

- Chapter One -
What is “Molecular Politics”?

Molecular Politics...

That’s an odd name for a book. What is the meaning of it and why did I use the term?

Before I answer that, let me ask this question. When you hear the mere mention of the word “politics,” what images come to your mind? Perhaps it is one or more of the following:

- (1) Conservatives and liberals arguing on radio or TV.
- (2) Angry crowds marching in the streets
- (3) Politicians insulting each other on Capitol Hill.
- (4) Dishonest and corrupt politicians.
- (5) Politicians taking our money through taxation and then spending it on pet projects that infuriate us.
- (6) Wars we do not support
- (7) Legislation we do not like

In other words, the key word that would sum up all that is political is “discord.”

On the other hand, what do we find when we examine the microcosmic world that makes up life itself? This life is composed of atoms, molecules, cells and our various organs. When we look at these components that make up human life, we see cooperating units that all function in such harmony that our human endeavors are put to shame by comparison.

Oxygen is to the cells in the human body like money is to us, or power is to politicians. It is an essential substance that keeps everything in motion and functioning. There is a huge difference, however, in the approach of our cells and human beings toward the two essential substances of oxygen, on one hand, and money on the other.

The cells in our bodies are much more cooperative than are

we. Each one takes what it needs and passes the rest along for the next one in line. Brain cells need a lot more oxygen than do the ones in the lungs, but they do not seem to mind brain cells having more, even though the lungs do the hard work of acquiring the oxygen to begin with. There seems to be a natural understanding among the cells that brain cells must have more oxygen to function properly, and, if the brain doesn't work right, then the health of the whole is negatively affected.

There seems to be no correlation in the body to the power struggle in humans between the Left and the Right, conservatives or liberals, traditional and progressives, etc. We sometimes have diseased cells appear, but these are a very small minority; and, when they attack the body, the billions of cells unite to fight a common enemy.

It is an entirely different situation with human beings. Most of them never get enough money or power to be satisfied. An individual can have six homes, twelve cars, and two yachts and still not be satisfied, feeling like he needs more. The politician can confiscate over half our income through taxation and still he doesn't have enough. He stays awake nights thinking of new ways to tax us more, yet keep enough people happy to get re-elected.

In addition, most politicians are in a power struggle, not only against the competing party, but also within their own party. The most cherished power, though, is that which they exert over the lives of ordinary citizens. That power never seems to be enough. After laws, regulations and restrictions are passed, they are not content, but always want more control over citizens whether they are needed or not.

Now, imagine the effect on the health of our body if the cells within us had a left/right power struggle, as do modern politicians. Let us say that the cells on the left hated the cells on the right side of the body and visa versa. Now imagine that every time a breath was taken, each side of the body tried to take all the oxygen for itself. Now imagine one side succeeding in gaining control of most of the oxygen. What would happen to the body? For a while, one side would be healthy and strong, and the other withered, weak, and gray with death. It would then not be long before the healthy side then suffered the same effect and the whole body would die.

The tiny lives in our body are smart enough to prevent this from happening. All their actions indicate an intelligent force guiding them that works toward health and abundance for the whole of the body, not just a part.

Why is it, then, that our tiny cells seem to be wiser than us

human beings? Why is it that, instead of intelligently cooperating for the good of the country as a whole, in many cases we fight for our party, right or wrong?

Why is it that we humans, who are individually composed of billions of molecules and cells (which set the example for us), cannot accomplish that which supposedly inferior life forms do every day?

My response is that we can proceed as intelligently, or more so, than the cells. Cells and molecules have been here for billions of years and have learned to function in harmony long before us. We have only been here a short time, geologically speaking, and we are playing catch-up.

Is it possible that we are finally, as a race of humans, approaching a time where we can learn to live in harmony as is the case with the tiny lives that compose our very bodies?

Yes, I think the time is approaching, and we are lucky to be alive now to be a part of a great new beginning. To successfully launch that new beginning we must look to the example set in the tiny cells and molecules in our bodies. As we seek to apply the principles illustrated there, we seek to apply molecular and cellular principles to that great body called humanity. As we apply these principles to politics, we are applying molecular principles.

Thus, we arrive at the very appropriate name: “Molecular Politics.”

How will Molecular Politics play out differently than the politics of the past?

There is one core difference between the two. The actions of the microcosmic life that makes up our bodies are logical, make sense, and are good for the health of the body. Therefore, true molecular politics support those actions that make sense and are good for the country as a whole.

Unfortunately, politics today is far from molecular, for few things supported by our politicians make sense today. Now, a lot of items are controversial, but, in addition, an amazing number of things supported by our politicians are seen as insane by the majority. Among them are:

- (1) Overspending and running up the national debt to a dangerous state.
- (2) Never ceasing to come up with more ways to raise taxes.
- (3) Creating and passing bills up to 2000 pages long that no one has read and understood.
- (4) Paying congressmen for their votes by throwing

millions of dollars of taxpayer money at his voting district.

(5) Pork barrel earmarks and spending.

(6) Demonizing the other party rather than seeking common ground supported by the majority.

(7) Attacking messengers rather than the message.

We could go on and on. In fact, at the end of this book, the reader will find 95 points where Congress is at odds with the majority of the people.

The main point to be made at this time is this: the tiny lives in our body, even though they do not have consciousness as we do, still follow the path of greater common sense. Humanity, as a whole, seems to be bent on the path of self-destruction. This is evidenced by history in that most governments do not last over a span of 200 years. The reason for this is that the politicians and decision-makers do not follow the path of common sense, and, more often than not, do not work for the good of the nation as a whole.

Amazingly, the United States has thrived for more than 200 years, but we are approaching a point of danger where those who preside over us are only looking out for themselves or their party, rather than the people or the nation as a whole.

This must change.

The good news is that it can change. When a path of common sense is revealed it is only a matter of time before the people will line up with it and support it.

Each chapter of this book contains common sense solutions. *Ofnote is Chapter 12, which goes into more detail about Molecular Politics.* May the ideas and facts here be studied and considered, and may this Republic receive new strength from a new awareness, that it may thrive again.

- Chapter Two -
Speaking the Same Language
Who Are the Liberals and Conservatives?

In this and the chapters that follow we will look at the problems that divide us and then at the solutions. It must ever be remembered that until each problem is seen correctly, a solution is not possible.

We will start this book with the most basic political dividing point there is: the two words we use to identify ourselves. We all know what they are: liberal and conservative. Generally speaking, the Democrats are identified with the liberals and Republicans as the conservatives.

I place this division of words as number one on the list because this is the core idea that separates America into the red and the blue, the left and the right, and the good and the bad – as it is held in the minds of many. This division not only applies to the United States, but to the world, for in almost every country we see a war between the conservative and the liberal mindset.

The Democrats and their sympathizers call every Republican (or sympathizer) they do not like a “right winger,” a “right wing extremist,” or just “extremist.”

A popular one that is over the line is “teabagger,” a sexual slur comparable to calling someone a “mother fu——.” Any of these terms used by the media implies that the person or group is way out of control and would nuke the world if they got a chance.

The Republicans and their sympathizers call every Democrat (or sympathizer) they do not like by basically one main term – a “liberal.” Some are using “extremists,” and this is gaining ground for them, but recently the Democrats have had dominion over this word.

Glenn Beck has been popularizing the label “progressive” as a somewhat different slant on liberal. Conservative talk radio has pretty much defined what a liberal today is, and it’s not pretty.

A generation ago, many Democrats (and a few Republicans) would admit to being liberal, but not anymore. Today, even the most liberal politicians run from the word at election time and proclaim themselves as “progressive,” “moderate,” “centrist,” “mainstream,” or “middle of the road,” while declaring the other side as extremists, even if they have views supported by half the country.

One who is labeled a liberal today is a person who could never get elected in a red state, for he is seen as a mindless person devoid of logic who will swallow any bill of goods if it just sounds good.

Now get this. The strange thing about all of the labeling is that even the staunchest Republican is part liberal and the most extreme Democrat has a lot of conservative in him.

The unrecognized truth is this. The difference between the Republicans and Democrats is not that one is conservative and one is liberal...for both contain a mixture of the two.

Now if these two traits do not demarcate the two, what does? I will discuss this shortly, but first I'll explain who are the liberals and who are the conservatives.

If we are to identify them we must first define their labels.

Who is a liberal?

Below are some applicable points from my Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary, copyright 2001. Let us examine them one by one.

(1) A liberal is “favorable to progress or reform...”

Both sides will periodically push toward progress and reform. To say this characteristic only belongs to Democrats is to fool ourselves.

Neither side does enough positive works in this area (as far as I am concerned), but during the Clinton and Bush II administrations, Republicans pushed for more reform - a liberal characteristic - than the Democrats. Examples are:

During the Clinton administration, the Clintons pushed for liberal health care reform and did not succeed. The main reform that did succeed during his term was welfare reform, which was promoted by the Republicans and reluctantly signed by the President.

During the Bush administration, we had an unsuccessful attempt to reform the Social Security system and some reform of the educational system with the No Child Left Behind Act.

After the 9/11 attacks, significant reform was made in our

military intelligence agencies along with the creation of Homeland Security.

Bush made a liberal goal to go back to the moon and on to Mars, whereas the Democrats wanted to take the conservative path and spend the money on the status quo. Now, Obama shows little interest in going to the moon and has cut funding.

Bush wanted to bring in a new generation of nuclear reactors which will generate power with no greenhouse gas emissions, and the Democrats again take the conservative stand with this by maintaining the status quo, though they do support various forms of alternative energy as long as the environment is 100% conserved (another conservative word).

Republicans take the liberal stand of seeking to reform the legal system, discouraging frivolous lawsuits and extreme awards. Again, Democrats want to conserve the system the way it is.

The fact that Democrats disagree with Republican reforms does not make the reforms conservative. They are, after all, still reforms backed by close to half the nation, establishing the point that the Republicans are as at least as liberal in the reform areas as are the Democrats.

(2) Second, the dictionary says the liberal is “in accord with concepts of maximum individual freedom possible, especially as guaranteed by law and secured by governmental protection of civil liberties...”

Both sides speak a lot of “individual freedom.” In fact, many forget that it was the Republicans under Lincoln who fought the war to free the slaves, and then later voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with a larger percentage of Republicans over Democrats, and over twice the number of Democrats in opposition than Republicans. Lyndon Johnson, the Democrat President, however, got the majority of the credit from historians even though he opposed the Eisenhower Civil Rights Bill of 1957.¹

Republicans liberally endorse the freedom to bear arms, freedom from higher taxes, freedom of speech, freedom to practice religious views, freedom from excessive litigation, freedom from excessive government interference and many others, making them perhaps more liberal than the Democrats in this area.

(3) The dictionary continues, saying liberals support “favoring or permitting freedom of action especially with respect to matters of personal belief or expression...” “Neither party is liberal enough in this area, as both seem eager to pass laws that restrict various freedoms. One thing that irritates many Americans is the drive to force the populace into politically correct speech as approved by the few. Democrats support this

non-liberal direction more than Republicans. Many Democrats also support passing something like the Fairness Doctrine, which would have the effect of silencing much of talk radio. This is not a liberal thing to support.

In the past, Republicans have been associated with censorship more than the Democrats, but today the Democrats are turning the tables with their support of politically correct speech and stance against hate speech and for politically correct speech and actions. They are trying to censor every bit as much as Republicans have done in recent times.

(4) The dictionary continues: “of or pertaining to representational forms of government rather than aristocracies and monarchs ...”

Again, Republicans are big on supporting representational government as outlined in the Constitution and oppose centralization. They qualify as being fairly liberal by this definition.

(5) A liberal is “free from prejudice or bigotry.”

Both sides accuse each other of prejudice and bigotry, but neither is free from it. It would be difficult to prove who is the most liberal here, so we’ll judge it a tie, even though both may disagree.

(6) The liberal is “open minded or tolerant.”

Both sides claim to be this. All people think they are open minded and tolerant and, again, it would be difficult to prove to the satisfaction of either side who is the most liberal in this department. Making the case would inflame one side or the other. Suffice it to say, it would be difficult to make the case that the Democrats are more liberal in this area than the Republicans.

(7) Liberals are “characterized by generosity.”

Democrats are indeed liberal in giving out other people’s money, but the true liberal gives away his own. One way to gauge as to which party has the most liberal givers is to examine a study done by the Catalogue For Philanthropy located at:
<http://www.catalogueforphilanthropy.org/cfp/db/generosity.php?year=2004>

The study tabulated which people in the various states give the largest percentage of their income to charities. Many will be alarmed to discover that the top 25 states in giving to charities ALL voted Republican in the 2004 election. Conversely, the seven stingiest states all voted Democrat. This is indeed an embarrassing statistic for Democrats, and hopefully it will inspire them to live up to their liberal image and be more giving.

Conclusion: To call the Democrats liberal is a misuse of the language and obscures the true differences between the parties.

Next, let us see who the real conservatives are.

Who Is A Conservative?

Again, here are a few things listed in my dictionary:

(1) A conservative is “disposed to preserve existing conditions, institutions, etc.”

Who are the biggest promoters of preserving “existing conditions”? None other but the environmentalists who despise most Republicans and are closely aligned with the Democrats.

The interesting thing is that environmentalists are big on conservation, which basically means to be “conservative” with the land. The fact they are called ultra liberal is perhaps the greatest misuse of the language in the history of our country. These people do not endorse liberal change with the environment, either good or bad, but are extremely conservative to the point that Jerry Falwell looks like a flaming liberal in relation to the two belief systems.

So, how about the second part of the definition regarding “preserving institutions.” Who is the more conservative here?

In many cases, it is the Democrats. As previously stated, they want to keep Social Security the way it is. Republicans want to liberally change it. They want to preserve the Department of Education; the Republicans want to alter it or do away with it.

Democrats want to preserve the status quo with unions; Republicans want to change them. Republicans wanted to bring democracy to the Middle East during the Bush administration; Democrats wanted to leave things alone. This was somewhat reversed during the Obama administration. Republicans want to overhaul the UN; Democrats want to keep it the way it is. Republicans want to remove barriers to trade and Democrats want to keep them in place.

Democrats do want to make liberal changes to health care but Republicans desire change also but take a different approach.

(2) The conservative seeks “to limit change.”

The fact is that the Republicans resist the Democrat ideas for change and the Democrats do the same toward the Republicans. When a Republican President is in power Democrats will resist change with Herculean will and the Republicans will do the same during a Democratic administration. I doubt if anyone can prove to the satisfaction of both sides who is the most conservative in this area.

(3) A conservative is “traditional in style or manner, avoiding novelty or showiness.”

I think most would agree that in this area, the Republicans

are the more conservative.

(4) The conservative has the “tendency to conserve,” or be “preservative.”

We’ve already made the point that the environmentalists want to conserve and preserve. But ask yourself – which presidents in recent history have placed the most emphasis on conserving energy, rather than liberally going after more of it?

Most would agree that these two would be the “liberal” Democrats Jimmy Carter and Barack Obama. Carter instructed us to be conservative and to turn our thermostats down, supported a law limiting the speed limit on highways to 55 miles per hour, and sought to decrease the size of our cars to conserve fuel.

In spite of attempting many liberal changes, Obama is big on conserving the environment, conserving energy, conservatively considering nuclear energy, conservative on defense spending and conservative on the space program.

Which party is less conservative and more liberal in conserving things as they are? Yes, here, Republicans are the more liberal. Many of them believe that extreme conservation is not necessary, that humankind has the ingenuity to create all the energy we need so we can liberally use all we want.

My point here is not to categorize one party as good and the other evil, but to make the case that the difference between the two parties has been defined with an illusion or fallacy; that illusion is that the Republicans are black and white conservative and the Democrats are liberal.

It’s time we faced the fact that this differentiation is simply not true. If anything, Republicans are more liberal as a whole than the Democrats.

Consider this. All these years, Republicans have hated Democrats because they are liberal, but, in the end, they are not that liberal. Democrats have likewise hated Republicans because they are conservative, and they are not always that conservative.

This brings us to the key question on this first division point. If the core difference between the two parties IS NOT that one is conservative and the other liberal, then what is it? If they are fighting for a reason that does not exist, then is there even a reason for the fight to continue? Does each party hate the other for what is really in themselves?

The Real Difference

Before any degree of harmony can be established between

the two parties, the true differences must be seen. We have the situation where the Democrats dislike Republicans because they are conservative. Yet ironically, they are really more liberal than themselves. Since this is the case, they do not really know what really upsets them and find no way to achieve compromise and understanding. Of course, the same principle applies to Republicans when they dislike Democrats, who are more conservative than themselves.

The real difference between the two parties may seem like a mystery to many, but it is really quite simple – simple, yet complex. It is as simple and complex as the difference between male and female, the left and right brain, the mind and the emotions.

Think on this. The entire universe is made of two energies – positive and negative. To put this in the right perspective, we must remember that, in chemistry, negative is not bad, but merely the opposite polarity of the positive charge. These two charges manifest as dualities in almost every sphere of existence, and are described by many names.

In addition to positive and negative, they are known as sending - receiving; teacher - student; masculine - feminine; radiant - magnetic; conservative - liberal, etc.

There are thousands of dualities, but the first three I mentioned are quite applicable to the two parties; these are male and female, the left and right brain, the mind and the emotions. In considering this, we must ask the question: which party is male and which is female in general characteristics? Which is right or left brain, mental or emotional?

Any reader reflecting on this will see the answer immediately, which is:

Republicans: male - left-brain - mental.

Democrats: female - right brain – emotional

To understand these differences, it is helpful to see the two polarities as influencing energies rather than completely dominating either party. Just like every male has a heart and is influenced by emotion, and every female has a mind and is influenced by reason. Neither gender is completely stuck on just one side of the duality but in general the female is polarized in the right brain and the male the left.

Even so, we find that the two parties are polarized in the two energies, one in the male and one in the female. To understand what we mean when using the word “polarized,” let us look at the average male and the average female. The average male is more centered in mind and reason, and the average female in heart and emotion. This is especially apparent when you examine their

decision-making processes.

According to Helen Fisher, PhD, there may be a physiological explanation of these polarity differences between females and males. The feeling nature can boost dopamine levels, a brain chemical that inspires creativity. Analytical thinking is promoted by testosterone.

(The Oprah Magazine, Feb. 2010)

Now the male is not completely centered in the mind, for he is certainly influenced by emotion, but if he is influenced 51% or more by mind and 49% by emotion, he is said to be mentally polarized because the majority of his energy is there. If he is influenced 75% by mind and only 25% emotion, he is still mentally polarized, the difference being the polarity is much stronger.

That said, how would one judge the polarity of the two political parties in the United States?

The polarity changes from decade to decade, but, at the present time, I would put it this way:

Republicans: 60% male/mental - 40% female/emotional.

Democrats are the opposite: 60% female/emotional – 40% male/mental.

In other times in our history, the polarity has been closer to the middle, but because the energy difference is so great at this time, we face a peculiar problem that can only be solved by mutual understanding of the differences.

To understand how these male-female polarities play out in the two parties, we must examine the areas of dominance and differences between the two, and see the two energies at work.

Let us list some of the male/female demarcations of the parties:

(1) As a whole, the majority of males support Republicans and the majority of females support Democrats.

For instance, in the 2000 election, where the votes were split down the middle, Bush received 53% of the male vote and only 43% of the female. Gore received 54% of the female vote and only 42% of the male. This general trend repeats itself in elections at all levels and doesn't change that much when a female runs for office. Voters are more attracted to the polarization of the party, as a whole, than to the gender of the person running.

(2) In the media, Republicans dominate talk radio; the Democrats dominate just about everything else.

Both sides complain about the domination of the other in the media, but few seem to be asking why this is the case. Democrats say that Republicans dominate talk radio because they are angry and want to let off steam. Republicans often think the Democrats

control the rest of the media because they lack any moral standard and are corrupt.

Both sides are in error. The fact that 61% of talk radio listeners are male tells us that talk radio appeals to the male analytical mind, and this is the reason it is dominated by the male-polarized Republicans.

Outside of Fox News, Democrats dominate the major TV and print media. This is because the major media appeals more to the feeling nature, as well as the creative side, which also draws emotional energy.

The proof of the Democrat domination here is indisputable, as many studies have been made.

One of the most notable studies was done by S. Robert Lichter of George Washington University, and Stanley Rothman of Smith College, surveying 240 journalists from the major print and broadcast media including ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS, The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Wall Street Journal, Time, Newsweek, and US News and World Report. This study was presented in their book published in 1986, *The Media Elite*. It found that in the presidential elections of 1964, 1968, 1972 and 1976, a whopping 86% of responding journalists in the major media voted Democrat.

Then, in 2001, Rothman and Amy Black did an updated study and established that 76% of the established media voted for Michael Dukakis in 1988 and 91% for Bill Clinton in 1992.

A Freedom Forum Poll did a secondary study and found similar results in that 89% of the Washington reporters and bureau chiefs voted for Clinton in 1992 and a paltry 7% voted for George W. Bush.

A good site for more information on this can be found at:
<http://www.mrc.org/biasbasics/biasbasics3.asp>

From the *Publisher's Weekly* review of the *Media Elite* found on Amazon.com we see they support the Democratic side also.

The authors proceed to demonstrate that media people's regional and class prejudices determine their handling of the news: they are distinctly against nuclear energy (although many experts are not), strongly pro-busing (despite the compelling arguments against the practice) and furiously anti big oil.

So, why is it like going against a brick wall for a Democrat to succeed in talk radio or a Republican to shine in the rest of the major media? Does it have to do with bias on both sides? There

is some, but that is only a small part of the answer.

The real answer is that the male-polarized Republican just enjoys talk radio and the female polarized Democrat is more attracted to working in the major media. Why is this?

The reason Republicans gravitate to talk radio is because they get to use the male-oriented analytical mind. The host and the callers are always mentally analyzing, arguing and debating. These are activities shunned by the female more than the male.

On the other hand, the major media offers more outlets for the female feeling and creative nature. Face-to-face interviews are a huge draw for them. Is it any wonder that we hear *"how does that make you feel?"* over and over again on television, but not radio? The female polarization helps us understand why the feminine Barbara Walters excels, in that more often than not she brings out the female feelings in even the most hardened male figures. The big question is always, *"Is she going to make him (or her) cry?"*

Another big draw for the female feeling nature is that major media concentrates on creative work more than the mere analyzing of facts. Creativity appeals to the feeling nature and depends on expressing it to achieve success.

The female feeling nature uses the news and information toward creative ends and this is good in that it helps keep us entertained so we do not change the channel while absorbing otherwise dry news. It also has a negative aspect in that the media person can creatively assemble facts in a story to present a picture that runs contrary to such facts, but supports the agenda felt true by the reporter/journalist.

It matters not that males anchor most of the news programs; the overall polarization of the media is still female and oriented toward feeling, harmony and creative presentation.

It is interesting to note that Fox News is seen as Republican oriented, and this broadcast is more like talk radio than the other television media. The highest rated programs are The O'Reilly Factor and Hannity. These do a lot of mental critical analysis and have a significant amount of male-polarized debate, decking it out with some intense macho arguments.

(3) Republicans explain their issues using logic. Democrats present theirs with feeling and emotionally charged words.

This is not true in every case, as members of both parties are influenced by both mind and emotion, but as a general rule it does apply.

As evidence of this, we need only look at how both sides attempt to sway the public.

Perhaps the most powerful tool of the Democrats in swaying public opinion by emotion is sound bites. By this I mean they use short catch phrases that appeal to the feelings of the people, and add little or nothing for the reasoning mind to digest. Here are some examples:

Tax breaks for the rich
 On the backs of the poor
 Right wing extremists
 Give peace a chance
 Working people (catch phrase referring to anyone on a salary that's not a Republican)
 Politics of personal destruction
 Support the troops, not the war
 Make love, not war
 Hate radio
 Hate speech
 Star Wars

Trickle down effect (this phrase was created and used by Democrats - not a quote from the Reagan Administration as thought by the majority.)

Then the Democrats are adept at seeing catch phrases in Republican speeches and using them to their advantage:

Example: "Wither on the vine" (From Newt Gingrich concerning Medicare)

They have also been successful in using just one or two words that have little meaning by themselves, but, over time, are charged with emotion:

Big Business
 Halliburton
 Mob

We can't leave this list without including one of the most potent emotional catch phrases of all time. It was not for political effect, but spoken by a true Democrat (Johnny Cochran) and accepted by a large portion of the Democrats:

"If the glove does not fit you must acquit."

Compared to the logic of a DNA match the reasoning in this phrase was very weak, but was more powerful because it had emotional punch.

Now, there are catch phrases that appeal to the mind, but these are generally non-political, such as *"the grass is greener on*

the other side.” Members of both parties respect these truisms. Political catch phrases are different in that they appeal to the emotions and are used largely by Democrats.

The important point to realize here is that the Democrats are more successful with such catch phrases because they appeal to the emotions. It matters not that the phrase itself has little meaning.

The Republicans use catch phrases once in a while, but with little success. The distortion of the word “liberal” is their one great achievement, but this is one word, not a phrase. Because of their more mental polarization, they seek to explain things instead using sound bites.

This appeals to the reasoning person who has time to listen, but because so much more time is involved to make the point, the Republican is at a great disadvantage.

For instance, in an argument about spending on missile defense, the Democrat merely has to state something with “Star Wars” in it. This immediately conjures up war in space raining down upon the earth.

The Republican will counter with a long explanation as to why the missile defense is necessary – that it could lead to less war. Before he gets half his point made, the subject is changed and the emotional listener feels the point of the catch phrase, “Star Wars,” while the Republican explanation seems to be meaningless gobbledygook to him.

It may seem that the emotional catch phrase could dominate forever over the lengthy logical explanation, but talk radio and debate programs on cable TV have changed that somewhat. These programs give time for lengthy talk and reasoning, and often the person commuting in his car or doing mundane work has plenty of time to listen.

This shift in media, which gives time to see beyond the catch phrases, is one of the main reasons for some Republican domination in recent times. They only lost the House and Senate in 2006 and 2008 because they did not satisfy the mental appetites of their base.

(4) Republicans choose their issues because they seem logical; Democrats choose theirs because they feel right. Both generally have good intentions, but often come to opposing conclusions. Because their conclusions are so different, neither can understand the thought process of the other.

As a result, Republicans see Democrats as downright stupid for supporting illogical beliefs and opinions. On the other hand, Democrats see the Republicans as mean-spirited, greedy and unfeeling for not jumping on their bandwagon.

At times, both parties see the other as power hungry in their motivations and sometimes they are right, but what else is new?

To illustrate the point, let us examine three basic issues:

(A) Big Government

Republicans preach the logic of limited government and reducing its size. This is a logical philosophy, since rarely has increasing the size and power of government produced much benefit. History reveals, though, that government grows in size and power no matter who is in office.

Democrats usually support giving more power to the government and increasing its size. This is rarely a logical or beneficial position, for increasing the size and power of government rarely results in the goal being reached.

If it is not logical, then why do they support it?

The answer is simple: because the program behind the expansion has good intentions, and it feels good to support it and throw money and government power behind health care, welfare, the environment, global warming, fighting AIDS, homelessness, financing the arts, public TV and radio, school lunches and many other benevolent programs.

If there seems to be no other way to move these projects ahead, Democrats will feel they must increase government power to make progress.

Unfortunately, both parties fail in their goals here. Republicans fail because they do not have the will to reduce the growing power of government; and Democrats fail because their method of approach is the same as the last one that failed.

Both parties need to apply the simple logic to be gained from the classic definition of insanity: "Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results."

(B) Taxes

Republicans: Taxes are closely related to big government, for the government cannot grow unless revenue grows. Therefore, the Republican philosophy toward taxes is similar to the first point. Even though they are rarely successful, they believe in limiting or reducing taxes. It seems logical to reduce taxes and give more power to the taxpayer, who has proven that he can more efficiently recycle money into the system than the government.

Republican logic teaches that decreasing taxes in the right circumstance will not always decrease revenue, but often increase

it.² There is a limit in how much you can tax and continue to increase revenue. Obviously, if the government taxed at 100% no one would work for nothing and all would collapse. There is always a certain percentage point for a tax base that creates diminishing returns. Some believe that figure to be around 30% but others disagree. With low taxes, excess dollars in the hands of the people can grow national income to the point that tax revenue can increase, even with a tax cut. Logic leads us to a possible win-win situation.

A problem rarely mentioned is the hidden tax of inflation created by over spending. If taxes are reduced 10% and spending increases 30% then inflation may result which could neutralize the benefits of a tax cut.

To correctly analyze the effect of a tax cut one must calculate whether any extra money was left in the hands of the people after loss through inflation is factored in.

Democrats: Though they rarely will say so while campaigning, they almost always embrace tax increases if such taxes are for a cause that feels good. They do not generally support tax increases for war (just or unjust) or the military, for that does not feel good. If a proposed tax increase is to funnel more money to the poor, education, health care or something that has no negative feelings attached, then they will support it and listen to no logic to the contrary, even if logic dictates that the money will be wasted or national debt will be increased.

(C) National Security

Republicans again take a logical approach, which is encapsulated in the slogan "Peace through strength." The reasoning goes like this: to retain national security, a country must maintain enough strength to discourage enemies from threatening them with war. This is a logical approach that works and is validated by history.

Republicans, therefore, support a strong military and that is one item for which they will support higher taxes if necessary. This approach - whether it works or not - "feels" wrong to the Democrats. They feel that if you are nice to others they will be nice to you. Because this works well with some people, they feel it will work with countries, even those that are led by tyrannical rulers. They, therefore, often support unilateral reductions in armaments, hoping that our good example will inspire our enemies to

do the same. It feels good to save money on defense and spend it on a good cause, such as the poor or health care.

Unfortunately, this “be nice” attitude has never proven to work against tyranny. A good example was the plan of Clinton and Carter to be nice as well as trusting with North Korea. They made a deal with them that if they would promise to not make nuclear weapons, we would help them, including financing, for nuclear power plants.

Surprise, surprise... A few years later, we found out that they did indeed use our assistance to further their nuclear program. But did this experience cause any Democrats to regret the “be nice” approach? No. No amount of logic or introspection changed any minds. They continue to support the “be nice” approach, not because it is logical, but because it feels good and it feels like the other nations should be nice in return.

These two widely different approaches to issues illustrate my point that the main difference between the two parties is that the Republicans are polarized in the mind, the Democrats in the emotional nature. Both the emotions and the mind have their proper place for influence, but balance cannot be reached if we do not even see what it is that must be placed in balance.

The question, then, is how is balance to be obtained?

The Key to Balance

We must face the fact that we can never expect the Republicans and Democrats, or any two political parties, to think alike and achieve total unity; but we should expect them to treat each other with respect and work together with the good of the country as the prime goal.

The key to achieving this is to understand that the two major divisions in each country correspond to the male/analytical – female/emotional nature. It is important to acknowledge that the male/Republicans also have feelings and use them, and the female/Democrats also use their analytical left-brain. We are not talking about a void of mind or feeling on either side; we are talking about polarization, which means that the Republicans lean toward analyzing and the Democrats lean toward feeling.

We must realize that we need both mind and feeling to create successful policies that will satisfy the many.

The key to getting along here is to look at the marriage relationship.

Everyone acknowledges that there are definite differences of approach between the male and female in a relationship. Just

as we have the war of the political parties, we also hear regular mention of the “war between the sexes.”

We have good marriages and bad marriages; we also have times where the parties get along and then other times where they hate each other’s guts.

The key to the parties getting along is to look at the example of a good marriage as compared to a bad marriage.

Bad marriage: does not have similar values and goals.

Good marriage: has similar goals and values in common.

Bad marriage: poor communication, with little attempt to understand each other’s thoughts and needs.

Good marriage: good communication, with a willingness to understand each other’s thoughts and needs.

Bad marriage: both demand their way and are unwilling to compromise.

Good marriage: both are willing to compromise to a reasonable degree.

Bad marriage: both carry grudges and do not show good will.

Good marriage: both go out of their way to show good will and affection to the other.

We could create a very large list here, but this gives us the general idea of how accurate the correspondence is and the similar needs had by both to establish success.

The first point is of extreme importance, for without common values a good marriage is virtually impossible. Without such values a divorce is inevitable. A divorce in a regular marriage is difficult enough, but a divorce between two political parties is unthinkable. We came close to it once through a civil war, which was basically a war between Democrats and Republicans. Lincoln patched up the marriage and we continued as one nation. Let us hope we do not let the division in relationship reach this point again.

The key to mending fences is to concentrate on that which the two parties do agree on and emphasize these things. To this end, I have written *The Principles of Political Unification*. If each individual in both parties reads over these and commits to them, a good political marriage can surface again.

The Principles of Political Unification

(1) I seek that which is good for my country and the world above that which is good for my party.

(2) I support the principle of free speech. All shall be allowed to express their political and spiritual views, however repulsive, without legal restrictions.

(3) I support the principle of freedom and work toward securing the greatest possible freedom for individuals and groups in every situation. I accept the principles of freedom enunciated in the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights.

(4) I commit myself to sending good will and the spirit of friendship to all involved in the political process, especially those with differing political views.

(5) Even though the majority may not always support my views, I realize that the majority, when properly informed, rarely will lead us on a dangerous path. I therefore seek to honor the majority will of the people. When I disagree with the will of the people, I will not seek to forcefully control them or change them, but will use peaceful means to inform, educate and enlighten them.

(6) There are a number of issues that cause division, heated debate and anger; examples are abortion, gun control, social programs, drug legalization, military activities and others. Most cannot be resolved in the near future through the conversion of the other side to my side. I support the following unifying approach: to support the principle of fairness on controversial issues, both sides must be heard even though the other side may be repulsive to me. Free speech and thought is the most important principle and the prime directive of unification and ultimate peace. I therefore commit to the principle of fair play, realizing that both sides deserve to be heard and have their representatives in positions of power. Both sides should have freedom to present their views without legal restriction. Fairness is not to be forced, but allowed and tolerated.

(7) I believe in integrity and honesty, and will seek to be truthful no matter what the opponents do. I seek not to distort or lie for the benefit of my party or for personal gain.

(8) I accept that we must be fiscally responsible and will do all in my power to create a balanced budget, except in times of national crisis. I will only support programs for which funds can be raised without adding to the national debt.

(9) I agree that the people are taxed enough and seek to keep the budget within the range of current tax revenues (or preferably

lower) and to not raise the percentage of taxes on anyone unless the majority of taxpayers agree.

(10) I agree to put the security of my country and the world above the views or actions of my own political party. If others of my party sabotage national security, or undermine a just effort toward the elimination of threats, I will be just as critical of them as the opposing party.

(11) I accept the fact that there is great waste and inefficiency in government spending and commit myself to eliminate waste and increase efficiency wherever and whenever possible.

(12) I accept and support the idea that we can save ourselves much grief by learning from the mistakes of history so we do not repeat them. It is therefore of extreme importance that the youth be accurately taught, without censorship, national and world history in a way that is of interest and will be absorbed by them. I will oppose all those who revise history in a distorted fashion for political gain or in support of a political agenda.

(13) I agree that extremism has been and is the cause of many problems in the world and seek to not impose extreme views on the people. If I happen to have extreme views that I believe to be of value, I will seek to persuade by education rather than by force.

It is also a problem when political opponents are called extremists when over a third of the public supports them. Such accusations are extremist in disguise. I seek to not be extreme myself in distorting the image of opponents by calling them extremists when such is not true. For instance, it is not extremism to be simply for or against abortion, as there are many on both sides of the equation.

(14) I support the elimination of poverty but realize there are two approaches to this. The first is to give a helping handout and the second is to provide circumstances so the person may help himself. Extremists on this issue have warred against each other and have been the cause of much division. I reject extremism on both sides and seek to recognize the value of both sides. There are times of helplessness when people need direct assistance, and times when they need to be encouraged to stand on their own feet. I do not support handouts to those who are capable of helping themselves and refuse to do so.

(15) I support the separation of church and state, but reject extremism on both sides. I reject the extreme that the government should endorse any specific religious influence on public policy even though all religions have the freedom to express their views. I also reject the other extreme that any mention of God, religious values, or the public display of religious symbols is not

to be tolerated.

(16) I support equal rights for all races, both sexes and members of all religions and ideologies. I recognize that the large majority of both sides of the political spectrum seek what is best for all races and minorities (even though the opposition has a different approach) and refuse to manufacture accusations for political gain.

(17) I recognize that the large majority on both sides of the political spectrum seeks what is best for the environment, but, again, both sides have a different approach.

Two extremes causing division are: the first is preserving the environment even if there is strong economic and job loss. The second is seeking profits at the expense of the environment. The truth is the two are interdependent. A strong economy can provide funds to help the environment and a healthy environment provides for a good long-term economy. I seek, therefore, to work with both sides of this issue and will desire cooperation rather than assigning blame. I seek to aid the environment without harming the economic structure.

(18) I recognize we are a nation of laws and will not support the subversion of law for political gain. I will condemn such subversion of those who share my views as well as those who do not.

(19) I will support the establishment of necessary law as well as the elimination of bad, as well as useless laws that clutter the system.

(20) In the end, I support the example of John Kennedy who, while campaigning, found good things to say about his opposition. Instead of tearing them down, he said, "we can do better." I support the idea of converting by good works and ideas rather than tearing down the opposition, who represents approximately half the country, many of whom are my friends and neighbors.

I'd say that if the average reader can support 16 out of 20 of these, we have fodder for a good marriage. Maybe we should realize that the basis we have for a political marriage is better than we thought.