

TEA PARTY VS. OCCUPY MOVEMENT DEBATE – OBSERVATIONS

Ricardo Beas -- February 2015

“We are on the verge of a global transformation. All we need is the right major crisis and the nations will accept The New World Order.”

- David Rockefeller

“We’re going to take things away from you on behalf of the common good.”

- Hillary Clinton

In December, 2014 I attended a debate between representatives from the local republican "Tea Party" and the "Occupy Wallstreet" movement. I was hopeful that I would see at least some common ground through which to build a coalition between the two groups in such an important time in the United States and the world's history, but unfortunately that was not the case.

Due to several reasons the debate was cut short so I did not have an opportunity to express my thoughts on the comments coming from both sides, so I sent an email to the organizers, moderator and each group's representative, hoping that they can meet again in a more cooperative way. Here is the letter:

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I was a guest at the Activist San Diego debate between the Occupy Movement and the Tea Party. I wanted to make comments, but unfortunately the debate's length did not allow it, so I am providing them here, hoping that both parties will join forces at some time in the future in these difficult times.

Although there are irreconcilable differences between both groups, the basic principles for both are clear: there are things to be fixed, including a corrupt government, from imposition of unnecessary rules and regulations that stifle economic growth, to selling out to corporate interests.

Both sides also look at the U.S. Constitution as an important tool to fix government, although there is disagreement as to how it should be applied.

From the Tea Party side, a belief of political corruption is evident because they needed to create a separate organization “within” the Republican party to bring up issues not addressed by the controlled Republican party oligarchy, and it was a great idea: It is too difficult to start a new party or even to give any serious legitimacy to an existing 3rd party, like the Libertarian and

Green parties. To use/infiltrate one of the two existing political parties to obtain your objectives was nothing less than genius.

There was mention of the Koch brother's influence on the Tea Party in the debate, and although I am not familiar with all the pros and cons about this or the accusations about the Koch brother's activities, on thing that did come to mind is that their father, Fred C. Koch, was one of the founding members of the John Birch Society, which was a beacon on the fight against government corruption and the big interests controlling it, exposing things that are now labeled as "conspiracy theories" by the mainstream media to discredit anyone exposing them. Coincidentally, the Tea Party's roots come from the political philosophy of Ron Paul, who pointed to such corruption and how to get rid of it.

Before making any further comments let me clarify that although I identify myself with the Occupy Movement, I voted for Ron Paul in 2008, and even in 2012 by writing him in the voting ballot. I am familiar with his overall philosophy and read his book, "Liberty Defined" and I agree with most of his beliefs arguments. And in essence, maybe without either side knowing it, for the most part, the foundations of both your movements have the same libertarian views as Paul.

In the debate, the Tea Party noted how the Constitution was a protector of rights and an opportunity for all to become economically successful. They pointed at the copyright and patents section of the Constitution as an example of this. In reality, all American jurisprudence has its roots in the English Common Law. The Common Law saw patents as rights that people have for life, as property. The Constitution actually limited that right to more or less 20 years, where before it was for life, so the Constitution in reality diminished such existing natural right. While as mentioned above, we all agree that the Constitution is a great instrument for government control and functionality, it was still created by men of power, to maintain such power. As noted by James Madison, ***"The essence of Government is power; and power, lodged as it must in human hands, will ever be liable to abuse."*** – 1787.

The Constitution was intended to limit power.

Something to consider is that none of us at the debate are part of the group known as "We The People;" we need simply to look at contract law to know that only the signers and the interests they represent are parties to it. In fact the amendments to the Constitution were an afterthought, which is why they are amendments: not part of the original intent. The Constitution is a corporate charter, nothing less than that, that represented the "new country" from its organization to it's legitimacy in the international stage. Had it not been for a few that insisted in the Bill of Rights, before ratifying the Constitution, such as Edmund Randolph, we would be in a bigger mess.

It is up to us to use the Constitution to the fullest of our ability. Just like government uses it to expand its influence on human activity, so should its residents use it to chain and control the use of such power, used coercively and every day more violently by government. And let's never forget that when we say government, we are not referring to a government that people voted into office, but of the big interests that manipulate the government to put in place all their schemes intended to deprive and rob the people of their wealth and freedom.

While the rise of the Tea Party has been mostly within the organized Republican forums, the Occupy Movement, sparked by a moment of despair after the recent financial collapse of 2008 and the political uprisings around the world in 2011, went to the streets, not having an existing forum or outlet, to try to organize and in the process, suffered police confrontation and brutality, as can be seen in my video, Break The Chains and Occupy: (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tKG_1qUFuPw).

In the debate the Tea Party saw the Occupy Movement in a limited way, pointing to people defecating in the streets, leaving trash behind, and that is sad, as it seems that the Tea Party was not focusing on the basic concept of the Occupy Movement, to stop corporate abuse thievery, with the government covering for them in many way, including the bailouts, all taxpayer-backed.

We had a speaker mention 9/11 and the belief that it was an inside job, and the Tea Party took this as an opportunity to place the Occupy Movement in the "conspiracy" realm, to imply that the ideals of the Occupy Movement were based on fantasy. This is wrong, because when we look at the roots of the Tea Party, we go back to Ron Paul, and many of his views mirrors that of many so-called, but wrongfully criticized "conspiracy theorists." I can bet my life that Ron Paul not only knows, but believes (even though he may not admit it because of the obvious attack to any one questioning the government) that 9/11 was an inside job, that it is the root of everything that is happening in the Middle East and the loss of liberties in our country today.

One thing I strongly disagree with the Tea Party was about their conclusion that if you are not well off economically, that it is your fault for not trying, for not being that smart or because of a disability. To add to insult, it was stated that it would be nice to help such unfortunate people. Not everyone can be a CEO, an owner of a company, we need people to pick up the trash, to work in all the stores we shop in, to manufacture all the things we use. It is when conditions in these types of jobs force employees to work two or three jobs just to make ends meet that the opportunity of the "American Dream" vanishes. As George Carlin said, "it is called the American Dream because you have to be asleep to believe it."

Government uses taxation to steal the fruits of the ordinary citizen, sets barriers for smaller businesses to thrive, while giving incredible tax breaks to large corporations that continue to swallow everything in their path. Add to this the financial collapse resulting from this government/banking partnership. No, people don't want to be poor, to be thinking how they will feed their family and have a roof tomorrow. No, poverty is not a result of not being successful, but of not being allowed to be successful for the majority of us.

There was an implication by the Occupy Movement that the Tea Party was against woman equality. From the Tea Party point of view, I can understand where in a conservative manner it would be great seeing woman in homes, raising kids, dedicating time to their education and being there so the whole family can be together, taking care of all household needs, and in the process enjoying their liberty of not being tied down to a 8-12 hour a day shift (most men would surely prefer that if it was optional). When my wife and I decided to have children we agreed that she would leave her job until our new born was 4 years old so she could dedicate to him all her time and love; and of course we had to tightened our belt, but we did it. Now raising a 6 year old, our third child, my wife wants to and is getting back into the workforce, for her own individual needs and to gladly contribute economically to the wellbeing of the family unit.

But when that woman does decide to go back to the workforce, she has a natural God given right to earn wages compatible to men in similar positions if she has similar abilities. Of all the things that divide us: race, religion, sexual orientation, country, state, city, sports teams, the primary one is probably sex; woman have been exploited since the beginning of time by men by way of man's superior physical strength. Had woman been stronger, they would have probably done the same thing – human nature, unfortunately. There is much room for improvement in this regards and this is a valid concern for women to bring to the forefront.

The ideals of the Tea Party regarding reducing government spending are the same as the Occupy Movement, although Occupy seems to have a more Democratic view of social justice, including having many social programs to help the poor. The Tea Party, as republicans in general, see these as give-aways that others that are better off have to pay for. Interestingly enough, I agree and disagree with both positions.

Let me make my second clarification. I was raised in Tijuana, Mexico and have been living in San Diego since the early 80's, I grew to love and compare both countries. As to America, although I am a harsh critic of the government and everything it is doing around the world, Americans in general are a kind people, always ready to help those in need, we see it every time there is a natural disaster around the world.

The problem is, when you place government in control of social programs corruption results and all those funds/"taxes on every individual" end up being spent (and stolen) in a manner which is much less efficient. I agree with the Tea Party view, it is true: we should have a right to decide how we want to spend our hard-earned money, not be taxed away to pay for social programs that will be abused. Yet, that is not to say that well managed programs, on a voluntary basis cannot be implemented, even managed in the private sector.

Of course, this brings us to the Occupy view that large corporations are the locust of the world and that argument is hard to disprove, just see how fragile our economy really is, looking at 2008 to come to that easy conclusion. And government agency officials (banking, Federal Reserve, FDA, DOE, etc. ad nauseam) are nothing more than a revolving door of corporate representatives taking sabbaticals from their employment to work in an agency that simply allows these corporations to ravish our environment and our lives even further. In this regards we need a different type of corporate structure, like the basis for the Anarcho-Syndicalism, where the workers own the company and the focus is on community wellbeing. An example of this is the Mondragon Corporation with headquarters in Spain (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pe2QJY2DUY>). Here is Noam Chomsky's analysis on such organizations: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SylqeewUB1Y>.

While many people in need benefit from government sponsored welfare programs (and I have in the past), it is also very obvious that some people "not in need" of such financial aid abuse these programs, this again is human nature, but in no way should this be a reason why not to have such programs.

It is not a matter of whether we should help "poor people," the question is, why do we have poor people? And this brings us to economics, no, not the redistribution of wealth, but the proper remuneration for one's labor, and more importantly, each person's contribution to overall society.

There must be a point where the Tea Party and the Occupy Movement meet and "sincerely" start with a clean slate, diluting all ideals to their essence to see that, at the end of the day, both side are looking for individual freedom and the happiness of their loved ones. Then, start outlining an agenda that will unite both strong political forces into one that can liberate our nation from what appears to be its continued movement towards complete control of all human activity under the hands of a few; and in the process, destroying nations and societies around the world.

If I were to set a list of things that both parties should be addressing, some of them would be, in no particular order:

- Loss of U.S. sovereignty via the United Nations
- Foundations working against US sovereignty, such as the Council on Foreign Relations

- GMO's harm on the environment and humans
- Chemtrail aerial contamination
- The Federal Reserves Manipulation of our economy and it's theft of government funds
- IRS abuses of power and the illegal taxing of "natural born human being" as opposed to corporate/fictitious/government-created entities (government can only regulate that which it creates)
- IRS loopholes for corporations
- The legal action against individuals at the high echelons of corporate control that are found to defraud the public, removing any sort of corporate immunity
- Creating an anti-corruption law
- Legal action against the banking industry, from the corporate standpoint.
- The elimination of government agencies and regulations that stifle commerce and which take action against natural persons (such as the DEA on the war on drugs and the FDA against homeopathic remedies).
- The war on Drugs
- The FDA and its attack on non-orthodox cures against cancer and other diseases
- The medical establishment's attack on the above (for an example see: http://cafepeyote.com/blog/cancer_the_fda_the_american_medical_association_and_you/)

There is much to do and little time to do it. I challenge the Tea Party and the Occupy Movements of San Diego to again meet and outline how they will work together to turn America into the true symbol of justice, equality, peace and opportunity. George Bush Sr., was wrong, nations in the Middle East don't hate us for our freedom, they hate us because of what we have done to their governments and economies (thus directly to each individual citizen of that country). If we really change America to represent what I mentioned above, all countries of the world will look at us with respect and as the "true" example of Freedom.

Hope this helps.

Best wishes on the New Year,

Ricardo