

BARROW REPUBLICAN NEWS

VOLUME 22 ISSUE 9 SEPTEMBER 2016
BARROW COUNTY REPUBLICAN PARTY
P.O. BOX 1054 WINDER, GA 30680-1054

MEETINGS

Our Next Regular Meeting – Mon., Sept 19 7:30 PM
@ Winder Woman’s Club (behind Winder Fire Dept.)
 Bethlehem City Council Meeting – Mon., Oct 3 7:00 PM
 Winder City Council Meeting – Tue., Oct 4 6:00 PM
 Barrow School Board Meeting – Tue., Oct 4 6:00 PM
 Auburn City Council Meeting – Thur., Oct 6 6:00 PM
 County Commission Meeting – Tue., Oct 11 7:00 PM
 Statham City Council Meeting – Tue., Oct 18 7:00 PM
 Auburn City Council Meeting – Thur., Oct 20 6:00 PM
 Carl Town Council Meeting – Thur., Oct 20 7:00 PM
 County Commission Meeting – Tue., Oct 25 7:00 PM

VOTING MEMBERS – COUNTY COMMITTEE (27)

Ken Young – Chr.	Lucretia Hughes	Kathy Hopkins
Mike Pentecost – 1 st VC	David Gunter	Teeny Allison
Leonard Koonce – 2 nd VC	Richard Pepper	Sara Pepper
Mark Staley – Sec.	June Miller	Julia Bridges
Terry Raber – Asst. Sec.	Cal Neff	Tim Walker
Clay Kelley – Tr.	Charles Powell	Jimmy Lomax
Bob Lanham – Asst. Tr.	John Reavis	Linda Reavis
John Stevens	Lynn Stevens	Marty Rahinsky
DuWayne Anderson	Dennis Hevener	Fe Hevener

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Chairman	Ken Young	770-867-5748
	email: kenyoung276@hotmail.com	
First Vice-Chair	Mike Pentecost	770-867-3775
	email: MCPWinder@aol.com	
Second Vice-Chair	Leonard Koonce	706-351-7441
	email: lkoonce1967@gmail.com	
Secretary	Mark Staley	770-539-0976
	email: staley93@hotmail.com	
Asst. Secretary	Terry Raber	678-492-6792
	email: terryraber.lcm@comcast.net	
Treasurer	Clay Kelley	770-560-4523
	email: BKCONSLT@comcast.net	
Asst. Treasurer	Bob Lanham	770-867-5459
	email: lanhamrj@hotmail.com	
C.C. Dist. 1 Rep.	Richard Pepper	770-725-2777
C.C. Dist. 2 Rep.	DuWayne Anderson	404-285-0978
C.C. Dist. 3 Rep.	Cal Neff	678-753-2912
C.C. Dist. 4 Rep.	David Gunter	678-425-4127
C.C. Dist. 5 Rep.	Marty Rahinsky	770-868-8919
C.C. Dist. 6 Rep.	June Miller	770-867-5932

Barrow 10th District Rep. DuWayne Anderson

MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION

Reg. \$ 15, Adv. \$ 25, Barrow 100 \$ 100, Barrow 360 \$ 360

LOCAL ELECTED REPUBLICAN OFFICIALS ARE EXPECTED TO RENEW THEIR MEMBERSHIP!

7:30 PM

September 19, 2016

**ROGER FITZPATRICK
PRESENTATION ON THE U.S. CONSTITUTION**

@@

MEMBERSHIP COMPARISON (as of 8/31/16)

Membership	'08	'09	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16
Regular	56	48	46	44	63	39	36	26	29
Advanced	75	68	58	59	71	59	41	55	55
Barrow 100	13	17	16	17	13	8	13	7	9
Barrow 360	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
Students					4	3	2	2	1
Total	144	134	121	121	152	110	92	91	95
Renewals	106	113	105	112	101	95	82	85	77
New	38	21	16	9	51	15	10	6	18

@@

www.barrowgop.org

VOTE REPUBLICAN

The Kansas Board of Education voted unanimously to defy the Obama administration’s demand that schools receiving public funding allow students to use the bathroom that matches their gender identity. “Just as every child is unique, so too is every school community,” the board said in a statement. “With that understanding, we are firm in our belief that decisions about the care, safety and well-being of all students are best made by the local school district based on the needs and desires of the students, parents and communities they serve.” Once upon a time, this sort of thinking was common sense. Now, it’s near to an act of rebellion. (*National Review*)

%%

REPUBLICAN: THE FREEDOM PARTY
LOWER TAXES *** LIMITED GOVERNMENT**
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

%%

MARK YOUR CALENDARS

Sept 17 (Sat)	Statham Sunflower Festival
Sept 19 (Mon)	Monthly Meeting
Oct 17 (Mon)	Monthly Meeting
Nov 8 (Tue)	GENERAL ELECTION
Nov 21 (Mon)	Monthly Meeting
Dec 5 (Mon)	Annual Holiday Dinner
Jan 16 (Mon)	Monthly Meeting
Feb 20 (Mon)	Monthly Meeting

**2016 CONTESTED RACES
AFFECTING BARROW COUNTY**

President	Trump – R	Clinton – D	Johnson – L
U.S. Senate	Isakson – R	Barksdale – D	Barkley - L
10 th U.S. District	Hice – R	Leonard Ware –	Write-In
Commission Dist. 2	Brown – R	Dwight Acey – D	
Commission Dist. 3	Wehunt – R	Michael Pope – D	
School Board Dist. 6	Bailey – R	B.L. Mayweather – D	

%%%%%%%%%

**THE LONG, SLOW DECLINE OF
WESTERN CIVILIZATION . . .**

Jeff Thomas, Editor, *International Man*

Recently an article appeared in Forbes magazine that recommended a universal basic income (UBI) for all citizens. The writer, who is from the UK, argues that: “we can indeed afford a UBI at an extremely reasonable level within the confines of the amount that we already tax. So thus the question moves on to the next point: do we actually want one? At which point I say yes, obviously we do, as I have been saying for some years now. Simply on the basis that a UBI would be vastly better than the cruel, almost wicked, welfare states that we currently have.”

The author picks US\$13,000 as the appropriate number that he feels should be granted to all US citizens over the age of 21 and placed automatically into their individual bank accounts in monthly installments, for the rest of their lives.

Since this concept is unquestionably socialistic in nature and encourages the government’s role as a nanny state to an even greater degree than it already operates, the reader may understandably raise an eyebrow at reading it in a publication such as Forbes. Whilst I would agree, I would add, in all fairness, that, today, the article might also have been acceptable in that old British stalwart, *The Economist*.

The Economist was established in the UK in 1843 and, for well over a century, could be counted on to reflect the principles of classical economics. When I was growing up, it was read religiously in our household and the subscription continued for generations. That tradition ended in the late nineties. The reason was that the older writers, each of whom had an exceptional grasp of fundamental economic principles, were retiring or dying off and were being replaced one by one by younger writers, many of whom had been educated at the London School of Economics (LSE) or similar institution, where, today, Keynesian economics has become a mainstay of the curriculum.

Were Adam Smith alive today, he might be inclined to say, “Economics is simply an explanation of the function of money. Keynesian economics does not fall within that definition. It is an exercise in the distortion of economic principles, intended to promote a political end – that of socialism, to which Mister Keynes was devoted.”

Of course, these are my own words and the reader is encouraged to question them and consider whether I’m correct that Adam Smith might indeed take this view.

As stated above, we’re witnessing the same deterioration of economic principles across the pond in the U.S. in such formerly reliable publications as Forbes. Is this a coincidence, or is there an overriding reason why the same anomaly should develop on one side of the Atlantic as on the other?

Forbes was founded by B.C. Forbes in 1917 and was later taken over by his sons, particularly the colorful Malcolm. Upon his death, Forbes fell to grandson Steve. But Steve Forbes is now nearing 70 and is likely to soon exit the Forbes stage. As he and others of his generation bow out, they will also be replaced by those who have been educated at LSE and similar institutions. (Today, Keynesian theory is predominant in universities on both sides of the Atlantic. As a result, we now have generations of Keynesians in politics, journalism, and economics, almost to the total exclusion of classicists.) But, let’s return to the Forbes article. Is the writer’s position really all that irrational?

He posits that, if an individual were to receive a UBI of \$13,000, courtesy of his government, his economic life would be improved. Quite so. He then extends this assumption to the effect that, if all adult citizens were to receive this unearned increment, they would all benefit, so the economy as a whole would be healthier.

Unfortunately though, the premise does not hold up under extension. If all citizens were to receive the UBI, a new leveling would take place within the economy. This is similar to an increase in minimum wage, wherein, if all employees receive a pay rise, all manufacturers and service providers will have increased costs, which have to be passed on to consumers – the same consumers who just got the pay rise. On balance, no one experiences an improved livelihood. Likewise, if all citizens received a UBI, the cost of living would rise to meet it, leaving no one better off.

Further, the classic mistake of empowering the government to take charge of the change would have its effects. In every case, when a nanny state increases the weight of its boot on the neck of the economy, the economy becomes less vibrant, to the detriment of all citizens except those connected directly to the government. Keynesian theory has it that major changes can be made to the economy in isolation, with little or no effect on the economy as a whole. This flawed assumption is a major contributor to the failure of Keynesianism. In truth, any variable affects the whole in some way.

But, returning to the overview, we may wonder why those publications, that were once so well-informed, are deteriorating together. The answer lies in the little-understood historical fact that each nation has a shelf life. It begins its rise as a result of determination and a strong work ethic. It then rises to a level of productivity, which in turn creates prosperity. This abundance leads the population to become easy prey to empty political claims that largesse from the state can enrich all. Largesse results in complacency, which then turns into apathy.

After a nation has peaked and a majority of the people have traded in their work ethic for the undeliverable promise of ever-increasing governmental largesse, the decline is set in stone. When this has taken place, it’s not only the work ethic that’s in a terminal decline. The nation heads inexorably downward in other ways.

Publications decline in quality, partially because the more well-informed authors are retiring and are replaced by those with a less global understanding. But the readership also deteriorates as, increasingly, the potential audience is eager to hear more empty promises, along with theories that support them. (Joseph Schumpeter and his fellow Austrians would be unlikely to be hired by *The Economist* today.)

Historically, when a nation goes into a terminal decline, it is not just one aspect of its existence that declines. Moral values,

sound economic principles, productivity, an independent media, and basic freedoms all tend to decline with it.

Today, many of those who anticipate an economic crash speculate whether, after the crash, someone will press the reset button, allowing the game to simply start over. Unfortunately, this is not the way history tends to work.

Since a decline envelops all aspects of socio-economic and political existence, it amounts to “burning down the house.” The nation, if it remains together at all (they often don’t) cannot just do a little remodeling. The nation must be completely rebuilt – moral certitude, a sound economic foundation, and a return to productivity, all of which require the presence of basic freedoms to drive them. This often takes generations to accomplish and many nations never return to their former levels of prominence.

So, is the situation hopeless? Well, in the words of Karl Kraus, “The situation is hopeless, but not serious.” In any era, some nations are in decline, but there are always others that are on the rise. When those in power begin to douse the floorboards with gasoline, it’s an indicator that a change of address should be considered.

%%%%%%%%%

Remember how the Left scoffed at the notion that the reaction to police shootings in Ferguson, Mo., and Chicago was leading to crime spikes in large American cities? It should scoff no more. A Department of Justice-funded study has now found that the so-called Ferguson effect is probably the most plausible explanation for a statistically significant surge in violent crime. The study’s author speculated that the tension between the police and inner-city communities was leading to a breakdown in trust: “Predatory violence increases because offenders believe victims and witnesses will not contact the police.” Political opportunism created the opening, criminals are taking advantage, and black Americans suffer most of all. (*National Review*)

WALL OF SHAME

A free speech “graffiti wall” was designated by Ohio University in Athens, OH. What could go wrong? Turns out, the only “free speech” at this institution of higher learning is speech the far-left Taliban approves. According to Campus Reform, a group of anonymous students at Ohio University painted “Build the wall” and “Trump 2016” on the campus wall. Yes, they did. But this was not acceptable graffiti. Outraged students complained, and free speech hit a brick wall as OU’s President Roderick McDavis groveled to those students “hurt” by the “troubling” messages. So the Trump comments were painted over with the words “Latino Pride.” And then came the most incendiary message of all. OU’s College Republicans wrote: “Trigger Warning: There are no safe spaces in real life! You can’t wall off the First Amendment.” At that, leftist students began bouncing off the walls, demanding a “mandatory investigation” by law enforcement. Yes, they wanted the cops to find and punish whoever dared defend the First Amendment in writing. Another off-the-wall lefty vowed to “beat the sh-t” out of members of the College Republicans. The “crisis” led the OU police to “host an open discussion” about the slogans with the college’s LGBT Center. And I’m sure the discussion was “open.” Totally free. (*Limbaugh Letter*)

Occasionally, the mask slips off completely. For years, constitutional originalists have charged that too many American judges believe their role is to invent, rather than to uphold, the law. In June, Judge Richard Posner came straight out and confirmed their fears. Writing in *Slate*, Posner confessed that he sees “absolutely no value” in studying the U.S. Constitution. There is, he wrote, “no value to a judge of spending decades, years, months, weeks, day[s], hours, minutes, or seconds studying the Constitution, the history of its enactment, its amendments, and its implementation,” for “18th-century guys, however smart, could not foresee the culture, technology, etc., of the 21st century.” They certainly didn’t foresee the nerve of some 21st-century judges. (*National Review*)

GUARD ARRESTED AFTER REMOVING MAN LADIES RESTROOM

On May 16, a female security guard at Giant Grocery Store in Washington, D.C. was arrested because she physically escorted a man out of the ladies’ restroom after he refused to leave.

The young man, who calls himself Ebony Belcher and identifies as a woman, said the security guard told him, “You guys cannot keep coming in here and using our women’s restroom. They did not pass the law yet.”

Belcher called the police to report the incident. He claimed he was emotionally traumatized by the incident and that the guard had no reason to put her hands on him. “People should not be discriminated based on their gender identity,” he stated. “I’m hurt by this. It’s terrible . . . I’m distraught.”

The security guard has been charged with simple assault, and D.C. police are treating the incident as a “suspected hate crime.”

A Daily Caller poll indicated as of May 24 that 97% agreed with the security guard’s decision to remove the man from the women’s restroom. (*AFA Journal*, July-August 2016, dailycaller.com, 5/19/16)

The ingenious college student, writing to an online advice board, seemed genuinely puzzled. She and her fellow interns at an unnamed major company felt its corporate dress code was too stuffy: Even employees’ shoes were restricted to certain styles, and to make matters worse, one worker conspicuously violated the shoe guidelines with impunity. (We will assume the writer is “she,” since a guy would not be so obsessed with shoes.) So they reacted the way any group of 21st-century undergraduates would: They drew up a petition and presented it to the boss – who responded by summarily firing all them all, after explaining that the worker with nonconforming footwear was a former soldier who had lost a leg. The intern was baffled: “The proposal was written professionally like examples I have learned about in school, and our arguments were thought out and well-reasoned.” Yet there they were, handing in their IDs, having learned that not every lesson is taught in school. (*National Review*)