

Donald Trump and the myth keepers

Pastor Chuck Baldwin's article today did a magnificent job of blasting Hillary Clinton. He made it very clear that Hillary Clinton would be a disaster if she became president.

I agree with everything the good Pastor said about Hillary, but when I got to the end of his article, something was missing. Something very critical was missing. In marketing, we call the missing part the "Call to Action."

As I read his article, I anticipated this would be the first time, to my knowledge, that Pastor Baldwin would advise his followers to vote for the Republican candidate. But that was not to be. He just left his readers hanging.

Do they vote a third-party candidate? Do they not vote at all? Or do they buy Baldwin's book on gun rights, clean their AR-15s, and bunker down for a shootout with the US government?

Pastor Baldwin is not clear.

Donald Trump has two groups of enemies

Trump's first group of enemies are the hard-core Hillary Democrats.

Trump's second group of "enemies" are the Myth Keepers. They are the undecided, tea party Evangelicals who follow the Negative Voting Myth.

Myth Keepers dominate the 5 to 10 percent of voters who will determine who be the president of the United States. So, this is a very, very serious subject.

Do we tell them to NOT vote for Hillary? Or do we tell them to vote FOR Donald Trump?

The difference is whether we see the world as negative or positive.

They believe the Negative Voting Myth

Myth Keepers do a good job of criticizing Hillary. But they won't admit to themselves that they must vote for Donald Trump to help stop Hillary from becoming our next president.

They are mixed up because they follow the Negative Voting Myth:

A vote for the lesser of two evils is still a vote for evil.

They admit Hillary is the "greater evil," but they consider Trump the "lesser evil" because he is not "perfect" enough for them. So, they use their Negative Voting Myth as their excuse to not vote for Donald Trump.

Their Negative Voting Myth is irrational, unethical, and immoral.

History of the Negative Voting Myth

In 1968, Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden led the progressives protest of the Vietnam War. Their protests involved supporting third-party candidates.

They promoted the Negative Voting Myth to get their third-party votes.

They did not realize the Negative Voting Myth does not win elections. It pulls votes from the "lesser evil" and helps elect the "greater evil."

In 1980, progressives abandoned Jimmy Carter because he "was not good enough for them." So, they helped Ronald Reagan beat Carter.

In 2000, progressives decided Al Gore was their "lesser of two evils." So, they gave 3 million votes, or 2.7% of total votes,

to Ralph Nader, United States Green Party “progressive” candidate. They unwittingly helped elect their worst enemy, George W. Bush, as President.

They thought their votes would help elect Ralph Nader even though it was obvious Nader had no chance to win. But like today’s Myth Keepers, the progressives rejected data that contradicted their preconceived beliefs.

Like today’s Myth Keepers, progressives voted their “principles” and their “conscience.” But their Negative Voting Myth caused them to elect the very opposite of their desired goals.

Unless they wake up, these Myth Keepers may do the same thing the progressives did to Al Gore. If they refuse to vote for Donald Trump, they may be responsible for electing Hillary Clinton.

Aristotle’s Positive Voting Principle

Aristotle was a Republican. He denounced the idea that the poor, by force of numbers, had a right to take property from the rich. He opposed the forced redistribution of wealth. Aristotle is the father of the scientific method.

Aristotle proposed the Positive Voting Principle to replace the Negative Voting Myth. Yes, the Negative Voting Myth existed in the days of Aristotle.

Aristotle (320 BC) wrote (as translated by Roger Crisp):

In the case of evil, the reverse is the case, since the lesser evil is counted as a good in comparison with the greater evil; the lesser evil is more worthy of choice than the greater, what is worthy of choice is a good, and what is more worthy of choice is a greater good.

In modern terms, Aristotle’s Positive Voting Principle is:

Our moral duty is to vote to achieve the most possible good,

which eliminates voting for candidates who cannot win, and eliminates mandatory conditions.

Stated simply, the Positive Voting Principle is:

Always vote and act to achieve the greatest possible good.

The Positive Voting Principle does not tell you how to vote. It tells you how to decide how to vote. It tells you about logic and lets you decide your politics.

The Positive Voting Principle works for all political parties and religions. It lets you decide which candidate you think is the greater good. It requires you to not consider third-party candidates who cannot win. It requires you to compare the candidates who can win, and choose the candidate whom you believe will produce the greater good.

Thomas Jefferson wrote "Aristotle, Cicero, Sidney, and Locke" were inspirations for our Constitution.

America's Founding Fathers used the Positive Voting Principle. They voted for the greater good. If each Founding Father rejected what he thought was imperfect, they would not have approved our Constitution.

All major Christian Religions support the Positive Voting Principle

Historically, all moral philosophers and all major Christian religions support the Positive Voting Principle. They all follow the wisdom of Aristotle.

Thomas Aquinas (1260) in his Summa Theologica told us to focus on achieving the possible good rather than upon preventing a lesser evil.

Aquinas wrote our moral duty is to achieve as much good as possible from every situation, including our vote. He says we cannot achieve good by acting on something that is impossible,

like voting for a third-party candidate.

Philosopher Pope John Paul II said we should vote for the “lesser of two evils” if we can help prevent worse evils from occurring.

Church Summary on Positive Voting Principle

- The Catholic Church gives very clear directions that Catholics must vote to achieve the most possible good even if that means voting for the “lesser of two evils”.
- A Baptist minister advises voting for the “lesser of two evils” candidate if this is necessary to achieve the greater good.
- A Methodist minister quoted Apostle Paul wrote, “Don’t be defeated by evil, but defeat evil with good.”
- The Lutheran Church says to vote for the person who will do the better job caring for our earthly needs, even if this person is the “lesser of two evils”.
- The Presbyterian Church says to vote for the candidate who will most consistently meet our personal agenda for the nation, even if this candidate is the “lesser of two evils”.
- An Evangelical minister says to vote for the “lesser of two evils” because a vote for a third-party candidate jeopardizes this nation.
- Calvinist representatives argue we must vote for the lesser of two evils if it is necessary to achieve the greater good.
- The Mormon LDS Church does NOT support the Positive Voting Principle.
- Many far-right Evangelicals and Baptists do NOT support the Positive Voting Principle.

All major Christian churches tell us to vote and to use the Positive Voting Principle:

Our moral duty is to vote to achieve the most possible good, which eliminates voting for candidates who cannot win, and eliminates mandatory conditions.

Only some far-right Evangelicals and Mormons support the Negative Voting Myth.

The Positive Voting Principle forbids Mandatory Conditions. Mandatory conditions are immoral because they can eliminate from consideration the candidate who may be the greater good. Some pastors proudly tell their flock a candidate must meet certain “mandatory” conditions to get their vote. Their mandatory conditions reveal they do not understand morality, logic, or the teachings of all major Christian religions and philosophers.

Don't be a Myth Keeper

Let's explain the Negative Voting Myth this way:

Suppose you get to vote for Candidate A, whose abortion policies will kill 10 million babies, or Candidate B, whose policies will kill 1 million babies. Who will you vote for?

All normal Christians will vote for Candidate B so they can save 9 million babies.

Myth Keepers won't vote for either candidate because they don't care about saving 9 million babies. They care about their “conscience” and “principles.”

Oath Keepers leaders Stewart Rhodes and Pastor Chuck Baldwin, the John Birch Society, tea party Evangelicals, and many tea party groups are Myth Keepers. They promote the Negative Voting Myth. Their myth would kill 9 million babies.

Reject the Negative Voting Myth and reject all groups that promote it.

How to vote right

Before we can make a good decision, we must define the key question.

The Key Question of the 2016 presidential election is:

Will Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton better serve America as President?

A subset of the Key Question is:

Will Donald Trump's 3 to 5 Supreme Court justices better serve America than Hillary Clinton's choice of Supreme Court justices?

The Key Question is NOT:

- Is Donald Trump perfect enough for me?
- Will I violate my principles if I vote for Donald Trump?
- Do I like Donald Trump?

When we choose a President, we should not be concerned about "likes." We should be concerned only about who will do the best job for America.

Conclusion

First, define and answer the key question:

Will Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton better serve America as President?

Second, follow the Positive Voting Principle:

Our moral duty is to vote to achieve the most possible good, which eliminates voting for candidates who cannot win, and eliminates mandatory conditions.

If you agree that Donald Trump will serve America better than Hillary Clinton would, then get out and vote for Donald Trump.

(That's my call to action.)

For a more complete discussion of this subject, please read my NEW book "Choose America."

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved