

A HUMBLE PROPOSAL

Although there are many good people in these United States of America; in considering this country, its history, and events, there are many aspects of it which are not all that great. Of course, if I were to fully cooperate with the designs of the ruling class by blindly accepting the propaganda played out in the media (generally that the U.S. is the greatest, always right, morally and ethically superior, blah, blah, blah), then I wouldn't dare question the position and moral composition of this country. Fortunately I am a truly independent thinker whom has given some analysis to these "truths" about the nation. I've come to believe that this is a nation full of hypocrisy and double-standards; here's why.

Foremost in the propaganda is the idea that the United States is a nation where freedom, justice, equality, and independence are cherished. In fact the nation is said to have been founded on these kind of principles. Just take a look at the Declaration of Independence, which states the following (in pertinent part):

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles

and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

This all sounds wonderful but if it only rings true in theory and on paper, then what really is its worth?

The Declaration states a self-evident truth is that all men are created equal. Despite that statement being ridiculous on its face, it creates the facade that equality amongst men is the prevailing norm in the U.S. Ironically, as these words were being adopted into the Declaration the institution of slavery, which denied certain men equal rights and treatment as citizens, was deemed acceptable. Thus the theory in the Declaration seems to be at odds with the reality of the way of life at that time.

And even in current times, despite all of the civil rights/equal protection laws, institutionalized racism still thrives in the forms of: higher loan rates for African-Americans and Latinos, income disparities between people of color and their Caucasian counterparts, the practice of racial profiling exercised by law enforcement agents, etc. So is equality really such a self-evident truth in the U.S.?

My position is that from the beginning to right now in this nation, bias has been an element in our society. For instance, it was once considered acceptable to despise slaves solely due to their social status, just as in more modern times prisoners have replaced slaves as society's punching bag.

There's also the issue of financial bias here in the U.S. A good example of this was illustrated on the television show "What Would You Do?", which is broadcast on the ABC network. The scenario was to see how many people

would stop and help a person, who suddenly passes out while in the process of walking down the street. Two different actors played the role of the person in need. One was a nicely dressed, by all appearance financially well off, female; the other was a man whom seemed to be homeless.

The people walking by were quick to aid the woman, there was no shortage of help for her. But the man was the exact opposite. Even at the point of one lady stopping and practically begging passers-by to help the man, people were still reluctant to offer any help. The take-away from this is that bias infects practically every aspect of our society. The concept of equality amongst men pervading society is like a dream that you wake up from to face the reality of bias.

The Declaration also states a self-evident truth is that all men are endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Unalienable being a key word because it means something that can never be taken away from you. So according to the Declaration a plainly obvious truth is that all men have and will always retain the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Again, these things sound good on paper but do the principles manifest in real, everyday, life?

Many of the states, and the federal government, approves the use of the death penalty as a form of punishment, which disqualifies the right of life as being unalienable. Then there's the supposedly unalienable right to liberty. With the U.S. having the highest rate of incarcerated peoples, the idea that a man's liberty

is an unalienable right is an obvious lie.

And how about the pursuit of happiness? We have so many legal restrictions in this country that it's virtually impossible for a person to freely pursue their happiness. Say that I decide having limo tinted windows on my car will make me happy. In most states limo tinting car windows is illegal, therefore I can't pursue that avenue of happiness. Or what if I decide that using Marijuana may make me happy. Despite the fact that my use does no one else any harm, it's illegal to use and a closed avenue. It seems these rights aren't so unalienable.

Moving right along in the Declaration, it states that governments are instituted among men for the purpose of securing those "unalienable" rights. Many of the laws drafted in the various state legislatures and Congress unambiguously deny men these rights, which is in total conflict to their supposed purpose of securing the rights. If the purpose of governments is to secure our unalienable rights, then our respective state and federal governments have failed us.

And not solely those rights outlined in the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution outlines what is commonly referred to as guarantees in its Amendments; these also seem to be empty words at times. One can go down the list of most of the Amendments and find an instance(s) where the government or its agents have acted in a manner which violates a Constitutional "guarantee." Ironically most government officials, upon assuming office, swear to protect and uphold the Constitution. Far from me just making the statement that

politicians at times trample the Constitution, here are a few examples of it. Think of the gun control laws in your city (some areas have stricter laws than others). Now consider the 2nd Amendment, which states:

"A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Many people interpret this Amendment as granting arms bearing rights solely to the military, for military operations, but the Amendment doesn't state: "the right of the people in the military to keep and bear arms..." it states the people.

The Framers of the Constitution were very smart men whom put a lot of thought and effort into drafting the Constitution. That being said, the logical conclusion to arrive at is that if the Framers meant for this right to be exclusive to a certain group of people then the language would clearly indicate such. The words of the 2nd Amendment are clear and direct, but the government doesn't care.

Consider the not so long ago debate on health care reform. One of the solutions proposed by the conservatives was to enact litigation reform, basically limiting malpractice liability. Their logic is that litigation reform will lower the cost of health care. I don't aim to highlight the subjective absurdity of that position, my consideration is from a purely constitutional standpoint.

The words of the first Amendment are pretty clear: "Congress shall make no law... abridging... the right of the people... to petition the government for a redress of grievances." The purpose of litigation reform is to

abridge a person's redress of grievances. How can one sworn to uphold the Constitution promote any kind of litigation reform?

The First Amendment also establishes the right of the people to peaceably assemble, quite interesting considering the police response in many cities to the "Occupy" movement. The ruling class and their politician puppets have been effectively working to deny the protestors their right to assemble through the harassment of their foot-soldiers the police. The fact is that there are no real guarantees here in the U.S. No one knows that better than the American-Indians, a group of people whom the U.S. government has lied to over and over.

The list of government initiated Constitutional violations can go on and on. Sure we profess to cherish the nation's Constitution but talk is cheap, the question is does our actions illustrate that we cherish the Constitution? My answer to that question is, as I've just shown, that we have the flaws of hypocrisy and active double-standards in the core functioning of our society, making it difficult to really live up to our professions.

Some people may outright disagree, or categorize the ideas that I've just asserted as out-dated; well here's a few current instances of some of those very same flaws. A very good point of study is the current U.S. Middle East Campaign; which has surface elements, that shout from the rooftop of how unethical our government's position is. A prime example of this is our government's recent killing of a U.S. citizen, whom the government labeled a terrorist, abroad without the benefit of a trial or other due process. If this isn't government agents acting in complete

disregard of the Constitution and moral decency then I don't know what is.

King Solomon said that there is nothing new under the sun and in many scenarios it rings true. The saying definitely rings true when applying it to certain U.S. military tactics. Think of how during the westward expansion, the U.S. government used propaganda to paint the American-Indian as the "bad-guy"; pitted tribe against tribe so that the "enemy" spends time picking each other off ("Divide & Conquer" tactic); isolate the remainder in order to deal with them individually (Divide & Conquer); all for the purpose of taking the land that the U.S. had previously agreed was the American-Indian's.

Now compare that with the U.S. Mid-East policy currently being displayed. The U.S. government uses propaganda to paint certain groups in the Middle-East as the "bad-guys"; pits tribe against tribe, nation against nation (Divide & Conquer); isolate particular countries to deal with them individually (Divide & Conquer); all for the purposes of gaining influence / control of their resources and society.

Jumping back to the issue of U.S. double-standards, what really is the difference between a drone attack and a suicide bombing? Both are violent, have collateral damage, and are considered justified means to kill an "enemy." Of course the U.S. government attaches positive adjectives to drone attacks and negative ones to suicide bombings. But from a purely impartial & objective position there's not much difference between the two.

And how about the U.S. accusations charging the various Mid-East dictators with committing crimes against humanity, isn't this an instance of the pot calling the kettle black? Consider the numerous insults to

humanity and decency originating from the U.S.

Slavery, an immoral and inhumane institution by most standards, was the way of life in the U.S.; doesn't that amount to a crime against humanity? The U.S. government refuses to acknowledge this crime, nor has it provided yet. Also, the U.S. is the only nation in the history of mankind to have used a nuclear weapon against another nation; a crime against humanity? Or more currently, the way that the U.S. uses its justice system to oppress people of color, by convicting / sentencing us more harshly than similarly situated Caucasians; wouldn't that be a crime against humanity? Why should one try and remove the speckle from their neighbor's eye when they have a log poking out of their own?

Sadly there seems to be no one to hold the U.S. accountable for its actions. The U.N. is impotent to reign in the U.S., as the Bush administration's decision to invade Iraq evinces. None of the other powerful countries seem to have what it takes to challenge the unethical actions of the U.S. And many U.S. citizens blindly support the policies and actions of our government unconditionally, although the recent "Occupy" movement indicates that more and more people's patience is wearing thin.

To again rely on language directly from the Declaration of Independence:

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, . . . that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it."

With the recent polls showing the people's disapproval

of the government being at record highs, it seems indisputable that the majority of people are tired of our current government and its policies.

I understand that most of those people are not at the point of violent revolution; thankfully there is a peaceful, yet very effective, measure to battle the indifference of our government. We the people, the citizens, support our government through our tax dollars. If at any time we feel that our government has become insufferably corrupt and want to fulfill what the Declaration has declared, our duty "to throw off such government." Without our tax dollars, our government cannot continue to coddle the 1%, while working against the 99%.

Of course the majority of the talking heads on T.V. will blast this idea of taking action against our current government as UnAmerican and treasonous but don't believe them, they speak out of self-interests. They are among the ruling class's best agents. The fact remains though that if the Colonists did not live up to their duty to be rid of an abusive government, then there would be no U.S.; we'd still be a British colony. Now that is UnAmerican?

The politicians are too far removed from the issues and pressures that the 99% deal with. Additionally most politicians, regardless of their lip-service, are in office to promote and protect the interests of those who contribute largely to their campaigns; they're not really on Capitol Hill to represent the masses. So all-in-all nothing will change as it stands; the disapproval rating, the protest, these things don't provide the politicians with any real and immediate consequences. The most reasonable, peaceful, and effective solution to the problem that the government presents is to refuse to continue financing it;

Meaning to cease contributing our tax dollars. That kind of consequence our government will definitely need.