

DAVID

#1 NATIONAL BESTSELLING AUTHOR

LIMBAUGH

Guilty by
Reason
of Insanity

WHY THE DEMOCRATS
MUST NOT WIN

The Threat from Within

The world is going crazy and America is rapidly following suit. The left's decades-long assault on our traditional values and constitutional liberties has immeasurably damaged our society and our republic. Up is down. Right is wrong. Good is evil. Words are twisted to represent the opposite of their actual meaning. Intellectual and moral anarchy abound. Radical leftist ideas are hailed as mainstream, while conservative ideas are demonized as extreme.

Every great world power eventually falls, and the process often begins with self-inflicted wounds. There has never been a greater and freer nation than the United States, but it is now tearing itself apart. How long can our nation survive amid the relentless attack on everything that has made it unique?

Well-meaning people say Republicans and Democrats have the same fundamental goals but different ideas and strategies for achieving them. I've always regarded this as wishful thinking, but if it were ever

true, it no longer is today. The two parties, as presently constituted, have distinctly different visions for America based on conflicting world-views. Some will object that all Americans want everyone to be prosperous, safe, free, and to live in harmony, but I'm not sure that's even true anymore, given the left's anti-Americanism, its intolerance and authoritarianism, its romance with socialism, its hysterical environmentalism, its preoccupation with identity politics, its radicalism on race and gender, its attempts to erase our borders, its culture of death, its devaluation of the Constitution, its hostility to Second Amendment rights, and much more.

The Democratic Party is a vehicle of leftist extremism that poses an existential threat to America as founded—because it is at war with our first principles and traditions. It is anti-capitalist and rejects equality of opportunity in favor of a hierarchy of privileges for identity groups ranked according to their levels of alleged historical oppression. It's a brazenly anti-life party that promotes gender anarchy, militant feminism, and hostility toward traditional male roles and masculinity itself. It prosecutes a vicious culture war punctuated by an ongoing assault on Christians' religious liberty.

The left isn't turning to socialism just because its members think it's more equitable than capitalism but also because they seek revenge against America's founding generation and its successor beneficiaries. They want to eradicate the Western tradition that spawned our unique American culture because it allegedly led to continental larceny against Native Americans, is in irredeemable moral debt over slavery, and is forever culpable for oppressing minorities and women through white privilege and the inherent exploitation of capitalism. They are hell-bent on suppressing conservatives and Christians and overturning the entire existing order. Their radicalism is unquenchable. They don't seek solutions but to create permanent turmoil. While holding themselves out as models of tolerance, leftists have become ideological totalitarians, intolerant of dissenting views and contemptuous of those who hold them. It is conservatives who promote a tolerant, optimistic message and still believe in the proverbial melting pot—a truly integrated society. For all the left's talk of tolerance and peace, its power depends on continually pitting Americans against one another.

Progressives have weaponized race to discredit and silence conservatives and to enhance their own power. They are consumed with avenging wrongs allegedly committed by certain groups against other groups. Democrats don't talk about maximizing liberty and prosperity but instead engage in virtue signaling by invoking aggrieved mantras—social justice, income equality, cultural appropriation, intersectionality, white privilege, patriarchy, and toxic masculinity. Having once campaigned for civil rights, they now seek victims to leverage for partisan gain.

It's frightening how rapidly extremists took control of the Democratic Party—and how little resistance they faced. While the party's establishment wing pretends to moderate the radicalism of its newcomers—and there is sometimes spirited infighting between the two groups—the old guard have largely adopted their extremism.¹ Few influential centrists remain. If left unchecked, the Democratic Party would complete—in horrifyingly short order—Obama's twisted vision of fundamentally transforming America. It would drastically redistribute wealth, suppress dissent, dilute and ultimately destroy our national sovereignty, and dismantle our constitutional structure and individual liberties.

AMERICA'S FOUNDING PRINCIPLES

The modern left, then, is in an all-out war against Western civilization and the values and liberties it produced. It is at odds with the Constitution, American sovereignty, and the free market. It does not believe in American exceptionalism. A Gallup poll showed that only 51 percent of Democrats are very proud or extremely proud to be American, compared to 95 percent of Republicans. While a higher percentage of Democrats were proud when Obama was president, Republican pride in the nation remained the same during those years.²

“We're not going to make America great again, it was never that great,” declared New York governor Andrew Cuomo. “We have not reached greatness, we will reach greatness when every American is fully engaged, we will reach greatness when discrimination and stereotyping against women, 51 percent of our population, is gone.”³ (After taking a deserved rhetorical beating, Cuomo unconvincingly walked back his remarks, claiming he meant America hasn't reached its full potential.)

Cuomo's statement was reminiscent of President Obama's America apology tour, wherein he repeatedly bashed the United States on foreign soil and proclaimed that America is no more exceptional than other nations.⁴ This attitude had been telegraphed during the 2008 presidential campaign by Michelle Obama, who exclaimed, "For the first time in my adult lifetime, I'm really proud of my country . . . not just because Barack has done well, but because I think people are hungry for change."⁵ More recently, Democrat Senator Cory Booker expressed similar sentiments. "I'm a big believer that if America, if this country hasn't broken your heart, then you don't love her enough," said Booker. "Because there's things that are savagely wrong in this country. There's a normalcy of injustice that we've accepted."⁶ Likewise, former attorney general Eric Holder queried, "When did you think America was great?" This supposedly great American past, said Holder, "never in fact existed."⁷

Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, the poster girl for America's left and today's Democratic Party, barely conceals her contempt for this nation. She describes America as racist and close to "garbage," insisting that the Reagan presidency was "a perfect example of how special interests and the powerful have pitted white working-class Americans against brown and black working-class Americans in order to just screw over all working-class Americans." She suggests that by promoting an image of black women as "welfare queens," Republicans created a racist caricature of one specific group of people and primed Americans to subconsciously resent them, thus providing a diabolical "logical reason" to "toss out the whole social safety net."⁸

Conservatives aren't angling to eliminate the social safety net; we just want to reasonably limit it because excessive dependency diminishes people's self-worth and productivity. Conservatives deeply value our God-given natural rights and individual liberties guaranteed by the Constitution and sustained by its structure of limited government. The Constitution promotes liberty through the enumerated powers of Congress, the Bill of Rights, the separation of powers among three branches of government, and the federalist system, which divides power between the federal, state, and local governments. Conservatives believe, and history has shown, that the closer people are to the seat of power, the more prudent and responsive the government will be. Accordingly, our

freedom, security, and prosperity depend on preserving the Constitution's designed limitations on government, which in turn rely on courts interpreting the Constitution according to its original intent and honoring the rule of law.

The left is far more interested in acquiring power to achieve its political ends than in upholding a system that guarantees personal liberties. Determined to control people's lives and thoughts, leftists push to consolidate power in the federal government—especially when *they* control it. They are untroubled by delegations of power to administrative agencies staffed with career bureaucratic liberals insulated from accountability.

Firmly believing in America's uniqueness, conservatives jealously defend America's sovereignty and its borders and oppose globalism. The overused term "globalism" is often associated with conspiracy theories of one-world governments out of a Robert Ludlum novel. But it's inarguable that leftists often seek to delegate important policy decisions that impact our national sovereignty and personal liberties to like-minded international bodies that hold the United States in contempt.

The disparity in the parties' fidelity to America's freedom tradition partially explains their differing views on illegal immigration. The conservatives' strong opposition to it is not rooted in nativism or racism, as Democrats maliciously allege. Our love for America is based on ideas, not race. We believe America's continued greatness depends on a culture united behind those ideas, which is why we favor the assimilation and integration of legal immigrants.

Squandering the progress memorialized in the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*,⁹ which outlawed racial segregation in our schools, the left incites minorities to obsess on their color and ethnicity. Consequently, in some ways we have come full circle. Universities now foster segregation by making race a criterion for participation in certain student organizations and housing arrangements. Some recommend separate workout rooms for minority students where white students are excluded. Leftists are preoccupied with race, assigning highly paid diversity coordinators to monitor the racial percentages of students, faculty, staff, and contractors. In their racial zealotry they have bastardized the term "diversity," which originally referred to people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds freely

interacting and comingling. But heightened race consciousness and the segregation of racial groups on our campuses undermines these goals, fomenting mutual distrust and deterring interracial interaction.¹⁰ This trend is hardly accidental. It's a logical outgrowth of the left's vision for America which, as we've noted, no longer includes people of all races, ethnicities, genders, and religions living together in peace and harmony but sees America as a fractured land of mutually suspicious groups living in uneasy hostility.

Civil rights icon Martin Luther King Jr. not only preached racial harmony but also endorsed America's founding principles—the universal application of the Declaration's guarantees of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. His quarrel was not with the American idea but with its unequal application to African Americans. He envisioned America as a land of equal opportunity for all, not one of government-enforced equal outcomes or perpetual victimhood in which the “aggrieved” continually battle with the “oppressors.” “When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence,” King proclaimed, “they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men—yes, black men as well as white men—would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

ASSAULTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL ORDER

Republicans believe in maximizing our liberties and prosperity through pro-growth policies that expand the economic pie by unshackling people from stifling taxes and regulations and unleashing their entrepreneurial spirit. Democrats see the economic pie as finite and the economy as a zero-sum game where one man's gain is another's loss. They believe enlightened central planners are wiser and more beneficent than the invisible hand of the market, and they support redistributionist schemes to equalize incomes. Just as they exploit racial and gender politics, they employ class warfare to augment their political power. It would be bad enough if they merely sought to pick economic winners and losers, but they also vilify the successful and inspire others to resent them. Some Democrats have conveniently reinterpreted America's

founding principles as demands for equal economic outcomes rather than equal opportunity—in other words, as a call for socialism.

The framers warned of another inherent threat to freedom. “Our Constitution,” wrote John Adams, “was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.” Constitutions are worth no more than the paper they are written on if the people and their elected representatives don’t honor them. The twentieth century is replete with examples of murderous, totalitarian regimes whose organizing documents purported to guarantee liberties to their citizens. While our nation still largely adheres to its constitutional framework, our commitment has measurably softened, as various branches of government have abandoned their fealty to the letter and spirit of the Constitution and usurped other branches’ powers or lawlessly delegated their own.

When courts usurp the legislative function and make laws rather than interpret them, when Congress delegates its legislative functions to an unaccountable administrative state, and when presidents issue lawless executive orders, they are abusing their respective constitutional authority. When the other branches fail to rein them in with constitutionally prescribed countermeasures, our government becomes less democratic, responsive, and accountable, and our liberties erode. As America’s body politic has grown complacent about the integrity of the Constitution, its prescribed checks and balances, and its federalist system, our freedoms have become imperiled. At the root of this indifference is a festering corruption of our values in which the rule of law is subordinated to the pursuit of raw political power and the political ends of those seeking or wielding that power.

The perpetrators of these assaults on our system maintain that they are honoring the spirit of a “living Constitution” and are interpreting its language progressively to accommodate modernity. They deny distorting its meaning and intent to achieve their policy goals. They rationalize their interpretations in emanations and penumbras that only they can divine, such as their declaration of a constitutional right to privacy as a justification for abortion in the infamous case of *Roe v. Wade*.¹¹

An earlier, egregious example of judicial rewriting of the Constitution was the New Deal case of *Wickard v. Filburn*,¹² in which the

Supreme Court sanctioned the federal government's regulation of purely *intrastate* activities under the Interstate Commerce Clause. Having established limits on wheat production to control wheat prices, the federal government imposed a penalty on Ohio farmer Roscoe Filburn for exceeding those limits. Filburn disputed the government's constitutional authority to impose the limitation because he not only didn't engage in interstate commerce, but he didn't engage in commerce at all, since he didn't sell his wheat. Unimpressed, the power-gobbling Court upheld the government's right to regulate Filburn's strictly local farming operations, arguing that even if the activity was local and not commercial, it could have a substantial economic effect on interstate commerce. The Court rationalized that because Filburn's wheat production reduced the amount of wheat he would buy for animal feed on the open market, it was within the federal government's regulatory scope under the Commerce Clause.

The Court knew that the framers never intended such an expansive reading of the clause but justified the federal overreach by presuming that a greater good would come from its decision. The Commerce Clause and *Roe v. Wade* are just a few of the myriad examples of liberal activist jurisprudence inflating the power of government and diminishing our liberties.

A NATION BORN IN HELL?

Conservatives are not indifferent to America's past sins, but we are proud of America's history and its freedom tradition, which has been a remarkable force for good in the world. The left portrays America's history as a morality tale of evil, slavery-loving whites dispossessing Native Americans of the land. In short, America is drenched in evil and born in hell. It must forever atone. We saw this in leftists' reactions to President Trump's Fourth of July "Salute to America." Liberal media networks ABC, CBS, and NBC refused to air the event¹³ while progressives roundly denounced the military's participation, revealing their fundamental loathing for traditional patriotic displays. Indeed, the left staged its own counterprogramming: activists burned an American flag in front of the White House, and the *New York Times* produced

a video debunking the “myth” that the United States is “the greatest nation on Earth.”¹⁴

The condemnation today of white Europeans for stealing the land from Native Americans is grossly oversimplified—factually and morally. Michael Medved observes that “the 400 year history of American contact with Indians includes many examples of white cruelty and viciousness.” But it was a two-way street. “The Native Americans frequently (indeed, regularly) dealt with the European newcomers with monstrous brutality and, indeed, savagery. . . . But none of the warfare (including an Indian attack in 1675 that succeeded in butchering a full one-fourth of the white population of Connecticut, and claimed additional thousands of casualties throughout New England) on either side amounted to genocide. Colonial and, later, the American government, never endorsed or practiced a policy of Indian extermination; rather, the official leaders of white society tried to restrain some of their settlers and militias and paramilitary groups from unnecessary conflict and brutality.”¹⁵

“One of the things we take for granted today is that it is wrong to take other people’s land by force,” writes Thomas Sowell. “Neither American Indians nor the European invaders believed that. Both took other people’s land by force—as did Asians, Africans and others. The Indians no doubt regretted losing so many battles. But that is wholly different from saying that they thought battles were the wrong way to settle ownership of land.”¹⁶ European colonization of the land occurred over four hundred years and was multifaceted. Without question, inexcusable acts of theft and murder occurred, but the typical pattern involved Europeans negotiating with Indian nations for land and the sharing of territory for a period—until war broke out, usually resulting in the Indians losing and being removed. While we mustn’t be callous to these hardships, it is unfair to single out Europeans for special opprobrium when what occurred in colonial America was much like what has happened all throughout world history among rival peoples and nations—including among rival nations of Native Americans.¹⁷

Nor is the issue of slavery in America as simple as the America-hating revisionists would have you believe. Sowell notes that slavery was a worldwide institution for thousands of years. It wasn’t a controversial issue, even among intellectuals or political leaders, before

the eighteenth century, when it became controversial only in Western civilization. All races of people were both practitioners and victims of slavery.

American history professor Allen Guelzo observes that the Constitution was never pro-slavery. While the Constitution contained concessions to the states on slavery, “nothing in it acknowledged ‘men to be property.’” In fact, James Madison said it would be intolerable “to admit to the Constitution the idea that there could be property in men.” Thus, writes Guelzo, “the fundamental basis on which the entire notion of slavery rested was barred at the Constitution’s door, even while its practical existence slipped through.”¹⁸ One member of the Massachusetts Ratifying Convention recognized that the Constitution was written to guarantee that slavery would eventually be abolished even if it was politically impossible to do so then. “It would not do to abolish slavery...in a moment,” said Thomas Dawes. But even if “slavery is not smitten with an apoplexy, yet it has received a mortal wound and will die of a consumption.”¹⁹

“To read the Constitution as pro-slavery...requires a suspension of disbelief that only playwrights and morticians could admire,” Guelzo concludes. “Yes, the Constitution reduced slaves to the hated three-fifths; but that was to keep slaveholders from claiming them for five-fifths in determining representation, which would have increased the power of slaveholding states. Yes, the Constitution permitted the slave trade to continue; but it also permitted Congress to shut it off, which it did in 1808.... Smearing the Constitution by characterizing it as a contract for the perpetuation of slavery is worse than trying to see as half empty a glass that’s half full; it is to see as bone dry a glass that’s nearly full, or even to see no glass at all.”²⁰

Sowell observes that many American leaders, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry, came to oppose slavery, but maintains that it was much easier to morally oppose slavery in principle than to decide what to do with millions of slaves who were from another continent and had no experience living as free citizens in the United States, where they constituted 20 percent of the population. While the private correspondence of Washington, Jefferson, and many others reveals deep moral misgivings about slavery, Sowell notes that

the practical question of what to do about the slavery question had them baffled and would continue to trouble the nation for more than a half a century.²¹

The question, of course, was settled by the American Civil War, in which more than 600,000 men were killed to free almost four million. Sowell cautions against the conceit that there was an easy answer to the problem—“or that those who grappled with the dilemma in the 18th century were some special villains when most leaders around the world saw nothing wrong with slavery.”²² Sowell says it’s hypocritical to castigate America as uniquely evil on slavery without so much as mentioning the historical prevalence of slavery worldwide and the millions of people throughout the world still enslaved today—more, in fact, “than were seized from Africa during the four centuries of the trans-Atlantic slave trade.”²³

Despite provisions in the Constitution virtually guaranteeing that the slavery issue would ultimately come to a head and despite the Americans who fought a brutal civil war to end it, the left teaches that America is far from atoning for its original sin. They regard America as an imperialistic and tainted nation dominated by a white patriarchy that enjoys the privileges and benefits of its race while oppressing women, minorities, and homosexuals. They demand that we view everything through the prism of oppressive historical race and gender hierarchies. To them, the idea of the melting pot is passé and even repellent because it distracts our focus from the historical injustices minorities have suffered and the redress to which they are entitled.

IDENTITY POLITICS AS A TICKET TO POWER

Democrats talk a good game of unity and bipartisanship, but their every action aims to divide us into balkanized, competing groups, suspicious and jealous of one another and in constant conflict. They realize their political power depends on convincing identity groups that Republicans are oppressing them and that their only hope is to trust Democrats to protect them. Liberals once abhorred segregation and vigorously advocated integration. Martin Luther King Jr. famously taught that people should be judged not by the color of their skin but the content of

their character. Today's left, however, speaks of racial harmony from one side of their mouth, but from the other comes a shrill message of identity politics, which holds that we must fixate on a person's color rather than his character, heart, or personal behavior.

Democrats exploit identity politics not to benefit minorities, women, or the poor, but as a calculated strategy to sustain their power on the currency of minority victimhood. No matter what the issue, they resort to charges of racism, sexism, homophobia, or class warfare when their other arguments fail. They accuse conservatives of supporting border enforcement because they are racists, promoting welfare reform because they despise minorities and the poor, supporting voter ID laws to suppress the minority vote, opposing radical environmental policies to conserve their own wealth, promoting America's national sovereignty and exceptionalism to preserve their "white privilege," defending their Second Amendment rights because they are indifferent to gun deaths, being strict constructionists of the Constitution to preserve our patriarchal system, opposing abortion to undermine women's autonomy and health, opposing state-sanctioned same-sex marriage because they are homophobes, supporting a strong military to impose America's malevolent will on the world, promoting entitlement reform on the backs of seniors and others in need, and opposing the involuntary unionization of workers because they are enemies of the working man. On all these issues there is only one acceptable position and dissenters are aberrant. To enforce these conclusions, the leftist thought police act as cultural hall monitors. Dissent brings consequences, especially for those within the "jurisdiction" of the thought cops, such as university students at the mercy of their professors and public figures and politicians subject to the liberal media's wrath.

Leftist race-baiting works. African Americans overwhelmingly vote Democrat, and their near-unanimous support was critical to electing the last three Democratic presidents—Carter, Clinton, and Obama.²⁴ A recent study showed that in competitive congressional elections in 2018, 90 percent of black voters supported Democratic House candidates compared to 53 percent of voters overall. It also found that 91 percent of black women and 86 percent of black men believe that President Trump and Republicans are dividing Americans with toxic rhetoric.

How could they not believe that when Democrats and the entire mainstream media hammer this false theme daily with their own toxic rhetoric? They have little else to attract voters.²⁵

By contrast, the Republicans' agenda is inherently more unifying because it sees people as individuals, not group members, equal in human dignity as made in God's image and endowed with inalienable rights and equal opportunity under the law. Conservatives believe that these ideas, enshrined in our founding documents, have made America the greatest, freest, and most prosperous nation in history and therefore must be preserved.

THE LEFT'S ACHILLES' HEEL

Progressives project themselves as morally superior guardians of the victim groups conservatives allegedly oppress. This is why they exempt themselves from accountability for their own racist statements, such as former senator Joe Biden's casual description of Barack Obama as "the first mainstream African American who is articulate and bright and clean and a nice-looking guy. I mean that's a storybook, man."²⁶ Similarly, former senator Harry Reid exclaimed that Obama could win the presidency because he was "light-skinned" and didn't speak with a "negro dialect."²⁷ According to the left's rule book, one's morality is not determined by his behavior but his political views and group identity. As members of the morally enlightened tribe of progressivism, liberals can be forgiven for an occasional heresy from the established orthodoxy when it's politically expedient to do so.

The left long ago asserted themselves as the sole arbiter of cultural morality, with a monopoly on compassion and "social justice." They adeptly pulled this off in the 1960s, according to author Shelby Steele, when America "finally accepted that slavery and segregation were profound moral failings." This acceptance, Steele argues, "imposed a new moral imperative: America would have to show itself redeemed of these immoralities in order to stand as a legitimate democracy." The left, always quick on the political uptake, seized the moment and anointed themselves the leaders of America's search for redemption—"from shame to decency."²⁸

The left parlayed its self-proclaimed moral superiority to institute a staggering panoply of government-funded social programs that would transform America forever. President Johnson assumed office upon President Kennedy's assassination and inaugurated a progressive domestic agenda so ambitious that it shocked and alienated the Kennedy family.²⁹ If anyone doubts the Democrats' socialist roots, he can go back a few decades earlier and examine FDR's New Deal, not to mention the presidency of Woodrow Wilson, whom some call the "Godfather of Liberalism."³⁰ Though liberal revisionists maintain that Roosevelt's energetic statism was part of a strategy to save capitalism from the ravages of the Great Depression, his policies exacerbated and prolonged the Depression rather than ameliorating it.³¹

But there is not a hint of ambiguity about the socialistic nature of LBJ's Great Society agenda, even down to its title, which Johnson borrowed from a 1914 socialist screed by British political scientist Graham Wallas.³² Unlike FDR, Johnson didn't present his grandiose agenda ostensibly to lift America out of a depression but as an unmasked plan of social reengineering. In his first State of the Union address on January 8, 1964, Johnson announced his utopian goal. "This administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America," Johnson pronounced.³³

Like all socialistic programs, the War on Poverty assumed that Washington elitists have more wisdom and compassion than the people and so could eliminate poverty and racial discrimination, remake cities, and repair our public education system. The sweeping magnitude of LBJ's program was revolutionary, from his education legislation providing aid and benefits for low-income students; to instituting Medicare and Medicaid for the elderly and poor, respectively; to dramatically relaxing immigration laws; to the Voting Rights Act. There were beneficial aspects to some of these laws, undoubtedly, but the Constitution vests state governments with authority over most of them and they were structured to be unsustainable in the long run. As many have argued, this was the defining moment when the Democratic Party permanently established itself as the party of big government and most major institutions in the United States came within the federal government's fiscal and regulatory control.³⁴ The program also delivered a devastating blow

to the constitutional doctrine of federalism, as the federal government swallowed much of the existing power of state and local governments by making them dependent on federal aid and increasingly encumbered by federal regulations.

To capitalize on this moment, Steele observes, the left had to ensure that America's past wrongs were seen as ongoing menaces that threatened the nation's moral legitimacy. Believing their power would increase commensurate with the gravity of the menaces, the left, over time, cleverly developed a list of additional "isms" and "phobias" that had to be defeated, and they positioned themselves to lead the charge against them.

The left also used these bogeymen to legitimize their policy agenda, which they argued, to great success, was directly connected to their moral authority to fight these menaces. As leftists were moral crusaders against America's ills, they deserved to be trusted to remedy them. The left's political agenda thereby acquired greater moral gravity—the policy prescriptions leftists advocated were billed as morally superior to conservatives' proposals, which were deemed to be aligned with the various menaces. So LBJ's Great Society programs were seen as moral necessities, and their supporters—Democrats and the left—were the great saviors. Those opposing them were immoral, uncompassionate, and, of course, racist.

Steele argues that the left's dependence on invoking these menaces became their "Achilles' heel" because the expansion of women's and minorities' rights made these issues less urgent and diminished the left's moral claim to power. As civil rights laws were enacted and enforced and racism gradually subsided, the left, whose *raison d'être* was crusading against discrimination, faced the crisis of their looming obsolescence, which is the source of their angst and hatefulness. Steele is correct that the left is steeped in hate, which is ironic, considering they always accuse conservatives of spreading hate. It's simple projection.

Unfortunately, negative attitudes are contagious. It is the nature of activists to proselytize. Unlike Christian evangelists who spread the Good News, leftists seek to sow discontent among the groups they depict as aggrieved. This was particularly evident with President Obama.

One would think his election to the presidency would have reassured Americans that racism had greatly diminished in the United States. Instead of treating it in that spirit, though, Obama used his bully pulpit to spread

racial division and distrust. He constantly racialized events and fomented ill will among minorities toward cops, from his outburst that the Cambridge police acted stupidly when arresting Harvard professor Henry Gates to his incendiary statements on Trayvon Martin. He demeaned conservatives as bitter clingers who recoil from people who don't look like them.

Taking Obama's cue, the liberal media further fanned the flames of racial disharmony. According to a Rasmussen poll released on July 19, 2016 (around the midpoint of Obama's second term), race relations had reached an all-time low. Sixty percent of the respondents said race relations had deteriorated under Obama and only 9 percent said they had improved.³⁵ By contrast—and certainly contrary to leftist propaganda—a recent study by Daniel J. Hopkins and Samantha Washington, two University of Pennsylvania sociologists, shows a decrease in racism under President Trump. “Anti-black prejudice...declined by a statistically-insignificant degree between 2012 and 2016... But then after 2016 it took a sharp dive that was statistically significant. Moreover, contrary to their expectations, the fall was as evident among Republican voters as it was among Democrats.”³⁶

DEMOCRAT DENIAL

The left, as noted, developed a comprehensive slate of policies for minorities, the disadvantaged, the poor, women, and children. Their overarching, self-professed righteousness facilitated their gross expansion of government—higher taxes, explosive regulations, income redistribution schemes, exorbitant entitlement programs, government healthcare, and expansive welfare programs—as their policies were assumed to be driven by compassion.

Conservative policies have been far more effective in improving the lives of all people, including disadvantaged groups, than has socialism, which tends to impoverish and enslave the people it ostensibly means to help. Smaller and less intrusive government means more liberty and greater prosperity across the board—a rising tide lifts all boats. The left's domestic policy agenda is fiscally unsustainable and has produced results opposite of those they promised.

After fifty years of experimentation, progressives' domestic policies—welfare, public housing, forced school busing, affirmative action, diversity programs, the Medicare and Medicaid debt bombs, Obamacare, public education, green energy, economic stimulus programs, and environmental boondoggles—have consistently failed. They are angry not only because of their declining relevance on race but also because their policies haven't improved American lives.

But they are in denial about their policy failures. They embrace their ideology with dogmatic fervor, more as a matter of faith than evidence. They reject the inconvenient fact that Jimmy Carter's misery index and pessimistic projections of permanent economic malaise were obliterated by Ronald Reagan's "Morning in America," and that Donald Trump's explosive economy has dwarfed Obama's anemic one, shattering Obama's Carter-like predictions of economic mediocrity. The Democrats' powers of rationalization have grown in proportion to the failure of their policies, so they delude themselves into believing that Trump's robust economy is merely an extension of the Obama "recovery" while ignoring the indisputable fact that Trump's policies have markedly improved the plight of minorities and women. A *Politico* headline summed up the left's self-deception: "Trump Inherits Obama Boom."³⁷

This disconnect has frustrated, confused, and outraged leftists—and their outrage is directed not at themselves for clinging to false promises, but at conservatives. They can't accept that people they deem morally inferior have superior solutions for society's problems. Even if conservatives' free-market policies are more effective, why should they get credit when they don't care about people? It would be like praising a robot—except praising conservatives would be worse because human beings, unlike robots, are capable of caring. Besides, if conservative policies work it's only because people are evil. If people weren't so selfish, competitive, and greedy, they'd be content with the government handing them an equal share of society's wealth instead of striving for more. No amount of evidence will disabuse progressives of their sense of moral superiority. It's as if leftists believe in the biblical notion of the Fall, but that it only applies to conservatives.

FEARLESS LIBERALS AND PARANOID CONSERVATIVES

Liberals have bigger hearts, and they've enlisted pop psychology to prove it. Consider, for example, evolutionary psychologist Nigel Barber's "Why Liberal Hearts Bleed and Conservatives Don't." Citing an allegedly scientific study, Barber concludes that "conservatives see the world as a more threatening place because their brains predispose them to being fearful." Conservatives' "brain biology," he argues, inclines them to hate complexity and compromise. "That would help to explain why politics can be so polarized, particularly in a rather conservative era like the present," he wrote in 2012.³⁸ (I suppose this means, from the leftist perspective, we are born conservative or liberal but not necessarily male or female.)

The biological predisposition to fear "illuminates the conservative take on specific political issues in fairly obvious ways," argues Barber. They are more religious "because religious rituals foster feelings of safety in a dangerous world." Liberals, you see, are less religious because they see the world as less threatening and they rely more on science and education to solve problems. Conservatives "tend to be more hostile to immigrants, foreigners, and racial or ethnic minorities and to view them as more of a threat." Liberals, of course, are more welcoming. "Conservatives are pro-family because being surrounded by close relatives is the best defense against threats that surround them," while "[l]iberals are less interested in family ties as a protective bubble."³⁹

Despite liberals' supposedly superior brain power, they do not—if Barber is representative of their thinking—have the faintest clue as to what makes conservatives tick. If conservatives view the world as a more "threatening place," it's because we are more realistic. Is it necessary to have a Judeo-Christian worldview to recognize that we live in a woefully imperfect world? That evil people exist who want to harm us? That the human species, despite our advances in science and technology, is not advancing morally?

Conservatives aren't drawn to Christianity because its rituals are comforting. That theory is frightfully similar to Karl Marx's mantra that religion is the opiate of the masses. Is that a coincidence? People become Christians not to shelter themselves from the world or to inoculate themselves with false feelings of security but because they understand they aren't capable of saving themselves. They understand that man is not the

measure of all things, so they trust in Jesus Christ to redeem them from their sins. The feelings of security that flow from their faith are based on the promise of eternal life. But Christianity does not assure the faithful that they'll be spared from earthly problems; in fact, it guarantees them they will not. Happily, however, those struggles often facilitate their spiritual growth.

Nor are conservatives hostile to science, but we oppose its politicization and reject the notion that science can answer all of man's questions or resolve all his problems. We understand that science must be kept within its own sphere and cannot address philosophical or spiritual issues, which are outside its domain.

Conservatives don't view minorities as a threat and are not unwelcoming to immigrants but adamantly oppose illegal immigration. Conservatives don't oppose progressive programs ostensibly aimed at helping the poor and minorities because we are uncompassionate. Rather, we know these programs are harmful to people's welfare and dignity and destructive to society overall. It is more reasonable to conclude that leftists are indifferent to minorities because their programs inevitably harm them. At what point is it fair to judge the left on the results of their policies rather than their professed good intentions?

“BIPARTISAN COMPROMISES LEAD TO EXPANDED GOVERNMENT”

It's time to jettison the myth that liberals are more conciliatory than conservatives. Modern American history shows that political compromise through the decades has invariably advanced leftist ideas, putting America on a steady march toward socialism. But liberals have masterfully sold themselves as being amenable to compromise, while it's the hard-hearted Republicans who supposedly refuse to negotiate. The liberal media have reinforced this canard for years. For example, they have successfully blamed Republicans for all government shutdowns. Some believe this is because the GOP is seen as anti-government and the Democratic Party as pro-government. In reality, the media present Republicans as harsh, extremist, and uncompromising, even though Republicans have not grown more conservative since the Reagan years,

while Democrats have moved radically left. Republicans may sometimes appear entrenched, but it's because we have had to ratchet up our resistance in proportion to the left's increasing extremism.

Empirical evidence belies the left's claim that Republicans are less willing to compromise. Michigan State University political scientist Matt Grossmann tested the conventional wisdom that congressional conservatives are the primary culprits in Washington's partisan dysfunction. He examined whether congressional overseers Norman Ornstein and Thomas Mann were correct in 2014 in blaming Republicans for running "the worst Congress ever." After Grossman "combed through hundreds of history books covering American public policy since 1945," he concluded that most policies under debate are liberal, and Republican leaders sacrifice conservative principles when they compromise. "Of the 509 most significant domestic policies passed by Congress," Grossman explained, "only one in five were conservative, in that they contracted the scope of government funding, regulation or responsibility. More than 60 percent were liberal: They clearly expanded government.... The view that normal legislating and bipartisan compromises lead to expanded government is no tea party illusion; it is an accurate reading of the past 70 years."⁴⁰

Grossman found that just 10 percent of the major executive orders and agency rules were conservative.⁴¹ Even if you count those instances of government expansion that advance conservative goals, it makes little difference, says Grossman, because substantial policy changes of this kind rarely occur. When Republicans have succeeded in shrinking a government program it's almost always in exchange for a liberal government expansion elsewhere.

It's natural that conservatives are seen as obstructive because lawmakers derive their worth from taking action, which means more domestic spending, regulation, and increased government control. Not only does the nature of the legislative branch militate toward liberalism, says Grossman, but progressive laws "are self-reinforcing because they create beneficiaries who act as constituencies for their continuation and expansion."⁴² Congress creates dependency groups who never ask them to roll back their programs but only to expand them. The legislative process generates its own expansion inertia.

Another force for expanding government is the constant pressure on politicians of both parties to deliver for their respective constituents. They have to be seen as doing something. Macro-level conservative pressure usually favors restricting the size, scope, and role of government—cutting taxes, slashing regulations, and the like. But micro-level pressure, even from red states and communities, is often directed at government expansion, as constituents lobby their congressmen to “bring home the bacon.” Conservative congressmen also feel obligated to prove they care about people as much as liberals do by enacting legislation that expands government. Tax cuts are one exceptional example of Republican legislation that reduces the government’s scope, but there are far more examples of Republicans expanding government, from wage and price controls under Nixon, to President George W. Bush’s “No Child Left Behind” and his Medicare Part D entitlement. Even President Reagan, according to Grossman, signed more government expansion legislation than government contraction legislation. It’s the nature of the beast.

Grossman’s takeaway is ominous: “The arc of the policy universe is long, but it bends toward liberalism. Conservatives can slow the growth of government but an enduring shift in policy direction would be unprecedented. History shows that a do-nothing Congress is a conservative’s best-case scenario.”²⁴³ Sadly, a do-nothing Congress doesn’t play well with voters.

SUITING UP FOR THE CULTURE WAR

Whether we like it or not, the left is waging a fierce culture war against our traditional values. Its worldview rejects the biblical teaching that man is fallen despite being created in God’s image. Most leftists believe that Christianity hindered man’s enlightenment for centuries and that the advancement of science and reason alone, particularly in the Enlightenment era, placed man on an inexorable path toward progress and moral perfection. They conveniently ignore the enormous blessings to humanity derived from Christianity as well as the deaths of a hundred million people in the twentieth century alone at the hands of godless Nazi, fascist, and communist regimes. They are trapped in a spiritual void they seek to fill through myriad utopian and idolatrous pursuits,

from socialism, to the environment, to social causes. Conservatives oppose the leftists' utopian dreams, which solidifies the left's perception that conservatives are immoral, uncaring, and on the wrong side of history. They view conservatives as heretics who reject the left's secularist worldview and oppose scientific, moral, and quasi-spiritual "progress." Metaphorically, at least, they want to burn us at the stake.

It's true that politics is downstream from culture, but there is also a symbiotic relationship between the two—they influence each other. While the left is diminishing our freedoms through the long arm of government, they are also assaulting them through the culture and obliterating traditional values and institutions. The Democratic Party embraces cultural extremism and institutionally advances it through legislation that codifies new cultural norms. Cultural influences also threaten our liberties beyond the political arena.

Political forces are impotent to stop or even slow most of this cultural corrosion, much less reverse it. Political correctness, even when operating solely within the private sector, is a suffocating suppressor of liberties. Social media giants, from Facebook to Google to Twitter to Instagram, have enormous power, including the unchecked prerogative to regulate speech within their sizable platforms. Leftist vultures hover over every digital acre of America waiting to pounce on conservative commentators and denounce their "hate speech." They lie in wait for any business or industry to support causes they oppose or oppose those they support. They aggressively target Christian businesses that deviate from their secular dogmas, organizing boycotts and judicially harassing those who don't toe the leftist line on same-sex marriage.

Corporate America displays a shocking cowardice in the face of leftist bullying. Just recall Nike's disgraceful cancellation of its plans for patriotic sneakers featuring the Betsy Ross flag due to objections from former NFL quarterback Colin Kaepernick. Nike got cold feet about introducing its Air Max 1 USA shoe after Kaepernick claimed the flag symbolizes slavery.⁴⁴ If the left can so easily intimidate our biggest, richest corporations, imagine the pressure it brings to bear when it targets a small Christian bakery⁴⁵ or a mom-and-pop convenience store.⁴⁶

The left has waged war on our culture for decades and conservatives have been losing ground, sometimes because they haven't suited up for

battle. In recent years, leftists have gained momentum at an alarming rate. The left controls our education system, Hollywood, the mainstream media, social media corporate giants, and the rest of Silicon Valley. Its monolithic voice floods American culture, indoctrinating generations of Americans with progressive propaganda. Conservative counterattacks are disorganized, lack strategic coherence, and are simply overwhelmed by the left's tireless determination to radically alter our culture and impose their values on us. Unless we fight back more effectively on both fronts—political and cultural—we won't be able to save America.

One of the left's many conceits is to anoint as "woke" those who profess to be down with the struggle against alleged racial, gender, and economic discrimination. But being "woke" means being aware, and the left may well be aware of many things that simply aren't true. As Ronald Reagan famously said, "The trouble with our liberal friends is not that they are ignorant, but that they know so much that isn't so."⁴⁷ To be "woke" to falsehoods is to be asleep to the truth. But leftists aren't asleep to the reality that the culture war is ongoing and gravely serious. And it's time conservatives "woke" up from their complacency.

GROUNDS FOR OPTIMISM

We deny at our peril the gravity of the threats we face. Will patriots remain mindful of the urgency of these threats? I believe they will—because of their passionate love for this nation and their unwavering dedication to preserving it for their children and their descendants.

Indeed, despite our beleaguered condition, there are reasons for optimism. Trump's election signals that America is finally coming to its senses and patriots want to fight back. Americans didn't elect Trump because he's a celebrity entertainer or because we are bigots, as alleged. Quite the opposite is true. Trump didn't arise in a vacuum. He is not the cause of our nation's division. He didn't start a groundswell movement behind new ideas he was articulating. Rather, he rose to power as a direct result of existing divisions and because establishment Republicans had failed to impede, let alone reverse, the leftist juggernaut.

Under Trump's leadership, conservatives have made great strides toward turning the tide, but progressives are not taking these

countermeasures sitting down. They have tenaciously redoubled their resolve to destroy Trump and disable his presidency. Each time they are thwarted, they regroup and re-attack. We must understand that we are locked in a perpetual struggle against relentless opponents and resolve to fight them with equal or greater force.

Our task is enormously difficult. Some conservatives don't want to admit that some of our own fellow Americans, wittingly or unwittingly, are working to change America into something our founding fathers wouldn't recognize. But we mustn't grow numb to what the modern Democratic Party has become.

Some discount the severity of the threat because they believe only part of the party has gone over the starboard side into the deep end. Nancy Pelosi and others from the old guard are battling AOC and her fellow travelers for control of the party, but that fight is more about power than ideology. Some commentators think otherwise—that if the young Turks would just settle down, the old guard would bring the party back to the center. Columnist Niall Ferguson, for example, opined that the Democrats will lose the 2020 presidential election because “they are not one party, but two: a liberal and a socialist. The former can beat Donald Trump—but not if it is associated with the latter.”⁴⁸

I believe Trump has a very good chance of being reelected, but not because the Democrats are two parties. Nancy Pelosi and her ilk are certainly more circumspect about their leftist views and would probably take us on a slightly slower path toward socialism if they had their druthers—but they would take us there nevertheless. All twenty-plus Democratic presidential candidates favor socialized medicine, healthcare for illegal immigrants, draconian environmental measures, and the balance of the far-left agenda.⁴⁹ Though Pelosi dismisses the party's AOC wing as merely “five people,” AOC and her cabal control the narrative, and seventy Democrats have voted with her 95 percent of the time.⁵⁰ Not only are they committed believers in socialism, but their hold on power depends on greatly expanding the dependency cycle, including to illegal immigrants. Recall that no less an establishment Democrat than Hillary Clinton based her presidential campaign on a promise to amplify President Obama's decidedly leftist agenda. Ferguson is correct, in my view, that the Democrats will commit political suicide if they embrace AOC's “campus socialism.” But regardless of whether they

nominate an openly socialist presidential candidate, they've already played their hand, and it's clear they will pursue a radical agenda if they win the presidency or regain full control of the legislative branch.

The 2020 presidential and congressional elections could determine whether this country heads permanently down the dark road of socialism, cultural Marxism, and eventually totalitarianism, or returns to its founding freedom tradition. We must work for the reelection of President Trump and congressional conservatives to reverse this leftist assault on America. To prevail in this war for our nation, which we did not start but have a moral duty to fight, we must present our message more clearly and expose the destructiveness of progressive policies and politics, which requires us to understand the left's thinking and why it is so inimical to the American idea. To that end I have written this book.