to determine apportionment means that many Americans—and states—are being defrauded of their fair share of representation in Congress.

The new Census data show that Texas, because of the addition of 4 million new residents, will get two more members of the House. Colorado, Florida, North Carolina, Oregon, and Montana will each have one new representative. This will be Oregon's first new representative in 40 years, and Montana will go from having just one member of the House to two.

The big losers are California, Illinois, New York, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, each of which will be losing a seat. This will be the first time in history that California loses a congressional seat, although that is no surprise given that the state's population decreased in 2020, also for the first time since 1900. Those who could move fled high taxes, burdensome regulations, and "restrictive policies on businesses and ongoing lockdowns." And the remaining residents are so angry that a petition to recall Gov. Gavin Newsom recently received the necessary 1.6 million signatures needed to qualify for the ballot.

High taxes and burdensome regulations seem to be driving congressional losses in other states as well, such as Illinois and New York. Americans are voting with their feet and moving to less restrictive, more affordable states like Texas, Florida, and North Carolina.

But those states could have lost even more seats, and other states could have gained more members of Congress, if non-citizens were not included in the apportionment formula. One of the first actions by newly sworn-in President Joe Biden on Jan. 20 was his issuing an "Executive Order on Ensuring a Lawful and Accurate Enumeration and Apportionment Pursuant to the Decennial Census."

In that executive order, Biden directed the Census Bureau to include all individuals that are residents of a state in apportionment "without regard" to their "lawful immigration status." In other words, all non-citizens—including the more than 11 million illegal aliens that the Department of Homeland Security estimates are in the U.S., a number that is rising rapidly given the crisis at the Southern border engineered by the Biden administration—were to be counted.

Illegal aliens don't even have a right to be in the country, let alone have representation in Congress. Aliens who are here legally also have no right to representation in Congress and are barred by federal and state laws from voting. Including them, particularly illegal aliens, in apportionment is fundamentally unfair to citizens since it distorts political representation in the House and dilutes the votes of citizens. It also incentivizes states like California, Illinois, and New York to obstruct enforcement of federal immigration law and attract illegal aliens with sanctuary policies.

How bad is this distortion? In 2015, the Congressional Research Service did an analysis of how representation in the House would have changed after the 2010 Census if apportionment had been based on the 2013 estimated citizen population. The result illustrates how much some states are benefitting from trying to nullify federal immigration law.

Instead of losing just one seat, California would have lost four seats because it has the largest population of illegal aliens of any state in the country. Texas, Florida, and New York would have each lost one seat. The states who would

have gained one congressional representative each were Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma and Virginia.

A similar study by the Center for Immigration Studies based on 2020 Census numbers estimates that if non-citizens were removed from the apportionment population, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, Minnesota, Alabama, Idaho, West Virginia and Rhode Island would each gain a seat. California would lose three members of the House, Texas would lose two, and Florida, New Jersey and New York would each lose one seat.

This means that Ohio, Michigan and West Virginia—three of the states Census is saying will lose a seat based on the apportionment formula that Joe Biden mandated—are being cheated out of one of their congressional seats because of non-citizens. Instead of losing only one seat, California should be losing three seats. The only reason it isn't is because it is a sanctuary state whose large population of illegal aliens is giving it more political power than it should have in the House.

Texas shouldn't be gaining two seats, and neither should Florida. And New Jersey is also hanging onto a seat that it doesn't deserve.

Congressional representation in the House is a zero-sum game. When one state gains representation, another state loses it.

There is no question that much of this is driven by the fact that we are a highly mobile society and state governments, with their policies on taxes, regulations, and other issues like COVID, are driving that mobility. But it is also being driven by a growing alien population that is unfairly and unjustly altering political representation in the House, cheating citizens and devaluing their votes.



Two Americas

By Bob Lonsberry, Rochester Talk Radio Personality on WHAM 1180 AM, in response to Biden's 'Income Inequality Speech'

The Democrats are right, there are two Americas.

The America that works, and the America that doesn't.

The America that contributes, and the America that doesn't.

It's not the haves and the have nots, it's the dos and the don'ts.

- Some people do their duty as Americans, obey the law, support themselves, contribute to society, and others don't. That's the divide in America.

It's not about income inequality, it's about civic irresponsibility.

It's about a political party that preaches hatred, greed and victimization in order to win elective office.

It's about a political party that loves power more than it loves its country. That's not invective, that's truth, and it's about time someone said it.

The politics of envy was on proud display a couple weeks ago when President Biden pledged the rest of his term to fighting "income inequality." He noted that some people make more than other people, that some people have higher incomes than others, and he says that's not just.

That is the rationale of thievery. The other guy has it, you want it, Biden will take it for you. Vote Democrat.

That is the philosophy that produced Detroit. It is the electoral philosophy that is destroying America.

It conceals a fundamental deviation from American values and common sense because it ends up not benefiting the people who support it, but a betrayal.

The Democrats have not empowered their followers; they have enslaved them in a culture of dependence and entitlement, of victim-hood and anger instead of ability and hope.

The president's premise – that you reduce income inequality by debasing the successful – seeks to deny the successful the consequences of their choices and spare the unsuccessful the consequences of their choices. Because, by and large, income variations in society is a result of different choices leading to different consequences. Those who choose wisely and responsibly have a far greater likelihood of success, while those who choose foolishly and irresponsibly have a far greater likelihood of failure. Success and failure usually manifest themselves in personal and family income.

You choose to drop out of high school or to skip college – and you are apt to have a different outcome than someone who gets a diploma and pushes on with purposeful education and/or employment.

You have your children out of wedlock and life is apt to take one course; you have them within a marriage and life is apt to take another course.

Most often in life our destination is determined by the course we take.

My doctor, for example, makes far more than I do. There is significant income inequality between us. Our lives have had an inequality of outcome, but our lives also have had an equality of effort. While my doctor went to college and then devoted his young adulthood to medical school and residency, I chose another avenue.

He made a choice, I made a choice, and our choices led us to different outcomes. His outcome pays a lot better than mine. Does that mean he cheated and Joe Biden needs to take away his wealth? No, it means we are both free men in a free society where free choices lead to different outcomes.

It is not inequality Joe Biden intends to take away, it is freedom. The freedom to succeed and the freedom to fail. There is no true option for success if there is no true option for failure. The pursuit of happiness means a whole lot less when you face the punitive hand of government if your pursuit brings you more happiness than the other guy. Even if the other guy sat on his arse and did nothing. Even if the other guy made a lifetime's worth of asinine and shortsighted decisions.

President Biden and the Democrats preach equality of outcome as a right, while completely ignoring inequality of effort. The simple Law of the Harvest – as ye sow, so shall ye reap – is sometimes applied as, "The harder you work, the more you get." Biden would turn that upside down. Those who achieve are to be punished as enemies of society and those who fail are to be rewarded as wards of society.

Entitlement will replace effort as the key to upward mobility in American society if President Biden Barack gets his way. He seeks a lowest common denominator society in which the government besieges the successful and productive to foster equality through mediocrity. He and his party speak of two Americas, and their grip on power is based on using the votes of one to sap the productivity of the other. America is not divided by the differences in our outcomes, it is divided by the differences in our efforts. It is a false philosophy to say one man's success comes about unavoidably as the result of another man's victimization.

What Biden offered was not a solution, but a separatism. He fomented division and strife, pitted one set of Americans against another for his own political benefit. That's what socialists offer. Marxist class warfare wrapped up with a bow.

Two Americas, coming closer each day to proving the truth to Lincoln's maxim that a house divided against itself cannot stand.



Points of Interest

- Peter Wood, President of the National Association of Scholars, has written an excellent article on the fact-based founding principles of the United States which were reflected in President Trump's 1776 Report, and debunks the claims from the left that its foundation was slavery beginning in 1619. The scholarly article titled "America Isn't Make Believe" can be found here: <https://americanmind.org/memo/america-isnt-make-believe/>
- Former U.S. Attorney General Bill Barr recently gave a speech to the Alliance Defending Freedom on what he considers to be the greatest threat to religious liberty in America today: the increasingly militant and extreme secular-progressive climate of our state-run education system. A transcript of his speech can be found here: <https://adflegal.org/william-barr-interview>
- Just a short note to let everyone know that the cards our wonderful WAC members sent to the Albemarle County and Charlottesville police forces last month were very much appreciated!

"Of all tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It would be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end for they do so with the approval of their own conscience. They may be more likely to go to Heaven yet at the same time likelier to make a Hell of earth. This very kindness stings with intolerable insult. To be "cured" against one's will and cured of states which we may not regard as disease is to be put on a level of those who have not yet reached the age of reason or those who never will; to be classed with infants, imbeciles, and domestic animals."

-- C.S. Lewis, *God In The Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics* (1948)

Board Members

President C.J. Hatcher:

cj@cjhatcher.net

Vice President Tamara Thies:

tamaramct@yahoo.com

Secretary Donni Long:

g_long@comcast.net

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

Upcoming Events/Announcements

- **Next Luncheon:** Anticipated 11:30 am, Thursday, June 17, the Greencroft Club
- **WAC Action Committees Sign-Up** – We need members to be involved! Contact: Rena Snow (renasnow@hotmail.com)

