

Community comment for May 21, 2014

this is Phil Arnott for community comment on K INS radio.

Well after my last community comment about the size of our federal government some people have said that they are still not convinced that our government is too big so I decided to further my argument with more statistics and facts that hopefully will convince those still in doubt.

There is a big difference between the old and the new way of governing. As a lawyer and as a reader of numerous pieces of literature I was proud to have read the Hillsdale College publication called Imprimus. In this particular publication the author who was president of the college, Larry Arnn said this: our laws in America used to be simple and beautiful and they were written with care and citizens could read them quickly and understand their meaning. Mr. Arnn goes on to say that the four laws that founded America, the Declaration of Independence, the articles of Confederation, the Northwest ordinance and the Constitution of the United States were no more than 4500 words long.

In 1862 Congress passed the Homestead act by which 10% of all US land which was more than 270,000,000 acres passed into the hands of individual citizens. The Homestead act was 1320 words. Compare the Northwest ordinance and the Homestead act, the perfect example of the older constitutional way of governing with the new bureaucratic way of imposing central control rules and processes that no one can understand. For instance the affordable care act, now commonly known as Obama care runs over 363,000 words and this does not include the countless rules and regulations that have been generated since its passage. No wonder Nancy Pelosi said we must pass this bill before we can read it and know what is in it. This bill is not readable or comprehensible. This publication goes on to say that there are two characteristics and dangers of the new way of governing. First, if you look at the size of the federal budget, you see that in economic terms the government is beginning to rival in size the rest of the entire country. Our private sector has been diminishing. Our Constitution placed sovereignty in control of a limited government that owes its authority to the govern which is all of us as citizens of this great country of ours.

James Madison as the father of the Constitution said that the Declaration of Independence set forth the authority for our government to operate. It says that we hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator or with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Later the declaration says that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of those ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute a new government.

Compare that statement of principles with Pres. Obama's book the audacity of hope where it says that in place it in the Constitution's structure, in the very idea of ordered liberty was a rejection of absolute truth, the infallibility of any idea or ideology or theology any tyrannical consistency that might lock future generations into a single, unalterable course... Mr. Arnn said that how did our president come to believe something so foreign to Americans heritage as the idea that in the name of liberty we must reject absolute truths.

I leave you with a point to ponder: I tend to agree with Mr. Arnn when he says that there are new ways of education just like there are new ways of governing. Think about it.

This is Phil Arnott for community comment