

# CBDC's: Death to Liberty

The Iowa legislature had an unexpected surprise last session. It was found in a normally routine noncontroversial bill the legislature usually passes each year with updates for the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC).

The “detective” who found this disturbing surprise in our UCC bill was State Rep. Charley Thomson of Charles City. He saw that it was laying the foundation for the rollout of Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) in Iowa by changing the definition of “money”. He immediately put out the alert and the bill was stopped. That was good.

Upon investigation, Rep. Thomson discovered that this UCC update bill had been passed in South Dakota and no one in the legislature had discovered this issue. But by the time it came to Gov. Kristi Noem’s desk for signature, the troubling change was discovered and so Gov. Noem vetoed the bill saying it would infringe on freedom in digital currency. She is right.

It turns out that this UCC update bill had been introduced in over 20 states last legislative session and likely to be introduced in all 50 states.

The Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) was first released in 1952 and generally helps standardize existing commercial and business transactions across the country. It traditionally makes uniform the business practices across all 50 states, thus allowing smooth transactions between states. This is after a normally deliberate and thoughtful process is used to flesh out the best commercial practices.

What the change in this UCC bill did was to adopt a new definition of “money”. It would specifically exclude cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin and other digital assets, which are decentralized and outside of government control. This would mean it would become more difficult, if not impossible, to use cryptocurrency as money. Gov. Noem was concerned this would limit freedom of businesses.

The new definition also included Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDC's) as money. The governor expressed concern that the federal government could easily adopt a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC), and it could become the only viable digital currency in the future. This would mean non-

governmental digital currencies would not be considered “money” and only governmental digital currencies would be considered “money”. She felt this would open the door to a massive overreach by the federal government.

To be clear: The proposed concerning change in the UCC bill does not establish a digital currency, nor does it require it to be created or established. However, it is setting the framework in place should the federal government ever implement a CBDC. This should not happen.

Currently, governmental electronic or digital currency does not exist and is not in use in the U.S. today. However, the Federal Reserve is currently developing a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC). The push for a CBDC comes from President Biden’s Executive Order 14067 issued in March of 2022: “Executive Order on Ensuring Responsible Development of Digital Assets”. The executive order says that the new digital currency would be used to promote “human rights; financial inclusion and equity; and energy demand and climate change”.

One aspect of CBDC’s the reader should understand is that they can be made “programmable”. This means that how you spend your money can be tracked. If every dollar you spend can be tracked and monitored, then it can also be controlled and used by the government to control your activities. This would be a tremendous loss of privacy and a practical death knell to liberty, plus the government could conceivably control how you spend your money by prohibiting or limiting transactions.

Under a digital currency, cash would soon be eliminated. You wouldn’t be able to go to the bank and take out your money in physical cash like you can today because the money is digital. The government would, in effect, become your bank.

Food stamp cards already work this way. There is a certain amount in a user’s account but they are prevented from spending these funds on items and services the government prohibits. This is understandable in this instance as the government must be responsible for how taxpayer dollars are being spent. However, CBDC’s are not taxpayer dollars; they would be your dollars.

Various versions of this system are already in place in some nations, such as Communist China. Their CBDC is known as the digital yuan. To make the transition to the digital yuan, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP)

incentivized its citizens to adopt its CBDC. They gave “digital money” for free or in exchange for CCP-approved behavior. Now the CCP enforces its will on citizens’ budgets, earmarking funds for food, health care, transportation and other things. If the citizen runs out of the funds that have been earmarked for those purposes, the citizen must wait until more is “deposited” for that purpose, even if he has other funds available and earmarked for something else. If a Chinese citizen obeys and publicly praises the CCP, the citizen is given extra money, low interest rates, and the freedom to spend largely as they wish. But if a Chinese citizen questions CCP policies, if the CCP doesn’t like what he’s been buying, or he associates with a disfavored religious group, then the CCP will simply limit that citizen’s ability to spend money, deny him loans, or erase part or all of the citizen’s savings.

Who is advocating for CBDC’s besides President Biden: the World Economic Forum, Federal Reserve, the Bank of England, the European Central Bank, and the Chinese Communist Party leadership. Just one look at who is on this list should tell you CBDC’s are a bad idea.

Members of Congress are pressing for an open and transparent debate over the role and function of a CBDC. Bills have been introduced to prohibit the creation of a CBDC by the government. No matter what your political stripe this issue should be alarming to you. These bills need to be passed. Please contact our U.S. senators and Congressmen and let them know your thoughts.

In the meantime, we will work to get the offensive language out of the UCC update bill this coming session.

## **Honoring God at the Capitol Building**

A couple weeks ago a horrendous and evil display was set up in the State Capitol Building in Des Moines, placed by the Iowa Satanic Temple. It was allowed by the guidelines for Capitol displays in the procedures used by the Department of Administrative Services (DAS). The outrage and disgust for this satanic display is widespread as I have heard from a number of people. It has since been vandalized by someone from out-of-state. All this has been in the news and you may have seen it.

I want to focus here on the legalities:

The Constitution and the law as interpreted by the courts give equal legal standing for religious faiths according to the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment freedom of religion and freedom of speech. That is as it should be.

However, as State Rep. Brad Sherman explains it: *“The Iowa Constitution is the supreme law of the State of Iowa, and it establishes the legal foundation upon which all other state laws are built. The opening paragraph (Preamble) of the Iowa Constitution sets the tone for the rest of the Constitution, or we could say, it establishes a lens through which the rest of the document is viewed and interpreted. The Preamble to our Constitution says:*

*Preamble. WE THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF IOWA, grateful to the Supreme Being for the blessings hitherto enjoyed, and feeling our dependence on Him for a continuation of those blessings, do ordain and establish a free and independent government, by the name of the State of Iowa...*

*According to these opening lines of our Constitution, the foundation for laws and continued blessing and success in Iowa is based on these points:*

- 1. There is One Supreme God.*
- 2. Blessings over this state come from the One Supreme God*
- 3. We must depend upon the One Supreme God if we want to enjoy continued blessings.*

*It is a tortured and twisted interpretation of law that affords Satan, who is universally understood to be the enemy of God, religious expression equal to God in an institution of government that depends upon God for continued blessings. Such a legal view not only violates the very foundation of our State Constitution, but it offends the God upon whom we depend and undermines our wellbeing.*

*If we claim to believe in the One Supreme Being, the God of all creation, we cannot claim an exemption from obedience to Him in things relating to civil government. In fact, if we claim Him as our God, then we as legislators and government officials are His ministers. As such we must submit to Him in government as much as any other area of life. Either He is God or He is not.”*

For those who wish to worship Satan they are free to do so under our Constitution and its laws. But I believe that displays on public property should be compatible with and in accordance with the Iowa Constitution and that they should reflect our state's and nation's history and heritage.

There should be legislation that prohibits satanic displays in our Capitol building and on all state-owned property as they are incompatible with the Iowa Constitution and do not reflect our state's and nation's history and heritage.

Feel free to contact me with ideas, thoughts, and concerns. My phone is 319-987-3021 or you can email me at [sandy.salmon@legis.iowa.gov](mailto:sandy.salmon@legis.iowa.gov) . I want to hear what you are thinking and will listen to your input. Together we will work to make a difference for the future of Iowa. Thank you very much for the honor of representing you!

Sincerely,

***Sandy***