

Chapter One - Not just a culture war

“On the whole, humans want to be good, but not too good, and not quite all the time.”—George Orwell

The American dilemma

We're in grave danger. We're in danger of losing the work ethic, productivity and innovation that has made America the greatest nation the world has ever witnessed. We're making excuses for sloth and criminality. We're accepting substandard effort, substandard goods and services, and a declining standard of living. We tax and regulate almost every form of innovation. We allow our government to serve us poorly. We punish risk-takers, visionaries and people who try to live within their means, while we reward criminals, politicians and idiots who don't plan their lives or take responsibility for their actions.

If you were a screw-off in high school and never bothered to learn a trade or attend college, why is it the responsibility of American government and American society to make it right for you? If you didn't save money for your retirement and instead spent it on good times, why should the people who scrimped and saved their entire lives be taxed so that you're provided a safety net? If you didn't plan for your kids' college tuition, why do you deserve a handout? Quite frankly it doesn't matter if your papa was mean to you or your mommy ignored you. At some point, you're an adult and you're responsible for yourself. Many successful immigrants from current and past generations had survived horrendous circumstances, arrived with nothing more than a bag of clothes and still managed to become successful, contributing members of American society and its economy. It's not the 'system' that's got you down, it's you, and only you, that's responsible for yourself.

Does this extend to the handicapped, the mentally ill or those with any form of mental or physical challenges? Absolutely not. And, in fact, our handling of the mentally ill and the physically challenged in America is despicable. Because they don't form a powerful political constituency, because they are less able to organize and apply pressure, these two groups are pushed into the margins, and

left to scabble for the scraps left by better organized, better financed entities representing allegedly aggrieved parties who can better apply unrelenting political pressure.

We as a people are unfailingly generous. Americans have always provided a helping hand to fellow citizens displaced by economic disruptions or natural disasters through charities, faith-based and fraternal organizations, and direct government assistance. In general, that help has been instantaneous and substantial - better than anywhere else in the world. And Americans continue to help, even when there's significant fraud, waste and mismanagement. But if the beneficiary of that generosity is still on the dole 5 years after the fact, perhaps some soul-searching is in order.

America is descending into a pit of self-absorbed, self-centered impotence that compromises our sensibilities, renders us helpless and demolishes what's left of our national prestige. We're becoming a nation of panhandlers, hustlers and whiners, expecting someone else to bail us out each time we stub our individual or collective toes. There is no personal responsibility for anything. We're being told that it's okay, even stylish, not to have any sense of obligation to make our marriages work, how our kids turn out or whether we're a pain in the neck to others. We've lost the capacity to be ashamed of sticking our hand out or blaming someone else for problems of our own making.

Not politics but personality

America, the land of rugged individualism and the pioneer spirit has turned into America the land of pork, patronage and power brokering. Professional victims of every stripe clamor for recognition, contrition from their alleged oppressors and, of course, monetary compensation or worse - government intervention.

Media pundits have divided our country into red states and blue states. Politicians define themselves and their constituents as Democrats, Republicans, Libertarians, Greens or some other ideology. Social commentators characterize Americans as liberals, conservatives or 'mainstream' - whatever that means anymore. Activists identify victims and their oppressors by race, creed, gender, and on and on.

Hundreds of special interest groups pull our legislation and public policy in different directions, each angling for its own station at the public trough.

America finds itself deeply divided by political ideology, or so one would think, given all the bad information that bombards us daily. Maybe it isn't ideology at all. Maybe, Americans are divided by something else, instead - their core personality. How you live your life, what you think is important and how you treat others is a good indication of what kind of person you are. Living in a civilized society is a matter of give and take. Some of us find fulfillment in giving on a variety of levels. Others find it more convenient or profitable to be on the taking side. Liberals take it upon themselves to promote the distribution of wealth through largely ineffective programs that all too often benefit the undeserving.

Producer vs. parasite

All of those different groups may just boil down to two - producers and parasites. Some people are full-time producers, contributing much and taking little, if anything, for themselves. Think of volunteers contributing their time or someone who saves their discretionary income and contributes it to charity. Others are full-time parasites, constantly engaged in the process of extracting as much as they can for as little effort as possible. Many of us exhibit traits of both, but usually lean much more to one side than the other. In other words, you're mostly a producer or mostly a parasite - nobody's perfect.

This book explores the thesis that these two sides to our behavior are being affected by politicians, our government, the media/entertainment cabal and other forces of induced societal change - and not for the better. It's wrecking our culture, the economy, our standing in the world and our collective future.

Producers work, contribute, volunteer, pay taxes, obey the law and live within their means as best they can. Parasites live off the producers, constantly clamoring for more. It's parasites that form many of the special interest groups, either to protect the gravy train they already enjoy, or to open up a new spot at

the public trough. And, our government is perfectly happy to give it to them in exchange for votes and political power.

Producers create wealth, a better life for themselves and their dependents, and a more stable society, while parasites divert wealth created by others, live off the efforts of producers, create more parasites and destroy our way of life.

Who is a producer?

Anyone who contributes something of value to the economy, to society and to the planet is a producer. It doesn't have to be monetary. A Red Cross volunteer is a producer. A parent that stays home to raise well-adjusted, well-mannered kids is a producer. Those who enlist in our armed forces are producers. A group of outdoor enthusiasts engaged in habitat restoration, as well. A popular writer that encourages our kids to read. It goes without saying that someone with a good idea and the energy to grow it into a successful business which in turn creates jobs and wealth is a producer.

Being a producer is a state of mind, not necessarily an economic designation. A producer gives more than he or she takes, shares their good fortune with others and gives back more than they've been given. A producer leaves behind a better world.

Not everyone is destined to be a rocket scientist, a Supreme Court justice or a Nobel laureate. That doesn't mean that their work output is meaningless. Anyone who works productively, honestly and consistently contributes to society on many different levels. There is dignity in work - any kind of work. The individual demonstrates that he or she is participating in society and the economy, contributing to the overall good, even if they're just making themselves self-sufficient.

Producers created the American phenomenon. Risk-takers, explorers, visionaries, inventors, crackpots, workaholics, day laborers and yes, capitalists, are some of the many different kinds of producers that made America. They defined the optimistic, goal-oriented, self-reliant personality of an entire nation. They

understood that they had a shot, a level chance, at the brass ring and it represented a better opportunity than anywhere else in the world, at any time in history.

Who is a parasite?

Anyone who diverts the wealth or efforts of others to their own gain, with no legitimate effort to better society or contributing anything of value is a parasite. A malingeringer who makes phony disability claims. A drug dealer. A moneylender who exploits the poor. A bureaucrat that diverts tax money into a crony's coffers. Organized crime in its many forms. A charity that keeps a majority of the funds it collects and offers little to those it purports to serve. The examples are plentiful.

Being a parasite is a state of mind - a sense of entitlement; a lack of concern for the well-being of others, and distaste for honest work. Parasites are everywhere - in private industry, the government, in trailer parks and penthouses, in the suburbs and the city core. It's not necessarily who they are or what they do. It's their attitude toward life and the opportunities they waste that defines them.

Parasites want a sure thing - as much as they can get for as little work as possible. Tragically, many of them are willing to settle for a lot less doing nothing than they could get if they worked for it. Some are resigned to being wards of the state, where their entire lives are a humdrum existence of public assistance, public housing and public health care - and there is nothing, absolutely nothing, to look forward to. But, some are comfortable with this tradeoff because it takes no effort at all.

Others are a little more enterprising. They gravitate to professions, situations and relationships where someone else pays the freight, leaving them with little responsibility, low effort and certainly low risk. A significant number are able to do extraordinarily well, at least financially. Others just bump along in life, taking whatever handouts come their way. Those who behave badly expect a government handout, not swift and sure justice.

A parasite is intellectually dishonest. They have to be in order to justify what they're doing to themselves, their family and friends, and society as a whole. There is no simple good or bad, right or wrong. There are only shades of gray, nuanced by excuses, analogies or outright lies. Parasites prefer the moral ambivalence and fluid positioning of situational ethics - whether something is wrong or right in the context of its immediate expediency. That's a fancy way of saying "whatever you can get away with at the time", and the resulting consequences are just swept under the rug.

President Bill Clinton epitomized this kind of thinking with his casual dismissal of consequences when scandals rocked the office of the President. After every major scandal, he was ready to 'move on' even before the investigations started. The leftist smear organization moveon.org co-opted this catchy phrase as an homage to Clinton, as he was able to slip past his critics and accusers at every turn and 'move on' with no personal consequences whatsoever.

Parasites are destroying the American phenomenon. With every new social program, entitlement or corporate handout come corresponding takeaways in our basic freedoms and economic opportunities. It's not just money and personal liberty. With every new low in antisocial behavior that's sensationalized in the news and entertainment media, a whole host of copycats emerge and our collective sensibilities are degraded yet again. The so-called activists and race-baiters continue to exploit differences in ethnicity and socio-economic standing that are unintentional by-products of a free society like America's, even when tremendous progress has been made.

It should also be pointed out that parasites do follow their own peculiar code of conduct. They cut fellow parasites a lot of slack - a form of professional courtesy. A left-wing activist will never question the motives of a TV news reporter, who will never question the motives of a rabble-rouser that never informs on fellow rabble-rousers to that reporter, who would never broadcast it anyway. But never, ever, do they give the producers an even break.

Are you a producer?

Producers enjoy an abundance mentality. They perceive that the only limitations placed on them are imagination and energy. There's a world full of possibilities, there's room at the top and there's always room for one more. From their life perspective, there's money and time - money for charities, friends and family. Time is abundant for family, volunteering and engaging with their community. They're not afraid to work hard, take risks and enjoy their rewards. This is the very heart of the American Dream. And it's only possible in America.

Being a producer isn't classified by job, social position or education. It's more about attitude and how you live your life. Lend someone a helping hand, and you're a producer. Make someone's life a little bit brighter, and you've accomplished something positive. Producers share their abundance with family, friends and those in need. It's a fact that Americans are the most generous of givers on many levels. Our charitable organizations are the largest in the world. We've helped every nation in the world at one time or another with money, goods, volunteers and military support. And usually, we're insulted instead of thanked. Yet, America continues to help, to forgive loans, to provide foreign aid - even to countries that are openly hostile.

Don't jump to conclusions about who's a producer and who's a parasite just by what they do for a living. An attorney can be either, depending on how he or she conducts their affairs. A class action lawsuit can benefit hundreds if not thousands of claimants who otherwise couldn't afford their day in court. Unfortunately, their compensation can shrivel to a meaningless figure when law firms take a huge sum that's way out of line for the work they actually performed - a purely parasitic move.

An entertainer, a politician or a plumber can be a producer. Even a used car salesman can be a producer. If you approach life from the perspective that it's up to you and only you to make something of yourself, you're probably a producer. If you grasp the concept that in helping others you ultimately help yourself, you're probably a producer. And, it goes without saying that generosity in every form is its own reward.

Producers understand that personal effort is the key to success, and that anything worth having is worth working for. That includes relationships. Want to have a good marriage? Work at it. Very few of us are fabulous enough to have someone else do all the hard work in a relationship and keep it viable. And, even if we were absolutely fabulous, is that really fair to the other person?

As a producer, you also have to understand risk. This is a foreign concept to parasites everywhere - the idea that you could work really hard or put up a bunch of money or lend your name to something that could fail. Producers accept that not everything can work out to their advantage, and that setbacks are no reason to cry foul, make excuses or look for a handout. Instead, they redouble their efforts and move ahead. Life is too short to wallow in self-pity.

Parasites want a sure thing at no risk and no effort on their part. They calculate risk and reward differently from producers - it's more of a social or political calculation such as "how much can I get for as little effort as possible at no risk to me whatsoever?" In the producer's case, it's "if I put in this much effort and everything works out, I could get so much..." These are diametrically opposed attitudes to everything that faces us in life. And it creates the natural friction between producers and parasites.

Some producers are even forgiving of parasites. They are generous enough to realize that they will be taken advantage of, that there will be persons who'll try to take away or take credit for their achievements. This is in sharp contrast to parasites who are denied a feeding - riots, mayhem and murder have resulted when the spigot is turned off. Think about all the howling and hand-wringing that occurs when a cut in entitlements is proposed or some guidelines are made stricter.

And lastly, if your first impulse is to be courteous, or when you're in an unfamiliar setting, you're respectful of others, or if you give someone the benefit of a doubt at first meeting them, you're likely a producer. For some reason, producers as a whole are a trusting bunch. It may be a projection - because they internally strive to be ethical, they assume that until proven otherwise, everyone

they meet is ethical as well. This could explain how producers are consistently victimized by parasites.

Are you a parasite?

Parasites and their apologists suffer from a scarcity mentality - or, they play the scarcity game to their own advantage. From their perspective, there's never enough to go around, and only more money, more resources, more taxes, more of everything will solve problems - not hard work, not clear thinking nor firm goals. They feel justified in taking from those who are productive without contributing anything on their own.

Parasites range from the purely criminal to the plainly clueless. Obviously, those who prey on others, whether they're con artists, burglars or stock manipulators, are parasites. But so are those who are completely ineffectual, relying on everyone around them to carry their load, do their thinking for them, and pay their way.

Parasites of every stripe are street savvy. After all, their 'job' is to get as much as possible with the least effort. And, parasites have their champions and enablers - apologists for their behavior. Their champions characterize them as victims or somehow disadvantaged, even if they're already better off than some producers, or enjoy a worry-free existence through no effort of their own. These champions and enablers populate universities, liberal think tanks, the mainstream media and almost all Democratic politicians. The liberal left is consumed with transgression, injury and reparation.

There are only victims and oppressors, as far as parasites are concerned. And the 'victims' need to be richly rewarded for their alleged suffering. This may require some real creativity and legal wrangling because in America true suffering is hard to come by. Therefore, in the absence of starvation, widespread disease, unacceptable mortality or intolerable living conditions, parasites must reach for 'hurtful' or 'disrespectful' to gain a shred of empathy from their fellow Americans.

The real victims

This is an insult to real victims of violent crime, abuse, neglect, fraud and disenfranchisement, which unfortunately occurs all too often in America. Victims of violent crime seem to have fewer rights and recourse than the criminal parasites that attacked them. Americans who've been abused, neglected or defrauded must simply take it, while those who exploited them are under no obligation to make reparations. Real victims abound, but they are individuals, not a class or easily identified group. This is an important distinction.

For example, mugging victims rarely organize and protest for safer streets and parks, simply because they are all from different walks of life - other than a mugging, they don't have anything in common. Same is true with identity theft, carjacking and other 'random' crimes. It's very difficult to organize when there is no common ground. It's nearly impossible to get political or bureaucratic action on behalf of such an undefined group. That's why identity theft, which affects a broad swath of Americans, is running rampant while piracy of Hollywood movies, produced by a handful of studios, is being addressed by the FBI - even though identity theft involves much more money and injury.

The Hollywood studios are very much alike, very well organized and very motivated to solve their particular problem. Although these are multibillion dollar organizations with extraordinarily well-compensated executives, they have managed to portray themselves as victims, as indeed they are. But it's tough to get sympathy from the American public or politicians when they're literally wallowing in money. So, they form a non-profit organization to represent them, hire lobbyists and lawyers, and then cut through bureaucratic inertia. They get their problem addressed by applying pressure in the right places. This is in contrast to a diffuse and largely silent group of average Americans who may complain individually. It's the power of the group with common traits that makes a difference - something the founding fathers had anticipated when they drafted the Federalist Papers No. 10 and 51.

Victim voodoo

Let's say you're part of an ethnic group that can claim injury or insult at some time in the past. The chances of a favorable outcome are quite good if the entire group decides to seek compensation or reparation. In this instance, the victims have much in common - their ethnicity and other factors such as proximity, economic condition and educational status. And, even though only a fraction of the group was actually injured or insulted and it happened 70 years ago, all can now claim harm, just by being members of the group. Unlike mugging victims, the only thing they don't have in common is the injury or insult. Because members of that group wish to be easily identified and because as an organized force they can apply political pressure, they will likely prevail. That compensation check won't go to anyone outside the group, because the group clearly establishes who is and who is not a member, and therefore, eligible for free money, special privileges, exclusionary practices and so on.

Please note that most members of the group have never been injured in any way and yet benefit from the suffering of the few. These are the dynamics of victim politics in America. Parasites pile on with the real victims. The real victims don't object because without the parasites, they don't stand a chance of winning anything. Victims that can't organize, that are incapable of bulking up their numbers, are squeezed out.

Given the lack of true suffering on the part of many professional parasites, new issues need to be invented along with the perception of suffering. Parasites and their champions have long harped about universal health care, and the media cabal successfully whipped it into a huge and long-running social issue. Never mind that anyone on public assistance can just walk into a free clinic or any emergency room in the country and receive free care, oft-times better and more sustained than the 'managed' healthcare with which white-collar Americans are saddled. Or, that those below a certain income level are immediately provided free or nearly free medical care. In the hysterical drum-beating for universal care, the media carefully omitted the fact that in 2006, the government already paid more than 50% of all healthcare costs for the entire nation, covering poor American citizens, indigent visa holders and illegal aliens.

Defining need

Politicians, bureaucrats and the media cabal are interested in helping the needy among us without critically distinguishing what constitutes need from what's driven by greed, that is, something for nothing. For example, how does one define need with respect to health insurance? Many working Americans say they can't afford health insurance. Sometimes, they're caught on-camera standing in front of their shiny new pickup truck when they complain about the high cost of health insurance. It's a bit like a guy complaining about the price of gas while he's filling up his Mercedes S-class sedan.

Does free health insurance become a 'right' before or after someone has spent a third of their paycheck on a weekend drinking binge? What really constitutes affordability - should it be more or less than the monthly lease payments on a fully-loaded Ford F-150? If a dooper cuts back just a little bit on his or her habit, they could easily afford to buy private health insurance, as much as the guy with a drinking or gambling problem. Even a 24 year-old single that spends \$5 a day at Starbucks can divert that \$150 monthly total to pay the monthly premium for high quality private insurance (in 2008 dollars). Of course, everyone would like health insurance if it's free, and any amount that cuts into someone's lifestyle is too much. That's just human nature. We'd all like to get something for free.

The government isn't about to develop any precise method of determining who really can't pay for health insurance and who can truly afford it if they just cut back on some discretionary spending. The government will overspend and overcompensate just to make sure that most of the need is addressed. After all, it's not their money that's being wasted. It's yours. And that's the problem that many parasites exploit. As far as they're concerned, there's tons of free money being given away. Does it really matter if they step in to snare a piece of the take?

This has become a way of doing business, even for Big Business. Large for-profit corporations actively pursue handouts from the government, whether in the form of subsidies, tax exemptions, financing or shirking their contracted

responsibilities to their own retirees. Lobbyists carve dollars out of government budgets for their corporate customers. The mantra is “Heck, everyone else is doing it. Why shouldn't we belly up to the bar and get our fair share?”

Multiply this many thousands of times across the vast landscape of federal or state handouts and one begins to appreciate the magnitude of the problem - a nation in the process of ransacking itself.

The power of pork

And politicians, looking to gain power, will promise just about anything to anyone for a vote. Hillary Clinton famously offered \$5,000 for every newborn as part of her giveaway strategy during her 2008 presidential campaign. A rough calculation set the cost of this trifle at more than \$100 billion. Asked how the government could possibly afford this, Ms. Clinton backed away from the statement a week later. But it serves to underscore the wholesale giveaway of tax dollars for votes that has created and expanded a parasitic mentality which pervades our country.

If you're handed a setback or the goals have been re-prioritized, or there's been a change of plan, do you give up? Do you sit back and let everyone else shoulder the load? Do you make excuses for those who've decided to sit back and let others do the hard work? Unfortunately, this characterizes way too many Americans. Some of it is deliberate and planned on the part of individuals intentionally gaming the system. Lots of it is poor parenting and inadequate education coupled with low self-image. And much of it is the work of the news/entertainment cabal which inculcates the notion that working hard, being loyal to family and friends, sticking up for America and being self-reliant is a sucker's game.

Who exactly is a liberal?

The term 'liberal' would seem to imply that someone is socially progressive, ambivalent about authority and skeptical of religion, patriotism and personality

cults, and tolerant of diverse points of view. In fact, that was a fairly accurate description in the middle of the 20th century.

The 'liberal' of the early 1960s was distrustful of government and 'The Establishment', railed against censorship, decried conservative moral values, reached across class and racial barriers, and adopted a 'if it feels good, do it' mentality. The only part of this vintage 'liberal' ideology that remains is the 'feel-good' aspect. Well, maybe the marching and chanting, too. Okay, probably some dope-smoking to round it all out.

Today's 'liberal' is anything but. The liberal label was co-opted by a fierce ideology that quashes dissent and discourse, imposes its narrow vision on others and attacks anyone with a different point of view.

Today's 'liberals' are out and out socialist fascists, committing to forcing a huge, intrusive government into our daily lives, freezing America's uniquely mobile social structure, quelling any resistance and controlling our every thought and emotion. They invoke class warfare because they believe in social classes -- so long as they are in the ruling class. They have done so by cloaking socialism in the guise of fighting for the rights of the average American.

How many times has a left-leaning political candidate shouted they're going to fight for you and your rights? Fight what, fight whom? Is there another civil war raging in America we don't know about? Where exactly is this fight going to happen and who's invited? What will they serve at the afterglow? Will someone bring dope to the candlelight vigil? What to wear?

Liberals are angry pretty much full-time. While it's not clear exactly why, it would seem that they're engaged in sympathetic suffering with every human being that's ever been exploited, abused or denied their rights - except of course those people whom the liberals exploit, abuse or whose rights they deny in their mad dash to create a dreary and hostile utopia. It must be exhausting to carry that big of a chip on one's shoulder all that time.

They are frightfully committed to creating a society that's 'fair' to anyone with a gripe or an axe to grind, but that somehow tramples everyone else. Their moves

are played out every day on network news - the usual 'separation' of church and state dramas, handing out condoms to 12 year-olds, the banning of Halloween and Christmas in public schools but still displaying Islamic symbols during Ramadan, suspending 7 year-old boys for drawing stick figures with guns, granting native Americans unrestricted hunting and fishing privileges so they can over-exploit natural resources, allowing sexual predators to roam the landscape. These and hundreds of similar issues are what keep liberals occupied and fermenting.

Liberals do volunteer their time. In fact, to hear them talk, they put in more time than conservatives by a big margin. But when they do, they mostly volunteer for causes, not their communities or local charities, because volunteering for a cause means you don't have to show any progress. You can just stand around and complain, maybe do a little marching and wave some signs. If you pick a really big cause, like genocide in Africa or global warming, you really don't have to do much because after all, what can one person do when confronted with problems of such magnitude? Maybe buy a ticket to a concert and watch another liberal sing about the problem and blame someone who had nothing to do with creating it in the first place.

When you actually volunteer to help your community, a charity or the environment, you yourself personally (not your stylist or bodyguard) have served "x" number of meals to the homeless, built a retaining berm for a wetland with your own hands, donated blood, or donned that clown costume to entertain sick children and so on. But that won't do for most liberals. It's just not 'big' enough. It didn't right any great social wrongs. Somehow, one can't imagine Sean Penn going door to door for Meals on Wheels. In the minds of most liberals, that's more appropriate for some white, middle-aged, Midwestern hick (presumably a conservative hick) in Champaign-Urbana or St. Louis.

An interesting characteristic of liberals is their uniformity of thought. Maybe interesting is a poor choice of words - scary would be more appropriate. Because they've pounded themselves into an ironclad orthodoxy of speech and thought, they all sound remarkably alike. There's not a lot of variation in their views,

books, articles, chants, insults and protest signage. Liberals are differentiated only by the level of aggressiveness they exhibit towards those with whom they disagree. When facts are not part of the original discourse, just opinions, the argument can never expand as new facts come into play. It all begins to sound like the same dreary story over and over which is why Air America failed so miserably.

Conversation with a liberal is like turning on a pre-recorded barrage of drivel. Once the 'play' button is touched, it hardly matters what the other person has to say. It's sad, really. Sometimes, you can see the look of alarm in their eyes as their mouth goes off, spewing a pre-emptive barrage of liberal goop, trying to get it all out before the opposing speaker can say something sensible, their voices getting louder and shriller as they run out of things to say.

This is frightening stuff. Psy-ops 'programmers' describe how brainwashed prisoners rattle off the propaganda that's been drummed into their heads. They can't control what's coming out of their mouths. Their lips and jaws are moving, but their eyes are begging for help. Some of them will put their hands over or in their mouths, trying to stop the chatter, but can't. It's a horrible thing to see. We are sentient beings gifted with speech. Yet, the power of speech can be turned back against us, reprogramming our brain against our will.

Occasionally, you'll get a smart liberal who'll look at you sadly, shake his/her head knowingly and sigh, because their weighty mission of enlightening the stupid (that would be conservatives) is an endless, thankless task they've nobly shouldered for the betterment of all humanity. And then, in a condescending monotone, they begin their toxic spiel, telling you just how completely out of touch and unsophisticated you are in believing that hard work, a good education and a positive attitude will get you a piece of the American Dream.

They'll talk about scarcity, inequity, oppression and abridgement of personal freedoms that you perpetuate by just obeying the law, going to work, showing up at your place of worship and trying to live within your means. Yes, you are the reason that millions are forced to make do with free food, housing, clothing,

education, entertainment and medical care, and it is your downright stinginess that is preventing them from having an even better life. If you weren't such a right-wing thug and bigot, millions more would have their day in the sun without actually having to work for it. Huh?

That's right. Liberals firmly believe that you, the taxpayer, can never, ever give enough to those who need it, namely the parasites. All of society's problems can be solved if only you could be forced to give up every penny you've ever earned and let bureaucrats and politicians determine who is truly worthy to get your hard-earned money. But, it won't be you.

Annoy a liberal - work hard and be happy

Who is a conservative?

The term 'conservative' surely wasn't picked out by the conservatives. In fact, the 'conservative' of 2008 was considered Joe Average, Mr. Mainstream, in 1980. Somehow, just staying married, going to church occasionally and holding down a steady job suddenly moved Joe to the right of center.

Was it because so many of Joe's peers thought it was okay to get a divorce, father illegitimate children, slack off at work and just generally screw off, or was there something else in play? Joe and his peers are still around - there's just not that many of them anymore. They've been outnumbered by the progeny of liberals, where 'family' is undefined, as are concepts such as 'morality' and 'personal responsibility'. By the very early 21st century, a psychographic shift had slowly pushed what was once the mainstream of 20th century America toward the right. Way right. Psychographics attempt to define what people think about, in contrast to demographics, which measure income, age and location, among other things.

One wonders who actually occupied that 'vast right wing' before Joe and his friends were shoved into it. Other than some gung-ho types, the right wing must have been a lonely place for quite a long time.

Unlike the intellectual lockstep of most liberals, where the only differentiation seems to be the depth of their hatred for America and all things American, conservatives seem to be more of a mixed bag. There are social conservatives, fiscal conservatives, religious conservatives, and then a mix- and-match of all three. Some Libertarians fit in here, as well, if only because they oppose a large central government.

A social conservative believes in family, an orderly society, and clearly established rules of conduct. Social conservatives believe in right and wrong, personal responsibility and justice equally applied. Further, they believe that criminals must be punished before rehabilitation, pornography is best kept away from children, violence against women or kids is a bad thing, and sex education is a parental responsibility. Some believe in the neutral participation of faith-based organization in the public sphere, others do not. Some are deeply religious but keep their faith separate from their politics.

But that doesn't mean social conservatives are committed to guaranteeing the rights and freedoms we're all entitled to, or that government needs to be responsive to all the people, not just pressure groups. Social conservatives are not necessarily concerned with the role of government in the economy or world affairs, except when it impacts conservative social values.

Fiscal conservatives are focused on the growth of government, stewardship of public monies, regulation of financial markets and the impact of monetary policy and credit on average Americans. It's not a preoccupation with money, but rather a focus on economic freedom. Without that critical freedom, our ability to vote becomes largely symbolic. Fiscal conservatives may or may not be socially conservative or practice a faith. They are however, the staunchest opponents to socialism because they fully appreciate its destructive power and its vulnerability to manipulation by a ruling elite. Unfortunately, they are a minority even among conservatives.

Religious conservatives are primarily concerned with how religion frames their participation in American society. They view all of society and government

through the lens of their particular faith, which may or may not have any position on how to interact with the government or society in general. For example, Amish are religious conservatives who have little or no participation in American society, and who maintain only necessary contact with American government. Their internal self-governance is invisible to the rest of us and despite their virtue and work ethic, the Amish have little or no positive effect on American society or cultural mores.

By contrast, the positions taken by Rev. Dobson or Pat Robertson have been very much public, political and intentionally so. They're of the belief that God had asked them to intervene in American society and engage in the political process to advance their agenda. In so doing, they were consistent with their evangelistic mission and had every right to do so. However, being religious conservatives didn't necessarily mean that they placed a high priority on economic freedoms, as do the fiscal conservatives, or that they regarded government entitlement programs as franchising dependency, as do social conservatives. The same could be said for Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist or Hindu clerics and laity who enter the political arena representing their faith.

The triple play

There are of course conservatives who combine all three characteristics - social and fiscal conservatives who are deeply religious. This is the stereotypical 'conservative' that the news/entertainment cabal serves up as their prime target. Somehow, a devout person who worships regularly, who gives to his/her church, who believes in the sanctity of marriage and the innocence of children, who lives within their means and demands that government does the same, has been portrayed as a deranged, uncivilized relic that must be excised from the American psyche.

Here's the weird part. This triple-play conservative is more likely to volunteer for military duty, volunteer during disasters, be a Good Samaritan, give to charitable causes, uphold the law, hold a job, make the most of a public education, stay married and make positive contributions to society and the economy. And yet, they are demonized by the left. No, they are not perfect in every way. Yes, they do make mistakes and lose their way.

And finally, conservatives, unlike liberals, exhibit a true spectrum of conservatism, from those who are extremely so to those just right of center. Unlike many liberals, where their 'left-ness' is akin to a simple volume control, conservatives do have differing opinions on specific issues. And, unlike liberals, conservatives appear to be more open to calm debate, reasoning and reflection. For most liberals this is maddening - how dare these conservatives think for themselves.

In the 60s, the socialist movement and its elitist backers saw a great threat emanating from Arizona - Barry Goldwater. His political agenda was so powerful, so inclusive and so absolutely fair-minded that they had no choice but to destroy him. And destroy him they did. They attacked his character, his religion, his family. They questioned his sanity. The socialist elite, with the willing help of its media and academic flunkies, was able to marginalize this unique individual. But, they weren't able to totally eradicate his political ideology, because he developed it in tandem with a union president from California who went on to become one of America's greatest presidents - Ronald Reagan.

The Reagan phenomenon

The Goldwater/Reagan agenda was extraordinarily positive and uplifting. It held out the promise of hope, happiness, material wealth and a worry-free America for everyone. It celebrated hard work, ingenuity, risk-taking, and proportional rewards for proportional effort. It was, in essence, eminently fair to everyone. And, it recognized America for what it was - the greatest nation this earth had ever witnessed and a force for good in the world.

Reagan was elected as America reached its lowest point in terms of economic power, prestige and global influence. Morale was low and America seemed to be collapsing into a state of self-induced helplessness, courtesy of a Democrat-controlled House, Senate and a White House previously occupied by what had to be the most ineffectual president in the history of this great country - Jimmy Carter.

As president, Reagan placed the country on a wartime economic footing without informing the Soviet Union, rattling the markets or unnerving the American public. Much to his credit, and in direct contradiction to the warnings of his critics, Reagan realized that American economic output made victory during WWII possible while simultaneously pulling the country out of the Great Depression, and that deficit spending in the defense sector only could re-create another 'postwar' economic boom.

He realized that 'productive' government spending - competitively bidding out defense contracts for war materiel, ships, jets and the 'Star Wars' SDI system would prime the economic pump for domestic investment and domestic consumption. Those hefty defense contracts would result in jobs, consumer demand and business investment that expanded the overall economy. It would come back to the government in the form of future tax revenues, paying down the initial spending. A larger, growing economy generates more tax revenue in the long run. Raising the rate of taxation in the hopes of generating tax revenue quickly, as Democrats have consistently done since the 1930s, cripples economic growth. It actually cuts tax revenues.

It was Reagan, when asked during his first 100 days in office how he'd like to advance the stalemated détente with Communist Russia, replied, "It's simple. We win. They lose." And then set about winning the Cold War with economic power. He forced Russia into a military buildup it could not economically sustain, resulting in the collapse of that socialist hegemony a decade later. He did it with abundance - outspend your opponent. And, without a shot being fired, the most bloodthirsty, murderous regime in human history disintegrated. The bonus was a robust US economy that survived for more than a decade after he left office, and a technology infrastructure we enjoy in the 21st century.

It could be argued that Reagan and Bush No.1 weren't necessarily social conservatives or religious conservatives. They did share some common ground on fiscal conservatism, even though Reagan took the extraordinary step of using government spending as a catalyst to reinvigorate the economy, something that Bush No.1 was truly concerned wouldn't produce the desired results. It did,

creating an unprecedented economic expansion during the Reagan and Bush No.1 years and one that Bill Clinton was able to ride for two terms.

This was possible because Reagan believed in the inherent productivity of Americans once provided proper incentive. Prior to Reagan, the crushing taxes and stagnant economy of the Jimmy Carter years had dampened the more typical American outlook - positive and forward-looking. It's an outlook shared by many Americans and one that has many times made the difference.

Conservatives enjoy an abundance mentality - there's plenty to go around because plenty more can be created through ingenuity and hard work. They donate to causes, they volunteer their time and they participate in their community.

Can conservatives be materially obsessed? Certainly, and probably to the same degree as liberals are. There's no getting around human frailties.

Producer vs parasite, conservative vs liberal

What do liberals have in common with parasites? What do conservatives have in common with producers? One can draw some uncomfortable parallels between parasites and liberals, and some pretty obvious ones between conservatives and producers. But it's not always that simple.

It's obvious which way parasites lean politically. If you feel like the world owes you a living, it's likely you've aligned yourself with the liberals. If you've really, terribly screwed up your life and think the world owes you an apology, you're probably a liberal. Let's get to the point - if you're a parasite, you're more likely to be a liberal.

But liberals aren't necessarily all parasites. There are many extraordinarily productive and spiritually enlightened liberals. They come from all walks of life, and they are kind, generous, open and tolerant. They mean well, giving time and money to noble causes. However, they can and do inadvertently promote or

apologize for parasites and their machinations. At the very least, they're willing to look past the parasites toward the greater good. This has the unseemly consequence of enabling parasitic behavior or laying the groundwork for its eventual emergence. And parasites have a way of crowding out those who truly deserve the help or have earned their right to a better life.

Being a conservative implies that you know the difference between right and wrong, because you believe in good and evil, truth or consequences. And as a conservative, you'd certainly know that living off someone else is morally reprehensible if you can easily fend for yourself. It's important to note that conservatives can be liars, cheats and scoundrels, as well. No one has a monopoly on morals and everyone has weaknesses. The primary difference between conservatives and liberals is that one side attempts to address and correct those weaknesses, while the other makes excuses for them.

Liberals are the enablers, champions and/or apologists for parasites, who align themselves with liberals for the free ride offered at the expense of producers. Of course, producers themselves can be either liberal or conservative, whether they realize it or not.

On the opposite side of that thesis, conservatives aren't necessarily all producers. Some conservatives withdraw completely from direct participation in the economy, society and politics. They aren't necessarily parasites because they ask for nothing. On the other hand, they provide no positive contribution other than possibly property or income tax. If every conservative drew back whenever they encountered something disagreeable, the liberals would have a sole voice in running this country and economy. Unfortunately, too many good people don't voice their opinions or demand answers from their elected representatives when it becomes obvious that the country is headed in the wrong direction.

And although many conservatives despise the actions of parasites, they say little or nothing, because they're afraid of being labeled as heartless, cruel, bigoted, selfish, xenophobic or worse by liberals or parasites anxious to extend their reach

and power. Liberals aren't afraid to espouse their extreme views and force them on others, often demonizing those who oppose them or question their motives. Conservatives, as Bernie Goldberg has characterized them, shouldn't have to be 'wimps'.

The struggle between those who want society to go downhill and those who think America can still elevate itself will probably continue forever. But the secular progressives and liberal left, who want a debauched, godless, mob-ruled America, appear to hold the upper hand.

Personality deficit factor acts like a contagion

One thing is certain - given the prevailing attitudes exhibited by a majority of Americans, the number of parasites will always be greater than the number of producers and will likely continue to grow. It's a trend that can be attributed to the personality deficit factor, a term coined just for this argument. The personality deficit factor works like a dominant gene. Let's say you've raised your daughter in a stable, loving home environment, with both biological parents present and actually married to each other for the entire time between your daughter's birth and her wedding. She's fallen in love with a young man whose mother has married several times, who's bounced between 'dads', homes and unrelated siblings, and who seems somewhat cavalier about this whole marriage thing. You have your doubts, but bite your lip. Your daughter is convinced this will work out.

In a matter of months, things aren't looking good. Your new son-in-law just isn't interested in this one-man, one-woman thing. He feels trapped, confined and resentful, taking it out on your daughter, who's completely unprepared for this kind of behavior. After all, she's never experienced it in your household. And now comes the bombshell - baby's on the way. A couple of months or couple of years later, your son-in-law is gone. All of the work and effort you put into raising your daughter, the values and morals that you've instilled, the careful grooming and preparation for life as an adult is all blown away by someone who is incapable of living life as a responsible grown-up.

Your daughter, as fine a person as she is, now has baggage and the responsibility of raising her child alone. Her quality of life, her unrealized potential as a human being and attitude about herself has been destroyed by the selfish, fickle act of another. The child is also down for the count, starting out in life knowing only the downside of marital relationships. And there's nothing you can do about it.

Oh, but you can't blame that young man. After all, it was his mother that put him on this self-destructive path. Okay fine, but then who put his mother on the road to serial divorces, her grandpa? This could go back twenty generations. The net result is still the same. It's not a question of determining the root cause or assigning blame, it's the harsh reality that this young man was going to destroy the relationship and significantly impact the lives of your daughter and grandchild.

Where there was only one diminished life, there are now three. Your daughter may or may not be able to remarry someone that will approach marriage with serious intent. The odds are against her. Your grandchild is statistically much more likely to end up divorced not just once, but twice, diminishing the lives of others who may have come from stable homes like yours. This spreads like a contagious disease, one diminished human being impacting the lives of others who had a decent shot at living life to its fullest, free of the trauma and stress that divorce visits on families, and the lasting damage it leaves on the psyche.

But divorce is quite common. No kidding. So is heart disease and herpes. That doesn't make it right or any easier on the kids, who suffer much more than the parents. Life is hard enough without that added burden and life-altering fallout. The personal deficit factor works similarly with drugs, alcohol, spousal abuse, impulse control, gambling, promiscuity, financial irresponsibility - any number of personality deficits that spread like wildfire.

How civilized societies function

What has kept this unproductive behavior in check, what made people force themselves to correct or compensate for these deficits is social or peer pressure - the stigma of being the town drunk, a hopeless gambler, a drifter or whatever negative fits the situation. In the 1930s, if Dad was a lazy bum, the entire family

suffered that humiliation. The wife was constantly prodding the husband, personally embarrassed by his lack of motivation. The kids were likely shunned and ridiculed by their peers. When those kids grew up, they remembered that horrible experience and for the most part did their level best to avoid a replay.

If that pressure is removed, if it's socially acceptable to be an addict, a petty thief, a prostitute, a slacker or a corrupt official, then there's no reason for someone to address their problems. They'll just go through life destroying and diminishing other people's lives, which will in turn do the same to others. Eventually, everyone's a mess and it all starts to crumble.

Unfortunately, our government, academia and the media cabal have done a great job of removing the social stigma from these personality deficits, either by creating huge governmental programs or by 'mainstreaming' them so they appeared more common and 'normal'. So, while it was scandalous to be a divorced mom with three kids in 1927, by 2007 one needed to be divorced at least 4 times with 10 kids to even raise an eyebrow.

It isn't a question of being prudish or intolerant. It's the notion that diminished and destroyed lives impact others and bring all of society down. Social and peer pressure exists because we as humans created civilization and social order to make our lives more productive, stable and less stressful. In a free and civilized society, we apply that pressure without violence, mostly in the form of ridicule, silence, shunning and so forth. In more primitive societies, or those consumed by some form of religious fundamentalism, women are still routinely stoned for adultery, arms are amputated for stealing, tongues are slit for lying, and on and on. Good or bad, this is how humans create orderly societies to live in. We're wired that way.

And once they've established a stable society in a particular place or time, most people immediately look to bettering their own lives. Many roll up their sleeves and build everything with their own hands. They engage in agriculture, commerce, manufacturing, trading, shipping and all those productive things that make life easier, more pleasant and less uncertain. Some do so by enslaving other people to do the work they find distasteful or unbearable. Still others look for

ways to divert the wealth of others into their own pockets without ever considering an honest day's work.

The personality deficit factor plays a big role in the problems facing America. People with diminished or devastated lives go on to diminish or devastate the lives of others. Sometimes they do it just to make themselves feel better, as if dragging down other people to their level will somehow make them appear more 'normal' or less conspicuously flawed. For others, it's a fatalistic gesture, taking as many people with them as they can on their downward spiral. And for a few select others, it's a way to gain power and wealth at the expense of productive individuals.

People with diminished or devastated lives are more likely to be parasites, some involuntarily so. They've been conditioned by circumstances and environment to be parasites, not even aware that a productive mind-set can exist or that there's a world full of possibilities out there. Many of those living diminished lives lean toward a liberal philosophy because liberals are supposedly more forgiving of personality deficits and anti-social behavior, although this is not necessarily the case. It's as if the people with screwed up lives and no intention of bettering themselves got together and said, "Hey, we're not so bad, look at how many of us there are. This must be okay..." An entire nation of these people spells disaster.

This is how and why dope sells

The 'bad' kids in high school give the 'good' kids a hard time because they're just not cool, hip (insert favorite term here) enough. In order to achieve that state of coolness, the 'good' kids would have to do drugs, engage in violence or promiscuity, or let their grades drop. And, of course, dressing the part is important, as well. Which begs the question, why do the 'bad' kids so actively want to convert the 'good' kids? Quite simply, if straight-laced Jack and Jill suddenly develop a drug or alcohol problem or start acting out, the kid who's already in trouble doesn't feel so bad. After all, if a goody two-shoes can fall from grace, the loser feels better about himself or herself.

And so, unrelenting peer pressure is applied to the 'good' kids. Eventually, drug

use grows because some kids crack under that kind of pressure. They then become part of the group that influences the remaining 'good' kids.

Apply this principle to the deteriorating standards of television programming, news, movies, popular music and online entertainment: It's as if everyone is diving for the basement, trying to outdo one another with the basest, crudest or most shocking content - lowering the bar for what's acceptable, but never raising it. To the educated people viewing this from a safe distance (separated by one or more oceans), it must look like middle-school delinquents are in charge of America's studios and newsrooms.

It is unfortunate, but from a social and political perspective, many Americans don't function at any higher a level than high school sophomores, if that. Even with the supposed broadening of perspectives that higher education promises (but rarely delivers), Americans seem more preoccupied with sports scores and the lives of celebrities than pressing bedrock issues that will alter the political and economic landscape of America forever.

Thomas Sowell, in his excellent book *Black Rednecks and White Liberals*, describes a culture utterly void of any redeeming qualities that existed during the late 17th century in the lawless borderlands between England and Scotland, the Scottish isles and the Ulster region in Northern Ireland. This 'redneck' culture was transported in whole to the American South where it flourished, affecting both blacks and poor whites, while its point of origination in the UK disappeared entirely.

The 'redneck' culture then spread into urban centers in the Midwest, North and West as impoverished southerners of both races moved in, looking for jobs and opportunity as the 20th century began. The southern whites had an easier time blending in with their white counterparts, mitigating some of the 'redneck' cultural impact. Unfortunately, segregated urban blacks retained the antisocial, unproductive aspects of the 'redneck' culture, now characterized as 'ghetto' or 'urban' culture tolerated and even promoted by white liberals as somehow genuine and therefore acceptable behavior.

Taking that thesis forward, the white liberals of the North, Midwest and West have over time absorbed aspects of this 'redneck' culture, which has now permeated and to a greater or lesser degree affected everyone in America. Ironically, white liberals view the urban culture as authentically 'black' when by Sowell's reasoning it originated with uneducated common whites back in the British Isles.

And 'redneck' culture appears to be alive and healthy, given the prevalence of serial divorces, multiple children out of wedlock by different fathers, sexual predation, substance abuse, illiteracy, lack of personal initiative and outright anti-intellectualism that plagues so much of this country. This is a contributing factor to the number and variety of parasites that now drag down American productivity, innovation, national prestige and our collective standard of living. It is a social outlook promoted by the secular progressives at war with the Judeo-Christian principles on which this country was founded.

How democracies fail

A political wag once wrote that democracies ultimately fail because 'the people' eventually vote themselves the treasury. Actually, it's only those 'people' who've entered the political arena for the expressed purpose of enriching themselves at others' expense. The ones paying the freight are too busy working, trying to make ends meet, to get involved in the political process. That's too bad. We need more producers and fewer parasites making policy, enacting legislation and managing our vast, left-leaning bureaucracies.

Democracies don't fail for political reasons. They fail because the economies supporting those democracies crumble, burdened by too much taxation, unrelenting demands from politically powerful constituencies and unchecked growth or corruption in government. When hundreds upon thousands of groups, companies, unions and individuals make it their daily task to ferret out as much money as they possibly can from our government's coffers, which in turn is compelled to collect even more tax revenue, it eventually breaks the back of even the most robust economy and sophisticated financial infrastructure.

This is why the founding fathers never wanted America to turn into a democracy.