

Chapter 06

PREFACE

Finished Rough Draft
(To be edited down)

Are there problems in the US? Yes. Are the problems being addressed properly, if at all? No. And, therein, for everyone to see, is what is wrong - the problems facing us are not being rectified. This leads to frustration and to anger. It fuels those who, without knowing better, see no other solution than to tear down the system and dive into the void - which is what faces us if we don't put our house in order.

What if someone were to tell you that the United States of America could be an harmonious nation, and that the ills being portrayed in the media, many of which are inflated for sensationalism, and others more serious being ignored by the media, could be ameliorated or even eliminated, not by changing the system, but by actually utilizing the system we have, correcting most of what is wrong by reducing the size and extent of the central government. The premise of this book is that the fundamentals of the American system are fine; but for too many years too many politicians working at the behest of so-called experts, using fancy words and specious concepts to defend corruption, have taken us far afield from the difficult but extremely effective course of republican government.

Republican government in this book refers to the system created by those who were adherents of classic liberal philosophy. Conservatism from the point of view of this book differs in some aspects from the free market economics of Reagan sycophants and the social agenda of religious conservatives following in the footsteps of Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell. The last true American Conservative to reach national status was Barry Goldwater - and while he was inevitably defeated by the ghost of JFK in the incongruous being of LBJ and by

the Eastern establishment Republicans who preferred to lose an election rather than lose control of their Party, he produced a solid 38% of the vote in the 1964 Presidential election. Much the same is happening in the 2016 election. And, it happened before in the election of 1812.

We have two major political parties, both corporate at their core. Both corrupt in their stewardship of the nation.

Right now we have people supporting a change in America from a republican form government to a national socialist form of government, referred to by one candidate for President as a Democratic / Socialist government, the Marxist-Leninist term used in lieu of Communism. Many of the people who are supporting this change are either uneducated to the ways of a republic or to the dismal results of socialist governments around the world. Some are just touchy feely utopians who want everything to be nice for everybody. Some hate America so much that they want to see it brought down and allow the world to devolve into a one world system run by bureaucrats and by bosses like those in the former Soviet Russia. Russia over the past one hundred years made a bloody transition from a monarchy to a strong man Communist government to a strong man de-facto dictatorship with a former Communist Party intelligence officer in charge. In our country, it would appear that over the past two hundred years the Presidency, which always carried with it a certain prestige and authority, has become the focal point of the American political system, and most recently the President has become more important than the Congress - and many people appear to be comfortable with this change. In our short history as Americans, we have gone from a king, subservient to a parliament, to a quasi-dictatorial President, subservient in most instances to no one; who has at his disposal a monstrously large bureaucracy.

It is apparent that the United States of today is a far cry from the country that was founded in 1791. But, it is not the obvious technological advances that have

occurred over the past two hundred years that have brought about the changes. Peoples' basic needs haven't changed. Peoples' hopes and desires haven't changed. How they satisfy those needs, hopes and desires may have changed. But, in all of its importance to the individual, these changes are ephemeral. The change is much deeper and began long before technology, elevated to the point of intellectual incapacitation, overwhelmed us. For example, can anyone truly describe as intelligent someone who drives a several thousand pound moving vehicle on the public byways while occupying themselves with a communication device? Still, it is done by American citizens at an alarming rate. It might be said that the average citizen displays less intelligence than his forbears who knew enough to pay attention to their surroundings. Cell phone use is a symptom of a larger problem, that being a lack of attention to the dangers that surround us, and a false sense of comfort in the modern era having provided safety for inattentive acts. One of those acts has much more serious consequences for the society at large than cell phone use while driving - voting. America has and continues to be inattentive to that for which they are voting. That has brought us to where we are today - on the proverbial doorstep to hell.

Technology aside, at its core the country is still different from its roots. And, the seeds of this change were planted at the beginning of the country by those who designed the Constitution and chose hopeful expediency over actual experience with powerful governments. The first fruit of what was planted at the Federal Convention in 1787 was a very bloody Civil War. The second flowering was the acceptance of progressivism at the turn of the 19th century, and again half a century later in the 1930's when the function and purpose of government was again redefined. Today, we are about to change the country forever, and along with it the liberty that we once knew.

This last change, unlike the quasi Socialist changes in the 1930's that some would say forestalled a revolution and the rise of Communism in the US, will accept a disguised form of Communism as the ultimate solution. In an attempt to

reduce the effect of corruption on a massive government, Americans are accepting an even larger government that they are being told will be more honest and fair and "just," run by people who are either just like them or who understand them and have their interests at heart. Discounted by most people is the basic fact that it is the size of the central government and the effect that political corruption is having on that government that is causing the greatest ills. Sadly, people don't seem to understand the lessons of the American Revolution, and its eternal meaning. Nothing relating to the struggle between people and their government has changed since societies were first formed time immemorial. The founders understood the inevitability of conflict inherent in the government / governed relationship. Sadly, the beneficial control manifested over that struggle for the past two and a half centuries is about to end, if it has not already ended. The struggle between those who control society and the average citizen wanting a good life and to be left in peace has not changed. Again, what has changed is the size of government and what people believe is within the purview of government to do.

People are told they need democracy to have what is now called 'social justice' - a new set of rights, granted by the government. But for the sake of efficient and fair operation, a democracy needs to be limited in scope and size. Democracies, especially large ones that depend upon majority rule, majoritarianism, by their very nature and definition are despotic. In small communities decisions relating to repairs done to some local streets may be done with a certain amount of favoritism as to the priority of which streets get done first, and who the supplier of street paving products will be, or which contractor will get the job; and although favoritism related to the project will line the pockets of some few local big shots, they most probably will not destroy the community. On a larger scale, in a country of 300,000,000 people, with a multitude of projects far removed from the casual observation of the citizenry, corruption is much more devastating, and a studied eye is needed to control what is going on. But even with the best of intentions, when a country's government becomes too large, inefficiencies and

corruption are impossible to control. It is also impossible for the individual citizen to have enough knowledge to vote intelligently, especially since almost no issues ever appear on a ballot. And recently, even when ballot initiatives have appeared during statewide elections, the democratically arrived at results have most often been rejected by an out of control Federal Supreme Court nullifying the democratically arrived at decision as being "undemocratic." On the one hand we see a demand for democracy and on the other we see a demand to reject democratic results.

The reason we have this conflict is that we are being asked to vote on issues that should never be allowed into the mix of politics. And if they are in the mix, they should never rise above the level of state authority. Responsible voting demands information about issues, and even if the news media were not inefficient and corrupt, enough information could not be gathered and disseminated and actually digested by the average citizen to allow them to make an intelligent decision. Add to the mix a country that is becoming less and less homogeneous, more "Balkanized," more and more divisive. And, in spite of hopes for a more just society, more and more demands for special privileges become commonplace. Each group wants its exception to this or that rule; wants some special benefit because of some special need they have, or because of some harm done to them by another group. And, with the admixture of more and more cultures, what is fair to one group is unfair to another group. What is frivolous to one group or to a set of groups is anathema and sacrilegious to a particular group in another set. Each of these groups will claim their piece of Democracy. Regardless of the intellectual construct, fairness is impossible in a large government with an infinite variety of forces pulling on it. Ultimately, some people will have to lose. The conundrum for majoritarianism is that, while we say we want majority rule, there is always the questions of how to protect the minority from the majority, and the majority from an energetic minority. We saw the results of an out of control majority in the middle of the 20th century in Germany. But in the United States today we are seeing the results of out of control minorities; in the board rooms of

large corporations and in the halls of Congress, tugging us one way, and organized mobs in the streets pushing us another way; all the while the vast majority of Americans have no real understanding of the forces behind the manipulation of their country. Of course, in a larger sense they shouldn't need to have a full understanding. There should be fewer governmentally generated options demanding their attention. In demanding equal rights, rights must be limited to what is essential to liberty. In a pure democracy, suppression of the minority by the majority is inevitable. One solution for this problem was in the former Yugoslavia, with warfare and genocide and ultimately the creation of several small states in place of the larger single state, in which all the competing cultures, mostly based on an historical divide between Christians and Muslims, had been for many years subjugated to a strong central authority.

In America, the Christian Mexican here illegally and the Muslim Middle Easterner brought here by executive action may each have a somewhat brown skin complexion, but other than that biological feature they share very few values; and it can be sure that the Mexican who has lived next door to the United States and has wanted to come here for years and finally sneaked across the border, will resent the Muslim who is brought here and lives comfortably under a veil, while the Mexican lives under the threat of being tossed out. Add to the mix, many in the welfare supported Black community with continuing high unemployment and high crime rates, the formerly comfortable middle class economically depressed New England and Mid Western Whites, and the immigrants who are legal citizens and have joined the American melting pot, and you have mutual resentment and a struggle for patronage from the central government.

Few, if any, of these recent immigrants, like those Middle Eastern and African Muslims arriving here from dictatorial war torn countries with values very different from the values of the majority American culture, will be like a particular recent immigrant from Pakistan. This particular person is a doctor with the Veteran's Administration, who upon arriving in the United States was so confused by the

American culture that he attended a philosophy class on the founding of America, so that he could understand its principles. He related to the author what he considered the most profound experience of his life, the aftermath of the 2000 Presidential election/ When the Supreme Court decision basically gave the election to Bush, Gore just went home. For most Americans, whether or not we agreed with the decision or how it was made, or whether hanging chads should have decided the course of a nation, we accepted what this one new citizen saw as profound; contrasting this with the assassinations and political rancor that occurred on a continuing basis in Pakistan after elections. But, the rancor and lack of respect that exists in many "third world" countries have reared their ugly un-republican heads here. During this recent election cycle, we now have seen organized Leftists and illegal aliens from Mexico violently demonstrating against a Republican presidential candidate, Donald Trump; and Trump supporters disrupting rallies of another Republican candidate, Ted Cruz; violently screaming insults at him, calling him names first uttered by Trump. With this degeneration of civility, promoted by the news media as exciting and apparently accepted by a sizeable group of American voters, it is quite possible that the traditional American system will not continue into the future.

This unraveling of the society has been instigated from the very top, by the current President of the United States, who has undermined our civility and instilled divisiveness in this country by a thousand subtle acts. He refuses to comment on the recent targeted killings of police officers [1], but instead invites to the White House leaders of the disruptive Black Lives Matter street mobs, who were involved with the destruction of Ferguson and Baltimore, and among whose ranks are "kill the cops" chanting people, responsible in a very direct rhetorical way to the dramatic rise in cop killing over the past year. [2]. He has told Christians to "get off their high horse" while ignoring the thousands of Christians being slaughtered in the Middle East. [3] And in the face of this slaughter he is bringing thousands of Muslims here from the same region [4]. With the message being broadcast from the center of American government and being filtered down

to the streets, it is questionable how much longer the Pakistani immigrant will be able to experience the profundity of this country.

Americans are now being told to clamor for their vote to count. But, when all a citizen knows is how much they are being promised, of what value is their vote to the nation at large? If they vote for candidates who promise them more welfare at some one else's expense, what value is that for the nation? If they vote for the right to call their union a marriage, when marriage has been defined differently for thousands of years by the majority of those who share a national culture, and is an issue that should never be decided upon by a central government, what value has that for the nation? If all anyone knows about voting is who will give them more of what they want, rather than protect the interests of the nation as a whole, what value is that for the nation? They say people want their vote to count. They want 'one person one vote'. They want to do away with the Electoral College. Essentially they want to do away with the republic and replace it with a democracy, a democracy with a faucet that pours out gifts when the right person is elected - their person.

Today many Americans look at the United States as one big country, not as a conglomeration of diverse regions and states, each with their own character. Corporate fast food chains and transcontinental hotels, (inter)national retail banks and (inter)national retail stores sharing a corporate logo have lead us to believe that everything everywhere in America is the same. But, it is not. There are still farming centers, and cattle centers and some few manufacturing centers. There are ports and there are communication and financial centers. There are areas of the country where religion is a more important aspect of life than in other areas. There are large population centers with mutually admiring cliques who thumb their noses at the more provincial traditionalists who like the liberty America has offered them. In a democracy where there are large concentrations of people who share particular values, their vote would inevitably overwhelm the vote of other disparate groups in smaller enclaves. How unfair it would be to the

people who live in rural settings to be told how to live their lives by people who ride subways and bicycles to work. How unfair it would be to the individual who works for the county highway department and lives with his wife and two children on two acres bordering a stream to have to live by the standards of someone who works at Starbucks and shares an apartment with two other people in a twenty story building in a metropolis. How unfair it would be to the farmer who lives by the transit of the sun over his farm, to have to be guided by those who work 9 to 5 and on the weekends party until sunrise, just when the farmer's family is rising to tend to the farm.

It is doubtful that those in the inner cities would understand the effect that their choice for a national government would have on people who grow their food and get it to the co-op, and the trucker who drives hundreds of miles bringing it to the local supermarket distribution center and then to each local store. Even within a state there are conflicts of interest between groups of people, but states grew to become what they are because of those conflicting interests, and still there is more of a connection between the individuals of one state than between the people of Manhattan, New York and Erwin, Tennessee.

We are all Americans, but we are also New Yorkers and Tennesseans. In many states there are large, or relatively large, population centers and suburban and urban areas. In others the extremes are more limited and the distances are either greater or lesser. In a state like California, its length and overall size and differences in geography make for extreme differences. The extremes are significant and there are many conflicts that have led to severe problems for the state. In New York, the differences between New York City and upstate New York are also significant, and there has been a tug of war in New York since the early 1900's and is becoming greater as the City's cultural, racial and political make-up changes.

For many in the larger cities in the North East, it is almost inconceivable to understand the regional conflicts between the North and the South that existed when the country was formed. It would be even more difficult to understand that General Robert E. Lee left his position at West Point to fight for his country in the Civil War. Yet these and other newer conflicts still exist, although they may be hidden from sight behind the big neon signs of the McDonalds and Exxons. Even at the inception of the country, with thirteen states, and the possibility of expansion only reaching to the Mississippi, if that far, the country was considered to be expansive. Only Russia, China, India and fledgling Australia were larger in area, and each of those countries were ruled by strong monarchies that allowed for limited freedom. The founders understood the relationship of size to democratic principles. They looked at Greece and Rome and to contemporary Switzerland as examples of how Democracy functioned. They understood that localized democracy, where people had the most direct control over their lives was the only examples of responsive democracy. They understood that as the size of a country increased, representative republican government was a necessity; and for the United States with 13 distinct States, a democratic federal republic would be the most efficient form of government to maintain liberty.

It is the federal system, the republican form of limited representative government, and the ability of regions to cast a vote that best represents their interests that has allowed America to grow and prosper as a free society. The lack of a republican system and the lack of republican values is what ultimately caused the collapse of the multi-cultural Communist Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has allowed the relatively homogeneous Communist Peoples Republic of China to remain as repressive as it is.

Still, with all that the United States has accomplished, and in spite of its many faults, it has been able to succeed where other nations have failed. Now, we are being told that republicanism must end and we must meld into one large country, with equal rules for everybody. We are going through a period of what is

euphemistically called "political correctness." Actually it is political conformity. And conformity is a prerequisite for fascism. In fascist society there can be no other voice than the voice of the state. In Communist China, it was put into place through a bloodletting called the Cultural Revolution that allowed the change to a Communist society. Every remnant of China's ancient history had to be extinguished, much as it was done in Germany through its youth training, and is being done today in the United States at the behest of the central government, with its bureaucratic decrees redefining basic rights and cultural and moral values. Removing statues from memorial plazas and Presidents from currency is only a small element in the Cultural Revolution that is taking place in America. We don't think of ourselves as NAZI's, but much the same happened in Germany after 1933. While the development of NAZI Germany was different from what is happening here, in one very large way it is the same. Germans in a federal country were being taught what it meant to be a German by a strong central authority. Before the NAZI's could succeed they had to destroy the historical regionalism that had defined Germany. Rhetoric aside, it was the imposition of a strong central authority that defined the horror that became the Third Reich. While America's fate may not be to dominate the world, the current course of events in America will lead to a monolithic oppressive central government controlling all of America; as an example of what lies ahead of us, we have the fate of the native American, locked away in reservations, their culture destroyed in Indian schools where not only was English taught, but their native tongues were prohibited from being spoken. Their differences were not acceptable to the larger culture. Yes, liberty is a difficult objective. When the hope of individual liberty was at its strongest, America may have been diverse in culture, but it was also a melting pot where the dominant American aimed for liberty. Whether or not that goal was achieved is debatable. But, a country without a culture is not a country. So, as we remove elements of our history, and familiar faces that represent our formative years, we are also removing what it is that is America - with all its good and bad. America demands leadership that understands the good and bad of American history. A good education system teaches that, But

destroying the overwhelming goodness of America because of its defects is no less than killing a cripple with a defective leg. Ironically, those who scream the most for compassion for the individual, demand punishment for the society as a whole. Just as the human condition allows for a world with people with this or that defect or affliction, the human condition will never create a society that does not have its own defects.

How many of those people clamouring for their vote to count in the presidential election have any understanding of the American system of government, how it functions and why it is designed the way it is? Once a democracy is instituted in place of a republic, few Americans will have any idea what the multitude of legislation that comes before the congress means.

Are we to become a country in which all the common citizen can say is, "I want that, give it to me." How something will be provided, how it will be paid for are questions that most citizens cannot answer. And, if the extent of our knowledge gathering is limited to the paradigm jokingly uttered many years ago by Will Rogers, "All I know is just what I read in the papers, and that's an alibi for my ignorance," then we are truly lost. [5]

Citations

1 - pg 4

2 - pg 4

3 - pg 4

4 - pg 4

5 - Will Rogers