League of Women Voters
Of Central Yavapai County

Meet and Greet
Wednesday, December 8, 2010
4 to 6 P.M.
Las Fuentes Lower Level
President’s Message

The League has had some really great programs this year. Although they are open to the public, we have been surprised that members of the public sometimes seem to outnumber League members in the audience.

We know that for many of you, League is not your only community involvement. Yet the Board operates according to the direction of its members, including content of programs, adoption of positions, time, and day of meetings. We need YOU, and we need YOUR INPUT!

Please join us on December 8 for a special opportunity to meet and greet some of the many nonprofits in the quad city area which make the Quad Cities area such a special place to live. Let them know about your interest and support.

Our annual MEET AND GREET coming up this month is on WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 8 (the exception to our usual meeting time and day of week). This brings together League members, governmental officials, and non-profit organizations involved in areas of League interest, in a relaxed, fun atmosphere. As usual, we will meet in the Community Room on the lower level of Las Fuentes, 1035 Scott Drive, in Prescott.

Needed: goodies and drinks for our invitees. Call Vivian Perry, 830-9165, and tell her what you will be bringing: – appetizers? Non-alcoholic drinks? Wine?

Bring it by 3:30, and stay on for the event from 4-6 PM.

Let me know, 445-8511, if you are willing to help with the set up of tables, which should start at about 3 PM.

Vicky McLane, President

January: Program Planning and Renewable Energy

Mark your calendars now for Saturday, January 8, when we will do program planning and have a special update on renewable energy from one of our knowledgeable members, Norman Perry.

Program planning in odd numbered years includes examining positions at both local and state levels. Our membership handbook contains our condensed positions, and is well worth reading beforehand. Other information is available on our websites:

LWVUS Website: www.lwv.org
LWVAZ Website: www.lwvaz.org
LWVCYC Website: http://centralyavapai.az.lwvnet.org/
In the wake of Arizona Gov. Jan Brewer appointing Robert Brutinel of Prescott to the Arizona Supreme Court this week, a closer look at judicial confirmations is in order. For an example of how dysfunctional our country has become, Americans need look no further than the judicial-confirmation process.

Brutinel, the presiding judge for Yavapai County Superior Court, will face confirmation by the state Senate. While some say it is not a done deal, that's a story and an editorial for another day.*

On the national scene, it matters not that the judicial branch is short on judges and that many judges speak of a "judicial emergency." If one U.S. senator decides to block a nominee's up-or-down vote for confirmation, then the whole process comes to a halt. In Washington right now, one senator is in fact blocking 24 nominees - all nominated by President Obama - and about half of them are slated to fill seats on courts facing dire shortages of judges. Sen. Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the Senate minority leader, has the authority to allow the confirmation votes to proceed, but he has not done so.

We must point out that it wasn't many years ago that Republican leaders in the Senate were quite concerned that a minority of Democrats would block confirmation of President George W. Bush's nominees by using delaying tactics. A compromise was forged and the confirmation votes proceeded. Now, the roles are reversed. Republicans are in the minority, and will be even when the new Senate convenes in January. Whether Republicans like it or not, Obama is the president and he is responsible for nominating judges.

If the Senate does not give a candidate an up-or-down vote by the end of the month-long lame-duck session that began on Monday, they will have to be re-nominated and go through the confirmation process, from the beginning, all over again. During the Bush administration, Senate Republicans provoked a national outcry against the minority party's obstructionism. Just allow an up-or-down vote, we argued in this space, demanding that Democrats allow the process to work as the constitutional framers envisioned. Now, McConnell and the GOP should heed the same pleas.

What's important to note here is that this is not a totally partisan matter. McConnell is blocking nominees who have been endorsed by their home-state senators, some of whom, including Sen. Richard Burr, are Republicans.

McConnell does not have to vote for these judges if he thinks they are not qualified or if he fears that they will rule contrary to his politics. He can vote against them. But the process should be allowed to play out with a vote of the full Senate.

These judges deserve a confirmation vote, up or down, and the federal bench - like the Arizona Supreme Court - needs reinforcements.

*Correction by: Daniel Furlong: The editorial was wrong when it said, "Brutinel, the presiding judge for Yavapai County Superior Court, will face confirmation by the state Senate." Arizona justices are not confirmed by the state Senate. The Commission on Appellate Court Appointments interviews applicants and sends at least 3 names to the governor, who makes the appointment.
A majority of Americans want Congress to keep the new health-care law or actually expand it, despite Republican claims that they have a mandate from the people to kill it, according to a new McClatchy Newspapers-Marist poll.

The post-election survey indicated that 51 percent of registered voters want to keep the law or change it to do more, while 44 percent want to change it to do less or repeal it altogether.

Driving support for the law: Voters by ratios of 2-1 or greater want to keep some of its best-known benefits, such as barring insurers from denying coverage for pre-existing conditions. One thing they don't like: the mandate that everyone must buy insurance.

On the side favoring the health-care law, 16 percent of registered voters want to let it stand as is.

Thirty-five percent want to change it to do more. Among groups with pluralities who want to expand it: women, minorities, people younger than 45, Democrats, liberals, Northeasterners and those making less than $50,000 a year.

Lining up against the law, 11 percent want to amend it to rein it in.

Thirty-three percent want to repeal it.

Among groups with pluralities favoring repeal: men, Whites, those 45 and older, those making more than $50,000 annually, conservatives, Republicans and "tea party" supporters.

Independents, who helped swing to the Republicans in the Nov. 2 elections, are evenly divided on how to handle the health-care law, with 36 percent for repealing it and 12 percent for restraining it (a total of 48 percent negative) while 34 percent want to expand it and 14 percent want to leave it as is (also totaling 48 percent).

Fifty-nine percent of registered voters vs. 36 percent want to keep the requirement that insurance companies provide coverage to people with pre-existing conditions.

The section of the law requiring insurance companies to allow young adults to remain on their parents' policies until age 26 also is popular. Sixty-eight percent vs. 29 percent polled said keep it.

The survey of 1,020 adults was conducted Nov. 15-18. The margin of error was 3 percentage points.

The Federal District Court in Richmond has promised to rule by the end of the year on the constitutionality of the health reform law’s requirement that most Americans obtain health insurance, which takes effect in 2014. Its decision will then probably be appealed to the US Supreme Court.

The novel question before the courts is whether the government can require citizens to buy a commercial product like health insurance. Because the Supreme Court has said the commerce clause of the Constitution allows Congress to regulate “activities that substantially affect interstate commerce,” the judges must decide whether the failure to obtain insurance can be defined as an “activity.” (On the state level, it is generally accepted that individuals must purchase automobile insurance by law.)

Congressional bill writers did not include a “severability clause” that would explicitly protect other parts of the sprawling law if certain provisions were struck down. The Justice Department, which represents the Obama administration, acknowledges that several of the law’s central provisions, like the requirement that insurers cover those with pre-existing conditions, cannot work unless both the healthy and the unhealthy are mandated to have insurance. Otherwise, consumers could simply buy coverage when they needed treatment, causing the insurance market to “implode,” the federal government asserts.

WASHINGTON - The 2010 elections turned into a rout of the Democrats because the elderly and wealthy surged to the polls to help sweep the Republicans back into power, and the balance of women's votes shifted to the GOP as well, according to a new report.

The study released Monday by Project Vote, a nonpartisan, non-profit group, also found that turnout by pro-Democratic blocs such as African-Americans, young people and Latinos dropped sharply from 2008 levels, leaving a lopsided pro-Republican electorate to dominate the national landscape.

Most of these trends are normal in non-presidential elections because presidential campaigns galvanize broader turnout trends. In most ways, turnout in 2010 was similar to the last midterm election in 2006.

However, one striking development helped Democrats in a few races: Hispanic voting surged in several states, helping Democrats win hotly contested Senate races in California, Colorado and Nevada.

Perhaps the most significant point about voter turnout in 2010 is how many voters didn't go to the polls.

About 38 percent of eligible voters didn't vote in 2008. This November, 33 percent of those who voted in 2008 stayed home, which means that "non-voters were the majority in 2010," the report said.

Compared with 2008, voting dropped off this year particularly among pro-Democratic groups:

- Young voters were down 55 percent.
- African-Americans were down 43 percent.
- Hispanics were down 40 percent.

Of those voters who did show up this year, four out of five were White; one in 10 was African-American; and one in 13 was Latino. The analysis is based primarily on exit-poll data and preliminary estimates from the U.S. Elections Project.

Senior citizens turned out in force: Their turnout was 16 percent higher than in the previous midterm election of 2006, and 59 percent of them voted Republican, up 10 percentage points from 2006. Although voters 65 and older are about 13 percent of the U.S. population, they made up 21 percent of this year's electorate.

Rich people voted heavily, too. Total ballots cast by people making $200,000 a year or more expanded by 68 percent over 2006, the study found. Those making $100,000 to $200,000 cast 11 percent more ballots than they did in 2006. The share of the vote declined for those making less than $50,000 annually.

"It is fair to say that 2010 was the year of older, rich people," the study said.

It's also fair to say that they tilted Republican more than the expanded electorate of the 2008 presidential campaign. For example, this year, fully 41 percent of voters said they supported the "tea party" movement.

Women voters' turnout surged significantly over 2006 as well - and the traditional gender gap vanished. In 2006, women voted Democratic by 55 percent to 43 percent for Republicans. This year, women voted 49 percent for Republicans and 48 percent for Democrats.

Local statistics regarding 2010 turnout:  Yavapai County, 68.01%; Legislative District 1, 66.3%; Arizona, 55.65%
The 2010 election is now a thing of the past. Fortunately the vitriolic political ads also have left the airwaves. It is troubling to see the lack of civility in our political discourse over the past few years. This year’s campaigns were the nastiest I can ever remember.

Instead of dialogues about issues, we heard about candidates’ shortcomings from their opponents. The mudslinging was confusing. Who could we believe?

During a KUAT-TV debate in October among U.S. Rep. Gabrielle Giffords and her challengers Jesse Kelly and Steve Stoltz, the moderator was unable to keep the audience from booing, clapping, and shouting insults. The campaigns were equally guilty. This did nothing to highlight the differences on issues among the candidates.

Last year, a friend drove an hour across town to Sahuaro High School on the east side to hear Giffords explain the health care bill that had just passed Congress. Our Congresswoman was continually shouted down and unable to make her presentation. The audience would not be respectful enough to listen to what the new law included and to hear how she felt it might benefit them. My frustrated friend left the meeting early and drove back home, with many unanswered questions about the legislation.

In August, proponents of Tucson Unified School District’s ethnic studies program demonstrated with signs and verbal insults and disrupted a forum of candidates for State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The anger being expressed with these outbursts does little to solve problems.

What is underlying this vile mood? There are many factors, including peoples’ fears about the future. There is the influence of talk radio’s talking points of messages from those who use showmanship and political guile to gain their audiences. Listeners are reacting without checking the validity of claims or realizing there may be another side to the story. There is also the impact of new technology with people online visiting Facebook and Twitter, blogging and looking at YouTube videos. Because of anonymity, people feel they can cut loose and say what they want. They may not be so anonymous, as things such as Facebook’s privacy settings have been a source of concern.

Time magazine recently put together a social media roundtable where commentators noted that “by creating a place where everyone contributes but few are held accountable, social media is posing new challenges and opportunities for journalism, activism, and government.” The contributors had varied viewpoints about the value of social media but they pointed out there is a danger (to democracy?) when people are too eager to listen to persons like themselves and not pay attention to others with differing opinions. “In general,” they concluded, “people tend to be more civilized when they have to answer to the consequences of the things they do and say.”

What can be done so people respect one another and learn to appreciate differing viewpoints? People can “agree to disagree without being disagreeable.” More interpersonal interaction will help.

One example is our own community’s visioning process now underway, Imagine Greater Tucson. This is a prime example of a way to share varied input for our future. Another is Project Civil Discourse, billed as a “statewide effort to create respectful dialogue and discourse on public issues” sponsored by the Arizona Humanities Council. Their aim is “to improve the quality of life in Arizona.”

They believe Arizonans must discuss potentially divisive issues such as healthcare, religion, race, immigration and transportation, wrestling with these matters without partisanship.

Project Civil Discourse has some practical advice for these troubled times, summed up in “respect diverse points of view, listen with an open mind, and speak with integrity.” We could all benefit from becoming better listeners, thinking about what we’re about to say before speaking and verifying facts before arguing a point of view. For the sake of our democracy, people must be accountable for their words and actions. Without following the simple rules of civil discourse, our society is in danger.
Calendar of Events

2010 - 2011

Wednesday, Dec. 1
Board Meeting: 5:30, Step One, PV

WEDNESDAY, DEC. 08
MEET AND GREET WITH NON-PROFITS
Las Fuentes

Wednesday, December 29
Board Meeting: 5:30, Step One, PV

SATURDAY, JANUARY 8
PROGRAM PLANNING & Renewable Energy Update
Las Fuentes

Wednesday, January 26
Board Meeting: 5:30, Step One, PV

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12
LWVUS STUDY
Las Fuentes

Wednesday, February 23
Board Meeting: 5:30, Step One, PV

SATURDAY, MARCH 11
LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
Las Fuentes

Wednesday, March 30
Board Meeting: 5:30, Step One, PV

SATURDAY, APRIL 9
ANNUAL LUNCHEON & BUSINESS MEETING
Las Fuentes

Wednesday, April 27
Board Meeting: 5:30, Step One, PV

SATURDAY, May 14
POVERTY IN YAVAPAI COUNTY
Las Fuentes

To be scheduled
Board retreat

Let's all make a special attempt to increase our membership.
Show your friends our newsletter.
Invite them to come with you to meetings!

Happy Holidays
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Happy Holidays
As 2010 nears its end, many state League boards are meeting to discuss legislative priorities for the coming year. A lot changed on November 2, so many of you may be looking at a different set of issues and priorities. Based on the political chatter recently, it would appear that many Leagues will be playing defense on core issues, such as proof of citizenship for voter registration and voter ID. And, of course, redistricting will be all important over the next year.

When you meet to set your priorities and develop your strategies, don’t hesitate to reach out to the LWVUS as well as other states. Many state Leagues have already confronted these legislative issues and have much to share. Here in Georgia, for example, the League put up a good fight on voter ID and proof of citizenship without success. So, we have real experience with the unintended consequences and the actual barriers that this type of legislation creates. Those facts may be very useful in legislative testimony or in media pieces.

Our greatest strength is our grassroots, and we should make good use of that strength going into the upcoming legislative sessions. The best support comes from our League family. Let’s make good use of the discussion lists to keep each other informed of our ideas, our challenges, and our successes and be sure to talk up our good work on Facebook!

**LWVUS Privatization Study Committee**

In accordance with direction from Convention 2010, the LWVUS will undertake a study of “Privatization: the policy agenda to transfer government functions, services and assets to the private sector.” This study will focus on the impact of privatizing government services on local communities. Committee members will be responsible for developing study materials and consensus questions and reviewing/tabulating responses submitted by participating Leagues. Based on the submitted responses, the Committee will recommend position language to the Board. If you are interested in being a member of the Study Committee, please complete the online application form and submit it along with your resume no later than December 16, 2010.

**ADVOCACY**

**Action Alert on DISCLOSE Act: Protect Your Vote**

In this year's elections, secret money ran rampant. If we're going cleanse our democracy with a strong dose of transparency that eliminates this kind of spending in our elections then we need action before Congress calls it quits for 2010. This morning at its press conference on Capitol Hill, the League again urged the Senate to pass the DISCLOSE Act during this “lame duck” session.

**In Support of the New START Treaty**

Read LWVUS President MacNamara’s letter to the editor in the New York Times regarding its Nov. 7 editorial, "Plenty of Work for the Lame Duck: And Other Urgent Business."

**Office of Congressional Ethics under Attack**

ABC News cites League’s call to Congress not to shut down the Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE) and quotes LWVUS Senior Director Lloyd Leonard in “Are GOP Leaders Quietly Trying to Axe Office of Congressional Ethics?”

**Open and Civil**

See recent e-engagement message from the LWVUS to our members and supporters on the League’s continuing efforts to help our fellow citizens discuss the issues in a civil and fact-based way and fight for transparency, accountability, and disclosure in America’s elections.

(Roll your mouse over underlined words, then Ctrl + Click to go to link)
**Reminder – Members are always welcome to attend Board meetings. Regular meeting times will be on the calendar.**

To request placement of an item on the Board agenda and/or to receive the Board agenda packet, contact the LWVCYC President a week in advance.

---

**LWV MEMBERSHIP REGISTRATION**

**2010-2011**

Name: _______________________________________________

Address: _____________________________________________

City/Zip:_____________________________________________

Phone: ____________________Fax:_______________________

Email: _______________________________________________

Please check type of membership:

__________$55/Yr Individual Membership

__________$82.50/Yr Household Membership

Plus

$_______Contribution to League (not tax deductible)

$_______Contribution to Education Fund (tax deductible)

Please make donations to LWVAZ Education Fund by separate check, to preserve tax deductibility. This supports our Webpage and Voter Service activities. Thank you!

Dues cover membership through June 30, 2011.

Both new and renewal members, please include this form with your check. Thank you!

New: _________ Renewal: ________

Membership in the LWV is open to any person who subscribes to the purposes and policies of the LWVUS. These dues cover payment for local ($15.30), state ($10), and national ($29.70) memberships.

OR

Be a “Friend” of LWVCYC:

_______$50/Yr Individual or ________$75/Yr Household

Please mail this form and all checks to:

LWVCYC
PO Box 11538 Prescott, AZ 86304-1538

---

**IMPORTANT WEBSITE REFERENCES**

LWVUS Website
www.lwv.org

LWVAZ Website
www.lwvaz.org

LWVCYC Website
http://centralyavapai.az.lwvnet.org/

We recommend that you check these out monthly, or more often. Lots of good information! Bookmark them to save on typing, or go to lwvaz.org, where there are links to click on. Or Google LWVCYC!

Our website includes current and past VOTERS, Pros and Cons of Ballot Initiatives, Directory of Elected Officials, and other great material.