Kacer’s Call on Statewide Propositions
8 November 2022 California General Election

Notes:
1. Following the title, “(C)” indicates a State Constitution change; “(S)” a Statute change
2. All biblical citations rely upon the ESV translation
3. How do I analyze the Propositions? See my Guidelines at the end
4. Who is Frank Kacer? See short bio at the end

Prop 1: Proposed Constitutional Protection of all Abortion “Rights” (C) – Recommended Vote: NO

Content: This State Constitutional amendment would remove any restrictions on a woman’s decision to abort her pre-born child at any time for any or no reason during the pregnancy, and would prevent any restrictions from being implemented in the future without another Constitutional change placed before the voters and passed.

Consider: Abortion destroys a human life made in the image of God from conception (Gen 1:27; Psalm 139:13-16); a pre-born child is to be protected (Prov 21:12-13) and not destroyed no matter what the circumstances were of their conception. Taking of innocent life (Gen 9:6; Ex 20:13) is unjust and must be condemned. Only God has the right to decide when the life of a child may be taken away (Deut 32:39; 1 Sam 2:6).

Prop 26: Sports Betting and Expansion of Gambling Options on Tribal Lands (C/S) – Recommended Vote: NO

Content: This State Constitutional amendment legalizes sports betting at racetracks and at Indian gaming casinos (limits high school and college sporting events; age 21 and older, no targeted marketing towards minors), and legalizes Indian gaming offerings of roulette and dice games. Imposes a 10% tax on all racetrack sports wagering profits; applies 70% of tax revenues to the General Fund, and remaining tax revenues applied to gambling related health issues and enforcement.

Consider: Gambling promotion is not a legitimate role of government (Rom 13:1-6). The negative societal impact costs (addiction; mental health; broken families; increased incidence of vice crimes; etc.) of incentivizing more gambling outweighs any financial benefit the State will gain. The promotion of gambling encourages individual (and governmental) greed (1 Tim 6:10) and the chasing of “fantasies” (Prov 12:11) instead of personal contentment/responsibility (1 Tim 6:6). Increased Indian gaming options does not promote tribal self-sufficiency (Prov 28:6), but instead additional dependence on destructive behaviors with nothing of value produced.

Prop 27: Allows Online and Mobile Sports Wagering Outside Tribal Lands (C/S) – Recommended Vote: NO

Content: This State Constitutional amendment legalizes Internet and mobile device sports betting (excludes youth sporting events; age 21 and older). Betting services must be under the control of gaming tribes (directly or under contract), with those who bet being residents of California, betting only while in-state and not on tribal lands. Imposes licensing fees and 10% “surcharge” on sports betting revenues, with 85% of surcharge to address homelessness and mental health issues; 15% goes to non-gaming tribes (“Tribal Economic Development”).

Consider: Gambling promotion is not a legitimate role of government (Rom 13:1-6). The negative societal impact costs (addiction; mental health; broken families; etc.) of incentivizing more gambling outweighs any financial benefit the State will gain. The promotion of gambling encourages individual (and governmental) greed (1 Tim 6:10) and the chasing of “fantasies” (Prov 12:11) instead of personal contentment/responsibility (1 Tim 6:6). More Indian gaming options won’t promote self-sufficiency (Prov 28:6) but instead more dependence on destructive behaviors, with nothing of value produced. New funding would only replace existing State and local homeless/mental health budget so those budget funds can be used for other purposes: this is a bait and switch (Gen 29:15-27; Prov 20:14).

Prop 28: Assigns More Public School Funding for Arts & Music (S) – Recommended Vote: NO

Content: This statute would add additional funding of an amount equal to or greater than 1% of total State public education budget from the State’s General Fund and use for arts and music education (certified teachers, classified personnel, materials) in K-12 public and charter schools. Use for preschool students is ambiguous. Does not raise taxes or affect Prop 98 allocations. A higher proportion of funds is to be provided to schools with more disadvantaged students. Legislature authorized to appropriate more funds in excess of the 1%.

Consider: Will any funding amount ever be enough for public education (Prov 30:15a)? Taking funds from the General Fund reduces the funding available for other purposes and delays or removes responsible prioritization of available education funding (Luku 14:28: plan ahead). Use of separate source of funding allows existing arts & music budgeted funding to be used for other purposes: this is bait and switch (Gen 29:15-27; Prov 20:14).

Prop 29: Additional Regulations on Outpatient Kidney Dialysis Clinics (S) – Recommended Vote: NO

Content: Requires for-profit dialysis corporations (which treat 75% of CA dialysis patients) to have a full-time physician on each clinic site at all times, and if the clinic cannot provide a physician, provide a nurse practitioner or physician assistant if approved by the State. If a clinic must close: it must obtain written consent of the State yet still ensure patients have no interrupted access to care, or the clinic must prove good faith
efforts to sell, lease or transfer ownership to another entity that would provide dialysis care. Significant quarterly reporting requirements from each clinic must be precisely met or significant fines will be applied.

Consider: Requiring full-time physician presence at each clinic (without compelling health need) will substantially increase costs & create high risk of closures and decreased dialysis availability – putting lives unnecessarily at risk. Forcing large, unnecessary cost increases, yet requiring continued, uninterrupted availability is punitive treatment with intent to destroy (Ex 5:10-14; Luke 11:46; 1 Tim 5:18). Government is not to treat similarly situated businesses differently & pejoratively (Prov 11:1; 24:23). Also, significant financial penalties could be assessed against any clinic for any inaccuracy, intended or not, on any and all information required to be submitted quarterly. This an onerous burden (Deut 25:4) with penalties far exceeding what “justice” would require (Deut 25:13-16; Prov 11:1; 20:10,23). Also, statute “intent” implies there are existing major health safety issues with no evidence to back up the claims (Ex 23:1; Prov 24:28).

Prop 30: Increase Taxes to Reduce Air Pollution & Prevent Wildfires (S) – Recommended Vote: NO

Content: Would increase income tax rate on personal income above $2M by 1.75% (current rate is 13.3%). Revenue placed in Fund separate from State General Fund and not accessible for any other purposes. 80% of funds are for Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) infrastructure and ZEV affordability (grants, subsidies, rebates, incentives) with emphasis on low income & disadvantaged communities. 20% of funds are to reduce wildfire Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions with emphasis on hiring and training firefighters. Sunset provision applies after 2030 if 3 consecutive years of GHG’s are reduced by 80% from 1990 levels, or 2043, whichever occurs first.

Consider: Massive subsidies (and giveaways) for purchase of ZEVs and infrastructure: de-incentivizes industry production of affordable ZEVs & charging stations, and ignores impacts on the grid, environmental recycling issues, decreased fuel tax base, and de-incentivizes good stewardship (Prov 16:26; 17:18). Without compelling analysis this is chasing fantasies (Prov 14:12,15; 28:19). Fire prevention is a core government health and safety issue (Rom 13:3-4); existing funding must be prioritized and not require higher taxes. Non-suppplantation requirement (can’t replace existing budget allocation) has no credible method to verify & enforce allocation from budget cycle to budget cycle.

Prop 31: Should State Law Banning Flavored Tobacco Products take Effect? (S) – Recommended Vote: NO

Content: This is a Veto referendum on SB 793, passed by the California legislature in Aug. 2020. SB 793 would ban flavored tobacco products and tobacco product flavor enhancers statewide with exceptions for hookah, loose leaf and premium cigar tobaccos. A YES vote would allow SB 793 to take effect and ban these tobacco products (with a few exceptions) from all adult customers.

Consider: SB 793 is promoted as protection for minors; however, State law already makes it illegal to sell or give any tobacco and vapor products to those under 21. Expanding government control over personal behaviors (even if unhealthy) is not a core role of government (Rom 13:4-5). Also, this Proposition puts two undesirable activities against each other: overreach of government controlling adult use of flavored tobacco products, & a tobacco industry with vested interest to indirectly entice youth to use tobacco. Promotion of Prop as needed to protect minors is deceptive (Ex 20:16 (lying)), real intent is to reduce adult freedom of choice, a “bait and switch” technique (Prov 20:14).

General Guidelines I Follow in Analyzing Propositions:

- Do: First read Title & Summary, then proposed legal text, then Legislative Analyst analysis; then arguments for and against
- Do: Ask yourself if this is a proper role of government biblically
- Do: Determine what general principles apply (biblical, conservative, practical)
- Do: Ask yourself if this is the right thing to do, who benefits, and what consequences will result
- Do: Apply common sense; come to a tentative conclusion – compare to positions of those you trust
- Do: Concentrate on the major implications and not on trivial aspects to make a decision
- Don’t: Rely on recommendations of organizations by name only (many sound good but can be deceptively misleading)
- Don’t: Wait until the last day to do your research (spread it out over time)
- Don’t: Support government going into future debt (there are only very rare exceptions to this)
- Don’t: Allow rare circumstances or emotional arguments to overly influence you (“rare cases make bad law”)
- Don’t: Support anything that’s too complex to completely understand (could be purposeful obfuscation)
- Don’t: Accept a lot of bad legislation for the sake of a small amount of good, “worthwhile” legislation

Who is Frank Kacer?

Frank has been married to Lynn for 49 years and has three married children and five grandchildren. He has served as a pastor/elder at Grace Bible Church since 1990 and is now pastor/elder emeritus. Professionally, Frank was a physicist in the Department of Defense Intelligence Community for over 35 years and was also a senior systems engineer with SAIC for 12 years. As a Christian worldview political activist, Frank has engaged in grass-roots political activism, candidate recruitment and assessment, precinct operations, and formal political party representation both locally and with state conventions. He has also served for seven years on the Board of Directors for the National Center for Law and Policy and currently serves as the Director of Research, Content and Curriculum for Well Versed ministries. As Founder and Executive Director of the Christian Citizenship Council (C3), Frank has published his “Kacer’s Call” biblical perspective on every California statewide Proposition since 2002. His most recent book is “65 Wisdom Principles for Christian Political Activists.”

To contact Frank by email, use: frankkacer@hotmail.com

Proposition analysis will be posted at: http://christiancitizenshipcouncil.blogspot.com/ after 15 September, 2022