

## OUR VIEW

Candidates help  
democracy work

Democracy is at its best when there is competition among various candidates or political parties, because the marketplace of ideas becomes a little more open for business.

Though politicians don't necessarily always like running against an opponent, it forces them to sharpen their game by directly engaging the voters.

Put simply, it's boring when someone runs for office unchallenged.

The two-week candidate filing period for Edenton Town Council began about a week ago and continues until noon Friday, July 19. So there is still an opportunity to put your name forward.

There are three seats on the Town Council — 1st and 2nd Wards and the at-large seat — are up for grabs, along with the mayor's gavel. The cost to file is \$5 for the mayor's seat and town council.

Other duties range from committee meetings to ribbon-cuttings, council meets twice a month. Annual salary for mayor is \$7,200 and for councilors, it's \$4,800.

We'd like to see, at minimum, two candidates for every office. That isn't a knock on any of our candidates who have filed to run.

However, we don't want the election to degenerate into what became of the unwieldy multi-candidate primaries for folks seeking to win their party's nod for 3rd Congressional District seat.

The Chowan Herald does not endorse candidates for public office, but we encourage folks to run for office because voters need choices. So if you have ideas to help make our community a better place, Edenton needs you on the ballot.

GOP Primary  
had 2 winners

BY DAN PERRY

From God's sovereign perspective we had two winners in the recent Republican Primary run off for the third Congressional district.

Congratulations are in order to Dr. Greg Murphy for winning the popular vote by a wide majority. As a conservative, he is set to run against Allen Thomas, the liberal Democratic candidate, Libertarian Tim Harris, and Constitutional Party Candidate, Greg Holt, in the Sept. 10 general election.

It is my thinking that our second winner was Murphy's opponent, Dr. Joan Perry who personally ran a vigorous above board campaign. Her consistent exemplary conduct further endeared her to her many friends as well as her winning the admiration of a host of her political opponents. Any negative advertising against Dr. Murphy did not originate in the mind of Joan Perry. It was a political decision created by a group of her supporters as a necessary ploy in answer to some false assertions that she was once a liberal Democrat and a present supporter of Nancy Pelosi. For the record, she has always been a conservative Republican and has never been a Pelosi supporter.

Joan Perry was a winner in both the Primary Run-offs for three basic reasons:

1. She sought God's will. She is a strong Christian woman, who after much prayer and genuine thought felt led by the Lord to offer herself as a candidate. It was not just a spur of the moment decision. She and her faithful husband, Jimbo, spent many prayerful hours together seeking God's highest will not only for themselves, but for their five boys and their families and extended family. I truly believe it was God's will that she run.

2. She sought to glorify God. That was the motivating force that led to her final decision to run. Actually, it was a joint decision, shared by both Joan and Jimbo. She felt confident all along that no matter how it came out, she would be a winner, for the Lord was giving her the opportunity to learn and grow spiritually from the unique opportunity of running as "a pediatrician, not a politician." The bottom line is she fulfilled her mission to glorify God, giving Him all the credit.

3. She fought the good fight. She gave it her best. It was a strenuous, time consuming effort, with no regrets, for she ran an exemplary campaign. The Lord of grace did her a great favor by allowing her to have a realistic glimpse in the real world of politics, with all its frailties and failures. I, along with her many friends and supporters were present to hear her concession speech in which she graciously asked us to support Dr. Murphy in the general election. But more importantly, she thanked her sovereign God for the privilege of running and for meeting her every need along the way.

Joan Perry truly understands and humbly appreciates her spiritual insight in seeing that God's hand at work in everything makes life a great adventure.

Dan E. Perry is an attorney and Kinston native. He is an uncle to Dr. Joan Perry through marriage.

## Rethinking the definition of 'term limits'

No, not that kind of "term." Yes, the idea of putting definite limits on time-in-office is a hot-button topic in politics today.

But this article is not about that issue. Rather, it is about the "limitations of terms." That is, it is about the hard fact that hot-button words like "conservative" or "liberal" have changed in meaning over the years, and those changes have gone wild at times.

In other words, just because these labels have changed over time, maybe we should take them with more than a grain of salt.

In Moscow of the 1960s, dissidents like Dr. Andrei Sakharov and his friends had a joke they liked to tell about "limitations of terms," and the uselessness of political labels: "What is the difference between Capitalism and Communism? Capitalism is the exploitation of man by man. Communism is the exact opposite." (That's just pure Russian melancholy humor.)

That reminds me of a great line from my favorite political humorist (and fellow-Sooner) Will Rogers: "I don't make jokes. I just watch the government and report the facts."

Politicians on all sides of the aisle have exploited this "limitation of terms." It seems that in the last 20 years or so if a candidate is liberal, then all his or her opponents must be extreme right-wingers. And the converse is also true: If an office-seeker is conservative, then all his or her competitors are abjectly liberal, or collaborators with the liberals (which seems to be worse). Sometimes, if you're a very lucky politician, you can even get a talking head on cable TV to ramp up the labeling in cartoon neon (and a concomitant lowering of IQ).

This makes for a lot of slapstick comedy. Prior to the primary, competitors denounce each other's character in ways that would make Pontius Pilate blush. But after the convention, primary losers praise the same characteristics of the party nominee that they had, only weeks before, characterized as the wickedest thing since Hitler.

This kind of stupefying rhetoric helps produce the

wild changes of words. There is also the fact that people get used to their conditions, and they start thinking that what they are familiar with now is "what has always been." That is, new things become old very soon, and as customary as Deuteronomy.

Here is an example of "change -ability" from about 80 years ago:

In the New Deal era prior to World War II, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his crew launched a great many new federal initiatives that were unsavory (to put it mildly) to most conservatives (like both my grandfathers and probably all four of my great-grandfathers). I remember my maternal grandfather, usually a taciturn Mennonite, broke out of his normal reticence about politics and launched into unreserved invective whenever he heard the mere mention of FDR's name.

That said, why is it that many post-modern liberal political scientists look upon these same New Deal initiatives with contempt (again, to put it mildly)?

The reason for this surprising reaction is that most of the New Deal legislation sought to protect and reinforce the family (nuclear and extended). In particular, Social Security — as originally conceived in the New Deal context — assumed that one person in the family (usually the father) would be the breadwinner, the mother (usually) would be the chief care-provider. The children were not identified as "little consumers," but were expected to be brought up to take their place as responsible American citizens.

But since FDR, the "liberationism" that exploded out of the 60's has rejected any notion of traditional family structure. For that reason, FDR and friends (yesterday's "leftists") are jilted by leftists of today.

This sort of change-over has happened many times in the past. Liberals of 19th

## COLUMNIST



JONATHAN TOBIAS

century Europe fought for the civil rights of the individual. Conservatives of the same society usually supported the interests of the government, including protection and regulation of a wide range of social and economic activities.

While it sounds odd today to hear it, it was Conservatives in those days who enacted the first factory laws — reforms that are today near and dear to labor and union movements. The moneyed business interests were usually on the side of Liberals.

In politics, labels and movements can be counted on to do only one thing consistently — and that is to change.

Jacques Barzun, the great cultural historian who wrote the magisterial "From Dawn to Decadence: 1500 to the Present" (a text that ought to be taught in every freshman year everywhere), made a long study of such changes. He concluded his observations with this intriguing list of social accomplishments, and just who brought them about.

This list might surprise you: "Free enterprise, free trade, freedom to vote and run for office, free speech and religion are Liberal achievements ...

"Tariffs, the income tax, the S.E.C., zoning, and generally the regulation of social, economic, and even moral behavior, rest on Conservative ideas;

"The post-office, the police and fire departments, public schools, city buses, and national parks are [historically] Socialist institutions" (Jacques Barzun, "The Great Switch," in Columbia Magazine, 1989).

Today, things are topsyturvy (and wrong). Free enterprise, free trade and freedom of religion are chalked up to the Conservative side. Liberals are typically blamed for taxation, zoning and regulations on the economy and the environment. And everyone wants to take credit for institutions that are, truth be told [historically], legacies of the 19th century Socialist movement in Europe.

Each of these achievements (freedom to vote, free speech and religion, the post office and police and public schools, etc.) has its own rationale, and each has value (even taxes, though I'm loathe to say it). Each achievement is the result of long discussions of robust ideas about politics and civilization (some of these discussions have gone on for centuries, even millennia). Most of the time, the people involved have been well-meaning. Most of the ideas have been good (or were intended to be so). Some have been downright stupid. Some have been outright evil.

Labels like "conservative" and "liberal" have never helped the discussion. In the hard work of ideas and conversation, the words "Republican" and "Democrat" historically have done more to confuse and distort. It is better to stick to the discussion of ideas without labels. It is better to look at a candidate's character on your own, without looking up his or her endorsements or affiliations.

It is better to think with discipline (and a lot of history, with maybe a smidgen of classical philosophy) about the candidate and her or his plans. It is better to drop the party label and those useless words "liberal" and "conservative." It is better to filter out every negative newsbyte about competitors and every single oppo-research tweet.

To every candidate, I'll do my Jack Webb impression from Dragnet: "Just the facts, ma'am (or sir)." Give me your ideas, your plans and aspirations. Share with me your philosophy. Talk to me about history. Tell me about God, and what love means.

But start throwing those "limited terms" around, I'll get a headache for sure, and I'll probably say "Have a nice day." And go away unseen.

There have been enough piles of that speech already, littering the civic green.

Jonathan Tobias (jantobias77@gmail.com) resides in Edenton, and is a lecturer in systematic and pastoral theology at Christ the Savior Seminary near Pittsburgh. A semi-retired Eastern Orthodox priest, he is also an occasional gardener at the Cupola House and sings with the Albemarle Chorale, and the Mighty Termightlees.

Breaking Big Wind may  
relieve rate payers

To the Editor:  
Utility customers don't benefit from approved and/or proposed wind and solar projects because Big Wind hasn't documented any real purpose or need anywhere their green projects bloom, other than the real benefit of destroying pristine horizon views.

Okay, let's say turbines and solar panels are needed. If existing electric rates don't supply a fair Return on Equity (ROE), as Dominion contends, why is more utility customer money needed to chase Dominion's bad investments? (This isn't a good business model given their public application numbers.) In other words, how much of the upcoming Dominion Energy rate increase request (\$30M) represents new wind and solar projects in Chowan County?

Their rate increase application outlines \$1.3 billion for a generating station, \$132 million for a solar facility and \$410 million for two new solar facilities. These figures don't include \$268 million in existing improvements and another \$200 million in proposed improvement investments. This is money Dominion corporate, wind developers and solar developers won't have to spend to make GRID projects a reality. Dominion's reimbursement scenario comes from customers paying the power companies who share the wealth with wind and solar developers.

This is how all wind and solar projects make their money back, which will include

## READERS WRITE

Chowan's Timbermill Wind Project should it be built. Timbermill, as one example, is estimated to cost \$350 million over its suspected 20 year construction and operational cycle.

A \$30 million request now means a rate increase of \$30 million every two years spanning 24 years just to recover the cost for one proposed Timbermill project, if the numbers contained in Dominion's application remain consistent every year. And that's just for Apex. These numbers don't include Apex profit or any Dominion reimbursement income.

So, Dominion seeks the first installment on its above mentioned projects at an investment total of \$1.84 billion. At a rate increase of \$30 million per year with all things the same it will take over 60 rate hearings to make up the investment costs listed in their current rate hearing paperwork. With one every two years that's 120+ years to see any money equilibrium if we project Dominion's current numbers out, with Dominion not expanding its business model with any new projects over the next 120 years.

This investment scenario suggests what happened with Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) in 2001. It looks like Dominion Energy will be in bankruptcy territory over the long haul, along the lines of PG&E's rolling blackout and rate manipulation inviting government intervention.

Analyzing wind and solar investments how are they affordable to Dominion's stockholders, let alone its North



Carolina customers who are presently being manipulated into subsidizing Dominion's excursions into the Dark Side of electric power creation? Their current application should be denied, and suggests millions of dollars no smart investor would choose to risk. Tell the North Carolina Utility Commission to say "no" to answer Dominion's current rate increase application request.

PATRICK FLYNN  
Edenton

As humans, we are all  
stewards of the Earth

Even if you thought, perhaps incorrectly, that your child's illness was completely natural in origin and nothing you did caused it to occur, would you sit back and simply watch her sicken, weaken, and possibly die? Even if you thought death was inevitable, would you refuse to comfort her? Would you block efforts to cool down her raging fever? Of course you wouldn't, because you are a good and loving parent.

The preponderance of objective, non-political, scientific evidence points to the fact that human activity has caused a sharp rise in global

warning, which could lead to the demise of our planet's health. Please read an informative page on NASA's website: <https://climate.nasa.gov>

Even if you can't bring yourself to accept this, would you want your great-grandchildren to look back on your generation of earth-dwellers and realize you sat back and did not do everything in your power to help relieve the situation? Even if you thought it might be futile? Even if it meant exerting influence over people outside your own country's borders? Would you not find a way to offer some relief? Some way to bring down the earth's fever?

What we do now or refuse to do now, has direct influence on the lives of our children of the future (and that is not a far-distant future.) Our own individual actions, and those individuals we elect to make our collective actions, demonstrate where our hearts and spirits lie.

We are both child and parent of the earth.

This earth, this home — God's gift to us to thrive within and care for.

KATE AHEARN  
Edenton