

WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT TWO STREAMS

LIFE	DEATH
CNN	FOX
Liberalism	Conservatism
= Change	= No Change
= Inclusive	= Exclusive
= Freedom	= Control
= Flexible	= Rigid
= Principle	= Policy
= Selfless	= Selfish

So, we came up with a situation. And the situation was that you have a mountain and a ledge, and there is a barrier in front of the of the edge.

The question is do we keep the barrier, or do we get rid of the barrier?

Also, what does the liberal mind do and what does the conservative mind do?

I want to ask you guys to think about that and brainstorm it.

So, does anyone have any question or comments?

My brother says that tradition says leave the barrier, which is the conservative mind.

So, let me say, we're coming together to decide if we are going to add a barrier or not. Half the room as Conservatives and half are Liberals; Conservative minded Liberal minded.

What side is going to argue what?

My sister said she would do everything in her power to help someone who is risking their lives.

In this case she would be putting up a barrier.

The barriers just about whether we're going to fall off the cliff or not.

**So, we have a few conflicting thoughts. We are saying,**

= Let's not put up a barrier, because if we do then it's going to take the responsibility away from the parents to teach their kids not to go near the edge.

= Another thought is the individuals should know not to go near the edge.

= If we leave it open it will look more dangerous and will detour more people from going near the edge.

= Proceed at your own risk.

And as my sister said before that maybe,

- We should do everything in our power to stop someone going over the edge even, at the expense of putting up some sort of barrier.

So, what is the Liberal going to do and what is the Conservative going to do based upon our definitions?

Okay then, let's frame it this way.

Why would we want a barrier and why wouldn't we want a barrier?

Let's separate it from Liberal and Conservative.

What is the motivation?

- = Control
- = Mitigating risk
- = Liability protection
- = Impose restrictions

The fundamental question is the idea of **collective responsibility** *verse* **individual responsibility**.

You can say that you should be responsible for yourself and your children and it isn't my responsibility to police you and watch out for your children because you shouldn't have let them walk too close to the edge.

Also, by putting up a barrier you are infringing on my rights or my choice. You can frame it that way in one argument. The responsibility is on yourself and I want to have maximum ability to walk to the edge if I want to.

The other side of the argument would say,

People have fallen off, and they could fall off, and therefore we should do everything in our power to minimize that risk and to mitigate that problem of people going off the edge.

Because what is one little barrier over the life of a child, would be the argument.

Based on the way I framed those arguments which one is Liberal in which one is Conservative?

You don't know anymore. That's great. It means we are really getting to something.

Let's add this idea to the argument.

Am I my brother's keeper?

Which side would use that argument?

Is it the side that doesn't want the barrier or the side that does?

The answer is, it is this side that doesn't want the barrier.

Who are you quoting when you say that?

Cain.

Wow let's put that into the record.

0

We could go all over the place with this.

And my sister just touched it!

Restricting freedom for the good of all. My sister said Caiaphas.

So, there's the idea of common good versus individual good.

So, this is what is going on. We have these two lists and the problem with them is that they are a little bit simplistic. I hope we are seeing that we have run into some issues at this point.

Will Conservatives and Republicans put up with the barrier?

As we stand, I think it is the Democrats who would put it up not the Republicans. As I understand it the Democrats would say, we must put up the barrier. They would put it up because if it was my child, I would want someone to do everything in their power to protect them at the cost of spending a little money and not letting me get to the edge of a still cliff. I think that is the argument that would be made.

The idea is that a Democrat would sacrifice some freedom to walk to the edge, it's not freedom that you have like a real freedom in the Constitution, for the sake of the greater good. There is no harm in doing that. Their mindset is that if we can all agree to sacrifice this little thing we can save as many children as possible. That's the idea.

It's the idea of **selflessness**. You're going to give something so that someone else is going to benefit. You aren't going to benefit because you are smart enough and know that you don't walk to the edge.

So, we have a brother and he wants to morph the argument into abortion. So now we have the cliff as abortion and the wall as stopping abortion or making it illegal. So, my brother is saying that the Democrats want to remove that wall so we can all jump over the edge. Everyone laughs....

Is that a good metaphor though?

Sister test at this point shows that you must look at the principal and make sure you don't take the metaphor the wrong way. The examples she gives are the first one that we talked about and then another example of the wall on the border between the United States and Mexico.

In the first metaphor you have a cliff and the Republicans don't want a wall because they don't want to have to be made to take care about the people.

In a second metaphor which is reality.... The Republicans want to build up a wall for the reason they don't want one in the first metaphor they don't want to take care of the people on the other side and don't want to be held responsible for them.

The point is don't look at the action to try to figure out what the answer is, **look at the motive**. In these examples you have Republicans doing completely opposite things but always the motivation is **selfish**.

But now we can see that some of the things can cross over from our list. For example, putting up a barrier can be a policy which is a Republican idea. They say they don't know if you are smart enough.

So, we are going to put a wall up. That kind of thing is also rigid and controlling. In some ways depending on the motivation it can be categorized as Conservative or Liberal.

So, the whole point is **Motivation!**

Also, the idea of how much personal freedom you are willing to sacrifice for someone else. This is a hard question and it shouldn't be. We can bring up a lot of examples that will really make you wonder.

A brother says what about given up freedom for security.

How does everyone feel about that?

How do you feel about the patriot act?

How do we deal with the patriot act?

We know there is **one right answer**, there must be a right answer.

**So, let's go back and talk about the patriot act.**

Why do we say the patriot act is a bad law?

- 1) It goes against rights, God given right.
- 2) It goes against the Constitution.
- 3) It goes against very specific parts of the Constitution.
- 4) The fourth amendment search and seizure which is your right to privacy to some degree.

Someone brings up a quote.

**"When you trade liberty for security, you get neither liberty nor security".**

How does that quote apply to our cliff?

Everyone laughs. .... It's a jagged edge.

So, now everyone is confused on what the right thing is to do, which is a good place to be. We are realizing that some of these ideas are challenging in the way we see the world. We are trying to find the principles and the continuity in this.

I think a good rule of thumb that we set so far is the idea of selfishness verse selflessness.

So, you can pass a law at different times and it can change whether it is good or bad depending on the context of that time. There is a famous example. In explaining the first Amendment, in the United States you are not allowed to yell fire in a crowded theater.

Is this true?

Are you never allowed to yell fire in a crowded theater?

No, you are not allowed.

Only if there is a fire you can yell fire in a crowded theater.

If there is not a fire, then you are not allowed.

So, context dictates what is appropriate, it's been king in most things.

Sister test is going to argue that the patriot act is a good thing. She says that when it comes to the online world the patriot act is good. Without it you have no control over the online drug trade, over child pornography, there is no jurisdiction without the patriot act there so the government can't touch it.

The principles within itself are good. Not as far as the Constitution is concerned but for the online world.

Tyler says interpretation is the problem.

Tess: I think we give the Patriot Act a bad rap.

They wrote the Patriot Act five years before, but they didn't get it through Congress. They needed it for what was happening with the World Wide Web so they wrote out this concept, but it would not get approval before 911.

LIFE	DEATH
CNN	FOX
Liberalism	Conservatism
= Change	= No Change
= Inclusive	= Exclusive
= Freedom	= Control
= Flexible	= Rigid
= Principle	= Policy
= Selfless	= Selfish

To reiterate. We have been talking about Liberal mindset and Conservative mindset. We are looking at our **two lists**. We found through example that our lists are a little bit simplistic to some degree. Some of these things can go back and forth depending on its context, depending on what we are talking about, depending on motivation even and interpretation. The general rule of thumb that we are dealing with is the idea of **selflessness and selfishness**. When you have these two and you judge whatever you're talking about based upon those two ideas, you are more likely to come to the right answer on the problem.

Okay so, I want to talk about this one thing that is a nice definition of Conservatism. We didn't read it yet, but the actual world Conservatism comes into play in the year 1818. This is kind of neat. This is when William Miller stops his study.

It says this and it establishes what we are talking about.



**Conservatism** is a political and social philosophy promoting traditional social institutions in the context of culture and civilization. The central tenets of conservatism include tradition, organic society, heresy, authority, and property rights. Conservatives seek to preserve a range of institutions such as religion, parliamentary government, and property rights, with the aim of emphasizing social stability and continuity. The more traditional elements- reactionaries- oppose modernism and seek a return to “the way things were”.

The first established use of the term in a political context originated in 1818 with Francois-René'-de-Chateaubriand during the period of Bourbon Restoration that sought to roll back the policies of the French Revolution. Historically associated with right wing policies, the term has since been used to describe a wide range of views. There is no single set of policies regarded as conservative because the meaning of conservatism depends on what is considered traditional in each place and time. Thus, Conservatives from different parts of the world- each upholding their perspective traditions-may disagree on a wide range of issues. Edmund Burke, an 18<sup>th</sup> century politician who opposed the French Revolution but supported the American Revolution, is credited as one of the main theorists of conservatism in Great Britain in the 1790s.

The idea is that the contexts of the first use of the word “Conservatism” was that the French Revolution had happened.

Let me ask this question.

Was the French Revolution good or bad?

Now we have jaded my brother in the conversations in the last two classes and now he is a moral relativist and he doesn't know how to see it.

But good question.

It depends what you mean by good.

In terms of the social change that it pushed, was it good or bad?

## What was it trying to do?

- Get rid of the papal institutions.
- Get rid of the monarchies.

They were trying to do the same thing as the American Revolution which is to get rid of the darkness. They failed though, in the implementations of the people doing it. It gets out of control. The idea is good in that they removed those things.

What happens is that after the French Revolution, after the fall of Napoleon, the monarchy of the brother of Louis XVI is going to come back to the country. He is somehow going to take charge of the country, and he is going to start rolling back the French Revolution policies. He tries to go back to before the revolution. He is trying to conserve the monarchies and some of those things. Now he isn't fully successful because they institute a Constitution. And so, he is not able to do it. But I want us to see that it is 1818 that was the first use of the word and its rolling back the things of the French Revolution so you can see the conservatism there.

For the liberals this one is a good one to use to talk about Liberalism.

Liberalism is a political and moral philosophy based on liberty, consent of the governed, and equality before the law.

**Liberalism** is a political and moral philosophy based on liberty, consent of the government, and equality before the law. Liberals espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of these principles, but they generally support limited government, individual rights (including civil rights and human rights), capitalism (free markets), democracy, secularism, gender equality, racial equality, internationalism, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of religion. Yellow is the political color most commonly associated with liberalism.

Liberalism became a distinct movement in the Age of Enlightenment, when it became popular among Western philosophers and economists. Liberalism sought to replace the norms of hereditary privilege, state religion, absolute monarchy, the divine right of kings and traditional conservatism with representative democracy and the rule of law. Liberals also ended mercantilist policies, royal monopolies and other barriers to trade, instead promoting free markets. Philosopher John Locke is often credited with founding liberalism as a distinct tradition based on the social contract, arguing that each man has a natural right to life, liberty and property and governments must not violate these rights. While the British liberal tradition has emphasized expanding democracy, French liberalism has emphasized rejecting authoritarianism and is linked to nation-building.

Conservatism was trying to keep those things and try to rollback history to where it was in power. It kept trying to get back to the dark ages. Here Liberalism is trying to get out of the dark ages. It is trying to remove hereditary right, state religion, absolute monarchy, the divine right of kings, and traditional Conservatism. All the things we were talking about before.

The ideas of John Locke that man has a natural right to life, liberty and property and governments must not violate these rights.

Where have we heard these before?

We've heard it from the Declaration of Independence.

So, when the founders said life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are our natural right, you now know that they are directly quoting the work of John Locke, who was a philosopher, and his whole idea about social contract.

Those are some historical context to Liberalism and Conservatism that I think we should see.

Now I want to ask this question. So, let's take our thoughts again. We haven't really come to hard and fast conclusions about Liberalism and Conservatism.

I was talking to a brother yesterday about Liberalism and Conservatism. We were talking about something like just dress reform.

What is just reform?

So, let me tell you what we were talking about. And so, I'll frame the conversation.

He was saying yeah Liberalism is good.

But don't we want to dress conservatively?

What does Conservative in that way look like?

My question is can you marry up the word liberalism and all these things with something like modesty?

And dress reform and how do you do that?

The answer is, Under principal.

So, what does it mean to dress conservatively?

The answer is, modesty.

What is modesty?

When you dress modestly how are you dressing?

The answer given is, Not flamboyant.

I guess there is a definitional problem with them, so will move on from that thought.

So, I want to move to a national level. Let's talk about countries.

If a country is conservative what is it?

And I don't mean it's a Republican or Democrat.

What are its policies?

The answer given is, Protectionism.

So, you're saying conservatism means rules. You're saying as an individual you're so conservative that you let the government do what they want.

Is that what you are saying?

What does a country whose conservative look like?

What are their policies?

Conservative based upon what we been talking about.

The answer given is, It looks like Saudi Arabia.

Why does it look like Saudi Arabia?

Let's not frame in these two lists we've made specifically in the idea of selfishness versus selflessness.

LIFE	DEATH
CNN	FOX
Liberalism	Conservatism
= Change	= No Change
= Inclusive	= Exclusive
= Freedom	= Control
= Flexible	= Rigid
= Principle	= Policy
= Selfless	= Selfish

Tariffs are protection.

So, we are going to say that we are going to protect everyone inside the country by imposing a 20% tariff on anyone outside the country. What it will do is it will keep commerce inside the country. People will try to keep local because it won't have that 20% tax on it.

What does a selfish country do?

The answer given is, Protectionism.

What else?

- Immigration
- To protect people
- Protect jobs in the country

I think those are some good ones.

And does a selfish country like to work with other countries?

The answer given is, not unless there is a benefit to it.

What kind of word would we put on this type of country?

The answer given is, Nationalism.

**Nationalism** is the selfish country. Nationalism seeks self-interest on a national level at the expense and even the detriment of other countries. The United States is very nationalistic right now in the present.

How is the United States nationalistic right now?

What do we do?

The question given are,

- America first
- We break trade agreements
- Restrict immigration

The United States wants unilateralism. "We want to run the show". "That is our idea". And that is what sister test was talking about with Gorbachev and a multilateral world.

**Multilateralism** keeps everyone in check. If everyone is working together it keeps everyone in check. That is a good thing where we all work together, and we all benefit each other.

The real idea was that we can keep America down by putting them under the yoke of everyone else so that we can remove all superpowers. There wouldn't be superpowers. But the United States said we will nominate ourselves to oversee this. Plainly they just want unilateralism.

So, the United States has tariffs, trade wars.

What is a trade war?

The United States wanted to re-negotiate its trade with Canada.

How did that go?

Did Trudeau like what Trump offered?

The answer given is, No he did not.

What did Trump do?

Trump walked away, and he said, were going to put tariffs on you.

He said if you are not going to play ball with us the way we want to play ball according to our rules, then guess what 50% tax on everything from your country.

This now means people from the United States don't want to buy anything Canada because now it just became so expensive. So now you lose all that business because no one wants to buy from here.

What is another word for that?



Bullying! That is just bullying.

If you see it, that is one thing that Trump has been doing a lot. He has been going around trying to renegotiate all the trade deals with everyone and at the same time he is saying “If you are not going to play ball then you get sanctions through tariffs”. He is doing a big one right now to China. And, Mexico. He has raised tariffs on all countries with the aluminum and iron coming into the United States. That wasn’t just on one country but all countries.

From a global perspective where you are the other countries, that is a **selfish** way to act. He is just trying to take care of his own country at the expense of everyone else.

So, **Nationalism** is a national scale of a conservative mind. This means the opposite of what **that would be the right thing to do**.

What is the opposite word for Nationalism?

**Globalism** is part of it but the actual word for it is Internationalism.

**Internationalism** is a lot like globalism, and I think they are synonyms. It’s the idea of the United Nations. We are all going to come together and hammer the problems out together to better the world instead of benefiting one individual country over everyone else. Another way you can think of it is, **“Rising water raises all ships”**. Everyone would be benefited by the success of anyone else. So, we all benefit, and we all rise.

**Internationalism** is a political principle which transcends nationalism and advocates a greater political or economic cooperation among nations and people.

Supporters of this principle are referred to as Internationalist, and generally believe that the people of the world should unite across,

- National
- Political
- Cultural

- Racial
- Or Class

boundaries to advance their common interests, or that the government of the world should cooperate **because their mutual long-term interests are of greater importance than their short-term disputes.**

### Now this is where Internationalism comes from.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century UK there was a liberal internationalist strand of political thought optimized by Richard Cobden and John Bright. Cobden and Bright were against the protectionist Corn Law in a speech at Covent Garden on September 28, 1843 Cobden outlined his utopian brand of inter-nationalism: and he says this.

#### Free trade! What is it?

Why, breaking down the barriers that separate the nations; those barriers behind which **nestle the feelings of pride, hatred and jealousy**, which every now and then burst their bounds and deluge whole countries with blood...

Cobden believed that Free Trade would pacify the world by inter-dependence, an idea also expressed by Adam Smith in "The Wealth of Nations" and common to many Liberals of the time. A belief in the idea of the moral law and an inherent goodness in human nature also inspired their faith in internationalism.

You have Nationalism on one side and Internationalism on the other just like we had our **two columns** here for Liberalism and Conservatism. One is trying to work with everyone and it's independent in that way. The other is saying our nation is first and that's just the way it is going to be.

LIFE	DEATH
CNN	FOX
Liberalism	Conservatism
= Change	= No Change
= Inclusive	= Exclusive
= Freedom	= Control
= Flexible	= Rigid
= Principle	= Policy
= Selfless	= Selfish

These two words, Liberal and Conservative don't fully serve us because of the complexity of the problem.

The ones that do are **selfishness and selflessness**.

These two cover the spectrum far more, I think, than the words Liberal and Conservative. I think they fit way better. So, you can use Liberal and Conservative, but I think the major way to identify would be **selfishness** and **selflessness**.

In theory if you are **selfless** you are always going to end up on the right side of the issue no matter what that is. If you are **selfish** you are always going to end up on the wrong side of the issue.

These are ideal. It doesn't work that way. There will never be a utopia in the world as we know it. But it is good to want to wish for such a thing.

**So, it's the idea of the two streams.**

One idea wants this and the other wants that.

If you pick the wrong idea and you then see the world incorrectly, you're going to miss the fact that from 2014 to Raphia to Panium to Sunday Law there are all these events that tie into to everything we are talking about right now.

- The Conservative
- **Selfish mind or Selfless mind**
- Nationalism and Internationalism
- It affects how we see politics
- How we accept the message

If you think that the left is wrong about how they frame what Trump is doing, and you're going to say it's probably a conspiracy. They are saying its fake news and everything they are saying about Trump is wrong.

Then you are not going to hear the message of the hour which says **Trump is a dictator.**

Even though it's a moot point that we will never reach the idea of Liberalism it is still important because it affects your mindset.

And this concludes the presentation, Thank you for your participation.

