



September 2012

The Lesser Of Two Evils

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

“Now it was Nimrod who excited them to such an affront and contempt of God. He was the grandson of Ham, the son of Noah, a bold man, and of great strength of hand. He persuaded them not to ascribe it to God, as if it was through his means they were happy, but to believe that it was their own courage which procured that happiness. He also gradually changed the government into tyranny, seeing no other way of turning men from the fear of God, but to bring them into a constant dependence on his power.”

Josephus (1)

“But how is this legal plunder to be identified? Quite simply. See if the law takes from some persons what belongs to them, and gives it to other persons to whom it does not belong. See if the law benefits one citizen at the expense of another by doing what the citizen himself cannot do without committing a crime.

Then abolish this law without delay, for it is not only an evil itself, but also it is a fertile source for further evils because it invites reprisals. If such a law — which may be an isolated case — is not abolished immediately, it will spread, multiply, and develop into a system.

The person who profits from this law will complain bitterly, defending his *acquired rights*. He will claim that the state is obligated to protect and encourage his particular industry; that this procedure enriches the state because the protected industry is thus able to spend more and to pay higher wages to the poor workingmen.

Do not listen to this sophistry by vested interests. The acceptance of these arguments will build legal plunder into a whole system. In fact, this has

already occurred. The present-day delusion is an attempt to enrich everyone at the expense of everyone else; to make plunder universal under the pretense of organizing it.” Frederic Bastiat (2)

In secretly recorded remarks to campaign donors that were leaked to the media by a reporter for the left-leaning journal, *Mother Jones*, Republican presidential aspirant Mitt Romney observed that roughly 47 percent of the electorate is dependent on government and will thus support the incumbent, Barack Obama, **“no matter what.”**

This is, of course, an incontestable fact about Obama’s core constituency. According to one well-circulated jibe, Obama voters sign the check on the back, and Romney voters sign the check on the front.

As with all caricatures, there is an element of truth in the cynical joke, but there is a segment of Romney’s core constituency that is composed of wealthy welfare recipients, corporate executives who promote corporate welfare programs.

In a closed-door fundraiser held during the 2002 Massachusetts governor’s race, Romney boasted, to an audience of exceptionally wealthy and politically connected donors, of the tireless lobbying he had waged on behalf of federal subsidies for the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City. He stated:

“I am a big believer in getting money where the money is.... The money is in Washington.”

Predictably, the Obama administration, with the eager assistance of the prestige press, cultivated outrage over Romney’s remarks about government dependency, but the media showed little interest in a recently unearthed recording of a 1998 speech at Loyola University in which Mr. Obama spoke candidly about his enthusiasm for redistribution of wealth, and stated:

“I actually believe in redistribution, at least at a certain level, to make sure that everybody’s got a shot.”

This wasn’t the first time in his political career that Mr. Obama unflinchingly spoke of the supposed virtue of government-imposed wealth redistribution.

During a Chicago radio interview in 2001, Obama criticized the Civil Rights revolution of the 1960s for focusing on litigation, rather than embracing undisguised class warfare.

According to Obama, the chief delinquency of the Civil Rights era was that:

"the Supreme Court never ventured into the issues of *redistribution of wealth*, and the more basic issues of political and economic justice in this society.... [O]ne of the, I think, tragedies of the civil rights movement was, because the civil rights movement became so court-focused, I think there was a tendency to lose track of the *community organizing* and activities on the ground that are able to put together the actual *coalitions of power* through which to bring about *redistributive change*. And in some ways we still suffer from that."

In this scheme, the role of a "Community Organizer" – which is how Obama described himself prior to his ascent to the Senate and then to the Imperial Purple – is to build **"coalitions of power"** devoted to plunder, or as he described it, **"redistributive change."**

That concept has been a consistent theme in Obama's ideology for as long as he has been a public figure, and has guided his activities since his first term in public office.

The statist media, for the most part, chose to ignore the recently unearthed recording of Obama's remarks on "redistribution." ABC News attempted damage control by accusing Obama's critics of wresting the remarks out of context, pointing out that in the following sentence Obama explained **"that he is speaking broadly about making city and state government more efficient in their use of resources — and endorses 'competition' in the 'marketplace'"**

Obama stated:

"How do we pool resources at the same time as we decentralize delivery systems in ways that [will] foster competition, can work in the marketplace, and can foster innovation at the local level and can be tailored to particular communities?" (3)

This formula assumes that the central government has both the moral right and native efficiency to "pool resources" – that is, to steal wealth at gunpoint and centralize it under political control – and that the responsibility of its local affiliates is to devise the most efficient means of re-allocating the plundered wealth according to the central government's design. This isn't really that different from mechanisms that were employed at various times in the Soviet Union – for instance, during Lenin's "New Economic Policy" of the early 1920s, which permitted a limited amount of nominal private ownership and industry in order to rebuild the war-torn and famine-wracked Soviet economy.

On the other hand, we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that Mitt Romney's campaign, rather than challenging the fundamental premises of Obama's economic approach, is also

focused on enhancing the **“efficiency’ and reducing the costs of redistribution”** of wealth. Just like Obama, Romney appears to believe that the chief value of economic growth is that it would actually increase the amount of revenue on which the central government feeds. Mitt Romney told Fox News (on September 18, 2012):

"I do believe that we should have enough jobs and enough take-home pay such that people have the privilege of higher incomes that allow them to be paying taxes....I think people would like to be paying taxes." (4)

It's not difficult to imagine how Republican-centered conservatives would react if Barack Obama had uttered the phrase, **“I think people would like to be paying taxes.”** In addition to being an utterly perplexing misreading of human psychology – what individual likes to be robbed at gunpoint? – that statement implicitly places the tax collector, rather than the entrepreneur, at the center of a prosperous, civilized society.

Anthony Gregory of the free market-oriented Independence Institute, capably encapsulates Mitt Romney's economic perspective in the following statement:

“Romney's agenda is not a free-market agenda. Nor is it anti-government-- which makes sense given that he wants to take over the government. What Romney offers is a slightly more rightwing version of the welfare state. This is nothing new. England first adopted poor laws not to reduce inequality but to control prices and keep beggars and vagrants in line. The modern U.S. welfare state traces its origins to Prussian autocrat Otto von Bismarck, who saw entitlements as a way to ensure national unity, strengthen the military, and co-opt the opposition.” (5)

America's system of electoral politics is an exercise in competitive mutual plunder in which Americans – like the residents of Nimrod's ancient Babylonian despotism....

“see the state as savior for doling out crumbs after crushing their opportunities at self-reliance....high-income taxpayers and the poor are pitted against each other”.....as a way “to keep us divided and conquered.... although Obama and Romney use different rhetoric and cater to different constituents to secure their power, they both offer plans that encourage dependence, keep the poor down, and fleece trillions from all productive Americans.” (6)

Frederic Bastiat, a contemporary of Karl Marx, wrote;

“The state is that great fiction by which everyone tries to live at the expense of everyone else.”

Barack Obama and Mitt Romney – both of whom are products of the semi-submerged Anglo-American Power Elite – have served that evil fiction faithfully. The same is true of those on both sides of the narrow, trivial, and contrived partisan divide who – either out of misplaced earnestness, or malicious cynicism – insist that this presidential election, like practically every other, represents a “clear” or “historic” choice between sharply opposed political and economic “visions.”

In fact, the 2012 presidential campaign offered a breathtakingly brazen display of the quasi-totalitarian methods used by the Establishment Party to prevent the possibility of a challenge to the Power Elite-imposed “consensus.” Both nominating conventions were spectacles of corrupt dishonesty worthy of the Soviet Politburo: Every procedural vote was literally scripted down to matters of detail, and – in the case of the Republican convention – brazenly criminal means were employed in an effort to create an illusion of “unity” behind the Romney nomination.

In all of this, we are irresistibly reminded of the political formula prescribed by Carroll Quigley in his book, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World In Our Time*, where Professor Quigley wrote:

“The argument that the two parties should represent opposed ideals and policies, one, perhaps, of the Right and the other of the Left, is a foolish idea acceptable only to the doctrinaire and academic thinkers. Instead, the two parties should be almost identical, so that the American people can ‘throw the rascals out’ at any election without leading to any profound or extreme shifts in policy.” (7)

The public is being fed a narrative in which Romney is a plutocratic capitalist, and Obama is his ideological opposite, but that isn’t true. Both candidates support corporatism – the conjoining of interventionist government with politically favored corporate interests, both candidates embrace the Warfare State, a “foreign policy consensus” that demands constant interference in the affairs of other nations, and both candidates support the expansion of the domestic Garrison State. In addition, neither candidate has any use for the U.S. Constitution, both candidates perceive the presidency as the center of human existence, at least in temporal terms, and both candidates consider the powers of that office to be limited only by the ambition and the imagination of the person who occupies it.

In substantive terms, there simply isn’t that much separating the two presidential candidates, but that is nothing new in presidential politics.

REFERENCES

- 1) Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, 4:2
- 2) Frederic Bastiat, *The Law* (Irvington-on-Hudson New York: Foundation for Economic Education ed., 2008), pg. 5.
- 3) “Obama ‘Redistribution’ Audio Clip Cited by GOP was Truncated,” ABC News, September 20, 2012.
- 4) “Romney defends donor comment, says more jobs will mean more paying taxes,” Fox News, September 18, 2012.
- 5) “The Real Problem with Romney’s 47% Remark,” Anthony Gregory, Huffington Post, September 21, 2012.
- 6) Ibid.
- 7) Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (New York: The Macmillan Company 1966), pg. 1247.

Written by William Grigg.

I believe William Grigg is correct. I believe we have a choice between “the lesser of two evils.”

Jesse Ventura recently announced he would enter the Presidential race if the public got his name on the ballot in every state, and he was certain he would be included in the Presidential Debates. Tragically that isn't going to happen, so you will have three choices.

1. You can vote for the presidential candidate of the Constitution Party or the Libertarian Party.
2. You can withhold your vote for the presidency.
3. You can vote for “the lesser of two evils.”

What am I going to do? I haven't decided, but I may vote for “the lesser of two evils” because Obamacare will destroy the last remaining vestige of the noble practice of medicine in the United States.

How important is the upcoming Presidential election? It isn't very important because it is a formality that is designed to divert your attention from the momentous events that are taking place throughout the world today. What are the momentous events?

1. There is growing tension between China and Japan over four barren islands that lie in the sea between the two nations. The U.S. is siding with Japan in the contrived dispute.
2. There is growing tension between the U.S. and China over trade policy, and trade policy disputes often lead to military conflict.
3. There will be a senseless war between Israel and Iran in the coming months, and the U.S. will be involved in that conflict. What will happen? Iran may launch an EMP attack on the U.S., and if that occurs, the electronic pulse could destroy the electronic infrastructure of a large segment of our nation.
4. The Muslim Brotherhood (covertly financed by the U.S.) is consolidating the Suni nations, and preparing for a war with the Christian nations.
5. The new leaders of the Sunni Muslims want to destroy the Shiite Muslims.
6. A minor incident could precipitate a nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan.

7. All of the major nations are inflating their currencies, and that will collapse the world monetary system. What will happen? The vast majority of the American people, and people throughout the world, will be impoverished.
8. Christianity is under attack and the attack is coordinated by the Brotherhood of Darkness, and other Anglo-American organizations.

What can you do? You must prepare yourself and your family financially, physically, and spiritually for the difficult period that lies ahead.

Study the scriptures, and establish a personal relationship with our Lord, Jesus Christ, because that may be the only thing that will sustain you and your family during the difficult period that lies ahead.

Please encourage your friends and relatives to listen to Radio Liberty so they can learn what is happening.

Please support Radio Liberty, and if you can't support us financially, please pray for Radio Liberty—for our provision and our protection.

Barbara and I appreciate your faithful support and your prayers.

Yours in Christ,

Stanley Monteith