

# **A Terrorist's Wish List**

It is obvious that the intention of the Swamp is to lower the American "Way of Life" until China and other nations can catch up to approximate their equivalent of the American standard of living. At that point, because most nations are now relatively "equal" the United Nations can insist that we all follow the same set of rules, e.g. whatever the Communist oriented plutocracy chooses.

---

# **G-d Is A Political Necessity**

Trump is but a mediocre beginning. Be Warned! Unless we have 20 years of successful Trump-like confrontation with The Swamp, your grandchildren will be growing up behind barbed wire and what will you say when they ask, "Grandpa, how did this happen and why didn't you do anything to stop it?"

---

# **Millennial's Are Confused; For They No Not What They Do By Calling For Golden Handcuffs**

[Editor's Note: Not long ago a Facebook Friend started a conversation that took on a political dimension. Not able to

let the pro-communist diatribes go without a response, I let loose. The retaliation was fast and furious. It was also looney as this long post will illustrate. Do note that I have answered Mr. Confused Millennial's gyrations line by line, thought by thought. My guess is that it was effective because Mr. Confused Millennial has refused to answer me. I have made no corrections to Mr. Confused Millennial's spelling, grammar or lucidity. I think it is important to see just how out of touch much of our citizenry is. Brainwashing is real and John Dewey was a great proponent of it. I had exposed some of Mr. Dewey's perverted thinking and it elicited the diatribe below, which answer I share with you.]

**You = Mr. Confused Millennial**

**Me = Coach Mitch**

Mr. Confused Millennial,

**Me:** I have decided to answer your post point by point. This has to be posted in several parts because FB will not take it in one post.

**You:** Everything you're saying is so twisted and ideologically wrong, it is pathetic more than anything else.

**Me:** The first rule of debate is to not personalize. You will note that the left does just the opposite, it typically tries to intimidate, first by labeling and then by personalizing. The key is to dehumanize the other party. This is taught in communist training. BTW, I read this in a KGB manual. Communists are very strategic, precise and determined. Potential violence is the under girding principle. Your post is full of anger which can explode at any time. This is how you are controlled as an unwary but fully enabled pro-communist sympathizer.

**You:** However, what you ARE doing is introducing your own firebrand of toxic misinformed ideology into the mix, which

acts like a cancer to the entire conversation.

**Me:** I am attempting to introduce some semblance of reality into the conversation. Because your generation has been taught certain views, you only seek confirmation of your views. It's called the Echo Chamber. I was also only taught certain anti-American views and not feeling comfortable about it had to seek other information which reflects a freedom oriented, constitutionally based world view totally different than what you espouse.

**You:** ctually a more true form of Socialism will be the only way forward into the future, because "Capitalism" ... help push it to a point where it starts crushing down on itself,... And eventually Revolution will take place, proving Marx was right.

**Me:** We are in revolution now, e.g. ANTIFA, BLM, and Soros. I perceive you as a soldier for communism, a form of Socialism – as you being used as a "useful innocent." This is a term coined by the great Ludwig von Mises in his 1947 book, Planned Chaos. The term was used by Communists for liberals, whom von Mises describes as "confused and misguided sympathizers".

**You:** Note: Democracy provides for the rights of the people to protest, and ask of its government things that are not being provided for through it's official representation,

**Me:** Agreed

**You:** Right now we are in a state of emergency, (phase 1 out of say.. 4) because the government is not listening to the people.

**Me:** Agreed – but this has been going on for a very long time, for plutocracy's never listen to the people. As a practical matter, I start with Woodrow Wilson and the passage of the Federal Reserve and the popular vote for Senators as acts totally antagonistic to freedom. Prior to that, the Civil War did not have to be fought, except that certain entrenched

interests wanted to split the US into two countries so that we could be more easily controlled.

**You:** And we have a leader who is corrupting the entire picture by only talking to a percentage of the populus,

**Me:** No so. Trump is only being heard by a certain part of the population. You are not listening. I would agree that Trump is not explaining his thought process well enough. However, you don't want to hear about self-reliance or self-regulation and other such values that are not conducive with socialism and notions of equality of outcome which require government to determine winners, causing antagonisms within the populations – a notion that is desired in order to have planned chaos.

**You:** that is out of touch with the Norms of society,

**Me:** The norms of American society were best enunciated by Tocqueville in 1835. In "Democracy in America." Tocqueville was amazed at the willingness of Americans of all sorts who seemed to gravitate together when necessary to overcome a common need and at their energy and zeal in moving themselves forward, primarily, he said, because of the absence of government, as opposed to France, where government was a stone on everyone's back. This "can do" and "will do" spirit carried forward to the 1880's when the Industrial Revolution and capitalism, having spawned a burgeoning middle class which took its individual moral responsibility seriously, joined fraternal societies to help themselves and others. By 1920, 50% of the population was part of an ethnic, business or community order where social needs were provided. No welfare was needed because we helped each other on a voluntary basis – the way it is supposed to be done. EX: Community hospitals were built all over the US with private donations, solely to provide for the needy, who could pay whatever they could afford.

**You:** let alone devoid of any clear thinking and logic,

**Me:** It is socialist training that removes voluntary action and replaces it with government mandates. Dewey was instrumental in having government schools institute regimes that coached students to be servile to government desires. One of Dewey's mentors, Hegel, was one of Marx' mentors. Hegel taught that people are "like clay, to be molded by the state" and to be used as the state needs. See Wikipedia – State. You won't see this quote in Wikipedia because this shows too much of Hegel's actual thoughts, which is what Marx took as his basic thesis.

**You:** based on the brainwashing that has occurred over the last two decades in the Republican Party, and it's crony news media.

**Me:** Probably agreed for the most part. This provides you mean the GOP Establishment rags like National Review, etc. and the Establishment think tanks like the Heritage Foundation. However, if you mean what is referred to as the MSM or Main Stream Media, e.g. The NY Times, LA Times, WA Post, et.al., then those are the Establishments communist oriented rags. Sadly, they all work for the same end, a totally controlled America.

**You:** I'm sure we can all agree we're all for capitalism, and the right of people to pursue wealth creation, and to be happy.

**Me:** Do not agree. You are not for Capitalism which is Laissez-faire, (French: "allow to do"), a policy of minimum governmental interference in the economic affairs of individuals and society, which you oppose as it is not the regulated socialist type Fascism that you espouse.

**You:** Which more and more means – that you must make more and more money, even maintain a modest amount of happiness: As you can't be happy if you are not healthy. And so you need – more and more money to be healthy; therefore to even be happy. And the only reason why that is becoming more and more evidently

true is, because of people in high places thinking more along the lines of what you are saying.

**Me:** This is a rant, not a political point. Do some meditation – it's free – and it helps with health.

**You:** Republicans ( and Libertarians) who want to deregulate,

**Me:** Agreed. But, to be clear, Establishment Republicans do not want deregulation. They are all for the corporate state. They have that in common with Establishment Democrats. That is why both parties have worked together so well in the past. There are lots of examples. Currently, the Democrats are being pushed by their pro-communist wing and the Democrats Establishment wing thinks it is moving too fast, that many Americans don't want a communized state yet, potentially causing a backlash and voting in Republicans. They are correct – hopefully.

**You:** and let corporations run roughshod over the entire system, causing instability throughout the entire socioeconomic hierarchical diagram.

**Me:** Totally agree and you have just enunciated Conspiratorial Thinking – congrats! “Causing instability” has been the agenda for over 170 years. Lots of examples, just two. 1. LBJ's Vietnam War. Our 2<sup>nd</sup> war that drained the treasury and we didn't win but caused lots of turmoil. (Some say Kennedy was killed because he wouldn't commit to the war.) 2. Nixon opening Red China. The plan closed 70000 US factories and moved them to Red China, dispossessing our entire lower-middle class of work and the potential of upward mobility. There are currently 30 million w/o a high school degree and unemployed who could have worked in those factories. BTW, these figures are not reflected in the current labor statistics.

**You:** A government is needed to implement smart regulation to maintain and control the system to keep the cogs in the wheel

moving smoothly so to speak. Because eventually without government interference in any way, the machine itself overheats and breaks down, because of too much greed and Corruption.

**Me:** Not so. So much to say here. Yours is the commonly held idea, but it is almost totally wrong headed. The quick answer is Tort Law. We can sue our way to freedom!!! There is already in place, all over the US, the ability to take every corporation to court and have a judge or an arbitrator deliver an opinion in 30 days. Just imagine if we were to take the banks to court for each infraction? In Small Claims Court, the corp must have an attorney, with its attendant costs. Eventually, suffocating legal actions will cause the banks to change their policies. Tort Law allows US to do class action suits against Monsanto, etc. for polluting our earth and every citizen with cancer causing agents. It was recently announced that a Monsanto owned brand, RoundUp, has 8700+ lawsuits against it and one litigant just won a \$200 million + award!!! We can sue these corporate monsters into changing behavior. Just imagine if the culture were that corporate officers and Boards of Directors were held personally responsible for the actions of the corporation that hurt people? This is where the law needs to go. Put these robber barons behind bars.

**You:** (Analogy – Think of government as the person who oiles the mechanisms of the machine. That is a very vital role between producer and consumer.

**Me:** This is so very wrong and illustrates the brainwashing your generation has suffered. The Declaration and the Constitution which you have not read, nor studied, make clear that the purpose of the American federal government is to defend life, liberty and property, from outside aggression, including aggression from government; and to guarantee that the states have the same form of government. To be clear: government in the US was created to promote personal freedom and individual responsibility so that our society could be

different from all societies in the past that have always devolved into a plutocracy, i.e. an elite running the society. Almost by definition, there is, therefore, no role for government to oil any mechanism save a few specific items that any viable society needs, like a stable money, courts, etc. all of which are seen in the Constitution and labeled as the Enumerated Powers. This extremely limited idea of government insures, i.e. defends, the idea that any person can move forward to achieve their goal. This mostly entails the defense of property – however socialism is antagonistic to individual control of property because property is the basis of personal wealth and the elite want to control the wealth themselves.

**You:** It's been proven over and over again throughout history that corporations are not good at regulating themselves,

**Me:** Agreed. The answer to good corporate behavior is not regulation but ruination. Aggressively sue and hold corporations and its management responsible for harm. This will make it necessary for corporations to self-regulate. It will also virtually make it impossible for corporations to become too big. Big corporations cannot compete against smaller, more agile firms, so they pay lobbyists to help pass regulations that only the big firms can afford to follow, putting the smaller firm out of business. What you label as Capitalism, is not Capitalism, this is how Socialism works. I define Socialism as a marketing system designed to have the public ask an elite to make all decisions.

**You:** and maintaining the correct amount of oil to properly facilitate the correct balance of goods and services, to the ability of the consumers to even demand those things at a proper level; as both encampments are in two diametrically opposed corners – with workers wanting to make more money, and companies wanting to pay less to the workers.

**Me:** Not so in reality. You are parroting Marxian theology again. Workers get paid what the market says they are worth –



as long as there is a free market. That most workers are not worth much is a function of the worker not preparing themselves for higher paying jobs. EX: Highly paid, desirable Google programmers just made Google pull out of government contracts that these programmers did not want to work on, and Google gave up this lucrative work because Google needed these particular programming skills.

**You:** Without the government in the middle to also facilitate minimums and standards,

**Me:** This is so wrong. More Marxian theology. The reason corporations do not fear regulation is that they influence the regulations as they are written. For every restriction that you would approve, the government and the corporation's write in a back door, an exception, a way around, that is their legal "get out of jail" card. This is the reality. You get a feel-good regulation, the big corporations get to legally not adhere to it.

**You:** Let alone anti-monopoly policies, preventing the large from gobbling up and squashing the small, the system fails.)

**Me:** Wrong. I wish it were so. It is just the opposite in reality. A main reason we have corporations that are so large is that the regulations, influenced by the lobbyists, who are mostly hired by the big firms who can afford them, are written so that the small and medium sized companies cannot afford to implement the new regs, so that they must sell out to the big firms. EX: Scrubbers were mandated to clean the pollutants from chimneys of the factories in the Midwest because the dirty air was drifting east to NY. Small-sized firms could not afford the millions needing to be spent so they had to close or sell out for pennies. This has happened in industry after industry. The EPA was set up by Nixon specifically to hamstring industry. IMHO, Nixon was the most socialist president, and was purposefully labeled a conservative because only a conservative could be trusted to "open Red China" or to

establish Fascist style Wage and Price Controls, or to cripple business by establishing the EPA, OSHA and proposed FAP, the Families Assistance Program that provided families with a guaranteed income, free health care, etc. When the Soviet Union fell, the Communist Parties in other countries also fell. The head of the Dutch Communist Party was stated as saying that, "We're not going away. We're going to join the environmental movement."

**You:** So government intervention and regulation as a buffer between an ever greedy corporatocracy and the people is actually the correct and healthy (partial) definition of capitalism.

**Me:** Not based in reality. More government propaganda to give more power to government and have the people back it up. This is what you are taught in government schools.

**You:** And conversely, to what you said – fascism stems out of government collaborating with corporations without any regard for protecting the welfare of the people against the ills and excesses that inevitably occur from corps without any controlling mechanism in place. And this symbiotic relationship between government and business breeds corruption within itself through bribery and malfeasance over the ever expanding desires for more and more wealth and power.

**Me:** Agreed. This is what we have now. So many examples. The government wants more regulations, they say to correct wrongs. I would often agree about the goals, but the wrongs only get partially corrected and the smaller firms get gobbled up by the bigger firms. It would be better were we to sue the firms for the harm they are doing to all of US.

**You:** We've been on this path for a long time now, such as this Administration is clearly doing everything it can to speed up the cycle and path that we're on – to where it will become inevitable based on the imbalances brought upon the system,

through greed and Corruption – and through the reverse distribution of wealth through the recent tax cuts, which totally throw out of whack, the balance the economic system needs to adequately function, providing for all classes of people living within our Society. And couple that with – improper spending and an unwatchful eye to waste Fraud and Abuse (on the government's part), in collaboration with their corporate cronies – our entire financing mechanism that runs the entire Society is in jeopardy now. This will lead to the next stages along the path of radical changes to our current form of government, as the dust clears from the chaos and destruction that the collapse of the entire system will cause. Look at all the world wide events that occurred in the twenties and thirties leading up to World War II. The one-size-fits-all financial model that the Republicans in power here in America used in 1929 to control our financial Direction, with low taxes, and taking an austerity like position is the same type of limited thinking that “the right” provides for any theoretical conversation to be had now which is short of the gratuitous and obscene acts of malfeasance in deregulating the very protectionary mechanisms needed to prevent such a collapse again. The short-term thinking that people like Paul Ryan, and the rest of the Republican establishment seem to take is completely ill-fated. Besides, we are already seeing the destruction of democracy right in front of our very eyes as Congress has obfuscated their duties to the American people in allowing the corruption to run roughshod throughout the Trump Administration. We currently have a tyrant in the making.

**Me:** This is all just a rant but it has some justification. I felt the exact same way, about almost every point, with Obama, the Clinton's, the Bush's, with Reagan, Ford, Carter, Nixon and LBJ. Think about it. Every administration has moved Big Government forward, allowing for Big Spending to occur along with Big Taxes, and allowing for Big Firms to propagate because of Big Regulation. That is Conspiracy! It is planned.

It's both GOP and Democrats, acting in sync, everyone getting a piece of the pie. It's called The Establishment, aka The Swamp, aka The Deep State. At least Trump is speaking about draining it. But the Swamp is fighting back. FDR said, "Nothing happens in Washington by accident. It was planned that way."

**You:** In any event Mitchell, there are multiple other falsehoods that you spewed,

**Me:** I hope you have a better understanding now. You really must read more, better material.

**You:** which does not make you an educated person on these subjects. Especially one that should be speaking from a seeming position of knowledge or authority, as you will taint and corrupt the minds of those who don't know any better. You my friend seem like a very dangerous person to me.

**Me:** The danger is believing the government, the schools, the left. The danger is in the population not reading the US Constitution and worse, thinking it is not relevant, that it is "too old." Well, the 10 Commandments are very old but the ideas are still a good way to run a society. My initial post was prompted by Mr. 2<sup>nd</sup> Confused Millennial, who said taxation was not theft, "Unless your stealing from the rich and giving to the poor" I was amazed that no one responded that this attitude was a bad idea. I realized that much of your generation thinks that Socialism is a good, humanitarian ideal – when it is just the opposite. Mr. Dewey has done his job well. BTW, Wikipedia has nothing about Dewey's real outlook. They do mention his being on the original Advisory Board of The Humanist Society of NY and signing the Humanist Manifesto which is an idea that fits in with having only one government in the entire world, the ultimate desire of The Conspiracy.

**You:** When I went to the link of that conspiratorial website your provided, and started reading about what they say about

John Dewey my BS meter quickly went off, as I became more and more repulsed by the guy, and knew there had to be something wrong with the picture they were trying to paint of the guy; so I read about him elsewhere. And I think you should too. 38 years investigating conspiracy theories and falsehoods will lead you down a very dark and dreary path. Try following the light my friend. ☐ And I say that as a VERY non religious person.

**Me:** Read anti-Dewey material to get a real perspective. One of the methods of the communists is to take over the language of their enemy. You said "Try following the light" The light is used as a metaphor for G-d. Communists follow the darkness, the lower nature of humanity, and therefore you have asked me to follow the Devil. That is the kind of statement I would expect from one who is VERY non-religious, an anti-G-d person and one who has been brain washed in our government schools. Were you to read one or two books regarding the One World Government Conspiracy, there is no way that you would not be convinced of its reality and you too would be called to waken your fellow citizens. As a start I suggest "The Unseen Hand" by Epperson, and "The Creature from Jekyll Island" [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lu\\_VqX6J93k](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lu_VqX6J93k) Also, see any information from the John Birch Society [www.JBS.org](http://www.JBS.org) Be well.

Editor's Note: I heartily suggest that all right thinking Americans join a political party, seek to be a Committeeperson and participate in the political dialogue within the party apparatus. Learn about and stick to a Constitutionalist philosophy. Read "The Federalist Papers" for a good overview of what freedom, self-responsibility and an honorable intention could achieve.

We are so blessed to be in America. It is our job to maintain some semblance of freedom so that future generations have something to defend. Engage them. Teach them. Help them.

G-d Bless US

© 2018 NWV – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Mitchell Goldstein: [CoachMitch@CoachMitch.com](mailto:CoachMitch@CoachMitch.com)

---

# **If you think big brother is bad – beware of big sister**

I received the following message from one of my Facebook friends. He was writing to all of his Facebook friends. I have deleted the names because they are not important to the idea I present.

My friend wrote:

To all of my Facebook friends...

The last few months, I have been very immersed in the political arena, especially the presidential election. I have been a loyal advocate of Donald Trump, not because he was the ideal candidate, or that he oozed presidential characteristics; no, it was mainly because I agreed with the bulk of what he says, but not necessarily the way he said it. But more than that, it is because I feel Hillary Clinton is so despicable, and so dishonest, a criminal, at best. I felt it prudent that I kept preaching the Trump gospel. The downside to my demeanor is that it has potentially cost me some friends that do not support Trump, in fact, they think he's dangerous and insane..

The truth is, some of my best friends are Democrats. They are all intelligent and thoughtful people that simply don't see things the same way as I do. People have told me that those friends who are not talking to me over my very vocal support

for Trump, were never really good friends to begin with. I don't agree with that. I think that I may have pushed them too hard, debated with them too much, and that pushed them away. I am a very strong willed person, and very passionate about everything that I take on. However, the reality is that my vote, and my opinions in this matter will amount to nothing in the grand scheme of things. I have devoted a tremendous amount of my time and energy into something that has, in my opinion, proven to be destructive to me. At this point, I'm not changing anybody's mind, so what am I really doing, aside from alienating non-like minded people that I really care about?

So, while my opinions and support have not yet changed, what will immediately change, is my propensity to initiate conversations of little else, other than politics.

I went out to dinner with some friends the other night, and not once did I bring up politics in any way. It felt like a real accomplishment.

Comment #1: We are all Americans. Sometimes we just see things differently.

Comment #2: Well articulated!

Comment #3: It's been a particularly intense election year.

Comment #4: Mitchell Goldstein (the author)

I truly wish that I could let this slide, but the stakes in this election are too high, e.g. the Supreme Court.

I am sure that these well-meaning and intelligent friends will make all the appropriate excuses when martial law is invoked because of some false flag operation created by an anti-American Clinton administration, similar to the recent fake coup in Turkey, a country now under almost dictatorial control by a militant Muslim currently holding our military personnel hostage.

Just like Bill, it is clear that Hillary Clinton is working to gain complete governmental control over US, i.e. to create a

plutocracy, where a small group makes all the decisions and the rest of US dangle on their string, plainly called "The New World Order" by fellow anti-American conspiratorialist, George W Bush.

How many times have we heard the same old slogans? We all know the problems that need fixing. Isn't it obvious that since the problems have not been fixed – that the political class does not want to fix the problems. The Miscreant Political Class promises things to get elected, knowing full well that people will hope against hope that this time it will be different. Besides being stupid and gullible, these people are cowards! That these fellow Americans refuse to acknowledge the facts in front of their nose proves that they lack the knowledge and the courage of conviction needed to uphold a pro-freedom agenda.

I have never understood how it is not obvious that a government solution is the worst possible path to solve any issue. However, know that these will be the same "friends" who, when it comes to it, will sell you out for a few food ration coupons; just ask any emigre from Eastern Europe or from Cuba.

Of course, they will feel bad about their betrayal, but their personal survival is paramount, isn't it? Political correctness, liberalism, et. al. has sapped the moral fortitude from our culture. Our "Me-centered" narcissistic culture justifies any action so long as we each get what we "feel" we want.

At this time, we all need to choose "friends" based upon who we would want in the foxhole next to US. You are well rid of these noxious individuals. Their only utility is to supply you with monies so you can buy more items to help your family survive the coming Anschluss – an Anschluss that they helped perpetuate with their decision to turn away from the obvious treason unfolding in front of their eyes.



Bottom Line – When you look at the long list of Hillary’s crimes and compare them to the idea that Trump is not saying something the way we would like him to say it – it is easy to pick the better party – Trump. To be acceptable, Trump merely needs to learn how to speak “PC.” However, don’t expect Hillary to undo a lifetime devoted to Statist ideals, i.e. she is devoted to a totalitarian agenda. If you thought Big Brother was bad; Beware of Big Sister!

It might help to turn people against Hillary were we to know details about some Obama/Hillary/New World Order policies, e.g.

- the North American Union where the US, Canada and Mexico are being planned to be merged into one regional country similar to the EU, and under the egis of the UN;
- the details of TPP, ex: that companies can import foreign workers into the US and pay them the prevailing wage of the country they came from rather than the competitive wage in America; Indian engineers would be paid \$17000, Vietnamese engineers, \$8000;
- Agenda 21 and 2030, a UN treaty amongst whose covenants require that US property rights be subject to UN approval, ex: if you want to put an addition on your house or business, you would need to get UN approval, etc.;
- the International Monetary Fund’s plan to have only one currency in the world, thus removing the constitutionally mandated control of our finances from Congress and into the control of some New World Order plutocracy;
- acceptance of the New States of America Constitution as written by the Ford Foundation.
- These are only a few of the plans that are in place to enslave US. If you don’t know the details of these and other issues then it is hard to effectively show how our government has gone off into a direction that will eventually turn America into a dictatorship.

Another friend Skyped me. He has turned hard left and has

embraced the ideal of the Socialist Anarchist. We parry back and forth with him never admitting to the dictatorial zeal of the left.

Friend: What's UP?

Mitchell Goldstein: The AC repairman just left. He repaired a leak in the central AC. Last month a previous repairman had repaired a bad braze which was leaking at the same joint. How to "prove" it was the same leak so as to mitigate the \$500 bill? How will the company "prove" that it was a different leak or that the joint was damaged in some way, creating the leak? Conundrum!

Friend: You don't prove it, you pay and move on. The nature of "Work" in our capitalist society is that it's completely alienated. Marx spoke of this, and this is one of the consequences. The fact that "companies" exploit the labor has also been true, they've gotten so compartmentalized that they now also exploit their customers.

Mitchell Goldstein: A certain standard in the quality of work is to be expected, otherwise simply showing up is sufficient to bill and collect. It is appropriate to demand a level of quality and that the work stand up to ordinary conditions.

Friend: Sure, it's "appropriate" it's just not effective.

Mitchell Goldstein: It didn't used to be this way. There used to be a much higher standard that was expected and provided in quality and service. Now, corp's are in the midst of a "throw-a-way" standard, not a "make it last" standard. This purposeful lackadaisical attitude has affected all areas of society, to our detriment. Honda has made a reputation of maintaining high standards and it has been "effective" for them.

Friend: Yes, this is what happens over time with capitalism. Predicted almost to the stroke by Marx. National brands are largely immune to some of these problems but even those who

have “quality” get awards for it LOL. Because quality isn’t its own reward, it would seem.

Mitchell Goldstein: It is not Capitalism that is at fault, but Socialism. The cartels and near monopolies that are currently ruling US are antithetical to Capitalism. The corp giants are allowed to combine and their virtual monopoly is created by lobbyists whose special interest legislation gives special benefits. The corps do not get bigger through better competition but by legislative fiat. They eliminate competition and create monopoly practices. That is not the fault of capitalism. It is the fault of installing socialist plutocratic practices, also desired by Marx.

Friend: It must be scary for you living in the world.

Mitchell Goldstein: It truly is

Friend: By the way, I completely disagree with what you wrote...in title but not in conclusion. Good thing is Marx’s words are written. So we can see he’s “right” about what’s happened.

Mitchell Goldstein: What I’ve never understood is that large corps are reviled for their monopoly power, yet, there never seems to be any worry about how a plutocracy, e.g. the Central Committee, will rule in socialism. They are uniformly authoritarian.

Friend: Um, “never” is a strange choice of words. But, beyond that, Noam Chomsky has very eloquently addressed that if you’d like to hear it

Mitchell Goldstein: send link

Friend: YouTube Video

Mitchell Goldstein: Of course, even if Chomsky has some theoretical ideas that have merit, the reality of all socialistic regimes are that they are authoritarian.

Friend: Socialist regime is like speaking of a geocentric solar system. That is... all REGIMES are authoritarian. Not all socialist economic expressions are regimes. They speak to different questions. Much like atheism and agnosticism. They speak to different questions

Mitchell Goldstein: We've been down this road many times in our conversations. While there are technical differences, the general theme is that socialistic regimes all concentrate power for the explicit purpose of concentrating power. The aim, at the least, is to control people, or, at worst, to enslave them, for the aggrandizement of the select few.

Friend: ...again, better if you say "all regimes" Socialism is a "coincidence" in much the same way that if you objected to a theft and kept calling the person a black thief. That would show a bias and racist one...even if it happened to be true (coincidental) to the thief. The "race" is not the relevant part.

Socialism answers a question about production and distribution and it can be and often is much more democratic than capitalism.

Mitchell Goldstein: Socialism is nothing but a marketing system, meant to keep control of the population in the hands of the plutocracy. It uses flawed economic theory and class warfare to fool people into gaining support.

Friend: no, it is that economic theory. You may feel there are those who use it to their benefit, but that's not a critique of the theory. As far as flawed, theories, what makes you say that? Belief?

Mitchell Goldstein: The proof is the failed Soviet Union, Cuba, Eastern Europe, etc. The proofs are the testimonies of emigres who run from these "wonderful" societies because they hate their constricted life.

Friend: Ah, okay, faulty thinking on your part is the proof. And worse, "anecdote" without considering incentives.

By the way, that's not how you test theories.

Mitchell Goldstein: The real proof of the theory is the reaction of the society. You believe it doesn't matter if the outcome is bad; was the idea well intended even if the outcome is bad? I don't believe that the idea was well intended.

Friend: Of course... But, that an "outcome" is bad doesn't mean it was an outcome "of" the idea or the perception of it.

For example... Your eye tells you that the St. Louis Arch is taller than it is wide. But we have a way to test that theory. We measure it, and we learn that your perceptions are wrong. What's interesting is that like this subject for you...knowing your perception is wrong doesn't fix the perception... that is, it continues to look taller than it is wide.

Mitchell Goldstein: You constantly refer to technical differences that don't create real distinctions. I don't perceive anything except the testimony of those who have run away from their country, leaving behind all possessions and family

Friend: For example, say that something has a 10% chance of X and a 90% chance of Y. It's a good idea to do it if you want Y. The "x" outcome doesn't invalidate the approach. Right, bad self-selected bias. Probably one of the worse ways to test something. Get this, you're not only perceiving ...you're perceiving about a "feelers" perception.

Consider someone who leaves the Orthodox Jewish Lubavitcher faith. Would you trust their perceptions about the problems of Judaism?

Mitchell Goldstein: If 90% left, yes.

Friend: LOL. Making up numbers again. And thank you for

admitting you WOULDN'T. You know why Baptists think that sex is bad, right? ...they're convinced it will lead to dancing.

Mitchell Goldstein: Do you have any doubt that if an honest poll were taken within Cuba or Soviet bloc countries, that the population would roundly express their disappointment and ask for something better.

Friend: I wouldn't make the mistake of thinking it says much about socialism. But it might say a lot about the power of economic sanctions and threats from an empirical power like the US... and other issues such as Castro's failure to live up to his ideals...the reason that Che G. left and went to Africa after the revolution.

Mitchell Goldstein: Interestingly, Che went on a killing rampage. He could have continued to do that in Cuba; killing in the name of freedom and doing it for your own good, of course. Che kills you because he loves you.

Friend: Yes, it's interesting that he was willing to put down the doctor's bag and pick up the rifle and fight for the people.

Mitchell Goldstein: He was fighting for personal power – period.

Friend: Not what I see in his biography. Unless by personal power you mean merely equal power. He left because Castro wouldn't give the land to the people as planned but saved it for authoritarian favors and power.

Mitchell Goldstein: I know. But Castro's actions were entirely predictable. As I've said, socialists use marketing to gain control. Have you come to the idea yet that, like Che, it is OK to kill regular folks if they will not fall in line with your ideals?

Friend: Do you mean "ethical" by the question OK? And by "fall

in line” do you mean “follow blindly” or do you mean “resist the power of the people?” Of course it’s legitimate and ethical to have revolution.

Mitchell Goldstein: You label a lack of desire to follow the dictates of a dictator as “resisting the power of the people.” That is very Stalin-like of you.

Friend: It is not ethical to kill people who “disagree” ... freedom of thought is ONLY possible in a collectivist society. Dictators have nothing to do with what I speak of.

Mitchell Goldstein: Now who is being silly?

Friend: Unlike you, I have a full and complete distrust of abiding authority. You are a Minarch. You believe in a “constitutional power.”

Mitchell Goldstein: Yes I do believe in a highly restricted government. Explain how a collectivist society can have freedom of anything, especially freedom of thought or expression?

Friend: Well, the irony is it’s the ONLY way you can. Without the collective, without “relationship” there is no way to test/expand one’s views... If one were “isolated as an individual” they would only have their automated thoughts, instinct, bias. Only by having a relationship to others can we identify thought...and only in an anarchist society can we have freedom.

Mitchell Goldstein: In some ways, it is sad there is no possibility of having an anarchist society. However, dictatorial collectivism abounds... “Collectivism means the subjugation of the individual to a group – whether to a race, class or state does not matter. Collectivism holds that man must be chained to collective action and collective thought for the sake of what is called ‘the common good’.” – Ayn Rand,

Collectivism in the real world is slavery – not freedom. Only in the ivory tower is a noxious idea like Collectivism believed to be a good.

Friend: It means the proper understanding that the individual is a sort of illusion. That the meaningful expressions of humanity can only be understood as a social level. So in one “sense” it subjugates. But in another way entirely, it’s the ONLY way for the individual to do well

For example, a guaranteed minimum income would open up levels of individualism we’ve never seen and...growth for the collectively we’ve never seen. And, by the way, people admit this all the time when they’re honest. Things like... recognizing the special exploration of identity that comes in a marriage contract...or upon becoming a father/ mother. These are collective relationships.

Mitchell Goldstein: There is some possibility that a guaranteed income would provide some good; you could be accurate to some degree.

The part that I fight within myself is the idea that without the “collective” or “the village” to help, the religious congregation or fraternal organizations are not always enough to help in continuing difficult situations, e.g. bad health or significant unemployment. However, I’ve always seen that the negatives of the collective far outshine the positives to society.

Friend: There is no “society” without the collective. Do you really not get that?

Mitchell Goldstein: I do. But your collective will always morph into plutocracy.

Do you really not get that?

Friend: I get that it doesn’t happen most of the times...and does happen when we lose site of the collective. The collective cannot be plutocratic, because it’s inherently



democratic and anarchistic.

Mitchell Goldstein: That is philosophical silliness. The collective, in the way you are thinking of it, starts out well, well-meaning and well-run. Then, talented individuals rise, gain more control, and their natural tendency is to gather more power, until the ideal is ruined. The weak amongst US are as lambs led to the slaughter. Lord Acton was absolutely correct about power corrupting.

Friend: LOL So are you part of the weak?

Mitchell Goldstein: Yes, to some degree. Mostly not.

I have ability. But that ability is constrained by the collective – for the collective – in the name of the collective – and enforced by the collective – but, it is for the benefit of the individuals at the top, the plutocracy.

Friend: Ha! “Enforced by the collective” What the F would that even mean?

Mitchell Goldstein: The legitimate collective of the people has been taken over by the plutocracy that had planned to do so all along. It always uses the collective “good” as its purpose for enslaving US.

Friend: See any good movies? (Changing the subject.)

I have come to understand that liberals just want things to be “nice.” That, everyone should “just get along” as Rodney King proposed. Well, the competitive spirit in man prevents that. The best we can manage is to be comfortable with chaos, i.e. to manage chaos, via a legal system, a moral system and an economic system, all that are essentially fair.

Some men will always seek power. They will use power to promote themselves and to aggrandize themselves. They will gather and surround themselves with servile yes-men. They will all lie, cheat, steal and promote policies for their own

benefit which are inimical to the population they control.

In the latest brazen show of power, the FBI Director has manipulated (rigged) the system to let Hillary off. By all rights, she should now be sitting in jail in a highly fashionable orange jump suit.

G-d Bless US – we really need it!

© 2016 Mitchell Goldstein – All Rights Reserved

---

# The solution to saving America

I recently received this email. It made me think.

You GOTTA LOVE this COUNTRY

My Dogs

This morning I went to sign my dogs up for welfare. At first the lady said, “Dogs are not eligible to draw welfare.” So I explained to her that my dogs are mixed in color, unemployed, lazy, can’t speak English and have no frigging clue who their Daddies are. They expect me to feed them and provide them with housing and medical care.

So the welfare clerk looked in her policy book to see what it takes to qualify for welfare. My dogs get their first checks Friday.

Darn, this is a great country.

\*\*\*\*\*

My liberal friends would label this commentary as racist and then ignore the reality of people taking advantage of government (taxpayer) largesse. My conservative friends would label this commentary as truthful and then ignore the racist undertones. I understand the human desire to help those in need. I also understand that any taxpayer support must be short term with strict oversight or we get what we've gotten, a permanent welfare class supported by a burgeoning bureaucracy and a growing police state. Without checks, there is no balance.

Questions we can ask liberals and conservatives.

1. For Liberals: Why won't liberals confront the reality that there are many people taking advantage of taxpayer largesse and advocate for systems that have limits and real oversight?
2. For Liberals: What should taxpayers think when people demand unending services but refuse to educate and upgrade themselves and their life situation?
3. For Liberals: Why do you automatically think it is understandable and forgivable for "poor" people to take improper advantage of middleclass taxpayers?
4. For Liberals: Why do you automatically think it is "fascist," "typical," uncharitable, not proper, etc. for taxpayers to want to weed out those scamming "the system" and restrict payments to those in genuine need?
5. For Liberals: Why do you not back efforts at real welfare reform, which examine Waste, Fraud, and Abuse within the Welfare systems?
6. For Liberals: How is it proper for young adults to refuse to educate themselves and to then expect the "right" to live on welfare for the rest of their lives and going forward for generations, as their parents have, going back several generations?
7. For Conservatives: When and why does an emphasis on maintaining standards become legitimately racist, mean spirited and wrongheaded?

8. For Conservatives: Does it matter if your opinion is racist, mean spirited or wrongheaded if you stop welfare cheats?

9. For Conservatives: Should we always allow people to wallow in their own lack of foresight, or should taxpayers provide long term support, or support only in emergencies, or should we not provide any taxpayer support at all?

10. For Conservatives: Should we go back to the old system of letting the churches and private institutions provide the help for the poor or has the situation gotten so out of hand that taxpayer support is necessary?

11. For Conservatives: Are there racial, class and other economic realities which conservatives ignore and should taxpayers be required to pay for them?

12. For Conservatives: Is it OK for people to go to churches and private institutions for help or is it too demeaning and therefore, public support is necessary to provide help?

13. For Conservatives: Why do conservatives feel a welfare program should be eliminated versus being well and properly controlled?

14. For Conservatives: Do you like receiving some of the government sponsored benefits being paid by taxpayers? Which ones would you give up?

15. For Liberals: When does help in an emergency cross over to being dependent care?

16. For Liberals: Why do liberals think it OK to steal the sustenance from the productive in order to give it to the non-productive?

17. For Liberals: Why do liberals get so exercised by symbolism and ignore realities, i.e. labeling "non-productive" as a racist term but never holding non-productive persons accountable?

18. For Liberals: Why do liberals think that theft via taxation for a supposed social good is not really theft?

19. For Both: How is society benefited when the number of individuals receiving taxpayer subsidies and the high amount

of those subsidies relentlessly limit the upward mobility of the taxpayers because the taxpayer must take a second job to pay the bills instead of using that time to get further education?

20. For Both: How is society benefited when corporations receiving taxpayer subsidies relentlessly limit the upward mobility of regular taxpayers?

21. For Both: How is society benefited when corporations are allowed to become so large that they squeeze out lesser competition, and with the connivance of government, become monopolies and the dictators of policy?

22. For Both: What is worse; people surviving at a low level with lots of government help and little potential to rise because of overwhelming government control, or because of little government control, people surviving at a low level but with the real potential of rising?

23. For Liberals: Is mere subsistence existence the desired end or is it the obligation of the lucky (providers) to forever provide for the unlucky (takers)?

24. For Liberals: Why and how is it a good thing for the government to transfer wealth from those who have it to those who do not?

25. For Conservatives: Why is allowing the unlimited size of a corporation seen as good and a right, rather than being seen as bad and a monopoly or oligopoly or part of a cartel?

26. For both: Why do we continue to believe the same, unending promises of "change" made by those seeking power?

27. For both: Why do those, having gained power, never, ever live up to the promises they made?

28. For Both: What is it about the human race that it will continually suffer the indignities perpetrated by those wishing to retain power?

29. For Liberals: In each socialistic society large business entities still operate. Why do liberals not see that liberal leaders merely want to transfer the power from Crony Capitalists to themselves?

30. For Liberals: The little understood but actual definition

of Socialism should be, "A marketing system intended to keep those at the top in control over those at the bottom." After seeing that no Socialistic society has benefited mankind, you still cleave to Socialism and its fellow travelers, Fascism, Communism, Egalitarianism, Fabianism, etc. Why do you believe The Freedom Philosophy does not move men forward?

31. For Conservatives: Why don't you believe in The Freedom Philosophy enough to help move it forward?

32. For All: The US Constitution set up a negative form of government, i.e. government that is required to defend a person's natural rights to their life, liberty and property, acting as a sheriff to right a wrong after it has been committed. The Constitution IS the republic. Why won't you defend "the republic" as you have pledged your allegiance to do?

33. For All: Why have you not come to study and understand how the concept of positive government, i.e. government creating rules to protect a person, gives government power while it deprives Americans of responsibility and freedom of action. Government gets the power to make and administer the rules and the power to enforce its rules against the people.

### Negative versus Positive Government

The argument for positive government is that it is supposed to prevent law breaking. However, persons of good will, and that is most of us, consistently perform good behavior. We don't break the rules, especially the unwritten rules. Positive government only gives government power and takes it away from citizens. Those disposed to breaking the rules don't care if rules exist, that's why some are criminals. Therefore, it is axiomatic that the positive government rules are in existence merely to enable power to exist, i.e. to allow the powerful to control those who would do correct behavior even if the rules were not in place.

If government were not in place, the Natural Law of Self Defense enables each person to hold accountable those who

steal or harm, hence, the idea of Citizen's Arrest. Because it is not convenient or possible for all of us to chase criminals, we hire a sheriff and entitle his office with the power of the people's rights to arrest so as to defend US. The sheriff has no more power than each of US.

Every time I hear someone say that the Constitution is a "living" document, I immediately ask what is meant by that. I'm always told that, "the Constitution can change with the times;" that, "the Constitution was written for an agrarian society." Some say this view is dangerous.

I ask them to compare the Constitution to the Ten Commandments. The ideas in the Ten Commandments are truths that endure, truths upon which an entire society can be based and prosper. I ask, "Would you do away with 'Thou shalt not steal.'?" "Of course not," they say. "Why not?" I ask. "The Ten Commandments are very old and were given during an agrarian economy – that seems to be your criteria."

People sort of shrug, realizing that their ideas are not fully formed but they don't change their minds because they have been brainwashed to think that positive government "is a good thing."

People see a problem and human nature requires a solution. Because government has become the be all and end all, they endorse some government solution which usually makes things worse; which of course, requires more government "solutions."

I have never understood why people do not take seriously the lessons learned from their own experience or from the experience of others? Why do we not make the clear connection between: 1. someone advocating a government solution, 2. the idea that it is the government that then has the power and 3. that despite overwhelming evidence, the belief that a government bureaucrat will not exercise power for his own benefit, which usually equates to the detriment of the people.

People are naïve believing that lawmakers and bureaucrats are going to make rules that will “fix” the problem. Lawmakers, under the spell of lobbyists, make law to assuage the public demand. Bureaucrats, who someday hope to be lobbyists, make sets of rules which set standards, but allow for lots of loophole exceptions. The lawmakers only speak about the high standards – but within the industry regulated, they instruct how to invoke the loopholes.

## The Answer

The answer to all the madness in society is Tort Law. This is the law of negligence. People, having been hurt by some action, are able to get compensated for the harm done. However, legal, corporate and other systems have been purposefully devised to evade legal and moral responsibility and personal and corporate liability. If the Common Law attitudes of responsibility and adherence to standards were followed, much negative in society would dissolve.

Examples of Negligence: Ralph Nader, in “Unsafe At Any Speed” outlined how the Chevy Corvair and other American cars were purposefully not designed to reflect safety needs. Lee Iacocca at Ford, who stated, “safety doesn’t sell,” was an icon of the economic appraisal of human life ideal. Iacocca signed the memo foregoing the retrofit to the Pinto because the analysis showed it would cost less to pay the monetary damages than to fix the car. The analysis showed Ford would benefit monetarily more if it allowed more victims to burn when the Pinto burst into flames from a rear collision than to fix the car. This was cost-benefit analysis run amuck. Yet, Portfolio named Iacocca the 18th-greatest American CEO of all time.

Example of a Tort Law solution: Instead of being absolved by corporate cover, just imagine if Iacocca had been held personally responsible for his Pinto decision. Along with the monetary damages, imagine that charges of Conspiracy to Commit Murder had been leveled at Iacocca and the rest of the upper



management at Ford and the Ford Board of Directors? Imagine further that they had been found guilty of this malicious conduct. Imagine if the assets of these individuals had been taken to compensate victims and to pay for court costs.

Result: For their good decision making, corporate management and Directors get well compensated and receive bonuses. Were corporate managements and Boards of Directors to be held personally responsible for a bad decision, then self-preservation requires that all businesses in all industries would self-regulate. The idea that business would stop is silly. People do business all the time without the benefit of legal "protections."

Result: Trial lawyers would need to seek other areas of law to work. If high level managers were being held responsible for their actions, I expect nuisance lawsuits would disappear, freeing up the courts, because juries would then also hold regular individuals to a higher standard and not pay out for spilling hot water on themselves when driving, as in the famous McDonald's case. Much government regulation would not be seen as necessary, therefore lobbyists would need other employment, lawmakers could restrict themselves to making law within the bounds set by the Constitution, government could be reduced, taxpayers could keep their monies and citizens and residents, legal or not, could live, work and prosper in an America that embodied the vision of the Founders.

Freedom Requires Responsibility. This idea applies to all areas of our lives.

G-d Bless US –

© 2016 Mitchell Goldstein – All Rights Reserved

---

# Right versus wrong – standards versus feelings

I recently received this email from a guru who teaches about buying and selling notes, a contracted financial instrument where one party promises to pay another party a determinate sum. The subject is not notes, rather, it is an opinion about a subject with societal import.

[From: Jack Sternberg-NoteWorthy  
[mailto:publisher@noteworthyusa.net]  
Sent: Sunday, February 14, 2016 9:55 AM  
To: coachmitch@coachmitch.com  
Subject: [NoteWorthy Newsletter] Not the Right or the Left – Right and Wrong Matter]

Hi Again,

When you were a kid, you might have justified certain behaviors to your parents with the classic kid line “but everyone was doing it.” They’d ask you back: “If everyone else were jumping off a bridge, would you, too?” Supposedly, the lesson was to think for yourself; don’t let the crowd form your thoughts or determine your behavior. The question is, now as adults, are we following peers off those bridges?

We all get that the United States has a political structure that’s designed as a two-party system. Sure, there are more than two in actuality – minor-league groups – and people call themselves “independent,” but basically there are Democrats and Republicans.

Left or right. Right or left.

And if you’ve been paying attention over the years, you might notice that there’s a bigger divide than ever playing out. The aisle between right and left is widening. This is occurring,

at least in part, because career politicians backed by big money supporters rely on appealing to the basest of the base ideologies of their respective parties.

I don't think you have to belong to one party or another to realize this is the case, and if you can look at things objectively, you might notice that, whichever your party, you can see how it's become more liberal or more conservative. I think people in both parties would hate to hear this, but if you do some research and look up the stances on multiple issues of both Ronald Reagan (revered/reviled conservative) and Barack Obama (revered/reviled liberal), you'd learn that they actually aren't far off on many things.

I've written before that we've become this nation of ideological extremes. Politics are combat, not compromise.

Recently, I've been reading about the commuting of criminals' sentences by President Obama. In case you haven't heard, he's ordered the release from prison those convicted years ago for crimes that are dealt with much less harshly today. For example, there were people back in late 1980s and early 1990s that were given life sentences for non-violent, drug-related crimes.

These days, life sentences for non-violent crimes are rare. Many who were sentenced decades ago would have already served their time had they been sentenced under today's laws. Why does this matter? Well, it's hard to justify keeping a guy in prison for 40 years in Colorado for selling marijuana when, these days, it's legal there and the government is profiting from it.

Of course, those who consider themselves Democrats support the president's commuting of certain sentences. And those who consider themselves Republicans don't. Don't you think, though, that they're looking at the issue from a purely partisan political perspective, rather than something much

simpler?

Right and wrong.

Maybe the drug offenders' releases from prison aren't the greatest example for you. If you, like many people, believe drugs ruin families and communities, then maybe you believe small-time drug convicts should spend their lives in jail. Do you think that because you really feel that way, or because that's the way those you share a political party affiliation with feel that way?

I'm not going to reveal my own political leanings here, but I know that I can put political ideals aside when I examine the criminal sentencing issue. If you can look at things logically, does it make sense that a guy busted with too much weed back in 1990 gets the same prison time as Bernie Madoff, who committed the biggest financial fraud in history, stealing \$80 billion from many, many victims?

Maybe worse, what about the convicted child molester, who, yeah, might have to register his address the rest of his life, but will likely get out of prison much, much earlier than someone caught selling drugs in the late '80s. Is this right?

Or is it wrong? That's the choice. Not right or left.

A bigger disappointment in someone I know is the real reason I'm writing about this now. This person, whom I believe to be more influenced by his political leanings than the average individual, was complaining about criminals being released from jail. But he wasn't talking about Obama's commutations.

He was talking about criminals being released after re-examinations of DNA evidence revealed they were innocent. There's a big difference between physical proof of a wrongful conviction and the commuting of drug sentences that some see as too harsh. If you're proven by science to be innocent, shouldn't you be let free? Isn't this even a simpler, cut-and-

dried case of right and wrong?

Not for my acquaintance, whom I will never name. His political beliefs have blinded him to the difference between the two circumstances, which are very different despite both involving convicts released from prison.

Logic would make it a matter of right and wrong. The influence of hardline partisan politics has made it a matter of right and left for him. I feel like his sense of party overwhelmed his logic.

And he jumped off the bridge because everyone else was doing it.

Hope this helps,

Jack

I responded:

You bring up the "fairness" argument, a good subject, but give very selective context.

Punishments are mostly based upon two thoughts, 1. The current law, 2. The disposition of the judge. As laws change, so do the punishments. The Constitution, Article 1, Section 10, does not allow for ex post facto Law, the prosecution of old crimes based upon a new law. This is only fair and logical. Something is not a crime until there is law making that action a crime. New crime can only be punished by the new standard. In the same way, using the same logic, a new punishment standard does not allow for old punishments to be done away with, excepting a pardon. You cannot take a 10 year sentence, which has newly been reduced to five years and readjust the sentence of all those criminals who are serving under the old punishment.

There is the argument that the Constitution is a "living document." You broaden that idea to having "living punishments." I do understand that your sense of what is right

and wrong can be affected when yesterday's punishment does not fit today's crime. However, today's political uproar and desire for a better way is a direct result of the significant problems stemming from a "living" or changing standard.

Sadly, gone is the understanding, even at the Supreme Court level, that the reason for having a Constitution is to put down a set of standards that are inviolate. The notion of an inviolable standard has been taken over by textualism, the idea that everything is open to discussion, which automatically means that there are no standards. How then is a society to move forward with surety? It cannot. The result is our current upheaval and chaos. Our societies upset is real, as can be seen by the increasingly disparate political opinions engulfing this nation.

Constitutional standards are lost through textualism or a 'living' Constitution

Example:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress has power "To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin,"

Article 1, Section 10: No state shall, "make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts;"

It is clear that the Founders did not want paper money, for they knew that fiat currency and the inflation it brings is the secret thief used by governments past to promote themselves. However, a changing mindset, a different view, the "living" Constitutional standard, a public without knowledge, allowed FDR to promote and for Congress to pass a mere resolution voiding this Constitutional prohibition against paper money. By voiding the Gold Standard, our government took the opportunity to spend, spend and spend some more. All "for our own good" of course. Need I say that the massive US debt is close to bringing down our entire society? This is the harm of change.

A “living” 10 Commandments. Change the name to The 10 Suggestions!

As a contrast, let’s look at the idea of a “living” Ten Commandments, like we do the “living” US Constitution. People are hungry and poor. Does this mean that we should allow for wanton theft of food, goods and money? Is the dictum against stealing elastic, or is it so necessary to a functioning society that it must be inviolate? I certainly understand that the punishment for taking an apple should be different than robbing a bank, and so does Talmud, from which much of Common Law is derived.

When special interests infiltrate our education and other institutions, over time, and to such a degree, that a substantial part of society has changed its mind on issues, something becomes “the old way” to them. Yet, there are many who cleave to the standard way of doing things. To be conservative, typically means to hold precedent in high regard, be it cultural traditions or law. Conservatism understands that ideas and feelings have developed in humans over long periods of time, that they develop for good reason, and that they are meant to have a bear hug hold on our mind, so as to help keep generations functioning in a similar way, at a similar level, using the same values. This is how societies develop their culture and retain their unique aspects.

However, the Progressivism of the last 100 years has dramatically imposed itself upon our society – mostly for the worse, but at the insistent urging and calculation of those in charge, who have their own purposes in mind. This last idea is conversation worth having.

Many examples can be given of changing standards and lowered expectations, but possibly the best example of bad Progressivism is the idea that change is good, that nothing is sacred and that self-restraint is passé, i.e. “if it feels

good, do it." Acceptance and tolerance can seem like a good idea, especially if we believe in "equality." However, when we "accept" and when we "tolerate" we also lower the standards upon which our society had accepted as valuable. The emphasis on self-esteem has lowered standards to such a degree that the last two generations are acknowledged to be narcissistic. A narcissistic people is very open to Authoritarianism, a very drastic change from our history.

Western Civilization and the US in particular developed faster than other parts of the world precisely because we felt the opposite, that self-restraint and personal responsibility were the cornerstone of personal behavior. This, along with a religiously based moral code, is what allows freedom to prevail. Part of this mindset was the development of the Common Law, i.e. law and judicial rulings based upon common sense and precedent. We have gone to statute to correct perceived wrongs and our society has never been in worse shape.

Correcting yesterday's wrongs, but in the wrong way

The impulse to correct yesterday's real or perceived faults has had dramatic negative consequences. By not staying on the gold standard, we have had run-a-way inflation, necessitating that woman must work, a great societal change. We have gone from holding a woman in high regard to today's wanton date rape. We've gone from very few births out of wedlock, e.g. 5% in 1960 to 44% illegitimate births with about 75% illegitimate amongst Americans of African descent. To achieve equality, we have lowered the standards of the military to allow woman in combat. Woman now serve in the line in fire and police departments.

Changing standards, to promote equality, put men in much greater danger.

However, the greater danger to the lives and limbs of men are,



seemingly, not a part of the Equality Calculation. I would bet that statistics of how women have increased injury to men are not kept, because it would not be politically correct to do so.

Similarly, we take in refugees, a wonderful US trait, despite our leaders knowing full well that terrorists will be amongst them. I ask you to please give me the politically correct calculation: How many saved refugees equals how many hurt or dead Americans because of the havoc from an infiltrated terrorist? Additionally, on certain college campuses, "feelings" based logic of the politically correct crowd, which is not logic at all, have conjured up the notion that certain words are not protected free speech and that you can be punished severely by uttering them, e.g. saying anything other than "Black Lives Matter."

Seemingly, acceptance and tolerance are to be imposed upon the traditionally oriented population. But, those who scream "intolerance" seem able to be hypocritical with impunity. More changing standards.

The idea that new evidence proving innocence should release an imprisoned person is beyond just, it is righteous. However, under normal circumstances, at the time, the criminal knew the price of the crime he was committing, and he went forward in spite of the danger. The harm caused to victims has not remitted, why should the punishment? One of the best ideas of the Founders was that each state should be able to decide its own path. That Colorado has temporarily lost its mind and leads the nation in jumping off a cliff is no reason that the rest of US should follow. Nor is it a reason for holding your position that Arizona or New York should follow Colorado's poor example.

Let us suppose that you purchase a note and that your ROI, Return On Investment, is 18%. Based upon your idea of all having the same standard, you should not seek more than 5%

ROI, or to be in line with the current mortgage rate, because it is not “fair” that you should profit from someone else’s situation. The idea of “fairness” can be very elastic, based upon the political calculation and motivation of any person.

That someone should impose their idea of what is fair onto your situation is another new change. Now, everyone’s opinion is taken into account before you can do with your property what you wish – even though you are the one paying the property taxes, not them. How is it fair for someone to stop you from doing something to your property for your convenience or profit? Are they paying you the difference for your loss of profit or convenience? No! There now seems to be the idea that we all are a “village” and we all have an equal say. Hello Socialism and despotism, goodbye personal responsibility and freedom. More change for the worse.

When skipping a flat stone across water, each skip causes a ripple. In the same way, each change has a consequence, each consequence leads to other consequences. This culminates, slowly, to an entirely new culture and to a new country. See the country that awaits US because of the imposed acceptance of lowered standards: [\[Link\]](#)

In this case, your ideas of right and wrong are not based in the logic of justice, but rather, are based upon feelings of injustice. I know that you can’t help it; I struggle also, for we both come from a tradition which upholds righteousness. It is part of our common and long developed attitudes and traditions. Talmud teaches us that feelings sway, but logic does not alter. We must be careful to not let feelings alter logic.

I welcome your response.

2016 Mitchell Goldstein – All Rights Reserved

---

# Mitchell Goldstein Archive

## 2011 – 2015

- [Clarence Darrow and other Socialists Advocate High Crimes and Misdemeanors](#), Part 2, 5-16-15
- [Clarence Darrow and other Socialists Advocate High Crimes and Misdemeanors](#), Part 1, 5-16-15
- [Property Taxes Create Hardships, Poverty and Foreclosures](#), 4-6-15
- [Cavaet Emptor: \\$200K in worthless tax lien certificates](#), 3-14-14
- [Property Rights; The most important rights we have](#), 11-2-13
- [Ron Paul: Constitutionalist or Racist and Anti-Semite?Â](#) 1-11-12
- [How We Came To Be Where We Are](#), 11-8-11
- [FBI, licensed brokers, bankers, lawyers and mortgage fraud](#), Part 2, 10-22-11Â
- [FBI, licensed brokers, bankers, lawyers and mortgage fraud](#), Part 1, 10-22-11
- [Liberals want to level society by taking away your benefits](#), 10-1-11
- [America is Becoming Israel's Worst Enemy](#), Part 2, 9-6-11
- [America is Becoming Israel's Worst Enemy](#), Part 1, 9-6-11