

INTRODUCTION: Freedom in Crisis

We are five days away from fundamentally transforming the United States of America.

—BARACK OBAMA, OCTOBER 30, 2008

sub o vert v. 1. To undermine or erode, especially with regards to the character of, principles of, or allegiance to; 2. To ruin or corrupt

Barack Obama promised to “fundamentally transform” America as our nation’s president. That’s not surprising, because in various ways most presidential candidates say they will do just that.

But it’s different with President Obama, because his plans, dreams, and vision for the United States are irreconcilably at odds with the most important thing our nation’s Founders gave us and hoped for us to keep safe forever: our Constitution. The Constitution of the United States stands in the way of what Barack Obama wants to do.

For Obama to remake our country into what he wants it to be, he must subvert the Supreme Law of the Land.

Key parts of the Constitution are designed to protect us from our own government. Obama knows he must execute an aggressive strategy to disarm those constitutional safeguards, to free himself from its constraints so that he can truly “fundamentally transform” this nation.

And that's what he's doing.

Fundamental Change Means Subverting the Constitution

Barack Obama ran on just two words: *hope* and *change*. But those are just a couple of words; they're not a plan for governing a nation. For those who were paying attention, he promised to "fundamentally transform" the United States of America. That's his plan, and he's working on it every day.

Those who listened to more than *hope 'n' change* started to hear things that didn't sound quite so "hopey." Obama talked about the "wealthy" paying their "fair share." He spoke about ditching traditional energy sources like coal and oil. He crooned about giving away trillions of dollars' worth of free stuff—health care, education . . . everything you might ask for except guns. (Because he says that people only cling to guns—or religion—out of "bitterness.")

But everyone knows that such things don't come for free. If he wants to spend trillions of dollars, then those dollars have to come from somewhere. So people who listened past the slogans knew there was more to the Obama plan than just hope 'n' change.

Once President Obama took office, we saw our worst fears realized. Legions of powerful officials, not confirmed by the Senate and not subject to congressional oversight, have been installed in key positions. The government is taking over massive corporations and attempting to take over entire sectors of our economy. To maximize the number of people who see things his way, the president is working to silence dissenting voices, shut down media outlets that expose the truth, and co-opt the rest of the media to parrot his daily messages. To make sure these changes outlast him, Obama's blueprint calls for changing the way Americans think about government, and even the way Americans think about themselves.

To keep the Obama plan moving forward in the face of certain opposition, the president's blueprint calls for changing

the way democracy works in this country so that he and his supporters can continue holding on to their offices and their power. And to keep these things in place and advance them even further, Obama plans on remaking our courts so that he will have judges who will decide constitutional cases in his favor.

Barack Obama does indeed plan on giving us “change.” He plans on changing our government, our families, our property, and our private lives.

He also plans to change our Constitution. Not changing it by literally rewriting it; instead, he’s changing it by ignoring the limits it imposes on government, disregarding the parts of the Bill of Rights that forbid his agenda, changing the way democracy works in this country so that he and his supporters can’t be voted out of power, and creating a Supreme Court that will simply rubber-stamp and uphold everything he wants to do.

The Constitution is what gives us limited government, protecting our states from an all-powerful government. Indeed, it protects each of us as American citizens from *any* government—federal or state—having too much power over our lives.

The Constitution is a problem for Barack Obama. Through its words, the Framers declare much of his blueprint to be unlawful. That’s why that same Obama blueprint calls for him to subvert our Constitution. President Obama needs to overcome the Constitution so that he can give us something that he genuinely believes to be better than our current form of government. He thinks he’s doing us all a great service by amassing unchecked power to give us things that he believes are for our own good.

Barack Obama’s blueprint would create the ultimate imperial presidency. It would be the end of our constitutional republic, and the beginning of a government with unlimited power over all our lives.

He promised us “change.” He promised that if elected to the

most powerful office in the world, he would start executing his blueprint for “fundamentally transforming the United States of America.”

And he is.

Obama Told Us He Would Do This

The amazing thing about Barack Obama’s far-left liberalism is that so many of us seem amazed by it. Look—he told us he would do this.

It’s true that some of his rhetoric was moderate. He promised to be a post-partisan president, just as he also promised to be post-racial. It seems his favorite line on the campaign trail was that we need to get past red states and blue states to be the *United States of America*.

Good words, but also empty ones.

Ironically, those words could have been uttered in all honesty by John McCain. To the perpetual frustration of the GOP base, McCain was often moderate. On some issues, such as cutting wasteful spending, ending earmarks, or strengthening national security, McCain was a reliably conservative vote. But on other issues, from tax cuts to the environment to campaign finance, McCain struck toward the middle. If McCain had used such moderate rhetoric, it might have rung true.

But it rang false from Obama.

First, his record gave him away. He was the single most liberal senator in the U.S. Senate. On everything—including the Supreme Court, taxes, spending, the environment, defense, abortion, health care, education, earmarks, terrorism, the military, foreign diplomacy, and national security—he was a purely knee-jerk, doctrinaire liberal.

National Journal, the well-respected and moderately liberal publication that rates senators every cycle according to where their votes place them on the political spectrum, rated Barack Obama the most liberal senator in America going into the 2008

election. That means Obama was to the left of the late Ted Kennedy, Barbara Boxer, and avowed socialist Bernie Sanders. You know that you're a radical when those people look conservative when compared to you.

Second, although he tried to maintain moderate rhetoric, occasionally his mask would slip, and there would be Obama's very telling and anything-but-moderate words. We need only to look at some of the highlights of statements he made either during the campaign or that came to light during the election season:

First, Obama said this to the editorial board of the *San Francisco Chronicle*:

*What I've said is that we would put a cap-and-trade system in place that is as aggressive, if not more aggressive, than anybody else's out there. I was the first to call for a 100 percent auction on the cap-and-trade system, which means that every unit of carbon or greenhouse gases emitted would be charged to the polluter . . . So if someone wants to build a coal-power plant, they can; it's just that it will bankrupt them. . . .*¹

Pair that with Obama's campaign speech where he said, "We can't drive our SUVs and eat as much as we want and keep our homes on 72 degrees at all times . . . and then just expect that other countries are going to say okay. . . . That's not leadership. That's not going to happen."²

Really? Who cares if countries like China and Venezuela approve of what we eat or what temperatures we set on our thermostats? We don't need foreign approval to drive an SUV.

But the mentality here is the terrifying part. First, his statements show that he thinks we should tailor our lives for the approval of foreign countries. Second, and far more troubling, is that he responds to the notion that we will live as we want by declaring, "That's not going to happen." In other words, if we

don't live as *he* wants us to, he thinks the federal government should have the power to force us to obey.

This imperial attitude goes beyond economics, extending into social issues. Regarding the need for teenagers to have the right to get an abortion, Obama said, "I've got two daughters . . . I am going to teach them first of all about values and morals. But if they make a mistake, I don't want them punished with a baby."³

Since the right to abortion was the product of a judicial activist decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1973 (*Roe v. Wade*), that brings to mind another statement Obama made about the Supreme Court. Talking about the Supreme Court during a 2001 radio interview when he was an Illinois state senator, Barack Obama said:

*The Supreme Court never ventured into the issues of redistribution of wealth and served more basic issues of political and economic justice in this society . . . I think one of the tragedies of the civil rights movement was because the civil rights movement became so court-focused . . . there was a tendency to lose track of . . . the actual coalitions of power through which you bring about redistributive change. And in some ways we still suffer from that.*⁴

What's scary about that statement is this is the language of the Ultra Left. Not the Left or even Far Left; it's the language of the Radical Left Fringe. Most of us have never used the terms *economic justice* or *redistributive change*, but these terms are common among radical leftists when discussing how government should redistribute wealth to create a society that is more "just" and "fair" in how it allocates economic resources to make sure the poor get their "fair share" of what is now held by the rich, and even the middle class.

This Obama opinion is pure socialism, possibly to the point

of sounding Marxist. It presupposes that it's the role of government to redistribute wealth, taking it from some and giving it to others. According to this mind-set, the government is entitled to decide how much of your hard-earned money you should keep, versus how much you'll be forced to give up so government can give it to others. It's a denial of the basic American concept of private property ownership.

For those skeptics who think such a characterization of Obama's views isn't completely fair, all you have to do is take those statements above, together with Barack Obama's now-infamous exchange with Joe the Plumber. When walking through a neighborhood in Ohio, Obama passed a resident named Samuel Joseph Wurzelbacher who was playing football in the yard with his son. Joe the Plumber approached then-Senator Obama, saying he wanted to buy his own plumbing business, and asked, "Your new tax plan is going to tax me more, isn't it?"

After Obama answered that it would, Joe the Plumber protested, "I've worked hard . . . I work ten to twelve hours a day and I'm buying this company and I'm going to continue working that way. I'm getting taxed more and more while fulfilling the American Dream."⁵

Obama responded, "My attitude is that if the economy's good for folks from the bottom up, it's gonna be good for everybody. I think that when you spread the wealth around, it's good for everybody."⁶

There you have one of the most revealing quotes in all of the 2008 campaign season. Barack Obama believes that "when you spread the wealth around, it's good for everybody." This is the core philosophy of socialism: When the government takes over the means of economic production and redistributes wealth according to the government's judgment as to what a "fair" allocation is of economic assets among the population, it makes for a better society.

It's the antithesis of free-market capitalism, where everyone has their fair shot and government gets out of the way. In capitalism, government levels the field at the beginning and provides equal opportunity. In socialism, government levels the field at the end and provides equal outcomes; government picks the winners and losers, removing the incentive to succeed because the more you make, the more government takes, and the less you make, the more government gives you.

Barack Obama told us all of these things before Election Day. Millions were outraged. But those millions were not enough, as America was unhappy at the moment with the incumbent Republican president, and thus with the Republican Party. (This outrage was fueled, however, through a Republican administration and congressional members that had abandoned conservative principles in favor of "big-government conservatism"—which is a contradiction in terms. In other words, voters were mad at the Republican Party for not acting like Republicans.)

Even so, the reality is that the McCain-Palin ticket took the lead over the Obama-Biden ticket in the polls starting September 7, 2008.⁷ After both party conventions were over and the VP selections were considered by the public, John McCain and Sarah Palin were ahead in the polls. Then the markets crashed and panic set in. People blamed George W. Bush, and the McCain campaign did not manage to separate itself from the Bush administration. Obama ran against the "Bush-McCain" economic policy, and won the White House.

But none of this changes one simple fact: We were given all the information we needed to understand exactly what Barack Obama planned to do. And now he's doing it.

Methods of Deception

In carrying out their plan to remake our country, Team Obama has a clear method of convincing the public and moving

Congress. There are four techniques Barack Obama, his White House staff, and his allies use to package and sell their agenda. These four techniques pop up repeatedly in our analysis of the topics you'll read about in this book.

1. Crisis

Almost everything the Obama White House demands is an “emergency” response to some “crisis.” The crisis is always so pressing, and the consequences of not blindly following Obama so dire, that immediate action is called for every single time.

No one read the disgraceful \$787 billion “stimulus” bill. Why? Because everyone was told there was no time. The bill was not released until after midnight in the early morning hours of Friday, February 13, 2009 (Friday the 13th—very appropriate). Despite the fact that the bill was 1,071 pages long—a monster that was over eight inches thick—Speaker Nancy Pelosi forced a vote on it just a few hours later on Friday, before a single member of Congress had had time to read it.⁸ The stimulus bill must be passed *immediately*, and if it was, unemployment wouldn't exceed 8 percent.⁹ (It's over 10 percent at the time of this writing. Change we can believe in? Keep the change.)

So it is with everything from this Obama White House. A calamity will befall us if we don't obey Obama right this moment without delay. So Congress obeyed, and calamity befell us anyway.

2. Straw Man

A “straw man” is a false argument, in which you characterize your opponent's position as something other than what it truly is when you're communicating with your audience. You then defeat this fabricated position and claim to have overcome your opponent's position in doing so. In other words, you erect a straw man (like a scarecrow in a field), and then you knock the straw man to the ground, call it your opponent and his position,

and claim victory. Of course you haven't beaten your opponent, because the argument you defeated was never what your opponent supported. But that's the deceptiveness involved in straw-man arguments.

Barack Obama loves to knock down straw men.

The perfect example is health care. President Obama says that Republicans oppose health-care reform. That's absurd. Republicans and conservative groups have put forward innovative health-care ideas—which Democrats have opposed for almost twenty years, and Obama has rejected since he entered public life (which wasn't all that long ago). For example, as you'll read in chapter 4, Republicans have (a) argued for tort reform to try to save more than \$100 billion a year in "defensive medicine"; (b) called for allowing small businesses to join together as associations to get the same large-group discounts that big corporations and unions get; and (c) called for allowing people to buy insurance across state lines in order to get the lowest-priced plan that best suits their needs.

One example from the campaign trail shows that this has long been a favorite tactic of Barack Obama. In 2007, one of your authors (Klukowski) went with his wife (who is an emergency room doctor) and a friend to hear then-Senator Obama speak. This was early in the campaign, and we wanted to hear for ourselves the person who was causing Hillary Clinton such headaches on the campaign trail, just to get some sense of what was going on within the Democratic Party.

We went to an event on the main campus of George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, on February 2. In a room with hundreds of college students who were ecstatic with joy, we listened to Obama make his pitch. During the speech, he said he would fight to change health care, saying, "I dream of an ER where you can go and you won't be turned away because you don't have the right insurance."

Suddenly, I heard a feminine voice I know very well shout out, “That’s a lie!” I turned, eyes wide, to see my usually friendly and happy wife with anger in her eyes and her fists clenched. My wife, who almost always avoids political debates when she can help it, chose to dive in with both feet on this occasion. I looked around, realizing that at least a hundred people were giving us looks that, if looks could kill, would have killed us dozens of times over. Wondering if the three of us might involuntarily be visiting an emergency room later that afternoon, I moved us to a different section of the crowd.

Fortunately for us, most of the crowd didn’t hear my wife. Obama kept speaking, the crowd kept hollering, mesmerized as if in a euphoric trance as they gazed upon their Anointed One, and we went unnoticed except for the people who had been standing around us when my wife had decided to contribute to the discussion.

But my wife was right. Barack Obama’s statement was, in fact, a lie. Federal law requires that every person who shows up at an emergency room be treated regardless of whether they have insurance or not. Under EMTALA (the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act), if any person shows up at an emergency room in a hospital that receives federal Medicare dollars (which is essentially every hospital in the country), the doctors and staff there will immediately give full treatment to a person regardless of whether they have any insurance, or even whether they are legally in the country.¹⁰ The federal government openly acknowledges that the whole purpose of the law is “to ensure public access to emergency services regardless of ability to pay.”¹¹

I can attest to that based on real-life knowledge. My wife told me that at the hospital where she did her residency after medical school, an estimated 70 percent of her patients—more than two out of three—were uninsured.

So no one is turned away from an ER for not having insurance. Barack Obama is too intelligent not to know that, yet he said it anyway to get a reaction out of the crowd (that cheered wildly at his vow to end the nonexistent, cold-hearted refusal to treat uninsured people in emergency rooms). It's the worst form of demagoguery. Obama set up a straw man and then knocked it to the ground to the adoring cheers of his onlookers.

We've seen this technique used in other issues, ranging from the automaker bailouts to stimulus bills. President Obama says that Republicans don't want to stimulate the economy. That's not true, and the president knows it. The truth is, Republicans don't believe that a decade-long spending bill filled with hundreds of billions of dollars of wasteful, pork-barrel spending will stimulate anything. Instead, many Republicans proposed an alternative bill that was largely based on across-the-board tax cuts for all people and all businesses, to surge fresh money into the economy.

President Obama's statement that Republicans opposed stimulating the economy was just one more straw man, and it's par for the course.

3. Bogeyman

The next trick used for each of the White House's agenda items is Team Obama's creation of a bogeyman to vilify the opposition.

It makes sense, doesn't it? If what President Obama and his henchmen want is so good and beneficial, then those who oppose it can't all just be thinking about it all wrong; some of them must actually be acting from reprehensible motives. They must be bad people. Thus, Team Obama must cast such an opposition figure as a bogeyman.

We saw this with health care, where insurance companies and pharmaceutical companies were cast as the bad guys. We also saw this with the cap-and-trade battles, in which oil and gas

companies were cast as villains. In card check, it was business owners who were portrayed as not caring about their employees, exploiting their workers out of greed. And it was corporate executives who were portrayed as devils during the takeover of the financial industry and corporate crackdown, where materialistic, cigar-smoking robber barons were seen as erecting luxury palaces on a foundation of deceit. Every time Team Obama goes after an issue, they always assign the worst motives to those private-sector actors who are engaged in that issue. Each time, the message is that this private-sector person (or opposition politician in government) cannot be trusted and is harming ordinary people, and the Obama administration must step in to make things right.

In President Obama's America, opponents are rarely simply wrong. Often, they are also evil.

We even saw this with a media outlet: Fox News. When the rest of the media was swooning over Obama, Fox was giving airtime to opposition voices. So White House brass, from the chief of staff to the senior advisor to the communications director, started saying that Fox was not a true media outlet and should instead be treated as a twenty-four-hour talk radio-style opinion show.

The coordinated attempt by Rahm Emanuel and other top Obama advisors to recast Fox as being anything other than a bona fide media outlet failed (more on that in chapter 8). But it shows that there is no one person or entity that Team Obama will not try to characterize as dishonest and conniving in order to demonize that opposition voice.

But on at least one occasion, the president overreached. In discussing health care, the president accused doctors of lining their pockets by making decisions out of greed and self-interest instead of the best interests of their patients. He used the example of a child with a sore throat going to the doctor, saying

that oftentimes a doctor would order the child's tonsils removed rather than a less-drastic treatment because the doctor would make more money by making the child undergo surgery.¹²

First, let us remove the appalling Obama bogeyman label from doctors. As a group, doctors are among the finest Americans. They have to perform at top academic levels all the way through college to get into medical school, where they spend four brutal years. Then they do a multiyear training program in residency, officially not exceeding eighty-five hours per week but which sometimes tops one hundred hours a week. After all this, and often with \$100,000 or more (often far more) in student loans, they're qualified to save lives on their own. These people are passionately dedicated to helping others. They deserve our thanks and our respect, not the scorn of an opportunistic politician who can't seem to refrain from insulting doctors as greedy, lazy, and self-serving.

Secondly, it's a flat-out lie, as any doctor in the country can explain to you. (We can hear Congressman Joe Wilson shouting, "You lie!" somewhere.) The family doctor who diagnoses the need for a tonsillectomy is not the ENT specialist who actually performs the removal surgery.

And third, it was a huge mistake. Doctors are one of the most-respected groups of people in our society, and rightly so. Politicians and lawyers (Obama is both), however, are among the most despised and reviled of professions, and often—though not always—rightly so. This hyperpartisan swipe coincided with the accelerating plummet of Obamacare in the polls, showing that the American people were siding with their trusted doctors over their smooth-talking president.

4. Victims

Fourth of President Obama's tactics is to always create a victim. He'll always tell a group of people that there's someone to blame, and that someone is never Barack Obama (or his friends, such as

the ever-popular Nancy Pelosi).

And whoever President Obama says should lay the blame, those are the victims. For health care, it's the uninsured or those with preexisting conditions. For wages or business issues, the victims are blue-collar workers. For affirmative action, the victims are blacks or Hispanics. (We can't say all minorities, because the tremendous overall success of Asians and Indians proves that there's no systemic racism that keeps all minorities down.) For school choice, the victims are teachers and public-school students. For cap and trade, the victims are our children and the apocalypse that Obama says they will inherit.

Whoever you are and whatever you do, if you are not a wealthy white male with a great education and a great career, a stable family, and in fine health, then Barack Obama says you are a victim of something and will tell you who to blame.

The politician who promised to bring us all together instead couches almost everything he does in terms of us-against-them, with "us" always being some sort of victim, who should blame "them" because "they" are somehow responsible for "our" lot in life.

The Pattern Is the Point

Some might be surprised at the widespread focus of this book. The sections of the various chapters in this book cover what seem like a lot of topics, even though we keep most of those chapters short enough to be read in one sitting and to avoid getting too far in the weeds on any one issue.

But covering that number of issues is essential, because the pattern is the point. For each of these chapters and the sections within each chapter, we show how what President Obama is attempting is not only bad policy, but it's also unconstitutional; it violates our supreme law, time and time again.

If this were two or three or five issues, then one could wonder if it's just coincidence. But when you have over twenty

separate issues around which the president violates our Constitution's safeguards, which are particularly designed to protect our liberty by restraining the power of government, then a terrifying truth emerges:

He's doing this deliberately. He seeks to remake our nation, violating our supreme law, and to abuse the levers of power to permanently change this country into a big-government collectivist society that our Founders would abhor.

This is not to say he's evil. Obama thinks that what he's doing is right. He thinks government really *does* have all the answers, and he paternalistically thinks he's helping ignorant people who don't know enough to run their own lives, and instead need the wisdom and direction of an all-powerful government to make decisions for them and their children. A government full of the best and brightest, led by a brilliant and eloquent leader. Him.

It's insulting. It's appalling. But that's how he thinks.

The Blueprint's Architects

Others share President Obama's values, priorities, and thinking. They are the architects of his blueprint, the people whom he's brought to the table to devise the details of the blueprint to achieve his vision.

For all his intelligence, Barack Obama was elected as perhaps the least-experienced and least-prepared president in more than a century. He was a U.S. senator for merely two years before he started running for president. Before that, he was only a state senator, representing a far-left city in a liberal state, and lecturing at the University of Chicago. Before that, as we all know, he was a community organizer working with groups such as ACORN.

Barack Obama had a vision for America. He knew the broad strokes of what he wanted. But lacking any experience or background with high office or the countless policy issues handled by the federal government, he needed others to devise

strategies and policies to realize his vision.

Three such assistants fill the most senior positions in his White House. They are Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel, Senior Advisor David Axelrod, and Assistant for Intergovernmental Relations Valerie Jarrett. These three form the execution half of President Obama's inner circle, responsible for passing and implementing Obama's programs and priorities.

Behind them are three more individuals, who actually think up the programs and policies. They are John Podesta, chairman of the Center for American Progress, top lobbyist and Democratic operative Harold Ickes, and Andy Stern, president of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU).

While others play a role in the blueprint, these six are perhaps the most important figures in designing the details to create the imperial presidency that the Far Left has dreamt of for decades.

But make no mistake: This blueprint is Barack Obama's blueprint. It's his vision. It's his agenda. And if he succeeds, the power will be his as well.

Conservatives Must Unite

For President Obama's power grab to be stopped, everyone who opposes his collectivist quasi-socialism, anti-sovereign globalism, social engineering, centralization of power, and court packing must unite. We cannot allow differences on one or two issues—even important ones—to keep us from working together for our common goal of stopping the most radical leftist president in America's history. And, needless to say, if we cannot allow policy differences to divide us, then we certainly cannot allow egos, personality conflicts, and old grudges to stand in the way. It's true that Washington, D.C., is full of prima donnas and control freaks, and that some of these people are as intolerably arrogant as they are self-serving.

But Barack Obama is counting on those divisions to keep us

from working together. He believes that these issues and feuds—many legitimate, but some not—will prevent us from working together to stop him from permanently changing the United States, moving it away from our Founding Fathers' ideals of limited government, personal responsibility, Judeo-Christian morality, and economic opportunity. We must prove him wrong.

At the signing of the Declaration of Independence, one of the most revered Founders uttered words that are as true today as they were then. Benjamin Franklin admonished all those present that, "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."¹³

The final clause of the Declaration concludes, "with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." They meant those words, because they knew that their lives were on the line. If they failed in the Revolutionary War and Britain reestablished control in America, then all the names we've grown up revering—Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, James Madison, Patrick Henry, George Mason, and the father of our country, George Washington—would all have been executed as traitors. Their lands and wealth would have been confiscated, and they would have been vilified for all time in British history.

We do not face times such as those. But as you'll read in this book, Barack Obama and his team seek not to cooperate and collaborate with any Republicans or other non-Democrats. Instead, they plan to divide opposition forces, and beat conservative interest groups one at a time, until none are left. In President Obama's America, dissent will not be tolerated.

The only solution is to unite. As the president's numbers remain consistently under 50 percent, there are more who disapprove of what he is doing than those who do approve. By marshaling resources and educating our fellow citizens, this

unconstitutional power grab can be stopped, and this ultra-left ideologue can be defeated in 2012.

Many conservatives are starting to come to the same conclusion. On February 17, 2010, more than one hundred conservative leaders (including both of your humble authors) gathered to sign the “Mount Vernon Statement,” also titled “Constitutional Conservatism: A Statement for the 21st Century.” This document makes the case that all three types of conservative Americans—social, economic, and national security conservatives—need to act as one. It makes the case that a prosperous society requires ethical citizens; that an overspending big government is dangerous to personal morality; and that national security requires both brave and virtuous citizens and a thriving, robust economy.¹⁴

Conservatives are starting to understand that we’re all in it together. The Constitution that serves as the Supreme Law of the Land also mandates conservative policies in all three of these areas.

The Constitution’s Promise: A Federal Government of Limited Powers

There are plenty of books out there on why what Barack Obama is doing is wrong. What’s different about this book is that we show how President Obama’s actions are not just wrong; they are *illegal*. More precisely, they are *unconstitutional*—they violate our country’s supreme law.

It’s impossible to overstate how important this distinction is. Our Constitution isn’t just some random collection of do’s and don’ts. It lays out the charter of our government, but what’s truly important here is why those charter provisions design the government the way that they do.

The Constitution creates a federal government of limited powers. After the American colonies declared independence in 1776, there was a reason that the Constitution wasn’t written

until 1787 (and not ratified until 1789). The Continental Congress, operating under the Articles of Confederation that were adopted in 1777, was a weak and disorganized entity that had almost no power, and the states were entirely sovereign entities that were essentially small countries unto themselves.

The American nation was a disorganized mess as a result; people may have been free, but the way they did things differed so much from state to state that it was impossible to organize a national defense, or conduct diplomacy with other countries, or for a thriving national economy to develop.

Yet for more than a decade there was no Constitution. The Founders were so concerned about the danger of replacing the British king with an American king that they didn't want much at all by way of a national government. Every year made clear, however, that the country could not survive without a stronger, unifying government. How could America have both a viable national government and still make sure that such a government wouldn't threaten the freedom of the people and the states?

The solution was to adopt a Constitution that established a government of strictly limited powers and a federal system with sovereign states.

A new national government would be created primarily to handle three areas of governing: military and national security, diplomacy with foreign countries, and regulating interstate and international commerce. The new government would have all the necessary powers to handle those three areas, such as raising and equipping an army and navy, and making a national currency. Beyond these, the only other federal powers would be those necessary for carrying out those express powers, which were thus implied in the Constitution.¹⁵ Any powers not explicitly granted to this federal government, nor implicit in performing those express powers, nor explicitly denied to the states, would

be reserved to the states or the people.¹⁶ It's the perfect definition of a limited government.

This is one of the biggest differences between the federal government and state government in America's federalist system. The legal terms are "general jurisdiction" versus "limited jurisdiction."

The states are governments of *general jurisdiction*, meaning they have the authority to make laws in every area of life as explained in their state constitutions, except for those few areas that the U.S. Constitution expressly reserves to the federal government. This general jurisdiction includes a government power called the police power, which is the authority to make laws for public health, public safety, public welfare, and social morality.¹⁷ States have this police power.¹⁸

The federal government, by contrast, is a government of *limited jurisdiction*. As a government of "enumerated powers," it only has those powers specifically granted to it in the Constitution.¹⁹ The federal government has no police power.²⁰ This means more than the fact that the government cannot violate any of your constitutional rights. It means that beyond protecting your individual rights, if any federal law is not authorized by at least one specific provision of the Constitution, then that law is unconstitutional.

Unconstitutional laws are a nullity. Any Act of Congress "contrary to the Constitution is not law," as the Supreme Court explained in its most consequential case, *Marbury v. Madison*, adding that any action of the federal government "repugnant to the Constitution is void."²¹ Anything done by the federal government that violates the Constitution is irredeemably illegal, with no rightful authority over any American citizen. Such unconstitutional laws must be recognized as such and struck down by the federal courts, and the voters should expel from office those officials who enact such illegal measures.

Conclusion

Freedom itself is in danger under the administration of President Barack Obama, aided and abetted by a far-left Congress led by Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid. Our supreme law is being ignored and at times even trampled underfoot, and the government is running rampant over the liberties of American citizens. The concept of limited government is on the verge of disappearing. That's what is at stake in America today.

Barack Obama is waging a war against the U.S. Constitution. He made his beliefs clear on a Chicago radio show (years before he became president), saying that the courts have not done their job in terms of bringing about "redistributive change" (i.e., government- and court-ordered "spreading the wealth") and "economic justice."²² These are (easily deciphered) code words for the Radical Ultra Left when speaking about government redistribution of wealth through cradle-to-grave government entitlement programs, paid for through crippling taxes and regulations.

These things are not simply the opposite of America's free-market economy and our concepts of personal liberty. They violate critical provisions of the Constitution that are designed to keep government at bay so that we may live free and happy lives, raising our children as we see fit, keeping most of what we earn, and living in a society where we can defend ourselves, each other, and our way of life.

President Barack Obama has a different vision for America than that of our Founders. It is one that is radically different in terms of social values, economic prosperity, the role of families, and the role of government. To get to his vision of America, he must violate critical parts of the Constitution, relying either on political allies to support him, or shaping a judiciary that will agree with him. Such changes would be so sweeping that they

would forever change our nation.

Remember—we should not be surprised by what President Obama is doing. As we've already shown, he told us he would do it. And now you know the basic techniques he's employing to sell specific parts of his plan to the American people. What you are about to read is a breakdown of the staggering number of changes Obama is attempting to make to our country, and the shockingly unconstitutional ways he will make them. The first step in preventing the current president from "fundamentally transforming the United States of America" is to inform ourselves of all the steps he's taking to make it happen.

Without further ado, here's President Obama's blueprint for building a permanent liberal nation upon the ruins of American exceptionalism.