



# Quail Creek Republican Club



Volume 2  
March 2007

Issue 3  
[www.quailcreekrepublicans.com](http://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

After a rather cold winter by Arizona standards, March brings us warmer weather and spring training baseball. On the 2007 political front, our Senator John McCain has entered the GOP Presidential race, QCR Christi Tucker was elected to the Board of the Greater Green Valley Republican Club, and the Congressional Democrats have demonstrated their inability to accomplish much of any substance. I suppose trying to get Democrats organized and focused is sort of like herding cats (entertaining, but a hopeless effort.)

Our March 16 speaker will be Linda White, Executive Director of the Pima County GOP. Linda will provide us with insights into the practical operation of the Republican organization in Arizona and Pima County and perhaps how we fit into the equation. Thereafter, my tentative plan is for the QCRs to host an informal gathering in April or May for our members and the greater QC Republican community and to invite some of our local political figures to join us for some GOP conversation and refreshment. Our October get-together was a huge success and a repeat performance should be fun for all.

Please remember to submit your dues (\$20 per person and \$25 per couple) to QCR Treasurer, Jim Nichols. To be a viable and effective local political organization, we need to have some financial resources available to us. We can not and should not depend on the QCR board members, the QC PCs, and other local GOP organizations to fund our efforts and activities.

I hope to see all at our meeting on Friday, March 16 at 9 AM, Ballroom #3. Keep the faith.

John Chernoski, President

## **February News Recap**

### **Senator Jim DeMint - comments on Iraq - February 5**

Theodore Roosevelt, one of our greatest presidents, once said, "It is not the critic who counts."

Rather, admonished Roosevelt, "the credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs, and comes short again and again, because there is no effort without error and shortcoming; but who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly."

Right now, our commander in chief and those he commands are daring greatly and our brave warriors are paying with blood, sweat and tears. Yet, many in Congress prefer to sit in the arena stands and offer scorn rather than support.

For a half-century, the Middle East has been a cauldron of brutality, war and despair. The instability has threatened the globe and reached our shores with a stark awakening on Sept. 11. It is for this reason that our involvement there is so important.

Yet, as our efforts in Iraq encounter fierce resistance from a determined and evil enemy, support among politicians at home has waned. Instead, many of my colleagues prefer to support a nonbinding resolution that expresses disapproval of the president's plan to reinforce our troops in Iraq.

Voting for such a resolution is not leadership; it is criticism -- criticism without offering alternative solutions. While this resolution may be legally toothless, it is full of meaning.

Voting to condemn the president's plan is a vote of no confidence in the mission that we have told our troops to carry out. It is also a smack to the face of Gen. David Patraeus, just days after the Senate voted unanimously to support his leadership of our troops in Iraq. "Godspeed General," said one of my colleagues, before introducing the very resolution that would undermine his authority.

This is not leadership. We were elected to make tough decisions and that requires understanding what our choices are.

However, I am afraid the critics do not acknowledge the real choices before us. We have only three: continue the unworkable status quo, admit defeat and withdraw or renew our strength until we win.

I can respect my colleagues who disagree with the president's strategy, but only if they exercise leadership and support an alternative solution, one that proposes a serious path to victory or announces defeat and ends our involvement immediately. If you do not support sending reinforcement to Iraq, then have the courage to introduce legislation blocking that action. While I believe this is shortsighted and wrong, at least it would be genuine leadership.

My hope is that senators would stop trying to look to the past in order to lay blame, and remember that the United States is locked in a struggle larger than Iraq. It is a struggle of security, hope and freedom versus insecurity, despair and fear. Congress should understand the stakes and demonstrate real leadership. This is not President Bush's war, it is freedom's war and we all share responsibility for the outcome.

Almost 100 years later, Roosevelt is still correct. The critic "who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better," is destined to be relegated to that terrible place "with those cold and timid souls who neither know victory nor defeat."

There is only one policy worthy of the blood and sweat of our troops: a policy that completes our mission with dignity, honor and victory.

## EVANS-NOVAK Political Report - February 7

While Republicans long have considered House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) a target of opportunity, she is the dominant Democratic figure so far in the Democratic-controlled Congress. She is eclipsing highly respected Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) in influence. A powerful figure behind the scenes is Rep. George Miller (D-Calif.), called Pelosi's consigliere. Former Sen. John Edwards (D-NC) was the winner of the parade of Democratic presidential candidates at last week's Democratic National Committee meeting in Washington. Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-N.Y.) was not exactly a dud, but she was not very inspiring, either. The breaking of support for her in Hollywood, where there is substantial backing for Sen. Barack Obama (D-Ill.), indicates there will be no unopposed coronation for the nomination as she had hoped. Democrats are already working on a hit list of Republican congressional retirements for 2008 to create open seats that are easier to win -- a factor in the '06 elections outcome. With life in the minority less pleasant, several retirements impend. The first announced retiree is Sen. Wayne Allard (R-Colo.). With former Denver Broncos quarterback John Elway ruling himself out as a Republican candidate, Rep. Mark Udall (D) is the early favorite.

President 2008

Hillary Clinton: While Sen. Clinton's presidential stock is rising among her congressional colleagues in Washington, prominent liberal Democrats in her home base of New York City fear that Clinton's national negative ratings remain high at around 45 percent. Clinton's performance in Iowa last week received poor reviews from liberals at home, who did not laugh at her little joke aimed at husband Bill Clinton when she was asked about her ability to handle "evil, bad men." John McCain:

McCain's frontrunner status has been in question with many polls showing former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani (R) in the lead for the Republican nomination. But McCain received a big vote of confidence when British Prime Minister Tony Blair requested McCain participate in the process of increasing the legitimacy of the Northern Irish Parliament. McCain was asked to contact the Rev. Ian Paisley, the hard-line Protestant leader in Northern Ireland, to press him to discuss a power-sharing plan. McCain has been actively engaged in this issue since 2005, and success could put him in the lead. Meanwhile, McCain has fallen out of favor with liberals because he is taking a more orthodox Republican line on taxes this time than he did in 2000. McCain now says he wants the Bush tax cuts to be made permanent, and he opposes any increase in Social Security taxes to finance Social Security reform. He now counts

supply-side economist Arthur Laffer among his advisors. This has cost McCain the support he once enjoyed among liberal journalists and other non-Republicans who were entranced by his campaign against George W. Bush in 2000. The tax question, to them, is one more straw on the camel's back, along with McCain's new

peace with the Rev. Jerry Falwell and his support for more troops in Iraq. McCain has many orthodox conservative credentials already -- he was fighting congressional earmarks before it was popular. But conservatives still do not trust him on questions such as the environment and campaign finance reform. In fact, McCain could

be embarrassed later this year if the newly composed Supreme Court strikes down key provisions of his signature McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill. Mitt Romney: No matter how much credibility McCain gains with conservatives, former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney appears to be winning their support much more. Romney unveiled the names of his 22-member congressional whip team, and among them was Rep.

Tom Feeney (R-Fla.), head of the House Conservatives Fund and a key player in the Republican Study Committee.

### **Paul Galanti – Richmond, Va. Times-Dispatch Guest Columnist – February 8**

Since I was otherwise occupied as a POW in Hanoi and wasn't able to observe firsthand, I suppose it was a '60s thing -- when everybody who was anybody was or deeply aspired to be a victim. And, later, when the soldiers who'd fought valiantly in a war they actually won handily en route to defeating an entire evil empire demanded the same respect given every other element in society -- deserving or not -- they were accorded their own category of victimhood and enshrined in the most out-of-sight, obscure memorial in Washington, D.C. The re-writing of history to correct the many historical perversions has been very slow in coming. I remember writing one of my first Op/Eds about the Vietnam "Wall," which reminded me then of a big hole in the ground or a large open mouth? Is a contemporary actress/ally of our enemy. But it was a nice gesture. Although it tended to patronize the suddenly glamorous former "baby killers," most of our contemporaries in military service shrugged it off as a belated, sort-of thanks from a grateful nation.

From my first days in the military, I was taught that our job was to serve; there would be tough times but keep a stiff upper lip and press on. And enjoy the good times and camaraderie that military life -- almost exclusively -- engenders. Most movies back then had male heroes who sucked up adversity and pressed on. Mothers encouraged their daughters to marry the strong, silent types -- like John Wayne.

On my return in 1973, being greeted by crowds and overuse of the sobriquet "hero" was embarrassing and confusing. The words and articles written about our incarceration in the filthy, miserable dungeons of communist Vietnam were laced with the term "heroes" -- and there were, in fact, a few of those. But it became apparent, early on, that by hero the writers and speakers and extollers usually meant victim -- as in you poor guys. There was obviously a confusion of terminology! In fact, the roles had been reversed.

At Home, the Same Spin

During my entire time in the infamous Hanoi Hilton POW compound, I felt like Winston Smith in Orwell's 1984 as the North Vietnamese propagandists talked about their glowing victories and mocked American efforts as the ignominious defeats of the U.S. aggressors and their lackeys. Now that I was home, I began to feel that propagandists in our country had developed their own strain of Newspeak to justify their weak arguments. When we POWs were released in February 1973 after the crushing B-52 raids and crippling of North Vietnamese commerce, I thought we'd won. Imagine my surprise when many Americans apparently indoctrinated by academia and a powerful media seemed to think we'd been routed.

Fast forward to 2007. Reading the generally unbelievable mainstream media, one would suspect that unemployed communist propagandists had found a new home -- as journalists. Their endless agonizing over American losses omits any mention of the good things that are happening throughout the Middle East or even the crippling losses of the other side! Embedded in the safe Green Zone, reporters write damning articles that cannot be corroborated. I'm almost glad this is happening because I can now see with my own eyes what transpired here in the 1960s while I read between the lines in Vietnam. From the condescending words used to describe the fighting forces, to outright exaggerations and lies, efforts are made to transform our servicemen into "victims."

Regardless of how it started, the assault on America by our own tenured, unassailable academy, by our own "free" press and politicians for personal gain is undone by e-mails from actual soldiers and Marines in harm's way. But the true story usually fails to gain traction.

It's much easier to manufacture hand-wringing bad news to weep and wail and whine about our valiant troops/victims than it is to find something interesting to report about our successes. Call it the Dan Rather/Jayson Blair School of Journalistic Integrity -- it has a deleterious effect on those who never cross-check the stories. It's a good reason that polls can swing up and down by 10 percentage points on the basis of an unreliable but sensational story.

Military Doesn't Need Sympathy

Our armed forces are not victims. They are not in Iraq because they're dumb. They are performing selfless acts on behalf of all Americans, and they don't need sympathy. That, simply, is what they do. Proudly. And justifiably so.

Always have, always will.

It's something the Hate America crowd will never understand. Frankly, most of those serving don't care what their de facto domestic enemies think of them. But, if those ungrateful Americans ever need help, their armed forces will be there serving proudly.

A Richmond resident, retired Navy commander and attack pilot Paul Galanti was a prisoner of war in Vietnam from 1966 until 1973. He is currently the chairman of the Board of Veterans Services for the commonwealth. His Commentary Columns regarding veterans appear regularly on the Back Fence.

### **Get Involved - Pima County GOP - February 13**

The new year is well underway. We have a new administration at our State Republican Party and we are moving forward with new ideas and great optimism for the future of Pima County. Please read the quote (below) from the Democrats of Pima County: "After re-electing Governor Napolitano and Attorney General Goddard, and sending two new Democratic members to Congress from Arizona, we have the GOP on the run. Of course our focus has now shifted to gaining control of the White House and of the state legislature, and if the GOP

nominee is not from our state, we have a great chance of delivering Arizona's electoral votes to the Democratic nominee, whoever he or she is."

The line is drawn in the sand. We have much work to do. It will be a very busy year. Along with our GOTV efforts for City Council, we will continue to register Republican voters and recruit and train new Precinct Committeemen and women. Our efforts last year produced 14,000 more voters at the polls in November than in the last mid-term election. We made over 500,000 voter ID and GOTV calls from April of 2006 through Election Day. As we are now the fastest growing state in the country, our work becomes even more important. Many people are permanently moving to Arizona and it is our job to get them registered and encourage

### **Evans – Novak Political Report – February 14**

President 2008

Two of the Republican presidential candidates embraced President Bush's troop surge. That puts all three of the top GOP candidates in favor of the surge.

Rudy Giuliani: His embrace of the troop surge is characteristic of his tough-guy posture toward issues of national security. It keeps him from stepping on the sitting President's toes, and it puts him in line with the other top GOP presidential candidates.

Giuliani is often dismissed because of his social liberalism. He leads in several polls for the GOP nomination, but many believe that his support will slacken when more Republican primary voters learn about his social liberalism.

But as Rudy courts conservatives, more than a few are willing to overlook his social liberalism and embrace his candidacy. The former New York City mayor tries to show that pro-lifers would probably see little difference between him and George W. Bush in terms of the kind of judges he would appoint, and he gives a soft sell to his support for gun control, arguing that New York was impossible to control without it. Throw in that Rudy is tough on terror and could be the most electable, and the conservative case for him is at least serious. The questions surrounding Rudy are first, whether enough conservatives can be sold on a pro-choice, pro-gun control candidate, and second, whether his meanness and his tumultuous personal life are too much for any presidential candidate to overcome.

Rudy has been the slowest of the major candidates to build up his organization, but he has hired 60 or more staffers in recent weeks.

Mitt Romney: Former Massachusetts Republican Gov. Mitt Romney's call for more troops in Iraq (to accompany his presidential announcement) was a rather bold move that goes strongly against the grain of the current debate. As the last man to announce his position, he still had the option of coming out with a qualified opposition; but instead, he has produced a situation in which all three of the top Republican candidates are in support of the Bush policy.

The Iraq troop surge is considered unpopular -- many have attributed the lagging numbers of Sen. John McCain, the surge's other supporter in the presidential field, as evidence of this fact. The new development in which all three leading Republican candidates back the surge could change that, but it could also hurt the Republican field over all.

Romney spoke of the Iraq War and the consequences of failure should the U.S. withdraw too soon. This represents a total embrace of the surge not just a belief that the surge can help the U.S. get out of Iraq as soon as possible. It may not be the wisest way to approach the surge politically, but it reflects the fact that Romney still views McCain as the man to beat.

Romney's announcement was not overshadowed by the decision of three state representatives to turn on him and instead support McCain, but the timing could not have been much better for McCain.

John Edwards: Former Sen. John Edwards (D-NC) handled himself very poorly when conservative bloggers exposed his two new webmaster hires as the authors of several vicious and some unrepeatable anti-Catholic posts on their blogs.

The material is offensive enough that it outraged some on the so-called "religious left" and not just the usual cadre of right-wing Christians. Yet it put Edwards in a rough spot: Should he alienate the liberal blog community by capitulating and firing the bloggers, or let a controversy rage on in which he was paying bloggers who had posted on the Internet, for all posterity, material clearly intended to offend Christians? He chose to keep the staffers, both of whom resigned this week.

Edwards is fortunate that so much of the Democratic base is secular. The political lesson for presidential candidates is to run a web search on the names of new employees, because a failure to check could be hazardous to one's candidacy.

### **Evans-Novak Political Report - February 21**

The principal issue in Washington is the Democratic effort to stop the surge of troops in Iraq. The non-binding resolution is only a sideshow. The coming battle over funding promises to be an epic struggle with constitutional implications. Whatever happens on the congressional scene, there is a strong feeling inside the Bush Administration that the Iraq issue must be decided one way or another long before the end of the year. Republicans are determined not to go into the 2008 election year with blood being spilled in Iraq. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) is functioning as a partisan leader, much more in the style of Newt Gingrich than Dennis Hastert. Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) has been eclipsed as Pelosi makes the decisions with her close friend and adviser, Rep. George Miller (D-Calif.). House Republican opponents of Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) for the presidential nomination are coalescing around former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney, forgiving and forgetting his liberalism of a dozen years earlier. Romney is the fastest rising of the Republican candidates. However, Romney has not yet connected with rank-and-file conservatives, who seem to prefer former Speaker Gingrich. Nobody thinks Gingrich can be nominated. But if he runs, he could do grave damage to Romney.

#### **Congress**

**Troop Funding:** Rep. John P. Murtha (D-Pa.) has a knack for shooting his mouth off, sometimes to his detriment. He did this again last week with his decision to divulge the rationale behind the Democrats' latest tactic in opposing the Iraq War. Rather than legislating directly in favor of redeployment -- either through another non-binding resolution (see below) or a cut in military funding -- Murtha has elected an indirect strategy of weighing down the Iraq occupation by subtly limiting the number of troops that can be deployed. The limitation would come under the guise of "readiness requirements" that would seriously hinder the military's ability to deploy. Murtha's climb from being an ideologically moderate senior back-bencher to becoming a prominent war critic was incredible enough. But his return from defeat and humiliation late last year toward a position of controlling the Iraq theater has been equally surprising. Murtha and his ally, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, had suffered a huge defeat on November 16, when the Democratic Caucus overwhelmingly rejected Murtha as majority leader, choosing instead Rep. Steny Hoyer.

#### **President 2008**

**Early Schedule:** This far out from the presidential election, it is easy to forget how suddenly (and perhaps undramatically) this year's presidential primaries will end. The various state party elections, caucuses and conventions are being moved so far forward that only a miracle will prevent both nominees from being obvious by this time next year.

Many of the primary dates remain unknown at this point. Several legislatures (including Illinois, California, New York, and New Jersey) are currently working on bills to move their state primaries further forward. If these pass, the 2008 primary calendar may look something like this:

## Possible 2008 Primary Schedule

(New Hampshire: See below)

January 14 -- Iowa Caucus.

January 19 -- Nevada Democratic Caucus.

January 29 -- Florida.

February 2 -- South Carolina Primary.

February 5 -- Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, West Virginia Convention.

February 9 -- Louisiana.

February 12 -- Tennessee.

February 19 -- Minnesota, Wisconsin.

March 4 -- Connecticut, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont.

March 11 -- Florida, Mississippi, Washington.

April 15 -- Alaska, Colorado.

April 26 -- Kansas, Nevada.

May 6 -- Indiana.

May 10 -- Wyoming.

May 13 -- Nebraska.

May 20 -- Kentucky, Oregon.

May 27 -- Idaho.

June 3 -- South Dakota.

June 6 -- Hawaii, Virginia.

June 9 -- Montana.

Of some interest is the status of New Hampshire, which is omitted above. Democrats are trying to isolate New Hampshire by removing its "Big Two" status with Iowa, but that is not likely to work. Democrats are trying to increase Nevada's significance by moving its contest to number two, but New Hampshire's state government is capable of moving its primary very quickly, and could do so at such a late date that Democratic officials will be powerless to stop them from going before Nevada.

That aside, the main point here is that the big states are being moved forward, so everything will probably be decided on or around Super Tuesday, Feb. 5, 2008. This has the potential either to heighten or diminish the significance of the earliest contests in Iowa, New Hampshire, and South Carolina. Either they will be rendered irrelevant as candidates focus on winning large majorities of the large delegations from Illinois, California, New York and New Jersey, or they will become extremely important by boosting one of the candidates heading into Super Tuesday.

There is also the possibility that the compressed schedule and the many simultaneous contests could result in a big split decision on Super Tuesday.

### Senate 2008

South Dakota: Despite the brain hemorrhage that has kept him from work so far this year, Sen. Tim Johnson (D-S.D.) appears likely to run for re-election. Sen. Kent Conrad (D-N.D.) served as a stand-in last Wednesday at a Washington fund-raising luncheon for Johnson. Democratic fund-raiser Haroon Khan plans to hold 13 similar fund-raisers for the absent Johnson between now and March. The senator will not attend any of the events.

### **London Financial Times - Oscars add lustre to idea of Gore candidacy - February 27**

The clamour for an Al Gore 2008 presidential candidacy stepped up several decibels yesterday after the evening award of two Oscars to the former vice-president for *An Inconvenient Truth*, his film on global warming. As the most popular politician in Hollywood, who raised the biggest cheers at two different moments during the awards, Mr. Gore put paid to his image as a robotic geek that helped sink his chances of victory against George W. Bush in 2000.

Mr. Gore's transformation has been assisted by his readiness to use self-deprecating humour - most recently on Sunday night when he seemed to be embarking on a speech to announce his presidential candidacy, only to be cut short by the orchestra.

And Democratic party activists who favour a Gore candidacy say the Oscar success, combined with his recent nomination for the Nobel peace prize, would provide the perfect platform for a declaration of his candidacy. Opinion polls put Mr. Gore third behind Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama but ahead of John Edwards and Bill Richardson among the Democratic hopefuls.

Senior Democrats say Mr. Gore could be catapulted into a frontline position, particularly if he waited until September or October when the public is likely to have become saturated with the increasingly tense contest between Mr. Obama and Mrs. Clinton. Last year's Nobel peace prize was announced on 13 October.

"Mr. Gore's extraordinary reinvention as a cultural icon is likely to be sustained by a series of prominent engagements in the next few months, including his appearance as the sole witness next month in Senate and House of Representative committee hearings on global warming.

Meanwhile, friends of Mr. Gore are divided on whether he will declare his candidacy. Some rule it out and others say it is scheduled for the autumn. "He could out-finance everybody except Hillary without too much difficulty," said one.

### **Now you Know**

A young woman was about to finish her first year of college. Like so many others her age she considered herself to be a very liberal Democrat and was 'for' distribution of all wealth.

She felt deeply ashamed that her father was a rather staunch Republican which she expressed openly. One day she was challenging her father on his beliefs and his opposition to higher taxes on the rich and the addition of more government welfare programs.

Based on the lectures that she had participated in and the occasional chat with a professor she felt that for years her father had obviously harbored an evil, even selfish desire to keep what he thought should be his. The self-professed objectivity proclaimed by her professors had to be the truth and she indicated so to her father.

He stopped her and asked her point blank, how she was doing in school.

She answered rather haughtily that she had a 4.0 GPA, and let him know that it was tough to maintain. That she studied all the time and never had time to go out and party like other people she knew. She didn't even have time for a boyfriend and didn't really have many college friends because of spending all her time studying.

Her father listened and then asked, "How is your good friend Mary doing?"

She replied, "Mary is barely getting by." She continued, "She barely has a 2.0 GPA," adding, "and all she takes are easy classes and she never studies."

"But Mary is so very popular on campus, college for her is a blast, she goes to all the parties all the time and very often doesn't even show up for classes because she is too hung over."

Her father then asked his daughter, "Why don't you go to the Dean's Office and ask him to deduct a 1.0 off your 4.0 GPA and give it to your friend who only has a 2.0." He continued, "That way you will both have a 3.0 GPA and certainly that would be a fair and equal distribution of GPA."

The daughter visibly shocked by her father's suggestion angrily fired back, "That wouldn't be fair! I worked really hard for mine, I did without And Mary has done little or nothing, she played while I worked real hard!" The father slowly smiled, winked and said, "Welcome to the Republican Party."

