

Friday, September 25, 2009

Tenth Amendment Key to Freedom

It is easy, with all of the debates and radical policy changes occurring in Washington, D.C., to develop an almost exclusive focus on the federal government. However, that would be a mistake. Certainly, we need to battle bad laws, corrupt politicians, and defend liberty, freedom and the Constitution. Unfortunately, as individuals, it is difficult to influence the politicians in Washington, D.C. The Tea Party movement has gained a great deal of support, many are waking up, and politicians are taking notice. However, in my opinion, in order to bring about lasting change, we must take the battle to the state level. In our system of Federalism, power is divided between the federal government, state governments and the people. Over time, the states and the people have allowed the federal government to usurp much of our legitimate power and to subvert the Constitution. That is the situation now, but it doesn't have to be reality tomorrow.

We can reassert our Tenth Amendment Rights.

.

We can demand that our State Representatives, State Senators, Governors, Congressional Representatives, Senators and other elected officials pledge to respect the power of the states and the people. One excellent way to do this is through the [Tenth Amendment Center's Pledge](#). Demand, don't ask, that current office holders, or candidates, at the [state](#) or [federal](#) level take the 10th Amendment Pledge. Download the pledges and get them signed. If you plan to run for office, download the pledge, sign it and send it back in.

Get involved in local groups that support the Tenth Amendment. For example, in Missouri, there is the [Missouri Sovereignty Project](#).

For too long, under both major political parties, we have seen the rights of the states and the people trampled on. It's time to say, "Don't Tread on Me!" Government won't give you back the power it has taken voluntarily. You have to demand it. You'll need allies to get your rights back, and some of the best allies are your neighbors, and state officials - if you let them know you expect them to protect your 10th Amendment rights.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 02:20

Thursday, September 24, 2009

Rebutting Annie Leonard The Story of Stuff

Just ran across this excellent point by point rebuttal of Annie Leonard's *The Story of Stuff* by [How the World Works](#). *The Story of Stuff* is so full of holes it makes a sieve look solid. It is unbelievable that any self-respecting teacher or school could show this in a classroom when it is riddled with inaccuracies, propaganda and outright distortions and lies.

The Story of Stuff with Annie Leonard provides a powerful object lesson and reminder that as consumers of educations, parents must beware and be aware at all times what is being taught in schools. The future of our country is at stake and we all need to pay attention to what is being taught to future generations.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 02:14

About Annie Leonard, Narrator of The Story of Stuff

Annie Leonard, narrator of *The Story of Stuff*, and one of Time Magazine's [Heroes of the Environment](#), is teaching school children a mixture of Malthus, Marxism and Green ideology.

To get a good idea of [what Annie Leonard believes in](#), it is worth looking at what organizations she associates herself with.

They include the following:

1. International Forum on Globalization (IFG). The [IFG](#)

IFG PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

IFG PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES are dedicated to examining the myriad effects of globalization and to promoting diverse solutions to the current model. We advocate alternative visions and economic policies based on the following principles:

LIVING DEMOCRACY: Democratic and accountable regional and/or international institutions that do not

disempower or undermine sovereignty of communities and nation-states.

SUBSIDIARITY—**FAVORING THE LOCAL:** Rules and structures that consciously favor local control over issues that have local consequences; a model of subsidiarity that recognizes the inherent democratic right to self-determination and self-reliance. In regard to trade agreements and institutions, the IFG supports **fair trade** based on a framework that favors **local production** for **local consumption**, supplemented by long-distance trade for those goods and services that cannot be supplied regionally.

ECOLOGICAL SUSTAINABILITY: **Environmental protection, sustainability and biodiversity** are keystones of any viable economy. The current globalization system contributes to rapid destruction of the environment in a variety of ways: through vast increases in transportation infrastructure and fossil-fuel based transport, excessive resource extraction, harmful industrial agriculture methods, and other myriad problems intrinsic to globalization.

COMMON HERITAGE: **Equitable sharing of common resources** such as water, air, forests and other natural resources; recognizing that culture and knowledge are collective creations of communities and regions; and promoting the right of everyone to "modern" common resources that address basic needs such as healthcare and education.

DIVERSITY: Cultural, ethnic, religious and economic diversity are key to the vitality, resilience, and innovative capacity of any living system and must be respected.

HUMAN RIGHTS: It is the **duty of governments** to not only ensure civil and political rights, but also to **guarantee economic, social, and cultural rights**.

JOBS AND LIVELIHOODS: Sustainable societies must **protect the rights of workers** in the formal sector and address the livelihood needs of the greater numbers of people who subsist in what has become known as the informal sector.

FOOD SECURITY AND SAFETY: **Local self-reliance in food production** and assurance of healthful, safe foods should be central to any economic model. Current trade policies undermine local food security by emphasizing an import-export model, making people dependent on food sources thousands of miles away.

EQUITY: **Social justice and greater equality**—among nations; within nations; between and among ethnic, cultural and religious groups, classes, and men and women—are cornerstones of sustainable societies.

THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE: **All economic regulatory activity should abide by the Precautionary Principle** which states that **when a practice or product raises potentially significant threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary action should be taken to restrict or eliminate it**.

Apparently, the IFG believes it is a small world after all. They want to roll back to a time when food production was local. The serfs had local food production, so how bad could that be? They also talk about "excessive resource extraction" and "harmful industrial agriculture methods". Those "harmful" agriculture methods are a part of the industrial trend that has saved untold numbers of people from starvation worldwide. As for "excessive resource extraction", it sounds bad, but I wonder who in the IFG's utopian world will determine the proper level of "resource extraction"?

"Equitable sharing of common resources" smells like Socialism. Then there is "human rights" and the "duty of government" to "guarantee economic, social, and cultural rights". Apart from those "human rights" not being defined, it again sounds like more Socialism.

We then have a laundry list of other utopian ideals such as "workers rights", "local self-reliance", "social

justice", "greater equality", etc.

Then, we have the kicker - The Precautionary Principle, which states "...when a practice or product raises potentially significant threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary action should be taken to restrict or eliminate it." Now notice, it doesn't say a practice need raise significant threats, merely "potentially significant threats". Basically, The Precautionary Principle gives a free hand to government and petty bureaucrats to restrict and regulate away all manner of private economic activity.

2. Health Care Without Harm. [Health Care Without Harm](#) sounds unsurprisingly like the IFG, only for health care.

Health Care Without Harm has eight core goals.

1. **Create markets and policies** for safer products, materials and chemicals in health care. Promote safer substitutes, including products that avoid mercury, polyvinyl chloride (PVC) plastic and brominated flame retardants
2. **Eliminate incineration** of medical waste, minimize the amount and toxicity of all waste generated and promote safer waste treatment practices
3. **Transform the design, construction and operations** of health care facilities to minimize environmental impacts and foster healthy, healing environments
4. **Encourage food purchasing systems** that support sustainable food production and distribution, and provide healthy food on-site at health care facilities
5. **Secure a safe and healthy workplace** for all health care workers
6. **Ensure patients, workers and communities have full access to information** about chemicals used in health care and can participate in decisions about exposures to chemicals
7. **Promote human rights and environmental justice** for communities impacted by the health care sector, while assuring that problems are not displaced from one community or country to another
8. **Address climate change** by improving energy practices and reducing the overall climate footprint of the health care sector

Wow, I just can't get enough of these organizations that Annie Leonard is part of. I mean who wouldn't want an organization that wants to "create markets", fiddle with hospital design, construction and operations, pick what foods you eat at the hospital, take care of health care workers, ensure that the sick and dying know about all the "harmful" chemicals around them, promotes "social justice" and, for good measure, addresses "climate change". Whew, I'm tired just thinking about all the swell stuff that Health Care Without Harm is going to do for me.

3. Funders Workgroup for Sustainable Production and Consumption. It's a mouth full, but the [Funders](#)

[Workgroup for Sustainable Production and Consumption](#) supports the following values:

- **Equity:** People are at the heart of a sustainable society and equal access to the opportunities generated by sustainable production and consumption is core to our work.
- **Inclusion:** Our workgroup is open to grantmakers exploring the values of sustainability no matter what their funding program is called.
- **Stewardship:** We promote "best practices" (zero waste events, locally sourced goods, etc.) at our own events and those of other organizations, including the Environmental Grantmakers Association, and we champion the sound stewardship of natural resources among our workgroup members in all our operations.
- **Transparency:** While we are part of the funder community, we believe that effective grantmaking occurs only in honest, open and respectful collaboration with the non-profit sector.

It's more of the same. Sustainable production. Locally sourced goods, etc.

These are the organizations that Annie Leonard supports:

1. [International Forum on Globalization](#) .
2. [Health Care Without Harm](#) .
3. [Funders Workgroup for Sustainable Production and Consumption](#) .

If you don't agree with Annie Leonard, her values, or the values of the organizations she supports, then you probably need to speak with your children's teachers, school administration, and school board and inquire why Annie Leonard and *The Story of Stuff* are being promoted to your kids. Are opposing views that point out the benefits of capitalism and economic progress being taught in your school. It's time to ask pointed questions, stand up, and make your voice heard. Bright shiny lies are being taught in schools across the country every day. Time to take the shine off Annie Leonard and the lies she spreads.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 00:04

The Story of Stuff: Dumbing Down Thomas Malthus' Principles of Population

Apart from being boring and wrong, *The Story of Stuff* is nothing more than a dumbed down version of Thomas Malthus' *Principles of Population*. Now, I was a weird kid growing up. I was the nerd interested in politics and more comfortable around adults than kids. While it definitely retarded my social skills, it had the wonderful side-effect of teaching me a good deal about business and economics. My Dad owned a small variety store and answered all of my questions about the business, sharing details ranging from mark-up, to profits and more.

Later, in high school, I enrolled in our Humanities Class where they taught us the Classics and reviewed works such as Malthus' *Principles of Population*. While my teachers were largely biased towards Humanism, Liberalism and Democratic politics, I was always a Conservative skeptic. Which leads me to the point: I would have never swallowed the BS spewed out in this video. Malthus believed that population would outstrip agriculture's ability to feed everyone. He advocated limited resources, which amazingly, 200 years later, *The Story of Stuff* repeats. Interestingly, technological innovation (and in my opinion God and the human spirit), trumped limited thinking.

The [Wikipedia](#) article about Thomas Malthus concludes:

However, the world generally has not developed in accordance with Malthus's expectations. During the late 19th and early 20th century, the population (and wages) increased as the industrial revolution gathered pace. However, birth rates in highly-developed nations have dropped to near bare replacement-levels, such that many Western nations like the US and Canada only grow due to immigration, and Japan faces a declining population when the post-World War II generation dies off. But due to an inequitable distribution of wealth throughout the world, most people live in relative poverty and continue to produce more children in order to increase their economic assets. Also, in the absence of social welfare systems, larger families favour the survival of more children to take care of old and infirm members of the family. One analysis postulates that poverty remains, not because of overpopulation or some innate human nature, but because workers do not get the true value of their labour, and because wealth depends on poverty. This differs from the Malthusian explanation of population dynamics.

Malthus assumed a constant labor-demand in his assessment of England[citation needed], and in doing so he ignored the effects of industrialization. As the world became more industrialized, the level of technology and production grew, causing an increase in labor-demand. Thus, even though labor-supply increased, so did the demand for labor. In fact, the labor-demand arguably increased more than the supply, as measured by the historically observed increase in real wages globally with population growth.

Simply put, Malthus was wrong. Human ingenuity, the human spirit, and the divine spark won. Humanism, which displaces God with man and his will, ironically underestimated humanities' ability to adapt. I didn't believe or agree with Malthus when I read his *Principles of Population*, and I don't agree with the regurgitated, dumbed down Malthus knock-off *The Story of Stuff*.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 23:13

The Story of (Government) Spending

No matter who is in power, the government's debt gets bigger and bigger. This video from [Bankrupting PA](#) shows the evolution of government debt from Franklin Roosevelt to Barrack Obama. The video is highly polished and should make an impact on anyone who watches it.

It also is a good example of the shifting political sentiment in the United States. Bankrupting PA is a project of the [Commonwealth Foundation](#). The Mission and Values of the Commonwealth Foundation are as follows:

Mission

The Commonwealth Foundation is an independent, non-profit research and educational institute that develops and advances public policies based on the nation's founding principles of limited constitutional government, economic freedom, and personal responsibility for one's actions.

Values

The Commonwealth Foundation's research and educational efforts are firmly established on several core values that form the basis of a "civil society." The activities of the Foundation are therefore committed to:

- Respecting and protecting the lives and property of others.
- Recognizing the inseparability of personal and economic freedom.
- Upholding personal responsibility and accountability for one's actions.
- Challenging the general perception that government intervention is the most appropriate and most efficient means of solving societal problems.
- Demonstrating the power of private institutions "both for-profit and non-profit" to create a good and civil society.
- Promoting the use of economic reasoning to understand a world of scarcity, trade-offs, and the unseen consequences of governmental solutions to societal problems.

So often today, when I bring up an issue in opposition to the current President or Congress, I hear an attack against the opposition political party or former president. I am a defender of neither. What is at issue is liberty, freedom, constitutional government, and the future of our country. Our massive government debt is one small piece of the puzzle. This video demonstrates, in a memorable way, how our deficit has grown. It interestingly, and accurately, lumps President Bush and Obama together as the biggest offenders in growing the national debt.

It isn't about Republican versus Democrat anymore. It is the people versus their Big, Oppressive Government (BOG). The government must be reduced severely in size if the people hope to retain their freedom and liberty.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Recommended Video at 22:43

Tuesday, September 22, 2009

Why U.S. is and Should Be a Republic, Not a Democracy

I recently wrote a post titled [United States is a Republic, Not a Democracy](#). It is interesting that whether or not the U.S. is a democracy, republic, or some other form of government is even open to debate. However, considering that politicians, teachers, and others throw around the term democracy so loosely, it should not be a complete surprise I suppose.

After posting the original article on my Twitter account [@tkinder](#) I received a reply from [@kalimkassam](#) stating:

Y wld a federal republic have 2 directly-elected chambers? Wht abt universal suffrage? These (and many more) r marks of democracy.

These are interesting points, but none of them change the fact that the United States is a Representative Republic. Some refer to the United States as a Democratic Republic. Whichever term you prefer, elections, universal suffrage, etc. do not make our country a democracy. We elect representatives who make decisions on our behalf. If the United States was a democracy, we would vote directly on issues, including laws. There would not be a need for a court system, as the people would decide the fate of the accused. Eventually, courts and legislative bodies would wither away and die.

However, we live in a republic. We have a Constitution that outlines our rights and protects them from infringement from the government. Interestingly, [@kalimkassam](#) referred to the United States as a federal republic. I don't know exactly what he meant by that, but I'm fairly sure I don't want to live in a federal republic. That sounds too much like a system of government dominated by the federal government in Washington, DC. Maybe we already live in a federal republic. Certainly that is the imbalance that the tea parties oppose. One of the primary reasons, in my opinion, that we have arrived at this imbalance, is encapsulated in another point [@kalimkassam](#) made. The United States Senate is directly elected by the people. This is a result of the 17th Amendment to the Constitution. This was a monumental mistake and needs to be undone by the people. By directly electing Senators the United States tipped the balance of power away from the states and toward the federal government.

The House of Representatives was supposed to represent the will of the people. The Senate was created to represent the will of the individual states. Unfortunately, the direct election of Senators has allowed the Senate to thwart the will of the states by imposing federal government mandates at every turn. If the state legislatures appointed, or otherwise selected Senators, it is doubtful that the Senate would impose unfunded mandates on states and would likely be more mindful of the proper balance between states and the federal government in our system of federalism.

If we value our liberty and freedom, we must restore the proper balance between the federal and state governments. That will require that candidates run for state legislatures who are committed to the Constitution and will oppose the federal government's continued violations of our rights. Too many in Congress are either ignorant about the Constitution or choose to ignore it. In order to win the day, we must oppose them at every turn. Part of that battle is to inform the people about our form of government. Those who incorrectly identify our system as democracy are either ignorant about the true nature of our Constitution or seek to implement another system in its place. We cannot allow that to happen.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 01:23

Monday, September 21, 2009

United States is a Republic, Not a Democracy

It never fails to amaze me how many times I hear politicians, regular folks, teachers and others state that the United States is a Democracy. In fact we are a Republic. Below is a good video which explains not only what system of government we have, but also explaining that there are only two long-lasting forms of government: republics and oligarchies.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 18:20

Friday, September 18, 2009

We're the Government and You're Not

From the Department of Homeland Propaganda: We're the Government and You're Not. Finally, a guide for serfs to know how to be good citizens. You already know the answers:

1. Pay your taxes.
2. Spend your money. Don't save.
3. Don't cause problems. Support your government and don't ask any embarrassing questions.

All that is missing is President Obama telling citizens he won the elections, so shut up while Congress shoves Health Care Reform down our throats.

Now be a good, servile little peasant and watch the short film below.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 03:51

Health Care Reform Questions

A few questions for President Obama, members of Congress or others that support Health Care Reform.

1. If government competition in the health insurance industry is a good thing, then why not allow competition with the Post Office for delivering the mail?
2. If the government has identified billions of dollars in fraud and abuse where it can save the taxpayers money, why doesn't it end that fraud and abuse now and then issue a public report?
3. If government competition in the health insurance industry is necessary, should the government provide competition to charitable organizations such as Red Cross by establishing a competing organization?
4. If government wants competition in the health insurance industry funded with taxpayer money, then why doesn't it support increased competition in education and public schools?
5. After Cash for Clunkers, and the late payments to dealers that participated in the program, do you trust the government will pay as quickly or more quickly than your insurance company?
6. Who would you rather discuss your insurance options with - an insurance agent, or an employee of the government?
7. Government spent rather than: a) investing or b) saving the money entrusted to it by the taxpayers in the Social Security Trust fund. Despite this bad faith on their part, they won't allow you to control even a small percentage of your own retirement money. Do you trust government to spend your health care dollar better than you could yourself?
8. Government programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid often restrict your ability to earn a living - making you dependent on government to survive. Would Health Care Reform be different?
9. Health Care Reform includes provisions to unionize hospitals. High union benefits were part of what made General Motors (GM) uncompetitive with other auto makers and, ultimately, bankrupted them. Will health care reform yield the same results in our health care system?
10. Bureaucracies are often "captured" by the very businesses they are designed to regulate. Will government health care run this same risk and result in a bureaucracy that does the bidding of the very people they are supposed to regulate?
11. At what point does compassion to do for others what they can't do for themselves become doing for those that could, but don't, because we do it for them?
12. What are rights?
13. If government provides my health care, can it tell me how to live my life? Can it tell me what to eat, drink, and more?
14. With 100 trillion or more in unmet Social Security, Medicare, Medicare Part D, and Medicaid obligations, should

we meet our current obligations first before we take on new ones?

15. Inflation is defined as an increase in the money supply. The law of supply and demand is central to determining the prices of goods and services. Government controls the supply of money. Is it wise to give government the additional power to regulate health care and significant influence over the supply and price of health care? If a private company had that much power, would we accuse it of being a monopoly?
16. Will government health care attempt to reduce budget expenses by controlling price? Past government efforts and imposing price controls throughout history have failed, resulting in shortages and higher prices.
17. Life often requires us to make choices. We have limited time and money. If Health Care Reform is important, should we consider eliminating less important government programs, or making cuts to current programs in order to finance it? What programs would you cut?
18. Has Congress done any in-depth evaluations of state efforts at health care reform? If so, what were the conclusions? If Congress hasn't taken a look, why not?
19. If Health Care Reform is a priority why not:
20. Roll out a pilot program in one state.
21. Allow the state to be chosen by a vote of the people. State with the highest percentage of voter in favor of entering the pilot program would be selected.
22. Freeze all federal spending as well as the debt ceiling during the pilot program.
23. If pilot program goes over budget, does not achieve defined results, is not deficit neutral as determined by a third party, then any Congressional Representative or Senator that voted for the pilot agrees to resign from office immediately and retire from public life.

One parting question. When President Obama campaigned using the slogan "Yes We Can," was we just a nice way of saying government? If so, maybe the slogan should be changed to "The Government Can." Luckily, for us, comedian Tim Hawkins has a video parody of the same title sang to the tune of "The Candy Man." Enjoy.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 00:14

Saturday, September 12, 2009

Congress: What Not To Do

The Ten Cannots was originally published by the Presbyterian minister William John Henry Boetcker in 1916.

Leave it to Congress to take ten things not to do, and instead do all of them.

- You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
- You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
- You cannot help little men by tearing down big men.
- You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
- You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
- You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
- You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
- You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.
- You cannot build character and courage by destroying men's initiative and independence.
- And you cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they can and should do for themselves.

Sounds a bit different than the sermon Reverend Jeremiah Wright and President Obama have been preaching.

It never fails to amaze me that there is truly nothing new under the sun. These issues have been debated for centuries, and will likely be debated for centuries more.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 05:13

Federal Reserve "Roots"

Little by little, business is enlarged with easy money. With the exhaustless reservoir of the Government of the United States furnishing easy money, the sales increase, the businesses enlarge, more new enterprises are started, the spirit of optimism pervades the community.

While there are some that deny the idea of financial bubbles, recent history under Federal Reserve Czars, er Chairmen Greenspan and Bernanke, have provided us with two bubbles - the Internet/Technology bubble of the 1990s, and the Housing Bubble of the 2000s - and ample evidence of the economic havoc created when the central bank makes the cost of borrowing artificially cheap.

Bankers are not free from it. They are human. The members of the Federal Reserve boards will not be free of it. They are human. Regional bankers will not be free of it. They are human. All the world moves along upon a growing tide of optimism. Everyone is making money. Everyone is growing rich. It goes up and up, the margin between cost and sales continually growing smaller as a result of the operation of inevitable laws, until finally someone whose judgment was bad, someone whose capacity for business was small, breaks; and as he falls he hits the next brick in the row, and then another, and then another, and down comes the whole structure.

So, during the last bubble, you could turn on your TV and watch programs about flipping houses - the practice of borrowing money at, preferably, low interest to purchase a house, rehabilitating it, and quickly selling it for a healthy profit. Unfortunately, easy money drew more and more into the dream/illusion of easy money. Home builders overbuilt. Speculators overbought. Banks loosened lending standards and made loans to people who could never, ever pay loans back. Investment firms bundled up wads of bad loans, securitized them, and magically declared them AAA. It was pure fantasy until the bricks came tumbling down.

Reading the above quotes, it would be easy to mistake them for something that Ron Paul or Peter Schiff might have said. Turning back the clock a few years, perhaps Milton Friedman spoke them. No, these words were spoken by Senator Elihu Root of New York in December of 1913. So, we were warned of the dangers of the Federal Reserve system even before it existed.

Root continued...

That sir, is no dream. That is the history of every movement of inflation since the world's business began, and it is the history of many a period in our own country. That is what happened to greater or less degree before the panic of 1837, of 1857, of 1873, of 1893, and of 1907. The precise formula which the students of economic movements have evolved to describe the reason for the crash following this universal process is that when credit exceeds the legitimate demands of the country the currency becomes suspected and gold leaves the country.

Time and time again we have had financial crises - call them what you will: panics, recessions or depressions. Whenever government artificially circumvents the free market - either attempting to stimulate growth or prevent further contraction - the results are always the same. Interference in pricing, whether wage and price controls, interest rates, or other manipulation by government creates excesses that must be allowed to be cleared out so the economy can be put back on the path to health.

[B]ehind the system under which we are working, and under which we have grown so great and strong, stands always the Government of the United States, with its credit unimpaired, with its solvency undoubted, always ready to come to the rescue by the sale of its securities to bring gold. This bill proposes, however, to put in pawn the credit of the United States; and when your time of need comes, it is the United States that is discredited by the inflation of its demand obligations, which it can not pay.

Today, we have reached the point where the good credit of the United States is in danger of being irreparably impaired. Our solvency is in doubt. Our government does not sell securities to buy gold. Instead, it issues IOUs from the FED to buy securities in an effort to manipulate interest rates. We live in deflationary times, but many believe inflation is coming.

Our elected leaders have failed to listen to the wisdom of Elihu Root, Milton Friedman, Ron Paul and Peter Schiff. It is now 9-12-09. All across the country, everyday citizens, long suffering under the burden of taxation and a crushing system fueled by debt, are making their voices heard. It is time that their voices are heard. Many have warned where our current path will lead us. More are raising their voices warning of the danger that lies ahead. I can only pray that someone will listen before it is too late.

Afterward: Elihu Root quotes appeared in "Money of the Mind: Borrowing and Lending in America From the Civil War to Michael Milken" authored by James Grant.

I stumbled across the Elihu Root quotes while reading "The Conscience of a Libertarian: Empowering the Citizen Revolution With God, Guns, Gambling & Tax Cuts" authored by Wayne Allyn Root, the 2008 Libertarian Vice-Presidential candidate and likely contender for the 2012 Libertarian Presidential nomination. While I haven't thought that far ahead, Wayne Allyn Root certainly strikes some good notes. He's not pitch perfect by any means, but if he can push the dialogue on the proper role of the federal government versus state government and individuals, and get people to think about monetary policy, constitutional government, etc. it could well be to the good.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 03:34

Friday, September 11. 2009

Milton Friedman Discusses Free Market Economics With Phil Donahue 1979

This 1979 Phil Donahue interview with Milton Friedman is astonishingly relevant today. They discuss a wide range of issues including:

- The government bailout of Chrysler
- Inflation
- The minimum wage
- Gasoline prices
- Government regulation
- Health care costs
- Poverty
- Wealth

[Phil Donahue Interviews Milton Friedman Part 1 of 5](#)

[Phil Donahue Interviews Milton Friedman Part 2 of 5](#)

[Phil Donahue Interviews Milton Friedman Part 3 of 5](#)

[Phil Donahue Interviews Milton Friedman Part 4 of 5](#)

[Phil Donahue Interview Milton Friedman Part 5 of 5](#)

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 01:12

Thursday, September 10, 2009

Doctor Obama Misdiagnoses Government Large-Heartedness

Last night, in an address to a joint session of Congress regarding Health Care Reform, President Obama - in reference to Senator Ted Kennedy - said,

That large-heartedness "that concern and regard for the plight of others" is not a partisan feeling. It is not a Republican or a Democratic feeling. It, too, is part of the American character. Our ability to stand in other people's shoes. A recognition that we are all in this together; that when fortune turns against one of us, others are there to lend a helping hand.

I am afraid that Doctor, er, President, Obama misdiagnosed the problem. Large-heartedness, or compassion for your fellow man, is wonderful when it springs from the heart of individuals acting of their own free will. However, government coerced large-heartedness is congestive heart failure of the body politic.

The heart of our political and economic system has been flooded with pork, regulation, mandates, and unconstitutional demands that can never be satisfied. Those self-appointed politicians who seek to reward their supporters - whether they be corporations, unions, individuals, etc., will never be satisfied with just a little. In the end, they want everything. So, they take the bread out of the mouth of the middle class and give it to banks, investment firms, unions, automobile companies, insurance giants, and every other special interest. They take money from small business - that if allowed to grow, might become big business. They stifle profit, squeeze growth, and rob capital - the lifeblood of our economy. They restrict our free choices until our choices are so narrow, and costs are so high that we are forced to seek government aid.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 16:30

Does Government Deserve Our Confidence?

Many of the arguments for any government program - including health care reform - assume that people either should, or do, trust the government.

I am a little bit cynical about trusting government. Let me pose a few questions about trust.

1. Do you trust your neighbors?
2. Do you trust your neighbors enough to leave your doors unlocked and your windows open?
3. Do you trust your government?
4. Do you trust your government enough to give them a blank check and the power to cash it at any time?
5. Do you believe elected officials have your best interests at heart?
6. Do you believe elected officials can be influenced by money - either campaign donations or offers of employment once they leave office?

My point isn't that you shouldn't trust anyone. Instead, the point is that there are limits to trust. That is why our governing document is the Constitution. It sets limits on what powers government has, and also protects our individual rights, as well as the rights of the individual states we live in.

Thomas Jefferson, in the [Kentucky Resolution of 1798](#) stated the case eloquently when he wrote, "In questions of power, then, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 15:23

Medicine Leads the Way to Socialism

Robert Welch's 1960's address on how mandatory health care, and the promise of security, have been pathways to Socialism.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 04:13

Questions to Ask About Obama Health Care Plan

Harry Browne, in the Great Libertarian Offer, posed a series of questions to ask when the government proposes any new program. These questions apply to any program, but appear particularly relevant in light of President Obama's Health Care Reform proposal.

- Why should government be asked to solve the problem? Why not a private agency that won't try to achieve its ends through taxation or by threatening people with fines and imprisonment?
- Why should we expect the politically motivated people who devise and operate the actual program to deliver the ideal program we imagine and want?
- Why should we believe the next government program will work better than all the ones that promised to solve the problems years ago?
- Will a government solution lead to new problems that are being overlooked?
- Did government cause this problem in the first place?

[Write](#) your representative today and ask them these questions. If you aren't already registered for Downsize DC you can register [here](#).

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 03:22

Wednesday, September 9, 2009

Debtor's Revolt Coming?

With the United States in the midst of a consumer and government debt crisis, it should be no surprise that more and more consumers are considering either refusing to pay their credit card debt or attempting to renegotiate interest rates, balance owed, or some combination.

In the video below, the woman talks about her particular experience with Bank of America. I have some second hand knowledge about Bank of America and know that they don't honor their agreements - not even with U.S. military who are covered by the [Soldiers Sailor's Civil Relief Act \(SSCRA\)](#).

One of the first things I noticed in the video, was the stuff behind the woman - model cars, etc. While on the one hand, it can be tempting to criticize - but many have fallen into the debt and overconsumption trap because of the Federal Reserve's easy money trap. That's not to say individuals are blameless, they aren't. But when government eases credit so the cost of money is practically nothing, it causes people to miscalculate the real cost of borrowing and get in over their heads.

Posted by Terry Kinder at 16:14

You Make Blood Shoot Out of My Eyes Video

For all you [Sarcasm] right wing extremist, racist, crazy, wingnut, hatriot [/sarcasm] Glenn Beck fans (me too) the "You Make Blood Shoot Out of My Eyes" video.

Song written and performed by [Roly O](#).

Video mashup by [Asderathos](#).

Thought it might put everyone in a good mood with the impending Obama speech on Health Care Reform tomorrow.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 03:56

Free Market Price, Government Rationing Not the Same

With the Health Care Reform debate raging, some are attempting to equate free market prices and government rationing as the same - they aren't the same.

Downsize DC shows the difference in their article, "[Are free market prices and government rationing the same thing?](#)"

Posted by Terry Kinder in Recommended Reading at 03:27

Talk Back to Congress About Health Care Reform

Whether you call it Health Care Reform, Insurance Reform, Big Oppressive Government (BOG) or unconstitutional government - the President is going to take another whack at convincing Congress and the American people that government is the solution to health care. In reality, health care is messed up because of the constant intervention of manipulation of the free market by government. However, that is not the point of this post.

If you are opposed to further government intervention in health care you need to make your voice heard. One excellent way to do that is through [Downsize DC](#). The first step is to [register](#) as a user. Once registered, I recommend sending messages to Congress via the following Campaigns:

- [Restore Consumer Controlled Health Care](#)
- [Read the Bills Act \(RTBA\)](#)
- [One Subject at a Time Act \(OSTA\)](#)
- [Write the Laws Act \(WTLA\)](#)
- [Enumerated Powers Act \(EPA\)](#)
- [Make your health insurance more affordable](#)
- [Tell Congress to Cut Federal Taxes](#)
- [Tell Congress to Cut Federal Spending](#)
- [Tell Congress to Cut the Red Tape](#)

Why so many campaigns at once? They are all related. Let me explain:

- The Restore Consumer Controlled Health Care campaign urges Congress to restore the free market to health care. Government mandates, regulations, price controls, etc. have only made the health care situation worse.
- Read the Bills Act (RTBA). Congress must read and understand the bills it hopes to enact into law. Otherwise we have special interests controlling our legislative process. A side benefit of having Congress read the bills is that it slows the legislative process down, giving citizens a chance to read, react and organize in support or opposition to proposed legislation.
- One Subject at a Time ACT (OSTA). Congress often lumps unrelated issues together in monster bills that nobody reads. While this helps move legislation through Congress, it results in many bad provisions sneaking through in the middle of the night. By forcing Congress to consider only one subject at a time, at a minimum debate will be a little more focused and some of the more egregious provisions might be kept out of bills.
- Write the Laws Act (WTLA). WTLA requires Congress to detail how laws will be interpreted rather than leaving it up to unelected bureaucrats. It also requires that courts, rather than bureaucrats, enforce laws.
- Enumerated Powers Act (WPA). The Enumerated Powers Act will force congress to cite the Constitutional authority for all laws that it passes.

- The Make Your Health Insurance More Affordable campaign allows your employer to purchase insurance for you in any state and urges states to liberalize insurance regulations.
- The Cut Federal Taxes, Cut Federal Spending and Cut the Red Tape are fairly straightforward campaigns. Together they aim to make government smaller, less intrusive, and less of a financial burden on each of us.

Any doubts - please check out the [Downsize DC about page](#).

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 01:19

Tuesday, September 8, 2009

Two Americas: Neither is the One John Edwards Spoke About

John Edwards big schtick during his presidential campaign was to talk about two Americas - the haves and the have-nots. He was half right. There are two Americas, but neither of them are the ones Edwards spoke about.

The two Americas are the America we have now - ruled by an out of control Congress, Executive Branch and judiciary that no longer feel restrained by the Constitution. The other America is the one envisioned by the Founding Fathers - one where the government is limited and the states and people retain their rights. It isn't that complex or difficult to understand unless you are living off the government and/or simply refuse to look at reality.

A nice video representation of the two Americas is presented by [The Enlightened Redneck](#). The version on The Enlightened Redneck's site is a little long - over 9 minutes.

A shorter version, just over 5 minutes, appears below.

It's a bit like when Coke came out with New Coke. It sounded like a good idea, but it didn't taste as good as the original. The "New" America is starting to leave a bad taste in our mouths. I prefer the original as outlined by the Founding Fathers in our Constitution.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 14:09

Don't Like Czars, Social Justice? You're a Political Terrorist

So, it's come to this. If you don't support all of Obama's Czars you are a racist, terrorist, angry, hateful member of the mob. You know what? That tactic doesn't work anymore. When I was young, other kids used to taunt and make fun of me. It was childish - just like the argument that anyone who doesn't agree with the extra-Constitutional, unaccountable Czars is a hater. Social(ist) Justice is just another way to say, "Spread the wealth around." We all know where that road leads. There is never enough of someone else's money to fix another person's problems. There is never enough to satisfy Big Oppressive Government (BOG). I don't hate the President or his Czars. I don't like where they are trying to "lead" the country. I find their political tactics extremely distasteful. They are in danger of making racism, something my Hispanic wife has experienced, a charge that no one takes seriously. Not every philosophical/political disagreement - in fact few if any of them - is about race. I want what is best for this country. I don't agree that Social(ist) Justice, spreading the wealth, or tearing down the foundations of our country are the correct way to solve our ills. Plus, I was in the Army, deployed to Bosnia and saw what real hatred and racism could do. Equating our current political disagreements with terrorism, racism, or mob rule only cheapens the debate and repels reasonable people from those making such accusations.

Posted by Terry Kinder at 02:06

What? No Right to Chocolate Donuts, iPhones or Health Care in Constitution?

Looks like even Democrats (Republicans for that matter) are dusting off there seldom read Constitutions and noticing that the Constitution doesn't authorize any of them. It may surprise some citizens who either: a) Attended public schools or b) are members of Congress that the Constitution does not guarantee a right to pimp your car, have a dope crib, own a Wii, etc.

Senator Mark Warner, D-VA, much to his dismay, had to admit that Congress has more or less erected an edifice of

unconstitutional programs, and now hopes he can embarrass you into not tearing generations of republic wrecking social engineering down. Sorry, Senator Warner, your bad. We need to rebuild the country on a sound foundation of capitalism, free enterprise, and restore the proper balance between the states and federal government...and, oh, eliminate the income tax.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 01:05

All Your Children Belong to Obama

There has been lots of controversy over President Obama's speech to school children. Had the speech been a straightforward address encouraging children to study and be successful, it likely would not have been so controversial. However, there was a lesson plan that encouraged children to write about how they would help Obama, which frankly seemed a bit like the President and teachers recruiting kids to Obama's cause.

Apparently, this isn't the first time Obama has stepped over the line with children. Here is a campaign video where a 13 year-old girl appears and speaks about how she is trying to convince her family to vote for Obama. Will the "Support Obama" talking Elmo be far behind?

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 00:35

Monday, September 7, 2009

Meg Whitman Runs, Not Walks, From Van Jones

It looks like another episode of "Which Party Will Destroy the Country First," in which Meg Whitman, "Republican" candidate for Governor of California, says she is a huge fan of Van Jones.

And who can blame her for her environmental love fest with Van Jones? After all, she supported "Republican" John McCain - who supported Cap and Trade.

Plus, what's not to love about Obama's ex-Green Czar? He called Republicans a**h*!s. He was an admitted Communist and part of the Marxist revolutionary movement [STORM](#), as well as serving on the board of the [Apollo Alliance](#).

It's hard to imagine that things could get much worse in California, but perhaps Meg Whitman will be the final blow to a state which seems to be trying to destroy itself. Maybe when California is done self-destructing they can sell what is left over on eBay.

Postscript: Meg Whitman a la Obama, is now [running, not walking](#) from Van Jones. She even rather [ineptly states](#) she met him on a cruise and "did not do a background check over dinner". I wish somebody had checked his background sooner.

Posted by Terry Kinder in Blog at 22:47