

# The Republican Club of Sun City NEWSLETTER

February 2012

Everett Schmidt, Editor

Sun City Texas

## The Second in a Series of Forums CANDIDATES FOR COUNTY COMMISSIONER AND DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO PARTICIPATE IN FORUM

The second "Candidates' Forum," one featuring candidates for Commissioner, Precinct 3, and District Attorney in the coming Republican primary election, will take place during the club's dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday, February 9 in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City.

Candidates for the Commissioner's Court position are incumbent Valerie Covey and Greg Windham; candidates for the District Attorney position and incumbent John Bradley and County Commissioner Jana Duty.

The usual format of forums calls for each candidate to make a statement about his or her qualifications and then respond to questions submitted on index cards by members of the audience. Moderator for the event is Georgetown Mayor George Garver.

**The Social Hour, Dinner and Program.** A social period will begin at 6:00 PM. The dinner will begin at 6:30 PM and will be followed by the program. The dinner will be catered by **Nemec Caterers** which will serve lasagna, green salad, vegetables and accoutrements. (NOTE: This meeting will utilize the traditional format involving seating around tables and a full dinner)

**Cost.** Cost is \$16 per person. Checks made out to **The Republican Club of Sun City** should be mailed to **The Republican Club of Sun City, Attention: Treasurer, 1530 Sun City Blvd., Suite 120, Box 227, Georgetown, TX 78633** by no later than Friday, February 3. Treasurer Dorothy Carlyle has set up a special collection box on her front porch at 173 Whispering Wind for individuals wishing to hand-deliver payments, provided delivery is made by the Friday deadline. For information about reservations contact Dorothy at 864-0353 or [dcarlyle@suddenlink.net](mailto:dcarlyle@suddenlink.net) **Visitors – regardless of party affiliation – are welcome!**

## CANDIDATE FORUMS FOR MARCH MEETING ANNOUNCED

Vice-president (for programs) Robert Fears announced there will be two "Candidate Forums" held during the club's dinner meeting scheduled for Thursday, March 15. One forum will involve the two candidates for the State Senate, District 5, position. The other will involve the three candidates for the State Board of Education, District 10, position. More information will be provided in the March newsletter.

## OTHER CLUB NEWS

Club treasurer Dorothy Carlyle reports that the number of attendees at the January 19 meeting was 156.

Vice president (for membership) Brenda Leisey reports that 2012 club membership now stands at 111.

Club members from 2011 are reminded that 2012 dues (\$15 per person) must be paid by February 28 or they will be dropped from membership rolls. Membership forms for renewing and new members are available from Brenda who can be reached at 868-6552 or [havenspt@suddenlink.net](mailto:havenspt@suddenlink.net). Membership forms will also be available at club meetings.

## THE 2012 REAGAN DINNER

The 2012 Reagan Dinner, a fund-raising event sponsored by the Williamson County Republican Party will be held on Monday, February 6 at the Marriott Austin North in Round Rock. Registration and a Silent Auction begin at 5:30 PM. The banquet is scheduled to begin at 7:00 PM

Emcee for the event will be Mark Collins, an impersonator of George Washington. Speakers for the occasion will be posted on the county party web site, [www.WilliamsonCountyGOP.org](http://www.WilliamsonCountyGOP.org), and otherwise announced.

To purchase individual tickets (\$75 per person) or to sponsor a table for ten (sponsorships begin at \$1,250), contact the dinner chairman, Nita Davidson, at [davidsondr@ecpi.com](mailto:davidsondr@ecpi.com) or 512-635-6482. The county party headquarters number is 863-8481.

## PRIMARY ELECTION PLANS CONTINUE TO BE UNCERTAIN

This news item is to report on recent developments regarding Texas' redistricting efforts; however, the reader should be aware that subsequent developments – some expected momentarily – may cause this report to be outdated.

This past Monday, a federal court panel in San Antonio, one of two federal court panels dealing with Texas' redistricting efforts, said, "If all parties want to maintain the current election schedule [including the April 3 primary], they should confer and submit agreed-upon maps for the court's consideration." If there cannot be such agreement in a timely manner, the vote will be delayed or it will be split into two dates, one for the presidency and other offices not defined by political districts. The second primary, at a later date, would take place after the court could draw new temporary maps. A "status conference" involving the court and parties involved in the law suit has been scheduled for January 27. Some answers may then follow.

But a second federal court panel, one located in Washington, D. C., is charged with the responsibility of determining whether the Texas maps, drawn by the legislature, can be given "pre-clearance" status. The ruling of that court, when it is finally issued, could have been affected by the guidelines provided by the Supreme Court in its order vacating the maps previously drawn by the San Antonio panel.

## THE 1965 VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Texas, like eight other states of the old south, must have changes in state election laws approved by the Justice Department or a federal court as is required by the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Two of the provisions in that Act were discussed fully by the Supreme Court in its recent opinion vacating the maps drawn by the federal court panel in San Antonio.

One such provision is Section 2, which "prohibits 'any State or political subdivision from imposing any electoral practice 'which results in a denial or abridgment of the right of any citizen of the U. S. to vote on account of race or color.'"

While the language of Section 2 is broad and general, plaintiffs have used that language to fashion imprecise charges such as "*diluting* the minority vote" thereby thwarting the efforts of legislatures to redistrict.

Another section of the Act, Section 5, is clear and is becoming more and more controversial. It calls for nine states of the old south designated to have a history of racial discrimination (including Texas) to get approval from the Justice Department or a federal court before they can make changes in their election laws. The process is called "pre-clearance."

That section is now subject to much criticism on grounds that it is unduly burdensome and is no longer necessary in a society that decades ago abandoned racially motivated impediments to voting. Chief Justice John Roberts, in 2009, said the section might no longer be necessary and could represent an intrusion on states' sovereignty. Justice Clarence Thomas spoke in more absolute terms, claiming "Section 5 is unconstitutional."

While the initial intent of the Voting Rights Act may have been noble, some of its provisions suggest that officials elected under its provisions should represent – and even favor – certain racial minorities over the population in general. Justice Thomas in a 1994 case (*Holder v. Hall*) stated in this regard:

few devices could be better designed to exacerbate racial tensions than the consciously segregated districting system currently being construed in the name of the Voting Rights Act . . . Our drive to segregate political districts by race can only serve to deepen racial divisions by destroying any need for voters or candidates to build bridges between racial groups or to form voting coalitions.

This past Monday, Texas Attorney General Greg Abbott, in regard to a related matter, filed suit against the Justice Department which has delayed approving or acting on Texas voter ID laws. Abbott notes that the Supreme Court has already ruled that voter identification laws are constitutional, and that "pre-clearance" had been given to at least 3 states, thus enabling them to begin to immediately enforce their voter ID laws. Abbott contends failure to approve the Texas law could subject Section 5 to "grave Constitutional questions" based on unequal treatment among the states and on violation of the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment. A Supreme Court ruling in this context could affect the implementation of state redistricting efforts. (The motives of the U. S. Justice Department, headed by Eric Holder, are now suspect)

## WILL REPUBLICANS HAVE A "BROKERED" CONVENTION?

The news media have, thus far, been seemingly oblivious to the number of delegates Republican candidates have acquired or have yet to acquire, determining, instead, to report the election results as either state or national popularity contests. But it is the delegates to the Republican National Convention meeting in August who determine the Republican nominee for president – a point not well understood by many, given the media coverage of election results.

**Differences From 2008.** The primary process this year is significantly different than it was in 2008 when Sen. John McCain acquired the needed number of delegates to win the presidential nomination very early in the process. One observer comments, "Nothing like that will happen in 2012."

One key difference this year is that, with but one exception, Republican rules require that delegates who are chosen before April 1 be allocated on a "proportional" basis instead of a "winner-take-all" basis. The exception – a significant one – is Florida which has its primary on January 31, and which can award its delegates on a "winner-take-all" basis. The number of delegates it can award - 50 - dwarfs the 28, 12 and 25 delegates Iowa, New Hampshire, and South Carolina, respectively, have to award. Also significant about the Florida election is the fact that only Republicans can vote – not the Democrats and Independents allowed in other states.

**The Ron Paul and "Establishment" Factors.** And then there is the Ron Paul factor to consider. In the three nominating contests held thus far (Iowa, New Hampshire, South Carolina), Ron Paul has won well over three times the number of votes he did in 2008. A *Wall Street Journal* writer, noting that phenomenon, observes: "The one thing you know for sure about Mr. Paul is that he hasn't changed his message to fit the times, which tells you the times have changed to meet his message."

Perhaps of most significance is the on-going rebellion against the "establishment," one indication of which is the Tea Party movement. In the context of the primary races, a WSJ headline describes the conflict thus: "It's the Insurgents Vs. the Establishment in the GOP."

**A "Brokered" Convention.** According to Wikipedia, a vote of 1,144 delegates is needed to claim the nomination. If that number has not been attained by convention time, the convention is considered "brokered" which means "the nomination is decided through a process of alternating political horse-trading, and re-votes." In this circumstance, all regular delegates (who, previously, were pledged to the candidate who had won their respective state's primary or caucus election) are "released," and are able to switch their allegiance to a different candidate before the next round of balloting.

**The Unpredictability Factor.** There are abundant signs that this primary election, even though still in its early stages, will not have the predictability of 2008 when Sen. McCain was nominated. Instead, there are signs this will produce much "high drama" and much excitement. Note in connection with the predictability aspect that the three contests which have taken place thus far have involved only 65 delegates, and that delegates, by party rule, are to be apportioned. We are still a long, long way from a single candidate attaining the 1,144 votes needed for nomination.

Given this situation, the reader may be interested in keeping a contest-by-contest tally of delegates. Consequently, the following chart which reveals, by state, primary and caucus dates, and the number of delegates is provided:

### STATE PRIMARY/CAUCUS DATES AND DELEGATE STRENGTH

<u>Date</u>	<u>State/Delegates</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>State/Delegates</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>State/Delegates</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>State/Delegates</u>
Jan. 3	Iowa – 28	March 6	Alaska – 27	Mar. 13	Alabama – 50	May 8	Indiana – 46
Jan. 10	New Hampshire -12		Georgia – 76		Am. Samoa – 1		No. Carolina – 55
Jan. 21	So. Carolina – 25		Idaho – 32		Hawaii – 20		W. Virginia – 31
Jan. 31	Florida – 50		Mass. – 41		Miss – 40	May 15	Nebraska – 35
Feb. 4	Maine – 24		No. Dakota – 28	Mar. 17	Missouri – 52		Oregon – 28
	Nevada – 28		Ohio – 66	Mar. 18	Puerto Rico – 23	May 22	Arkansas – 36
Feb. 7	Colorado – 36		Oklahoma – 43	Mar. 20	Illinois – 69		Kentucky – 45
	Minn. - 40		Tennessee – 58	Mar. 24	Louisiana – 46	June 5	California – 172
Feb. 28	Arizona – 29		Vermont – 17	April 3	Dist. Columbia – 19		Montana – 26
	Michigan – 30		Virginia – 49		Maryland – 37		New Jersey – 50
Mar. 3	Washington – 43		Wyoming – 29		Texas – 155		New Mexico – 23
		Mar. 10	Guam – 9		Wisconsin – 42		So. Dakota – 29
			Kansas -40	April 24	Connecticut – 28	June 26	Utah – 40
			Virgin I. -9		Delaware – 17		
					New York – 95		
					Penn. - 72		
					Rhode I. - 19		

## TO UNDERSTAND THE NATION'S PERIL, UNDERSTAND ERAS AND THE CLASH OF WORLDVIEWS

**Evidence of Peril.** According to a new poll by The Hill newspaper, 69% of Americans now believe the USA is in “decline.” In addition, a whopping 83% indicate they are worried about America's future. And these poll numbers, as the reader is aware, are typical of a multitude of other polls reflecting similar conclusions.

Other evidence of concern about America's future is the plethora of books whose titles, alone, in addition to their substance, convey a sense of alarm. Given the mood of the country, these books should not be dismissed simply because they appear to be sensational – as may be the temptation. Among those books:

- “**Suicide of the West**” by James Burnham
- “**Suicide of a Superpower**” by Patrick Buchanan
- “**After America: Get Ready for Armageddon**” by Mark Steyn
- “**Ameritopia: The Unmasking of America**” by Mark Levin
- “**Now of Never: Saving America From Economic Collapse**” by Sen. James DeMint

Indicating a concern for America's future, a major magazine, *Commentary Magazine*, asked 41 Americans to respond to the question, “Are you optimistic or pessimistic about America's future?” Probably typical of most responses was that of columnist/talk show host, Dennis Prager, who said he was both optimistic and pessimistic. But in terms of describing the basis of his pessimism, he expressed concern about American values which, if lost, could change the very definition of America:

First, the unique American values system . . . is under assault. These three values are declared on every American coin: Liberty, “E Pluribus Unum” and “In God We Trust.” The left has declared war on all three. *And it is winning.* It seeks to replace Liberty with egalitarianism, “E Pluribus Unum” with multiculturalism, and “In God We Trust” with a godless society.

**The Clash of Worldviews as a Factor of Understanding.** If there is to be some understanding of the “clash of worldviews,” there must be some understanding, at least conceptually, of the definition of “worldview.” David Noebel provides this definition: “A worldview answers fundamental questions such as *Why are we here? What is the meaning and purpose of life? Is there a difference between right and wrong? Is there a God? Are*

*humans merely highly evolved animals?*

Jeff Myers of Summit Ministries adds, "Specifically, a worldview contains a particular perspective regarding at least each of the following disciplines: theology, philosophy, ethics, biology, psychology, sociology, law, politics, economics and history." Myers then goes on to make a claim which many club members, by virtue of having undergone life experiences, can also claim: "If you tell me what you believe about God, human nature, and life purpose, I can predict with a high level of accuracy what your position will be on the issues of the day."

**The Warring Factions in the "Clash of Worldviews."** Aware that Judeo-Christian values were central to the nation's founding documents and to the tenets of its formation, David Noebel wrote:

On one side is clearly the Christian worldview. On the other side are five other worldviews: Islam, Secular Humanism, Marxism, Cosmic Humanism (or New Ageism) and Postmodernism. While these five worldviews don't agree in every detail, they unanimously concur on one point: their opposition to Christianity.

**Eras as a Factor of Understanding.** Kirby Anderson, author and moderator of the "Point of View" talk show, and author David Noebel provide information about three eras of our day which can provide some perspective for understanding in regard to today's "crazy world in which we live." With each brief description, Anderson also provides a tongue-in-cheek analogy with the call of a baseball umpire.

**Pre-Modern Era.** "This is a God-centered view of the universe that believes in divine revelation. Most of the ancient world had this view of truth and believed that truth is absolute," says Anderson. His baseball umpire analogy: "I call 'em the way they are."

**The Modern Period.** In regard to the Modern Period, Noebel states:

During the Enlightenment, authority shifted from traditional institutions to human reason. A scientific approach to the world yielded tremendous advances in medicine, technology, and communication and challenged the centrality of theology and religious belief as the paradigm for learning. . . The "Big Story" of the world was not *given* by revelation; rather, it was to be *discovered* and perhaps even *determined* by science, reason and technology. This major transition was at the heart of the modern period.

Anderson contend modernism was influenced by the scientific revolution, and began to reject a belief in God. His baseball umpire analogy: "I call 'em the way I see 'em."

**The Post Modern Period.** According to Anderson in regard to the era of postmodernism, "there is a complete loss for truth." He continues:

The worldview of postmodernism provides the foundation for moral relativism. Although a view of ethics as relative began in the era of modernism, it has reached full bloom in the era of postmodernism.

If there is no absolute truth, then there is no absolute standard for ethical behavior. And if truth is merely personal preference, then certainly ethics is personal and situational.

His baseball umpire analogy: Truth is not discovered; truth is created. "they ain't nothing until I call them."

**Summary.** In summary, the clash addressed above is "between those who claim the Judeo-Christian worldview and those who have abandoned that worldview in favor of the "ism" of contemporary life – feminism, multiculturalism, gay liberation, lifestyle liberation."

While the discussion in this report has been somewhat abstract, columnist Jeff Jacoby states the issue in practical terms:

For in a world without God, there is no obvious difference between good and evil. There is no way to prove that murder is wrong if there is no Creator who decrees "Thou shalt not murder." It certainly cannot be proved wrong by reason alone. One might reason instead – as Lenin and Stalin and Mao reasoned – that there is nothing wrong with murdering human beings by the millions if doing so advances the Marxist cause.

Several decades ago, Will Durant, the great historian/philosopher made a prescient observation about the clash of worldviews. Although Durant was a humanist, he made this profound observation about today's world: "The greatest question of our time is not communism versus individualism, not Europe versus America, not even the East versus the West – it is whether man can live without God."

## **NOTES ON THE PASSING SCENE**

**(Some random observations on this crazy world in which we live)**

**People Power on Display.** On November 8, Killeen residents did what most people would consider impossible: they voted to recall through a recall election five city council members.

The Killeen election stems from action taken last spring when the council first voted to spend a whopping \$750,000 buying out the employment contract of former City Manager Connie Green, and then resisted providing a credible explanation to outraged taxpayers. Jonathan Okray, a private citizen, maneuvered through the bureaucratic process and led a petition drive resulting in all seven council members being tapped for recall. One member lost an election and another resigned. Of the five remaining, four were recalled by 70+ percent of voters and one by 60+ percent.

**Two Ways to Play Saul Alinsky.** Saul Alinsky was a Chicago-born social-movement organizer who was closely associated with President Obama when he (Obama) successfully organized poor neighborhoods of Chicago to agitate for change. Hillary Clinton wrote her thesis about him.

Mr. Alinsky openly courted controversy and hostile reactions as a way to change society, and urged his followers to do the same. He wrote, "The organizer dedicated to changing the life of a particular community must first rub raw the resentments of the people of the community, and fan the latent hostilities of many of the people to the point of overt expression."

Adam Brandon, spokesman for Freedom Works, which has been organizing tea-party activists and includes Dick Armey as chairman, says the group gives Mr. Alinsky's "Rules for Radicals" to its top leadership members. Alinsky's book is proving to be a two-edged sword.

**Countering Charges of "Racist".** Republican conservatives have often, without one iota of valid evidence, been charged being "racist." In general, their response has been from a defensive mode, tepid and without lashing back.

But for those who, after having been unfairly charged being "racist," wish to lash back in kind, there is a word that may fill the bill. That word: Demagogue.

The work is valuable in two respects. The definition fits those individuals making irresponsible charges of "racist." As found in Webster's, the definition (with certain words being emphasized) is: "A leader who makes use of popular prejudices and false claims and promises to gain power."

In addition to a valid definition, the term "demagogue" may be useful in another way – particularly in regard to those individuals who don't know what the term means. It just sounds as if it means something "bad."