

VOTING STRATEGY - 2004

WHEN "THE LESSER OF TWO EVILS" IS NO LONGER AN OPTION



SONS OF LIBERTY - CENTRAL FLORIDA

NOVEMBER 2003

(REVISED APRIL 2004)

TAKEN FOR GRANTED

The most effective argument to convince patriotic Americans to support the Republican Party has been that “The Republicans will do less damage to the Constitution than the Democrats will - and besides, what other choice is there?” The conservative vote is taken for granted by the Republican leadership because they believe that we have nowhere else to turn; from a purely pragmatic short-range view, perhaps they are correct. The result has been a Republican Party that ignores conservative values because it has no incentive to do otherwise.

The time has come to provide that incentive.

BACKGROUND

The political system of America is, by default, a two-party system. It was not designed this way - political parties are never mentioned in the Constitution or any of the early founding documents. It just evolved that way. As it continued to evolve, it took the form of an elaborate game where the winning team (party) was the team that could gather the most votes.

Capturing votes became the sole purpose of the parties; platforms exist only to better define the targeted voters. Platforms and principles became meaningless beyond their usefulness in

luring a gullible voting population into their snare.

As with most games, it just seems to work out better for those in the game if there are only two teams. Other teams (“third party” organizations) complicated things and did not benefit the key players. They were, for all practical purposes, shut out of the process. They still exist, but as long as voters believe that a vote for a third party candidate is a vote wasted, it will continue to be a game between two players who have no incentive to be held accountable to the people beyond winning the game.

REPUBLICAN EXERCISE OF POWER

The Republican Party is the dominant party today because it has the conservative vote. Let's look at what Republicans have done with the power that conservatives entrusted to them.

President George W. Bush has presided over a dramatic increase in the size, cost, scope, and power of the federal government that would be the envy of even the most radical socialist. He has stated his support of the clearly-unconstitutional Clinton gun ban and has vowed to sign a replacement into law (the current law has a sunset provision that expires in 2004) should it reach his desk. His Attorney General has made it his personal crusade to get ever-greater power for the government to snoop into the private lives of citizens. Bush has used the military to invade a sovereign nation that had no realistic chance of threatening America, while at the same time encouraging a flood of illegal third-world immigrants across our borders. Yet many conservatives continue to support this administration. Why? Because they believe they have no other choice - the alternative is even worse.

Conservatives have fallen into the trap of only looking at the short range. It is probably (but no longer certainly) true that America would be better off with a Republican administration than with a Democratic administration - in any given year. However, that completely misses the point. The direction that the country is headed in must be looked at

in terms of decades and generations - not as a four-year presidential term.

THE OPTIONS

- 1) Continue to vote for the Republican Party candidates. Maybe we won't end up with a Democrat - or maybe we will. Either way, the Republican Party learns once again that they have the conservative vote no matter what they do.
- 2) Vote for the Democratic candidates. Some on the far edges of conservatism have suggested this as a way to hurry along what they see as the inevitable collapse of America, and see a rebuilding as freedom's opportunity.
- 3) Don't vote at all. This is a common strategy in other parts of the world. The objective is to demonstrate that the elections are not valid by boycotting the election. Another objective of this strategy is to voice dissatisfaction with all the candidates - effectively saying "None of the above."
- 4) Vote for a third party candidate.

We have already discussed Option 1 - continuing to vote Republican just means hoping that instead of heading toward a cliff with the accelerator to the floor, the Republicans will drive toward that cliff and stay within the posted speed limit.

We won't even discuss Option 2. That should be dismissed without a second

thought; it doesn't even lend itself to rational discussion.

Option 3 is based on the assumption that anyone would notice that people were not voting. It is also based on the assumption that the parties would know *why* people were not voting. Not voting at all simply means that the political strategists ignore you. Being ignored is not our intent.

Option 4 is what we believe to be the best choice at this point. There are two possible outcomes - both of which work toward greater liberty:

- A) Third party candidate wins. Although it is highly unlikely, circumstances could evolve resulting in the third party candidate actually winning. Again, highly unlikely, but still possible under the right conditions.
- B) Third party candidate loses, but garners a significant percentage of the votes. The objective here is to show that there are votes available that the Republican Party will not get until they change their ways. The objective is not based on finding and supporting a third party candidate who can win an election. For the foreseeable future, the chances of that happening are remote. Instead, the objective is to demonstrate to the Republican Party that voters *will leave the party* if they are not represented by that party. The working assumption by the Republican Party has always been that conservatives have no where else to turn, and that they are pragmatic enough to not "waste their vote" by voting for a third party. Our objective is to show that assumption to be false.

Either outcome results in a net gain toward restoring the Republic.

The question then becomes "Which third party?" When this document was first released, we had no firm reply. There was considerable debate over whether we should recommend any specific candidate at all. That has now changed with the announced candidacy of Michael A. Peroutka of the Constitution Party.

Voting for Mr. Peroutka accomplishes all of the objectives that we see as important:

- 1) The candidate must be a man of integrity and honor who has vowed to uphold the Constitution as the supreme political authority of this republic, and yet understands that all power comes from God.
- 2) The candidate must be a man who is being supported for who he is and what he stands for, rather than just being "anybody but the other guy."
- 3) Each vote that the candidate receives must be clearly seen as a vote that the Republican Party should have gotten had they been true to their earlier stated position as the party of limited-government.

SUMMARY

- We must take a long range view and sacrifice in the short term if needed. We are working not for ourselves, but for future generations. Taking a long range view means not basing voting decisions solely on who will hold an office for the next four years, but on how future decisions will be made based on election analysis.
- We must not allow poll numbers and political pragmatism to be the criterion of right. If a candidate represents what we believe in, then that is who we must vote for - regardless of prospects for winning.
- The ideal would be to have a President of integrity and honor who respects the Constitution as the supreme political authority of this nation. Failing that, we must demonstrate to the Republican Party strategists that conservative voters cannot be taken for granted, and that we do have a viable alternative.
- For the 2004 Presidential election, Michael A. Peroutka is clearly the best, and indeed the only choice for those whose criteria is “doing what is right” rather than political expediency.

Michael A. Peroutka’s campaign slogan is “Honor God. Defend the Family. Restore the Republic.” There is nothing that we could possibly add to that.

© Copyright 2004 Stephen Clay McGehee