

**Notes on
Dawn's Early Light. 274 Pages
Book Author: Kevin D. Roberts PhD
Notes Author: William Gasarch. 96 Pages
Percent: $96/274 = 0.35$**

Typographical note- I have tried to have quote from the book in italics and all other quotes in bold.

I will refer to the author as *Kevin Roberts*.

Overall:

PROS

1. Some of what he says is wrong with America he is right about.
2. He is absolutely fine with some policies that those in his own party would not like (he is for regulation in some cases).
3. Some of what he says made me look things up of interest. On some he was correct and that was interesting to know. On some he was wrong but that was also interesting.
4. He often raises good questions. He would not put it that way. For example, he says that the Enlightenment threw out traditions that were good. Okay. That raises a good question: how were things before and after the Enlightenment on a range of issues.

CONS

1. He is anti-vax (without giving any argument for that position) which undermines some of his arguments. For example, he uses that Churches had to close during COVID as an example of government intrusion on religion. This is really bad because I really do want to hear how the government intrudes on religion.
2. He is a global warming skeptic without giving any argument for that position.
3. He is anti-gay without any argument for it. Actually he seems unaware that gay people exist (I know that is not true.)
4. He is very one-sided. For example, he decries online censorship but seems to think its only on the left. Note that Trump has threatened to execute those who disagree with him.

5. He will make a gratuitous comment that undermines an argument. For example, he wants more funding for community colleges and trade schools. I agree. He says we have job shortages there. I will take his word for that. He says that a further benefit is that it will deprive the Ivy league schools of students. I doubt that's true, but that has nothing to do with the issue. If he wants to argue about how the Ivy League is destroying students' minds with its leftist drivel, fine, but do that in the proper context.
6. He sometimes can't seem to make up his mind about government regulation. In the end he seems to only want to use regulation against liberals.
7. He thinks that Donald Trump will help enact the agenda intelligently. He is just wrong about that. More generally, he has a big blind spot with regard to The Donald being part of the problem, not part of the solution.
8. He never mentions Jan 6, slavery, the USA's treatment of Native Americans, actual racism, Trump's morality, or anything that will jeopardize his points.
9. He is actually anti-capitalist. If a private company chooses to (say) have a clean-energy fund or a DEI program he objects. It's a private company. Let the invisible hand of the market guide what they do.
10. He seems to think there is a conspiracy of companies to do ESG and DEI. He never explains what they get out of it. And the above point—if they are private companies and they think it's good for business then what's his problem, especially as a small-gov person.
11. A more overarching problem that is related to the last two points: he does not distinguish between objecting to the government forcing companies to do things (a reasonable to object to) and objecting to what they do on their own (which, as a conservative, he would need a very good reason to object to).
12. Parts of the book remind me of the Frank Sinatra song *Something Stupid* with the line:

And then I spoil it all by saying something like I love you

Kevin Roberts has a half-paragraph that is interesting and correct and then spoil is all by saying something stupid.

CAVEAT I read this book hoping it would be an honest intelligent defense of some policies I likely disagree with. I like finding honest intelligent arguments for positions I disagree with because (1) they can be interesting even if I disagree, (2) they may give me insight into who holds them, and (3) I might read them and change my mind. This book was *not* that. It was not an honest intelligent defense of anything. This may be unfair. Perhaps it was not meant to me. Perhaps it was written for those who already hold the points of view expressed. However, this was written by the president of the Heritage Foundation, who has a PhD in History. If I can't get an intelligent argument here, where can I?

CAVEAT 2 Before reading the book my thought was **This is an intelligent Trumpian who does not go in for conspiracy theories like that Obama was not born in America, COVID was a Hoax, or Biden stole the election.**

I was wrong on all three counts.

I asked Google about Kevin Roberts view on Obama's birth

Yes, Kevin Roberts (president of the Heritage Foundation and its lobbying arm, Heritage Action) has admitted to having been an Obama "birther".

Unearthed audio clips from a September 2024 podcast interview with MeidasTouch founder Ben Meiselas revealed Roberts saying that he was "a birther a long time ago". In the clips, he stated he had since abandoned the belief but that he had been "very public" about it at the time.

[BILL: I would need to explain why he thought Obama was not born here and what changed his mind.]

COVID Hoax: No, Kevin Roberts does not think COVID was a hoax, but he is anti-vax.

I asked Google about Kevin Roberts view on the election of 2020.

I got this link:

<https://www.mediaite.com/media/news/heritage-foundation-president-just-comes>

1 The Conspiracy Against Nature

The BLM protests caused LOTS of damage. The California Wildfire caused LOTS of damage. He blames both on *The Uni-party* though more on the liberals. It is fair to ask whose fault all of this is. It is fair to question the reaction of the government. However, he never mentions the following:

1. For BLM: Were the BLM grievances legit?
2. For the California Wildfires: What role does global warming plays?

He goes on to say that the real conflict in this country is *the party of creation vs the party of destruction*. To his credit, he does not just blame liberals. He also blames *wax museum conservatives*.

Page 3-4 is about when Europeans overthrew *all* traditional society. I think he is saying that the enlightenment threw out too much, such as traditional religion. He may have a point here, but he fails to mention just how oppressive traditional religion was in those days. So I view what he says as *raising* a good question.

I thought he was going towards a Burkean view (quoting someone, not sure who): **Traditional wisdom has some value so do not dispense with it to quickly when pondering change.** This is also known as (quoting Google-AI) **Chesterson's Fence: you should not remove a law, custom, or structure (like a fence) until you understand why it was put there in the first place, otherwise you risk unintended consequences, such as a farmer's fence being removed, causing livestock to escape, and leading to famine.**

He has no such point of view. Here is a direct quote.

(Page 2) For America to flourish they [American Institutions] don't need to be reformed, they need to be burned. A nice start would be:

Every Ivy League College, the FBI, the New York Times, the National Institute of Allergy and Infections Diseases, The Department of Education, 80% of all "Catholic" higher education, BlackRock, The Loudoun County School System, the Boy Scouts of America, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the World Economic Forum, the Chinese Communist Party, and the National Endowment for Democracy.

I will comment on a few of these.

1. Every Ivy League College. If he wants to talk about how the Humanities departments are left-biased and how DEI is a sham, that is a discussion worth having. But what about the STEM fields and all the good they've done for the country over the last 50 years? Kevin Roberts is a climate change denier, so he might not like that part of STEM. But there is so much more.
2. The FBI used to be a rather conservative organization. Is he mad because they politely asked Trump to give back those documents and when Trump didn't they had to ask him less politely? Is he mad because of the prosecution of the Jan 6 rioters?
3. The National Institute of Allergy and Infections Diseases. A discussion of the PROS and CONS of their approach to COVID would be welcome. But Kevin Roberts is actually an anti-vaxer (later in the book) so he is not interested in such a discussion.
4. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. I looked them up.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gates_Foundation

They seem to mostly give grants to other nations to help them with Medical care and Farming. Whats not to like? I can guess a few aspects:

- (a) STD controls including HIV/AIDS.
- (b) Reproductive Health Care and Family Planning (Kevin Roberts is against abortion and birth control).
- (c) Agricultural Development—will these countries compete with our farmers?
- (d) They have teamed up with Hillary Clinton (and probably other liberals) and the World Economic Forum.
- (e) I can't tell if he is against what they give or who their friends are.

I point out that the Gates Foundation is private—it seems odd for a conservative to want to dictate to a rich person how to spend their money. To be fair, Kevin Roberts calls his movement *New Conservative* and often wants government intervention.

5. BlackRock Investments. I looked them up. There are a few thing he could object to:
 - (a) They have ESG funds. Note that this is a private company that happens to believe in global warming and is trying to do something about it. Is that really objectionable?
 - (b) After anti-gun protests BlackRock introduced two funds that would exclude gun manufacturers. Again—a private company so how can you object?
 - (c) They have done business with China that might be immoral and/or illegal. It might even be illegal. He **does** discuss this some and seems to have a legit point here.
 - (d) BlackRock has ties to the Federal reserve that might be immoral and/or illegal. He **does** discuss this some and seems to have a legit point here.

A list of people he doesn't like:

(Page 4-5) But here's the most uncomfortable truth of all: the parasites that have taken over so much of the country: pantsuited girlboss advertising executives, Skittle-haired they/them activists, soy-faced pajama-clad work-from-home HR apparatchiks, aderall-addicted dog-mom diversity consultants, nasally-voiced Ivy-League regulatory lawyers, obese George Soros-funded police abolitionist district attorneys, hipster trust fund socialists— are some of the least impressive people in the world.

1. Some of these are weirdly specific—why advertising executives? What does he have against pants-suits? Does he really think women should only wear dresses?
2. The term *activists* is really odd since if they were activists for things he liked, that would be fine. I had to look up *Skittle-haired*. It means brightly colored hair. If an activist had normal hair would that be okay?
3. I had to look up *soy-faced*. It is an effeminate face. So if an HR person had a masculine faces, that would be okay?
4. I had to look up *dog-mom* (so the book has added to my vocabulary!). Its a women who treat her dog as a person-pampering it to much. So

he doesn't like women who (a) pamper their dog to much AND (b) work from home AND (c) their job is a diversity consultant. So if a diversity consultant worked at the office and didn't like dogs, he would be happier with that?

5. Nasally-voiced. You can fill in my comment.
6. The George Soros comment is veiled (or not so veiled) anti-semitism.
7. Note: Chris Hitchens did a similar thing in his book *god is not great* where he said that the Mel Gibson movie *Passion of the Christ* was *anti-semitic and badly acted*. I wonder if he would have liked it better if it was well acted.
8. We can have an intelligent discussion about DEI and overregulation. and some of the other points he seems to be bringing up. But all of those negative and irrelevant adjectives make it hard to take him seriously.
9. I showed this quote to someone as an example of the book. They thought this book had to be put out by democrats as either a satire or an attempt to make Trump supporters look bad. I showed them that YES it was written by the *President of the Heritage Foundation* and YES that quote really is there word for word and YES I did not leave out any context. They believed me but were amazed at the quote, amazed that I got through an entire book of this stuff, and amazed that I produced over 100 pages of notes on the book.

Kevin Roberts has an interesting take on Carter:

(Page 5-6) Beneath the turmoil lay something deeper. President Carter put his finger on the problem in a July 15, 1979, prime time address on American's "crisis of confidence" What America was facing, he claimed, was not an energy crisis but a spiritual one. . . . In the face of serious problems such as energy shortages, high inflation, stagnant growth, and exploding crime, Americans have found nothing but gridlock, stasis, and decline.

Of course Carter's speech is usually remembered today as the "malaise" speech thanks to some clever branding by Reagan. Why did it stick? Because despite putting his finger on the problem, Carter himself was stuck. His vision of the future fell woefully short, amounting to resignation and decline.

Kevin Roberts then claims that Reagan got America moving again. Again, this is a debate one could have (Mike would agree, Clyde would disagree). And its not clear what Reagan did spiritually.

Kevin Roberts says that America is in a Spiritual crisis but at first says its not a religious thing. However, later Kevin Roberts leans into Christianity. He also says that policy solutions are only part of the problem— but its hard to say how to fix a spiritual crisis.

Here is a list of problems we have:

(Page 7) Fentanyl overdoes, childhood gender mutilation, dead-end jobs, racial quotas, online censorship, grocery-store shelf shortages, open borders, religious persecution, violent carjacking, chronic shoplifting.

1. Fentanyl overdoes is a problem. An intelligent discussion of how to fix this would be welcome. In 2025 (after the book was published) Trump has done the following:

Made it harder for people to break their drug habits:

<https://www.npr.org/2025/03/27/nx-s1-5342368/addiction-trump-mental-health>

Bombed Venezuela ships and kill all of the passengers and then claim they were carrying drugs to America.

So—what policies is Trump going to do to solve this problem?

2. Childhood Gender Mutilation: We DO need more study of gender dysphoria. Later Kevin Roberts claims children are being taken away from their parents and forced to change gender, which is NOT true.
3. Dead-end jobs. This may get worse with AI. This is valid but this is one of many things where he is a fool to think that Donald Trump will do anything about it.
4. Online censorship. He is not referring to Donald Trump wanting to lock up anyone who speaks badly of him. Too bad. An intelligent discussion of left and right censorship (online and offline) would be welcome.
5. Open borders. This is a made up problem entirely. Immigrants are good for the country and do jobs Americans don't want to do. We are now seeing the problems with limiting immigration.

6. Religious persecution. I would like to have an intelligent discussion of this but later Kevin Roberts considers closing churches during COVID to be religious persecution. And again, he only cares about (imagined) persecution of Christians.

When the country was in good shape (post Reagan) it was appropriate to have free trade and less regulation (Clinton passed NAFTA and Welfare reform). But we are in a different time now.

I applaud Kevin Roberts for recognizing that times have changed and for criticizing *wax museum conservatives*. However, his solutions are at time loopy or non-existent, and the notion that Donald Trump, will do anything about this in a competent way that makes sense is absurd.

2 Fighting Fire with Fire

Pat Buchanan's campaign for president recognized that America had a spiritual crisis. He lost but he was challenging the conservative out-dated orthodoxy of free trade and less government.

George Bush Sr. wanted a new-world-order which meant sacrificing traditions and families to please the S & P 500. I applaud that he is bucking some of his party.

2.1 The Party of Creation Run on Gratitude

(Page 16) Tradition is not the worship of ashes but the preservation of fire Mahler.

This raises a good question: Which traditions should we keep, which should we modify, and which should we discard. Kevin Roberts never does that triage.

(Page 6) Conservatives acknowledge that our lives depend on what we have been given by God, by our country, by our forebear's, by our communities and home places.

Thats fine. Does Kevin Roberts not realize that Donald Trump is the opposite of all of this. He was born on third base and thinks he hit a triple. He has no gratitude. Loyalty only goes one way.

Kevin Roberts complains about some schools taking down pictures of George Washington (since he was a slave holder). On this I AGREE with him. However, I want to know what he thinks of taking down confederate war monuments. Here is my litmus test (due to Scott Aaronson). We give three examples of how this works.

1. George Washington: Even though he had slaves he believed in the principles of freedom, he did not become a king, and he set this country in the right direction. The key is that there is a legitimate positive thing to say. Someone may still disagree, but that is the argument, do the PROS outweigh the CONS?
2. Nathan Bedford Forrest: Even though he fought for the South in the civil war, had many slaves, and was an overt racist, this must be balanced with the following: he massacred many soldiers (especially black ones) and was later the first grand wizard of the KKK. UH, is that

really an **on the other hand** argument. NO. The only counter is that he had skills and acumen as a cavalry leader—but this is irrelevant to the argument.

3. Thomas Jefferson: Even though he had many slaves and raped the teenager Sally Hemmings and later the adult Sally Hemmings, he wrote the declaration of independence, and was aware of the moral problems with slavery.

None of this is in the book—but my point is, I am curious about Kevin Robert’s opinion of, say, tearing down Nathan Forrest’s statue. Or renaming Mt McKinley.

Kevin Roberts mentions Edmond Burke positively which surprises me given my comments on the first chapter

2.2 The Permanent Things

Family Marriage between a man and a women and for life and lots of kids.

1. So why does he like thrice-divorced, brags-about-adultery Trump? He needs to confront this. One evangelical who is disappointed in his fellow evals liking Trump said **The evangelicals are NOT saying “he has his flaws but he will do what we want so we will hold our noses and vote for him” The evangelicals are HAPPY with him. Ecstatic.** Another evangelical who is disgusted with his fellow Evangelicals said **I think the entire evangelical community owes Bill Clinton an apology for criticizing his sexual morals.**

I googled both **What does Kevin Roberts Think of Divorce** and *What does Kevin Roberts think of Trumps adultery?*

What does Kevin Roberts Think of Divorce:

Kevin Roberts, president of The Heritage Foundation, views divorce as a negative societal force and personal adversity. He has personally experienced the effects of divorce, as his own parents divorced when he was four years old, and he has spoken about its various disadvantages, including spiritual, economic, and educational ones.

Key aspects of his perspective include:

1) Adversity and Forgiveness: Roberts describes his parents' divorce as part of "extreme adversity" in his early family life. He emphasizes overcoming these disadvantages through faith in Jesus Christ and operating in a spirit of forgiveness toward family members.

2) Societal Costs: As the leader of The Heritage Foundation, he is associated with the organization's stance that divorce contributes to "social collapse" and "dysfunctional behavior and despair". The organization advocates for policies that strengthen marriage and discourage divorce due to the significant cost to society.

3) Opposition to No-Fault Divorce: His general viewpoint is strongly against divorce, and this position is consistent with the broader conservative movement's focus on preserving the nuclear family.

4) Policy and Project 2025: His views influence the Heritage Foundation's work, including the controversial "Project 2025," which some critics suggest aims to "undo modern divorce laws" by promoting a specific vision of the family unit, although the project's proponents argue they are merely offering conservative policy recommendations and want to save marriage.

In summary, Roberts sees divorce as a highly detrimental event for individuals and society, one that needs to be discouraged through cultural and potentially policy changes.

What does Kevin Roberts think of Trump's adultery?

Kevin Roberts, president of the conservative think tank The Heritage Foundation, has not made his personal opinion on Donald Trump's adultery a prominent part of his public commentary, but the organization he leads and the broader conservative movement have generally focused on the political and policy implications of such scandals rather than the personal morality.

Public commentary from figures within the conservative sphere, including articles published by the Heritage Foundation's media outlet, generally follows these lines:

1) **Focus on Political Impact:** Many conservative commentators argue that a politician's private sexual life is less important than their public policy actions and political efficacy. The priority for many conservatives is the advancement of their agenda and defeating the Left, which is seen as a more significant moral issue than personal infidelity.

2) **Comparison to Other Presidents:** Some arguments suggest that other past presidents have also committed adultery or lied, implying a double standard in the media's focus on Trump's actions.

3) **Character is Secondary to Policy:** Roberts' work with the Heritage Foundation, including the controversial Project 2025, prioritizes a specific policy vision for the country, which frames the debate around political outcomes rather than individual character flaws.

In short, available public information does not offer a direct, personal condemnation from Kevin Roberts regarding Trump's adultery; rather, the stance within the associated conservative sphere tends to minimize the significance of such personal issues in favor of political goals and policy objectives.

While that is a reasonable view to have, (1) he should have explained it in his book, and (2) it contradicts what I got when I googled

What does Kevin Roberts think of adultery?

The person named Kevin Roberts most relevant to public discourse, president of the conservative think tank The Heritage Foundation, has not made direct public statements specifically detailing his personal opinion on the act of adultery itself.

However, his public life and organizational affiliations provide context for his likely stance:

1) He identifies as a "Cowboy Catholic" and advocates for a vision of America defined by conservative values, which typically align with traditional views of marriage and morality.

2) As head of The Heritage Foundation, he is part of a movement that has criticized public figures for behavior related to

extramarital affairs and sexual misconduct, framing such actions as a form of "moral compromise" that can undermine a person's moral authority in leadership.

[BILL HERE: I could not find any cases where Kevin Roberts criticized a public figure for adultery.]

3) His background includes his parents' divorce, a detail mentioned in a profile about his upbringing, which could shape his personal views on family and marriage, though his explicit opinion on adultery is not stated.

Overall, while he has not given a specific, widely-publicized quote on adultery as a standalone topic, his public persona and the ideology he represents strongly suggest a view that would not condone the practice.

2. The declining birthrate in America and elsewhere has been because of much less teen pregnancy, and much less young women having kids which is bad for their health and life. Later in the book he claims that there are many couples who want to have more kids but can't. He points to Hungary and other countries that have financial incentives to have kids. He says they have worked. The Economist says they have not. Or that they have been way too expensive. This could be the beginning of an intelligent discussion, but Kevin Roberts won't do that. Also, some women **regret** having kids, see

<https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/nokids.pdf>

Later in these notes I will discuss Hungary, Israel, and (the country) Georgia and their policies. Spoiler alert: In Hungary the pro-birth policies did not work, but in Israel and Georgia they did. This is interesting so I am surprised he doesn't discuss it.

3. Kevin Roberts does not mention gay couples here but it is implied that he is against Gay Marriage. One of the early arguments for Gay Marriage was by Andrew Sullivan, a gay conservative, arguing why gay marriage is a conservative position. Here is an article that argues that gay marriage is GOOD for straight marriage in that kids see that marriage is normal and living together is less desirable:

BILL- PUT IN ORIGINAL ANDREW SULLIVAN ARTICLES ON GAY MARRIAGE AND SODOMY LAWS.

<https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/BOOKCLUB/gaymarriage.pdf>

If Kevin Roberts thinks Gay Marriage is bad then what is the alternative? Civil Unions? In some countries that tried that straight people were attracted to the option since it meant less hassle if you divorce.

Since Kevin Roberts does not actually say he is against Gay Marriage I googled it:

Kevin Roberts, president of the conservative think tank the Heritage Foundation, strongly opposes same-sex marriage and advocates for policies that define marriage exclusively as a union between one man and one woman. He does not believe the fight over same-sex marriage is settled and hopes to see the Supreme Court's decision that legalized it nationwide (Obergefell v. Hodges) overturned.

Key Views

1) Definition of Marriage: Roberts asserts that "marriage is between one man and one woman, full stop," a concept he describes as a "foundational bedrock of human society" and essential to human flourishing.

2) Overturning Obergefell: He has explicitly stated that he would like to see a future court case go to the Supreme Court "and completely tear out, root and branch, Obergefell". If this occurred, he hopes it would lead to the annulment of existing same-sex marriages, as he views same-sex marriage as a "really bad social experiment".

3) "Respect for Marriage Act" Opposition: Roberts was a vocal opponent of the federal "Respect for Marriage Act," which requires the federal government to recognize any state-recognized marriage. He called for Congress not to vote on the measure, arguing it would threaten religious institutions and put those who believe in "man-woman marriage" at risk of losing government funding or non-profit status.

4) Project 2025: Under Roberts' leadership, the Heritage Foundation has developed Project 2025, a detailed transition plan for a potential second Trump administration. This manifesto includes provisions to eliminate protections for LGBTQ+ individuals and redirect federal funds to organizations and agencies that support

a "biblically based" definition of the family (one man and one woman).

5) Political Stance: He sees a belief in the traditional definition of marriage as fundamental to being a "movement conservative" and believes that conservatives should "fight" for their principles on this issue.

So- what do do about the fact that there are Gay people who want to live together and have legal protections? He could have come out in favor of Civil Unions, but did not mention that.

I then asked ChatGPT what Kevin Roberts thinks of anti-sodomy laws. This is the kind of issue that pits libertarians (who should be against those laws) to social conservatives (who are for those laws). Rand and Ron Paul coped out by being for individual states being allowed to pass such laws (gee, they don't feel that way about gun laws or drug laws or just about anything else).

Anyway, here is Kevin Roberts view which won't surprise anyone:

Kevin Roberts, president of the conservative think tank The Heritage Foundation, has not publicly stated a direct, personal opinion on whether anti-sodomy laws should be reinstated or abolished, but his expressed views and the organization's platform align with a social conservative ideology that has historically opposed court rulings against such laws.

While no direct quote on his specific current view on anti-sodomy laws was found in the search results, his general stances suggest an opposition to the rulings that invalidated them:

1) Opposition to Lawrence v. Texas: The Heritage Foundation has published several articles and commentaries that criticize the Supreme Court's 2003 decision in Lawrence v. Texas, which declared anti-sodomy laws unconstitutional. These commentaries argue that the ruling was an "illegitimate use of its power" and part of a "slippery slope" that would undermine traditional morality and institutions like marriage.

2) "Freedom to Live as You Ought": In the introduction to "Project 2025," a Heritage Foundation initiative, Roberts laid out a view of freedom not as the ability to live how one wants, but as the ability "to live how you ought to according to the Bible". This philosophy is used to justify policies that promote a traditional, "nuclear family" structure (married man and woman) and

discourage other forms of sexual and family life.

3) **Criticism of LGBTQ+ Rights Rulings:** Roberts has criticized other Supreme Court decisions expanding LGBTQ+ rights, such as the Bostock ruling regarding employment protections, claiming that the word "sex" in law refers only to "biological reality as male or female".

4) **Focus on Traditional Morality:** Roberts follows strict Catholic teachings on issues like contraception and has been associated with the idea that conservatives are leading the charge to "end recreational sex and return sex to its original purpose, which is to have children". This worldview is fundamentally at odds with the liberty interests that the Lawrence decision established for consensual private sexual activity.

Therefore, while he may use "discernment" or "concealment" regarding the full extent of his views in public political discourse, his and his organization's stated positions and underlying philosophy are consistent with the perspective that anti-sodomy laws were legitimate expressions of public morality and should not have been struck down by the courts.

I wonder non-rhetorically what he thinks of applying anti-sodomy laws to heterosexuals (e.g., banning oral sex).

Faith The book says that religion is good (hmmm-is it true?) and that the Government should support any faith. Sabbath laws, support for religious schools. This is more of the starting point for an intelligent discussion. But he ends with

(Page 19) American society is rooted in Christian Faith—certainly public institutions should not establish anything offensive to Christian morals under the guises of "religious freedom" or "DEI"

What about things offensive to other faiths? The **Philadelphia Riots of 1844** was about which VERSION of the bible (Catholic or Protestant) to read in public school. Each thought of the other as offensive.

<https://www.au.org/the-latest/church-and-state/articles/a-history-of-violence-1>

Community This was fine—he values community where people help each other. The harder question is how much OUTSIDE help (e.g., government) do you need if things go really bad.

Work Men need work for human dignity (I do not know if he is leaving out women intentionally). Fine. But the last line is rather odd

(Page 20) In the Western tradition, a Republican government [I DO NOT THINK HE MEANS THE PARTY] befitted only men who were masters of themselves, who were economically self-sufficient.

What about women?

What about people who were born slaves or really poor—they would have a hard time

What about people who were born rich?

What about people who had Government jobs?

More generally, its really hard to be economically self-sufficient NOW and even THEN.

Nation Talks about the nation and the people working towards **the common good**. He gives a very strange example:

*(Page 20) Our deepest traditions about the purpose are reflected in the ancient ceremony for crowning England's Kings, when the Archbishop of Canterbury hands to his sovereign the Sword of State with these words: **With this sword do justice, stop the growth of iniquity, protect the holy Church of God and all people of goodwill, help and defend widows and orphans, restore the things that are gone to decay, maintain the things that are restored, punish and reform what is amiss, and confirm what is in good order.***

I looked up when this tradition started. It was 1678. I asked Wikipedia for bad kings after that date and only got three (one of which might not count), so this alliance of royalty and religion might be good. Here are the three:

1) James II (r. 1685-1688): A fervent Catholic, his policies alienated Protestants and led to his deposition in 1688, often cited as a deeply unpopular ruler.

2) George III (r. 1760-1820): Known for the loss of the American colonies and bouts of mental instability, though he was also a long-reigning, dutiful king. (This does not seem so bad.)

3) George IV (r. 1820-1830): Had a reputation for extravagance, poor treatment of his wife, and a scandalous lifestyle, damaging the monarchy's image.

2.3 Controlled Burn

Talks about how a forest sometimes needs a controlled burn to keep it healthy (e.g., to get rid of Dutch Elm Disease). Then that some parts of the government need that, but others need to be burned to the ground. Okay. This could be an interesting discussion about at parts of the government work and don't work and how to either reform or get rid of them.

Its not. Here is a quote:

(Page 24) In 2020 COVID-19-like Dutch Elm disease, an import from East Asia made this abundantly clear. As Anthony Fauci's National Inst of Allergy and Infectious diseases (NAIAD) locked down the country, the churches that conservatives faithfully attended were helpless a federal bureaucrats locked down the doors.

My thoughts

1. Calling COVID-19 an import from East Asia probably refers to the leaked-lab theory which is that the virus escaped from a Chinese Lab. This may be true. It is also irrelevant to his point.
2. The question **was the lockdown needed** would be the start of an intelligent discussion. He is not going there.
3. He complains that the lockdown affected **churches that conservatives faithfully attended**. It affected **a lot more people than that**. Does he care that it affected other faiths? Restaurants? Other businesses?
4. The question **were churches unfairly targeted by lock downs, where as other businesses were not** would be the start of an interesting discussion. Indeed, there may be some merit to the argument that the choice of what to lockdown was not driven by health issues (Kevin Roberts later makes the VALID point out that the BLM protests were NOT told to put on masks). So again, this could be the start of an intelligent discussion. And again, he is not going there.
5. COVID was one of the times we needed government to step in. SO this is a very odd choice of where he draws his line in the sand.

Here is more:

(Page 24) The last decade has been full of grim Inspector general reports of weaponized law enforcement at the senior levels of the FBI, of obscene waste and fraud in the United States war in Afghanistan, of corruption and incompetence in our surface navy, not to mention cover-ups of sexual abuse in the Catholic Church, the Boy Scouts, and (with Jefferey Epstein scandal) the upper reaches of the ruling elites.

My comments.

1. He is pointing out some of the problems our society has. GOOD.
2. He **does not** say that this is all the fault of liberals. GOOD.
3. It would be interesting to see which party or president does more of this.
4. Here is a contrast: The Democrats weaponize the DOJ by seeing how much involvement Trump had in Jan 6, and all those documents he had at Margo Lago. The Republicans go after Hunter Biden. I think the Republicans are far worse. But again, would be of interest to study that.
5. Does Kevin Roberts want to burn down the Catholic Church? Thats supposed to be one of the pillars of our society. What does he blame that on?
6. Jefferey Epstein. It would be unfair to laugh at this now since the book was written before Trump tried to suppress the Epstein files. However, in 2007 it was Alexander Acosta, a Republican (and later Trumps Sec of Labor) who gave Epstein a really generous plea deal. I wonder if the next edition of the book will quietly leave out the Jeff Epstein comment.

Another paragraph that sounds interesting but undermines itself:

(Pages 24-25) . . . Boeing planes falling out of the sky, Harvard and Stanford presidents caught faking their research, real wages stagnating amid record profits, the imposition of rolling blackouts while politicians brag about renewable energy.

1. Boeing Plane: YES because Boeing was sold to a company that cares more about short term profits. So does Kevin Roberts want to regulate them?

2. Harvard and Stanford. TRUE- on this one he is CORRECT.
3. Real wages stagnating. YES this is happening. But is your solution more gov regulation? A better social safety net? I doubt it. Later its tariff's but thats not really a good idea.
4. Renewable energy is the reason for rolling blackouts? I doubt this is true but if Kevin Roberts wants to claim it, he has to show SOME evidence for it. (Note the book has no footnotes or index.)

2.4 The Conspiracy Against Nature

In earlier parts he made analogs between forest management and policy-controlled burns, getting rid of parts of the gov that are bad. In this part he talks about actual forest policy. He blames environmentalists and bad policy for forest fires. He may well be right about the policy being bad, but this is to big a topic to just say its all the liberals fault and move on. It would be more helpful to say what we are doing WRONG and what to do RIGHT, but that would be an entire book. Plus, once again no mention of Global Warming's role.

He says that liberals are pessimists. Isn't Trump also a pessimist?

He says the book is unapologetic populist. There have been populists on the left in the past (Huey Long was one—he will come up later). I wonder if he would be such a fan of populism if the population was against his policies.

2.5 The Faith of my Fathers/Cajun Country

He tells his families story- they were immigrants from France who settled in New Orleans and kept their culture. He says that the phrase **nation of immigrants** also indicates that they LIKE their new land. Okay.

He seems to like pluralism and that his family could keep their traditions. This seems at odds with his general anti-immigrant position.

He accuses liberals of trying to destroy traditions. But his arguments here are very unclear.

2.6 Reagan The Creator

Reagan created the challenger space shuttle program and did not give up after one of them blew up.

Kevin Roberts needs to say more clearly why the space shuttle program was a good thing. His reasons are more philosophical than anything real. There may well be real reasons why it was a good thing but they are not articulated. Recall that manned space flight is far more expensive than unmanned but does not give back more useful information.

What would Kevin Roberts think of Trumps devastating cuts to the NSF and NIH. I asked Google

Kevin Roberts, President of the conservative Heritage Foundation, is a strong supporter of Elon Musk's work with the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE). Roberts views the initiative as a necessary step to combat a "bloated" federal government and reduce wasteful spending.

Kevin Roberts' View on DOGE

1) Praise for Cost-Cutting: Roberts has praised DOGE for its efforts to reduce the federal workforce and identify significant savings. He claimed the department identified \$160 billion in savings and was on track to save a trillion dollars by the end of 2025, though these figures have been disputed by other sources like NPR and independent analyses.

2) Dismantling the Administrative State: He sees DOGE as a key part of the broader Project 2025 initiative (for which the Heritage Foundation published the anthology) to dismantle what he calls the "administrative state" and bring "creative destruction" to Washington bureaucracy.

3) Support for Musk's Methods: Roberts supports Musk's approach, viewing the "sunlight" cast on alleged "abuse, corruption, fraud, and waste" as a positive outcome.

4) Addressing the "Swamp": He views the initiative as a necessary correction to what he describes as intentional corruption and bureaucratic bloat that has affected both parties.

In essence, Roberts is a staunch advocate for Musk's efforts within DOGE, considering it an essential, patriotic step toward a more efficient and fiscally responsible government.

Gee, none of that is true.

Kevin Roberts says that Clinton downsized the program (probably true) but that its NOW going up again. Trump has talked about planting an American flag on the moon. Trump DID give NASA 9.9 million dollars. But again, one needs an intelligent debate about which science to fund and why.

Variety is good since you never know what's going to be important (messenger RNA).

Throughout the book Kevin Roberts proposes some things that are expensive—like the space program. How to pay for them? Higher taxes? I doubt he would say that.

2.7 The Second American Revelation

The first revolution was against the British elites, and the second one will be against elites also.

Was the first one really against the elites, or was it American Elites replacing British Elites? (Howard Zinn has this hypothesis—later in the book Kevin Roberts does not like Howard Zinn but does not refute him either.)

These are reasonable points to bring up, but he does not do so.

And the current revolution is even worse—does he really think that Trump and Musk are not the new elites?

2.8 The New Conservative Movement

Old C movement: Social Traditionalism, Free enterprise, anticommunism

New C movement: Mom, Dad, Kids. So it's a Family First Fusionism

This is cute but also trite.

He says the new C movement has to have a big tent. Really? His book is really small tent.

He again complains about divorce, not enough kids, and (this one is new) families not eating together. Again, look at your leader Trump. Also,

(Page 38) Families that do stick together struggle to make ends meet.

Agreed. It's not clear how he goes from these problems to his solutions and to supporting Trump who has no interest in these issues.

3 Family-First Fusionism

He recounts his rough family life, especially in 1983.

1. His parents got divorced. Here and later he is very much against divorce. This is **not** hypocritical—he has seen how bad divorce can be on families. He criticize people who say **Kids are resilient, they will be fine** and quotes Phil Donahue saying that. He is **RIGHT** about divorce being hard on kids. Neither here nor elsewhere does he ever mention Donald Trump or Ronald Reagan being divorced. Even his support for those two is not necessarily hypocritical but the silence is deafening. I want to know, and **NOT** as a **GOTCHA** moment, what he thinks of his heroes being divorced (especially Trump who cheated on all three of his wives). Also, I am curious to see what solutions he proposes to curb divorce. (Earlier in these notes I had an excerpt from Google-AI where the Heritage foundation does not care about a leaders personal life, followed by another quote where they do. However, I have not found any case of the Heritage Foundation commented on, say, Bill Clinton’s affairs. So I have **NOT** found hypocrisy or bias.)
2. He never says what he would do about divorce. Make it illegal? One approach that was tried but didn’t work: **Covenant Marriage**. In Arizona, Arkansas, and Louisiana you can get married in such a way that its harder to get divorced, so its more of a commitment. When this was first passed Clyde worried that couples when they **FIRST** get married would do it as a Cov marriage and later regret it. The opposite happened—only 1% of all marriages in those states are Cov marriages. This still leaves the question: What can the state do to make divorce less likely?
3. Kevin Robert’s family got government help—subsidized housing and free lunches at school. He is against government help now. Later he seems to be against Federal help and wants instead state or local or just Church help. I’ll address this later when he brings it up.
4. Kevin Robert’s brother got a hold of a gun and committed suicide. Quote from the subsection **Pain which Cannot Forget**
(Page 45) Even though it may have been an impulsive act, a catastrophe such as the suicide of my brother, Doug, was the product of years and

years of cultural decay, lies, and neglect.

While I am sure this is true, the lack of any mention of gun control in a political book which later argues against gun control, is a deafening silence. I expected Kevin Roberts to say **Gun Control would not have helped because . . .** Here is an argument from the web that Gun Control would have helped:

Yes, multiple studies show that Missouri's firearm suicide rates, particularly among young adults, significantly increased after the state repealed its permit-to-purchase (PTP) handgun law in 2007, with research linking the repeal to a substantial rise (around 22%) in firearm suicides for ages 19-24 and overall higher firearm deaths in the state, indicating weakened gun laws are connected to greater firearm mortality.

Key Findings from Studies:

1) Young Adults: A University of Missouri-Kansas City study found a 21.8% increase in firearm suicide rates for Missourians aged 19-24 after the 2007 repeal of the PTP law, a trend that reversed earlier declines.

2) Overall Firearm Deaths: Research from Johns Hopkins and the NIH linked the repeal to a 23.5% increase in firearm suicides and a significant rise in firearm homicides, leading to dozens more deaths annually.

3) Specific Age Groups: Lowering the concealed carry age in 2014 was also associated with increased firearm suicides in both adolescents and young adults, notes this NIH article.

4) Broader Context: Studies consistently show that loosening firearm restrictions, like permit-to-purchase laws, correlates with higher rates of gun violence and suicide, whereas such laws are linked to lower risks, say researchers from Johns Hopkins and ScienceDirect.

5) In essence, data suggests that relaxing Missouri's handgun laws made firearms more accessible, contributing to a measurable rise in firearm suicides and deaths in the state, especially among younger populations..

Since Kevin Roberts' brother committed suicide on impulse when he was young, and the statistics show this is more likely if gun control laws are weak, Kevin Roberts should have addressed the issue.

He could have said the following which was said by a fellow Trumpite:

It's worth it. I think its worth it to have a cost of, unfortunately some gun deaths every single year so that we can have the 2nd amendment to protect our God-given rights. That is a prudent deal. It is rational. Nobody talks like this. They live in a complete alternative universe.

Thats a quote by Charley Kirk. I bring it up NOT to be funny, but to say that Kevin Roberts could have said something similar.

3.1 Family is the Foundation/The First Snake/NEPAtiam

The book discusses the low birth rate. He repeats what he said in the chapter **The perm things**. I won't repeat my rebuttal. He also say **why** a low birth rate is bad:

(Page 47) Unless we reverse our growing culture of despair, we will face insurmountable trade-offs. Every other challenge to the American way of life that we face this century will become more and more difficult. There are already fewer and fewer citizens able to support retirement programs, serve in the military, take care of the elderly, and maintain critical infrastructure. Soon we will be forced to choose between a total dependence on immigrants and a prolonged national senescence [deterioration with age].

1) These are fair points to debate. One could solve the problems of low birth-rate with a sane immigration policy and technology. The alternative is some kind of policy to increase the birth-rate. This document will consider what he considers on that, and the reality, soon.

2) All the problems he mentioned are problems for society, not for the individuals having the children. This makes it hard to solve: people want to do whats best for them, not whats best for society. I am surprised he didn't talk about how wonderful it is to have kids, how they enrich your life, etc.

He proposes some solutions:

He talks about the housing crisis, blames Democrats and Republicans and his solutions are the same ones from **Abundance** (he **does** credit their

article in the Atlantic—their book may not have been written then). Less regulation, make it easier to build and buy houses. Later in the chapter he acknowledges that liberals are coming around to how regulation has blocked their green plans. This is all quite reasonable.

And then, as usual, he says something that shows he is more interested in pursuing his agenda of women-out-of-the-workplace than seriously consider the ideas in **Abundance**.

(Page 49) For any individual household supported by a single income (normally the husbands), a second income would greatly contribute to purchasing better housing in a better neighborhood and better education for the kids. But as more and more women enter the workforce, it just contributes to bidding up the price of housing, child care, and education, higher still, leaving everyone worse off.

Does Kevin Roberts really think that people having MORE money (from a second income) causes prices to go up? I ask non-rhetorically. I don't think this is true (and Kevin Roberts has already given plenty of other reasons housing has gone up) but I willing to be convinced if he gave evidence. But he never gives evidence.

I suspect this is more of an excuse to get women out of the workforce, into the house, and having more babies.

He then looks at medical costs. He says we need less regulation there. He gives an example of a Trump Policy that brought down the cost of dialysis. This seems to be true (I wonder why Trump didn't brag about this one.) Here is article from a valid source:

<https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2019/7/10/20687507/trump-kidney-disease-tra>

However, part of the big beautiful bill (passed after the book was written) undermines Trumps accomplishment. See

<https://www.kidney.org/news-stories/kidney-patient-action-guide-to-trump-s-one>

His main target in this subsection seems to be regulations. Here is one where Kevin Roberts may well be right:

(Page 50) A Heritage Foundation report Diversity University: DE Bloat in the Academy revealed that the Univ of Michigan was spending \$18.1 million on more than 163 DEI personal, almost six per hundred faculty members and more than twice the number of faculty teaching history.

While I am glad to find something that is probably true in this book it makes the rest even sadder- Kevin Roberts CAN give evidence of a problem but mostly chooses not do. This also again shows the problem with Think Tanks—if the Heritage foundation publishes that evidence supports THEIR

point of view, do I believe them?

DEI is a valid target. If only Trump and Musk's approach to education had been to see where waste really was, what was working, what was not working, instead of just destroying the entire academy.

3.2 First Comes Love; When Comes Marriage

The book CORRECTLY points out how costs have gone up making it hard for families to make ends meet, which is hard on a marriage. Here is a quote:

(Page 54) The truth is, changing regulatory demands and Uniparty managerial control exert much more influence over the markets for health care, new cars, new houses, child care, and education than do consumer choice. That's why when the Trump administration instituted policies that reversed globalization, lowered regulatory burden, and unleashed investment, the long stagnation of American working-class wages briefly lifted Bidenomics, rampant spending, and a crackdown on energy production have sent inflation soaring, dragging real wages back to pre-2015 levels.

1. Some sources on the web DO say that real wages went up under Trump:

<https://waysandmeans.house.gov/2020/10/07/trump-tax-cuts-results-part-three>

That from the ways and means committee so may be biased.

2. A journal called **The Conversation** argues that it did not:

<https://theconversation.com/real-pay-data-show-trumps-blue-collar-boom-is->

3. I would think that COVID would distort and affect any study of the issue.
4. Why would reversing globalization help? We have seen the damage of Tariffs (after the book came out).
5. That there was inflation under Biden is correct. I don't think Biden *cracked down on energy production* but I am willing to believe that if he gave some evidence.

A quote that blames both parties:

(Page 57) They (DC conservatives) won't stand up for reality of one-man one-women marriage, the reality that every child needs a mother and a father, or the reality that men and women want different things.

And they wring their hands when you talk about materially supporting working families, easing their burden, recognizing the real costs and difficulties of raising kids, supporting women who want to be house makers, or building an economy of stable jobs for marriageable men.

1. Kevin Roberts won't stand up for the reality of gay couples existing.
2. One can easily take his paragraph for supporting many liberal policies that he does not support: family leave act, subsidized child care, others. He needs a coherent economic policy and does not have one. He later talks a lot about tariffs but that has the problem of raising prices.

3.3 An Abundance Agenda for American Families

Some of this is from the Abundance book (Kevin Roberts DOES credit Klein and Thompson for an article on the topic—the book Abundance came out later).

Kevin Roberts claims that countries can reverse the birth dearth. Here is a quote:

(Page 59) What you see in countries that have increased the birth rate (Israel, Hungary, Georgia) is a combination of serious social family policy and a culture that cherishes children and upholds a mission of national renewal. . . . Today Hungary, the world's leader in family policy, spends up to 6 percent of its DDP on measures to encourage family formation and the raising of children. But these policies, where they work, operate not by nudging parents but by changing the culture.

1. Later in the book (Page 72) he says that economic incentives do not work and more is needed—a wealthier society. It is hard so square helping families and the economy to weather economic storms and do well with his anti-gov stance.
2. See my comment under **The Permanent Things**.
3. Fact Check: Hungary: The birth rate really did go from 1.2 to 1.6 from 2010 to 2020. But then it went down to 1.4. Here is an article from **The American Enterprise Institute** about this here:

<https://www.aei.org/op-eds/hungarys-government-is-trying-to-make-more-bab>

It looks like the policies didn't really help.

4. **The Economist** had articles on this. Their conclusion was that the amount of money Hungary (and other countries) are spending on raising the birthrate is much larger than any benefit they may get. To be fair, they are only looking the issue **economically**, whereas Kevin Roberts is looking at other issues as well (not clear what they are).
5. Fact Check: Georgia (the country). Here the policies seem to have really helped raise the birth rate. The policies were a combination of economic and social, with social being that if a married couple has a 3rd child (prob also beyond that) then the head of the Georgian Orthodox Church will personally baptize the baby. The following excerpt from Google-AI is about the baptism but leaves out the economic incentives that I will get to later:

Yes, Georgia's efforts, primarily led by Patriarch Ilia II's initiative to personally baptize third and subsequent children, significantly increased the country's birth rate, creating a notable "baby boom" starting around 2008, boosting fertility rates and encouraging larger families, especially among Orthodox families, though long-term trends and broader economic factors also play a role.

Key Aspects of the Effort:

- 1) *Patriarchal Initiative (2007/2008): The head of the Georgian Orthodox Church, Patriarch Ilia II, pledged to personally baptize the third (and subsequent) children of married Orthodox couples.*
- 2) *Cultural Significance: Being a godchild of the Patriarch is a great honor in Georgia, motivating many families to have more children.*

Results of the Initiative:

- 1) *Sharp Birth Rate Increase: After years of low fertility, Georgia saw a significant jump in births, with numbers rising from around 49,000 in 2007 to 63,000 by 2009.*
- 2) *Focus on Higher Birth Orders: The increase was particularly pronounced in third and higher-order births, directly aligning with the Patriarch's pledge.*
- 3) *Measurable Impact: Studies found a substantial increase in the national total fertility rate (around 17%) and much larger boosts for Georgian Orthodox women's birth rates.*

4) *Beyond Economic Factors: The boom occurred during a period of weak economic growth, suggesting the religious and cultural campaign had a strong, independent effect.*

In Summary: *The religiously-inspired campaign successfully stimulated a demographic shift, leading to a notable rise in births and influencing family size decisions in Georgia, demonstrating the power of cultural capital in affecting social change.*

The economic incentives in American Dollars are here:

<https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/BOOKCLUBNOTES/gbirth.pdf>

or below:

- 1) Monthly benefit (means-tested) of around \$70 a month until the kid is 16.
- 2) One time bonus for third and later children of around \$375.
- 3) Four months paid maternity leave.
- 4) Up to 2 years Parental leave, but only a small portion is paid.

Upshot: A combination of MILD economic incentives (compared to other countries) and a cultural dimension (not available in other countries) worked.

For more see here:

<https://ifstudies.org/blog/in-georgia-a-religiously-inspired-baby-boom#:~:text=In%202007%2C%20Patriarch%20Ilia%20II%20of%20the,cultural%20capital%20to%20effect%20targeted%20social%20changes>

6. Fact Check Israel: YES, the incentives are working there:

Yes, Israel's pro-natalist incentives, including generous child allowances, subsidized fertility treatments (like IVF), tax breaks, and strong cultural support for large families, have been highly effective, contributing to its status as a developed nation with one of the highest birth rates globally, though debates exist about long-term efficacy and impact across different communities. These policies work in conjunction with deep cultural values, a post-Holocaust imperative, and security concerns to foster a societal norm of frequent childbearing, particularly within Jewish communities.

How Incentives Work:

- 1) **Financial Aid:** Monthly child allowances (Bituach Leumi payments) increase with each child, alongside tax breaks, providing significant direct financial support.
- 2) **Fertility Support:** Extensive public funding for treatments like IVF makes having children more accessible, notes The Christian Science Monitor and Reddit users.
- 3) **Workplace & Childcare:** Broad access to childcare and supportive workplace policies reduce barriers for parents.
- 4) **Cultural & Social Norms:** A strong cultural emphasis on family, national identity (Jewish demographic security), and religious values (especially in Haredi communities) reinforce high fertility, says The Yale Review of International Studies and Mercator.

Evidence of Success:

- 1) Israel boasts the highest population growth rate in the developed world, with families averaging over 3 children, far exceeding typical Western rates, reports The Christian Science Monitor and Reddit users.
- 2) Studies show financial incentives have a statistically significant positive effect on fertility, particularly for lower-income households, notes IZA - Institute of Labor Economics.

Nuances:

- 1) While policies boost overall rates, the degree of success differs; some argue benefits become less effective as people get used to them, while others point to strong religious and cultural drivers, notes AFR and Reddit users.
- 2) In essence, Israel's approach is a successful blend of financial support and deeply ingrained societal values that make having children a national priority, says Mercator.

My take Away:

- 1) Kevin Roberts claimed the policies worked in Hungary, Georgia, and Israel. This is not correct. The policies worked in Georgia and Israel. I am surprised he made this mistake since the truth helps **his**

point—Georgia did it with a combination of **cultural** and **Financial** incentives. Could that work in America? That is an interesting discussion that I think he would want to have.

2) For Israel, and I've read it elsewhere, that one obstacle to women having children is that its bad for their career. Family leave policies (Israel has those) can make that easier. Telework might make that easier. But Kevin Roberts is **against** the government having such policies—though the Heritage Foundation, to its credit, does have those policies.

7. It is not at all clear how the government can change the culture, and even if it should. The book does give some ideas on this but they all end up being economic ideas from abundance or (later in the book) minor things like removing the tax on diapers.
8. I disagree with the fact that a low birth rate is a problem.

3.4 The Second Snake: Culture Changing Technology

He is against Contraception. Really!

(Pages 63—64) It's true that contraception gives families more control over when they have children. But the creators of the technologies wanted to go much further than controlling a natural process; they wanted everyone in our culture, regardless of their beliefs about contraception, that having kids is an optional individual choice instead of a social expectation or a transcendent gift.

1. I don't think the people who first thought about contraception thought that far ahead. In fact, one of the scientists who worked on the pill, John Rock, was a Catholic who thought the church should accept the Pill since it was similar to the Rhythm method which they did accept. I asked Google if the Catholic church should accept the pill since it is similar to the rhythm method. Here is what I got:

While some, like Catholic physician John Rock, argued the Pill was similar to the rhythm method (Natural Family Planning) because it used natural hormones and could regulate cycles for better NFP use, the Catholic Church officially rejected this view, teaching that artificial contraception, including the

Pill, separates the unitive and procreative aspects of sex, making it morally impermissible, whereas NFP only involves abstaining during fertile periods, preserving the integrity of the marital act. Pope Paul VI's 1968 encyclical *Humanae Vitae* reaffirmed the ban on artificial contraception, distinguishing it from the Church-approved NFP.

Arguments for the Pill (from some Catholic perspectives/early debates):

- 1) **Similar Hormones:** The Pill uses hormones naturally present in the body, leading some to see it as an "extension of nature".
- 2) **Regulating Cycles:** The Pill could make the rhythm method more effective by regularizing irregular cycles, making it a tool for the "allowed" NFP.
- 3) **"Pill-Established Safe Period":** Dr. John Rock argued the Pill created a reliable "safe period," morally equivalent to the rhythm method's goal.

Catholic Church Teaching (Official Stance):

- 1) **Distinction from NFP:** The Church differentiates between NFP (abstaining during fertile times) and artificial contraception (using barriers or hormones).
- 2) **Integrity of the Act:** Artificial contraception frustrates the natural procreative potential of the sexual act, which the Church views as intrinsically evil, violating the natural law of sexuality.
- 3) ***Humanae Vitae* (1968):** Pope Paul VI's encyclical explicitly condemned artificial contraception, allowing only for NFP (also called the "rhythm method") to regulate births when necessary.
- 4) **Openness to Life:** All marital intercourse must remain open to the transmission of life; contraception separates the unitive (love) and procreative (life) purposes of sex.

Conclusion: Despite the theological arguments made by figures like John Rock, the official teaching of the Catholic Church, solidified in *Humanae Vitae*, maintains that the Pill is a form

of artificial contraception and morally impermissible, unlike the Church-approved practice of Natural Family Planning (formerly the rhythm method).

2. I think its a good think that having kids is NOT a given. In the old days it was an obligation.
3. Does he want to ban contraception? I asked Google-AI.

Kevin Roberts, president of The Heritage Foundation and the architect of the Project 2025 initiative, has expressed a strong cultural opposition to contraception, but has not explicitly called for an outright federal law banning it. He has, however, described outlawing birth control as the "hardest" political battle facing conservatives and urges "radical incrementalism" to achieve related policy objectives.

Roberts' views and the associated Project 2025 plan focus on dismantling the culture surrounding birth control, rather than an immediate, comprehensive ban:

1) Cultural Opposition: In his forthcoming book, Dawn's Early Light, Roberts "rails against birth control," calling contraceptive technologies "revolutionary inventions that shape American culture away from abundance, marriage, and family". He argues that having children should be viewed as a "social expectation or a transcendent gift" rather than an "optional individual choice".

2) Policy Recommendations: The Project 2025 blueprint does not explicitly call for a nationwide ban on all birth control, but it does propose actions that would severely restrict access. These include:

a) Removing requirements under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) that insurance plans cover contraception at no cost, which would allow employers to drop coverage, including for emergency contraception like Plan B.

b) Promoting "fertility awareness" programs (e.g., ovulation tracking and abstinence) as an alternative to more reliable contraception methods.

c) Potentially utilizing the Comstock Act, a 19th-century anti-vice law, to criminalize the mailing and receiving of abortion and potentially some birth control medications.

2) "Radical Incrementalism": Roberts advocates for a strategy of "radical incrementalism," pushing for small legislative victories that can gradually advance the ultimate goal of restricting access to contraception and other reproductive choices.

In essence, while Roberts has voiced a deeply critical, anti-contraception worldview, his stated political strategy involves a step-by-step approach to restrict access through regulatory changes and legal challenges rather than a single, sweeping ban.

4. Birthrates declined because people in a more advanced society do not need more farmhands to run the farm. That may be a bigger factor than contraception.
5. Kevin Roberts later claims that contraception made abortion rates go up, not down, since people see children as a choice. That would be interesting if true. Its not:

<https://divisionofresearch.kaiserpermanente.org/contraception-aca/>

How can I take a book seriously if some of its facts can be debunked with a simple Google search?

3.5 Procreative Technologies/The Third Snake: Anti-family Propaganda

Keeper is a dating site aimed at being a marriage app—find someone to marry. I have read that online dating has begun to be more specialized, so this is one more of those. Does it work? I looked it up- it gets 4.5 stars out of 5, so thats a good sign. It uses AI.

The book suggests bringing back the sabbath as a day of rest and to not do work. I think he may have a very good point—life is to hectic and we may need a day off. But how to really do it? Some communities do it voluntarily. Blue laws are not mentioned, and I suspect they would not work.

Our culture and entertainment are anti-family, unwanted pregnancies, unhappy marriages. I HAVE noticed that

(1) there are very few happy marriages on TV shows, and

(2) couples sleeping together or living together before marriage is not just common, its incredibly non-controversial.

On **Wheel of Fortune** they routinely have things like:

PAT: Steve, tell us who is rooting for you?,

STEVE: My husband Bob who is in the audience.

For a very brief time there were some comments on this but now it does not raise any comments.

Even less controversial:

PAT: Steve, tell us who is rooting for you?,

STEVE: My girlfriend Alice and our two kids Bill and Susan.

Pat Sajak is very conservative so I wonder what he thinks of Gay couples on his show. Or couples who live together.

SIDE NOTE: They also have inter-racial couples on both fiction shows and game shows, without anyone caring—I wonder when that tide changed.

I looked it up:

The shift towards the non-controversial inclusion of interracial couples on television was not a single event but a gradual process that gained momentum in the 2000s and 2010s, eventually becoming mainstream and routine. This change was influenced by several key moments and legal decisions over several decades.

Key Milestones in Interracial Representation on TV

1) 1950s: I Love Lucy (1951) featured Lucille Ball and Desi Arnez, a real-life Cuban American man and a white woman, as a married couple. While they faced some industry pushback at the time, their on-screen marriage helped break early barriers for a Latino man in a leading role.

2) 1967: The U.S. Supreme Court’s landmark decision in Loving v. Virginia struck down all state laws banning interracial marriage, legalizing these unions across the country and providing a legal foundation for social change.

3) 1968: The Star Trek episode ”Plato’s Stepchildren” featured the first scripted Black-white kiss on American network television between Captain Kirk (William Shattner) and Lieutenant Uhura (Nichelle Nichols). Though the kiss was involuntary within the storyline (forced by aliens) and some Southern stations refused

to air the episode, it was a groundbreaking cultural moment that challenged existing norms.

4) 1970s: The sitcom *The Jeffersons* (1975) featured Tom and Helen Willis, a Black wife and white husband, as a married couple whose relationship was a recurring, though often comedic, point of discussion. This was considered daring for the era's primetime television.

5) 1990s-2000s: The mid-1990s saw an increase in interracial couples in advertising as a shorthand for diversity, signaling a subtle shift in market perception and public readiness.

6) 2010s and Beyond: The "tide turned" when shows began featuring interracial couples where their race was not the primary storyline or the source of conflict. Popular shows like *Grey's Anatomy*, *Modern Family*, and *Parenthood* routinely included interracial and multi-ethnic families without "making a big deal" about the characters' different races, reflecting a burgeoning social acceptance.

Today, seeing interracial couples across a wide variety of programming, from teen dramas to commercials, is commonplace and generally non-controversial, a reflection of changing American demographics and cultural attitudes.

Kevin Roberts says that the acceptance of childless couples is a plot:

(Page 68) Our elites are actively antagonistic to promoting normal family formation in the common culture (they don't want to "exclude" or "shame" anybody!), but of course they practice married parenting in their private lives.

1. AGREE that entertainment is anti the usual sort of 2-hetero people married with 2-3 or more kids.
2. That its a actual conspiracy is odd. It could just be that unhappy families are more interesting and the ratings are higher. He **does** object to the free market producing such stuff, and criticizes conservatives who worship the invisible hand of the market. But the usual problem—what to do about that? One approach is to have cable channels that only have shows with Christian values. There are a few of those; however, they don't get many viewers.
3. That the elite live actually practice married parenting is odd since he seems to be criticizing them for doing what he considers the right

thing. Also, I think he is wrong about that: In Hollywood there are MANY divorces and people living together (My Uncle Irwin is a Movie producer, married to his wife Margo for 66 years. Margo tells me that at parties she is the ONLY first wife. Everyone else is on their third wife at least. One counter: Alan Alda has been married for 67 years.)

3.6 Making a Home Is Real Work

He wants women to have the choice of working at home.

(Page 70) But having more women working isn't axiomatically good, because large numbers of women with kids at home prefer to support their own families as homemakers or to work part time (over 70 percent, according to one recent study from the Institute of Family Studies).

1. I reinterpret what he begins with as an interesting question: **Is a society better off if women stay home raising the kids.**
2. So 70 percent of women with kids want to be homemakers. That is interesting if true.

A Gallup poll says that 56% want to stay at work

<https://news.gallup.com/poll/267737/record-high-women-prefer-working-homen.aspx>

I find it really bad that he sites facts that are debunked with one google search. However, that 34% want to be stay-at-home moms IS impressive and he should have gone with the truth.

3. The problem with using the **a large number of Americans want X** argument is that if later (or now in this case) **a large number of Americans do not want X** then you need to go along with that. In 1960 96% of Americans were against black-white marriage.
4. The pressure on women to work outside the house is social and economic. In the past the pressure to NOT work outside the house was social, economic, and LEGAL- for example, law schools could legally NOT take women.

Here are some of Kevin Roberts' thoughts

1. *(Page 71) The Left's approach to family policy is simple: to pretend that women's work at home counts for nothing and should be actively discouraged, and so build policies that actively reward two-income households, and child care in state-regulated day cares.*

He is trying to solve a very hard problem. Lets say he is right and its better for society to have women as housewives.

What do to about that? Have ads showing being a housewife in a more positive light? There is a tradwife movement that encourages women to marry young and have kids but also to drop out of college. Thats not good, especially if later their husband dumps them for a younger model and they are left without any job skills.

What about women who don't want to? What kind of policies would help this?

I can think of one: a **paid** family leave act. Which Republicans blocked. See next point.

2. *(Page 71) We also need to find regulations that trap women into coming back to work. Today the family and medical leave act (FMLA), punishes mothers who choose to leave the workforce afterwards, requiring them to pay back thousands of dollars of medicaid care premiums (whereas someone using FMLA for an injury has no such requirements)*

So he wants a better FMLA. So do Democrats.

3. *(Page 72) ... having a huge family is about valuing children in and of themselves above a more comfortable lifestyle.* He assumes that this is a good thing to do. He never says why. He has said in person that families should be willing to get by with less so they can have kids.

1) That is what the USSR used to tell its people—get by with less.

2) That is what Donald Trump is telling people so they wont' blame him for inflation.

3) Kevin Roberts makes \$600,000 and has four kids. He is in no position to tell people to make do with less. He was raised poor so I wonder why he has no sympathy.

4. Now my thought: There are women who don't want kids, women who can't have kids, families that really NEED the second income. He seems to ignore these important issues.

3.7 Creative Abundance over Nihilistic Decadence

The Heritage foundation has generous maternity-leave and paternity-leave policies. That is so woke :-). They are in a bind here:

1. They think that companies should be more family friendly.
2. They do not want the government interfering.

However, he does give examples of pro-family policies that some states have done:

1. 24 states have removed all sales taxes in disposable diapers.
2. Tennessee provides free diapers (a state medicaid program) for half a year.
3. Post-Dobbs, some states have expanded Medicaid to help needy pregnant mothers and babies.
4. Massachusetts introduced the first universal tax credit for children and other dependent family members, which has since been expanded with bipartisan support to remove the cap on the number of children it provides for. [That is so woke which is why it came from the communist state of Massachusetts.]
5. States are partnering with pregnancy resource centers. BUT, to quote the web

Pregnancy resource centers (PRCs), also known as crisis pregnancy centers (CPCs) and pro-life pregnancy centers, are anti-abortion nonprofit organizations that offer services like pregnancy tests and ultrasounds to dissuade pregnant individuals from choosing abortion. While they present themselves as legitimate healthcare facilities, they are often unregulated, not subject to medical standards or confidentiality laws, and lack legally obligated medical staff, according to organizations like the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG). These centers prioritize their anti-abortion agenda over evidence-based care, potentially providing misinformation and withholding comprehensive information about all

reproductive options, including abortion, contraception, and adoption.

I wonder if planned parenthood would do a better job.

6. He does criticize wax museum conservatives for only giving lip service to helping families.
7. State family tax credits for families. Isn't that the dreaded social engineering that conservatives usually object to? The book seems to mostly be against regulation and go spending unless its for families. That is **not** hypocritical, however he needs to say why this is an exception.

A general problem with the book is that his plans here require money but he never talks about raising taxes or closing tax loopholes to pay for it. The Big beautiful bill cut taxes even more.

Another question is: Do Americans actually want this?

4 Schools Should Teach Piety

His main point is that education has been destroyed in many ways. He has some points to make here that are reasonable and some that are not.

4.1 A Century Long Conspiracy

1. The book claims that John Dewey sought to change the educational system and quote Dewey as saying aspiring to **the fundamental method of social progress and reform**. I suspect that's true but I'm not sure if it's bad.
2. *(Page 80) Dewey and others made the case that liberal arts and Western tradition were not useful to a modern industrial society and the school should instead focus on teaching methods and skills such as critical thinking and training in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Once education has been emptied of anything substantive from the American tradition (in the name of mere technique), a new philosophy of moral formation could quietly take place.*
 - (a) Yes, the liberal arts have had a diminished place. There are many factors here. (a) He says a conspiracy for social progress and reform. (b) More jobs in STEM. (c) A correction or perhaps over-correction for a very biased view of American History (Manifest Destiny is good, slaves were treated well, Lost Cause mythology, we were on the right side of the Alamo—see my notes on the last chapter for more about that). What puzzles me is the book **Everything you learned in school is wrong** that we read for bookclub a while back says that schools STILL are whitewashed and shallow.
 - (b) His description of Oregon schools: *(Page 81) Traditional US Civics accounts for only 1/6 of overall graduation requirements. The rest is taken up by modules in such areas as Ethnic studies, Tribal History, Genocide Studies, focusing on concept such as “identity” and “resistance” in which the teachers are instructed to “discuss incidents and types of oppression” making sure to “attend to trauma-informed and social emotional learning.” One student I spoke to said that in lieu of a traditional Freshman history class they did*

a yearlong seminar on the radical leftist historian Howard Zinn's "A People's History of the United States" This DOES seem problematic. Harvard has had the same problem with its core, or lack of a core.

- (c) Kevin Roberts complains, and rightly so, about students wanting to take down a stature of George Washington (probably GW has slaves), but Kevin Roberts has not a word to say about confederate war statues which is a more interesting question. Kevin Roberts' silence on this issue is deafening. (I realize this is repetitive for what I said in Section 2.1 which you should look at. but if I am repetitive its because Kevin Roberts is repetitive.)
- (d) **Howard Zinn**—I got his book out of the library. There are some things I agree with, some things that I disagree with. However, he gives actual arguments and intelligent discussing, no ad hominem attacks, no tossing in irrelevant biased side comments, unlike this book. So if I want to read a book that I disagree with to get an intelligent opposing viewpoint, Howard Zinn's book is far better than this book.
- (e) A course in American History using Zinn's book AND a more traditional, perhaps even conservative book, would be good.

4.2 Rule 1: Tradition is Oppressive

This is one of the strangest sections of the book, as you will see.

He first recounts growing up in Louisiana as a Cajun.

1. Huey Long was the governor. He says that Huey Long was a progressive and used the anti-trust laws, but never says if thats bad (that may be implied) or what the issue was. Later in the book Kevin Roberts wants to somehow break up Google and other Liberal companies but does not want to use anti-trust laws. This is typical: He wants to do some things that only the Gov can do, but doesn't want to use the Gov. ANYWAY-not sure what Huey Long using Anti-Trust has to do with the Liberals thinking that tradition is oppressive.
2. Huey Long was hostile to Cajuns (*Page 83*) *He viewed our way of life as fundamentally backwards.* I wonder if Kevin Roberts values Hispanics that way. Native Americans? African Americans?

3. *(Page 83) The Louisiana Constitution of 1921 (overseen by state elites, including the Progressive governor) had banned Cajun French from being taught in the schools. Huey Long went a step further. [Huey Long made all of the textbooks English, not French]*

MY THOUGHT: Pat Buchanan, who Kevin Roberts admires, wanted to make English the OFFICIAL language of the United States:

Here is a video of Pat B's add when he was running for prez:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pUgTDmD4vW4>

Here are two more articles about this.

<https://www.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/10/10/latimes.buchanan/index.html>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meatballs_\(advertisement\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Meatballs_(advertisement))

NOTE: I had this thought BEFORE reading later on that same page.

4. Later on that same page he brings in Pat Buchanan as someone who would have been AGAINST banning French.

(Page 83–84) Pat Buchanan, writing 20 years ago, saw the Conditioners aimed to do to all of America what Huey Long and the Progressive movement had tried to do to the Cajuns. Of the cultural carnage wreaked by the Left's march through our institutions. Buchanan observed:

“Destroy the record of a people's past, leave it in ignorance of who its ancestors were and what they did, and one can fill the empty vessels of their souls with a new history, as in 1984. Dishonor or disgrace a nation's heroes, and you can demoralize it's people”

So if Hispanics want to keep their language, or Blacks want to remember the evils of slavery, then Pat B and Kevin Roberts should support that. I doubt they do. What about the Native Americans whose culture was obliterated and who were massacred and cheated **far more** than Kevin Roberts' comparatively minor problem of French not being allowed anymore.

Kevin Roberts sounds woke—wanting to keep his own culture rather than assimilate.

I googled "What does Kevin Roberts think of Americans Treatment of Native Americans"

Kevin Roberts, president of the Heritage Foundation, generally avoids specific public comment on the historical treatment of Native Americans. One analysis of his book, Dawn's Early Light, noted that he "never mentions Jan 6, slavery, the USA's treatment of Native Americans, actual racism, Trumps morality, or anything that will jeopardize his points".

His public statements and the policy positions of the Heritage Foundation tend to focus on modern conservative principles, such as:

1) Individual rights and limited government: His general philosophy emphasizes individual liberties and reducing the size of the administrative state, though explicit application to historical Native American issues is not typically made.

2) Sovereignty: While he has not commented directly on historical treatment, the topic of tribal sovereignty is a contemporary issue with varying views across the political spectrum.

3) A positive view of American history: Roberts generally promotes an optimistic view of the American founding and expresses concern that children are being taught to be "ashamed of our country, founded as it is on racism and sexism," suggesting a belief that the U.S. Constitution and founding principles are inherently sound and not fundamentally defined by these historical wrongdoings.

Note that ChatGPT quotes *My document about his book!*. I then asked ChatGPT if it knows who asked the question and hence may use that in its answer. It does not! I think this says more about ChatGPT than about my expertise on the book. It may be that I had the only document that had the words **Kevin Roberts** and *Native Americans* in the same sentence.

5 The Economy Should Serve the Country

This chapter is part Bernie Sanders, part deranged-MAGA, and part some policy ideas that may be good but seem at odds with Trump.

5.1 Globalist Capitalism and Socialism are the Same/Managerial Rev/New Road to Serfdom

1. In an earlier era American businessmen were loyal to America and to their community, they themselves had worked in the industry and had sympathy and understanding for their workers. Now they are all managers who only care about short-term earnings and disdain the workers.

Kevin Robert mentions Rockefeller and DuPont and other Robber barons positively—this is a nostalgia for an age that never was. Later he agrees with Theodore Roosevelt breaking them up. He may be confused.

2. He complains about nepotism and crony capitalism. Later looking at his solutions one can deduce that he is against corporate welfare and other ways the government helps business.
3. When he tries to say that Global Cap is Socialism he babbles:

(Page 104) Behind the seemingly capitalism facade of global corporatism lies, simply, socialism. The most sophisticated model of socialism, including Schumpeter, have understood that some elements of classical socialism ideas, such as public ownership of the means of production and centralized economic planning by government boards, are incidental to its essence. What is important is its aspiration: the effectual control and micromanagement of production decisions to achieve social goals and re-engineer society.

The ends towards which socialism works have proven to be remarkably flexible, encompassing August Comte's scientific society Karl Marx's proletarian paradise Paul Ehrlich's demographic doomerism and AOC's Green New Deal. Socialism's polestar is its means: bureaucratic management oriented towards "rational" planning objectives decided upon by a technocratic elite perched on the commanding heights of society.

My response:

- (a) Socialism **is** when the gov owns the means of production. It **is not** about **bureaucratic management oriented towards “rational” planning objectives**. The sad thing here is that he may have a legit complaint here, but by calling it socialism he derails his own argument.
- (b) I think this is a case of taking something he does not like and labeling it socialism.
- (c) I honestly wonder what he would think if the goals being worked for are one that he liked.
- (d) He later goes on an ANTI-DEI and ANTI-ESG rant without saying why either is bad. On DEI I probably agree with him but he never gives a coherent argument against it or even define what it is (this is a problem with the entire book). On ESG I disagree with him since, call me a radical, I believe that global warming is happening and caused by people and can be slowed with the right mix of policies.
- (e) Why would businessman intentionally push the Green New Deal or DEI or ESG? They would not.
- (f) Trump has arranged for the government to have 10% of intel. Bush bailed out companies. Nixon had wage and price controls. That all seems like socialism to me. Some of Obama’s and Biden’s policies might also be socialism, but they don’t claim to be anti-big-gov.

5.2 The Managerial Rev Costs Are Invisible Because They Are Immeasurable

1. Complains on how GDP and other eco stats are measured and used. Here is a paragraph that is correct but biased

(Page 106) When the Chinese Comm. Party opens a Confucius Inst, GDP goes up. When a mom who wants to stay home can no longer afford to do so she joins the workforce, GDP goes up. When a municipal Gov. uses taxpayer money to house illegal immigrants in a hotel for months, GDP goes up. When a meth addict breaks a car window

to steal camera equipment and the beleaguered photographer dips into savings to repair the the window and buy new equipment then GDP goes up. In fact, almost anytime spiritual decay in American life requires the government or private sector to do something that our culture and community once provided, GDP goes up.

He could have picked more neutral examples, but they would not have made his final point. For example.

When a scientist on a gov grant makes a discovery that leads to a product, GDP goes up.

2. The stats are good but Americans don't feel good because the stats are measuring the wrong thing. THIS IS TRUE. But Donald Trump's firing the head of Labor Stats because he didn't like the numbers is a far better example. So is Trump just SAYING that inflation is down when its not. To be fair, the book was written before Trump took office.

Economists of all stripes are united in being against the firing. See either this article:

<https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/5435327-economists-alarm-trump>

or read the following from Google-AI

Economists across the political spectrum widely objected to President Trump's August 2025 firing of Erika McEntarfer, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The move, which followed a weaker-than-expected jobs report, raised significant concerns about the potential politicization of independent and nonpartisan federal economic data.

Reasons for Objection

Economists, policymakers, and former BLS officials, including those appointed by previous Republican administrations, condemned the firing as a dangerous precedent that could undermine the credibility and integrity of the U.S. statistical system.

Key points of objection included:

- 1) **Threat to Data Integrity:** McEntarfer's dismissal, the first time a president had fired the head of the BLS, was seen as

an intentional harm to the integrity of U.S. economic data. Critics warned that if the data is no longer reliable, the country would be "flying blind" in making policy and business decisions.

2) **Politicization of an Independent Agency:** The BLS operates as a nonpartisan agency, and its data is a cornerstone of informed economic decision-making. Economists argued that firing the chief statistician for releasing data the president did not like was a move typical of autocracies and "banana republics," not an advanced economy.

3) **Loss of Trust:** Experts warned that a loss of public trust in economic statistics, as seen in countries like Argentina and Greece, could lead to severe economic consequences, including higher inflation and increased borrowing costs

4) **Nomination Concerns:** The subsequent nomination of EJ Antoni, a conservative economist and vocal critic of the BLS from the Heritage Foundation, was also met with criticism, with many questioning his suitability for a historically nonpartisan role.

The consensus among many economists was that ignoring or attacking unfavorable data does not make economic problems disappear; instead, it damages the U.S.'s credibility in the global market.

3. Hard to start a small business with the gov helping big business. To his credit he does blame wax-museum conservatives for this. But his solutions later are pathetic to the task.

5.3 A Fake Economy Creates Weak People/Why Everything is Coordinated

1. He complains that the economy is no longer based on material things. But he later gives as an example of a good company, one that provides labor market data, so also not material things. Undermines his own point.

2. He complains about companies having to follow stupid HR rules and having to issue statements about the George Floyd Riots. He may have a point here, but see my next point.
3. For DEI and ESG and other things he doesn't like there is a clear distinction he never makes:
 - (a) If a company decides ON THEIR OWN that DEI is good (e.g., they notice there are many intelligent women who are not being hired because they are women, so they hire them, perhaps at a lower salary than they would men) he should NOT object to that. That is a company doing what it thinks it should do to make money. Trump and Musk seem to want to make it illegal for a PRIVATE company to do DEI stuff. That is against laissez-fair principles.
 - (b) If the GOVERNMENT imposes DEI requirements on its own agencies or on companies, that IS something to object to.
 - (c) A middle ground is, say, a company that gets grants from the government.
4. I might agree with him about the Government imposing DEI, but he would make a better argument if he clarifying the distinction.

I am reminded of the following—some private companies think they will get more business if they say HAPPY HOLIDAY instead of MERRY CHRISTMAS. Yet FOX NEWS brings out the false **War on Christmas** narrative.
5. Objects to companies doing DEI and ESG and PRIDE MONTH all lockstep. Would he object if they all did Christian things lock step?
6. (This is throughout the book) He uses the word woke so much it seems to just mean things he does not like.
7. The following quote puzzles me

(Page 113) After decades of sending tens of billions of dollars to New York City Financiers with no strings attached, adding fuel to the fire of woke capital, last year the state of Florida instituted sweeping restrictions on state investment funds that are designed to protect the interests of everyday Floridians, especially by eliminating ESG investments.

I wonder if the first part is true, and if so, what does it have to do with ESG? This passage isn't so much wrong as incoherent.

5.4 A Revolutionary Response

1. Kevin Robert says that the founders would have hated the current state of affairs. I wonder if we care what the founders would have liked or disliked. Thomas Jefferson was worried about the dead hand of history guiding the future.
2. Kevin Robert gives an example of something the founders did hate: The British East India Company had complete control of the Tea market. But see next point.
3. He talks about the Boston Tea Party and gets it right, which most books do not. (Though his presentation is muddled) The colonists were protesting a DECREASE in Tariffs on Tea which was bad for local merchants.

This Schoolhouse Rock video shows what is commonly taught about the Boston Tea Party and its incorrect (Its a very short part of the song).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wv0Zs3g3qIo>

4. He mentions Teddy Roosevelt taking on corruption and anti-trust. This is correct. He seems to avoid two points
 - (a) In an early chapter his complaint was that in an earlier era American Companies were PRO America, including the Robber Barons. Now he is against them.
 - (b) Later in the book he is shy about using anti-trust. This is his usual dilemma: He wants to DO SOMETHING to make America work, but as a conservative he wants a small government. But see next point.
 - (c) He DOES want stop trusts that are government protected. This is CORRECT and GOOD, no undermining here. But he doesn't quite know what to do about big corporations that are not protected by the government.

5.5 The Future of our Prosperity/The Ownership Society/Rebuilding

1. *(Page 115) The best conservative approach towards Unions, government interference in business, and woke capitalism works towards one goal: The restoration of American Ownership in dynamic companies founded in real communities.*
 - (a) He should like Unions in that its a way for workers to get their fair share. There ARE arguments against them, but he does not make those arguments.
 - (b) Gov Interference in Business– some interference (e.g., Tariffs) he would like, some he wouldn't so for him this is to much of a broad stroke.
 - (c) What is woke Capitalism?
 - (d) American Ownership is a very hard to define concept now. There are foreign companies with factories in America, supporting American jobs. Cars are now made from parts from different countries, so much so that Car companies are against th Trump Tariffs (prob against the tariffs on car PARTS but for the Tariffs on cars).
 - (e) Recently there was a Hyndai factory in the state of GEORGIA that had 300 South Koreans there to help install stuff. Everything they were doing was legal. Even so ICE raided them and they will likely be going back to South Korea. This will COST Americans their jobs. This might be Trump being petty since he doesn't like that the Rep Gov of Georgia, Brian Kemp, refused to find the votes for him to win in 2020.
 - (f) What is a **real community**? I think he wants to go back to small towns where everyone knows you name. Nostalgia, perhaps for an era that never was, or never was as good as he paints it. Company towns were like that and were awful.
2. He claims that big companies only concerned with the bottom line have hampered innovation. He is probably right about that. But Tariffs also hamper innovation.

3. (Page 119) *For every Hillsdale College or Univ of Texas at Austin there were dozens of institutions coasting on huge subsidies in the form of student loans and credential inflation while failing to deliver a transformative education experience for their students. Many students waste their years in school and end up learning on the job anyway.*

That's why the Heritage Foundation recommended, in our Project 2025, that Congress pass legislation prohibiting automatic algorithmics filtering by educational level in hiring, at least for positions in which a professional degree isn't required by law (such as nurses, doctors, and structural engineers).

- (a) The first paragraph may well be true. However, the two examples he gives are odd. Hillsdale is a conservative Christian liberal arts college. They rank 50th for liberal arts colleges (I do not know if that's good, but it might be). By contrast Haverford (which he does not mention) is a non-religious (even leftist) liberal arts college. It ranked 8th. He wants to equate Conservative Christian with Good School. One red flag from Wikipedia: **In October 2023, two female students sued the college after reporting instances of sexual assault from male students. They accused the college of performing a phony investigation and then blaming them for being raped.** Haverford has no such scandals.

The University of Texas at Austin is a fine school, but since they get state funding, I thought he wouldn't like that. I wonder if he meant **University of Austin**.

Hillsdale does not take federal funding and Haverford does.

- (b) Prohibit automatic filtering for education. I can easily imagine a liberal saying that since Blacks often don't have a college degree and having Kevin Roberts call it **woke**.
- (c) More seriously, isn't prohibiting filtering government interference with business? He should distinguish- if he says the GOVERNMENT should not filter or have requirements (he brings up that Day Care Workers need a college degree in Wash DC which he says is absurd and he is correct) he has a point, but for private business I'd be curious what he thinks. He does not make the distinction so I assume he thinks Private companies should be PROHIBITED

from filtering on education. I wonder how he feels about filtering on RELIGION. I suspect he would be in favor of companies being allowed to do that (he mentions Christian Companies favorably in other parts of the book).

(d) There is a movement to BAN having say if you ever served time in jail. Its called BAN THE BOX. I wonder how he would feel about that one?

4. *(Page 120) The federal gov spends more than \$100 billion per year subsidizing higher education but less than \$2 billion supporting non-college pathways. . . .*

After decades of pushing every student to go to college, we now face a situation in which critical industrial and artisanal skills, not to mention the trades, are in shorter supply.

This is interesting if true. I do not know if its true. I also wonder how much AI and technology will make many of the jobs he is referring to obsolete. He wants the government to spend MORE on non-college pathways (I assume trade schools and small business loans). An intelligent discussion could be had on the value of college, bringing down the costs, the value of trade schools, and more gov support for them, and are they needed.

5. Kevin Roberts seems to equate college with courses on ultra liberal interpretations of history and obscure courses (e.g., How the American Constitution was based on Native American Tribal ideas).
- (a) He seems to ignore STEM entirely.
- (b) He exaggerates the extend to which schools are politically left. An intelligent discussion could be had about this. He is not interested in that.
- (c) He never mentions slavery or the destruction of the Native Americans or anything bad about America.
6. *(Page 121) Entrepreneurs will find ways to use AI to outsource and automate many bureaucratic and admin functions. We need to ensure that our regulatory framework allows them to do so, that the Uni-party doesn't use regulation to protect make-work HR jobs and impose*

woke commissars throughout the corporate economy (the current status quote). Preserving open-source AI not controlled by woke companies is especially critical for our time.

This is very muddled.

- (a) woke is, as usual, undefined.
- (b) The AI will be programmed to be woke so why is this a win?
- (c) Lots of jobs may be destroyed by AI. Including Trade jobs and others that he cherishes so much. The question of **Which jobs WILL AI replace? Which jobs SHOULD AI replace? What is governments role in this?** is a very important one that requires an intelligent discussion. More than usual he is not interested in that conversation and picks at a very small (perhaps zero) aspect of it.
- (d) If he wants to complain that HR jobs are make-work, he has a point. To bad its lost in his other babble.

5.6 Make Ownership Great Again

1. (Bill) I had heard that the 2008 recession was caused by a loosening of financial regulations and that the Dodd-Franks bill, which was passed because of the recession, would help fix that. I have no idea if this is true. He claims that the DF bill hurts small business. I have no idea if this is true. He wants to exempt small business from many regulations. This may be a good idea. It may also be a good idea to look at some regulations and see which ones you want to dump.
2. (Page 123) *Personally, I think unionization is not the right answer: in almost all every case, something like a worker's council could do the same job.* He should say WHY he doesn't like unions (there ARE real reasons he could point to). I looked up Worker's Councils https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Workers%27_council and I think they only work for small businesses. An intelligent discussion needs to be had about this. Here I think he might be interested in that.

3. (This is Bill) A very hard question for a capitalist society is what to do about companies that legally squeeze out the competition? Anti-Trust law would seem to be an answer, but he is muddled and biased on that: (Page 123–124) *I am skeptical about the use of antitrust powers to micromanage the “right” amount of competition. [Bill-I respect that opinion and may agree with it, but what should be done then?]. But I am not skeptical about their proper-use, as envisioned by Teddy Roosevelt: To rein in globalist corporatism that threatens the republic [Teddy Roosevelt was concerned with the Robber Barons who Kevin Roberts seemed to think were TRUE AMERICANS in an earlier part of the book.] Uniparty managers, modeling themselves on the East India Company, pursue scale to destroy local competitors and then prostitute themselves to the Deep State to avoid accountability to the American public for the destruction they cause to American Families and communities. [A problem with the entire book is thinking that the Uniparty is that Unified or powerful—some of what is happening to America is the result of unchecked capitalism.] Burning down companies such as Google and BlackRock by breaking them up will be good for America [What happened to your skeptical use of micromanaging?]*

He began with a good point, slide into conspiracies, and then ends with only wanting to break up companies he does not like.

I looked up Black Rock-

- (a) They are in favor of ESG (investing in Green products)
- (b) They are in favor of DEI.
- (c) They have close ties to China which George Soros said **is a tragic mistake that would damage National Security.**
- (d) Has ties to the Federal Reserve.

The first 2 points—its a private company and I do not see any HARM in ESG or DEI. The last 2 points are valid gripes against them. So I can see why he has legit gripes with them (the second two). Even so, is there any conservative company that he would want to break up. This all requires an intelligent discussion that he is not interested in having.

4. (Page 125) *Corporations can no longer have their cake and eat it, too, lecturing Americans about wokeness and bossing around their small*

business suppliers and customers, all the while manufacturing their wares in smog-ridden Communist China.

wokeness and smog-ridden seem irrelevant to his point.

BILL- RESUME HERE

6 Freedom Requires Order

I actually agree with much of this chapter though, as usual, the silence on some points is deafening.

He talks about how we need order and uses the LA Riots (following Rodney King) and the George Foreman riots as examples. What about the Jan 6 insurrection (never mentioned in the entire book. I give his views on that soon)? Lynchings of black people in the south (to be fair that was a long time ago)? White supremacists beating up gays and blacks (to be fair that was on a smaller scale). He also objects to the woke capitalists approving of these riots, and of the BLM marches being allowed to not wear masks during COVID whereas others had to.

There are some valid points here (as in my parenthesis) but also omissions.

As his first example of the need for order he uses a **movie about events that did not happen**. Talking about the movie **The Man who Shot Liberty Valence** he writes

(Page 127) [Jimmy] Stewart understands that if “Liberty” is let loose without law, a society will be unjust and anarchically. He starts learning to use his Second Amendment rights, and— well, you’ll have to watch it to find out what happens next.

That sounds like the basis for a parody YouTube clip, where cowboys in the old west talk about their second amendment rights rather than talk about practicing how to shoot.

(Page 134) He tells a long story that I won’t quote here about Prop C in 2018 San Francisco that doubled the business tax—the money was supposed to be used for *Homeless services*. It was supported by Marc Benifoff, a business man, because he thought it would help him by hurting his competition. It had very bad consequences. The whole story is probably true and is indeed awful.

In his complains about Gavin Newsom being soft on crime (which may be correct) he talks about restrictive gun control laws and says

(Page 131) To make matters worse, as chronicled in Zach Smith and Charles D Stimson’s expose “Rogue Prosecutor: How Radical Soros Lawyers Are Destroying America’s Communities”, California is now run by George Soros-backed progressive prosecutors such as LA DA George Gascon, whose

city saw property crime increase by a whopping 49% during his previous tenure in the same post in San Francisco.

This is a valid critique. However, he just had to throw in the anti-semitic dog whistle term *George Soros*. He will mention Soros two more times, on pages 135 and 139, to remind me again that Gascon is a *Soros-backed DA*. That's three anti-semitic dog whistles in one book. It makes me not want to take him seriously.

I googled "What does Kevin Roberts think of the Jan 6 pardons",

Kevin Roberts, president of the conservative think tank The Heritage Foundation, commended the January 6 pardons issued by President Trump. Roberts viewed the pardons as a "necessary corrective" to what he described as a politicized justice system.

In a statement, he expressed his views:

1) The pardons mark a "pivotal moment in restoring the integrity of America's justice system".

2) They reject the "politicized double standards" that Roberts claims have affected the nation under left-wing leadership.

3) Roberts stated that Democrats used January 6 as a "political cudgel" to distract from policies and smear opponents.

4) The move, in his opinion, sends a clear message that justice should be blind and not used for "leftist power grabs".

The Heritage Foundation, which Roberts leads, also released an official statement echoing these sentiments, commending the pardons and asserting they were a blow against the "brazen weaponization of our justice system".

I then contrasted that to Hunter Biden's Pardon: I googled "What does Kevin Roberts think of the Hunter Biden Pardon"

Kevin Roberts, president of the conservative think tank The Heritage Foundation, strongly criticized Joe Biden's pardon of his son Hunter, stating that the action helps Donald Trump politically and demonstrates a lack of integrity.

Roberts' key points include:

1) Lying to the public: He asserted that President Biden lied repeatedly to the American people when he previously said he would never consider pardoning his son.

2) Selfishness and poor judgment: Roberts described the pardon as an act of "stubbornness and selfishness" that, along with other decisions, was disastrous for the Democratic party.

3) **Political advantage for Trump:** He argued in an opinion column titled "Roberts: Hunter's pardon helps Trump," that the controversial nature of the pardon provides political ammunition for Donald Trump and his supporters.

4) **Weaponization of government:** The Heritage Foundation's "Oversight Project" has also been involved in scrutinizing the specifics of the pardons, including claims (without evidence) that an auto-pen was used for the official documents, which they used to question the legitimacy of the orders.

6.1 Learning Helplessness

1. He talks about how when terrorists are captured they are deprived of things and learn to be helpless, which makes them talk. This is part of enhanced interrogation. He does not say if this is good or bad. He goes on to say that ordinary American citizens are being taught to be helpless. Odd analogy but the point that American's are being taught to be helpless may be true. I thought he was going to talk about over dependence on Government. But see next point.
2. *(Page 137) Today, the Uniparty is applying these same psychological torture techniques not to radical jihadists but to the population of law-abiding everyday Americans. This torture method is the rampant violence and petty crime. It's the state forcing experimental vaccines into people' arms, lest they lose their jobs or business and schools for months on end and to huff through itchy masks. It's the smug despotism of tellings parents that schools are going to trans their kids whether they like it or not, or Child Services will take them away. Its the sexual humiliation of forcing teenage girls to change in the same locker room as biological men and of making their parents let it happen.*
 - (a) COVID again? That is a terrible example since it really was a health crisis, made worse by the anti-vax movement. And again, one can do a scientific study about the effectiveness of masks or lock downs. On vaccines the evidence is quite clear. But he is not interested in an intelligent discussion.
 - (b) The state is NOT telling parents to trans their kids. In fact, quite the opposite, some states are BANNING any kind of treatment for

gender-issues. It IS possible that some kids are transitioning and shouldn't be. What is needed is more studies on gender-issues. OH, Can't because those funds were cut.

- (c) Trans people in Locker rooms is a rare issue but it is a valid issue.
- 3. He then talks about the shooting in Uvalde where the police were incompetent and the parents and others were not allowed to help out. The police being incompetent is an issue. The parents not being allowed to storm the place- not sure about that. This happened in TEXAS. Gee, he doesn't blast their DA as being Soros-backed.

6.2 Fighting Back

- 1. Fight homelessness by making it illegal. The book *Abundance* had much better ideas about that.
- 2. Katrina-he does not mention that a Republican, George W Bush was prez at the time. He suggests that local communities can do better with disasters. I am skeptical.
- 3. This is not in the book but worth a mention: The following is a true sequence of events
 - (a) North Carolina has hurricanes and needs help.
 - (b) The Biden administration sends FEMA.
 - (c) Republicans spread rumors that FEMA will take away their homes.
 - (d) NC homeowners threaten FEMA workers with guns, so they leave.
 - (e) Republican leaders complain that FEMA does not help republicans.

6.3 The Guarantor of All Other Liberties

This is the usual stuff about how the Second Amendment—the right to bear arms (as opposed to the right to arm bears) guarantees all of our other liberties since it keeps the government in check.

I agree with this. With Trump sending ICE troops and others into cities, with masks on (so NOW they like masks!), and trying to prevent people

from voting (no more mail-in), its good to know that all of those second amendment people who own guns recognize the danger and will protect us.

Kevin Roberts repeats the lie that Biden sold us out to the Taliban when it was Trump who made the deal. Biden then felt he had to honor it.

6.4 Cultivating Order

(Page 145) We're going to put into place district attorney's who enforce the law

1. In Trumps first term he cut the FBI's budget dedicated to tracking white supremacists who commit violence.
2. Jan 6
3. In Trumps current term his AG is going after people who he doesn't like.

7 There's No Freedom Without the Frontier

1. The American Frontier offered people a chance to excel and challenged them.
2. He leaves out any mention of the massacre of the Indians.
3. He leaves out any mention of how the Government actually was needed to conquer the frontier.
4. There is a notion that the frontier is closed. He challenges this by talking about business innovation and space. Good Point. I wonder what he would think of the right-wing-meme that we never landed on the moon.
5. He complains that people in California look to inner space rather than outer space. The following passage starts to make this point, but then gives an example that undermines his point.

(Page 149) For every would-be astronaut exploring outer space, there was a psychonaut of "inner space" looking to conquer the frontiers of human consciousness: Eastern yogis, Pentecostal preachers, Esalen seminar leaders, New Age gurus, LSD chemists. It's no coincidence that Steve Jobs living in an LSD-soaked orchard commune, chose an apple with a bite out of it as his companies symbol "And ye shall be god's, knowing good and evil.

- (a) Looking into yourself is not necc. bad.
- (b) I am surprised Kevin Roberts includes Pentecostal preachers.
- (c) Steve Jobs lead Apple—a very successful company. Is this supposed to be an example of why its bad to look into yourself? I think Kevin Roberts wanted to take a shot at communes, hippies, and Steve Jobs, but he jammed it into this passage.

7.1 The False Frontier: The Internet

1. Kevin Roberts quotes (in order to refute) the following from John Perry Barlow's 1996 manifesto "A Declaration of the independence of Cyberspace"

Cyberspace does not lie within your borders. ... Ours is a world that is both everywhere and nowhere, but it is not where border live.

Kevin Roberts objects since the buildings and stuff ARE somewhere. Who controls the internet matters. He point to two examples of the internet having real-world effects

- (a) *(Page 151) As seen in the US Government's keeping Twitter on-line to fuel protests against the Iranian government or supplying Ukraine with battlefield internet via Elon Musk's starlink, being able to turn it on and off is a powerful geopolitical tool. Correct. I wonder if he approves or not.*
- (b) *(Page 151) The Deep state's proximity to the internet has made it not only easy but positively convenient for NSA programs such as MUSCULAR to scoop up the entire data flow of companies such as Yahoo! and Google. He later does say that he objects. To his credit and my surprise he does not blame the liberals. He just says that its bad.*
- (c) Kevin Roberts thinks being drawn away from a real frontier Americans will *(Page 152) be tempted towards electing not a violent tyrant but an infantilizing guardian.* I thought he would talk about people looking at their phones and screens and ignoring whats around them. He does not. And it looks like Trump is both a violent tyrant and an infantilizing guardian.
- (d) Kevin Roberts makes a leap to *(Page 152) Either the people of the USA will rise up and reclaim the American Frontier, and burn down the fences enclosing us, or the Uniparty will slaughter us, replacing us with a diverse array of foreigners, cyborgs, and hive mind bureaucrats extolling the virtues of "our sacred democracy."*

7.2 The 1st, 2nd, 3rd temptation: Convenience, Safety, Immaturity

I thought this would be about how we give away private information just for discounts and convenience, but it was not.

1. The Deep state and corporations work together and share data on Americans and this is bad. TRUE.
2. (Page 153) *Thanks to the brave work of the Republicans leading the House of Reps' select subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Fed Gov, we are just beginning to see the scope of the problem.* No mention of how Trump has weaponized the government. To be fair, no mention of Biden either.
3. Kevin Roberts (as usual) gives a lot of space to an example that undermines his point. He complains that the *Hunter Biden Laptop* story was censored. This may be true. But compare the following:
 - (1) The harassment of Hunter Biden by the Republicans even though no evidence is found,
 - (2) A story about whats on Hunter Biden's laptop, which was obtained illegally, is suppressed.
4. He claims that whenever something goes wrong people clamor for the government to *do something* and this can lead to too much gov. Thats a good point. He then uses as an example the Canadian Truck Drivers who refused to get vaccinated and protested by blocking traffic. Again, a really bad example of what might have been an interesting discussion. The question of when government should intervene can be discussed intelligently. He's not interested in that.
5. Trump has bailed out farmers harmed by his own policy (in his first term) and has now had the government buy 10% of intel. Here is an article that says the Trump administration is socialist:

<https://www.theamericanconservative.com/taking-the-postman-pledge/>

I wonder what Kevin Roberts would make of that.

What does Kevin Roberts think of subsidizing farmers?

Kevin Roberts, president of The Heritage Foundation, and the organization as a whole, are broadly against the subsidization of farmers, viewing it as a form of corporate welfare and government market distortion.

Their position emphasizes:

1) **Opposition to market distortion:** Subsidies encourage farmers to make planting decisions based on government incentives rather than market demand, which distorts the free market and stifles innovation.

2) **Support for free enterprise:** Heritage policy experts argue that U.S. agricultural producers are sophisticated businesspeople capable of succeeding without taxpayer assistance, just like other businesses. The vast majority of crops are grown profitably with little to no government assistance, demonstrating that the remaining subsidized crops could as well.

3) **Targeted assistance only for major disasters:** At most, federal intervention should be strictly limited to situations involving significant, catastrophic crop losses due to unforeseen natural disasters, not minor losses or general income fluctuations.

4) **"Corporate welfare" for the wealthy:** Most subsidies go to the largest, high-income farms, many of which have household incomes and wealth significantly greater than the average American household. The organization frequently refers to the current farm subsidy system as America's largest corporate welfare program.

5) **Replacement with private solutions:** The Heritage Foundation proposes replacing most federal subsidies with market-based solutions, such as expanded access to basic private crop insurance and the creation of tax-free farmer savings accounts for managing business risks.

In line with this, the Heritage Foundation's Project 2025 (of which Kevin Roberts is a foreword author) proposes significant cuts or elimination of current farm subsidy programs like the Agriculture Risk Coverage (ARC) and Price Loss Coverage (PLC) programs.

This is the first issue I found where Kevin Roberts disagrees with Trump.

6. *(Page 160) In 2022 the FBI sent a SWAT team to arrest pro-life activist Mark Houck at his home, pointing guns at his wife and seven kids (he*

was acquitted). This is TRUE and helps to make Kevin Roberts' point. He did leave out what Mark H was accused of. The story is murky but he seems to have either (a) assaulted a volunteer reproductive health clinic escort, or (b) shoved a volunteer reproductive health clinic escort. There is a law, Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) that makes impeding people from getting an abortion illegal. So it is likely that Mark H broke the law. But it does not sound like you need a SWAT team.

<https://www.witf.org/2022/11/07/how-conservative-media-and-republican-politicians-are-trying-to-keep-their-members-from-getting-abortion>

Mark H and the rep media say there were dozens of agents. There were four.

7. *In 2023 FBI agents raided and shot dead Craig Robertson, an overweight 75 year old crank, after he posted violent memes about president Biden*

This seems to be true, though the violent memes were death threats. Even so, being shot was not warranted

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2023/aug/10/craig-robertson-biden-assault>

8. The last two points are interesting and I didn't know them and perhaps the left wing lame-stream media did keep them from me. However, the Trump admin has unleashed violence on Wash DC and ICE agents across the country. So this is a general gov problem.

7.3 Total Control

More complaints about DEI that I might agree with if they were more coherent and less personal.

7.4 Back to the Frontier

He tells us about Palmer Luckey who was fired from Facebook because he donated \$10,000 to the Donald Trump Campaign. He later sued and got \$100 million.

His point is that Conservatives are discriminated against. This is undermined in that (a) his grievance was addressed, and (b) Trump wants to charge the following people with treason:

1. *Former Prez Barak Obama (2025)*
Formal Charges: Politicized Intelligence about Russian Interference in 2016 election.
Real Reason: Barak is everything Trump wants to be—respected, admired. And of course Barak IS guilty of a PWB (President While Black).
2. *Miles Taylor and Christopher Krebs*
Formal Charges: Not clear
What Trump Did: Stripped them of their security clearances.
Real Reason: They were critical of his leadership.
3. *General Mark Milley (2023)*
Formal Charge: Calling the Chinese. He DID do this. Here is the context: The Chinese had bad intel that Trump was going to do a first strike against them. Mark M may have averted WW III by calming them down. He may have done things outside the chain of command. However, the Sec of Defense, Christopher Miller, was involved with these events.
Real Reason: Trump was mad since the events made it seem like he DID want to attack China.
4. *Comcast/NBC News (2023)*
Formal Charge: Their news coverage is Treasonous.
Real Reason: Their news coverage is anti-Trump
5. *James Comey and the FBI (2023 but also earlier)*
For the Russia investigation.
6. *Joe Biden (2020)*
Formal Charge: Spying on the Trump campaign.
Real Reason: Beating Trump in 2020.
7. *Democrats (2018)*
For not clapping at his state of the Union address.

8. *Former Special Council Jack Smith*

Formal Charge: Violating the Hatch Act which limits a fed employees partisan activities. Even if true, not treason.

Real Reason: Smith brought 2 Fed indictments against Trump. the Hatch Act.

9. *Senator Adam Schiff (2019)*

Formal Charge: Trump demanded the FBI investigate mortgage fraud allegations. Trump also complained that they helped bring the impeachment over Ukraine.

Real Reason: The impeachment over Ukraine.

10. *Former Veep Mike Pence*

Formal Charge: I don't know

Real Reason: Not supporting Trumps attempt to steal the election on Jan 6.

11. *Former AG Bill Barr*

Formal Charge: I don't know

Real Reason: Not supporting Trumps claim that the election was fraudulent.

7.5 Reasserting the Principles/Reclaiming the Power

1. Lots on federalism-bad, localism-good. Kevin Robert complains about the red tape that Space X has encountered from the Environmental protection agency. These complaints may well be valid. But Kevin Robert does not mention that Space X needed Federal funds to get started.
2. *(Page 169) Lawyers and policy makers in the New Conservative Movement need to interrogate every single authority claimed by the admin state to discern what is a valid and needful use of federal powers and what is an unconstitutional and unenforceable infringement on our endless frontier federalism. This process should not be just a casual chitchat*

but rather a body cavity, strip-search, enhanced interrogation. So unlike perhaps some of the 1990s conservatives, I don't want to drown the government. I want to waterboard it.

- (a) The first part of this statement sounds like he is making an honest attempt to see what WORKS and DOES NOT WORK in government. But the last sentence indicates that he is eXtremely biased going in. Elon Musk proved the point by not doing a careful study and just doing a casual chitchat to decide that lots of what the gov did was bad.
- (b) The bias is bad in two ways. I illustrate why bias is bad and how to avoid it with three examples.
 - i. I quote an old blog post of mine *Imagine that the CATO Institute (a Libertarian think tank) did an honest study of gun control. (a) they find that gun control reduces crime—would they publish it?, (b) they find that gun control increases crime—they would publish but because of the known bias nobody would believe them.* My point: you really have to go into these studied unbiased and accept the conclusion. So DO NOT have the CATO institute do a study—have an honest third party.
 - ii. The Republicans insisted on a recount in Arizona. They did it. They found that Biden still won. They DID NOT accept that. They STILL claimed the election was stolen.
 - iii. A future example: RFK Jr will soon do a study that SHOWS that vaccines cause autism.
- (c) He gives good examples of government overreach. His story about a kids lemonade stand being regulated is true (I looked it up). Farmers selling their wares to neighbors are also regulated. But he does not have an intelligent discussion of when the gov should step in. There have been real cases of tainted food (radioactive shrimp is a recent one). If the answer is to only step in after the fact—that may be to late. (He does seem to want NO regulation of small business but YES regulation on large businesses, so that IS the start of an intelligent conversation.)

7.6 Reining in the Deep State

He gives several examples of the government abusing their power, which I assume are correct (I checked some of them). He DOES NOT do this in a partisan way. Here is a quote that I agree with with regard to the Trump admin so I wonder if he would

(Page 174) ... Congress needs to rein in the weaponization and politicization of federal law enforcement by providing better direct oversight of the FBI, instead of letting the agency hide behind the skirts of the dept of justice.

8 We're Not an Empire

This is the least partisan chapter of the book. That's because foreign policy does not have clear partisan issues. There have been far left and far right people who are isolationists.

8.1 Woke Imperialism/Enlargement/The Foreign Policy Blob

1. Kevin Roberts is an isolationist. (*Page 178*) *The New Conservative movement must reject the woke imperialism that has characterized our post-Cold War foreign policy, renew our emaciated military forces, and restore our traditional America First approach to global statesmanship devoted to preserving the United State' liberty and independence and leading primarily through friendship, free commerce, and our own virtuous example.*
 - (a) The phrase *woke imperialism* seems odd. I thought he meant that we shouldn't do nation-building. But the next section of the book titled *woke Imperialism* talks about how Ukraine, during its war, made Gay Marriage legal. So I don't know what *woke Imperialism* is. Perhaps imposing our values on another country? But what if they were values he approves of? He does not clarify any of this.
 - (b) Does he know that *America First* is (a) a movement against us going into WW II which was part-honest-isolationism an part-anti-semitism, and (b) a dog whistle to anti-semitism.
 - (c) Ignoring my first two points the statement is reasonable but I wonder how we should deal with, say, the Ukraine war. His answers later are very weak.
2. He gives a pretty good history of the Military post-Cold war: there were no threats to our way of life (even 9-11 didn't change that- Al Quada is nowhere near as much of a threat as the USSR was) and we could have withdrawn somewhat from the world, but we didn't. He seems to AGREE with some of what we did (expand NATO). He is against the free trade treaties but that seems like a DIFFERENT TOPIC. He seems to talk about military engagement and Free Trade interchangeably.

3. To be fair there is one issue where free trade and military stuff may be in the same conversation: China. He does not like our free trade with them, which enables them to build up their military. And worse—they are beating us economically because they cheat on their treaties. There is some truth to that, though (as usual) the issue is more complex than he says.
4. Post Cold-War the majority of Americans and even politicians wanted to be less involved with the world militarily. But minority of two usually-opposed groups pushed us into Foreign engagement: liberal internationalists who wanted to defend *the liberal order* and neoconservatives.
5. (Bill) The question of when to intervene in a conflict IS a hard one. (Bill) Here is a list of wars the US has been involved with post-cold-war and my comments on them. The wars are from these website:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_wars_involving_the_United_States_in_the_20th_century

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_wars_involving_the_United_States_in_the_21st_century

The comments are mine.

I rate each war as

GOOD: We won and the final result was good

I may add DK for Don't Know if I am not sure of my answer.

MIXED: We won but the final result is mixed

BAD: We lost. If it a good cause I may add that.

SMALL: Not really a war. I may also add GOOD or BAD

ONGOING: To early to tell. I may also add GOOD or BAD which applies to us being there.

Kevin Roberts' main complaint is that we should not be in these wars at all, independent of if we win or lose.

1990-2000:

- (a) 1990-Gulf war I. George HW Bush. Wikipedia says its a win. Iraq was clear aggressor. We had a clear objective and achieved it. GOOD
- (b) 1991-2003. No Fly Zone over Iraq. George HW Bush, Bill Clinton, George W Bush. Wikipedia says USA won. I'm less happy since we had to go into Iraq again and its still a mess. MIXED.
- (c) 1992-1995. Somali Civil War Round 1. George HW Bush, Bill Clinton. Wikipedia says Somali won (is that good or bad) and that the UN Mandate saved close to 100,000 lives. BUT Civil War is still going on. BAD.
- (d) 1992-1995. Bosnia and Herzegovina. George HW Bush, Bill Clinton. Wikipedia says US Victory. NATO has achieved military and peacekeeping activities. Wikipedia says we won. GOOD (this one surprised me).
- (e) 1994-1995. Intervention in Haiti. Bill Clinton. We restored democratically elected president Jean-Bertrand Ariside. But he was toppled later. So was it worth it? MIXED.
- (f) 1995-1996. The third Taiwan Strait Crisis (I don't know what the first two were) Bill Clinton. Not really a war. China was mad that America hosted the prez of Taiwan so China conducted large scale military exercises. So we did the same. Then tensions were de-escalated. This hardly seems like a war. Kevin Roberts might approve of this one since he hates China. SMALL-GOOD.
- (g) 1998. Monrovia Crisis. Bill Clinton. Liberia. Very limited- The US embassy was attacked and American Defended it. Some of the rebels were killed which lead to the second Liberian civil war which lead to the deaths of 50,000 people. Our role here is so limited that I don't think this counts. SMALL-MIXED. Short term objectives achieved but long term was terrible. Not sure how much the two are connected.
- (h) 1999. NATO intervention in the Kosovo War. Bill Clinton. NATO won. Lots of bombing, lots of civilian deaths, but the ethnic cleansing of Albanians was stopped. MIXED.

2001-present

- (a) 2001-2021. Afghan War. George W Bush, Barak Obama, Donald Trump, Joe Biden. Complete disaster for America. BAD.
- (b) 2002-present. US Intervention in Yemen. George W Bush, Barak Obama, Donald Trump, Joe Biden, Donald Trump. Lots of drone strikes, 1500 dead. To what end? To help the brutal dictatorship of oil-rich Saudis? I ask non-rhetorically. ONGOING-BAD.
- (c) 2002-2017 Operation Freedom Eagle (Philippines). George W Bush, Barak Obama, Donald Trump. American victory-Substantial reduction in terrorist groups GOOD-DK.
- (d) 2003-2011 Iraq War. George W Bush, Barack Obama. A mess for them and for us. BAD.
- (e) 2003. Intervention in Iraq-Kurd conflict. George W Bush. The US ended an Islamic Incursion. SMALL-GOOD.
- (f) 2004-2018. US intervention in a war in Northwest Pakistan. George W Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump. Drone strikes on Jihadists in Pakistan. MIXED. Seems to have worked but also killed many civilians.
- (g) 2007-present. Second US intervention in the Somali Civil War. George W Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump, Joe Biden, Donald Trump. ONGOING-BAD.
- (h) 2009-2016. Operation Ocean Shield (Somali Pirates). Barack Obama. SMALL-GOOD.
- (i) 2011. International Intervention in Libya. Wikipedia calls is a victory since we overthrew Qaddafi, but there was a civil war in Libya in 2014. MIXED.
- (j) 2011-2017. Against the Lord's Resistance Army in Central Africa which is an extremist Christian group. Wikipedia calls is a win. The major activities were stamped out but there are still some minor ones. GOOD-DK.
- (k) 2013-2024. Us Military Intervention in Niger. Obama, Trump, Biden. BAD-DK.
- (l) 2014-2021. US led intervention in Iraq. Wikipedia says its a win. Killed lots of jihadists. Iraq government regains control-but is that good? MIXED.

- (m) 2014-present. Syria Civil War Obama, Trump, Biden, Trump. The gov of Syria was overthrown, which we wanted. The current president Ahmed ao-Sharaa is former Al-Quada member but now says he is not. Has made some good moves and some bad moves. MIXED-Wait and see.
- (n) 2015-present. Saudi-led intervention in Yemeni Civil War. Obama, Trump, Biden, Trump. ONGOING-BAD.
- (o) 2015-2019. US Intervention in Libya. Obama, Trump. Wikipedia says a win. Thousands of Jihadists in Libya killed. Troops Withdrawn. GOOD.
- (p) 2020. Nigerian hostage rescue. Trump. Wikipedia says US won. Six of the Seven bad guys killed. Seems to small to count. SMALL-GOOD.
- (q) 2022-present. Ukraine War Biden, Trump. Only money and arms, no people. To early to tell. But this one has a very definite aggressor so its justified. ONGOING-GOOD cause.
- (r) 2023-present. Operation Prosperity Garden. This is to break a blockade the middle east of our ships. Biden, Trump. Middle East. On going so hard to tell. ONGOING.
- (s) 2024-present. Gaza War. Biden, Trump. To early to tell. ONGOING-BAD. This will set the cause of Mideast peace back . . . forever.
- (t) 2024-present. Israel-Hezbollah conflict. Biden, Trump. ONGOING-BAD. The middle east is always a mess.
- (u) 2025-present. Iran-Israel war. Trump. ONGOING-BAD.

Of the 29 wars I ranked 9 as being GOOD. Of those 9, 4 were small, 2 were DK, and 1 is ONGOING, though I still stand by them as GOOD.

I list them all in brief:

1990-Gulf war I.

1992-1995. Bosnia and Herzegovina.

1995-1996. The third Taiwan Strait Crisis. (SMALL)

2002-2017 Operation Freedom Eagle (Philippines). (DK)

2003. Intervention in Iraq-Kurd conflict. (SMALL)

2009-2016. Operation Ocean Shield (Somali Pirates).(SMALL)

2015-2019. US Intervention in Libya.

2020. Nigerian hostage rescue. (SMALL)

2022-present. Ukraine War (ONGOING)

On this point Kevin Roberts has a good point. I was surprised we've been involved in 29 wars which is a lot!

8.2 Hindsight/Hollow Forces

1. To Kevin Roberts' credit he says he was for Gulf War 2 and he was WRONG. (Andrew Sullivan, another Conservative, also admits he was wrong and wrote an entire book just on that. However, the two would not get along since Andrew Sullivan is gay and early on made the conservative case for Gay Marriage).
2. Kevin Roberts should wonder what points of view he holds now will he regret later. I suspect he will regret supporting Trump since Trump either doesn't agree him, or is to inept to do policies the Kevin Roberts wants.
3. Kevin Roberts never mentions Gulf War I.
4. He quotes Fareed Zakaria and I agree with the quote: *William F Buckley once remarked that the defining element of conservatism is realism—realism about the limits of state power, the nature of human beings and societies, the complexity of international life. Yet many conservatives [necons] who believe the state can do nothing right at home think that it can do nothing wrong abroad. (If things go badly, why, more money, bigger bombs and ground troops will straighten it out.) Many who are scornful of social engineering at home seem sure it will work beyond our borders.*
5. He quotes *The Sharon Statement (1960)* and agrees with it: *That American Foreign Policy must be judged by this criterion: Does it serve the just interests of the United States?*

The Sharon statement was the founding statement of principles for Young Americans for Freedom. The inaugural meeting of the group

was in Buckley's childhood home in Sharon, Connecticut, hence the name. Two year later Tom Hayden had *The Port Huron Statement* as a response. It would be interesting to read both and see how they held up over time.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sharon_Statement

- (a) The Young Americans for Freedom were anti-communist and I suspect supported the Vietnam war and other wars. This is NOT hypocrisy, but it does raise the point that it can be hard to tell whats in America's interest.
 - (b) Sometimes it is hard to tell. For example, if NAFTA makes South America better economically then we will have less immigrants coming from their which Kevin Roberts would approve of. But this is a long term idea that might not work.
 - (c) It was in America's interest to declare war on Mexico and take their land (the Mexican-American war). Other policies were also good for America but objectively immoral.
 - (d) Does this lead to a *might makes right* policy, both militarily and with trade?
 - (e) My view: We need to consider our own interests, short term and long term and morally, carefully. So the statement is to simple, but is a good starting point.
6. Kevin Roberts says that our military is over-stretched and thats probably true. And then his woke-tick comes out:
- (Page 189) Ensnoced in sinecures where they [American Military Decision makers] where they earn half a million dollars a year (or more) to cheerleaders for the woke Empire.*
7. Other countries cashed in the peace dividend from the end of the Cold War but we didn't.
8. To many military projects are badly thought and and/or canceled. So the money we are spending is being wasted. He seems to mind BOTH that we shouldn't be spending it at all AND that we are spending it badly.

8.3 Returning to America First Statesmanship

1. (Page 192) *Foreign entanglements and disunity at home go hand in hand.*

This is probably right but he undermines his own point with an absurd example: He points to Democrats who call Putin an *evil genius* and Republicans who are now *pro Russia*. This not a case of *both-side-ism* since Putin really is *evil* and there is no good reason to be pro-Russia.

2. (Page 192) *We must vigilantly restrain foreign influences. The more we are involved in other countries, the more influence they will have, that can lead to corruption.*

This may be correct, though the biggest example of this is Trump and Tariffs and Trump taking gifts (like planes) from other countries.

3. (Page 193) *The essence of strategy is the alignment of means and ends. The wars we fund are crushing us—look at the deficit.*

Counter: Trump's tax cuts also contribute to the debt. Kevin Roberts refers to *GOP budget hawks* but I think they are mythical.

4. (Page 194) *Friendship and commerce are the best means of promoting the United States Statesmanship.*

That sounds so woke.

Some interesting history (paraphrase): Kevin Roberts says that before WW II the USA was NOT isolationist—we traded a lot with other countries, accepted immigrants, and our Navy roamed the world (I wonder if Kevin Roberts would approve of all of that). But the following sentence is odd:

(Page 194) The United States intervened periodically when its interests or citizens were threatened, principally in the Western Hemisphere but also against the Barbary Pirates, to open trade with Japan, and to secure needed Pacific coaling stations.

I am surprised he mentions opening trade with Japan since that was done partially by military force, not *Friendship*.

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1830-1860/opening-to-japan>

5. One point- he doesn't seem to ever say whether entering WW II was a good idea. His hero Pat Buchanan explicitly says that we should not have entered WW II

<https://richardlangworth.com/buchanan-unnecessary-war>

I do not dismiss this viewpoint out of hand.

- (a) One reason why WW II is remembered as a good war is because WE WON.
- (b) Another reason is The Holocaust. But that is not why we entered it.
- (c) If we had never entered it then what would have happened? Would Germany eventually attack us or would we have a cold-war-type peace with them?

6. (*Page 195*) *Statesmanship demands cultivated virtue*

Kevin Roberts invokes George Washington here and elsewhere as warning about being entangled in foreign conflicts. I do not find this argument compelling since the world is very different from what it was in the early 1800's.

Kevin Roberts says that places like Harvard's JFK school of government brainwash their students into thinking America can fix any problem abroad. He may be right about that. He earlier said that Necons (Republicans) have the same view so this is not a partisan point.

8.4 Ukraine and Reagan's Real Legacy of Statesmanship

1. Kevin Roberts begins by saying that the initial support of Ukraine was good and reasonable.
2. Kevin Roberts criticize that Biden had no real endgame and no strategy beyond giving them money and arms. While this may be true, I'm not sure what the endgame could have been.
3. And then it all falls apart: (*Page 199*) *In the spirit of Ronald Reagan the Peacemaker, even as the United States continues to support the*

Ukraine cause, we must begin earnest negotiations with the Russians to try to find a peaceful settlement for the wider region. Any settlement will surely be a painful compromise (the bywords of any true statesman, one the neocons are allergic to). It will require pushing our European allies to do far more for Europe's defense. But the alternatives are unending war, substantial escalation and wider war, or the collapse of one of the states involved (which would unleash horrors). I know what the Gipper would have sought.

Putin has shown time and time again that he is not interested in a peaceful settlement. He even turned down a generous one that Trump offered.

Trump has shown time and time again that he is a terrible negotiator—giving away stuff to Putin even before negotiations begin.

The above quote says nothing about tougher sanctions on Russia.

4. Woke-Tick: *(Page 197) So under our [Kevin Roberts'] new paradigm (really a return to our principles) our initial military aid for Ukraine might have looked basically the same, even if the foreign aid budget for the woke governance in Ukraine would have been redirected to accountability and counter-corruption efforts.*

Remove the word “woke” and it makes sense.

8.5 The Problem of the Pacific

Seems to have a set of valid complaints

1. *(Page 199) The White house (Biden) asked for \$60 billion more for Ukraine, \$14 billion more for Israel, \$14 billion more for border security, and a paltry \$7 billion for the broader Indo-Pacific theater—only \$2 billion linked in any meaningful way to deterring China.*
2. Lots of stuff about waste in the Military.
3. Erosion of our defense industrial base.

8.6 Sacrifice

He talks about how are men in the military sacrifice and die. True.

Quote:

(Pages 205–206) The American people were encouraged by their leaders to shop at the mall while some families made the ultimate sacrifice. That wasn't just bad policy; it was a spiritual attack more deadly than anything Al-Qaeda could cook up. It was a direct assault on our republican character and system of self-government.

He does not mention that he is referring to George W Bush, a Republican.

8.7 Gratitude

This is about Buckley's call for a national service program so that young people can give back to this country and learn the value of service (non-military).

That sounds so woke.

9 We Can't Coexist With Communist China

China and American have incompatible goals. American liberals and wax-museum conservatives want America and China to get along.

1. Liberals think that everyone can and should be friends. The New Republic 30 years ago had an article about how letting China into the WTO will bring democracy to China. Didn't work out.

BILL- POINT TO THAT ARTICLE

2. Wax-M conservatives thing that free trade solves everything (this was written before Trump began Tariffing and the party all went along with it).

He also claims that China is sending honeypots to America—sex spies. I would have wanted a reference on that. On the web I DID find some, though only from conservative sources. Here is one:

<https://www.thetimes.com/us/american-politics/article/silicon-valley-spy-china->

9.1 The Mandate of Heaven/China's Century of Humiliation

Before the first opium war (1839-1842) China was an extremely important trading partner. Recall that Marco Polo went there, and that Columbus and others wanted to find a better way to get there. China was an economic powerhouse and wanted the world to run according to its rules. The wanted (and got) other nations to kow-tow to them. England did not kow-tow and they also fought back:

1. The Chinese had a monopoly on many luxury goods including silk. Tariff's helped them keep that monopoly. Europeans began making their own luxury goods.
2. Opium: between 1773 and 1839 Indian opium exports to China increased 20 fold. This weakened China. This clearly immoral activity by Britain does not draw any criticism from Kevin Roberts. He is talks about how the Chinese are getting Americans addicted to opioids. I can't tell if he is ouraged by that (which would be hyporctical) or is just trying to tell us how to stop the problem (which is reasonable).

3. Britain forced their way into the Chinese markets (I could not tell how they did this.)
4. China became more corrupt (its not clear if this is related to what anything that Britain did) so jobs were given on connections not merit. (Trump does this all the time, yet Kevin Roberts does not object.)
5. All of the above lead to China declining and being humiliated. And now China wants to go back to when it was the main economic power.

9.2 How China is Repeating History

Now (in the last 20 years) China is fighting back:

1. Theft of IT. Sometimes its not theft—companies that work in China must give China some of their tech.
2. Choke points. China controls many ports.
3. China regulates American Companies that want to do business there. I wonder—if a business wants to work in China and its good for the company (or so it thinks) but bad for America, should America stop it? For that matter, it may be bad for the company but only the all-knowing nanny state knows that. Seriously, this is a hard issue and could be the beginning of an intelligent conversation.
4. China imposes Tariffs on us. I can see what Kevin Roberts thinks Trump would be good at this—tariff them back. But the real goal should be to have trade deals where both countries lower their tariff's (90% of all economist agree on this). Trump does not have the temperament to negotiate wisely. He should read *The Art of the Deal* for some tips on that.
5. China gives subsidies to industry which gives them an unfair advantage. Biden did the same with the Chips Act. I looked up what Kevin Roberts thought of the Chips bill. He has some objections which may be valid:

Kevin Roberts, president of the conservative Heritage Foundation, is a strong critic of the CHIPS Act, viewing it as

”corporate welfare” that increases inflation and fails to genuinely counter the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). Both the Heritage Foundation and its lobbying arm, Heritage Action, actively opposed the bill.

His key arguments against the legislation include:

1) **Corporate Welfare:** Roberts argues the act spends billions of dollars to assist ”Fortune 500 companies, with no guarantee those dollars won’t end up supporting these companies’ business operations in China”.

2) **Inflation Concerns:** He claims the multi-billion dollar price tag contributes to record inflation and increases the cost of living for Americans.

3) **Ineffective Against China:** The Heritage Foundation asserts the U.S. ”cannot beat China by becoming more like China” through centrally planned industrial policy and that the bill was a ”major missed opportunity” to address national security threats.

4) **Government Overreach:** Roberts believes the government has grown too large and that the U.S. should address existing barriers preventing companies from competing rather than providing industry-specific subsidies.

Missed Opportunities: The legislation fails to hold CEOs accountable if their firms aid Beijing’s human rights abuses, neglects to restrict lobbying by CCP affiliates, and does not provide meaningful support for Taiwan, a major semiconductor producer. Overall, Roberts and The Heritage Foundation view the CHIPS Act as a ”bloated spending bill” that erodes America’s economic freedom.

I then asked Google if the Chips bill worked? It said YES (see below)

The CHIPS and Science Act is widely considered to be working in terms of stimulating massive private investment and job creation in the U.S. semiconductor industry, though its overall success is still unfolding. The law has attracted hundreds of billions in private capital, which most analysts agree would not have happened otherwise.

Key Outcomes and Progress

1) **Massive Private Investment:** Companies have announced over \$540 billion in private sector investments across more than 100 projects since the bill was passed in August 2022. Realized investment (actual construction spending) in related facilities has rocketed from averaging under \$7 billion per year to over \$90 billion in 2024.

2) **Job Creation:** The act has contributed to an estimated 15,000 to 20,000 new jobs in semiconductor production-related fields, with forecasts of tens of thousands more manufacturing and construction jobs.

3) **Bringing Advanced Manufacturing to the U.S.:** For decades, the U.S. had no advanced chip production capabilities. The CHIPS Act has successfully incentivized major global firms like Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co. (TSMC), Intel, Samsung, and Micron to build cutting-edge fabrication plants (fabs) in states like Arizona, New York, and Ohio, with some advanced production already nearing operation.

4) **National Security and Supply Chain Resilience:** A key objective was to reduce U.S. dependence on foreign manufacturing, particularly in Taiwan, to mitigate geopolitical risks. The new domestic fabs are a significant step toward shoring up the American supply chain.

Challenges and Criticisms

1) **Pace of Funding:** The Department of Commerce was deliberate in reviewing applications and has only recently begun to broadly finalize major grant and loan awards, leading to some early criticism regarding the slow rollout of funds compared to other countries.

2) **Implementation Difficulties:** Companies have faced issues with construction delays, a shortage of skilled labor, and high operational costs in the U.S..

3) **"Corporate Welfare" Criticism:** Some critics argue the law amounts to corporate welfare, handing public money to private corporations with insufficient focus on workforce par-

icipation and community benefits, despite the guardrails in place.

4) Long-Term Goals: While the act has made significant progress, achieving the goal of the U.S. producing 20% of the world's advanced chips by 2030 will require sustained effort and overcoming ongoing challenges.

In summary, the CHIPS Act has succeeded in catalyzing the intended private sector response, leading to a significant increase in U.S. semiconductor investment and jobs, but the long-term economic and national security benefits will take years to fully materialize and evaluate.

6. China did currency stuff that I didn't understand but is probably bad.
7. China's Road and Belt plans make them welcome in third world countries. We could do the same but Trump has no interest in this.
8. *(Page 223) But that's where the final step of China's Playbook paved the way for dominance: Spiritual warfare. The British example proved helpful yet again. China has pursued the same two-prong strategy of cultivating addiction both among the people and among the elites. Among the American populace, China has not only cultivated addiction to cheap Chinese TVs and T-shirts, it has also cultivated more sinister additions: essentially all fentanyl and methamphetamine today are made in China or with chemicals imported from China.*

I did a Google search on this and the answer is a partial yes: China is the main supplier of the chemicals used. But they also point to the (1) Mexican Cartels that import the chemicals, make the drugs, and export them, (2) the United States for insufficient domestic treatment of these problems, (3) Chinese and Mexican money laundering. (Note that Venezuela is not involved with any of this so Trump bombing their ships is a terrible idea.)

So he is correct on this point. A solution would be a combination of stopping the imports and more drug treatment and helping people with withdrawal. Trump has cut funding for addiction treatment:

<https://www.npr.org/2025/03/27/nx-s1-5342368/addiction-trump-mental-health>

While all this was happening American DID NOT wake up to the crisis. He says the elites were bribed- not quite with actual money (though that may be a part) but with the myth that China will be a good trading partner and the entire world economy will benefit.

But whereas it took British gunboats to pry open Chinese markets, the Chinese Comm. Party walked right through the front door. In fact, our Uniparty elites rolled out the red carpet, welcoming the country to permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) status and membership in the WTO, all the while assuring themselves that trade would mean liberalization and democracy in China.

This seems correct to me (and NO this is not a back-handed or left-handed compliment). Two points in support:

1. I've heard the following happened with many presidents: they run saying they will get tough on China, but once in office their business-donors or their economists tell them not to, and Most-Favored-Trading Status is given AGAIN.
2. A quote from Google AI:

It was Brent Scowcroft, President George H.W. Bush's National Security Adviser, who was famously photographed toasting Chinese officials, which occurred in December 1989, a few months after the Tienanmen Square crackdown, during his second trip there. There was also a prior, secret visit in July, about a month after the crackdown.

Following the bloody suppression of pro-democracy protests in Tienanmen Square on June 4, 1989, President Bush publicly condemned the violence and suspended high-level military and diplomatic exchanges. However, concerned about isolating China and maintaining a strategic relationship, he engaged in secret diplomacy.

July 1989: Bush secretly dispatched Brent Scowcroft and Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger to Beijing to meet with Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping and other officials. The mission's purpose was to express U.S. concerns privately and "keep open the lines of communication".

December 1989: Scowcroft and Eagleburger made a second visit, which was announced only after their arrival in Beijing. During this trip,

photographs of Scowcroft toasting Chinese officials were released, leading to significant criticism from the U.S. Congress and public. Critics accused the administration of "kowtowing" to the Chinese leadership and undermining U.S. human rights principles.

Bush defended his actions by arguing it was in the long-term U.S. strategic interest not to isolate China, a policy that set a framework for future U.S.-China relations.

3. An article in *The New Republic* from the year 2000 which said that Free Trade would bring Democracy to China: here. BILL- FILL IN THE ARTICLE LATER

9.3 DEI and ESG Mean CCP

This section begins with more (true) stories about American Companies and Chinese companies doing immoral (not clear if illegal) things. Black Rock is criticized and rightfully so.

Then it makes a jump from this to DEI and ESG being part of this. The leap does not make sense.

Possible intelligent points he could discuss but doesn't:

1. Is DEI hurting American companies and universities? If so, how to scale it down or get rid of it. This has nothing to do with China.
2. Are the current regulations on global warming (are there any?) helping China and hurting America? He seems to think so. He may even be right—but he also assumed that Global Warming is a hoax which undermines his arguments.

9.4 China's Globalist Tyranny Has Created a Class of American Princelings

Why did we get into this mess? Who benefits. He says that a small set of American elites benefit. This chapter is more of the same as above but I want to point out one really odd thing he says:

(Page 229) Conservatives have gotten so fixated on the sensational tabloid aspects of the Hunter Biden story (the tawdry and incestuous family dramas, the hookers and crack, the bumbling incompetence) that they have neglected

the much more important ways in which his business behaviour was utterly typical of our ruling class.

He then tells a story of how Hunter made 5.8 million dollars on some Chinese deals using his connections. Bill—this is likely immoral but not illegal.

Here is why this passage is so odd

1. It is a gratuitous mention of Hunter Biden. It has nothing to do with if his father had influence or did anything on his behalf.
2. Kevin Roberts says as much- *utterly typical*. So why use Hunter Biden as the example. This is very distracting.
3. Trumps sons have done business with Saudi Arabia.
4. To be fair Kevin Roberts does mention that Mitch McConnell's sister-in-law is on the board of the Bank of China.

Here is an out-of-left-field quote

(Page 230) The CCP wants you shutting up about the Uyghurs genocide.

This may be the only line in the entire book where Kevin Roberts talks about some other people being oppressed. However, his point is not *it is terrible that the Uyghurs are being killed* its *its terrible that the CCP is not letting us talk about it*.

Note also that this is the only time he cares about how some non-American group is being treated. Thats fine—he is an isolationist. But that makes picking on this one issue rather selective.

9.5 We're in a Spiritual War with China

(Page 231) Back during the 1990's, Republicans gleefully slashed congressional staff and operations budgets as part of a broad sweep of fiscal reforms. I think we need to recognize in hindsight that this was a mistake. A weak, distracted Congress without a robust, dogged staff, is a recipe for foreign penetration and lackadaisical oversight.

I wonder what Kevin Roberts thinks of the Trump cuts.

(Page 232) The first thing a beefed-up Congress should do (after banning Tik-Tok) is bring back the House of un-American Activities Committee (HUAC).

1. I Googled asking why Trump changes his mind about TikTok (he wanted to ban it and then changes his mind).

As Donald Trump reverses his position on potentially banning TikTok ahead of an expected House vote this week on legislation that could lead to it being blocked in the U.S., the former president has been rebuilding his relationship with a GOP megadonor who reportedly has a major financial stake in the popular social media platform.

Trump met with the donor, hedge fund manager Jeff Yass, earlier this month at a Club for Growth donor retreat in Palm Beach, Florida, on March 1.

The Club for Growth, a conservative political organization to which Yass has donated millions of dollars, has opposed anti-TikTok efforts.

The group's president last year wrote: "Giving the government the power to ban apps and pick and choose between competing apps is a huge restriction on phone freedom."

The former president, who had originally spearheaded efforts to ban TikTok during his time in the White House, reversed his stance last week, posting on his own social media platform that getting rid of TikTok would benefit Facebook and that he doesn't want that to happen, suggesting Facebook is a bigger problem for the country.

"I don't want Facebook ... doing better. They are a true Enemy of the People!" he wrote.

The Trump campaign did not respond to a request for more information about what motivated Trump's changing view, and it's not yet known what he and Yass discussed in their March 1 meeting.

This is not the way to do economic policy.

2. The HUAC? Really. If Kevin Roberts knew some history he would know that not only did the original HUAC accuse people who were innocent, it also *did very little to catch a single communist*. I had heard that J. Edgar Hoover didn't like them though when I asked Google I got a more nuanced answer:

J. Edgar Hoover generally supported Senator Joseph McCarthy's anti-communist goals but was privately dismayed by his theatrical, unsubstantiated methods, feeling McCarthy's sensationalism damaged the legitimate anti-communist cause by focusing on "name-calling" and "explosive" behavior rather than methodical investigation, which Hoover believed undermined public perception and the serious threat of Communism, though publicly Hoover often praised McCarthy as a fellow crusader against subversion.

Hoover's Perspective on McCarthy:

- 1) Shared Ideology: Hoover and McCarthy were both ardent anti-communists who saw Communism as an existential threat, aligning on the necessity of rooting out "subversive elements".
- 2) Methodological Differences: Hoover, known for his methodical approach, found McCarthy's "name-calling" and theatrical style counterproductive and damaging to the anti-communist movement.
- 3) Public vs. Private Stance: Publicly, Hoover presented a favorable image of McCarthy as a martyr for the anti-communist cause, but privately, he was concerned about McCarthy's lack of discipline, according to historians.
- 4) FBI's Role: The FBI, under Hoover, was already deeply involved in investigating suspected communists through surveillance, a function McCarthy's hearings sometimes overlapped with, but Hoover preferred the FBI's quiet, behind-the-scenes work over public spectacle.

Hoover's View on the Hearings (Army-McCarthy Hearings):

- 1) Hoover saw the hearings as a way to further the anti-communist fight but disliked the public airing of tactics that he felt were unprofessional.
- 2) He considered the Senate's investigation of McCarthy as persecution, yet his own Bureau operated in a similar, often unchecked, manner, blurring lines between legitimate investigation and political persecution.

In essence, Hoover and McCarthy were allies in the war against communism, but Hoover disapproved of McCarthy's reckless style, seeing it as a threat to the very cause they both championed.

I then looked up if the HUAC caught any real communists. I thought the answer was NO but its also more nuanced; however, it seems it was not worth the humiliation it gave to fellow travelers

The House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) identified and investigated individuals who were indeed members of the Communist Party USA (CPUSA). However, it did not typically "catch" Soviet spies or agents involved in espionage, as its primary goal was to uncover domestic communist influence and subversion rather than foreign intelligence operations.

Key points regarding the HUAC's investigations:

1) – Communist Party Members: Many of those who appeared before the committee, particularly in the Hollywood hearings (such as the "Hollywood Ten"), were known Communist Party members or had past affiliations. Membership in the CPUSA was legal at the time, but the committee's actions led to blacklisting and social condemnation, ruining many careers.

2) Alger Hiss Case: One of HUAC's most famous cases was the investigation of Alger Hiss, a former high-ranking State Department official. Whittaker Chambers, a former communist and Soviet agent, accused Hiss of being a secret communist who had supplied him with government information. Hiss was eventually convicted of perjury in connection with the espionage charges, a conviction most historians believe was justified. This case convinced many of the committee's value in exposing communist threats.

3) Espionage vs. Sympathy: There is a significant distinction between being a Communist Party member (which was not illegal) and engaging in espionage (which was). HUAC's tactics often blurred this line, focusing heavily on political beliefs and

associations rather than concrete evidence of criminal acts like spying.

4) **Methods and Impact:** The committee's methods often involved public accusation, pressure to name names, and circumventing constitutional rights, which has led to widespread criticism that its proceedings were a "witch hunt". The investigations created a climate of fear and conformity known as "McCarthyism" (though Senator Joseph McCarthy operated in the Senate, separately from the House-based HUAC, their campaigns overlapped in time and tone).

In summary, while the HUAC did bring to light the communist affiliations of many Americans, it rarely uncovered actual Soviet spies, with the notable exception of the information that led to Alger Hiss's perjury conviction.

9.6 Restoring Our Commerce/Spiritual Warfare Requires Spiritual Resistance

In these sections he proposes solutions. They are pretty weak tea.

1. Stop China from stealing our IT. I googled *Trump cuts programs to fight Cybersecurity* and got a YES:

Yes, reports and government documents indicate that the Trump administration has cut numerous federal programs, positions, and funding related to Cybersecurity efforts, particularly within the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA). These actions have drawn significant criticism from Cybersecurity experts and lawmakers of both parties, who warn that they place the U.S. at greater risk of cyberattacks.

Key actions and impacts include:

- **Budget and Personnel Cuts:** The administration's proposed Fiscal Year 2026 budget included a \$495 million cut and the elimination of over 1,000 positions at CISA, a 30% reduction in staff.

- **Program Eliminations:** The administration shuttered CISA's election security mission and halted funding for programs like the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center (MS-ISAC) and the Elections Infrastructure Information Sharing and Analysis Center (EI-ISAC), which provide critical threat intelligence and incident response services to state and local governments.
- **Executive Orders:** An executive order signed in June 2025 eliminated several Biden-era Cybersecurity initiatives, including mandates for federal contractors to provide "secure software development attestations," requirements for agencies to adopt post-quantum cryptography, and programs to test AI for critical infrastructure defense.
- **Agency Restructuring:** The administration has emphasized a shift in responsibility to state and local governments, a strategy that many experts argue leaves numerous entities unprepared to manage the complex and evolving cyber threats.
- **Advisory Board Dissolution:** The Cyber Safety Review Board (CSRB), a key public-private panel for investigating major cyber incidents, was disbanded.
- **Overall Impact:** According to an annual review by the bipartisan Cyberspace Solarium Commission 2.0, the U.S. has regressed in its national cyber preparedness for the first time in five years due to these cuts and a lack of clear leadership.

The administration has stated that these changes are intended to eliminate "wasteful and weaponized spending," avoid burdensome regulations, and refocus agencies like CISA on their "core mission" of protecting critical infrastructure and federal networks. However, experts warn that the reductions weaken national defenses at a time when threats from foreign adversaries like China and Russia are escalating.

I then Googled to ask how Trump and Biden compared on stopping China from stealing our IT. Trump has done some actions, but his lack

of cooperation with allies is a problem. Here is the complete quote:

Both the Trump and Biden administrations have employed different strategies to counter intellectual property (IP) theft by China, and experts hold varied opinions on which approach has been more effective or the results generated. The effectiveness of each approach is subject to ongoing debate and economic analysis.

Donald Trump's Approach

The Trump administration pursued a protectionist approach, primarily using tariffs and trade pressure to compel China to change its practices.

- (a) **Tariffs:** The administration imposed tariffs on approximately \$360 billion worth of Chinese goods after a Section 301 investigation concluded that China engages in widespread IP violations. These tariffs were intended to serve as a punitive measure and a bargaining chip.
- (b) **"Phase One" Trade Agreement:** This agreement included some commitments from China to strengthen its IP protections (such as changes to anti-unfair competition laws and patent laws) and increase purchases of American products.
- (c) **"China Initiative":** The Department of Justice (DOJ) launched this program to prioritize the prosecution of Chinese trade secret theft and economic espionage.
- (d) **Export Controls:** The Commerce Department used export controls to limit the sale of cutting-edge technology to specific Chinese companies like Huawei.
- (e) (I added this one) Some of Trump's tariffs have nothing to do with what's good for America. Putting Tariff's on Brazil since the government has put on trial their former Trump-loving president for doing his version of Jan 6. Also, helping out Argentina because he likes the president.

Critics argue the tariffs imposed heavy costs on American businesses and consumers and underdelivered on their promise

to stop IP theft, while the "China Initiative" faced criticism for allegedly creating a climate of fear among Asian American academics and researchers.

Joe Biden's Approach

The Biden administration has continued a tough stance on China but advocates a different strategy, emphasizing working with allies and investing in domestic competitiveness.

- (a) **Continued Tariffs and Sanctions:** The Biden administration has largely kept the Trump-era tariffs in place and has expanded on export controls and financial sanctions on Chinese entities, exceeding the Trump administration in the number of persons and entities added to restricted lists.
- (b) **Ending the "China Initiative":** The DOJ ended the program after a strategic review and transitioned to a broader approach to countering national security threats from various countries.
- (c) **Domestic Investment:** The administration has focused on strengthening America's economic footing through investments in key technologies like semiconductors (e.g., the CHIPS Act, which provides subsidies for domestic manufacturing) to outcompete China and reduce reliance on its supply chains.
- (d) **Legislation:** President Biden signed legislation into law that imposes clear consequences, including property-blocking sanctions and visa bans, for individuals and firms found to be involved in significant theft of U.S. trade secrets.
- (e) **Supporters point to greater relative economic gains compared to China during Biden's term and a more strategic, less unilateral approach.**

Conclusion Determining who was "better" often depends on an individual's preferred policy approach—Trump's emphasis on direct pressure and tariffs versus Biden's focus on alliances,

targeted controls, and domestic investment. Both administrations have used various tools, but the challenge of IP theft from China remains an ongoing concern.

2. Raise Tariffs. Trump has done this. He has not done them in an intelligent and targeted way so I doubt they will be effective.
3. *(Page 234) The fact is, driven by short sighted stock price concerns and a buck-passing approach, it was American executives who played right into the hands of Xi Jinping and the Chinese Politburo*

So far I agree. I am waiting for some good ideas to fight this.

(Page 234) A reinvigorated case for another American Century, helped along by a reinvigorate HUAC, must remind America's business elites of their duties to the common good of the republic and reinstall a sense of patriotism in them.

Really? That's your answer?

4. Public Prayer. Really! I quote directly since otherwise I would wonder Really?

(Page 234) To restore public prayer to a place of prominence—to take a moment for prayer before football games, to have prominent leaders including our president not just issuing the occasional prayer proclamation but actually publicly take a knee before the almighty God (as Washington did) to begin school days again with a prayer (enabled by school choice legislation)—would be to once again properly acknowledge our gratitude to God and humbly seek His assistance in our struggle to restore vitality to our nation.

Many conservative ministers were against Prayer in the schools since it would just be rote and meaningless. In the 1800's there were riots in Philadelphia about which prayers would be said in school. So again, Kevin Roberts needs to learn some history:

The **Philadelphia Riots of 1844** was about which VERSION of the bible (Catholic or Protestant) to read in public school. Each thought of the other as offensive.

<https://www.au.org/the-latest/church-and-state/articles/a-history-of-violence>

5. These solutions are very weak. Biden's Chip bill and intelligent use of Tariff's were far better.

10 Elites Must Serve the Nation

He was at the Davos meeting and said the following:

(Pages 237–238) Our current elites see themselves not as leaders of a republic but as members of a global community. Their loyalty is not to the United States. If I ever felt tempted to believe our current elite’s self-justification that their rejection of American Identify is simply a response to an ever more complex world, it ended when I went to Davos. What I saw there wasn’t a response to reality but a bubble of privilege totally disconnected from ordinary people’s concerns.

I was invited to the World Economic Forum to discuss what to expect from a future Republican administration. I accepted in order to get a chance to see Uniparty’s biggest global festival for myself and to give the participants a piece of my mind on behalf of the American People.

*What most people who will never go to Davos think is it is . . . is what it absolutely is: The **biggest conspirator** of them all. an entire village full of back rooms where self-selected elites from all over the world decide what matters. It is shot through with hypocrisy: politicians and CEOs descend in their private jets to lecture ordinary people about climate change and ESG. They swan around extolling the importance of diversity by an army of invisible plebes. It’s a place where “billionaires tell millionaires about what the middle class feels,” as the global banker Jamie Dimon sheepishly put it.*

At Davos, I realized that there is one question that cuts like Alexander the Great’s Sword through the Gordian knot of immigration and trade, a question that our Uniparty elite wriggles to avoid at every step. The question is Do the ordinary people of this country matter?

Do the ordinary people of this country matter?

DO THE ORDINARY PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY MATTER?

(Bill) I thought the problem with Davos was crony capitalism, not caring too much about DEI and ESG.

10.1 Dead Souls

1. Samuel Harrington wrote a book *Who Are We: The Challenge to America’s Identity* which Kevin Roberts says is a good book written by someone who was (is?) an Elite and hence has the inside scoop. It might be a better book than this one—I may check it out.

2. In both this section and the beginning of this chapter Kevin Roberts talks about how the Uniparty does not care about ordinary people. Does he really think that Trump does? Trump has been cutting taxes on the wealthy and taking away services from ordinary people his entire term. See next point.

3. Steve Bannon and JD Vance at one time really wanted to help the common man. Here is a quote from the Wikipedia page on Bannon:

Bannon favors raising the federal income taxes to 44 percent for those earning incomes over 5 million dollars a year as a way to pay for middle class tax cuts. He also supports significantly increasing spending on infrastructure, describing himself as "The guy pushing a trillion-dollar infrastructure plan"

So why is he supporting Trump? Same could be said of Kevin Roberts and JD Vance.

4. Here is an interesting and perhaps true observation: In the past Elites were conservatives who wanted to preserve the status quo, and perhaps their place in it. But now they want to change it. This could be the beginning of an interesting conversation: (1) is it true, and (2) if so then why. But as usual Kevin Roberts is not interested in an interesting conversation. Here are some quotes

*(Page 240) Throughout history elites have usually been conservative forces, defending the status quo they sit atop. So why is it that America's Uniparty elites attack the traditions, culture, and the institution that made America great? My point isn't that this turn in our elites has been **bad** (though it's turned into a disaster); it is that it has been **profoundly weird**, profoundly unnatural of elites throughout history.*

He seems to say that the old system wasn't that good— they were guarding a system that was benefiting him. Why the change is bad is most of this book. But he raises a good question: WHY have elites stopped defending the system that benefits them.

He does not give a good answer.

(Page 241) The reason why is that piety, gratitude, and a sense of duty get in the way of technocratic management, the centralization of power, and the strip mining of the American way of life. Student activist who

*tear down statues on campus have no problem working, upon graduation, for vulture hedge funds stripping viable companies for parts, or for PR firms whitewashing Qatari terrorist financing. [Bill: This book was written before Trump accepted a Plane as a gift from Qatar.] Holding the United States to be a **racist settler-colonial state** they feel no shame in working for her enemies. They are encouraged to feel no sense of duty towards their families, their communities, or their countrymen, and they dub this moral emptiness a virtue.*

This passage began by saying something that might be interesting (I'll get to that) and then complains about hedge funds (but I thought he was a free-market Republican) and then about students who protest the establishment and then work for it. That may be true but its not related to the question of why elites have changed.

He has one phrase that may be part of an explanation *technocratic management*. It IS true that companies are now much bigger than in the past and the people making decisions about it are further away from the consumers they serve. I ask non-rhetorically if this is bad. The corner grocer used to know who you were, the barbershop used to be a place to gather socially, those are gone. But prices are lower and you have more selection. Amazon is an extreme case of this. But are we better or worse off, and in what ways, is a good question.

I looked up what the Heritage foundation thinks about anti-trust:

The Heritage Foundation's stance on antitrust cases has evolved, traditionally favoring limited government intervention but now advocating for aggressive antitrust action against Big Tech to curb perceived censorship, protect free speech, and ensure fair markets for smaller innovators, aligning with broader conservative concerns about tech power, though still emphasizing judicious application and consumer welfare principles, not broad economic planning. They support using antitrust laws to address tech giants' anti-competitive practices, like self-preserving and gatekeeper abuses, while cautioning against expanding antitrust to weaponize it or control normal business, focusing on re-balancing democracy and competition.

Key Aspects of Heritage's View:

(a) Target: Big Tech: Heritage focuses antitrust efforts on

dominant tech platforms (Google, Apple, Meta, Amazon) for censorship, anti-competitive conduct, and leveraging power across markets.

- (b) **Goals: Protect Free Speech:** Countering tech censorship of conservative viewpoints is a major driver. **Promote Competition:** Ensure tech giants don't stifle startups and smaller competitors. **Rebalance Power:** Use antitrust to put power back in the hands of the American people.
- (c) **Methodology: Judicious Enforcement:** Calls for careful, targeted application of antitrust, not broad economic planning.
- (d) **Focus on Conduct:** Scrutinize anti-competitive practices, but avoid new laws that "weaponize" antitrust.
- (e) **Consumer Welfare:** Still rooted in the consumer welfare standard, but interpreted to include non-price harms like lack of choice or free expression.
- (f) **Shift in Stance:** While traditionally opposing expanded government power, Heritage now sees tech monopolies as a significant threat to free markets and democracy, justifying stronger enforcement.

In essence, Heritage seeks to apply existing antitrust tools more aggressively against Big Tech to serve conservative goals, contrasting with past conservative approaches that favored deregulation and minimal intervention.

My thoughts

- (a) This all sounds reasonable. But why only tech companies?
- (b) Trump will go after those firms that he does not like. This is not a coherent policy and its more like the Mafia. Will the Heritage foundation then disagree with him? I doubt it

10.2 The Birth of the Global Citizen

Princeton's unofficial motto in the early 1900's was
a school of duty in the national service.

More recently it has become
a school of duty in the Service of all nations.
and later
a school of duty in the Nation's service and the service of humanity.
This raises a good question. I have phrased this as
How big is your clan?
The bigger it is the more there is world peace.

1. We can no longer imagine a war between two countries in the European Union.
2. There are very few wars (zero?) between the different branches of Christianity.

This is all to the good!

JD Vance and Pope Francis had a disagreement about what Catholic doctrine says about helping immigrants.

From Google:

Yes, JD Vance and Pope Francis had a significant disagreement over Catholic doctrine, specifically the concept of *ordo amoris* (order of love), related to immigration and charity. Vance argued that loving one's family and nation first, using *ordo amoris*, justified strict immigration policies, while Pope Francis countered in a letter that Christian love requires an open fraternity for all, like the Good Samaritan, not concentric circles prioritizing one's own group, highlighting a clash over compassion for migrants versus nationalistic priorities.

Key Points of the Disagreement:

1. **Ordo Amoris (Order of Love):** Vance used this concept, which suggests a hierarchy of love starting with family and country, to support his views on restricting immigration and prioritizing national interests.
2. **Pope Francis's View:** He rejected Vance's interpretation, stating Christian love isn't a concentric expansion but a universal fraternity open to everyone, citing the Good Samaritan as the model for serving the most vulnerable, including migrants.

3. **Immigration Policies:** The debate intensified due to the Trump administration's harsh immigration crackdown, which Vance defended, leading to Francis's critique of policies that harm migrants' dignity.
4. **Vance's Response:** Vance acknowledged the Pope's criticism but stood by his views, calling himself a "baby Catholic" while asserting his commitment to serving the American people.

The Exchange:

1. In a letter to U.S. bishops, Pope Francis directly addressed Vance's position, explaining that true Christian love builds a universal fraternity, not prioritizing one's own over others.
 2. This doctrinal debate reflects a broader tension between nationalist policies and Catholic social teaching on welcoming the stranger, with Francis championing the latter.
1. Kevin Roberts says that after the Cold War was over we should have disengaged and handled problems at home. Again, a good question: how to use the peace dividend, how to re-orient the country. Also in hindsight, how to help Russia join the fraternity of nations peacefully and be integrated into the world economy. No mention of 9-11 as a reason we need to be engaged. To bad— this is an interesting issue.
 2. Page 244. Back to how elites got to be against the status quo. Here is a better answer than earlier: they became citizens of the world. More money that way. This does not explain why they are in favor DEI and ESG. Indeed—I do not think they are.
 3. He has an interesting surprising bi-partisan criticism of the Uniparty:
(Page 244) Leftist criticism of our elites have focused on wealth and income inequality. Right-wing populism has focused more on the rise of a disconnected and imperialistic elite that pushes its values on the rest of the world

10.3 The Uniparty Sees Americans and Non-Americans as Interchangeable

He talks about immigration being a problem because for *both parties* its just not an urgent concern. I would go further—Republicans like having cheap illegal labor and Democrats like having potential voters. So here I think he may be onto something. And then he ruins it.

(Page 247) The most important thing to realize is that for members of Uniparty on both sides of the aisle, none of this is in any way, shape, or form an urgent problem [FINE]. They don't have to deal with it. It doesn't affect their lives or those of their donors. It is beneath their notice. [FINE but they need to say why immigration is bad]. They don't have Sino-Mexican fentanyl addicts on their block [Kevin Roberts didn't get the memo to blame Venezuela], menacing young "asylum seekers" leering at their daughter [This is a bigoted and incorrect stereotype.] or occupying their kid's schools [What about smart immigrants who power America.], illegal immigrants undercutting their wages or flooding their doctors offices

This passage points to the real issues we might have with immigrants (and perhaps some are false problems) but is not serious. Here are some serious thoughts:

1. How to deal with the drug problem in this country? This is little to do with immigration but is a legit problem.
2. Do immigrants bring crime. Studies show no.
3. Do immigrants take jobs from American? I've heard anecdotes that they do not, that they do jobs Americans don't want, but this needs a more serious study.
4. Flooding our doctors office? This would be true if we had Universal Health Care. Indeed—our medical system is a mess. And again, this has little to do with immigrants.

10.4 The Uniparty versus Real America

He discusses Opelousas, Louisiana—a small town where small business's were chased out by big businesses [that gave better products at a cheaper price?] They also lost their traditions.

(Page 250) What led to the war between the Uniparty and the Opelousas? As in any war, the Battle is joined when the defending party decides to fight back? In the wake of the global financial crisis, the American people had had enough of our elites and their disastrous leadership, not only in bailing out Wall Street at Main Street's expense, but also in snaring us in Middle East Quagmires, surrendering US sovereign, opening the borders, appeasing Communist China, and otherwise selling out American people to the Davos class. Populist movements arose on the left (Occupy Wall Street) and the right (The Tea Party) that, for all their disagreements, shared a single goal: to demand accountability for elite failures. Elite institutions responded, and they have been trying to divide ordinary Americans every which way they can ever since, to avoid being forced to reckon with their sins.

Thats a lot to unpack!

1. To many issues in one paragraph. The unifying theme is elites, but the issues are to different. What if I am against bailouts but want us to define Israel? What if I believe in bailouts and free trade?
2. Sharp irony here: He seems to want Occ wall Street and the Tea Party to team up an get along. The entire book has been trashing leftists so he is not the one to suggest unification. Or maybe he is— *only Nixon could go to China*.
3. I don't really know what he wants. More government? The Heritage foundation is generally against that.

10.5 Elites Who Love America

He lists the following types of people who may be future GOOD elites

1. Veterans
2. Silicon valley people who dropped out of college (or never went) and are actually DOING things.
3. State legislatures who are really doing things.

Again, there are people in these categories on both sides of issues.

10.6 Nationalize the Elites

1. Third Fellowship: Given students \$100,000 to drop out of college and do something great. What if they don't? Most people need to *know* things to do something great. Kevin Roberts criticisms of schools are vague but they seem to be about the humanities. He never mentions STEM. To do great things in (say) Computer Science most people (That woke liberal Bill Gates is an exception) need some training.
2. Some schools he likes are new ones that are founded on *American Values*. Here is a list and what I found out about them.

(a) **Hamilton Center at the University of Florida** The Florida legislature and some donors founded this as part of the Univ of Florida at Gainesville. DeSantis wanted it to fight wokeness. The course are American History and politics, philosophy, all humanities. I tried to find some bias with the professors but I didn't find any. It might be okay despite the intentions.

(b) **Civitus Institute at the Univ of Texas at Austin** The website had all political articles. Some were fair, but some were not—they seem to be climate change deniers.

(c) **University of Austin** This is a real school with math majors. They have some *Forbidden courses* which means you are free (I assume free of wokeness) to speak your mind. Here are the courses:

(a) Who's to blame for inflation.

(b) Partisan politics and the decline of democracy.

(c) Discrimination in Higher Ed: What do the numbers tell us .

(d) When the truth is too much to bear: The fearful pursuit of truth in ancient Greek tragedy.

(e) Why does government fail so often?

The first four *could* be unbiased. The last one really can't.

Here is a big **Red Flag**: Steven Pinker and Robert Zimmer, who are in favor of more intellectual freedom at colleges, were on the board of directors but resigned after 10 days.

Here is one article:

<https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2021/11/17/university-austin-ba>

Google AI gave me the following about why Steven Pinker resigned:

Steven Pinker resigned from the University of Austin (UATX) board because he felt the new university was too focused on the political right and "anti-woke" culture, confusing free speech with a partisan agenda, and was essentially becoming a "university of the canceled," rather than a true academic institution dedicated to free inquiry. He was concerned the board and faculty were "stacked with right-wingers" and people "who had been canceled," and felt a viable university couldn't be built on being "un-left-wing".

Key Reasons for Resignation:

- 1) **Political Stance:** Pinker believed UATX equated free speech with right-wing politics, rather than upholding broad intellectual freedom.
- 2) **Focus on "The Canceled":** He felt the institution was becoming defined by its opposition to "woke" culture and by the profiles of those who had faced academic cancellation, which he saw as a flawed foundation for a university.
- 3) **Divergence from UATX's Direction:** Pinker felt the university's critical statements about higher education diverged significantly from his own views on what a university should be.

Timeline:

- 1) Pinker announced his departure from the board of advisors just a week after UATX's founding was announced in November 2021.
- 2) While he initially gave a brief statement about concentrating on his projects, he later elaborated on his concerns about the university's ideological direction.

3. *Page 254 We need to attack some of the privileges of globalist elites who are free to do business in the United States as they please (and also, many analysts believe, free to hide income from the IRS.)*

This sounds like Bernie Sanders talk. That's not bad, but it's odd. I wonder if Kevin Roberts' co-workers at the Heritage Foundation would agree. Or pretend to agree so long as they are not targeted.

The IRS? Trump has cut the IRS a lot.

<https://nstep.org/article/trump-just-hired-6700-irs-workers-middle-tax-sea>
and

<https://taxlawcenter.org/blog/the-trump-administrations-proposed-irs-cuts->

4. Page 254. He is complaining about foreigners having jobs in America. Dual loyalty is bad.

My General Comment: There is a lot of complaints about hiring a person of nationality X. The complaint is insane. Would he object to a Cuban who is staunchly anti-Castro running our Cuba policy? Marco Rubio is from Cuba and is anti-Castro. If Kevin Roberts wants to complain that these people are biased, that's a complaint that may be legit (I do not know). But there can be (say) Wisnians who are pro-Wisnia or anti-Wisnia, and even within that they can be pro or anti for a good reason or a biased reason. By saying that a person with nationality X cannot do job Y you may be violating Gibbs rule 5: You don't waste good.

The accusations of dual-loyalty is also a very old anti-semitic trope.

Here is a quote where I interject a lot

(Page 254) It's insane that we let a Ukrainian (Aleksander Semyonovich Vindman) run the National Security Council's Ukraine desk and attempt to overthrow the duly elected president of the United States because he didn't like his Ukraine Policy.

Vindman was against Trump blackmailing President Zelensky. Vindman was born in Ukraine and came over to America when he was 4 years old. Vindman is an American Citizen. If Vindman had the same policies but was NOT from Ukraine would that make Kevin Roberts happier? If Vindman had policies that Kevin Roberts liked would Kevin Roberts object that Vindman is Ukrainian. (I won't repeat this kind of remark, but it can be made in all of the cases below.)

(Pages 254–255) Its insane that we have an elected member of congress (Ihhan Abudullah Omar) who promised to protect the borders of her homeland, Somalia, while refusing to protect those of the United States.

These two issues are unrelated. There really is a war in Somalia but there is not in America. She came over to the United States when she was 13. Would Kevin Roberts say that people who were born in other countries (like Ted Cruz) can't be elected to congress?

(Page 255) It's insane that the Senate confirmed a Sec of Transportation (Elaine Chao) whose family runs a Chinese Shipping company and whose sister sat on the board of the Bank of China (in the George W Bush years she oversaw the dept of labor during the flood of outsourcing jobs to Chinese factories, which shipped goods back to the United States on her family's boats).

Kevin Roberts should mention that Elaine Chao is Mitch McConnell's wife. This would NOT be a problem for Kevin Roberts to mention since Kevin Roberts regards Mitch as a member of the Uniparty. Sitting on the board of a Chinese bank is a massive conflict of interest. Having been born in China is not.

It's insane that the Biden administration has a Colombian native running its Latin America Policy and a Palestinian coordinating its response to Hamas terrorist offensive. Its insane that liberal critics will attack you as racist or xenophobic just for noticing this.

10.7 An America First Trade and Immigration Policy

1. *According to a 2021 study by the Libertarian Cato Institute, 61 percent of Americans want 500,00 or fewer immigrants admitted each year.*
 - 1) Any think tank which says what its biased to believe ahead of time is worthless. Ind of the question at hand consider the two scenarios
 - a) If CATO did a study and found that more guns means less crime, would anyone believe them since they are ahead-of-time pro-gun?
 - b) If CATO did a study and found that more guns means more crime, would they publish it? I honestly don't know.

- 2) Do people fear immigrants because Trump told them to?
 - 3) Now that Trump has cut immigration farmers can't get migrants to help.
 - 4) This is one of those times when people are out of their depth having an opinion, especially a precise number like 500,000.
2. Kevin Roberts DOES like having high-skilled immigrants. And letting students come in and stay. Trump used to believe this but no longer does— student visas are way down. I'd be curious if Kevin Roberts is now disagreeing with Trump.
 3. Page 259. Praises Trump for the renegotiation of NAFTA. The book was written before Trump said its a terrible treaty and is wrecking the US and Canada economy.

10.8 Restoring our Border Sovereignty/Regime Change

More on immigration. More on the call for revolution.

11 The Dawn's Early Light

11.1 An Order Reborn/The Unbroken Chain

1. Kevin Roberts is optimistic about America's ability to change:

(Page 268) In surprising places in our culture, especially among young people, there is a real yearning for family and friendships, a hatred of meaningless sex and pornography, an interest in handicraft, a rejection of hyper-individualism and consumerism, and a desire for what is sacred.

My thoughts:

1) Handicrafts? Why is that particularly good? How does it fit in with the other items which do hang together.

2) Libertarians (and he used a CATO study about immigration) are all about hyper-individualism.

3) Republicans claim to be in favor of individualism and consumerism.

4) Again, I don't think Trump or the Republican party are the ones to bring any of this about. Sounds like woke hippy talk (except the part about hating meaningless sex).

2. A nice passage (I am not being sarcastic.)

*(Page 269) You may feel that you are serving only a few people, a small community, maybe even just your own family; that what you're doing isn't important, at least not as important as what is going on in the halls of government. That is exactly backwards. We'll never have an end of government, but what goes on at America's dinner tables, on its front porches, and in its church pews is a scarce and irreplaceable treasure. **Everything depends upon it.** The future of America will not be won or lost in Washington; it will be won or lost in the hearts of the American people.*

This is nice but I do not know what policy this leads to. He seems to have a contradictory view of Government and can't decide if he wants it to help his cause or stay out of his life.

He is the president of the Heritage Foundation which is in Washington. That seems odd.

11.2 The Seeds of Fire

Here is a story he tells which Wikipedia backs up and he is probably on the right side of it.

In 1970 the University of Kansas had a program called the *Integrated Humanities Program*. Quote from Wikipedia:

In the words of Dennis Quinn, the program sought to "teach the Great Books, the classics, from the Greeks up through the Romans and through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance into the modern times." [1] In addition to studying the great books, the students also got together for poetry memorization, singing folk songs, formal waltzing lessons, and stargazing, an activity the founders thought to be one of the greatest sources of wonder.

According to Micah Meadowcroft, writing for National Affairs, IHP was "short-lived but enormously influential". Several alumni went on to found Cair Paravel Latin School in Topeka. [2]

That seems good! But then there was a controversy that shut it down unfairly:

After numerous conversions on the part of students to Catholicism and the subsequent publishing of an article on the part of the Kansas City Times newspaper depicting a Darwinian evolution of a hippie gradually becoming a Catholic monk, the university administration set up an investigation of the program to determine whether or not the three faculty were proselytizing. Ultimately, the program was disbanded following the investigations, despite the investigation group having issued a statement saying "In the face of charges of religious indoctrination and proselytizing, the Committee has found no evidence that the professors of the program have engaged in such activities in the classroom." [3]

I tried to find on the web if there was an intelligent reason to shut it down. ChatGPT gave me a terrible essay on why it should be shut down- mostly vague. Reddit had many comments why it shouldn't not be shut down and zero why it should. Here are two quotes

If the students became atheists then the school would pat themselves on the back with how the students were now free from religious dogma.

It may have also been protestant parents objection to their kids becoming Catholics

11.3 The Alamo

I first quote my notes on **The War That Forged a Nation: Why the Civil War Still Matters** by James McPherson. Note that James McPherson is a respected historian and not a *radical leftist historian* like Howard Zinn.

Mexico won its ind from Spain in 1821. (Read elsewhere: This was done by War, but not the usual sort. It was more of a sequence of uprisings from 1810 to 1821). Mexico invited Americans to settle in the sparsely populated area now called Texas. *Conflict of Ideas*: Mexico had outlawed slavery, but the Americans brought their slaves with them. There were other issues as well: Americans did not obey land-rights laws. In 1836 the Americans declared Texas Ind. Texas petitioned America to annex them (I find this unusual- usually when a country annexes another, the annexed-country doesn't like it.) Texas entered the USA as a Slave State.

(Back to Bill) So clearly America was on the wrong side of the war: the USA was the aggressor and the main issue was that the Americans in Texas wanted to have slavery.

The battle of the Alamo was during this war. America lost that battle, but the slogan *Remember the Alamo* became a rallying cry for Americans to support the war.

Kevin Roberts has a PhD in History. So you would think he knows this and has learned that America was on immoral side of that war.

The last section of the book is about the Alamo and the struggles we face now. Here is a quote

(Page 273) Crockett could have despaired [when at the Alamo and it looked hopeless]. . . . He could have counted up the Mexican soldiers and the horses and cannons and decided that the Texas cause was surely lost. But he didn't.

He didn't despair, not because he anticipated some miraculous rescue but because he believed in the justice of his cause even if he didn't live to see it. Knowing that he faced certain death, he was nonetheless full of hope.

⋮

(Page 274) There is a time for writing and reading—and a time to put down the books and go fight like hell to take back our country and build our future. Taking his stand at he Alamo, Crockett

wrote his last entry before putting aside his diary forever to help guard the walls. They'll be my last words too:

“No time for memorandums now. Go ahead! Liberty and Independence forever!”

Kevin Roberts does not seem to realize that Davy Crockett was on the wrong side morally. Kevin Roberts may still think that getting Texas was good for the USA (it was!) but he totally ignores the moral issues. Since he is a serious Christian this is hypocritical.

12 Added Later

This is not from the book.

12.1 Greenland

I asked Google-AI what Kevin Roberts thought of Trump wanting to take Greenland.

He gave a thoughtful intelligent response about Greenland which would seem to counter what Trump is doing.

Kevin Roberts, president of the conservative think tank The Heritage Foundation, views Greenland as a national security priority for the United States due to its strategic location and natural resources.

While he has not directly commented on Trump's specific desire to "take" the island, The Heritage Foundation has published commentary suggesting a mutually beneficial relationship with the people of Greenland is a wise pursuit. An article on their website suggests several approaches for increased U.S. cooperation, including:

- 1) A "Freely Associated States" relationship, similar to that with the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and Palau, which would give the U.S. military access in exchange for security guarantees and financial aid.*
- 2) Keeping open the possibility of offering territorial status to Greenland if positions on the island's independence and the Danish government's opposition become less firm.*

The commentary emphasizes using respectful diplomacy and negotiation rather than coercion or military threats, noting that a "buy" or "take" approach could impede cooperation and threaten alliances. They advocate for exploring

possibilities through negotiations to gain a strategic advantage in the Arctic region. Roberts generally aligns the Heritage Foundation's policy aims, including those within Project 2025, with a broader "Trumpism" agenda, although he has noted the organization is legally independent of any specific campaign.