

Principles Shminciples

What principles?

Whose principles?

Republican principles? Liberal principles? Progressive principles? Conservative principles? Neo-Con principles? Libertarian principles? Personal principles?

Oh... I know... God's principles!

We have a first amendment, kids, and although I live by, and advocate that all live by God's principles, that's not gonna fly in a privatistic, pluralistic, multi-religious and largely non-religious nation with a Constitutional amendment that guarantees this diversity.

We think we get down to basic principles when our side invokes God in its principles and then cites the references to Him in our founding documents.

But for the agnostic, the atheist, the idolator, etc, that's way too easy to dismiss. We have to be smarter than that.

How do we get down to basic American principles without letting those categories above dismiss us so easily?

I have two suggestions... not because we are to be afraid to proclaim God's principles, nor because we've been cowed from standing for them. But because there are some foundational things that we ought to espouse that are inarguable for any, other than those with the *obvious* intent of undermining the nation and its codified principles.

One: Stop voting self-interest and stop teaching others to vote self-interest.

I'm not referring to "enlightened self-interest" and its role in free-market capitalism. I'm talking about the responsibility of the voter on election day, to remember, support and perpetuate the form of government he enjoys, which allows and empowers such enlightened self-interest.

To draw a distinction between pure self interest and enlightened self-interest, we have on the one hand, President Bill Clinton, who said famously, "*It's the economy, stupid.*" , and on the other hand another Democrat president, JFK, who said perhaps more famously, "*Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country.*"

Compare and contrast those two presidential declarations and you'll see that one is an advocacy of pure self-interest, while the other is the enlightened advocacy of a potentially sacrificial attitude for the sake of the country.

President Bill Clinton and his election advisory group appealed to the pocketbook for political gain. Naturally, a healthy economy appeals to every individual who'll likely benefit from it. My kids have to

eat, and eventually go to college. How's that gonna happen if the economy isn't sufficiently healthy to guarantee my livelihood?

I understand. A vote of pure self-interest might support your personal economy's health, but if that vote doesn't also support the health of the nation's economic system upon which your livelihood depends, namely free-market capitalism, then your personal economic security is in fact, endangered.

I actually heard a liberal millennial on a talk show, pushing the idea that seniors should be allowed to give their votes to someone younger who will get “more mileage” out of his/her vote. The premise under that idea is that voting is, and should be purely about self-interest. It should not.

Contrast this with the sacrificial, enlightened self-interest alternative, voting to ensure the preservation of a Constitutional Representative Republic with a healthy free-market capitalist economy, period.

JFK's advocacy of that sacrificial attitude requires a look back at our educational system, *which used to teach civics*: both local and national.

I'll end this section with a personal anecdote that makes the point.

As Public Relations and Communications Chair for the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisor (NAIFA), Greater New Haven chapter, I was in battle with the president of NAIFA over the Tax Relief and Reconciliation Act of 2001.

That act phased out the federal estate tax gradually over ten years, where by 2010 there would be no federal estate tax. But the phase-out had a sunset provision. In 2011, the tax would come roaring back in at 2001 levels.

Republicans in congress were working to override the sunset provision so that the zero federal estate tax rate would remain zero. I supported the override, An obvious win for the American people.

This NAIFA official on the other hand, who made a very, very good living on estate planning (which is nothing more than selling products and services that insulate the client against estate taxes), wanted all NAIFA members in good standing to support the perpetuation of estate taxes. “To Hell with America, I've got a business to run!”

Two: Stop basing policy, law and regulation on purely contemporary phenomena.

The other principle is to *avoid basing the development of policy and law on contemporary phenomena rather than historical, eternal reality.*

This is best explained by citing an exercise I do with couples during premarital counseling. I ask them to think for a few minutes about what their lives would be like, what their relationship would be like, and what their respective roles in the family would be and how they'd raise their children, with just one thing missing from the world... electricity.

He can't work at the factory. She can't stay up nights watching netflix. There's no refrigerator. Food will not come from a super market, but from their own ground or a neighbor's. Children will not be born at

hospital. There will likely be no hospital. The house will be relatively dark except when the sun's up. Water will be procured manually by pump or fetching. Indoor plumbing may or may not exist, likely not, etc, etc, etc.

You see, electricity is a contemporary phenomenon, which could possibly go away. Should we all then live without it? No, of course not, and thank God for it! But when we assume that it will always be there because it has always been there, and then have the shortsightedness to legislate as if it will always be there, we err. It has not, and it may not.

What's the underlying principle here? It's not about electricity (though that's a great example in the world of personal transportation in CT today, is it not?).

It is about making decisions about our future laws and regulations - that will have enforcement mechanisms behind them - on contemporary phenomena and not on historical or even eternal reality.

Current examples of contemporary phenomena informing policy, regulation and law include climate change hysteria, critical race theory, the "public health" narrative and the transgenderism issue.

When making his groundbreaking film, "What is a Woman", Matt Walsh visited the Masai tribe in Africa and presented the idea of transgenderism to them.

Theirs is not an "abundance culture" like ours, but is closer to a "subsistence culture". Not surprisingly, they asked numerous times for clarification of his questions, and ultimately laughed at the blatant ridiculousness of it, lacking the luxury of organizing their society around contemporary phenomena. Their survival is based on and dependent upon, reality.

Or how about allowing the government to control publishing, or our children's access to information and what they are or are not exposed to? How about the government's involvement in the baby formula world... or did you miss that during the plandemic? Mothers can't feed their children without the federal government's oversight and control?

You may not have heard yet, but the disposable diaper world is going down the same federal control road.

Need more?

If we are going to stand on principles, I have no qualms about standing on the principles of God.

But there are things foundational upon which we can stand, without contradicting the principles of God, which will only be opposed by the nation's enemies.

In standing against these foundational principles, they will call themselves out as destroyers of the nation and its Constitution, or as fools, or both.

Likely both, I shouldn't wonder.