



# MONETARY & ECONOMIC REVIEW

Volume XXII, No. 3

Winter 2007

## Road to the White House: Electing a President

By Dr. Larry Bates

*Bates, an economist and publisher and editor of Monetary and Economic Review and Unraveling the New World Order, is a former member of the Tennessee House of Representatives and Chairman of its powerful Committee on Banking and Commerce. He is a former bank CEO and an internationally recognized expert on political systems and the Federal Reserve and how they affect the economy and your investments. Dr. Bates is the author of the book, The New Economic Disorder.*

It is important to understand that in a modern world, there is only one type of economic system – capitalism. No, we are not in a struggle between communism and capitalism, and never have been. Capital is the means of production – i.e., the manufacturing plants, tractors, trucks, trains, planes, etc. We can all agree that the aforementioned tools of production exist even in communist-controlled countries like China, Cuba, and the former Soviet Union. All are capitalist societies – so, where is the struggle?

### **Monopolistic Capitalism vs. Competitive Capitalism**

The struggle is between conflicting systems. Under monopolistic capitalist systems such as communism, fascism, Nazism, and socialism, capital is held privately or by the state, but is controlled by a few elites or by the state. The historical characteristics of such systems are high prices, poor quality, scarcity of goods, and little privately controlled property for all who want to work for it.

Competitive capitalist systems such as we have known in the USA, on the other hand, foster privately held and privately controlled capital. The characteristics of competitive capitalism are relatively lower prices higher quality products, and private property for all who want to work for it.

If we polled the general public as to which system they prefer, it would be no contest; a vast, overwhelming majority would choose competitive capitalism along with all of its desirable characteristics. Unfortunately, we don't get to vote directly on which system we would choose in the coming 2008 elections. In reality, however, we do get to vote indirectly on the question of monopolistic capitalism vs. competitive capitalism.

### **How so?**

We vote indirectly on our choice of monopolistic or competitive capitalism by way of a candidate's political philosophy. This is true whether the individual is a candidate for President, Congress, Governor, Legislator, or even City Council. The candidate's political philosophy is reflected in his/her philosophy of either limited government and more individual responsibility – or bigger and more expansive government. Plainly put – your political system determines your economic system and financial well being. Big government equals weak economy. Throughout history, socialist ideals of cradle-to-grave nanny states have been colossal failures. Government has NO money to spend that it first did not extract from someone else. Most socialist-leaning politicians sincerely want to do good, but they want to do it with someone else's money. In the former Soviet Union, there was government provided housing, health care, places to shop, and even a job – such as those things were – but the system collapsed. In the waning days of the Soviets, the mantra among the people was “they pretend to pay us and care for us, and we pretend to work.”

### **Power Corrupts**

The founders of the USA had a big fear – and that fear was a too-big and too-powerful government. Accordingly, they devised a system of checks and balances that distributed power inside the federal government and to the states and ultimately to the people.

There is a peaceful struggle for one branch of government to encroach on the powers of the other branches, particularly inside the federal government. Ours was to be a system to self-government where the citizens control themselves, restrict themselves, and conduct themselves according to God's laws. In reality, the Constitution and statute books are for heathens and those believers who have lost sight of their responsibilities under God's laws. The Founders of this nation gave us a republic (rule by law), not a democracy (mob rule) where the purpose of law was to protect life,

liberty, and the private property. Over time, the rule of law has been perverted and many politicians are trying to use the law as an instrument of plunder. These politicians have learned the art of robbing “Peter” and giving to “Paul,” and in return they get Paul’s vote. Many times these same politicians also get Peter’s vote because of the slick rhetoric that lulls him to sleep while he is being robbed. Once in power, these same politicians use the same methods to stay in power; they just use those methods on a grander scale.

### **History Show Us**

Alfred Frayser Tyler, a British professor some 200 years ago, stated, “A Democracy can only last as long and until a majority of the people discover they can vote themselves largesse (large gifts) out of the public treasury; and then, they will continue to elect the politician promising the most; the end result will always be a fall of the democracy due to economic ruin and chaos.”

### **Most Important Races**

The most important races are those for the Congress (U.S. Senate and House of Representatives). The most important of congressional races is the 435 House seats that are up for election every two years. You see, every specific bill and every tax bill must originate in the U.S. House of Representatives. If you don’t fund a government program, nothing happens – and you get to keep our money and spend it as we see fit.

### **Road to White House**

Most of the general public is focused on the presidential race, where we will elect a new leader of the free world in less than twelve months. The presidency is important as it is Commander in Chief of the military and head of the Executive branch of government, The President, with advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, appoints judges to the federal court system, including Supreme Court Justices.

### **Democrats vs. Republican or Third Party**

Reality tells us that either the Democrat or the Republican candidate for president will be elected. There has been some talk of a third party, backed by some evangelical leaders. History shows us that third parties serve only to split votes and elect one of the other party’s nominees. Such was the case with the candidacies of Ralph Nader and Ross Perot. As a practical matter, third party candidates are birthed out of frustration with one of the major parties. Unfortunately, most of these people failed to involve themselves in the political process (education and activism) until shortly before the election.

### **Clear Choices**

If you believe in big government and less individual responsibility you will probably want to take a look at any of the Democrat candidates and one or two of the Republican candidates. If you are opposed to killing babies in the womb (abortion) and tend to favor marriages between “Adam and Eve” instead of “Adam and Steve,” you will look to the Republicans – with the exception of a couple of their candidates. If you are concerned about the massive number of illegal aliens in the country, you will have to forego supporting any of the Democrats and look to only three of the Republican candidates. Then there is the debate in both major parties as to which candidate of the opposition party will be easiest to beat.

### **The Candidates:**

#### ***Hillary Rodham Clinton***

Hillary Rodham Clinton comes to the highest “negatives” of any candidate to ever seek the presidency. She has one of the most tightly organized and heavily funded campaigns for 2008. Once considered the presumptive nominee of the Democrats, she is locked in a tight race with Barack Hussein Obama, Jr. As with all the Democrat candidates, she is pro-abortion and panders to the homosexual groups. Clinton wants to keep the inheritance tax (death tax), and she even teamed up with billionaire Warren Buffet to stake her position on opposing repeal of the death tax. Clinton is running on a platform of bigger and more expansive (and expensive) government. These new programs include everything from “free” health care to subsidies for any and every interest group that can deliver a substantial voter turnout. Our analysis is that her campaign is in trouble, and we will doubtless observe the Clinton brand of politics of personal destruction being practiced on Obama.

#### ***Barack Hussein Obama, Jr.***

Obama is fresh off his road trip with celebrity Oprah Winfrey, where thousands greeted them in the early primary states. Like Clinton and all the Democrat candidates, Obama displays a “laundry list” of things he would like government to do for you and me, hoping to attract votes from those wanting something “free.” He uses the anti-war message to appeal to the crazies on the Left. He, too, strongly supports abortion, homosexual rights, gun control, and is more of a “pure” Socialist than Hillary Clinton. Obama is considered by some black leaders to be “not black enough,” prompting former Atlanta Mayor and UN Ambassador Andrew Young to proclaim, “Bill Clinton has gone with more black women than Obama.” Obama’s early years were spent in an Islamic school in Indonesia, where he was trained in the militant Wahabi Islamic traditions. Obama’s successful fund raising is on a par with Clinton, and he has a real shot at getting the Democrat nomination.

#### ***John Edwards***

The former North Carolina Senator is a trial lawyer by profession and is very much a Socialist; he regularly touts in his message the taking from the “haves” and giving to the “have-nots.” Perhaps he could open up his 27,000-square foot mansion to the homeless. He, as with all the Democrat candidates, is pro-abortion and pro-militant homosexuality. He, as with all Democrat candidates, favors amnesty for illegals. Although he is for gun control, Edwards is somewhat softer on the gun control issue. He too, proposes raising your taxes for his special interest, big-government programs. Edwards is a long shot to get the nomination unless Clinton and Obama “slice and dice” each other so badly that they end up as damaged goods. Any of the top three Democrat contenders can be beaten with the right candidate from the Republicans.

### ***Rudolph Giuliani***

Once considered the Republican front-runner, Giuliani has failed to increase his lead and in fact is slipping in the polls from his early highs. Giuliani is pro-abortion, pro-homosexual, pro-gun control, and pro-big government. Many think he should be running as a Democrat. Rudy married his cousin before he married his mistress, and was involved in a messy, scandalous divorce while serving as Mayor of New York City. Giuliani has cashed in on his politics with his firm Giuliani Partners, where millions flow from businesses ranging from Fox News owner Rupert Murdoch to Arab States that fund terrorism. His law firm, Bracewell and Giuliani, is heavily involved on behalf of clients seeking to facilitate the merger of the USA, Mexico, and Canada into a European-style North American Union that eliminates the sovereignty of the USA and the two other countries.

### ***Mike Huckabee***

The former Arkansas Governor can best be described as a pro-life, big-government-loving Socialist who believes government should have a solution for all of our problems. Some observers say Huckabee’s surge in Iowa is akin to 1988 when Pat Robertson won the state. Huckabee’s record includes an attempt to make Arkansas a sanctuary state for illegal aliens, and he has been instrumental in destroying the conservative movement in the Arkansas Republican Party. In the midst of the recent fight inside the Southern Baptist Convention between conservatives and liberals, Huckabee sided with the Jimmy Carter wing of the SBC. Huckabee is considered by the Democratic National Committee to be the weakest Republican and easiest to beat; the DNC circulated a memo to all political operatives to “lay off” criticizing Huckabee unless he gets the nomination.

### ***Duncan Hunter***

The California congressman and former chairman of the U.S. House Armed Services Committee is perhaps one of the best and most knowledgeable of the Republican candidates. Hunter gets it right on all the issues that freedom-loving Americans really care about. He understands the China threat, both in trade and militarily. He is retiring from Congress, but his son is running for the seat. Hunter has had difficulty in raising funds to mount a serious campaign, but he would be a great Vice President or Secretary of Defense.

### ***John McCain***

The McCain campaign is going nowhere. McCain misjudged the mood of the American people when he supported amnesty for illegals. This one issue, among many, helped derail any momentum his campaign had achieved. Many observers view McCain as old and tired.

### ***Ron Paul***

Ron Paul has amassed a good record in the Congress as a constitutionalist, but has been very weak on defense and national security. Paul comes across as very naïve on the realities of the world we live in, particularly with regard to our enemies and how we deal with them. He sounds similar to the Democrats that are running, proclaiming himself as an anti-war candidate. The sizeable sums of campaign cash Paul has raised are due in large part to his anti-war sentiments. His views on some social issues are fuzzy, while some of his recent pronouncements are bizarre, even Stalinist in nature. Unfortunately, some observers say, he may even lose his congressional seat over some of the “goofy” actions he has taken in the presidential race.

### ***Mitt Romney***

Romney as governor of Massachusetts governed as a pro-abortion, pro-homosexual liberal. He also favored gun control. He now says he was wrong on those issues. Romney has spent much of his own cash to help fund his campaign, but it is getting less support for each dollar spent than any of the other candidates. His recent “religion speech” is indicative that he feels his Mormon religion is causing political problems. Some observers describe Romney as “plastic,” well programmed, and “slick.”

### ***Tom Tancredo***

Tancredo has done more to help stop illegal immigration than any other single individual. He amassed an impressive conservative voting record while in the Congress. Unfortunately, he is not running for re-election to his House seat and probably won’t be the Republican nominee for president. Hopefully, a Republican president would appoint him to head Homeland Security or Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

### ***Fred Thompson***

The former Tennessee Senator is the most articulate and knowledgeable candidate running. His record in the U.S. Senate was strong pro-life, pro gun and pro individual liberty and responsibility. Absent his support of the McCain Feingold Campaign Finance Reform Act, Thompson would have had a 100% lifetime rating from the American Conservative Union. The old saying among economic and political elites who try to run the USA, "We don't care who you elect. Democrat or Republican, as long as we get to do the nominating" has come into play against the Thompson campaign. The elites are frightened at the prospect of a Thompson presidency and have attempted to trash him and his campaign from the very day he entered the race. Thompson has a tendency to keep his own counsel and does not suffer from a disease known around Washington as "staff infection." In Washington, staff + policy and too many of the "professionals" in D.C. are void of any understanding as to how government should run under Constitutional limitations. Thompson recently received the coveted endorsement of the National Right to Life organization. This group, with over 3,000 chapters and an army of volunteers nationwide, will make a difference in the 2008 primaries and delegate selection. We believe the Republican race will go down to the wire with the final battle being between Thompson and Giuliani. Our analysis is that Thompson is the strongest candidate the Republicans can put forth.

The 2008 elections are the most critical in the history of the U.S.A. Your assets, freedoms, and well being are all at stake. These are serious times.