

The Republican Club of Sun City

NEWSLETTER

October 2017

Everett Schmidt, Editor
(Website: rcsctx.com)

Sun City Texas

(Topics Below: Human Nature and the Constitution; Slavery – Founding Era Through Civil War; Black Participation in Post Civil War Politics)

STATE REPRESENTATIVE TERRY WILSON TO ADDRESS CLUB

Rep. Terry Wilson, representing House District 10 which encompasses the counties of Burnet, Milam and part of Williamson county, will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for **Sunday, October 8 in the ballroom of the Social Center in Sun City.** (The event was scheduled for Sunday because of scheduling problems with other dates.)

He is expected to provide insights into the legislation passed and stymied, the political maneuvering connected therewith, and other matters of interest to club members concerning the regular and special legislative sessions.

Terry Wilson is a native Texan, having been born in Odessa, Texas. He is a lifelong conservative Republican and a decorated combat veteran. He holds a BS in Business Administration from Texas A&M University and a MS in Strategic Logistics Plans and Management from the Air War University.

Having attained the rank of Colonel, he recently retired from the Army, after a serving there for over 30 years, where he was a highly regarded senior leader within the Department of Army. He is well versed in major weapons systems development, as well as command and control, communications, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance systems. As a Department of Defense Acquisition Executive, he managed research and development programs with multi-billion dollar budgets.

In his first legislative session in 2017, he was appointed to serve on the Criminal Jurisprudence and Defense & Veterans' Affairs committees.

He has been married to his wife Shannon, for 21 years and together they have two sons. He is also an Assistant Scout Master, and supports local education by speaking to students in schools and serving on special projects.

Special Visitors. Club president Chiles announces there will be some special surprise visitors present during the social period. She says, "members will not want to miss meeting them!"

INFORMATION ABOUT THE MEETING OF SUNDAY, OCTOBER 8

BEGINNING TIMES: Doors Open – 5:45 pm; Social Period – 6:00 pm; Dinner – 6:30 pm; Program – 7:00 pm

MENU: Spinach salad with almonds, mandarin oranges served with cranberry vinaigrette; roasted pork tenderloin with assorted sauces, corn souffle casserole; chef's sauteed garden medley, red skinned mashed potatoes with cream gravy; assorted rolls

COST: Dinner fee is \$18 per person. Checks made out to "The Republican Club of Sun City" should be mailed to: **The Republican Club of Sun City, 1530 Sun City Blvd., Suite 120, Box 227, Georgetown, TX 78633**, or left in a special drop box located on the front porch of the home of club treasurer Gene Edwards at 202 Duck Creek Lane. For information, contact Gene at 520-990-1159 or geneedwards@earthlink.net The deadline for payment or reservations is Monday, October 2.

Complimentary Wine. Judge Rick Kennon of the 368th District Court and Judge Stacey Matthews of the 277th District Court will provide complimentary wine at this meeting.

Attendees are reminded of the request made by the Executive Committee that advanced payments for the dinner be submitted by the payment deadline so the proper amount of food can be ordered, and that attendees who have made reservations in advance make payments *prior* to the *meeting*, when possible, so that a "boggling down" of the line at the ballroom entrance can be avoided.

VISITORS ARE WELCOME! (Non-members may attend a maximum of two meetings per year – as attendees for the dinner or as observers for the program – without having to pay membership dues.)

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PCT. 3, TO ADDRESS CLUB IN NOVEMBER

Judge Bill Gravell, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 3, will address the club during its dinner meeting scheduled for **Thursday, November 16.** (Judge Gravell is the club's chaplain) Details of the meeting will be provided in the November newsletter.

OTHER CLUB NEWS

Nominating Committee's Report. The Nominating Committee – comprised of Meredith Chiles, Cathy Cody, Bill Harron, Brian Olson and Jan Whitlow – will, consistent with club bylaws, officially nominate during the club meeting of **Sunday, October 8** the following individuals as officers, as indicated, for the year 2018:

President – Cathy Cody

Secretary – Laura Kreiger

Vice President (programs) -Susie Johnson

Publicity Manager – Anne Marshall

Vice President (membership) – Brian Olson

Hospitality Director – Pam Olson

Treasure – Gene Edwards

Voting, followed by a brief installation ceremony, will take place during the club's Nov. 16 meeting.

Club Membership for 2018. The Executive Committee will soon announce plans for a membership drive to increase membership in 2018 when important elections will take place. The elections are especially important because of the noted increased strength of Democrats, at least locally.

Present club members may be of some help – even at this early stage – in recruiting new members for 2018 by simply informing prospective new members of two club regulations which could enable them to gain insights into the joy of being with “kindred spirits,” an expression often offered by current members. One regulation enables non-members to attend a maximum of two club meetings per year – as attendees for a dinner (provided the dinner fee was paid) or as an observer for the program – without having to pay membership dues. The second regulation involves the fact that, thanks to the work of webmaster Bill Harron, both members and non-members have access to the club's website at rcscx.com where they can view, download, or transmit to others current and past issues of the club newsletter.

Statistics. Club VP (for membership) Cathy Cody reports that current membership for the year 2017 stands at 402, representing another increase over the previously reported all-time high! Club treasurer Gene Edwards estimates there were 170 members and guests at the dinner meeting of September 7 with an additional 7 individuals attending the program as observers.

HUMAN NATURE AND THE FORMULATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

Foreword. On this past September 17, the U. S. Constitution became 230 years of age, an unprecedented length of time for a governing document. However, while the Constitution has served the nation well for this lengthy period, it has for several decades – beginning primarily from the era of President Wilson and continuing through the era of President Obama – come under attack, as evidenced by recent riots and campus disruptions when other forms of government – including those recognized as fascist, statist or anarchist – are being advocated.

The advocates of another form of government have been successful to a great extent, one might speculate, because there has been little effort expended in our educational systems, or otherwise, to explain to the general public the philosophies which shaped our Constitution.

This report is an attempt to fill that void, at least locally, with particular emphasis on how the framers dealt with human nature, as they understood it, in governmental affairs.

A Realistic View of Human Nature, a Primary Concern of the Framers. Author/talk show host Kirby Anderson points out that James Madison, the chief architect of the Constitution, argued in Federalist 51 that government must be based on a realistic view of human nature, and that “In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men [in contrast with monarchies and religious-based government], the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.”

While in an effort to wisely structure provisions of a Constitution the framers referenced some of the great thinkers of their era – Blackstone (for his “Commentaries”), Lock, Montesquieu and others - researchers have found that, by far, the reference most cited was the Bible. It was from that source that the framers accepted the Bible's portrayal of human nature and factored it into the design of government. That portrayal was that man, while capable of doing good, has a sinful nature of which only one of many manifestations was, as cited by Bible.org, “people are selfish and they do what is good for themselves.” Incorporating a realistic and unchanging view of human nature, as the Framers understood it, in the design of the Constitution may have been a major factor in that document remaining in operation for 230 years, and continuing this day, through a myriad of change.

Madison's Plan. Madison, in coping with man's flawed human nature, divided the the problem of dealing with tyranny into two broad categories: (1) government tyranny stemming from abusive government authority (addressed in Federalist #47-51), and (2) the tyranny of the majority vote of people (addressed in Federalist #10). What follows are excerpts from Anderson's description of Madison's plan to deal with both forms of tyranny, excerpts the reader may find both enlightening and fascinating:

Madison concluded from his study of governments that they were destroyed by factions. He believed this factionalism was due to “the propensity of mankind, to fall into mutual animosities” (Federalist #10) which he believed were “sown in the nature of man.” Government, he concluded, must be based upon a more realistic view which also accounts for this sinful side of human nature.

Madison realized the futility of trying to remove passions (human sinfulness) from the population. Therefore, he proposed that human nature be set against human nature. This was done by separating various institutional power structure. First, the church was separated from the state so that ecclesiastical functions and government functions would not interfere with religious and political liberty. Second, the federal government was divided into three equal branches: executive, legislative and judicial. Third, the federal government was delegated certain powers while the rest of the powers resided in the state governments.

The separation of powers allows each branch of government to provide a check on the other. According to Madison, the Constitution provides a framework of supplying “opposite and rival interests” (Federalist #51) through a series of checks and balances. This theory of countervailing ambition” both prevented tyranny and provided liberty. It was a system in which bad people could do the least harm and good people had the freedom to do good works.

The Framers' Concept of Democracy. Just as the framers structured government to cope with the flawed human nature of elected officials (discussed above), so too did they formulate constitutional provisions to cope with flawed human nature of voters.

The framers were wary of the passions of direct democracy, and wanted to encourage a politics of thoughtful opinion through a representative process. An analysis found in *The U. S. Constitution Online* illustrates how they applied their wariness to government:

One of the most common critiques of the Framers is that the government that they created was, in many ways, undemocratic. There is little doubt of this, and it is so by design. The Electoral College, by which we choose our President, is one example. The appointment of judges is another. And the selection of Senators not by the people but by the state legislatures, is yet another. [As discussed below, that method was changed by Amendment.]

Spalding notes also that the process by which the Constitution itself is amended is ultimately based on state approval. He then concludes : “It is striking that in this powerful national government, there is not a single official chosen by a national constituency.”

“A Republic – If You Can Keep it!” The reader will recall the response of Benjamin Franklin at the signing of the Constitution in 1787 to the question about what kind of government the signers had given us. His response, pertinent to the above discussion, was: “A republic – if you can keep it.” The definition of a “Republic” as published in the Noah Webster's Dictionary of 1828 and probably consistent with the understanding of the Framers is: “A state in which the exercise of the sovereign power is lodged in representatives elected by the people. In modern usage, it differs from a democracy or democratic state, in which the people exercise the powers of sovereignty in person.”

The Electoral College. The wisdom of having “electors,” chosen by states, to elect a president and vice president at an Electoral College, as the Constitution provides – rather than having all the people via a popular vote make the decisions – becomes readily apparent in light of the nation's experience during the most recent presidential election. Had presidents been elected then via a popular vote instead of via the Electoral College vote, the nation would have elected as president a person who by an ever-growing number of citizens is regarded as corrupt, decadent, immoral and otherwise flawed.

The Selection of U. S. Senators. Madison, being concerned that the federal legislature could predominate over other branches of government, proposed in Federalist 51 that the remedy for this predominance was, in stark contrast with the unicameral arrangement of a parliament, to divide the legislature into different houses and make them, by different modes of election, as little connected with each other as the nature of their common functions will allow. Thus the Constitution originally provided that Representatives were chosen by one mode; Senators by another. A practical illustration of the application of the framer's philosophy can be noted by the following passage from *Wikipedia*:

Originally, a Senator was elected by the legislature of a state, and was expected to represent the state government within the Federal government. This was expected to help keep the balance between Federal and state authority. Also it was believed that while an unqualified candidate might win a popular-vote majority through demagoguery or superficial qualities, whereas the legislature, which could deliberate on its choice, and whose members had been selected by their constituents and had experience in politics, would be safe from such folly. Finally, election by the legislature was expected to insulate Senators from the distraction of public campaigning for election or re-election, leaving them free to concentrate on the great business of the Federal government.

Hugh Problems Began to Emerge. According to *Wikipedia*, the election of Senators by legislatures generally occurred without major problems up to the mid-1850s when the sectional crisis over slavery led to increasing partisanship and strife. Some states – such as Indiana, California and Delaware – were unable to elect Senators for periods of around two years. And there were other problems. Nine bribery cases were brought before the Senate between 1866 and 1906, and 45 deadlocks occurred in 20 states between 1991 and 1905.

To cope with these problems, several states had resorted to using unofficial referendums for the people to use to express to their legislatures their choices of Senators.

These and other problems prompted people to make changes via constitutional amendment.

Contrary to the Plan of the Framers, Amendment XVII was Passed. To cope with problems described above, the nation, in 1913, adopted Amendment XVII which provided that a state's U. S. Senator would be elected by the popular-vote of the people in a given state, even though it was contrary to the intentions of the Framers which were (1) to avoid or to minimize popular vote, and (2) to have unduplicated methods of electing individuals to the various branches of government; i.e., Electoral College elects President; Legislature elects Senators; people elect Representatives.

But Then New Problems Emerged. It may be instructive to consider how ObamaCare would have fared if Senators were elected by legislatures, as originally prescribed, rather than by popular vote as the Amendment prescribes. ObamaCare, in the eyes of many has attained the standing of an entitlement program and as difficult to deal with as Social Security and other such programs. Columnist Steve Heber offers the following observations about the present state of affairs regarding ObamaCare:

Many of you have watched, perhaps in disgust, many of our senators being “bought off” so they could pass the health care bill. This is the result of changing how our bicameral system works designed by our founders. Had those senators been representing their states, had they been looking at how this bill will affect their state budget, we would be looking at an entirely different outcome.

The Emergent Alternative View of Human Nature and Governance. With a rising secularist movement and a lessening – if not repudiation – of the teachings of the Bible, an alternative description of human nature – has emerged along with consideration of other forms of government. Columnist Dennis Prager was able to describe in practical and meaningful terms the differences between the emergent “left” (regarded as tantamount to Secular Humanism) and the “right” (generally regarded as being consistent with the views of the framers). Following is a sampling of the points made by Prager:

LEFT/SECULAR HUMANIST

- *People are basically good
- *Liberals argue that poverty, despair and homelessness cause poor people to riot and commit violent crime
- *Since people are basically good, their acts of evil must be explained by factors beyond their control; their behavior is not really their fault.
- *There is no transcendent source of morality. Man is God, and therefore each human being is the author of his or her own moral standards.

RIGHT/TRADITIONAL VALUES

- *Man is born morally flawed – not necessarily born evil. But surely not born good.
- *Conservatives blame those who engage in violent behavior more than liberals do.
- *People who do evil are to be blamed because they made bad choices – and they did so because they either have little Self control or a dysfunctional conscience
- *There are moral truths, objective moral standards, to which every person is accountable. In America, this refers to the God of the Bible, and to Judeo-Christian values

The Emergence of Fascism. Various court rulings, the curricula of universities and public schools, the culture promoted by the entertainment industry and other sources now promote yet other ideologies incompatible with the traditional Judeo-Christian ideology upon which much of our Constitution is based. In addition to Secular Humanism (noted above), another competing ideology is now in the news – thanks to today's rioting and campus disruption – is that of fascism which refers to a “powerful centralized state.” It is no longer limited to the Hitler and Mussolini. Columnist Jonah Goldberg, author of *Liberal Fascism*, contends that “liberals from Woodrow Wilson to FDR to Hillary Clinton have advocated policies and principles remarkably similar to those of Hitler's National Socialism and Mussolini's fascism.” He also notes there are prominent individuals and organizations supporting fascism. Revealing views remarkable similar to Goldberg's stunning contention are the views of Dinesh D'Sousa whose new book, *The Big Lie: Exposing the Nazi Roots of the American Left*, which documents the main thrust of both writers and which is sure to rub Democrats wrong!

While the efficiencies of fascism can be recognized, Goldberg points a danger possibly not adequately understood: “A system which imposes a vast complex of decrees upon a people while subjecting them to confiscatory taxes to support the immense activities of the government cannot be operated except by an absolute government that has the power to enforce compliance.” Is this not the case with virtually all dictators, especially in communist countries? Did not President Obama, via Executive Orders and other devices, show signs of behaving like a dictator?

SLAVERY DURING THE FOUNDING ERA THROUGH THE CIVIL WAR

It's Relevance to Today's Debate on Racism

Foreword. Following is a re-print of a report that appeared in the August 2014 club newsletter. Although it appeared more than 3 years ago, its contents are not only still relevant today, they are even *more* relevant today, given the rioting, disruption and especially the demagogic charges of “racism – sometimes made against all whites – heard today.

Perceptions. Columnist Dennis Prager comments on today's perceptions of slavery during the founding era. He contends that citizens of, say, 45 years of age or older, upon viewing an iconic painting of America's Founders – as, for example, the signing of the Declaration of Independence – are apt to see great men founding a great country. But, continues Prager, if you ask recent graduates of almost any university what they see, they are apt to see something different. To many of these younger folks-

These men are not only not great; they are morally quite flawed in that they were slaveholders and/or founded a country that allowed slavery. Moreover, they were not only all racists; they were all sexists, who restricted the vote to males. And they were rich men who were primarily concerned with protecting their wealth, which is why they restricted the vote to landowners.

From this belief can come the belief the founding of the nation and its founding documents were similarly flawed and therefore the nation's form of government should be destroyed because it has no legitimacy. Further, Prager contends, “In colleges throughout America, students are taught to have disdain for the white race.” In justifying this contention, he cites the fact that the president of Western Washington University posed this question on the university's web site: “How do we make sure that in future years we are not as white as we are today?” In regard to a related matter, Prager notes that inner young blacks who work hard in school are routinely chastised by other black youth for “acting white.”

But the nation's founders and framers may not, these days, be given an adequate or a fair presentation about their roles in perpetuating or ending slavery during the founding period. That constitutes a void which may lead to the conclusion that there was a monolithic and approving view of slavery by all whites. That void may also encourage charges of “racist” being uttered by demagogues of the left against people with whom they have political disagreements. The purpose of this report is therefore to help fill that void.

The Founders and Framers. Assertions that all of the nation's founders and framers were slave holders and advocated slavery may simply stem from an ignorance of the nation's history; but in other instances, they may have been motivated by the benefits which can accrue to those individuals who or causes which, in claiming the nation's founders were racist, can undermine the form of government the founders created, a constitutional republic. In any case, given the propensity of many politicians, the major news media many college professors and others to support leftist causes and provide intimidation by promoting white guilt, an accurate presentation of facts about our founders and their attitude toward slavery should prove valuable.

David Barton*, an history scholar who specializes in examining and analyzing original documents of our founders offers insights into the conduct and beliefs of those men. He states:

While some framers did own slaves, rarely is anything said of the overwhelming majority of framers who did not own slaves and who rejected slavery. And rarely is it acknowledged that slavery was not the product of, nor was it an evil introduced by, the founders; rather, slavery had been introduced into America nearly a century-and-a-half before the founders and had been strongly enforced upon them by British law. In fact, many of the founders vigorously complained about the fact that every attempt they had made to end slavery and the slave trade in the Colonies (as Virginia had attempted in 1767 and Pennsylvania in 1774) had been vetoed by King George III.

In addition to British law which prohibited the cessation of slavery were the laws of the states. It is significant to note, for example, that, since both Washington and Jefferson resided in the state of Virginia, that that state had a series of laws which severely restricted the emancipation of slaves, including a law which, for a while, forbade emancipation even by last will and testament. Further, Virginia law did not recognize slave families; consequently, the law made it impossible for a slave, should he have gained freedom, to remain near his spouse, children or family members who had not been freed, for the law required that a freed slave promptly depart the state. That situation constituted a complication for slave owners who wished to free slaves.

Barton reports that, prior to the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, there had been few serious efforts to dismantle the institution of slavery, that it was the founders who collectively initiated the first changes against slavery, and that it was the language of the Declaration which not only enabled these changes to begin but also to bring about the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments so important in securing protection for civil rights.

It is interesting to note that one of Jefferson's oft-quoted phrases - "Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever" - was made in the context of his deploring the institution of slavery.

The Civil War. With respect to the effort to eradicate slavery in America, it should be noted that, during the Civil War, the loss of life on both sides of the conflict was staggering. The Union, whose losses were greater than those of the Confederacy, lost an estimated 359,528 soldiers – most of whom were white – who died from combat and related causes in the struggle to end slavery. A failure to note these sacrifices and conclude, by omission, by inference, or by direct statement, that the entire white race was complicit in promoting slavery should constitute an affront to the memories of those soldiers.

Providing evidence that many whites of the Civil War era wished to end slavery and were prepared to dedicate their lives to that end were the lyrics to some of the songs which were then sung. One such song of Civil War days was known as "John Brown's Body," which provides in its lyrics information about an important historical event (the battle of Harpers Ferry) and about the dedication of those seeking to end slavery. The first verse of that song follows:

**Old John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave
While weep the sons of bondage whom he ventured all to save;
But though he lost his life struggling for the slave,
His truth is marching on.**

The lyrics to the more famous "Battle Hymn of the Republic," written by Julia Howe in 1861, states in religious terms the mission of those seeking an end to slavery. The sheer eloquence and the profundity of thought in the six verses of that song contrast markedly with charges of "racist" being hurled or implied today so as to make such charges appear to come from demagogues. Following is a portion of the lyrics to the first verse:

**As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free;
While God is marching on.
Glory! Glory! Hallelujah! Glory! Glory! Hallelujah!
Glory! Glory! Hallelujah! While God is marching on.**

=====

*David Barton is a former vice chairman of The Republican Party of Texas, author/historian, and former member of the textbook adoption committee of the Texas State Board of Education. Textbook committee meetings are often contentious because they involve conflicting ideologies such as evolution, LGBT, religion and others which are of special interest to leftists, and particularly the leftist Texas Freedom Network.

It was in connection with a race for a position on the State Board in 2010 that two Democrat candidates made charges that Barton was a white supremacist and otherwise biased. Barton, however, pushed back. He claimed in a court of law that such charges defamed him and should result in a one million dollar settlement. He was successful in that effort and, according to the American Family Association, donated the one-million dollar settlement.

In addition to making the payment, the two Democrats issued an apology which, because it is so instructive and informative, is reproduced in its entirety below:

During our respective campaigns in 2010 for separate positions on the Texas State Board of Education, we published a video entitled: "A True Tale from Texas," that created a false impression about David Barton. The purpose of that video was to discredit our Republican Party political opponents on the State Board of Education, and those on whom they relied, by depicting their position as politically extreme and detrimental to education. Thus, the video stated that David Barton, who advised the State Board of Education, is known for speaking at white supremacist rallies. We believed that statement had been fact-checked by our political consultant, Scott Garrison, who relied for confirmation solely on information provided him from The Texas Freedom Network. As professionals in education and the proper use of language, we understand that this statement suggested the David Barton is a white supremacist, and that the two organizations he is affiliated with, Wallbuilder Presentations, Inc. and WallBuilders L.L.C., were associated with or supportive of white supremacists. After learning more about Mr. Barton, we realize this statement was false. We separately and jointly apologize to Mr. Barton for damage to him individually and to his organizations as a result of that statement. (Source: Warren Throckmorton, patheos.com)

BLACK PARTICIPATION IN REPUBLICAN POLITICS AFTER CIVIL WAR

Foreword. Although there is currently considerable tension about Civil War statues, racism of whites, discrimination, etc., there has been little, if any, information about the Reconstruction era which took place after the conclusion of the Civil War and ended in 1876. Such information may be helpful in bringing about some understanding among the warring parties. Why has there been such void about the Reconstruction period?

An article appearing in the American Thinker.com suggests a reason for the void when it reports: "In all, 16 African Americans served in the U. S. Congress during Reconstruction; more than 600 more were elected to the state legislatures, and hundreds more held local offices across the South," according to *The Truth About Jim Crow*. Every black elected was a Republican . . . When Reconstruction ended in 1876, and the Democrats regained power in the South, they quickly enacted an elaborate system of Jim Crow laws designed to deprive blacks of even the most basic civil rights, *especially voting*."

Comments by a Retired Judge and University Professor, Likely a Black. Harriet Murphy, a retired judge and former government professor at Huston-Tillotson University, a predominately black institution, provides a uniquely insightful history of black participation in post-Civil War Republican politics in an op-ed piece appearing in the July 4, 2014 issue of the *Austin American-Statesman*. Following are some excerpts:

One of the ironies about the current state of partisan politics and the African-American community is the fact that not that long ago, our greatest leaders in these communities were Republicans. Following the Civil War, there was a fierce loyalty to the party of Abraham Lincoln. Even modern-day GOP promotional materials fondly reflect on the birth of the party being an outgrowth of the abolitionist struggle against expansion of slavery.

Once the war was over, a majority of black voters supported the party in both the north and south, and Republicans took control of most Southern states' governorships and state legislatures, electing many blacks to state and national offices.

In Texas, between 1865 and 1897, there were more than 42 black elected legislators. Some estimates put African-American participation in the Texas Republican Party immediately after Reconstruction at more than 90 percent. The first state Republican convention that met in Houston on July 4, 1867, was predominantly African-American in composition, with about 150 African-American Texans attending and 20 Anglos.

African-Americans remained loyal to the party even after Jim Crow laws squashed their rights and black representation in the South all but disappeared until the civil rights era. . . long-standing black Republican families switched parties and their politically active heirs emerging as Democrats.

What happened to this majority of black voters supporting the Republican Party? Did the party simply abandon them in both the North and South? It didn't start with Lyndon B. Johnson: it started with Franklin D. Roosevelt, who recognized the power of the black press in the Northern states.

Lower-income blacks were won over by Roosevelt's soup kitchens, WPA jobs and other programs. As the Depression recovered, many of the younger blacks turned to the Democratic Party without taking into consideration that it was not going to be a bed of roses, especially in the South.

Abandonment and the failure of northern Republicans to support the rights of blacks – and the lack of initiatives to keep black Republicans in the party of Lincoln – may have negated any future success.