A Perspective:

THE COMMON THREAD that binds one man to another is the ideals and understandings they hold in common. The measure, more or less, of the success of that interaction is also the extent to which the product of the same resonates from a fundamental truth. I can find no document that universally states so fundamental a cause, so perfect an understanding of this common thread upon which the foundation to which all will find a firm footing and simultaneously so fertile a ground from which to harvest the fruits of their labors, than the magnificently crafted Declaration of Independence. I speak specifically of Thomas Jefferson's mastery so perfectly expressed in that document's preamble:

"We hold these truths to be <u>self-evident</u>, that <u>all men are created</u> <u>equal</u>, that they are endowed by their <u>Creator</u> with certain <u>unalienable Rights</u>, that among these are <u>Life</u>, <u>Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness</u>. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the <u>consent of the governed</u>, That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the <u>Right of the People to alter or to abolish it</u>..."

Scholars far better equipped than I can exercise a far more collegiate disquisition as to the historical significance of the document and the many influences on which Mr. Jefferson drew while engaged in this efforts. For now, let me just highlight a few personal observations which I find most powerful.

In his writing he identifies fundamental truths that until that time, though frequently mused by many, never appeared as a foundation for a form of government. Terms such as "self-evident," "created equal," "endowed by their Creator," "unalienable rights," "consent of the governed," and "the right of the People to alter or to abolish it" not only suggest a profound understanding of providential ideals and yet, simultaneously, they are inexorably linked to one another so fundamentally that without one, the whole becomes imperfect! Lastly and perhaps most inspired, he makes no suggestion that these are newly discovered nor does he suggest that they are permitted by some legislated act or dispensation. Oh no, these are not of man but "they are endowed by their Creator!" I

"Transfixed by the wonder of the star field darkness of infinite space, I pondered the origins of Man his nature and limits. Silently reflecting its image upon me I was to hear the word: Infinite!" 2

I begin here not as an introduction to a discussion of American history but as point of reference for what I hope to accomplish in this composition. For various reasons this country has set out on a political and economic course that has, I believe, lead the nation and its people away from its founding principles. Consequently we now question these very founding principles and our system of government. Further, it is my observation that it is neither our founding principles nor our system of government that is the problem! The problem IS the practice

¹ Throughout the entirety of this material I will use the word "Foundation" and "Fundamental Principles" frequently. When you happen upon these words, I trust you will recall this entry.

² Insertions, in visual presentation form such as in this instance, appear throughout this composition with no reference to its author. Their source, be it various compositions or public presentation, is the product of my own efforts and/or authorship.

of government which no longer seems willing or able to operate by its specific mandate and in the service of the "consent of the governed." It is the practice of distortion that has and continues to affect our standing amongst ourselves and as a nation in the global community. These foundations I speak of are universal to all and if we intend to espouse their ideals then I would suggest that we first refine these in the function(s) of our own process and leave others (nations) to perfect their own. Then, and if only they should discover our approach worth replicating, they might express their individual desire to make our success theirs as well. Lastly, I hope to present throughout, albeit deliberately rudimentary, economic, monetary and political points all from both an historical and contemporary perspective which, ultimately, will conclude with my final presentation, *Volume III: Valor in Prosperity.* This particular volume contains a summary resolution entitled "A Functional Stimulus." A composition which is, to be sure, a must read!

I readily admit there are men and women of "letters" who may engage in theoretical discourse on these subjects to a degree that will draw the very air from your lungs, which again, is duly noted. However, I intend not to offend their knowledge base with a simpleton's offering however I will assert that my faith, my formal, private and practical education along with my years engaged in successfully generating income from which I provide comfort and care to my family (all, by the way, without government assistance and despite government interference) make me eminently qualified to discourse soundly on these matters. I've seen both the practice of success and the markers of failure and as is the case with our foundations, they are absolute and most certainly NOT theoretical. I make none nor do I offer any apologies for the product of my cumulative experience and the historical compass on which they are based and neither should you.

I believe it equally important to note that I'm not, as you will soon see, a patron of any particular political party. In other words, the only dog I have in this hunt is uniquely an American one, accordingly, I find discussion about "party" wholly irrelevant. With this thought in mind and observing the political pandering of the day, it is clear to say both parties are equally at fault, both possessing an equal measure if toxic guile the consequence of which is the near complete reprogramming of a proud political and economic heritage. We no longer espouse the value of productive capability; we now champion the pirate! Where once there was an ideology of republicanism³, we now rally around the proven fallacies of collectivism. The valor of the common man, once sacred and protected, is now profane and proletariat. Perhaps the image I intend is best characterized by the image of the helpless vagrant begging at the gate of his lord and master, "feed me!" The "ism" of the day is now a particularly malignant form of elitism — a hegemonic cabal of pelegian misfits who through a form of philosophical nepotism have transformed an entire culture. What we now have at the helm of government is, in effect, a heretical and misanthropic form of self-entitled elites!

I agree that many who read these words may label them dramatic and profane. However, equal only to my right to say (or print) them, is your right to disagree with my perspective. This right is expressly preserved by way of the First Amendment (Bill of Rights) to the Constitution of the United States yet NO WHERE in the Constitution do I see the document specify party or partisanship, or for that matter, as an enumerated power and never have I seen any principle of our foundation assigned either to one or the other (party). Further, if one

³ Republicanism: Ironically, this term refers to a "representative form of government" and not a political party. Democracy, is only the process.

were to review James Madison's essay "Federalist No. 10," which is a component of the "Federalist Papers" series, one will witness first hand the concern of the founding father as to the evils of partisan politics. Abusing the privilege of office with the overbite of partisanship, just to name but one, is shameful and disruptive! These practiced excesses are abhorrent and constitute a breach of public trust which are lasting and detrimental to all far beyond the measure of personal gain and party affiliation! It is, after all, the UNITED States of America!

The Constitution of the United States, for all intents and purposes, IS a living document born out of the revolutionary quest to claim the inveterate right of self-determination. It is not, nor will it ever be, an evolutionary document. "Why," you might ask? Simply and to the point; the foundations upon which it rests are timeless, unchanging and unwavering! Natural Law is as old as time and like time, completely unaffected by the passing fancies of the human condition or mind! Yes, we have refined the document to resolve and/or perfect, particularly in the case of the 13th Amendment (the abolition of slavery), issues. However, it is important to note that no amendment has yet been added or recanted that has changed the very foundation of the document.

Unfortunately, the far reaching effects of legislating from the bench, also known as judicial activism, have introduced a very dangerous trend where courts have vacated the "will of the people" in a most egregious and recalcitrant manner! It was never the intention of the enabling document to invite the courts to legislate through supervenient interpretations which are and have become an illusory and completely manufactured practice. It must be the practice of the judiciary/courts to be only an extension of the overriding intent of the Constitution,

Appendix: I

Sample Q & A

What would you do to fix our Constitution?

The Constitution is self-regulating and needs only to be followed and applied with persistent resolve. In this, there is the perfection of its design. It, as an entity unto itself, neither needs nor requires fixing.

What are your thoughts on national health care and how would you recommend the government handle the question?

Wow, a loaded question! First, let me reward your question by saying you'll find a complete answer to this question in volume three of the "Blind Vision" series, *Valor in Prosperity*. Next, to your question "How would I recommend the government...?" I would answer it this way: What has happened to our national conscience that we believe the government should be involved, at all, in the process? Haven't we sufficient evidence, yet, to see how the government is incapable of performing an economic function? Aren't the malignant failures of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society sufficient proof? (E.g., Social Security, Medicaid/ Medicare and the near countless other federal and state programs.) How can we sanely consider that more of a bad thing makes an already terrible situation better? However, there is a solution. For the idea to truly function, it cannot have the "economic crutch" of government involved with it. When the tensional forces that compel economic efficiency are removed (which is precisely what happens when government intervenes) then you no longer have the benefit of economic efficiency. To come to a sustainable solution regarding any government program we must first start with the addressing the fundamental flaw, as I just stated, that is inherent in all things government. I assure you, a profoundly functional way to address this issue exits.