



# Quail Creek Republican Club



Volume 2  
April 2007

Issue 4  
www.quailcreekrepublicans.com

## Quail Creek Republicans

### Officers 2007

**President:**

**John Chernoski**

**1st. Vice President:**

**Roger Williams**

**2nd. Vice President:**

**John Emery**

**Secretary:**

**Rose Neff**

**Treasurer:**

**Jim Nichols**

**Program Chair:**

**Darren Venters**

**Membership Chair:**

**Henry (Hank) Harrison**

### **Precinct 314: Republican Precinct Committeeman:**

**Richard Casey**

**David Werth**

**George Norcross**

**Charles E Claflin**

**Darren Venters**



## Quail Creek Republican Club

### President's Message

April brings us our second old fashioned GOP political gathering on Friday, April 13 from 4 PM to 6 PM at the Club-house patio. Darren has invited the Sahuarita municipal council candidates, some local GOP officeholders, and potential GOP candidates to the gathering. At this juncture several of the Sahuarita candidates and a QCR favorite, Frank Antenori, have accepted the invitation. The event will be a great opportunity to talk one-on-one with these folks and to discuss politics. Liquid refreshments and light snacks will be available. Invite your friends and neighbors. Bring along a D or I and maybe we can convert them.

Check out "Arizona Eighth" on the web (<http://arizonaeighth.blogspot.com>). It is an interesting and informative political blog with a GOP tilt. A recent article discussed some inside GOP political action in the Green Valley area. I have added the blog to my favorites list and I check it out a couple of times a week.

I offer you my Easter or Passover greetings (as appropriate.) I will see all of you on April 13 (remember to wear red.)

John Chernoski, President

## **March News Recap**

### **London Financial Times – March 5**

Rudy Giuliani, the former mayor of New York, on Monday provided further evidence that he is stepping up his presidential campaign for 2008 when he sold his boutique investment bank, Giuliani Capital Partners, addressing concerns about potential conflicts of interest and adding to his war chest of campaign financing. The terms of the sale to Macquarie Group, an Australian financial group, were not disclosed but analysts said that Giuliani Capital Advisors could be worth as much as \$100m. It represents a large chunk of Mr. Giuliani's business interests, which he began building in early 2002, shortly after leaving his post as mayor. After months of being coy about his intentions Mr. Giuliani has emerged as the Republican frontrunner, benefiting from strong name recognition, celebrity status from 9/11 and doubts about Senator John McCain and his advocacy of the unpopular troop surge in Iraq.

A Newsweek poll at the weekend showed that in a head-to-head contest with Mr. McCain, he jumped into a 25-point lead, with 59 per cent to 34 per cent for McCain. That compared with just a 4 per cent edge in a January poll. Mr. Giuliani came second this weekend in a straw poll of conservative activists at the Conservative Political Action conference.

On Tuesday Mr. Giuliani will add to his resources with a fundraiser in Palo Alto hosted by Floyd Kvamme, a leading technology veteran from Silicon Valley who served on the National Finance Committee for President George W Bush.

Although he is a social conservative, Mr. Kvamme is willing to overlook Mr. Giuliani's liberal positions. "You can't help but be impressed by his leadership on 9/11. He was the bright shining star that day," he said, adding: "Rudy Giuliani is a strict constructionist and wants judges who don't make laws from the bench. I'm comfortable with that."

Charlie Cook, editor of the Cook Political Report, warned that three-quarters of those surveyed in a recent Gallup poll were unaware of Mr. Giuliani's views on abortion and gay marriage.

"His backers are mostly conservatives and evangelicals drawn by his 9/11 strong leadership. That support will melt like an ice cream cone in August once abortion, guns, gay rights, Vietnam draft, marriage to his second cousin, and infidelities come out."

In a hint of those potential problems, Andrew Giuliani, his son from his second marriage, told ABC this weekend that he "got his values from his mother" and had "problems with my father", but added that he would still make "a great President".

### **Michael Medved - March 7**

In the run-up to the fateful election of 2008, conservatives face a clear-cut choice: we can rebuild our movement as a broad-ranging, mainstream coalition and restore our governing majority, or else settle for a semi-permanent role as angry, doom-speaking complainers on the fringes of American politics and culture. We can either invite doubters and moderates to join with us in new efforts to affirm American values, or we can push them away because they fail to measure up to our own standards of indignation and ideological purity.

In short, we must choose between addition and subtraction: either building our cause by adding to our numbers or destroying it by discouraging all but the fiercest ideologues.

No political party or faction has ever thrived based on purges and insults and internal warfare, but too many activists on the right seem determined to reduce the conservative cause to self-righteous irrelevance.

The most recent outrage involving Ann Coulter provides a revealing example of the self-destructive tendencies of some dedicated partisans on the right. Addressing the Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC) in Washington, D.C., the best-selling author and glamorous Time magazine cover girl declared: "I was going to have a few comments about the other Democratic candidate for President, John Edwards, but it turns out you have to go into rehab if you use the word 'faggot' so I'm kind of at an impasse. I can't really talk about Edwards."

Some members of the audience gasped as she deployed the forbidden slur, but many others laughed and applauded. Naturally, Democratic Chair Howard Dean and many others pounced on the incident as another example of conservative viciousness and bigotry, demanding that all Republican Presidential candidates dissociate themselves from Coulter's comments.

This challenge creates a miserable dilemma for every GOP contender. If the candidate ignores the controversy, he looks gutless and paralyzed in the face of obviously inappropriate and over-the-top insults. If he condemns Coulter, he looks like he's wimping out to the liberal establishment and offends right-wing true believers who feel instinctively protective of Ann the Outrageous. Any comment by a presidential candidate also refocuses the national conversation on the absurd and unacceptable suggestion that John Edwards is secretly gay.

In fact, Edwards has been a visibly loyal husband to Elizabeth, his wife of more than 29 years, who's currently battling breast cancer. Together, they've brought five children into the world, including a son who died in a tragic traffic accident at age 16. Drawing attention to Edwards' personal life and away from his policies only helps Edwards and harms conservatives.

Reasonable people can disagree about the wisdom of concentrating fire on a fellow Republican but there can be no argument about the purely destructive impact of Coulter's sneering slur against Edwards. How could such a nasty shot possibly assist the conservative cause? Which potential Republican supporters would feel motivated or mobilized by her casual use of the term "faggot"? How could a smart woman expect anything other than a disgusted and negative response for her implication that a long-married father of five deserved outing as a homosexual?

The Coulter commentary reinforced the public image of conservatives as unreasonably hostile to gay people in general, not just opposed to the dubious particulars of the so-called "gay rights" agenda. In fact, exit polls showed that self-identified gay people made up 4% of the total electorate in the incomparably close election of 2000, and nearly one third of those homosexual voters cast their ballots for George W. Bush. In other words, more than a million gay citizens voted for Bush-Cheney, in a race that ultimately turned on a mere 527 votes in Florida, and a national margin in the popular vote of just 537,000 for Gore.

Finally, the most serious challenge of all involves the rapidly growing and increasingly prosperous Latino communities. Were it not for his competitive showing among Hispanics, Bush wouldn't even have come close to victory, either time.

Meanwhile, elements of the President's party seem perversely determined to make sure that no future Republican repeats this success with the nation's fastest growing minority group. Imagine how naturalized Hispanic citizens, or even native-born Latinos might feel, at the suggestion that their cousins amount to an "invading army" bent on destroying America, or the common equation of terrorists (who have all been legal U.S. entrants by the way) and those who enter the country to care for our children and mow our lawns. Anti-immigrant rhetoric (which increasingly dispenses with any distinction between legal and illegal arrivals) provoked a disastrous shift of Latino voters away from the GOP in 2006. If Republicans continue to draw just 20% of Hispanic votes they will never regain control of Congress and stand scant chance of retaining the White House. Nativist posturing (like Congressman Tom Tancredo's obnoxious slogan, "America Is Full") may play well with some elements of the conservative base but it could easily doom Republicans to permanent minority status.

Obviously, the future of the conservative movement and of the Republic itself requires GOP recruitment of more Latinos, Blacks and gays, and anything that stands in the way of such participation fatally undermines the party's future.

Republicans don't need to drop our implacable opposition to gay marriage in order reach out to gays.

We don't need to reverse our criticism of race-based quotas in order to bring more black involvement in the party.

And we certainly don't need to endorse automatic amnesty or "open borders" as a way to connect with Latino voters – but we might want to avoid widespread public advertising for games like "Find the Illegal Immigrant" (devised by a College Republicans chapter in New York City) or giving undeserved respect to crackpot fringe groups like the scandal-tainted "Minute Man Civil Defense Corps."

Republicans need to return to the open, expansive conservatism of Ronald Reagan: more concerned with bringing in newcomers than driving out dissenters, more committed to winning elections than to scoring points in arguments, more determined to steer the government in the right direction than to sit at the sidelines carping about inevitable decline. We should make skeptics feel welcome as Republicans and urge them to fight the issues inside the party where they can have the most impact.

Every major event, every potential speaker, every resolution, every specific approach, deserves evaluation in terms of effectiveness in party building—winning new adherents to the cause.

We should ask a crucial question before we speak or act: will this draw people to conservative ideas and ide-

### Evans-Novak Political Report – March 7

President 2008

The Republican Presidential pack passed some important mile-markers last week with a key straw poll that have shaken up everyone's view of the race. With a second-place finish, Former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani (R) is proving his ability to win the Republican nomination in spite of his perceived liberalism.

No one is now doubting Giuliani's ability to win the nomination. He has become the clear frontrunner, a status confirmed by a Newsweek poll showing him well ahead of Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.). In New Hampshire, a new poll gives him 37 percent, putting him ten points ahead of McCain.

The big question about Giuliani, however, remains his tumultuous personal life. His son's newly public negativity toward his candidacy reflects the natural conclusion of Giuliani's decision in 2000 to make his divorce into a public circus in the New York City tabloids.

Romney 21%

Giuliani 17%

Brownback 15%

Gingrich 14%

McCain 12%

All Others Less than 5%

CPAC: Giuliani was the big winner here, despite exerting no effort whatsoever to influence the outcome of the Conservative Political Action Conference straw poll or sway attendees in any other way. The biggest loser was McCain, who skipped the event.

Some activists expressed dismay that so many conservatives would cheer Giuliani without even making him offer anything for the Right. Giuliani stuck to safe topics in his speech -- terrorism, Ronald Reagan, tax cuts - - without wading into the issue areas in which he disagrees with most conservatives, such as abortion.

Unlike former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney, Giuliani had not stacked the crowd with supporters. This applies to the entire conference, not just the speeches or the straw poll. Giuliani had absolutely no presence there whatsoever. Not a single sticker, sign, T-shirt, or visible volunteer was present for Giuliani at CPAC.

Yet somehow, without trying, he succeeded.

Romney's young volunteers -- he bussed in and paid for scores of students, many or mostly Mormons -- were ubiquitous carrying his signs and passing out his stickers. His speech, delivered in his typical staccato style, was not bad. He also pleased conservatives with specific promises for keeping down government spending and repealing McCain-Feingold. But much of the applause in the room was clearly driven by the volunteers, who were carefully placed throughout the large ballroom at Washington's Omni Shoreham Hotel.

Romney, whose problem is not money but credibility, won the straw poll. But the real story of the event was how well Giuliani did among the conservative activists. He finished second to Romney 21-17 percent, and did so effortlessly, despite the fact that only ten percent of those voting in the straw poll described themselves as "National Security" conservatives. Giuliani performed strongly enough among those describing themselves as "Limited Government" conservatives that he proved he is for real, pushing aside fears over his social liberalism. This is CPAC -- the conservatives' event. The feeling is that if he can make it there, he can make it anywhere.

McCain, who was the only GOP presidential candidate to skip CPAC other than former Wisconsin Gov.

Tommy Thompson (R), had very little overt support at the conference. He was loudly booed when his name was mentioned in the straw-poll results, in which he came in behind Brownback and former House Speaker Newt Gingrich. McCain was not present because he was launching a nationwide fund-raising campaign that began in Salt Lake City Thursday and Phoenix on Friday. McCain's campaign staff did not mention these fund-raising commitments when it turned down CPAC's invitation. It said the senator's conservative record was known to everybody without him going to CPAC, but this decision was made only after heated debate within the McCain campaign.

Clinton-Obama: Sen. Hillary Clinton (D-N.Y.) suffered from another major defection with Greg Craig, a Washington super-lawyer with close ties to the Clintons, supporting Obama. Craig was a White House special counsel defending President Bill Clinton in the Senate impeachment trial. He also served as an adviser to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.).

### **Wall Street Journal – March 9**

The crowded field of 2008 presidential contenders includes a former mayor, a former governor (or two, who can keep track?) and a former first lady, so why not toss in a former president? Thomas Jefferson, or at least a man dressed up just like him, has set his sights on reclaiming the nation's highest office. August "Gus" Jaccaci calls himself a "professional futurist and social architect" and he will celebrate his 70th birthday by announcing his plans to run for president as a write-in candidate impersonating the founding father." I feel a tremendous personal affinity to him as probably the greatest American icon that the world knows," Mr. Jaccacci told the Associated Press. "The words 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,' are the best-known phrase for the whole meaning of America worldwide." He said that his campaign's "bumper-sticker message" is "abolish war, love all nature and know your neighbors."

### **Newt Gingrich – Human Events Online – March, 12**

Reading the news this week and talking to friends and leading conservative analysts has convinced me that we are seeing something new and powerful emerging: We are seeing the beginning of a three-way split in American politics among "Stand-pat Republicans" who do not understand change is needed, a leftwing machine that wants to impose the wrong changes, and those Democrats, Republicans and Independents who understand that America is truly being challenged by historic forces and that we must find real solutions large enough to meet those challenges.

Let me begin with the patterns of power in Washington, Detroit, and Sacramento that convinced me there is a new power structure on the left. There is an emerging alliance of leftwing activists and union leaders that will change the pattern of politics and government. These groups have worked together before, of course, but never before have they been this well funded, this well organized, and this determined to impose their will on America.

Their strategy isn't to work collaboratively with all Americans to develop solutions to the challenges that threaten our future. Their strategy is to work together as a machine to mutually benefit themselves -- at the expense of the American people. They want to impose their leftwing agenda from the top down. And their tactic isn't to encourage debate, it's to stifle it.

The Leftwing Machine vs. the 'Stand-Pat Republicans'

If the 2006 mid-term elections taught us anything, it's that "Stand-pat Republicans" are no match for this leftwing machine.

Who are the "Stand-pat Republicans"? They are those in the Republican Party who don't recognize the need for large-scale solutions to deal with challenges of the aging baby boomers or the unending effort to drive God out of the public square. If the leftwing intimidation machine believes in the wrong changes, Stand-pat Republicans don't believe in much change at all. But business as usual isn't what our party or our country needs.

The country wants real change when it sees bureaucracies failing as they have in New Orleans, failing to control the border, failing by graduating only one out of every five entering freshmen in the Detroit public schools on time, failing in the California prison system that potentially may have to release up to 75,000 convicted criminals before serving their full sentences, and failing to win in Baghdad.

The country wants its values defended on issues such as English as the official language of government, teaching American history, and protecting the right to say "one nation under God" as part of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Stand-pat Republicans fail to offer real leadership on both implementation effectiveness and on successfully defending classic American values.

The leftwing machine actually wants the wrong changes.

For real change in both our politics and our policy, a third coalition will have to emerge: Americans who know we need change and who understand that standing pat and doing nothing will fail and that the left actually wants the wrong changes. I believe there are millions of these Americans, in fact a vast majority, who want the values of classic American civilization and the solutions necessary for our country to successfully win the future.

### The Big Labor Payback Act

Now to the evidence for the emerging leftwing machine.

Exhibit A was the March 1 vote in the House of Representatives on the so-called "Employee Free Choice Act." This bill should have been called "the American Worker Coercion Act." It literally strips American workers of the right to a secret ballot in deciding whether or not to unionize their company. It exposes every worker to intimidation and coercion tactics from the union seeking to get their dues money.

The hypocrisy of this bill was revealed in a 2001 letter signed by the bill's main sponsor, Rep. George Miller (D.-Calif.) and 11 other members including Gabrielle Giffords, who voted for the bill. The letter was addressed to Mexican government officials and it urged them to protect secret ballots for Mexican workers because -- and these are the exact words -- "we feel that the secret ballot is absolutely necessary in order to ensure that workers are not intimidated into voting for a union they might not otherwise choose."

Is Your Representative a Member of the Leftwing Machine?

So what has changed for George Miller & Co.? Two things: This is the United States and the Democrats just won the mid-term elections, and American private-sector workers are turning away from the unions in droves. And as the Wall Street Journal put it: "Reversing this trend is a top union priority. Labor leaders made it clear to Democrats that, in return for political support in last year's election, they wanted a vote on legislation that would make organizing much easier. House Democrats have now delivered, but don't let them fool you into thinking this has anything to do with 'free choice.'"

Last week brought even more evidence of an emerging leftwing machine of powerful unions and leftwing activists -- aided and abetted, at times, by activist judges.

\* In California, a local union front group convinced a judge to prevent a hotel chain from terminating employees with invalid Social Security numbers, as required by federal immigration law. These workers were using false Social Security documents. In effect, the unions are working with the help of a judge to force the hotel to violate federal immigration law, keeping illegal immigrants on the payroll. Think of that. A judge is making it illegal to obey the law.

\* Also in California, an attempt to ease dangerous overcrowding in state prisons by transferring inmates to other states was blocked by the powerful prison guard union. Even though a judge has threatened to begin releasing criminals back onto the street if the overcrowding isn't eased, the union found a state judge to rule against the transfer plan. So the leftwing machine -- in this case the unions, allied legislators in Sacramento and activist judges -- would prefer to see criminals released back into communities, threatening innocent citizens rather than have prison guards lose some overtime pay.

\* And finally, leftwing activists, whose disdain for the Fox News Network knows no bounds, succeeded in intimidating the Nevada Democratic Party into canceling a Democratic presidential debate in Reno to be broadcast on Fox in August. The desire of the leftwing machine to oppose Fox evidently outweighs their desire to have open and honest debate.

These are just a few examples of this leftwing machine, but they illustrate how large a threat this machine represents.

The leftwing machine isn't merely an example of governmental failure or incompetence. Like any greased machine, the leftwing machine actually functions quite well, and therein lies its danger. The culture of political payoff and mutual benefit that defines the leftwing machine serve many powerful political interests. And they will not be defeated by business-as-usual, Stand-pat Republicans.

If Republicans "stand pat," the leftwing machine will roll right over them. If you are not the stand-pat-and-get-rolled type, we have about seven months to begin to create a future for our children and grandchildren that is not ruled by either a machine on the left or complacency on the right.

### **London Financial Times – March 14**

Third Democrat hopeful colours primary race for front-runners

To judge by the amount of prime time television coverage devoted to Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, the Democratic party's presidential campaign is a two-horse race.

But, according to opinion polls in Iowa and Nevada - the states that hold the first Democratic caucuses in early 2008 - John Edwards, the former vice-presidential candidate, is as well placed as the celebrity senators from New York and Illinois.

Having come second to John Kerry in the Iowa caucus in 2004, Mr. Edwards has visited the mid-western state 19 times in the past two years - significantly more than the front-runners.

The candidate who wins in Iowa often picks up the momentum to go on and take the nomination. In 2004, Mr. Kerry came from almost nowhere to win Iowa and go on to beat favourites Dick Gephardt and Howard Dean.

"If either Hillary or Obama won in Iowa then nobody would be surprised - it wouldn't necessarily give them momentum," said Joe Trippi, campaign manager for Mr. Dean in 2004. "Of all the candidates, I think Edwards might be in the best position now."

The former trial lawyer from North Carolina is gaining popularity among the Democratic party's internet community - the so-called Netroots - partly because of his clear positioning as the candidate of the left. Having apologised for his decision to vote in favour of the Iraq war in 2002 when he was still a senator, Mr. Edwards differentiated himself from Mrs. Clinton, who consistently turns down requests to admit her vote was a mistake. Although he opposed the war, Mr. Obama was only elected to the Senate in 2004.

Mr. Edwards has also picked up popularity for -having been the first Democratic candidate last week to boycott a televised debate on Fox News, the conservative cable news channel, which is owned by Rupert Murdoch and sports the logo "Fair and Balanced". The Edwards campaign team said they felt the channel was biased.

A few days later, Roger Ailes, the head of Fox News, prompted the Democratic party to cancel the debate altogether when he made a joke linking Mr. Obama's name and growing confidence to that of Osama bin Laden. "It is true that Obama is on the move," he said. "It is not true that President Bush called Musharraf and said: "Why can't we catch this guy?"

Mr. Edwards then picked up more sympathy in the "liberal blogosphere" after Ann Coulter, a right-wing commentator, described him as a "faggot" - derogatory slang for homosexual - at a conservative conference. Her remarks referred to Mr. Edwards' hairstyle, which was mocked by conservatives in the 2004 election. But perhaps Mr. Edwards' chief advantage comes from his championing of the US's economically insecure middle classes and the fact that he is the only one of the Democratic candidates to have detailed a plan to provide universal healthcare - at an estimated cost of up to \$120bn (€1bn, £62bn).

His economic populism also distinguishes him from Mrs. Clinton, who is associated with her husband's strong support for free trade during the 1990s. In contrast, Mr. Edwards sounds increasingly like a protectionist - a stance aimed at winning over a significant portion of the Democrat's traditional union base.

Last month, Mr. Edwards called on President George W. Bush to kill talks with South Korea on a free trade agreement. "In-stead of pursuing policies that put Americans out of work . . . Congress should make it clear to the president that it will override any agreement that does not protect America's jobs and interests," he said. However, Mr. Edwards faces significant hurdles including the fact that he is the only conventional white male among the front-runners in a cycle that many believe will produce a candidate who represents one of the US's minorities - be that women, African-Americans or Hispanics (Bill Richardson, the governor of New Mexico who runs in fourth place, is half-Hispanic).

"If you look at the Democratic primary voting base, only about a quarter are white male," said a leading Democratic strategist.

Mr. Edwards will also have to overcome the fact that his charisma, and thus his level of recognition, does not match either of the front-runners. "His best hope may be that Mr. Obama and Mrs. Clinton target each other so strongly during the campaign that he slips through un-scathed," said the strategist.

## **Evans-Novak Political Report - March, 14**

President 2008

Republicans

Thompson: The hype over former Sen. Fred Thompson has some substance to it, as the actor-politician has already begun approaching experienced campaign hands in key states. Thompson already evokes the obvious comparison to Ronald Reagan because of his profession.

Thompson effectively embraced the Republican right when he ran for and entered the U.S. Senate. From the perspective of the Republican Party's conservative base, he stacks up well against each of the "Big Three" leading Republican candidates. His voting record (lifetime American Conservative Union rating: 86%) in the Senate is more conservative than that of Arizona Republican Sen. John McCain (lifetime ACU rating: 82%), none of his position-switches are nearly as bad or as recent as those of former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney (R), and nothing in his background is as negative as that of former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani (R).

Given enough money, Thompson could make a good run at it by tearing down the conservative credentials of the "Big Three" and then building himself up as a tax-cutting, pro-life former senator. His acting role on "Law & Order" does not hurt, either.

Democrats

Edwards: Former Sen. John Edwards (D-N.C.) had been slipping as the Obama-Hillary contest became a two-way race, but he received help at CPAC when columnist Ann Coulter used the term "faggot" during a reference to Edwards. So hated is Coulter on the left that it was probably the best publicity he'd received in months. His campaign was soliciting donations over the event almost immediately after it occurred, sending e-mails to supporters that included a video clip of Coulter's insulting him.

Obama-Clinton: Sen. Barack Obama (D-Ill.) seems to have Sen. Hillary Clinton right where he wants her. Her campaign is constantly reacting to what he does.

This includes her recent appearance in Selma, Ala., in which she reinvented her own past. Clinton, speaking at Selma's First Baptist Church on the 42nd anniversary of the "bloody Sunday" freedom march there, declared: "As a young girl [age 16], I had the great privilege of hearing Dr. King speak in Chicago. The year was 1963. My youth minister from our church took a few of us down on a cold January night to hear [King]. ... And he called on us, he challenged us that evening to stay awake during the great revolution that the civil rights pioneers were waging on behalf of a more perfect union."

That all sounds great, except that the young Hillary went on the following year to become a supporter of Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater, who opposed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Clinton's commencement address, made at Wellesley as a student, did not mention civil rights. She and her handlers are so afraid of Obama that they were implying the existence long ago of a teenager in Chicago's suburbs who never really existed.

Clinton's speech in Nashua, N.H., was a clumsy attempt to return the focus to herself as the "barrier-breaking" candidate instead of Obama. It was not exactly the comparison of herself to JFK that it was called in some headlines, but it was definitely a ham-fisted attempt to assert that she was an underdog seeking to overcome a major cultural barrier. The comparison she made, however, only highlights the fact that Obama's inauguration would break really huge barriers, whereas hers would be what everyone has been expecting anyway -- four more years of Clinton.

Obama gave some rare praise to President Bush at a dinner hosted by the National Council of La Raza.

Obama praised President Bush for having his heart "in the right place" on immigration reform.

### **Evans-Novak Political Report – March, 21**

President 2008

Giuliani: The biggest Washington area fund-raiser for former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani is a reception scheduled for tomorrow night at the Maryland mansion of millionaire lobbyist Peter Terpeluk. Terpeluk, who served for four years as ambassador to Luxembourg after being named by President George W. Bush, is one of several Bush backers across the country recruited by Giuliani. Lou Cordia, a longtime Republican political operative in Washington who started in the Reagan Administration, is managing the fund-raiser, which requests \$4,600 from individuals and \$9,200 from couples.

One major Washington contributor who is not yet committed to a presidential candidate has received four telephone calls and two e-mails soliciting for the Giuliani event.

McCain: Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) is now publicly flirting with an immigration reform bill that would require illegal immigrants to return to their home countries in order to apply for United States citizenship -- something he has opposed in the past. As recently as 2005, McCain had derided such a proposal as "Report to Deport" and said that "11 million people are not going to voluntarily come out of the shadows just to be shipped home." Now, however, McCain feels a need to move himself to the right. He expressed openness to such a proposal while in Iowa this week.

Romney: Former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney's (R) gaffe before a crowd of Florida Cubans has gotten a considerable amount of attention, even if only because his detractors are making it an issue. Florida Cubans are very Republican and likely to play a large role in Florida's Super Tuesday primary. The mistake is unlikely to cost him the Cuban vote, but it does play into the image he has picked up of being a bit too much the good-looking and perfect candidate -- of being too scripted.

Romney used a Spanish motto that is dear to Communist dictator Fidel Castro -- "Patria o muerte, venceremos!" ("Fatherland or death, we shall overcome.") Romney's defenders point out that the phrase was commonly used in pre-Castro Cuba as well.

Romney's other problem is in his backyard -- the decision by the Massachusetts GOP to take legal action against the anti-Romney group, Massachusetts Republicans for Truth, for infringing on the party name. The group's founder, consultant Holly Robichaud, responded by pointing out that the party never had any objections when Massachusetts Republicans for Choice backed Romney in 2002. This gives Romney's detractors another opportunity to point out his shift on the abortion issue.

Clinton: Sen. Hillary Clinton (D-N.Y.) raised eyebrows among Democratic insiders when Washington Post columnist Al Kamen reported that Clinton dined last week at the 701 restaurant in downtown Washington with former Ambassador Joseph Wilson, his wife, Valerie Plame, and left-wing journalist Sidney Blumenthal.

Leading Democrats have stayed away from Wilson since a Senate Intelligence Committee report in 2004 discredited him. Blumenthal was known as a vicious attack man when he worked as an aide to President Bill

### **HERE IS A GERMAN EDITORIAL**

If any of you still feel that this war on terror is a mistake, here is an opinion from an unexpected source. It's fascinating that this should come out of Europe. Mathias Dapfner, Chief Executive of the huge German publisher Axel Springer AG, has written a blistering attack in DIE WELT, Germany's largest daily paper, against the timid reaction of Europe in the face of the Islamic threat.

#### **EUROPE - THY NAME IS COWARDICE**

A few days ago Henry Broder wrote in Welt am Sonntag, "Europe - your family name is appeasement." It's a phrase you can't get out of your head because it's so terribly true.

Appeasement cost millions of Jews and non-Jews their lives, as England and France, allies at the time, negotiated and hesitated too long before they noticed that Hitler had to be fought, not bound to toothless agreements.

Appeasement legitimized and stabilized Communism in the Soviet Union, then East Germany, then all the rest of Eastern Europe, where for decades; inhuman suppressive, murderous governments were glorified as the ideologically correct alternative to all other possibilities.

Appeasement crippled Europe when genocide ran rampant in Kosovo, and even though we had absolute proof of ongoing mass-murder, we Europeans debated and debated and debated, and were still debating when finally the Americans had to come from halfway around the world, into Europe yet again, and do our work for us.

Rather than protecting democracy in the Middle East, European Appeasement, camouflaged behind the fuzzy word "equidistance," now countenances suicide bombings in Israel by fundamentalist Palestinians.

Appeasement generates a mentality that allows Europe to ignore nearly

500,000 victims of Saddam's torture and murder machinery and, motivated by the self-righteousness of the peace movement, has the gall to issue bad grades to George Bush... Even as it is uncovered that the loudest critics of the American action in Iraq made illicit billions, no, TENS of billions, in the corrupt U.N. Oil-for-Food program.

And now we are faced with a particularly grotesque form of appeasement. How is Germany reacting to the escalating violence by Islamic Fundamentalists in Holland and elsewhere? By suggesting that we really should have a "Muslim Holiday" in Germany?

I wish I were joking, but I am not. A substantial fraction of our(German) Government, and if the polls are to be believed, the German people, actually believe that creating an Official State "Muslim Holiday" will somehow spare us from the wrath of the fanatical Islamists. One cannot help but recall Britain's Neville Chamberlain waving the laughable treaty signed by Adolph Hitler and declaring European "Peace in our time".

What else has to happen before the European public and its political leadership get it? There is a sort of crusade underway, an especially perfidious crusade consisting of systematic attacks by fanatic Muslims, focused on civilians, directed against our free, open Western societies, and intent upon Western Civilization's utter destruction.

It is a conflict that will most likely last longer than any of the great military conflicts of the last century - a conflict conducted by an enemy that cannot be tamed by "tolerance" and "accommodation" but is actually spurred on by such gestures, which have proven to be, and will always be taken by the Islamists for signs of weakness. Only two recent American Presidents had the courage needed for Anti-appeasement: Reagan and Bush.

His American critics may quibble over the details, but we Europeans know the truth. We saw it first hand: Ronald Reagan ended the Cold War, freeing half of the German people from nearly 50 years of terror and virtual slavery. And Bush, supported only by the Social Democrat Blair, acting on moral conviction, recognized the danger in the Islamic War against Democracy. His place in history will have to be evaluated after a number of years have passed. In the meantime, Europe sits back with charismatic self-confidence in the multicultural corner, instead of defending liberal society's values and being an attractive center of power on the same playing field as the true great powers, America and China. On the contrary - we Europeans present ourselves, in contrast to those "arrogant Americans", as the World Champions of "tolerance", which even (Germany's Interior Minister) Otto Schily justifiably criticizes. Why? Because we're so moral? I fear it's more because we're so materialistic, so devoid of a moral compass.

For his policies, Bush risks the fall of the dollar, huge amounts of additional national debt, and a massive and persistent burden on the American economy - because unlike almost all of Europe, Bush realizes what is at stake - literally everything.

While we criticize the "capitalistic robber barons" of America because they seem too sure of their priorities, we timidly defend our Social Welfare systems. Stay out of it! It could get expensive! We'd rather discuss reducing our 35-hour workweek or our dental coverage, or our 4 weeks of paid vacation... Or listen to TV pastors preach about the need to "reach out to terrorists. To understand and forgive".

These days, Europe reminds me of an old woman who, with shaking hands, frantically hides her last pieces of jewelry when she notices a robber breaking into a neighbor's house.

Appeasement?

Europe, thy name is Cowardice.

---God Bless America---

