



RULES FOR CONSERVATIVE RADICALS

◆
*How the Tea Party Movement
Can Save America*

Dr. David L. Goetsch
& Dr. Archie P. Jones

**RULES FOR
CONSERVATIVE
RADICALS**

**How the Tea Party
Movement Can Save America**

**DR. DAVID L. GOETSCH
&
DR. ARCHIE P. JONES**

**WHITE HALL PRESS
POWDER SPRINGS, GEORGIA**

RULES FOR CONSERVATIVE RADICALS

How the Tea Party Movement Can Save America

by Dr. David L. Goetsch & Dr. Archie P. Jones

Copyright © 2012 White Hall Press. All Rights reserved.

Produced and Distributed by:

WHITE HALL PRESS
3150A Florence Road
Powder Springs, GA 30127

www.WhiteHallPress.com
www.PatriotDepot.com
800-651-0211

ISBN: 978-1-4675-0258-0

Cover design by Joseph Darnell

Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
STRATEGY ONE: Advocate for Limited Government	11
STRATEGY TWO: Support Initiatives to Reduce Taxation	22
STRATEGY THREE: Insist on a Free-Market Economy	28
STRATEGY FOUR: Encourage Individual Liberty	39
STRATEGY FIVE: Require Personal Responsibility	43
STRATEGY SIX: Support Military Preparedness And a Strong National Defense	60
STRATEGY SEVEN: Restore Constitutional Sovereignty and Integrity	68

Introduction

*The Tea Party:
Voice and Vehicle for
Restoring First Principles*

America has arrived at a critical juncture in its history. As a nation, we can either reverse our current course—one that leads to a country of the government, by the government, and for the government—or we can chart a new course that will, once again, be guided by the principles for which our Founders pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor.

For 200 years or so, America's principles of liberty and equality, of consent, of religious liberty and private property, of the rule of law and constitutionalism have been under attack in the name of history and science and relativism, in favor of evolving truths, living constitutions, and bureaucratic government, through the

2 RULES FOR CONSERVATIVE RADICALS

*Progressive movement and the New Deal, the Great Society, and now into the age of Obama.*¹

The key to turning America around and charting a new course is to revive the first principles applied by the Founders in carrying out the great experiment that became the United States of America. Those first principles include: limited government, low taxation, a free-market economy, individual liberty, personal responsibility, a strong national defense, and constitutional sovereignty. The Tea Party Movement came into being because Americans of all stripes who believe in these principles were concerned that they no longer had a vehicle for making their voices heard.

The Democrat Party has become the party of statism and socialism. The Republican Party often resembles nothing more than a slightly to the right version of the Democrat Party, controlled by moderates and RINOs (Republicans In Name Only). As a result, those who believe in the principles upon which America was founded had come to feel voiceless. This feeling contained the

seeds of what became the Tea Party movement. Rather than sit back and watch the country drift ever closer to the point of no return on a river of statism, entitlement, and government tyranny, Americans in all walks of life came together to turn the ship of state around. These patriots who still believe in the first principles of the Founders have come to be known as the **Tea Party**.

Tea Party patriots are political conservatives who reject the big government policies of those who illogically call themselves “progressives.” If the American left is progressive, then what is progress? Is ignoring the Constitution’s limits on the federal government progress? Is bankrupting the American economy progress? Is using government entitlements to buy political support progress? Is promoting a victim mentality progress? Is perpetuating racial strife progress? Is transforming America’s public schools, colleges, and universities into centers of leftist indoctrination progress? Tea Party patriots and other conservatives have the same answer to each of these questions: a resounding “No!”

4 RULES FOR CONSERVATIVE RADICALS

Alexis de Tocqueville, a French dignitary, warned about the despotism of big government, or what is now referred to as *nanny government*. In an article for the Heritage Foundation, Matthew Spalding summarizes where so-called progressives are taking America:

Where we are tending is a government that does more, spends more, and regulates more and more. Our politics is covered by an intricate web of policies and procedures, rules and regulations, driven by growing streams of money from Washington to every state and locality, thousands of private and nonprofit organizations, and millions of individuals. As a result, growing numbers are dependent on government benefits and entitlements. The American people are becoming more subjects of the state than self-governing citizens.²

What Spalding describes is not at all what the Founders had in mind when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and, later, the Consti-

tution and the Bill of Rights. The Founders were committed to securing their independence from Great Britain and establishing a new country that would provide its citizens economic opportunity, religious freedom, and individual liberty. The Founders knew that establishing such a country would require a structure that limited government, required only minimal taxation, demanded personal responsibility, benefitted from a free-market economy, and enjoyed constitutional sovereignty. They soon learned that bringing their vision to fruition would also require military preparedness for a strong national defense. These are the first principles that Tea Party patriots and other conservatives believe should still guide public policy in America.

The Tea Party can play a critical role in saving America from the false, destructive, socialistic principles and policies of the left by being the **vehicle** and the **voice** for a re-birth of conservatism based on the first principles of the Founders. Encouraging, equipping, and empowering Tea Party patriots and other conservatives to

work together to save America is the purpose of this book. There are many things Tea Party patriots and other conservatives at the grassroots level can do to wrest control of the socio-political dialogue in America from the socialistic grip of “progressivism” and, in turn, reverse our nation’s present downhill course.

The things Tea Party patriots and other conservatives can do to save America include recruiting others to the cause through on-going community outreach, providing tools and resources, conducting educational activities, sponsoring rallies and other public events, offsetting the nefarious influence of the mainstream media and Hollywood elites by communicating the truth to Americans on a continual basis through radio, television, and the Internet, and keeping constant pressure on the Republican Party to move to the right in developing its political platform, selecting candidates for elective office, and governing our country. All of these tactics should be firmly grounded in and guided by the first principles set forth by the Founders.

We do not recommend or suggest that the Tea Party become a formal political party or even run its own candidates for office. We believe one of the greatest empowering assets of the Tea Party is that it is *not* a political party. We believe further that much of its strength derives from the fact that there is no single entity that calls itself “The Tea Party.” Rather, just as the original Tea Party patriots were a loosely connected coalition of like-minded Americans committed to doing their part to put off the tyranny of King George, the contemporary Tea Party is a nationwide collection of patriots determined to save our country from the tyranny of disastrous leftwing government policies—statist policies that, if not reversed, will eventually blossom into socialism just as surely as a certain cute and cuddly puppy grows up to become a dangerous and snarling pit bull.

Conservatives have the moral high ground and should use it wisely to save America from the growing grip of socialism. The left’s propensity for cloaking unethical practices such as legalized

theft in the flattering robe of “fairness” is a lie and a sham. In short, it is immoral. For this reason, Tea Party patriots and other conservatives must make more than just practical arguments against the left. We must also make moral arguments. **Practically speaking, statism, socialism, and big government do not work. Morally speaking, they are wrong.**

To assist Tea Party patriots and other conservatives who are concerned about America’s present course, we have developed seven broad strategies that are based on the first principles of the Founders as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. These strategies will help Tea Party patriots and other conservatives make practical and moral arguments against liberals who are taking advantage of the poor economic conditions they have created to pander to those most affected by these conditions. Using such tactics as the deceitful rhetoric of social justice, redistribution of wealth, and class envy, liberals are trying to divide Americans and turn us against each other. Consequently, it is up to

Americans who still put the long-term best interests of the country ahead of personal gain and partisan politics to stand up and fight for what is true and right. Strategies presented in this book for saving America from statism, socialism, and nanny government are as follows:

1. Advocate for limited government.
2. Support initiatives to lower taxes.
3. Insist on a free-market economy.
4. Support only those policies that encourage individual liberty.
5. Support only those policies that encourage personal responsibility.
6. Speak out on behalf of military preparedness and a strong national defense.
7. Commit to restoring constitutional sovereignty and integrity.

In his article, Matthew Spalding tells the story of Levi Preston, a young man who fought in the Battle of Concord at the outset of America's War for Independence. When asked what motivated

10 RULES FOR CONSERVATIVE RADICALS

him to put his life on the line fighting against the biggest, best-trained, best-equipped army in the world, Preston replied: “What we meant in going after those Redcoats was simple. You see, we had always governed ourselves, we always intended to govern ourselves, and they didn’t mean that we should.”³ The simple logic of a simple man is poetically eloquent in expressing why we believe the contents of this book are important for modern-day patriots who, like Levi Preston, are committed to governing themselves.

STRATEGY ONE

Advocate for

LIMITED GOVERNMENT

Due to the economic and financial excesses of liberals in the White House and Congress going back at least as far as President Woodrow Wilson, conservatives have become more vocal about the concept of “small government.” Conservatives use the term frequently in political discourse and understand precisely what they mean by it. We also understand what is meant by conservatives who use the term “small government,” but suggest it is more accurate and advisable to use the term “limited government.”

We emphasize the need for accurate terminology because liberals have a well-earned reputation for twisting the language to suit their agenda. For example, we are accustomed to hearing liberals make such statements as: “If you conservatives really want small government, why not just eliminate

12 RULES FOR CONSERVATIVE RADICALS

the military?” Of course, eliminating the military *would* shrink the size of government and please many liberals, but it would also leave America undefended against enemies bent on our destruction. It'd be better to preempt liberals from the outset by using precise terminology.

When conservatives use the term “big government,” they mean *unlimited government*—government that has grown too big and is prone to grow even bigger. When they use the term “small government” they mean government that operates within the specified limits of the Constitution. In other words, they mean *limited government*. The limits established by the drafters are enumerated in the various articles that make up the Constitution and clarified by the Bill of Rights, especially the Ninth and Tenth Amendments. The Ninth Amendment specifies that the rights of the people do not have to be enumerated in the Constitution. However, lest this amendment lead to opportunistic interpretations—precisely the kind liberals are noted for—the drafters added the Tenth Amendment, an amendment liberals

have spent the last 100 years ignoring. This final amendment in the Bill of Rights specifies that any delegated powers of the federal government are authorized to be performed only if such powers are expressly and specifically delegated to the federal government by the Constitution. The federal government is *allowed* to do certain enumerated things and is not *allowed* to do what is not specifically delegated to it by the Constitution. Some powers are forbidden to state governments by the Constitution; but the rest of the powers—and by far the majority of them—are reserved to the states. The federal government that exists today has so far exceeded its enumerated powers as to not even resemble the government set forth in the Constitution.

The federal government is too big because it has grown beyond the scope of its Constitutional boundaries. What was intended by the Founders to be a limited federal government that carried out specific enumerated duties has, over time, become an unlimited monstrosity that goes well beyond its enumerated duties and any reasonable

interpretation of the duties that were not enumerated. **Minor cuts to entitlement programs and minimal economic adjustments will no longer suffice.** Americans must demand a major restructuring of the federal government and a downsizing of the public's expectations of government. What follows are our recommendations for "right-sizing" the federal government. Tea Party patriots and other conservatives should be able to articulate these recommendations.

Recommendations for Properly Limiting Government

Visit Washington, D.C. and you will see monuments to history, monuments to art, and monuments to waste. In fact, the monuments to history and art—as massive in scale as they are—are dwarfed by the monuments to waste: a multitude of unnecessary and unconstitutional departments of the federal government.

Federal spending is soaring, and government debt is piling up at more than a trillion dollars a year. Official

projections show rivers of red ink for years to come unless policy makers enact major budget reforms. Unless spending is cut, the United States is headed for economic ruin. In recent decades, the federal government has expanded into hundreds of areas that should be left to state and local governments, businesses, charities, and individuals. That expansion is sucking the life out of the private economy and creating a top-down bureaucratic society that is alien to American traditions. Cutting federal spending would enhance civil liberties by dispersing power from Washington.⁴

To balance the federal budget, Congress must reduce spending by approximately one trillion dollars a year for the next ten years—no small challenge. Strategies for making the necessary reductions are as follows:⁵

- *Department of Agriculture.* End all farm subsidies, cut food subsidies by 50 percent, and end all rural subsidies. These

cuts will save approximately \$87 billion annually and reduce the behemoth Department of Agriculture to a minor government office. Making the recommended cuts will begin the process of eliminating the Department of Agriculture altogether.

- *Department of Commerce.* End all telecommunication subsidies and economic development subsidies. These cuts will save approximately \$3 billion annually and transform the Department of Commerce into a minor government office. Further, making the recommended cuts will begin the process of eliminating the Department of Commerce altogether.
- *Department of Defense.* Reduce the Department of Defense budget by a reasonable \$150 billion rather than the huge and unreasonable \$500 billion reduction recommended by liberals in Congress and the White House. These cuts could be proportionately absorbed by the various branches of the military without

threatening the viability of America's national defense.

- *Department of Education.* Eliminate the Department of Education and all of its entitlement programs forthwith for a savings of approximately \$86 billion annually.
- *Department of Energy.* End all subsidies for energy efficiency, vehicle technologies, electricity research, and nuclear energy. Also eliminate the technology loan program and fossil energy research. Privatize the power marketing administrations. These cuts would save approximately \$21 billion per year and reduce the Department of Energy to a minor government office.
- *Department of Health and Human Services.* The following actions will reduce the federal budget by approximately \$353 billion annually: freeze spending on Medicaid, repeal Obamacare, increase Medicare premiums, reduce non-Medicaid state and local grants

by 50 percent, cut the Medicaid payment error rate by 50 percent, increase Medicare deductibles, and enact tort reform. These cuts will reduce the Department of Health and Human Services from a mutating giant to a minor government office.

- *Department of Housing and Urban Development.* Eliminate the department and all of its entitlement programs forthwith for an annual savings of approximately \$61 billion.
- *Department of Justice.* End all state and local grants for an annual savings of approximately \$5 billion.
- *Department of Labor.* Eliminate all federal employment and training programs, job corps, community service for seniors, and trade adjustment assistance for an annual savings of approximately \$9 billion. Making these cuts will begin the process of eliminating the Department of Labor altogether.

- *Social Security Administration.* Just a few cuts to this gargantuan federal program will save the federal government approximately \$86 billion annually without endangering the financial security of seniors currently collecting social security. The necessary cuts include the following: price indexing of initial benefits, increasing the normal retirement age, and reducing the disability program by 10 percent.
- *Department of Transportation.* By ending all urban transportation grants, privatizing air traffic control, ending rail subsidies, and privatizing Amtrak, the federal government can save approximately \$15 billion annually and reduce this department to a minor government office.
- *Department of the Treasury.* Two simple adjustments in the budget of this department will save the federal government approximately \$46 billion annually: cut the earned income tax credit by 50 per-

cent and eliminate the refundable part of the child tax credit. These cuts would be temporary measures on the way to replacing the entire tax code with a flat tax.

- *Miscellaneous Reductions.* In addition to the specific budget reductions recommended above, the federal budget can be reduced by another \$98 billion annually by making the following miscellaneous cuts: reduce civilian government employee compensation by 10 percent, cut foreign aid by 50 percent, cut NASA spending by 50 percent, privatize the Army Corps of Engineers, repeal the Davis-Bacon Labor rules, end all EPA state and local grants, end foreign military financing, end all subsidies for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, end all subsidies for the Corporation for Community Service, privatize TSA, and eliminate the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

The sum of the various budget reductions recommended here would balance the feder-

al budget in ten years and result in a savings to American taxpayers of approximately \$1 trillion annually. By making the recommended budget reductions—and only by doing so—can America return to the limited government described in the Constitution. Making the types of changes recommended in this strategy will require courage, perseverance, and determination on the part of America's elected officials, things that are typically in short supply inside the beltway. Consequently, Tea Party patriots and other conservatives must be prepared to do what is necessary to put some *steel* in the spines of elected officials and to replace the ones with *steal* in their hearts.

STRATEGY TWO

Support Initiatives to

REDUCE TAXATION

Liberals, statist, and socialists have this in common: they love to spend other people's money. This is why British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, once said: "The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money." Try this experiment: Engage a liberal in a conversation about taxes. Ask the liberal how much taxation is enough. In all likelihood he will not be able to give a coherent answer. This is because for liberals no amount of taxation is ever enough. Consequently, a constitutional amendment to limit federal government taxation and borrowing is necessary.

Conservatives, on the other hand, can easily answer this question: The proper level of taxation is the minimum level needed to support the government as established in and limited by the Con-

stitution. That level of taxation, by the way, would be substantially lower than the one Americans are currently burdened with. Tea Party patriots and other conservatives must be able to articulate the case for lowering America's tax burden.

Articulating the Case for Lower Taxes

As a consequence of the tax-and-spend mentality of liberals in Congress and the White House, the federal government has become a bottomless pit into which liberals, statist, and socialists are continually throwing more money. This bottomless pit simply *cannot* be filled, no matter how high the tax rates are set. This being the case, **what should conservatives say to those who do not understand the benefits of lower taxes for all Americans?** The following facts will help to articulate effectively the case for low taxation.⁶

- Current tax laws encourage people to avoid the taxable economy. For example, in May 2012, Facebook co-founder, Eduardo Saverin, decided to give up his

U.S. citizenship and move to Singapore to avoid paying America's ridiculously high capital gains taxes on the almost \$4 billion he was scheduled to receive from Facebook's IPO. Saverin is just one of many. The number of people renouncing their citizenship to avoid taxation is now more than seven times what it was when President Obama entered office. Many more Americans evade taxes by becoming part of the underground economy or simply working less.

- High taxes bleed off precious dollars American businesses need to invest in technology, innovation, and expansion—the keys to global competitiveness and job creation. Too much of the money American businesses need to reinvest in their on-going improvement and development winds up in Washington, D.C., where it is frittered away on liberal social programs that do nothing to make America stronger and very little to help the people for which these programs were created.

- The costs to businesses and individuals are not limited to the taxes themselves. There is the additional time and expense being wasted trying to interpret and comply with a huge, confusing, ever-changing tax code, which even IRS personnel do not fully comprehend and that results in almost half of all Americans paying zero taxes. Economists estimate that compliance and administration costs add 20 cents to every dollar businesses pay to the government in taxes. The costs of administration and compliance are just two of several good reasons for eliminating the current tax code and replacing it with a flat tax, protected by a constitutional amendment limiting the percentage.
- America's tax code is inherently unfair and skewed (not what liberals mean by the term, but truly *unfair* in that some pay too much and many pay nothing at all). Under the current code, the top five percent of taxpayers pay more than 60 percent of all taxes collected by the

federal government. This means that five percent of Americans are carrying the bulk of the load for the other 95 percent—a fact that is wrong both practically and morally. Ironically, American citizens who live on government entitlements contribute nothing to the financing of those entitlements. The majority of businesses in America earn \$250,000 a year or less, yet collectively these small businesses are the backbone of the economy. Small businesses account for 95 percent of new jobs created, yet they are hurt the worst by the current tax code.

- High taxes take the incentive out of working. Why work when you have to turn most of your income over to the government in the form of taxes? Studies have shown that as tax rates increase, the number of hours worked decreases. For example, studies have shown that highly taxed Europeans work 50 percent less than their American counterparts. This fact helps explain why Europe lags be-

hind Japan, Korea, and the United States in productivity.

- Lowering taxes creates jobs because businesses will contract for services, invest in new technologies, invest in innovation, and hire specialists. Raising taxes has the opposite effect.
- Because of over-taxation, Americans now pay more in taxes than they do for food, clothing, and medical care combined. This is a moral outrage. President John F. Kennedy summarized the problem of high taxation in these words: “An economy hampered by restrictive tax rates will never produce enough revenues to balance our budget—just as it will never produce enough jobs or profits.”

STRATEGY THREE

Insist on a

FREE-MARKET ECONOMY

A free-market economy exists when people can buy and sell goods and services without restrictions, limitations, or inhibitions from outside sources concerning value and price. The American economy was intended to be a free-market economy and began that way. However, as the country grew, so did government and big government is the mortal enemy of free-market economics. Moreover, the growth of government was spurred far more by the growth of socialistic thought and propaganda than by the real needs of historical circumstances. Government inevitably becomes the outside source that limits the free-market. It does so through unnecessary and burdensome regulations and policies.

As things stand today in America, **virtually every transaction for goods and services is**

limited—directly or indirectly—by government regulations. In fact, the federal government—through the promulgation of a multitude of regulations—has infiltrated every aspect of American life. The constricting tentacles of government regulation have choked the freedom out of America's free market. Try to envision what George Washington or Thomas Jefferson—both gentlemen farmers—would think if they somehow learned that a mother in today's over-regulated America cannot purchase raw milk for her children without fear of prosecution. America's Founders would be aghast to learn that some type of government regulation now applies to every market transaction taking place in the country.

When a nation over-regulates and allows the government rather than the free-market to be its economic engine, it has slipped into *statism*, and statism is an intermediary step on the way to socialism. Many of the economic problems America now faces can be traced—directly or indirectly—to its retreat from the free-market and its growing acceptance of statism. In modern

America, the government stands between buyer and seller, dictating terms in every transaction for goods and services. America's free market has been replaced by a government market and the situation worsens daily.

Statism has been creeping into the American psyche for a long time, but during President Barack Obama's first term in office, it took a great leap *forward* and gained momentum, thereby draining even more individual freedom out of the free-market. Milton R. Wolf—a cousin of President Obama and a board-certified diagnostic radiologist—describes the economic crisis created by President Obama and his fellow conductors in Congress in this way:

America has become a train with too many cabooses and not enough engines, and our government is riding the brakes with anti-competitive taxes and regulations. We cannot hope to re-establish our AAA credit rating until we once again start behaving like a AAA nation. Welcome to downgraded America.⁷

Historical Perspective on the Free-Market in America

America's War for Independence was largely fought to protect the property rights of Americans against repeated violations by the King of England and Parliament. The first and last of the *Federalist Papers*—the authoritative commentary on the intentions of the framers of the Constitution—show that the intent of the framers was to protect republican government, liberty, and property. *Federalist Number 10*, the most important of the essays concerning ratification of the Constitution, reveals that the government of the United States was designed to protect justice and liberty by protecting private property against the unwise and unjust actions of a ruling majority or a vocal minority. Private property rights are an essential component of a free-market economy.

One thing that becomes immediately clear from even a cursory reading of *The Federalist Papers* is that America's framers rejected the kind of perversions of justice that modern-day liberals propose in the name of "fairness." Liberals believe the

federal government has the right and the authority to take property (money) from selected Americans and “redistribute” it to other Americans. But *Federalist Number 10* makes it abundantly clear that justice consists not of artificially redistributing private property but protecting it from redistribution. In a free market economy, property is acquired in an unequal manner because the amount of talent, effort, and ingenuity put into its acquisition is inherently unequal. In other words, some people are willing to work harder, longer, and smarter than others, and the fruit of their labor must be protected. This is justice—true fairness—as envisioned by the Founders.

Writing for the Heritage Foundation, Kim Holmes and Matthew Spalding explain the connection between liberty and economic freedom with these words: “Economic freedom is a crucial component in liberty. It provides individuals with the ability to profit from their own ideas and labor, to work, produce, consume, own, trade, and invest according to their personal choices. It is necessary for self-government.”⁸

In other words, economic freedom is essential to entrepreneurship, business innovation, commerce, and economic development. Without economic freedom these things are not possible. And, as the framers of the Constitution knew, without economic freedom, liberty and justice are not possible. Holmes and Spalding continue:

The American Founders always had a keen sense of the importance of economic freedom and the extent to which it is intertwined with political liberty. The American Revolution started as a rebellion against “taxation without representation”—against economic policies over which they had no say. That was the breaking point, the reaction to a long list of unanswered grievances against a far-away government that repeatedly abused their rights.⁹

This same kind of abuse occurs today on a regular basis in America by a government that has forced its way into every corner of our lives.

Leftwing economic policies—and the bailouts, handouts, and entitlements they have pro-

duced—are undermining America’s economic freedom, entrepreneurial spirit, and traditional work ethic, as well as our long-term economic well-being. The determination of the left to insinuate the government into every corner of American life is undermining the free-market, loading it down with burdensome and unnecessary regulations. As a result, America’s competitive position in the global marketplace is like that of an Olympic sprinter who must pull a giant anchor behind him. If this statist trend is not reversed, America is destined to go the way of Great Britain, France, Germany, Greece, Portugal, and Spain—once powerful nations that are now burdened with second-tier socialist economies and no longer able to follow through on promises made to their citizens.

Statism Is Socialism “Lite”

Economists define socialism as a centrally planned economy in which the government controls the means of production and distribution. This is an accurate but understated definition akin to calling

inoperable cancer an illness. Socialism is more than just an economic system, much more. It is a worldview based on the premise that the state knows best what individuals should think and how they should live. Socialism seeks government control of *all* aspects of the individual's life. Further, it rewards unproductive people who contribute little or nothing to society at the same level as productive, contributing people. Socialism is the "brave new world" Kipling lamented when he said: "All men are paid for existing and no man must pay for his sins." When liberals talk about "redistributing wealth" in the name of "fairness," they are advocating a basic socialist principle.

With socialism, the state is supreme and all problems have the same solution: government. In a socialist system, the free market is replaced by coercive government regulations. When the state becomes supreme and government becomes the solution, economic freedom, the free market, entrepreneurship, the work ethic, and individual liberty quickly become casualties. Socialism almost always begins as statism. Statism is a men-

tality in which people look first to government for their needs and to solve their problems. It is not socialism, but it is a dangerous step in that direction, and it has a similar effect on people. Think of statism as *socialism lite*. It is the opposite of the free market.

Like socialism, statism creates a dependence on government that is passed from generation to generation. If the government will provide for me, why should I provide for myself? To a growing number of Americans, this is a perfectly logical question. **Of course, the obvious answer is that government cannot provide everything for everyone.** The economic and social turmoil in such countries as Britain, Greece, Spain, and Portugal provide evidence of this fact. When students in Great Britain instigated violent demonstrations over increases in college tuition, the world saw first-hand where government dependence leads. The level of government dependence in America is higher than it has ever been. Many Americans have contracted the disease of statism, and there is already evidence that economic freedom, en-

trepreneurship, the work ethic, personal liberty, and our country's economic well-being are suffering as a result. Consequently, it is important that Tea Party patriots and other conservatives understand and are able to articulate the benefits of a free-market economy.

Articulating the Benefits of a Free-Market Economy

What follows are only some of the many benefits of a free market economy:¹⁰

- A free market gives individuals and organizations freedom, flexibility, and variety in buying and selling goods and services.
- A free market allows buyers and sellers to switch products and services, thus allowing them to quickly and effectively adjust to market conditions.
- In a free market, individuals and organizations may buy and sell what they want at prices they deem appropriate, thus encouraging production, commerce, and entrepreneurship.

- In a free market, individuals and organizations with goods and services are more willing to risk capital on research, development, and innovation because they have greater control over their own success.
- In a free market, individuals and organizations can maximize their profitability because they are not burdened by excessive regulations, which have the effect of limiting and inhibiting.
- A free market encourages healthy, productive competition that ultimately benefits end users and consumers.
- A free market leads to maximum efficiency, thereby making the best possible use of a nation's resources.
- A free market allows market-related decisions to be made on the basis of supply and demand, which is always more efficient and accurate than the sluggish, politically-motivated decisions of government legislatures and bureaucracies.

STRATEGY FOUR

Encourage

INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY

Liberty is what individuals have when they are able to peacefully pursue, nurture, and make independent decisions about personal, family, voluntary, and commercial interests and relationships. In defining individual liberty, Benjamin Constant, the French classical liberal, said:

It is the right to be subjected to the laws, and to be neither arrested, detained, put to death or maltreated in any way by the arbitrary will of one or more individuals. It is the right of everyone to express their opinion, choose a profession and practice it, to dispose of property, and even to abuse it; to come and go without permission, and without having to account for their motives or undertakings. It is everyone's right to associate with other individu-

*als, either to discuss their interests, or to profess the religion which they and their associates prefer, or even simply to occupy their days or hours in a way which is most compatible with their inclinations and whims.*¹¹

The statist and socialist policies advocated by the left are antithetical to individual liberty. In a socialist environment, the individual's liberty is subjugated to the state and his status, standing, and stature are all determined by his relative position within the political order. A nation cannot have a civil society without individual liberty. "The hallmark of a civil society is the autonomy of private associations and institutions as well as that of private business firms... A market economy is the appropriate pattern of life in a civil society."¹²

Articulating the Case for Individual Liberty

Because leftwing policies and practices continue to move America inexorably toward socialism and the corresponding loss of individual liberty, it

is important for Tea Party patriots and other conservatives to be able to articulate the benefits of individual liberty. What follows are some of the many benefits of individual liberty:¹³

- Individual liberty allows people to shape their own destinies, manage their own lives, and pursue their own dreams unencumbered by government interference.
- Individual liberty allows people to enter into contracts, exchanges, and interactions voluntarily and to set the parameters so that both will benefit. Exchanges between individuals who have the benefit of liberty can be win-win exchanges, whereas exchanges directed, controlled, or manipulated by government tend to be win-lose or lose-lose exchanges.
- Individual liberty allows people to freely and voluntarily enter into associations and relationships of mutual interest such as religious and church activities, cultural associations, clubs, professional organizations, and charitable groups without requiring the approval of government.

- Individual liberty allows what Austrian economist Friedrich Hayek called the “spontaneous social order” to develop. The social order in a free society is spontaneous because people form their associations—whether in church, professional organizations, cultural groups, clubs, or charitable groups—voluntarily rather than by government coercion. Socialism does not allow for the development of a spontaneous social order. Rather, the ways in which people form associations are designed, planned, and controlled by the government. For example, after Hitler’s National Socialist Party took control in Germany prior to World War II, membership in the Nazi party was a prerequisite to securing a good job, decent housing, and other amenities of life.
- Individual liberty is the antithesis of the collective tyranny of statism and socialism where the state, not the individual, is paramount.

STRATEGY FIVE

Require

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

While serving as President, Harry Truman became known for the sign on his desk that said: “The Buck Stops Here.” Truman’s sign was the ultimate expression of personal responsibility. It told the world that he took responsibility for the actions of the United States government regardless of whether these actions had the desired effect or failed miserably. But, alas, Harry Truman is no longer president and America is no longer the country it was when he served. Instead, **America has devolved into a nation of finger pointers and blamers**; a country in which people no longer expect to be held accountable for their actions. Worse yet, we have become a nation of *entitled* Americans, people who, rather than taking personal responsibility for their lives, expect the government to take care of them. These, then,

are the counterpoints to personal responsibility: finger pointing and the entitlement mentality.

From elementary school children who don't do homework to oil company CEOs who engage in criminal behavior, the consequences often seem to fall on the system rather than on the people who actually misbehaved... No wonder oil company executives cut corners: if they get away with it, they are rewarded with higher pay. If they get caught, they just retire to their generous retirement plans. Like students do, maybe BP thought that if the well blew up they would get a "do over" or an opportunity for "extra credit" to make up for the spill or their lawyers would take care of it. That is how it is becoming in America from cradle to tomb. Okay, America, I substituted cheap pipes. Okay, I didn't hire enough people. And maybe I knew the blow out preventer had flaws. Yup, we bribed the regulators with sex and money. But don't blame us: Blame the

*government for not regulating us. And while you're at it, blame society for its oil addiction.*¹⁴

How the Entitlement Mentality Came to Replace Personal Responsibility

The entitlement mentality is like a disease that infects the immune system, making people more susceptible to the allure of government bailouts, handouts, and entitlements, and correspondingly less willing to take personal responsibility for themselves, their actions, and their decisions. At the same time, the nanny-government approach of liberals reinforces and feeds the entitlement mentality in an unending cycle. As the entitlement mentality and nanny government mutually feed each other, personal responsibility is undermined with each repetition of the cycle. This is why it is so important to break the cycle by replacing the entitlement mentality with an attitude of personal responsibility that encompasses such

values as integrity, diligence, self-reliance, self-discipline, and accountability.

Replacing America's propensity for entitlement, litigiousness, and finger pointing with an attitude of personal responsibility will require leadership from Tea Party patriots and other conservatives. The effort should begin with a thorough understanding of the causes of the entitlement mentality and its corresponding practices of litigiousness and finger pointing. Primary among these causes are the following:

- Overindulgent parents
- Misguided school systems
- Government handouts and bailouts

Overindulgent Parents

Many parents of entitled young people grew up in lesser socio-economic circumstances than those they now enjoy, circumstances they worked long and hard to overcome. Having done so, they vowed that their children would not have to endure the same trials and tribulations, which in-

cluded such things as: working their way through college without federal grants or loans, doing without certain things until enough money was saved to purchase them, and starting at the bottom economically and career-wise and working up. As a result, well-meaning parents became overindulgent and, in the process, unwittingly *protected* their children from the very trials, challenges, disappointments, and consequences that would have given them the experience they needed to confront life as responsible, self-reliant adults. All too often, parents of entitled young people gave their children everything they could possibly need, except the two things they needed most: responsibility and accountability.

This notion of *protecting* children from the normal problems of growing up as well as the attendant responsibility, accountability, and consequences associated with these problems gave rise to the term “helicopter parents.” Helicopter parents are ones who hover over their children throughout their formative years, rushing to the rescue every time the children’s bad behavior or

poor choices result in negative consequences. When their children get at odds with authority figures, helicopter parents tend to respond with such comments as: “My son would never do such a thing!” or “Why are you being so hard on my daughter? She is just a child!” In years past, when parents received a telephone call from a principal or police officer, they asked: “What has my child done?” When helicopter parents receive such a call, they ask: “What have you done to my child?”

While parents of previous generations tended to side with authority figures—principals, teachers, coaches, and police officers—holding children responsible when they got into trouble, parents of the “entitled” tend to side with their children. They side with their children automatically, without even taking the time to learn the facts of the situation. Further, they often continue to side with them even when the facts reveal that their children were at fault. Some of the errors frequently made by helicopter parents include: 1) shielding their children from the consequences of their behavior, 2) giving their children too much

latitude and too little responsibility, and 3) failing to hold their children accountable for their actions and behavior. Unfortunately, these types of errors reinforce the behaviors that got their children into trouble in the first place and undermine the concept of personal responsibility.

Misguided School Systems

Many of the adults who exhibit an entitlement mentality grew up during an era in which the public education system in America underwent a major philosophical shift in its approach to preparing young people to be responsible, contributing, productive citizens. When previous generations attended school, it was thought that setting high standards, having high expectations, and teaching self-discipline constituted the best way to achieve this goal; but this all changed with the children of the 1960s and their children.

During the formative years of today's entitlement generation, the focus of public education in many states shifted from high standards to "inclusiveness." Educators in these school systems came

to believe that developing self-esteem and being inclusive were more important than student achievement in reading, writing, computation, history, and critical thinking. This major philosophical shift was made in spite of the fact that there was not, nor is there now, any credible evidence supporting its viability. **It should also be noted that in attempting to artificially develop self-esteem in students, educators were trying to give what can only be earned.** Self-esteem is not a gift that can be given to an individual. Rather, it is like a masonry wall—it must be built slowly and surely, brick by brick. Failure of liberals to understand how self-esteem is really built is the result of misguided leftwing thought in the philosophies of American public school theorists. Failure of schools to properly teach reading, writing, computation, history, and critical thinking is the result of left-leaning educators using public schools to indoctrinate rather than educate.

The philosophical switch from high standards to inclusiveness and from self-reliance to self-esteem was the result of socialistic ideals—such as

hatred of individualism, devotion to egalitarianism, and moral relativism—that inevitably led to a number of misguided practices on the part of educators. Some of the most egregious of these practices are as follows:

- Eliminating so-called *exclusive* practices such as naming a class valedictorian, assigning class rankings, and publicizing the honor roll.
- Praising students even when their work, performance, or efforts are less than praiseworthy.
- Eliminating such practices as naming the Most Valuable Player in sports and academic teams.
- Allowing all who sign up to make the team (sports or academic), regardless of merit in the form of talent, motivation, preparation, or performance.
- Giving all participants a trophy regardless of which team wins or loses.
- Requiring that all members of the team get to play in every game, regardless of

their talent, effort in practice, attitude, or other considerations of merit.

The net result of practices such as these has been to transform schools into artificial environments that are completely at odds with the realities of the world in which young people will need to function after graduation—a world that values and rewards personal responsibility, effort, and accountability.

Government Programs

People who take personal responsibility seriously respond to adversity by looking for ways to solve their own problems. This is the self-reliance element of personal responsibility. Unfortunately, self-reliance, personal responsibility, and accountability are undermined by statist politicians who think government is the answer to every problem. Government programs in the form of handouts and bailouts are products of the entitlement mentality, which is fundamental to a socialistic mindset. Government handouts and bailouts are major contributors to the entitlement mentality that is

undermining personal responsibility in America. In fact, many of the government's most expensive programs are called *entitlement programs*.

In his book *Liberty and Tyranny*, Mark Levin says this about government entitlements: "If the Statist were to devise a scheme whereby a grandparent would be stealing future earnings from his own grandchild, would the grandparent consent to such immoral behavior? Yet entitlement programs tend to be intergenerational swindles that threaten the well-being of future generations with massive financial obligations incurred from benefits received by today's generation."¹⁵

Levin pinpoints the real problem with government bailouts, handouts, and entitlements. It is not just that they are crippling the American economy, which they are, but that they are crippling individual Americans by robbing them of any sense of self-reliance and personal responsibility—two key ingredients in the traditional American work ethic. People who come to depend on government entitlements are saying that it is acceptable to expect someone else to pay for

their needs rather than taking personal responsibility for them. This is nothing more than legalized theft, and the government is the thief.

Three examples of government entitlement programs for college students—the types of programs favored by members of the *Occupy Movement*—are the Pell Grant, federally-guaranteed student loans, and government programs based on state lotteries. Formerly known as Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOGS), Pell Grants are federal government grants to undergraduate college students. The stated purpose of the Pell Grant is to promote access to higher education. Student eligibility and the amount that can be received depend on income level, the cost of attendance, enrollment status (full or part-time), and length of attendance (full-year or less).

In addition to the Pell Grant, government-backed student loans are readily available to students who meet the eligibility requirements, irrespective of college major. Why is the student's college major an issue? Because the college major is an important factor in determining the student's

ability to pay back the loan. For example, students who major in one of the STEM disciplines (Science, Technology, Engineering, or Math) will be better situated to repay than students who major in other disciplines that lead to lower paying jobs or, worse yet, that have no marketability.

State lotteries are now available in most states. They are typically used, at least in part, to help defray the costs of college tuition and books for students. In fact, advocates of state lotteries often use additional funding for education as the centerpiece of their marketing strategy when trying to win approval of lotteries at the ballot box. Among the problems with state lotteries, the Pell Grant, and government-backed student loans is that they promote a *something-for-nothing* attitude among the students who use them to finance a college education. This attitude undermines personal responsibility even further. Because financial aid has become so readily available from the state and federal governments, young Americans now view a college education as just another entitlement, instead of as a privilege. In other words,

they believe they have a right to expect others to pay for it, rather than being something for which they should take personal responsibility.

Students who view a college education as an entitlement rather than a privilege quickly come to view the college degree as an entitlement also. This is why college professors so often find themselves saddled with students who feel they are entitled to a passing grade for doing nothing more than showing up for class, if that. After all, if they are entitled to a college education, why should they work for it? If all a student must do to receive financial aid from the government is fill out the right forms, why should he have to do any more than that to receive a degree? This is how entitled students who lack any sense of personal responsibility think.

Articulating the Case for Personal Responsibility

Thanks to decades of liberal indoctrination, it is increasingly common for the poor to blame the wealthy for their economic circumstances, for

the entitled to believe that income redistribution through taxation is valid, and for Americans to embrace the concept of nanny government. Consequently, it has become critical to be able to articulate the case for personal responsibility. The following statements illustrate why it is so important for Americans of all stripes to take personal responsibility for their lives, their families, their communities, and the future of our country. People who refuse to accept personal responsibility are often characterized by the following:¹⁶

- Overly dependent on others in all aspects of their lives. This dependency leads to the development of an entitlement mentality where everyone wants to ride in the wagon and there is no one left to pull it.
- Viewing the world as inherently unfair and seeing themselves as victims. Over time they respond to the perceived unfairness and their corresponding victimhood by becoming chronically angry. When this happens, they often act out

their hostility in counterproductive ways (think of the Occupy Movement).

- Fearful of taking the risks that are essential to success in a competitive society. When this fear sets in, they opt for the security of nanny government.
- Failing nearly every enterprise they undertake—including personal relationships—because they have developed a negative attitude, which becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy; they expect to fail, and so they do. Eventually they come to accept failure as a normal way of life instead of an anomaly to be overcome by working hard and working smart and learning from mistakes.
- Physically and mentally unhealthy. For example, obesity is an epidemic in America. Obese people tend to blame their eating problems on everyone but themselves. They tell themselves: “It’s not my fault. I can’t help it.” Then they sue the fast-food establishments they have freely and without coercion frequented for

years. Self-inflicted poor physical health, in turn, often leads to poor mental health where the “victims” pay psychiatrists and psychologists enormous fees to listen patiently as they blame everyone but themselves for their problems.

- Addicted to counterproductive behaviors and substances. Their rationale is typically something like this: “Since the world is unfair and the deck is stacked against me, and since I cannot help myself, I will seek comfort in drugs, alcohol, gambling, or other counterproductive behaviors.”
- Unable to trust other people, because everyone is out to get them. As a result, they are unable to form or maintain positive, productive, helpful relationships.
- Seeing themselves as permanent victims who deserve to be taken care of by others in the form of government entitlements, for which they are neither appreciative nor thankful.

STRATEGY SIX

Support

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS AND A STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

Every day, terrorists scattered around the world are hatching plots against America. Every day, the Chinese take another small step toward achieving their stated goal of military superiority over the United States. And, every day, liberals in Congress are plotting their next move to undermine the morale and effectiveness of the American military. As president, Barack Obama has mastered the left's new approach of expressing its animosity toward the military: **praise loudly in public, but attack quietly in private.**

Using this approach, liberals are often heard publicly extolling the virtues of the military, especially when doing so will allow them to make political hay. Perhaps the best example of how hypocritical liberals can be when dealing with the

military was President Obama's handling of the historic takedown of Osama bin Laden by Navy SEALs. Because the long-awaited death of this despised terrorist was such welcome news to Americans of all stripes, President Obama was full of praise for the courageous men who carried out the mission. Predictably, liberal journalists rushed to credit Obama with the kill of the century.

As Commander in Chief, it was appropriate that President Obama be given his share of credit. In fact, in a show of national unity on the subject even prominent conservatives were quick to compliment the president for the success of the mission. However, what the media conveniently forgot to mention in its rush to praise the president was that just a year earlier his administration was pursuing the prosecution of Navy SEALs for allegedly bloodying the nose of a terrorist. Navy SEALs treat a terrorist no rougher than six year-old boys treat each other on the playground and the Obama administration wanted to prosecute them. This incident, not the Osama bin Laden mission, shows what liberals really think of the military.

Many liberals lack an appreciation for what soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and Coast Guard personnel endure in the name of America's national defense. Further, they either do not understand, or do not care, how their misguided policies affect the ability of members of the various branches of the armed forces to perform their duties. Nor do they appreciate the consequences of military defeat at the hands of our enemies. Because so few of today's members of Congress have served in the military, there is a growing and dangerous disconnect between those who declare wars and those who fight them.

Following the tragedy of the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, our country underwent what appeared to be a transformation. Liberals, conservatives, and moderates pulled together in a show of patriotism. "We Will Never Forget" bumper stickers could be seen displayed on the automobiles of people from both ends of the political spectrum. American flags were proudly displayed, and the military was once again afforded a level of respect

it had not enjoyed since the end of World War II. Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, this surge of national unity was short-lived. Many people who claimed they would “never forget” forgot.

The antipathy of the left for the military has not changed since the Vietnam War. Owing to the vocal support of mainstream Americans for the military, the left has turned down the volume of its public animus toward our men and women in uniform. However, the attitude of the left toward the military is the same as it has always been: negative. What has changed though, is that liberals like President Obama act out their negativity toward the military in more subtle ways than in the past. Evidence of what the left really thinks about the military can be found in: 1) their treatment of military personnel; 2) the rules of engagement forced on military personnel (*e.g.* do not shoot unless someone is shooting at you, do not shoot an insurgent if he drops his weapon and runs, you must get permission to shoot—even if someone is shooting at you, etc.); 3) the watering down of military training; and 4) the propensity for cut-

ting the military first when budget cuts must be made. The military tends to suffer in all four of these critical areas when liberals control Congress and/or the White House.

Because of China's determination to overtake the United States in military superiority and because terrorists are determined to bring America to her knees, it is critical that we maintain the best-trained, best-equipped, best-led, and best-funded military in the world. Attempting to balance the federal budget on the backs of the military services as liberals are determined to do is an economic strategy that can lead only to disaster.

Articulating the Case for Military Preparedness and a Strong National Defense

Liberals think that peace can be achieved by putting bumper stickers on cars and trusting in the United Nations. China and the terrorists who despise America and everything it stands for scoff at bumper stickers and the United Nations. In fact, they would be more than happy if the United

States continued to cut its military and put its trust in sentimental bumper stickers and an impotent U.N. The following statements help articulate the case for military preparedness and maintaining a strong national defense:

- As long as hate, envy, greed, covetousness, and the lust for power reside in the hearts of men, there will be wars. Consequently, Americans must understand that neither the Chinese nor terrorists are interested in peace. They are interested only in dominance. Nor are they interested in negotiating, except as a way to buy time as they plan and work for the downfall of the United States. People who hate America and everything it stands for are bent on America's destruction. They do not think like we think, they do not share our values, nor do they respond to reason. They respect only one thing: strength. Consequently, any lack of strength on America's part invites mischief on their part.

- The world is filled with people who hate the United States and everything for which it stands. Some are determined to do everything in their power to bring this country to its knees. Worse yet, many of these hate-filled fanatics are more than willing to lose their own lives if, in doing so, they can kill innocent Americans. Therefore, it is important to reject the naïve posturing of liberals who think it is possible to sit down with those who despise America and talk reason. Unmitigated hatred knows no reason. America's enemies use dialogue and so-called *peace talks* to gain the time and access they need to plan and carry out their attacks.
- Reject all attempts by liberals and misguided moderates to balance the budget on the backs of the military. There has never been a time in the history of our country when having a strong, well-equipped, properly-trained, and fully-supported military was more important than it is now. Picture a tourist with pock-

ets full of cash getting lost and walking through the most dangerous, crime-ridden neighborhood at night. This unfortunate tourist will not be able to negotiate his way out. In fact, he will be lucky to get out alive. This is the same type of situation in which America finds itself right now. The world is an increasingly dangerous place for Americans. There is only one way to effectively prevent wars in this environment, that is to field the best-equipped, best-trained, best-led, best-funded, and most dedicated military in the world—a military that can quickly and effectively make the cost of attacking the United States too high to even contemplate. Politicians must take the gloves off the military and let it do what it is trained to do, and what is necessary to protect America. Shackling American warriors with politically-motivated rules of engagement that empower the enemy is no way to prevent wars. In fact, pandering to the enemy encourages more attacks on America and discourages young men from joining the military.

STRATEGY SEVEN

Restore

CONSTITUTIONAL SOVEREIGNTY AND INTEGRITY

The United States' Constitution is one of the most significant documents ever written. It is a document that every American should be knowledgeable of and conversant about. One of the most important of its drafters was James Madison. Known as the Father of the Constitution, Madison kept a journal of the debates that occurred during the development of the original document. From Madison's notes, as well as the notes of other first-hand participants, we can learn much, including the thinking of the framers at the time the Constitution was drafted. Unfortunately, proponents of the concept of the "living constitution" have adopted a that-was-then-this-is-now attitude toward Madison's journal and other sources of first-hand, eyewitness knowl-

edge. Those who subscribe to the concept of a living constitution think the views of the framers are irrelevant. They believe the Constitution should flap in the fickle breeze of continual change and be revised by judicial fiat, Congressional legislation, or presidential executive orders to fit the fleeting social mores of the moment. To living constitution advocates, what the framers envisioned as our nation's by-laws to enact the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence are irrelevant.

If the Declaration of Independence represents America's vision, the Constitution is the game plan for transforming that vision into reality. Key principles in the Constitution as set forth by the framers and that are especially important in today's political environment are:

- *Republican Form of Government.* A form of government that is based on popular consent and popular participation, it also includes precautions against pure majoritarian democracy while also protecting against governmental tyranny.

With Republicanism, public policies are made by representatives elected by the people, rather than directly by the people themselves as would be the case in a pure majoritarian democracy. Federalist papers 10 and 51 written by James Madison, describe the republican form of government, America's particular federal form of republican government, and the rationale for adopting the republican form of government.

- *Selection of Government Leaders by Election.* Those who make public policy are elected by the people. This ensures that there is popular consent of the governed and participation by the governed while also protecting against the possibility of the tyrannical few ruling over the many.
- *Limited Federalism.* The Constitution did away with the loose confederation of states established by its predecessor, the Articles of Confederation. In its place was established a federal system, but a limited federal system. Some powers

are delegated to the federal government (and can be taken back by a state as the New York, Rhode Island, and Virginia ratification documents stated and others implied), some are forbidden to the states, some are shared by the state and federal governments, and the rest—by far the most—are left to the states. Article VI, Section 2, of the Constitution, known as the “Supremacy Clause,” describes the federal system it established:

This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every state shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.

In other words, the Constitution established a limited federal system that leans in favor of the federal govern-

ment for certain specified national purposes by giving it the power to do such things as regulate commerce, provide a uniform currency, provide uniform laws on bankruptcy, raise and support an Army and Navy, declare war, collect taxes, provide for the common defense, collect custom duties, and other powers vital to national well-being (see Article I, Section 8 for a complete listing of the federal government's powers). The federal government does not rightly have powers that are not stated in the Constitution. Powers not specifically given to the federal government are reserved for the state governments.

- *Limited Government.* The framers were careful to specifically define what the government could and could not do. In other words, they envisioned limited government and developed a document to ensure that government would be limited. The limitations on the federal government are contained in the Constitution in Article I, Section 8; Article I,

Section 9; and the Bill of Rights. Article I, Section 8 lists what the federal government may do. Article I, Section 9 lists particular things the federal government may not do. The Bill of Rights—the first ten amendments to the Constitution—provides important protections for the individual from the national government, and protects the powers retained by the states.

- *Barriers to Pure Majority Rule.* Concerned about the potential abuses of pure majority rule—for example, mob rule—the framers built several barriers into the Constitution to preclude majoritarian democracy. These barriers or precautions include a bicameral legislative branch (a Congress consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives); an unelected, appointed judiciary; limits on the powers of the federal government; indirect election of the president (Electoral College); and various checks and balances, including federalism—a system of separation of power, and

checks and balances between the state and federal governments.

- *Separation of Powers.* The framers were concerned about misrule and excesses on the part of all three branches of government: executive, legislative, and judicial. They were especially concerned about guarding against any branch of the government usurping power from the other branches or from the states. They solved this problem by applying the concept of balanced government envisioned by the French philosopher Montesquieu and learned from their studies of history. Balanced government is based on an awareness of the nature of man and on the principle that it is dangerous to entrust any one branch of government with too much power. This danger is overcome by dividing the various powers of government up and distributing them among the various government branches (i.e., the legislative branch makes laws, the executive branch enforces laws, and the judicial branch adjudicates disputes

over laws). This separation of powers was codified in the Constitution with Article I listing the legislative powers, Article II the executive powers, and Article III the judicial powers. The framers also included various ways that the three branches of government check each other by ensuring that no branch of government can carry out its duties solely on its own. Rather, each branch requires the cooperation of the other branches.

- For example, the Supreme Court can declare executive acts to be unconstitutional, but the president enforces the law and nominates judges to the Supreme Court. Congress enacts laws, but the president can veto them. The Supreme Court can declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, but federal judges must be confirmed by the Senate. In addition, Congress controls the Supreme Court's appellate powers and budget, and Congress can impeach and remove federal judges. As *Federalist Number 51* and others make clear, fed-

eralism provides a double security for the rights of the people by establishing a separation of powers as well as checks and balances between the national and state governments.

Undermining the Sovereignty and Integrity of the Constitution

The Constitution is the law of the land in America. It is a document of the people, by the people, and for the people of the United States. Unfortunately, its sovereignty and integrity are under attack. Its sovereignty is being undermined by liberals in Congress, on the courts, and in the White House who are advocates of international law. Increasingly, liberals in Congress look to international law for guidance when drafting laws in Congress. Worse yet, liberal judges look to international law for guidance in making their decisions in the cases that come before the bench. This is especially the case in the appellate courts and the Supreme Court.

The Constitution's integrity is being undermined by "living constitution" advocates in the courts who reject the limits imposed on them by the Constitution and legislate from the bench. Rather than accept what the Constitution actually says, these liberal judges twist the words of the framers to make the Constitution say what they want it to say. As a result, they are turning our country into a rudderless ship adrift on a sea of uncertainty. Perhaps a better analogy here would be of a disabled ship piloted by a mad captain and crew attempting to weave the maze of rocks and shoals of global tyranny it faces.

Articulating the Case for Constitutional Sovereignty

The sovereignty of the Constitution is being steadily undermined by adherents of international law. International laws are enacted by people who do not share America's traditional values. Further, American citizens have no voice in their passage. Therefore, it is important that Tea Party patriots and other conservatives be able to effec-

tively articulate the case for maintaining the sovereignty of America's Constitution. The following statements will help in this regard:

- The Constitution was established as the supreme law of the land for the United States. No other law, treaty, or action may take precedence over the Constitution. Unfortunately, advocates of a "living constitution"—including some Supreme Court judges—are moving ever closer to allowing international treaties and international law to supersede the Constitution. In order for a treaty to be valid, it must conform to the Constitution, because the Constitution is a higher legal authority than a treaty. The Constitution is what gives our government the legal authority to enter into treaties, a fact that protects America's sovereignty when interacting with foreign powers. The sovereignty of the Constitution protects the sovereignty of the American people, that is, our authority to govern ourselves independent of foreign influence.

- International law consists of laws developed and ratified by other countries and organizations, which means that American citizens have no significant voice in their development or ratification. To make matters even worse, these other countries and organizations are often composed of people with radically different religions, worldviews, moral values, goals, and interests than those subscribed to by most Americans. *Consent of the governed* is a fundamental principle of the Constitution. Therefore, laws that were developed and enacted without the consent of the American people should not be applied to the American people.
- Threats to constitutional sovereignty are not limited to international law. International treaties represent another risk to the American people. International treaties are supposed to be subservient to the Constitution because the Constitution is the source of authority for government officials who enter into treaties. Unfor-

tunately, some left-leaning government officials believe their personal authority supersedes that of the Constitution. These self-anointed officials are showing a disturbing propensity for putting international treaties over and above the Constitution and for using these treaties to undermine parts of the Constitution that do not support liberal, socialist, and Marxist ideology. Some of the tenets of these treaties would deny Americans their constitutional rights relating to parenting and educating their children, keeping and bearing arms, and other fundamental rights.

Articulating the Case for Constitutional Integrity

The integrity of the Constitution is being undermined by liberal judges who take a “living constitution” approach to interpreting the Constitution, rather than the more valid approach of originalism (either original intent or original meaning). The “living constitution” approach allows judges

the luxury of making the Constitution say anything they want it to say, which, in turn, allows them to legislate from the bench, or, worse yet, *amend* the Constitution from the bench. Consequently, it is imperative that Tea Party patriots and other conservatives be able to effectively articulate the case for maintaining the integrity of the Constitution. The following statements will help in this regard:

- The practical integrity of the Constitution is a function of how it is interpreted by those empowered to do so. The battle over constitutional interpretation is a battle between advocates of the living constitution and advocates of originalism. Only if originalists win this battle will the integrity of the Constitution be restored. The integrity of the Constitution was on the mind of James Madison—the “father” of the Constitution—when he wrote:

I entirely concur in the propriety of resorting to the sense in which the Con-

*stitution was accepted and ratified by the nation. In that sense alone it is the legitimate Constitution... If the meaning of the text be sought in the changeable meaning of the words composing it, it is evident that the shapes and attributes of the Government must partake of the changes to which the words and phrases of all living languages are constantly subject.*¹⁷

- Originalism tethers the decisions of judges to the original meaning of America's Founders. The "living constitution" approach, on the other hand, opens the judiciary to arbitrary, reckless, and self-interested decisions that are driven by false and dangerous ideologies. American society is like a balloon floating in the air. As the winds change, the balloon will blow in that direction. As the winds change again, the balloon will blow in the new direction. If it is tethered tightly to a solid stake in the ground, the balloon can blow only so far, but if not tethered it will blow away.

The Constitution is what tethers America to its founding principles, justice, and freedom, and originalism is what keeps the tether from being severed.

- “Living constitution” advocates like to claim that the Constitution must change to match the ongoing changes in American society, but they miss, or, more likely, *ignore* an important point. Think of the Constitution as your home. Americans often change their homes—color schemes, carpet, flooring, window treatments, and furniture—to accord with changes in fashion, taste, and financial status. The reason these changes can be made without undermining the integrity of the home is the solid foundation on which the home sits. As long as the foundation under your home is solid, you can make all the changes you want. But undermine the home’s foundation and the changes will one day cause the home to come crashing down around you. Advocates of a “living constitution” are undermining the foundation of our country. If this trend continues, Americans will one

day wake up and wonder what happened to the sovereignty, freedom, and liberty they had always taken for granted.

- In his book *Liberty and Tyranny*, Mark Levin explains what is really behind the “living constitution” point of view:

The Statist considers the judiciary his clearest path to amassing authority, for through it he can proclaim what the law is without effective challenge or concern with the fleeting outcome of an election cycle. Moreover, the federal judiciary is populated with about one thousand lawyers—and the Supreme Court a mere nine—making statist infiltration easy. Even when holding high office in the executive or legislative branches, the Statist today looks for ways to enhance judicial authority at the expense of his own branch, for in doing so he seeks to immunize his agenda from a possible change in public attitudes. And the Statist on the Court tolerates representative govern-

*ment only to the extent that its decisions reinforce his ends. Otherwise, he overrules it.*¹⁸

CONCLUSION

America is stumbling down a dangerous path—a path that begins with statism and ends in socialism. Conservatives have historically looked to the Republican Party as the vehicle for voicing their opinions and concerns in the political arena. Unfortunately, **the Republican Party’s established leaders have become increasingly “moderate” and, in turn, accepting of statist policies and practices.** As a result, true conservatives in America need another vehicle for expressing their political views. That vehicle can be the Tea Party movement. Using the strategies set forth in this book, Tea Party patriots and other conservatives can come together to restore the Founders’ vision for America and, in the process, save America from those who would transform it into the USSA: the Union of Socialist States of America.

ENDNOTES

1. Matthew Spalding, "A New American Fusionism: Recovering Principles in Our Politics," *The Heritage Foundation*, March 17 (2009). www.heritage.org
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Chris Edwards, "A Plan to Cut Spending and Balance the Federal Budget," *Cato Institute*, April 30 (2012), 1, www.downsizinggovernment.org/balanced-budgetplan
5. Edwards, 3–4.
6. David John Marotta, "CBJ: The big benefits of lowering taxes," *The Daily Progress*, December 14 (2009), www.dailyprogress.com
7. Milton R. Wolf, "After downgrade, what needs upgrading? Plenty," *The Washington Times*, August 22 (2011), 36.
8. Kim R. Holmes & Matthew Spalding, *Why Does Economic Freedom Matter?* (Washington, D.C., The Heritage Foundation: 2011), back cover.
9. Holmes & Spalding, 3.

10. Brady Mickelsen, "Advantages of a Free Market Economy in America," April 30 (2012), <http://voices.yahoo.com>
11. Quoted in Richard M. Ebeling, "Individual Liberty and Civil Society," *FREEDOM DAILY*, May 1 (2012), www.fff.org/freedom/0293b.asp
12. Edward Shils. "The Virtue of Civil Society," *Government and Opposition*, (1991).
13. Ebeling.
14. Steven Reiss, "Whatever Happened to Personal Responsibility? Blame Me and I'll Sue," *Psychology Today*, June 14 (2010), www.psychologytoday.com
15. Mark Levin, *Liberty and Tyranny*, (New York, Threshold Editions, A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc.: 2009), 95.
16. Jake Lawson, "Accepting Personal Responsibility," May 1 (2012), www.livestrong.com
17. James Madison, "Letter to Henry Lee," dated June 25, 1824.
18. Levin, 40.



Current Events • Politics

US \$4.95



LIBERTY
ALLIANCE

ISBN 978-1-4675-0258-0



9 781467 502580

50495

