

# Part One

## A REVOLUTION IS BREWING





# Chapter 1

## It's All Familiar

### *The Journey Begins with Barry Goldwater*

*“The government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs that are outside its constitutional mandate . . . By reducing taxes and spending we will not only return to the individual the means with which he can assert his freedom and dignity, but also guarantee to the nation the economic strength that will always be its ultimate defense against foreign foes.”*

—BARRY GOLDWATER, *THE CONSCIENCE OF A CONSERVATIVE*, 60–61

**M**y journey for the White House actually began in 1964, at the age of 3, in my father's arms, when we handed out political literature for Barry Goldwater in front of a supermarket in Mt. Vernon, New York. I remember it like it was yesterday—it is one of the strongest memories from my childhood. I can still feel my father's strong arms wrapped around my body. I can still see his big smile as we greeted shoppers and handed them each a Goldwater pamphlet, button,

or bumper sticker. My dad loved Barry Goldwater, and, of course, I did, too. As far as I was concerned, my father always knew best. By the time I was in sixth grade, I was reading Barry Goldwater's best-selling book *The Conscience of a Conservative*. By the time I graduated high school, I had read that book probably a dozen times. Today I still carry it in my briefcase. When I have a question about a controversial issue in the news, I always refer back to it. The answer is always there. That book has political wisdom and common sense for the ages. It has never gone, and will never go, out of style.

Barry Goldwater's signature book *The Conscience of a Conservative*\* was published in 1960 (a year before I was born). This best-selling conservative book of all time was authored by Goldwater in 1959. At the moment this book, *The Conscience of a Libertarian*, hits bookstores, it will be the 50th anniversary of when Goldwater put pen to paper. Coincidence . . . I think not. After all, Goldwater dealt with many of the same political, economic, and social issues and criticisms that I discuss in this book 50 years later. What's more, Goldwater often offered similar solutions to those that I propose today. When you compare these two books, you'll realize that nothing in politics ever really changes. Not the issues, not the problems, not the obvious solutions, not the debates. They are all virtually the same 50 years later! A half century has vanished and the more things change, *the more they stay the same*.

Not only have the same problems never changed, in most cases they've gotten far worse. In the next few pages, I discuss a few specific examples:

- The growth of government and rampant government spending
- The increase in taxation
- Bloated and irresponsible education spending and the poor results
- Spending-gone-wild on specific government departments, wars, foreign aid, and foreign military spending

In this chapter, I quote liberally (excuse the pun) from Barry Goldwater to give you a sense of the man's political ideology and brilliant thinking. As you read his words, you start to get a sense of the familiarity between his words and the severity of the same situation (only worsened) today. After all, if you leave an injury (even a minor one) untreated for many years, it gets worse. Eventually you need to

---

\*I quoted from the 30th Anniversary Edition, published by Regnery Gateway, 1990.

be hospitalized. At that point, you often need to take dramatic steps to save the patient's life. We are at this point in the United States today. Without those drastic steps, the patient will die.

Let's hope the battle doesn't go on for another half century before anyone bothers to listen (or take action). I fear we are coming to the end of the road. We don't have 50 more years of unabated government expansion and spending. The time to make changes (and dramatic cuts) is now. That is why I wrote this book. We didn't listen to Barry Goldwater. But Barry was probably too nice of a guy. He had manners and class. He came from a wealthy family. I don't. I'm a big-mouthed, bold, passionate, self-made New Yorker who isn't afraid of anyone or anything. I will scream from the highest mountains, and I will never stop screaming. I am *relentless*. Perhaps I can get your attention, whereas Barry was too nice to hit you over the head with a 2 by 4, or to tell voters that they are voting for idiots. I'm not too nice. It's time to throw niceties overboard. It's time to suspend manners. We don't have time for nice. Being nice hasn't gotten us anywhere. While we've been nice, the problem has reached the critical stage. It's time for action. This book is the opening shot across the bow of the *Titanic*. The United States is the *Titanic* nearing the end of a long journey. The iceberg is ahead. Someone has got to get the taxpayers' attention before we all perish. Now is not the time for nice. But before I get rough and raw and loud (with the rest of my book), let's first examine the remarkable record of Barry Goldwater.



In 1959 Barry Goldwater predicted the descent of our nation. His main issues were always government over-spending, over-reaching, and interference in the lives of individuals, which often goes hand in hand. He said,

It is in the area of spending that the Republican Party's performance, in its 7 years of power, has been most disappointing. (57)

Sound familiar? I could not have said it any better when referring to the first seven years (or any year) under President George W. Bush (in 2007). In Eisenhower and Bush, we have two Republican presidents, with virtually identical disappointing results, a half century apart. The biggest

problem, of course, was unrestrained government spending and growth. In Bush's case, the sins included the doubling of spending during his reign, the dramatic increases in corporate welfare, dramatic increases in military spending to fight wars on multiple fronts, and the passage of a prescription-drug entitlement added to Medicare. All of these actions dramatically expanded the size and scope of government.

Another timeless issue that Goldwater discussed nearly a half century ago was the president's unending promise to lower taxes. Goldwater said,

Where is the politician who has not promised to fight to the death for lower taxes—and who has not proceeded to vote for the very spending projects that make tax cuts impossible? (52)

Sound familiar? Goldwater was, of course, referring to Eisenhower and other big-government Republicans of the 1950s. Yet, those identical words could be spoken in 2009 when looking back at George W. Bush and the GOP Congress. The size of government expanded under Bush by historical levels, yet Bush didn't veto a single spending bill in his first term. The first veto of his entire presidency came in his second term—against stem cell research. Embarrassing.

As always, the issue of increased taxes always leads me back to the issue of government spending. Goldwater also said,

I believe that as a practical matter spending cuts must come before tax cuts. If we reduce taxes before firm, principled decisions are made about expenditures, we will court deficit spending. . . . (56)

Sound familiar? We experienced the same exact problem in 1959 as in 2008—Bush dramatically cut taxes, but let spending grow unchecked. The result? Gigantic budget deficits that will result in President Obama taking away those same tax cuts (and then some). Tax cuts that could have been permanent, if spending was reduced to make up the difference, instead became temporary, just as Goldwater predicted. Same mistake, same result, a half century apart. But, of course, this isn't a Republican problem. President Obama has promised gigantic middle-class tax cuts, and even tax cuts for people who never paid taxes in the first place, at the same time he expands government spending dramatically. Both major parties spend irresponsibly—it is only what they

choose to spend the money on that changes. What's the difference? Either way, we're spending money we don't have, with a blank check paid by taxpayers, and our children and grandchildren. Either way, we are headed for bankruptcy, insolvency, and crisis. In Obama's case, he seems to believe that we can solve the problems of overspending, deficit, and debt with more spending, higher deficits, and far more debt. And you wonder why we are in economic crisis? President Obama's first-year deficit is four times higher than the *worst* year under Bush. Obama's own budget projections predict a tripling of our national debt. The long-term budget Obama laid out in his first year is bigger than all the budgets in U.S. history *combined*—from George Washington to George W. Bush. Amazing. This is not how you solve a crisis. This is how you bankrupt a country.

Although Goldwater specifically supported his thesis by exposing the actions of Republican President Eisenhower, he understood that the blame (and irresponsibility) was assigned to both parties. In fact, he often said that although Republicans are irresponsible, Democrats are even worse. Goldwater said,

Every year the Democratic national leadership demands that the federal government spend more than it is spending, and that Republicans propose to spend . . . and (this year) the Democratic National Advisory Council issued a manifesto calling for profligate spending increases in nearly every department of the federal government; the demands for increases in domestic spending alone could hardly cost less than \$20 billion a year. (59)

Sound familiar? If I didn't know better, I'd think Goldwater was talking about the Democratic Congress of 2006–2009. Wait until we all experience the pain of President Obama's spending plans. Obama's economic proposals and promises during the 2008 campaign alone suggested the biggest spending increases of any president in history. That was before Obama supported the trillion dollar government bailouts. That was before Obama proposed an almost trillion dollar stimulus package. But the reality of his actual spending plans once in office is far more than even I could have imagined. Obama isn't just bankrupting this generation—he is bankrupting America for generations to come.

But how do we cut spending? Goldwater had the suggestions a half century ago. He said,

The Constitution is an instrument, above all, for limiting the functions of government. (10)

In other words, our brilliant Founding Fathers never intended for the federal government to be involved in all areas of our life. They created a Constitution specifically to spell out the limits on government. All these years later, Congress and our political leaders have abandoned even the pretense of following the Constitution. A 2008 poll by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute explains how this has happened—the poll proves that most U.S. citizens cannot even pick the key points of the Constitution or Bill of Rights out of a lineup. But here's the real shocker: Elected officials fared even worse than ordinary citizens. (If you don't believe me, log onto to [www.americancivilliteracy.org/](http://www.americancivilliteracy.org/) for the civic liberty report.) Even when given multiple-choice answers, leading politicians and government officials did not recognize the Constitution. How can you follow it, if you've never read it?

What specific cuts did Barry Goldwater have in mind? He said,

The only way to curtail spending substantially, is to eliminate the programs on which excess spending is consumed . . . government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs that are outside its constitutional mandate—from social welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal and all the other activities that can be better performed by lower levels of government or by private institutions or by individuals. (60)

Sound familiar? Since Goldwater wrote his book, the federal government has created multiple new cabinet departments, including Homeland Security, Energy, Education, Transportation, Veterans' Affairs, and HUD (Housing and Urban Development). The federal government is involved in more areas than ever before—with more bureaucrats, more power, more rules and regulations, and dramatically increased spending (correlating with our dramatically increased deficit). And, of course, what goes with bigger government, more spending, and more power is automatically more government employees, more powerful government employee unions, bigger salaries, bigger pensions, and lifetime health care for this "privileged class." Unfunded liabilities for government employees today threaten to bankrupt local, state, and federal government. Barry Goldwater



saw it all coming in 1959. Nothing has changed in half a century—it has only gotten worse. Far worse.

Want some specific examples? Goldwater said,

The federal government has moved into every field in which it believes its services are needed . . . the result is a Leviathan, a vast national authority out of touch with people, and out of their control. This monopoly of power is bounded only by the will of those who sit in high places.” (13 and 14)

Sound familiar? Goldwater used as his example of government growth and waste going unchecked during the Eisenhower presidency, the creation of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Goldwater raged about its budget of \$15 billion per year back in 1959. But that same agency is today called the Department of Health and Human Services *and* its budget is now more than \$737 billion. Yes, I said \$737 billion versus \$15 billion in “the good old Goldwater days.” Thus, proof that once a government agency or program is created, it never goes away. It simply grows out of control.

Goldwater saw this main issue of government spending and over-involvement coming a half century ago. One Goldwater quote sums it all up:

The root evil is that the government is engaged in activities in which it has no legitimate business. As long as the federal government acknowledges responsibility in a given social or economic field, its spending in that field cannot be substantially reduced . . . the only way to curtail spending substantially, is to eliminate the programs on which excess spending is consumed. (59–60)

Amen. Nothing about government has changed in a half century. Yet, just like a wound or injury that goes untreated, it has only gotten more infected and more expensive to maintain.



Goldwater outlined numerous areas in which the growth of government was rampant and consequently spending too much money. One

such area was education, which is certainly on the top of my list as well. Goldwater said back in 1959,

... education is one of the great problems of our day ... (lobbyists) tend to see the problem in quantitative terms—not enough schools, not enough teachers, not enough equipment. I think it has to do with quality: How good are the schools we have? Their solution is to spend more money. Mine is to raise standards. Their resource is the federal government. Mine is to the local school board, the private school, the individual citizen—as far away from the federal government as one can possibly go. And I suspect that if we knew which of these two views on education will eventually prevail, we would know also whether Western civilization is due to survive, or will pass away. (70)

Sound familiar? When George W. Bush took over the presidency, the federal budget for education was less than \$33 billion. That's \$33 billion more than in Goldwater's day, when there was no such agency on the federal level. Today the budget approaches \$70 billion and touches every school and student in the United States. But the Department of Education budget does not include the extra \$130 billion or so that Obama will spend on education through his economic stimulus plan. So actually \$33 billion in the year 2000 has turned into \$200 billion in 2009.

Since our education spending has doubled during the Bush years, does anyone believe our schools have doubled in performance? Does anyone believe our students are twice as smart as they were when Bush took office in 2000? Does anyone believe that doubling the spending has improved the education system at all? Does anyone think that we got our money's worth?

The federal government now spends almost \$70 billion annually on education (or more honestly \$200 billion—see above), despite the fact that the Constitution doesn't mention the word education. Our educational spending is at the top of the industrialized world, yet our results are at the bottom. A 2006 study of education in industrialized nations reported that U.S. 15-year-olds score significantly below average compared to our chief economic rivals. Out of 30 industrialized countries, U.S. students ranked 25th in math and 21st in science. Polls also show

that Americans believe that good academic performance leads to financial success later in life. If that is true, we are facing a dismal future.\*

Goldwater said it best a half century ago: We need quality, not quantity. In other words, the more involved the federal government has gotten in our education system, the more dismal the results. And yet with those dismal, disappointing, and devastating results come ever increasing spending on education. Are we getting our money's worth? Shouldn't we demand accountability for education? Why is education the only business I know of where the worse the results, the more money that education bureaucrats demand? Why should we reward failure with more money? Based on Goldwater's amazing track record, and his gut instincts about education leading to the success or failure of Western civilization, we are in grave danger.



Another area in which Goldwater also saw the over-involvement of government was "corporate welfare." In 1959 Goldwater was aghast at the money lavished on big corporate farms by the Department of Agriculture. He said,

No power over agriculture was given to any branch of the national government . . . disregard of the Constitution in this field has brought about the inevitable loss of personal freedom; and it has created economic chaos . . . I doubt if the folly of ignoring the principle of limited government has ever been more convincingly demonstrated . . . Doing something about it means—and there can be no equivocation here—prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program. (33)

Sound familiar? Nothing ever changes—the same government programs just grow bigger (and more entrenched). In 2002, President Bush dramatically increased corporate welfare spending for farmers at a time of record farm profits. Why? Politics is the answer. Senators

---

\*Snyder, Elizabeth. "Leading Economists Warn That Education Gap Between the U.S. and Industrialized Countries. . . ." Reuters. June 27, 2008.

and Congresspersons from farm states pushed hard to bring home the bacon (excuse the pun) for their constituents. Lobbyists pushed hard to increase the lard (excuse the pun) on behalf of billion dollar farm conglomerates. And so spending went up, even while profits reached record highs. Does this make any sense for taxpayers? Spending on the farm welfare program back in 1959 pales when compared to the almost \$100 billion per year now lavished by our federal government on corporate welfare. Goldwater saw it coming, but he'd be shocked and embarrassed by the 2002 farm bill signed by President Bush.



Yet, Goldwater did not only focus on domestic issues, he also discussed the overarching growth and spending by government in international affairs. Foreign military aid, foreign aid in the form of bribes, and the financial burden imposed by the United Nations are three areas where Goldwater suggested dramatic spending cuts. He said,

For many years now, our allies in Western Europe have devoted smaller portions of their national budgets to military forces than we have. The result is that the American people, in the name of military aid, have been giving an economic handout to these nations; we have permitted them to transfer to their domestic economy funds which, in justice, should have been used in the common defense effort. (90)

Sound familiar? It is almost unfathomable that a half century later U.S. taxpayers are still paying for the national defense of wealthy countries like Germany, Japan, and South Korea. In a time of economic crisis, why on earth are we paying billions of dollars annually to defend them? The Cold War is over. Let them pay for their own defense. That was Barry Goldwater's gut instinct a half century ago. We still haven't listened.

Perhaps, more than listening, we haven't been told that we are paying for the national defense of wealthy nations. This is welfare for our allies. Do the taxpayers understand that this is money our "friends" can use to prop up their economies and major industries to compete against us? Does this make sense decades after World War II and the Cold War ended? Nothing ever changes—not when government is involved.

And then there's foreign aid in the form of bribes to other governments. Goldwater said,

. . . the Constitution does not empower our government to undertake that job in foreign countries, no matter how worthwhile it might be. Therefore, except as it can be shown to promote America's national interests, the Foreign Aid program is unconstitutional. (89)

More common sense from my hero Barry Goldwater,

Increasingly, our foreign aid goes not to our friends, but to professed neutrals—and even to professed enemies . . . our present Foreign Aid program, in sum, is not only ill-administered, but ill-conceived. It has not, in the majority of cases, made the free world stronger; it has made America weaker . . . (93)

Sound familiar? Has anything changed in half a century? We waste billions of dollars today on countries led by tin-pot dictators, who steal it all and give nothing to the people. What do we gain from it? Do any of these nations actually do anything for us? For the U.S. taxpayer? Do they even vote our way at the United Nations? I say it is time to drastically cut foreign aid. It comes 50 years too late, but better late than never. Can you even imagine the savings for the U.S. taxpayer if we had heeded Barry Goldwater's advice a half century ago?

Finally there is Goldwater's wisdom about the United Nations. He said,

The UN places an unwarranted financial burden on the American taxpayer . . . the United States is currently defraying roughly a third of all UN expenses. That assessment should be drastically reduced . . . we should not be surprised that many of the policies that emerge from the deliberations of the United Nations are not the policies that are in the best interests of the United States . . . it becomes clear that our present commitment to the UN deserves re-examination. (108)

Sound familiar? Nothing ever really changes, does it? How many billions of dollars could we have saved from 1959 to 2009 by demanding proportional payments from each member nation of the United Nations?



Goldwater not only criticized the government, he also posed solutions to end government spending and slow the formation of a welfare and entitlement state. Using different terms, he suggested obvious solutions that would reduce the federal budget. Goldwater's goal was to stop the government bailout madness (for both individuals and corporations) before it got out of control. Goldwater predicted it all a half century ago. Sadly, we didn't listen. He said,

. . . the Welfare State can be erected by the simple expedient of buying votes with promises of "free" federal benefits—"free" housing, "free" school aid, "free" hospitalization, "free" retirement pay and so on . . . the effect of Welfarism on freedom will be felt later on—after its beneficiaries have become its victims, after dependence on government has turned into bondage and it is too late to unlock the jail. (64)

Sound familiar? Think of the lost souls in the streets of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina. They waited desperately and helplessly for government assistance. Think of where this "something for free" mentality has led—to Bear Stearns, AIG, Citibank, the Big 3 automakers, Bank of America, and our biggest banks begging the federal government to bail them out of financial Armageddon in the fall of 2008 (and beyond). The desire for "something for free" from government now permeates all areas of our society from the welfare mother to the CEO suite. Think of LBJ's Great Society promises. Has a half-century of welfare solved the problem of poverty? Hardly. Have poverty-stricken inner cities been improved by spending trillions of dollars on welfare, entitlements, handouts, free school breakfast and lunch programs, free housing, or free medical? To the contrary, a half-century later we have created a welfare mentality: the expectation and desperate need for handouts from government. Worse, it has extended from individuals to corporations to entire industries. We have "enabled" an entire generation of addicts. No, I'm not referring to drug addicts. I'm referring to entitlement addicts. But just like drug or alcohol addicts, you cannot help them by providing them with a crutch. You cannot help drug addicts by giving them money. It just makes them worse. Only discipline and personal responsibility (and a strong faith in

God) can save an addict. “If it is to be, it is up to me.” Goldwater saw it a half century ago. If only we had listened.

But the problem is that government entitlement and welfare programs have never been about helping the poor. They’ve always been about giving more power and control to politicians and government. Once again Goldwater understood this problem 50 years ago. He said of the welfare state,

The long range consequences of Welfarism are plain enough: as we have seen, the State that is able to deal its citizens as wards and dependents has gathered unto itself unlimited political and economic power and is thus able to rule as absolutely as any . . . despot. Consider the consequences to the recipient of welfarism . . . he concedes to the government the ultimate in political power—the power to grant or withhold from him the necessities of life as the government sees fit. (66–67)

Sound familiar? What is so frightening is what is happening before our very eyes here in the United States in 2009. This economic crisis, which may yet be called a depression (as I predicted back in early 2008), has caused more people than ever to run into the arms of big government. It has caused voters to elect the ultimate Big Brother politician Barack Obama, who, in turn, sees big government as the answer to every problem; who spends *more* to solve the problem of looming bankruptcy; who adds millions of new government employees in response to growing unemployment; who gives over \$100 billion to state and local governments so that their government union employees do not have to be laid off (worse, so that they can get their annual pay increases); who bails out banks so that government can have authority and apply pressure to bankers to dole out bank loans and mortgages to the “right kind of people” (those who support Obama—unions, union projects, environmentally conscious “green” projects, politically correct projects). Overnight, virtually all of America has become dependent on the welfare state. Corporate CEOs are now bigger welfare queens than welfare mothers and fathers. Unions, big corporations, cities, states, banks—they all beg the federal government on hands and knees to save them.

The welfare state now is on the verge of being the official state of affairs. Crisis and fear has driven Americans into the arms of socialism, without even realizing we have cut a deal with the devil. We are going quietly to our deaths—at least the death of capitalism—willingly and quietly. We are jumping off a cliff like lemmings following a Pied Piper. Barry Goldwater must be rolling over in his grave. The welfare state he predicted has come to pass, except worse than even he ever imagined.



How did this all happen? Goldwater said it best a half century ago,

. . . we were swindled. There are occasions when we have elevated men and political parties to power that promised to restore limited government and then proceeded, after their election, to expand the activities of government. (15)

Sound familiar? We have only ourselves to blame. We—the citizens, voters, taxpayers—let it happen. We voted for two major parties that outdid each other to bribe the voters. Getting elected, gaining and retaining power, making government bigger (thereby increasing their power)—those were their only goals.

But Goldwater doesn't stop there. He uses his crystal ball to predict the reasons for Obama's election as well. He said,

But let us be honest with ourselves. Broken promises are not the major causes of our trouble. Kept promises are. All too often we have put men in office who have suggested spending a little more on this, a little more on that, who have proposed a new welfare program . . . We can be conquered by bombs or by subversion; but we can also be conquered by neglect—by ignoring the Constitution and disregarding the principles of limited government . . . Like so many nations before us, we may succumb through internal weakness rather than fall before a foreign foe. (15–16)

Sound familiar? If Obama keeps his promises to expand government, increase government spending, increase stimulus packages from the billions to the trillions, increase entitlements, create government-run health care, and provide tax cuts to people who don't pay taxes in the first place, he will most certainly bankrupt the United States. We will be



conquered from within. I am left to only imagine what historians will be saying about Barack Obama and his effect on the United States 50 years from now (the 100th anniversary of Barry Goldwater's book).

The only way for Obama to keep his promises without bankrupting the United States is to dramatically increase taxes on successful U.S. citizens to levels that will destroy motivation and productivity. Obama thinks it's "fair" to spread the wealth around. Goldwater had the answer to that scheme as well. He said,

... a man's earnings are his property as much as his land and the house in which he lives. It has been the fashion in recent years to disparage property rights—to associate them with greed and materialism. This attack on property rights is actually an attack on freedom . . . How can (a citizen) be free if the fruits of his labor are not his to dispose of, but are treated, instead, as part of a common pool of public wealth? Property and freedom are inseparable: to the extent government takes the one in the form of taxes, it intrudes on the other . . . The very imposition of heavy taxes is a limit on a man's freedom. (53–54)

Sound familiar? Obama, and his running mate Joe Biden, explained why higher taxes on successful citizens are fair by using this same attack on "greed and materialism" as liberal politicians used in the 1950s. There is no doubt that President Obama will use this identical argument to dramatically grab the property (income) of business owners, taxpayers, and job creators, so he can spread the wealth around to those who have not earned it (his voters).

Does Goldwater think we therefore have no obligation to pay taxes to our country? Of course not. Goldwater said of taxes,

Having said that each man has an inalienable right to his property, it also must be said that every citizen has an obligation to contribute his fair share to the legitimate functions of government. (54)

But the key word is *legitimate*. As Goldwater pointed out back in 1959, the Constitution is the proper arbiter of what is legitimate. If we simply limit the spending of the federal government to programs authorized by the Constitution, spending and taxes would drop dramatically. As Goldwater points out,

... when the federal government enacts programs that are not authorized by its delegated powers, the taxes needed to pay for such programs exceed the government's rightful claim on our wealth. (55)

If only we had listened to Barry Goldwater back in 1959—spending, taxes, and the national debt would be far lower in 2009.

Goldwater foresaw Obama's argument on what is a fair level of taxation. He said,

... the graduated tax is a confiscatory tax. Its effect, and to a large extent its aim, is to bring down all men to a common level. Many of the leading proponents of the graduated tax frankly admit that their purpose is to redistribute the nation's wealth. Their aim ... does violence both to the charter of the Republic and the laws of Nature. (56)

Sound familiar? The tax battle rages on unabated a half century later.



Although I have been discussing Goldwater's commentary on political and economic issues, his brilliance and foresight also expanded to social issues. Think of the biggest social and personal freedom issues of our day: abortion, gay marriage, stem cell research, online gaming, the right to die (assisted suicide), and medical marijuana. Goldwater had the solution a half century ago,

The Tenth Amendment is not a "general assumption," but a prohibitory rule of law ... States' Rights mean that the States have a right to act or not to act, as they see fit, in the areas reserved to them ... today neither of our two parties maintains a meaningful commitment to the principle of States' Rights. (18, 22)

Sound familiar? Quite simply, these issues are none of the federal government's darn business. One size does not fit all. Half a century later we can solve all of these issues on the state and local level—where it is closer to the people—without federal interference.

Later in life, it was revealed that Barry Goldwater, the man who literally *invented* the conservative movement was quite centrist and libertarian

on the topics of personal and social issues. Goldwater felt that abortion was a personal choice, not intended for government intervention. He was also supportive of gays in the military. Goldwater said,

You don't have to be straight to be in the military; you just have to shoot straight . . . Everyone knows that gays have served honorably in the military since at least the time of Julius Caesar.

After his retirement from the U.S. Senate, Goldwater endorsed an Arizona voter initiative for legalization of medical marijuana. All of these were consistent with his views to get government out of our lives. But more importantly, they were part and parcel of his belief in States' Rights. Whether Goldwater personally supported abortion, gay rights, or medical marijuana would be of no matter, if in fact the citizens of each state make their own decisions on personal freedom issues like these.

Goldwater even foresaw the issue of warrantless wiretaps by the Bush administration. Goldwater often argued that faithfulness to the Constitution was more important than any reform that might come of restricting the freedoms the Constitution guaranteed.

Sound familiar? If we heeded the wisdom of Barry Goldwater, the federal government would not have the right to listen into your phone calls or read your e-mail messages (without a warrant). Goldwater often opined that the Constitution was not just a piece of paper to be ignored if you disagreed with a certain issue. The Constitution is the law of the land—to be obeyed no matter the circumstances at the moment. The authority of the Constitution is more important than the government's immediate needs during a war on terror. If one presidential administration overrides the Constitution over warrantless wiretaps, what will the next administration decide to override in the name of a “national emergency?” Like my hero Barry Goldwater, I am today uncomfortable with any administration overriding or ignoring the Constitution for any reason. Or as Benjamin Franklin once said, “They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety.”



It's one thing to read all of the quotes listed above. It's quite another to realize that all of these brilliant observations, conclusions, and solutions were uttered by Barry Goldwater a half-century ago. I am not the

soothsayer that Barry Goldwater was back in 1959. I've had the luxury of a half-century to figure out that Goldwater was right (excuse the pun). But my role is that of the town crier. I believe that I was put here at this moment in time to translate Goldwater's wisdom to a new generation, and to make sure that this generation *listens*. *My job is to wake up the citizenry.*

The old political saying goes, "A billion here, a billion there, and pretty soon you're talking about *real* money." Well, just think for a moment what the result would be if we'd saved billions per year on each of Goldwater's recommendations since 1959? Add up cuts in waste, cuts of entire federal cabinets, cuts of welfare and entitlements, cuts of corporate welfare, cuts in foreign aid, cuts in foreign military spending, and cuts in United Nations contributions. A billion here, a billion there, saved for a half century and we'd have some *real* savings—perhaps enough to eliminate the entire national debt, with enough left over to easily fund the entire \$9.7 trillion bailout. Of course, with Goldwater (or myself) in charge, there never would have been a bailout in the first place. Barry Goldwater is my hero. His wisdom applies now, more than ever.