

There appear to be numerous enemies of the US Constitution. The reason ultimately is because the US Constitution was admirably designed to prevent power-seeking people from developing unilateral and oppressive power over other citizens of the country. It did so by incorporating a representative republican system of government with numerous features designed to provide checks and balances against the obtaining of unrestricted power by any one group. It separated political jurisdictions in various ways and assigned separate legislative powers, administrative responsibilities, and judicial powers to each distinct jurisdiction.

Unfortunately, the world is full of power-seeking people who seek to enhance their influence by utilizing government force to increase their power over others. Thus, these individuals and groups have repetitively attacked the restrictions upon various governmental exercises of power that are imposed by the US Constitution. In recent years the attacks have increased.

In this essay we look at some of the major groups that have attacked the restrictions imposed by the US Constitution and we try to look at their motives.

Major groups that seek to supplant or reduce the influence of the US Constitution include the following:

1. Major Philosophies that are opposed to the philosophy of our nation's founders
  - A. Religious Philosophies
  - B. Political Philosophies
2. Major economic interests that wish to enhance their wealth and power in various ways.
  - A. Monopolistic Interests
  - B. Crony Capital (Fascist) Interests
  - C. Vested Administrative Interests (and the Deep State)
3. Major Political forces that seek to enhance their wealth and influence by gaining greater control over governmental powers.
4. Major foreign interests that wish to gain by limiting US philosophies or activities that may restrict their abilities to exploit US citizens or other peoples of the world.

#### Religious Philosophies

Religious groups are prevented from the US Constitution from governmental interference that prevents the free exercise of religion (under the first amendment) but they also are prohibited by the Constitution from exercising undue influence over the government since the Constitution explicitly states that no religious test can be used as a qualification for public service. The objectives of our nation's founders were to prevent any one religious group from using the power of the state to enhance their religion or to war against or persecute members of other religions. At the time of our Constitution's writing, Americans were vividly aware of the damage that had been done by the 100 years of religious wars in Europe as well as of the horrors of the Spanish Inquisitions, which was still being practiced in areas under Spanish jurisdiction in South America.

As a general rule, Americans have accepted the premise that the operations of religion and of the state should be separate. However, in recent years, various foreign influences have tried to assert control over all or parts of US political jurisdictions so they can engage in religious practices that would violate Constitutional standards. In the most extreme case Jihadists attacked key buildings in the US (on 9/11/2001) in order to assert the superiority of their religious beliefs over the US. In addition, various adherents of the Islam religion have sought to practice their Sharia law in preference to the laws mandated under the US Constitution. In many ways Sharia law may conflict with the US Constitution in that it often places women in subordinate positions and may even allow the practice of "honor killings" and other punishments banned by constitutional requirements designed to protect individuals' rights as defined by the Bill of Rights of the US Constitution and under US laws. Individuals who wish to practice Sharia law in preference to US Constitutional requirements are basically opposed to the sovereignty of the US Constitution. Unfortunately, some members of Congress, possibly with various religious beliefs, seem to have forgotten that their oath of office requires that they defend the US Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Thus, some explicitly religious groups are not alone in wishing to weaken the US Constitution's attempt to prevent various religious practices and beliefs from interfering with the Constitution's attempt to protect individual rights.

#### Political Philosophies

Religious philosophies have an emotional hold upon people that may make them antagonistic toward anything (such as the US Constitution) that interferes with religious dictates. However, they are not the only philosophies that have such an effect upon people. Political philosophies often have similar effects. Instead of seeking salvation by belief in a "higher power," political adherents often seek to have an impact upon the world by feeling that their efforts will make it a better place. They dedicate their ego and sense of importance to their cause and justify their actions by believing that they

will leave a legacy in the form of an improved world and society. Since their ego is entwined with their cause, their efforts are often intense and emotional. As a result, they may resent constitutionally imposed restrictions upon their behavior that prevent them from achieving their goals. Many of these political adherents believe that “the end justifies the means” so anything that they must do to improve the world, in their opinion, is justified.

One of the most antagonistic political philosophies relative to the US Constitution is Marxism, or one of its variants—such as various forms of socialism or communism. Marxism is popular with many people because it proclaims that a utopian society is possible where all people create wealth and economic goods and share equally. It particularly appeals to people who believe that some members of society have too much and that they and/or others have too little. It also appeals to people who feel that they have too little influence given the existing power structure in society and who wish to gain respect and influence by leading people to a “better” world-- as they see it.

Marxism conflicts with the US Constitution because the Constitution recognizes that individuals have inherent rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness (which is understood to include rights of personal property ownership). The Constitution also specifies numerous rights of the individual to be free from warrantless searches, trials without juries or legal representation in most cases, and the seizure of property without just compensation—in addition to rights to free speech, religion, a free press, freedom of assembly, the right to keep and bear arms, and the right to petition the government for the redress of grievances. Marxism, in contrast recognizes the rights of the collective (as determined initially by a “dictatorship of the proletariat”) to determine the property rights, if any, and the individual responsibilities of individual citizens. In short, the US Constitution emphasizes the importance of individual rights while Marxism recognizes the overriding importance of collective rights over individual citizens.

Marxism has always had some appeal among intellectuals who live in a theoretical world and begrudge the fact that others, whom they deem to be intellectually inferior to themselves, have become more prosperous—possibly because they have inherited wealth or positions to which the intellectuals have not had equal access. However, the appeal of Marxism grew substantially after World War I and the Great Depression as many people suffered greatly after each event and felt that there should be a better way of organizing society.

The assumption that Marxism was superior was furthered during the 1930s by much of the elite US academia and the US press that reported glowingly on the economic progress of Russia under Communist Marxism. Unfortunately, the mainstream US press did not adequately report the suffering of the Kulaks and others whom Stalin intentionally starved into submission so the Communist collective could seize their land and collectivize their independent farms. They also uncritically accepted Communist propaganda about growing economic progress, and did not fully describe the horrors of the Soviet Gulag and persecution of dissidents until after World War II.

As a result, many American intellectuals who received an elite education during the 1930s became convinced that Marxism was a superior form of political control. Those people were joined by various labor union leaders who believed that labor unions should gain political power in order to advance the interests of the “proletariat” whom they represented. Thus, the US developed a cadre of dedicated Marxist followers during the 1930s. Many of those followers joined the government in order to influence US policy. Others joined the education, entertainment, and media industries since, in the “Communist Manifesto” Marx and Engels specified that their followers should seek to control the education and publication industries in order to convince people of the validity and superiority of their ideas.

The attempt of Marxists to influence US policies backfired in a way. After World War II Ronald Reagan became a staunch anti-communist after witnessing the attempt of various communist inspired labor union leaders to influence the entertainment industry. Joseph McCarthy launched a crusade in Congress against Communist influences in government and in the entertainment and media industries. Unfortunately, McCarthy did so in an excessive and hack-handed way and, thus discredited his efforts and earned the calumny of the remaining media establishment. Nonetheless, the anti-communist forces in the US after World War II caused the remaining people who sympathized with Marxist ideology to lie low and disguise their leanings. They often promoted their policies through many patriotically named front groups. When I applied for advanced ROTC in the late 1950s I was asked to confirm that I was not a member of a very long list of patriot sounding groups that the government had confirmed or suspected of being communist front organizations. Communism was not popular in the US and “under God” was added to the US pledge of allegiance in the 1950s to emphasize that the US was not in favor of “godless Communism.”

Nonetheless, while not admitting that they were Communist or Marxist leaning, many US intellectuals and others who sympathized with the Marxist ideology persisted in their beliefs. Some became influential academics. Others became influential “community organizers.” A particularly important member of the latter group included Saul Alinsky.

Saul Alinsky became important for organizing and teaching “community organizers” in the Chicago area. He wrote an important book titled, “Rules for Radicals” that explains the steps that his followers should follow to advance their objectives. Their main objective should be to obtain political power and they should remember, “The end justifies the means.” Thus, all behavior—lying, stealing, generating false information to discredit foes, picketing people's businesses and homes, striking businesses, engaging in primary and secondary boycotts, and anything else that would further their objectives—was acceptable as long as the end justified the means.

Alinsky conducted many training sessions for community organizers in the Chicago area. In the early 1980s I personally witnessed one of the Chicago community organizers at a meeting with major banking executives in Chicago. She

essentially threatened them that if they needed to give generously to support their community organization. Otherwise, anytime a bank wished to establish a new branch, merge, or do anything else that required regulatory approval the community organization would sue to prevent the banks from getting the required regulatory approvals on the grounds that the banks were not adequately representing the interests of their “community.” At the very least this would require that the affected banks engage in expensive litigation and, in the end, they might not be able to do what they wished. Thus, her statement was essentially an “extortion” attempt—which most likely was successful. It also may have induced the banks to make a number of bad loans that manifested themselves in later years.

The importance of Alinsky should not be understated. His policies have had a great impact on various politicians and one political party. Bernie Sanders was originally a community organizer in Chicago, as was Barack Obama at one time. In addition, Hillary Clinton wrote her senior thesis at Wellesley College on Saul Alinsky. Even today, when I see people demonstrating on the lawns of Supreme Court members or on the lawn of Tucker Carson and when I see people verbally assaulting people such as Ted Cruz, or Sarah Sanders (when she worked in the White House) while they are trying to have a quiet dinner at a restaurant I think of Saul Alinsky and his Rules for Radicals and its calls for uncivil behavior.

I also have noted that various people who have reached political power under various Democratic administrations have admitted to past flirtations or more with Communist ideologies. I have read (on the internet) that James Comey, who later headed the FBI, admitted in 2005 that he had once voted for a Communist for President, and John Brennan, who later headed our CIA, admitted that he had been a communist in his youth. Since I saw this on the Internet it needs additional verification. However, those indications should be examined if one wishes to confirm that Marxist sympathies have affected many of the important politicians in the Democratic Party. One should also look into why Bernie Sanders honeymooned in Moscow, why Bill Clinton was able to go to Moscow while he was at Oxford, and why Barrack Obama was able to go to Pakistan at a time when US citizens were prohibited from doing so. In addition, one should note that the father of our vice president Kamala Harris was hired by Stanford to teach Marxist economics, and that our transportation secretary, Pete Buttigieg—who, like Bill Clinton, was a Rhoades scholar at Oxford-- is the son of an admittedly Marxist oriented professor. In addition, it appears that the “Frank” who Obama mentioned several times in his biography as giving him good advice, was Frank Marshall Davis, a well-known black Communist from the 1930s on. He may have influenced Obama. In addition, after leaving the Presidency, Obama started a group called “Organizing for America” which supports community organizer organizations across the country. Supposedly that organization has over 30,000 members. If they all support Progressive policies and are politically active, it might explain why so many more Progressive Democratic politicians have been elected across the country in recent years. Maybe all of these allegations only exist on the Internet, but maybe where there is smoke there is also fire.

An interesting phenomenon that I have noted in academics is that various circles of people preferentially give themselves awards and opportunities to enhance the prestige of each other. Thus, there is a good old boys network that may work to enhance the value of various “elite” institutions relative to other institutions. I have seen this operate in the sense that I heard the editor of a “top” journal say that he was trying to get a paper submitted that he had seen in working paper form from another top university so he could publish it—others had to pay hundreds of dollars just to get papers reviewed by his journal, with no guarantee of acceptance. In addition, I met a scholar when I participated in a large NSF grant who told me an interesting story. Since he loved trout fishing, when he received his PhD he went to the University of Montana. He wrote numerous articles and all were rejected by top journals. However, after he left Montana he joined the staff of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. He pulled his rejected papers out of the drawer and submitted them to good journals. With his new letterhead, all were accepted. I also was personally told on the “quiet” when I went in the job market with my PhD that I might hear from another “cartel” university about a position they had that they didn't want to advertise in the general market. That was one way that the “leading” universities could recirculate their graduates among themselves. I also realized that some of my “Best Paper” awards at professional meetings were, in part, because I or my coauthors knew the people making the awards and, since I had a good reputation already, they felt there would be little risk in giving us the awards. A similar phenomenon may be at work when Ivy League graduates receive awards from each other since an Ivy league degree presumably means the person is well qualified—even if he or she was a “gentleman’s C” student who was given easy passing grades. Thus, in academics, good reputations can be self-reinforcing, sometimes by design.

In addition, the importance of insider control of politically popular narratives in prestigious publications became evident in 2009 in the case of leaked e-mails from East Anglia University in the UK. Those e-mails showed that researchers who did not advance the “global warming” hysteria in their research would not be favored for publication in the “top” journals. Further, even though the attempt to paint Trump as being in cahoots with the Russians has now been totally discredited, the New York Times and Washington Post still retain the Pulitzer prizes they won for reporting that Trump had been compromised by the Russians. Clearly, the evidence shows that many awards that the “elite” institutions receive are the result of recycled favoritism that enhances the prestige of others in the group and enhances the reputation of the group as a whole.

Overall, this analysis suggests that there may be a substantial influence of Marxist oriented people, institutions, and politicians who have had and continue to have a considerable influence upon our media, our politicians, and our “elite” institutions. A good investigative journalist probably could profitably dig deeper to find and verify all the Marxist philosophy connections that apparently exist. Because Marxism and the US Constitution are completely divergent when it

comes to the rights of individuals versus the rights of the government, it is important to understand the pervasiveness of the Marxist influence on US politicians, on US institutions (including academic and media institutions) and on US government policies.

#### Pure Democracy Advocates

Some political forces are opposed to the US Constitution because the Constitution did not create a pure “democracy” but rather, created a representative republic form of government with numerous checks and balances. The reason for this is explained in Federalist Paper #10, written by James Madison, who authored much of the US Constitution. As Madison explains, pure democracies are often influenced by emotion and excess passion and, as a result, often end quickly and disastrously. Madison had studied the ancient Greek experience, and even though Democracy originated in Athens, that political form often did not last long as it often gave way to totalitarianism in one form or another. He also was undoubtedly aware that the renowned philosopher, Socrates, was sentenced to death or exile by a democratic vote. Thus, Madison explains that the US Constitution provided for a representative republic where the elected or appointed representatives (Senators were initially to be appointed by their respective states) were assumed to be more balanced and reasonable in their judgments and less subject to making emotional decisions. In addition, a system of checks and balances was devised so no decisions could be made in haste without thorough consideration by all affected parties. That is why the House of Representatives was supposed to represent the interests of the people in each district while the Senate was supposed to represent the interests of the states. Furthermore, supermajority voting was required for some key decisions so a “tyranny of the majority” could not be easily established. In addition, the functions of the executive were to be strictly limited and the judicial authority was to be separate from the legislative and administrative branches of government. Finally, minimum age limits were established for key representative and administrative jobs (Congress, the Senate, and the President) so the people making decisions would be less subject to the emotionalism of youth and would have greater wisdom from having lived longer before they made decisions affecting the lives of others.

People who advocate for a pure democracy may have personal bias at stake as they often hope to obtain political power under such a government due to their ability to emotionally influence the masses. They also may have other political motivations, as many Marxist-oriented states call themselves “democracies.” For instance the “German Democratic Republic” was, in fact, East Germany when it was ruled by Communists.

#### Major Economic Interests Opposed to the Constitution

##### Monopolistic Interests.

Economic interests that have no competitors can often charge higher prices for their existing products and spend less upon innovation to provide consumers with new choices. As a result, they can earn higher profits than would otherwise be the case. Consequently, consumers pay higher prices and have fewer choices than might otherwise be the case. Some types of industry may be subject to economies of scale that make it cheaper for one large firm to provide the product than smaller firms. However, even in those cases, under free market conditions, new entrants to the market may develop that offer substitutes for the product provided by the monopolistic firm or firms. Foreign firms with cheaper production costs may offer cheaper goods in the market. Other firms may offer innovations (such as cell phones or synthetic fabrics) that compete with preexisting technologies (such as landline phones or silk garments). However, monopolistic firms and industries may seek to restrict peoples' choices so the new technologies or imports cannot compete with existing technologies. As a result, governments may try to protect monopolistic industries or services by imposing tariffs on foreign imports, extra taxes upon new types of products, or restrictions on peoples' ability to buy or produce various products or services —declaring them smugglers or criminals if they import, buy, produce or use the competitive products or services. Thus, monopoly profits are often maintained by governmental restrictions upon individuals that reduce their individual freedoms and impose taxes and restraints rather arbitrarily. In a separate paper I have written entitled “Monopoly and Governments: Enemies of Free Markets” I explain this process in more detail. In this context, however, one can see that the process pits the government against the freedom of the individual so the government can favor existing monopoly interests. That, of course, interferes with individuals' freedom of choice and abilities to “pursue happiness.” However, it can benefit politicians by letting them earn “monopoly rents” in the form of payments from the firms and individuals that benefit from politically granted monopoly powers.

##### Crony Capitalism (a form of Fascism)

Fascism is a theory of government that requires that all institutions in the society operate cooperatively and pursues common interests as defined by the ruling elite. Thus, industries and institutions that favor and cooperate with governmental policies will be accepted and, often' rewarded. For instance, in Nazi Germany, the munitions and steel industries were generally able to prosper because they served the interests of the Nazi government.

In the US, governmental leaders have often favored industries, such as clean energy providers, with numerous subsidies and access to low cost or free financing credits. At the same time some governments have punished industries

with restrictive regulations and taxes, if they provide products (such as fossil fuels) that are not favored by the governmental elite. As a result “capitalists” who obtain governmental subsidies and produce what the government wants are often able to earn higher profits and individual salaries than would otherwise be the case. The non-favored industries might suffer losses and be forced out of business—with ensuing losses for their stockholders and participants. Thus in the US, many politicians have engaged in a form of “fascism: which is best called “crony capitalism” --since the cronies of the government politicians are the ones who are favored. This should not be confused with “free market capitalism” where business and individual rewards and punishment are determined by market forces and not by the good graces and objectives of politicians.

Because, under crony capitalism, some industries and individuals are favored and others are not, many non-favored individuals may suffer because of a loss of individual choice or because the products they desire are unavailable or prohibitively expensive (think of the rising prices of gasoline and natural gas after the Biden Administration began to stop issuing drilling permits and pipeline authorizations and increased regulatory restrictions upon the oil and gas industries in their first year in office). Since the US Constitution was designed to favor the unbiased operation of free markets and individual choice, crony-capitalist interventions conflict with its intent.

#### Vested Administrative Interests (the deep state)

In his 1830s book, “Democracy in America,” the Frenchman, de Tocqueville noted that the US was fortunate because it did not have an overbearing administrative state. He ascribed the US's good fortune, in part, to the fact that the US had strong religious institutions that furthered trust and a strong tradition of volunteerism that made state intervention in all aspects of the economy unnecessary. Unfortunately, that was in the past. Starting with Franklin Roosevelt the number of regulatory agencies in the US has exploded.

Furthermore, because Congress has abdicated its responsibility to write complete laws the Federal regulatory agencies have gained considerable power. They not only can write numerous regulations that affect people's lives, but also they can impose fines and penalties, and use their own courts to adjudicate disputes when someone does not comply with their regulations as they wish. In addition, many of the regulatory agencies have their own enforcement agents. The scope of what they do in that regard became obvious under the Obama administration when the Federal government ordered one billion rounds of .40-caliber hollow point ammunition for its regulatory forces. Since hollow point rounds are used to kill people but are banned for warfare (since they leave horrible wounds) and .40 caliber rounds are for pistols, while rifles are most commonly used in war, it is clear that the huge purchase of people-killing ammunition was primarily for federal regulatory agents rather than military personnel.

Many of the regulatory agency powers violate restrictions that were supposedly imposed by the US Constitution. Under the Bill of Rights, people are supposed to be able to have hearings and judicial proceedings decided by a jury of their peers whenever a significant financial amount is at dispute. That is not the case with hearings held by regulatory agencies and in their courts. In addition, people's property should not be seized except for public use and if it is taken, appropriate compensation should be paid. That is not the case with civil confiscation of private property and regulatory seizure of various property rights through regulations that prohibit private activities under various pretexts (such as saving “spotted owls” etc.) In addition, the Constitution's Fourth Amendment prohibits searches and seizures that have not been approved by a warrant issued by a judicial authority and that specify what is to be seized and searched.

In spite of the fact that many regulatory activities conflict with protections that our constitution promises to individuals, they have continued to increase in recent years as Congress and many judicial authorities have not reined them in. As a result, the number of regulators and regulatory agencies and their powers has continued to grow. Hence, regulatory agencies have become an important arm of government as they employ many people with numerous powers.

Unfortunately, regulatory agencies and their employees have become an important governmental force that has restricted or violated individuals' Constitutional rights and protections. Furthermore, their employees recognize that their salaries and privileges continue to rely upon the existence of a large and powerful Federal government that has great influence on the economy—and their employees tend to think of themselves as an “elite” who are superior to ordinary people and therefore, have the right to exercise power over them. Furthermore, intelligence and military agencies recognize that their power and influence will be enhanced if the US has viable enemies. Thus, they have an incentive to overemphasize or even provoke risks from abroad in order to maintain their funding and influence. Thus, military and intelligence agencies, along with domestic regulatory agencies have all become part of the “deep state” that resents and opposes attempts by the general population and populist politicians to rein in their power and influence. As a result, we have provisions in the Patriot Act and the Nations Defense Authorization Act as well as in rulings by the regulatory agencies and domestic law enforcement agencies that tend to violate individual protections guaranteed to US citizens by the US Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The old Pogo comic strip often had a statement by a principle character who said, “We have met the enemy, and he is us.” As far as the curtailment of individual rights and freedoms goes, we often are our own worst enemies. Emotional people frequently react to emotional news items by saying, “There ought to be a law.” However, intemperately passed laws often restrict individual’s Constitutional rights. At present, this can be seen most commonly with laws proposed to restrict or prevent gun ownership. It is not clear the advocates of such laws have righteous objectives in mind. Would be totalitarians, such as Marxists; know that they can most easily exercise their totalitarian objectives over an unarmed public. However, in Federalist paper #43, James Madison (who wrote much of the US Constitution) explains that gun ownership is one reason that Americans have not been subjected to control by despots, as often occurred in Europe where people were disarmed. In more recent history, it should be noted that Hitler required that privately owned guns be registered and then confiscated before he embarked on the horrors of the Holocaust. That is why the Second Amendment to the Constitution exists and states that people have the right to keep and bear arms in the US.

Laws impinging upon gun ownership are not the only intemperately passed laws that exist in the US. There often is no good reason to impose on individuals' freedoms to do what they wish as long as they do not harm or threaten others. Yet the nation is full of laws that restrict individuals' abilities to consume unpasteurized milk, various herbal supplements, or other items (such as marijuana) that might harm them but no one else. Such laws are often passed after the press popularizes the bad effect some item or behavior had on an individual. However, in a free economy, individuals, not the government, should be responsible for their own actions.

Unfortunately, regulatory agency employees and many lawyers are complicit in supporting laws that impinge upon individuals' rights and behaviors as the enforcement process provides employment for them. Lawyers can find employment at the regulatory agencies and in legislatures creating regulations, in private practice suing people under the new regulations, and in private practice defending individuals who are being prospectively punished under the new regulations.

An even greater concern is that the accrediting body for law schools has recently proposed that all law schools should provide courses on “woke” law. “Woke” laws are laws that are popular with “progressive elements” in our society—as they frequently restrict individual freedoms and behaviors in ways that may violate constitutional protections—even freedoms that are supposedly protected by our Constitution's provisions and its Bill of Rights. Thus, freedom of speech and freedom of the press may be against the “woke” law if it is found to be “offensive” to some group. Freedom of assembly may be limited if poetical authorities deem the reasons for the assembly to violate some, possibly arbitrary, standard. Protections against governmental seizure of private property without proper legal authorization may be violated by warrantless searches and by “civil forfeiture” seizures of private property without just compensation—as they may occur merely on the suspicion that a person or their private property may be in violation of some restrictive law or regulation. Individuals may be deprived of their private property (guns) and freedom, without judicial assent merely if someone states that they are a threat. Law schools should be in the business of explaining why our Constitution was written as it was to provide individuals' protections against possible incursion by would-be tyrants. However, too many law schools have courses that explain how the restraints of the US Constitution can be avoided or modified, and the teaching of “woke” law would go further in that direction.

Consequently, while one would hope that law schools and lawyers aggressively defend the individual rights and freedoms guaranteed by the US Constitution and Bill of Rights, too often they appear as advocates for laws and regulations that, in fact, reduce or nullify those Constitutional guarantees. Unfortunately, emotional people, stirred up by our sensationalist, regulation-loving “woke” media, too often clamor for the passage of those restrictive laws and regulations without realizing that those regulations impinge upon individual rights and protections guaranteed under our Constitution.

### Political Parties and Their Major Contributors

Political parties often will adopt policies that potentially enhance their power and influence even if those policies are not in the best interest of the country as a whole. A prime example is the zeal with which the Democratic Party claims that global warming is an existential threat that requires expensive government spending on their favored industries (such as the solar and electric vehicle industries) and penalties against productive industries (such as the oil industry) that often operate in states that favor their poetical opponents. They do so even though the solar and electric vehicle industries are not yet able to produce power efficiently when all costs of production (pre-subsidy) and resource constraints (such as shortages of lithium and rare earths) are considered. The Democrats have often argued for additional government spending that would go to their supporters and favored groups even though such spending has been causing substantial inflation, and greater spending would cause more inflation. While the Democrats' favored groups would gain, the country, as a whole, particularly the middle and lower classes, would be seriously harmed by the additional inflation. However, even though the resulting inflation would harm the country and most of its people, those who first received the additional government spending and subsidies would benefit and, in return, would likely contribute handsomely to the finances and influence of the Democratic Party. This process can occur with any organized political group but at the moment it is dramatically clear that it is a policy

that is being pursued by the Democratic Party in the US.

In addition to organized political parties, other groups can organize themselves to form political pressure groups that pressure political parties and regulators to grant them favorable regulations, subsidies, and monopoly privileges in return for political support. Such groups can include groups like pharmaceutical manufacturers who may try to enhance their monopolistic and oligopolistic profits by gaining extensive and long-lasting patent rights or by banning foreign imports of competing products. Similarly, entertainment industries may lobby for extensive copyright protections (such as the Mickey Mouse law that extended copyright protections for many years when it was about to run out for the creator of Mickey Mouse). Furthermore, medical providers may seek to limit the number of competing institutions in one area or limit the number of people admitted to medical schools and resident positions. They also may require that all practitioners repetitively pass expensive and extensive qualifying exams before they are allowed to practice in various fields. Because monopolistic and oligopolistic powers can enhance the incomes and profits the parties involved, they have a powerful incentive to pay politicians to change laws and regulations in their favor. The net result of all these restrictions is that individuals have less freedom of choice and may have to pay more to obtain needed services—even if such services are still available. Restrictions upon consumers' freedom of choice may not conflict directly with protections promised citizens by the US Constitution but they definitely interfere with citizens "pursuit of happiness" as stated in the US Declaration of Independence.

### Major Foreign Interests

Various foreign interests may seek to influence US policies in ways that restrict US citizens' Constitutional rights and protections. Such effects can occur because of international treaties and agreements that limit citizens' rights. Most recently the US incurred lockdowns, quarantines, and other severe restrictions upon individual and civic behavior as a result of "pandemic control" policies recommended by the UN and its agency, the World Health Organization (WHO). While compliance was not mandatory previously, the Biden Administration has since recommend that UN rules and WHO policies be allowed to mandate individual countries comply with WHO "pandemic" rules in the event that a new "pandemic" be declared by the WHO. Thus, restrictions upon the speech, freedom of movement, possessions, and behavior of US citizens could be imposed even if those restrictions violated individual choice and the rights guaranteed to US citizens by the US Constitution and Bill of Rights.

One of the most worrisome policies invoked in the COVID pandemic scare was the development of vaccine passports that were necessary for people to fly or engage in various other activities. They severely restricted consumer choices involving freedom of movement and permitted activities. In the future such passports could be used to severely restrict individuals' freedom of movement and to punish people who did not wish to comply with vaccine requirements (especially requirements that might be harmful to them or violate their religious beliefs). Such restrictions would clearly violate individuals constitutional rights, but totalitarian authorities do not care since such requirements enhance their power over their citizens—as can be seen most clearly in China, which has implemented numerous lockdowns and travel restrictions upon its people.

Another major problem became apparent during the COVID "emergency" as governments took on extraordinary powers that infringed upon peoples' personal property rights. In Canada, the bank accounts of people who donated more than \$25 to the Truckers' vaccine restriction protests were frozen so they could no longer spend their own money. Free speech has also been obstructed as major social networking companies have repetitively banned people who have criticized the necessity or the effectiveness of various vaccines or have pointed out complications that people have suffered from the vaccination process. People who provide negative information on vaccines have been accused of spreading "disinformation" and have been banned from speaking in many venues. If vaccine passports were to be required to access the US financial system in the future—possibly by restricting bank account access by people who violated various rules, such as vaccination requirements, speech violations or purchase violation attempts (such as prospective firearms purchases), opening up US citizens to international restrictions upon their lives, speech, and activities could generate severe damage to the Constitutional rights and protections accorded to US citizens.

Because an international agency, such as the WHO, or UN, need not be responsive to domestic complaints, if it were to obtain unlimited power over domestic citizens in the future, there would be no easy way to stop it from violating individuals' constitutional rights in any country.

Other international agreements can also limit domestic individuals' rights and freedom of action. Most of the time such restrictions obtain legal authority through the Congressional approval of various treaties. However, in recent years, the US administration has imposed various restrictions upon US citizens and governments in the name of fighting "global warming" even though the US Congress has never ratified the Paris Accord. In addition, US financiers have started to

impose restrictions upon the availability of financing to firms that fail to satisfy their (somewhat arbitrary) ESG (environmental, social, and governance) requirements. The argument is that such firms may incur the wrath of regulators in the future so their financing should be restricted now—even though Congress has not yet mandated such restrictions upon their behavior. As a result, US corporations may incur financing penalties or hardships or management pressures just because they may be unwilling to comply with the “woke” agenda proposed by the Progressives and implemented by cooperating financiers (including mutual fund managers who vote proxy votes on behalf of their unwitting or uncaring investors). ESG requirements have been proposed internationally and are often imposed by international bankers and fund managers even if they have not been codified into law. Many of these requirements are concerned with preventing “global warming” even though the science behind such attempts is sketchy. Other ESG requirements may mandate diversity in managers and employees even if those requirements may be costly to implement and may not be in the best interest of the corporation—because they cause expensive reporting and make it difficult to obtain and retain the highest quality employees. Restrictions upon the freedom of operation and availability of financing for US corporations and citizens are likely to deprive them of some degree of freedom of choice and to burden them with higher costs and less efficient operations than would otherwise be the case.

### Globalism Effects

Globalism can have various effects. Some can be beneficial. By allowing imports of goods sourced from other countries, greater specialization and economic efficiencies can be obtained than if all goods and services available in a community had to be made from local market resources. If the reduced cost and availability of goods is passed on to individuals they can definitely benefit from globalization because of greater freedom of choice and the fact that they can obtain needed goods at a lower cost.

However, globalism can also have costs. The major problem is that global operations can be used to establish monopoly or monopsony situations that can have deleterious effects upon domestic citizens. Monopolies can result when an industry has decreasing costs as scale increases or when there are first mover or patent advantages that restrict potential competition. Also, the larger the network, the more attractive it often becomes. Thus, the first one to establish a network can gain scale and foreclose other potential entrants through price competition. First movers often can generate scale advantages since it costs far less to add an additional point on a network than to start a new network. This has been done by many tech industries, such as telecommunication or social media industries. In addition, international patents can provide monopoly rights for an industry or product over an extended period. Furthermore, if a firm in an industry develops a technical standard that is widely adopted, it can obtain an advantage over firms that do not use uniformly acceptable standards—thus, it often pays firms to solicit international organizations that approve technical standards to endorse their procedures.

When companies and countries compete globally, many countries find it in their best interest-- in terms of providing future employment for their citizens-- if they subsidize the development of patents or the first mover industries and procedures and standards that will allow their international industries to gain monopoly advantages over firms in other countries. Such monopoly powers will enable those firms to obtain higher prices and offer less product choice than would otherwise be the case. As a result, consumers in countries that do not subsidize their producers and related innovations may have to pay more to obtain needed products and have less freedom of choice. Also, potential employers in those affected countries will not have as many possible employment opportunities as might otherwise be the case.

Because the Chinese and others have subsidized the development of various cheap products and have underpriced US domestic producers in many areas, employment opportunities for US citizens have been correspondingly reduced. This has had little effect upon highly skilled employees, as their skills are hard to duplicate around the world. However, it has had an adverse effect upon lesser skilled US citizens, as they essentially must compete for jobs with lesser skilled citizens around the world. The higher skilled US employers, as well as people in general, have benefitted by being able to buy cheap products but the lesser skilled citizens have found it harder to gain employment in many goods producing industries. While the displaced lesser-skilled workers may be able to obtain alternative employment in various service industries, they may incur significant adjustment costs and retraining costs as they try to do so.

An additional problem with globalization of production is that trade flows can be disrupted so that at times crucial parts or products are not available in extended supply chains. We have seen this with the production shutdowns due to COVID restrictions. We also have seen it when politicians impose trade restrictions on various important goods and products—as they have done because of the Russian attack upon Ukraine.

Because of the potential disruption to various industries caused by the globalization of production, many countries have tried to impose tariffs to protect various industries. They also have proposed subsidizing the domestic production of certain “key” goods. Unfortunately, such tariffs and subsidies may protect the friends of politicians better than they protect people who work for less influential corporations. Thus, they often favor large corporate (potentially fascist) corporate



interests to the detriment of ordinary citizens and independent producers.

## Summary and History

Enemies of the constitution have a variety of motives. Some are motivated by ideology—including strongly held political or religious beliefs. Others are motivated by personal interests—usually financial, as is the case with people who wish to gain monopoly powers, employment, or other government favors or handouts for themselves or their industry. Some are motivated by their (short-sighted) “do-gooder” desire to improve the lives of various people and they (typically) ignore the fact that their attempts to overthrow constitutional protections in order to do so may, in fact, result in potential harms to others. Finally, some people are motivated by their desire to exercise power over others, sometimes for political reasons but sometimes just to assert themselves so they can feel important. Because the US Constitution was designed to prevent people from exercising potentially arbitrary or tyrannical control over others without proper checks and balances, many people want to avoid its restrictions in order to more easily achieve their own objectives.

Among the most dangerous of motives for people who are enemies of the constitution are motives related to religious beliefs or strong political beliefs because such beliefs are typically imbued with strong emotion and can induce people to pursue violence and personal martyrship in order to achieve their objectives. While most Muslims are honorable, peaceful people, there is a minority fringe of jihadists who will use violence (as on 9/11/2001) in order to further their objective of replacing the US Constitution and US government with Sharia Law and a new caliphate. Because the jihadists are limited in number, even among Muslims, they do not constitute a major threat at the present time. However, a much more severe threat is posed by the Marxists and Cultural Marxists who wish to destroy the US Constitution because its protections of individual rights and personal property rights stands in the way of their utopian ambitions of creating a world where all people share economic goods equally and live happily in a common community. Because of their emotional commitment to their objectives, they ignore the fact that Marxist societies have never proceeded beyond the point where they have a “dictatorship of the proletariat.” While the dictators in Marxist societies have often gained personally, the average person has not because Marxist societies typically stagnate economically (witness North Korea vs. South Korea or East Germany versus West Germany after World War II when culturally equivalent countries were divided between a Communist (Marxist) side and a more democratic free market side where personal freedoms and property rights were protected.)

Because of its ideological component, Communistic Marxism, and its more recent version, Cultural Marxism, currently poses a major threat to the US Constitution. The problem is that the Marxists have taken to heart the prescription in Marx's Communist Manifesto that Marxism should attempt to control the media and educational institutions in order to propagate its ideas. In addition, the Cultural Marxists (starting with Gramsci) have expanded Marxist objectives by advocating that existing elements of cultural continuity be destroyed so people will accept Marxist ideas more willingly. Thus, cultural Marxists have launched attacks upon existing religious and family structures so people will lose faith in their historic cultural ideas and identities and will more easily accept the ideas promoted by the Marxists. Some Marxists are strongly motivated by their ideological belief that they are trying to produce a better world. Others may be motivated by the fact that they see that the “dictators of the proletariat” have personally gained greatly in many Marxist societies. Still others may be motivated by “fascist” corporate concepts that show that those who cooperate with government power will prosper while others will not. Because of their various personal financial and political motivations, many Marxist adherents have often worked tirelessly to advance their beliefs. Many have used the ideas of Saul Alinsky to form community organizations that pursue Marxist objectives by seeking income redistribution and the abrogation of various personal property rights. Many of those community organizers have become influential in the Democratic political party (as noted earlier). Because they provide stalwart supporters and financial support to politicians who will pursue Marxist objectives of redistributing income and weakening personal property rights as well as other individual rights protections the Marxist leaning members of the Democratic Political Party have exerted disproportionate influence upon many US politicians in recent years. That is why the Democratic Party has opposed individuals' rights to keep and bear arms, and have often tried to impose restrictions upon individuals' First Amendment Rights as well as other rights guaranteed by the US Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The clear and present danger for the US is that the Democratic Political Party has seemingly been captured by people who have Cultural Marxist beliefs. Thus, that Marxist influence must be pointed out so the Marxists can no longer labor in obscurity in their attempt to take over and dominate the US and its government. Even now it appears that the words

written upon Biden's teleprompter have been written by people who believe in maximum government control and minimal individual rights and property rights. It also appears that many government policies are designed to weaken personal property rights through regulatory excesses as well as to weaken existing constitutional protections of individual rights and the US economy in general.

## References and Related Works

This essay has pointed out that there are a number of potential enemies of the US Constitution since there are many who hope to gain by gaining personal wealth or power over others if the constitution's attempts to prevent tyrannical behaviors and to protect individual and property rights were to be overthrown. At present the most important enemy is that posed by the “cultural Marxists” since they are well organized and have obtained a major influence over a major political party and its media and educational institution allies.

A key reference to the ideals and tactics that are employed by the “Cultural Marxists” is Saul Alinsky's book, **Rules for Radicals**, originally published in 1971. It has gone through extensive editions and he has produced much related work in his “community organizer” training instructions. If one reads his work carefully, one is appalled because it is willing to ignore common decency issues and advocates that “the end justifies the means” to achieve one's objectives. Thus it advocates lying, calling people names and defaming their character, mass demonstrations against people and businesses that are opposed to them or their objectives and “calling the pot black” to hide the fact that the radicals have or will soon employ the very same tactics that they disparage in their potential competition. It is not uncommon to see members of Alinsky followers to use the same tactics in Democrats' political discourse and in pursuing various “Progressive” agendas. In his book, Alinsky makes no bones about the fact that he has found Marxism appealing in the past and is trying to encourage young people to obtain meaning for their lives by adopting radical ends in order to disrupt the comfortable middle class. Their rationale is that by making the middle class less comfortable with its existing beliefs, financial condition, and cultural heritage, they will be able to enlist them in order to achieve their (Marxist-oriented) revolutionary objectives of national income redistribution. The version of Alinsky's work that I read has an ISBN number of 978-0-679-72113-0.

Another important reference that does a great job explaining the history and growth of “cultural Marxism” is a book entitled **The Red Trojan Horse** by Alasdair Elder written in March 2021. It explains how the original Marxist ideas did not appeal to the “proletariat” in general since workers observed that they generally did better under a capitalistic system. Thus, the Marxists decided that it was best to undermine peoples' confidence in their old culture by attacking their adherence to family, religion and historical, economic, and cultural traditions. Thus “cultural Marxism” was born with the intent of undermining peoples' traditional culture so they could more easily be convinced that Marxism would provide a superior way to organize the world. That book points out that cultural Marxism has been developing for some time and that Alinsky as well as some radical professors in the US in the 1960s did much to advance its influence. The book's ISBN number is 9781548830502.

A related book by Michael William was written in January 2016. It is called **The Genesis of Political Correctness: the basis of a false morality**. It looks at the growth of political correctness as an outgrowth of “cultural Marxism” and primarily uses numerous examples from Great Britain to explain how it has been promoted and thrived in that country. It shows how political correctness has resulted from the Communist Manifesto of 1848. It also notes that under political correctness “dissent is not tolerated,” “free speech is not allowed,” “human rights are corrupted,” “sex attacks ...by immigrants are covered up,” “democracy is undermined,” “economies are plundered,” and “race war politics are aggressively promoted,” all the quotes are taken from the book “jacket (rear cover)” to explain its coverage. Its ISBN number is 9781523611058.

Before reading these books and occasionally listening to some related presentations at The Constitutionalist Society, I confirmed a suspicion that I had long suspected that the “leftists” and related progressives were organizing themselves in an attempt to gain political power. After hearing Hillary Clinton blame a “vast right-wing conspiracy” for her troubles, I realized that no such thing existed but maybe she was aware of a vast left-wing conspiracy. Thus I wrote a paper that I posted on the statement page of my political website, *www.chipperson.com*, in 2010 titled “Is There a Vast Left-Wing Conspiracy?” At the time I wasn't positive but I suspected as much from the personal experiences I had had when in Washington—which I document in the paper. Now I am convinced that there is a cadre of “leftists” who work diligently and behind the scenes to get “useful dupes” who have strong emotions about some public policy issue to join their coalition

against the status quo. The groups are interconnected by their adherence to “progressive” ideologies and are orchestrated by the leftists.

Other writings on my political website may be of interest to some people. One, the “Elites Versus Individuals” points out that the US has a class of “elites” who can gain by keeping ordinary people in debt and ignorant of economics. These are the would-be monopolists and government bureaucrats who are willing to suspend individual rights and to give ordinary people deficient economics educations in order to gain and maintain their privileged positions. That is why in the essay cited I point out that the “elites” gain by giving themselves advantages and awards to solidify their claim that they have a “right to rule.” I also wrote a paper on “Power vs. Wealth in Politics” which points out that power dominates wealth. In addition, I wrote a paper on “Property Rights Vs. Personal Rights” along with a number of others that explored the issue of private rights versus political power. In addition, I wrote a paper on “Political Capitalism, Socialism and Fascism” that describes important differences in each system regarding private property and personal freedom issues. It also points out that wherever Marxism has been tried, the economy has stagnated and the ordinary people have suffered even though the Marxist elite may prosper. One paper on the website that I like the best is a paper titled, “Government and Criminality” as it describes the many ways in which governments and criminals perform similar functions. I wrote it after the Russian Mafia took over many government functions in the USSR when it collapsed, but then realized that the US government also has many characteristics that are shared by criminal organizations—as both may use their power to gain financial and power objectives.

Finally, and more accessibly, I have written a number of papers that are posted on the members' papers section of [TheConstitutionalistsociety.org](http://TheConstitutionalistsociety.org) website that are relevant to this essay. One is “Don't Trust People Who Are Holier Than Thou.” While such people come from a variety of both left-wing and right wing backgrounds, it appears that frequently they are “progressive” in nature (due to the emotionalism attached by many progressives to their cause) since the key element in this paper is that people who are emotionally committed to defending or advocating their cause are most likely to believe that “the end justifies the means” and hence are most likely to treat dissenters adversely. Another is “Monopoly and Government: Enemies of the Free Market,” which points out how monopolists and government may create and use monopoly powers to enhance their interests at the expense of the ordinary people. An additional paper of relevance is “The Seen and Unseen: Economics in One Lesson” that points out how many people are economically ignorant and do not see the future implications of most political economic policies. The papers on “Political Capitalism, Socialism, and Fascism” and on “Socialistic Fascism” describe current trends in the US political environment, with particular emphasis on how the Marxists and Crony Capitalists are cooperating to obtain potentially tyrannical powers. The papers suggest that it is often in the elites interest to keep the bulk of the population economically ignorant and enamored with the siren song of (often simplistic Marxist) solutions, with lamentable consequences for the nation as a whole. Finally, and most recently, the paper on “Weimar America?” written in early 2021 points out how trends in America including the potential for large inflation is crippling the middle class and could soon lead to the threat that we might evolve as Germany did when it adopted Hitler's government and abandoned the previous Weimar democracy.