

Freedom Works Best!

Highlighting John Stossel's Libertarian Teachings
with Conservative Analysis



R. Nathan Richardson

Updated 3.22.26



Copyright R. Nathan Richardson. This work may be shared with attribution.
(CC-BY-SA)

Nathan is the editor of RichardsonStudies.com and is a member of The
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.



Contents

A Few Conservative Disagreements with Stossel	5
JOHN STOSSEL: NO THEY CAN'T! WHY GOVERNMENT FAILS & INDIVIDUALS SUCCEED	7
Introduction.....	9
Ch. 1 Fixing the Economy.....	12
Ch. 2 Making Life Fair	17
Ch. 3 Keeping Business Honest	20
Ch. 4 Improving Life for Workers	24
Ch. 5 Fixing Healthcare	31
Ch. 6 The Assault on food	36
Ch. 7 Creating a Risk-Free World	39
Ch. 8 Making Sure No One Gets Offended.....	41
Ch. 9 Educating Children	44
Ch. 10 The War on Drugs	47
Ch.11 War to End War	49
Ch. 12 Keeping Nature Exactly as it is Forever.....	52
Ch. 13 The Budget.....	54
Ch. 14 There Ought Not to Be a Law	55
Give Me A Break: How I Exposed Hucksters, Cheats and Scam Artists and Became the Scourge of the Liberal Media 2004 – Book Highlights & Commentary	57
Ch. 1-3: 1 What Happened to Stossel & Ch. 2 Confrontations	59
Ch. 3 Confusion (Regulations)	61
Ch. 5 Scaring Ourselves to Death	68
Ch. 6 Junk Science & Junk Reporting	71

Ch. 7 Government.....	73
Ch. 8 Welfare for the Rich	75
Ch. 9 The Trouble with Lawyers.....	78
Ch. 10 The Left Takes Notice.....	82
Ch. 11 It's Not My Fault! (Victims).....	85
Ch. 12 What About the Poor?.....	87
Ch. 13: Greed or Ambition?.....	89
Ch. 14 Owning Your Body	93
Ch. 15 Free Speech	104
STOSSEL VIDEO HIGHLIGHTS	107
4 Socialism Myths - John Stossel.....	108
Socialism Fails: Reason TV 6m.....	110
Not all Students are Woke Students – John Stossel 6m.....	111
\$2 Million Government Bathroom - John Stossel 5m	112
Welfare for the Rich - John Stossel 5m	113
Bankrupting America - John Stossel 5m.....	113
Military Boondoggles - John Stossel 5m.....	114
Biden Big Spending - John Stossel 5m.....	115
Trump Big Spending - John Stossel 5m.....	116
Free Stuff 2020 - John Stossel 5m	116



A Few Conservative Disagreements with Stossel

Stossel is a libertarian, I am a conservative, so I don't see everything on the same page as Stossel, but I will highlight a lot of great points he makes and write about why I differ from him on certain points throughout these highlights of his teachings.

I believe there are some social values like marriage that should be maintained by the laws of society. I would say the ten commandments are God's opinion on what should be legal and illegal. But I do have many libertarian views.

Stossel as a libertarian thinks government shouldn't interfere even on clearly immoral things like gay marriage, gambling, porn, prostitution, abortion, and drugs. I disagree with him and am more conservative on those topics. But he does make good points about making these state

rather than federal issues, and many worthwhile commentaries on conservative principles.

He says he supports legal prostitution as a woman sharing her body to make money similarly to how athletes use their bodies to make money. The problem with this first and foremost is that God has forbidden it. And it's not hard to see why, these are matters of life and death. But even when strict birth control measures are used it makes a mockery of the sacrament of sexual intimacy which is supposed to be reserved as a symbol of commitment and oneness between parents. Those who Miss use and advocate the free misuse of these divine powers will not be guiltless before God

Stossel thinks that homosexuality is natural and should be legal etc. This is also wrong on many levels first and foremost being that God has forbidden it. Due to the politicized sophistry of the devil and many have been persuaded to think this is something natural and normal when it is anything but natural and anything but normal. It destroys God's plan for the family as the central unit of society, etc.

Stossel admits supporting is abortion. Of course abortion is murder and it has nothing to do with women's rights but everything to do with baby's rights. There's never a good reason to kill a baby.

JOHN STOSSEL: NO THEY CAN'T! WHY GOVERNMENT FAILS & INDIVIDUALS SUCCEED

Highlights & Commentary on

John Stossel's

No They Can't!

Why Government Fails & Individuals Succeed, 2012



Contents of 'No They Can't!'

Introduction

Ch. 1 Fixing the Economy

Ch. 2 Making Life Fair

Ch. 3 Keeping Business Honest

Ch. 4 Improving Life for Workers

Ch. 5 Fixing Healthcare

Ch. 6 The Assault on Food

Ch. 7 Creating a Risk-Free World

Ch. 8 Making Sure No One Gets Offended

Ch. 9 Educating Children

Ch. 10 The War on Drugs

Ch.11 War to End War

Ch. 12 Keeping Nature Exactly as it is Forever

Ch. 13 The Budget

Ch. 14 There Ought Not to Be a Law

Introduction

People crave simple answers that some program will fix everything. The government fails repeatedly, yet when something goes wrong, we say, 'Why doesn't the government do something?' The government makes us deeper in debt and makes the problem worse.

Hayek said the curious task of economics is to show men how little they know about what they can design.

If the government did nothing, the free market would self-correct and actually solve problems.

Obama called for more government control of production. Even though he didn't call for complete government control of production, it's still socialist.

Bush, Obama, and most Americans agree that we should use socialist means like bailing out Banks and car manufacturers who would otherwise fail.

We may want the government to make laws to get rid of bad stuff, but the more the government is involved in promoting good stuff and getting rid of bad stuff, the more it will have its nose in everything.

Reality limits our fantasies about what government and spending can do.

The reality is that no one knows enough to efficiently centrally plan our society.

A law cannot make a \$5 worker worth \$10; if it could, we might as well set the minimum wage at \$100.

Minimum wage laws prevent people from having access to low-salaried jobs, which give people great experience and training.

Oil was not arbitrarily picked as our main source of energy, it is much more efficient than all the other sources we have, and the green subsidies use other types of energy suck away resources from things that actually work putting those resources into things which don't.

Real heroes don't control other people's lives. When asked who your heroes are, in 2001, Christ topped the list, in 2009, Barack Obama followed closely by Ronald Reagan and George Bush. When people think about heroes, they think about politicians. Businessmen and scientists who develop and promote useful products are the real heroes compared to politicians who just talk about things.

Bush launched us down the road of bailouts, and Obama continued it.

Politicians just want to punish the bad guy who ran off with a sack of money in business instead of doing the research to find out which bad policies were sucking all the money out.

Nader said a certain Chevrolet car wasn't safe and never apologized, even when it was proven it was just as safe as other cars. The regulations still stand which came from the Nader propaganda.

The code of federal regulations and codes is 160,000 pages long. Every year, Congress adds several thousand new ones.

The way capitalists get rich is by serving their customers well. If they try to rip you off, word gets out, and they will likely lose business. The free market is ruthless at ferreting out low-quality products.

Progressives always fear the power of business, not the power of government, but government has a power no business has - the power of force.

If you're free to do business with the government, they will find you or jail you if you refuse to pay the IRS for their wars and their government bailouts, etc, no matter how dissatisfied we are with the results.

The more power we give the government, the more businesses try to do business with the government. Rather than focusing on real entrepreneurship, they focus on getting involved with political people who help them get around the rules.

Computers came into existence far away from Washington, DC, in Silicon Valley, and they did it without any lobbyists. But then the government attacked them, so now they have to spend millions on lobbyists.

When we get rid of government regulations, liberals panic and think disaster will happen, but the opposite happens: everything gets better. Companies begin to face competition again without government restrictions, and prices therefore drop. Flying in airplanes becomes something not just for the rich but something for everyone.

He found Reason magazine about the libertarian view and began to teach those things, and he fought against liberal pushback for two decades.

Liberals deny they have any bias and slam conservatives, accusing them of bias. But really, everyone has bias.

Both political parties share the same mistake and idea that their plan will fix everything. No economic genius could run everything.

Just because the government can't solve our problems does not mean humanity cannot solve our problems. Individuals can succeed. Markets aren't perfect, but they create a world where prudence is rewarded and recklessness is punished. It makes a world where people are more likely to take risks and innovate. It creates a world with much more prosperity.

Ch. 1 Fixing the Economy

The recession gave government an excuse to do what they wanted to all along, which is spend. Obama said in 2009 that we have to do whatever it takes to get out of this recession, yet he spent spent spent.

For some reason, we think that giving a dollar to the government, the government will multiply it, but people spend money more wisely than the government does. Individuals are more likely to bring returns on investments. In the free market, people creatively make new things, and wealth comes from that.

The economy is not a machine that needs jump-starting with government spending, as some economists suggest. It is individuals with incentives.

Businesses sit on cash rather than investing it when they don't know what's coming, when they're afraid of the government making some new rule, some new restriction that will tie their hands and cut them down.

When labor laws make it almost impossible to fire someone, businesses hire less.

Politicians hype up how many jobs they created but what we don't see is what might have been created without them getting in the way.

The government creates jobs, but they are often useless. Think of the Egyptians building the pyramids. Non-government jobs are more meaningful.

People favoring government job creation are using the logic that it would be great if everyone was hired to dig holes then fill them up again or if we were to ban all machines because people would have to work much harder.

Money spent rebuilding from a war can help the economy but that money could have been used elsewhere for much greater purposes.

Non-government jobs are more productive.

If someone breaks your window yes you have to hire a repairman but if your window didn't get broken you could have used that money to hire someone else to do something more useful.

Minimum wage laws price people out of the market. There results in many people who don't get any job at all.

Creating jobs is not difficult for government. What's difficult is creating jobs that produce wealth.

Since government projects are funded by compulsion we have no way of knowing if what would have happened otherwise would have been at a better rate etc.

People assume the government is the only one who does something productive with money, whereas the private sector has people who are all just goofing off with money. On the contrary, the private sector uses its money wisely.

The policies of FDR probably lengthened the Great depression
Generating a depression within the depression.

When the government made things like the Fannie May Bernie Mac the 0% home buying they created a housing boom that could not be sustained. Canada does none of these things and more people there have houses than America.

When governments deem businesses too big to fail and bail them out, it invites recklessness.

Obama complained about how we weren't regulating business enough when there were certain failures, but it was the government aid given by Bush and prior politicians that made the unstable situation in the first place.

Failure is what makes markets work. It's called creative destruction. Businesses should fail; it helps adjust the market.

Banks ensure up to \$250,000 to protect the truly needy, and when the people who had tons of money invested in a certain bank would have lost big without a government bailout, it should have taught them to diversify their investments.

Panic creates the situation where people think they need to support government bailouts.

Government bailouts result in huge taxpayer losses. If the bailouts didn't get in the way, those companies could have negotiated, reevaluated, and adjusted, but now we will never know.

We'll never know what would have happened without the taxpayer payouts and bailouts for the big companies. They should have been left to adjust like everyone else. Businesses avoid reckless behavior when they know they won't be bailed out. The banks that are declared too big to fail have advantages over small banks; this is not free market capitalism.

Many mainstream economists think stimulus spending is a terrible mistake, but the mainstream media is not interested.

Companies that give money to political campaigns get more attention and praise. For example, a company called Serious Windows was praised by Biden and Obama and other liberal politicians as an example of the wonders of stimulus spending. The only thing special about that company is that they gave money to the Obama campaign. The company also got a special tax credit that others didn't. The company got a tax credit, which others didn't get, which gave them an advantage when accused of getting a subsidy. They said No,

we didn't get a subsidy. In reality, they got a tax credit; it was a word game.

Tariffs to boost certain industries etc are crony capitalism, or "crapitalism."

When the government subsidized alpacas, it created a market bubble for that.

When subsidies are given for this and that, we will never know what that money would have otherwise been used for. It's the same with war, you never know what the money that goes into war could have been used for.

There was a big subsidy for golf carts, and people got tons of those for free; it helped the golf cart industry, to be sure.

See the book Economics in One Lesson.

Cash for Clunkers benefited a few people and the auto industry, but it increased used car sales, and the environment didn't notice. Mechanics who would have serviced the used cars lost business. The government money spent on these new cars that people were trading in comes from more borrowing, taxpayer funding, debt, and interest. Low-income people depend on the used car market. So many clunkers were destroyed that the used car prices went way up.

The government subsidizing the destruction of useful things is no good; we saw it in the New Deal, where piglets were killed and milk was poured down sewers to keep prices high. Leave it to politicians to think that we can prosper by obliterating wealth.

When taxpayer dollars go towards private companies, like people who build football stadiums, it just further impoverishes the town.

Bureaucracies have no bottom line, no market incentives, no demand for excellence, just people who want them to spend more money and spend all the money budgeted best they lose it next year. No one spends other people's money as carefully as he does his own.

Ch. 2 Making Life Fair

Michael Moore and other socialists claim that wealth is a public resource belonging to everyone, which should be distributed, like Obama wanted. Michael Moore says capitalism needs to be replaced with democracy, but he really means socialism.

People who bash on capitalism often bash on the government bailouts, the government getting in the way which makes capitalism inherently unfair, but of course that's not really free market capitalism, it's crony capitalism.

Socialists say they want the government to represent the working class, but the government does that best when it protects their freedom. **The Constitution clearly calls for a free market.**

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac (government buying mortgages from lenders to 'help the poor') created the environment for the housing bubble.

Running your own business is the best way to prosperity and happiness, but big government makes it hard to start a business - in

Iraq it can take 2 months to get the permits to start a business; in Europe one month; in the US a week or two; in Hong Kong one day.

The little guys are who benefit most from market freedom.

When you make a transaction you instinctively say 'thank you' and the storekeeper says 'thank you,' because both people are gaining from the interaction - it's not inherently oppressive like radicals suggest. Government is force, trade is voluntary.

License requirements and minimum wage requirements get in the way of trade.

Obama echoes the sentiments of FDR saying that he wants to live in a society that's 'fair.' To these guys fair means forcing you to give your money to other people. Sharing is good, but when government requires sharing, bad things happen.

Note: And it's no longer sharing. You can't force charity. End note.

The first Thanksgiving almost didn't happen until they changed from socialism to private property. Plymouth pilgrims almost starved because of their sharing system. Some people would fake illness to get out of work; people became de-incentivized to work hard when they got the same share everyone else did. Some stole. When they moved from socialism to private property everything prospered. The problem of 'the tragedy of the commons' has been known since before ancient Greece. Aristotle said that which is common in the greatest number has the least care bestowed upon it.

Note: the only way a consecrated society can work is when such is voluntary, not by force. There must always be real incentive, whether that's working for

God or for money. Either way, each individual must chose how he serves, it can't be by force; treat people like animals, and their work quality will never be what people are capable of. End note.

The land reserved for Indians, which is common property, is never well taken care of. Across the street where you have private property it's well taken care of. By claiming to care for Indians the government kills their spirit. When asked what should be done, tribal leaders often say 'more government' like most people.

Public parks which become privatized run well. Central Park was privatized which converted it from being rundown into a nice place. It doesn't matter who keeps the money, the point is the park is actually nice. When the government runs it it's a place for vagabonds and drug dealers. When private business runs it, it's an attractive place for people to enjoy themselves and have markets. In Central Park there's still the same number of homeless people, but now there's also thousands of other people. Homeless people are welcome if they follow the park rules and citizens feel safe to go there because it doesn't just look like a homeless Park.

Thomas More advocating abolishing private property as the way of ending social ills. He could be called the grandfather of socialism. His ideas appealed to many Catholics except for when they found out that confiscating private property usually began with the confiscating church property.

Note: More was a good man but wrong on this point. Perhaps he envisioned something only possible in a private society and made the error of trying to impose that on the public. End note.

Stossel highlights various religious communities who tried communal living which failed.

If you want fair, letting people decide how they'll interact with each other rather than being forced is the most fair. You shouldn't be able to vote to regulate your neighbors or tax them extra which is what happens when government gets involved in the way of business.

Note: This is why Ayn Rand said only those who support a free market support human rights. End note.

"People who join committees tend to think like socialists."

(Hilarious!)

Only an unimaginative person would think he could micromanage society from the top down. Only an arrogant man would want to.

Classical liberalism is now called libertarianism. Libertarians are **not against rule**, they are **against top-down rule**. In other words they **favor local** government and dislike big government. They also don't want unelected people making decisions, which often happens.

Ch. 3 Keeping Business Honest

We don't need government regulation laws to protect us from dishonest business, we need reputation. Businesses want a good reputation and word gets out quickly if they are cutting corners. It's a good thing that businesses want your money, this is what motivates them to outdo competitors, which benefits you.

It's not just the businesses that are in it for themselves, the lobbyists, politicians and unions are too, but it's worse with them because they aren't accountable like businesses are.

Stossel highlights a public transportation union in New York that seeks to crush any competitors in transportation services. The labor boss says these little transportation people offering alternative transportation undermine the transportation business, but when they say **undermine** they mean **compete** with. The transportation entrepreneurs have to apply for business licenses and they **almost always get denied that license. Government doesn't want to compete** in a free market. They fight against entrepreneurs who offer services that people voluntarily want.

Most New York subways were built by private organizations, not government. Eventually the government took them over. The world's only profitable mass transit is privately run.

Note: On public trains you get people cramped in and it's not an enjoyable experience. A private company would stop selling tickets when the vehicle is full to get customer satisfaction, and build more cars as demanded by customers. This is pointed out in The Politically Incorrect Guide to Capitalism by Robert Murphy. End note.

Competition works better than regulation.

Brand names are a good thing, a sign of quality. Companies must constantly innovate and improve their product and work to keep prices down to maintain their good name. Liberals complain about brand name products suggesting they're just brainwashing us into buying their products but they're not.

Whenever someone proposes to cut government spending people complain that it's going to kill a bunch of people. But it's not regulation

that keeps us safe, it's businesses making sure they have a quality product that people will actually want. Companies do plenty of safety checks which aren't required by the government just to make sure their brand is quality.

The only way to protect from reckless businessmen is the discipline of the market. No privileges, no bailouts. When there's government bailouts it makes brand names irrelevant - you never know if they're really being responsible. Free market capitalism automatically tells us which institutions we should trust.

In Las Vegas and Nashville, car regulations require a minimum fee to be charged per ride, and no one can enter the market (obtain a license) unless they prove it won't adversely affect other similar businesses. That's absurd; the whole point is competition. Competition among businesses is good for customers.

One hair braider had hundreds of satisfied customers then was told she needed a cosmetology license because a competing business filed a complaint. She would have to take a 1200 hour course on hair cutting. Then she would need an instructor's license because she employed others, which would be another 2,000 hours. Neither license dealt with the braiding service she provided. Then she would have to work for 3 years as an apprentice before she could reopen business. She was able to fortunately get the law changed because this was **arbitrary government involvement preventing** her from doing business.

In Louisiana monks who made wooden caskets for hundreds of years were threatened with jail time. They were forced to get funeral directors licenses in order to make these boxes. It would force the monks to turn their monastery into a full-fledged funeral home, complete with embalming facilities, and a one-year course would be

required. It's **established funeral directors who make the complaints and sit on the boards to make these rules.**

No one can sell flower arrangements without a license which you get by passing a test created by people who already sell flower arrangements. They don't want competition, so the test requires knowledge of techniques that aren't used anymore. In Louisiana existing flower shops were surveyed, and 86% of them liked that law. Duh! It keeps competitors from entering the market, which is good for them, but bad for consumers.

Some places require a license to be a yoga instructor.

When margarin was made the dairy industry got a law making margarin illegal in several states. Businesses often try to get laws to stop their competitors.

There have been laws that forbid markets from putting food on sale in an attempt to minimize competition. Licensing always hurts consumers by limiting competition. Licensing is mostly an expensive restraint on trade.

One guy went to jail for writing a letter of a legal nature. He didn't misrepresent his credentials. He was not a licensed lawyer so he got sent to jail. Writing this letter saved a guy \$3,000, maybe that's why they put him in jail.

Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln had no license to be lawyers, yet they were lawyers, some of the best. It was the customer who decided whether they were worthy of being hired. Competition and reputation are better than licenses at protecting customers.

When you move somewhere new, you don't decide who to have for a doctor, dentist or mechanic based on their checking their licenses, you ask around and see who's highly recommended. Even with licensing laws there's a wide range of quality and lots of quackery.

Smart consumers use private consumer rating agencies. Licensing raises costs, stifles innovation, and decreases customer choice.

Philadelphia required a license fee for blogging, and a lady who earned \$11 on her blog was prosecuted because she didn't have the \$300 license.

In practice, monopolies almost never happen, and customers benefit from “predatory” pricing.

In Milwaukee you have to purchase a license to go out of business.

You get in trouble for giving an unlicensed tour of Washington DC, including 90 days in jail.

Insurance companies and other private businesses have plenty of regulations in place, we don't need government regulations. Insurance companies require higher premiums for people who behave recklessly.

Theft, physical assault and fraud are the three crimes that have to be policed for a free market to thrive.

The reason companies don't rip you off is not because of a government rule, it's because they want repeat customers.

Ch. 4 Improving Life for Workers

Unions pair up with friends and government to make things bad for workers, customers, businesses, taxpayers and even union members. Employers then have to cut costs by hiring less people or changing the location of their business overseas and so on.

Charts showing that OSHA improved fatality rates are misleading because the mortality rates were already improving before OSHA came around.

Safety measures created by the government such as OSHA save some while hurting others. For example, the company is not going to bother with making their own safety regulations if the government is requiring them to deal with all of theirs. Rules are better when vested players in the industry themselves make them rather than outside government agencies.

Even ruthless employers want to protect workers because it's expensive to hire and train new ones.

It's easier to rally people in favor of dramatic solutions that will never really work than to rally them around gradual economic processes that naturally resolve these issues subtly.

Reagan once said he wanted to take President Gorbachev on a flight over American cities and point out all the swimming pools that were owned by the workers.

Often labor unions create monopolies that force workers to join the unions. This treats diverse individuals as an undiverse collective and requires people to pay dues to the unions that don't appear to do much.

Union culture is often very slow, basic tasks begin to take elaborate amounts of time.

Employers have an incentive to keep a good relation with their employees or the employees will quit and go work for the competition.

Government agencies don't face private competition so they aren't pressured as much to serve the people.

Bosses in the private sector face competition all the time, whereas government bosses only have some soft pressure on rare occasions.

Businesses and charities do much more for the public than government agencies do.

Government agencies suggest that their facilities are open to the public, but it's much easier to enter a supermarket or a church than a public school without permission, in which case you might get arrested. Don't call them public buildings and public sector work, they are government buildings, government schools and government jobs.

Note: Let's call public schools 'government schools,' and home and private schools 'freedom schools.' End note.

Gerrymandering ensures most politicians get elected year after year, regardless of how they perform.

Unions elect their own bosses and in turn the bosses reward the people who got them in. So politicians give workers the wages they demand, and in return the people vote in these highly promising labor union leaders. It's a money cycle from the taxpayers to the public employee salaries to dues to the union then from the union to the candidate who promises to do more for the union. This leads to unsustainable government pension deals.

It used to be that government work was a trade off - you got paid less, but you get more job security and earlier retirement. But now government jobs are paying more than private jobs. A federal salary council said that government workers earn less, but it was deceptive. The council was just nine people, most of them labor representatives . The so-called study ignored pensions and medical benefits, which are known to be much better than private sector benefits. A Heritage Foundation study concluded that federal employees earned 30 to 40%

more. The wages are comparable to the private sector, but the benefits are much better.

Cooks working for the federal government earned \$38,000 a year but 23,000 in the private sector. Janitor's 30 government versus 24 private. Landscape architects 80 government versus under 60 private. It's unlikely these government workers are so much more skilled. They get paid more because they negotiate with bosses who don't get paid, bosses who don't pay the bills. Politicians don't want the bad press of a strike so they give what is wanted. They're incentivised to get a deal done. After that politician leaves office people discover they are liable for his promises. Government workers retire at 58 the rest at 65 or older.

The US public sector is basically the European welfare state, which Europe is rolling back.

Factories are safer because of market prosperity, not because of unions.

Most employees make more than minimum wage, not because the government forces it, but because competition insists on it.

Government rules hurt workers by making things less flexible.

Work slows because you have to wait for a union specialist to do something. If you do it yourself, you risk repercussions.

Union rules send a message - don't try anything new, don't shake the boat, work is something to be minimized, not an opportunity, not something that could be enjoyed.

Union membership has fallen to only 8% in private sector jobs because workers understand that unions suck the fun out of work.

Unionized companies atrophy while free ones grow.

Union rules protect workers all the way to the unemployment line.

We trade with people at distant places because there are things they can do more efficiently than we can. Free trade is not a race to the bottom. We don't need tariffs and limits on trade. States are allowed to trade with each other even when certain states pay lower than other states. When American businesses save more money they can use that money to pay workers here.

Studies show that American companies who outsource jobs also hire more people in America. New jobs replace the outsourced ones.

Americans leave the factories and move on to better jobs.

Disappearing manufacturing jobs in America should be accompanied by cheers for all the more pleasant jobs we have created.

Unemployment would be worse without globalization. Trade is win win.

Most people now are calling for tariffs and blocks on foreign imports but be careful, you might want to buy those foreign goods and you might want to work for those foreign companies. When people lose money they invest less.

Historically when we have required federal projects to be done with American-made goods, it has resulted in higher costs and unemployment. There doesn't have to be a trade war, don't use tariffs sanctions and embargoes, then it can be win-win. Then people can focus on what they do best and have competitive advantage.

When politicians leave us alone we do our specialized work and it's a win-win. You'd rather pay money than make a drink and someone else would rather make a drink and get money.

See the Independent Women's Forum. A woman from that group defended the right to contracts. The laws that say you can't refuse to hire or fire a woman because of being pregnant make employers more

skeptical of hiring women in general so it actually hurts women. The employer with these laws lives in fear of being sued by the woman if he does happen to fire her. The cost of hiring a woman gets higher when that law is in place.

After the ADA American Disabilities Act was signed into law in 1990 the number of disabled people employed dropped from 60% to 49%. Protective rules like this cause employers to avoid hiring people from those groups. The employer doesn't think about what the person might bring to their business but about what burdens the person might cause.

Several people report that they would not have been successful if the ADA was around when they were young because the ADA encourages people to **think about how to get accommodations rather than how to succeed.**

Minimum wage laws help a very small percent of people but it causes lots of people to lose their job and many people to not be able to find a job.

Some 90% of American workers are paid above the minimum wage because real wages are not determined by an arbitrary law, they're determined by the supply and demand of the market.

Minimum wage law is why gas stations no longer hire teenagers to wipe your windshield and why construction companies no longer allow teenagers to come learn on the job

*Note: Less service for you, and less jobs and starter opportunities for them.
End note.*

Wage minimums tell employers not to give beginners a chance.

Minimum wage laws lead to many businesses never opening, automating, and hiring fewer people. They don't want to be forced to pay someone more than what they think a job is worth, so they don't.

If minimum wage laws really help workers, why stop at \$15 an hour why not make it \$100? (*Note: As we see, there is no reliable principle in wage laws. End note.*) Every little bit hurts when the government forces employers to deviate from market prices. Wages are a function of productivity, not whim.

Big companies like minimum wage laws because their rivals can't handle paying that much. This is why unions favor minimum wage laws even when their own workers already make more than the minimum. Where there's humanitarian government intervention, there's often special interests.

The Obama administration wanted to get rid of unpaid internships for students. They said internships can't directly benefit employers. But interns that don't benefit a company are a nuisance. Students like internships and report that they learn more at The internship job experience than they do at the school, and they don't even have to pay for it. For many students internships lead to careers. It's a win-win for employers and students.

Note: Our society now bullies its youth to go to expensive schools to get a certificate for basic jobs that don't really require the four year training programs, often unrelated to the job. Government deals with schools have lead to this scenario. End note.

Note: Unpaid internships give us a glimpse into the past where low-rung beginners had real possibilities of on the job training like apprenticeships to get into careers they wanted, without the burdens of government guild regulations. Now that is mostly a thing of the past, and these internships are experienced only by college students while the rest of the population suffers. End note.

When companies had to pay interns \$10 an hour, the number of interns dropped by half. The student is not an indentured servant, if the employer exploits the student, he can quit. The contract should be no one's business but theirs.

We are taught to think that markets are cruel and governments are kind, but in reality government attempts at kindness are cruel. The best way for more people to find jobs they like is to make everything free for people to interact in contracts they want.

Pregnant women do impose more costs. They need more time off work for appointments. They can't work as long of hours. That's normal and fine, just don't require employers to pay them the same amount as people who don't need those accommodations. Allow them to work less hours and be paid less. Then employers won't be afraid of hiring women.

Minimum wage law is not compassion, it's denial of reality. People can learn how the market really works without these laws in the way, and have much greater chances of success.

Ch. 5 Fixing Healthcare

Government already dominates healthcare, and that's the problem.

The government reports Cubans living longer, but socialist governments lie. 20 years ago the Soviets insisted there were no poor people in Russia. Why would anyone believe a Cuban health statistic? Cubans claim a low infant mortality rate, but doctors there say if the baby dies soon after birth they don't count it as an infant mortality, not counting the baby as ever having lived.

Government does give equal healthcare treatment, but it's equal second rate treatment.

Government healthcare is fine if you don't mind waiting and if you only want immediate attention for extreme emergencies. Making people wait is how government healthcare keeps costs down. But rich people can jump ahead of the line. The relationship between income and health is greater in Canada than America.

Free healthcare means taxpayers pay, and when that happens individual choice dies, and rationing kicks in. They hate the word rationing because it brings up the ugly truth. Who gets to make rationing decisions: you or a bureaucrat?

Some want to spend their money for every ounce of health care that might keep them alive, others want to save that money for their children.

British government healthcare has such long waits that people with toothaches pull their own teeth to avoid the four month wait.

In Canada you'll hear surveys of people who like the healthcare system, but the people who get those phone calls usually aren't sick. Some Canadian towns hold lotteries to see who will get to see a family doctor. Sometimes Canadians can't even get heart attack victims in the ICU. Canadian officials declared a blocked artery as an elective surgery so a lady had to go to America to actually get it done before she died.

Pursuit of profit brings innovation even in medicine. Government healthcare countries preload off of American healthcare inventions. America is where they allow profit so that's where we get advances. Governments don't innovate. Only the hope of profit gets people to break free of their comfort and get investors to risk the big money required to invent. *(Note: Profit isn't the only thing that inspires inventors*

and thinkers, but it's a big one. Economic freedom also allows a sufficient amount of prosperity such that people have free time they can use to pursue innovation.)

Before the free market, people only lived a few decades. If Canadians live long it's because they use American inventions.

When Michael Moore decided to get treatment for his weight problem he didn't go to Canada or Cuba, he went to a private spa in Florida.

In Canada dogs can get a CT scan in one day, but people have to wait a month. Canadian vet care is cutting edge because the market demands fit.

In the agriculturally rich communist Soviet Union (USSR, United Soviet Socialist Republic) there was so little food that mothers sent their children into the fields to catch rats to eat.

No, patients would not have to haggle over the price for a surgery in a free market, those decisions would have been made by thousands of other decisions being made before. In a free market, private rating agencies would evaluate hospitals for quality - word would get out about where to go for the best care. Health insurance companies would have already haggled about the price.

Yes, healthcare is complicated, but so are cars, and the free market guides cars just fine. Reputations of good mechanics grow and bad ones atrophy.

Note: And if you think this process is too slow, it's the best we've got, government goes much slower, without having much incentive to respond to market forces. End note.

When the government tries to make cars it's way worse. Yugos and Trabants disappeared along with the Soviet wall.

It took us decades to apply grocery store technology to hospitals to scan medications with barcodes because of all the barriers to competition in the hospital world.

Doctors don't give out their email address because insurance companies don't pay for that. If there was a free market that would be a competitive advantage where a doctor would give out his email address for the most effective communication.

Insurance companies are part of the problem; they love insurance mandates. The problem isn't that not enough people have insurance, the problem is that most people have too much insurance. Doctors spend 14% of their income on insurance paperwork. Much of our healthcare we are blind to the costs, you likely don't know how much your insurance was charged for your last checkup. Employers should not pay for your insurance; they don't pay for your food and clothing, so why should they pay for this? Originally paying for your insurance was an advantage a business could offer, but then due to taxes it became better to get insurance from an employer than on your own.

When other people pay for your stuff you don't care how much it costs; this is the effect of insurance. Doctors often don't even know how much what they're doing costs the patient, or in other words, costs the insurance. We should be asking ourselves whether a certain procedure is really necessary, and whether there's a cheaper place to get it, but we don't because of insurance. Third party payment destroys the shopping process which is the essence of a market.

When people go to a restaurant paying their own check, they order less than if they were all going to split the total. The cost of healthcare rises at twice the rate of inflation because it's someone else paying.

Private abortions charge around \$370, and abortions at hospitals charge around \$5,400.

Health insurance companies don't even need to advertise.

Some healthcare like Lasik surgery is private pay, so those procedures stay cheap because competition keeps prices down, as there is no government involved. Waiting time is short and the patients are treated nicely.

We **should only insure against catastrophes** that would bankrupt us. Insurance is not supposed to be about routine things. If you billed your insurance whenever your car needed an oil change prices would skyrocket.

There were many more charities before the government pushed them aside.

At whole foods their employees get a health savings account where it's their money and they can choose to spend it or not. This causes them to be much smarter about when they go to the hospital.

People are smart enough to make decisions for themselves.

Risk-based pricing in insurance motivates us to take better care of ourselves.

Women go to the doctor more often than men so it makes sense to charge them more for insurance, but politicians have called this wrong.

When the government demands that everyone pay the same for insurance, insurance just becomes another part of the government.

No discrimination in insurance pricing encourages dangerous and unhealthy behavior, and makes prices go up for everyone.

Almost all people get healthcare even if they don't have insurance as hospitals rarely turn people away. Some people pay cash, and some doctors forgive bills.

Being forced to pay for preventive medical care just makes the whole of medical care more expensive and a lot of false positives occur and people get on medicines and operations they never really needed.

We don't have free healthcare in America as the government and business have colluded to corrupt it.

In 1960 the 1960s hospitals became heavily subsidized, that's when prices shut up.

Half of American healthcare is already government paid.

Whenever the government comes up with something it ends up costing way more.

Medicare is unsustainable. Politicians promise 34 trillion more in Medicare benefits than they can pay. Social security promises 5 trillion more than it can pay.

People say they paid their dues and are just getting out what they put in, but now that you live longer than 65, that's not the case. We now live on average upwards of 78 years so today's elderly collect 2-3x more than they paid in.

There is no trust fund that your money is being stored in when you pay towards Medicare tax; that money gets spent immediately. Future Medicare payments will have to come directly out of young people's checks.

Becoming bankrupt is the biggest threat to America's future.

Ch. 6 The Assault on food

Natural fruit juices contain about as much sugar as soda. *(Note: Fruit juice is indeed like liquid beer, but is still better in some ways. But it is a junk food. And the soda will have less vitamins etc., but neither are health foods.)*

In the US they try to ban trans fats, salt, etc.

Healthier foods are catching on, companies are innovating without government force.

Beware the government wanting to help you make better choices. The government is people with guns who force you and take away your choices.

When the government arrests people to level the playing field in the market, that's crony-capitalism.

Producers who pasteurized use government force to shut down competitors who don't. *(Note: There are pros and cons to pasteurization, Stossel would say let the market, not the government, decide.)*

About half the chemicals we use for everything industrially are toxic, and one by one the EPA is hunting them down, so companies switch to chemicals that haven't been tested yet, and they have to keep switching. This drives up costs.

Both natural and man-made chemicals induce tumors in rats at about the same rate. Perhaps we will ban half of nature to be safe.

He doesn't believe in the danger of BPA (but I do).

He says the water you drink is fine. (I don't believe it, and several states like Utah are now banning fluoride from drinking water).

He says irradiating food kills the bacteria inside it, it's the way the astronauts eat food, but people are scared of nuking their food. Some say doing this to food causes cancer death but many agencies say it is safe and would save lives.

Grain-fed beef mature a lot faster so they require less resources than grass-fed.

He claims there's no difference between organic grass-fed beef and regular beef. Note: I disagree in general, but I'm sure this has happened at times.

What about the hormones fed to beef? He says everything is has hormones in it. Note: We don't want those extra and foreign hormones.

Natural things like antibiotics help save many lives. Note: Yes they do save many lives but there are bad side effects too, and we are in a situation of unsustainable antibiotic use.

Activists aren't just altruistic, they also want to make money and get fame, so they can't always be trusted.

Government scientists are often from advocacy groups aiming at regulation.

Freedom is more important than health. Don't let the state decide what you should eat. Note: This is true but we also want to be not deceived by food companies.

If you let the government regulate and provide your health care, it will most certainly begin to regulate your choices.

We have nutritional information, we have advocacy groups, we have nutrition celebrities. This is enough, we don't need the government messing with food choices. Note: One important step towards nutrition could be getting rid of school lunches as they are extremely unhealthy and they mean the government chooses what we eat.

Sometimes America enforces silly rules from other countries. There were some people who brought goods from Honduras in bags rather than boxes. The Honduran law required boxes. So when the people got

to America, they were arrested and put in a federal prison for 6 years. Later the Honduran government said 'by the way, we repealed that law.'

The more government is involved the easier it is for people to get arbitrarily in trouble

Note: This is one of the reasons why privacy is very important it's not because you have something to hide it's because people who are out to get you can take normal things and twist them into something that looks bad taking them out of context exaggerating them etc. *End note.*

Congress creates on average one new crime every week and federal agencies create many more.

Plus Hobbs road about Leviathan as in a government which is very involved and strong But he thought it would be about protecting us from war not planning our dinners.

You can't just say everything good should be legal and everything bad illegal because then you'd have a totalitarian government involved in every detail of life.

Ch. 7 Creating a Risk-Free World

Rosie O'Donnell calls for banning guns, yet she has armed security guards. Gun control is not crime control. The media ignores stories about people with pistols disarming robbers.

In Texas, there was a law that said you can't bring your firearm into a restaurant, and a guy shot a bunch of people in the restaurant. He even

stopped to reload and continued shooting. He could have been stopped if someone had a gun. Someone present reported that they did have a gun, but they kept it in their car because they weren't allowed to bring it into the restaurant. Texas fortunately changed the law. Several states don't even require a permit to carry a gun.

In the US where people own guns, people are afraid to break in and rob those houses.

When more people have guns, crime goes down. We saw this in DC etc.

See the book One Nation Under Arrest.

One girl was sent to prison for 9 hours for having a butter knife in her car at school. Kids were suspended from school when they were playing cops and robbers and one of them yelled 'I have a bazooka.'

Zero tolerance leads to zero common sense. Government one size fits all solutions don't make people safer, they make people sadder.

When people do stupid things and we help them on tax dollars, they're more likely to do stupid things. You should charge for these medical rescues of foolish events; when that's been tried, people still call for help.

Federal flood insurance means taxpayers like you pay for it when someone foolishly builds their house too close to the water. There are flood zones where building is outlawed, but let's just let people use their own money, and take their own risks the way they want, and let them pay for it.

You aren't free if you can't decide what medicines you can take. The government rules out helpful medicine and treatments because of possible side effects, but desperate people are willing to risk the side

effects, and everything they try, even the approved stuff, has plenty of side effects.

Many medicines and procedures can't get approved because it costs so much money for the approval process.

Doctors have to under prescribe pain medication due to fear of getting sued for over prescribing it. Just because some people abuse prescriptions to get high doesn't mean they can't be prescribed at all, or in insufficient quantities to those who need it. Doctors learn to be stingy with pain meds as they hear of people getting sued for giving more than the government thinks is right.

Seat belt laws don't save lives. When people are required to be safe by law they act more recklessly. Let people choose. If seat belts make you safer, word would spread quickly and auto companies would compete to make safer more comfortable seat belts. But with all the regulations companies had great barriers on changing seat belts. We don't know what good things we might have had if government didn't step in and get in the way. The improved safety belts would result in more people wearing them.

Patrick Henry didn't say give me safety or give me death, he said give me liberty or give me death. That's what America is about.

Ch. 8 Making Sure No One Gets Offended

The New York times endorses limitations on speech when it's funded by rich people.

People on the left and right support free speech right up until it counts, that is, when it offends them.

No one can be trusted to limit others.

Note: This isn't a call for anarchy, but a call for a less regulatory approach to government. End note.

Affirmative action based on race (like deciding who gets into a school based on quotas of having certain numbers of people of a certain race) is like selling food at different prices depending on what your race is. It's inherently racist. No matter what race you're favoring, you shouldn't favor any race.

On college campuses students often scream to drown out the voice of someone they don't want to hear, usually conservative voices.

Censorship rules give the power of censorship to whoever is most easily offended. This gives everyone the perverse incentive to become more easily offended.

At one school a student was reading a book about the history of the Klu Klux Klan which had a picture of them on the cover. Another student complained about that cover offending her, and the student with the book got serious consequences, though fortunately he was able to get those consequences removed.

One company got in trouble for advertising bagels because they said the advertisement was not aesthetically appealing.

On college campuses everybody agrees that black women and homosexuals need special protection, but nobody worries about a Baptist being offended when someone mocks Christ.

The government uses one-size-fits-all rules. Instead, individual businesses and the marketplace in general should decide.

Note: He talks about a pornographer who was getting fined for obscene material who got off the hook. I disagree here. Porn isn't speech, it isn't conveying ideas, its just filth. I do not want to make legal any circumstance

going against one of the ten commandments to not commit adultery. Those are Gods laws, and are there for a reason. End note.

The book The catcher in the rye was banned and called obscene and explicit, but today people call it a classic, and kids read it in school.

Note: I do not like such books and would vote for them not to be used on earth as it isn't used in heaven. It's ok to vote for a moral society, to make a society that's good. Who decides what's good? For starters, in a free society, we vote on it. So make your opinion heard. End note.

Those who censor claim to seek politeness, but telling people to shut up isn't polite. Note: True, but sometimes we encounter evil, and it is proper to shut that down.

Banning private discrimination is an overreach. We condemn racism, but there's freedom of association. We don't want government discrimination, but private companies should be able to.

If you disagree then argue and shun and boycott, just don't bring the government in to settle the dispute.

Private groups should be allowed to air political ads.

Corporations are people because they're made of people.

When Private companies choose what is said, that's not censorship, that's editing. Note: But companies should be upfront about their bias. We all have bias, and that's ok.

The tolerance preaching liberals are the most intolerant.

Fox news doesn't censor liberal views. He thought they would, but when he went to work there he saw they didn't. But those at ABC NBC CBC, they did censor conservative and libertarian views. They hid their political views and claimed to have no bias. We should be open and up front about our political interests and affiliations.

Ch. 9 Educating Children

American education spending has tripled but scores have flatlined. It's not improving since it's not a free market. It's not about the money, it's what you do with the money.

One successful private principal says he doesn't do teacher evaluations, he just walks around, and if the kids aren't working, the teacher gets fired.

Note: Indeed, getting students to work is a key job of teachers, not just to coddle and do everything for the students. To be educated is to be able to self-teach. The older the child, the less help the student should need. Ron Paul's School Revolution treats this subject at length. End note.

Like athletes, teachers need coaches to keep them at their top game.

You don't need experts to tell you whether something is good or not.

Public government schools are not the great equalizer of poor and rich and all colors. Rich parents buy homes in neighborhoods where there are better schools. This has resulted in government schools being more segregated than private schools.

Government schools tear communities apart. You have the conservative parents who want conservative authors in the school, and the liberal parents who want liberal authors taught in the school, and if we just had school choice this wouldn't have to be a problem; more parents could have what they want.

Public schools just means government schools, and that just means you have to pay for it like it or not. Note: And if you want to send

your kid to a private school, you still get to pay for the government school and your school on top of that.

Government schools are inefficient centralized bureaucracies, just like everything else the government does. We should be horrified that the special task of teaching has been left to the government. Note: Socrates warned us that if teaching became a profession, it would quickly become corrupted. Many of the great teachers have shared their ideas freely.

Great teachers typically don't get paid anymore than the bad ones.

Tenure makes organizations unaccountable. Being able to fire people is the only way to keep them accountable. Public School teachers generally get tenure after they've taught for about 3 years, meaning it's basically impossible to fire them.

*Note: Of course I have heard of horror stories where there have been witch hunts of sacking good teachers, but generally, the teachers stay in forever.
End note.*

They couldn't even fire a tenured 600-pound teacher who urinated into a bottle and had his seven year old students carry the urine to the bathroom.

Even the employees are often better off when they get fired because then they can go find jobs for which they are better suited.

Non-union schools can fire their teachers, and those schools typically outdo union schools on all standardized tests.

Good teachers want the bad teachers out so the bad teachers don't bring down the morale of the group.

If you're a doctor who isn't doing his job, you get fired. It should be the same for teachers, but union schools want to give excessive chances for low performing teachers to improve before firing them. Unions

complain about how hard it is on a teacher to get fired, but think about how hard it is on kids to have a bad teacher.

A 37-year-old lady was put in charge of a school district and saw it wasn't working, there was incompetence everywhere so she started firing people who demonstrated that incompetence. People complained of course, and said the only way you can fire a teacher is if the teacher hits a kid and you get it on camera, or if a teacher was caught stealing money from the school and you have a receipt to prove it. She assumed people would be happy with the school improving, but she was wrong.

Some claim that charters outperform the public because the charter schools get better kids, but its not so. Some public school advocates have touted a study that shows public kids to be as good or better than private school kids in reading etc., but the actual study skewed the data adjusting for race, class, and a bunch of other things to get the result it wanted. The plain data was that the kids in the private schools do better.

When a charter school fails it goes out of business. When a public school fails it just keeps failing, and hardly ever closes.

Even the poorest parents in the inner city still try to send their kids to private schools at great sacrifice.

Studies show that the Head Start program, though it might help a little bit during the program, there's no long-term results, no long-term benefits, and yet it doesn't get discontinued, it just keeps going.

Universal pre-kindergarten is a flagrant waste of money. It is like going shopping for a dress for yourself and buying one for everyone whether they need it or not.

Pre-K isn't showing good results on academic measures. They say we don't just want academics, we want social emotional, but how are they going to do that if they can't even get the basic measurable academics?

It's hard to think of better ways to do things until competition makes it apparent. When competition is limited we will never know what we could have had. That goes for education and everything else.

Before innovation all you had was your local teacher, your local singer etc. Now with the internet you can have access to the best teachers, no matter where you are.

Note: And the top universities are putting lectures online free. The way of the future in education involves an online component where the best teachers around the world can be accessed on an unlimited level. End note.

Ch. 10 The War on Drugs

He says making laws against drugs drives it underground so people use guns rather than lawyers to settle the disputes, and they smuggle it instead of ship it.

Note: These inherently dangerous things we should at least try to control. We can't give way to bad things just because they're hard to police. Here's a hint - execute big drug dealers; this dissuades drug crime in an effective way. People know where this law exists, and the dealers don't go there. They fear death more than prison. End note.

He compares heroin and nicotine saying they are of a similar level of addictiveness.

Note: Obviously there is a different level of danger. You don't see people speeding down the road at breakneck speeds to get their next nicotine fix like you see with heroin addicts. End note.

He points out those who use medical marijuana avoid drug side effects.

Note: While that's likely true, there's also side effects to marijuana such as coughing delirium lung cancer and many other negative side effects. End note.

He advocates punishing people who do stupid things under the influence more so than punishing being under the influence peacefully.

Note: Of course this is correct, and even some conservatives have taken this position, but I don't think it's wise to make such dangerous things commonplace and normalized. End note.

Each state is supposed to be its own experiment on democracy the powers of the federal government are supposed to be very limited, it should be state's choice.

Note: Making drugs a state level issue could work, but the issues of drugs crossing the border could change the nature of this. If some states get tougher on drug crime and others get weaker, it would indeed be a good way to see what works and what doesn't. End note.

Some things are legal in a state and illegal on the federal level so people get in trouble for doing something perfectly legal.

Alcohol is more likely to create addiction than crack or heroin. He claims most who try them don't continue to use them, and those who do continue often use safely and he advocates adults choosing.

Note: He underplays the dangers of these drugs. More are addicted to alcohol likely due to alcohol being more widely available. Creating a culture where this takes place does not seem wise. End note.

He claims that prohibition does not keep people from using and that while drugs harm people, making them illegal leads to even more harm.

Note: We did see during prohibition that plenty of underground crime rings developed. We have decided to allow alcohol to adults as a society and punish them heavily for infractions under the influence. But doing this for drugs is a whole new level. Drugs are typically more toxic and dangerous than alcohol, and most people recognize this. End note.

Many of the times people who are enforcing the law directly benefit as in seizing cash and goods from drug users or potential drug users on suspicion. It ignores innocent until proven guilty.

Despite its illegality, marijuana is easier to buy than beer.

Voluntary social pressure might be enough to deter people from using dangerous substances without government rules.

Ch.11 War to End War

Defense is something the government is actually supposed to do; it's in the Constitution.

Sticking around after a war to do nation-building is scandalous.

Sending someone money after we beat them in war is scandalous.

The Vietnam War was not necessary to protect America.

Intervention frequently goes wrong - when you help one person, you arm the others.

You get an overextended military when you try to 'kill people over there before they kill us over here.'

When we try to smash the bad guys at every opportunity, it creates new bad guys that want to kill us.

People have a never-ending list of things they want the military to do, like build democracy in other countries, teach other countries how to teach other countries to build democracy, make the internet safe, change regimes abroad, etc., and you simply can't accomplish all this stuff.

Some people advocate keeping troops in conflicts longer than they should be so that we look tough, but it's not worth risking trillions of dollars and soldiers lives to look tough.

Note: It's also as a deterrent of more terrorism and communism, like our Korean border soldiers who remain to this day. We saw what happened in Afghanistan when we pulled out our token forces there, the place quickly collapsed. Perhaps we shouldn't have gone in the first place, but we were attacked, and leaving a token presence there could have brought stability. End note.

When you spend money on other nations, giving them what you think they should have, they're not grateful, and you get upset that they're not grateful.

We've had to do all kinds of bizarre things in foreign countries like paying people to go see a play about donkeys, or paying for a farmers market that never gets built, or paying to hand out croissants, or paying Iraqis to attend a French pastry class.

There have been projects abroad of rebuilding houses, and the people in charge hired higher contractors after taking their share, and then those contractors hired more contractors after taking their share, and so on until there was no money left to build the houses, and there's just a few wooden beams they used for firewood which cost 150 million.

In order to establish a need for financing, they'll often spend money one year to get that money the next year, like sending people on pointless helicopter missions just to use fuel.

Candidate George Bush said he didn't think we should spend money on foreign nation-building, then, when he was the president, he changed his mind and orchestrated a war of nation-building.

Today, the US spends about as much on defense as all the other countries in the world combined. If we focused on defense rather than offense, it wouldn't cost us almost a trillion dollars a year in defense spending.

We built an Air Force Base in Greenland to monitor the Soviets during the Cold War, but we're still there for some reason.

There are places where the United States is defending them, where they could defend themselves, but they don't because we are there.

After 9/11, everybody wanted federal security at airports, but the problem they'll never fire themselves for failing. If you had private contractors in there, the government could fire them.

The CIA has failed to detect just about every major event, and they failed at 9/11. They claimed they had bad computers, so they weren't able to keep track of the hijackers, and they failed to investigate suspicious reports.

Those who want to cut defense spending are not isolationists, they're often in favor of trading with the whole world. When goods cross borders, armies don't!

Ch. 12 Keeping Nature Exactly as it is Forever

If you want to preserve an animal species, don't ban the hunting of it; encourage the breeding of it. In cases where you let people own these exotic animals and farm them on private property, that works, but in cases where you ban the hunting and selling of animals, that never works, because it always goes underground.

Privatize the water system, and people will pay more for quality water and less for irrigation water.

He does not believe that there is evidence that DBT pesticides harm humans. Tens of millions have died because of the DBT ban. DBT is the best anti-mosquito anti-malaria product we have. Many environmental agencies have now backed off and have welcomed the use of DBT.

Note: It does seem like DBT is the lesser of two evils to be used when there's nothing else, but it does not seem that it is a health product by any means, as in not for ideal health, but of course if it's saving lives that's better than not using it. Perhaps it should be people's choice on this. But I'm not savvy on the research. End note.

Ever since the '50s they've been claiming that electric cars are the way of tomorrow and still they aren't viable for consumers other than the government grants that are fudging them on us.

Note: Even today, electric cars are a nuisance, running out of fuel all the time. End note.

If there's some great way to make windmills that work well enough to be worth their while, the free market will buy them, no need for a subsidy. Solar and biofuels simply aren't worth their while. Biofuels take up lots of land that could have been used for farming.

Many presidents promised to reduce America's oil imports, and none of them did.

People rave about how Denmark uses a lot of wind power, but they don't realize that Denmark uses way more coal and oil than wind.

Windmills barely make a dent in our energy needs. It would require an area the size of the state of Rhode Island for windmills to give as much energy as one nuclear power plant. It's not political, it's just physics; these alternative energies can't do the job.

Green jobs programs are snake oil; other countries that tried this are shutting them down. They're very expensive. Obama said they'll only work if we do lots of it fast. Not so.

Note: Classic scam pitch: buy lots of my product now, or else! End note.

All green projects have done is make energy cost more, though some like that.

The planet does not notice our efforts to recycle, etc. Politicians want us to spend the money on global warming causes, which won't do anything to the environment for over 100 years; it's just a waste of money

When they spend money on global warming, we're not spending that money on other, more useful causes.

Ch. 13 The Budget

Before Landon Johnson, when the government was less than 5% of the economy, was when we grew the most.

Give money to the people who earn it, not to the government to spend on programs that don't work. No group of people are smart enough to manage the economy

When you tax people too much, they'll hide their money and leave the country or state. The rich stop working when the tax gets too high.

Republicans recently pulled off a 1% government spending cut. Democrats complained that basic services were going away. But this isn't nearly enough to keep us from bankruptcy. We are like alcoholics in our spending, always insisting on just one more drink.

We think we are entitled to Medicare & Medicaid, but people usually get three times out more than they put in.

*Note: In part due to living longer these days than the program was built for.
End note.*

Not all military spending is sacred and well-spent.

Entire departments need to be eliminated for us to have a balanced budget. See Downsizinggovernment.org for the numbers.

Emmys are a silly award the liberal media gives to people who confirm their anti-capitalist views.

No giving foreign aid.

Note: Particularly when you're in debt, you're not in a position to help others. Wise stewards are in the best position to help others, so balance the budget and operate in a surplus if you're interested in helping others. End note.

No department of education.

Note: Astonishingly, the Trump administration has spoken of possibly ending this department. Indeed, if any government is to be in schools, its state, not federal. Ultimately I believe we will realize that schools are too big a drain on tax dollars, and all schools will be privatized. End note.

No energy department. No agriculture subsidies. No Nasa. Privatize TSA. No national endowments for art,s humanities, etc. Cut the whoppers Medicare Medicade and Social Security.

The government almost always spends less efficiently than the private sector. What we see about how the government spends money is vague and misleading.

Ch. 14 There Ought Not to Be a Law

When in doubt, leave it out.

Even the fall of the Soviet Union (an epic failure of big government) didn't convince people not to use big government. People think "next time, centralized government will work."

No Child Left Behind is useless.

The march toward more central government and free stuff continues.

The US is rated far from the top in a list of free countries.

Businesses make big cuts all the time, but the government never does, it only does rare tiny cuts.

When fewer people work for the state, that's a good thing.

The US was founded on more libertarian principles than other nations, yet now it refuses to admit it has big government.

Government can't even count votes correctly.

Government doesn't have special wisdom. We can do better.

Give Me A Break: How I Exposed Hucksters,
Cheats and Scam Artists and Became the
Scourge of the Liberal Media 2004 – Book
Highlights & Commentary



Contents of 'Give Me a Break!'

- 1 What happened to Stossel
- 2 Confrontations
- 3 Confusion
- 4 Epiphany
- 5 Scaring Ourselves to Death
- 6 Junk Science and Junk Reporting
- 7 Government
- 8 Welfare for the Rich
- 9 The Trouble with Lawyers
- 10 The Left Takes Notice
- 11 It's Not My Fault! (Victim Mentality)
- 12 But What About the Poor?
- 13 Greed or Ambition?
- 14 Owning Your Body
- 15 Free Speech

(My notes won't always fall in the exact sequence of the book, so if you're comparing my notes to the book and something doesn't match up, it's from surrounding chapters.)

Introductory Note: Stossel is a libertarian. Someone who has a basically hands-off morality approach; he says let people do whatever they want. There's some truth to this, but it has limits. So there are several key things I disagree with that I'll point out here and there. But I don't want to throw the baby out with the bathwater. He still has tons of great stuff to teach, if you can discern what's good and what's not.

Ch. 1-3: 1 What Happened to Stossel & Ch. 2 Confrontations

Ch. 1 What Happened to Stossel

When Stossel exposed **corrupt business**, the media loved him. But when he exposed **corrupt government**, media turned on him, and the left rejected him.

A good job will teach you more than school, and they'll pay you for it.

Union work discourages creativity and innovation. They have no reason to hurry because no one ever gets fired. They have no reason to work harder because everyone gets paid the same. They say things like 'it can't be done, it's against the rules' rather than innovating.

Even when your boss is a jerk you can be grateful that he hired you.

When he couldn't get a hired research assistant at his job, he called around to colleges to get volunteer interns.

Sometimes we have a personality problem where we live for the next

achievement and then we're happy for a little bit, and we're back to being nervous and worried.

Note: We need to focus on truly meaningful goals, or attaining the goals we set won't bring fulfillment. Life is a mission, not a career. And yes, there's something to being able to have joy in the journey and not being hyperfocused on advancement. Perhaps service to others, especially via family life, is the best way to check ourselves in these matters. End note.

He was a consumer reporter, yet the lawyers got mad at him for calling out specific brands. So he threatened to quit and the lawyers came up with some way for him to be able to mention the brands, and he went on to do tons of important work exposing frauds.

Ch. 2 Confrontation

Confrontation (aka debate & asking hard questions) allows you to listen to both sides under pressure and decide for yourself. So he was an in-your-face reporter. Sometimes we have to ask rude questions when we catch people lying. Often he had to ask people several times before they'd confess. He just keeps asking the same question. People are shocked when they get confronted directly about missing money. When he would expose people for lying they would just go on in their lies.

Back in the day he could do private recordings to expose people, but now there's privacy laws where you can't do that as much.

Some doctors were falsely reporting women as pregnant so they could get paid for doing an abortion on them.

Some cosmetics companies were selling cheap stuff just in different labeled bottles.

Ch. 3 Confusion (Regulations)

Every regulation has unintended consequences. Tax dollars have a way of getting into the pockets of the rich. **Regulations often hurt** people rather than protect them. When Stossel exposed businesses, a bad, unintended consequence would happen - the government people would want to make all kinds of new regulations. But those regulations often do more harm than good.

The consumer protection agency which was created as a result of Stossel's reporting did little to help people. They forced more people to have licenses. Licensing doesn't make life better. The costs are passed on to the consumers. There are so many consumer protection laws now it's impossible to keep track of them. Companies who can't afford lawyers have to just ignore these laws.

Most bureaucracies just shuffle papers to kill time. Sometimes they catch somebody doing something wrong, but most of the time people are in compliance.

When these agencies find unlicensed businesses, they shut them down. Those businesses usually weren't doing anything wrong, they just didn't have a license. They were the businesses on the fringe, the ones most likely to give cheap services to poor neighborhoods. The regulations usually just benefit the unions and the entrenched businesses, protecting them from competition.

Politicians say we need to build businesses but they put up all kinds of barriers to entry that discourage new business.

One hair braiding company was ordered to cease and desist because they didn't have a license. It was said that people who do hair use dangerous chemicals and need a license, but this company didn't dye or perm any hair or use any chemicals, they just braided hair. The competing businesses were the ones that pushed prosecution against this lady's business, they wanted her to take years of unpaid extensive training.

Note: Leave it to the government to overly-generalize and put arbitrary limits on freedom. End note.

Innovators don't join boards; they're too busy innovating. Consumers don't join boards, they don't care, it's just a hair company and they don't get their hair done that often. Scientists, doctors and experts in commerce don't want to get involved in agencies, they're too busy doing useful things. So who usually runs the **government agency boards? Established businesses who are trying to limit others** from entering their playing field.

Note: As Stossel said in his 'No They Can't!' book, people who like to be on committees tend to think like socialists! End note.

One person admitted that the salon boards are usually 90% run by established salon owners to use their power to stifle competition.

People pay \$5,000 for a funeral. Somebody tried opening a business selling cheap caskets, and the funeral government board shut him down because he didn't have a license.

The Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 sets wages on union construction jobs. Those who support Davis Bacon law make good money from it, and there's little chance it'll ever be repealed. The union jobs often pay double. In theory it means people are protected from exploitative business owners, but in practice it means those **union employees benefit while everyone else doesn't**. The work goes to **union contractors** rather than small businesses.

Union workers are paid higher at the expense of taxpayers. Unions get the contracts for government jobs and it costs the government way more. Some say we need these union companies to build stuff so it's safe, but there's plenty of buildings that are safe, not done by the union companies, done for much cheaper. Supply and demand are flexible and respond in real time to the market, unlike union wages.

Basic jobs are called sweatshops. The workers want the jobs. When the government shuts these jobs down, the illegal workers just go find somewhere else illegal to work.

Back in the day, young unskilled laborers could work on the job site for a low wage and get skills. Now that's not an option. One underage kid was working as a bat boy for a major baseball team. The government shut him down due to his age. The law was that kids under 16 can't work on school nights. But why should all the other kids get to spend their time sitting around watching the baseball games on school nights while this kid can't spend his school night doing a job he wants to do? The case of this bat boy got lots of press and some people intervened so he could keep his job, but this is a rare exception.

Note: Great point - if you're going to outlaw youth for working school nights, you better also outlaw them from playing on school nights. End note.

Let parents make the choices for the kids, not the government. It's probably not going to kill a kid to have some paid work to do in good settings which the parents can help them find.

There are unintended consequences to regulation such as medical drugs taking a long time to get cleared which could have saved many lives. Think about all the lives that weren't saved in the decade it took the drug to get cleared.

Oftentimes to avoid all the paperwork and lawyers people just avoid doing stuff that's regulated and go find a different business to focus on. This means there's entire categories of services that we aren't getting, especially not as good as we could get them.

People should have the freedom to choose without an agency of the government making all decisions. Some people want to take a risk, others will not, leave it to them. Getting the FDA's seal of approval should be optional. Private regulatory agencies can compete with government agencies like the FDA to give us even better quality audits.

Note: All people have different dispositions and skills. To some, walking on narrow catwalks is little risk, and they're happy to do it. For others, this wouldn't go so well. So let the people choose what works for them. Everything in life is a tradeoff, there's no such thing as a risk-free life. End note.

Notwithstanding the regulations and agencies, people still sell bogus stuff. The crooks will do what they do regardless of rules. It's the honest businesses that get delayed by the regulations.

Without licensing how would we know which doctors were good? By word of mouth, by newspapers, by experience, by the same way as we know which computers and cars are good. In a free society we will be more **vigilant in looking for what's good and what's bad**. In a society where the government tells you what's safe, people become lazy and just do whatever the government tells them. In a free society, in the age of the internet, word will get out immediately about what's good and what's not.

The lawyers, politicians and regulators are the people who are really ripping us off. The liberal talking points are that 'no risk is acceptable' and 'corporations are evil.' The reality is that the free market allows us to voluntarily buy or not buy what we want. Yes, we have a government and contracts and courts to enforce the very basic rules of not hitting people and not stealing stuff, but when the government grows to try and meet everyone's needs *and wants*, it quickly gets out of control and becomes wildly ineffective.

Companies police themselves so they have quality goods and services that people actually want. But the government almost never polices itself. When the government fails to meet a goal, it says that's proof they need more money. (That's not how it works in the real (accountable) world.) Not only do most people have morals, but they'll also make more revenue if they're known as a reputable honest company.

Note: in his book Stealing America, Dinesh D'Souza identifies that the two groups of people always looking out for others, to serve them, are capitalists and priests. Capitalism is all about giving people what they want. End note.

Ch. 4 Epiphany (Free Market Works Best)

When the government got out of the way, shipping became much more efficient.

Communists rely on experts. Thomas Sowell calls it ‘the conceit of the anointed,’ the idea that other people know better than you. The experts insist on maintaining control even when they fail repeatedly.

Note: In a free society, we can make choices based on information we encounter without being experts. We can hear an explanation of one side, hear an explanation of the other, and make a choice. It is a tyrannical society that says the commoners can't be involved in the decision making. End note.

Note: You hear this line all the time from evolutionists too – “us peasants couldn't possibly understand ‘the science.’ Better just trust the experts”. Point out flaws in their theory? “Oh, you're just misrepresenting ‘the science.’” After all, you're not on ‘their team.’ End note.

A lot of forests burn because the government doesn't let them be touched. Privately owned forests clear away underbrush so there's a lot less fires.

The permit process often takes longer than the actual construction.

Note: And in building a home, about half the cost is getting the permits. This is a prime example of government extortion. Deregulate, and get rid of the armies of regulation-checkers. Let the people choose what type and quality of home they want to and are able to invest in. There are plenty of inspectors happy to be hired to tell people the pros and cons of a home. People will choose what they can afford and will build and buy accordingly. Endless regulations not only make a large barrier to enter a profession, but they make working in that profession much less enjoyable with much more undue pressure. End

note.

Someone was trapped and construction workers jumped in to save him. The rescuers got fined for not wearing the appropriate hard hats.

Businesses which have railings which are considered by the agencies to be a couple inches too long or a couple inches too short are forced to rip it all out and replace it, or be shut down.

Small companies go bankrupt just trying to hire lawyers to deal with the hundreds of pages of regulations.

Airbags are dangerous for small drivers, but the government forces you to have them. You can't have an on and off switch. If you're lucky, extensive applications and appeals processes will make it legal for you to not have to have one of these little bombs in your car.

Where does the government seeking our safety come to an end? Will exercise police come into our homes and make us do push-ups and run laps? Patrick Henry didn't say 'give me absolute safety or give me death.'

In his consumer reporting, he reported on statistically insignificant threats - activists have selfish agendas just like the businessman. The activists often want to get famous, to feel morally superior, and to scare people so they can raise money.

Risk takers built America, but today most of us are paralyzed by fear.

Note: We have been intimidated by the big state, and have seen examples of political targets being crushed. But of course, this doesn't mean we can give in. End note.

Ch. 5 Scaring Ourselves to Death

News reporters exaggerate scary things going on because it makes news people want to watch. You'll hear about a plane that crashes, but you won't hear about the thousands that don't.

In the summer of 2001 a bunch of news companies, not having much else to talk about, talked about sharks in the ocean so people were afraid to go in the ocean. But there's the same number of sharks as usual.

If you get scared about minimal risks, you're probably going to fall for bigger ones. If we focus on spending tons of money to make safer rubber duckies, we won't have that money to take care of the real problems.

Driving is 180 times more dangerous than flying, but a plane crash will get way more news coverage. Because of the hype more people choose to drive, putting themselves in more danger. Normal stuff like hot water, stairs, and bunk beds kill more people than stuff you hear about in the news.

You can't fear everything. If you're focused on fearing the little silly stuff, you won't be able to have a healthy fear of the real dangers of life.

Note: A flagship method of the left is to focus on minor problems. For example, they took the Iwo Jima Marine Corps memorial and replaced it with the soldiers holding up a tree rather than holding up the flag. They value

animal rights over human rights. Everyone wants a battle to fight, and if you're unable to detect real moral evils, you'll focus on trivial minor ones. Dennis Prager in Still the Best Hope treats this subject well. End note.

Natural gas is invisible, highly flammable, toxic and odorless, and it kills people on a regular basis. But everybody uses it because it was adopted before everyone became overly panicked about everything.

People are terrified of nuclear energy because of the Chernobyl explosion which only killed 30 people and maybe some others down the road. But natural gas still kills way more people than that. Nuclear energy is new and mysterious, so we are scared of it. How can we innovate and improve in this culture of fear?

Just a century ago people would die at age 55. We are living longer now than ever, and a lot of that is because of this new stuff that you might be afraid of.

Note: Of course the ancients lived hundreds of years, but that's beside the point here, as he's pointing out that we're living longer now than any other time in recent history. After the flood of Noah, lifespans dropped dramatically. Something likely changed in the atmosphere due to the catastrophic event. End note.

When people got scared about asbestos, they tore open walls and ripped it out of schools, never mind the fact that that safely contained asbestos was now being introduced into the air people would actually be encountering. And closing the schools to do all this work would result in the kids playing in the streets, which is a much greater risk as well.

The most common cancers are lung cancer from smoking and skin

cancer from excessive sunbathing. Aside from this, cancer is going down. Everyone became terrified of chemicals. Protecting the environment is within the proper role of limited government, but this is often taken too far and gets in the way of freedom.

Note: There are plenty of dangerous chemicals and plenty of stupid things going on with the processed foods we eat. I'm a fan of making reasonable changes, but the key word there is 'reasonable'. Often proposed laws in these matters are dramatic limits on freedom. End note.

Smoking is a dramatic health concern, yet smokers are often more concerned about getting brain cancer from using cell phones because that's a new and exciting threat.

Taxes don't go to what's most important, they go to whatever the loudest advocates want.

Because people complain so much about AIDS, even though it doesn't kill as many people as other things, it gets the most research out of anything.

Breast cancer also became a popular fight because people were accused of being anti-woman if they didn't focus on this disease, even though it doesn't affect very many people compared to other health dangers. Breast cancer is ninth on the list of diseases that kill people, and AIDS is all the way down at 18th. Heart disease is the biggest killer, but it's not as popular.

Note: One reason heart disease is a less popular fight is because it is more obvious that heart disease is from the food we eat, and that's a sacred cow no one dares touch. Soon it will become more common knowledge that various cancers are also from toxic foods. End note.

Note: AIDS of course is predominantly from the abomination of homosexuality, but saying that is politically incorrect, and many woke disciples have lined up to make sure you know that. Who would have thought that breaking God's laws would result in health problems? Surely we can't put religion into health! Oh yes we can! Satan is always about trying to make things irreligious, divorced from religion, but the truth is that everything is religious. God says he makes no distinction between temporal and spiritual commandments in the Doctrine & Covenants. End note.

Ch. 6 Junk Science & Junk Reporting

Journalists joke that some stories are too good to verify.

People think everything scientists say is flawless, but individual scientists are just as likely to come to dubious conclusions as the rest of us.

Note: And its not just individual scientists who it wrong, there are often popular scientific theories, like Darwin's common ancestor, that are dead wrong, but which get a monopoly on tax dollars, and scientific journals refuse to publish anything against their pet theories. Not coincidentally, evolution theory is also staunchly anti-religious from its inception - there's an agenda here. End note.

There's no such thing as a child being affected from being born to a cocaine addicted mother. The idea of crack babies helped the Republican war on drugs and helped the Democrat mission to get more social programs.

Note: I believe there is evidence for various substances of the mother impacting the child, cocaine potentially being one of these. But Stossel could be right, that this was taken advantage of for ulterior motives. End note.

Lawyers can point to bogus science. To win court cases, all they have to do is convince the jury.

A ridiculously large number of 150,000 women a year dying of anorexia was going around. That's triple the number killed in cars, and double those killed in the Vietnam War. The real number is more like 50. The huge number was feminist dogma.

*Note: This is a surprisingly common phenomenon. Similar tactics are done for various claims of abuse. One of the tricks is to count a man stomping out of a room after an argument as abusive. Another is to claim that many American kids go hungry, just because parents reported in a survey that limited money influenced their shopping choices. Who doesn't have limited money? Basic realities of scarcity are being politicized for government money by special interest groups. Crafty people know how to slant things to get the message they can use to milk us of cash. Dinesh D'Souza's *Stealing America* book has many interesting points on this subject. End note.*

Another totally false claim was that domestic abuse against women is the top killer, more than any other cause of death. Reporters like to believe feminist myths even when the numbers don't make sense.

One popular report said that one in four children in America are hungry. It was based on a study that asked if people ever cut down their meal size, but it was spun to make it look like these kids were starving. Look around - America has a problem with obesity, not starvation.

We ignore people's political agendas and trust their claims based on scanty evidence, not much different from superstitious people of the past!

Ch. 7 Government

Before the TSA (Transportation Security Agency) the airport security wasn't that great, but they were meeting all the government expectations. So to increase security you didn't have to get rid of the private companies, you just had to make higher rules and let companies compete to meet those standards. This is what many European countries have done. On 9/11 the US government failed to detect the plot and shut it down. There were people on terrorist watch lists going around from flight school to flight school looking for how to fly a bigger plane, but we did nothing. Several of the attackers were allowed into the US without visas.

No one can fire the government. There's no competition. This is why performance by government agencies deteriorates. Yet when there's a crisis, our automatic reaction is to bring in / grow the government to fix it.

The government is a little bit flexible. It's supposed to respond to the people, but the elections are infrequent, and the accountability is minimal. The political system is so corrupt that 90% of people in office get put back into office again.

Note: It does not seem right that members of Congress can serve decade after decade. There is a movement to change this. No more career politicians. End

note.

The two-party system does not give us many options. Imagine if shopping were that way, that you only get two choices, and maybe a third if it got enough signatures, and you only get to choose again every 4 years. The government gives one size fits all rules, and even when it does something clever, its rigidity makes that innovation quickly no longer applicable.

The private market does miracles every day. You can go to a foreign country where you don't speak their language and they'll give you a car if you give them a plastic card and sign a piece of paper. Yet the government can't manage to count votes in Florida.

The French government gave everyone a computer, but those computers were quickly obsolete and this actually made France lag behind. When governments are in charge they can't keep up with the hundreds of thousands of spontaneous innovations happening everywhere all the time.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs can't keep safe the money they were supposed to save for Indians. Two billion were missing. Yet no one gets fired, no one gets demoted, no one gets named.

At the Pentagon accounting discrepancies totaled two trillion dollars. They've spent billions of dollars on things they can't find. No private company would get away with this kind of bookkeeping - investors would be furious and the company would go bankrupt. The managers might go to jail. But the government doesn't have to follow the same rules as private companies. When the government loses money they just demand we give them more, and we do.

Ch. 8 Welfare for the Rich

The agriculture department gives farmers money to make sure that there's enough wool to make soldiers uniforms. Today soldiers' uniforms aren't even made of wool, yet the government money assigned for that purpose still comes.

Mass transit doesn't have to be done by the government. In New York the original mass transit was done by investors. But the government forcefully took this away from the builders when they wanted to raise the price on rides. When you compare all the money the government spends on mass transit compared to how much of it gets used for that purpose, the people would be much better off if the government just gave them some money to spend on travel.

Private ambulance companies get better ratings than public ones. The workers are happier to have more innovative resources and methods, and the taxpayers are happier to not have to pay so much in taxes.

Note: Horrific ambulance ride costs can also go down in a competitive market. Many now who could benefit from such rides deliberately avoid them, not wanting to pay thousands of dollars for the ride. And PS - the training manual for EMS personnel is inflated and hard to follow, clearly a government project. End note.

Competition makes us focus and brings out our best. Government

eliminates competition, creates stagnation, and fails to innovate.

The Federal aviation system still uses vacuum tubes in its radar system. These are so primitive they were taken out of TV sets dozens of years ago. The government is bad at modernizing. Canada has privatized air control and it does the job well for about 1/3 the cost.

Thomas Jefferson said the natural progression of things is for government to gain, and liberty to yield.

Note: Most people today aren't familiar or comfortable with the concept of liberty. They want safety guarantees, but that's not what we are here for. Ron Paul's Liberty Defined book does a great job of showing how we really don't have liberty, and how we really could. End note.

America grew fastest when our government was small.

The Bible warns against big government and kings. But today government state and local taxes are about 40% of the economy. Americans now pay more in taxes than they do for food, clothing and shelter combined.

Note: Egyptian slavery of the Hebrews was only a fifth of their income, 20%. We are in bondage! End note.

The focus of government is no longer on securing individual liberty. Everyone gets money from the government. Everyone gets policed by the government at home and abroad. Since FDR, every president has expanded the government.

Note: Some say the Ezra's Eagle prophecy began around the Hoover or FDR time. End note.

We need rule of law, but do we need so much of it? The Founding Fathers' genius was to give us the concept and structure of **limited government**. It is **one of the greatest philosophical achievements of humanity**. It protects us while leaving us free to pursue our interests. Freedom is what makes many good and creative things possible.

When people build homes in risky places right by the ocean, there's a government National Flood Insurance program guarantee that they will pay you for it if it gets destroyed. Why are we paying for rich people's stupid choices? Private insurances didn't want to insure homes built in such risky locations, so the government decided it would do it. You can get a quarter million dollars per house per flood with no limit to the number of claims, and the government's insurance premiums on this are dirt cheap.

American farmer subsidies from the government out compete small farmers around the world, hurting those small farmers.

Note: Wherever there is a government subsidy, someone suffers. For example - since the government gives student loan money to pay schools, schools raise their prices deliberately above what students can afford on their own. Why would schools not raise prices if suddenly way more money was available to them? A similar racket exists in the government-mandated insurance world. To charge a lower price would mean getting less money, because the government will just pay for the bigger price. Thomas Sowell's Inside American Education book goes into detail on this and other government education boondoggles. End note.

Food is important, but just because something's important doesn't mean the government needs to pay for it.

Note: We make up fake rights all the time. People think anything a person needs is now a right, and what they mean by that is that the government should give it to them whether they want to work for it or not. This flies in the face of reason and basic economics. Soon we will be slaves if we keep this up (and in many ways we already are). We have always had limited resources. And who is going to work to provide for those who won't work? Is it fair to them? When government gets involved, setting prices and the like, everything becomes unfair and unsustainable. The Bible teaching gives us wisdom, that those who won't work won't eat. That's life. Work is life. No work, no life. There's no magic wand to change that. End note.

Illegal bribery occurs via "contributions."

Subsidies are given to prosperous American companies who sell goods overseas. Justifications are made by the politicians for just about anything. They say it'll be good for America to have products sold overseas. Okay, that'll be good for America, but they don't need taxpayers to help them do it.

Politicians talk people into paying for sports stadiums by taxes, but studies show these stadiums never bring in as much as they cost.

Eminent domain, where the government can have someone move and take their property if it's in the way of a major road etc., is now extended to helping private businesses.

Ch. 9 The Trouble with Lawyers

Lawsuits should be treated like a necessary evil, like nuclear weapons. We shouldn't be using them all the time. Just one lawsuit can ruin your life. Even if you win, it can take all your time and money. For every personal lawsuit that helps someone, it hurts five. Our legal system makes litigation too inviting. Now anything new is a liability, and it's safer not to try. Lawyers could have been helping the good guys against the bad guys, but now they have become the bullies. By attacking the innovators, lawyers are making America worse and less safe. Even when companies are in the right, they pay off lawyers who threaten them to avoid the legal hassle. Lawyers crush entrepreneurs and kill jobs. They sue people for potentially minor risks and bankrupt the companies thereby. Companies often buy the lawyers off. We call it settling. Lawyers make the prices for everything go up, making business owners jump through many more hoops, and the costs of doing that are passed on to the consumers.

Note: If you need a lawyer to make a business work, rest assured corruption exists in that industry. So basically everything now is corrupt. The purpose of lawyers is to scam and avoid getting scammed. No one can explain to me why we have to pay a lawyer for a will, a divorce, or other basic transactions involving practically uniform documentation. The law profession has heaped up mountains of rules, and if you break them, you're in trouble. Why the trouble? Not because you did something inherently bad, but because you did something they arbitrarily made a rule against to protect their craft. It's a good ol' boys club racket. In this tumultuous climate we do need good lawyers to protect us from the bad ones, but it's a frightful situation all around, feeding on the fear of the people. End note.

Girls' camps have eliminated horseback riding in fear of lawsuits. Fewer people are volunteering to be leaders of Boy Scouts for fear of lawyers. Many are afraid to coach little leagues for fear of lawsuits. When an airline fires a pilot for being drunk, they don't say anything

about it to cover themselves from a lawsuit. So you have a bad guy who's going to just go get another job and do the same thing. Due to fear of lawsuits the vaccine industry is limited to five companies.

We don't read warning labels anymore because they're all so full of nonsensical legal jargon. A candle contains a warning label that there is fire, do not eat. A medicine for sleep warns that it may cause drowsiness. A step ladder comes with over 40 instructions. This is verbal pollution (from excessive lawyerism and litigationism) and we respond to it by ignoring it.

The court system is a racket for both sides. The winner and the loser both pay tons of money. The lawyers on both sides are happy. After fighting in court they both shake hands and go to the bank. It takes a long time to get the money you win, and when you do, the lawyers take most of it. Lawyers pick a target and keep suing until they win, and they almost always win eventually.

Note: Charles Dickens in Great Expectations shows the drama of a family who hopes across generations to win a high stakes court case. Once they finally do, all the winnings have been used up in legal fees. A young man who staked his life's vision on winning that case falls over dead in shock. End note.

Some lawyers make \$100,000 an hour. They rarely tell how much they make, claiming it's a secret.

The Democratic party's biggest supporters now are trial lawyers.

The American Disabilities Act has become a big money game for lawyers; they sue people who don't post a handicap sign. A company who builds and repairs wheelchairs were themselves in wheelchairs and didn't have a sign for handicap parking - they got sued.

Many countries have something called 'loser pay.' It allows people who are in the right to defend themselves and fight back without getting hit with huge costs. Lawyers say that the loser pay system would discourage some good lawsuits, but that's okay because good lawsuits are being taken way too far. It's not just England that does the loser pay system - it's every civilized country in the world except America. America is the one who has the strange rule of favoring the lawyers.

A General Mills company accidentally used a wrong unapproved chemical. No one was hurt. They were sued to high heaven.

Most large companies pay settlements because it's cheaper to pay that than to fight, and the costs are passed on to the consumers.

Note: Bad press is another threat associated with the lawsuit threats. End note.

Why do lawyers have to charge so much for a divorce or a will? It's just a piece of paper nearly identical to all the other ones they do. When there's money to be made, lawyers insist on tons of due process. They waste time obsessing about everything. There's less competition in law because lawyers ban outsiders. They prosecute competition, calling it 'unauthorized practice of law.' Criminals have the right to a speedy trial, but most of where lawyers make their money is civil trials, and those are dragged out for a long time to make the lawyers more money.

Lawyers don't have an obligation to truth, they have an obligation to money. It's extortion coupled with pompous ceremony. Judges wear robes and we call them honorable whether they are or not, and many

put the now useless word Esquire after their name. The pompous rituals make it seem like there's magic to the law, making it seem like only they can do it.

The legal system encourages people not to do business.

Trial lawyers practice fighting every day. They might not be right, but they know how to win.

Ch. 10 The Left Takes Notice

In liberal cities that use the word 'conservative' the same way they use the word 'child-molester.' They all agree conservatives are oppressive terrible things who are indifferent to the suffering of the poor. Leftist thinking is simply the culture we live in.

A story recently reported the North Pole turning into water. Ten days later the times magazine apologized, saying that what was happening was a normal cyclical condition. But it didn't matter, by then the story had spread everywhere. News agencies and television all around the world were talking about it.

Stossel is not a conservative, he is a libertarian. But compared to the radical left, many of his views are quite conservative. The term classical liberal meant those who seek freedom but doesn't anymore.

20 million people watched Stossel's show criticizing the government, and the only thing that the liberal media could say about it was that it

was terrible. **The left was on his side when he criticized businesses, but when he began to criticize the government, they came after him.** The left assumes that businessmen are evil and that the government and lawyers are doing the Lord's work. The left mocks basic free enterprise principles.

Almost all economists agree that rent controls cause housing shortages.

FEMINISM:

In 1995 saying boys and girls are different became controversial. At first Stossel went along with the agenda that differences in boys and girls are all just made by society, but then he had kids and saw he was completely wrong. Now science vindicates the fact that there are many inherent differences in boys and girls. For example, men's brains are better at remembering directions and women's brains are better at remembering details. Boys who aren't allowed to use guns end up shooting each other with carrots. Girls draw faces on baseballs and talk a lot. Boys are extra physically active.

Feminists say research about differences in men and women shouldn't even be done. Gloria Steinem wouldn't admit to any inherent differences in men and women. She said it's all sexist parenting that makes boys and girls different. She told Stossel, "we badly need to raise our boys more like our girls." Feminist lawyer Gloria Allred also denounced the topic of differences between boys and girls. She says talking about it is an attack, and was angry.

Note: Rather than defend their position logically they resort to name calling and emotion when you point out the error of their dogma. End note.

Sure the women's movement has brought us some good things like allowing women more career choices and allowing men more parenting. But the equality feminists have become so dominant in the universities and media that they **think they have the right to demand** that gender differences **shouldn't even be discussed**. Gloria Steinem said it's crazy anti-America thinking to do research about the differences between men and women. What's truly un-American is the censorship of thought police like Steinem.

Someone pointed out that the female firefighters have to drag someone out of a building whereas the males could carry them. Stossel talked to Gloria Steinem about this, and she made the absurd response that it's better to be dragged because there's less smoke down there, and that male firefighters are probably killing people carrying them out at that height.

Note: Never mind the fact that dragging is slower and more damaging than carrying. How can anyone take radical feminists seriously? End note.

FOOD:

There are certain procedures for getting rid of bacteria from cow manure on food, but many organic farmers don't take those necessary steps. And organic foods can have more bacteria.

Things like spring lettuce in a bag have sewage on them. It's true that meat is more likely to be contaminated than produce but the foods advertised as organic are still dangerous. Many more people die from bacteria than from pesticides. So focus on the bacteria.

Organic farming uses more land because they need more space since

much of their crop is lost to weeds and pests.

—

Ch. 11 It's Not My Fault! (Victims)

Compensating victims creates an incentive for people to be victims. Yes, suing and getting compensation has its proper place but many of us are tempted to frame everything in the perspective of victimhood. Many people get out of trouble by claiming victimhood. Like saying if you're caught driving drunk that you're a victim of alcoholism.

America wasn't founded and built by people who wanted handouts, but by people who wanted government to leave them alone.

The Americans with disabilities act supposedly is protecting 43 million Americans. This implies that one in six people is disabled. The definition of disability is being lost and turned into a political money game. The vague definition allows lawyers to mess around and get lots of money. Some say being stupid or fat is a disability. Disability laws have actually made it harder for disabled people to find work because employers know that hiring a disabled person, thanks to all the new laws, is a giant potential lawsuit waiting to happen. There are too many unpredictable loopholes and rules to want to even mess with the whole system that makes it impossible to fire a disabled person.

New laws are making more and more people special classes to be protected by the government.

Note: Making new protected classes is a key strategy of the left. This is their constituency, how they get more votes, more power, and more of your money. Prager in Still the Best Hope treats this well. End note.

One crazy example of a new protected class is addiction. Many people get checks from the government because of their disability of being addicted to drugs. Stossel spoke to many addicts who admitted they just like doing drugs and they like getting checks from the government. Labeling addiction as disease shifts the responsibility away from the individual. The addict said that they just use the government checks to get high and to buy drugs to sell.

Note: We are sensitive to the nightmare addiction can become, but our sensitivity must not stop us from having a tougher stance. Surely our society is in moral decay when we think drug addiction is a reason to shovel out perpetual cash to someone. End note.

Social security disability check recipients don't bother getting a job because they would lose their check. The system encourages people to act like victims. The idea is growing in America that people don't have to take responsibility for their own actions because the government will always be there to pick up the pieces. Now everyone has rights, and no one has responsibilities.

Note: It's a trap! They turn you into a slave by giving you a little reward. Something for nothing. It pales in comparison to what you could do without caps on your savings, but few will choose to budget and save more carefully, and merely continue on in the money trap, always borderline impoverished, but not without bread and circuses. End note.

There are many loosely defined diseases that qualify people for government money. One of them is back pain. Many doctors have

demonstrated that in many cases back pain can be from psychological rather than physical causes. The pain is real but what's going on emotionally is what causes it. Many people who actually have bulging discs, etc., don't have back pain. To cope with stress, our brain redirects blood flow to certain areas of the body which then increases pain in those areas. That pain distracts our minds from the unacceptable feelings. Much of this pain would go away if we ignored it and focused on other things, including resuming physical activity. See the book, "Healing Back Pain", by Dr Sarno.

Ch. 12 What About the Poor?

LBJ's War on Poverty showed that the government spending tons of money isn't the problem.

There are so many overlapping programs of government welfare for poverty that much of the money has now disappeared.

Government welfare recipients adopt the belief that they have the right to a monthly check.

When welfare reform has happened, it has had positive results, getting many people off of welfare and back into the workforce. Opportunity abounds for those who are willing to work.

Children of immigrants often earn more than the average American because they have a work ethic.

In New York they introduced an idea called Workfare where recipients of government welfare money had to work. The people revolted calling it slavery and had their nice little riots saying things like, "Hey hey, ho ho, Workfare has got to go." But no one's making anyone participate in the Workfare program. They could walk away and get a job whenever they want. So when they complain that the jobs of Workfare are menial, it's them who's choosing to participate in the program. Those on the welfare system refuse to take minimum wage jobs thinking that they couldn't afford to live on minimum wage. It's true that first jobs may not pay well - they are the first rung on the ladder of opportunity. They teach you how to show up on time, how to work hard, how to do a good job, follow instructions and handle responsibility. They give people the self-respect that work alone brings. Then the workers can move into better jobs. There are many stories of people who started at the bottom and worked their way up.

If you're looking for work, you'll find it. If you're looking for excuses and evidence of racism and depression, you'll find it. Do something instead of whining.

People who refuse to get a minimum wage job thinking it won't pay the bills and prefer welfare will never climb out of their poverty. The welfare system does not foster self-reliance. There are people who are generationally on the welfare system.

Note: The Lord's system of charity for the poor is not to give endless handouts, but to give rare crisis financial support, and to focus on training and work opportunities. The Workfare idea of having to work to get money in a welfare system is a correct principle. End note.

Government housing projects are often in disrepair and full of crime. One government apartment complex became abandoned due to the

high drug use. But then a private owner came in and established a healthy culture. Then he even hired someone to give private karate lessons. It again became a place where children could play. Under private management the message was sent that they cared about the dignity of the housing and then everything changed.

Note: When there's no real ownership and minimal accountability, things fall apart. End note.

In one area convicts got together and helped each other. A private association was formed. They ran businesses, etc., and do very well. Of course the government tried to smother the program with red tape. Someone commented that if Jesus Christ wanted to start Christianity today, he wouldn't be able to do it because the government would say, 'You need a psychiatrist and a social worker, etc. before you'll be allowed to do anything.'

Ch. 13: Greed or Ambition?

Capitalism lets people get rich no matter what color they are etc. Sure, some people will get richer than others, and that's okay. The alternative is a system where everyone stays poor.

Note: Dinesh D'Souza in Stealing America points out that the people who make the rich rich are the consumers. He uses the example of a popular book author. The people want the book so they all pay the author. Then the author's net worth has gone up by many times, and those who bought the book have that much less money. So in capitalism it's not by oppression that the rich get rich, it's by voluntary exchange, which rewards innovation. D'Souza says

those who are always looking out for what others want are capitalists and the clergy. End note.

President Bill Clinton wanted a third option between socialism and capitalism. Someone who had experience with communism heard about this and commented that the third way is the fastest way to the third world. You're either free or not free. Every regulation throws sand in the gears of the economic engine. The regulations seem like they'll be helpful, but they have the unintended consequence of making employers afraid to hire people and making people afraid to start businesses. Many people are now leaving America to go to more economically free areas.

You know you're living in a good country when the main problem is getting too fat. A billion people in the world are trying to live on a dollar a day. But in America, even 75% of the poor own TVs and cars. Nearly half of America's poor own a house.

The thing that makes America succeed is not its natural resources. It's not the democracy. It's not the people. It's economic freedom. India has plenty of natural resources and democracy, yet it is much poorer than America. Some blame it on overpopulation, yet it has the same population density as New Jersey. The reality is that they have less economic freedom. Hong Kong has 20 times as many people per capita as India and no natural resources, yet they are not poor like India. Again it's because they have economic freedom. Hong Kong thrived because its rulers sat around and didn't do much. Without the crutch of government welfare, more people in Hong Kong are inspired to create things. Without high taxation they get to keep more of what they make. Singapore is oppressive in lots of ways but they do have economic freedom, so they've climbed out of poverty really fast as

well. Despite the collapse of the Soviet Union, despite the success of free America and free Hong Kong, many places around the world still put many restraints on economic freedom. A leader in Calcutta India speaking to Stossel insisted that socialism works better, claiming it was merely his implementation of it that was failing. Anyone paying attention to modern history can see that economic freedom works!

Rule of law is also needed for a society to prosper. People need to be protected from theft if they are to do business. 94 countries are poor because there's not enough law enforcement to protect from theft. Limited government is needed by everyone, especially the poor.

In the movies, the person most likely to be portrayed as a murderer or destroyer of the environment is a businessman.

But yes, those who just try to get ahead by stepping on the heads of others do deserve condemnation.

Greed is having more than you deserve, but who's to decide what you deserve? Ask anyone if they've ever turned down a pay raise.

Note: Dinesh D'Souza in Stealing America points out how capitalism takes the human nature of greed and puts it in a proper restraint, basing earnings on serving the customer rather than theft. He makes a similar analogy for marriage, that marriage controls lust (the desire for sex) in a healthy environment, channeling it into a relationship more likely to create lasting attachment, stability, and children. End note.

Innovators and leaders do get paid more, but it's for a reason. They are responsible for the growth that brings in massive amounts of income for many people.

Note: Entrepreneurs take many risks that workers do not, and have a right to more of the profits. Ben Shapiro gives a brilliant brief explanation of this in this video: Socialist Tells Ben Shapiro: Workers Should Own the Means of Production <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3xq-q6a9tCM> End note.

Sectors of the economy that are motivated by what could be called greed, run smoothly. Whereas the sectors run by selfless motives don't run well. Not much would get done if we all depended on human kindness. Greed gets people to cooperate. In the free market you don't have to care about your fellow man, but you do have to serve him.

Government Red Cross non-profit lifeguards perform lower than private company lifeguards. Some people say, 'Don't trust something that important to a private company that might cut corners.' But the reality is that the private companies outdo the government all the time. Over a thousand pools have switched from Red Cross to private lifeguards. Making profit motivates an organization to save lives.

Some think that money is not made, it's just transferred. This isn't correct. Capitalism is not a zero-sum game. When someone gets a billion dollars, it doesn't mean everyone else has a billion less. Entrepreneurs get rich by making the pie bigger. They find the world new ways of saving time and money.

The type of greed that does hurt the poor is when government programs take money and use it poorly. In voluntary capitalism everyone wins unless someone cheats. To run a successful business year after year, businessmen have to be honest. They must price their products competitively. They must do a host of consumer friendly things better than their competitors. In this sense, greed is a good thing.

Cornelius Vanderbilt and John Rockefeller were called “robber barons” but they were neither robbers nor barons - they were not born into wealth, and they didn't steal. Vanderbilt invented ways to make travel easier. It was competing businessmen that persuaded the newspapers to depict him as someone who hurts the poor. Rockefeller was labeled as a monopolist in the oil industry, but he wasn't - there were competitors. No one was forced to buy his oil, people were enticed to do so because he sold it for less. He found cheaper ways to get oil from the ground to the gas pump, and his success is what his competitors hated about him. And he saved the whales because he decreased the need for whale blubber by decreasing the cost of kerosene and gasoline. Vanderbilt and Rockefeller also gave great sums to charity.

Stossel gives about 10% of his money to charity.

People who have the skills to build companies & new products should invest their resources on those things more than just giving their resources away.

Note: Everyone should give some of their resources away, and particularly by forming families they are responsible and donating to church, but yes, a person can do great good by magnifying his talents. The Lord has a parable about the importance of magnifying one's talents. End note.

Ch. 14 Owning Your Body

Dwarf tossing is a party sport in some parts of the world. Some dwarves want the freedom to be tossed to make money. In a world

where athletes wreck their bodies for money, the dwarves should also be able to choose for themselves. In the political world, the activist winners get to tell everyone else what to do.

In much of the Islamic world homosexuality is punished by death. In America sexuality of any kind is tolerated as long as you don't get in other people's faces about it. A lot of states still have laws against fornication and adultery, though they are not enforced. In 2003 a Georgia law against sodomy was overturned.

Note: Of course in 2015 the Obama administration made homosexuality a legal form of marriage on a federal level, much to the dismay of religious America. End note.

Note: It is true that the government of Islam (Sharia Law) is overly strict and penalizing, like stoning a woman for not covering her face. But homosexuality should not be tolerated in a civil society. It is proper for people to elect a righteous government which does not tolerate theft, lying, murder, sodomy, fornication, and other crimes against nature and nature's God. End note.

Note: Stossel suggests that we should legalize things like prostitution and pornography. That's not right. It is best when we obey God's laws. Society without God God's law will not last long. It may not be understood by those who claim to just be acting on reason, but God's ways are higher than our ways. The truth is that many people are hurt, especially children, when sexual debauchery is allowed. And the act of sexuality is inherently different from other physical achievements or activities. It is a sacred sacrament. End note.

Note: On a similar note, this is why it is corrupt for churches to charge money for sacraments. It was wrong for the Catholic Church to sell indulgences. That's not how God works. There is a proper function of government in blocking legitimately evil deeds. Conservatives recognize this more than libertarians. End note.

Someone Stossel interviewed was talking to the point about how some say you can't legislate morality but that we actually do legislate morality frequently in government. Stossel disagrees with him.

Note: I agree with the man who said we do legislate morality. Politics are actually quite closely tied to morality and religion. This is why most people can't handle talking about religion or politics. This is why parents are so essential, because they're basically the only people brave enough to teach these things to children. End note.

Note: Stossel says sex is not a direct threat to someone but that's not the whole picture. It leads to murder from abortion. It leads to divorce and children being raised outside of marriage. It leads to disease and premature death. It leads to corruption of society. It leads to societal birth rates dropping below the reproduction level. The list goes on and on. But the most important thing is God has made the rules, and we accept or reject them to our peril. End note.

Note: It is important here to discuss plural marriage. God has sanctioned this system at times so we know that it is sometimes morally permissible. In the 1800s the Latter-day Saints were commanded to practice plural marriage, and it was wrong for the government to force them not to. Biblical plural marriage (as in a man having several wives) actually has many of the opposite effects of sexual deviation. Widows are taken care of. The children have a wholesome place to be raised. The poor are taken into families where they have a meaning important roles. The Latter-day Saints don't practice plural marriage today because it's strictly governed by God's priesthood and the direction came to discontinue the practice in part due to the harsh political climate, but it is clear to see when one begins to do a more than perfunctory review of it why God has sanctioned this system in ancient and modern history. Many places around the world still practice polygamy, such as Africa and the Arab world.

And many report this system being beneficial for families. So here I would agree with Stossel that the government should not legislate against these relationships. But there is an inherent difference between this and clear immoral sexuality. It was peculiar indeed when the gay rights crowd and the polygamy crowd agreed on something! Of course polygamy is the elephant in the sexual rights movement room that will never be recognized by the corrupted United States government, it has too much potential to be something that actually does good in the world. End note.

Stossel says laws in the past which were against adultery didn't stop adultery from happening any more than today's laws, and laws against drugs and prostitution don't stop those from being used. There's a group that lobbies for legalization and protection of prostitutes called "Coyote" which stands for "Call Off Your Old Tired Ethics".

Note: I disagree that immorality should be legal just because it is hard to enforce. Society should at least provide some guideposts to people about what a good life looks like. Adultery and drugs are decaying influences on society and attempts should be made to limit their prevalence, even if not to entirely eradicate them. Our ethics may be old and tired, but they have kept us safe through many challenges, and will continue to do so if we allow them. End note.

Stossel says vices are part of life and making it illegal drives it underground and makes it more dangerous.

Note: Even if something goes underground, even if we can't tax it, even if it becomes something more enticing to rebels, a good society is one that makes it easy to be good, and a bad society is one that makes it easy to be bad. Making a vice of a most serious nature legal is morally wrong, even if you can't now see the bigger picture of the net negative impact it will have on society. End note.

Stossel points out that it's legal for men to go into the boxing ring and meet each other up for entertainment, but it's not legal for a woman to give sexual pleasure for financial profit.

Note: Of course this goes against the whole morality of decent society. It destroys the family. It doesn't put people in a position to have a family and maintain a family. It goes against many commandments and it's just so corrupt it's unbelievable that people would draw a parallel between sports and sex. The erosion of sex has been going on for decades now. It was never meant to be mere recreation or entertainment. It was meant to be the fountain of life, the symbol of marital unity, the glue that holds together marriage, and the most sacred element of life. But now people fail to understand sacred space - everything has become profane. Profane means open to the public, sacred means reserved for very specific conditions. Societies self-destruct when they take these things lightly, and they incur the wrath of God. End note.

Note: Modern feminists, instead of rebuking unfaithful men, decided they get the right to be unfaithful as well. If there's people doing stupid things, why does that justify doing more stupid things? Rather, call for reformation. Bring them up, don't go down to their level. End note.

Note: Ultimately when the American public demands stupid things they will make them legal. But acting to make some things officially illegal does show that there is a conservative voice. There is a voice of reason and morality. End note.

Note: Stossel points out the dramatic amount of money being spent on the drug war, and yes, this is of course wasteful. But the solution isn't to let people do drugs and make drugs a convenient part of life. The solution is to

change the method of the drug war; to execute big drug dealers and stop playing around with all this. Drug dealers know that there are places that take drug crime use seriously, and they don't mess with those places. Cleon Skousen as chief of police of Salt Lake City cracked down on drugs and virtually eliminated the problem. But it was the leftists who said he was being too strict, got him fired, then all the drugs and prostitutes and homeless started showing up again. End note.

Note: Stossel talks about how we're locking up in jail more people for drug use than for other serious crimes. But at the end of the day, as many people want to do crimes, that's how many people we're going to lock up. And again there needs to be more serious law enforcement, not less, to make real deterrence. As Stossel points out, most people arrested on drug charges are quickly released. Is this really doing anything to deter the deadly drug use? End note.

Note: Stossel says drug crimes aren't inherently bad, they are just criminal because we have labeled them that way,. and that most drugs just make people stupid or sleepy. But when the person becomes stupid they do stupid things. Dangerous things. So no, it's not just arbitrary illegality. Most domestic abuse cases involve drugs, etc. Drug users are more likely to neglect their children, more likely to fail at basic civic responsibility, more likely to act unethically in many fields. Drugs corrode society, and we don't want them here. The least we can do is heavily punish criminals when drugs were also a part of their crime. Toughen up drunk driving laws, etc. This is a solution Joel Skousen suggests. But I don't think that cuts it. End note.

Note: Stossel talks about how dangerous Columbia is in terms of murders and kidnapping. He talks about how Columbia grows cocaine for America. But to me this is evidence that the drug use there is leading to more violence and child abuse and it's not just because there's laws against drugs in America. Make it legal in America and we will get a society that looks more

like Columbia. End note.

Note: Stossel talks about people who sell drugs making a lot of money in America and having the nicest cars and how it doesn't discourage people from working normal jobs when the role models and the rich people are criminals. But I think Stossel's approach to this is backwards because you legalize something that doesn't make it morally good. There are things you can do that are illegal that are still immoral. So we're still encouraging immoral behavior, even if you make something legal. Something being legal or illegal doesn't determine it's morality. I think Stossel's weak stance on the reality of God and natural moral law could be impacting his judgment on this and similar topics. The point of law is to encourage good sound morality. End note.

Note: Stossel talks about drug money making very profitable gangs, how alcohol prohibition made Al Capone, and how the drug money can even fund terrorists. But people are always going to take advantage of money from corruption. If you make bad things legal, then you'd have people parading as making money on these things while at the same time claiming to be good moral people and our society would no longer have a clear sense of good versus evil. People should not be taught to make a career out of vice, and legalizing vice would do that to an even greater extent than what you see with the gangs. End note.

Note: Stossel talks about how we can't enforce everything. For example, we can't have exercise police come in our home and make us run laps and do push-ups. But this is a different category. Yes, there are some things making us unhealthy and it might be the role of the government to step in and ban more of those things as they have done in Europe. Just because we're asking for some inherently immoral things to be illegal, doesn't mean we're asking for a complete micromanaging police state. We're just saying a few big hitters like immorality and drugs should be illegal. Making very immoral things illegal is justified due to their potent addictive destructive nature. End note.

Stossel says to hold people accountable for what they do, not for what they put in their bodies. He says it's ironic that people want to outlaw drugs but not alcohol. And someone responded by saying people use alcohol for the taste, not to get high. Stossel quickly caught them in this because of course people use alcohol to get high/drunk.

Note: This is an oversimplification of the situation. Drug use creates a culture of irresponsible sickly and resentful people who rely on the government and don't value freedom. That's not what America stands for. We aren't a police state, but we also aren't a stupid state. Furthermore, you can't equate drugs and alcohol. Brewing up a large batch of meth is like making a nuclear bomb, destroying the lives of all it touches. No one would advocate allowing people to make nukes in their garages. We don't even allow people to make smaller bombs. We don't even allow people to own functional tanks. We must recognize heavy drugs as lethal weapons, mass killers. Alcohol addiction can get bad but it's on a whole different level compared to heavy drugs. In our legal system, we must recognize differences in kinds. Not all substances are created equal. The more dangerous things need more limitations. End note.

Note: Stossel says making drugs illegal means basically we should make bad movies, bad art, bad music illegal. First, we can't equate lethal drugs to bad media. However, there is a case to be made for also making more limits on media when it comes to grotesque and inhumane productions. As a democratic people we can at least vote to limit the absurdities being done in the name of art. Pornographic 'art', movies with extreme horror gore and immorality, these are not good for society, and there used to be laws prohibiting these things. It is strange that anyone would even want to make them, much less consume them. Yes, there's freedom of speech and expression. But what happens when people use those freedoms wrongfully and send lethal satanic messages that lead people to immorality? There are other fields in which we limit speech. Like if someone yells 'fire' in a building, or someone incites violence. Therefore, we already understand that speech which is

inherently very dangerous should be limited. And if we can recognize the danger of a lot of this in popular media, we should not tolerate it as a society. It's time we ask ourselves how long we want a society with epidemics of suicide, violence, and ignorance. When will we have a revival, and become what America used to be? End note.

Note: Stossel says a person should be able to do dangerous drugs because it's their own body. There's some truth to this, but also falsehood. For one, Christ has bought us with a price and we are not our own. For two, when it comes to the very dangerous things, responsible adults of society have a duty to help limit dangerous things for the benefit of the rising generation. We must uphold the moral fabric of society. End note.

*Note: Stossel talks about having the option to end your life via euthanasia (medically assisted suicide). But this is another big pitfall. It would tear down the moral fabric of society if we normalized suicide. Life is not ours to give or to take. It is God's domain. It is cowardice to seek to end our life in our own time tables. It is pagan and it is not the way of Judeo-Christian Western Civilization. Soon we would have doctors pressuring people toward death when they have a bad day, as has been happening in Europe. Sorrow is a normal part of life. Sickness is a normal part of life. Suffering is the great school of humanity. And helping those who suffer is what brings out the best in us, and teaches us life's most important lessons. We play god when we think we know how better than He concerning the terminating of life. Another point along these lines that people like Stossel would not understand is **abortion**. Where there is life, we do not have moral permission to terminate it. We only kill when one has murdered, indeed, the Bible says for murder there must be no substitute punishment other than to take the murderer's life (to prevent further murder and to have justice). **War** is a necessary evil to shut down those who would seek to destroy humanity. But the **innocent** baby can never be terminated justly. Nor should we seek to eliminate our elderly and sick, though the movement to do so is appallingly alive and well today as*

*it was in the 20th century. Rather, we must communicate that **life has great value**. It is a crime against humanity to normalize or assist with suicide. Many are pushing for ending the use of the phrase 'commit suicide,' as though it were not a horrifying crime. Suicide is a **crime** against god, a crime against he self, a crime against loved ones, and a crime against the rising generation who thereby learns that life is cheap. Suicide is murder, let's not call for the legalization of murder. Let's not go in the direction of the **government** deciding about who needs to live and who needs to die. It'll be like Hitler, who wanted to and did kill the sick and the aged and the 'unfavored races.' You may think race is protected today, but they always come up with some excuse or another. End note.*

Stossel says social peer pressure is more powerful than political laws to deter bad behavior. Note: Again, there's some truth to that. But there's also the basic point of law in society that when people are being immoral, they need more laws to govern them.

These days women are accusing men of rape when they have consensual drunk sex. Stossel went to talk to the people involved in one of these cases and radicals on the school campus shouted, "Stop sexual violence," and wouldn't let him talk. They said they don't have to prove anything. They just have to say if it's likely, then kick him out. Stossel asked them to clarify the definition of rape because when he was growing up that meant actual force. As soon as he said that, they all shouted and wouldn't let him talk anymore. The totalitarian left insists that the other point of view not even be heard.

Note: A good point to be made here is that these topics should be debated. After debate, people can vote on them and make legally binding decisions. For example, the people can decide that they don't want certain immoral television programs, or certain immoral music, or certain immoral drugs, or certain immoral sexual activities to be allowed, etc. We express our will

through the laws of our society. It is proper, even necessary, for us to vote according to our conscience. Let the people speak. Let them debate, and let them make choices which are legally binding. End note.

Some call Stossel a woman hater because he has pointed out the differences between men and women.

Stossel recognizes that some free speech is not allowed. Like inciting direct violence and lawless action. Some people want to outlaw all criticism as offensive speech, but we must allow criticism.

Private companies can have rules where they will fire someone if they criticize certain things. But the problem is that the laws these days and politics of the left have frightened schools and other companies into passing suffocatingly restrictive speech rules. Some say there's a new commandment in America, thou shalt not hurt others with words. It's a noble idea to create a kinder, more civil society, but placing strict limits on speech is dangerous. You don't have the right to not have your feelings hurt. But in today's legal climate, people with disabilities (and other every-growing protected classes) have the right to not have their feelings hurt. If you accept this logic, the censorship will never end.

Workers now sue bosses because a co-worker told a dirty joke. Companies make flirting illegal. States are pressured to change Columbus Day into Indigenous People's Day. Speech codes have put many organizations in fear of being sued. For the longest time the workplace has always been a place to find love, but now companies are banning all dating and flirting and making people sign weird contracts in this regard. The government is setting up a nationwide orthodoxy telling us detailed lists of what we can and can't do. In

work trainings these days you're told you can't do the most basic human interaction like touching someone on the shoulder or complementing someone.

Note: It's almost like marriage isn't part of the agenda for Satan's inverted plan. End note.

Ch. 15 Free Speech

Speech police say that our words are bullets. But for the sake of freedom, we need to make the distinction between words and bullets!

The party that loses a lawsuit should pay the other side's costs. This would prevent lawsuit abuse. The losing lawyer should pay, too, if the client is poor. Lawyers say that loser pay would deny some people access to the courtroom, but it works well enough in the rest of the world. Would you like people to have access to missiles because they are destructive? Lawsuits are also destructive. Limit them.

Some companies, like vaccine makers, are given exemption from the law. This does not make us equal under the law.

We must adjust to risk ourselves, rather than expecting the government to do it.

Note: There's a lot of truth to that. But the government does have a role in blocking things that are inherently immoral. For a fully free society, the people must operate on conscience. This is why the US Founding Fathers said our government is wholly unsuitable for non-religious people. End note.

Passing regulations have unintended negative consequences so when you want to pass a new regulation get rid of two old ones first.

Stossel says government should set basic rules for safety, keep the peace, then leave people alone.

Note: This is mostly true, but who decides what is basic safety? The people, of course, get to vote and decide. For example, whether they want legal drugs, legal prostitution, and other controversial things. It'll be put to vote. The Book of Mormon says that most of the time, the voice of the people will choose that which is just, and when they don't, they are ripe for destruction. So ultimately, God has a safety valve built in such that when people do choose to make immorality and vice legal and normalized, the clock starts ticking for them to be shut down. It is the job of saints to speak against vices of a serious nature, even when the majority seeks to normalize them. End note.

Note: For example, if neither leading candidate for president is a good pick you can vote for someone else even when you know they won't win but because it's the right thing to do. At least you can say 'I didn't vote for this.' I don't say that is the right path in every situation, one rarely finds a perfect candidate, but it is an important principle to remember if you find yourself in a situation where there are serious issues on both sides like theft immorality and so forth. End note.

Science thrives in the US because no one authority has the right to decide what is permissible.

Note: America has been known as the nation of inventors but that is changing. Other countries now are inventing more than the us. And tyrannical academic boards insisting on dogmas of modern science, such as Evolution Theory, are now squashing the truth and suppressing her. End note.

America isn't run by the president. It is run by millions of people making choices every day. Most of the best of life has nothing to do with government like falling in love, worshiping, creating things, and making families work. For the most part, the country runs itself. It's free markets and free minds that innovate, not government!

STOSSEL VIDEO HIGHLIGHTS

Stossel Videos Contents:

4 Socialism Myths

Socialism Fails: Reason TV

Not all Students are Woke Students

\$2 Million Government Bathroom

Welfare for the Rich

Bankrupting America

Military Boondogles

Biden Big Spending

Trump Big Spending

Free Stuff 2020

4 Socialism Myths - John Stossel

Video part 1 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RVBPgvY3TbU>

Is capitalism a raw deal? What about the wage gaps? The socialists call for taxing the rich. Chomsky promotes socialism and is paid \$30,000 to speak at colleges.

Myth 1: That Wasn't Real Socialism.

Socialism inevitably delivers government ownership of production.

In practice, individuals not owning business means government owned.

Venezuela is socialist. They say it isn't. Hugo Chavez, who wrecked Venezuela, called for expropriating, taking, industries. He railed against capitalism.

Myth 2: That Socialism Just Wasn't Managed Well.

They say Chavez just didn't manage things well. But the nature of socialism is that the economic policies won't adjust to reality.

Entrepreneurs will adjust how to deliver products and services, but government won't. No central authority could possibly direct all these individual adjustments, instead they prevent needed adjustments and cause failure.

The free market allows experimentation to find what works. Socialism is a one size fits all economy.

Trabant cars of Germany were terrible. The socialist economy didn't let them expand and adjust.

Vox's video blamed the collapse of Venezuela on everything but socialism. But isn't just Venezuela that deals with oil issues.

Video part 2 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bGURPuoXgW4>

Myth 3: Democratic Socialism is Different.

Things start off democratically elected, then when the government controls the economy, it's impossible to un-elect them.

Venezuela's socialism was elected. Maduro bought votes, made it so people would lose their job if they didn't vote for him, gave food if they voted for him, etc.

Socialism always turns into a totalitarian government.

Socialist things in America are famous for not working well, like public education, congested streets, and UPS.

Myth 4: Socialism Works well in Scandinavian Countries.

Scandinavian countries aren't socialist. Markets organize their economics.

Sweden had big government, when they did, there were large lines for healthcare, etc. So Sweden said enough. They privatized trains, sold government owned businesses, lowered taxes, etc.

When Americans called Denmark socialist, the prime minister of Denmark came and said, “No. We have a market economy.”

Fascism and socialism aren’t exactly the same but have many things in common. They both replace decision making with state control. In both systems you lose control over your own future. Only in capitalism can you say, ‘No.’ In capitalism entrepreneurs offer you services and you can say no and make a better choice.

See the book Socialism Sucks.

Problems people point out with America are from the socialism in America. America is not entirely capitalist. Far from it.

Socialists call for reallocating wealth to who needs it.

Note: How do you control this redistribution? Is it by force. Redistribution is a fancy way of saying theft.

Socialism Fails: Reason TV 6m

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ACXTTfE4GxM>

(This is not Stossel, but Stossel is a big fan of Reason Magazine / TV.)

Gloria Alvarez, presenter of this clip, is from Guatemala and saw firsthand the evils of socialism. Her father had to flee Cuba etc.

We saw socialism fail in Latin America. Castro in Cuba was going to help the poor and make everyone equal. Many hundreds of thousands fled Cuba.

Cuba didn't pay people well for their services. Hugo Chavez took Venezuelans down the same path as Cuba. He called capitalism a reign of injustice. They just printed more money. There was a million times inflation.

Chavez seized lots of private industry, 1000's of businesses. People cheered for this. They called it social justice. But it made shortages of almost everything. It was like the apocalypse - no food, no medicine.

People blame Venezuela's failure on everything but socialism.

Scandinavia's private businesses are left alone. There's not even a minimum wage. Yes, there's a welfare state, but it's funded by private free enterprise.

Denmark's prime minister said Denmark is far from a socialist planned economy, it's a market economy. Socialism hasn't worked anywhere.

You don't need the government to tell you how much you can make, spend, etc.

Violence is inevitable under socialism.

Not all Students are Woke Students – John Stossel 6m

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZKMkyCk03xM>

People want more government.

Jefferson said the natural thing is for liberty to yield, and government to gain.

It's hard to gain freedom, and hard to get it back when lost.

Everything in the media calls for eating the rich and feeding the poor.

Yes, inequality of wealth and income have surged. Yes, capitalism has inequality, but all can choose to grow. Contrast this with socialism where everyone is equal, but equally poor.

Stossel in the Classroom is a free resource with many basic educational materials reaching many students.

[\\$2 Million Government Bathroom - John Stossel](#)

[5m](#)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qKRuhiMDOjo&list=PLFtZbRNUjWfyAX8FXtH-o0igAzpEWMNy6>

Government spending gets out of control due to many rules.

Private businesses build cheaper bathrooms.

The private bathroom at a private run park is better run and is much busier.

The public pays union 'prevailing' wages, based on what people voted for, not based on the market supply and demand (reality). Union wage is sometimes over 100/hr.

The government bathroom took 7 years to build. It only took 2 years for the private sector to build the empire state building.

Welfare for the Rich - John Stossel 5m

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FwpIBJ3jbFA&list=PLFtZbRNUjWfyAX8FXtH-o0igAzpEWMNy6&index=4>

See the book Welfare for the Rich: How your tax dollars end up in Millionaire's Pockets.

Politicians often build elaborate football stadiums on tax dollars. Voters are promised many jobs will come, but research shows the stadiums cost around 188 million dollars and return around 40 million.

Huge companies get government money, close, and keep the money.

Green Peace mocks big company greed, but takes plenty from taxpayers themselves.

Politicians say we won't have a stable food supply without subsidizing grain farmers.

Bankrupting America - John Stossel 5m

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OmjkEM3AJIQ&list=PLFtZbRNUjWfyAX8FXtH-o0igAzpEWMNy6&index=2>

75 million to NPR public broadcasting. 50 million for a museum. The US has 24 trillion debt.

Modern monetary theory, that we can just print more money and debt doesn't matter, has destroyed many countries. 1920s Germany, Argentina, Russian, Venezuela, Zimbabwe and other countries have all seen this. Unemployment goes way up.

Europe bailed out Greece, but who would bail out the US?

Politicians talk about the rising debt but don't do anything about it.

The debt doubled under Obama, but it's going up even more under Trump.

Stossel doesn't apply for or accept loans and grants from the government, seeing such as immoral.

[Military Boondogles - John Stossel 5m](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H58xTtT6qk&list=PLFtZbRNUjWfyAX8FXtH-o0igAzpEWMNy6&index=5)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H58xTtT6qk&list=PLFtZbRNUjWfyAX8FXtH-o0igAzpEWMNy6&index=5>

Defense contractors mark up prices thousands of percent when selling to the government.

Defense has such a large budget that it doesn't care about overspending.

Politicians get pork. People get employment in their district.

The US built an extremely expensive natural gas station in Afghanistan which nobody used.

The US gave large planes to Afghans they never used and just trashed.

We can't do everything. We have to choose which things are worth spending on. The goal of converting the whole world to democracy is vague and unrealistic.

The US spends 10x more than any other country on military.

The US military says maybe they will be audited in 2027. No private companies get away with that.

Now the military wants to spend more on climate change.

[Biden Big Spending - John Stossel 5m](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ekS6LdfXkEY&list=PLFtZbRNUjWfyAX8FXtH-o0igAzpEWMNy6&index=10)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ekS6LdfXkEY&list=PLFtZbRNUjWfyAX8FXtH-o0igAzpEWMNy6&index=10>

Biden was suggested to be the lowest among democrats on federal spending, then when he was the official candidate he cranked it up saying we would spend the most since WWII.

Spending won't give efficient infrastructure.

Don't just tax to care for children and the elderly. We know better ways to care for them. Leave the money in our pockets to care for our own families.

A right to free speech means government leaves us alone. But a right to housing, college, etc., means government takes money from some and gives it to others.

See Pete Sepp of the national taxpayer's union who calls for less taxation.

Deficits and debt destroy economic growth.

Trump Big Spending - John Stossel 5m

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pqgEhhJnEF0&list=PLFtZbRNUjWfyAX8FXtH-o0igAzpEWMNy6&index=11>

Trump promised to cut spending.

Trump said he had to fix defense spending. Yet he pumped more into it than ever.

Trump cranked up spending for COVID. Both parties wanted to look caring. Government should help but enough is enough.

Most government departments got more money under Trump.

The state department has 60 sub departments.

Trump proposed slowing the growth of programs, but congress called that “the blueprint for destroying America.”

Washington is growing at the expense of everyone else.

Free Stuff 2020 - John Stossel 5m

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G5odA8Gsmzs&list=PLFtZbRNUjWfyAX8FXtH-o0igAzpEWMNy6&index=13>

Students may be debt free, but the taxpayers won't be.

Bernie Sanders was the only self-described socialist in the 2020 Democratic party race, but he wasn't the one proposing the highest government spending. (The running Democrats were all socialists.)

Sanders wanted to guarantee everyone a government job.

No one tracked all the proposed spending so Stossel charts them up in this video.

Totals: Trump 267 billion. Biden 297 billion. Buttigieg 690.4 billion. Warren 3.0806 trillion. Sanders 3.976 trillion. And at the top, Kamala Harris 4.162 trillion.

No matter who wins, as they all want to spend more, and the taxpayers are the losers.

(A follow up video, "More Free Stuff 2020", shows that the candidates just kept calling for more and more, far beyond their previous promises.)

Stossel Tells It Like It Is!

From economics to social solutions, Stossel has a terrific understanding of how freedom works!

Some topics treated are teaching children, making life fair, improving life for workers, fixing healthcare, food laws, the mistaken approach of being risk-free, drugs, wars, government spending, media bias, lawyerism, victim mentality, the welfare state, owning your body, greed, the poor, and much more!

While highlighting several of Stossel's major works, I contribute conservative analysis of some places where a purely libertarian approach to government falls short. I defend the importance of religion and traditional families in the context of freedom and specific claims of Stossel, giving a reasonable approach for why many conservative approaches to society should be maintained. In short, not every vice should be legal!

Stossel is one of the great freedom writers of our time. Come and enjoy feasting on his clarity, and gain a better understanding of how freedom makes the most prosperous and happy societies!