

INTRODUCTION

An Absurdity Based Society

When I look at the political circus we call American politics, I sometimes start to wonder whether the people who say we are living in the *Matrix* might actually be onto something. The things our politicians do, the things they say, and—perhaps most troubling of all—the complete lack of meaningful public reaction often make me question whether any of this is real.

Where is the logic?

Where is the common sense?

Most importantly, where is the outrage and demand by the citizens for change after decades of dysfunction?

There are situations I refer to as **Political Absurdities**—events and conditions in both our political and social systems that are, quite frankly, absurd. Yet we have grown so accustomed to them that we now treat them as normal, everyday realities.

Here are just a few examples:

Political Absurdities

- **We accept that politicians lie to us.**

Not occasionally. Not just a few of them. But routinely and almost universally. We hand these people power over our livelihoods, our freedoms, our families, and our future—fully aware that many of them are dishonest. Most people would not lend five dollars to a known liar, yet they will hand over enormous authority to one at the ballot box which will cost them hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars. I am sure that many of you would agree that Democrats are liars and fraudsters, but do you have the intellectual honesty to admit that most Republican politicians are the same?

We all understand human limitations. Human beings are not especially good at predicting the future, managing highly complex systems, or making flawless judgments. Yet we routinely empower individuals who not only fail in those areas, but pretend to possess extraordinary wisdom and foresight that allow them to be succeed where everyone else fails. The truly disturbing part is that many of them cannot even manage basic budgeting, and many have long records of poor judgment and failed decision-making. They stand before us with a metaphorical sign that says “**I’m a FRAUD**”, and we ignore it.

- **We allowed unelected bureaucrats to exercise extraordinary control over our daily lives.**

We accepted a level of government control that would have once been unthinkable. During the COVID crisis, bureaucrats and non-elected officials told people when they

could leave their homes, what they had to wear, and what medical decisions they had to make. At the same time, dissenting scientists and doctors were often publicly smeared or silenced for offering contradictory evidence or alternative viewpoints. This happened in both Democrat and Republican held states.

Even after many of those policies and claims were challenged or shown to be flawed, there was little accountability. Those who misled the public faced few, if any, consequences. Worse still, few meaningful legal safeguards have been put in place to prevent the same overreach from happening again. Which may be the greatest absurdity of all: if another crisis occurs, there is every reason to believe much of the same conduct will happen again.

- **We elevate people with the worst personality traits into positions of power.** Many of the individuals most likely to rise in politics display traits that should disqualify them from leadership—narcissism, super egos, manipulative, and self-centered. These are not the qualities of good public servants. These are the qualities of people who see themselves as rulers and care more about image, influence, and control than the well-being of those that elected them.

In many ways, we have elevated some of the least trustworthy personalities in society and then act surprised when they govern accordingly.

- **We normalize political self-enrichment.** It is now considered normal for someone who enters office making a relatively modest income to leave office worth millions. This happens so often that most people barely react to it anymore. And again, it is not just Democrats.

That should be shocking and totally unacceptable. Instead, it is treated as just another feature of political life.

- **We tolerate “Rules for Thee, But Not for Me.”** Politicians and public officials routinely operate under a different set of standards than the rest of society. They violate rules, ignore laws, abuse privileges, and often face no consequences. In fact, it has become common to hear journalists or public commentators say things like, “*If that were you or me, we would probably be in jail*” but then... nothing happens. No serious outrage. No sustained demand for reform. No real accountability. Often, these same people are praised, protected, and re-elected.
- **We accept laws that are disconnected from reality.** We live under laws and regulations that are often poorly thought out, poorly researched, and obviously flawed even under basic scrutiny. Yet many people act as if this is simply how government works.

We all know that wealthy interests and political favoritism influence public policy every day. We recognize it when we see it. Yet many still resist admitting that our political

system is deeply corrupted in ways that resemble the third world countries we often criticize.

- **We allow fear and disorder to shape how we live.**

We have reached a point where many people avoid certain neighborhoods, avoid public spaces, avoid going out at night, and avoid letting their children experience the freedom that earlier generations once took for granted. Rioters and violent agitators are allowed to take over our streets. People increasingly are making decisions based on concerns about safety, instability, or social disorder.

That is not a sign of a healthy society. It is a sign of a society losing confidence in its own institutions and culture.

- **We are forced to debate things that should not require debate.**

We are now having surreal national arguments over matters that, not long ago, would have been considered self-evident. Basic realities are increasingly treated as optional or offensive, and institutions are often expected to deny what common sense and biology plainly reveal. Having a serious debate and having laws passed regarding the issue of what is male and what is female has to be the most absurd topic imaginable. Yet, it is one of the top debated issues of our time and is having impacts on medical practices, privacy issues, and education.

We also see laws and moral standards that are often riddled with contradictions so extreme that they would be laughable if they were not so consequential.

These are the conditions—and the so-called “norms”—of the circus we call American politics. We see the clowns. We see the antics. We even laugh at them. Yet year after year, election after election, we continue empowering the same people and act as if everything is the way that it should be.

That is what I find so baffling—and so frustrating.

The Conservative Contradiction

Among conservatives, I still see far more common sense, realism, and rational thought than I do in most other political circles. I identify as a conservative because I believe the core principles of conservatism—personal responsibility, ordered liberty, common sense, and respect for reality—remain fundamentally sound.

But even within conservative circles, I see absurdities.

Election after election, conservatives continue voting for Republican candidates they already know will not truly fight for conservative principles. Too often, they are elected for one reason only: because they are not Democrats. Then, when they betray their base, conservatives are disappointed—but rarely shocked. And even more rarely do they hold those politicians accountable in any lasting way.

That is a major problem.

Conservatives today are living under a political reality in which liberal and socialist ideologies have become so institutionally dominant that they are now advanced with open confidence and very little fear of meaningful resistance. Laws are passed not simply because they are believed to be beneficial, but often because they serve as demonstrations of power—signals that say, “*You cannot stop us*” and “*You are irrelevant*”.

And too often, they are right.

Each year, more freedoms erode. Government expands further into private life. More troubling laws are enacted. And when conservatives do secure a win—which is increasingly rare—those victories are often short-lived. They are overturned by courts, undermined by bureaucrats, or reversed by other political actors before they can have lasting impact.

For every step forward, we seem to take two steps back.

What may be most discouraging of all is that many of the loudest conservative voices no longer seem interested in changing the culture or building a winning movement. Too many have settled into the role of commentator, complainer, or heckler. They criticize. They react. They vent. But they do not lead.

I see far less strategy than I do frustration.

Far less action than I do outrage.

Far fewer calls to build—and far more content designed simply to complain.

Enough Is Enough

At some point, we have to say: **Enough is enough.**

If the opposition has become this arrogant, this overconfident, and this brazen, then perhaps this is precisely the moment conservatives should stop playing defense and start going on offense. Their arrogance will be their downfall. We just need to start *successfully* challenging them.

I want conservatives to become the side that is advancing, not retreating.

I want common sense to become politically powerful again.

I want the absurdities to stop.

And for me, that is not just a hope or a slogan.

Over the past 15 years, I have spent significant time researching these issues, interviewing both grassroots conservatives and political leaders, and examining the institutions, systems, and behaviors that shape our political world. From that work, I believe I have identified a path forward—a strategy that could allow conservatives not merely to survive politically, but to begin winning in a meaningful and sustained way.

Before laying out that strategy, I want to make a few promises about the proposals I am about to present.

My Promises

I promise that my proposals:

1. Will not require conservatives to compromise their principles.

Too many conservative leaders have accepted the idea that liberal and socialist concepts are simply more popular and therefore must be accommodated or partially adopted. I reject that premise entirely.

I do not believe conservative ideas are inherently unpopular. I believe they have been poorly communicated, poorly organized, and poorly defended. Presented properly, conservative principles can still resonate with a large and receptive audience.

2. Will not require the creation of a third party—except as a last resort.

The Republican Party has serious flaws, and many of them are structural. But abandoning the party entirely would mean walking away from decades of infrastructure, relationships, and political capital that can still be used if properly redirected.

My goal is not to start over from scratch. It is to transform what already exists into something that can actually function as an effective vehicle for conservative success. Only if the leadership of the Republican Party can somehow stop our movement will we consider starting a new party, but that is our last resort, not our first or second.

3. Will not depend on politicians or party leadership to produce results.

We have relied on them long enough. We have trusted them long enough. And we have been disappointed enough times to know better.

Real change will not come from waiting for better politicians. It will come from ordinary conservatives deciding to take responsibility for the future of the movement themselves.

My proposals are built around empowering the members—not the leadership, and certainly not the political class.

Most of all, I make this promise:

If enough people understand and apply the principles I am about to present, conservatives can build something far more effective than anything we are currently doing.

More importantly, we can begin laying the foundation for a better society—one rooted in stronger institutions, better governance, and sounder values.

Why We Are Losing

Before discussing how to win, we first need to understand why we are losing.

Because we are not losing for the reasons many people have been told.

We are often told conservatives are losing because:

- liberals are too entrenched in media, academia, and government;
- billionaires and major donors are outspending the Right;
- conservatives do not engage in disruptive, media-generating activism the way the Left does;
- or that voters—especially younger ones—simply prefer liberal ideas.

There is some truth in those explanations. But they are not the root cause.

The real reasons we are losing are much more serious:

- **We are fighting the wrong way.**
- **We are fighting the wrong enemy.**
- **We are following the wrong leaders.**
- **We are fighting for the wrong reasons.**
- **And too often, we are fighting against ourselves.**

When you look at it honestly, it is remarkable that conservatives win anything at all.

If we want different results, we cannot keep using the same methods.

We cannot pour new wine into old wineskins.

A Necessary Warning

I often tell a joke when speaking to conservative audiences:

“Doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results is the definition of what?”

People usually answer, “*Insanity.*”

And I respond:

“**No—it’s conservatism.**”

It gets a laugh, but there is truth in it.

Conservatives, by nature, are cautious about change. That is not always a weakness. In many ways, it is one of our strengths. Conservatives value continuity, order, tested principles, and the preservation of what is good and worth keeping.

But conservatism is also supposed to be rooted in common sense and rational judgment. That means that when evidence clearly shows something is not working, we should be willing to change our methods—even if we do not change our principles.

That is exactly what I am asking for here.

What I am proposing is not a minor adjustment.
It is not a cosmetic rebranding.
It is not a slight change in messaging.

It is a **fundamental rethinking** of how conservatives organize, communicate, lead, and fight.

Not for the sake of novelty—but because the evidence increasingly suggests that our current approach is failing.

I want Republican politicians who are fundamentally different from the ones we keep electing. I want a Republican Party that is known not merely as an election machine, but as a force for building a better society and a better government.

I want a political shift that changes not only who wins elections, but what kind of country those victories help create.

At the risk of being misunderstood, what I am proposing is nothing less than a peaceful political revolution.

Not violent. Not chaotic. But transformative.

And yes—transformative change is often disruptive.

Having said that, I intend to show you sound arguments and logical plans on how these changes will result in a Republican renaissance that will give us victory. I only ask that you carefully consider my proposals and evaluate for yourself if they can succeed where our past efforts have failed.

I am counting on common sense and logic to overcome resistance to change.

Why I Am Speaking to Blue State Conservatives

I am directing this effort primarily to conservatives living in blue states dominated by Democrats.

Why?

Because you have suffered the most, and because you have the clearest view of the failures I am describing.

You have lived under the Orwellian policies.

You have experienced the overreach.

You have watched your freedoms erode and your communities decline while being told that your concerns are either irrational or irrelevant.

You have been insulted, ignored, and politically marginalized for years.

And because of that, you are the most willing to try something bold.

Blue state conservatives have something unique: **very little left to lose.**

When traditional methods have repeatedly failed, people become more open to serious alternatives. I believe many blue state conservatives are at exactly that point. They are tired of losing. Tired of being dismissed. Tired of watching terrible policies advance while Republican strategies collapse over and over again. You know that if you trot out the same politicians, with the same programs and the same stories, you are going to continue to have Democrat domination.

And because of that, Blue states are the most fertile ground for a serious political reset.

I am willing to state plainly that if the principles I am proposing are applied correctly, they have the potential to transform even deeply blue political environments over a very short time. We are not talking about decades, but just 4-7 years at most that the state will flip.

That is how strongly I believe in these ideas.

The Advantage of Being Outside the System

There is another reason blue state conservatives are uniquely positioned to lead this effort:

They are not the ones who built the systems currently causing the damage.

They did not create the absurd laws.

They did not build the corrupt institutions.

They did not vote for the dysfunction that now dominates their states.

That gives them a unique strategic advantage.

They are not burdened by ownership of the current system. They can critique it, confront it, and challenge it with far greater clarity and moral freedom than those trying to defend flawed Republican governance in red or purple states.

Red states, by contrast, often face a different problem. While conditions may be better in many of them, they are hardly immune from bloat, compromise, weak leadership, or institutional drift. In many so-called red states, the reality is they are much closer to purple. The resistance there often comes not only from the Left, but from inside Republican structures themselves. While I am not saying that these reforms will not work in Red states, I am saying that they will be much, much more difficult to implement.

That is why I believe Blue states may be the best place to begin.

Final Challenge

If you are tired of losing to liberals, socialists, and Democrats...

If you are deeply concerned about the future of the United States...

If you are wise enough to know that civil conflict should be the **last** resort, not the next one...

If you see the same absurdities that I do and want to restore common sense, logic, and sanity to government...

Then I ask only this:

Evaluate these ideas honestly.

If they are sound, then the next step is the most important one of all:

Join together. Take action. And stop accepting the absurd as normal.

“SOCIALISM!”

“You keep using that word. I do not think it means what you think it means.”

(How We Are Fighting the Wrong War)

We tend to think this political war is about stopping Democrats, liberals, and socialists from taking over the country and turning it into a socialist state.

Yeah... I hate to be the one to tell you this, but we lost that war about a hundred years ago.

That battle was over long before you or I were even born.

We are not a democracy in the way most people think. We are not functioning as a true constitutional republic. We are not a capitalist country. And we certainly cannot honestly describe ourselves as “a government of the people, by the people, for the people” if by that we mean a system rooted primarily in liberty, democratic accountability, and free-market principles.

We are, in fact, a socialist country—governed by a socialist system, operating under socialist economic policies, and sustained by a society that largely accepts socialist assumptions without ever seriously questioning them.

In other words, we are a socialist society.

The funny thing is, you probably had a strong reaction when you read that. But in my experience, when I make that statement to people, most do not actually argue with it for very long. More often, after thinking about it, they say something like:

“Yeah... now that I think about it, you’re right.”

And that is because, if you really step back and look at it honestly, it is pretty obvious.

A Better Definition of Socialism

To understand our situation, we need a clearer definition of socialism than the one most people have been taught.

Socialism is a system in which a small group of wealthy, powerful, and self-appointed elites use government—the state—to control and subjugate the general population. These elites see themselves as more enlightened, more educated, and more capable than the people they govern. They believe they know what is best for society and that ordinary citizens should be managed accordingly.

Socialism is not merely an economic model. It also includes political and social components, all of which must work together to reinforce state control. Its ultimate goal is to create a culture in which the state is seen as supreme, individual rights are secondary, and citizens are conditioned into obedience, dependence, and loyalty.

Once you understand socialism that way, it becomes much easier to see what kind of government we actually live under—and how effectively we have been conditioned to believe otherwise.

Bad News, Good News, Bad News

Here is the bad news:

There is no truly capitalist country in existence. None.

The good news is that there are also no genuinely communist countries in existence either—at least not as a separate and distinct system.

Which brings us back to the bad news:

That means every country in the world is operating under some form of socialism.

We have been taught that there are three competing systems: **capitalism, socialism, and communism**. In reality, socialism is the dominant system in all existing political entities. What we are really looking at are **three different varieties of socialism**, which is why people mistakenly think they are separate systems.

I classify them this way:

1. Oppressive Socialism

This is what most people usually call **communism**, although it can also appear in the form of a dictatorship, military junta, theocracy, or any other government that uses direct force, violence, and fear to maintain control.

I also call this “**Honest Socialism**.”

Why? Because unlike the other two forms, it does not pretend to be something it is not. It is honest about its contempt for self-government. It openly assumes that citizens are incapable of ruling themselves and that only the “enlightened” elite can be trusted with power.

In this system, the citizen's role is simple:

- Serve the state
- Be loyal to the state
- Submit to the state

Any opposition is treated as dangerous, disloyal, or traitorous, because anything that threatens the state is portrayed as a threat to society itself. The elites in this system condition the citizens to be self-deprecating and constantly in a state of unworthiness to control something complex as a country. They accept and want rulers because they trust the state to be able to take care of their needs.

This system is the most prevalent of pushing personality cults. They make the elitist leaders into gods, demi-gods, and super humans. They know all, see all, can handle all. Should any leader make a mistake, it is simple to resolve - should anyone point it out, have them shot. Then imprison their family in a "reeducation camp". Problem solved and we are back to being right 100% of the time.

Even with its draconian model, it does have fatal flaws. You see, it seems that within everyone of us, there burns an internal flame that yearns to be free. We are genetically designed to hate chains and confinement. At all times, many people see through this and know that it is not true. Everyone once in a while, they rise up to make their point. Of course, to the elitist leaders, that is just a bunch of people that are pointing out errors, so the response is the same as with individuals who do that.

It is brutal, oppressive, and murderous but we need to give them credit where credit is due – they are very honest about it.

2. Popular Socialism

This is the form of socialism most Americans associate with **Europe** and with self-described democratic socialism.

This is also the direction many American elites and modern leftists appear to want the United States to move toward.

Popular Socialism involves a strong central government with heavy control over economic and social life. That control may range from nationalizing major industries to maintaining intense regulatory dominance over them. The specific mechanisms may differ, but the key feature remains the same:

The government is deeply and directly involved in the economy and in shaping social outcomes.

Unlike Oppressive Socialism, this version gives citizens the illusion of meaningful participation. Elections exist. Political parties compete. Public debate is permitted—within limits.

But the public is still conditioned to believe that government is the default solution to every major problem.

People are not really choosing between freedom and state control. They are choosing between different administrators of the same underlying system.

That is the deception.

Citizens in Popular Socialist systems often believe they live in democracies, when in reality they are simply allowed to choose which faction of elites will rule them.

The government presents itself as a **benevolent parent**—guiding, protecting, and “helping” society while steadily accumulating power.

For all practical purposes, the citizens do not meaningfully control the direction of the country. They simply select their preferred kings, queens, and aristocrats every few years.

3. American Socialism

And then there is the most deceptive version of all:

American Socialism

This system has the unique distinction of being practiced in only one country: the United States.

Of the three versions, it has historically had the least visible oppression—but by far the greatest amount of deception. That does **not** mean there is little oppression. It simply means the prison is larger, more comfortable, and more cleverly disguised.

American Socialism is unique because it denies that it is socialism at all.

That denial, however, is becoming less necessary as government control becomes more normalized and more accepted.

In my view, American Socialism was born on the same day capitalism in the United States officially died: October 28, 1929.

Capitalism had been in decline for decades prior, weakened by increasing government manipulation and intervention. But the Wall Street crash represented the final collapse of what remained. It was triggered by government takeover of the banks, then being manipulated by both

government agencies and the corporate banks that had risen at the turn of the century. Because of policies and people using the system to get rich quick, it caused a catastrophic collapse.

The Great Depression that followed then provided the perfect crisis for the socialist takeover of American life. And every revolution needs a crisis.

Franklin Roosevelt, like the dictators that preceded him, used that crisis to implement what were, in substance, openly socialist-style programs but under the more politically palatable labels of “**Progressive**” and “**New Deal**” reform.

The message to the American people was essentially this:

“We are not abandoning freedom. We are simply updating the system for a new age. We are still capitalist. We are still constitutional. We are still free. We just need more government to make it all work in this new world order of industrialism and new technologies.”

And the public bought it. Hook, line, and sinker.

The suffering of the Depression was so severe that people were willing to accept almost any explanation—and almost any solution—that promised relief.

Then Pearl Harbor gave the new order exactly what it needed: an external threat large enough to justify a massive expansion of federal power, military buildup, and centralized control.

From there, the system only deepened.

Over time, government expanded further into every aspect of life while still insisting that America remained fundamentally capitalist and constitutionally restrained. It was not. The socialists simply became better at disguising state control under pro-American language and familiar institutions. Using Nationalism (a socialist favorite go-to) disguised as Patriotism (more on that later), and ensuring that socialists occupied the three great social institutions – Academia (educators to indoctrinate the little kiddies), Government (to regulate the citizens), and Media (because socialism and propaganda go hand-in-hand), they patiently and slowly expanded using time to hide what they were doing. When you expand for 40-50 years, it is harder to detect.

That is what makes American Socialism so effective.

You were not merely persuaded into it. **You were born into it.**

You were raised in it.

Educated in it.

Conditioned by it.

And taught to call it freedom.

That is not your fault. But it is something you need to understand if you want to defeat it.

What All Socialist Systems Have in Common

Despite their differences, all socialist systems share several core traits.

1. Socialism Is Built on Lies

Socialism survives through total deception. Not little lies. Not occasional lies. It lies 100% of the time.

Its promises are rarely, if ever, fulfilled. Even when it does fulfill its promises, they have hidden agendas and secret outcomes. It says one thing and does another. Its goals are framed in idealistic language, but its actual outcomes are almost always coercive, unequal, and destructive.

The elites who promote it know this.

They may convince themselves that their motives are noble—that they are simply trying to improve society or “help people for their own good”—but in reality, these narratives are most often used to justify control.

That is why socialism’s greatest enemy is **truth**.

Truth exposes contradictions.

Truth reveals outcomes.

Truth strips away slogans.

Like a virus, socialism weakens when exposed to the intense light of honest scrutiny and open debate.

If citizens become committed to truth rather than propaganda, the system begins to crack.

2. Government Does Not Truly Care About You

This is one of the hardest truths for people to accept:

There has never been a government in human history that consistently placed the well-being of its citizens above the interests of those in power.

Let me repeat that so it really sinks in.

There has never been a government in human history that consistently placed the well-being of its citizens above the interests of those in power.

Not one. Not Denmark, not the United States, not Britain, and definitely not China or Russia.

Governments may occasionally do good things. Individual leaders may occasionally have decent intentions. But as institutions, governments are not structured around compassion. They are structured around power, preservation, and control.

In fact, if we are being honest, **government is the greatest killer in human history.**

War, famine, economic collapse, political purges, reckless policy, corruption, forced labor, medical mismanagement, ideological experiments, and bureaucratic indifference have led to more suffering and death than almost any other force in human existence.

And when governments make catastrophic decisions, they rarely say:

“We were wrong.”

“We are sorry.”

“We should not have done that.”

More often, they just double down (and in Oppressive Socialist countries, start shooting). This is not always because elitist leaders were planning something evil. Sometimes it is simply because people in power are just as flawed, limited, prideful, and shortsighted as everyone else—except they are making decisions that affect millions. My point is, whether or not Mao had good intentions with the Culture Revolution, millions still died. That is important, because the main part of socialist brainwashing is believing that the elitist leaders are doing everything for the best of reasons. Our retort is always, “Yeah, and when you are starving to death, you can praise them for their good intentions with your last breath”.

We need to understand that people continue treating government as if it were a wise parent, a moral guardian, or a benevolent protector. We know better, but we have to start with the premise that most do not.

That is danger that we must expose.

3. Government Cannot Create Equality

Another core lie of socialism is the promise of equality.

There has never been a government that achieved true equality. There is no government achieving it now. And there never will be.

Why?

Because human beings are not interchangeable.

Every person is unique in talent, temperament, ability, limitation, opportunity, experience, and suffering. No two people are exactly alike. No two lives unfold under identical conditions. Human existence is too varied, too complex, and too shaped by uncontrollable variables for equality of outcome—or even equality of lived experience—to be possible.

That does not mean people should not be treated fairly or with dignity.

It means that **government cannot engineer sameness without violence, distortion, or dishonesty.**

Socialism depends on pretending otherwise.

That is why equality rhetoric is so important to the socialist mindset: it creates a permanent justification for more intervention, more control, and more centralized authority.

And when equality inevitably fails to appear, the answer is always the same:

“We just need more government.”

It is a self-feeding lie.

4. The Founders Understood Something Socialists Reject: Human Humility

One of the greatest strengths of the American Founding Fathers was not simply intelligence.

It was **humility.**

They understood something profoundly important: no human being is wise enough, virtuous enough, or competent enough to safely wield unchecked power over others.

They knew people were flawed. More importantly, they were humble enough to know their own flaws.

They knew rulers were often arrogant.

They knew governments inevitably overreached.

And they knew even brilliant men were terrible at predicting the future.

That is why they built a system designed to **limit power, decentralize authority, and put decision-making as close to the people as possible.**

They did not create a perfect government. They created a restrained one. This is an area where I feel that conservatives need to rethink. We hold the Founding Fathers as semi-gods, prophets, or as men that were being guided by God in the creation of this country. While I would agree with Benjamin Franklin that the hand of God was present in their deliberation, I feel it is important that we understand that they were just men. They had flaws. Some had major flaws. That is not degrading them or disqualifying the work they did, indeed, it actually makes them even bigger super heroes than the edifying method.

The left loves to degrade the Founding Fathers because they live on a “Kill the Messenger” mentality. They cannot argue the points, so they kill the messenger to cause doubt with the masses. This is no different. If they can make Washington, Jefferson, Adams, and Franklin to be debauched, cruel, racist, and monogynist individuals, then the country they founded would be based on evil men. Conservatives tend to counter with the opposite. They were all good, strong Christian men with the highest moral character that allowed them to communicate with God and receive His inspiration in creating this country.

Neither version is true. We are fortunate that this country was created in a time when there were copious amounts of written work that described them and their work. Those documents show that they neither the debauched leaders that the left says they were nor the good Christian men that conservatives promote.

It is VERY important that we understand this, because it has a profound impact on the creation of this country and the principles that we live by. Our Founding Fathers were geniuses. The miracle was that we had so many brilliant minds in one place at the same time. They were extraordinary insightful and learned men. But the supreme characteristic that makes the United States Constitution possible is that they were humble. Humility is what separates patriots from tyrants. Humility gives you a Constitutional Republic; elitist thinking gives you a Socialist State.

They knew their flaws. They knew that they were the brightest and best men that their country could create. They knew that they were superior to the average person in education, culture, and experience. They knew that they had the traits to become rulers, but also realized that they were flawed, just like every other human. Those flaws, and the courage and discipline to admit them, was what guided them to reject ALL rulers. They saw their own flaws, they just spent 20 years frustratingly trying to negotiate with (and then fighting) a flawed King and Parliament. Because of that, they decided that a great society should be built on limited and constrained government. They understood correctly the value and need for government to have a functioning society, but they put their trust in the people. They decided that multiple voices would be better than one or a

small few. That we could not completely avoid the flaws but could limit them by having more people involved in the decision process. THAT was their inspiration from God. THAT was the hand that guided their decisions.

THAT is what we base our government on. Were our Founding Fathers flawed? Yes, but no more or less than any other person. It is easy to prove their motivations regarding slavery, that Thoms Jefferson did not rape his slave (I personally feel that it was consensual relationship and that Jefferson was 200 years ahead of his time), and that they went out of their way to ensure that they did not personally benefit from this new country. The left's version of the characteristics of our Founding Fathers is just as wrong as their version of anything that matters.

So what that they were flawed men? So was the Democrats great champion, Barak Obama. Joe Biden was massively flawed. You want to discuss Bill Clinton's flaws? Let's talk about the flaws of John Kennedy. George Bush, Donald Trump, and even our beloved Ronald Reagan are also very flawed individuals. That is our point. Nobody is smart enough, wise enough, benevolent enough to be given unrestricted control and power. So, we create a government that avoids that by using the model the Founding Fathers created – the Bottom Up system of the most power at the local level and the least power at the federal level. It also requires, however, that every person in this country sees our politicians as flawed individuals who need to be monitored, constrained, and held accountable. This is the staple of the government we want to create.

A government not too weak to maintain order, but not so powerful that it could dominate society.

That is what made the constitutional system extraordinary.

And that is precisely what socialism rejects. Socialism is rooted in the belief that there *are* people wise enough, moral enough, and enlightened enough to direct everyone else's lives.

That is not humility. That is arrogance dressed up as compassion.

5. Socialism Thrives by Dividing People

The equality narrative is also useful to socialists for another reason:

It helps them divide society into rival factions.

Race against race.

Rich against poor.

Urban against rural.

Native-born against immigrant.

Liberal against conservative.

One grievance against another.

The specific categories do not matter.

What matters is that people are kept fighting each other instead of recognizing who is actually benefiting from the division.

Socialist elites do not truly care about any of the groups they claim to defend. Their objective is not justice. It is fragmentation.

Because a divided people are easier to manipulate than a united one.

The greatest threat to an elite-controlled system is not dissent from one faction. It is a broad population that begins to see one another as allies instead of enemies.

This division is used by the current Democrats and Republicans. As long as Republican politicians and leaders convince you that you must get them elected and to have power in order to win your issues, then it maintains the ruler model.

We will always have issues. We will always have conflicts. It is built into every society. There is always a PUSH – PULL persona to any large social network. There are those that push boundaries and constantly wants to challenge established values and those that pull back and resist going full speed into the dark and destroying needed social constructs that provide for a happy and stable community. That will exist as long as people live in communities.

What we want to avoid is allowing these issues to divide us and allowing the socialists to exploit our differences to have us hate and mistrust each other. By limiting government control, we force issues to be discussed and force the use of PERSUASION, not force, in determining what our society should do and how we should act as a nation. Each side can make their arguments and state their facts. Each side makes their points, but only in very, very limited circumstances do we make them into laws and use force.

Then there is just the basic fact that we are more alike than we are different. 90% of us want 90% of the same things. It is the 10% that separates. If we see others as enemies. If we take race and cultural different to say “This is my tribe and you are from that other tribe”, then we cannot be united. The utopian society that we need to build has be united. Yes, we will have differences and will celebrate that diversity. But we do not allow that diversity to divide us. We do not use it to pit one against the other. We do not allow them to balkanize us.

It is important that you understand this because we have Liberal Socialists and Conservative Socialists. Both want division and an issue-based political system. Both want power and control. Both are made up of elitists that feel that they know what is best for us. Our new Republican Party will get rid of the Conservative Socialists. When we start winning elections and having every country filled with Republican politicians, the Liberals will eventually see the light and get rid of the socialists in their mist and enact the same, but liberal leaning, system. Granted, it will take 20-40 years for them to change since they are more committed to socialism than us (which will be good for us), but eventually, it will happen.

6. Large Corporations Love Socialism

Socialists would have you believe that the protection from abuse by large corporations is from government, that government is the enemy of large corporations, and the large corporations hate a large government because it requires higher taxes and more control.

That is a lie.

They LOVE large government.

They love that they can bribe small groups of government officials to get big contracts, manipulate rules to benefit them, and allow them to take advantage of both their workers and clients by having government pick up the costs of supplying services and programs to them. They absolutely love that government will bail them out when they do stupid things because their company is “too big to fail”. They love that government can create crises that allow them to foreclose on homes at half value, hold on to them (because they have the funds to do so), and then sell them years later at full price.

They don't like paying more taxes and will argue against new taxes, but that is more for show than anything else. They understand and, more importantly, know that politicians understand, that you cannot “tax the rich” to pay for uncontrolled government spending. It will always require taxing the entire population. They also understand on how to pass on taxes to consumers. The larger the corporation, the easier that is done. It actually even helps them because their smaller competitors cannot pass on the taxes as easily. Yes, they are paying a large amount of taxes and the Republicans are always correct when they say that the wealthy is paying the most in taxes. However, loopholes and other schemes allow them to keep a significant amount of their wealth.

To ensure that I am not being misunderstood, we will be reducing taxes to the wealthy by A LOT. However, we need to understand that large corporations will probably be opposing us rather than supporting our cause. If they really look at what we are doing, they would understand that they will have more to gain, but I foresee that they will not want to give up the control over the government that they have. Some of the really smart billionaires will see the great advantage that we offer (and I spell them out in my discussion on capitalism), but corporate elites are like political elites and have the same flaws and misunderstandings.

Here is the biggest reason, however, why large corporations LOVE socialism.

It is because socialism kills competition.

It is much harder for a small company to survive and thrive under a socialist regime. They don't have the capital and the resources to handle the regulations, the taxes, the programs, and all the things that government requires. So, they don't put money into research. They don't expand. They resist hiring more employees. A capitalist-based economy is based on competition.

Competition is death to the large corporation. Paying a 30% tax rate is a good investment if it keeps your competitor from knocking you out.

7. Socialism Substitutes Nationalism for Patriotism

This is one of the most effective deceptions in American socialist politics—especially on the Right.

Many conservatives believe they are acting patriotically when, in reality, they are often expressing **nationalism**.

Those are not the same thing. Let me also help here with clearer definitions:

Nationalism

Nationalism is loyalty to the **state** and its institutions. It glorifies government symbols, government power, and government authority. It encourages people to see criticism of the state as disloyal or dangerous.

Nationalism says:

- “Love it or leave it.”
- “My country, right or wrong.”
- “Support the government no matter what.”

It promotes obedience and emotional attachment to the machinery of power.

Patriotism

Patriotism, by contrast, is loyalty to the **people, principles, culture, and moral foundations** of a nation—not blind loyalty to its government.

A patriot loves the country enough to criticize its government when it becomes corrupt, abusive, or unfaithful to its founding ideals. They are proud to be Americans and are loyal to the ideals and principles of the American society. They would like to be proud of their government, but it does not come automatically included to be considered a Patriot.

A patriot does not worship politicians.

A patriot does not excuse corruption.

A patriot does not confuse the state with the nation.

That distinction matters enormously.

The first true American patriots were revolutionaries resisting their own government.

That should tell us everything.

False Patriotism in Practice

There are many ways conservatives unknowingly drift into nationalism.

Blind support for military action

Questioning war is often treated as unpatriotic, even when the government has not clearly justified the conflict or properly followed constitutional procedures. But sending citizens into harm's way should invite the **highest level of public scrutiny**, not the lowest. Patriots do not reflexively oppose every war. But they also do not suspend judgment simply because the government wraps a policy in a flag.

Unquestioned military spending

Conservatives often speak passionately about wasteful government spending—until the spending is tied to “their side” or a favored institution like the Pentagon.

But patriots question *all* government spending.

They ask:

- Why are we funding this?
- Is this the best use of public money?
- Is there waste, fraud, or abuse here too?

A patriot does not become fiscally blind simply because the spending is labeled “national defense.”

To be perfectly clear – we want the most powerful, most technologically advanced, and the best trained military in the world. If you do something to piss us off to the point that we send in our military, you are going to end up with a stone-age civilization. If you threaten us, we will have the ability to project enough military firepower to totally obliterate your government right to your front lawn. Patriots will proudly serve and will be willing to give up their lives to defend America, its people, and even to support liberty worldwide (because a world based on liberty is a peaceful and prosperous world).

We do not have to have unlimited and unmonitored military spending, and we don't have to support unneeded and dubious military actions. They are mutually exclusive.

Cult of personality

Another nationalist habit is turning politicians into celebrities.

Presidents and other officials are often spoken of as if they are heroic figures, larger-than-life leaders, or irreplaceable saviors.

That is dangerous.

Politicians are public servants—not icons, not celebrities, and certainly not objects of devotion.

If your garbage collector did a terrible job, you would complain immediately. You would not excuse it, rationalize it, or pretend it did not happen to protect that person. You would report it immediately and be angry that it happened. So why do people do exactly that with politicians? (In my opinion, the garbage collector is actually more important to me than any politician. If given a choice of having to keep either the garbage collector or a state representative, the politician is out the door without a thought).

As such, patriots should hold politicians to **higher** standards, not lower ones, especially if they are of their own party. They are representing YOU. If they do something that causes dishonor to your party, they are dishonoring you.

8. All Socialist Systems Eventually Become More Oppressive

This is the final and perhaps most important point:

All forms of socialism ultimately move in the same direction—toward greater control.

American Socialism drifts toward Popular Socialism. Popular Socialism drifts toward Oppressive Socialism. That is where the logic of the system leads.

It does not end in freedom.

It does not end in equality.

It does not end in utopia.

It ends in coercion, suppression, and eventually brutality.

That is why socialists who market their ideas as humane, noble, or compassionate are either deceiving others or deceiving themselves.

Socialism does not have a happy ending.

It never has.

The Irony No One Wants to Admit

And here is where it gets funny.

Many modern socialists and progressives constantly condemn our current economic system. They say it is unfair, racist, corrupt, and designed to benefit elites and corporations.

And on that point, they are often describing reality accurately.

But then they make a critical mistake:

They call that system **capitalism**.

It is not capitalism.

It is **socialism**—specifically, American Socialism.

What they are actually condemning is the very system they want more of.

They are effectively saying:

“This system is unjust and corrupt... therefore we need more of the same kind of state power that created it.”

That is like saying:

“I really need to cut back on caffeine.”

“Then what you need is more coffee.”

This is one of the biggest strategic openings conservatives have—and almost no one is using it.

We should be saying:

“Yes, we agree our current system is corrupt, elitist, unequal, and deeply flawed. But that is not capitalism. That is what happens when government and elites control economic life. That is socialism wearing a different costume.”

That changes the whole argument.

Understanding Socialism and what our current situation is then opens up the ability to understand that we are fighting the wrong war.

We think we are defending the country against socialist invaders storming the beaches.

But in reality, the invaders landed long ago.

They are already entrenched.

They already hold the institutions.

They already control most of the cultural terrain.

And they have far more resources than we do.

That means we are not going to win by fighting conventionally.

We need a different strategy.

A smarter strategy.

An unconventional strategy.

Something closer to what George Washington understood.

Not head-on collisions where the enemy is strongest—but targeted strikes where they are weakest.

Hit where they are vulnerable.

Hit where they are exposed.

Hit where they cannot defend themselves.

Cause disruption. Create pressure. Force them to respond on unfavorable ground.

That is how you beat an entrenched system.

That is what I mean by **Political Sun Tzu**.

And once you understand that, everything changes.

When we get into the structure of organization and how we will implement our goals, you will see that we are not fighting the old way and we are not fighting conventionally. Understanding our true enemy and understanding their strengths is what allows us to plan a different strategy. Remember we are the minority. We are outsiders. We are the ones with limited resources.

Up until now, we have been throwing rocks at the castle walls. Every once in a while we hit a guard or knock over a post. When we do, we celebrate like it is this great victory. But the wall remains, the castle stands, and we are still on the outside.

What we are now going to do is start digging tunnels...

CAPITALISM – WELL, SORT OF...

This is where we need to talk about capitalism—not the version socialism has described to you, not the counterfeit capitalism we are currently practicing, and not even the version most politicians and economists talk about. In fact, it is not exactly the capitalism Adam Smith advocated in *The Wealth of Nations*. It shares many of the same core ideas and principles, but the form of capitalism I am proposing is designed for the modern world.

Just as I did with socialism, I need to offer a new definition of capitalism and give it a distinct name so it is not confused with what the general public usually means by the term. I like the term "**Modern Capitalism**" because it reflects a system that is built for our modern age. It incorporates the changes that have occurred in technology, transportation, communication, and embraces the concepts of cryptocurrencies and other digital finances which can replace socialist fiat currencies.

This definition builds on many of the key concepts outlined in *The Wealth of Nations*, but it does not attempt to recreate the free-market, laissez-faire system that many people assume is required for capitalism to work. Adam Smith had the right instinct and developed a strong model for his time, but the world has changed dramatically since 1776. The values of modern society, particularly in relation to poverty and human suffering, are different from those of Smith's era. Today, people are generally more aware of and more concerned about the suffering of others. Smith's model, at least in its pure form, does not adequately address that reality.

Charles Dickens captured this problem well in *A Christmas Carol*, written not long after Smith's ideas gained influence. Dickens highlighted a society in which people could ignore the suffering of others so long as it did not directly affect them. That tendency still exists. Human beings are often willing to overlook "other people's problems" if left entirely to themselves. That means we must acknowledge a hard truth: a purely laissez-faire system would create unnecessary hardship and suffering. We need a system that provides care for the poor and vulnerable—but without putting government in charge of managing all of it.

There is another major challenge Smith could not have fully anticipated: the rise of industrialization, global commerce, and modern technology. Advances in communications, transportation, and international trade have turned the world into a deeply interconnected global economy. We need an economic system that can take full advantage of those developments while also recognizing that every nation now plays a role in a shared global marketplace.

The influence of Ayn Rand and libertarian thought on modern conservatives cannot be overstated. Their ideas surface repeatedly among conservative leaders and commentators. But I am convinced that the Ayn Rand/laissez-faire model is ultimately flawed, because it does not lead to freedom or to the economic utopia libertarians often promise. Instead, it leads to **corporatism**.

Corporatism is, in many ways, socialism with different branding. It is the same kind of oppressive structure, only run by corporate elites rather than state bureaucrats. If I had to put it bluntly, I would say that corporatism is like socialism—except they play you a catchy jingle while throwing you in prison for failing to be an obedient servant. And instead of ideological reeducation, your punishment would be nonstop advertising. The point is simple: a libertarian, laissez-faire model does not create a truly free society. It simply replaces one set of oppressors with another.

I am not claiming to understand economics better than the great thinkers, economists, and political theorists who debate capitalism, socialism, and communism. They know all the theories and nuances of their fields of study. They are often highly skilled at examining principles and systems in detail. My disagreement is not with their intelligence or their depth of knowledge. My argument is that too few of them take **human behavior**—especially the behavior of large groups—into their equations and theories.

That is the fatal flaw shared by both communism and pure free-market theory: both may sound compelling in theory, but both break down once actual human beings get involved. History shows again and again that people do not behave as neatly or predictably as theory assumes. Good theories often collapse when they hit the hard wall of human behavior.

No one would have predicted that millions of Germans would participate in or tolerate the Holocaust. No one would expect citizens to love and support governments that have murdered millions of their own people. Ayn Rand's writings do not adequately confront the suffering created during Britain's industrial revolution, when entire populations were displaced and those who benefited economically often did little to help those who were left behind. Her arguments matches that mentality – it is my money and if others suffer, they suffer. That does not fit with today's society and will never be (nor should be) accepted by the majority of Americans.

What I am proposing is built around these known realities of human behavior—both the admirable and the destructive parts of it. It takes the best ideas of equality, free commerce, and limited government, and adapts them to fit how real societies actually function.

Socialists also appeal to human behavior, but they do so in order to justify control. They argue that human beings are selfish, destructive, cruel, and incapable of governing themselves. Therefore, they say, people must be ruled by those who know better. But what they fail to understand is that the rulers and controllers suffer from the very same flaws.

What I am proposing is not original to me. The principles do not come from me. They come from figures such as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, George Washington, and others who developed a profound understanding of government and human

nature. Where socialists believe control must be broad, centralized, and comprehensive, the Founders understood that only limited control is necessary to keep society ordered and free.

Their philosophy took into account both the failings of individuals and the failings of large groups, then built a system intended to minimize both. It was not perfect, but it offered the best framework for human flourishing. I also recognize that implementing such a system today would require many thoughtful and capable people working out its details. What I am presenting here is the structure—the underlying architecture—based on the principles that guided the founding of the United States.

I have often said that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 was, in many ways, the first meeting of the Human Behaviorist Society of America. Those men had a remarkable understanding of individual behavior, group behavior, and institutional power, and they used that understanding to create a more perfect union. I am simply drawing from the same source.

With that in mind, we should break down Modern Capitalism into the same three major components we used with socialism: **government, economics, and society**.

Government

Under Modern Capitalism, government power is strictly limited. Government does have a legitimate role: it must provide order, protect society, and preserve stability. But those responsibilities must exist within firm boundaries that prevent abuse.

To achieve that, government should be built from the bottom up. The greatest influence over citizens should exist at the local level, where government is closest to the people. Local communities should have the most control, followed by counties, then states. At the federal level, government should be limited primarily to interstate and international matters, with minimal direct control over the daily lives of citizens.

This structure diffuses power as broadly as possible and reduces the opportunity for corruption and abuse. In this system, elected officials are not rulers or leaders in the grand sense—they are **representatives**. They serve limited terms, perform a public duty, and then return to their communities.

At every level, government should focus on core responsibilities: protecting life and property, maintaining police and fire services, ensuring national defense, managing infrastructure, overseeing growth responsibly, and providing limited oversight where no fair private-sector solution exists. Government should not dominate social life or attempt to engineer society. Its chief purpose is to protect the rights guaranteed under the Constitution.

This is the kind of government the Founding Fathers were trying to create: a government strong enough to preserve order but restricted enough to prevent tyranny. To paraphrase Cleon Skousen, it is a system that takes freedom to its outer edge, stopping just short of anarchy and chaos. It has power, but it is constrained in how it may use that power.

This bottom-up structure produces two major benefits.

First, it allows for “**thousands of local experiments**” that our Founding Fathers referred to. The Founders understood that decentralized government allows communities to try different approaches, test new ideas, and build workable social structures. If a local approach succeeds, it can be adopted elsewhere. If it fails, the damage is contained to a small area rather than imposed on the whole country.

Second, it makes large-scale corruption far more difficult. With more than 3,000 counties and nearly 20,000 cities in the United States, corruption would have to spread through thousands of different officials and institutions in order to take total hold. Corruption can never be eliminated entirely, but decentralization makes it far harder to concentrate power and buy influence on a national scale.

The principle is simple: the fewer people involved in a government office, the less power that office should have. Under this model, the President becomes one of the weakest individuals in government. The Supreme Court is similarly limited. Congress has more influence than either, but power still grows as government gets closer to the people. States have more daily impact than the federal government, and counties and cities have the most direct influence of all. Within the state, the same rules apply: the governor has the least power, etc.

This is **Goldilocks Government**: enough power to preserve order and protect the vulnerable, but not enough to invite large-scale corruption or oppression. Combined with the concept of elected representatives rather than elected rulers, it creates a healthier and more accountable system.

Economics

Economically, Modern Capitalism is built on one simple principle:

Create as much competition as possible within a market-friendly environment.

As I explained earlier, large corporations thrive under socialism because socialism protects them. It gives them the power to restrict competition, capture regulators, and use government to eliminate threats. Modern Capitalism is designed to do the opposite. It is designed to protect and expand competition.

In a healthy capitalist environment, small businesses should constantly challenge larger businesses. As they grow, some of them will replace the corporations that came before them. Then they, too, will eventually be challenged by the next wave of competitors. This cycle of growth, success, stagnation, and replacement is essential to a healthy economy.

This approach addresses a reality that socialists have never properly understood: it is referred to as **the Law of Large Organizations**. Large organizations—whether governments, corporations, or any other large institution—tend over time to become less efficient, less responsive, less disciplined, and less effective. Socialists try to solve this by making those institutions even larger

and layering on more bureaucracy. Capitalism solves the problem by allowing smaller, leaner, and more agile competitors to replace them.

This is the natural economic cycle: birth, growth, decline, replacement. And then the cycle begins again.

This does not mean there would be no large corporations or billionaires under capitalism. In fact, there would likely be more of both. But the difference is that their dominance would be more temporary and more contingent on performance. The problems of oversized institutions often take decades to emerge. During that time, companies can still thrive, innovate, and become very successful. But eventually, if they become too bloated or too centralized, causing them to lose their edge and invite replacement. A Republican Capitalist model is based on quantity, not longevity. We have thousands more successful companies that grow, thrive, create wealth, and serve a need. Most will be replaced later on, but still benefit their owners during their lifetimes.

The same applies to wealth. Billionaires do not become billionaires because they are unintelligent. Under a Republican Capitalist system, many of them would diversify into multiple ventures instead of consolidating power into one giant institution. That means they would become the seed money for innovation—investing in emerging businesses, new markets, and future competitors.

In this model, thousands of venture capitalists and investors would constantly be searching for the next successful idea. That gives smaller businesses a better chance to succeed than they have under the current system. Wealthy individuals would help fuel the economic engine rather than merely concentrating control. If current billionaires understood and believed in this model, then they would not want to oppose us. The problem is that they know what they have right now and will have to give it up to get something better.

And to create more fuel, we would need more wealth creation overall. That means creating more millionaires and billionaires—not through favoritism, but through widespread opportunity, competition, and investment.

Government's economic role in this system is straightforward: **for the most part, leave the economy alone.**

That does not mean government has no role at all. Unlike pure free-market theorists, I believe government does have a limited responsibility in economic life. It should prevent unfair monopolies that suppress competition. It should punish fraud, swindles, knowingly defective products, and criminal business practices. It should regulate activities that cause measurable harm to consumers, workers, or the environment. It should also manage international commerce through treaties and tariffs and provide a fair legal framework for resolving disputes.

Beyond those limited functions, government should not decide who succeeds and who fails. It should not pick winners and losers. Its operating mentality should be hands off, and even when intervention is necessary, it should be minimal, restrained, and narrowly targeted.

Society

Socially, Modern Capitalism requires something many Americans will find uncomfortable:

Citizens must take responsibility for their own actions.

One of socialism's greatest appeals is that it relieves people of responsibility. Government becomes the decision-maker, the excuse-maker, and the scapegoat. If something goes wrong, people can blame the system, the politicians, or the bureaucracy. That dynamic is one of the reasons socialism gained so much ground in America.

But in a capitalist society, people understand that control and responsibility go together. If you want real freedom, you must also accept real responsibility. You cannot demand one while rejecting the other.

As I will discuss later when describing implementation, this shift would need to happen gradually. Government would still manage certain programs in the beginning, but over time, responsibility would increasingly shift back to citizens, communities, and private institutions.

Another difficult adjustment would be **patience**.

Modern Americans have not shown the kind of patience earlier generations often had when working through social change. It is much easier to demand a law, pass a regulation, and force compliance than it is to persuade a majority of people over time. Persuasion is slower. It requires debate. It involves uncertainty. Laws are faster, but they also create resentment, unintended consequences, and overreach.

Both conservatives and liberals are guilty of relying too heavily on government to impose solutions on issues that may not require legal force at all.

If Americans are going to move from a socialist mentality to a capitalist one, this is one of the habits we must break. We are so accustomed to using government power as our first tool that it feels unnatural to step back and allow ideas to compete in public. But that is exactly what a healthier system requires.

Citizens must learn how to debate, persuade, research, and build consensus on a large scale. This process is slower, but that is often a strength, not a weakness. When governments rush to impose solutions "on the fly," mistakes, oversights, and unintended consequences become much more likely. Serious public debate reduces those risks.

Unless there is an immediate threat to life, health, or property, we should not merely tolerate the fact that change takes time—we should embrace it. Just as citizens must gradually learn to reclaim responsibility, they must also gradually learn patience.

A capitalist mentality also creates a very different relationship between citizens and government.

First and foremost, citizens do not trust government automatically. They recognize that government is necessary, but they also understand that it must be treated with caution. I call this the **Patriot Model**. Government is like a firearm: sometimes necessary, sometimes useful, but always dangerous if handled carelessly. It should only be used for specific and justified purposes.

This mentality also reinforces the importance of local government. The government body with the greatest influence over my life should be the one closest to me. Elected officials should come from the same communities they serve, live under the same conditions, and bear the consequences of the decisions they make.

One of the defining features of this mindset is that citizens question everything. When a politician proposes a new law, the public should greet it with skepticism and with dozens of hard questions. Politicians should be treated like aggressive salespeople:

“What you are offering may sound useful, but my default assumption is that you are trying to take advantage of me until you prove otherwise.”

That mindset also changes how citizens view elected officials.

A capitalist mentality does not want rulers. It does not need political celebrities or superior classes. It does not treat elected officials as masters. Citizens owe no greater respect to a politician than to a business owner, teacher, firefighter, or any other contributing member of the community. Public officials are employees, not bosses. They work for the people.

Socialists have rulers. Capitalists have representatives.

In this system, elected officials would be understood as **government servants**—individuals chosen to serve the public, not command it. I have a term for this type of public official: the **Patriot Politician**.

The concept comes from the idea of a patriot who loves his country, his community, and his fellow citizens enough to serve them. We see that spirit in police officers, firefighters, and military service members. Our politicians should be expected to have that same mentality. We need to restore the right relationship between citizens and elected officials.

Once that relationship is properly understood, accountability becomes automatic. Elected officials should be held responsible for their actions while in office, just as any employee is held responsible for the job they were hired to do.

To be clear, I understand that politics still requires capable, articulate, and dynamic individuals. We do not want dull or incompetent people running for office. We still want intelligent, persuasive, energetic candidates. The difference is not in whether they are compelling people. The difference is in how the relationship is defined.

Notice that I said we want **dynamic and inspirational people**—not “leaders.”

CORRUPTION

If we accept the premise that we are operating under a socialist-style government, then we can logically conclude that such a system is fundamentally about power. Elites require power to implement their agendas, and they consistently work to centralize that power—primarily at the federal level, and to a lesser extent at the state level.

Why? Because a successful socialist system depends on concentrating authority within a small group. Ideally, that power is held by a single individual (such as a president or governor). At most, it may extend to a few hundred people (like Congress or a legislature). But beyond that, power becomes too diffuse to effectively maintain control.

Can we agree on that?

If so, then the role of such a system becomes clear: it must continuously acquire more power and control. The most effective way to do this is by consolidating authority into the smallest group possible—most commonly at the federal level. This consolidation makes both control and corruption more manageable.

But how do you get people to accept this centralization of power?

You use one of the oldest strategies in history: divide and conquer.

First, you divide the population—encouraging groups to fight among themselves. You create division, amplify differences, and foster distrust. You convince each side that the other is a threat to their way of life. The critical piece, however, is ensuring control over all sides of the divide. Centralized power makes this far easier to achieve.

In more authoritarian systems, this is simplified through a single-party structure. In others, multiple parties exist—but real power remains concentrated among those who control the central government. In the United States, this manifests as two dominant factions—Democrats and Republicans—with power consolidated at both federal and state levels due to the size of the country.

The result is a system where both parties benefit from division. Each builds loyal followings—Democrat loyalists and Republican loyalists—by focusing on issues that keep people divided. The specific issues matter less than the division they create. The more division, the stronger the dependency on the party.

Politicians benefit from this dynamic. By keeping the public focused on divisive issues, attention is diverted away from the politicians themselves. In exchange for your loyalty—and ultimately, your freedom—they promise to defeat the “other side” and protect your interests.

Over time, politics becomes a team sport.

We cheer for our side, celebrate victories, and defend our leaders no matter what. We want strong leaders who can impose our agenda and defeat the opposition. As a result, politicians must project strength, certainty, and infallibility. They cannot appear wrong, admit mistakes, or change positions.

But here's the problem: politicians are human—and often deeply flawed.

So how is this contradiction resolved?

Through blind loyalty.

When politicians act improperly, their supporters defend them at all costs. Evidence is dismissed. Blame is shifted. Facts are obscured. Accountability is avoided. Criticism—especially from within the same party—is treated as betrayal.

This creates a system that rewards bad behavior.

Like a criminal who never faces consequences, politicians who are protected by loyal supporters have no incentive to change. Their behavior escalates because they know they will not be held accountable.

Layer onto this the well-known truth: power corrupts—and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The accumulation of power inevitably leads to corruption. And that corruption does not remain isolated—it spreads throughout the entire system. It appears not only in government institutions, but also in political parties, media, education, nonprofits, and any organization connected to political influence.

This is not limited to small or developing nations. It exists everywhere power is concentrated—including in the United States.

Whether we want to admit it or not, corruption is pervasive.

And that leads to an uncomfortable question:

Do you believe your preferred political leaders are exempt from this corruption?

While not every individual politician is corrupt, it is reasonable—especially at higher levels of government—to assume corruption exists unless proven otherwise. In fact, it may be more practical to assume corruption first and allow leaders to demonstrate otherwise.

This issue extends beyond the two major parties. Smaller parties and reform movements are not immune. In many cases, they are even more vulnerable to influence due to limited resources and concentrated leadership structures. The problem is not the size of the organization—it is the pursuit of power itself. Any organization whose primary goal is control will eventually become corrupted.

This brings us to a critical realization:

The problem is not simply who is in power—it is the existence of concentrated power itself.

The “Magic Room”

Imagine government as a “magic room.” Whoever occupies the room has control over everyone else. Both sides fight endlessly to gain access.

But there’s a catch: the door cannot be locked from the inside.

The only way to permanently solve the problem is for those inside the room to voluntarily leave, close the door, and lock it—removing that power from everyone.

But those who seek power will never willingly give it up.

So the real solution is not just electing different people—it is electing individuals who understand the dangers of power and are willing to reduce it.

That principle matters more than any individual political issue.

It is not enough to ask whether leaders use power “for us” or “against us.” The real question is: are they reducing power—or expanding it?

Rethinking the System

If we continue to focus only on winning elections and controlling powerful positions, we reinforce the very system we claim to oppose.

This creates several problems:

- Winning becomes more important than integrity
- Politicians become the center of the system
- Party members become tools rather than stakeholders

A fundamental shift is needed.

The purpose of a political party should not be simply to win elections. That is a goal—but not the primary goal.

The primary goal should be to build a better society.

That means:

- Electing representatives, not rulers
- Returning power to citizens
- Prioritizing local governance over centralized authority
- Demanding transparency, accountability, and ethical conduct

It also means recognizing that government is often inefficient and should be limited to functions that cannot be handled elsewhere. At the same time, society must ensure that basic human needs—such as food, shelter, healthcare, and education—are addressed effectively and responsibly.

A New Direction

We must reject any system that concentrates power in the hands of a few at the expense of the many.

We must also hold ourselves to the same standards we expect from others:

- Truth is truth
- Right is right
- Facts are facts

If we fail to do this, we become part of the same problem. We must be the party that embraces and loves the truth. Our actions must be centered on the acknowledgement and acceptance of those truths. When facts show us the truth, we need to act accordingly. Not to save face, not to support our organization, and not to present an infallible front to our enemies. Instead, we tell the public that we are an organization that embraces truth and, more importantly, we **SHOW** them that we do. In doing so, we build trust. In building trust, we build strength. In building strength, we build our new society.

Finally, unity is essential. Internal division weakens movements and benefits those who seek to maintain control. Minor differences must be set aside in pursuit of a larger goal: restoring accountability, reducing centralized power, and creating a system that serves the people—not the other way around.

SOCIAL SPENDING

57% of Americans overall disapprove of the Republican Party's image. The most common criticisms are that the party is dishonest, greedy, racist, and corrupt. It is also widely seen as the party that prioritizes corporations and the wealthy over the poor. Much of that perception stems from Republican policies and rhetoric surrounding government social services. This is a complicated issue, and it deserves a more serious and thoughtful discussion.

While I would agree that there is at least some merit to the criticisms of dishonesty and corruption (criticisms that, to be fair, are often equally applicable to Democrats), I do not believe the other accusations are justified or accurately reflect Republican values. At the same time, I do not think these perceptions are simply the result of successful Democrat propaganda. Democrats may repeat and amplify those narratives, but many Americans are also forming these views based on the daily actions, tone, and messaging of Republican politicians themselves.

At its core, the Republican Party is often branded as greedy and racist because our messaging is built around a philosophy that is only **half right**. That philosophy is that government should not be heavily involved in social spending. There is real merit in that belief. It aligns with one of our strongest and most effective arguments: government is the most inefficient, ineffective, and expensive solution to any situation. The problem is not the philosophy itself. The problem is how we communicate it.

When Republicans talk about social spending, too often the message is simply: **cut, cut, cut**. Eliminate this. Downsize that. Reduce this budget. Divert those funds. We are excellent at talking about saving taxpayer money, but we often sound as if we are willing to throw struggling Americans to the wolves. That is where the perception of greed comes from.

The accusation of racism is more complicated and often rooted in misconception. Many Americans assume that Black and Hispanic communities receive the majority of government social benefits, when in reality White Americans make up the largest share of recipients. But whether that perception is accurate or not, it still shapes public opinion. When people hear "cuts to social spending," many automatically assume those cuts will disproportionately harm minorities. That perception must be addressed, but not in a defensive or dismissive way.

To fix this, I do **not** recommend that Republicans simply argue over racial statistics. That can be easily turned against us with a response like, "*So you are just as cruel to poor White people as you are to everyone else.*" That is not a winning message. Instead, we need to completely reframe how we talk about the issue.

Our messaging should focus on the same three core arguments Republicans already believe about government:

- **Ineffective**
- **Inefficient**
- **More costly**

Instead of saying, “**We want to cut social spending,**” we should say:

“We want to provide the most effective, efficient, and least costly way to get resources to the people who truly need them.”

That single shift changes the entire political narrative. Suddenly, Republicans are no longer framed as heartless. Instead, Democrats become the ones defending waste, bureaucracy, corruption, and systems that fail the very people they claim to care about. If our argument is that the current system is bloated, ineffective, and riddled with fraud, then the question becomes: **why are Democrats defending a broken system?**

We have already seen examples of how Democrat-aligned NGOs and politically connected organizations can become vehicles for waste, patronage, and self-enrichment. That gives Republicans a real opportunity—but only if we present ourselves as reformers who want better solutions for those that need help, not simply cutting government spending.

The First Problem: Nobody Really Knows Where the Money Is Going

The first and most urgent concern with social spending is this: **we are spending enormous amounts of money, yet we still do not clearly know who is receiving the benefits, how much they are receiving, and how much is being lost in the process.** The system has become so large and so fragmented that it is practically unmanageable.

Whether that dysfunction exists because of deliberate fraud or simple bureaucratic incompetence, the end result is the same: too much money is being absorbed before it reaches the people it was intended to help.

Various studies suggest that recipients may receive anywhere from **18% to 50%** of the total funds allocated. The exact number depends on who is doing the study. Conservative estimates are generally lower, liberal estimates higher. But even if you use the most generous numbers, you are still admitting that **half or more of taxpayer dollars are going somewhere other than the person in need.**

That money is overwhelmingly going to bureaucracies, administrative structures, consultants, staff, and intermediary organizations (that is assuming that it is not being diverted to Democrat fundraising). And unlike struggling families, those groups are not likely to generate much public sympathy if Republicans argue that they should be removed from the process.

The Second Problem: Republicans Must Show That We Actually Care

If Republicans want to win this issue, we must stop sounding like accountants and start sounding like leaders.

We need to make it unmistakably clear that we **do care about people in need**—and not in some vague, political, checkbox way. We need to show that we care in concrete, measurable, and morally serious ways.

First, we should emphasize that our goal is to ensure that **more of the money intended for struggling Americans actually reaches them**. That is both compassionate and fiscally responsible. For example, if charitable organizations are often expected to keep administrative costs around 10%, why should government social programs be allowed to consume 50% or more in internal overhead? If charities can be held to that standard, why can't the government?

In fact, Republicans could credibly argue for a system that **increases aid to the needy while also reducing costs to taxpayers**. If we eliminate unnecessary layers of bureaucracy and middlemen, we could potentially increase direct benefits by 20% while also reducing waste by 20% or more.

But we should go even further. We should not just say we want to make welfare cheaper. We should say:

“We do not want to fund poverty. We want to end it.”

That is a far more powerful and morally compelling position.

We understand that poverty will never be eliminated entirely. But millions of Americans could be moved out of it. More than **40 million Americans** live at or below the poverty line. What if Republican reforms could reduce that by 25%? Or even 50% over time? That would mean **10 to 20 million people** living better, more stable, more dignified lives.

That should be our objective.

The Republican position should be that every American in need should have access to the essential resources required for a decent life: shelter, food, healthcare, safety, and the basic conditions for human wellbeing. Not just enough to barely survive, but enough to stabilize, recover, and move forward.

That does **not** mean creating a permanent welfare state. It means creating a system that helps people recover and become productive, independent, and self-sufficient whenever possible.

That means investing in what actually helps people get out of poverty:

- mental health care
- drug rehabilitation
- child care assistance
- family counseling
- job training
- employment pathways
- transitional support systems

The goal is not to trap people in dependence. The goal is to **move people from crisis to stability, and from stability to independence.**

If someone is healthy and able to work, the system should be designed to help them reenter productive society—not simply keep them parked in long-term dependency. But just as importantly, Republicans should never appear to support **suffering as a motivational tool**. There is no real evidence that making people miserable helps them improve their lives. In fact, it often worsens crime, addiction, depression, family instability, and hopelessness.

The balance is this: we should not make welfare easy to stay on indefinitely, but if someone genuinely needs help, they should receive enough support to live with dignity while they get back on their feet.

The Conservative Messaging Problem

This is where things get politically difficult.

To make this argument effectively, Republicans must first confront some of our own long-held assumptions.

The “cut government spending” mantra is rooted in two powerful ideological traditions: **capitalism** and **libertarianism**. Both are based on an important moral principle: people should have the right to keep and control the fruits of their own labor. That principle has real merit.

But when applied too rigidly to social spending, it becomes politically unworkable and, in many cases, morally incomplete.

First: Taxes Are Not Theft

This is one of the most self-defeating slogans on the Right.

Taxes are not theft. That is unserious, anarchist rhetoric, and Republicans should stop repeating it.

A functioning society requires shared contribution. Taxes are, in many ways, a **membership fee for civilization**. A sustainable society will need infrastructure (roads, courts, first responders, etc.) to exist. Government is an essential part of society and serves a purpose. As such, taxes form the membership fee that each person who lives and benefits from the productivity of the society in general should be required to pay. If you don't want to pay the fee, then leave. However, if you are going to enjoy the privileges of the society, it has the right to request fees for that and government is the fairest and most honest way of extracting those fees.

Now, **excessive taxation** can absolutely become exploitative. When government takes far more than is reasonably necessary, that is abuse and that can be considered theft. But the existence of taxes in and of themselves is not immoral. In fact, most Americans would have no issue paying reasonable taxes if they believed the system was fair, efficient, and genuinely beneficial.

The real Republican argument should not be **"taxes are theft."** It should be:

"Taxes should be reasonable, transparent, and used effectively for the benefit of society—not wasted, stolen, or weaponized. They should be the extracted in such a way to have the least amount of impact on the citizens as possible."

That is a far stronger and more defensible position.

Second: The Old Libertarian Answer Has Not Worked

The hard truth is this: **our modern system, flawed as it is, still provides more support to the poor than the systems that existed before it.**

Yes, it is expensive.

Yes, it is corruptible.

Yes, it is abused.

But we also have to admit that purely voluntary or market-based systems have historically failed to adequately care for the poor, especially at scale.

Human beings do not consistently and collectively take care of the vulnerable unless there is some structure that compels or organizes it. History has shown that clearly. Without systems in place, the poor are too often ignored, hidden away, or left to fend for themselves in conditions most Americans would find unacceptable. We are good at taking care of our ourselves, our immediate friends and families, and even will address wrongs that we can see. We are horrible of taking care of everyone and everything else. "Out of sight, out of mind" creates outcomes that cause suffering to many people in the world.

That is why the Republican message cannot simply be, **"Get government out of it and everything will sort itself out."** That is not a serious transition plan. It is a slogan, not a governing philosophy.

Third: You Cannot Dismantle a 100-Year System Overnight

This may be the most important political reality Republicans fail to accept.

America has spent over a century building a government-centered social support system. Every living American has grown up in that environment. Whether they like it or not, it is what they know.

So, when Republicans talk as if they can just shut the system off overnight and everything will be fine, the public understandably rejects it.

This is the “ON/OFF switch” problem in conservative politics. We talk as if government involvement can simply be switched from **ON** to **OFF** in one election cycle. That is not how deeply embedded systems work.

We should not be talking about on/off switches. We should be talking about **dimmer switches**.

If Republicans want to move the country from a heavily government-managed model toward a more decentralized, market-driven, community-based system, then we need a serious transition plan. That means gradually reducing dependency, gradually increasing accountability, gradually shifting responsibility, and gradually rebuilding a culture of civil society and voluntary support.

That may take decades. And that is okay.

It took over 100 years to build the current system. It may take 50 to 75 years to responsibly unwind and replace it. That is not compromise. That is realism.

Force creates speed—but often at the cost of justice and stability.
Persuasion protects liberty—but it takes time.

And when you are dealing with systems so deeply woven into American life, sudden removal would not create freedom. It would create collapse.

A Republican Transition Plan

If Republicans truly want to move the country toward a more effective and less government-dependent model, then the transition must happen in phases.

Phase 1: Eliminate Fraud and Abuse

Start where the public is most likely to agree.

Use DOGE—or any serious oversight mechanism—to identify fraud, waste, misappropriation, and abuse. If a program is intended to feed the poor, provide shelter, or deliver healthcare, then that function should continue. But every contractor, agency, NGO, and intermediary should be required to prove that funds are being used as intended.

The first step is not to eliminate help.
The first step is to eliminate **theft, waste, and corruption**.

That is a politically defensible place to begin.

Phase 2: Shift Delivery Away from Bureaucracy

Once waste is identified and controlled, the next step is to reduce dependence on bloated government administration and move service delivery toward organizations that can operate more directly and efficiently.

This will be controversial because NGOs have, in many cases, become vehicles for political patronage and abuse. But that does not mean the NGO model itself is invalid. It means it has been corrupted. Our kneejerk reaction to Democrat abuse and fraud is to completely go in the opposite direction and eliminate everything associated with the socialist program. NGOs are very good tools to use to get to our goals, they just need to have the proper accountability and oversight. Used correctly, they provide the best vehicle for resolving social issues.

So, the answer is not to abandon the concept. The answer is to regulate it properly.

Any NGO receiving public funds should be subject to:

- full financial transparency
- document disclosure
- regular audits including surprise audits and spot checks
- performance reporting
- public accountability
- citizen access through FOIA-style transparency standards

If taxpayer money is involved, secrecy should not be tolerated. Period.

Phase 3: Make Providers Compete

No organization should be permanently funded simply because it exists.

Any organization receiving government-backed funding to address a social problem should be required to compete based on **results**. That means organizations must demonstrate how they will improve outcomes, reduce dependency, and solve the problem more effectively than their peers.

One possible model would be to select several organizations across comparable regions or populations and allow them to compete over a fixed evaluation period—perhaps one to three years. At the end of that period, the best-performing model is expanded and the others are discontinued.

Most importantly, funding should be structured to reward **problem-solving**, not perpetual maintenance.

In other words, organizations should be incentivized to **reduce poverty, reduce homelessness, reduce dependency, and reduce social dysfunction**—not merely manage those conditions forever in exchange for continued funding.

That changes the entire incentive structure.

Phase 4: Give Citizens More Say in Where Their Money Goes

Eventually, Republicans should move toward a system where taxpayers have more influence over how a portion of social spending is directed.

People should still be required to contribute their fair share. But within that framework, citizens could be given meaningful options to direct some of those funds toward approved causes, providers, or models they believe are most effective.

This is essentially a **School Choice-style principle applied more broadly**: if public money is being spent in your name, then you should have more input into where it goes and what kind of solutions it supports.

That would create a far more participatory and accountable system.

Phase 5: Rebuild a Culture of Voluntary Civic Responsibility

Long-term, the real goal should not merely be policy reform. It should be **cultural reform**.

Over time, Americans should be encouraged to see helping one another not as a burden imposed by the state, but as part of responsible citizenship. Businesses, schools, communities, and institutions should reward and normalize civic contribution, philanthropy, and local problem-solving.

If we can rebuild a culture in which people genuinely value helping their communities, then one day we may be able to transition to a model that even libertarians would admire: one based primarily on **voluntary participation rather than coercion**.

But that kind of society cannot simply be declared into existence. It has to be built.

The Political Opportunity

This entire framework ties directly into one of the strongest Republican talking points about government:

Government is too inefficient, too expensive, and too ineffective to be trusted with solving major social problems.

But instead of using that argument to justify abandonment, Republicans should use it to justify **better solutions.**

That is how we win this issue.

We tell the American people:

- The current system is not getting enough help to the people who need it.
- Too much of the money is being diverted, wasted, mismanaged, or stolen.
- Republicans want to fix that.
- Republicans want more help to reach the needy, more efficiently, and at lower cost.
- Republicans want to solve the problem—not just fund it forever.

That is a winning message.

It flips the moral perception of the issue. Suddenly, the “bad guys” are no longer the people calling for reform. The bad guys are the ones defending systems that waste money, trap people in dependency, enrich insiders, and still fail to provide basic dignity.

An easy way to prove our point is to ask, “Why are food banks still necessary in a country that already spends **billions upon billions** on social welfare programs?”. That is a powerful and simple question. If the system is working effectively, why do so many gaps still exist?

That is where Republicans should press the case:

“If we are spending this much money, why are people still not getting enough?”

That question resonates.

And the answer should be:

“Because the current system is built to sustain itself—not solve the problem.”

Republicans should be the party that says:

- **We want more money to reach the needy.**
- **We want less waste and corruption.**
- **We want programs that actually work.**
- **We want to help people become stable, productive, and independent.**
- **We want to solve the problem, not preserve it.**

That is a message that can work for virtually **any** social spending issue.

Final Political Thought

And one final point: imagine taking this message directly into Black, Hispanic, and lower-income communities.

Many of those voters are already drifting away from Democrats because they increasingly feel Democrats no longer represent their moral, spiritual, or cultural values. If Republicans also become the party that can credibly say:

“We care about helping your family more effectively, more honestly, and with better results,”

Now that would be politically explosive and that is how you change the map.

Party Organization

How we structure our party organization is a critical part of the overall strategy. If our goals are different, then the structure of the party must be aligned to achieve those goals.

This is where the truly radical part of the reforms begins.

The overall infrastructure of the party must be built around its primary purpose:

To create a government that is instrumental in establishing and maintaining a capitalist, Constitutional Republic-based society.

To accomplish that mission, the party must pursue several key subgoals:

- Shift the focus of government back to the local level and decentralize operations.
- Prevent corruption by diffusing power to local communities and instituting party committees dedicated to holding Republican candidates and elected officials accountable.
- Reestablish the Precinct Committee Officer (PCO) as the primary political position within the party structure.
- Win elections by overwhelming margins in order to establish a clear public mandate for our agenda.

Each county party organization should focus on its own county. This must be a local effort aimed at local results. At the beginning, we are not trying to change the nation or even the entire state. We are trying to change **our county**. Our first priority is to implement our reforms locally. That requires that we allocate our resources to local priorities. That may be hard when the media and attention is on state and federal elections, however, we are taking a long-term approach. This is why issues must take a backseat to social rebuilding. Issues can suck us back into supporting and focusing on national issues instead of concentrating on just rebuilding our county.

There are several strong reasons why we begin at the county level:

- We want to be able to make changes regardless of whether the state Republican Party supports us. We should fully expect resistance from party leaders and politicians who benefit from the current structure. Starting at the county level limits their ability to interfere.
- Since the county is the primary political structure we want to build around, it makes sense to begin there.
- Smaller organizations are easier to reform. County governments typically have smaller staffs, smaller budgets, and fewer bureaucratic obstacles. That makes it easier to implement changes, evaluate results, and make adjustments quickly.

The strategy is straightforward: reform one county, reorganize the party, win local elections, use those victories to implement changes in government, and then move to the next county.

Wash. Rinse. Repeat.

Each successful county then helps neighboring counties adopt the same reforms. County by county, the movement grows until it begins influencing state politics as well.

Reorganizing the County Party

Party reorganization begins with the Precinct Committee Officers (PCOs) and the active participants already involved in the county party. While it would be ideal to have the county executive committee join us, we should not expect that to happen initially.

To succeed, we need to reach every PCO in the county. We should also engage local influencers and active party members who can help spread the message, but our main focus must remain on the county organization itself.

From an infrastructure standpoint, we are not talking about moving thousands of people at the outset. We are talking about perhaps **100 to 200 committed individuals**. That is entirely achievable.

The first step is to reframe the role of the PCO.

PCOs are no longer just free campaign labor, party marketers, or donors. Their role must shift from simply promoting candidates to becoming actual representatives of their precincts and advocates for the citizens they serve.

They are supposed to be the main voice and controlling authority of the party.

The executive committee does not “own” the party. It is not the leadership of the party in the true sense. It exists to serve the members. The executive committee should not rule over the party; it should act on behalf of the members and in their best interests.

The goal, then, is to build enough support within the county organization to elect fellow reformers into leadership positions—committee chairs, county chair, and other key voting roles.

To help identify supporters of this movement, we need a name.

I propose calling the movement **Political Remodel**.

The name reflects exactly what we are trying to do. We are not trying to create an entirely new party or abandon our political affiliation. We are trying to **remodel** the Republican Party.

Those who support this movement can identify themselves as **Political Remodelers**, or simply **Remodelers**.

County Remodelers will then form coalitions to elect fellow Remodelers into county leadership.

If you are already a PCO, then this begins with you.

If you are not a PCO, then your role is to contact your precinct's PCO and engage with other PCOs in your county organization. Talk to them about becoming Remodelers.

We must educate and train our people so they can be effective. The goal is to build a **supermajority** within the county organization—one where every committee, every chair position, and most voting members are held by people committed to these reforms.

Redefining the Role of the PCO

Once the county organization has been reorganized, the next step is to expand the role of the Precinct Officer.

At present, PCOs are generally treated as support staff. Official descriptions may say otherwise, but in practice, most are viewed as free campaign labor—useful for recruiting members, donating to candidates, and helping turn out votes.

That model works for a party whose primary purpose is acquiring power and winning elections.

But if the party's mission is to build a better society and hold elected officials accountable, then the PCO's role must become much more meaningful.

The Precinct Officer should be one of the most important positions in the party.

Their role should include:

- Active participation in the direction of the party.
- Serving on committees that help carry out party goals.
- Acting as the primary representative of their precinct.
- Ensuring that party leaders and elected officials remain accountable to the principles and platform of the party.

They should help ensure that every county officer, every party leader, and every politician connected to the county organization is held accountable for both their actions and their promises.

The PCO becomes both:

1. The **main communication link** for their precinct—what might be called the “Village Elder” role.
 2. A functional part of the party’s accountability and vetting infrastructure.
-

The Patriot Politician Policy

At the heart of the entire process is what I call the **Patriot Politician Policy**.

This policy is designed to fundamentally change the relationship between the party, the voters, and the candidates.

It works like this:

1. Every candidate signs a written contract.

Every Republican candidate must write and sign a contract with both the Republican Party and the citizens regarding the promises they make during their campaign.

The wording of the contract is up to the candidate. They decide what they are promising and how they want to state it. However, by signing it, they agree to be held accountable for those promises.

Candidates may add promises up until Election Day, but they may not remove them. As they meet with voters and hear their concerns, they can add commitments in response to constituent demands.

2. Every contract includes non-negotiable baseline commitments.

Each contract must include minimum standards, such as:

- No tax increases beyond existing per-capita levels except in extreme emergencies.
- Any significant tax increase must be approved directly by voters.
- Commitments to integrity, ethical behavior, and avoidance of corrupt practices.
- No personal benefit from laws or policies they help pass.
- A two-term limit for their service.

3. Candidates must be approved through a vetting process.

Candidates must submit their contract to the **Vetting Committee**, which reviews both the candidate and the contract.

Candidates are free to write whatever they feel comfortable promising—but if their contract does not meet the standards of the vetting committee, or if another candidate presents a stronger and more trustworthy contract, they may be rejected.

The vetting committee must also determine whether the candidate understands that they are a **Representative of the people**, not a ruler over them.

Candidates must demonstrate that they:

- Understand the proper role of government.
- Accept the principle of servant leadership.
- Will work to advance the party's broader goals.

4. Elected officials are monitored after election.

Once elected, the candidate signs the final contract and it is filed with the party and posted publicly.

From that point forward, they are monitored by **Oversight Committees** responsible for ensuring that the official keeps their promises and acts in the best interests of the public.

These committees monitor:

- Voting records
- Public actions
- Policy proposals
- Statements
- Conduct in office

The signed contract becomes the primary evaluation tool, but the broader goals and principles of the party are also used as a standard.

5. Failure has consequences.

If an elected official fails to honor their contract, they agree in advance to resign.

If they refuse to resign, the county party will initiate efforts to remove them—whether through recall, public opposition, or withdrawal of endorsement.

At a minimum:

- They will lose party endorsement.
- The party will actively support a replacement candidate.
- They will be barred from holding positions within the Republican Party.

This is what accountability actually looks like.

Why the Patriot Politician Policy Matters

This process accomplishes four major things:

It gives voters clarity.

Campaign promises are usually vague, emotional, and unenforceable. This policy turns promises into measurable commitments.

If a candidate does not put something in writing, then it is not a guarantee—it is just a “maybe.”

This gives voters a much clearer picture of what the candidate will actually deliver.

It establishes the proper relationship.

The proper relationship is simple:

- **The voters are the owners**
- **The party is the manager**
- **The candidate is the employee**

The voters are the boss. The party helps vet and manage the process. The candidate works for the people.

This restores the correct understanding of representative government: politicians are not rulers. They are public servants.

It strengthens the role of the PCO.

This process naturally reinforces the importance of the Precinct Officer.

Citizens in each precinct will increasingly rely on their PCO to communicate concerns, relay information, and stay informed about what their elected officials are doing.

It puts the opposition in a difficult position.

This strategy creates a major contrast with opposing candidates.

Either they:

- Adopt the same model and sign a contract themselves, or
- Refuse—and expose themselves as unwilling to be held accountable

That gives us a powerful message:

“If they really intend to do what they are promising, then why won’t they put it in writing?”

This can become one of the most effective campaign tools we have.

We are no longer running on empty promises. We are running on **campaign guarantees**.

That creates something most voters are starving for: **trust**.

Even if only 10% of voters respond positively to that difference, it could swing many elections.

Building the Committee Structure

Once the county organization has leadership aligned with the movement and a clear campaign model in place, the next step is to establish the committees needed to carry out the mission.

These should include:

Vetting Committee

This committee evaluates all Republican candidates seeking office.

Its responsibilities include:

- Reviewing candidate backgrounds
- Assessing campaign viability
- Negotiating and approving the candidate’s initial Patriot Politician contract
- Ensuring candidates support the party’s reform philosophy

Candidates should be evaluated not only on their ideology, but also on their ability to succeed.

They can be graded on:

- **Voter Engagement** – charisma, communication skills, ability to connect with people
- **Campaign Management** – financial support, volunteers, organization, and operational strength
- **Campaign Strategy** – message discipline, voter appeal, and effectiveness of campaign approach

Once vetted and graded, candidates can then be presented to party members for final endorsement.

Accountability Committees

These committees monitor elected officials within assigned jurisdictions.

Their job is to:

- Track meetings, votes, actions, and public decisions
- Report information back to PCOs and voters
- Ensure Republican officials honor their contracts and act ethically

If a Republican elected official violates their commitments or acts improperly, these committees initiate the process of bringing them to account.

These committees should monitor:

- City councils
- School boards
- Port authorities
- Sheriff's offices
- County commissioners
- Any other elected office operating within the county

There should also be a **Party Accountability Committee** to ensure that county party officers themselves remain accountable to the members.

Public Affairs Committee

This committee handles public outreach and messaging.

Its role includes:

- Social media
- Events
- Digital campaigns
- Community engagement
- Influencer outreach
- Small business outreach
- Organizational partnerships

The party should not merely exist to support candidates. It should become a visible and active presence in the community.

Additional traditional committees—finance, executive operations, state committee representation, and administrative support—should remain in place as needed.

Bottom-Up Reform

These reforms will not happen overnight. The party will evolve as it grows.

At first, the changes may be limited to candidate vetting, communications, and basic accountability. But as more reform-minded Republicans are elected, the organization can expand its influence and begin helping elected officials implement broader reforms.

The most important structural shift, however, must occur at the **state level**.

If we truly believe in decentralization and local power, then the party itself must reflect that belief.

That means building a **bottom-up** system:

- More power at the county level
- Less power at the state level
- Minimal concentration of power at the top

The state party should be accountable to the counties—not the other way around.

Counties should be involved in every election within their borders and should collaborate with neighboring counties on shared legislative or congressional districts.

The state party's role should be limited primarily to:

- Statewide offices (Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, etc.)
- U.S. Senate races
- Coordination and support functions

The state organization should not function as a command center. It should function as a **service center**.

Its purpose should be to assist county organizations, provide resources, and carry out the will of the State Committee—not dominate local politics.

The State Committee—not the State Chairperson or Executive Board—should be the main authority within the state party.

And most importantly, **the money should flow upward, not downward**.

County organizations should fund the state party—not depend on it.

Why?

Because whoever controls the money controls the organization.

If the state party controls the funding, it can control the counties. That cannot be allowed.

The state party must remain dependent on county organizations, not the reverse.

The DOGE Concept

This also leads to a discussion of a DOGE-style organization.

While the DOGE effort under President Trump brought attention to government waste, fraud, and abuse, it suffered from major structural flaws. It was effective more as a media tool than as a long-term institutional reform effort.

Still, the **core concept is excellent** and should absolutely be part of our broader reform strategy.

The version we should advocate for is different.

The DOGE-style organization we promote should be:

- **Independent**
- **Created under the authority of the legislature**
- **Empowered to investigate fraud, waste, and abuse across government**

Because the legislative branch controls spending, it makes sense for this office to operate under legislative authority.

However, it must also have independent investigative powers.

Its structure should resemble that of a law enforcement or inspector-general style agency. It should have the authority to demand records and information from any government office or publicly funded organization—without being stalled by endless bureaucratic delay tactics.

No FOIA games. No intentional delays. No stonewalling.

If a public official controls information relevant to fraud, waste, or abuse, they must turn it over.

Naturally, this office would require strong safeguards to prevent abuse and protect legitimate confidentiality concerns. But a serious anti-corruption system must exist at every level of government.

This office would not be part of the Republican Party itself, but the party should strongly support its creation and operation.

Oversight and accountability committees at both the county and state levels would act as feeders into this organization by reporting suspicious activity, citizen complaints, or evidence of misconduct.

This creates a real mechanism for exposing corruption—and more importantly, doing something about it.

The Solution Is Diffusion

At this point, the broader strategy should be coming into focus.

County organizations become the central political force in their communities. As reform spreads from county to county, it creates pressure upward—forcing change at the state level and beyond.

This county-first model exists for one simple but essential reason:

The secret to reducing corruption is diffusion.

The more people who must be corrupted in order to control the system, the harder corruption becomes.

Likewise, the less power centralized institutions hold, the less attractive they become to those seeking influence and control.

If an office has little power, it has little value to corrupt actors.

Bribing a governor is only worthwhile if the governor has enough centralized authority to deliver something meaningful. But if power is diffused, even a corrupt governor becomes far less useful.

By contrast, the United States has over **3,000 counties**.

That means anyone seeking national control would have to influence or corrupt thousands upon thousands of local actors—county commissioners, city councils, mayors, sheriffs, party officers, and PCOs.

That is exponentially harder.

The solution is diffusion.

This creates a system where corporations, billionaires, and political elites cannot quietly impose unpopular agendas through centralized institutions. Instead, they would be forced to persuade the public openly.

And that is exactly how it should be.

Now, to be clear, wealthy and influential people will always have influence. That is reality. They will still shape public opinion, fund campaigns, and advocate for policies.

But there is a huge difference between **influence** and **control**.

People are free to persuade. They should not be able to use government power as a weapon to force compliance.

If power is sufficiently diffused, then persuasion must replace coercion.

And once that happens, the people regain the upper hand.

Messaging

As I mentioned earlier, conservatives are not naturally inclined toward change or doing things differently. Too often, we accept small wins as justification for continuing to use the same outdated systems—systems that have slowly eroded our relevance in American politics.

We have now reached a point where Democrats feel comfortable introducing even the most radical and absurd policies with little fear of serious political consequences. Nothing says “*you are irrelevant*” more clearly than when your opponent can openly push ridiculous ideas and you are unable to stop them.

We laugh at these policies. We mock them. But the joke is actually on us.

Why?

Because they are introducing these ideas without meaningful backlash and without any real decline in support. Conservatives, meanwhile, are unable to mount an effective response that can even slow their momentum—much less stop it. Instead, we continue rolling out the same tired messaging, the same worn-out programs, and the same uninspiring candidates.

That has to change.

We need more than a messaging refresh or a few better slogans. We need more than recycled candidates who lose election after election. We need to bring something to the American public that can actually challenge and defeat a sophisticated, deeply entrenched political machine.

If we want to win, then we must embrace two words conservatives usually hate:

Radically different.

Before I get into the specific methods we should use, we need to address what we are currently doing wrong in how we communicate our message.

The Bubble Problem

I am a marketing and business consultant, and when I work with clients, I often see two internal problems that repeatedly undermine their success.

The first is what I call “**Bubble Bias.**” That happens when people build a bubble around themselves and only allow in voices that already agree with them.

Closely related to this is what I call the “**Anecdotal Fallacy**”—making decisions based primarily on isolated personal stories or individual experiences rather than actual data, broader trends, or systematic evidence.

Both of these habits cause people to ignore important information—especially information coming from competitors or the market itself.

I always tell my clients:

You need to pay as much attention to your competitor’s advertising as you do your own.

That same problem exists in the Republican Party.

We have built bubbles for ourselves—on social media, within party systems, and even in our marketing. These self-contained echo chambers prevent us from hearing what the broader public is saying or how people are reacting to what either we or the Democrats are doing.

That creates a false sense of success.

We end up “preaching to the choir” and mistaking internal applause for public persuasion. We convince ourselves that our messaging is effective because the only people hearing it are people who already agree with us.

That is a disaster.

The Cantankerous Contrarian Problem

These bubbles create another serious problem: they push us into the role of the **Cantankerous Contrarian**.

Whatever Democrats say, we feel obligated to say the opposite.

There is often very little thought behind it beyond:

“They’re for it, so we’re against it.”

If Democrats want to spend money, we say shut it down.

If they go left, we lurch hard right.

If they promote a program, we default to just stopping it.

Our responses become automatic. Knee-jerk. Predictable.

And in the process, we fail to offer meaningful alternatives.

Too often, our messaging boils down to:

- “That idea is stupid.”
- “That policy is bad.”
- “They’re wrong.”

But that is not enough.

You cannot win by simply being against something. You have to offer something better.

Collective Compliance

There is one more problem we need to talk about: **Collective Compliance**.

This term is often used to describe how ordinary people in Nazi Germany gradually accepted a regime that showed obvious signs of moral evil from the very beginning.

The idea is simple: once people commit to a system, a cause, or a social norm—especially one from which they benefit—they tend to excuse or normalize things that should never be accepted.

It often sounds like this:

“Well, that’s just the way it is.”

“That’s how politics works.”

“It’s always been like that.”

That mindset is poison.

And we apply it today to the total corruption of our political system.

We tell ourselves:

- All political parties are corrupt.
- All politicians lie.
- That’s just part of politics.
- There’s nothing we can do about it.

But if we are being honest, that is a complete surrender.

The correct response should be:

“This is unacceptable, and we are no longer willing to tolerate it.”

Change is not impossible. It simply requires the decision to stop accepting the current system as normal.

Stop Leading with Money

Let's start with the messaging bubble.

One of the biggest changes we need to make is this:

We need to stop leading with money and taxes.

These are two of conservatives' favorite subjects. Government spending, taxes, debt, waste, deficits—those topics dominate conservative discussions.

Now, to be clear, those are important issues. Out-of-control government spending is a major threat to the future of this country.

But here is the problem:

It does not emotionally resonate with most voters.

Especially younger generations.

Many younger Americans have grown up in a world where debt, deficits, and government dependency are simply part of the landscape. They do not react to those topics the same way older conservatives do.

Worse, our constant focus on money can make us sound like Scrooges—people who only care about keeping more of our own money and cutting everything else (and if you listen to some libertarian-influenced commentators, they will proudly tell you that is exactly their goal).

Let me be very clear:

Quoting Ayn Rand and anarchist theory is not a winning mass-market political strategy.

Yes, we are going to reduce government spending dramatically.

Yes, we are going to eliminate waste.

Yes, we should eventually remove government debt entirely.

But we need to stop leading with that.

Instead, we need to talk about something far more powerful:

We need to talk about creating a better society.

That is the conversation that inspires people. That is the conversation that reaches both the heart and the mind. That is the conversation that connects to what most people actually want:

- Freedom
- Prosperity
- Security
- Opportunity
- A better life for themselves and their children

That is the conversation we should be having.

The Gospel of Politics According to Gary

To be effective, you cannot just trash your competition.

You must offer a better alternative.

The stronger the alternative, the more likely you are to win.

In business, I often teach what I call the **Separate and Elevate** strategy.

The concept is simple:

First, separate yourself from your competitors.

If you look the same, sound the same, and operate the same, then people have no compelling reason to choose you.

Second, elevate yourself above your competitors.

You need to offer either a better product, a better service, or ideally both.

Third, make sure your message actually appeals to your audience.

That requires real research and real understanding of the people you are trying to reach.

At the end of the day, it does not matter how “right” you think you are. If you cannot win the marketing war, you lose.

And that is exactly where the Republican Party has failed.

We have not made a compelling alternative offer to voters.

How We Separate from the Democrats

Most conservatives would say,
“We have nothing in common with Democrats.”

But from the perspective of the average voter, that is simply not true.

To many Americans, both parties look alike in all the worst ways:

- Both parties appear corrupt.
- Both parties appear obsessed with power.
- Both parties appear willing to sacrifice principles to win.
- Both parties constantly attack each other and weaponize scandal, outrage, and media narratives.
- Both parties appear to only be loyal to their big donors and politicians—not ordinary members or citizens.
- Both parties seem self-interested and disconnected from the public.
- Neither party appears trustworthy.

The fact that the term “**Uniparty**” has gained traction tells you everything you need to know.

Whether we like it or not, that is how many voters see us.

And if we want to win them over, we must become visibly and structurally different.

Not just in rhetoric. In **systems, processes, and behavior.**

We need to present a very clear contrast:

The Democrats are staying the same.
We are becoming something better.

And as strange as this may sound, that means we need to become the true agents of change. In many ways, **we need to become the real progressives.**

Yes—you read that correctly.

Not progressive in the modern left-wing sense, but in the literal sense: the people pushing meaningful reform, dismantling broken institutions, and challenging the corrupt status quo.

That realization stunned me when I first fully understood it. But the truth is this:

We did not become radical.

Society drifted so far from sanity that basic conservative principles now sound revolutionary.

That means conservatism is no longer merely “traditional.” In this cultural environment, it is actually **countercultural**.

That is a very powerful position, especially for young voters—if we know how to use it.

The Good News Strategy

All socialist systems are built on fear, control, resentment, and darkness.

Our message should be the opposite.

It should be built on **hope, truth, confidence, freedom, and optimism**. Christians, in particular, should be very familiar with this format. Their whole religion is based on these same principles. As such, many conservatives should find this messaging very easy to adopt.

That means our messaging should not just be anti-Democrat. It must be **pro-human flourishing**.

And that is why I call this the **Political Gospel Strategy**. It has nothing to do with Christianity and is not intended to be an endorsement of Christianity or endorsing it as a party. We are a multi-cultural, multi-religion party and will always be religious neutral in our policies.

The word **gospel** literally means *good news*. And that is exactly what our political message should become:

Good news for our political institutions.

Not empty slogans. Not fake optimism. Not naïve utopianism.

But a compelling, practical, believable vision of a better life.

Start a National Conversation: What Makes a Great Society?

One of the most powerful things we can do is start a national conversation around a very simple question:

What makes a great society?

Socialists love to talk about utopia—but their utopia always seems to benefit the elites who run it.

Still, there is value in asking the question honestly:

What kind of society should we actually be trying to build?

Not a perfect society. That does not exist.

But what I would call an **Achievable Utopia**:

A society built around what humans can realistically achieve, given our strengths, weaknesses, limitations, and aspirations. This society must be rooted in concepts that work with the realities of human behaviors and capabilities. Worthy, but totally unrealistic goals, such as people not getting their feelings hurt, or not having to hear “offensive” speech, or that everybody will be totally equal in everything, or that the 99.9% must accommodate the 0.1% are not realistic. Instead, we should look at those systems, programs, and processes that are manageable, achievable with our current resources, and acceptable to the vast majority of the people.

If we are going to lead, then we need to define what that society would look like.

We need to show Americans not just what we are against—but what we are **for**.

What would the United States look like if we actually got this right?

A Vision of the Future

If we are successful, then the future of the United States could look radically better than what most people imagine today.

Imagine a country where:

- The United States leads the world in exports, GDP, average income, quality of life, disposable income, and scientific discovery.
- American innovation dominates the global economy.
- Transportation and logistics become so efficient that global goods move faster and cheaper than ever before.
- Jobs are so abundant that the immigration debate shifts from *“How do we stop people?”* to *“How do we attract enough workers?”*
- Small businesses and manufacturers thrive because they are no longer strangled by government-corporate monopolistic systems.
- Americans live longer, healthier lives due to genuine breakthroughs in medicine, science, and technology.
- Crime becomes rare—not because of tyranny, but because of highly effective and properly focused public safety systems.
- Everyday Americans enjoy a standard of living that exceeds what billionaires today can buy in terms of quality, comfort, technology, and access.
- The federal government becomes so limited in day-to-day importance that people know the name of their mayor, but struggle to remember who the current President is.

That last one may be the most important.

A truly healthy and prosperous society is one where people are primarily engaged with their local communities—not obsessed with the constant circus of federal politics. That is one of the clearest signs of a functioning republic.

Now, I realize some of this may sound overly optimistic. But let me ask you a few very basic questions.

A Few Reality Checks

What happens if the United States actually embraces a truly capitalist economic model?

Not the corporatist, monopolistic, over-regulated system we have now—but a real free-market-based system that protects citizens while unleashing productive capacity?

No one can honestly say it cannot work, because no modern nation is actually running a true capitalist system. We are no existing capitalist systems to evaluate effectiveness.

American Socialism is the closest thing to capitalism but is still very socialist in its application. Yet, even our current broken hybrid system still outperforms most of the world. So, if less socialism produces better results, what happens if we totally remove the inhibitors that keep our economic engine from performing at its best?

What happens if government gets out of the way?

What happens if we stop allowing trillions of dollars to be wasted through bureaucracy, corruption, inefficiency, and political gamesmanship?

What happens if those resources go instead to organizations that actually produce results?

What happens if we unleash human potential?

What happens if people are free to build, create, innovate, experiment, and solve problems without being smothered by government barriers designed to protect entrenched interests?

What happens if we stop dividing ourselves?

What happens if Americans reject the endless social engineering designed to pit us against each other and instead choose to build a common culture rooted in liberty, justice, respect, tolerance, and shared purpose?

What could we accomplish then?

Even if I am only **50% right**, or **70% right**, can anyone honestly argue that life would not be dramatically better?

That is what we should be preaching:

A better life.

Marketing the Party, Not Just the Candidate

Right now, the Republican Party mostly comes alive during election season.

When there is no campaign, the party goes quiet. It builds resources, waits, and then reappears for the next election cycle.

That is not how effective marketing works.

We are currently marketing like a **Christmas tree company**—all our effort concentrated into one season.

We need to think more like a **toy company**.

Yes, Christmas is the biggest sales season—but toy companies market all year long because people buy for birthdays, special occasions, and everyday life.

Politics should work the same way.

We should be marketing **365 days a year**.

And most importantly:

We should market the party—not just the candidates.

Why?

Because most Americans do not trust politicians.

So why are we making politicians the centerpiece of our “product”?

That is backwards.

The party should become the trusted institution.
The candidates should be extensions of that trust.

The New Role of the Precinct Officer

This is where the Precinct Officer becomes so important.

Right now, PCOs are severely underutilized. We mostly use them for:

- door knocking,
- campaign support,
- basic recruiting,
- and voter turnout efforts.

That is far too limited.

In the new model, the Precinct Officer becomes a central part of both our **organization** and our **marketing strategy**.

They become the trusted political contact for their precinct.

The person people go to for:

- political discussion,
- information,
- guidance,
- updates,
- and connection to the party.

That is incredibly powerful.

Because if we build trust in the PCO, then we build trust in the party.

And if we build trust in the party, then we build long-term voters.

A 24/7 Local Marketing Strategy

We need to market all year long—not just during campaign season.

And we need to do it **locally**.

At the beginning, we do not need statewide saturation. We do not need to market to the whole country.

We need to market **county by county, precinct by precinct.**

That means using:

- Social media
- Traditional media
- Direct mail
- Door hangers
- Email campaigns
- Flyers
- Community events
- Local influencers
- Business outreach
- PCO-to-citizen contact

This should be an ongoing campaign—not a one-time blast.

Each PCO should be able to distribute information in ways that fit their personality, skills, and resources.

Where there are no PCOs, the county party should deploy volunteers while simultaneously recruiting new ones.

At the same time, the **County Chairperson** should function as the county's **Chief Marketing Officer**—attending events, connecting with local business owners, working with community leaders, and constantly promoting the party's message.

Our Core Message

Our initial public-facing message should be simple and powerful:

The Republican Party is changing.

The Republican Party is improving.

The Republican Party is becoming more accountable, more local, and more focused on building a better life.

That message should be built around these themes:

Growing local businesses and creating good local jobs

We want better opportunities, stronger wages, and more prosperity for our citizens.

Transparent, responsible, accountable government

We want open records, open meetings, independent audits, and real oversight.

Representatives, not rulers

We want elected officials who serve the public—not govern as elites.

Effective government, not bloated government

We want government focused on the things it should actually do well.

Better services where they matter most

We want excellent schools, safe neighborhoods, strong emergency services, good infrastructure, and healthy communities.

Open communication with citizens

We want government and party systems that are responsive, accessible, and connected to the people.

That message can be summarized in clear, positive language:

GOOD JOBS

SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS

GREAT SCHOOLS

EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT

ACCOUNTABLE POLITICIANS

CITIZEN-FOCUSED LEADERSHIP

That is a message people can actually rally around.

Why Positive Messaging Works

Modern political marketing is overwhelmingly negative.

It is built on fear, anger, suspicion, and demonization.

That kind of messaging can work in small doses—but it has limits.

People eventually become exhausted by it.

Our message should still expose the flaws of our opponents—but the overall tone should be positive and constructive.

The contrast should be:

They want a system that benefits them.

We want a system that benefits you.

That is a far more powerful long-term message.

Building Trust in the Party

A day-in, day-out marketing campaign does something extremely important:

It builds trust.

And trust is what creates long-term, reliable voters.

Most voters are not deeply informed. Most are not highly engaged. Many are not ideological.

That is not a weakness—it is an opportunity.

If we build enough trust in the party, then over time many voters will simply look for:

- the Republican endorsement,
- the Republican brand,
- or the Republican “R” next to a name.

That kind of trust is powerful.

And when those voters have questions, they should know exactly where to go:

Their Precinct Officer.

That is how the party becomes useful.

That is how the party becomes valuable.

That is how the party becomes a trusted institution.

Becoming the Political Experts

Think about how we use experts in everyday life.

Most of us are not plumbers.
Most of us are not electricians.
Most of us are not mechanics.

When something goes wrong, we turn to people who specialize in that area.

Politics should work the same way.

The Republican Party—its members, PCOs, and candidates—should become the experts.

We do the research.
We study the issues.
We spend the time.
We work through the details.

Why?

Because we care about it and we are passionate about it.

That allows the average voter to say:

“I trust them to handle the politics while I live my life.”

That is exactly the kind of relationship we should be building. This takes advantage of the uninformed and uncaring voter (which makes up 80 – 90% of Americans). They just want to live their lives and are more interested in their football teams than anything to do with politics. If they see us as the trusted expert, then they will vote based on our recommendations.

Expanding the Audience

Our target should not just be the traditional conservative base.

We should also be actively targeting:

- Moderate Republicans
- Independents
- Non-voters
- Young voters
- Classical liberals
- Politically disengaged citizens

And our goal should not merely be to “appeal” to them temporarily.

Our goal should be to **turn them into consistent Republican voters**.

That means we stop trying to water down conservative principles to imitate the left.

Instead, we confidently make the case that conservative principles are the better path to a good society. We show that Democrat and Progressive ideology does not fit with the new society that we want to build and that conservative principles will bring about better results. They are not right, their ideas are not superior, and their vision for America is one that is based on oppression and their own greed.

One of the biggest failures of the Republican Party is that we stopped believing our own ideas were better. They are not just slightly better, they are far superior. Again, the problem was not the ideas, it was that we never presented them correctly.

We compromised because we lost confidence.

That needs to end.

The Website and Digital Hub

The county party website should also be transformed.

It should no longer function as a static page with a few contact forms and election notices.

It should become the **community hub** for the county party.

It should:

- Explain the party’s goals and reforms
- Offer articles, videos, and educational content
- Provide information on candidates and issues
- Allow citizens to engage directly with the party
- Serve as an ongoing resource for local political involvement

It should be interactive, useful, and worth returning to regularly. It needs to become a community hub as well as a political resource. We will have webpages for the public and webpages exclusively for candidates and members in order to achieve our goals. The main point is that our website reflects the change in our goals and operations.

The Three Truths of a Successful Society

Our broader social message should also be built around what I call:

The Three Truths for a Successful Society

A society cannot survive—much less thrive—without these three truths.

If it loses one, it begins to decay.

If it loses two, its future becomes extremely unstable.

Those three truths are:

1. Truth in Information

Information must be honest, accurate, and trustworthy.

That means local influencers and communicators become critical to our strategy.

Each county should cultivate individuals who can communicate effectively and act as trusted local voices.

This could include:

- Podcasters
- YouTubers
- Community writers
- Social media personalities
- Citizen journalists

These people should help spread the message—but also serve as local watchdogs who report on what government is actually doing.

In many ways, this restores the role local journalists once played before media became nationalized, corporatized, and politicized.

And most importantly, thousands of local information sources are far harder to censor than a handful of centralized media institutions.

2. Truth in Academics

Truth in academics includes both **science** and **education**.

Scientific research must be based on:

- valid methodology,
- replicable results,
- independent verification,
- and real peer review.

It is critical that we get our science right. Too many big decisions require that we have the best data, the best information, and that the results are based on unbiased research. We definitely need to get government out of the science community, but we also need to go back to the Scientific Method that ensure that every theory or research being conducted is challenged, proven, and accepted by the majority of experts in that field.

Likewise, education must be grounded in truth rather than ideological indoctrination.

Both conservatives and liberals have at times allowed education to become political rather than educational.

That must stop.

Children should be taught what is true, what is useful, and what helps them become capable, thoughtful, productive adults. When it comes down to what is best, the basic philosophical and academic concepts are what is needed. Ideological discussions are only required and should be taught at the adult level of education. Young children only require the basics and much of the other aspects of life need to be taught by the parents.

This subject alone deserves its own book—but the principle is simple and the message that we will convey is:

A healthy society cannot survive if it lies to its children or manipulates its science.

3. Truth in Government

Right now, the phrase “**honest politician**” is treated like a joke.

And while that joke is funny, it should also deeply disturb us.

Why is honesty not our first expectation from people we trust with enormous public power?

This is exactly what the **Patriot Politician** program is designed to address.

One of its most powerful features is that it changes who politicians should fear.

Right now, politicians fear:

- the opposing party,
- the press,
- public scandal,
- and sometimes donors.

But they often do **not** fear their own party holding them accountable.

That has to change.

We want Republican politicians to know that if they engage in unethical or criminal behavior, their biggest concern should be:

“What happens when my own party finds out?”

That is how you build a culture of integrity.

Because if employees are not held accountable, they will do whatever they can get away with.

The Patriot Politician program restores the proper relationship:

- The citizens are the bosses
- The party is the management
- The politician is the employee

And employees should absolutely be accountable for how they perform their jobs.

What About Candidates and Campaigns?

Candidates still matter.

They still need to campaign.

They still need to raise funds.

They still need to connect with voters.

But in this model, their first and most important task is simple:

Earn the endorsement of the Republican Party.

Once they do that, much of the heavy lifting is already done—because the party has built trust with voters in advance.

That makes the endorsement itself extremely valuable.

Why the Party Should Stay Out of Candidate Funding

The party as an institution should avoid becoming a major source of candidate funding.

There are several reasons for this:

1. Money creates control.

If the party funds candidates, then whoever controls the party's money controls the candidates.

That usually means the state party gains too much influence—which directly undermines decentralization.

2. If we do this right, money should matter less.

If we build a strong enough system for trust, communication, branding, and voter mobilization, then campaign cash will become less decisive.

Even if Democrats spend far more, we can still win because we will have already won the trust and branding battle.

3. Competition produces stronger candidates.

We want candidates to rise based on merit, ability, and connection with voters—not based on who gets financial favoritism from party insiders.

Candidates should still have to prove themselves.

Yes, voters will still respond to personality, confidence, charisma, and communication skills.

That is human nature.

The role of the party should make sure voters know the candidate is trustworthy.
The candidate must still make voters feel confident in choosing them.

The party wins the head.
The candidate wins the heart.

That is the proper division of political labor.

Final Thought

This is the Gospel of Politics:

A political strategy built on conservative principles, rooted in common sense, and designed not merely to win elections—but to **change minds, build trust, and create a better society.**

We are not just trying to appeal to Democrat voters. We are trying to **turn them into Republican voters.** No compromise required.

And ultimately, we want to force the Democrat candidates are in the position where *they* are the ones willing to compromise trying to appeal to *Republicans*.

That is how you know the battlefield has changed.