

# A critique of a Mark Levin Monologue

We are Americans. So for the Founding Fathers, individual liberty was not possible without private property rights. For the Founding Fathers, the only legitimate government was not only one that was instituted with the consent of the people, but one that would preserve and protect the individual's right to property. Jefferson talked about it, talked about 'tyranny of the legislature.' So the consent of the governed is only part of it.

So if individual liberty was so important to the "Founding Fathers" then they must have been racists because they settled for only white men having it, liberty, guaranteed. If they believed that the only **legitimate government** was one that was instituted with the consent of the people (only a certain class of humans were considered to be "the people") and one that would preserve and protect the individual's right to property, then they were proponents of class warfare, predominately elitist because many humans who were present at the country's founding didn't even possess themselves. This means that from its beginning, America was a place where race was a proxy for class.

But the government never has the authority to be tyrannical; it never has the authority to seize your property illegitimately.

So then I wondered, what does he mean "seize your property illegitimately?"

Private property represents the individual's labor, your labor, your initiative, your industriousness, your ambition, and so forth. We all have an equal right, an unalienable right as they wrote in the Declaration to pursue happiness. That especially involves **the pursuit of property and wealth** – not that materialism makes you happy, the point was so you can at least subsist, but even more expand your wealth and improve your lifestyle and that of your family. **We do not have a "right" to equal results and outcomes.** And this is the battle – we do not have a right to **make demands** on the labor and property and wealth of another individual, for that individual also has unalienable rights.

The purpose of government in the United States of America, according to the Founders is first and foremost to protect and preserve the individual's unalienable rights. These rights are God-given natural rights: no man, no government has the authority to deny them or destroy them. That is not to say that we as a community or society ought not look out for our fellow man; we did this even before there was a massive, leviathan State. We did this through good works, through charity, through churches and synagogues, through volunteerism, through good acts all the time. **Most of us do not mind being taxed** at a rational level to help take care of those who are truly incapable of survival due to physical or mental disabilities. That is different than redistributing the wealth. That is different than "spreading the wealth." That is different than class warfare.

Conservatives say they don't mind being taxed to help take care of those who are truly incapable of survival due to physical or mental disabilities. But that "is different than redistributing the wealth." That is different than "spreading the wealth." But that is what spreading the wealth is. It is transferring from those who have to those who have not or those who have less. All wealth in this country was derived from a collective. ("The earth is given as a common stock for man to labour and live on. If, for the encouragement of industry we allow it to be appropriated, we must take care that other employment be furnished to those excluded from the appropriation." - Jefferson) From America's beginning it was collective activity which made the accumulation of wealth possible. And it is wise redistribution which promotes the general welfare and insures domestic tranquility. Too much wealth concentrated in two few hands undermines democracy. This is what makes the "Constitutional Conservative" the ideal skill for corporatists. They are advocates of a survival-of-the-fittest state where the little guy is destined to suffer in a Grapes-of-Wrath environment. In reality, you even need wealth redistribution to establish justice because men with too much money have been inclined to abuse other men and impose a "might-makes-right" society like a fiefdom or a company-owned town.

When constitutional conservatives speak of unalienable rights they focus on the right to pursue happiness and see that as especially involving the pursuit of property and wealth. And they say that the Constitution does not grant the federal government the power to "violate our unalienable rights." They say that the federal government is not authorized to "take the fruits of our labor" in order to "equalize economic outcomes." So what do they mean when they speak of equalizing economic outcomes? It would seem that conservatives are speaking of giving people things they don't deserve and didn't work to obtain. Perhaps this is what they mean when they say they are against "spreading the wealth." They seem to be saying that they are against taking money from people and giving it to other people so that the recipients can have the same lifestyle as the people who are better off economically before the transfer. It is Reagan's "big-strapping-buck" racially-tinged story ingrained into the America psyche as the great problem with America manifested in this generation of conservatives (Constitutional Conservatives). I hear it all the time from members of a certain group who complain about prisoners having it too good in prison and people on assistance having cell phones. Yet I have yet to find one of these aggrieved Americans who would change places with one of these prisoners for the "three free meals a day" or the "government provided" health care they get. I have yet to meet one of these disciples of Bunker (as in Archie) who would change income levels with people who receive SNAP benefits. No, in order to be a Constitutional Conservative you have to be better off than the people you are attacking. None taxpaying Corporations and people who run for President of the United States while stashing money in the Cayman Island and Switzerland are exempt from racially animated tirades.

Oh, by the way, when people like Levin talk about the purpose of the government but go to the Declaration of Independence and talk about the pursuit of happiness just remember that someone actually wrote do the purpose of government

“We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

**Our Constitution is intended to protect us from a central government that would take advantage of us as individuals.** It does not grant power to the federal government to violate our unalienable rights. It does not authorize the federal government to take the fruits of our labor, whether physical or intellectual, to “spread the wealth” for “economic justice” or anything of the sort. **The Constitution does not empower anyone, especially the President of the United States, to take our labor, our property, our wealth from us and our families in order to equalize economic outcomes.** I don’t care what you are worth. To say that some person has a right to another person’s labor simply because one person demands it, or because a politician thinks it can be put to better use, or because a group of people think it can be put to better use and vote that way, does not make it Constitutional nor does it make it moral, and it clearly violates the unalienable rights of the person who is being targeted. When the government seizes the power to take what you have earned with your own labor and put it to an illegitimate use, then government has power that is not recognized in the Declaration or the Constitution.

Here is the center piece of constitutional conservatism. They believe the Constitution does not empower anyone to “take” our labor, our property or our wealth because “a group of people think it can be put to better use and vote that way.” This is in essence an argument against democratic government. This is an argument which says that a government of the people (in the conservative lingo this would be “a group of people” can’t fund programs through taxation which they, constitutional conservatives judge to be “wealth distribution” or an equalizing of economic outcomes. A constitutional conservative is a person who is against taxation (which they define as taking labor, property, or wealth) that people a majority of people think is necessary to achieve an end with which they, constitutional conservatives don’t agree. They believe in some taxation for the mentally or physically disabled but that everything else should be left to the churches and the private sector. However, like true disciples of Hayek they can’t show you where in American history this has worked.

Since property rights are inextricably tied to an individual’s liberty, the government is expanding its power not only over your labor, but over you, as a human being. This is exactly what is

happening today. This is exactly what you hear Obama saying in these speeches. He is claiming a power he does not have. That is, the power to decide whose labor is to be protected by the government, and whose labor is to be seized by the government. Obama is saying that the government has the power to take whatever it needs from an individual, thereby punishing that individual and **rewarding some other individual who has not earned it**. They call this “a right.” You have a “right” to health care, a “right” to go to school; you have a “right” to this, a “right” to that. But somebody else is losing their liberty, in support of this politician who is stealing from one to give to another. And by the way, not altruistically either, but for power and votes. This is said to be “just”; this is said to be “fair.” This is said to be “compassionate,” yet it violates the individual’s unalienable rights and the limits the Constitution places on the federal government. There is nothing fair, just, or compassionate about it.

A constitutional conservative is mainly the white person who hears government (i.e. Obamacare) and thinks “welfare queen.” A Constitutional conservative is in essence, an aggrieved white person who believes that the tax money that goes to support health care (ObamaCare) or education is a theft that goes to support things which a person should earn. Constitutional conservatives see today’s government as an entity which is abusing them. In their own words: “Obama is saying that the government has the power to take whatever it needs from an individual, thereby punishing that individual and **rewarding some other individual who has not earned it**. The Constitutional conservative says that you are losing your liberty because the government (of the people) is using tax dollars to provide the “right” to healthcare or education.

The reason why liberals cannot tell you ‘what are the limits of this new power’ is because there are not any limits. The government identifies what’s unequal, what program it wants to fund or create, what “entitlement” it wants to create or expand, calls it a “right” and then plunders individuals that it targets. You might think ‘why do I care? Let me have my piece.’ ... Your children are also, under God granted unalienable rights, recognized by our Declaration. Your children, and their labor, and their motivation, and their ambition, and their industry, and who they want to be, and how they want to be, is also protected by the United States Constitution. If Obama and people like him, people of this alien ideology who reject unalienable rights, who reject the limits of the Constitution are successful, then what are you? What are your children? They will not have the freedom that your parents and grandparents had. They will not have the ability to be successful, to pursue opportunities, to improve their lifestyles, to take care of their families the way that you, your parents, and your grandparents have. This is fundamental ladies and gentlemen...we need to get back to first principles. ... What is an

American? What is the American society? What is the American culture? It's completely different; it's the opposite of what you hear Obama saying day in and day out. [emphasis added]

– Mark Levin, *The Mark Levin Show*, 4/19/2011 ~2:00-10:30

So what is this “alien ideology” that drives the conservative Constitution experts so mad? Perhaps it is taking “our **labor, our property, our wealth from us and our families,**” to provide clean water, build roads, or build schools. Perhaps rewarding “some individual who has not earned” health care by closing the donut hole for seniors or compelling insurance companies to return some of the premium payments not used on medical care to the policy holders is anathema to the Constitutional conservative. Maybe they think these are things that the church and the community should do in their memory “[w]e did this through good works, through charity, through churches and synagogues, through volunteerism, through good acts all the time.” You see the real problem with the Constitutional Conservatives is they remember things that never were and long for a society that they believe existed before Social Security and Medicare. They believe that destruction of the social safety net is the best way to serve man. The bad news for them is that too many of us, having seen the old episode of the Twilight Zone and having some familiarity with history, realize that “to serve man” can have an alternate meaning. The true alien ideology in America is the one in which corporations are people who are in the process of dismantling democracy in America by offshoring profits and writing laws which allow them to escape taxation entirely while simultaneously sending jobs out of America depriving Americans of opportunities to contribute to the maintenance of “American society” and “American culture” and giving their self-righteous, delusional countrymen the opportunity to label those deprived of a living wage, “takers.” Fortunately, those who would have us go back to a past that never existed are fewer, with diminishing numbers, than those who support a social democracy with assured outcomes like clean water, clean air, an FDA, a CDC, an NIH for everyone and Social Security, and Medicare, public education, and yes, one day universal healthcare. Americans are “entitled” to these things because “we the people” can provide them through better policy, from a policy for the people. And the sooner more of us become educated about how to counteract corporate lobbyists and network as stakeholders the sooner we can truly reduce the national debt and affect our trade deficits. Destruction of government by the people, which is what the Constitutional Conservatives who invoke the Founding Fathers so often nowadays would accomplish by destroying the social safety net, would surely benefit the wealthy and, for the wage earning American, make uncertain the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity.

