

2024 Voters Guide Update 2: [General Election](#) (Please forward)

Dick Pence – Billings, MT Cell 406-672-9207 rapence45@gmail.com

Why Worldview and Politics Are Related:

See info on Next Big Sky Worldview Forum [here](#) *Does Evidence of the Design of the Earth Suggest a Designer & What is the Real Science Relative to Climate Change?* Dr. Jay Richards, Heritage Foundation

- **Note to those outside of Montana:** The section 1-3 of this guide is very relevant to you.
- **IF this shoe fits you, wear it:** This simple but profound prophetic text should awaken you:

“There just aren’t enough people in office, or out of office, who are willing admit the problems we have and take actions necessary to address them.”

(Montana Congressman Matthew Rosendale, personal TEXT, 9/5/2024)

*Last night I attended a Republican function and was disappointed to see the degree to which so-called Conservatives were willing to compromise and SHIFT Center-Left to support State and National candidates – including Trump who I support – for office. **How far are we willing to SHIFT to accommodate the Establishment?***

This voter’s guide is written for the engaged voter, if you’re looking for sound-bit thinking, this may not be for you. However, there is a table of contents so you can choose what you read. **It is a combination of voters’ guide, and hopefully fileted through the lens of Christian Worldview thinking, to address the current situation in Montana and America.**

Some have suggested that politics and worldview issues are in different purviews. Many Christian leaders have adopted this thinking arguing that **politics** - or **cultural issues** if you will - are not in their purview. This has been the posture of too many churches.

As the church has declined to teach about cultural issues such as abortion, same-sex marriage, transgenderism, religious liberty etc., these **issues have moved into the political arena**. There is an old Axiom that states that **Policy Promotes Practice**. Translated that means once the public sees a policy being adopted politically, they tend to adopt that thinking. Prime Example, same-sex marriage

was much less popular before the Supreme Court said it was the law. Before that, same-sex marriage was not nearly as popular and was not legal in many states. Now, even 69% of Catholics have adopted this unbiblical thinking and the Evangelicals are just as bad.

If you think these moral-ethical issues are not on the ballot, you are not paying attention

What is [*The Spiral of Silence*](#) and what is its effect? (See explanation in End Notes) A [three minute YouTube](#) explains it. It is the reality that people, leaders in particular, are **sensitive to whether their opinion is generally compatible** with public opinion or influencers. In simplistic terms, the more one realizes that they are out-of-step with public opinion, **particularly about moral- ethical issues**, the more inclined they are to **increasingly spiral more silent** about those issues as culture spirals down. In no issue has this been more evident than in the issues of same-sex marriage. The more the public accepted it, the more silent Christian leadership became on it. This process is glaringly obvious in Megan Basham's book [*Shepherds for Sale: How Evangelical Leaders Traded Truth for a Leftist Agenda.*](#)

This voter's guide is NOT just aimed at Christian. I do believe that most conservative voters will appreciate my stand on social issues.

I always strive to message through the lens of a Christian worldview, keeping in mind what Jesus said about Truth and not wanting to shrink back. I will address issues in this voter's guide that relate from abortion to Marxism, embracing Truth as Jesus would when He said ***"For this reason I was born, and for this reason I came into the world- to testify to the Truth"*** (John18:37)

Rightly did the respected Dutch theologian Abraham Kuper (1837 to 1920) prophesy when he said:

"There is not one square inch in the whole domain of our human existence over which Christ, who is Sovereign over all, does not cry, Mine!"

Focus in this General Election:

A word of concerning the recent Primaries. As I looked at the Primary numbers across races in Montana – **the numbers told a resounding, disappointing story.**

Uninformed voters who voted for incumbents, big names, without due diligence. The imbalance in the numbers simply did not reflect the reality of the differences between the two candidates – in race after race. It was not about who won or lost, it was about the lopsided numbers in so many races.

This focus will be on the Montana Supreme Court, the Presidency, and ballot initiatives. This edition of the Voter’s Guide relates to the November General election. I will not reference races of Republicans vs. Democrats – or [Libertarians](#) or Green Party. If you wish to look back at my Voters Guide for the Primary you can find it [Here](#).

I will only support Republicans so I am assuming you will have clear choices on your ballots. The [Democratic party has become radicalized, anti-American, pro-Marxist](#) and anti-Christian. Their candidates are either complicit or so naive that they should not be supported. I am not shy to say that **Kamala Harris is an enemy of America and Christianity**. She has thumbed her nose at God.

I do not assume you must vote for all Republicans. You may choose to leave some of the boxes blank and not vote for certain candidates based on your own principles. The older I get – and the more I observe of government – the less I subscribe to the guilt-mantra *“hold your nose and vote for the candidate you hate the least.”* **In some of the races, this has become out-right bullying, shaming of people who won’t comply with the establishment.** Much of the time, this has been orchestrated by elements of the [Establishment or Uni-Party](#).

Table of Contents: (The PDF version will give you page numbers)

- Section 1: Why Worldview Matters, a look back at the Primary election, and our focus: – p. 1-3
- Section 2: Feminism – The Stealth-Trojan-Horse that led us to this hour – p.3-8
- Section 3: The Presidential Election – will America embrace Marxism? Who is the Real Kamala Harris and **Who is Your Neighbor?** – p. 8-11
- Section 4: The Montana Supreme Court– Most Important Montana Race – p.11-14
- Section 5: The [Ballot Initiatives](#) – from Evil to Deceptive. Note my [change on CI-127](#) p.14-19

- Section 6: End Notes – p.19

Feminism – the *Stealth-Trojan-Horse*: Why It Matters – In Montana and America.

First, I will address the Feminization of our culture because it is a critical issue in this election. From a worldview perspective, I believe it is the most important issue of *our times*. However, I believe the data and the polls reinforce my argument.

Knowing what we should do: I Chronicles 12:32 is a challenge for us, just as it was for the men of Issachar in their day, to ***understand our times and know what to do***. With that in mind, I will take a moment to address what I believe is a ***defining issue in our times***.

Addressing the outcomes of Radical Feminism is difficult because the public is so unaware of its history and influences. As you research the subject, you soon realize that the Feminist movement was a **primary tool of the Marxists** to change America!

I will also outline why I am persuaded that this issue could deliver the Presidency to a Radicalized, Feminist. Have you been following the polls that indicate that women – especially young women - [are breaking for Kamala](#)? Follow me for a few minutes.

I had a conservative get upset with me for talking about feminism. This person obviously knew little of the history and influence of 2nd and 3rd, wave feminism – and - its current impact. They thought I was just attacking women; the truth is, it has had just as much effect on men – arguably, more.

The movement's roots are **deeply embedded in Cultural Marxism**. In fact, the Marxists have used this movement for a century – much the same as they are now using *Critical Race Theory* and *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion* today. You can see some of the studies I have made in **six books in the End Notes below**. You will see that I have filtered through about 2,000 pages by some excellent authors, not to mention dozens of articles.

Every one of the leaders of this movement have been broken people- mostly women - who were intensely committed to Marxism. **One of their main themes has been selling the Marxist theme of “*the oppressed and the oppressors*?”** By

the 60's they had progressed to the point where they could **sell this to American housewives** – promoting the idea that you were “just a housewife” and **not a career woman**, you had been deprived of your rights. And it sold like hot cakes on a frosty morning.

Marxists worked, starting a century ago, with key influencers to give us the Feminist movement and abortion, the sexual revolution, the Trans movement, and same-sex marriage etc. all followed.

This ideology is not well recognized – much less – understood. Being free from its influence – in America – is like trying to swim in a pool without getting wet. In her excellent book [*The End of Woman: How Smashing the Patriarchy Has Destroy Us*](#), Carrie Gress outlines - just the history - not the philosophies of this movement **in the last 100 years**. On our [Big Sky Worldview website](#), I have uploaded just 10 articles of the scores that I have read on this issue under Resources/library you will find [Feminism – Understanding its History and Influence](#). Just three articles for your consideration that may help you understand why I risk talking about this volatile subject.

- From 2018 Kevin Williamson writes [Dismissing Feminism? A Definition Problem](#) where he exposes how Marxist propaganda infiltrates this issue.
- In his 2018 article in the Federalist, Joseph D’Hippolito writes [How The Left’s Attachment to Abortion Reflects Its Inner Marxism](#).
- To really understand how this all fits together and has all happened (or is happening) I highly recommend Dr. Del Tackett’s article (you can read or listen) [The Loss of the Noble Male and The Rise of Malevolent Compassion](#). Here, an internationally respected author of *The Truth Project*, explains the process we are watching of the role-reversal ordained in Genesis 1-3.

If you think conservative women **won’t vote for a woman just because she is a woman**, take a look at Montana! [I have made the case](#) in some detail (p.3) that **Republican woman** in the Western Montana Congressional race in 2022 cast thousands of votes for a candidate **only because she was a woman. Don’t believe me?** Follow the LINK and draw your own conclusions.

What about America? This [above mentioned article](#), (how women are breaking for Kamala) is complex but this part is of what it points to:

*...Across the six states identified above, though, there was a **10-point shift in the margin to Harris' benefit among women** — almost twice as large in the Sun Belt states (Arizona, Georgia and Nevada) than in the “blue wall” states (Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin)*

There is lots to consider, the article [Kamala Harris' Chances in November Could Hinge on Women's voting Surge](#) is even more troubling.

Abortion is on the ballot, just as it is in Montana, and you're dreaming if you think large numbers of Republican women won't support it. **Why?** Partly because they have **never heard a good case made against abortion** in their churches. This is a key reason why we need to pray for CI-128 to be defeated – abortion is popular in Montana 😞 .

But the march goes on as shown by this article [The Gender Gap Widens in the Harris Trump Contest.](#)


*Take the recent New Your Times/Sierna College poll Harris **holds a 14-point lead over Trump among likely female voters (55% to 41%),** while Trump holds a 17-point lead among men (56% to 39%). That's a net 31-point gender gap.*

OR

*It's even bigger in the latest Quinnipiac University poll, **where women are breaking for Harris by 16 points (56% to 40%)** and men are siding with Trump by 23 points (60% to 37%). (Note: The Quinnipiac poll was conducted before and after Biden exited the 2024 race.) That's a whopping 39-point gender gap.*

If your still in denial, take a look at the bar graphs in this article if you think women aren't breaking for Kamala.

Some Harris-Trump polls are showing a huge gender gap



Source: Polls taken in late July. The New York Times/Siena College poll surveyed likely voters; the others measured registered voters.

Compare that to the race between Trump and Hillary Clinton in

It is critical that people understand who Kamala Harris is, she perfectly fits the mold you will see below. In the Federalist article (08/07/24) [Hating Men is Now the Democratic Campaign Strategy](#), we see that **Harris knows who her voting base is and it is women of all stripes**, particularly single women. Just a couple of relevant quotes:

- *“Simply stated, it’s a fully intentional effort by the Harris campaign to make the 2024 electorate **split about sex, not policy...**”*
- *[For starters, a February 2024 Pew Research Center study shows men are now more interested than women in starting families by a margin of 57 to 45 percent.](#)*

The last part makes it crystal clear that a **huge percentage of America’s women have been evangelized by Radical Feminism** – most are not even aware of it. They are **unaware of who they are in terms of God’s creation**. Godly women are, by their created order, inclined to want children... **until now**.

Truth be told, women generally lean more liberally than men, in part because of how they are created. As Del Tackett explains in the abovementioned article, Men were created to **be driven by Truth**, but tethered by compassion. **Women** were

created to be **driven by compassion** and tethered by truth. These roles have been destroyed and totally reversed by a hundred years of radical Feminism. Radical Feminists like Kamala are working with the Marxist to completely reverse this model and now what we are left with is what Del Tackett calls **Malevolent Compassion** and Carl Trueman calls [expressive individualism](#) where **feelings and emotion dictate everything.**

President of the United States

Dangerous Choices & Challenging Personal Decisions about Messaging:

Many of the Founders told us – in varying language:

*“When a great democracy is destroyed, it will not be from enemies without, but rather because of [enemies from within.](#)” **And here we are!***

An in-depth look at Kamala Harris and Tim Walz:

First, a couple of resources that will help you understand just how anti-American the Harris ticket is:

- An interview with Curtis Bowers and Trevor Loudon: Trevor is a leading authority on everything [Marxism-Communism. Communist Kamala and her Running Mate Tim.](#) Of all the things I have seen, this is the best 28 minutes exposing **how evil, pagan, and anti-American these two are.** You will not regret spending this time.

Kamala Harris - the only difference between her and Vladimir Putin or Xi Jinping of China is that they are not stupid, she is! Her worldview and ideology are the same. **Kamala Harris has taken up arms against the United States** as surely as if she had a gun to our head! If you think that is hyperbole, keep reading - for your country, your kids, and for your faith. Let me say it plainly! **Anyone, who votes for these two has taken up arms against America and the God of the universe!**

- Four years ago, Trevor Loudon (the leading authority on Communism on the planet) wrote [Why is No One \(Except Trump\) Calling Out Kamala Harris’s Communist ties?](#)
- Major General USMC (Ret.) Geoffrey Higginbotham says this same thing in a slightly different manner in his article [The History of Kamala Harris – How](#)

[Bad Can it Get?](#) (Interestingly, even with Duck-Duck-GO, you may not find these two articles – it will immediately jump to FACT CHECK?)

As bad as Biden was, Harris is much worse. ***This Feminist is the vilest candidate in my life time.***

Kamala fits this Radical Feminist- Marxist-Abortion Narrative to the Tee.

Yes, Marxism is everywhere. While Kamala is not the first Marxist candidate – **Bidens, Clintons, and Obamas are all Marxist**, Harris is openly Communist – no longer feeling like she needs to hide it. Biden was a puppet, Obama may not be the key driver of this far LEFT movement, but he has found the **doofus** who is willing to **bring Marxism forward** in the Democrat Party. Her VP choice, Tim Walz, Governor of Minnesota cheered at the Black Lives Matter crowd, destroyed Minneapolis, and she did all she could to get these criminals out of jail. They are a perfect match.

Maj. Gen. Geoffrey Higgenbotham's tells a story of her and her family's life-long dedication to Marxism, especially of the **Chinese Communist** variety. Kamala was radicalized as a child – she knows no other doctrines.

Trevor Loudon exposed her even more. **Both writers describe her as LEFT of Bernie Sanders**, and a rabid Socialist. Her parents were LEFTIST-Marxist. She is what informed writers call a [Red-Diaper-Baby](#) because she has never known anything but Marxism.

Like many good Progressive women, **she slept her way to the top.** After college, 30-year-old Harris became the mistress of 60-year-old Willie Brown, a Democratic Marxist. He helped her become the AG of California and later a U.S. Senator. Today, Willie Brown is widely regarded as one of the **Chinese Communist Party's best friends** in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Harris has long aggressively supported Marxist Black Lives Matter; **the Black Panther Party served as the model for creation of the Black Lives Matter.** Don't miss the fact that homosexual [Karine Jean-Pierre](#) was her chief of staff before becoming Bidon's press secretary. Pierre also worked for [Movon.org](#). She is from the Haiti Communist party. Kamala's husband is waist-deep in Chinese Communism.

Interestingly, Higgenbotham makes the following observation about Kamal

“Office holders are not subject to the security clearance process. If the FBI did a Background Investigation on Kamala Harris, she never would have passed, because of her 40-year close ties with Marxists, Communists, Maoists, and Communist China.”

Trevor Loudon chimes in...

“If Harris was to apply for a mid-level job in the Department of Agriculture, she would almost **certainly fail the security background check**. She owes her entire career to sympathizers or active enablers of the **Chinese Communist Party**.”

But there is much more!

But now comes the hard part that will separate the principled from the unprincipled – will we *hide our lights under a bushel* or **will we boldly love our neighbors?** We all have neighbors, relatives, and friends that are Democrats. **It’s time we stand for God!** YOU, WE, need to think prayerfully and carefully about how we are going to tell these people that if they vote for Harris, they - also– **have taken up arms against America – just as she has!** We need to risk those relationships to stand for TRUTH and GODLINESS! To do anything else is not Agapy love that **“seeks the welfare of the other even when it comes at our expense.”**

A warning shot across the bow to those who think they can **flirt with this Marxism and call themselves Christians.** [You can be a Christian; you can be a Marxist, but you can’t be both](#)

Former President Donald J. Trump – Being clear eyed and honest:

It will be to our strategic advantage to be honest with those questioning the Trump campaign – he has also had issues, but they are mild by comparison. I am troubled by the blind loyalty I see with the Trumpsters! This is not helpful; it plays to the LEFTs message when we show no objectivity.

With that said, lets also be clear eyed that with all his warts, **Trump has done more for Christianity – and conservatism – than all of the other Republican Presidents combined, in my lifetime**

It will help our message for Trump if we concede that:

- The Republican Platform was drastically changed in Detroit without delegates being allowed to vote. It is much **softer on abortion** – with the Trump campaigns approval.
- We also need to be clear-eyed that many of our friends are hesitant to vote for Trump because of his moral failures. I think that is not wisdom, but it is real and we need to make the case to them. We have work to do!

The Montana Supreme Court, Our Most Important Choice - Supposedly Non-Partisan:

There are two open seats. Our MT supreme court is arguably the most LEFT leaning in America. Make no mistake, this will be a battle and the Democrats have already taken the gloves off. They know that there are issues they **can't win by legislation** so they work to control the courts.

The two liberals are obviously activists that have been recruited by the Progressives. Corey Swanson and Dan Wilson are endorsed by ALL the conservatives that I trust. You can read about them on their web pages.

Cory Swanson for Chief Justice, Townsend, MT swansonforjustice.com **Cory is a solid conservative.** No other candidate has more Montana state courtroom experience than Cory Swanson. Cory joined the Montana National Guard in 1997 and was commissioned as a 2nd Lieutenant in 1998. He was deployed to the Middle East three times and currently holds the rank of Colonel. He got his law degree at the University of Montana. In January 2013, Swanson was hired as a Deputy Attorney General in the Montana Department of Justice. Cory's challenger is...

Jeremiah (Jerry) Lynch, for Chief Justice. Lives in Missoula, Butte native. lynchformontana.com Jeremiah (Jerry) Jerry served 13 years as a Federal Magistrate – **he has never been elected to a bench position.** At age 71 he is coming out of retirement (2019) to run. The question is **why?**

Progressives can be very crafty at disguising motives, especially in the judiciary. **The ACLU (a Marxist organization) is financing TV ads boldly promoting that he will fight to protect abortion from the bench even as our current Supreme Court has with CI-128.**

You often have to **pick up bits and pieces** from different articles. One of the things, you begin to sense with this individual is **a motive of activism on issues**. As you are vetting candidates, look for **buzz words or phrases**, so let's look at a couple here:

- **He is very Pro-Abortion:** In the one-minute video on his webpage you hear. *He is a **Staunch advocate** of the Montana Constitution with its “**protection for the right to privacy**”* – this phrase has been used by our Supreme Court to support the right to abortion. (See [Armstong v. State](#) issue discussion).
- **He is a Climate Change Activist:** The Montana Constitution guarantee of “**a clean and healthful environment**” – this phrase is currently being used by a group of kids from Missoula to sue the state for environmental pollutions and our Supreme Court has taken their side.
- **More Environmentalism:** *Embraces a **sustainable** future for the Big Sky State* – the word sustainable is almost always a **signal of environmentalism** and if you read his experience, you find this in his background.
- He speaks of the “***brilliant career in public service of Chief Justice McGrath.***” Actually, McGrath has the distinction of **presiding for 16 years over the most liberal state supreme court in America.**

Judge Dan Wilson - for Associate Supreme Court Judge, from Kalispell. Find him at [wilsonforjustice.com](#) **Dan is the clear choice for Associate Justice.** In a meeting with Judge Wilson, you encounter a measured, man who is committed to the rule of law. He does not cave to special interests. This is the kind of man we want on our highest court. **He, alone, took on Governor Bullocks Covid mandates and destroyed them in Western Montana.**

In case you're wondering why Dan did not get the vote count in the Primary election that his opponent did, the explanation is this. There were three candidates for this office, two considered conservative. Jerry O'Neil was the other conservative-libertarian candidate who took about 20K votes. Reality is that, while Jerry appears to be a good man, he was not qualified to run for this office and never should have been on the ballot. You have to be recognized to be a lawyer by the State Supreme Court and have to have practiced for five years. O'Neil had done neither. The Republican Party failed to challenge this and so did the

Commissioner of Political Practices – both should have. Little wonder why the Democrats didn't challenge this – it had potential to work in their favor. Jerry had worked on the Reservations, but not as a member of the Bar. You can argue that lawyers should not have to complete law school and could just take the Bar. Fine but change the law, don't just complain. If you're looking for an in-depth explanation of this issue, [*The Jerry O'Neil Candidacy for the MT Supreme Court, The Montana Constitution and Probably Legal Outcome*](#) on our website.

Judge Katherine Bidegaray for Associate Court Judge. How do you spell LEFTIST? [Judge Katherine Bidegaray](#) from Sidney. **Reported to be endorsed by the Montana Trial Lawyers Association. Translation? Big\$.** Knowledgeable people have serious questions about this **lady's professional skills**. Every person I talked to labeled her as an **activist**. She met Dan when they both filed. He pledged to run an honest campaign, she agreed. Since then, she has accused him of accepting dark money and – in typical Democrat fashion – has **invented lies of every sort**. Those in eastern Montana cringe at the idea of this woman being on our high court.

The ACLU (a Marxist organization) is financing TV ads boldly promoting that she will fight to protect abortion from the bench even as our current Supreme Court has with CI-28.

But more concerning is [her statements](#) about the **current Supreme Court situation** - this is what liberals are saying about her:

*"In the face of current **unprecedented challenges confronting the Montana Supreme Court**, including assaults on the rule of law that endanger the liberties and rights dear to Montanans, Judge Bidegaray grasps the magnitude of these issues. **She stands ready to confront these challenges head-on, committed to defending the Constitution and delivering justice for everyone.***

If you are aware of the current LEFTISM in our Supreme Court and some of their shenanigans, you know this is dangerous language. They have been challenged for doing "polling on bills in the legislature" – a move that is clearly compromising and much more.

More Buzz words - she has also said she is *a visionary, an innovator*... poised not merely to follow, but **to lead**. This is activist language. We don't want this activist judge anywhere near the Montana Supreme Court.

On her webpage you read *"Alongside her then-husband, she raised five children on their family farm/ranch in northeastern Montana."* What you **don't see** is that she **divorced that husband and is now allegedly living with another man.**

It is absolutely essential – above all else – that we get Cory Swanson and Judge Dan Wilson elected. We will likely have CI-128 on the ballot putting what will make abortion engrained in the Montana Constitution **for two reasons.** This liberal court that does Planned Parenthood's bidding and weak pastors who refuse to teach on abortion from the pulpit. **Two years ago, the voters of Yellowstone County cast 11,000, votes for wildly liberal Ingrid Gustafson and defeated conservative James Brown. NEVER AGAIN!**

Montana Ballot Initiatives – from Evil to Deceptive:

I recommend that you **VOTE NO** on CI-128, 126, and 127. CI-128 is backed by Planned Parenthood and their friends, CI-126 and 127 are backed by [Montanans for Election Reform](#) and as you will see below, they are backed by some very liberal money groups.

You can read about the requirement of these three measures at this [address](#). It is my understanding that these are all being challenged in the courts so stay tuned.

CI – 128 Vote NO – **WARNING!** All conservative advisors agree, if it is on the ballot, it will pass and it probably will be on the ballot. We need your voice.

- **The ONLY thing that could stop this colossal evil – outside of divine intervention - would be if Pastors and Christians across Montana would TEACH to persuade on abortion**
- **This will create a constitutional right to abortion.** It is very vague, there are no real bounds on who can approve this. It also opens the door to Transgender surgeries etc. Human traffickers could easily get a girl who was pregnant an abortion. **This is the vilest thing I have seen in my life time.** I will link here to helpful information that you can easily download or print:

- [Why you should VOTE No on CI-128](#) (This is a current piece from the Montana Family Foundation – very **brief and to the point**. Their three bullet points about this radical abortion measure are:
 - **No Parents** – this eliminates existing parental notification for minors
 - **No Doctors** – any so-called health care professional can decide if the abortion is necessary to protect the mother’s health.
 - **No Limits** – this radical change to our constitution erases decades of well-vetted laws to protect women and babies. Abortion will be allowed at any stage of a pregnancy.
- [Lutherans For Life](#) and the LCMS have done an **excellent, in-depth** piece for those who want their questions answered. Their key points are:
 - **What CI-128 is!** – any change to our constitution should be a matter of grave importance. CI-128 would state that abortion is a fundamental right of every citizen. That would put abortion on the **same level** as the right to **freedom of religion, or speech**. Is abortion really that kind of fundamental right?
 - **What CI 128 Does!** Makes Montana one of the most proabortion states... There are yet no other states granting this right by constitution...Designates any health care provider fit to prescribe abortion... Renders any health concern an excuse for abortion.
 - **Who We Are!** Outlines the background, values, and goals of Yellowstone Lutherans for Life.
- [CI – 128 – Talking Points](#)
- [CI-128 – Six Things to Know](#)

NOTE: CI-126 is detailed below 126 because my 126 writeup is long

CI – 127 VOTE No (This is a change) – (see additional information in the Endnotes)
 This could require a runoff election and be more expensive. The language in this initiative **is so vague as to make it dangerous**. Would this apply only to the General Election, or to both General and Primaries – it does not say.? Could Democrats cross over and vote against the candidate they don’t like? Montana has open primaries so this could happen. **Way too many unanswered questions in this wording. Ballot Language:**

Ballot Language: A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION CI-127 amends the Montana Constitution to provide that elections for certain offices must be decided **by majority vote** as determined as provided by law rather than by a plurality or the largest amount of the votes. If it cannot be determined who received a majority of votes because two or more candidates are tied, then the winner of the election will be determined as provided by law. CI-127 applies to elections for governor and lieutenant governor, secretary of state, auditor, attorney general, superintendent of public instruction, state representative, state senator, United States representative, United States Senator, and other offices as provided by law.

CI-126 – Vote NO, a really bad idea. Will big money determine how Montana Votes? (See below)

CI-126 leaves this question unresolve - would you know who the candidate was in terms of their affiliation – Republican, Democrat, Green Party etc.? **Any person in touch with reality knows** that so-called non-partisan races are NOT non-partisan.

An example to consider: In the Montana Senate Primary, in western Montana, a certain Republican won by a strong margin. If 126 passes, that person, his republican challengers, and the Democrat would run in the General election. **If CI 126 were in effect, the Republican vote would be split** and the Democrat would almost certainly win. **That appears to be the nefarious intent of 126.**

This is apparently being financed and pushed by moderate to liberal groups who are spending of millions of dollars to get this done, probably from out of state.

The result will be more moderates-liberal and the liberal *Republican Solutions Caucus* will benefit. **Why isn't the Governors group pushing back?**

Virtually every election would result in an expensive run-off. You could easily have four candidates, depending upon who filed in the Primary

NOTE: Below you will see **four organizations financing** this I could only find information on three of them. These are moderate to liberal organizations:

- **Article IV:** – I have not yet been able to find info on this group, but note that they are the primary contributor, giving \$2,659,000.
- **[United America PAC](#):** Previously known as the Centrist Project, its goal is to reform the political system bridging the partisan divide. The **[Centrist Manifesto](#)** suggest “ A vision - and detailed road map to power - for a new party that will champion America’s rational center.” Unite America works by

making strategic investments to accelerate the democracy reform movement. Through the [Unite America Fund](#), the organization invests in campaigns across four key reform areas:

- [Ranked Choice Voting](#)
- [Open Primaries](#)
- **Independent Redistricting Commissions**
- [Vote at Home](#)
- [Action Now Inc.](#) – while they claim to be “a philanthropy dedicated to tackling some of the most pressing problems in the United States” you will find that they have supported Health Care for All, Clean Energy Buyers Assoc. and other Obama efforts.
- [Sixteen Thirty Fund](#): Here is a little hint of who they are *“a **Sixteen Thirty Fund** grantee, is an organization led by changemakers fighting for social, racial, and economic transformation.... Sixteen Thirty Fund and the projects we support are fighting for economic equity, affordable health care, climate solutions, racial justice, voter access, and other essential social-change goals.”*
- **From Ballot Pedia** [https://ballotpedia.org/Montana_CI-126_Top-Four_Primary_Initiative_\(2024\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Montana_CI-126_Top-Four_Primary_Initiative_(2024))

The **Montana Top-Four Primary Initiative** is on the [ballot](#) in [Montana](#) as an [initiated constitutional amendment](#) on [November 5, 2024](#).

A **"yes"** vote supports creating a **top-four primary system** for elections for governor, lieutenant governor, state executives, state legislators, and congressional offices, in which all candidates would run in one primary and the top-four vote getters would advance to the general election regardless of party.

A **"no"** vote opposes creating a top-four primary system for elections for governor, lieutenant governor, state executives, state legislators, and congressional offices, **thereby maintaining Montana's existing open partisan primary system.**

[Montanans for Election Reform](#) is backing two ballot measures – CI-126 and CI-127. Here you see their spokesman, former Republican legislator Frank Garner on [NBC News](#) The committee leading the campaign in support of the top-four primary initiative and the [majority vote requirement to win elections initiative](#). The committee reported \$4.93 million in contributions and \$3.48 million in expenditures.^[2]

	Cash Contributions	In-Kind Contributions	Total Contributions	Cash Expenditures	Total Expenditures
Support	\$4,933,615.00	\$1,554.62	\$4,935,169.62	\$3,486,511.38	\$3,488,066.00
Oppose	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Support

The following table includes contribution and expenditure totals for the committee in support of the initiative.^[3]

Committees in support of CI-126					
Committee	Cash Contributions	In-Kind Contributions	Total Contributions	Cash Expenditures	Total Expenditures
Montanans for Election Reform	\$4,933,615.00	\$1,554.62	\$4,935,169.62	\$3,486,511.38	\$3,488,066.00
Total	\$4,933,615.00	\$1,554.62	\$4,935,169.62	\$3,486,511.38	\$3,488,066.00

Donors

The following were the top donors to the support committee.^[3]

Donor	Cash Contributions	In-Kind Contributions	Total Contributions
Article IV	\$2,659,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,659,000.00
United America PAC	\$1,200,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,200,000.00
Action Now Inc	\$185,000.00	\$0.00	\$185,000.00
Sixteen Thirty Fund	\$130,250.00	\$0.00	\$130,250.00

Opposition

Ballotpedia has not located committees registered to oppose the initiative.

My questions appear in brackets []

Ballot Language: A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION CI-126 amends the Montana Constitution to provide a top-four primary election. **All candidates, regardless of political party, appear on one ballot.** The four candidates receiving the most votes advance to the general election. A candidate may list a political party preference, but **a candidate isn't required to**

be nominated by a political party. [How would you know if the candidate was a Green Party candidate or a Republican?] A candidate's political party preference isn't an endorsement by the political party. The legislature may require candidates gather signatures up to five percent of the votes received by the winning candidate in the last election to appear on the ballot. All voters may vote for one candidate for each covered office. CI-126 applies to elections for governor and lieutenant governor, secretary of state, auditor, attorney general, superintendent of public instruction, state representative, state senator, United States representative, and United States Senator.

End Notes

Supplemental Information on CI-127:

Some elections that CI 127 would have affected in the past. That is the initiative that would require runoff elections if none of the candidates received over 50% of the votes cast.

2012 General Election for MT U.S. Senator

J Tester; 236,123 votes; 48.57%

D Rehberg; 218,051; 44.86%

Dan Cox; 31,892; 15.2%

[If Cox had not been allowed, Rehberg might have won?]

2014 U.S. House Primary Election Republican

R Zinke; 43,766; 33.2%

C Stapelton; 38,591; 29.3%

M Rosendale; 37,965; 28.8%

Drew Turiano; 2290; 1.7%

2022 U.S. House Primary Election, Republican, Western District

R Zinke; 35,241; 41.7%

A Olszewski; 33,633; 39.8%

Mary Todd; 8789; 10.4%

Matt Jette; 4931; 5.8%

Mitch Heuer; 1940; 2.3%

[If there had been a run-off between Zinke and Olszewski, Olszewski almost certainly would have won.]

These are three elections that had a winner that didn't receive a majority of the votes. **I don't know how CI 127 would handle a runoff election?** Is it just the top two; when is a runoff election conducted; do just those that voted in the first election get to vote a second election, etc.? Imagine a runoff election for the 2022 Republican U.S. House Primary Election. **MT has open Primaries, so all Democrats could vote in the runoff.** That wouldn't be a good idea. But a runoff in the 2012 General Election for U.S. Senator might have gone Rehberg's way...

MT needs closed Primaries where the Republicans choose their champion and the Democrats choose their champion and they go head-to-head in the General Election.

Reference Books on Nefarious Feminism:

[Domestic Tranquility – A Brief Against Feminism](#) – [Carolyn Graglia](#) 1998

(372pages, 75 pages of endnotes) *“The principal targets of feminist fire in the on-going "gender wars" are not men, but traditional wives and mothers, says a lawyer-turned-housewife in a powerful critique of contemporary feminism... Finally, after exposing feminism's totalitarian impulse and its contribution to the "tangle of pathologies" that have left marriage and family life in tatters, she argues for a renewed appreciation of the transforming experience of motherhood and the value of the domestic vocation.*

By page three, she exposes Feminisms inner Marxism... In its avowed aims and the programs, it promotes, the movement has adopted Kate Millett's goal set forth in her Sexual Politics in which she endorsee Friedrich Engel's' conclusion that... the family must GO?"

[The End of Woman: How Smashing the Patriarchy Has Destroyed Us](#) by [Carrie Gress](#) Feminism, (2023) the ideology dedicated to "smashing the patriarchy," has instead made male lives the norm for everyone. After fifty years of radical feminism, we can't even define "woman." In this powerful new book, Carrie Gress

says what cannot be said: feminism has abolished women... But there are real answers. Real answers for real women. Carrie Gress—a wife, mother, and philosopher—punctures the myth of feminism, exposing its legacy of abuse, abandonment, and anarchy. From the serpent’s seduction of Eve to Mary Shelley's Frankenstein to Kate Millett’s lust, violence, and insanity to Meghan Markle’s havoc-ridden rise to royalty, Gress presents a history as intriguing as the characters who lived it. The answers women most desperately need, she concludes, are to be found precisely where they are most afraid to look

[*The Flipside of Feminism – What Conservative Women Know – and Men Can’t Say.*](#) By [Suzanne Venker](#) and Phyllis Schlafly. **2011** (197 pages plus endnotes) *“Forty years have passed since the so-called women's movement claimed to liberate women from preconceived notions of what it means to be female - and the results are in. The latest statistics show that as women have gained more freedom, more education, and more power, **they have become less happy..”***

[Sexual Suicide](#) by [George Gilder](#), (also author of *Wealth and Poverty*, member of the Discovery Institute) **1975** (307 pages) Can we survive the rising tide of feminism? Or, are we doomed to a life without family and marriage. A brilliant damning book – one of the most crucial ever written on the roles of male and female in contemporary society.

[The New Politics of Sex – The Sexual Revolution, Civil Liberties, & the Growth of Government Power.](#) [Stephen Baskerville](#) (2017 – 393 pages)

[The Feminization of American Culture](#) by [Ann Douglas](#) (1998 – 375 pages). A Catholic author says this in part about the fact that this Marxist led movement is older than the 20th Century... “Beginning with the misguided notion that "feminization of culture was a 20th century project." By the turn of that century, it was long underway--perhaps irreversibly so!

The Spiral of Silence Defined:

<https://www.britannica.com/topic/spiral-of-silence>

Written by - [Thomas Petersen](#) the Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica

[See all related content →](#)

spiral of silence, in the study of [human communication](#) and [public opinion](#), the theory that people's willingness to express their opinions on controversial public issues is affected by their largely unconscious perception of those opinions as being either popular or unpopular. Specifically, the perception that one's opinion is unpopular tends to [inhibit](#) or discourage one's expression of it, while the perception that it is popular tends to have the opposite effect. Developed by German survey and communication researcher Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann in the 1960s and '70s, the [spiral](#) of silence theory more broadly attempts to describe [collective](#) opinion formation and societal [decision making](#) regarding issues that are controversial or morally loaded.

In the [context](#) of the theory, the term *public opinion* refers to opinions or behaviors that can be displayed or expressed in public without running the risk of social isolation or, in some cases, that even must be displayed to avoid the danger of isolation. Thus, *public* is not meant in a legal or political sense—as something that is freely accessible to all or that concerns the general population or society as a whole. Instead, the concept is interpreted from a social-psychological perspective as a state of [consciousness](#) in which individuals are aware that their actions are “seen by all” or “heard by all,” requiring that they constantly monitor not only their own actions but also the reactions of others in their [environment](#). Accordingly, Noelle-Neumann viewed public opinion as a form of social control that ultimately applies to everyone, regardless of [social class](#), and that is apparent in many areas of life, ranging from controversial political issues to fashion, [morals](#), and values. Such an understanding of public opinion differs markedly from the traditional [conception](#), according to which most people's opinions on public issues are influenced by rational debate among educated elites.

Origins of the theory

The theory of the spiral of silence arose from a surprising discovery in connection with [election](#) research conducted during the 1965 German federal election campaign. Months before election day in September 1965, Noelle-Neumann and her staff at the Allensbach Institute for Public Opinion Research launched a series of surveys designed to track the political opinions of the electorate throughout the campaign. From December 1964 to shortly before election day, survey findings on voters' intentions remained practically unchanged. Month after month, the

two major parties, the governing [Christian Democratic Union](#)–Christian Social Union (CDU-CSU) and the opposing [Social Democratic Party of Germany](#) (SDP), were in a dead heat, with about 45 percent of the population intending to vote for each party. Under such circumstances, it seemed impossible to predict which party was most likely to win the election.

In the final few weeks of the campaign, however, the situation suddenly changed, with survey findings showing a last-minute swing in favor of the CDU-CSU. The percentage of respondents who said that they intended to vote for the CDU-CSU suddenly climbed to almost 50 percent, while the share that intended to vote for the SDP dropped to less than 40 percent. In the end, the result of the election confirmed those findings: the CDU-CSU won with 48 percent of the vote, as against 39 percent for the SDP.

Interestingly, while voters' intentions remained unchanged over the course of many months, their expectations regarding the outcome of the election shifted dramatically during the same period. In December 1964, the percentage of respondents who expected the SDP to win was about the same as the share who anticipated a CDU-CSU victory. But then the results began to change: the percentage of respondents who expected a CDU-CSU victory rose continuously, while the SDP lost ground. By as early as July 1965, the CDU-CSU was clearly in the lead regarding voters' expectations, and by August, almost 50 percent expected that it would win. Late in the campaign the bandwagon effect came into play, as a sizeable number of former SDP supporters or undecided voters cast their ballots for the party, they expected to be victorious.

How could party strength have remained constant for so long while expectations as to who would win changed so dramatically? Noelle-Neumann suspected that a visit by Queen [Elizabeth II](#) to [Germany](#) in May 1965, during which she was often accompanied by the Christian Democratic German chancellor, [Ludwig Erhard](#), may have created an optimistic mood among supporters of the CDU, prompting them to publicly proclaim their political [convictions](#). As a result, supporters of the SDP may have (wrongly) concluded that their opponents' opinions were more popular than their own and that therefore the CDU would win. SDP supporters were accordingly discouraged from publicly [articulating](#) their own views, reinforcing the impression that the CDU was more popular and more likely to be victorious.

Key elements of the theory

According to the spiral of silence theory, most people have a natural—and mostly unconscious—fear of social isolation that prompts them to constantly monitor the behaviors of others for signs of approval or disapproval. People also issue their own “threats” of isolation—mostly unconsciously—through behaviors such as criticizing someone, turning away from someone, scowling at someone, laughing at someone, and so on. To avoid isolation, people tend to refrain from publicly stating their views on controversial matters when they perceive that doing so would attract [criticism](#), scorn, laughter, or other signs of disapproval. Conversely, those who sense that their opinions will meet with approval tend to voice them fearlessly and at times vociferously. Indeed, speaking out in such a way tends to [enhance](#) the threat of isolation faced by supporters of the opposing position, reinforcing their sense of being alone. Thus, a spiraling process begins, the dominant camp becoming ever louder and more self-confident while the other camp becomes increasingly silent.

Importantly, the spiral of silence occurs only in connection with controversial issues that have a strong [moral](#) component. What triggers a person’s fear of isolation is the belief that others will consider him or her not merely mistaken but morally bad. Accordingly, issues that lack a moral component or on which there is general [consensus](#) leave no room for a spiral of silence.

As demonstrated by the 1965 German federal election and other examples, the actual popularity of an opinion does not necessarily determine whether it will eventually predominate over opposing views. An opinion can be dominant in public discourse even if a majority of the population actually disagrees with it, provided that most people (falsely) believe that the view is unpopular and refrain from expressing it for fear of being isolated.

Public opinion is limited by time and place. With few exceptions, a spiral of silence holds [sway](#) over only a single society (a nation or cultural group) and for only a limited period. When viewed in hindsight or from an outsider’s perspective, it is sometimes hard to comprehend the agitation and emotional fervor that can accompany a spiral of silence.