

California Republican League
888 Robb Road
Palo Alto CA 94306



The Progressive Republican

The California Republican League's Newsletter

Vol. Four, Issue One

www.republicanleague.org

Fall 2009



LINDA LINGLE

by Mark Herrick
President, CRL

If McCain was set on choosing a VP candidate in the last election that was female and from one of our newer and smaller states, McCain should have picked Linda Lingle and not Sarah Palin. Linda Lingle is the type of woman that should be seen as the future of our party, not Sarah Palin. Linda Lingle

A TALE OF TWO WOMEN

became the first female Republican governor in the history of Hawaii. The Democrat party had a lock on the state since its founding in 1959, and she broke that lock. She could not get elected without a rash of Democrats and Independents voting for her. On the other hand, Pee-wee Herman could win the governorship of Alaska with the Republican nomination, but it took a very special woman to

pull an upset for the Republicans in Hawaii. And Linda Lingle is a very special woman. She is a smart, well-educated woman who has a strong record of cleaning up corruption, reducing waste and fraud, and making government more efficient.

What social conservatives don't understand is that you need more than the base to win a



SARAH PALIN

presidential election in this country. You need a candidate that appeals to people beyond the base. How many Democrats or Independents have you met that would vote for Sarah Palin? It's like the social conservatives confuse the idea of wanting a candidate that scares the rank and file Democrat because of their policy positions with the idea of a candidate that

[Continued on Next Page...](#)



JULIETTE FRETTE

THE FEMINIST FROM PLAYBOY

by Mark Herrick

As you can imagine, the last issue of The Progressive Republican stirred up quite a controversy. "The Denial Continues: The GOP and Abortion" ruffled quite a few feathers. The article was reprinted in many other newspapers, including the California Congress of Republicans' newsletter Grass Roots. Consequently, there was a lot of discussion about the article on blogs and in other parts of the internet. I must say controversy is fun.

The most current controversy is the Open Primary that Senator Abel Maldonado pushed through the legislature as a price for his yes vote on the budget. The Open Primary is critical to the future of the GOP, but I am going to put off addressing it until the spring because there is another issue that needs addressing now.

That issue is Feminism.

SEXISM IN THE LAST ELECTION

In the last election, many feminists felt that the mainstream media bent over backwards avoiding reporting on or legitimizing any racist attacks on Barack Obama but reported and legitimized many sexist attacks on Hillary Clinton. Whether or not that is true, I do believe that Sarah Palin was subject to attacks that were blatantly sexist and completely unacceptable.

[Continued on Next Page...](#)

Continued from "A Tale of Two Women" on front

scars the Democrat leadership because of their electability. Sarah Palin scares Democrat voters (and independents) because they would hate to see her in office. Sarah Palin may scare the average Democrat voter but most people in the Democrat leadership would sell their right arm to have Sarah Palin be the Republican nominee in 2012.

Nominating Sarah Palin would be like punting on first down. She would get almost zero Democrat and Independent votes thereby insuring her opponent's victory. Democratic voters in Hawaii like Linda Lingle, and she scares the Democrat leadership because they know she could steal voters away from them. Sarah Palin becoming the Republican nominee in 2012 would be Obama's greatest dream. Linda Lingle would be his worst nightmare.

In California we had a governor with the worst approval ratings in California history; Governor Gray Davis. During the Republican primary Gray Davis actually

ran ads against the moderate Republican Los Angeles Mayor Riordan to insure that his opponent would be the socially conservative Simon in the general election. The social conservatives, who control the leadership of the California Republican Party, were sure Davis had made a mistake by helping Simon. Unfortunately the Democrat leadership in California is much more politically savvy than our own Republican leadership.

Not only did Simon scare Democrats and Independents, but he scared them so much that they chose the most unpopular governor in California history instead of Simon. Simon lost the un-losable race. Just nine months after Davis beat Simon by five points; there was a recall election where Arnold Schwarzenegger, who many social conservatives refused to support, crushed Gray Davis in one of the biggest landslides in history.

So the social conservative lost to Davis, and the socially moderate candidate crushed him by almost twenty points only nine months

later. Any Republican that is interested in winning instead of just whining and being condemned to the minority should study those two elections and never forget them.

To win back the White House, the House of Representatives, and the Senate we need candidates that will appeal to Democrats and Independents. Not ones that will scare them. Linda Lingle was the first woman elected to the office of Maui County Mayor, at the age of 37. In 1994, Lingle easily won re-election. Under Lingle's leadership, Maui County implemented performance-based budgeting. Its successful passage and execution earned for Lingle the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award from the Government Finance Officers Association.

As governor, Lingle has created a record surplus of \$730 million, coming from the budget's previous deficit of \$250 million. Governor Lingle has signed a number of important bills into law, including the Three Strikes

Law and Sex Offender Registry Website Law. On November 20, 2006, her approval rating stood at 71%, with only 24% disapproval. Those numbers are even more amazing when one realizes that the Democrats are the majority party in the state of Hawaii. Can you even name one positive legislative or executive accomplishment that Sarah Palin achieved in Alaska while she held elective office?

The Democrat leadership is sitting around hoping and praying that we choose candidates like Sarah Palin and Simon in 2010 and 2012, so no matter how badly the Democrats screw up, they can still get reelected. The Republican Party has a long and strong bench of potential female Republican candidates: Christine Todd Whitman, Susan Collins, Kay Bailey Hutchinson, Linda Lingle etc. But former Governor Palin is not one of them. Let's hope she remains in the dugout.

Continued from "The Feminist from Playboy" on front

The most obvious sexist attack was the accusation from many corners that she had too many children to take care of to have time to do an effective job if she became President. Many male presidential candidates have had many children and never has such an attack been made against them. Yet I did not hear a peep of complaint from the feminist community about this sexist attack or any others. And there were many opportunities for feminists to come to her defense. While I did not agree with many of Ms. Palin's positions, her treatment illustrated the hypocrisy of many feminists, for whom partisanship trumps principles. So in this issue I would like to address feminism and what feminism really means.

THE CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN LEAGUE AND FEMINISM

The California Republican League (CRL) is a socially progressive organization. We support a woman's right to choose, support equal rights for woman and, in general, support the feminist cause.

However, its current president (me) since his halcyon days in college has not considered himself a feminist. Truth be told, since college I have considered myself an enemy of the feminist cause. This may cause many to question my qualifications for holding the position of President of this venerable organization, but at least hear my case. When I entered college I considered myself sympathetic to feminism and feminists, but after going through the "Political Correct" meat grinder of a liberal arts institution, I came out the other end very much a skeptic of feminists and feminism.

FEMINISM AND AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

My college, like many others during the mid 1980s, was going through a phase of shedding its white male-dominated curricula that it had used for over a century and was embracing a new curriculum that exposed students like myself to "alternative studies" courses. So

instead of fulfilling my general education requirements by studying Plato, Locke, or Nietzsche, I found myself in a "woman studies" course.

It soon became apparent that the purpose of this class was to purge my "chauvinist programming" which had been indoctrinated in me since birth. Part of this reprogramming regime was to extricate the use of the words mankind, he, him and history from my vocabulary. But the most important goal of this class was to sweep away the smoke screen that had blinded me my whole life and get me to embrace an incontrovertible truth: every aspect of our modern western culture either directly or indirectly, aided and abetted in, the subjugation of and discrimination against the fairer sex.

I was taught only a complete overhaul of the entire system would enable us to purge our vile culture of its intrinsic chauvinism. Capitalism and Feminism could not coexist because Capitalism was a system created and engineered by white males to keep white males

dominant. Therefore Capitalism needed to be replaced by a more "socialized" system that could insure gender equality. I was also taught that 95% of all sex was rape, and that fraternities (one of which I was a member at the time) were simply organizations designed with the exclusive purpose of raping and exploiting women.

I left college, and immediately entered a joint JD/MBA program, where much to my surprise my feminist reeducation continued. I had "feminist professors" who imbued their courses with this new progressive thinking, which was an amazing feat considering not one of the classes I took in law school or in business school had the term feminist, feminine, women – or even the term equal rights – in their title. I had a torts professor who taught us that the bonds created through female relationships were much stronger than any familial bonds and supported the idea that socialism was the only way to cure the inequality between men and women. I had a management professor

Continued on Last Page...

THE WOMEN'S ISSUE

In this issue you may notice that we are focusing on women. McCain turned Governor Palin into a national public figure overnight by choosing her as his running mate, and now many consider her the leader of our party. In California we have serious female Republican candidates running for Governor and for the U.S. Senate. So, in this issue of the Progressive Republican, I hope to start a general conversation about issues that concern women and which sort of women we want to lead the Republican Party.

Please notice that the California Republican League has undergone a facelift. We have a new logo, a new webpage, we are now on Facebook, MySpace, and you can follow us on Twitter. The front page of the web page www.republicanleague.org is now a Blog. A Blog is basically a place where people can post their ideas concerning articles posted on the website. If you have the time, please visit our Blog and make comments on the articles posted there. Also please feel free to send letters into the CRL to continue the discussion in the Progressive Republican. Any thoughtful letters will be published in the next issue of the Progressive Republican and will be placed into the Blog on the CRL webpage.

CARLY FIORINA SAVES THE DAY

It looked as though Boxer was going to take another walk on this election but Ms. Fiorina has come to the rescue. In the last issue of the Progressive Republican, I explained how the main Republican candidate prior to Ms. Fiorina's entrance, Chuck Devore, can never be a Senator from California. (To see that article go to the CRL website at www.republicanleague.org and look at the archived newsletters) Ms. Fiorina has two qualifications that one needs to be elected state wide in California that Mr. Devore Lacks. First, she is pro-choice; California has not sent a pro-life Senator to Washington in my lifetime, and I am middle-aged. She also has truck loads of money. California is a huge state, and the only way to reach the voters is through television, and we live in the most expensive TV market in the United States. Of our two Democrat Senators, Senator Boxer is definitely the most vulnerable. Now that Ted Kennedy is no longer with us, Senator Boxer just might be the most liberal Senator in the U.S. Senate. California is not the most liberal state in the Union, so Boxer's views do not mirror the views of the majority of California's voters. If the Republicans are smart enough to nominate Carly Fiorina (not a sure bet – we are notorious for choosing bad candidates for statewide office – just look at Simon), the California Senate race will be interesting for the first time in decades. If the Republicans nominate Chuck Devore, Boxer won't even have to enter the ring to get a TKO. The race will be over before it begins.



CARLY FIORINA

Become a Member!

There are four ways you can join CRL:

1. Cut out the order form below, fill out the requested information, and send it in with a check payable to CRL.
2. Cut out the order form, fill it out, and mail it to the address above with your credit card information written on the form in the space provided.
3. Fax the order form with your credit card information written on the form in the space provided.
Fax number: (650) 941-6987
4. Go to our website at www.republicanleague.org and sign up there using your credit card.

Email comments, suggestions, or questions to: president@republicanleague.org

2009 Membership Order Form

Name:

Address:

City: State: Zip:

Phone: Fax:

Email Address:

Please include your email address above as email will be the primary means of communication among the CRL membership.

\$40 for an individual member \$65 for a couple
 other amount _____

Credit card type (circle one):

Visa Mastercard JCB Diner's Club
Carte Blanche American Express Discover

Credit Card Number:

Expiration Date:

Print your name exactly as it appears on the credit card:

If you are paying by credit card, please ensure the address you provide matches the address and telephone number on file with your credit card company.

Mail to:

California Republican League
888 Robb Road
Palo Alto, CA 94306
Fax: (650) 941-6987

Continued from "The Feminist from Playboy" on Page 2

in my MBA program that pretty much treated her class as a sexual harassment sensitivity training program. The main task of a business seemed to be gender sensitivity, rather than making some money.

After suffering through these classes my opinion still remained that the basic goals of feminism – i.e., of letting a woman have control over her own body (through the right to choose and through access to contraceptives) and to be treated equally under the law – were goals I should support. But as an avowed Capitalist, I treated any feminist who wanted to end Capitalism as the enemy, and any woman that wanted to institute affirmative action as the enemy.

Then there was the whole issue of the objectification of woman.

A FEMINIST PLAYMATE? YOU MUST BE JOKING.

Quite through chance, a friend of a friend turned out to be a recent Playboy Playmate. Not only is she a Playmate, but she considers herself a feminist. And not only is she a feminist, but she has the credentials to back it up. She graduated as a "woman's studies" major from UCLA. So she had gone through the same indoctrination I had gone through in college, but unlike me, this indoctrination was repeated in many classes (in the double digits) and she wrote a thesis about feminism.

During my brief encounter with feminism, I had learned that Playboy was an evil institution created to further the exploitation of women through objectification, and its existence encouraged rape and the degradation of women. So here was the seeming paradox of a woman who had majored in feminism, considers herself a feminist, and at the same time supports Playboy as an institution. So it seemed to me she was the equivalent of an African American being part of the Aryan Nation.

I had the lucky opportunity to meet Ms. Frette to find out her view of this seeming paradox. She is not only a Playboy Playmate, but is a professional artist (yes, she has really sold some paintings) and is a paid writer who has written critiques and articles about other artists and their work. In other words, she is a published writer and professional painter by the age of twenty-four. (By way of comparison, at

twenty-four I was still in graduate school honing my drinking skills and pickup lines.)

With Ms. Frette, not only was I able to confront my issues with feminism with an actual credentialed feminist, but I was able to confront a credentialed feminist who was being attacked by other feminists for being a traitor to the cause.

The first big issue we tackled was the Objectification of woman.

THE OBJECTIFICATION OF WOMEN

Objectification, according to Ms. Frette, was any time a woman was treated as a mere object as opposed to a thinking rational being. Obviously, women are objectified in Playboy, but then again they are also objectified by most of the great artists of the world. How many nude women are portrayed in famous works of art? These models were not chosen for their high IQs.

According to Ms. Frette, objectification is fine when women are being appreciated purely for their beauty and their feminine form. According to Ms. Frette there is nothing wrong with the appreciation of beauty. Therefore, objectification is fine as long as women are not being degraded while they are being objectified.

When posing for Playboy, Ms. Frette always felt she was treated with respect, and the work she was posing for celebrated the female form and beauty. At no time when working with playboy has she ever felt degraded. The kind of objectification she finds objectionable is objectification that is degrading, which Ms. Frette has certainly experienced. For example, when she was applying to be a host for a TV program and the producers discussed her physical shortcomings in front of her, it was degrading. They treated her as if she was not there, and that her feelings did not matter. This was degrading objectification.

So Ms. Frette felt that objectification, as long as it was respectful and celebrated beauty and the feminine form, was not degrading and therefore does not conflict with the feminist cause. However, if the woman who is the subject of the objectification is not treated with respect, and her body is not treated with respect, then Ms. Frette asserts that this sort of objectification is degrading and harmful to the feminist cause. Obviously there are a lot of feminists that disagree with her, but I found her reasoning compelling. She clearly had put in a lot of thought into the

subject, and probably more thought than most of her feminist detractors.

SEX, CAPITALISM AND FEMINISM

Much to my relief, Ms. Frette did not consider ninety-five percent of all sex to be rape and did not consider all men to be the enemy of feminism. Ms. Frette does have a boyfriend that she is in a committed relationship with, and does not feel used or abused in that relationship. (I got the feeling from our conversation that her boyfriend is a Republican, which unfortunately she is not).

Also to my relief, Ms. Frette does not consider Capitalism to be in direct opposition to feminism, as she believes a well-working Capitalist system provides equal economic opportunity to all. Our system may not provide equal opportunity to men and women, as there is a wage gap and glass ceilings scattered throughout our system, but these problems do not exist because we have a Capitalist system. We just haven't made our system as truly efficient as it could be. Our system, by not providing equal opportunities, is inefficient and has distorted markets because resources are not being utilized to their fullest extent. In many cases, the best person for the job is not getting that job (the glass ceiling) and in certain places less efficient producers are earning more than more efficient producers (the wage and salary gap). This is a distortion of Capitalism, not a natural consequence.

Therefore once feminists help cure these inefficiencies, it will improve the system for everyone. The problem is not Capitalism, just American Capitalism, which is a good system, but we can improve upon it. I certainly couldn't argue with that position.

WOMEN IN COMBAT

One interesting conversation we had was about women in the military; specifically, should woman be allowed in combat roles where they might be potentially harmed or captured?

I have to admit that I am against woman serving in combat roles for three reasons. First, female casualties are especially hard on army morale (among the men). Second, it is hard for men to leave women casualties behind in a strategic retreat. Lastly, woman prisoners are more often subjected to sexual abuse and exploitation than their male counterparts.

Ms. Frette insisted that if a woman wants to fight for her country, the perspective of

other people or the actions of the enemy should not deprive her of that right. Her position reminded me of the movie *Glory* where the African American soldiers were told that if they were captured by the Confederate Army, they would not be taken prisoner but would be immediately shot as "rebellious slaves." The white officers that led these men were also told that if they were captured they would be treated as men inciting slave insurrection and would be immediately shot upon capture. However, most of the African Americans and their officers chose to remain and fight.

Ms. Frette pointed out that just because the enemy might abuse woman more, or men might have a problem fighting alongside woman, women should still have the right to fight for their country just as the African Americans did in the Civil War.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The last subject we discussed was a subject on which I was sure we would disagree: affirmative action. Of course I do not oppose the hiring of qualified women and minorities, but I do oppose preferences and quotas. I believe preferences and quotas based on race or sex are reverse discrimination and make our system inefficient. Surprisingly (at least to me), Ms. Frette's views on the subject are as follows: "I support equal opportunity - affirmative action at best is an imperfect temporary solution to a long-term problem. The best person ultimately should get the job; however, I do not oppose aiming to hire more women in certain job categories if there are deficiencies. In other words, you can endeavor to find more female applicants to add to the field of applicants, as long as in the end, the most qualified person from the field of applicants is hired." So it seems on that one subject we agree.

There were many more subjects we discussed that I just don't have the space in this periodical to address. However, Ms. Frette did make me seriously reexamine my ideas about feminism, and hopefully this article did the same for you. If you are interested in further reading about Ms. Frette, you can visit her web page at www.julietfrette.com. Her web page has clips of many of her writings and pictures of her artwork.