

POPULISM IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE UNITED STATES: THE CASE OF THE TEA PARTY MOVEMENT*

*Darío Fernández-Morera***

This paper outlines some differences in the conception, inception, and practice of populism in Latin America and the United States, using the concrete example of the Tea Party movement. Underlining these distinctions is the proposition that, just as not all populism is the same, not all populism is necessarily bad from the point of view of the preservation of liberty and the promotion of responsible individuals in a free society.

Populists in both Latin America and the United States have shared a mistrust of what they consider intellectual, political, and economic elites—the last two sometimes conflated into the same multimillionaire individual. These elites constitute what a number of commentators, in the case of the United States, have called a new “ruling class.” It includes “government workers,” that is, bureaucrats who for all practical purposes are “lifers,” people whose only job ever has been for the government, who cannot be easily laid off, and who in many cases can retire with generous pensions and health benefits at the ripe old age of 55.¹

However, one important distinction between populists in Latin America and the United States resides in their attitudes toward the Republican process and the wealth redistribution political agenda.

Populism in Latin America normally presents two fundamental characteristics. One is a “top-down process of political mobilization that either bypasses institutionalized forms of mediation or subordinates them to more

* Lecture given at Mont Pelerin Society’s Regional Meeting, organized by Fundación Libertad (Rosario) on the topic “The Populist Challenge to Latin American Liberty”, and held April 17-20, 2011 in Buenos Aires. Reproduced here with permission.

** PhD in Comparative Literature (Harvard University). Associate Professor of Literature and Hispanic Studies (Northwestern University). Email: fkalokagathos@aol.com

direct linkages between the leader and the masses.”² The other is “an economic project that uses widespread redistributive or clientelistic methods to create a material foundation for popular-sector support.” One does not have to believe, with Eric Voegelin, that socialism, fascism and National Socialism are all political forms of the Left to argue that they do share a number of characteristics also found in Latin American populism. The most clearly shared one is trust in the power of the state, when correctly and disinterestedly applied, to improve the condition of the masses. Naturally, such beneficial power requires a certain, shall we say, strength on the part of the state and a necessary drastic extension of its intrusion into the economic life of the citizens, as well as the elimination of competing sources of influence, such as religion, especially –though not only– organized or institutional Christianity

None of these features, however, characterizes populism in the United States. In the United States, populism is usually averse to wealth redistribution, perhaps because populists believe that it ends up taking away wealth from the populists. A similar disparity exists regarding Republican institutions of mediation and subordination. Unlike American Labor Unions and their occasional allies (such as community activists, university students, and faculty), which use intimidation and graded violence to achieve ends that the Republican process would deny them (a direct method perfected by Chicago-born neo-Marxist activist Saul Alinsky³), contemporary American populism as represented by the Tea Party Movement not only continues to trust the Republican political mechanisms, but even calls attention to the documents of the American Founding Fathers to justify that trust.

Before examining these differences further, one should look at their genesis. Populism has different origins in Latin America and the United States. In Latin America, the revolutionary momentum of populism usually has centered around a *caudillo*, a more or less charismatic figure, frequently with a military background and a perceived or real personal courage, sometimes a lawyer, sometimes a literary man, sometimes both –but, most important, a figure who promises to improve the condition of the masses by re-distributing wealth from those who have more to those who have less, once he and his party or followers achieve government power.

Rarely have the better-known of these Latin American populist leaders run a business. Víctor Haya de la Torre was a literary man and lawyer; Juan Perón, a military man; Hugo Chávez, a military man; Fidel Castro, a gangster student of law and eventual lawyer at the U of Havana⁴; Che Guevara, a caricature of a military man, and certainly a leader who never worked for a living⁵; Abimail Guzmán, a professor (Ayn Rand would have loved this) of Kantian philosophy at the University of Ayacucho. Evo Morales is an exception, having been a coca farmer. If one goes one step further and includes among the caudillos some personalities superior in every way to those in the previous list, such as the great Simón Bolívar, we are still left with military men at the helm of revolutionary movements –men who by the sheer force of their personalities have generated the political movement.

What about the Amerindian masses in Latin America? They offered no alternative conception of politics: before the Spanish conquest they had been ruled, especially in the most successful and culturally advanced commonwealths, by autocrats who commanded quasi-totalitarian, quasi-socialist empires. In other words, the Amerindians, too, were ruled and inspired by their own versions of a caudillo and a powerful government at his command.

It is worth mentioning one other feature of Latin American life that does not lend itself to generating the kind of populism that characterizes the United States: the way institutions of higher education have come into being. In Latin America, in most cases, the major, most prestigious universities, at least until relatively recently (I count among these recent exceptions the Universidad Francisco Marroquín in Guatemala, an extraordinary phenomenon in every way), were founded either by the state or by the centrally directed Catholic Church- not by groups of private citizens, religious or otherwise, acting on their own initiative, for their good and the good of their fellow men, and not based on a business model whereby students paid for their education, with varying support for people of lesser means. In other words, in Latin America, organized educational life, which is normally the breeding ground for the intellectual and cultural life of a nation, resulted from a top-down process.

Now let us examine the case of the United States and how its earliest revolutionary movement, which I will argue was a populist movement, came into being. Let us start with some of the principal “Founding Fathers” of the United States, who led the American Revolution and were as close to being part of a political and cultural elite as one can find at the inception of the American Republic: men such as Hamilton, Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Adams, and Madison. Alexander Hamilton had for years administered a business, and therefore knew how to meet a payroll. Washington had run a plantation and the fact that he used slave labor did not alter his need to match income with expenses, including the maintenance of the slave force, and therefore his need produce enough to make his business viable. As a plantation owner in Virginia, Thomas Jefferson had a similar experience. Benjamin Franklin managed a printing business and therefore knew the difficulties of meeting a payroll and produce enough to make his business viable. Only James Madison and John Quincy Adams were lawyers (not that there is anything wrong with being a lawyer; some of my best friends are lawyers); but even lawyer Madison had lived with parents who had to run a business, a tobacco plantation. None of these men was a professional soldier. One might count Washington a partial exception, for he did serve in his youth. However, from 1759 to the outbreak of the revolution in 1776 Washington dedicated himself to the management of his property, not to professional soldiering.

It was precisely as a result of such real-life market experience that Washington, along with the other American farmers, who made up a majority of the population, saw themselves exploited by the mercantilist policies that favored English businesses. In other words, these American revolutionaries, leaders and masses alike, knew well the real world of the marketplace and how this world relates to political and personal liberty.

No mere abstract ideas were at work among these people, but real, everyday concerns. Of this critical mass of the revolution made up of farmers, shopkeepers, and other small businessmen, most knew how to read and write not through government-organized or top-down Church-organized elementary schools, but through small, privately run, “dame” schools where Christian

religious texts were part of the children's education.⁶ With limited forms of home entertainment, people who could read did so voraciously, and the revolutionary pamphlets made an impact on this population. But both those who could read and those who could not were also exposed to the revolutionary sermons of the Christian preachers at their churches—preachers and churches being an often neglected factor in the genesis of the American revolution no less than in the genesis of American traditions and life.⁷ The Christian religion, or at the very least the Christian churches and their church-based social networks and traditions, would continue to play a central role in their lives. As the naturalized Frenchman John de Crevecoeur (1735-1813) had noticed and later Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859) had confirmed, these people derived their virtues and cohesion largely from their concern with family, neighborhood and religiously-based social networking, if not with religion itself.

The Christian religious factor would have an impact also on the development of intellectual and cultural life among the early generations of Americans in the United States. In contrast to Latin America, most of the great universities of the United States were founded, not by government, or by a centralized Church, or by intellectual elites, but by groups of religious and well-educated common people, all of them Christians, some of them ministers in one Church or another, all working independently from the state as well as from centrally organized religions. My own university, Northwestern, was founded by a group of Methodists, and the two mottoes on the seal of the school are taken right out of the Christian Gospels: one of them is in Latin, *Quaequumque sunt vera*, “whatsoever things are true,” taken from Saint Paul’s *Epistle to the Philippians* 4:8; the other is in Greek, Ο λογος πλήρης χαριτος και αληθεια, “the word, full of love and truth,” taken from *Saint John* 1:14. Of course, today most students and professors don’t think about, and in some cases don’t even realize, this, blissfully ignoring that they owe to religious people (oh the horror!) their place of work and study. But the point is that these early Americans were self-reliant, yet very involved in the civic life of their small communities, a civic life which included a very strong Christian component. Basically, they wanted to be left alone to carry

on their family life, their town life, their economic life, and their religious life. Their safety net consisted of family, neighbors, and church.

These early Americans were what today one would call “provincial” people - concerned primarily and in a progression of less and less concern, with their family, friends, neighbors, town, region, state, and, lastly, with other regions of the United States. The signers of the Mayflower Compact of 1620 were not members of an intellectual class; they were not inspired by philosophical ideas but by their religion and their experiences as a persecuted religious group; and their inspirational leader was not some charismatic fellow, but the God of the Christian Gospels. John Winthrop’s great sermon, “City Upon a Hill,” fondly recalled by Ronald Reagan more than once⁷, was not inspired by the ideas of an intellectual elite, but, again, by his religious readings (Ronald Reagan himself was a twentieth-century version of this provincial American Middle Class, what neo-Marxist professors continue despectively and anachronistically to call a “bourgeoisie,” and consequently he was profoundly despised by the intellectual elites of the United States).

The American Revolution and the early United States were therefore a people’s revolution and a people’s country- a land where individuals concerned primarily with their families, friends, neighbors, towns, region, and state, in that order of importance, made momentous decisions without following a charismatic leader or some abstract ideas. The thinking process in the political actions of these farmers and their leaders was no different from the thinking process in their decisions on when to plant, what to plant, how to cope with the weather and plagues, how to take their produce to market, and how and for how much to sell it. They were not ideological or even philosophical decisions. They were practical ones, fitting a practical people, as all farmers must be.

These people’s idea of “liberty” was very concrete, very basic. No statues to goddess Reason, or parades to celebrate Liberty, or even grandly literate essays celebrating freedom bore the primary responsibility here. An analogous type of decision making took place in the lives of the American shopkeepers and other small businessmen.

These people did not need leaders to make business and personal decisions and they did not need leaders to make political decisions. They read revolutionary pamphlets that used ideas traceable to Locke or listened to revolutionary sermons that used ideas taken from the Christian Gospels, but they processed pamphlets and sermons with a practical sense of immediacy, of how the ideas in those texts would affect their livelihood, families, neighbors and towns. Their process of decision making was very different from that of today's university student or professor who makes a decision for a line of political activism on the basis of the written or heard word alone, or at best on the basis of how the student and the professor think their political action will affect poor people in Africa, or oppressed women in the Middle East, or those two thirds of the world that some academicians tell us go hungry every night—not on the basis of how the student and the professor think their political action will affect their father, mother, sister, children, extended family, neighbor, and town, not to mention their own livelihood, which today's university students and tenured professors don't have to worry about, since they are kept by parents, scholarships, taxpayers, and tenure. The American Revolution then was a populist revolution with no statist potential, no caudillo potential, and therefore no populist potential in the Latin American sense. It was very middle class, very selfish, very provincial, very what the neo-Marxists academicians today still refer to with the despective and potentially murderous term: "bourgeois."

In *Federalist* 1, 9, 10, 37, 51, 63, 71, and 78; in the various *Antifederalist* papers (such as the *Cato Letters*, *Brutus I-V*, George Mason's *Objections to the Constitution*, *Federal Farmer I-III*, etc.)⁸; in the *Constitution of the United States* and its Amendments⁹ (with the exception of the sixteenth)- in all these foundational documents there is a profound mistrust of the power of government. This mistrust is the opposite of the socialist vision of the state, presented quite poetically by Leon Trotsky in his *Terrorism and Communism* (1920) as a lamp which, before going out, shines most brightly; that is, the state under socialism will reach its maximum power, it will penetrate everywhere- before of course going away in the Radiant Future of communism, as the prophet Marx prognosticated.¹⁰ The Founders' mistrust of government

power accounted for the creation of what has been, until relatively recently, one of the most marvelous political systems in the history of the world.

Crevecoeur noticed what joined together these otherwise peevish early Americans: their religion and their language.¹¹ He also noticed that they were, for the most part, tillers of the earth- in other words, an agrarian people, with merchants and lawyers by and large making up the rest of the population, and all of them Europeans or the children of Europeans. Their work, Crevecoeur observed, was founded on what they considered the basis of human nature: self-interest. Therefore these people probably would not have understood why they had to give part of their hard-earned money as aid to other nations; why they or their sons had to be sent abroad to fight and often to die in order to improve the well being of other nations¹²; and why they had to allow to become part of the political and cultural life of their towns, regions, and nation people who did not share their language, which was English, their views on religion, which were broadly Christian, their views on the family, which were derived from their religion, and their views on politics, which conceived their nation as a Republic. In short, these masses who carried out the American Revolution and built the United States were what an outstanding member of the journalistic elite, the great H. L.

Mencken, influenced by such elitists as Friedrich Nietzsche and George Bernard Shaw, would later call derisively “the booboisie.”¹³

The Tea Party Movement claims to follow on the steps of these early Americans. Neo-Marxists characterize it as an unholy mixture that includes “racism” and “right wing populism.”¹⁴ Tea Party people do see themselves as twenty-first century versions of the largely agrarian and therefore conservative American revolutionaries of 1776, who carried out what was arguably a conservative revolution.¹⁵

Unlike Latin American populist movements, the Tea Party has no recognized charismatic figure. The winner of the Conservative Political Action Conference in February 2011, a conference with a heavy Tea Party attendance, was the very uncharismatic, common-looking, very Middle Class old physician, Ron Paul,¹⁶ with the handsome and big money-backed governor Mitt Romney second, and the very charismatic and very attractive Sara Palin

third.¹⁷ Radio and TV commentator Glenn Beck is not a candidate supported by the Tea Party, for contrary to what one hears in the media, he is not part of the political vision of the Tea Party, merely one among a few media personalities who support it, and none of them among that TV elite which includes the likes of Oprah Winfrey and David Letterman. Businessman multimillionaire Donald Trump, who also attended the CPAC, pointed out that Paul cannot be elected. Trump was probably right, but he was booed for his words.

In their effort to discredit the Tea Party, outstanding members of the political and media elites have consistently resorted to epithets and ad hominem arguments. Former President Jimmy Carter called Tea Party followers racists.¹⁸ A *New York Times* editorial called them bigots.¹⁹ A National Public Radio senior vice-president for fundraising called the Tea Party so Christian fundamentalist as not to be even Christian; according to him, Tea Partiers were regrettably “white, middle America gun-toting,” “scary,” “not just Islamophobic, but really xenophobic,” “seriously racist, racist people.”²⁰ Rather tellingly, this representative member of the ruling elite complained that “the thing that I guess I am most disturbed by and disappointed by in this country is that...the educated, so-called elite is too small a percentage of the population so that you have this very large uneducated part of the population that carries these ideas.”²¹ The NPR vicepresident’s comments reveal a mentality analogous to that shown by presidential candidate Barack Obama in April of 2008, who said at a San Francisco fundraiser that Pennsylvania’s “small town voters” are “bitter” and “cling to guns or religion or antipathy to people who are not like them” because of fears of losing their jobs.²² A *Washington Post* Op-ed columnist likened the Tea Party’s “white faces” to those of the racists protesting at the University of Alabama in 1956.²³ Black adherents of the Tea Party, of which there are a few, have been called Uncle Toms, or simply deranged. Neo-Marxists see Tea Party blacks as confused, incapable of realizing their true condition without the help of the neo-Marxist intellectuals, who alone can raise their political class consciousness (or, in this case, for Marxism is infinitely flexible, their racial consciousness). Journalists have dug up

words and actions dating back twenty years, such as one Tea Party candidate's attending a witchcraft session in her youth (one wonders what will happen to a graduate from my university, running for political office twenty years from now, who on February 28, 2011, watched with great interest at Northwestern's Ryan Auditorium a live performance where a naked woman was pleased by her "partner" with a mechanical device as part of an optional viewing in a Human Sexuality psychology class taught by a professor who is, as the university put it in its initial defense of the professor, "at the leading edge" of his discipline, a live performance intended not only to increase the students' knowledge, but also to help liberate them from their hang ups about the wonderful diversity that exists in expressing human sexuality).²⁴

Its enemies also mock the Tea Party because some of its "crazy" supporters claim that Barack Obama was born in Kenya.²⁵ Tea Partiers offer a number of arguments to back their claim, including the presumed testimony of Obama's grandmother, his half-brother and his half-sister (Obama's father had many wives and many children, none of whom he seems to have taken care of), declarations on video by Michelle Obama, an NPR interview of its correspondent in Kenya, as well as some discrepancies in his birth documents.²⁶ Interestingly, Northwestern University has an exhibit in the library showing how Kenyans consider Obama a Kenyan, which is rather surprising, since only his father, educated at Harvard, was born in Kenya.²⁷ So Kenyans and many Tea Party supporters have this in common: both consider Obama a Kenyan. This exhibit at Northwestern, which started in September of 2010, was planned even before the Presidential election that Obama won. It has lasted longer than any exhibit at the library that I can recall and is still going on as of the writing of this paper.

Media personalities have eagerly set traps in their TV interviews of Tea Party favorites, while notable gaffes by such media darlings as President Obama and Vice-President Joe Biden have gone unremarked.²⁸ The ambushing of Sarah Palin conducted by Katie Couric on *CBS News* is now a classic of its kind.²⁹ In an *ABC TV* interview, a Congresswoman supported by the Tea Party, Barbara Bachman, was repeatedly asked by the anchorman if she

believed that Obama was an American citizen.³⁰ This anchorman is a former aid to President Clinton - a good example of the interchangeability that exists today within the media, politics, and business elite of the United States.

The mixture of contempt and fear towards the Tea Party is hardly limited to the left wing elites. The dislike of the Republican Party establishment for the Tea Party is well known. Last year I attended a conference sponsored by a classical liberal institution, where more than half the participants not only voiced their opposition to the Tea Party as a political force, but went further, mocking its adherents for their risible efforts to understand the Constitution of the United States and such staples of the United States' Republican system as the Federalist Papers. Almost all the participants opposed to and mocking the Tea Party were university professors of Political Science and History, probably surreptitious Social Democrats, the exception being an ex-member of the George W. Bush administration. Not surprisingly, one could not tell from the words of this member of the Republican Party if he or she (I will not tell) had any sympathy for either conservative or libertarian philosophical principles; this person seemed to be what one calls in the United States, usually in a praising manner, "a pragmatist," interested only in administering well and making grow the agency of which he or she was a head. The university professors invited to this conference found particularly amusing that Tea Party activists dare organize little study groups of the

Founders' writings. The professors' assumption seemed to be that only academicians had the capacity, and therefore the right, to understand and discuss the Founders' ideas. Now, here is what one may call a *prima facie* case to justify the contempt felt for the intellectual elites by American populists. Curiously, the Tea Party and such a member of the Old World intellectual elite as Eric Voegelin unknowingly shake hands in their common animosity against this "cognitive elite," who with what they claim is superior knowledge look down on the rest of the population, and who are best represented in the United States by the academic intellectuals.³¹

In view of such enmity from both the Left and the Right, it is significant that the Tea Party has done so well at the ballot box. In the Congressional elections of November 2010, fifty percent of Tea Party favored candidates

won their Senate races; and one third of Tea Party-favored candidates won their House of Representatives races, helping the Republican Party to ride an electoral wave that ended with a win of 66 House seats.³² More than one million people, and probably close to two million, flooded the streets of Washington DC on September 14 2010 in a harbinger of what was to come in the November elections. This in the face of a massively unfavorable barrage from the Mainstream newspapers and television, not to mention left wing blogs on the internet, all of them portraying Tea Party people as racist, ignorant, crazy, or all of the above.

The Tea Party victories ran also against the predictions of most main stream analysts of both the Right and the Left. Even good political observers, such as Mario Vargas Llosa, predicted that the Tea Party would not achieve great gains in the November 2010 elections.³³ He was wrong of course.

Despite their visceral dislike of the Tea Party, and their consistent putting down of its importance, the intellectual and media elites have found it necessary to deal with some of its claims. They have accused the Tea Party of unjustifiably co-opting the writings of the Founders, including the United States Constitution. However, since it is difficult to maintain this argument if one actually reads the documents, the intellectual elites have built a fall-back position: to argue that the Constitution itself is not sacred, but a flawed text, like any human endeavor, and therefore open to correction.³⁴

Therefore the Tea Party's insistence on respect for the Constitution has limited value. This is a defensible and reasonable argument, but is not followed by its logical complement, namely that the Constitution itself provides the means to its correction through a process of Constitutional modification that includes a vote of $\frac{3}{4}$ of each of the states' legislatures in favor of any amendment. Instead of advocating this Republican process, the "updating" of this "living Constitution" desired by the enemies of the Tea Party is to take place on the one hand through the courts' interpretation of the law of the land—a method which naturally favors the elites, in this case politicians who name and approve the elite judges who will interpret the law of the land— and on the other hand through the de facto action of government agencies not directly responsible to voters³⁵—agencies which are organized

by the ruling elites in Washington D.C, and which the earlier mentioned ex-functionary of the Bush administration exemplifies.

The Tea Party is what the neo-Marxists in academia label with the standard epithet “bourgeois.” The neo-Marxists are close to the mark. The Tea Party is a middle class, bourgeois movement if there is one. The Republican Party operative’s dislike of the Tea Party at the conference mentioned earlier is symptomatic of the fact that the Tea Party’s populist critique of the present-day political situation in the United States goes beyond anything contemplated by the Republican Party establishment, which, it can be argued, is as much a part of the ruling elite as the Democratic Party operatives. This symbiotic entity made up of the Republican and Democratic parties’ establishment is what John Kass, speaking of Chicago and of Illinois politics in general, has called “The Combine.”³⁶

The Tea Party traces the decline of American liberties not just back to the 60’s, usually demonized by neoconservatives, some of whom once belonged to the Democratic Party; nor does it trace this decline back to the New Deal of the 1930’s, as other conservatives do; instead, it traces the decline to as far back as professor Woodrow Wilson’s “progressive” presidency, which circumvented and twisted the United States Constitution, or even earlier, to Abraham Lincoln’s power grab in his effort to preserve the Union and thwart the dreams of independence of the Southern States.³⁷

Reading Professor Wilson’s speeches in the light of historical events does show that this academician was one of the biggest liars in the history of American politics, no easy feat in a roster that includes such giants of lying as Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Barack Obama, and the Bush presidential family.

The Tea Party is the closest thing to the Hayekian Spontaneous Order ever produced by United States’ politics. José Ortega y Gasset, who did not know much about the United States, nonetheless got it right when he said that this country was the paradise of the masses.³⁸ True, but the masses in the United States, no less than the elites, at least until recently, have been and have had a genesis quite different from the masses and the elites in Latin America and Europe. This Ortega did not understand.

NOTES

- 1 See among many Angelo M. Codevilla's "America's Ruling Class and the Perils of Revolution," *American Spectator* (July 10-August 10, 2011) online at <http://spectator.org/archives/2010/07/16/americas-ruling-class-and-the/print> A substantial percentage of politicians (famously, Senator Edward Kennedy) and high level bureaucrats (for example, Secretary of the Treasurer Timothy Geithner) have never held a non-government job. The teachers in the Chicago public schools can be fired only after one year of litigation and the chance of "rehabilitation," according to the Teachers Union, or only after five years of litigations, according to the *Chicago Tribune*: Karen G.J. Lewis, "First Hand Experience on Improving CPS," *Chicago Tribune*, March 7, 2011; Editorial, "A Parent Revolution," *Chicago Tribune* March 2, 2011.
- 2 I select two of the five "core properties" listed by M. Kenneth Roberts, "Neoliberalism and the Transformation of Populism in Latin America: The Peruvian Case," *World Politics* 48, no. 1 (1995): 88.
- 3 Tony Salazar, "Great Information About Demonstration Tactics," *Patriot Action Network* (March 5, 2010).
- 4 Cfr. Humberto Fontova, *Fidel: Hollywood's Favorite Tyrant* (New York: Regnery, 2005)
- 5 Álvaro Vargas Llosa, *The Che Guevara Myth and the Future of Liberty* (Washington, D.C.: The Independent Institute, 2006); a documentary DVD by Agustín Blázquez, *Che: The Other Side of an Icon* (AB Independent Productions, 2010) available at <http://www.cubacollectibles.com/cuba-108-cc7.html> For a review of this documentary see <http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/cuban-filmmaker-stonewalled-in-trying-to-tell-the-truestory-of-che/>
- 6 Mary Cobb, *Sampler View of Colonial Life* (Brookfield, Conn.: Millbrook Press, 1999), 38-40.
- 7 *Political Sermons of the American Founding Era: 1730-1805*, ed. Ellis Sandoz (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1998), 2 vols
- 8 The last time in his "Farewell Address to the Nation," January 11, 1989.
- 9 These foundational documents are now available online at <http://www.teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?subcategory=71> and <http://www.teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?subcategory=73>
- 10 Leon Trotsky, *Terrorism and Communism* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1963), 170. The 10 points of the *Communist Manifesto* outline such an extension of the power of government, including the capacity to move masses of people from the cities to the countryside- social cleansing, as the Red Khmer, among other faithful followers of Marx, carried out to the letter.
- 11 J. Hector St. John Crevecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, 1782, in *Letters from an American Farmer*, (New York: Fox, Duffield, 1904), Letter III: What is an American?
- 12 The main Founding Fathers' documents against military intervention for humanitarian reasons in other countries are George Washington's Neutrality Proclamation of April 22, 1793, at [http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=1910&chapter=112540&layout=html&Itemid=27%20\(1\)](http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=1910&chapter=112540&layout=html&Itemid=27%20(1)); his Farewell Address of 1796

- at http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp; the Helvidius-Pacificus Debate, excerpted at <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=429>, and John Quincy Adams great speech of July 4, 1821 at <http://economicthinking.blogspot.com/2007/07/john-quincy-adams-july-4-speech.html>. The best arguments for humanitarian intervention on liberal principles are the works of Fernando Tesón, such as “Eight Principles for Humanitarian Intervention,” *Journal of Military Ethics*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 93-113 (2006).
- 13 *A Companion to American Thought*, ed. Richard Wightman Fox and James T. Kloppenberg (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 447.
 - 14 <http://www.socialistalternative.org/news/article15.php?id=1417>
 - 15 David Servatius, “Anti-tax-and-spend group throws ‘tea party’ at Capitol,” *Deseret News*, March 7, 2009 at <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/705289328/Anti-tax-and-spend-group-throws-tea-party-at-Capitol.html>
 - 16 Ron Paul’s very non-elite biography can be seen at [Lewrockwell.com](http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig8/paul-carol1.html) <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig8/paul-carol1.html>
 - 17 Jeff Zeleni, “Conservatives’ Straw Poll Shows Unsettled Republican Field,” *The Caucus*, The Politics and Government Blog of The Times, February 12, 2011 at <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/02/12/ron-paul-repeats-as-cpac-straw-poll-winner/>
 - 18 “TV’s Tea Party Travesty,” *Media Research Center*, at <http://www.mrc.org/specialreports/2010/TeaParty/Scoring.aspx>
 - 19 Tobin Harshaw, “‘Are Tea Parties Racist? Is Al Qaeda?’” *The New York Times*, July 16, 2010; for the *Times*, anyone who opposes Obama is a racist: see the earlier Nicholas D. Kristof, “Obama and the Bigots,” *The New York Times*, March 9, 2008.
 - 20 James Taranto, “‘The Other White Meat,’” *The Wall Street Journal. Best of the Web* (March 8, 2011), reporting on a recorded interview of Ron Schiller at http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704758904576188711705044054.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_MIDDLETopOpinion. Schiller is now working for the Aspen Institute, another elite institution where President and CEO Walter Isaacson claims Schiller “shares the values that we share as a community,” an assertion in consonance with the general stance of most elite intellectual think tanks.
 - 21 Complete interview carried by Real Clear Politics at http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2011/03/08/npr_senior_exec_wed_be_far_better_off_without_federal_funding.html
 - 22 Jeff Zeleny, “Opponents Call Obama Remarks ‘Out of Touch,’” *The New York Times* (April 12, 2008) at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/12/us/politics/12campaign.html?ref=politics>
 - 23 Colbert I. King, “In the faces of Tea Party shouters, images of hate and history,” *Washington Post* (March 27 2010).
 - 24 John Kass, “An OMG Moment at Northwestern. A peep show during class? Beats some lecture on Indo-European languages or trying to figure when you’ll flunk out of Engineering Graphics 103,” *Chicago Tribune*, March 3, 2011, at http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2011-03-03/news/ct-met-kass-0303-20110303_1_nustudents-dorm-peep-show
 - 25 Bob Unruh, “NPR describes Obama as ‘Kenyan-born,’” *Worldnetdaily* April 8, 2010 at <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=138293>. The NPR interviewer calls Obama “a son of Africa,” although his mother was an American blonde. A video

- posted on and repeatedly taken down from YouTube shows Michelle Obama referring to Kenya as Obama's "home country" ("Michelle Says Barack's home country is Kenya") is as of this writing at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dBJhJBePcs> Other videos shown by the "birthers" (as those who argue that Obama was born in Kenya are often called pejoratively in the media) include an interview with the Kenyan Ambassador, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zH4GX3Otf14&feature=related> a British TV piece on Obama's "home country" at and on Obama's "birth place," and a video of Obama talking to students, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pT1PB1ud8GQ&feature=related> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6zsQ-v7kD5Q&feature=related>
- 26 "Obama Born In Kenya? His Grandmother Says Yes," by Tishrei, *Israel National News* October 12, 2008 at <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/blogs/message.aspx/3074> See also the previous note. A challenge to Obama's American citizenship is now back in court: see <http://www.supremecourt.gov/Search.aspx?FileName=/docketfiles/10-678.htm>
 - 27 <http://www.library.northwestern.edu/highlight/2010/november/africa-embracingobama> and <http://timeoutchicago.com/arts-culture/museums/95675/presidential-selection>
 - 28 For a wonderful collection of Obama gaffes see http://www.facebook.com/note.php?note_id=463364218434. Biden is even more notable for putting his foot in his mouth.
 - 29 <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/09/24/eveningnews/main4476173.shtml>
 - 30 http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2011/02/17/bachmann_on_obamas_birthplace_that_isnt_for_me_to_state.html
 - 31 I have examined this intellectual species in my *American Academia and the Survival of Marxist Ideas* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1996). At the conference in question I pointed out that the writings of the Founders were not rocket science, but intentionally clearly argued pieces addressed to the general educated public of their time, who did not need university professors in order to understand them. For the professors' gnostic ancestry see under "Gnosis" the Dictionary of Voegelinian terminology at <http://watershade.net/ev/evdictionary.html#gnosis>. For politics as religion among the intellectual elite, see Eric Voegelin, "Religionersatz: Die gnostischen Massenbewegungen unserer Zeit," *Wort und Wahrheit* 15 (1960): 16; *Political Religions* (Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen, 1986; translation of *Die politischen Religionen*, 1938); Emilio Gentile, *Politics as Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006; translation of *Le religioni della politica: Fra democrazie e totalitarismi*, 2001).
 - 32 <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/11/02/poll-closing-key-east-coast-racesbalance-power-line/>
 - 33 Mario Vargas Llosa, "Las caras del Tea Party," *El País* (October 24th, 2010).
 - 34 Andrew Romano, "America's Holy Writ: Tea Party evangelists claim the Constitution as their sacred text. Why that's wrong," *Newsweek's Education Site* (October 17 2010) at <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/10/17/how-tea-partiers-get-the-constitutionwrong.html>
 - 35 Angelo M. Codevilla's "America's Ruling Class and the Perils of Revolution."
 - 36 John Kass, "In Combine, cash is King, corruption is bipartisan," *Chicago Tribune* (March 23, 2008).

- 37 W. James Antle III, "The Tea Party: A Mixed Bag," *Chronicles: A Magazine of American Culture* (July 2010), 13; Norman Podhoretz, "The Neo-Conservative Anguish Over Reagan's Foreign Policy," *New York Times Magazine*, May 2, 1982; Robert Lekachman, "Kristol's Red Persuasion?" *The Nation*, September 21, 2009.
- 38 Jose Ortega y Gasset, *La rebelión de las masas* (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1930), chapter xiii, "El mayor peligro: el Estado."