

March 31: Cesar Chavez Day: Honoring an American Hero

The story has been told now in many articles, books, documentaries, and a relatively recent movie of how Cesar Chavez, while working as an organizer in Los Angeles, became convinced a union for farmworkers had to be created if working conditions were to be improved. He quit his job. He and Helen loaded up their old station wagon with the kids and a mimeograph machine, and headed to Delano.

March 29: National Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day

While more than nine million Americans served when the country called them to defend the nation of South Vietnam from aggression by Communist North Vietnam led by Ho Chi Minh, anti-war demonstrations involved many thousands who condemned not only the war, but those who were sent to fight it.

Feb. 22: Reinstate Washington's Birthday as a

National Holiday – On His Real Birthday

Congress should re-establish George Washington's Birthday as a National Holiday – and celebrate it on his actual birthday, February 22. The Father Of Our Country deserves no less. The people of our nation, especially the children, deserve no less.

February 3rd is “National Four Chaplains Day” – Why?

But a question is raised on this Four Chaplains Day, Feb. 3, 2025: Do Americans of this era, in government, in the media, in the public schools as teachers or administrators, still believe in those truths? Will Americans express that belief by honoring the Four Chaplains as once the American nation did?

Pearl Harbor Attack Dec. 7, 1941: Survivor S. J. Hemker

Remembered

Hemker had four sons. All four, like their father, are veterans who served in the Vietnam war. Hemker had no biological daughter. But, in his declining years, he had for more than fifteen years lived in his own room in the home of a loving “daughter-in-fact” if not of biology, Sue McConnell, and her husband.

D-Day: June 6, 1944

Those who fought at Normandy on D-Day to preserve freedom from defeat by Hitler’s national socialist fascists paid a terrible sacrifice. The beaches at Normandy, with NAZI artillery and machine guns established in cross-fire patterns, were, indeed, “killing fields,” prepared for slaughter. The sea and sands ran red with blood.

Memorial Day 2024: Will Americans Still Die For Freedom?

Memorial Day—which will be officially observed on Monday, May 27 this year – is a day to remember what should be remembered every day: The service and sacrifice of the more than 1.3-million American veterans who have given their lives in war so

that we, their posterity, might live as free Americans.

Armed Forces Day—Third Saturday of May

May God bless and keep all those more than 1.3-million patriotic Americans who by their service and sacrifice on active duty in the armed forces or in the Reserves or National Guard protect and defend the freedom of all 340-million of the rest of us Americans.

“No Va Resources for Illegal Aliens Act”—Now!

There are an estimated 16-million living American veterans. Many, many, of them need VA care and have earned that care by their service in defense of America—and of Americans. We, each one of us, including each veteran, should stand with those veterans for whom VA was created and demand that VA resources go exclusively to and for those who have earned it—the veterans.

March 31: Cesar Chavez Day: Honoring an American Hero

The story has been told now in many articles, books, documentaries, and a relatively recent movie of how Cesar Chavez, while working as an organizer in Los Angeles, became convinced a union for farmworkers had to be created if working conditions were to be improved. He quit his job.

March 29: National Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day

There will be many observances, especially by veterans, at posts of the American Legion, VFW, and other veterans organizations, which welcome the participation of non-veterans in honoring all who honorably served. Go, welcome the Vietnam Veterans home, and be welcomed by them.

Feb. 22: Reinstate Washington's Birthday as a National Holiday – On His

Real Birthday

By observing Washington's Birthday as a National Holiday on his actual birth date, Feb. 22, the focus of the nation was on Washington. However, all that changed in 1971. Congress – pressured by federal government bureaucrats and other employees and their unions desiring another paid three-day holiday – abolished “Washington's Birthday” as a National Holiday.

Feb. 15, 1973: American POWs Come Home With Honor—A Day To Remember

It was a day of great importance in 1973, in an America divided by the war in Vietnam. And, it is a day to remember all these years later in an even more divided America. It is important for what it teaches about duty, honor, sacrifice and country. It is about who we are and what we can be.

Pearl Harbor Attack Dec. 7, 1941: Survivor S. J. Hemker

Remembered

Although S.J. Hemker may no longer be with us physically, he can be and should be with us spiritually—the spirit of patriotic love of country and service in its defense that he exemplified, as did and do so many others of the WWII Greatest Generation. Neither his life nor his words should be forgotten, if, as he warns, we Americans are to remain free.

Veterans Day 2023—Will We “Keep Faith” To Our Veterans?

On Veterans Day 2023, may God bless all the veterans who have served in defense of our freedom in all the wars. And may the country whose freedom they preserved honor them on Veterans Day and on every day. They kept the faith with us; and, as expressed in the haunting words of “Flanders Field,” we must not “break faith” with them.

GAO: “Deplorable” Living Conditions in Military Barracks

In Democrat run states and cities illegal’s that break our laws, sneak across the border are put up in the best fancy

hotels in NYC, LA, etc. with 3 meals a day, free cell phones, \$2,500 a month, all at taxpayers expense. No wonder they're coming by the millions, while our veterans who sacrificed everything for our country live in deplorable conditions.

July 4, 1776 and 2023—America Then and Now

Indeed, on this Independence Day, July 4, 2023, we Americans must search our souls and answer the question: Are we Americans willing to fight, to sacrifice, and to give our lives if necessary, in defense of American freedom now, as the Americans of the Founding Fathers generation did then, on July 4, 1776?

D-Day: June 6, 1944

Hitler was convinced – and had convinced most of the western world – that his Fortress Europe could turn back and defeat any attempt to invade occupied Europe by sea. So confident were the NAZI socialists, that their top generals were elsewhere—including Erwin Rommel, the “Desert Fox,” Hitler’s best fighting general who had gained fame in the Africa campaign.

Memorial Day 2023: Will American's Still Die for Freedom?

Finally, may we have the courage, the integrity, the love of God, family, comrades, and country, to make the choice they did if we are called upon to make the ultimate sacrifice for freedom.

Armed Forces Day—the Third Saturday of May

May God bless and keep all those more than 1.3-million patriotic Americans who by their service and sacrifice on active duty in the armed forces protect and defend the freedom of all 340-million of the rest of us Americans.

Cesar Chavez Holiday—Honoring An American Hero

There are also malicious myths tainting the life and the memory of Cesar Chavez that need to be repudiated, most particularly the lies that he was not an American but a Mexican national, and that he was a “Communist,” both of which were first promulgated by the John Birch Society. They are

utterly false.

March 29: National Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day

There will be many observances, especially by veterans, at posts of the American Legion, VFW, and other veterans organizations, which welcome the participation of non-veterans in honoring all who honorably served. Go, welcome the Vietnam Veterans home, and be welcomed by them.

A Tale Of Two Cities—Kiev, Ukraine and Palestine, OH

Among other things, the Zelensky government in the Ukraine has now outlawed all other political parties. Zelensky has shut down all media the government does not control. Zelensky has outlawed the ancient Russian Orthodox Church— and Zelensky, who is Jewish, is actually arresting Christian Priests and Nuns.

Feb. 15, 1973: American POWs Come Home With Honor—A Day To Remember

February 15, 2023 is the 50th anniversary of a shining moment in American history: It was on that day in 1973 that American prisoners of war began the repatriation process that would finally bring them home from Vietnam with their honor intact.

February 3rd is “National Four Chaplains Day” – Why?

On Four Chaplains Day, Feb. 3, 2023— the 80th anniversary of the day in which the Four Chaplains sacrificed their lives “so that others may live.” —will the media again fail to report on it, and the schools fail to teach it, and Americans, in the main, fail to observe it?

Pearl Harbor Attack Dec. 7, 1941: Survivor S. J. Hemker

Remembered

Although S.J. Hemker may no longer be with us physically, he can be and should be with us spiritually—the spirit of patriotic love of country and service in its defense that he exemplified, as did and do so many others of the WWII Greatest Generation. Neither his life nor his words should be forgotten, if, as he warns, we Americans are to remain free.

Veterans Day 2022—Will We “Keep Faith” To Veterans?

On Veterans Day 2022, may God bless all the veterans who have served in defense of our freedom in all the wars. And may the country whose freedom they preserved honor them on Veterans Day and on every day. They kept the faith with us; and, as expressed in the haunting words of “Flanders Field,” we must not “break faith” with them.

Pow MIA Recognition Day: They Should Never Be Forgotten

On National POW-MIA Recognition Day, we Americans, all of us, have the opportunity to remember and honor all of the POWs and all the MIAs, by participating in one of the many observances, or, if not able to do so, to pause in our busy lives to honor

and remember them and to stand with their families...

Is the Biden Regime Going to War—Against the Veterans?

President Joseph Biden began his first days as Commander-in-Chief of America's armed forces by a disastrous surrender to the Taliban and a disgraceful withdrawal from Afghanistan. Now, the question must be raised: Is Commander-in-Chief Joseph Biden, who never served a day in defense of America, going to war—against Veterans serving now, and Veterans who have served?

July 4th 1776 and 2022—America Then and Now

On this July 4th 2022, 246th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence and the birth day of our United States of America, and on every day, we Americans ought to remember, honor, emulate and give thanks for the patriots of July 4th 1776 – from Gen. George Washington, the Father of Our Country, to the least ranked unknown soldier of the Revolutionary Army, whose service and sacrifice created our freedom.

Memorial Day 2022: Will We Keep America Free?

Memorial Day is a day to remember what should be remembered every day—the service and sacrifice of the more than 1.3-million American veterans who have given their their lives in war so that we, their posterity, might live as free Americans.

Cesar Chavez Holiday—Honoring An American Hero

I am greatly indebted to Cesar Chavez, especially for the example of his humble, selfless life in service for others. I will always walk in his shadow. May the God he so faithfully served bless and keep him. May the country he so faithfully served, always remember and honor him.

Feb. 22: Reinstate Washington's Birthday as a National Holiday – On His Real Birthday!

Congress should re-establish George Washington's Birthday as a National Holiday – and celebrate it on his actual birth day,

February 22. The Father Of Our Country deserves no less. The people of our nation, especially the children, deserve no less.

Feb. 15, 1973: American POW's Come Home With Honor—A Day To Remember

I confess that I am greatly concerned about what is happening in our country today. No one seems to be held accountable. We have a debacle in Afghanistan in which Americans were left behind. We have an invasion at our southern border. We have rising inflation. We have crime escalating all across the country. We have mandates telling us...

Pearl Harbor Attack: Survivor S. J. Hemker Remembers

Although S.J. Hemker may no longer be with us physically, he can be and should be with us spiritually—the spirit of patriotic love of country and service in its defense that he exemplified, as did and do so many others of the WWII Greatest Generation. Neither his life nor his words should be forgotten, if, as he warns, we Americans are to remain free.

Veterans Day 2021–Will We “Keep Faith” to Veterans?

On Veterans Day 2021, may God bless all the veterans who have served in defense of our freedom in all the wars. And may the country whose freedom they preserved honor them on Veterans Day and on every day. They kept the faith with us; and, as expressed in the haunting words of “Flanders Field,” we must not “break faith” with them.

Memorial Day 2021: Will We Keep America Free?

But Memorial Day 2021 differs from past Memorial Day observances. Our nation is more divided on this Memorial Day than perhaps any time since the Civil War. Indeed, the country has been transformed from “one nation under God” into a divided nation without God, resulting in seething, increasingly violent, animus and mutual distrust.

Cesar Chavez Holiday–Honoring

An American Hero

March 31 is an official State holiday in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, and is observed in several other States (including Colorado, Michigan, Nevada, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin) in honor of the birth on March 31, 1927, of an extraordinary American – Cesar Estrada Chavez, the late co-founder and president of the United Farm Workers of America who became a legend in his own time in the civil rights era.

Pearl Harbor Survivor S.J. Hemker: Remembering Dec. 7, 1941: “A Day Which Will Live in Infamy”

One American for whom the Pearl Harbor attack did “live in infamy” for all of his long, productive, and patriotic 100-year lifetime was, Pearl Harbor survivor Shelby John (“S.J.”) Hemker of Banning, California.

Veterans Day 2020 –Will We “Keep Faith” to Veterans?

On this Veterans Day 2020, may God bless all the veterans who have served in defense of our freedom in all the wars. And may

the country whose freedom they preserved honor them on Veterans Day and on every day. They kept the faith with us; and, as expressed in the haunting words of "Flanders Field," we must not "break faith" with them.

The Spirit of WWII Generation Needs to Stop This Misguided Generation

The reality must be recognized: What is happening is the real, revolutionary, thing: Black Lives Matter, its allied domestic terrorists of Antifa, their affiliated racial or Marxist allies, are not "reformist organizations" and individuals attempting to make America better. They are revolutionary organizations and individuals seeking to overthrow America

Cesar Chavez Holiday—Honoring An American Hero

There are also malicious myths tainting the life and the memory of Cesar Chavez that need to be repudiated, most particularly the lies that he was not an American but a Mexican national, and that he was a "Communist," both of which were first promulgated by the John Birch Society. They are utterly false.

Feb. 22: Restore Washington's Birthday As A National Holiday

February 22, 2020, is the 288th anniversary of the birth in 1732 of General and President George Washington, the "Father Of Our Country." He is the most universally respected and admired American in the age of the Founding Fathers, and in the history of America.

Pearl Harbor Survivor S.J. Hemker Remembrance of Dec. 7, 1941: "A Day Which Will Live In Infamy"

December 7, 2019 ,Pearl Harbor Day, marks the 78th anniversary of the Japanese air attack on U.S. naval and air installations at Pearl Harbor, HI, at 7:53 a.m., Dec. 7, 1941 – without a declaration of war. It was then the worst attack on American soil in history: Some 2,403 died, 2008 of them Navy personnel; another 1,178 were wounded.

POW MIA Recognition Day: They Should Never Be Forgotten

By Act of Congress in 1979, the third Friday of September, while not a national holiday, is observed annually as "POW-MIA RECOGNITION DAY." Its purpose is to remember and honor all those who suffered as prisoners of war, and all those many thousands who were and are still missing in action.

Cesar Chavez Holiday—Honoring An American Hero

March 31 is an official State holiday in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, and is observed in several other States, in honor of the birth on March 31, 1937, of an extraordinary American – Cesar Estrada Chavez, the late co-founder and president of the United Farm Workers of America who became a legend in his own time in the civil rights era.

Pearl Harbor Survivor S. J. Hemker Remembers Dec. 7,

1941: “A Day Which Will Live In Infamy”

December 7, 2018, Pearl Harbor Day, marks the 77th anniversary of the Japanese air attack on U.S. naval and air installations at Pearl Harbor, HI, at 7:53 a.m., Dec. 7, 1941, without a declaration of war.

It was then the worst attack on American soil in history: Some 2,403 died, 2008 of them Navy personnel; another 1,178 were wounded.

Eighteen Navy ships, including the U.S.S. Arizona, were sunk or damaged. Almost all the planes at the island bases were destroyed or damaged while still on the ground.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt memorably called December 7, 1941, “a day which will live in infamy” in his dramatic speech to Congress, which then declared war on Japan.

Only the sneak attack on America by radical Islamic terrorists on 9-11-2001 in New York resulted in more deaths. But for many Americans of this generation – and millions of immigrants, legal and illegal – the significance of Pearl Harbor is not fully known, or appreciated.

One for whom it does “live in infamy,” is Pearl Harbor survivor S. J. Hemker of Banning, California, A retired three-war combat Navy veteran – WWII, Korea, and Vietnam –and an American Legionnaire, Hemker, who will celebrate his 100th Birthday on Jan. 10, 1919, remembers Pearl Harbor up close and personal as if it was yesterday:

“Ordinarily, we would have been at sea. We were at Pearl Harbor because we had to repair an engine that had been sabotaged at the shipyard back in California. I was up on the fantail of our ship, the USS New Orleans, a heavy cruiser,

with the Chief Master at Arms. The Quartermaster was there, getting ready to raise the flag," Hemker recalls.

"It was 7:53 a.m. when we saw the Japanese planes. They were flying so low I could see the pilots' faces in the cockpit. They were grinning at us as they went down toward Battle Ship Row. Grinning at me and the Chief. They were so close, you could have thrown something at them and hit them. A potato, maybe. They were that close. Just skimming the top of the water. Torpedo planes. The pilots grinning at us," Hemker reluctantly, but vividly recalls.

"The loudspeakers blared: 'Man your battle stations – the Japs are attacking'. All hell broke loose... It was terrible, horrible, ...," he says, pausing in his remembrance.

"I spent the next eight hours down in the magazine loading for our five-inch anti-aircraft guns. We fired everything. If we had been hit, that would have been it for us in the magazine. We would have been blown up. We had a big crane over the top of our ship. I think that's what saved us," he states matter-of-factly as to his own circumstance, then somberly relates:

"The Arizona capsized. Thirteen hundred men went down with her. Half the guys I was with in boot camp died on the Arizona. That's where the Memorial is today. They say that oil still leaks out every day. Those guys...they're still down there," Hemker says quietly, his voice trailing off, as if physically turning away from a memory, and reality, which is still too painful to talk about.

Getting Hemker to talk about it at all is no easy task. Like many of his fellow World War II veterans, he still doesn't talk about his war experiences, never expects any thanks or gratitude, and never, ever boasts about it, despite the fact that after Pearl Harbor he served America in battles and combat zones for the duration of WWII, in the Korean War, and in Vietnam.

Hemker, a widower, roguishly handsome into his 90's and possessed of a sly sense of humor, for years charmed the ladies in the American Legion Auxiliary with his country gallantry. He is universally admired by his comrade veterans in the American Legion. "I'm not able to do what I used to do, but I do what I can," he says.

Hemker's beloved wife died more than 30 years ago. For the last thirteen years of her life, Hemker's wife was bedridden, unable to perform the most basic of everyday tasks of life, totally dependent. It says a great deal about the kind of man S.J. Hemker is, that for all of those thirteen years Hemker cared for her, seeing to her every need, lovingly dedicating his life to her care, until her death did them part.

Hemker had four sons. All four, like their father, are veterans who served in the Vietnam war. Hemker had no biological daughter. But, in his declining years, he has for more than fifteen years lived in his own room in the home of a loving daughter-in-fact if not of biology, Sue McConnell, and her husband,

No daughter has rendered more loving care to a father than has Sue McConnell to S.J. Hemker.

"I call him my 'Dad' because he is that to me. I couldn't love him more," says Sue, who has known Hemker for thirty-seven years, which during she has often up risen up in fury when the VA has not done its duty to "to this great man, this hero, my Dad."

Reflecting on Pearl Harbor seventy-seven years after surviving it, Hemker, who has lost his eyesight, but not his vision for America, observes:

"We Americans should never forget. If we forget our past and those who died, we won't have a future. A free one, anyway. Look at what happened on 9-11. More people were killed on that day then were killed at Pearl Harbor. It can happen again," he

warns.

“I don’t think people remember Pearl Harbor and what it means, the way they used to do,” Hemker concludes. “That’s too bad. A lot of us can’t forget. An awful lot of really good people died to keep America free. They shouldn’t be forgotten.”

© 2018 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Rees Lloyd: ReesLloydLaw@gmail.com

Cesar Chavez Holiday –Honoring An American Hero

“I am convinced that the truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness, is to sacrifice for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men!” –Cesar Chavez

March 31 is an official State holiday in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, and is observed in several other States, in honor of the birth on March 31, 1937, of an extraordinary American – Cesar Estrada Chavez, the late co-founder and president of the United Farm Workers of America who became a legend in his own time in the civil rights era.

In his honor, his headquarters for the UFW, which he named “La Paz” (“The Peace”), in the Tehachapi Mountains in Keene, CA, on Highway 58 between Bakersfield and Tehachapi, is now officially the U.S. Cesar Chavez National Monument, established by the federal government. The U.S. Navy, of which he was a veteran, has named a ship for him. He was posthumously awarded the Medal of Freedom, which was accepted

by his widow, Helen Chavez. Many cities have named streets, schools, libraries and other public buildings in his honor.

But there are many Americans today who are unaware there is a Cesar Chavez Day (the major media ignore it), or why there should be a holiday honoring him. There are also malicious myths tainting the life and the memory of Cesar Chavez that need to be repudiated, most particularly the lies that he was not an American but a Mexican national, and that he was a "Communist," both of which were first promulgated by the John Birch Society. They are utterly false.

I worked with Cesar Chavez for some twenty years, starting in 1973, when I was a young long haul trucker participating in a nationwide strike of some 100,000 independent truckers in protest against escalating fuel costs in the so-called "Arab Oil Embargo."

I was helping coordinate the the truckers' "Shutdown" at the Triple T Truckstop in Tucson, AZ, as a member of the steering committee of the "Truckers For Justice."

Cesar Chavez mentored me in that strike, which remained non-violent because of

his demands in mentoring me that "violence is a failure of creative intelligence; violence is failure of creative intelligence."

After that strike was broken, an alliance between the Truckers For Justice and the United Farm Workers of America was established. During that work, in which we refused to haul non-union ("scab") lettuce and grapes, Cesar told me I needed to go to law school as I could do more good as a lawyer. His recommendation got me into law school.

I worked with UFW lawyers while in law school, and after graduating and passing the California Bar in 1979, I became one of Cesar Chavez' lawyers until the day of his death on

April 23, 1993, and for the UFW thereafter as called upon. I have remained to this day exclusively a civil rights, workers rights, veterans rights attorney. ([I have written in more detail about experiences with Cesar Chavez in an earlier tribute](#)).

I can attest based on that long “up close and personal” experience that Cesar Chavez was, in his own way, a true American hero; that there are valuable lessons to be learned from his honorable life; and that he is deserving of recognition by all Americans for his service and sacrifice for others, no matter their race, color, or creed.

However, in order to understand that, it is necessary, first, to overcome the lies and myths which continue to distort the truth of who and what Cesar Chavez was. These are myths by those who hated and maligned him for their own political purposes; and by those who want to exploit who and what he was in order to appropriate him based on race, ethnicity, or nationality for their own political ends.

The most malicious of those myths are, as stated above, first, that he was not an American but a “Mexican” national; and, second, that he was a “Communist.”

These malicious myths were first promulgated, utterly falsely and politically deliberately, by the John Birch Society in the 1960’s. Almost sixty years later, they are repeated to this day.

First, as to nationality, the truth is that Cesar Chavez was a native-born American, not a “Mexican.” While proud of his Mexican-American heritage, he was a third-generation American, born on his grandfather’s small ranch in Arizona in the Yuma area. No matter the indisputability of those facts, Wikipedia, for example, on which many students and others rely, informs even now: “Chavez was born on the Mexico Texas border and therefore has dual citizenship.” Utterly false.

Second, Cesar Chavez was no “communist.” He was a devoted Catholic Christian. He was attempting, humbly, to live his Christian faith as faithfully as he was able by sacrifice and service for others as taught and exemplified by Jesus the Christ, not Marx the Communist.

Perhaps the best proof, although none should be needed, that Cesar Chavez was not a Communist but a devoted Catholic Christian living his faith, is the fact that the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), in its *U.S. Catholic Catechism for Adults*, which is taught to all adults seeking to become members of the Catholic Church, chose as the exemplar of living a “life in Christ” and “the principles of the Christian moral life”—Cesar E. Chavez. (See, USCCB Catholic Catechism for Adults, Chapter 24, “Life In Christ-Part Two,” pages 323-234).

Moreover, almost never mentioned by those who hate Cesar Chavez and define him as a “communist” and a “Mexican” rather than an American, is that Cesar Chavez, in 1944 at the age of 17, enlisted in the U.S. Navy in WWII and served for the duration of the war in the Pacific in defense of the country of his birth, the United States of America.

Ironically, those who claim to love Cesar Chavez make themselves accomplices of those who hate him (and them) by obscuring Cesar Chavez’ American birth – and by almost never mentioning that he was an American veteran of WWII. They do this not to honor Cesar, but in order to appropriate Cesar Chavez on race or ethnic grounds as a “Mexican,” “Chicano,” or “Raza” race-based civil rights movement leader rather than as an American hero who should be honored by all Americans – as an *American* hero.

In regard to that, Cesar Chavez, while proud of his ancestral heritage, always identified himself as a “labor” or “union leader,” not as a civil rights leader of Mexican-Americans, Chicanos, Latinos, Hispanics, or La Raza.

In fact, in the some twenty years I worked with him, Cesar never defined himself as a "Mexican," or "Chicano," "Latino," etc., and, regarding the identification "La Raza" ("The Race") he told me he didn't use it because he considered it racist.

Those who condemn him as a "Mexican" and "Communist,," and those who claim a possessory interest him as a leader of a race-based "Chicano" or "La Raza" civil rights movement, are both wrong: He defined himself as, and acted as, what he was—a "trade union leader," and a devout Catholic Christian.

Cesar Chavez was the moral heart of the American labor movement.

He built the first viable farm workers union in American history, the United Farm Workers of America. As president of the UFW, Cesar Chavez represented *all* farm workers, whatever their race, ethnicity, or nationality.

One example which refutes the myths of both those who hate Chavez and those who appropriate him based on race, and shows the willingness of both to corrupt historical truth to suit their political ends, is Chavez' acts regarding illegal immigration, which was then and remains now at the center of national controversy and division.

In 1969, Cesar Chavez famously led a march from Indio, CA, to the border. It is portrayed today as primarily a march in protest against discrimination by racist growers oppressing Mexican and other Hispanic farmworkers. That is false historical revisionism.

The primary purpose of the 1969 march to the Mexican border was a protest against the federal government's failure to secure the border from importation of illegal immigrants who were being used to keep wages and working conditions down and to break strikes and the farmworkers union entirely. Indeed, as UFW members set up picket lines waving "Huelga" ("Strike")

flags, buses would arrive from Mexico to unload strike breakers.

In short, Cesar Chavez' 1969 march to the Mexican border was for the same purpose that the Minutemen later went to the border in the 70's and 80's— to secure the border and demand that the government stop illegal immigration. (It should be noted that the Minutemen were widely condemned as as “racists” for doing just what Cesar Chavez did. Was Cesar Chavez a racist?)

In the 1970's, Cesar Chavez fell out of favor with race-based civil rights groups, white liberals, Leftists including open socialist and communist organizations, and liberal media. He was criticized because he adopted the position of calling upon and aiding the then-Immigration And Naturalization Service (INS) to deport strikebreakers illegally in the country.

In 1979, ten years after the march from Indio to the border to demand enforcement of the immigration laws, Cesar Chavez testified before Congress about immigration. He testified that illegal immigration had to be stopped, and the border secured, as illegal immigrants were used to hold wages and working conditions down, and to break as strikes, defeating efforts of farmworkers to build a union to improve their wages, hours, working conditions, and lives.

Today, Cesar Chavez' 1969 march from Indio to the border is historically revised to be a protest against racist growers and his 1979 Congressional testimony is rarely cited, to satisfy the political ends of race-based *la raza* groups and non-*raza* liberals who want to transform him from what he was, i.e., a leader of a labor movement to improve the lives of all farmworkers, to what they want him to be, i.e., a race-based political leader..

Meanwhile, many conservatives continue the original wrong and error of the John Birch Society when it falsely slandered and

branded Cesar Chavez as a non-American and a "communist." That continually repeated malicious lie has alienated many Mexican-American and other Hispanics for whom Cesar Chavez is, rightly, a hero, as he should be for all Americans.

In his lifetime, although he became nationally and internationally renown, Cesar Chavez never sought personal fame, wealth, or celebrity. It was all about the cause, *la causa*, not about him. Indeed, Cesar Chavez turned down millions of dollars offered for the rights to make a movie of his life. Similarly, he rejected all offers to write an autobiography or for the right to produce an "authorized" biography. All that he would authorize was the "*Autobiography of La Causa*," by Jaques Levy, who didn't "buy" the right but earned it by working with Chavez in *la causa* for some ten years.

Cesar Chavez' achievement is monumental. Farmworkers, and domestic workers, were exempted from the right to organize into unions provided to all other workers by the National Labor Relations Act. There were no State laws creating a right of farmworkers to support unionization. They could be and were fired and "blacklisted" with impunity by employers who suspected them of supporting a union. Farmworkers were also migrant, moving from employer to employer on the migrant trail during harvesting seasons. Therefore, more than a hundred attempts to organize migrant farmworkers by major international unions with money, members, and paid full time organizers failed. It was thought impossible to organize migrant farmworkers.

Then came Cesar Chavez. He had nothing. No money, no members, no paid staff. Nothing but the belief that the only way to help farmworkers was to build a union in which they could themselves achieve better working conditions, and dignity. He himself had become a migrant farmworker at the age of ten when the ranch of his grandfather on which he was born was lost on foreclosure in the Depression and taken over by the Bruce

Church Corp., largest lettuce grower in Arizona. He had little education, attending some fifty different elementary schools as his family followed the migrant farmworker trail. After his service in the U.S. Navy, he had married his sweetheart, Helen, in Delano, CA. Together they had eight kids.

The story has been told now in many articles, books, documentaries, and a relatively recent movie of how Cesar Chavez, while working as an organizer in Los Angeles, became convinced a union for farmworkers had to be created. He quit his job. He and Helen loaded up their old station wagon with the kids and a mimeograph machine, and headed to Delano. There, they rented a house, set up the mimeograph machine, and sent out a flyer calling for a house meeting, the first step in creating what would become the United Farm Workers of America.

How did Cesar Chavez succeed where all others had failed? By touching the hearts of Americans and the conscience of the nation by exposing the true working conditions of migrant farmworkers through creative, non-violent acts and actions, including his fasts and boycotts, and by his manifest personal selfless service and sacrifice.

Cesar Chavez did not merely say: *"I am convinced that the truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness, is to sacrifice for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men!"*

He lived it.

By doing so, he succeeded where so many others failed. He achieved what was thought impossible. He inspired and taught by his example, humbly serving and sacrificing for others, and thereby has enriched the lives not only of farmworkers, but the lives of millions of Americans, of all races, all colors, all creeds, including my own life.

I am greatly indebted to Cesar Chavez, especially for the example of his selfless life in service for others. I will always walk in his shadow.

I write this in the early morning hours of Good Friday, the day on which Jesus of Nazareth was crucified, giving his life for others. It was Jesus Christ whom Cesar Chavez worshipped, followed, and humbly attempted to emulate by service to others through living his Catholic Christian faith. I have little doubt that in the fullness of time, Cesar Chavez will one day become one of the Blessed of his Catholic faith, if not canonized.



May the God that Cesar Chavez so faithfully served bless and keep him as one of His adopted sons; may his native country he so faithfully served, the United States of America, always honor and remember Cesar Chavez as one of its greatest native sons, for his life in service to and for others.

CESAR CHAVEZ AND REES LLOYD

At Press Conference during truckers strike in Tucson, AZ, in 1973, announcing alliance of Truckers For Justice and United Farm Workers of America (UFW)

© 2018 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Rees Lloyd: ReesLloydLaw@gmail.com

Feb. 22: Restore Washington's Birthday As A National Holiday

Repeal The Uniform Monday Holiday Act

February 22, 2018, is the 286th anniversary of the birth in 1732 of General and President George Washington, the "Father Of Our Country," the most universally respected and admired American in the age of the Founding Fathers, and in the history of America.

For generations, George Washington's Birthday was a National Holiday celebrated on the actual anniversary of his birth, February 22. On Washington's Birthday, Americans paused to remember and honor him. Parents and schools taught American children about his life on his birthday; urged the children to learn about the Father Of His [Their] Country, and to follow his example of patriotic love of country, selfless service and sacrifice for freedom, personal honor, dedication to duty, fidelity to principle.

By observing Washington's Birthday as a National Holiday on his actual birthdate, Feb. 22, the focus of the nation was on Washington, on the example he set by his extraordinary life, establishing him as "the Greatest American."

However, all that changed in 1971. Congress, pressured by federal government bureaucrats and other employees and their unions, abolished "Washington's Birthday" as a National Holiday. It was replaced with "Presidents' Day" to be observed on the "third Monday of February" as a result of the "Uniform Monday Holiday Act," which gave government employees their sought after three-day weekends.

As a result, American children in government schools learn

little or nothing about the greatest man in the history of America, without whose extraordinary virtues and sacrifices they would not be free.



The “Uniform Monday Holiday Act [For Government Employees Convenience]” should be repealed. “Washington’s Birthday” should be reinstated as a National Holiday, and should be celebrated on Washington’s actual birthday: February 22, not be just another three-day weekend holiday for pampered “public servants” in government employment.

Nor should Washington be lumped in with other, less deserving presidents in a concocted “Presidents Day.” No other president has been so universally admired in America or in the world as was General George Washington.

Washington was by far the most admired man of the Founding Father’s generation. He was called the “Father Of His Country and unanimously elected and re-elected as our First President because he was, as Revolutionary War hero Gen. “Light Horse” Harry Lee memorably said, “First in war. First in peace. First in the hearts of his countrymen.”

Can that be said today, when Washington’s Birthday is no longer a National Holiday, and the nation’s children learn more in progressive liberal, politically correct, cultural relativist government schools about “the life of Mohammad” than the life of George Washington? When the schools, politicians, and media celebrate such farcical concocted

“holidays” as “Kwanzaa” and “Cinco de Mayo” while George Washington’s Birthday Holiday is no more?

George Washington, first, last, and always a soldier serving God and Country, was heralded in his time as the “Apostle of Liberty,” the “Indispensable Man,” having with his ragtag band of American citizen-soldiers of the Revolutionary Army defeated the most powerful military nation in the world in eight years of war to establish our American independence, our freedom.

He did not seek the Presidency—it sought him. He was elected unanimously –twice. He was offered the Presidency for life.

But he stunned the world when he refused a third term and even monarchical rule, and, instead walked away from power to return to his home as citizen. He was, is, our American “Cincinnatus,” who, like that Fifth Century (BC), Roman general, fought the battles of the nation, held unequalled power, but did not covet it, and instead returned to his farm. So was Washington satisfied to be a citizen of a free America, rather than its ruler.

When Washington did that, walked away from ultimate power, even England’s King George III, whom Washington had defeated, hailed Washington “as the greatest man of his era.”

John Adams, his successor as President, said of him: “If we look over the catalogue of the first magistrates of nations, whether they have been denominated Presidents or Consuls, Kings or Princes, where shall we find one whose commanding talents and virtues, whose overruling good fortune, have so completely united all hearts and voices in his favor?...His example is complete; and it will teach wisdom and virtue to Magistrates, Citizens, and Men, not only in the present age, but in future generations.”

Thomas Jefferson, father of the Declaration of Independence and our third president, said of Washington that he was: “The

only man in the United States who possessed the confidence of all. There was no other one who was considered as anything more than a party leader...And it may be truly said that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies have merited from man an everlasting remembrance."

Even the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, who admitted his love of power and yielded to no man a claim of greater glory than he himself possessed, spoke of his admiration of Washington: "This great man fought against tyranny: he established the liberty of his country. His memory will always be dear to the French people, as it will be to all freemen."

Are those words still true to this generation of Americans? Those words of Adams, Jefferson, Gen. Harry Lee, the English King George III and the French Emperor Napoleon, all speaking with awe at the example of Washington's life as one which would be taught "not only in the present age, but in future generations," as John Adams said, and his memory "held dear..to all free men" as Napoleon said? Is Washington still "First in war. First in peace. First in the hearts of his countrymen," as Gen. "Light Horse" Harry Lee said of him?

If not, why not? Are we Americans better for it, as a people, a nation, when we honor no longer the one American who was so universally acknowledged in his time – and up to this generation of transformed Americans – as the Greatest American, the Father Of Our Country? He who defeated tyranny, held ultimate power by acclamation and then walked away from it to preserve the freedom he had created as a soldier? He who lived his life for God and Country?

Are the children of a nation, like the children of a family, really better off, better people, by forgetting their father, being without their father, forgetting the virtues their father taught, being orphaned?

We Americans today, whatever our ages, whatever our ancestry, ethnicity, or race, as Americans, are the children of the American Founding Fathers, including in the particular, George Washington, whom the Founding Fathers proclaimed the greatest among them, the Father Of Our Country.

May both the God that George Washington so faithfully served bless and keep him; may the Country he so loyally served always remember and honor him; and may the lessons of his life be learned in this and every generation so that the freedom he fought for and created may not wither and weaken, to be destroyed by enemies foreign, or domestic.

Tell Congress to repeal the “Uniform Monday Holiday Act” no matter the tears and anguish of taxpayer-paid government employees who will be deprived of a three-day holiday, and no matter the loss to the politicians of those government employees’ campaign contributions by which they purchased their uniform three-day weekend holidays from the politicians.

Congress should re-establish George Washington’s Birthday as a National Holiday – and celebrate it on his actual birth day, February 22. The Father Of Our Country deserves no less. The people of our nation, especially the children, deserve no less.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY–NEVER!

© 2018 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Rees Lloyd: ReesLloydLaw@gmail.com

Feb 15, 1973: American POW's Come Home With Honor

February 15, 2018 is the 45th anniversary of a shining moment in American history: It was on that day in 1973 that American prisoners of war came home from Vietnam with their honor intact, after suffering unspeakable torture, some for eight years, at the hands of North Vietnam led by dedicated Communist Ho Chi Minh.

It was day of great importance in 1973 in a divided America faced with war, and it is day to remember all these years later in a divided America; it is important for what it teaches about honor, duty, country, and who and what we are as Americans.

The Vietnam War had divided Americans as never before. It was and remains the first time in American history that veterans came home from war not to be honored for their service and sacrifice, but to be vilified, defamed as "war criminals," told by their military commanders not to wear their uniforms in traveling home, many even spat upon as they arrived home at airports, train or bus stations.

Altogether, some 9,137,000 Americans would serve in the Vietnam War-era (1960-1975), constituting 9.7 percent of their generation. Some 2.6-million of them were deployed to Vietnam, of whom between 1-1.6-million either fought in combat, provided close support, or were at least fairly regularly exposed to enemy attack." (www.VeteransHour.com, from which all statistics are taken.)

Fifty-Eight Thousand Two Hundred And Two (58,202) of those American veterans would give their lives in service to their country. Another 303,704 were wounded; 18% suffered "multiple amputations," compared with 5.7% in WWII; amputation or

crippling wounds to the lower extremities were 300% higher than in WWII, and 70% higher than Korea.

Of the 58,202 who were killed, 61% were 21 or younger. 30.4% were draftees. 79% had a high school education or better (compared with 63% in Korea and 45% in WWII). 76% were of middle/working class grounds. 88.4% of those who actually served in Vietnam were Caucasian, including some 170,000 Hispanics, 3,070 of whom (5.2%) died. Blacks constituted 10.6% (275,000). 86.8% of the men who were killed in combat were Caucasian; 12.5% were Black (at a time when Blacks were 13.5% of the population).

A later survey of Vietnam veterans showed: 82% of those who saw heavy combat "strongly believe" the war was lost because of lack of political will, with which "nearly 75% of the public" – modernly – agrees it was a failure of political will, not of arms. 97% of Vietnam Era Veterans were honorably discharged. 91% of combat veterans are proud to have served their country. 66% of Vietnam Veterans "say they would serve again if called upon."

With the passage of time, reports VeteransHour.com, "87% of the public now holds Vietnam Veterans in high esteem."

If that is true now, it most definitely was not true during the Vietnam War.

Many Americans who never served turned their opposition to the war into vilification of the Americans who were sent to fight it. Many of the more affluent fled to Canada or Sweden or elsewhere to avoid the draft. Some blatantly lied when their draft number came up causing another American to go in their place, most infamously perhaps in the documented case of the utter lies told by William Jefferson Clinton to be excused when his draft number came up. Clinton is the first draft dodger ever to be elected President of the United States—or to any office in House or Senate. Clinton remains today a darling

icon of the modern progressive liberal Democrat Party, more popular, it is said, than Barack Hussein Obama, the only other president since WWII not to have served in the armed forces he would presume to lead as Commander-in-Chief.

Many others did not flee but stayed to aid and abet the North Vietnamese Communists at home, waiving the "Viet Cong" flag, making a hero of Communist torture-master Ho Chi Minh – chanting "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh, 'Uncle Ho' Is Going To Win!"—and vilifying the Americans who did serve when the country called.

These "anti-war" protestors, were mainly affluent, self-righteous, elitist, college "radicals," conscious aiders-and-abettors of the socialist/communist cause in Vietnam and at home. They were led by pampered celebrities symbolized by Jane Fonda, whose name should live forever in infamy; never-held-a-job self-proclaimed "revolutionary" college students like SDS leader Tom Hayden, "Mr. Jane, Fonda," later a Democrat Party politician in California; political opportunist John Kerry who, as a leader of the Vietnam Veterans of the War (VFW) charged "war crimes" by Americans without being able to produce any proof, and earned having his photo in a place of honor in the Communist's War Museum in Hanoi along with Fonda; and out-and-out domestic terrorists like "Weatherman" bombers Billy Ayers and Bernardine Dorn, who would later become the close associates of Barack Hussein Obama, who announced his first run for political office in Illinois in the living room of Ayers and Dorn.

Of the Americans who served, those who were the most despised, and vilified by Jane Fonda, Hayden, Kerry, et al., were the American prisoners of war, almost all American pilots, who resisted Communist demands that they betray America despite appalling, inhumane, torture, ordered and orchestrated by Ho Chi Minh right up to the day of his death.

There were 770 Americans taken prisoner of war. 113 of them

died in Communist captivity. The Communists refused to recognize them as Prisoners of War, and, instead, declared them to be "war criminals" and blatantly violated the Geneva Convention. In what became known by the POW's as the "Hanoi Hilton," and like prisons, the POWs were kept in filthy, windowless, vermin-infested airless cells only 9 feet long and 3 feet wide. Three feet.

Those seen as "ringleaders" of the resistance, like ranking officers of the resisters in what became known as the "Alcatraz Eleven," James Stockdale, who would later receive the Medal of Honor, and second in command Jeremiah Denton, would be locked in solitary confinement for over four long years, in which horrific torture was inflicted on them, and the other resisters.

The fact of that torture was not confirmed until 1966. Then, the Communists attempted to force Jeremiah Denton to participate in a propaganda broadcast to be filmed by a Japanese crew for international distribution. Instead, Denton not only did not say what the Communists wanted him to say, but he blinked his eyes as if he had an eye problem. He was in fact blinking in Morse Code: "T-O-R-T-U-R-E." Naval intelligence immediately understood what Denton was communicating. When the Communists later realized what Denton had done, they tortured him nearly to death, as he recounts in his now classic book on what POW's endured: "*When Hell Was In Session.*" (WND Book)

However, Jane Fonda, Hayden, John Kerry, then lying to Congress about alleged war crimes as a member of the VVAW – without, as noted above, being able to produce *any* evidence to support his allegations – and their progressive liberal followers in the "anti-war movement" and the media, did not denounce the Communists' torture, they denounced the POW's as "liars," claiming their Communist allies under Uncle Ho Chi Minh were innocent of torture. Fonda, Hayden, Kerry, of course, lied.

Overwhelming post-war proof of torture beyond any reasonable doubt has given the lie to Fonda, Hayden, Kerry, et al, including books by many of the POWs. These include, the late Admiral Jeremiah Denton's classic *"When Hell Was In Session;"* *"Surviving Hell,"* by Col. Leo Thorsness (USAF, ret.; Medal of Honor); *"The Passing Of The Night,"* by the late Gen. Robinson Risner (USAF); *"American Patriot,"* the biography of the late and legendary Col. Bud Day (USMC, WWII, Korea, Vietnam); *"Chained Eagle,"* by Everett Alvarez, Jr., the first pilot shot down, a POW for eight years; and, among others, *"Faith of my Fathers,"* by Sen. John McCain who refused an offer of early release by the Communists because his father was the Commanding Admiral, and suffered horrendous torture for his refusal. McCain, a true hero and recognized as such by his fellow POWs, was left permanently crippled in his arms by torture.

More recently, Author Alvin Townley has written a book magnificently telling the true story of the torture POW's endured in Vietnam, and what their families endured at home: *"DEFIANT: The POWs Who Endured Vietnam's Most Infamous Prison; The Women Who Fought For Them, And The One Who Never Returned."* It is highly praised by the surviving POWs themselves for being at once accurate, and extremely readable. Indeed, although loaded with documented facts, it reads like an adventure novel. It is a must read. (see, for more on ["Defiant,"](#) on YouTube.)

The nation was and remained terribly divided over Vietnam. It was not until February, 1973, after POWs like Edward Alvarez, James Stockdale, and Jeremiah Denton had endured almost eight years as tortured POWs, four years of which was in solitary confinement for Stockdale and Denton, and almost as long solitary confinement for others, including (now Texas Congressman) Sam Johnson, who was in solitary for over three years, that the breakthrough in peace talks came and Operation Homecoming began.

The first flight of emancipated POWs out of Vietnam to Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines was on Feb. 12, 1973, fittingly if coincidentally on the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

At Clark, the spokesman for the POWs, then-Captain Jeremiah Denton, in military uniform, stepped to the microphone, and spoke in short stroke a few simply stated words which began the stirring of the heart of a divided nation:

“We are honored to have had the opportunity to serve our country under difficult circumstances. We are profoundly grateful to our Commander-in-Chief and to our nation for this day. God Bless America.”

Then came that shining moment three days later on February 15, 1973, when Denton, Jim Mulligan, and the others of the first group of POW's landed at the Portsmouth Naval base in Virginia, back on American soil. Their wives and children rushed to embrace them, as, to the POWs surprise, a huge crowd of Americans roared with cheers for them, waving flags, laughing, some weeping with joyful emotion, Americans at last embracing the Americans they sent to war, welcoming them home as all Vietnam veterans should have been welcomed.

Operation Homecoming began an operation of healing some of the division, some of the rancor, some of the hatred in the American atmosphere up to that time in the war. Parades, ceremonies, welcoming events were held in the hometowns of POWs and many other cities, America began to heal, and, for many, to repent of how Americans sent to war were treated on coming home.

“Vietnam had claimed more than 58,000 American lives—young men who would never walk off a plane to public fanfare. Many of their families would not experience the same outpouring of compassion that their POW/MIA counterparts received. More than 300,000 soldiers returned wounded, some disabled for life.

Others returned physically intact, but emotionally shattered. Many never received a welcome of any sort," author Alvin Townley wrote in "DEFIANT."

"More than 770 known Americans were captured during the Vietnam War, and they valiantly upheld those high standards we expect of our servicemen and they in turn expect of themselves; 113 POWs did not survive. Every man has a valuable story and his own unique perspective...To me, they are all heroes, although no more so than the men who fought the war in other places, under different sets of difficult circumstances. I will always remain in awe of what they endured and accomplished. I hope it inspires America like it continues to inspire me," Townley wrote, concluding: "Finally, to all our POWs and Vietnam veterans: GBU."

Many of the POW's are no longer with us, including Admiral James Stockdale, Admiral Jeremiah Denton, many others. But their example is.

The surviving POWs gathered together for a 40th Reunion at the President Richard Nixon Library in Yorba Linda, CA in 2013. It was taped, and is very moving. It is available at "[Vietnam POW 40th Reunion News Coverage-You Tube.](#)"

"*Jeremiah*" is a very important new documentary on Adm. Jeremiah Denton, and his family. It reveals "up close and personal" what the POWs and their wives and children went through in the long years of separation, never knowing for sure if their POW father was still alive, in what condition, or if he would ever come home. It is as moving as it is informative, showing [what it takes by way of service and sacrifice to keep America free.](#)

Who the Vietnam POWs who came home on February 15, 1973, are and what they did, the honor they brought to themselves and to our country, should be remembered on every February 15, if not every day. That is because who and what they are is who

and what we can be when we are at our very best as Americans.

May the God they served bless and keep them; may the country they served always honor, and never forget them.

© 2018 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Rees Lloyd: ReesLloydLaw@gmail.com

Pearl Harbor Survivor Remembers: A Day Of Infamy

December 7, 2017, Pearl Harbor Day, marks the 75th anniversary of the Japanese air attack on U.S. naval and air installations at Pearl Harbor, HI, at 7:53 a.m., Dec. 7, 1941, without a declaration of war.

It was then the worst attack on American soil in history: Some 2,403 died, 2008 of them Navy personnel; another 1,178 were wounded.

Eighteen Navy ships, including the U.S.S. Arizona, were sunk or damaged. Almost all the planes at the island bases were destroyed or damaged while still on the ground.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt memorably called December 7, 1941, “a day which will live in infamy” in his dramatic speech to Congress, which then declared war on Japan.

Only the sneak attack on America by radical Islamic terrorists on 9-11-2001 in New York resulted in more deaths. But for many Americans of this generation – and millions of immigrants, legal and illegal – the significance of Pearl Harbor is not fully known, or appreciated.

One for whom it does “live in infamy,” is Pearl Harbor survivor S. J. Hemker, now 98, of Banning, California. A retired three-war combat Navy veteran – WWII, Korea, and Vietnam –and an American Legionnaire, Hemker remembers Pearl Harbor up close and personal:

“Ordinarily, we would have been at sea. We were at Pearl Harbor because we had to repair an engine that had been sabotaged at the shipyard back in California. I was up on the fantail of our ship, the USS New Orleans, a heavy cruiser, with the Chief Master at Arms. The Quartermaster was there, getting ready to raise the flag,” Hemker recalls.

“It was 7:53 a.m. when we saw the Japanese planes. They were flying so low I could see the pilots’ faces in the cockpit. They were grinning at us as they went down toward Battle Ship Row. Grinning at me and the Chief. They were so close, you could have thrown something at them and hit them. A potato, maybe. They were that close. Just skimming the top of the water. Torpedo planes. The pilots grinning at us,” Hemker reluctantly, but vividly recalls.

“The loudspeakers blared: ‘Man your battle stations – the Japs are attacking’. All hell broke loose... It was terrible, horrible, ...,” he says, pausing in his remembrance.

“I spent the next eight hours down in the magazine loading for our five-inch anti-aircraft guns. We fired everything. If we had been hit, that would have been it for us in the magazine. We would have been blown up. We had a big crane over the top of our ship. I think that’s what saved us,” he states matter-of-factly as to his own circumstance., then somberly relates:

“The Arizona capsized. Thirteen hundred men went down with her. Half the guys I was with in boot camp died on the Arizona. That’s where the Memorial is today. They say that oil still leaks out every day. Those guys...they’re still down there,” Hemker says quietly, his voice trailing off, as if

physically turning away from a memory, and reality, which is still too painful to talk about.

Getting Hemker to talk about it at all is no easy task. Like many of his fellow World War II veterans, he still doesn't talk about his war experiences, never expects any thanks or gratitude, and never, ever boasts about it, despite the fact that after Pearl Harbor he served America in battles and combat zones for the duration of WWII, in the Korean War, and in Vietnam.

Hemker, a widower, roguishly handsome into his 90's and possessed of a sly sense of humor, for years charmed the ladies in the Legion Auxiliary with his country gallantry. He is universally admired by his comrade veterans in the American Legion. "I'm not able to do what I used to do, but I do what I can," he says.

Hemker's beloved wife died more than 30 years ago. For the last thirteen years of her life, Hemker's wife was bedridden, unable to perform the most basic of everyday tasks of life, totally dependent. It says a great deal about the kind of man S.J. Hemker is, that for all of those thirteen years Hemker cared for her, seeing to her every need, lovingly dedicating his life to her care, until her death did them part.

Hemker had four sons. All four, like their father, are veterans who served in the Vietnam war. Hemker had no biological daughter. But, in his declining years, he has for more than thirteen years lived in his own room in the home of a loving daughter-in-fact if not of biology, Sue McConnell, and her husband,

No daughter has rendered more loving care to a father than has Sue McConnell to S.J. Hemker.

"I call him my 'Dad' because he is that to me. I couldn't love him more," says Sue, has known Hemker for thirty-seven years and become his daughter in fact who has through the years as

risen up in fury when the VA has done its duty to

Reflecting on Pearl Harbor seventy-five years after surviving it, Hemker, who has lost his eyesight, but not his vision for America, observes:

“We Americans should never forget. If we forget our past and those who died, we won’t have a future. A free one, anyway. Look at what happened on 9-11. More people were killed on that day than were killed at Pearl Harbor. It can happen again,” he warns.

“I don’t think people remember Pearl Harbor and what it means, the way they used to do,” Hemker concludes. “That’s too bad. A lot of us can’t forget. An awful lot of really good people died to keep America free. They shouldn’t be forgotten.”

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Rees Lloyd: ReesLloydLaw@gmail.com

American Legion, VFW, Oppose NFL Protests: Not A “Free Speech” Right

Another “Football Sunday” has passed with Black NFL players continuing to refuse to respect the National Anthem and the Flag, while the NFL and team owners refuse to enforce their own rules requiring players to respect the primary symbols of the American nation.

The American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, the nation’s two largest and most influential wartime veterans

organizations, have now taken stands opposing the NFL players disrespect for the Anthem and Flag – which are not in fact acts of Constitutionally protected “freedom of speech,” as detailed below.

I forward on this continuing controversy three powerful commentaries on the decision of Black NFL players to refuse to respect the American Flag and Anthem, and thereby the 1.4-million American veterans who have given their lives to create and preserve the freedom in which Black Americans generally, and Black athletes in particular, have more freedom, more equal opportunity, and more prosperity than in any nation in history.

That includes the Black African countries which sold into slavery the Black African ancestors of Black Americans for profit, even sending their leaders to testify and protest in the English Parliament *against* the abolition of the slave trade because they were making so much money engaging in it. Indeed, Black-on-Black slave trade still thrives in Black Africa, about which millionaire Black athletes and their Black supporters are generally silent in word and deed.

The American Legion and the VFW have now condemned and called for the end of the disrespect for the National Anthem, the Flag, and for veterans, of the Black players protests, as reported by www.Armytimes.com: “[American Legion And VFW ‘Slam’ NFL Players For Anthem Protests.](#)”

Maj. Gen. Patrick H. Brady (USA, ret.), Medal of Honor (Vietnam), considered America’s most decorated living veteran, is one of many veterans denouncing the disrespect of the National Anthem and the Flag, and the veterans who have served and died under that Flag. Gen. Brady has written a powerful column on WND.com: “[Limp Wristed Libs Have Ruined Football.](#)”

The third commentary is from the American Legion’s www.BurnPit.US [www.Legion.org]: “[NFL Players Take Knee On Day](#)

[Designated To Remember And Cherish Gold Star Moms.](#)"

I submit also a legal comment by me: "Are NFL Players Protests Matters Of Constitutional Freedom Of Speech?"

Because of confusion in the ongoing controversy, it is necessary to answer the question: Are the protests of Black NFL Players to disrespect the American Flag and Anthem matters of protected Constitutional "freedom of speech"? The answer is no, absolutely not, for the following reasons:

The acts of Black NFL players, and the failure of the NFL and team owners to repudiate it, has nothing to do with Constitutional "Free Speech," as misleadingly claimed by the players; Black and White politically-correct apologists and enabling individuals and organizations; Black race hustlers; progressive liberal Alinskyite revolutionists-anarchists-socialists-and communists exploiting the divisive issue (under the Marxist and Saul Alinsky rule for radicals that whatever is bad for America is good for them); and Liberal broadcast media pundits and talking heads.

As any Constitutional attorney will affirm (I am one): First Amendment Constitutional "freedom of speech" only protects Americans from regulation, deprivation, infringement, or punishment of speech *by government*, not by private parties or entities. Absent government action, so-called "state action," there cannot be a violation of the First Amendment Constitutional guarantee of "freedom of speech."

Private, non-government persons and entities include without limitation, employers—who have now and have always had the right to set standards of speech in the work place. The Black players are millionaires because they are the employees of private employers, i.e., the team owners, who provide a product, i.e., professional football, to the public who are willing to pay for it. The players' protests are taking place in the workplace, i.e., the fields. They are taking place in

the course and scope of their employment. The government is not involved.

Therefore, there is no Constitutional right of free speech involved. Acts by the employers, or the owners to regulate, repudiate, or punish the players activity, including by firing them, is not and cannot be a violation of the players Constitutional "freedom of speech." They have none in this context. Context, too, matters.

Indeed, under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* the owners' condonation of that speech activity in disrespect of the Nation, the National Anthem and Flag, and veterans, constitutes ratification of that activity and makes the owners responsible for the acts of their employees. The owners cannot run from that responsibility by claiming they are protecting the players "freedom of speech" or have no control or responsibility for the employees' (the players') acts. The employers are responsible for the acts of their employees in the course and scope of their employment.

Thus, the acts of Black NFL players, and failure of the NFL and team owners to repudiate it, have nothing to do with Constitutional "Free Speech."

Simply stated, if the government is not involved, there cannot be a violation of Constitutional freedom of speech. The government is not involved in regulating, depriving, or infringing upon the speech of the NFL players. Therefore, there cannot be a violation of the Constitutional "right of free speech" of the players, as they have no such right as employees of private, non-government owners. Period.

Thus, there should be no more teardrops alleging that the poor, oppressed multi-millionaire black football players are being deprived of "freedom of speech." They aren't, as a matter of Constitutional law.

In contrast, the nation, the National Anthem and Flag, and

the 1.4-million veterans who have given their lives for that Nation under that Flag, are being deprived of the respect they deserve from all Americans, including multimillionaire black athletes, and the NFL and team owners who are condoning and thereby ratifying those acts.

As a veteran and an active member of The American Legion, I am aware that resolutions are circulating raising the question of whether there should be a grass-roots call for an all-out boycott by veterans and other patriots of NFL professional football if the disrespect of the American Anthem, Flag, and veterans who have given their lives for America isn't stopped by the NFL and owners who are, ultimately, responsible. If they won't act, let them, and the players, pay the price of their disrespect.

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Rees Lloyd: ReesLloydLaw@gmail.com

Constitution Day–Sept. 17, 1787: Will We Preserve It?

The question facing America as the Constitutional Convention deliberated from May to September, 1787, was what kind of country the Founding Fathers would create for the nation. American patriots had won their freedom in a war of independence from England from 1775 until the Treaty of Paris in 1783, led by Commander-in-Chief and later President General George Washington, then and now the Greatest American.

The answer to that question in 1787 was a constitutional republic of limited central (or “federal”) government

restrained in its authority to certain enumerated powers, only. Authority for governance, except for matters expressly enumerated as held by the central government, was to remain with the States and "the people." This limitation on the federal government's power would be expressly commanded by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments which would follow with the adoption of the Bill of Rights on December 15, 1791.

Founding Father Benjamin Franklin. when asked by a citizen on the close of the Constitutional Convention, "what kind of a government have you created, Mr. Franklin?," famously answered:

"A republic, Madam –if you can keep it."

Ben Franklin's challenge, "if you can keep it," was serious: The United States of America was then the only Constitutional Republic, created "on the consent of the governed," in the world. There was extreme doubt if this American great experiment in freedom, could succeed. The generation of the Founding Fathers did "keep it," and bequeathed it to us of this generation as their progeny, their descendants in freedom. Will we "keep it" for the generations of Americans who will come after us?

That is, the question facing America on September 17, 2017, is whether Americans can keep the free constitutional republic of limited central government powers created under the leadership of the Founding Fathers; or whether America will continue to be "transformed" into a socialist state, with the federal government ignoring the Constitution's limitations on its authority and expanding to control, regulate, or dictate seemingly all areas of American life, in the name of "social justice," transforming the nation from individual freedom and personal responsibility under a limited government, to Socialism, what famed economist the late Frederick Hayek aptly named "the road to serfdom."

While the election of President Donald Trump in November, 2016, represents a defeat for Progressive Liberals seeking to “fundamentally transform” America, as former President Barack Hussein Obama put it, into a European-style Socialist State, the foaming-at-the-mouth backlash against the election of President Trump, an avowed “America First” patriot, by Progressive Liberals in the government, media, and academia, as well as avowed Socialists, Communists, Liberal Fascists and Black racial supremacists like the Black Lives Matter Movement reacting violently in the streets, evidence that the fight “to keep” the Constitutional Republic the Founding Fathers created must continue to be waged vigorously if America is not to be “transformed” from a free Constitutional Republic to Socialism.

Ever since the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson, liberal “Progressives” have sought to undermine the Constitution, and the individual freedom and personal responsibility it at once protects and requires, and instead, by creeping incremental expansion of federal government authority, transform the nation from freedom of thought, religion, conscience, and enterprise, into government-dominated Socialism, all in the name of “social justice.” In that regard, Founding Father Ben Franklin observed also that “those who would exchange freedom for security, will have neither.”

Progressive Liberal Democrat Woodrow Wilson was the first U.S. President to openly argue that the Constitution should be discarded as outdated, and be replaced in by an “Administrative State” in which an elite ruling class of political and academic “experts” heading central (federal) government bureaucracies will create an American socialist utopia, from food stamps to to foreign policy, intruding into and dominating almost every aspect of American life.

An indication of the liberal “progressives” success in transforming American from the vision of the Founding Fathers into their own liberal “progressive” vision of a soft

totalitarian state led by “experts,” i.e., themselves, is that few American children in government schools dominated by liberal “progressive” teachers and education bureaucrats, will be taught on Constitution Day 2017, or any day, of the historic importance of September 17, 1787, for our nation, and for the world. Consider just these aspects of that American history on this September 17:

On September 17, 1787, after weeks of often bitter debate by delegates of the States gathered at the Constitutional Convention at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the Constitution of the United States, beginning with the words, “We, the People,” was signed by thirty-nine of the fifty-five delegates. The world was changed forever as America began its ‘great experiment’ in self-government.

Never before had a constitution been established in the name of “the People” of a nation, rather than by and in the name of a monarch, a state, or other governmental power. Many of the most erudite thinkers of the so-called “Age of Enlightenment,” did not believe that a constitutional republic of limited government “by, for, and of the people” could survive in a broad land containing a large and diverse population. America is still an ongoing experiment in liberty.

The Constitutional Convention had commenced on May 14, 1787, with a challenge to the conscience and integrity of delegates by George Washington, commander-in-chief of the Continental Army which had won the Revolutionary war. Washington, then and now the model American patriot, was elected President of the Constitutional Convention by unanimous vote.

“If to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the Hand of God,” said Washington, who would later become the First President of the United States and be regarded as “the Father of his country.”

The delegates were learned American patriots who had studied history deeply to meet the task of creating a constitution fit for a free people. Thomas Jefferson, who authored the Declaration of Independence but did not participate in the Constitutional Convention because he was in Paris representing the United States, wrote of the delegates with utmost respect as "a gathering of demigods."

The Constitution the framers wrought in the name of "We, the People," was one creating a government of expressly limited powers – a limited federal government, not a national government of self-expanding powers.

The subsequently adopted "Bill of Rights," contained in the First Ten Amendments, for which the efforts of James Madison earned him recognition as "the Father of the Constitution," begin with five words limiting powers of the federal government over the people:

"Congress shall make no law...," respecting an establishment of religion nor abridging the fundamental rights of free exercise of religion, freedom of speech, of press, of assembly, of petition for redress of grievance."

These are rights which the Founding Fathers believed Americans were "endowed by their Creator," as expressed in the Declaration of Independence. That is, the Founders believed these were natural rights, rights granted by the "hand of God, not the hand of a generous government.," as the late President John F. Kennedy would express it.

The Ninth and Tenth Amendments reinforced the words "Congress shall make no law..." by mandating that the people and the states retained all rights not enumerated as possessed by the central government.

Never before in history had "We, the people," had their natural rights so expressly protected by a constitution so expressly limiting the government as to its powers. By

changing the relationship of the people and their government, limiting the power of government and making the retained rights of the people superior, the Founding Fathers changed the world. Ever after, the people of the world who have dreamed of the freedoms of Americans, have looked to the values expressed in the American Declaration of Independence, and the United States Constitution, as a model for liberty in a constitutional republic.

The framers of the Constitution, the Founding Fathers of America, were faced with a great challenge, and they met it. The Constitution which they framed was finally ratified by all states by January 10, 1791.

It has now endured for 230 years since it was signed on Sept. 17, 1787. That, the keeping of the free constitutional republic that the Founding Fathers bequeathed to us, is our challenge.

We owe a great debt to all those Founding Fathers and other Americans who came before us who preserved our freedom. We pay that debt by what we do to preserve freedom for those Americans who will come after us.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY—NEVER!

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Rees Lloyd: reeslloyd@aol.com

Flag Day June 14, 1777 – June

14 2017: From Celebration To Assassination

A Need To Return To Our Root Values

Flag Day until recent years had been observed by generations of Americans with patriotic joy, celebration, parades, and a sense of American unity ever since the Second Continental Congress adopted the first American Flag on June 14, 1777. That same day is also the birthday of the first American Army which would fight and win American independence and freedom by defeating, at great cost of life and limb, England, then the most powerful army and empire in the world.

Flag Day 2017, however, takes place in a nation divided since the presidential elections of November 8, 2016. The election of President Donald Trump ignited a bitter, hate-filled, ongoing intolerant totalitarian political tantrum by those who lost the election.

Thus, Flag Day 2017 does not begin with news of a national celebration of the Flag which is the symbol of the greatest, because most free, nation in the history of the world.

Rather, it begins with news of the attempted assassination of U.S. Congressman Steve Scalise (R-La), the third ranking Republican in the House of Representatives, and other Republican members of Congress, in Alexandria Virginia.

Rep. Scalise was shot as Republican members of Congress engaged in practice for an annual all-American baseball game between Democrat and Republican members of Congress for charity. A Congressional staff member and two members of the Capital Police detailed to provide protection, were wounded. Another Congressman, a staff member, and a seance officer had non-bullet injuries.

All were at the baseball diamond were in danger of assassination. It is unclear at this time whether this was an act of terrorism inspired by foreign or domestic enemies, or just a lone wolf assassination attack by an anti-Trump, anti-Republican, Bernie Sanders supporter.

There is no doubt, however, that the purpose was to terrorize by assassinating Republicans. What is known is that the perpetrator asked at the baseball field if it was the Democrat or Republican team that was practicing. After he was informed they were Republicans, he attempted to kill the Republicans. The would-be assassin, now dead, was reportedly fatally shot by a police officer who was herself shot. (I decline to give the would-be assassin glory and celebrity by naming him.)

The would-be assassin has been identified as a supporter of Socialist Bernie Sanders who volunteered to work in Sanders' campaign for the Democrat Party nomination. Sanders has condemned his supporter's attempted assassination of Republican members of Congress.

Of course, no one should blame Socialist Bernie Sanders for the acts of a supporter. This is true even though Democrat Party leaders, including Nancy Pelosi, Chuck Schumer, and Socialist Sanders, and the liberal media, have consistently blamed Trump for any inappropriate act of a supporter of Donald Trump.

They do this on a claim that Trump has created an "atmosphere" of violence. On this pretext, they have blamed Trump even when it is Trump supporters who have been victims of attacks by supporters of the Democrats and opponents of Trump.

These attacks on Trump supporters at Trump rallies and events have been composed of a motley crew of Democrats, Progressive Liberals, Democratic Socialists, Socialists, Communists,

Anarchists, Clintonists, Obamists, or Racialists like the Black Lives Movement or the New Black Panther Party, both which were warmly embraced by former President Barak Obama and each of his two Attorney General appointees, Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch.

Not all Democrats are of this noxious totalitarian political ilk, of course. But all of this noxious totalitarian political ilk are anti-Trump supporters of Democrats or Socialist Bernie Sanders. against Trump. As such, they have been coddled in major cities under Democrat administrations. They have rarely prosecuted at all for violence against persons or property in violent demonstrations against Trump before or after his election.

Further, these violent demonstrators against Trump have never been prosecuted, as far as is known, for violation of Trump supporters' civil rights under the federal Civil Rights Acts, including the Ku Klux Klan Act, 42 U.S.Code Section 1985(3), although the civil rights violations are blatant in attacks on Americans attending Trump rallies or events. I have no doubt whatsoever that had white Trump supporters attacked non-white anti-Trump Democrats attending Democrat rallies or events, there would have been multiple prosecutions under the Ku Klux Klan Act and other of the federal Civil Rights Acts.

While blaming Trump, personally, for any wrongful conduct by Trump supporters, Democrat Party leaders, liberal media, liberal politicians spewing hate against Trump, take no responsibility for creating an "atmosphere" in which their supporters carry out violent attacks on Trump supporters, now including attempted assassination of Republican members of Congress.

This "atmosphere" of hate has included open calls for violence against elected Republican President Donald Trump. A great many of these hateful calls have been by entertainment and media "celebrities." They have included calls for

assassinating President Trump; burning down the White House; a progressive liberal since-fired CNN hack “comedienne” appearing carrying a bloodied severed head replica of President Trump like those severed heads carried by Islamist terrorists; a “play” on Broadway by theatrical “artists” depicting the assassination of President Trump so repulsive its financial backers have backed out in disgust.

It also involves an ongoing witch hunt dominating the news in attempting to prove “collusion” between President Trump or his campaign and the Russians in the election – although in seven long months of investigation by the FBI and House and Senate committees, along with daily false and fake news vilification of President Trump, there has not been a finding of any evidence of “collusion.”

Nonetheless, the anti-Trump witch hunt continues with great venomous vitriol as if it is a “scandal” like Watergate, or the real scandal of Benghazi in which the U.S. Ambassador and three other Americans were murdered by Islamist terrorists while then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and then-President Barack Hussein Obama, along with then U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, lied to the nation that it was all just a spontaneous demonstration by Muslims who were offended by a purported trailer to a non-existent film critical of Islam.

All of this media vilification of Trump to bring down his administration, has thus far produced no evidence of conclusion despite “leaks” from federal employees, much of which is wrong or is revealed as out-and-out “fake news” after investigation. However, how many members of the public exposed to the original false reports actually learn later that the reports are false, is unknown.

All of this is being done by influential, opinion shaping progressive liberal politicians; media through alleged journalists who have become nothing more than rumor-mongering political gossip columnists; liberal academic “experts;” and

most conspicuously, liberal entertainment and media celebrities; as well as assorted other embittered progressive liberals who can't get over the loss of the election to President Trump.

The would-be Flag Day assassin reportedly fired between "50 and 70 shots" before he was shot. It has to be asked: How many rounds would he have been able to fire if he wasn't the only one armed, other than the few Capital police detailed to provide protection to Scalise because of his office. If those police weren't there, the would-be assassin might have systematically killed all those members of Congress, firing at them from the third-base dugout as they were trapped within the fenced baseball field

Predictably, the Democrat governor of Virginia, Terry McAuliffe, a Clinton Democrat who is one of the Democrat Party's and Clinton Foundation's biggest fundraisers, exploited the tragedy to call for more gun control. Right. Disarm all law-abiding Americans to be helpless targets and victims of armed lawless gangsters, political creeps like this Sanders-Democrat would-be assassin, and by other enemies of America, foreign and domestic.

This assassination attempt is but more evidence that the farther we Americans walk away from the values of the Founding Fathers and the American veterans of the Founding Generation who gave their lives under the American Flag to establish our American freedom, the more we are becoming a First World economic power with a Third World political culture, as more and more people act out violently if they cannot get their way in free elections.

Ironically, great social injustice is being carried out by those proclaiming they are acting in the name of "social justice." They proclaim rhetorically that they are righteously acting in the name of "anti-fascism" –and then act in fact like fascist thugs.

Indeed, the progressive liberal/socialist/communist/anarchist violent demonstrators wearing black shirts (and masks) and committing violent acts in liberal Portland, OR, and other cities, as self-identified “anti-fascists” in the “anti-fa” movement, are indistinguishable from the “Black Shirts” of Mussolini in Fascist Italy, and the “Brown Shirts” of Adolph Hitler in Fascist Nazi Germany.

President Donald Trump is the subject of this self-righteous hate and vilification by the rhetorically politically correct but existentially politically incorrect.

He is the target of hate-filled, tantrum-like murderous political venom spilled out from progressive liberal entertainment celebrities, politicians, academics, and irresponsible modern American media inventing fake news to protest their loss of political power as the *de facto* “Fourth Estate” or “Fourth Branch” of government.

Ironically, despite all this hate and personal attacks on him, President Donald Trump, on the day before Flag Day, continued to call for Americans to “Believe in yourselves. Believe in your future. And believe, once more, in America.”

To do this, to preserve and protect the free Constitutional republic that the Founding Fathers bequeathed to us by the service and sacrifice of those of the Founding Generation who served under the American Flag from its adoption on June 14, 1777, I respectfully suggest on Flag Day, June 14, 2017 that we Americans must remember that we are Americans; we must remember our own American history; our own American heritage; we must return to our root American values, and we must “Walk In The Footsteps of Founders” to preserve the freedom they created.

We can begin that renewal of America, by, on Flag Day and every day, remembering also the history of our Flag, which is briefly but informatively provided by one of America’s

greatest patriots –author/essayist, and orator William J. (“Bill”) Federer, in his historical www.AmericanMinute.com on Flag Day.[[Link](#)]

It is our Flag, and ought to be revered and held as sacred and protected from physical desecration by passage of the Flag Amendment, H.J. Res. 61, and ratification by vote of “We, the People” in our States, as the symbol of our nation, our history, our heritage, our root values, and of the sacrifice of the 1.3-million American veterans who have given their lives fighting for freedom under our American Flag.

It should be realized, too, that the same kind of people who today express their hatred for President Trump, and for America, by burning or defecating on our Flag, are the same kind of people who will in their self-righteous political fervor attempt to assassinate Republican Members of Congress, or the Republican President of the United States, Donald J. Trump.Or you, or your children, and family members, should you dare to disagree with and oppose their political positions and values.



**FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY—AND
TERRORISM —NEVER!**

[FLAG DAY “Millions of our school children will daily](#)

[proclaim...dedication of our nation...to the Almighty" - Eisenhower.](#) (www.AmericanMinute.com, [[link](#)])

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Comey, “Capt. Courageless,” Exposes Himself–And The Bureaucracy Itself

FBI Director James (“Captain Courageless”) Comey, fired by President Donald Trump, sought his revenge on President Trump in testimony before the Senate investigating committee on June 8, 2017, resulting in wall-to-wall television and a tsunami of liberal media and political “spin.”

Comey’s anticipated “bomb shell” testimony to destroy President Donald Trump – prayed for by liberal media, which even had a “count down” of the time before broadcast of Comey’s testimony as if as important as “Watergate” – simply fizzled.

If anything, Comey vindicated President Trump (discussed below), while exposing himself and the nature of the federal government bureaucracy.

Thus, the most valuable thing about fired FBI Director James Comey’s testimony before the Senate investigating committee on June 8 was not that he exposed Donald Trump – he didn’t. It was that Comey exposed before the entire nation the integrity-corrupting impact of living life and making a career in governmental bureaucracy.

That is, for anyone who needed proof, Comey exposed, and proved beyond a reasonable doubt what really matters to

bureaucrats in the government bureaucracy: It is first and foremost, "CYA" to protect your government position and power, no matter the cost to integrity.

This is why Comey would rush to write "memos-to-self" after meetings or phone conversations with President Trump. This is a bureaucracy-wide tactic by which bureaucrats protect themselves in the event that they face later adverse employment circumstances or threats thereof.

I do not write this on speculation: As a workers rights attorney, I have represented thousands of rank-and-file government employees in "blue collar class" positions against abuses of managerial bureaucrats for decades, and know the bureaucracy for its true corrupting nature.

Most public sector employees enter government service with a sincere desire to "help people," as they will all tell you. However, the nature of the bureaucracy itself soon causes them to adapt CYA as a way of survival and to get ahead in the bureaucracy. Bureaucrats have long memories and sharp knives, and are obsequious to superiors and tyrants to subordinates. It is not long before "public service" in the government becomes personal advancement in the bureaucracy, CYA is a rule of survival, and integrity is diminished if not destroyed, as exemplified by Comey, who would end as a venomous, reptilian "leaker" to the media to benefit himself, only after he was fired.

It has been said that security makes cowards of us all. That is absolutely true of those, like Comey, who live their lives and make their careers in the government bureaucracy. Most prefer the security of government employment in the wealth-consuming public sector, rather than the risks of success in the wealth-producing private sector, often referred to as the "real world."

In short, the nature of the bureaucracy is corrupting. Period. Comey's testimony is evidence of that enduring truth.

Indeed, Comey, in his nationally televised testimony, with angelic choir-boy innocent countenance, delivered himself

before the nation and the world of a long, pouty, self-serving bureaucrat whine that revealed Comey's own lack of integrity, his admitted cowardice when faced with ethical choice, his vengeful "leak" to the N.Y. Times evidence of corrupted integrity.

Comey exposed himself as a *poseur* of personal and governmental rectitude. He provided proof positive that he was and is in reality a slippery, slithering bureaucrat who made his way in the federal bureaucracy with reptilian skill, so without integrity that he would end by becoming a "leaker" himself to the N.Y. Times through a third party "friend," – although Comey, himself, as head of the FBI, had been charged with the duty of investigating the "leakers" in the bureaucratic "deep state" who in violation of the law had used their federal positions to attack the Trump Administration to which they are politically opposed.

What an irony that a Bernie Sanders supporting leftist Democrat employed in the federal bureaucracy – a left over, like Comey, from the progressive liberal regime of Barack Hussein Obama – is being prosecuted for leaking to the media after investigation by the FBI. Yet James Comey leaks the content of a memo written by Comey, in the course and scope of his employment as bureaucrat heading the FBI, on a government-issued device, concerning a communication with the President of the United States. Comey's assertion that document somehow became his private property because he was fired is an utter absurdity, and cannot excuse "leaking" it surreptitiously to the N.Y. Times.

It is no wonder that the American public distrusts government, especially the distant Federal Government in which bureaucrats like Comey have established themselves in effect as a "National Government" over the States instead of a limited government of federated sovereign States.

Here is Comey, a public servant who admits his "cowardice" in taking no action whatsoever against what he now says in Senate testimony that he thought to be wrongful conduct by President Trump in expressing a "hope" that an investigation

of Michael Flynn would be “let go,” an investigation at that time which was only about Trump firing Flynn for not being truthful in reporting to Vice President Pence about his contact to the Russian Ambassador.

Further, Comey casually testified that Obama-appointed AG Loretta Lynch ordered him not to call his “investigation” of Democrat Presidential Nominee Hillary Clinton an “investigation,” but, rather a “matter,” which is what Hillary Clinton’s campaign called it. Comey testified that he questioned Lynch’s directive, thought it was a lie, because the FBI was in fact conducting an “investigation.” Nowwithstanding, he cowardly, wilted and followed Lynch’s order to call the “investigation” a “matter,” thereby deceiving the American public.

It has to be asked—will the media and Democrats in Congress now be an investigation of former AG Loretta Lynch, the “First Black Woman To Be Attorney General? Will Comey be investigated for carrying out her order to lie to the American people?

Further, throughout his testimony, Comey, a bureaucratic knife-fighter of the first order, testified with choir-boy innocence of so often being “confused,” or “concerned,” or intimidated in the presence of President Trump or on the phone with him, even admitting he was not “strong” enough to do the right thing, so “confused” that just saying “no” or otherwise objecting to President Trump or AG Lynch “never came to my [his] mind.”

Consider: Comey is the man who was supposed to stand up as FBI Director to protect the American people from: Islamist terrorists. Gangsters. Heinous murderers, rapists, and other criminals. Wealthy, politically-connected “white collar” criminals with ties to such things as the Clinton Foundation, or former Nazi collaborator George Soros and his multi-headed “Open Society” pouring billions into creating a Socialist America. Or corruption in government. Or “leakers.” This is the man who with Boy Scout *persona* held himself out as the only person in Washington of such high integrity he could be trusted?

In conclusion, Comey did not expose President Trump of wrongdoing. Instead, he exposed himself, and the bureaucracy itself.

As to President Trump, and to Comey, himself, consider the following points in which Comey confirmed. unequivocally that:

First, Comes confirmed that President Trump was telling the truth when Trump said Comey had informed Trump three times that Trump was not under investigation in the Russian-Election Collusion Matter. Trump, himself never was under investigation, Comey testified. This destroys all of the Democrat Party/News Media defamatory rumor mongering attempting to convince Americans that Trump was under investigation and was attempting to impede or terminate that investigation.

Second, Comey testified that in fact Trump not only did not attempt to interfere in the investigation into Russia's acts to influence the election but that Trump actually told Comey it would "be good" if the investigation resulted in findings that one of "my [Trump's] satellites" colluded with the Russians. This should end all of the daily claims that Trump colluded with "Putin" and the Russians—But will it?

Third, Comey testified that while FBI investigation showed that Russia attempted to interfere in the U.S. elections, the investigation did not find evidence that a single vote was changed because of Russia's acts.

Fourth, Comey testified that Trump only stated to him, one time, early on, shortly after Trump fired Michael Flynn for not truthfully reporting to Vice President Pence, that "I [Trump] hope" that Comey would let go of that because Flynn was a "good guy." That's it. Nothing more than that has been the basis of all the media and Democrat Party preoccupation. Comey's only reply was, he testified, that ,yes, he, too, believed Flynn was a good guy.

Fifth, notwithstanding, Comey testified now that he thought

that Trump's expression of a "hope" was in fact a "directive" from Trump to drop the investigation, and was wrong. It was so wrong that he rushed out to memorialize it in a memo-to-self on his government provided device in case Trump later would "lie" about it. But, as noted above, all that Comey said to Trump in fact was to agree that Flynn was "a good guy." He didn't question Trump as to his meaning. He didn't tell Trump he interpreted "hope" as a directive and seek objection or object to what Trump was said. Where was Comey's integrity not to in any manner object to Trump if he thought what Trump said was objectionable?

Further, on questioning, Comey testified that Trump did not use any words actually in the nature of directing or ordering him to terminate any investigation of Flynn.

Moreover, Comey testified that Trump never again raised any issue with Comey about Flynn, at any time, in any circumstance. Nor did Comey ever after express to President Trump that Comey objected to Trump's expression of "hope" as improper or objectionable, or even express that Comey felt uncomfortable with that statement.

Comey also admitted, when questioned, that he knew of no case, ever, in which anyone was prosecuted for "obstruction of justice" for expressing a "hope" that one thing or another might happen.

Sixth, It must be emphasized:

First, if Comey believed at any time that President Trump had acted to obstruct justice, by expressing a "hope" or otherwise, Comey had a legal duty at that time to report that to the Department of Justice. He didn't. If he really believed the President had issued a directive obstructing justice and Comey didn't report it, Comey should be prosecuted. Period.

Second, Comey testified that he gathered together all the top leaders of the FBI and told them what President Trump had said. If any one of them, or all of them, believed what President Trump said was an obstruction of justice, each had the same duty as Comey—a duty to report it. No one did. Each or all, the entire group of them, therefore, should be prosecuted.

Third, remarkably, notwithstanding that he testified he believed he interpreted Trump's statement of a "hope" as a

“directive” to drop the investigation not a mere “hope,” Comey testified flatly, without condition or equivocation, that had Trump not fired him, Comey would have stayed on as FBI director. Got that? This alone is dispositive evidence of the absence of integrity, and credibility, of James Comey

Seventh, finally, Comey destroyed any credibility he may have had when he testified he surreptitiously “leaked” through a third-party to the N.Y. Times information obtained in the course and scope of his official duty involving privileged communication with the President. He should be investigated by a Special Prosecutor, and prosecuted, like any other leaker. The information was on and from a government document. The fact that Comey kept it after he fired did not convert it from a government to a private document.

Finally, June 10, 2017, on the day after Comey’s testimony, President Donald Trump met with and held a press conference with the Secretaries of Transportation and the Interior. President Trump announced an innovative dynamic and dramatic change in the way Washington will do business regarding issuing permits by bureaucrats to citizens in order to facilitate a great construction boom on the nation’s infrastructure.

President Trump also held meetings and a press conference with the President of Rumania strengthening relations between the two nations, including particularly economic matters, fighting terrorism, and funding and strengthening NATO.

In short, President Trump concentrated on matters important to the nation, and carrying out the duties he was elected to carry out to improve America.

Meanwhile, the media, at the press conferences, and in their written and broadcast journalism, concentrated on the testimony of Comey, the admitted “leaker,” even though he testified that so many of their news reports that President Trump was under investigation, or that the investigation had found collusion with Russia in the election, were “wrong,” including “totally wrong.”

Comey, “Capt. Courageless,” Exposes Himself—And The Bureaucracy Itself

FBI Director James (“Captain Courageless”) Comey, fired by President Donald Trump, sought his revenge on President Trump in testimony before the Senate investigating committee on June 8, 2017, resulting in wall-to-wall television and a tsunami of liberal media and political “spin.”

Comey’s anticipated “bomb shell” testimony to destroy President Donald Trump – prayed for by liberal media, which even had a “count down” of the time before broadcast of Comey’s testimony as if as important as “Watergate” – simply fizzled.

If anything, Comey vindicated President Trump (discussed below), while exposing himself and the nature of the federal government bureaucracy.

Thus, the most valuable thing about fired FBI Director James Comey’s testimony before the Senate investigating committee on June 8 was not that he exposed Donald Trump – he didn’t. It was that Comey exposed before the entire nation the integrity-corrupting impact of living life and making a career in governmental bureaucracy.

That is, for anyone who needed proof, Comey exposed, and proved beyond a reasonable doubt what really matters to bureaucrats in the government bureaucracy: It is first and foremost, “CYA” to protect your government position and power, no matter the cost to integrity.

This is why Comey would rush to write “memos-to-self” after meetings or phone conversations with President Trump. This is a bureaucracy-wide tactic by which bureaucrats protect themselves in the event that they face later adverse employment circumstances or threats thereof.

I do not write this on speculation: As a workers rights attorney, I have represented thousands of rank-and-file government employees in “blue collar class” positions against abuses of managerial bureaucrats for decades, and know the bureaucracy for its true corrupting nature.

Most public sector employees enter government service with a sincere desire to “help people,” as they will all tell you. However, the nature of the bureaucracy itself soon causes them to adapt CYA as a way of survival and to get ahead in the bureaucracy. Bureaucrats have long memories and sharp knives, and are obsequious to superiors and tyrants to subordinates. It is not long before “public service” in the government becomes personal advancement in the bureaucracy, CYA is a rule of survival, and integrity is diminished if not destroyed, as exemplified by Comey, who would end as a venomous, reptilian “leaker” to the media to benefit himself, only after he was fired.

It has been said that security makes cowards of us all. That is absolutely true of those, like Comey, who live their lives and make their careers in the government bureaucracy. Most prefer the security of government employment in the wealth-consuming public sector, rather than the risks of success in the wealth-producing private sector, often referred to as the “real world.”

In short, the nature of the bureaucracy is corrupting. Period. Comey’s testimony is evidence of that enduring truth.

Indeed, Comey, in his nationally televised testimony, with angelic choir-boy innocent countenance, delivered himself before the nation and the world of a long, pouty, self-serving bureaucrat whine that revealed Comey’s own lack of integrity, his admitted cowardice when faced with ethical choice, his vengeful “leak” to the N.Y. Times evidence of

corrupted integrity.

Comey exposed himself as a *poseur* of personal and governmental rectitude. He provided proof positive that he was and is in reality a slippery, slithering bureaucrat who made his way in the federal bureaucracy with reptilian skill, so without integrity that he would end by becoming a “leaker” himself to the N.Y. Times through a third party “friend,” – although Comey, himself, as head of the FBI, had been charged with the duty of investigating the “leakers” in the bureaucratic “deep state” who in violation of the law had used their federal positions to attack the Trump Administration to which they are politically opposed.

What an irony that a Bernie Sanders supporting leftist Democrat employed in the federal bureaucracy – a left over, like Comey, from the progressive liberal regime of Barack Hussein Obama – is being prosecuted for leaking to the media after investigation by the FBI. Yet James Comey leaks the content of a memo written by Comey, in the course and scope of his employment as bureaucrat heading the FBI, on a government-issued device, concerning a communication with the President of the United States. Comey’s assertion that document somehow became his private property because he was fired is an utter absurdity, and cannot excuse “leaking” it surreptitiously to the N.Y. Times.

It is no wonder that the American public distrusts government, especially the distant Federal Government in which bureaucrats like Comey have established themselves in effect as a “National Government” over the States instead of a limited government of federated sovereign States.

Here is Comey, a public servant who admits his “cowardice” in taking no action whatsoever against what he now says in Senate testimony that he thought to be wrongful conduct by President Trump in expressing a “hope” that an investigation of Michael Flynn would be “let go,” an investigation at that time which was only about Trump firing Flynn for not being truthful in reporting to Vice President Pence about his contact to the Russian Ambassador.

Further, Comey casually testified that Obama-appointed AG Loretta Lynch ordered him not to call his "investigation" of Democrat Presidential Nominee Hillary Clinton an "investigation," but, rather a "matter," which is what Hillary Clinton's campaign called it. Comey testified that he questioned Lynch's directive, thought it was a lie, because the FBI was in fact conducting an "investigation." Nowwithstanding, he cowardly, wilted and followed Lynch's order to call the "investigation" a "matter," thereby deceiving the American public.

It has to be asked—will the media and Democrats in Congress now be an investigation of former AG Loretta Lynch, the "First Black Woman To Be Attorney General? Will Comey be investigated for carrying out her order to lie to the American people?

Further, throughout his testimony, Comey, a bureaucratic knife-fighter of the first order, testified with choir-boy innocence of so often being "confused," or "concerned," or intimidated in the presence of President Trump or on the phone with him, even admitting he was not "strong" enough to do the right thing, so "confused" that just saying "no" or otherwise objecting to President Trump or AG Lynch "never came to my [his] mind."

Consider: Comey is the man who was supposed to stand up as FBI Director to protect the American people from: Islamist terrorists. Gangsters. Heinous murderers, rapists, and other criminals. Wealthy, politically-connected "white collar" criminals with ties to such things as the Clinton Foundation, or former Nazi collaborator George Soros and his multi-headed "Open Society" pouring billions into creating a Socialist America. Or corruption in government. Or "leakers." This is the man who with Boy Scout *persona* held himself out as the only person in Washington of such high integrity he could be trusted?

In conclusion, Comey did not expose President Trump of wrongdoing. Instead, he exposed himself, and the bureaucracy itself.

As to President Trump, and to Comey, himself, consider the following points in which Comey confirmed, unequivocally that:

First, Comes confirmed that President Trump was telling the truth when Trump said Comey had informed Trump three times that Trump was not under investigation in the Russian-Election Collusion Matter. Trump, himself never was under investigation, Comey testified. This destroys all of the Democrat Party/News Media defamatory rumor mongering attempting to convince Americans that Trump was under investigation and was attempting to impede or terminate that investigation.

Second, Comey testified that in fact Trump not only did not attempt to interfere in the investigation into Russia's acts to influence the election but that Trump actually told Comey it would "be good" if the investigation resulted in findings that one of "my [Trump's] satellites" colluded with the Russians. This should end all of the daily claims that Trump colluded with "Putin" and the Russians—But will it?

Third, Comey testified that while FBI investigation showed that Russia attempted to interfere in the U.S. elections, the investigation did not find evidence that a single vote was changed because of Russia's acts.

Fourth, Comey testified that Trump only stated to him, one time, early on, shortly after Trump fired Michael Flynn for not truthfully reporting to Vice President Pence, that "I [Trump] hope" that Comey would let go of that because Flynn was a "good guy." That's it. Nothing more than that has been the basis of all the media and Democrat Party preoccupation. Comey's only reply was, he testified, that ,yes, he, too, believed Flynn was a good guy.

Fifth, notwithstanding, Comey testified now that he thought that Trump's expression of a "hope" was in fact a "directive" from Trump to drop the investigation , and was wrong. It was so wrong that he rushed out to memorialize it in a memo-to-self on his government provided device in case Trump later

would "lie" about it. But, as noted above, all that Comey said to Trump in fact was to agree that Flynn was "a good guy." He didn't question Trump as to his meaning. He didn't tell Trump he interpreted "hope" as a directive and seek objection or object to what Trump was said. Where was Comey's integrity not to in any manner object to Trump if he thought what Trump said was objectionable?

Further, on questioning, Comey testified that Trump did not use any words actually in the nature of directing or ordering him to terminate any investigation of Flynn.

Moreover, Comey testified that Trump never again raised any issue with Comey about Flynn, at any time, in any circumstance. Nor did Comey ever after express to President Trump that Comey objected to Trump's expression of "hope" as improper or objectionable, or even express that Comey felt uncomfortable with that statement.

Comey also admitted, when questioned, that he knew of no case, ever, in which anyone was prosecuted for "obstruction of justice" for expressing a "hope" that one thing or another might happen.

Sixth, It must be emphasized:

First, if Comey believed at any time that President Trump had acted to obstruct justice, by expressing a "hope" or otherwise, Comey had a legal duty at that time to report that to the Department of Justice. He didn't. If he really believed the President had issued a directive obstructing justice and Comey didn't report it, Comey should be prosecuted. Period.

Second, Comey testified that he gathered together all the top leaders of the FBI and told them what President Trump had said. If any one of them, or all of them, believed what President Trump said was an obstruction of justice, each had the same duty as Comey—a duty to report it. No one did. Each or all, the entire group of them, therefore, should be prosecuted.

Third, remarkably, notwithstanding that he testified he believed he interpreted Trump's statement of a "hope" as a "directive" to drop the investigation not a mere "hope," Comey testified flatly, without condition or equivocation, that had Trump not fired him, Comey would have stayed on as FBI director. Got that? This alone is dispositive evidence of the

absence of integrity, and credibility, of James Comey

Seventh, finally, Comey destroyed any credibility he may have had when he testified he surreptitiously “leaked” through a third-party to the N.Y. Times information obtained in the course and scope of his official duty involving privileged communication with the President. He should be investigated by a Special Prosecutor, and prosecuted, like any other leaker. The information was on and from a government document. The fact that Comey kept it after he fired did not convert it from a government to a private document.

Finally, June 10, 2017, on the day after Comey’s testimony, President Donald Trump met with and held a press conference with the Secretaries of Transportation and the Interior. President Trump announced an innovative dynamic and dramatic change in the way Washington will do business regarding issuing permits by bureaucrats to citizens in order to facilitate a great construction boom on the nation’s infrastructure.

President Trump also held meetings and a press conference with the President of Rumania strengthening relations between the two nations, including particularly economic matters, fighting terrorism, and funding and strengthening NATO.

In short, President Trump concentrated on matters important to the nation, and carrying out the duties he was elected to carry out to improve America.

Meanwhile, the media, at the press conferences, and in their written and broadcast journalism, concentrated on the testimony of Comey, the admitted “leaker,” even though he testified that so many of their news reports that President Trump was under investigation, or that the investigation had found collusion with Russia in the election, were “wrong,” including “totally wrong.”

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

D-Day: June 6, 1944

June 6, 2017 is the 73rd anniversary of a day which should live in history and the minds of all generations of Americans as a true milestone of liberty: D-Day, June 6, 1944 – a day to be emulated by Americans if tyranny again makes it necessary to fight and perhaps die for freedom.

On D-Day, in the largest amphibious landing in history, some 156,00 soldiers, sailors, marines, air corps and coast guard members of America, Britain, Canada, free France, Poland, and other nations, participated in the allied invasion at Normandy, France, to defeat the totalitarian tyranny of the National Workers Socialist Party (NAZI) of Adolf Hitler, who had conquered all of Europe.

Those who fought at Normandy on D-Day to preserve freedom from defeat by Hitler's national socialist fascism, paid a terrible sacrifice. The beaches at Normandy, with NAZI artillery and machine guns established in cross-fire patterns, were, indeed, "killing fields," prepared for slaughter. The sea ran red with blood. There were more than 10,000 casualties. The beaches designated Omaha, Utah, and Gold were covered by the wounded and dying. Over 4,000 of them, including 2,500 Americans, were killed in action. But by their bravery and sacrifice, they turned the tide of war in what the late famed historian Stephen Ambrose called "the climatic battle of WWII," in his book "D-Day: June 6, 1944."

Hitler was convinced – and had convinced most of the western world – that his Fortress Europe could turn back and defeat any attempt to invade Europe by sea. So confident were the NAZI socialists, that their top generals, including Erwin Rommel, the "Desert Fox" who had gained fame in the Africa

campaign, were elsewhere. Rommel himself was on leave in Germany, when the invasion was launched from Great Britain for Normandy – and not Calais, which the Nazi's thought would be the point of invasion if one were made.

But Hitler was confident his Fortress Europe would defeat any invasion, anywhere. Rommel, his best fighting general, had overseen the NAZI's military arrangement of massive armaments all along the coast from Spain to Norway, creating Fortress Europe.

On D-Day, June 6, 1944, there was great doubt the invasion could succeed. General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Allied Commander, actually paused to write a note in his own hand a statement to be made should the battle be lost. General Eisenhower wrote that if the invasion was lost, it was entirely his fault. He made no excuses, did not the fault of his subordinate officers or the soldiers who fought it, or blame anyone else. (Compare that American leadership in the WWII generation with "red lines" drawn by Commander-in-Chief Barack Hussein Obama proscribing use of gas or genocide in Syria, which turn out to be writ in sand and blowing in the wind; or, the excuses of Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in Benghazi.)

After writing that note, Gen. Eisenhower issued a simple order, "OK, let's go!" American and allied soldiers went. They fought. They died, including 400,000 of Americans in WWII. But, they conquered, they saved the freedom of America, and the world, from the tyranny of Hitler's national socialist fascism, NAZIism.

It can truly be said that without the bravery and sacrifice of that WWII generation of Americans, we Americans, would not be free today. We would be but the serfs of socialism under the brand of Hitler's NAZIism, mouthing political platitudes of social justice being achieved under a messiah, Adolf Hitler.

But the question to ask on the 73rd Anniversary D-Day is, how many Americans will remember D-Day, June 6, 1944, on June 6, 2017? How many of us will remember today that we are the heirs of freedom purchased for us by the blood of the 400,000 members of the WWII Generation who gave their lives for freedom, and the 16-million veterans who served in that war – many of whom are still with us, though we are losing them at the rate of some 1,500 a day?

What of the values of the WWII generation who fought in Europe on D-Day and thereafter, and in the Pacific against Japan, often called the Greatest Generation. They were the children of the Depression and the men and women of WWII, not the children of material comfort and privilege of subsequent generations. They had no “safe zones.”

The late author Michale Novak, in his important book entitled, “On Two Wings—Humble Faith And Common Sense At the Founding Of America,” cites a study done in the late 1950’s on the values of Americans. What the study found was that the Americans whose values were closest to the Founding Fathers’ values was –the American families who had served in WWII.

What is the state of the Founding Fathers values in today’s America, especially after eight years in which progressive liberal President Barack Hussein Obama who openly stated his intent was to “transform America” away from its traditional values, and into a country modeled on European socialism?

Abraham Lincoln once observed: “Show me what the children are being taught in the schools in America today, and I will show you the kind of government America will have in the next generation.”

What will progressive liberal teachers in the government schools of America teach American children on June 6, 2017, about D-Day, June 6, 1944? Will the children be taught that their freedom has been purchased for them by the courage and

bravery of American veterans who fought, some 400,000 whom died, beginning at Normandy Beach on June 6, 1944, so that Americans might be free?

We face today another totalitarian ideology as evil as Hilter's NAZIism-Islamism. Through such Islamist supremacists as al-Queda and IS (Islamic Snake), they are attempting to rule by terror, genocide, just as Hitler did.

Will we Americans today, and will the next generation, respond to fight to the death to preserve freedom from the tyranny of Islamism as did the WWII generation did to fight to preserve freedom from NAZIism?

May God bless and keep all those who served on D-Day, June 6, 1944, and the entire WWII, as all gave some, and some gave all. May we, as Americans, have the love of God and love of Country of the Greatest Generation that led them to fight and die for freedom if we receive the call, as they did from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower on D-Day: "Let's go!"

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY-NEVER!

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Questions On Memorial Day 2017

The late General Norman ("Stormin' Norman") Schwarzkopf, Commander of forces in the Persian Gulf War ("Desert Storm"), succinctly stated an enduring truth: *"Some things are worth living for. Some things are worth dying for. One of those things is freedom."*

Another enduring truth is that each of us Americans owes a debt to all of the more than 1.3-million American veterans who came before us and sacrificed their lives for our freedom. We pay that debt by what we do to preserve American freedom for all those who will come after us.

Memorial Day is a day to remember what should be remembered every day—the service and sacrifice of American veterans who gave their lives in war so that we, their posterity, might live as free Americans. (See below the appended chart of casualties in all the wars.)

On Memorial Day 2017, as on every Memorial Day, all across America, veterans of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW), Disabled American Veterans (DAV), American Veterans (AmVets), veterans of other organizations and individual veterans who know what it means to serve, gathered at their Posts, meeting halls, National or State Veterans Cemeteries, or at community events, to honor and remember all those veterans who paid for our freedom with their lives.

But, unfortunately, many citizens, and others residing in America, including our young in government schools – and including immigrants, legal and illegal – have neither knowledge of the real meaning of Memorial Day, nor respect for the veterans who are to be honored, remembered, and thanked for their service and the sacrifice of their lives for American freedom by a grateful nation.

That historical and cultural ignorance is understandable, since government public schools no longer teach the young such things about their heritage as Americans regarding the meaning of Memorial Day; the nobility of military service; patriotism and love of our country; or America as an “exceptional nation” – the first government in world history to be created “by, for, and of” the people instead of being imposed on the people; a nation which has defended freedom from tyranny and terrorism throughout the world, including against tyrannical national socialist fascism, international communism, and radical Islamist terrorism, each aimed at compelling submission to its totalitarian ideology.

Patriotism generally, and selfless service for God and country by military service as noble, has been replaced by a progressive liberal political, media, and educational elite substituting political correctness, multiculturalism, and cultural relevance in which "American exceptionalism" is derided, and condemned.

Indeed, even a sitting President of the United States, the Commander-in-Chief in a time of war, Barack Hussain Obama, self-described progressive liberal, famously instructed and insisted to Americans, including the young and those serving in the military during the continuing war against terrorism, that America is objectively no more an "exceptional nation" than any other country which subjectively thinks it is "exceptional."

THREE QUESTIONS ON MEMORIAL DAY 2017

In such a political and cultural atmosphere, after transformation of America and Americans by progressive liberal politically correct rule for eight years, at least three questions are raised on Memorial Day 2017:

First, should remembrance of the sacrifice of their lives by veterans who have paid the price of American freedom be limited to one Memorial Day a year?"

Second, are Americans today—not just those in the all-volunteer modern military – willing to give their lives for freedom in battle if necessary, as have prior generations?

Third, have Americans been so transformed by eight years of progressive liberal politically correct rule that they timidly fear to even demand that Congress pass the Flag Amendment, H.J. Res. 61, to protect from desecration the Flag under which 1.3-million veterans gave their lives in defense of Freedom?

I. THE "21 SECOND REMEMBRANCE RESOLUTION"

Regarding remembrance of veterans who gave their lives for American freedom, there is a growing effort to have the "21 Second Remembrance Resolution" adopted throughout the nation to remember and honor veterans on more than Memorial Day.

The 21 Second Remembrance Resolution calls on governmental

units from villages, towns, cities, counties, States and the Federal (not "National") Government in Washington, D.C. – as well as non-governmental businesses, organizations, and individuals – to pause for 21 seconds of silence, at noon, on the 21st Day of each month, to remember and honor those veterans who have given their lives for freedom.

Ray Trosper of Norco, California, a former U.S. Marine, an American Legionnaire, and a Patriot Guard rider, is the founder of the "21 Second Remembrance Resolution."

"Those American veterans who died in service gave their lives for us. We should never forget their sacrifice. We should remember, and honor, them for their sacrifice on more than one day of the year, to preserve awareness of the true cost of our freedom, and to show respect for those who paid that price," says Trosper.

Trosper is not one of the effete elite. He grew up in a patriotic Wisconsin farm family; joined the Marines after high school; and, after his military service, came to California and worked his way up in the mobile home industry to become a successful small business owner operating a wholesale mobile home supply business, SDCK Corp., in Ontario, CA. In short, he is living by what were once "traditional American values" including self-reliance, hard work to get ahead, faith, family, fidelity, and patriotism.

Trosper says of his 21 Second Remembrance Resolution: "We have a tradition of the 21-gun salute. We have the tradition of the Honor Guard taking precisely 21 steps at the Tomb Of The Unknown Soldier. We should be willing to remember those who gave their lives for us by at least pausing in our own lives for 21-second moments of silence, one time a month, at noon, on the 21st day of every month."

Trosper's "21 Second Remembrance Resolution" was adopted as a statute by the California legislature in 2014. It urges all California governmental units, employees, and private businesses and citizens, to observe 21-seconds of silence at noon on the 21st day of the month. It was also adopted, first,

by Trosper's American Legion Riverside Post 79, then, sponsored by Post 79 and District 21, by the American Legion Department of California, forth largest Department in the 2.4-member American Legion.

"Honoring and remembering those who gave their lives for us costs us nothing, neither for government or private businesses and organizations," Trosper notes. "Although the cost to the veterans who preserved our freedom was their lives, it costs us nothing to pause for 21 seconds once a month, at noon, on the 21st day, to remember and honor them and their lives."

Trosper embodies the concept of "once a Marine, always a Marine," and in that spirit is working for adoption of the 21 Second Resolution nationwide. (For more information and how to join the effort: www.21SecondsNow.com.)

II. WILL AMERICANS STILL DIE FOR FREEDOM?

As to the second question, are we, as individual Americans, still willing to sacrifice our lives in defense of freedom?

Those serving in our military as volunteers definitely are. Most veterans will tell you they still are. But are all Americans prepared to make that sacrifice? Each American must answer that question in his or her own heart. But in this age of radical Islamic terrorism, with atrocity upon atrocity being committed at home and abroad, and America "transformed" after eight years of progressive liberal rule with political correctness overruling patriotism, it is a question which may have to be answered as an existential reality by everyone sooner than anyone would have thought. Progressive liberal politically correct appeasement of Islamist terrorism is an utter failure. Islamist terrorism is here and growing, from Boston to San Bernardino, and all points between. We will have to choose.

III. THE FLAG AMENDMENT, H.J. RES 61

As to the third question, protecting the Flag: I have to emphasize here that each of more than 1.3-million American veterans who gave their lives in defense of American of freedom did so serving under the American Flag, which is the symbol of the American Constitution and Nation.

That Flag, in the last eight years during the progressive liberal politically correct rule of Barak Obama, has been subjected to increasing desecration by burning, even by defecating on the Flag, by those openly identifying themselves as enemies of America, domestic and foreign.

The shield for such desecration is the decision of five of the nine lawyers on the Supreme Court who decided for the first time in American history in 1989 in the case of *Texas vs. Johnson*, 5-4 –that is, by a majority of one lawyer-judge –that the desecration of the Flag by physical act, which would include burning, defecation, or other physical act, is “speech” intended to be protected by the First Amendment by the Founding Fathers.

Does non-lawyer actually believe that Gen. George Washington –Father of the Country, Thomas Jefferson–Father of the Declaration of Independence, or James Madison – Father of the Constitution, or other Founding Fathers, actually intended the First Amendment they created to protect defecation as “speech”? Please excuse me for believing that anyone, including lawyers on the Supreme Court, who thinks that defecating is “speech,” is talking out of the wrong orifice himself or herself.

Notwithstanding, the only way to overcome the decision of the five lawyers on the Supreme Court in *Texas vs. Johnson* and protect the Flag is for “We, the People” to exercise the right to make such decisions by demanding that Congress pass the Flag Amendment, H.J. Res. 61, and send it to the States for ratification by vote of the people.

The Flag Amendment, H.J. Res. 61, would amend the Constitution itself to provide: “*Congress shall have the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.*” Thus, the Supreme Court could not declare it “unconstitutional” for Congress to protect the Flag from physical desecration by legislation.

American Legion National Commander Charles E. Schmidt, and Maj. Gen. Patrick Brady (USA, ret.), Medal of Honor (Vietnam), considered America’s most decorated living veteran and the

chairman emeritus of the American Legion's Citizens Flag Alliance, have each called for all veterans and patriots to revitalize the effort to pass the Flag Amendment, H.J. Res 61, in the new 115th Congress under a new President who has expressed his respect and love for the Flag, President Donald J. Trump.

"When you burn the Flag, you burn the Constitution," says Maj. Gen. Brady. "If ever there was a time in which to pass the Flag Amendment, this is that time."

IV. CONCLUSION

Thus, on Memorial Day 2017, we Americans, who may be called upon to sacrifice our lives for American freedom as did our ancestors, should have at least respect enough for those who have given their lives for our freedom to adopt the 21 Second Remembrance Resolution (www.21SecondsNow.com).

We should have also at least the respect and courage to demand that Congress pass the Flag Amendment, H.J.Res. 61, in order to protect from physical desecration the Flag under which 1.3-million American veterans have given their lives in defense of Freedom. (For more information on the Flag Amendment, see, www.CitizensFlagAlliance.com, and, www.patriotoutreach.org/Honor_Our_Flag.html).

Finally, I close this Memorial Day 2017 commentary by appending data on those who have given their lives for our freedom; followed by the greatest war poem ever written, *Flanders Fields*. Although written in 1915 during the Battle of Ypres in WWI, it is as relevant, compelling, and moving today as it was then. This is most especially true of the final lines, which call on us to take up the "torch" of freedom from the falling hands of those dying, and warns: "**If ye break faith with us who die/We shall not sleep, though poppies grow/In Flanders fields.**"

We must not, we shall not, "break faith" with those 1.3-million American veterans who have died. For us. May God bless and keep each and all of them; may we Americans never forget, and always honor them. May we have the courage, the integrity, the love of God, family, comrades, and country, to make the choice they did when called upon to make the ultimate

sacrifice for freedom.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY—NEVER!

—Rees Lloyd

FREEDOM IS NOT FREE — REMEMBER THE AMERICANS WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES IN WAR THAT WE MIGHT BE FREE:

American Wars: Killed In Action

Revolutionary War.....	25,324
War of 1812.....	2,260
Mexican War.....	13,283
Civil War.....	650,000
Spanish American War.....	7,166
World War I.....	116,708
World War II.....	408,206
Korean War.....	54,246
Vietnam War.....	58,223
Persian Gulf War.....	363
Afghanistan.....	2,215
Iraq.....	4,212
TOTAL KIA:	1,342,206

TOTAL MISSING IN ACTION: 83,126

In Flanders Fields

by [Canadian] Major John McCrae, May 1915

*In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.*

*We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie*

In Flanders fields.

*Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.*

*If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.*

[\[Click here for the full story on Flanders Fields and the Poppy tradition.\]](#)

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Cesar Chavez Holiday –Honoring An American Hero

“I am convinced that the truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness, is to sacrifice for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men!” –Cesar Chavez

March 31 is an official State holiday in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, and is observed in several other States, in honor of the birth on March 31, 1937, of an extraordinary American – Cesar Estrada Chavez, the late co-founder and president of the United Farm Workers of America who became a legend in his own time in the civil rights era.

But there are many Americans today who are unaware there is a Cesar Chavez Day (the major media ignore it), or why there should be a holiday honoring him. There are also malicious myths tainting the life and the memory of Cesar Chavez that need to be repudiated, most particularly the lies that he was

not an American but a Mexican national, and that he was a "Communist," both of which were first promulgated by the John Birch Society. They are utterly false.

I worked with Cesar Chavez for some twenty years, starting in 1973, when I was a long haul trucker participating in a nationwide strike in protest against escalating fuel costs in the so-called "Arab Oil Embargo."

I was helping coordinate the shutdown at the Triple T Truckstop in Tucson, AZ. Cesar Chavez mentored me in that strike, which remained non-violent because of his demands in mentoring me that "violence is a failure of creative intelligence."

After that strike was broken, an alliance between the Truckers For Justice and the United Farm Workers of America was established. During that work, in which we refused to haul non-union (scab) lettuce and grapes, Cesar told me I needed to go to law school as I could do more good as a lawyer. His recommendation got me into law school. I worked with UFW lawyers while in law school, and after graduating and passing the California Bar in 1979, I became one of his lawyers until the day of his death on April 23, 1993, and for the UFW thereafter as called upon. I have remained to this day exclusively a civil rights, workers rights, veterans rights attorney. ([*I have written in more detail about experiences with Cesar in an earlier tribute, available here*](#))

I can attest based on that long "up close and personal" experience that Cesar Chavez was, in his own way, a true American hero; that there are valuable lessons to be learned from his honorable life; and that he is deserving of recognition by all Americans for his service and sacrifice for others, no matter their race, color, or creed.

However, in order to understand that, it is necessary, first, to overcome the lies and myths which continue to distort the

truth of who and what Cesar Chavez was. These are myths by those who hated and maligned him for their own political purposes; and by those who want to exploit who and what he was in order to appropriate him based on race, ethnicity, or nationality for their own political ends.

The most malicious of those myths are, as stated above, first, that he was not an American but a "Mexican" national; and, second, that he was a "Communist."

These malicious myths were first promulgated, utterly falsely and politically deliberately, by the John Birch Society in the 1960's. Almost sixty years later, they are repeated to this day.

First, as to nationality, the truth is that Cesar Chavez was a native-born American, not a "Mexican." While proud of his Mexican-American heritage, he was a third-generation American, born on his grandfather's small ranch in Arizona in the Yuma area. No matter the indisputability of those facts, Wikipedia, for example, on which many students and others rely, informs even now: "Chavez was born on the Mexico Texas border and therefore has dual citizenship." Utterly false.

Second, Cesar Chavez was no "communist." He was a devoted Catholic Christian. He was attempting, humbly, to live his Christian faith as faithfully as he was able by sacrifice and service for others as taught and exemplified by Jesus the Christ, not Marx the Communist.

Moreover, almost never mentioned by those who hate Cesar Chavez and define him as a "communist" and a "Mexican" rather than an American, is that Cesar Chavez, in 1944 at the age of 17, enlisted in the U.S. Navy in WWII and served for the duration of the war in the Pacific in defense of the country of his birth, the United States of America.

Ironically, those who claim to love Cesar Chavez make themselves accomplices of those who hate him (and them) by

obscuring Cesar Chavez' American birth – and by almost never mentioning that he was an American veteran of WWII. They do this not to honor Cesar, but in order to appropriate Cesar Chavez on race or ethnic grounds as a “Mexican,” “Chicano,” or “Raza” race-based civil rights movement leader rather than as an American hero who should be honored by all Americans – as an *American* hero.

In regard to that, Cesar Chavez, while proud of his ancestral heritage, always identified himself as a “labor” or “union leader,” not as a civil rights leader of Mexican-Americans, Chicanos, Latinos, Hispanics, or La Raza.

In fact, in the some twenty years I worked with him, Cesar never defined himself as a “Mexican,” or “Chicano,” “Latino,” etc., and, regarding the identification “La Raza” (“The Race”) he told me he didn't use it because he considered it racist.

Those who condemn him as a “Mexican” and “Communist,,” and those who claim a possessory interest him as a leader of a race-based “Chicano” or “La Raza” civil rights movement, are both wrong: He defined himself as, and acted as, what he was—a “trade union leader,” and a devout Catholic Christian.

Cesar Chavez was the moral heart of the American labor movement.

He built the first viable farm workers union in American history, the United Farm Workers of America. As president of the UFW, Cesar Chavez represented *all* farm workers, whatever their race, ethnicity, or nationality.

One example which refutes the myths of both those who hate Chavez and those who appropriate him based on race, and shows the willingness of both to corrupt historical truth to suit their political ends, is Chavez' acts regarding illegal immigration, which was then and remains now at the center of national controversy and division.

In 1969, Cesar Chavez famously led a march from Indio, CA, to the border. It is portrayed today as primarily a march in protest against discrimination by racist growers oppressing Mexican and other Hispanic farmworkers. That is false historical revisionism.

The primary purpose of the 1969 march to the Mexican border was a protest against the federal government's failure to secure the border from importation of illegal immigrants who were being used to keep wages and working conditions down and to break strikes and the farmworkers union entirely. Indeed, as UFW members set up picket lines waving "Huelga" ("Strike") flags, buses would arrive from Mexico to unload strike breakers.

In short, Cesar Chavez' 1969 march to the Mexican border was for the same purpose that the Minutemen later went to the border in the 70's and 80's— to secure the border and demand that the government stop illegal immigration. (It should be noted that the Minutemen were widely condemned as as "racists" for doing just what Cesar Chavez did. Was Cesar Chavez a racist?)

In the 1970's, Cesar Chavez fell out of favor with race-based civil rights groups, white liberals, Leftists including open socialist and communist organizations, and liberal media. He was criticized because he adopted the position of calling upon and aiding the then-Immigration And Naturalization Service (INS) to deport strikebreakers illegally in the country.

In 1979, ten years after the march from Indio to the border to demand enforcement of the immigration laws, Cesar Chavez testified before Congress about immigration. He testified that illegal immigration had to be stopped, and the border secured, as illegal immigrants were used to hold wages and working conditions down, and to break as strikes, defeating efforts of farmworkers to build a union to improve their wages, hours,

working conditions, and lives.

Today, Cesar Chavez' 1969 march from Indio to the border is historically revised to be a protest against racist growers and his 1979 Congressional testimony is rarely cited, to satisfy the political ends of race-based *la raza* groups and non-*raza* liberals who want to transform him from what he was, i.e., a leader of a labor movement to improve the lives of all farmworkers, to what they want him to be, i.e., a race-based political leader..

Meanwhile, many conservatives continue the original wrong and error of the John Birch Society when it falsely slandered and branded Cesar Chavez as a non-American and a "communist." That continually repeated malicious lie has alienated many Mexican-American and other Hispanics for whom Cesar Chavez is, rightly, a hero, as he should be for all Americans.

In his lifetime, although he became nationally and internationally renown, Cesar Chavez never sought personal fame, wealth, or celebrity. It was all about the cause, *la causa*, not about him. Indeed, Cesar Chavez turned down millions of dollars offered for the rights to make a movie of his life. Similarly, he rejected all offers to write an autobiography or for the right to produce an "authorized" biography. All that he would authorize was the "Autobiography of La Causa," by Jaques Levy, who didn't "buy" the right but earned it by working with Chavez in *la causa* for some ten years.

Cesar Chavez' achievement is monumental. Farmworkers, and domestic workers, were exempted from the right to organize into unions provided to all other workers by the National Labor Relations Act. There were no State laws creating a right of farmworkers to support unionization. They could be and were fired and "blacklisted" with impunity by employers who suspected them of supporting a union. Farmworkers were also migrant, moving from employer to employer on the migrant trail

during harvesting seasons. Therefore, more than a hundred attempts to organize migrant farmworkers by major international unions with money, members, and paid full time organizers failed. It was thought impossible to organize migrant farmworkers.

Then came Cesar Chavez. He had nothing. No money, no members, no paid staff. Nothing but the belief that the only way to help farmworkers was to build a union in which they could themselves achieve better working conditions, and dignity. He himself had become a migrant farmworker at the age of ten when the ranch of his grandfather on which he was born was lost on foreclosure in the Depression and taken over by the Bruce Church Corp., largest lettuce grower in Arizona. He had little education, attending some fifty different elementary schools as his family followed the migrant farmworker trail. After his service in the U.S. Navy, he had married his sweetheart, Helen, in Delano, CA. Together they had eight kids.

The story has been told now in many articles, books, documentaries, and a relatively recent movie of how Cesar Chavez, while working as an organizer in Los Angeles, became convinced a union for farmworkers had to be created. He quit his job. He and Helen loaded up their old station wagon with the kids and a mimeograph machine, and headed to Delano. There, they rented a house, set up the mimeograph machine, and sent out a flyer calling for a house meeting, the first step in creating what would become the United Farm Workers of America.

How did Cesar Chavez succeed where all others had failed? By touching the hearts of Americans and the conscience of the nation by exposing the true working conditions of migrant farmworkers through creative, non-violent acts and actions, including his fasts and boycotts, and by his manifest personal selfless service and sacrifice.

Cesar Chavez did not merely say: *"I am convinced that the*

truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness, is to sacrifice for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men!"

He lived it.

By doing so, he succeeded where so many others failed. He achieved what was thought impossible. He inspired and taught



by his example, humbly serving and sacrificing for others, and thereby has enriched the lives not only of farmworkers, but the lives of millions of Americans, of all races, all colors, all creeds, including my own life.

I am greatly indebted to Cesar Chavez, especially for the example of his selfless life in service for others. I will always walk in his shadow.

CESAR CHAVEZ AND REES LLOYD At Press Conference during truckers strike in Tucson, AZ, in 1973, announcing alliance of Truckers For Justice and United Farm Workers of America (UFW)

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Restore

“Washington’s

“Birthday” holiday

Repeal The Uniform Monday Holiday Act

February 22, 2017, is the 285th anniversary of the birth in 1732 of General and President George Washington, the “Father Of Our Country.” Washington was the most universally respected and admired American in the age of the Founding Fathers, and in the history of America.

Once upon a time, George Washington’s Birthday was a National Holiday celebrated on the actual anniversary of his birth, February 22. On Washington’s Birthday, Americans paused to remember and honor him. Parents and schools taught American children about his life on his birthday; urged the children to learn about the Father Of His [Their] Country, and to follow his example of patriotic love of country, selfless service and sacrifice for freedom, personal honor, dedication to duty, fidelity to principle.

By observing Washington’s Birthday as a National Holiday on his actual birthdate, Feb. 22, the focus of the nation was on Washington, on the example he set by his extraordinary life, establishing him as “the Greatest American.”

However, all that changed in 1971. Congress, pressured by federal government bureaucrats and other employees and their unions, abolished “Washington’s Birthday” as a National Holiday. It was replaced with “Presidents’ Day” to be observed on the “third Monday of February” as a result of the “Uniform Monday Holiday Act,” which gave government employees their sought after three-day weekends.

As a result, American children in government schools learn little or nothing about the greatest man in the history of America, without whose extraordinary virtues and sacrifices they would not be free.

Therefore, I urge that "Washington's Birthday" should be reinstated as a National Holiday. It should be celebrated on Washington's actual birthday: February 22, not another day for the three-day holiday convenience of alleged "public servants" in government employment. Nor should Washington be lumped in with other, less deserving presidents in a concocted "Presidents Day."

George Washington was acknowledged at the genesis of the United States of America as the "Father Of His Country," the greatest of all Americans. He received such honors for good reasons that endure and should not be forgotten, or never taught to succeeding generations. He set an enduring example of fidelity to God and Country. His life should be known, remembered, honored, and emulated by Americans of this and future generations, as he was by the generation of the Founding Fathers who knew him best.

George Washington was the most admired American by the Americans of the Founding Generation who created the free, Constitutional republic of America: "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen," as Washington was described by Revolutionary War hero Henry ("Light Horse Harry") Lee. No president, no American, has every been so universally respected and admired as was Washington.

Washington set an enduring example in war by his conduct as Commanding General of the American Revolutionary Army in the War of Independence, 1776-1883, in which he was regarded as the "indispensable man" without whose leadership freedom would never have been achieved in the war against England, then the greatest military power on earth.

Washington continued setting the example in peace when he was elected by acclamation as president of the Constitutional Convention, and thereafter elected as the First President of the United States.

He set perhaps an even greater example by walking away from power and returning home to Virginia as a private citizen after his second term, refusing offers that he be president for life.

His act of humbly declining power as President and returning home stunned the world, in which the United States was then the only republic in a world of monarchs and potentates. He was hailed as a (then) modern "Cincinnatus," the Roman general who walked away from imperial power when Rome ruled the world. When others grasped for power—then and now—George Washington, singularly, relinquished power, setting an unprecedented example of duty, honor, country, first.

After his death on Dec. 14, 1799, George Washington was hailed in the western world as "the greatest man of his age." Even Napoleon, who had no small estimation of his own greatness, deferred to Washington, saying (on Feb. 9, 1800) : "This great man fought against tyranny; he established the liberty of his country. His memory will always be dear to the French people, as it will be to all freemen of the two worlds."

Americans once believed those words. George Washington was the first American to be honored with a federal holiday. "Washington's Birthday" was established by Act of Congress in 1879. As noted above, "Washington's Birthday" holiday was observed on the anniversary of Washington's birthday, February 22, until Congress, putting the care, comfort and convenience of government employees first, adopted the "Uniform Monday Holiday Act," which became effective on Jan. 1, 1971.

That Act effectively subordinated remembrance of the example of George Washington's life, and maintaining or inculcating those virtues in the national character, especially of the young, and immigrants who would be Americans, for the higher purpose of insuring that federal and other government employees will have nice three-day weekend holidays, while the rest of the country goes to work.

“Washington’s Birthday” holiday was in effect abolished from national consciousness in the 1970’s, when the the holiday was renamed “President’s Day,” submerging America’s greatest president, George Washington, into an undifferentiated mass of competent men and con men, the good, the bad, the ugly, the avaricious, meretricious, and salacious, who have managed, often by hook and crook, and lying through their teeth, to get themselves elected President.

With the abolition of George Washington’s Birthday, and Abraham Lincoln’s Birthday to satisfy government employees three-day weekend demands, the only American in all of history now to have a National Holiday in his name is Martin Luther King.

Concisely stated: It is the singular, unprecedented virtues, character, and example of George Washington which ought to be remembered and honored, singularly, on his actual birthday, February 22, as a National Holiday.

Therefore, let us Americans of this generation demand that Congress restore the “Washington’s Birthday” National Holiday to be observed on February 22, annually, the actual birth date of George Washington, no matter the lamentations of government bureaucrats and employees who may suffer the oppression of one less three-day weekend holiday.

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

“Defecation” is not speech –

pass the flag amendment

There have been many instances during and after the election for the presidency of demonstrators burning or defecating on the Flag of the United States— all, or almost all, self-defined disaffected Democrats, progressive liberals, socialists, communists, or race-or-sex based political activists.

This desecration of the Flag is the result of a decision in 1989 by five lawyer-judges on the Supreme Court in *Texas vs. Johnson* that burning the Flag, or defecating upon it, is “speech” protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

Although the people of the United States had the ability from the very founding of the country to 1989 to protect the Flag from desecration by law in their communities and States, those five lawyer-judges on the Supreme Court – the other four disagreeing – nullified all the laws that had been enacted in all of the States to protect the Flag from desecration. The American people, after 213 years, lost the ability to decide if and how to protect the Flag.

Almost immediately, American patriots, particularly veterans, acted to reverse that 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision. Congress and States, passed laws to protect the Flag. However, they were dead on arrival in the Supreme Court. Therefore, there is no option: The only way to protect the Flag is to pass a Constitutional amendment giving Congress the authority to enact protective legislation..

The Citizens Flag Alliance, involving some 140 veterans, civic, business, and fraternal organizations, was created to urge Congress to adopt a Flag Amendment stating simply: “The Congress shall have power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.” The Flag Amendment does not dictate what a Congressional enactment should state; it only

empowers Congress to legislate to protect the Flag from desecration.

The Citizens Flag Alliance, led by its first chairman, Maj. Gen. Patrick H. Brady, a Medal of Honor recipient (Vietnam) who is regarded as America's most decorated living veteran, succeeded in convincing the House to adopt the Flag Amendment six times with each new Congress, and came within one (1) vote in the Senate of adoption in 2006, which would send the Flag Amendment to the States for ratification by vote of the people.

However, in the November elections in that same year, 2006, the Democrats regained control of the Congress, stalling the Flag Amendment effort. With the election of Barack Obama as President in 2008, the effort to pass the Flag Amendment appeared, and was, futile.

All that has been changed by the 2016 election of President Donald Trump, who has called for "consequences" for desecration of the Flag; election of a Republican majority in House and Senate; and what appears to be a renewed patriotic spirit in America.

"We are revitalizing and relaunching the Citizens Flag Alliance campaign to persuade Congress to adopt the Flag Amendment in the new 115th Congress, and send it to the States for ratification by vote of the people," said Jill Druskis of the American Legion, president of the Citizens Flag Alliance.

Gen. Brady, who led the Citizens Flag Alliance for ten years before stepping down as chairman in 2007, has issued a call for all veterans and other patriots to join with the CFA in actively urging Congress to adopt the Flag Amendment.

"If ever there was a time to revitalize the Flag Amendment movement, it is now," said Gen. Brady. "We need to re-energize the Citizens Flag Alliance and create a nationwide grass roots movement to convince the new 115th Congress to pass the Flag

Amendment, and restore to the American people their right to decide if and how our Flag should be protected.

There are 23-million living American veterans. As one, I believe that burning the Flag, or defecating on the Flag, is an insult to every American veteran who is serving, or has served—including the 1.4-million veterans who have given their lives in war in defense of America under the Flag.

Further, as a Constitutional and Civil Rights attorney, I believe that the five lawyers on the Supreme Court who have decided that “burning” or “defecating” on the Flag is a form of “speech,” are not only wrong in a jurisprudential sense, but as a matter of common sense exercised by non-lawyer mere mortals. Indeed, I believe that any lawyer-judge who dictates to the nation that “defecation” is “speech” is not only guilty of judicial tyranny, but is talking out of the wrong orifice himself or herself and should be impeached for inanity if not insanity.

Does any American possessed of common sense really believe that Founding Fathers Gen. George Washington, presiding officer at the Constitutional Convention, our first American President, the Father Of Our Country, or Thomas Jefferson, Father of the Declaration of Independence, or James Madison, Father of the Constitution, or any of the Founding Fathers who established the Constitution believed that burning or “defecating” on the Flag was not only “speech” but speech the Founding Fathers, patriots all, intended to be protected in the First Amendment?

Only lawyers could reach such an absurd decision, and then impose it on the American people. However, that decision by five lawyer-judges on the Supreme Court while the other four lawyer-judges disagreed, makes burning or defecating on the Flag a “legal right,” only. It does not make it “right” to do.

Burning the Flag or defecating on the Flag is a cowardly,

narcissistic, morally despicable “wrong.” The Flag must be protected from such disgraceful actions. Supreme Court decisions are not writ in stone; they are reversible by the ultimate American sovereign—“We, the People.”

Join and support the call of the Citizens Flag Alliance and of Gen. Patrick Brady to demand that Congress pass the Flag Amendment to protect the Flag from desecration and send it to the States for ratification so that “We, the People” may have the “right,” again, to decide whether and how the Flag should be protected from desecration.

For more information: CitizensFlagAlliance.org,

HONOR OUR FLAG –PASS THE FLAG AMENDMENT

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Good riddance – Megan Kelly has cheapened journalism

I write this in exasperation at encountering news on the internet, television, and radio all about Megan Kelly moving from Fox News to NBC. Why is this news? On what basis is fame awarded to those who only read, announce, or chatter about the news made by other people who actually do something other than “observe” what others do and report or comment on it? Why, for the first time, have those whose role it is to report the “news,” become the “news”?

This particularly applies to Megan Kelly. She, and more and more other television “journalists,” think and act like they are the story; they are the celebrities; and those who

actually make the news by doing things are just props for the "reporters" to put on a show in which the reporter is the star. For Kelly, as a "reporter," its "all about her," as the reporter, instead of who she is reporting on.

It wasn't always this way. Once upon a time many years ago, I was what is called "an award winning investigative reporter" for a large circulation newspaper in one the most corrupt urban areas of the country. Among other things, I wrote a series of more than twenty parts on corruption, drugs, gambling, bookie joints, whore houses, public housing and other corrupt "poverty programs" that made organized crime, government officials, and "poverty program pimps," rich by payoffs and graft.

Death threats began after the first installment of the series appeared. By the third day, I was ordered into the managing editor's office. Two FBI agents informed me they believed the death threats were serious. Thereafter, although death threats continued as the series went on day after day, I had 24-hour FBI-supervised protection, Where I went, they went. As I slept, they guarded. A corrupt mayor and a number of other government figures ultimately went to prison for corruption. That was professional journalism, and I was proud to be a small part of it.

But that was a long time ago and far, far way from contemporary television broadcast journalism, epitomized by Megan Kelly. Today, purported professional journalist Megan Kelly has become a celebrity broadcast journalist whose career move is reported on endlessly by other "journalists" in a breathless worshipful manner that used to be reserved for teenage readers of fan magazines. "Will she or won't she?" "What will Megan do"? "Megan Kelly announces she will...! Provoking the question: Knowing how Megan Kelly has cheapened journalism, why should anyone care where she sells her soul?

This celebration of purported journalist Megan Kelly in

endless purported “news reports” by other purported journalists takes place even as she almost nightly cheapens the profession of journalism.

Kelly has cheapened professional journalism by cheapening herself, to the present and future injury of other women who really are or want to be ethical professional journalists, but don't want to be hired, promoted, or judged on an “eye-candy” standard of sexual attractiveness, allure, or suggestiveness.

Consider: What is the lesson of Kelly's career actions for other women, especially young women, if they want to get ahead and be respected as a professional journalist ?

First, following the Kelly model, what a woman needs to do to get ahead in television journalism is to pretend to be a professional journalist but dress on television “news programs” like a high class call girl on her way to an assignation as soon as the broadcast ends.

And do such other things as Kelly has done to promote herself, such as: Going on the Howard Stern Show and chatting all smiles with Dirty Howard about matters sexual. Giggle without objection as Kelly did when drooling Howard complimented her leeringly as “a great piece of ass.” Carry on with Howard as Kelly did in titillating banter about sexual acts and practices like a low class hooker being probed, so to speak, by Dirty Howard, and enjoying it. Really high class, professional journalist conduct by Kelley to get ahead.

Or, following the Kelly model, do a “come-and-get-it” soft-porn photo spread for GQ or similar magazine, as Kelly did, while simultaneously insisting all you want to be recognized for is your professionalism as a journalist and not as a woman trying to get ahead on her sexual attractiveness and attributes.

Most importantly, exploit your position, as Kelly did on Fox as its eye-candy news queen, to make yourself famous by doing

something really cheap but self-promoting, as Kelly did in ambushing Donald Trump in the first presidential campaign debate with an accusation posing as a journalistic question regarding Trump being abusive of women by, inter alia, calling Rosie O'Donnell a "pig." (That apparently is being abusive of women even if true about Rosie O'Donnell, at least to the degree that Rosie O'Donnell is one, although it isn't clear that she "identifies" as one.)

Kelly gained fame by her cheap ambush of Trump, but by the same act she lost all credibility personally as an objective journalist, and cheapened the profession. But that doesn't mean Kelly won't get ahead at NBC, which, especially through MSNBC, has evidenced that it has even less journalistic integrity than Kelly, and will say or do anything if it is self-promoting, no matter how cheap.

In sum, Kelly has cheapened journalism by the way she has sought advancement by figuratively selling sex. There is a word for that when the sale is literal rather than figurative. That word sometimes fits when the sale, replete with come on, remains figurative. That word, in my opinion, fits Megan Kelly, and fits the kind of "journalism" of which she is the exemplar.

Megan Kelly's is not the kind of professional journalism that should be celebrated by "journalists" as "news" in story upon story about Meagan Kelly's career change. Cheap is as cheap does, and Kelly does it cheap, indeed. All that needs be said of her are words that are ancient, but wise, and fitting for Megan Kelly: "Go, and sin no more."

© 2017 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Obama backstabs Israel

A widely distributed political cartoon shows Barack Hussein Obama embracing Raul Castro, the totalitarian Communist leader of Cuba, and the Ayatollah leading the fascist Islamic Republic of Iran. It is one of the best evidences of Obama's self-promoting hypocrisy and Machiavellian duplicity.

This is especially true since it was published on "another day which will live in infamy" – Dec. 23, 2016. That is the day on which the United States, two days before Christmas, by order of Barack Hussein Obama, aided and abetted the Muslim dominated United Nations General Assembly, fascistic Islamic theocracies, and overt Islamic terrorist organizations like ISIS, al-Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Palestine Liberation Organization, in adopting a resolution condemning Israel in the Israel-Palestinian conflict and declaring as a matter of international law (since U.N. resolutions have that status) that Jews have no right to settle outside of the 1948 borders of Israel, forbidding them to live even in the "Jewish Quarter" of Jerusalem.

Eight years of Barack Hussein Obama ruling by race in the U.S. and by pro-Islamist policies in the world, has come to this disgraceful end of his presidency in the U.N.

If anyone needed further proof that Obama – America's first and hopefully last Affirmative Action President who was elected not because of his achievements but because of, not in spite of, his race – is an utter conman who deceived Americans as to what he really is at his progressive liberal neo-socialist anti-American core in which it is and always has been "all about him."

The duped and deceived by Obama include in particular Israel supporting American Jews, secular and observing, who voted for him despite his utter lack of achievement and contributed

millions in support of his elections in a percentage almost as high as American blacks who voted by race (96% in 2008; 93% in 2012).

Note that Obama waited until after the 2016 election – that is, after American Jews had contributed their financial support all but exclusively to Hillary Clinton and the Democrat Party – to reverse American policy by abandoning Israel by “abstaining” on the resolution condemning Israel in the U.N.

Indeed, the Machiavellian hypocrisy is blatant– the U.S. vetoed the same resolution in 2011 when Obama was running to be re-elected in 2012. Now, when Obama’s term is ending and he cannot run again, Obama reverses the U.S. position of 2011 and stabs Israel in the back.

Thus, Obama betrays and makes dupes of all Americans who believed him, and in him, including the American Jews whose millions in campaign contributions helped to elect him twice when in both campaigns Obama gave assurances that U.S. unwavering relationship in support of Israel would not change if he was elected.

Further, while Obama issued the order to “abstain” and thus effectively support the Muslim UN attack on Israel, Obama claims his disgraceful decision was taken with the support of Democrat Party leaders Hillary Clinton, who ran in 2016; John Kerry, who ran in 2004, and Joe Biden, who now says he will run for President, again, in 2020. Thus, they, too, and the Democrat Party which they lead, are guilty.

But it is Obama who issued the order and owns this disgraceful decision to align the U.S. with the totalitarian Islamic theocracies in the U.S. and to weaken Israel. This despicable decision is further evidence, if any was needed, that Obama is not only the “First Black U.S. President” he is also the “Worst U.S. President.”

Now that his presidency has ended and he can't run again, watch Obama campaign, overtly and as well as covertly, to be elected Secretary General of the U.N. He will be able to tell the Muslim nations which have numerical superiority in the General Assembly to remember how he sided with them in his presidency, from his "Apology For America Tour" and kowtowing to Islam "Cairo Speech" in the beginning of his presidency in 2009, to the U.S. action in the U.N. on Dec. 23, 2016.

President-elect Donald Trump denounced this anti-Israel dirty deal of Obama and the U.N. and promised that American policy will change on July 20, 2016, when he is inaugurated as President. Not a minute too soon.

Subscribe to NewsWithViews Daily Email Alerts

Email Address *

First Name

*required field

This shameful overt anti-Israeli U.N. action, which manifestly strengthens and supports totalitarian Islamic governments and Islamic terrorist organizations, and weakens Israel – the only democracy and America's only true ally in the Middle East – is an infamous betrayal of America as well as of Israel.

It should be the last straw for "We, the People" of America regarding the value of the U.N. as presently constituted; and regarding "the value," first and foremost, of Barak Hussein Obama and his "historic election as the first black president," as well as "the value" of Hillary Clinton, John Kerry, Joe Biden, and the other leaders of the Democrat party who supported and are responsible for this disgrace in the U.N.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY–NEVER!

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Tribute to John Glenn—a great but also good man

John Glenn, Boy Scout, Marine, Astronaut, Senator, Patriot, was a great American hero, and also that very rare being: A great man who was also a good man, a humble man, a man who went to the heavens not only in a space ship, but in his heart, with an abiding faith in God.

There are many many tributes to John Glenn on his passing at age 95 on Dec. 8, 2016, for his heroic achievements. But for me, what struck me was a story I read years ago in the book “Right Stuff” about the Apollo Astronauts. The very “down to earth” story about Glenn, as a man, as a husband, went like this:

Then Vice President Lyndon Johnson decided that a great publicity opportunity presented itself should Johnson go to Glenn’s home to comfort Mrs. Glenn while John was off on astronaut duty with the whole country watching in anticipation. So, Johnson arrived in his limousine and his entourage, including media, at the Glenn home.

John’s wife, however, was very shy, including about a stutter in her speech, and did not want to have to participate in any media event. So, she wouldn’t let Vice President Johnson in. Instead, she locked the door and telephoned John, informing him of what was going on and that it distressed her.

John Glenn, whom the media dubbed “the Boy Scout among the Apollo Astronauts,” knew, of course, that embarrassing the Vice President could mean the end of Glenn’s Astronaut career. So, what did Glenn do? He stood up for his wife, no matter the risk of outraging Vice President Johnson and ending John’s

career. John told his wife not to let Johnson in, and went on to raise holy hell that Johnson would do what he did to the distress of Mrs. Glenn, which would not be tolerated even if Johnson was Vice President.

John Glenn had incredible courage, indeed – from sitting alone atop the Apollo when there was a very high risk that he might die at any moment from an explosion at blastoff (one in four attempts failed), in Space, or coming home. But he also had the courage, the manly chivalry, to stand up in defense of his wife, even though the offender was the Vice President of the U.S. who had the power to end Glenn's career in a peeve.

So, Mrs. Glenn remained inside behind her locked door as the uninvited visitor, VP Lyndon Johnson, sat outside stewing in embarrassment as the Boy Scout, Marine, Astronaut, American Hero – the “Man,” John Glenn, would not retreat. “What a man,” as used to be said of such men as John Glenn “back in the day” before the Feminist Movement emasculation of American males.

John Glenn survived his Apollo flight, the first American to orbit the earth in space, and survived his face-down with the Vice President of the U.S. in defense of his wife's right to choose with whom to speak, when, and how. That was perhaps a “little thing,” a small act in the scope of all that John Glenn did in a magnificent, honorable, heroic life, including returning to outer space at the age of 77. But that “little thing,” standing up for his wife no matter the risk to his career, meant a lot to me when I first read it, and now, about what kind of man John Glenn was. That love, that marriage of the Glenns, lasted seventy (70) years by the time of John Glenn's death.

John Glenn was an extraordinary American hero, but he was also what American men used to want to be, and were: First and foremost– “A Protector.” Males willing to do what is necessary to protect others, including females, no matter the consequences (and no matter the shrieks and howls of the

politically correct elitists and the feminists i.e., female supremacists perpetually aggrieved by manliness).

John Glenn, a great man who was also a good man, a humble hero, said his historic Apollo flight into space, while a great scientific achievement, made his faith in God stronger, not weaker. May the God John Glenn served now embrace and keep him; may the country which he served always honor and never forget him. Godspeed, John Glenn. Godspeed.

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Pearl harbor survivor remembers: a day of infamy

December 7, 2016, Pearl Harbor Day, marks the 75th anniversary of the Japanese air attack on U.S. naval and air installations at Pearl Harbor, HI, at 7:53 a.m., Dec. 7, 1941, without a declaration of war.

It was then the worst attack on American soil in history: Some 2,403 died, 2008 of them Navy personnel; another 1,178 were wounded.

Eighteen Navy ships, including the U.S.S. Arizona, were sunk or damaged. Almost all the planes at the island bases were destroyed or damaged while still on the ground.

President Franklyn D. Roosevelt memorably called December 7, 1941, “a day which will live in infamy” in his dramatic speech to Congress, which then declared war on Japan.

Only the sneak attack on America by radical Islamic terrorists on 9-11-2001 in New York resulted in more deaths. But for many

Americans of this generation – and millions of immigrants, legal and illegal – the significance of Pearl Harbor is not fully known, or appreciated.

One for whom it does “live in infamy,” is Pearl Harbor survivor S. J. Hemker, now 97, of Banning, California. A retired three-war combat Navy veteran, and an American Legionnaire, Hemker remembers Pearl Harbor up close and personal:

“Ordinarily, we would have been at sea. We were at Pearl Harbor because we had to repair an engine that had been sabotaged at the shipyard back in California. I was up on the fantail of our ship, the USS New Orleans, a heavy cruiser, with the Chief Master at Arms. The Quartermaster was there, getting ready to raise the flag,” Hemker recalls.

“It was 7:53 a.m. when we saw the Japanese planes. They were flying so low I could see the pilots’ faces in the cockpit. They were grinning at us as they went down toward Battle Ship Row. Grinning at me and the Chief. They were so close, you could have thrown something at them and hit them. A potato, maybe. They were that close. Just skimming the top of the water. Torpedo planes. The pilots grinning at us,” Hemker reluctantly, but vividly recalls.

“The loudspeakers blared: ‘Man your battle stations – the Japs are attacking’. All hell broke loose.. It was terrible, horrible, ...,” he says, pausing in his remembrance.

“I spent the next eight hours down in the magazine loading for our five-inch anti-aircraft guns. We fired everything. If we had been hit, that would have been it for us in the magazine. We would have been blown up. We had a big crane over the top of our ship. I think that’s what saved us,” he states matter-of-factly as to his own circumstance., then somberly relates:

“The Arizona capsized. Thirteen hundred men went down with her. Half the guys I was with in boot camp died on the

Arizona. That's where the Memorial is today. They say that oil still leaks out every day. Those guys...they're still down there," Hemker says quietly, his voice trailing off, as if physically turning away from a memory, and reality, which is still too painful to talk about.

Getting Hemker to talk about it at all is no easy task. Like many of his fellow World War II veterans, he still doesn't talk about his war experiences, never expects any thanks or gratitude, and never, ever boasts about it, despite the fact that after Pearl Harbor he served America in battles and combat zones for the duration of WWII, in the Korean War, and in Vietnam.

Hemker is a widower whose wife died more than 20 years ago. He has three sons. All served in the Vietnam War. Hemker, still roguishly handsome and possessed of a sly sense of humor, charms the ladies in the Legion Auxiliary with country gallantry.

He is universally admired by his comrade veterans in the American Legion. "I'm not able to do what I used to do, but I do what I can," he says.

Reflecting on Pearl Harbor seventy-five years after surviving it, Hemker, who has lost his eyesight but not his vision for America, observes:

"We Americans should never forget. If we forget our past and those who died, we won't have a future. A free one, anyway. Look at what happened on 9-11. More people were killed on that day than were killed at Pearl Harbor. It can happen again," he warns.

"I don't think people remember Pearl Harbor and what it means, the way they used to do," Hemker concludes. "That's too bad. A lot of us can't forget. An awful lot of really good people died to keep America free. They shouldn't be forgotten."

Veterans day—know the history to “keep the faith” with veterans

Veterans and other patriots participate in annual Veterans Day ceremonies on November 11th to “keep the faith” with those who fought and died in World War I to safeguard our American democracy, just as today Americans who have picked up “the torch” of freedom once held high by WWI veterans are fighting, and dying, in combatting tyrannical Islamic jihadist terrorism.

However, many more Americans and others in America, not only ordinary citizens but many politicians, office holders and policy makers – not to mention the estimated 11-million or more aliens illegally living in America while still bearing allegiance to and flying the flag of the countries of their origin – know there is a “Veterans Day Holiday,” but either do not remember or have never learned of the truth of the costs of freedom paid by veterans from Flanders Fields in WWI to Veterans Day 2016, or even why there is a “National Veterans Day” with roots in WWI.

The history of the Veterans Day Holiday should be known, including being taught to school children of the rising generation (instead of being taught by progressive liberal government school teachers and bureaucrats such farcical multi-cultural concocted non-holidays as “Kwanza” [not in fact an African tradition] or “Cinco de Mayo”[not in fact a Mexican tradition]), if we are to “keep faith” with American

veterans, from the time of WWI battles in Flanders Fields, through all the wars, to the battles being fought against radical Islamic tyranny in the Middle East.

Veterans Day observances traditionally commence at the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month of the year, the anniversary of the date and time of the signing of the Armistice ending combat in World War I on November 11, 1918.

It was World War I, "The War To End War," "The War To Make The World Safe For Democracy," which gave birth to what was originally Armistice Day, to honor WWI veterans. It was thought then that WWI was so terrible that there could not be another such war. Only twenty years later, the even more terrible World War II began in Europe. By Act of Congress, WWI Armistice Day is now Veterans Day, honoring all veterans of all the wars.

It has to be remembered that WWI was a most terrible war, the horrors of which are difficult to comprehend. The spark which set off WWI was the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the crown in Austria, and his wife, on June 28, 1914, in Sarajevo, Bosnia, by a Serbian nationalist. But scholars debate to this date who and what actually caused the war to escalate as it did into a world war, and why, in fact, it was fought. Each side blamed the other. Whatever the answer, a complex web of entangling alliances and mutual defense treaties set off what would become the most horrendous war in the history of the world.

An estimated 10-million combatants were killed in that war; an estimated 22-million were wounded. It was a war in which almost 100,000 died from poison gas, use of which has since then been banned as a war crime. It was a war fought on the model of earlier "trench warfare" in which waves of soldiers charged across fields to combat the enemy in an opposing trench often in bayonet and hand-to-hand combat. The difference was that in WWI it was not soldiers with rifles and

bayonets in the opposing trench; it was a trench defended with machine guns which did not exist in the earlier wars. Troops were slaughtered in those fields by the tens of thousands in single days of fighting in the new reality of WWI, while their generals drew battle plans based on outdated tactics of the last war.

For but one example, the battle of Verdun, regarded as the most momentous battle of WWI, began in mid-February, 1916, when the Germans launched an offensive. By mid-March, more than 90,000 French troops had been killed in that one month. The battle of Verdun went on for seven (7) months in which more than 700,000 troops died, a hundred thousand dead soldiers per month.

The United States did not enter the war until 1917. President Woodrow Wilson, a Princeton academic progressive liberal politician who believed the U.S. Constitution was outdated, ran for re-election in 1916 as the Democrat Party candidate in a campaign based on the slogan, "He Kept Us Out Of War."

Wilson was sworn in on March 4, 1917. Only a month later, his deceitful campaign slogan no longer needed, Wilson called on Congress to declare war on Germany, which it did on April 6, 1917. The first of some 4-million Americans who would serve in that war began arriving in France in June, 1917.

There is no doubt that the Allies defeated the Central Powers – Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Muslim Ottoman Empire –because of the American sacrifice. Prior to the entrance of the U.S. into the war, Germany was victorious and advancing on three fronts. By 1915, Great Britain so feared defeat that it established a naval blockade in an attempt to literally starve Germany into surrender. In response to the starvation blockade, which is today generally regarded as a violation of international law by scholars, the Germans declared all the seas around Great Britain and Ireland to be a "war zone" and all shipping subject to German submarine U-Boat

attack. Wilson, after his re-election, cited the submarine threat to American shipping as the reason to declare war on Germany. The tide of war turned when the Americans arrived, and not before.

The first Americans to die were three soldiers who were killed in combat on Nov. 3, 1917. By the time the Armistice was signed a year later, on Nov. 11, 1918, some 117,000 Americans, almost 10,000 per month of combat, had given their lives in service.

The horror of WWI, side-by-side with the honor of those Americans and allied forces who served, fought, and died, is expressed most profoundly by the poem, "Flanders Fields", written by then-Major John McCrae, MD, a surgeon in the Canadian Army who was born in 1872 and would die in 1918, the year that terrible war ended.

Although "Flanders Fields" was written by a grieving Dr. McCrae in the devastation of the battle of Ypres in WWI, days after his best comrade had been killed, his words reach across the more than a century to bring home the reality of all the wars, and of the service and sacrifice of all those Americans who have served when our country has called, believing that the defense of freedom was why they were serving, and was worth dying for if necessary. It is a poem which calls on us not to "break faith" with those who gave their lives so that we might be free.

May God bless all of them, all the veterans who have served in defense of our freedom in all the wars, and may the country whose freedom they preserved honor them on Veterans Day and on every day. They kept the faith with us; and, as expressed in the haunting words of "Flanders Field," we must not "break faith" with them.

IN FLANDERS FIELDS

By Lt. Col. John McCrae, Army of Canada, WWI

In Flanders Fields the poppies blow,
Between the crosses row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders Fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be it yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders Field.

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

History of veterans victory over ACLU in Mt. Soledad Cross case

“Never give up – never, never, never give up!” –Winston Churchill

Victory has finally been achieved in the Mt. Soledad National Veterans Memorial Cross Case, the longest running, most important current Establishment of Religion case: After twenty-seven years of litigation to destroy the Cross by the extremists of the ACLU, which has become the Taliban of

American liberal secularism, the Cross has been saved "as it was, where it was" since 1954. It will now continue to honor veterans into perpetuity as a universally recognized symbol of selfless service and sacrifice for others.

U.S. District Judge Lawrence Byrne's final order in *Trunk vs. City of San Diego* was filed on Sept. 13, 2016. It dismissed the ACLU's lawsuit once and forever as moot, due to the transfer of the Mt. Soledad Memorial from the federal Department of Defense to the private, non-profit Mt. Soledad Memorial Association by purchase for \$1.4-million. The purchase was authorized by Congress in legislation sponsored by Rep. Duncan Hunter (R-CA), the former combat Marine who represents the District.

Many thanks for this victory are owed attorneys and members of the Liberty Institute in Texas, the Alliance Defending Freedom in Arizona, the Thomas More Law Center in Michigan, the Pacific Legal Foundation in California; former Congressmen Jerry Lewis (R-CA), Rep. Duncan Hunter (R-CA), former Rep. John Hostettler (R-Indiana) and other legislators; veterans of The American Legion, and other veterans service organizations, as well as individual veterans and other patriots; and most of all to San Diego Attorney Charles S. LiMandri, founder of the Free-dom of Conscience Defense Fund (FCDF) who has done more than any other single American to save the Mt. Soledad Cross "as it was, where it was," to honor veterans.

WHY MT. SOLEDAD CROSS VICTORY IS SO IMPORTANT

The importance of this victory cannot be overemphasized. What has been at stake in the Mt. Soledad Cross Case, and the companion Mojave Desert Veterans Memorial Cross Case, is whether 300-million Americans will continue to have the ability to honor their war dead as they choose in their communities, including by use of the Cross or other symbol or expression with a religious aspect; or whether intolerant atheists, agnostics, or extremist progressive liberal secu-

larists epitomized by the ACLU, who are “offended” by the sight of the Cross, the Ten Commandments, or a monument bearing a religious symbol or expression honoring veterans, will have a veto power over those choices.

What is beyond any doubt is that, if the Mt. Soledad Case had been lost, the precedent established would create a tsunami of lawsuits by the ACLU, or other progressive liberal extremist organizations of its ilk, suing veterans memorials all across the country at which the Cross, or monuments containing any religious expression, exists honoring veterans.

In each of those cases the ACLU would seek judge ordered-taxpayer-paid attorney fee “awards” for destroying the Cross. Indeed, most Americans are unaware that the ACLU has reaped millions of dollars in profits through judge-ordered, taxpayer-paid attorney fee “awards” in Establishment of Religion Clause lawsuits which most Americans abhor, cases to destroy Crosses, the Ten Commandments, public seals, or monuments containing religious quotations or expressions.

HISTORY OF VETERANS ROLE IN VICTORY NEEDS TO BE KNOWN, EMULATED

Veterans played a significant role in fighting the ACLU to preserve the traditional Crosses at Mt. Soledad and Mojave Desert Veterans Memorials. That history needs to be known to inspire the same kind of commitment in other important “grass roots” battles for the preservation of freedom and traditional American values against rich and powerful special interests, like the ACLU, who would destroy those values. Therefore, without diminishing the importance of the efforts of all veterans and patriots in the victory, the history of the role of veterans of the American Legion will be focused on as it sheds light on what can be achieved when veterans and patriots unite to fight with “Audacity, Audacity, Audacity – always Audacity,” as Gen. George Patton taught, and to “never, never, never give up,” as Winston Churchill taught.

There has been a Cross at Mt. Soledad, in various forms, since 1913. In 1954, Mt. Soledad, in La Jolla, CA, but owned by the City of San Diego, became a memorial honoring the veterans of the Korean War. The American Legion Post in La Jolla played a leading role in its creation. Later, the scope of the memorial was expanded to honor all veterans. As the memorial grew, so did the Cross honoring veterans. Today, it is 29 feet tall, mounted on a 43-foot base, a majestic presence above more than 3,000 plaques honoring veterans on circular walls below.

ACLU ATTACKS MT. SOLEDAD MEMORIAL CROSS IN 1989

ACLU litigation to destroy the Cross began in 1989. A single atheist who claimed he was "of-fended" by the Cross, Phillip K. Paulson, a Vietnam veteran, sued to destroy the Cross as in violation of the Establishment of Religion Clause. (Paulson - vs- City of San Diego). In 1991, based on this complaint by a single atheist, the U.S. District Court in San Diego ordered the Cross removed or destroyed. Appeals, related litigation and legislation, ensued, including a referendum in which San Diego citizens voted overwhelmingly (i.e., by 76 per cent) to override the San Diego City council vote to surrender and remove the Cross, and instead to retain the memorial "as it is, where it is" with Cross intact.

The legal defense of the Mt. Soledad Memorial Cross was led from the beginning by San Diego Attorney Charles S. LiMandri, who has expended untold attorney hours pro bono to save it "as it where it is," including later as founder of the Freedom of Conscience Defense Fund. (www.FCDF.org.)

ACLU ATTACKS MOJAVE DESERT MEMORIAL CROSS IN 2000

As the Mt. Soledad Cross litigation progressed, the extremist ACLU in 2000 filed a related law-suit to destroy the Mojave Desert Veterans Memorial Cross. That Cross was erected in 1934 by members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to honor their fallen comrades who died in WWI. The Cross consisted of two

pipes strapped together and mounted on a rock outcrop known as Sunrise Rock in the remote Mojave Desert, twelve miles off of the highway. It is necessary to drive to it to be offended by it.

For sixty-six years, there had not been a single complaint against the old rugged cross in the desert. Nonetheless, Frank Buono, Ass't Mojave Preserve Superintendent, waited until he retired, moved to Oregon on his federal pension, then, as ACLU's poster boy plaintiff, sued to destroy the Mojave Cross honoring veterans 1,000 miles away because it "offended" him. He was later joined by a Jewish member of the VFW who admitted in his deposition he had never seen the Cross in person, but was offended by it just knowing it was out there in the desert. The U.S. District Court in Riverside, CA, ordered the Cross destroyed in 2002, which was upheld by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. (Buono vs. Salazar).

THE AMERICAN LEGION ENTERS BATTLE AGAINST ACLU IN 2002

The American Legion fightback against the ACLU's Cross-destroying campaign began in 2002 when it was learned the Mojave Cross was ordered destroyed by the U.S. District Court in Riverside, CA.

As Judge Advocate of San Geronio Pass Post 428, I contacted then-Congressman Jerry Lewis (R-CA) and requested he initiate Congressional action to save the Mojave Desert Memorial. Rep. Lewis did. Lewis introduced legislation authorizing the one-acre Mojave Desert Veterans Memorial on public land to be exchanged for five acres of private land owned and donated by patriotic desert ranchers Henry and Wanda Sandoz. For many years they had been volunteer caretakers of the Mojave Memorial in fulfillment of a death-bed request of a VFW member who helped erect the Cross in 1934.

In 2003, as San Geronio Pass Post 428 Commander, I wrote a resolution entitled "Support Legislation Of Rep. Jerry Lewis

To Save Mojave Memorial." It was adopted by the California Department Convention 2003. At the National Convention, it was referred to the Standing Committee for further study, then was later adopted by vote of the National Executive Board. That put the American Legion, the nation's largest veterans service organization, solidly behind Rep. Lewis' land-exchange legislation to save the Mojave Memorial.

In 2004, I wrote a second resolution to fight the ACLU. It was initiated by Riverside Post 79, then adopted at the Department of California Convention 2004. Sponsored by California, it was adopted at the 2004 National Convention as Resolution 326, "Preserve Mojave Desert Veterans Memorial." It calls for Congress to rescind the authority of judges to order "taxpayer paid" at-torney fee "awards" under the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.Code Section 1988, to the ACLU, or anyone else, who sues to destroy the Cross or other religious symbols, including the Ten Com-mandments, or religious expressions at veterans memorials or other public places.

This Congressional reform is necessary because the very threat of having to pay ACLU's attor-ney fees in Establishment of Religion Clause cases has been used as a club by the ACLU to bludgeon towns, cities, counties, school boards and other public entities into surrendering rather than fighting against ACLU's secular-cleansing demands to destroy Crosses, public seals, or other public expressions of religion for fear that taxpayer-funds will be diverted from needed community services to pay ACLU "attorney fee awards" ordered by judges. Therefore, the original Resolution 326, has been reiterated biannually at every American Legion National Convention on even years and introduced in each new Congress.

LEGION FIGHTS ACLU: "IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE FOUNDERS"

Adoption of Resolution 326 by the 2004 National Convention authorized the National Legion to launch, for the first time, a nationwide fightback against the ACLU's abusive

Establishment of Religion Clause attacks against Crosses, the Ten Commandments, the Boy Scouts, public seals, and seemingly any expression of religion at veterans' cemeteries or other public spaces. As author of Resolution 326, I was asked by National to participate in drafting a guide on making that fight. The final version is entitled: "In The Footsteps Of The Founders: Grassroots Guide For Fighting The ACLU." It had a first printing of 50,000 copies distributed to the then-15,000 Legion Posts. It was followed by additional printings.

In 2005, a third resolution, Equal Access To Justice, which I authored and was adopted by Riverside Post 79, the California Department Convention, and ultimately the National Convention 2005. It calls on Congress to rescind the authority of judges to award taxpayer-paid attorney fee "awards" to the ACLU, or anyone else, in Establishment of Religion Clause lawsuits not only under the the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.Code Sec. 1988 but under any and all federal statutes. It has been reiterated with every new Congress by incorporation in the reiteration of the original Resolution 326.

2006: COURT ORDERS MT. SOLEDAD CROSS DESTROYED; FIGHT ESCALATES

In 2006, the U.S. Judge in San Diego ordered San Diego to remove or destroy the Mt. Soledad Cross or he would fine the city taxpayers \$5,000 per day, escalating the fight.

In response, in order to enter the litigation, Attorney Joseph Infranco of the Alliance Defending Freedom based in Arizona, and I co-founded the Defense of Veterans Memorials Project of the Department of California and the ADF. The Department Executive Committee voted unani-mously and enthusiastically to establish the Project in March, 2006.

A press conference was held at Mt. Soledad, beneath the Cross, to announce that the American Legion, for the first time, was entering litigation to fight the ACLU in support of the

efforts of attorney Charles S. LiMandri, founder of the Freedom of Conscience Defense Fund (FCDF), lead attorney in the fight against ACLU to save Mt. Soledad "as it is, where it is," with Cross intact. The California Defense of Veterans Memorials Project thereafter participated in the court court fight by filing friend-of-the-court briefs in the California Court of Appeal, the U.S. District Court(s), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal, and in the U.S. Supreme Court.

The National American Legion, after the initial action by the Department to enter the Mt. Sole-dad litigation in San Diego, also entered the litigation at all stages, represented by the Liberty Institute in Texas, which, like the ADF, specializes in defense of religious liberty. The California Defense of Veterans Memorials Project was adopted as a National American Legion Project in 2007.

In Congress in 2006, two bills of great importance in this fight had different fates:

First, then-Rep. John Hostettler (R-Ind.), joined by Rep. Jerry Lewis and other Republican Rep-resentatives as well as some Democrats, sponsored a Legion-sponsored bill pursuant to Resolu-tion 326, entitled Veterans Memorials, Boy Scouts, Public Seals, and Other Public Expressions of Religion Act ("PERA"). It would rescind the power of judges to grant taxpayer-paid attorney fees to the ACLU, or anyone else, in Establishment of Religion Clause cases attacking Crosses at veterans memorials and other public expressions of religion. I had the honor being appointed to represent the National American Legion at hearings on the PERA bill before the U.S. House and Senate.

The day of the vote in the House, every member of the House received a joint statement in sup-port of the PERA bill by two of America's greatest military heroes: Maj. Gen. Patrick H. Brady, Medal of Honor (Vietnam), considered America's most decorated living veteran, and the late Rear Admiral Jeremiah

A. Denton, Navy Cross, legendary P.O.W. resistor for seven years, seven-months in Vietnam and later U.S. Senator for Alabama. The PERA Bill was adopted by the House by a substantial margin.

However, PERA was blocked from being voted on in the Senate by then Republican, later De-mocrat, Arlen Specter, then head of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Specter stalled the PERA Bill in Committee and blocked a floor vote so long that the Democrats took control of Congress in the elections of November 2006, and effectively killed the PERA Bill.

However, also in 2006, and of great importance, the legislation sponsored by Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-CA), which authorized the land swap transferring the one-acre Mojave Memorial from public land to the private hands of Henry and Wanda Sandoz for their five-acres of private land, was adopted by Congress—unanimously by the House, and without opposition in the Senate.

It was thought that had saved the Mojave Desert Veterans Memorial. But the Taliban-like fanaticism of the extremist ACLU knows no bounds: The ACLU then filed a new lawsuit in Riverside U.S. District Court, this time suing Congress itself. ACLU alleged that Congress violated the Establishment of Religion Clause because its real intent was not to preserve a memorial in order to honor veterans, but to advocate a particular religion, Christianity, by preserving the Cross. The then-Federal Judge in Riverside nullified the Act of Congress, and ordered then-President George Bush to destroy the Cross. President Bush didn't. Appeals were filed against the destruction order.

VICTORY IN USSC IN MOJAVE DESERT CROSS CASE; ACLU SURRENDERS

In 2010, the U.S. Supreme Court overruled the Cross destruction order of the U.S. District Court in Riverside, and the Ninth Circuit decision upholding the destruction order.

The Supreme Court held the District Court exceeded its authority in nullifying an Act of Congress, and remanded the entire case back to the Riverside Federal Court for action in light of the Supreme Court's opinion.

In April, 2012, after ten years of litigation to destroy the Mojave Desert Veterans Memorial Cross, the ACLU finally surrendered. It agreed to cease its litigation to destroy the Cross – after the government agreed to give ACLU an undisclosed amount in taxpayer-paid attorney fees.

Meanwhile, the Mt. Soledad Cross had not been destroyed because Congress exercised the power of eminent domain to put Mt. Soledad in control of the Department of Defense. That nullified the order of the federal court in San Diego to destroy the Cross. The ACLU then filed a new suit against the DOD.

The original plaintiff, Paulson, had died. He was replaced as plaintiff by another atheist, Stephen Trunk. ACLU, which is its custom, sought to divide and conquer and pit people against one another by joining as plaintiffs with atheist Trunk: A Jewish M.D. and his Muslim wife, who said they were “offended” when they visited her relatives in San Diego because they could see the Mt. Soledad Cross from the relatives’ house; a female Jewish lawyer who said she was “offended” when seeing the Cross when driving to work; and the Jewish War Veterans (the national organization but not the San Diego chapter, which voted to support Mt. Soledad “as it is, where it is” with cross intact).

MT. SOLEDAD CROSS CONTINUES FOUR MORE YEARS UNTIL ACLU SURRENDER

In 2008, U.S. Federal Judge Lawrence Byrnes, who had been assigned to the new ACLU case against DOD ruled that the Cross did not violate the Establishment of Religion Clause because a reasonable person would perceive it as honoring veterans for

their service, and would not perceive it as the federal government advocating one religion, Christianity, over any other, or advocating religion generally. ACLU appealed to the Ninth Circuit.

The Mount Soledad litigation would continue four more years after the Mojave Desert Cross case was won. Then an ironic thing took place: The ACLU had cited the Mojave Desert Case as a precedent for destroying the Mt. Soledad Memorial prior to the Supreme Court's decision in 2010. However, after that decision, the Mojave Desert Cross case became a precedent for saving Mt. Soledad.

That is, as the litigation continued, Congressman Duncan Hunter sponsored legislation for a land swap, similar to Rep. Jerry Lewis' land exchange authorized by Congress in the Mojave Desert case. Rep. Hunter's bill authorized transferring Mt. Soledad by sale to the private, nonprofit Mt. Soledad Memorial Association for \$1.4-million. That legislation was passed and an agreement was reached for the sale in July, 2015. While the ACLU continued the litigation for another year, seeking, among other things, attorney fees, the ACLU finally surrendered. The Ninth Circuit declared ACLU's lawsuit "moot," and directed Judge Byrne to dismiss it. Judge Byrne did, ending the long Mt. Soledad Memorial fight once and for all on Sept. 13, 2016, twenty-seven years after it began.

LESSONS OF THE HISTORY OF VETERANS FIGHT AGAINST ACLU

I have written long on part of the history of veterans' role in the the fight to save Crosses honoring veterans at the Mt. Soledad and Mojave Desert Veterans Memorials, because it has been a long battle, and this history of the grass roots victory over the ACLU needs to be known, and emulated, as there are many more causes to fight with the same determination, the same commitment. the same spirit.

Veterans were told when this fight with the ACLU began that it

could not be won—"ACLU has too much money, too many lawyers; you just can't beat them." But veterans stood, fought, heard the echo of Churchill's words "Never give up—never, never, never give up," and ultimately with other patriots, won an honorable battle to preserve the Mt. Soledad National Veterans Memorial, and the Mojave Desert Veterans Memorial.

This victory could not have been without the litigative efforts in court of lawyers like Charles LiMandri of Freedom of Conscience Defense Fund, lawyers of Liberty Institute, the Alliance Defending Freedom, Thomas More Law Center, and Pacific Legal Foundation, and the legislative efforts of members of Congress like former Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-CA) and Rep. Duncan Hunter (R-CA), who authored and sponsored the land exchange bills in both cases, and former Rep. John Hostettler (R-Ind.), who was primary author and sponsor of the Veterans Memorials, Boy Scouts, Public Seals, And Other Public Expressions Of Religion Act (PERA).

But each of them, or members of their staffs, have communicated to me that this very long, very important battle with the ACLU, fought on many fronts, could not have been won without the grass-roots efforts led by veterans along with other patriots. In the end, they have told me, it was veterans who made the difference, veterans who never surrendered, who never, ever gave up, until ultimate victory, saving the Mojave Desert Veterans Memorial, and the Mt. Soledad National Veterans Memorial, as they were intended to be, where they were intended to be, with Crosses intact, honoring veterans. Forever.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY—NEVER!

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Arine murdered in South L.A. —where is Obama, Hillary, and the media?

“US MARINE SHOT IN SOUTH LA WHILE ON MILITARY LEAVE DIES:

“The 19-year-old U.S. Marine who was shot in the head while on military leave in South L.A. last week has died, officials said.”

So reads the headline and lead sentence of the ABC news report of September 20, 2016, on the death of Carlos Segovia, U.S. Marine Corps, only 19 years old. (ABC News report)

Marine Segovia, was not shot down in Iraq, Afghanistan, or other foreign terrorist war zone in the heat of battle with foreign enemies of America. He was murdered in cold blood on the streets of So. Central Los Angeles, apparently by urban thugs or gangsters, domestic enemies of America, terrorizing communities and turning urban areas like So. Central LA into domestic war zones with mounting death tolls.

According to police, Marine Segovia, while home on leave from Camp Pendleton, was shot in the head, twice, on Sept. 16, 2016, at approximately 11:30 p.m., as he sat behind the wheel of his car waiting for a traffic light to change at 31st and Washington streets in So. Central L.A. . The shots came from the car next to him, which apparently drove off when the light changed. Four days later, Marine Segovia was declared dead on Sept. 20, 2016. As of this writing, the murderers remain at large to continue on their murderous way, once again killing with impunity.

This is apparently the new norm of “America transformed” under Barack Hussein Obama. Life is now that cheap and dangerous, and death so random, in L.A. and other American cities, even the life of a Marine who is living his life in service to

America.

It is so much the new norm that, outside of local media reporting, the death, the wanton murder, of U.S. Marine Carlos Segovia in So. Central L.A. has not been deemed "news worthy" enough by the media to be the subject of national news media reportage, nor media demands for action to stop such murders. The "talking heads" of television political punditry are not talking about the outrage of a Marine being cold bloodily murdered in So. Central L.A. There is no media outrage.

But, the most important question is not about just the failure of outrage or even concern over the murder of Marine Carlos Segovia by the political whores of the liberal national media who are so willingly pimped by progressive liberals in political power from the White House on down. The most important question to be asked is:

Where is Obama, Hillary Clinton, Attorney General Lynch, the Democrats most beloved Vietnam draft dodger, sexual predator, disbarred lawyer (for perjury) and Impeached President Bill ("BJ") Clinton, California Governor Jerry Brown, LA Mayor Garcetti, progressive liberal Democrats all, to denounce as an outrage the murder on South L.A. streets of a Marine home on leave, to pledge and take action to search out the murderers, and to vigorously prosecute the killers of this Marine?

After eight years of ruling-by-race of the Obama regime, eight years of unequal enforcement or non-enforcement of the law based on race, eight years of refusal to act against urban gangsterism and thuggism and instead to appease, coddle, and make excuses for preening urban terrorist thugs who have no fear of prosecution and burn, loot, rob, rape and murder with apparent impunity, American urban streets are no longer safe, even for Marines.

Even the murder of a U.S. Marine home on leave draws no immediate expression of outrage from the progressive liberal

Obama regime in Washington or the progressive liberal regime of Jerry Brown in Sacramento. There are no "executive" or other orders to finally take effective action against self-proclaimed urban terrorist gangster thugs from the government whose primary job is to keep Americans safe, at which Obama has been and is an abject failed President and Commander-In-Chief.

Obama, the Narcissist-In-Chief, the Peacock President, preened before his election in 2008 that "we are the ones we have been waiting for," and that he and they would "fundamentally transform" America.

Indeed, he and they are the "ones [they] have been waiting for" and he and they have "fundamentally transform[ed] America: The streets of major American cities are now of "third world" danger under a corrupt government, where even a Marine home on leave can be murdered without a peep of protest from the same President Obama and Would-be President Hillary Clinton who are so quick to condemn our police, or our military if they should commit an act of political incorrectness even in war, and to condemn "white" American patriots generally as "racists," "bigots," or "deplorables."

The names of thugs whose own misconduct has resulted in them being shot by police are now household names. They are made famous, rather than infamous. They are made "victims" of "police racism" rather than racist urban thugs terrorizing their communities, perpetrators not victims of crimes, whose deaths are decried as "racism" by police and whites generally.

The President of the United States aids-and-abets them, excuses their misconduct, refuses to hold them equally responsible under the law for their acts. Obama even speculated in one famous case that "if I had a son he would look like" the black alleged victim of a racist, unlawful homicide. Thus, before any evidence was in making an alleged victim of racist violence one who, when the evidence was in,

was shown to be the perpetrator of violence who died due to his own violent acts.

More generally, Obama, the purported "post racial" president further infamously observed that non-Harvardonian, Yalean, or other Ivy League-educated white people are just backward, racist, bigots "clinging to their guns and religion." Not to be outdone, she who would be President, Hillary Clinton, the Hillarybeast of Benghazi, recently informed all of America and the world that those Americans opposing her election are just a "basket of deplorables," who are "irredeemable."

Why shouldn't urban terrorist thugs and gangsters believe they can get away with rioting, burning, looting, beating, knifing, shooting and killing, and murder of a U.S. Marine on American city streets when government in the Age of Obama reassures them constantly they are but victims of racism and not responsible for their own choices and acts, and the media make them famous as "heroes" to other thugs and gangsters by wall-to-wall coverage of their anarchic riots, interviewing them on national television in all their posturing self-glory as they riot, burn, and loot in alleged protest against "racism"?

Why shouldn't such despicable cretins believe they can with impunity stop at a traffic light, and open fire on the driver of the car next to them, murdering the driver, in this case a U.S. Marine, in an America "fundamentally transform[ed]" after eight years of Obama, and the prospect of more of the same by Hillary Clinton? They are but "victims," after all, not to be equally held to the same standards of conduct as others.

Here is a name that Obama, Hillary, all of those who are "the ones we [progressive liberals] have been waiting for," those "fundamentally transform[ing] America, and the media which is pimped by them should make a "household name" known to all Americans, of all races:

CARLOS SEGOVIA, United States Marine, wantonly murdered on the

streets of Los Angeles while home on leave from his chosen duty as a U.S. Marine to keep Americans, all Americans, safe from harm from all enemies, foreign and domestic. Dead at 19.

May the God U.S. Marine Carlos Segovia served bless and keep him; may America and the Americans he served as a Marine remember and cherish him. May he not have lived, served, or died in vain.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY—INCLUDING THUG TYRANNY – NEVER!

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Obama's illegal \$400-million ransom deal with Iran

Why Are We Ransoming Dual Citizen Iranians?

At the risk of being accused of political incorrectness, allow me comment that not only is the news that Obama has paid \$400-million to Iran illegally – through a scam of flying U.S. dollars to Europe and converting the dollars to Euros and Francs – further evidence of the utter totalitariaan arrogance and deceitfulness of the Progressive Liberal Obama-Hillary Democrat Regime– it also raises the question:

Why are all of these men who just cost Americans \$400-million called “Americans,” and not what some if not all are, i.e., Iranian “dual citizens” of America and Iran?

I have a problem with that—I don't know how to swear exclusive allegiance to America and America's terrorist enemy, the Islamic Terrorist Republic of Iran, at the same time.

Why were dual citizen Iranians back in Iran in the first place, knowing the knowing the risk created by the totalitarian reality of the terrorist Muslim theocracy from which they or their families fled, in which they may even remain "citizens"?

Why should Americans pay \$400-million for the release of pseudo-Americans, or Americans "for convenience," who gain legal American citizenship but maintain dual citizenship in Iran or other Islamic cesshole?

If they or other Muslims are still citizens of Iran, then they should go there and stay there. If their Iranian co-citizens toss them in jail, they should stay there without demanding that non-"dual" American citizens pay a ransom for their return.

Any Iranian "dual citizen," or any other person from Iran or any other Islamic cesspool, or anyone else who is of descent from those Islamic terrorist cesspools who is in America but returns there, should have to sign an "assumption of risk" agreement before being allowed to travel there.

Once in Iran or other totalitarian Islamic nation, they should be on their own. Not a dollar should be paid to ransom them – even if the federal law forbidding doing business with Iran in U.S. Dollars is deceitfully evaded by converting U.S. Dollars to Euros or Francs before handing millions to the terror-sponsoring Ayatollahs of Iran.

\$400 million to ransom Iranian citizens, "dual Americans" claiming the legal (not cultural) status of Americans citizens, when the Obama regime claims it just doesn't have enough money fulfill its duty to provide effective health care to American veterans, or process the hundreds of thousands of unprocessed claims of veterans for earned benefits, many dying while waiting for care or decisions on claims?

If "dual citizen" Iranians, or others with roots in Islamic

countries, will not renounce their citizenship in those countries, Americans should not spend a dime's worth – in U.S. Dollars, Euros, or Francs – to ransom them back when they have deliberately put themselves in harm's way.

Legal fictions of "dual citizenship" notwithstanding, a person cannot serve two masters at the same time, as the Bible states.

It has been the articulated policy of America, including by the Progressive Liberal Democrat regime of President Barack Hussein Obama and his Secretaries of State Hillary Clinton and John Kerry, that America does not pay ransoms for the release of Americans taken captive by terrorists or terrorist nations.

Obama has made a lie of that policy with his \$400-million payoff to Iran to ransom "dual" citizen Iranian Americans. That purported American policy of no dealing with terrorist body snatchers is now revealed as empty of meaning as Obama's famous false threat of real response should Obama's "red line" be crossed Syria.

Thus, this despicable, illegal, payoff to Iran by Obama-Hillary-Kerry, in untraceable "small" Eurodollars and Francs, flown to the Ayatollahs in an "unmarked plane," without notice to Congress – is further evidence of the utter totalitarian arrogance and deceitfulness of progressive liberal power-driven "progressive-liberal" Democrats in power, of which Obama and Hillary and Kerry are excrescent exemplars.

It is one more thing about them to "remember in November:" Progressive Liberal Democrat Lies Matter.

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Khizr Kahn, Trump, and the “real story”

Excuse me for not joining in the hypocritical frenzy of liberal media and supporters of Hillary Clinton over the so called “Khan Family” controversy in which Donald Trump is portrayed as an evil anti-Muslim ogre unwilling to prostrate himself to be lectured at by Hillary Clinton supporter and Muslim immigrant immigration lawyer Khizr Khan, whose son, Army Capt. Humayun Kahn heroically gave his life in service.

It happens I believe in the Biblical injunction that the sins of the father should not be visited on the sons. I believe also, however, that the heroism of the son should not be visited upon the father.

In this case, the son is U.S. Army Captain Humayun Kahn, who gave his life in service. He is a hero who indeed should be honored by all Americans for his sacrifice.

The father is Khizer Khan. He is a Pakistani Muslim immigrant and immigration lawyer who is neither hero nor a person otherwise to be honored.

Indeed, Khizr Khan has made his wealth in America as a Muslim immigration lawyer associated with a large law firm by importing other mostly wealthy Muslims in the notoriously corrupt “EB5” immigration visa program. That EB5 cash-cow for immigration lawyers is, of course, threatened by the possible election of Donald Trump.

After his appearance as a speaker at the Democrat Convention where he was used to attack Trump on behalf of Hillary Clinton of Benghazi infamy, Khizr Khan, emulating the corrupt Hillary Clinton who deleted her e-mails from public view, has deleted his law firm’s website from the internet lest Americans find out how he has been making his money in the corrupt EB5

immigration program.

Oddly enough, despite the media frenzy over Trump's failure to genuflect before Khizr Kahn as he exploited his son's death for his own fame and glory and preservation of his EB5 Immigration wealth, all of this about Khizr Kahn was first exposed by Breitbart and by Robert Spencer's "Jihad Watch" (www.JihadWatch.com), not by the mainstream media.

Further, although Khizr Khan dramatically waved a pocket-copy of the U.S. Declaration of Independence and Constitution in his star turn as Democrat Party tool, he in fact is the author of tracts supporting the desirability of elevating Sharia Law over our Constitution, as also exposed by Robert Spencer in his Jihad Watch columns.

Therefore, allow me to salute and honor the heroic service of the son, Army Captain Humayun Kahn, who paid the ultimate sacrifice in military service for America.

But excuse me from visiting the heroism of the son on the father, Khizr Khan, who has exploited his son's death as he has exploited America to enrich himself as Muslim immigration lawyer in one of the most corrupt aspects of immigration law, the EB5 program, all the while authoring articles advocating Sharia Law over Constitutional Law.

Further and finally, allow me to associate myself with the position and comments of Kris "Tonto" Paronto,. He is the American patriot and hero who survived the Muslim attack on the American consulate on 9-11-2012 in Benghazi despite the absolute failure of duty of then Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

Hillary Clinton allowed the U.S. Ambassador and three other Americans to be killed by Muslim terrorists as she did nothing to save them. Among other things, Hillary did nothing to save the Americans – for over 13 hours – in part because of her fear Muslims would be "offended" if U.S. troops were sent in

uniform to rescue the Ambassador and other Americans. The blood of Benghazi is, indeed, indelibly on Hillary Clinton's hands, disqualifying her from holding any office, let alone Commander-in-Chief, even Muslim immigration lawyer Keizer Khan supports her.

In contrast to Hillary Clinton is Benghazi hero "Tonto" Paronto, who co-authored "13 HOURS: The Inside Account Of What Really Happened IN BENGHAZI". "He is now heading the "Leading From The Front" effort of the American Legacy Center. He writes there regarding the Kahn Family Controversy worked up by the Hillary, the Democratts, and the media (www.AmericanLegacyCenter.org):

"This is getting ridiculous. The debate we're having about Donald Trump and the parents of slain U.S. Army Captain (and hero) Humayun Kahn is a complete waste of time.

"After essentially ignoring Pat Smith, whose son Sean was killed in Benghazi, the mainstream media is now fanning the flames of this latest controversy, and every candidate and elected official in America from dogcatcher up is being asked to take a side.

"But here's the real story that every single American should be focused on – in its online magazine this week, ISIS showed a picture of Captain Khan's tombstone in Arlington National Cemetery with the caption: "Beware of dying as an apostate." The article then urged American and other Western Muslims to either migrate to ISIS-controlled lands or carry out lone wolf attacks "where it hurts them most."

"I know this enemy, and while we're focused on politics, they're butchering 84-year-old priests at the altar."

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Hillary's "hispanic" exposed as liar: what's in a name?

The Wall Street Journal has exposed that Hillary Clinton's "Hispanic" potential vice presidential running mate, Thomas Perez, has lied repeatedly that his grandfather was an heroic resister to the totalitarian Hispanic dictator Rafael Trujillo in the Dominican Republic. WSJ exposes that in fact: "Grandfather of potential Clinton VP pick served dictator" Trujillo. (WSJ, July 20, 2016).

It is obvious, thus, that Hillary's Hispanic, Thomas Perez, has much in common with her – i.e., the capacity to lie without shame to gain power – but what does he have in common with other so-called "Hispanics" other than a Spanish surname?

Politically-correct, Progressive-Liberal Democrat Party totalitarians like Hillary Clinton and Barack Hussein Obama like to speak of their great love for "Hispanics," or "Latinos," as if "Hispanics" constitute a monolithic ethnic group, apparently because they have Spanish surnames in common. However, that is about all that "Hispanics" have in common.

Indeed, there are enormous cultural, political, and historical differences among the many nations of peoples who are lumped together by the leaders of the Progressive-Liberal Politically-Correct Modern Democrat Party into one, undifferentiated ethnic blob designated "Hispanic."

In reality, there is great diversity among peoples designated "Hispanics." This great diversity includes great divisions, not to mention antagonisms and down-right dislike if not hatred by and between different "Hispanics." Notwithstanding,

despite this diversity, “Hispanics” are treated as a monolithic ethnic group owned and controlled by the ever-so “Liberal” Democrat Party, aided and abetted by the liberal media.

For one instance of this, Hillary Clinton is now floating the Hispanic name of Labor Secretary Tom Perez, as a possible Vice Presidential candidate with her. The liberal media informs Americans how much this will help Hillary to win the “Hispanic” vote.

Why? It is not because Perez has been such a wonderful Labor Secretary or former head of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice—he wasn’t. He has been as ruthlessly totalitarian in those bureaucratic roles as was, for example, Trujillo, the former dictator of the Dominican Republic.

The analogy of Perez with excrescent dictator “Hispanic” Trujillo, is apt. It turns out that although possessed with a Spanish surname which has made many believe that Perez is of Mexican heritage, his roots are in the Dominican Republic. There, his was a very privileged family due to the fact that his grandfather was a loyal collaborator serving in the Trujillo dictatorship, Indeed, he was at one point Trujillo’s Ambassador to the United States, as is revealed in the WSJ article.

So, it has to be asked: Why would Hillary designate Perez her Hispanic, and why does the media think Hispanics will therefore vote for her, not withstanding all of the scandals surrounding her, not the least of which is the Benghazi atrocity, the blood of which is on Hillary Clinton’s hands.

What does this Thomas Perez, whose Hispanic roots are in the Dominican Republic, have in common with, say, Americans of Mexican decent, other than a Spanish surname? Americans of Mexican descent are overwhelmingly the most numerous people lumped by Democrats into the category of “Hispanic.” What of

the other non-Mexican “Hispanics,” those of Central America, South America? Will they all rush to the polls because they have so much in common, culturally or historically, with “Hispanics” of the Dominican Republic?

Can Thomas Perez, proud descendent of one of the privileged families of the Dominican Republic because of their connection with the dictatorship of Trujillo, be held out as a “Hispanic” to be embraced by Americans of Mexican decent? Or Argentinians, Chileans, Brazilians, Paraguayans? What is the racial, ethnic, or cultural tie of any of those ethnicities with Thomas Perez with cultural roots in the Dominican Republic, and political and historical roots in the “Hispanic” dictatorship of Trujillo?

This is not to deny that Perez has much in common with Hillary Clinton – he is a totalitarian self-declared “Progressive-Liberal” given to the big lie to get a head politically, in his case the now exposed lie that his grandfather was an heroic opponent of the dictator Trujillo, which he wasn’t; rather than a collaborator with Trujillo’s dictatorship, which he was.

Excuse me for opining that the lumping of all persons with Spanish surnames into a monolithic mass is insulting, racist, and blatantly colonialist as the Democrat Party attempts to herd “Hispanics” to the polls like colonized serfs, easily manipulated by dangling a Spanish surname before them as purportedly deserving of their vote as a “Hispanic” by way of Spanish surname – no matter how excrescent is the person bearing it, as in the case of Thomas Perez.

In short, the only thing Hillary Clinton and the Politically-Correct, Progressive-Liberal, Modern Day Racially Divisive Democrat Party love about “Hispanics” is their votes, and how they can be exploited, as Mexican serfs once were by the Haciendista land owners pre-Emiliano Zapata, Pancho Villa, and the Mexican Revolution. Zapata famously said “It is better to

die on your feet than live on your knees.” Hillary, Obama, the contemporary Democrat Party wants to force all “Hispanics” back on their knees, an undifferentiated, unthinking monolithic mass genuflecting before the Democrat Party as once they did before the Spanish colonizers, and their collaborators.

Rafael Trujillo, the heinous dictator of the Dominican Republic would smile upon Hillary and the Democrat Party today, using Thomas Perez as a mascot “Hispanic” today for Hillary as once Perez’ grandfather did for Trujillo.

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

GOP convention: the new “party of the people”?

There were many thought provoking speeches on important issues at GOP convention. Also, great patriotic energy, enthusiasm, unashamed love of country. If the GOP was once the “Party of the Rich” or “the Country Club set,” it certainly isn’t any more.

These delegates were, obviously, just patriotic Americans, sharing and living the concerns of most ordinary working Americans – committed to the foundational American values of God and country, and “We, the People” as the sovereigns, not elitist social engineers in Washington, academia, and the courts.

On the evidence of the Convention, the GOP is not an elite-dominated party led by the wealthy, professional politicians, would-be academics and lawyers seeking to be leaders of “the revolution” by executive and judicial orders in the socialist

style, rather than by laws made by elected representatives in Congress and carried out, not made, by the President—or by lawyers sitting as judges in the Judicial Branch in which only one class, lawyers, may serve.

That party of elitists is not the GOP. That party would be the modern “transformed” Politically-Correct, Progressive Liberal Party of Hillary Clinton, on whose hands the blood of Benghazi remains—which must and does “make a difference,” so great a difference it should forever disqualify her as commander-in-chief, as does her history of lies concerning her e-mail, influence peddling, and Clinton Foundation scandals.

One of the best yet most most disappointing speeches was that of Ted Cruz. One of the best as he emphasized that “Freedom,” and the very existence of America as the freest nation in the history of the world, is what is at stake in this election. One of the most disappointing as despite the rhetorical eloquence of his speech, he did not fulfill his pledge, and the pledge of all the other candidates for the nomination, to endorse the nominee chosen by vote of the primary voters and the delegates. It is unfortunate that Cruz would diminish himself in such a manner.

If Cruz was attempting to advance himself as future candidate and diminish Trump as the elected nominee, Cruz instead diminished himself. It was Trump who was made to appear a bigger and better man by Cruz’ betrayal of his pledge.

Trump, in contrast to Cruz, was gracious in victory. He invited Cruz to speak at the convention without any conditions. He did not attempt to block or interfere with Cruz’ speech although Trump, who read the advance copy of the speech, knew Cruz would violate his pledge. Trump was made to appear the better man by Cruz’ self-centered pettiness, violating his pledge, putting himself and his own political ambitions ahead of the country’s need to defeat Hillary Clinton and the Democrat Party’s leftward march leading the

nation from free enterprise and individual freedom, to Socialism and individual serfdom.

Deeds speak louder than words about who and what a man is. Cruz' words were wonderful in defense of "Freedom." His deeds were despicable. A shame.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY –NEVER!

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Ted Cruz joins Trump to defeat Hillary

The Donald Trump campaign has announced that Ted Cruz has "buried the hatchet," and will call for unity behind Trump to defeat Hillary Clinton when Cruz speaks at the GOP Convention. (Here is the link to the announcement by the Trump campaign) I have enormous respect for Ted Cruz, as an American patriot, as a man, a sincere Christian, and an absolutely brilliant attorney who has taken on and won before the Supreme Court seven (7) precedent setting cases preserving the Constitutional rights of all Americans. (Read his book, "A Time For Truth" for these cases, and so much more about him.)

Cruz was my first choice for President for all of the above reasons. If he is now supporting the election of the GOP nominee, Donald Trump. It is further reason to believe what a good man he is, to put the good of country ahead of his own presidential ambitions, and forgive the bruising and undeserved personal attacks aimed at him in the primary election, first by Marco Rubio, then by Trump.

Now that the choice is between Trump and Hillary Clinton, the Beast of Benghazi, all Americans, including all Cruz supporters should – indeed must – support the GOP nominee, Trump, like Ted Cruz is doing, in order to defeat Hillary Clinton.

Hillary Clinton is as crooked as her husband, but with the blood of Benghazi on her hands, an indelible stain which cannot be washed off by more lies. As Secretary of State, she was an utter incompetent failure in foreign policy, from the initial embarrassingly inept if not farcical “Re-Set” of relations with Russia, to Libya and ultimately Benghazi. (If you need more proof regarding the Benghazi Scandal, see or read “13 Hours,” in which four Americans died at the hands of Muslim jihadist terrorists while Hillary, and Obama, did nothing to get help to them for 13-hours.)

Domestically, Hillary’s endangerment of national security in her E-Mail Scandal, and the lies attendant thereto, proved in her “indictment without an Indictment” by the FBI, is evidence that she is even more arrogant in the exercise of power, and even farther “Left” as a self-declared politically-correct, “progressive-liberal” (i.e., neo-socialist) than Barack Hussein Obama.

That is saying something as Obama is the most “Liberal” President in history. He has brought America closer to a European-style socialist state than ever before, epitomized by his creation of “socialized medicine” through the job-destroying “Obamacare” government takeover of health care. He is also the most destructive of our tri-partite government based on “separation of powers,” as well as the most destructive of Constitutional freedom through his “imperial presidency,” ruling by Executive Order on culture-changing policies. Those Executive Orders effectively change and make law on immigration enforcement or lack thereof. He has effectively usurper the authority of Congress to make law rather than enforcing the laws Congress creates as head of the

Executive Branch.

In truth, we Americans are not just facing difficult problems that need solving in this election. We are facing an existential threat from enemies foreign and domestic:

Domestic enemies mean to transform America from a free Constitutional republic based on free enterprise, and individual freedom, to socialism and serfdom. The domestic enemies include the contemporary progressive-liberal, politically-correct Democrat Party transformed by Obama, Hillary, Affirmative Action exploiter and fake Native American Elizabeth "Pocahontas" Warren, Black Lies Matter, and the various malicious America-hating socialist-communist parties who are using BLM and the New Black Panther Party today as they once used the old Black Panther Party as black "shock troops" in the '60's.

Evidence of the the Black Lies Matter demonstrators are being used, knowingly and willingly, or stupidly as dupes by communist manipulators, is the fact that the printed placards used at Black Lies Matter protests are not even their own, but are provided – as is printed on the bottom of the placards – is the noxious "RCP," i.e., Revolutionary Communist Party, which, like Dracula, rises periodically from the political grave when it finds black anti-Americans malicious enough, or stupid enough, to join with that excrescent communist rump organization as what Lenin called "useful idiots."

Foreign enemies, i.e., Muslim jihadist terrorists inspired by the Quar'an, the Hadith, ISIS or other Islamic extremists, mean to transform America into an Islamic theocracy based on Sharia Law. They are working to transform America in this way by terrorism abroad – as well as increasingly here – combined with using Muslims living in America to exploit domestically the very Constitutional freedoms of the Bill of Rights they mean to destroy and replace with Sharia Law, as freely admitted by such Muslim supporters of Obama, Hillary, and the

Democrat Party as the Council of American Islamic Relations (CAIR).

Indeed, CAIR, an unindicted co-conspirator in the Holy Land Scandal involving Muslim "charitable" donations being used fund terrorist Islamists, confidently predicts that America will be an Islamic republic under Sharia Law within "100 years." They say, however, that they will accomplish this "peacefully." How? Through the high-birthrate of Muslim women, Muslim immigration, importation of Muslims as so-called "refugees" without effective vetting, and increasing demands to Islamize or Muslimize American law and culture to incrementally demand more and more accommodations to Muslim preferences, including acceptance of Sharia Law and courts, through exploitation of the Bill of Rights and Civil Rights laws intended originally to protect black African Americans.

Either way, triumph of socialism by domestic enemies, or triumph of Sharia Law by foreign enemies, is a triumph of tyranny, destroying American freedom and the free, Constitutional republic the Founding Fathers bequeathed to us.

Americans, therefore, must unite to defeat Hillary Clinton, the Benghazi Bungler, who has moved in her campaign even further toward a socialist America, promising to continue and expand the immigration, Muslim "refugee" importation, failed economic and abhorrent freedom-destroying policies of Barack Hussein Obama in fulfillment five days before his election in 2008 to "fundamentally transform America."

As Cruz has stated about "burying the hatchet," unifying to defeat Hillary Benghazi, and what he will say must be done when he speaks at the Republican Convention at the invitation of Trump:

"I'm going to urge Americans to get back to the Constitution to change the path we're on: eight failed years of the Obama-Clinton economy; eight failed years of a presidency

disregarding the Constitution and Bill of Rights,” he told reporters. “Eight failed years of a commander in chief not protecting Americans and keeping us safe from radical Islamic terrorism. It’s time for that to end.”

Amen.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY—NEVER!

© 2015 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

American freedom: resistance or abject submission to tyranny?

“The time is now near at hand which must probably determine whether Americans are to be freemen or slaves; whether they are to have any property they can call their own; whether their houses and farms are to be pillaged and destroyed, and themselves consigned to a state of wretchedness from which no human efforts will deliver.

“The fate of unborn millions will now depend, under God, on the courage of this army. Our cruel and unrelenting enemy leaves us only the choice of brave resistance, or the most abject submission. We have, therefore, to resolve to conquer or die.”

Gen. George Washington, Commander-in-Chief, spoke these words July 2, 1776 to the soldiers of his Revolutionary Army as the War of Independence began. Few thought then that Gen. Washington’s ragtag volunteer army of patriot soldiers could triumph over England, then the greatest military power in the

world. One of every twelve of those American patriot soldiers would die in that war, which went on from 1776 to 1883, America's longest war until Vietnam.

But by choosing resistance instead of abject submission to the increasing tyranny of England's King George III, those Revolutionary War veterans under Gen. George Washington secured freedom, and established the first free constitutional government based on the "consent of the governed" in the history of civilization.

We of this generation are the "unborn millions" of whom Gen. Washington spoke. We live in freedom today because of the sacrifices veterans who fought and died for free-dom in the War of Independence, and all the wars which have followed.

American Independence Day, the 4th of July, is a time to annually rejoice in our free-dom, and also to remember that our freedom was bought by blood, from the Founding Fathers of the first generation of free Americans, through the veterans of all the Ameri-can generations who served in all the wars, to the sons and daughters of America of this generation who serve today in the Army, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard and Air Force to preserve and protect the freedom our American Founding Fathers bequeathed to us.

All together, from the War of Independence of 1776 until today, some 1.4-million! veter-ans have given their lives in defense of American freedom.

We Americans of today owe a great debt to all of the generations of Americans who came before us and preserved for us our most precious possession: Freedom. We pay that debt to those Americans who came before us by preserving and protecting freedom for the Americans who will come after us.

The question presented on this July 14th is: Do Americans still have the courage and love of freedom to fight for freedom against the tyranny of Islamic fascism and terrorism

in the War Against Terrorism today that Commander-in-Chief Gen. George Washington and the patriot soldiers of the Revolutionary War had in fighting for freedom and against tyranny in 1776? This is no idle question: The very existence of a free constitutional America is at stake as Americans decide upon resistance to Islamofacist tyranny, or abject surrender to it.

GEN. GEORGE WASHINGTON: CHOOSING FREEDOM, FIGHTING TYRANNY

We Americans have before us as the model for resisting, and defeating tyranny the fin-est exemplar of service to God and country: General George Washington. He is the greatest American of any generation, our First American President, honored as "The Father Of Our Country," saluted by those of the Founding Fathers' generation as "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen," as expressed by Revolutionary War Gen. Henry "Lighthorse Harry" Lee.

Gen. George Washington was hailed internationally by such as French Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte as the "greatest man of his era," a new "Cincinnatus," because Washington, like the Roman General Cincinnatus walked away from power to return to his home as a citizen. Washington did this although offered life tenure as U.S. President, or even the title of "King," all of which he rejected as incompatible with patriotic virtue and devotion to individual freedom in our republic.

Gen. George Washington and the soldier patriots of the Revolutionary War made us free. He and they set the example of what must be done to keep us free. We must be willing to emulate it, make the fight, and make the sacrifices they made, if Americans are to remain free "citizens" of a free democratic republic and not the "subjects" of an Islamofascist totalitarian "caliphate" beheading "infidels," slaughtering "infidel" children, raping and stoning women to death, under 7th Century Islamic Sharia Law in place of our Constitution.

Today, Americans face an even more “cruel and unrelenting enemy” than did George Washington and the Founding Fathers: Tyrannical Islamofascist jihadist terrorism. But we no longer have a Gen. Washington to fight that tyranny in defense of freedom.

Islam is a political ideology cloaked as a religion, fanatically determined to destroy American freedom and impose Sharia law worldwide, giving Americans but three choices: (1) convert to Islam; (2) abject submission to Islamic governance as subservi-ent subjects paying a special tax; or (3), to die, to be killed in the name of Islam.

George Washington, the Founding Fathers, and the citizen soldiers of the American Revolutionary Army, and each war thereafter did not apologize for America’s stand for freedom, did not seek to appease the power that threatened to deny and destroy free-dom, did not bow before tyrants, did not invent euphemisms for tyranny but called it by its name. They chose “brave resistance” rather than “abject submission.” And we are free because of their courageous choice.

The question presented to us is whether we, the “unborn millions” of Americans for whose freedom George Washington and his soldiers fought, and each generation fought, still believe, as did Gen. Washington, the Founding Fathers, and the soldiers of the American Revolution, that we must also choose “brave resistance” rather than “ab-ject submission” in order to preserve and protect the freedom that they bequeathed to us.

Gen. Arnold Schwarzkopf, who commanded in Desert Storm, famously and succinctly said: “Some things are worth living for. Some of those things are worth dying for. One of those things is freedom.” Do we American believe that? Are we Americans today “re-solve[d] to conquer, or die,” as Gen. Washington said, against the Muslim terroristic tyr-anny of today in order to preserve freedom for “millions of unborn”

Americans?

This means sacrifices for freedom. More than 12,000 Americans out of a population of approximately 4-million died fighting against the imperialist English monarchy of King George III for a free American republic. It must be remembered that only a minority of Americans were willing to sacrifice and fight for our freedom: One-third of the Americans supported the war; one-third were neutral; one third actively supported England against their fellow Americans, choosing submission rather than freedom, many fleeing after the war to Canada, still a colony under governance by England.

I have no doubt that those Americans of this generation serving in our Armed Forces are possessed of the full measure of devotion to liberty that was possessed by the Founding Fathers' generation. Those serving today in Afghanistan, Iraq, and wherever freedom is threatened by the fascistic drive for world domination in the name of Islam, are making that sacrifice.

But can we say that the generation of Americans now in governmental power and media dominance in America, who call themselves "progressives," i.e., ultra-liberal neo-socialists who flee from name "liberal," are equal to the Founding Fathers in any respect, including in particular the will to choose "brave resistance" over "abject submission" to Islamist tyranny in order to preserve American freedom?

Not to put too fine a point of it, but compare, for instance, Commander-in-Chief George Washington and Commander-in-Chief Barack Hussein Obama, the first American president to "bow" to an Islamic Wahabist tyrant, or the first in an international gathering of world leaders to be photographed with his hand raised above his head in a fist but with his index finger raised demonstrating the signal of solidarity of Islamic jihadists as Obama passed by leaders of Muslim countries in a photo-shoot, all those Muslim leaders smiling broadly as they

saw Obama's index finger silently signaling solidarity with Islamic jihadism.

Or compare President Thomas Jefferson who sent the Marines to subdue Muslim terrorists in Libya with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton who would be Commander in Chief. She is a modern Lady MacBeth, risen to power by clinging to a corrupt husband, possessed of such ruthless self-serving ambition for power that after the U.S. Ambassador and three other American patriots were slaughtered in Benghazi, Libya, on her watch and due to her malfeasance in office, she would spew to Americans and the world a blatant fabricated lie that they didn't die because of Islamic terrorism but because of an amateur "movie trailer" demeaning Muhammad, and would later pound the table in Congressional testimony to shriek: "What difference does it make!" who killed those Americans and why.

It makes a difference! If she doesn't know that, then Hillary Clinton is manifestly morally and temperamentally unfit for any public office, let alone the Presidency. It is a long way from Gen. George Washington to Barack Hussein Obama, He Who Bows, and from Thomas Jeffersons to Hillary Clinton, She Who Lies – and all downhill.

Thomas Jefferson, possessed of the greatest mind ever to reside in the White House, or any American house, was the principal author of the American Declaration of Independence, the greatest and most inspiring declaration for freedom ever writ. His personal motto was: "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God."

As an American revolutionary and Founding Father, Jefferson did not apologize to, bow to, or grovel in appeasement to the English tyrant King George III. As third U.S. President and Commander-in-Chief, Jefferson did not apologize to, bow to, or grovel in appeasement to the oppressive Muslim tyrants who preyed on American ships, and freedom—Jefferson sent the U.S. Marines to Tripoli, without apology, or concern about "the

Muslim street," or political correctness lest Muslim feelings be hurt and they "be offended."

Does that Jeffersonian determination to choose "brave resistance" over "abject submission" reside in the minds and hearts of those who lead America today, many of whom, including Barak Hussein Obama and Hillary Clinton, call themselves "progressives," euphemism for net-socialism. Is the transformation of the presidency from that of George Washington to that of Barack Hussein Obama by any commonsense understanding "progress"? Does the American Spirit of 1776 reside in the minds and hearts of Americans today, or have Americans become so "transformed" by the politically-correct, progressive liberalism of Obama, Hillary Clinton, and the modern Democrat Party that this July 4th they are prepared to choose "abject submission" if the alternate is "brave resistance"?

Jefferson wrote in our American Declaration of Independence that we Americans believe that "all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." The question presented is: Do Americans today still believe that?

Do Americans still believe, most particularly do self-described "progressives" believe today, as Democrat President Jack Kennedy said, that "the rights of man come not from a generous government, but from the hand of God?" Or is it to the hand of the government to which contemporary Americans look as the source of their rights, as "progressive" governmentalism incrementally creeps over seemingly every aspect of American life, while belly-crawling to appease Islamic terrorism?

Do we Americans, from the most humble to the most exalted in the White House and the present regime, still believe that the choice must be for "brave resistance" and not "abject submission," that the price of freedom is paid in the blood of patriots, and that price must be paid if we are to preserve

freedom for “unborn millions” of Americans?

If that is not believed, from the most humble home to the White House, from those with roots in the Founding Fathers generation to the most recent legal immigrants who desire to become Americans – and even to the millions of illegal aliens squatting in America who seek all the rights of Americans with none of the responsibilities, including the responsibility to obey American laws and defend American freedom – if that belief no longer exists that there must be resistance to tyranny rather than submission to it, then American freedom is in peril.

It is important, therefore, that on each Independence Day, and every other day, we remember the values, and sacrifice, of those who created, and preserved, our free constitutional republic.

In that regard, that we contemporary Americans have a wealth of information at our fingertips as to our own history, more accessible information than any generation has had to know who we are as Americans by knowing our American roots.

The lesson of history is clear – from the tyranny of England’s King George, to the tyranny of national socialist fascism of Hitler in WWII, to the tyranny of communism Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Ho Chi Minh, and Pol Pot in Korea, in Vietnam, and in the Cold War, to the tyranny of Islamofascism today – if we do not walk in the footsteps of the Founding Fathers, we will walk away from freedom.

We will walk away from freedom to the soft tyranny of an all-encompassing governmentalism, whether it calls itself “progressivism,” “Marxism,” “socialism,” or “communism,” or by any other name, promising security but leading ultimately to governmental soft tyranny, or the harsh tyranny of Islamist Sharia Law.

Islamic jihadism is today as great a threat, or greater, than

was the fascist axis of Nazi Germany's Hitler-Italy's Mussolini-and Japan's Emperor Hirohito in WWII, or the socialist totalitarianism of Stalin-Mao-and Pol Pot under communism, which is the ultimate expression of socialism. This is true no matter the good intentions of liberal "progressives" and their Orwellian euphemisms for the tyranny of governmental control over every aspect of life.

Finally, it should be remembered, on every Independence Day – and every other day – that it is American veterans, those who served when our country called them to arms to defend freedom, who have chosen "brave resistance" over "abject submission," and preserved our freedom.

It is veterans who have paid the price for freedom, of whom "some gave all, and all gave some." As noted above, some 1,400,000 American veterans, from the Revolutionary Army under Gen. George Washington in 1776 to today, have given their lives for American freedom in all the wars, including those Americans serving in the War Against Islamic Terrorism today, who are suffering terrible wounds, and dying, for freedom.

May God bless and keep each one of them. And may God continue to bless the United States of America, the greatest, because the most free, nation in the history of the world.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY FOREVER; SURRENDER TO TYRANNY–NEVER!

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Sgt. David Thatcher, the

Doolittle raid and World War eleven

Victoria Taft, broadcast and print journalist, radio talk show host, and blogger, recently reported on her Facebook page about a school teacher who taught her students that “WWII” on a veterans cap meant meant he was a veteran of “World War Eleven.”

That teacher is definitely the product of progressive liberal government schools. So will those kids be.

In that regard, I recently reported on the notice of the passing of WWII hero and “Doolittle Raid” veteran Sgt. David Thatcher at age 94 on June 22, 2016. (Facebook/Rees Lloyd Law; twitter @ReesLloydLaw.)

AmericanVeteransCenter.org has provided more, and very interesting, information on Sgt. Thatcher and the history of the “Doolittle Raid.”

You might consider not only reading it, but also providing it to your children, grandchildren, or great-grandchildren. They are definitely not learning about it in their progressive liberal, politically correct government schools.

Come to think of it, you might provide it to your local schools – the teachers of those kids are not only not teaching it, apparently some of them are so ignorant of our history, the Doolittle Raid, and veterans, that they are teaching that “WWII” means “World War Eleven,” as Victoria Taft reported.

God bless those vets of WWII like Sgt. David Thatcher, and the veterans of all wars. It was those veterans, ordinary Americans who made extraordinary sacrifices, who preserved our freedom.

Some 1.4-million of those veterans have given their lives that America might remain free. But, “while some gave all, all gave some.” They should not be forgotten; ignored; or wiped out of history by progressive liberal political correctness, or because someone might be “offended” based on natural origin, or religion.

Every one of those veterans took an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against “all enemies, foreign and domestic.” America survived those wars, because veterans defeated all foreign enemies.

Now, the question is whether we will survive the political-correctness, and creeping European-style socialism that is a modern domestic enemy destroying America from within.

For God And Country Forever; Surrender To Tyranny–Never!

Staff Sgt. David Thatcher – American Veterans Center

Staff Sergeant David Thatcher was the Engineer-Gunner aboard Crew 7 of the famed Doolittle Tokyo Raid. After his plane, the Ruptured Duck, dropped bombs over their target in Tokyo, the crew made their way towards China. After crash landing on the water near a small island, Thatcher and his crew even...

AMERICANVETERANSCENTER.ORG

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

On the “La Raza” judge –

hypocrisy and judicial tyranny

The hypocrisy of the attacks on Donald Trump for criticizing the perceived bias of an Hispanic (Mexican-American) federal judge appointed by Obama who was a member of the race-based “La Raza (“The Race”) Lawyers Assn. of San Diego,” needs to be repudiated by the American citizens that judge serves, lawyers, politically correct politicians and media pundits preening their political correctness – and by the federal judge himself.

In a fact-filled, truth-filled column, Ann Coulter details the hypocrisy of the hysterical denunciations of Trump for questioning whether this judge’s allegiance to “La Raza” is influencing his decisions in the Trump University case, and criticizing that judge for not recusing himself given his membership in the La Raza Lawyers Association. (Ann Coulter’s column is available [here](#)).

I concur. The attacks on Trump are, in my view as a Civil Rights lawyer for more than thirty years, utterly hypocritical. I base this on the undeniable fact that for decades “White” judges (and jurors and prosecutors and police) have been repeatedly attacked and their decisions criticized with express citations to the fact that they are “White.”

Why shouldn’t this Hispanic judge be treated like a White judge? The fact is, all judges, including Hispanic and other non-White judges, are unelected, unaccountable, politically-connected political appointees, who are subject to criticism just as is any other governmental office holder.

Judges are not a high-priesthood to which we citizens are required to genuflect, and never criticize or question. They are politicians by-any-other-name. It is just easier for these

lawyers to get appointed to government office, i.e., judgeships, by appropriate political donations to the right party and the right political connections, then it is to get elected.

If any citizen would criticize any politician in any elected office, or any bureaucrat in any appointed office, then that citizen should feel free to criticize any judge, no matter their race, and including questioning whether their decisions are influenced by their race. Otherwise, we citizens are but serfs or subjects quivering with fear under the tyranny of judicial mystic. After all, they are nothing but political appointees; lawyers in dresses. Never should a citizen quake before a man who goes to work in a dress.

Although Donald Trump was not my first choice, I give Trump, as a public figure, newly minted political office seeker, and presumptive nominee for the Presidency, credit for having the courage to eschew political correctness and to publicly criticize this federal judge for perceived bias and failure to recuse himself from the Trump University litigation while being a member of a Hispanic racist organization, the La Raza Lawyers Association.

Why should Trump or any American fear to publicly question the impartiality of a judge who is a member of an organization which has in its very name a racial identification, "La Raza," and is not shy in proclaiming "Viva La Raza!" (Long Live The Race!)"? If he was White and a member of the KKK Lawyers Association, would the politicians, media mavens, and the politically-correct thought police rush to condemn Trump for questioning whether the Judge's race influenced his decisions?

I was one of the attorneys for Cesar Chavez in California for some twenty years. He was proud of his Mexican heritage, but never once did I ever hear him identify himself as "Raza," or join in crying "Viva La Raza!" On the contrary, Cesar Chavez, a great, third-generation American of Mexican descent, a WWII

veteran who joined the Navy at 17 and served for the duration in defense of his country, the United States, and was the moral heart of the American labor movement, expressly told me he wouldn't use the term "La Raza" because he considered it "racist."

Why, then, this rush of politicians and media to defend this Hispanic judge from criticism and questioning as to whether his decisions are influenced by his race? There is no similar rush to defend White judges, prosecutors, police, or jurors, when they are questioned, criticized, and attacked as "White" by the likes of Al Sharpton, Jesse Jackson, Black Lives Matter, anti-Trump "Viva La Raza!" rioters waving Mexican Flags and burning the U.S. Flag, or other race-baiting non-White racist individuals or organizations. Isn't that "racist"?

Manifestly, this federal judge was appointed by President Obama to his life-tenured federal judgeship not despite being Hispanic but because he is Hispanic. This is true, too, concerning Supreme Court Justice Sotomayor, who was appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court by Obama not on merit, but because she is Puerto Rican, and an activist leader of the Puerto Rican Legal Defense Fund.

Indeed, Sotomayor, herself, described herself as an "affirmative action baby" upon her nomination, admitting that throughout her college and post-college career her peers exceeded her in performance.

Sotomayor also famously stated that because she is a Hispanic female, in her words, a "wise Latina," she likely make better decisions than "white" judges. Nobody called her a "racist," or Obama for appointing her based on her race.

End this hypocrisy. Judges are no more to be immune from criticism by citizens, including whether their decisions are influenced by their race, ethnicity, or gender, than are members of Congress or the President of the U.S. "Hispanic" or

other non-White judges are not entitled to special treatment because of their race. Neither is the President, who has ruled by race from the White House for seven long years—all of them downhill, while the media and politicians cringe before criticizing him for his obvious race-based governance.

It has long been a maxim of the law that: “The appearance of evil is as damaging to the institution of justice as is actual evil.”

It is that standard, avoiding even the “appearance” of bias, that is to be followed by judges in recusing themselves in order to protect the institution of justice.

Under that standard, this federal judge, knowing he was a member of a race-based, race-advocacy organization of lawyers, should have recused himself in the Trump litigation. He should not be able to hide behind his Hispanic race to shield himself from criticism for that failure.

If this judge wants to involve himself in a race-based, race-promoting, organization, so be it. But, having done so, he cannot attack as “racists” citizens like Trump, or like me for this commentary, who question publicly whether his failure to recuse himself is improper. Nor does he have the right to hide behind his Hispanicity to be shielded from criticism which all other politicians, let alone mere mortals like us citizens, are subject. Indeed, does any reader of this commentary doubt that one or more readers are certain to attack it on the basis that I am “White,” no matter that I was in the trenches of the Civil Rights Movement when they were not?

In short, this Hispanic federal judge’s membership in an organization racially identifying itself as “La Raza” creates at least an “appearance” of bias. That he is “Hispanic” does not immunize him from criticism by Trump or any citizen, any more than a white judge who maintains a membership in the “KKK Lawyers Association” could claim “racism” if his or her

impartiality was questioned because of that membership.

Enough of this hypocrisy. We are citizens, not “serfs” groveling under judges who perceive themselves as modern Feudal Lords to whom all must kowtow, and none must criticize. These Lords of the Judiciary, perched in benches above mere mortals, requiring citizens to address them as “Your Honor” upon pain of contempt citation, are in reality naught but politically-ambitious, politically-connected lawyers in dresses.

Its time to take away their black “robes” (i.e., dresses); take them off their high courtroom perches and put them not above but on the same level as the citizens over whom they sit in judgment; and end their demand to be addressed as “Your Honor” even when they have none, and subject them to the same scrutiny, questioning and criticism as any other holder of public office purporting to be a “public servant.”

When one of them associates himself or herself with an organization promoting one race, instead of the human race, citizens, like Trump, should not cower from publicly criticizing and questioning them for at minimum creating the “appearance” of race-based bias, as has the “La Raza” Judge in the Trump case. He cannot be shielded from criticism or questioning by Trump or other citizens because he is an “Hispanic” rather than “White” judge. That is itself the very racial discrimination which the judiciary should be ending, not perpetuating.

For God And Country Forever; Surrender to Tyranny—including Judicial Tyranny – Never!

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Vietnam “pacifist” claim disqualifies Bernie Sanders for presidency

Bernie Sanders, a draft-dodging self-proclaimed “Socialist” who evaded service in the Vietnam War by seeking “conscientious objector” status as an alleged “pacifist opposed to all war,” now seeks to be elected Democrat President and Commander-in-Chief, empowered to send other Americans to war although he refused to serve himself. His perfidy in the Vietnam War, if not perjury, disqualifies him from being elected to serve as President and Commander-in-Chief now.

Oddly enough, although television anchors “moderating” the 2016 presidential campaign debates refer to Sanders as “authentic,” they have failed to question him about, or investigate, his evasion of military service in Vietnam by claiming to be a “pacifist” opposed to all wars as required for conscientious objector status. He wasn’t believed then— he was denied c.o. status – and the excuses he offers now for his non-service should not be believed.

Indeed, the excuses offered by Sanders and his campaign for his claim of being a committed “pacifist” opposed to all war in order to evade the draft just cannot withstand scrutiny.

First, he claims that while he is still a sincere Socialist, as he was then as a college radical, he is no longer a “pacifist” as he was then. How does one stop being a committed “pacifist,” if it is a “sincerely held belief,” as he claimed in order to evade military service and have someone else serve in his place in Vietnam? Did he stop being a “pacifist opposed to all war” when the Vietnam War or Draft ended and he was safe from service?

His campaign admits that Sanders sought conscientious objector status when his Draft number came up. They also admit that his claim of being a "pacifist" was rejected as a back then and he was denied c.o. status. But, they explain, he appealed the ruling against him, and the process dragged out so long that he became "too old" to be drafted.

How does that work? Sanders doesn't say when he received his draft notice to which he responded by claiming c.o. status as a "pacifist." But he had to receive draft notice, as otherwise there is no reason to file for c.o. status.

Sanders was born in 1941, and the draft age cutoff was "35," in the Vietnam era. He would not have been age 35 until 1976 – three years after all troops came home. So, the excuse that he was "too old" to be drafted by the time he was drafted appears as false as his "pacifist" claim.

Significantly, Sanders doesn't claim he had a college deferment. He graduated from college in 1964, when he was 23. In 1966, he married his first wife, "Honeymooning" in the Soviet Union. Both Jews, they lived in a kibbutz in Israel for a time. As far as is known, Sanders did not volunteer to serve in the kibbutz in Israel on condition that, as a pacifist, he would not fight to defend the kibbutz if it was was attacked, as many were, or if Israel was again invaded.

So, how is it that Sanders was young enough and healthy enough to volunteer to serve on a kibbutz in Israel and potentially have to defend it if attacked, but not young enough to volunteer for, or be drafted into, military service to defend his own country during the Vietnam War?

Many, many, Vietnam-era Americans were opposed to the Vietnam War. Many people drafted were opposed to that war—but they served when the country called, not being so arrogant as to believe that someone else should serve in their place because they disagreed with the particular war to which they were

called to serve.

Many others opposed to the war agreed to perform alternative service. Many fled the country, most heading to Socialist sanctuaries like Sweden. (One of former Democrat President Jimmy Carter's first acts was to issue an Executive Order granting all such draft dodgers them immunity from prosecution, regardless of the impact on those who did serve.) Others opposed to the Vietnam War went to jail rather than serve. Many simply lied to evade service.

The most well-known of those Vietnam War draft-dodgers proven beyond a reasonable doubt to have lied to avoid service when their draft number came up is, of course: Bill Jefferson ("BJ") Clinton, later Democrat President, sexual satyr and seducer of 21-year-old intern Monica Lewinsky in the Oval Office, and husband of Hillary Clinton, Sanders' Democrat opponent for the 2016 Democrat Nomination for President.

Regarding Hillary Clinton, as Bernie Sanders' acts claiming to be a "pacifist opposed to all war" in Vietnam to avoid the Draft should disqualify him, Hillary Clinton, too, should be disqualified as Commander-in-Chief by her actions, non-actions, and utter lies in the Benghazi, Libya, scandal. Indeed, the blood of the American Ambassador and three other Americans murdered in Benghazi by Islamic terrorists is on Hillary Clinton's hands, and the hands of Barack Obama. (See, e.g., "13 Hours In Benghazi: The Inside Account Of What Really Happened" by Mitchell Zuckoff and the members of the Annex Security Team who survived the Islamic terrorist attack of 9-11-2012, fighting terrorists for 13 hours waiting for help that never came due to Hillary and Obama. See also the movie based on the book, "13 Hours.")

Was Sanders one of those, like Bill Clinton, who lied his way out of service? Was Sanders really a "pacifist," who was "sincerely" opposed to all wars? Or was Sanders merely one of the many who opposed the Vietnam War, but not all wars, and

evaded service and caused others to serve in their place?

Sanders may have had a "sincere belief" that the Vietnam War was wrong, as did so many others. But opposition to a particular war does not give Sanders, or anyone else, a license to claim to be a "pacifist" opposed to all war – a claim of Sanders which was not believed then by Selective Service as other than phony – while another American was drafted to serve in his place.

If Sanders did what he did because of his opposition to the war, then he should have had the integrity to pay the price that his lifelong hero, Eugene Debs, Socialist and Pacifist, did. Debs went to jail, as did other socialists, communists, and pacifists in Debs' era in WWI.

Sanders did not declare his opposition to the Vietnam War, as Debs declared his opposition to WWI, and go to jail for refusal to serve in that war. Instead, he apparently lied, on a phony claim that he was a pacifist, opposed to all war. He had to claim to be a pacifist opposed to all war in order to try evade the Draft because, as far as is known, no court has ever found that "sincere" opposition to a particular war, rather than all war, provides a basis for conscientious objector status.

Why did Sanders do what he did? What are all the facts, including about the manifest fiction that he was "too old" to be drafted? Those are questions which he has not answered and which the media has neglected to probe, while advising and assuring Americans that Sanders is "authentic" in his claims. Really?

When Sanders' draft number came up and he lied his way out of service on a claim being a "pacifist opposed all war," was that "authentic"? When Sanders did what he did, the draft number of next American on the draft list came up. That American was drafted to serve in the Vietnam War because

“authentic” Bernie Sanders filed a phony claim of being a sincere “pacifist opposed to all war”? Did the draftee who served because Sander’s didn’t survive the war? Was he wounded? What was the impact on the life the person who was drafted because Sanders was not? How does this evidence “authenticity” in Bernie Sanders?

Seven per cent of Americans of Sanders’ generation served in Vietnam, whether or not they believed in the Vietnam War. Fifty-eight thousand of those Americans who served when called died. Several hundred thousand were wounded. As veterans say, “All gave some; some gave all.” Not Bernie Sanders, who lied his way out of service, and caused someone else to serve in his place. What is “authentic” about that?

Sanders today dodges questions about his draft-dodging in the Vietnam War on his claim of being a sincerely believing “pacifist” opposed to all war. Instead, he assures Americans that he is no longer a “pacifist” (“His thinking has evolved,” his campaign claims, without explanation.” Sanders, notwithstanding prior “pacifist” claims, now claims he is ready, willing, able to wage war if necessary as Commander-in-Chief, if elected in what he says is his “history making campaign” to become “the first Jewish President,” not to mention “first Socialist” and “first (allegedly former) pacifist” President. Is Sanders’ dodging of questions about his draft-dodging in Vietnam, his obviously false excuse that he became “too old” to be drafted as his c.o. appeal dragged on, evidence that Sanders is “authentic”? If so, an “authentic” what?

It must be asked: If Sanders’ claim of being a “sincere” pacifist in the Vietnam War was true, then how was he able to so easily betray and abandon his alleged “sincere belief” as a “pacifist opposed to all war”? If Sanders could betray his alleged “sincere” belief in pacifism, how is it that he can be trusted not to betray his “sincere” representations now that he is not a pacifist and will wage war, including all-out war,

if necessary, as Commander-in-Chief?

I respectfully propose that anyone who claims to a true "pacifist" in one war, is forever disqualified to be President and Commander-in-Chief.

This is especially true now, when we are at war with fanatical Islamic terrorism bent on conquering America, and the world, for Islamic rule under the Muslim Caliphate and Sharia Law. Islam is a religion, but it is also a political ideology, and that ideology is a form of totalitarian fascism. Islamofascism, because it is also a religion, is no less a totalitarian threat to American freedom today than was Adolph Hitler's National Socialist fascism in WWII. The Commander-in-Chief must be prepared to wage war against Islamic terrorists who are waging war on "the Great Satan," us, the United States, not appease it by pretending it is other than what it is and refusing to name it for what it is, i.e., Islamic terrorism. No pacifist can wage that war if necessary.

Therefore, anyone who evades military service by claiming to be a "pacifist" in one war should be disqualified to serve later as Commander-in-Chief. Period.

In sum, If any candidate's claim to be a "pacifist is true, then he or she must be disqualified because sincerely held pacifism means opposition to all war, and would prevent that candidate from taking the military action necessary to protect the American people as Commander-in-Chief, the chief duty of the President being the defense of America and Americans.

If a candidate's claim to be a "pacifist" in a former war turns out not to have been true but a dodge to evade military service, then that candidate should be disqualified to be Commander-in-Chief for lack of integrity and trustworthiness, a person capable of changing core principles like changing clothes, a liar about supposed core values.

Therefore, Bernie Sanders should be disqualified on either

ground. Further, Sanders' candidacy to be President and Commander-in-Chief is an insult to all who did serve in the Vietnam War era when called to defend American freedom.

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

March 31st – why a holiday for Cesar Chavez?

“I am convinced that the truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness, is to sacrifice for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men! ” –Cesar Chavez

March 31st, anniversary of the birth of Cesar Chavez in 1927 in Arizona, USA, is now observed as an official holiday in California and several states, and commemorations of various kinds are held in communities all across America. Why should he be so honored?

An irony is that in his lifetime, Cesar Chavez, leader of the United Farm Workers of America, shunned all personal publicity and celebrity. For Chavez, it was always about “La Causa,” the cause of justice for farm workers, who have always been excluded from the protections of the National Labor Relations Act and other statutory protections, although theirs is regarded as the most dangerous occupation in America.

Among other things, Cesar, at the height of national attention to the farm workers movement and his personal though unsought fame, refused offers in the millions for the rights to make a movie of his life. He refused similar offers to buy the right to write his authorized biography. The clos-est thing to an

authorized biography is "The Autobiography Of La Causa," by Jacques Levy. He didn't "buy" the right to write it; he earned it by working in the movement with Cesar for over a decade.

Although it was never about him and always about La Causa, Cesar Chavez deservedly became internationally renown as the moral heart of the American Labor Movement. He became an icon in the American Civil Rights Movement, too, before it lost all honor due to the black race-exploiting likes of Al Sharpton, Jesse Jackson, Louis Farrakan, and Jeremiah Wright, and others of their exclusionary black racist ilk, along with white, black, and 50 Shades Of Gray Progressive Liberals like Barack Obama in between infected with anti-American "we will transform America" totalitarianism."

Despite Chavez' own reality in his life of eschewing all personal aggrandizement, Liberals and Latinos have attempted to exploit his name and fame and "transform" Chavez into their own Progressive Liberal image, just as they desire to "transform" America into their own image. Lib-erals and Latinos have diligently exploited Chavez' life, name, and work, to claim an ownership of him by race , ethnicity, national origin, or ideology, and transform him from what he was into what they want him to be, and he wasn't.

They want him to be understood by Americans as like them. He wasn't. He was uniquely himself: He was an unabashed, unapologetic Christian, a devout Catholic attempting to live a life of faith in God and service to others, all out of love for Jesus Christ, his savior in a world of hurt, and injustice.

At his death, although Cesar was not a priest and held no office in the Catholic Church, then-Pope John Paul II, now a saint, issued a statement from the Vatican on Cesar's passing. Of all the many awards and honors he received, perhaps Cesar would have been most touched by the fact that in the U.S. Bishops Catholic Catechism For Adults, in the section on "Life

In Christ," the life which is used as exemplary is that of Cesar Chavez.

Almost as distasteful and repugnant to Progressive Liberals as is Chavez' essence as a Christian, is the fact that Chavez was an American veteran, a third-generation American, born in Arizona, who volunteered to serve in defense of his country, the United States, in the U.S. Navy in World War II. (I spell out "World War II" these days as I have learned that the modern generation of Americans have been taught so little about the history of America by liberals running government schools, that many don't know what "WWII" means anymore than they know what "WWI" means.)

An example of Liberals and Latinos transformation and exploitation of Chavez to celebrate and honor themselves by purporting to honor him arises in Portland, OR, the Principality Of Progressive Liberal Political Correctness, a "Sanctuary City" which spends several hundred thousand dollars a year extorted from taxpayer's to operated an an illegal aliens hiring hall, to undermine working conditions of American workers for work elitist Progressive Liberals have no need to compete.

Portland Progressive Liberals and race-baiting Oregon "Latinos" exploited Cesar Chavez' work and name to celebrate themselves by insisting that the name of historic 39th Street, a major thoroughfare running through the city, be changed to "Cesar Chavez Blvd."

They said it was to honor him. It was, in fact, to honor themselves as just so much more noble and good they are than the rest of us, because they are busy "honoring" him – but not, however, by bestirring themselves to drop their government or non-profit corporation jobs or college student status and go to California and work for justice in the fields with Chavez' United Farm Workers of America. That, in fact, is the only way in which he desired to be "honored."

Far from honoring Chavez, renaming 39th Street for Chavez is, in fact, an insult to Cesar Chavez. He never sought such personal publicity, especially in a city in which he had such minimal actual contact. Cesar did next to nothing in Portland. He had no real connection or relation to the city. He was used by Liberals to celebrate their politically-correct better-than-thou self-righteousness, and by resentful Latinos to poke other white people in the eye. (Latinos, after all, are but Caucasians who speak Spanish, the language of slavery in the Americas, Spain being the first leading slave-trading power in the world.)

I have no doubt, based on actually working with him including as one of his lawyers for more than twenty-years, until his death on April 23, 1993, that if Cesar had a choice, Cesar would have asked the name of 39th street not be changed to honor him, especially if he learned of the overwhelming opposition to re-naming 39th Street of the people who actually live there. They turned out by the thousands to be oppose it. But they were merely tolerated (given "1 min-ute" to express opposition), then ignored by the city's liberal rulers on the All-Liberal Portland City Commission. When the Oregonian newspaper finally thought it might be a good idea to find out what the Chavez family thought about re-naming 39th Street for him, Chavez' son, Paul, for the family, said: "I think my Dad would have said that there are a lot more important things to be doing than naming a street after him."

Indeed, especially cringe-worthy is the fact that self-righteous Liberals and resentful Latinos of Portland who have done nothing or next to nothing in the civil rights movement insisted on changing the name of 39th Street for Cesar Chavez – who had never been in Portland except for driving through it or giving an occasional speech – while ignoring such Oregonians who had actually resided on 39th Street as world-famous scientist, double Nobel Laureate Linus Pauling.

Renaming a street in Portland on which Linus Pauling lived to

allegedly honor Cesar Chavez who had no real contact with Portland, is as preposterous as would be East Los Angeles renaming a street on which Cesar Chavez lived to honor Linus Pauling. But one must not in Portland question the acts of totalitarian Liberals—their motives, after all, are “pure,” even if their acts appear to be naught but anally birthed political dross.

However, notwithstanding such Liberal and Latino distortion of Cesar Chavez’ own reality, Cesar was, in fact, a humble and faithful Christian living as best he could the theological and moral teachings of Jesus Christ, the latter of which Thomas Jefferson wrote were “the most sublime ever offered to humankind.”

Cesar Chavez was an American proud of his Mexican heritage but also proud to be an American. He was a man and leader who lived and preached racial inclusiveness not exclusiveness, and who, in the two decades I was with him, never identified anyone as a “Latino” or a “Hispanic” (from which derived the slur, “Spic”), and refused to use the term “La Raza,” expressly telling me that was because he believed it was racist. In the millions of words he spoke in fighting for justice in ‘La Causa,’ I don’t believe one will ever encounter the three words together: “Viva La Raza!” (Long Live The Race!)

Although often held out as a “Mexican-American Civil Rights Leader,” or just “Mexican,” Cesar himself did not identify himself as a civil rights leader. On the contrary, he consistently identified himself as a “union leader,” leading a union composed of all farm workers whatever their race, and not a “Mexican union,” “Chicano union,” or “Latino union.”

It should be remembered that the famous march that Cesar Chavez led from Indio, CA to the Mexican border in 1969 was not in protest against growers exploiting farm workers: It was to protest the federal government’s failure to secure the

border from illegal entry of Mexican who were used as strike breakers. Ten years later, in 1979, Cesar Chavez testified before Congress that the border had to be sealed as it was all but impossible to better farm workers' wages, hours, and working conditions when there is an endless supply of exploitable labor from Mexico through a porous border. He also cooperated with the the Border Patrol and INS (now ICE) to secure the border and keep out strike breakers and others undermining the effort to improve farm workers lives through the union.

Those who demand that the border be secured today are denounced as "bigots" and "racists" by Liberals when they are in fact making the same demands the Cesar Chavez made. Was he, too, a "racist"?

The essential reality of Cesar Chavez, untransformable no matter how much Progressive Liberal propaganda is pumped out that Chavez was really one of them, is that Cesar Chavez was a Christian living a life in Jesus Christ.

That is the man, the Christian man, who is and should be honored on each March 31 marking the anniversary of his birth because of his service to others through consciously attempting to live his life in Christ.

That is the man whose deeds as well as words brought dignity to so many who were without it. That is the Christian who "transformed" lives by the example of his own life in Christ. That Christian cannot be "transformed" now in death by Progressive Liberals feeding vulture-like on his life.

We Americans treasure freedom, which our Declaration of Independence declares is not given us by government but which God, our "Creator," endowed each of us with at conception. But the truth is that there is no dignity without freedom; and there is no real freedom without dignity. Cesar Chavez did many things for many millions of Americans in his lifetime, of

all races. But perhaps most importantly, by living a life in Jesus Christ and his teachings, Chavez brought dignity to those who had not known it.

Cesar did that not by rendering unto Caesar, but by rendering his life onto God – hour by hour, day by day, every day, to the best of his ability, in service to others. His faith and love in Jesus Christ informed his life, and made him what he was.

The quote of Cesar Chavez cited at the beginning of this tribute – “ I am convinced that the truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness, is to sacrifice for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men!” – is carved into the stone memorial to him at his gravesite at “La Paz,” the headquarter’s of the United Farm Workers of America in the Tehachapi Mountains, in Keene, CA, now a National Historic Memorial.

What Liberal would say those words of Cesar Chavez today? Which of those Progressive Liberals transforming Cesar into a clone of themselves would dare to say those words, referencing “God” and “manliness” and not be figuratively stoned by contemporary Progressive Liberal Democrats?

Cesar Chavez was in his own reality, not as transformed by those who would exploit his life for their own purposes, a great man, a Christian man, the lessons of whose life have inspired and influenced so many others’ lives, including my own.

Thus, in 2016, at a time when the 89th anniversary of his birth on March 31, 1927, is remembered and honored in various ways, I respectfully once again salute, honor, thank and remember him for the lessons he taught by the example of his inspiring life in Christ in service for others. Please take a moment, if you will, to read more of the tribute I wrote on

the 80th anniversary of his birth. “Lessons From The Life Of A Great American—Cesar Chavez.” [Link]

On Cesar Chavez Day, and every day, I will always walk in his shadow.

© 2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

On the GOP debate, and Muslim “hate”

I was asked to comment on “who won the GOP debate” on CNN on March 10, 2015. In short, I think the GOP candidates won, CNN lost – they could not provoke a dogfight.

But they definitely tried hard, especially by attempting to make themselves look “good,” as in “politically-correct-good,” and to make Donald Trump look bad by baiting him by asking whether, when he stated in an earlier interview that he believes that there is a problem of “hate” in Islam, he “meant all 1.6-billion muslims.” It was and is a loaded, cheap, “gotcha” question as asked. It is also utterly hypocritical in light of the media’s general reaction after 9-11: “Why do they [Muslims] hate us?”

To his credit, Trump did not cave-in politically-correctly and rabbit-like retreat from that which is manifestly evidence of “hate” among Muslims inspired by the doctrines of Islam, itself. Instead, he said we need to face it and investigate, not pretend it doesn’t exist, from Paris to San Bernardino, CA, and Islamic terrorism all across the world.

But here’s my question about CNN’s question, which is a

question embraced by other media, utterly hypocritically: After 9-11, CNN, and almost all major media were filled with stories on: "Why do they [Muslims] hate us?" So, why is it wrong to even raise the question of "hate" now?

That question, "Why do they [Muslims] hate us?" dominated the news after 9-11. No one questioned that it was "hate" we faced; the question was only (and pathetically): "Why do they hate us?"

In 2015, Donald Trump states what was obvious in 9-11: It is about "hate" of Islamics toward us. But the same media that acknowledged "hate" was a motivating factor of Islamic terrorists on 9-11 now paint Trump as some kind of awful anti-Muslim monster while they are ever-so-good in their political correctness, no matter that in 9-11 those same media acknowledged Muslim "hate" for America—and Americans.

Indeed, the evidence of hate in the act of the 9-11 Muslim terrorists could not be denied. That hateful act was celebrated by dancing in the streets by Muslims all over the world, and terrorist Osama bin Ladin was raised up as a Muslim messiah.

Media in America made pouty-faced "but we are innocent" postures expressed in multiple "Why do they (Muslims) hate us" articles and broadcasts. They didn't question that it was "hatred," only lamented that how and why could Muslims "hate us"? Articles even appeared that it was all our fault that Muslims hate us. Even those pathetic articles didn't deny Muslim hatred for us, but instead only argued that Muslim hatred was our fault.

After 9-11, I read the Koran cover-to-cover, without any prejudice but instead a desire to learn. I found very, very little in the Koran evidencing that Islam "is a religion of love and peace," but an awful lot of evidence, in the Koran itself, not only advising but commanding hatred for, and death

to non-believing “infidels,” in particular Jews and Christians, and even of one’s own father, mother, brother, sister, should they have an “infidel” friend. It is undeniable that the Koran commands that “infidels” have but three choices: (1) Convert to Islam. (2) Pay a special tax and live in a second (third, or fourth, etc.) class position in Muslim society. (3) Or die, be killed. Osama bin Ladin declared war on America based on those principles of the Koran, not ones he invented. If you doubt it, read the Koran yourself, and decide yourself.

I am not a Trumpeter, but there should be no doubt, on this issue Trump is right—the evidence of Islamic hate is in the hate-filled acts of terrorism by Muslims throughout the world, which Muslim leaders have the power to stop and refuse to stop, fearing to take effective action which would make themselves targets of Muslim hate and terrorism.

That objective evidence of hate cannot be denied by politically correct pieties of hypocrites in media and government. That hate, condoned and inspired by the Koran itself, represents an existential threat to America, and cannot be defeated by pretending it does not exist. It exists—and must be defeated.

2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Restore “Washington’s Birthday” holiday

Repeal Uniform Monday Holiday Act

February 22, 2016, is the 284th anniversary of the birth of

George Washington in 1732. He should be honored on his actual birthday: February 22, not another day for the three-day holiday convenience of alleged "public servants" in government employment. Nor should Washington be lumped in with other, less deserving presidents in a concocted "Presidents Day."

I believe George Washington, the "Father Of His [Our] Country," to be the greatest of all Americans. He set an enduring example of fidelity to God and Country. He should be known, remembered, and honored, by Americans of this and future generations, as he was by his contemporaries in the generation of the Founding Fathers at the genesis of America.

Therefore, I urge support for the proposition that the holiday now known as "Presidents Day," and observed on the third Monday of February, as a result of the "Uniform Monday Holiday Act" of 1971, be repealed, and the holiday known as "Washington's Birthday" honoring George Washington be reinstated and observed on February 22, the actual date of his birth.

In support, I submit for your consideration the following comments, annual February 22 of renown author and patriot William J. Federer on his www.AmericanMinute.com which provides information and evidence of who George Washington was, and what he believed, in Washington's own words, as well as international praise of him in his era.

George Washington was the most admired American by the Americans of the Founding Generation who created the free, democratic republic of America: "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen," as Washington was described by Revolutionary War hero Henry ("Light Horse Harry") Lee.

Washington set an enduring example by his conduct as Commanding General of the American Revolutionary Army in the War of Independence, 1776-1883, and in following years when he

was elected president of the Constitutional Convention and thereafter the First President of United States.

He set perhaps an even greater example by walking away from power and returning home to Virginia as a private citizen after his second term, refusing offers that he be president for life.

His act of humbly declining power as President and returning home stunned the world, in which the United States was then the only republic in a world of monarchs and potentates. He was hailed as a (then) modern "Cincinnatus," the Roman general who walked away from imperial power when Rome ruled the world. When others grasped for power—then and now—George Washington, singularly, relinquished power, setting an unprecedented example of duty, honor, country, first.

After his death on Dec. 14, 1799, George Washington was hailed in the western world as "the greatest man of his age." Even Napoleon, who had no small estimation of his own greatness, deferred to Washington, saying (on Feb. 9, 1800) : "This great man fought against tyranny; he established the liberty of his country. His memory will always be dear to the French people, as it will be to all freemen of the two worlds."

Americans once believed those words. George Washington was the first American to be honored with a federal holiday. "Washington's Birthday" was established by Act of Congress in 1879. The "Washington's Birthday" holiday was observed on the anniversary of Washington's birthday, February 22, until Congress, putting the care, comfort and convenience government employees first, adopted the "Uniform Monday Holiday Act," which became effective on Jan. 1, 1971.

That Act effectively subordinated remembrance of the example of George Washington's life, and maintaining or inculcating those virtues in the national character, especially of the young, and immigrants who would be Americans, for the higher

purpose of insuring that federal and other government employees will have nice three-day weekend holidays, while the rest of the country goes to work.

“Washington’s Birthday” holiday was in effect abolished from national consciousness in the 1980’s, when the the holiday was renamed “President’s Day,” submerging America’s greatest president, George Washington, into an undifferentiated mass of competent men and con men, the good, the bad, the ugly, the avaricious, meretricious, and salacious, who have managed, often by hook and crook, and lying through their teeth, to get themselves elected President.

For example of why Washington should not be lumped with others, excuse me for possible political incorrectness or insult to socialists, communists, Black Lies Matter adherents, or other haters of America seeking to take it over, in stating that in my opinion, it is a very long road from George Washington to Barack Hussein Obama, and all down hill.

Concisely stated: It is the singular, unprecedented virtues, character, and example of George Washington which ought to be remembered and honored singularly, on his actual birthday, February 22.

Therefore, let us Americans of this generation demand that Congress restore the “Washington’s Birthday Holiday to be observed on February 22, annually, the actual birth date of George Washington, no matter the lamentations of government bureaucrats and employees who may suffer the oppression of one less three-day weekend holiday.

2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Feb 15, 1973: American POWs come home—with honor!

February 15, 2016 is the 43rd anniversary of a shining moment in American history: It was on that day in 1973 that American prisoners of war came home from Vietnam with their honor intact, after suffering unspeakable torture, some for eight years, at the hands of North Vietnam led by dedicated Communist Ho Chi Minh.

It was day of great importance in 1973 in a divided America faced with war, and it is day to remember all these years later in a divided America; it is important for what it teaches about honor, duty, country, and who and what we are as Americans.

The Vietnam War had divided Americans as never before. It was and remains the first time in American history that veterans came home from war not to be honored for their service and sacrifice, but to be vilified, defamed as “war criminals,” told by their military commanders not to wear their uniforms in traveling home, many even spat upon as they arrived home at airports, train or bus stations.

Altogether, some 9,137,000 Americans would serve in the Vietnam War-era (1960-1975), constituting 9.7 percent of their generation. Some 2.6-million of them were deployed to Vietnam, of whom between 1-1.6-million either fought in combat, provided close support, or were at least fairly regularly exposed to enemy attack.” (www.VeteransHour.com, from which all statistics are taken.)

Fifty-Eight Thousand Two Hundred And Two (58,202) of those American veterans would give their lives in service to their country. Another 303,704 were wounded; 18% suffered “multiple amputations,” compared with 5.7% in WWII; amputation or

crippling wounds to the lower extremities were 300% higher than in WWII, and 70% higher than Korea.

Of the 58,202 who were killed, 61% were 21 or younger. 30.4% were draftees. 79% had a high school education or better (compared with 63% in Korea and 45% in WWII). 76% were of middle/working class grounds. 88.4% of those who actually served in Vietnam were Caucasian, including some 170,000 Hispanics, 3,070 of whom (5.2%) died. Blacks constituted 10.6% (275,000). 86.8% of the men who were killed in combat were Caucasian; 12.5% were Black (at a time when Blacks were 13.5% of the population).

A later survey of Vietnam veterans showed: 82% of those who saw heavy combat "strongly believe" the war was lost because of lack of political will, with which "nearly 75% of the public" – modernly – agrees it was a failure of political will, not of arms. 97% of Vietnam Era Veterans were honorably discharged. 91% of combat veterans are proud to have served their country. 66% of Vietnam Veterans "say they would serve again if called upon."

With the passage of time, reports VeteransHour.com, "87% of the public now holds Vietnam Veterans in high esteem."

If that is true, it most definitely was not true during the Vietnam War. Many Americans who never served, turned their opposition to the war into vilification of the Americans who were sent to fight it. Many of the more affluent fled to Canada or Sweden or elsewhere to avoid the draft. Some blatantly lied when their draft number came up causing another American to go in their place, most infamously perhaps in the documented case of the utter lies told by William Jefferson Clinton to be excused when his draft number came up. Clinton is the first draft dodger ever to be elected President of the United States—or to any office in House or Senate. Clinton remains today a darling icon of the modern progressive liberal Democrat Party, more popular, it is said, than the party's

titular head, Barack Hussein Obama, the only other president since WWII not to have served in the armed forces he would presume to lead as Commander-in-Chief.

Many others did not flee but stayed to aid and abet the North Vietnamese Communists at home, waiving the "Viet Cong" flag, making a hero of Communist torture-master Ho Chi Minh – chanting "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh, 'Uncle Ho' Is Going To Win!"—and vilifying the Americans who did serve when the country called.

These "anti-war" protestors, were mainly affluent, self-righteous, elitist, college "radicals," conscious aiders-and-abettors of the socialist/communist cause in Vietnam and at home. They were led by pampered celebrities symbolized by Jane Fonda, whose name should live forever in infamy; never-held-a-job self-proclaimed "revolutionary" college students like SDS leader Tom Hayden, "Mr. Jane, Fonda," later a Democrat Party politician in California; political opportunist John Kerry who, as a leader of the Vietnam Veterans of the War (VFW) charged "war crimes" by Americans without being able to produce any proof, and earned having his photo in a place of honor in the Communist's War Museum in Hanoi along with Fonda; and out-and-out domestic terrorists like "Weatherman" bombers Billy Ayers and Bernardine Dorn, who would later become the close associates of Barack Hussein Obama, who announced his first run for political office in Illinois in the living room of Ayers and Dorn.

Of the Americans who served, those who were the most despised, and vilified by Jane Fonda, Hayden, Kerry, et al., were the American prisoners of war, almost all American pilots, who resisted Communist demands that they betray America despite appalling, inhumane, torture, ordered and orchestrated by Ho Chi Minh right up to the day of his death.

There were 770 Americans taken prisoner of war. 113 of them died in Communist captivity. The Communists refused to

recognize them as Prisoners of War, and, instead, declared them to be "war criminals" and blatantly violated the Geneva Convention. In what became known by the POW's as the "Hanoi Hilton," and like prisons, the POWs were kept in filthy, windowless, vermin-infested airless cells only 9 feet long and 3 feet wide. Three feet.

Those seen as "ringleaders" of the resistance, like ranking officers of the resisters in what became known as the "Alcatraz Eleven," James Stockdale, who would later receive the Medal of Honor, and second in command Jeremiah Denton, would be locked in solitary confinement for over four long years, in which horrific torture was inflicted on them, and the other resisters.

The fact of that torture was not confirmed until 1966. Then, the Communists attempted to force Jeremiah Denton to participate in a propaganda broadcast to be filmed by a Japanese crew for international distribution. Instead, Denton not only did not say what the Communists wanted him to say, but he blinked his eyes as if he had an eye problem. He was in fact blinking in Morse Code: "T-O-R-T-U-R-E." Naval intelligence immediately understood what Denton was communicating. When the Communists later realized what Denton had done, they tortured him nearly to death, as he recounts in his now classic book on what POW's endured: "When Hell Was In Session." (WND Books)

However, Jane Fonda, Hayden, John Kerry, then lying to Congress about alleged war crimes as a member of the VVAW – without, as noted above, being able to produce any evidence to support his allegations – and their progressive liberal followers in the "anti-war movement" and the media, did not denounce the Communists' torture, they denounced the POW's as "liars," claiming their Communist allies under Uncle Ho Chi Minh were innocent of torture. Fonda, Hayden, Kerry, of course, lied.

Overwhelming post-war proof of torture beyond any reasonable doubt has given the lie to Fonda, Hayden, Kerry, et al, including books by many of the POWs. These include, the late Admiral Jeremiah Denton's classic "When Hell Was In Session;" "Surviving Hell," by Col. Leo Thorsness (USAF, ret.; Medal of Honor); "The Passing Of The Night," by the late Gen. Robinson Risner (USAF); "American Patriot," the biography of the late and legendary Col. Bud Day (USMC, WWII, Korea, Vietnam); "Chained Eagle," by Everett Alvarez, Jr., the first pilot shot down, a POW for eight years; and, among others, "Faith of my Fathers," by Sen. John McCain who refused an offer of early release by the Communists because his father was the Commanding Admiral, and suffered horrendous torture for his refusal. McCain, a true hero and recognized as such by his fellow POWs, was left permanently crippled in his arms by torture.

More recently, Author Alvin Townley has written a book magnificently telling the true story of the torture POW's endured in Vietnam, and what their families endured at home: "DEFIANT: The POWs Who Endured Vietnam's Most Infamous Prison; The Women Who Fought For Them, And The One Who Never Returned." It is highly praised by the surviving POWs themselves for being at once accurate, and extremely readable. Indeed, although loaded with documented facts, it reads like an adventure novel. It is a must read. (see, for more on "Defiant".)

The nation was and remained terribly divided over Vietnam. It was not until February, 1973, after POWs like Edward Alvarez, James Stockade, and Jeremiah Denton had endured almost eight years as tortured POWs, four years of which was in solitary confinement for Stockdale and Denton, and almost as long solitary confinement for others, including (now Texas Congressman) Sam Johnson, who was in solitary for over three years, that the breakthrough in peace talks came and Operation Homecoming began.

The first flight of emancipated POWs out of Vietnam to Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines was on Feb. 12, 1973, fittingly if coincidentally on the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

At Clark, the spokesman for the POWs, then-Captain Jeremiah Denton, in military uniform, stepped to the microphone, and spoke in short stroke a few simply stated words which began the stirring of the heart of a divided nation:

“We are honored to have had the opportunity to serve our country under difficult circumstances. We are profoundly grateful to our Commander-in-Chief and to our nation for this day. God Bless America.”

Then came that shining moment three days later on February 15, 1973, when Denton, Jim Mulligan, and the others of the first group of POW's landed at the Portsmouth Naval base in Virginia, back on American soil. Their wives and children rushed to embrace them, as, to the POWs surprise, a huge crowd Americans roared with cheers for them, waving flags, laughing, some weeping with joyful emotion, Americans at last embracing the Americans they sent to war, welcoming them home as all Vietnam veterans should have been welcomed.

Operation Homecoming began an operation of healing some of the division, some of the rancor, some of the hatred in the American atmosphere up to that time in the war. Parades, ceremonies, welcoming events were held in the hometowns of POWs and many other cities, America began to heal, and, for many, to repent of how Americans sent to war were treated on coming home.

“Vietnam had claimed more than 58,000 American lives—young men who would never walk off a plane to public fanfare. Many of their families would not experience the same outpouring of compassion that their POW/MIA counterparts received. More than 300,000 soldiers returned wounded, some disabled for life.

Others returned physically intact, but emotionally shattered. Many never received a welcome of any sort," author Alvin Townley wrote in "DEFIANT."

"More than 770 known Americans were captured during the Vietnam War, and they valiantly upheld those high standards we expect of our servicemen and they in turn expect of themselves; 113 POWs did not survive. Every man has a valuable story and his own unique perspective...To me, they are all heroes, although no more so than the men who fought the war in other places, under different sets of difficult circumstances. I will always remain in awe of what they endured and accomplished. I hope it inspires America like it continues to inspire me," Townley wrote, concluding: "Finally, to all our POWs and Vietnam veterans: GBU."

Many of the POW's are no longer with us, including Admiral James Stockdale, Admiral Jeremiah Denton, many others. But their example is.

The surviving POWs gathered together for a 40th Reunion at the President Richard Nixon Library in Yorba Linda, CA in 2013. It was taped, and is very moving. It is available at "Vietnam POW 40th Reunion News Coverage-You Tube;".

"Jeremiah" is a very important new documentary on Adm. Jeremiah Denton, and his family. It reveals "up close and personal" what the POWs and their wives and children went through in the long years of separation, never knowing for sure if their POW father was still alive, in what condition, or if he would ever come home. It is as moving as it is informative, showing what it takes by way of service and sacrifice to keep America free.

Who the Vietnam POWs who came home on February 15, 1973, are and what they did, the honor they brought to themselves and to our country, should be remembered on every February 15, if not every day. That is because who and what they are is who and

what we can be when we are at our very best as Americans.

May the God they served bless and keep them; may the country they served always honor, and never forget them.

2016 Rees Lloyd – All Rights Reserved

Rees Lloyd Archive 2010 – 2015

- [Pearl Harbor Survivor Remembers: A Day of Infamy](#), 12-7-15
- [Giving Thanks to Vets For Our Freedom](#), 11-29-15
- [Black Students Occupy Coons Hall at Liberal occidental College](#), 11-27-15
- [Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial Cross – Saved “As It Is, Where It Is”](#), 7-25-15
- [Memorial Day: Can Freedom Survive, If We Won’t Die For It?](#), 5-27-15
- [March 31st – Why A Holiday For Cesar Chavez?](#), 4-3-15
- [Feb. 22, George Washington’s Birthday – No Longer Honored](#), 2-23-15
- [Why no Focus on Black Female Supervising Cop in Garner Case: Equality?](#), 12-25-14
- [Pearl Harbor: A Survivor Remembers A Day Which Should Live in Infamy](#), 12-7-14
- [Veterans Day – Keeping Faith With America’s Veterans](#), 11-11-14
- [Elect Vets To Congress-It Makes A Difference](#), 10-31-14
- [Supreme Court Denies Expedited Review of Mt. Solidad Cross Case](#), 7-5-14
- [Flag Day 2014: Where Have All the Flags Gone?](#), 6-15-14

- [May 18: Tribute to Karol Wojtyla, Pope John Paul II, Greatest Man of Our ERA, 5-20-14](#)
- [Tribute to an American Hero: Admiral Jeremiah A. Denton, R.I.P., 4-1-14](#)
- [Will Animal "Civil Rights" Trump Human Rights?, 12-20-13](#)
- [Pearl Harbor: A Survivor Remembers A Day of Infamy, 12-6-13](#)
- [Black Racist "Knock-Out" Attacks Must End, 12-2-13](#)
- [Constitution Day"Sept. 17, 1787: Can it Survive in 2013?, 9-17-13](#)
- [Col. Bud Day: America Loses a Legendary Hero, 7-31-13](#)
- [D-Day: June 6, 1944, 6-7-13](#)
- [New Court Action, Legislation, In Mt. Soledad Cross Case, 5-18-13](#)
- [New Film: VA "Betrays" Homeless Vets, 5-14-13](#)
- [April 29, 1975: Vietnam War Infamy, 4-30-13](#)
- [End the Disgrace of Unprocessed Disability Claims of Veterans, 4-19-13](#)
- [Easter Sunrise Services at Mojave Veterans Memorial Cross, 3-30-13](#)
- [The American Legion: For God and Country, 3-15-13](#)
- [February 3: Four Chaplains Day, 2-3-13](#)
- [Liberators Arm, Totalitarians Disarm, the People, 1-15-13](#)
- [Vets Die Waiting for Obama VA Action, 12-29-12](#)
- [Pearl Harbor Day 2012: A Time to Remember and to Heal, 12-4-12](#)
- [Benghazi-Gate: A Disgrace To The Nation, 11-3-12](#)
- [Creating and Conserving Liberty: Constitution Day, 9-18-12](#)
- [San Bernardino County Supervisors Honor Those Who saved Mojave Cross, 8-25-12](#)
- [Remembering the Korean War and Those Who Fought, 6-25-12](#)
- [Obama's Queering of the Military, 6-22-12](#)
- [Flag Day 2012: Pass the Flag Amendment, 6-16-12](#)
- [Memorial Day 2012: Time to remember the price of freedom, 5-26-12](#)

- [California Legion Scandal: Convicted Child Molester Ordered Removed](#), 4-3-12
- [Convicted Child Molester Case in California Legion Youth Program Deepens](#), 3-25-12
- [Corruption, Convicted Child Molesters, In California Legion](#), 3-13-12
- [Portland Schools Anti-Military "Counter-Recruiter" Policy](#), 3-3-12
- [Restore "Washington's Birthday" Holiday](#), 2-25-12
- [Occupiers Occupy While Soldiers Die: Enough is Enough](#) 11-21-11
- [Supreme Court to Review Stolen Valor Case "Right to Lie"](#) 11-4-11
- [In the Hand of God: U.S. Constitution Day – Sept. 17, 1787](#), 9-20-11
- [Korea: Remembering the Forgotten War, Forgotten Warriors](#) 7-30-11
- [Government Bans "God" at VA Cemetery in Houston](#) 7-2-11
- [New navy Homosexual Love Boat to be Named for Cesar Chavez?](#) 5-21-11
- [Celebrate American National Day of Prayer, Not Mexican](#) 5-10-11
- [Remembering Cesar Chavez: Christian, American, Veteran](#) 4-2-11
- [Valor Stolen by Judge Alex Kozinsky: Proven Porno Pervert](#) 3-29-11
- [Will Ordinary Americans Fight For the Bill of Rights?](#) 12-30-10
- [Repeal the Homosexualization of the American Military](#) 12-28-10
- [Is it Time For an Official National Tea Party Day?](#) 12-18-10
- [Portland Oregon Progressives to Launch Almost-Free Breakfast For Themselves](#) 12-14-10
- [Why no Salute by Obama at Medal of Honor Ceremony?](#) 11-26-10
- [Anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address: A Milestone](#)

[of Liberty](#) 11-22-10

- [Ronald Reagan, Tea Party Patriots, and an Historic Election](#) 11-6-10
- [Repeal It, Repeal Them, Repeal Him](#) 11-2-10
- [Threats to Troops Opposed to Open Homosexuality](#) 10-15-10
- [Allegiance to Only One Flag and Nation](#) 9-20-10
- [Stolen Valor – Stolen Constitution](#) 8-29-10
- [American Freedom: Resistance or Abject Submission to Tyranny?](#) 7-7-10
- [New Developments Against ACLU to Save Veterans Memorials](#) 5-31-10
- [ACLU Defeated in Mojave Desert Veterans Memorial Cross Case](#), 5-5-10
- [Homosexuals, Liberals and Lawyers Attack Boy Scouts of America](#), 4-19-10