Jerry Scheidbach Page 1 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

Segment.01 Hello. I'm Jerry Scheidbach, pastor at the Lighthouse, and your brain masseur—get ready for your brain massage. (Had to take a short trip to visit a dear, lifelong friend in Kansas who lost his wife (suddenly, an aneurism) — I was unable to post my show on Friday in time for the radio broadcast, but decided to go ahead and post for the podcast audience. So, from 32,000 feet—) [TRUTH]

Cruz announced Carly as his VP-pick — Isaiah 3:12 "As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." Too bad!

It's disappointing—It does not dissuade me from supporting for Cruz. God has had His Deborahs, Goldas, and Thatchers—just a little hard for see Carly in that company.

Ah ha — so you *are* one of those chauvinist pigs—I knew it! (HAHA—as the kids would say, LOL)

Well, actually, the term chauvinism applies much better to Trump supporters! (hahahaha).

Let's look at this word, and then you'll understand why I say it applies much more aptly to Trump supporters than it does to anyone who has a problem with Carly as VP.

Originally, the word came from a fictional character in a post Bonaparte vaudeville play called *La Cocarde Tricolore*, whose name was Nicholas Chauvin (chauvee—no, it's Show'-vaghn - very soft on the ending). Chauvin was a popular name in that period, a derivative of Calvin — as the theologian John Calvin. Anyway, the cocarde tricolore was the red, blue, and white cloth badge, or patch, worn by French Revolutionaries. In this vaudeville play,

Jerry Scheidbach Page 2 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

Chauvin was depicted making grotesque and threatening displays of his attachment to Napoleon I in 1815.

He became a caricature representing the excessive devotion Napoleon inspired in some followers—blind, and absurd, to the point of obsession; and over time it came to be used for vainglorious or exaggerated patriotism.

Webster explains it refers to someone who is wildly extravagant, fretful, silly, and childish in his devotion, so that if someone expresses even a doubt concerning their hero they resent it as an insult.

It was not until much later that the word came to be used broadly for anyone "displaying excessive or prejudiced loyalty or support for a particular cause, group, or gender," and then, only during the bra burning 60s did it come to be used almost exclusively for someone that holds to the stereotypical male and female roles of traditional American culture—which are reflective of biblical ideas of these roles

Pay close attention here — the word depicts exaggerated, outlandish, silly, absurd, obsessive, devotion to a cause, or a gender, or some personality.

In other words, as Webster points out, "To have a generous belief in the greatness of one's country is not chauvinism." Nor would it be chauvinism to have a faith-based commitment to biblical definitions of male and female distinctions—however, a wild, exaggerated, silly, and childish commitment to a cause, like the bra burning 60s chics and today's radical homosexual marriage promoting, or gender blurring, and race baiting Sharp-tongues—not that there are not differences between these groups—and including those who go wild in anger and rage against someone

Jerry Scheidbach Page 3 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

who holds traditional views on these things—oh yeah—that is the sort of thing the word chauvinism was created to describe.

Someone who calls himself or herself a conservative but blindly follows Trump even though he is clearly not a conservative—that's not chauvinism. But those whose eyes bulge, veins swell, forehead reddens, jowls throb, teeth grind, and fists clinch, and screech threats against anyone who criticizes Donnie —yep, Chauvinisme — what's with these characters. Do they think he is going to give them some of his money? Haha! I think some have actually put their fist into their car radios while listening to my show—these are chauvinists.

It's certainly not because they are that passionate about national health care. Maybe they are rooting for him to use eminent domain to take away the propertie of the Aristos and give it to le people.

I certainly hope the GOP does not allow this phony to steal the nomination from the conservatives in the party. I'll discuss the importance of the GOP rules in the second segment.

Laura Inghram thinks we are being foolish to keep pointing out that Trump is not a conservative—are you ready for the reason? Here it is — it's because so many conservatives obviously don't think so because they are voting for him. There you go! Not because his policies are conservative—but because conservatives are voting for him. Isn't that insightful? What a brilliant and insightful analysis of what's going on with Trump. I think Laura is confusing conservatives with Republicans—wow, is she ever behind the curve on this one. She does not know that the conservatives in the party reject him? Oh, you say the establishment RINOs reject him too — well, then, there you go, once again, overwhelmed by such depth of insight—if the RINOs

Jerry Scheidbach Page 4 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

reject him, then he must be conservative—unbelievable! Really? You are serious? Okay! The enemy of your enemy could still very well be your enemy. It's possible for group A to oppose a candidate and group B to oppose the same candidate without making Group A friends of group B.

Okay, let's see, Russia can work to destroy America and China can work to destroy America while at the same time they work to destroy each other.

But Laura thinks that if Republicans in liberal states like Maryland vote for Trump that shows conservatives like Trump—you've got to be kidding me.

It's like the thing where we define someone by who hates them. In other words, all the right people hate Trump, so that means I don't need to bother looking at his record, or statements, and so forth — and I've done this too, by the way. Oh, sure—I've pointed out that "all the right people oppose this or that person or policy" and to a point there is some validity in that. I mean, I do think it means something that Trump has said he is friends with Hillary and Bill—

If there is a difference, it's that I would never let that be the controlling criterion—it might be a supporting observation—but I would never do what Laura did here—saying Trump must be conservative evidently a lot of conservatives think so. Well, Laura is sharp, I can't believe she — here is what I think is happening there — she actually does not have a problem with Trump's views, I mean not particularly—Trump would be a totally acceptable alternative to Hillary, and those policies that disturb me simply don't disturb Laura, and some of the others—

Jerry Scheidbach Page 5 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

And I'm talking about solid concerns: national health care, abuse of eminent domain, and what's with the two faced, double speak on Israel coming from Trump lately — I thought you guys despised that sort of political double-speak.

It's so weird! There is definitely a spiritual component to this, something I'll get to in a bit. But Trump recently called a private/public meeting in which he came out strong in support of Israel—but he has consistently talked about neutrality—right along—so much so some have expressed concern he is just like Obama regarding Israel — so now he comes out with a speech saying all the things we are accustomed to hear from leaders who unequivocally support Israel — as our only real ally in the region, the only really free republic in the Middle East, and so on, so which Trump do we trust? Trump is the GOP version of Obama.

You have in Trump every single one of the traits of insider, establishment politicians that we all despise—along with some very un-Republican policy positions, all the way over to liberal policies (National Health Care)—but he does not "sound" like an establishment politician. Cruz has every one of the characteristics and policies we identify as anti-establishment and PRO CONSTITUTION — but he "sounds" like an establishment politician.

But all the "right" people hate Trump—there it is, proof positive he is one of us. The same people what hate Trump hate us so that makes Trump one of us? Wow! Why won't these characters (and I mean Laura, Hannity) look at his record and pay attention to what he is saying? A CHILD is known by his DOINGS, and a heart is revealed by the words that come from it—LISTEN and WATCH!

Jerry Scheidbach Page 6 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

Trump is negotiating a deal and the hand he is playing right now is carefully constructed to win the Republican nomination—but just like Obama (Trump is the GOP version of Obama—people are emotionally dedicated to him for what he represents to them, not for what he believes—and if his supporters are actually so committed to his approach to the illegal immigration issue so they are willing to overlook his obviously liberal policies in other areas, then this problem has gotten worse than even I thought it was—we really have descended into a rabid racism—because Cruz has all the same answers to the problem only he does not take the angry tone Donnie does—that tells me Trump's supporters are simply mad at illegal immigrants and want to punish them, rather than simply deal with the problem with a cool head).

Bu Trump is sending out subtle signals that he will pivot after the nomination—he is already signaling a back away from the pro-life plank in the GOP platform (which does not surprise me at all), he is signaling a libertarian view on social issues like the bathroom deal (so keep in mind if you are visiting the Trump (Nimrod) Towers that if Brucey is walking about, your wife might prefer to go, uh, elsewhere)—so he is not particularly friendly with us on the homosexual agenda issues—but he is being careful not to go too far—too quickly, he is planting his foot in preparation for the pivot you are going to see him make if he does succeed at stealing the Republican nomination from what might be our last best opportunity to get a Constitutional conservative in the White House.

So Boehner comes out and calls Cruz "Lucifer in the flesh." And says he will only get the nomination "over his dead body." And Boehner is about as inside-establishment as they come, and has been known to prematurely spill the beans on insider sentiment

Jerry Scheidbach Page 7 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

before — actually reveals what I've been saying all along — the one they really fear is Cruz — I think this whole thing has been a ruse to stop Cruz — and frankly, if that is true, it is one of the most masterful political plays of the century—but GOD is greater than all of this—and at the end of the day, we know "He gives the kingdom to whomever He wills" and "according to His pleasure."

That does not mean whoever gets the job ought to have it—or that whoever gets the job is the one God would choose—Hosea 8:4; Deuteronomy 17:15-17.

No! It means that God will search the hearts of His own people, and if they humble themselves and pray and seek His face, and turn from their wicked ways, then HE will hear from heaven, forgive their sin and HEAL THEIR LAND.

Okay, gotta close the first segment.

I don't know of one poll that has Trump winning against Hillary — and I'm not sure that Trump cares. Listen, I can see it now! Trump gets the nomination, Hillary wins, and Trump says something like, "I think Hillary will make a fine President" — and maybe joke that, you know, I like to win, and it was a good race, but really, I've always liked Hillary and Bill.

And if he wins, I think secretly that'll be fine with the establishment Republicans—the Gophers will breath a sigh of relief. They don't want to deal with Cruz—they would much rather deal with the guy to whom they already owe so much and understand, and with whom they have been in bed for years.

For example, Boehner will vote for Trump—of course he would—but never Cruz. He said he and Trump play golf together — and no doubt, Boehner took a lot of money from Trump too — so, you

Jerry Scheidbach Page 8 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

know how it is — you play some golf, you know, enjoy the "greens," and then Trump slides some "green" of another kind across the politician's palm — it's all very nice, it's all very friendly, very nice—as Trump would say—I get along with everybody.

Hold on through the break. I'll be right back!

Segment.02 Hello. Welcome back! I'm Jerry Scheidbach, pastor at the Lighthouse, your brain masseur, and Paul Revere's lantern lighter, lighting the lamps in the church belfry arch, signaling the enemy is on the march, an enemy that would steal from us our liberty.

I've been saying right along that Trump is an insider, he is a player, he is everything his supporters have declared they hate in politics today — his core values are liberal — by the way, at this point it's really not about trying to convert Trump supporters, I'm just going on record—now I draw some criticism for not speaking to Cruz's negatives—and I think there is some merit to that criticism. But it's not because I don't believe there are any—it's just that right now all my fire power is directed at doing what I can to wake people up and get them to SEE Trump before it's too late, and we miss the best and perhaps the last opportunity we'll ever have to get a Constitutional conservative in the White House.

But, I must say, it looks like Cruz has a little bit of the politically correct thing going on—a bit of the political gamesmanship we've come to resent in politicians? Cruz's pick is I think sad evidence that his worldview, in many ways instructed by the Word of God, has been influenced by the world in which he is immersed — and I'll get to that in a moment.

Jerry Scheidbach Page 9 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

So I think picking Carly is not a winning move for conservatives—but it's not because she is a woman. God has used women in important roles in the Bible — Deborah is the most well known example. And we've seen some very capable women politicians—such as Golda Meyer and Margaret Thatcher. I do believe it is evidence of judgment when "women rule" over us and that in general, it's a very bad idea—for reasons I've addressed very thoroughly in earlier shows.

I don't believe the office of the President is the right role for a woman—although I can think of many women who would make a far better President that the one we have in the White House right now (ever seen how that guy rides a bike? Haha)

I don't think trench warfare is the place for women, I don't think it fits with the whole "women and children first" value that grows out of natural reason, not to mention biblical world-view issues.

It's instinctive for women to protect their young, and support their men, and it's instinctive in men to protect their women and children—

But, actually, that is a different discussion—but I do wonder if Obama's girls will ever be drafted into military service or see front line action. But back to the main point!

The reason Carly is a bad pick is that she is a weak candidate. I guess she could be a counterpoint to Hillary—but I think Hillary is going to drag her into a catfight and she will become a huge distraction from real issues that need to be addressed. The media are going to headline it Carly vs Hillary — and Cruz will once again be in a position of laboring in the background of meaningless drama trying get his message front and center stage.

Jerry Scheidbach Page 10 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

Maybe I'm wrong.

I get the concern! The Cruz team doesn't want the media to spin the upcoming contest as a men vs women thing — and cast Hillary as a victim being ganged up on by a couple of men.

But it's simple enough to steer clear of that. Simply focus like a laser beam on the issues that contrast conservatives and liberals.

The election needs to be a referendum on whether America wants socialism or conservatism.

But, now, to all my Christian conservative listeners who are disappointed that Cruz chose Carly for VP —

The fact is, when a nation loses Heaven's favored nation status, God turns it over to the oppression of tyrants.

One of the evidences that a culture is moving away from God's order is when women begin taking positions of rule over the land. Isaiah 3:2 is very clear on this.

I Corinthians 11:1-4 is very clear on this. God is the head of Christ, Christ is the head of man, and man is the head of women.

I know most people in America reject that these days. I'm aware of that. I am keenly aware that the gender distinctions ordained by our Creator, evidenced in creation, and defined in the Bible by the Creator are rejected by most Americans today—and that includes most of those who call themselves Christians, by the way.

The stereotypical gender roles reflected in the family order of, say, the fifties, is ridiculed, scoffed, and even resented as oppressive—when the exact opposite is true. Our God denying culture is purposely generating ever-increasing pressure on the natural order, pressing men and women into roles for which they were not

Jerry Scheidbach Page 11 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

designed by the Creator, breaking down the natural infrastructure that God designed to support a social order that protects and provides for family, church, and government—in short, the divinely appointed institutions designed to cultivate and protect a social order that encourages and protects the rearing of children in the nurture and admonition of God, their creator.

The farther our society moves away from the divinely ordained model the more you see children reared without the benefit of both mother and father, causing more and more children to be angry, and socially alienated, vulnerable to being manipulated into service to those who want to enslave humanity—to the Nimrods and their Towers.

I think Cruz could have picked a better running mate. Carly was here in California trying to unseat Boxer when Boxer was most vulnerable, and Carly lost handily; and I think it's because she did not present a sufficiently clear message of distinction from Boxer. She tried to sell herself as Boxer lite — or as a GOP alternative to Boxer she hoped would sell because people were so angry at Democrats then. Once again, the GOPers in CA tried to get the conservative Republicans in California to go along with their conviction that the only way to win in California is to be a Donkey with an elephant's nose. But a good many of us said no! We are conservatives first, and Republicans second. Quit trying to pin an elephant's tail on the Donkey.

Okay—as for the idea that Cruz is trying to steal the nomination with the GOP rulebook.

The system of electing delegates to choose a nominee is a good system. In fact, more than once, it has protected the party from ending up with a demagogue candidate. Abraham Lincoln was

Jerry Scheidbach Page 12 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

nominated in I think the third vote—he did not win sufficient delegates in the process to win, and in fact, his opponent had more delegates going into the convention—there are other examples.

The rule is if you don't get 50% plus one of the votes, you don't win the nomination—in that case, it goes to what is called the second ballot, and this continues until some candidate receives 50% plus one. And the rule is a good one, especially in the case before us in this primary.

Think about how unfair it would be for Trump to get the nomination only because he had the most delegates going into the convention.

First, at the start of the primary process, there were at least five candidates dividing up the conservative vote. Trump consistently only received 30-35% of the GOP vote, and that included a large number of crossover dems—many of whom we know are liberal in their political persuasion, not conservative.

So there is a legitimate question whether he would have won so many delegates as he did if it had been between only two candidates.

In other words, many, and it seems likely most, of those who voted for Rubio, or Carson, or Carly, or ... and so on ... would very likely have cast their vote for Cruz if they had the opportunity now, and if it's simply handed to Trump, those voters will be totally disenfranchised — their vote was virtually wasted — but these rules allow a possible correction for this.

Second, consider how unfair it would be to the candidates if the GOP changed the rules after they have spent so much time, energy and money campaigning within the present rules — in truth, they

Jerry Scheidbach Page 13 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

actually have the right to do exactly that. However, it would be difficult since any rules change that would hurt either Trump or Cruz would not likely pass because the rules committee is chosen from the delegates, and between these men and each one has enough support to stop any rules change they don't like. Even so, a rules change the decidedly favored one or another candidate would be considered foul play and would create even more havoc than we already have.

Finally, and actually this is the most important of all reasons not to tamper with the rules or with the delegate system is the rationale coming from the Trump side for doing so. The rule is the candidate must get 50% plus one of the delegates through the nominating process—but Trump's supporters want to change it to whoever gets the most delegates wins. I've mentioned the problems this creates, especially in the current environment. However, listen to Trump howl about it not being *democratic*. The prevailing sense out there seems to be that we are a Democracy — but we are not, and there are good reasons that we are not. America is a Representative Republic. We are a nation governed by laws and not by men. Men govern under our laws that are appointed to govern according to our laws. The reason we want government by laws and not by men is that public sentiment can be swayed to surge in very bad directions at times — a la Germany under the Third Reich.

Majority rule was despised by our founders and we should want a check on majority rule in the same way we want a check and balance on the Executive, the Legislative and the Judicial branches—right? We want checks and balances — we don't want any branch of government to take over the whole government, we want checks and balances. Some of you say you have heard all your life that the majority rules — well, whoever is telling you that

Jerry Scheidbach Page 14 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

has been lying to you. We are a government organized around a system of CHECKS and BALANCES. You might remember that one. Checks and balances, checks and balances, checks and balances — anyone remember that expression?

Well, what about a check on majority rule? Remember the Salem witch trials? That was a case where the majority went crazy — it took some preachers to come into town and straighten out that ridiculous mess—that's right. I think it was a Congregationalist pastor who was called in to reason with the crowd and get that nonsense stopped. But, mobs that gather and take someone suspected of a crime and hang 'em — that's not how we do things here—but that's where you are headed.

We don't want any group to have enough power to trample down the rights of any minority group.

It would be unfair for the GOP to change the rules—it would be unfair to the candidates who have labored, and spent time, energy and money and laid out their strategy within the rules that were in place when they entered the race. It would be unfair to the millions of voters who will have wasted their vote on Carly, Rubio, Carson, and several others too—it all adds up! It would be unfair to the conservatives in the party who see Trump as a pretender, who believe him when he says he is liberal when it comes to health care, who believed him when he said he thought the economy does better under Democrats, who believed him when he said he thinks the government should take over private business at times—it would be unfair to the conservatives who make up roughly 60% of the party to lose the nomination to a candidate who only appeals to about 1/3 of the party.

Jerry Scheidbach Page 15 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

Sometimes issues are not so clear as this one—but this one is very, very clear. There is no way a rules change that allows Trump to take the nomination with a simple majority of delegates that he was able to put together only because certain rules allowed it to happen. Rules like, once a member of the party has voted, if their candidate later falls out of the race, they can't reassign their vote. That's a rule that greatly favored Trump. So, how about we change that rule—in truth, that would be the most fair thing to do, if it were practical—re do all the primaries now with only Trump and Cruz on the ticket and let's see who wins the most delegates.

After all I've seen, I think it would be a lot closer than I would have thought when all this began. I'm being taken to school here along with many others — I had no clue that guys like Hannity, and ladies like Laura would close their eyes to the obvious liberal inclinations in Trump and not get 100% behind Cruz, like "the great one" Levin, has done.

I know the wrath of the Trumpsters—believe me, I'm feeling it; they are vicious and vindictive and they will make you pay for talking bad about their little boy. All Trump has to do is pout a little, and these Trumpsters all rally around him like the chauvinists that they are.

Some of these characters would be perfect casting choices for a replay of the French play *Cocarde Tricolore*, in the role of Chauvin (Show-vaughn).

I have lit the lamps in the Church belfry arch and now you let me know if you see them. You say LIGHTS ON if you see the LIGHTS ARE ON and you will ride like Revere and spread the warning, (essentially, it means you agree with what I'm saying) or you say LIGHTS ARE OFF — which means you reject what I'm

Jerry Scheidbach Page 16 Last Opened: 5/10/16

Air Date: 04-30-16

saying and disagree strongly with me. So, what will it be today, lights on, or lights off?

Call 1-888-770-8000, that's 1-888-770-8000 and leave a message on our listener response hotline. For those who prefer it, you can email me by going to our web site at thebrainmassageshow.com. That's thebrainmassageshow.com.

God bless you. God save America! I'll see you in Church.