



Shenandoah Valley Tea Party Patriots

April 15th Rally

Staunton, Virginia

Following is an excerpt from the new book by Charles Kraut scheduled to appear in September 2010 from Tate Publishing. This material is copyrighted. Please do not make or distribute copies.

The Patriot's Guide to Taking America Back

Chapter Three: Citizens of the World

The impact of the infamous 1948 United Nations

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

For more information or to make comments or corrections please contact the Charles Kraut at ckraut1@comcast.net or through www.wcandp.com.

© Charles W. Kraut, MBA April 2010

Introduction: *Human Rights* versus *Natural Rights*

The Framers of the Constitution, our Founding Fathers, created a miracle. They ordained and established the Constitution of the United States, the finest political document in the history of the world. The constitutional republic established by the Constitution was the culmination of millennia of history distilled into the thinking and the writing of men who many people believe were inspired of God. As George Washington put it:

"[The adoption of the Constitution] will demonstrate as visibly the finger of Providence as any possible event in the course of human affairs can ever designate it."

The centerpiece of the Constitution is man's natural rights. As Jefferson stated in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

The Constitution is man's greatest experiment in freedom. The Framers knew their work was not perfect, which is why they permitted an amendment process. They knew, however, that this government would receive its power from the people, and not the other way around. This government was to be kept in strict control by the people and through a system of checks and balances, so that no one branch of government would usurp power or step out of its constitutional bounds. Only a limited, restricted federal government would enable men to be truly free to pursue happiness.

Note that Jefferson's original thought was to use the word "property" in place of the words "pursuit of happiness". Jefferson clearly understood the importance of property rights.

To put it very simply:

Natural rights are the "I may work to improve my situation as I see fit" rights. If I don't work, I don't eat. I have the right to pursue happiness, not the guarantee of happiness. I have the right to buy, own, and control property free from the threat of arbitrary or illegal search and seizure.

Human rights are "the world owes me a living" rights. I have the right to share in the fruit of your labors because I live on this planet and because you have more than I do, which is unfair. All the earth is the common property of its inhabitants. All must share, and the government is armed and empowered to force us to share.

We need to understand that human rights are *not* an extension of natural rights. If anything, human rights as currently defined *supplant* and *replace* natural rights. The attempt to advance and enforce human rights is an attempt to replace God, for in theory if every man were subject to the human rights found in the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights, suffering, greed, hunger, poverty, illiteracy, and self-determination would vanish from the earth. Or, at least, that is the stated intent. The unintended consequences of the pursuit of human rights must inevitably bring a very different, and very painful outcome.

Most people who claim to be religious believe that this life is a period of trial and testing where we prepare ourselves for a better life in the next phase of existence. Eliminating the negative aspects of mortal life may deprive life of its purpose and meaning.

In the next chapter we will explore this Declaration in more depth, and try to understand the terrible effects it is having on the people of the world today.

Please note that we have not created a firm definition of what freedom is, nor should we expect to do so. Instead, we have placed ourselves in much the same position as the Founding Fathers when they were trying to determine what freedom was and how their definition could become part of the Constitution of the United States. We know what freedom *is not*; it is not the right to be cared for by the state. We're just not entirely sure about what freedom really *is*.

Now let's look at this Declaration, after which we will project current trends and see what this country will look like in the year 2015.

Chapter Three

Citizens of the World

It seems that whenever a nation goes through a period of trial and difficulty, when it emerges its people will re-examine their values. Difficult times can bring discouragement and disillusionment, as well as pain and fear. Often we want to try to ensure that we do not experience such things again. When the hard times come to an end we may have lost the will to struggle, even when we need to rebuild our own lives.

This happened in the United States after the Civil War and, to a lesser extent, after World War I. During the Civil War President Lincoln temporarily removed certain freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights for certain individuals and groups, and even imposed martial law on more than one occasion. All these things established precedents which would be revisited time and again in the years to come. Subsequent abuses of the Constitution would become more flagrant and affect many more people.

The latter part of the 19th century was characterized by massive industrialization, accompanied by the rape of the landscape and the growth of labor unions. No country had effectively dealt with the negative consequences of industrialization, with the rise of slums, the further stratification of society with the super-rich and the downtrodden workers, and the waste and destruction of natural resources and national treasures. The Framers certainly could not have envisioned the overwhelming changes that would come about, or their effect upon the American people and their way of life.

The first two decades of the 20th century witnessed an unprecedented response to industrialization and its effect upon the masses. Unrest, poverty, and unhealthy working conditions prepared the working classes for socialism and communism, both of which were supposed to exalt the worker and amply reward him for his labors. Many in Europe and the United States debated these new philosophies, for we had not yet learned to fear them. In recent years we have forgotten the lessons we learned.

During the 1920s Americans rejoiced at having ended The Great War, and prided themselves on being great, noble, and free. For the moment we rejected the notion of unifying the nations of the world in order to avoid further war and conflict, but we didn't do it for the right reasons. We should have rejected the League of Nations because it violated American sovereignty, and because that organization did not support our concept of natural rights. Instead, the United States did not join the League of Nations primarily because the US had decided not to ratify the Treaty of Versailles. Many Americans preferred the isolationist stance that George Washington had recommended, and which had served us well.

Two decades later, as the world recovered from the Second World War, the people of the world wanted to see if there wasn't some way to make sure that wars would never again be fought. The United Nations was founded in 1945, and the United States Senate ratified the United Nations treaty in July of that year. Between the failure of the League of Nations and the founding of the United Nations many people had changed the way they thought about politics, economics, and rights. Many were ready for a new, more Utopian way of life in which all men would be treated as equals, and have the same opportunity to make of themselves whatever they wished. These were lofty thoughts and high ideals, but their foundation was sinister and very dangerous.

Men and women now created a new "generation" of rights. The first generation consisted of the natural rights which were associated with the Enlightenment and particularly the American Revolution. Natural rights, as we have mentioned previously, include the rights to life and liberty and the rights to freedom of speech and worship, among others.

The second generation of rights, which expanded into the social, cultural, and economic areas, was associated with the problems of unregulated capitalism, and they include the right to work and the right to an education. Now, with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights issued by the United Nations in 1948, the third generation of rights was enthroned. This group of "rights" included the collective rights to political self-determination and economic development.

The United States Congress initially paid little attention to the Declaration. It was not a treaty, and as a declaration it did not require ratification. However, in the 60 years since its creation more and more governments around the world have adopted large chunks of the Declaration into their constitutions and/or utilized the Declaration as guidance in amending their existing legislation.

It didn't take long for Congress to realize that they could greatly expand the power of the federal government by taking advantage of the favorable feelings many Americans had toward the Declaration. They began to use the Declaration as if it superseded and encompassed the Constitution, which it clearly did not.

Here are a couple of examples of human rights as found in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

Article 22

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Even though there is a difference between "social security" as described above and Social Security as we understand it, there can be little doubt that this article flies in the face of our natural rights as described in the Constitution and in the writings of the Founding Fathers.

Article 23

3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

This is another very popular socialist notion, devoid of specific definitions and leaving the door open to individuals making impossible demands upon their government for their maintenance and support.

Article 25

1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

This is a classic definition of a welfare state. The underlying assumption is that all governments suppress their people and treat them as subjects while denying them opportunities for self-improvement. Placing the United Nations' stamp of approval on the document gave tremendous weight to its pronouncements, regardless of how ill-conceived and destructive they were. By the time the Declaration was signed, these ideas had been featured prominently throughout the United States for decades, and Americans were ready

to receive them with open arms.

Human rights were proclaimed as a “higher law”, and the world assumed that government had the responsibility to be our brother’s keeper. For some reason – and it is easy to imagine why – the downside was never disclosed. No one ever mentioned what would happen when people realized they didn’t have to work, and that if they did their efforts were not rewarded. It was a much easier sell to tell people they would be cared for cradle to grave, instead of saying that the middle class would be taxed out of existence and most of the nation would descend into chaos and poverty.

What other doctrine could be so powerful and so persuasive as to move Americans away from their Constitution, their religious faith, their morals, and their integrity? If you don’t carefully think through each of the principles in the Declaration you can come away with the mistaken belief that these are worthy and attainable ideals. In 1948 the world was turned upside down; after the greatest conflict in human history the United States made friends with and generously rebuilt our former enemies, while we renewed our animosity and hatred toward our former ally, the Soviet Union. It was a time when traditional values were under fire, for we were taught that they had failed to prevent that terrible conflict that had just ended.

Perhaps you had an experience similar to mine when you were growing up. I was in public schools in the 1950s and 1960s. I distinctly remember never being taught about the Constitution, and instead being taught about the wonderful United Nations and how the world was going to be united. It was many years later before I realized the significance of those teachings, and only now as I write this that I grasp their full impact.

Of course, back in those days we still waved the flag and honored our veterans. We still talked about duty to God and duty to country. I learned to revere those who had paid the ultimate price so that I might live in freedom. But then the United States seemed to lose its way. Korea was a turning point, an undeclared war with terrible losses on both sides which has yet to be brought to a successful conclusion half a century later. We blundered into Vietnam, fighting a war on behalf of the French when they found the situation untenable. We were the only nation ever to use nuclear weapons on an enemy, and on primarily civilian populations at that. We were told we should feel guilty about having done so regardless of the American lives those weapons probably saved.

The call for human rights found many listening ears. Who didn’t want to abolish poverty, ignorance, sickness, hunger, and fear? Who could stand against the concept that all men deserve to have everything given to them? Who would be foolish enough to argue with those who wanted to give men all that they had sought for throughout human history?

I like to make simple comparison between the effects of the nation governed by means of natural rights than one governed with a more expansive human rights. Following is a rather imperfect progression of events in a world where all the things are equal and unchanged.

Natural Rights

A strong work ethic is one of the founding principles of society, and is advocated by government and all public institutions.



Property rights are fully respected.



The central government is relatively small and weak, and fulfills only those functions necessary to the preservation of the natural rights of its citizens, including defending its citizens both from external aggression and internal subversion.



There are multiple social classes covering the entire economic spectrum. The boundaries between classes are arbitrary and fluid.



Taxes are minimal, and are assessed only as needed to support the essential functions of government.



Governments at all levels encourage and incentivize philanthropy and charitable work to help lift the poor and the needy.



Poverty is diminished by abundant economic opportunity and because all who can labor must do so in order to support themselves and their families.



Economic opportunity increases wealth, and all classes benefit.



The creation of wealth by a few encourages many to follow their example and create wealth for themselves.



The country thrives. Because the government has created and maintained an environment in which any may prosper, dissension and strife are significantly reduced.



The country makes significant economic and technological progress, and its citizens are encouraged to improve themselves and voluntarily serve others.

Human Rights

In order for any government to grant unto its citizens the full spectrum of human rights, the government must ensure that no one will fall through the huge social safety net that must be created.



The government provides cradle-to-grave support for all of its citizens.



Property rights may exist initially, and laws regarding property may remain on the books indefinitely, but the government must have a claim on enough of its citizens' assets in order to guarantee human rights to all.



The central government is strong and large, for it must look into and micro-manage every aspect of life to ensure that there is no suffering, poverty, or want.



The people are divided into two classes; the governing elite and all the rest. Those who are wealthy leave the country as soon as they realize that their government can seize everything they have.



The government taxes those who work, and redistributes the proceeds after funneling the money through massive bureaucracies.



Taxpayers begin to realize that they are not going to be allowed to keep the fruits of their labors, and they either leave the country for greener pastures or abandon their work ethic and allow themselves to be cared for.



With the decline in the number of wealthy in the country, taxes must be increased on all the remainder who are still paying taxes.



As the incentive to work diminishes, citizens begin to grab all they can from government. Government bureaucracies increase in size in order to handle increased numbers of beneficiaries. The government becomes a major employer.



Poverty increases as more and more citizens take advantage of the free ride government is offering.



A crisis develops as tax receipts decline and benefits payouts increase. Government debt grows and becomes permanent.



The quality of education declines for all citizens.

The quality of healthcare declines for all citizens.

The quality and quantity of government services declines for all citizens.



A downward spiral accelerates as cracks appear in this Utopian veneer:

The quality of life plummets as illiteracy rises and the citizens become self-indulgent.

The economy grinds to a halt, for the means of production and distribution have both been taken over by government. Government is never capable of running an economy.

Rationing is everywhere, which brings about unrest and dissent.

Crime increases as frustrated people look for any outlet to vent their anger.

The nation itself may start a war with some hapless country just to shift attention away from ineptitude of its leaders.



Eventually the country goes bankrupt and self-destructs, all in the name of social progress and human rights. The former beneficiaries of the social safety net may rise up and demand their rights.

A recipe for disaster

It is hard to imagine a better or faster way to destroy a nation, a race, or even a species than by implementing the subversive and dangerous doctrines found in this Universal Declaration of Human Rights. All that mankind has accomplished will be wiped out as we apply these high-minded ideals and they take us back to the law of the jungle. When the State has been tasked with maintaining the health and well-being of all of its citizens, those citizens have become subjects and they will soon become slaves.

Based upon this brief discussion, can there be any doubt that “human rights” is simply another name for slavery? If everyone is provided for by government, government becomes the source of all the people have. In order to provide all the people have, the government must steal or extort it from others. This creates an endless demand upon those who continue to work or produce. Ultimately the state must own everything, including the means of production, for the demands made by the people will quickly become greater than government can meet. Government will be forced to tax everything until it owns everything.

Human rights mean the end of law, for it removes the foundation of order every society must possess. Human rights by definition must transcend national boundaries so that all may share equally. It means the end of nations, and the creation of a super-government that will rule with an iron fist in redistributing and squandering the world’s dwindling wealth.

Citizens of the World

The other primary purpose of the United Nations is to unify the nations of the earth, in a political sense if possible, and in an economic sense in any event. For millennia people have migrated from one place to another seeking a better life. Millions have come to America for just that reason, and for the most part they have been made welcome. America has been more than generous to tens of millions of immigrants, and the greatest gift we have given them is the opportunity to make something of themselves, free from the restrictions and bonds that held them down in their former homes.

If the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were to become the law of the land - and clearly all three branches of our federal government act as if it already were - millions more would want to come here. This time, however, they would not be coming to create a better life; they would be coming to be taken care of.

The world would be divided into the "haves" and the "have-nots", and those in the "have-not" nations would do everything they could to get to one of the "have" nations. There would have to be a substantial body of international law to deal with these issues, and in all likelihood those laws would mandate that the "have" nations would share their abundance with the "have-nots". This could be viewed as something of a bribe, with the implicit promise that all those huddled masses would not appear at our doors as long as we pay them off to stay in their own countries. Longer-term, it seems obvious that the trend for the elimination of national and state boundaries would accelerate. After all, if all men fall under the Universal Declaration, what need do we have with national governments when a single world government could be so much more efficient?

Besides, we would need new bureaucracies to ensure that the distribution of natural resources and wealth was balanced and fair. These Iraq receives would have to have powers that span the entire planet, for all men have equal human rights.

Let's leave this fantasy world, which is rapidly approaching, and sum up. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights poses four major threats to the entire human race:

1. The Declaration gives governments a license to steal, for they point to the "higher law" which mandates that all men are equal and must be treated as if they were equals. In order to treat them equally government must eliminate property rights, for all that its citizens own must be available for redistribution to others.
2. The Declaration can only be fully implemented when nations ceased to exist so that all men may be truly equal.
3. The Declaration has tremendous appeal to the vast majority of the human race. Some of us think we are entitled to share in what others make. Some of us want to "get even" for having been born in the Third World. Some people actually believe that we can create a Utopia on earth. Many simply don't care about the philosophy; they just all those benefits without having to earn them.
4. Perhaps the greatest threat may be that the Declaration is *amoral*. If it is universal, it must apply to all. If it applies to all, no person has the authority to judge the conduct of another in moral terms. Human dignity is whatever people say it is, and in order to be given that dignity they must be free to live whatever lifestyle they choose. That lifestyle may include every form of sexual perversion, substance abuse, the right to abortion on demand, homosexuality, and every vice, sin, and negative behavior that will surely destroy any society.

There may even be a fifth threat, and it might be the one that forces the Declaration upon us. It is easy to negatively label anyone foolish enough to speak out against human rights. We used to say that Social Security was the "third rail" of politics; speak against it and your political career dies instantly. How can you speak against "compassion", "caring for the poor and the needy", "providing for the homeless, the widowed, the infirm, the elderly, the

disabled, and the orphans? We are being told that our corporations are corrupt and the rich are greedy. We are told that Americans must be compelled to be generous. After all, if we were generous and compassionate, would there be so much suffering in the world?

It is easy to fall into the trap posed by such questions. When confronted by them it is easy to feel a little guilty. Because most of our taxes are withheld from our paychecks we don't realize the full extent of the involuntary contributions we are already making, nor do we see the immense waste and fraud in the monstrous bureaucracies we are funding.

Americans have always been compassionate and caring people. However, when the government is stealing so much of our hard-earned money, we have little enough left to provide for our own, much less for those who receive the money taken from our pockets.

If we are to save our Constitution, our country, our freedom, our planet, and ourselves, we must find a way to effectively speak out against human rights. This is the war we will fight the rest of our lives, and we have been losing for decades.

I have two suggestions, one of which is detailed in *The Patriot's Guide*:

1. Build a Constitution Party to do all of the things discussed in *The Patriot's Guide*. This Party (and possibly two, a Federalist and an Anti-Federalist Party) will proclaim and defend the Constitution as the only answer to the horrors of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. The Party will run candidates for office who know, understand, and revere the Constitution, and who will begin to reverse our long slide into a welfare state. Millions of Americans will participate in Party activities and increase their understanding of the Constitution. They will send a clear signal to our elected and appointed officials that we will tolerate no further dalliance from the Constitution. They will assert that America will not go "the way of the world", but that we will retain our sovereignty.
2. Establish a foundation that will recruit and train thousands of American volunteers, many of them retirees, to participate in local PTA and school board meetings all over the United States. These people will carry the message of the Constitution and point out the differences between human rights and natural rights. They will encourage and urge each public school in the United States to offer compulsory courses on the Constitution along with specific regular programs such as Constitution Day. The Foundation will search out the best educational programs for the public schools, home schooling, college and university as well as adult and CE classes, and help fund them where necessary.

We cannot sit back and be innocent bystanders in this conflict. Our children and grandchildren will never forgive us if we allow the light of liberty to be snuffed out forever.

Bibliography / Recommended Reading

Books and articles listed with a * are recommended. The number next to the star indicates the order in which they should be read, beginning with the Constitution itself.

In all instances I try to find books written without bias or prejudice in favor of one political philosophy or another. At the same time, this list must include books favorable to the Constitution and to the thinking of the Founding Fathers.

The Constitution

*1. *The U.S. Constitution and Fascinating Facts About It*, Oak Hill Publishing Company, 2009. www.constitutionfacts.com. This is my favorite edition of the Constitution, and I have distributed many copies of it. Is worth the extra money it costs over the "free" versions.

Ackerrman, Bruce, *The Failure of the Founding Fathers: Jefferson, Marshall, and the Rise of Presidential Democracy*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005

* Fineman, Howard, *The 13 American Arguments: Enduring Debates That Define and Inspire Our Country*, Random House, 2008

*3. Hamilton, Alexander, Madison, James, and John Jay, *The Federalist Papers*, Bantam Books, 1982

Jefferson, Thomas, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, University Of North Carolina Press, 1982

Lipsky, Seth, *The Citizen's Constitution: An Annotated Guide*, Basic Books, 2009

*6. McDonald, Forrest, *States' Rights and the Union: Imperium in Imperio, 1776-1876*, University press of Kansas, 2000. It's amazing how little we are taught in history class.

Padover, Saul K., *The Living U.S. Constitution*, Third Revised Edition, Meridian, 1995

*Peters, William, *A More Perfect Union: The Making of the United States Constitution*, Crown Publishers, 1987. An excellent video is available from the National Center for Constitutional Studies.

*2. Skousen, W. Cleon, *The Five Thousand Year Leap: The 28 Ideas That Changed the World*, National Center for Constitutional Studies 1981

Story, Joseph, *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States*, Regnery, 1986

American History

Beeman, Richard, *Plain, Honest Men: The Making of the American Constitution*, Random House, 2009

Davis, David Brion, and Mintz, Steven, *The Boisterous Sea of Liberty: A Documentary History of America from Discovery Through the Civil War*, Oxford University Press, 1998

* Ellis, Joseph J., *Founding Brothers: The Revolutionary Generation*, Vintage Books, 2002. Joseph Ellis is an outstanding author. This is a history book, but its value to me is the insights it provides into the lives of some of the Founding Fathers.

* Ellis, Joseph J., *His Excellency George Washington*, Alfred A. Knopf, 2004

*4. McCullough, David, *1776*, Simon & Schuster, 2005. This is an absolutely wonderful book, particularly in the more recent edition which has pockets containing replicas of various documents from the period of 1776.

McDonald, Forrest, *A Constitutional History of the United States*, Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1986

*5. Simon, James F., *What Kind of Nation: Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, and the Epic Struggle to Create a United States*, Simon & Schuster, 2002. Jefferson and Marshall fought tooth and nail over the power of the US Supreme Court; this book details how Jefferson lost every battle.

Ferling, John, *Adams vs. Jefferson: The Tumultuous Election of 1800*, Oxford University Press, 2004

Larson, Edward J., *A Magnificent Catastrophe: The Tumultuous Election of 1800, America's First Presidential Campaign*, Free Press, 2007

Schweikart, Larry, and Allen, Michael, *A Patriot's History of the United States: From Columbus's Great Discovery to the War on Terror*, Sentinel, 2004

Sloan, Cliff and McKean, David, *The Great Decision: Jefferson, Adams, Marshall, and the Battle for the Supreme Court*, Public Affairs, 2009

Economics

*Booker, Christopher, *The Real Global Warming Disaster: Is the obsession with 'climate change' turning out to be the most costly scientific blunder in history?*, Continuum, 2009

* Klein, Naomi, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, Picador, 2007. This book is a real eye-opener: I wish that everything Naomi Klein says about Milton Friedman and the effect of his teachings was wrong. This is one "economics" book you shouldn't shy away from; you will find a lot more readable and a lot more interesting than you might think.

"Problem" books

These are books that state the problems America faces because we have departed from the Constitution. Most of them offer very little in the way of practical solutions.

Bloom, Allan, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students*, Simon and Schuster, 1987

* Bork, Robert H., *Slouching Towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline*, Reagan Books, HarperCollins, 1996

Flynn, Daniel J., *Why the Left hates America: Exposing the Lies That Have Obscured Our Nation's Greatness*, Forum, Prima Publishing, 2002

* Gross, Martin L., *National Suicide: How Washington is Destroying the American Dream from A to Z*, Berkley Books, 2009. This is intended to be a "quick read".

Kick, Russ, editor, *You Are Being Lied To: the Disinformation Guide to Media Distortion, Historical Whitewashes and Cultural Myths*, The Disinformation Company Ltd., 2001. I don't like reading books like this, particularly when they offer no solutions. This oversized volume is not designed to be a "solution" book. It is an extensive discussion of numerous events in recent American history.

* Levin, Mark, *Liberty and Tyranny: A Conservative Manifesto*, Threshold Editions, 2009. This book is meant to be a "quick read".

Ponnuru, Ramesh, *The Party of Death: The Democrats, the Media, the Courts, and the Disregard for Human Life*, Regnery Publishing, 2006

Schweizer, Peter, *Architects of Ruin: How Big Government Liberals Wrecked the Global Economy – and how they will do it again if no one stops them*, HarperCollins, 2009

* Wiggan, Addison, and Bonner, Bill, *Empire of Debt: the Rise of an Epic Financial Crisis*, John Wiley & Sons, 2006. I recommend this book because it gives you some idea of how aggressive America has been in the past hundred and 50 years, and the price that all of us are now paying to sustain the "Empire of debt" that remains.

* Wiggan, Addison, and Incontrera, Kate, *I.O.U.S.A.: One Nation. Under Stress. In Debt*, John Wiley & Sons, 2008. A DVD version of this book is available.

* Wolf, Naomi, *The End of America: Letter of Warning to a Young Patriot*, Chelsea Green Publishing, 2007

"Solution" Books

Brookhiser, Richard, *What Would the Founders Do? (Our Questions / Their Answers)*, Basic Books, 2006

Conservatism

Edwards, Mickey, *Reclaiming Conservatism: How a Great American Political Movement Got Lost – and How It Can Find Its Way Back*, Oxford University Press, 2008

Democracy

Rahe, Paul A., *Soft Despotism, Democracy's Drift: Montesquieu, Rousseau, Tocqueville, and the Modern Prospect*, Yale University Press, 2009

De Tocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America*, Alfred A. Knopf, 1980 This is an important classic - and you'll be surprised to find that some of the things de Tocqueville is famous for saying were never said by him.

Liberty

*7. Bastiat, Frederic, *The Law*, The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., 1968. This is a classic on free markets and natural law. It is a small but very important book.

Political Correctness

Woods, Thomas E., Jr., *33 Questions about American History You're Not Supposed to Ask*, Crown Forum, 2007

Socialism and Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR)

Folsom, Burton, Jr., *New Deal or Raw Deal: How FDR's Economic Legacy has Damaged America*, Threshold Editions, 2008

Libertarian books

Libertarian books are different than books advocating a return to the Constitution. Libertarianism is in the often uncomfortable position of advocating for victimless crimes,

which are deemed to include homosexuality, abortion, alcoholism, and drug abuse. The idea is that you can do whatever you want to yourself as long as it harms no one but yourself. This stand leaves Libertarians without an adequate moral foundation. I believe the Founding Fathers would have unanimously disapproved of Libertarianism. Even Congressman Ron Paul disagrees with the Party's stand on abortion.

* Paul, Ron, *The Revolution; A Manifesto*, Grand Central Publishing, 2008

Other Books Worth Reading

Diamond, Jared, *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*, Viking, 2005

Alinsky, Saul, *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals*, Vintage Books, 1989. This is the handbook used by Communists, Socialists, Democrats, liberals, leftists, and revolutionaries, including many in the American government today: why shouldn't we apply some of the same tactics, as long as they are not illegal, immoral, or unethical?