

## **SUPREME COURT, PRO-LIFE MOVEMENT, TAXES ARE AMONG THE ISSUES AT STAKE IN THE ELECTION OF 2008**

By: Anthony J. Sacco, Sr. © October 2008.

---

PINE BLUFFS - A couple of friends recently suggested like Bob Dole in 1996, this year John McCain is a "giveaway candidate" who in losing this time around will surely set the stage for a Republican win in 2012. Sounds good, doesn't it? Until you begin to wrap your brain around it.

There will be many very serious problems with four years of Barack Hussein Obama at the helm and the Democrats in control of Congress. That the public is already at least partially aware of this, but has not yet completely connected the dots, is seen by recent job approval ratings for this Democrat-led Congress; presently at 13%, according to a combined NBC/Wall Street Journal Survey taken October 4-5. Here are a few of the concerns that I see.

### **That Pesky Supreme Court Issue:**

Say what you will about George W. Bush's presidency, unlike a few of his predecessors, his father among them, he's certainly done well with Supreme Court appointments, placing two Justices on the Court who don't attempt to legislate from the bench. John Roberts and Samuel Alito, appointed during Mr. Bush's second term, have moved the Court from a liberal body to a more conservative one. However, that spot is tenuous at best, because it depends upon what Anthony Kennedy - who took Sandra Day O'Connor's role as the swing Justice - will do on any given day.

But four liberal Justices still sit on that Court: John Paul Stevens, who is 88, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, 75, Steven Breyer, 69, and David Souter, 68. It is said that Stevens, who once announced he'd not retire while a Republican president occupied the White House, still plays tennis at 88. Ginsburg, 75, works out regularly in the Supreme Court gym. These two oldest Justices — half the Court's liberal wing — will, whether they like it or not, probably be forced to retire during the next presidential administration. Despite Stevens' and Ginsburgs' apparent vigor, change on the Supreme Court is more likely than not over the next four years. If nothing else, the actuarial tables will catch up with them.

With five Justices 70 or older by the time the Court meets again in October 2008, interest groups and others are buzzing about the Court's role in the presidential election. One change on a Court that divides 5-4 in key cases can alter the results in a case and affect the law for years. But two? That possibility was acknowledged by both presidential candidates during the debate on Wednesday, October 15<sup>th</sup>.

I recently read a tongue-in-cheek story that the Justices, concerned about the number of 5-4 decisions they were releasing, met to decide if they could not begin to have at least a few more 6-3 decisions. Their vote? 5-4.

But predictions of the pundits on the future makeup of the Court depend on three factors — who wins the presidency, who leaves the Court, and who is appointed. Democrat Barack Hussein Obama would surely replace liberal justices with like-minded successors. Just imagine: William Ayers, former member of the Weathermen terrorist underground as a Supreme Court Justice. Or worse yet, Hillary Rodham Clinton taking Ruth Bader Ginsburg's spot. On the other hand, Republican John McCain, if elected, might fulfill a campaign pledge and put conservative justices on the court in the mold of Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Alito, who don't seek to impose their own agenda on the country.

The problem of liberal judges and the mischief they can cause is highlighted by this story. Although homosexual activists remain zero for fifty in their efforts to change the definition of marriage in State legislatures, Connecticut's Supreme Court, in a 4-3 decision, became the third one to judicially mandate recognition of "marriages" of same-sex couples, following Massachusetts in 2003 and California earlier this year. Pro-family forces in Connecticut face a long struggle to reverse this judicial activism. According to the *Hartford Courant*, a ballot question in November would call for a constitutional convention. Fortunately, voters in California, Arizona, and Florida already have marriage amendments on the ballot November 4th, which will take the definition of marriage out of the hands of activist judges once and for all.

And this one: In Washington, D.C., a U.S. District judge, ignoring the fact that there's a war going on — a war against Terrorists - ordered the release, into the United States, of 17 detainees who have been held at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base since 2002 as enemy combatants.

Luckily, this latest detainee disaster was averted - at least temporarily - when an appellate panel issued a stay the following day so that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit could consider the issue before the status quo changed. Nevertheless, the stark and shocking reality of the initial ruling remains; 17 terrorists released into America simply because a liberal judge decided that they can be tried in our civil courts. Maybe we should ask the judge who made this decision to guarantee their appearances in court by putting them up at his house until then.

If an ultra-liberal president appoints two liberal justices to the Court, we'll be saddled with them for anywhere from 20 to 35 years. That's too long for the United States to again suffer under a liberal Supreme Court, as we were forced to do under the Warren Court.

### **The Pro-Life Angle:**

Ever hear of the Mexico City Policy? This policy was originally announced by President Reagan in 1984 at an international population conference in Mexico City. It required that to receive funds under the population control aid program overseen by the Agency for International Development (USAID), private overseas organizations would henceforth have to agree not to perform abortions, except to save the mother's life or in cases of rape or incest, and not to promote abortion as a method of family planning — by campaigning to weaken or repeal the pro-life laws of foreign nations.

When Bill Clinton took office, one of his first acts as President was to sign an Executive Order overturning this policy. He did that to placate his ultra-liberal base. But when George W. Bush was elected, he reversed Clinton's anti-life act with an Executive Order re-instating Reagan's Mexico City directive. Obama? His long-standing pro-abortion record, which goes back to his days in the Illinois State Legislature where he opposed the Born Alive Infants Protection Act on the state level, and later at the federal level, points to what could be in store for us if he's elected.

### **Taxes, Taxes, Taxes:**

When you consider these two extremely important social issues, and then toss in Obama's promise to raise the capital gains tax, which Republicans have fought so hard for years to reduce to its present level in order to benefit those millions of Americans - ordinary Americans who now and then purchase a few shares of stock or make an occasional investment in real estate rental property - to help make ends meet or to put the kids through college; well, I can't go along with the idea that we should not be too concerned about four years of a Democrat in the White House. Nor do I agree with Obama's vice-presidential nominee, liberal Senator Joe Biden (D-DE), that it's "actually patriotic" to pay higher taxes.

### **Think It Over:**

These are crucial times. As Dr. James Dobson, former head of Focus on the Family recently said so eloquently, "Our nation's future literally hangs in the balance."

And Rev. Thomas J. Euteneuer, head of Human Life International, said, "More is at stake than just the economy in this presidential election season. In fact, the manufactured economic woes of our country are in some ways a smokescreen to keep our minds off the weightier moral issues. . ."

So, if you're thinking about voting for Barack Hussein Obama to show you're not prejudiced toward blacks, or to register your dissatisfaction with the abuses of some Republicans while in power during the years following the Contract with America in '96, when we gave Republicans a majority in Congress for the first time in 50 years, or because - as the Media are now suggesting - you want to avoid the possibility of race riots should Obama lose, or if you're thinking about simply sitting this election out and not voting at all because you feel that John McCain is not conservative enough for you, think again. There's just too much at stake for America this time around.

---