

## THOUGHTS RE REAGAN'S CHOICE<sup>®</sup>

Ronald Reagan—1964: “A Time For Choosing”:

Reagan’s Choice: Not left or right, but up to mankind’s age old dream . . . maximum individual freedom, consistent with order, or down to the ant heap of totalitarianism.

Ben Enis proposal: use Mr. Reagan’s Choice as an analytical framework—begin an examination of every speech, action, proposed law or regulation that involves public policy—by asking: does this policy trend upward toward individual freedom, or downward toward totalitarianism?

### Using EAF framework—four questions

1. Goal: What result—compatible with values, feasible, worthwhile?  
Examples—highways and bridges; Cobern, Redskins
2. Process: economic v. political—private enterprise more likely to be effective (DMV, Post office). Political process  
Contract provides oversight, tax revenues, cancellation for poor performance; renewable for good performance
3. Benefits/Costs: diffuse costs difficult to measure; concentrated benefits to small group  
Lobbying, crony capitalism  
Four types of costs: money, time, effort, psychic  
Einstein: not everything that can be counted counts; not everything that counts can be counted.
4. Consequences: known (risk—measured mathematically w/ con intervals); unknown (uncertainty Rumsfeld—non-random adjustments estimates)

### The Desired Product is Health—four stages of acquisition

1. Genetics, age, healthcare—good parents, youth, self care
2. Self Care—diet, exercise , rest, no smoke, alcohol moderation, purchase healthcare
3. Healthcare—family and friends, cash, savings, health insurance
4. Health insurance—many levels: catastrophe to Obamacare “complete coverage”  
car insurance: accident, not routine maintenance

### Individual v. Group: camel, never ask a committee to write poetry

Solving the minimum wage: set at \$1000/hr; tax rate at 90%

Each person has \$100/hr to spend; gov’t has boucoup tax revenue—  
What could possibly go wrong . . .wrong . . .wrong . . .?

Reagan Choice: give min wage via politics v. earn via individual effort—mine v. ours

If given, why save? Giving wage destroys soul (pride, self respect)

Kids game: Chutes & Ladders—metaphor for EAP: hard to climb up the freedom;  
easy to slide down to totalitarianism—slippery slope

Negative Ads: do not work well in Economic Marketplace—because America consumers have so much experience evaluating ads. But Neg Ads do work fairly well in Politics—because Americans have little experience with them, but as learned as consumers, tend initially to trust advertising.

Limited Government—has specific connotation: less government. But let's not use this connotation—let's use EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT. After all, even the most die-part tea-partier must admit that, sometimes, Americans do not want to limit government: WWII carpet bombing of Germany and atomic bombing of Japan; police action to subdue rioters; efficient, far tax collection, especially of government employee scofflaws.

Win/Win ECONOMICS v. Win/Lose POLITICS—I taught 32 yrs, three major US universities, Mostly MBAs. In my classes, 60% was a failing grade; any company with a 60% customer satisfaction rate would be failing. But—in POLITICS, 60% is a landslide victory!

Up to Freedom/down to totalitarianism—some descriptive antonyms:

Win/lose; make/take; vote/rule; exchange/pillage; trade/fight; good/evil; save/spend; persuade, preach, proselytize; lie, cheat, steal, force; earn/give; tax generators/tax users; merchant/soldier; grow/loot; moral/amoral; citizens/ubermenshen, untermenshen; reality, what is/ideology, what ought to be; objective/subjective; scientific methodology/science as consensus, elite beliefs; FACT/SPIN.

Star Wars--in 1987, Mr. Reagan bluffed Gorbachev; left the bargaining table at Reykjavik rather than take "star wars" missile defense off the table. Gorbachev caved, even though Reagan had no such system. A generation later, Israeli Iron Dome system validates Star Wars!

Rorschach Test—experimenter hands subject an image of an inkblot, and asks what subject sees. The subject who believes what he/she sees (perhaps trained in scientific methodology) responds "I see an inkblot". But the subject who sees what he/she believes (perhaps steeped in ideology) says, "I see Daddy beating Mommy" or "that's my president changing the world".

Great Description of America—Dolly Parton:

Now we didn't have much money  
But I was rich as I could be  
In my coat of many colors  
That my mother made for me.

Avoid Common Connotations—words in common parlance take on meanings—liberal, conservative, progressive, tea-partier, right wing, left wing, etc. So let's coin new labels for

communicating Reagan's Choice: those who strive up to freedom—FREEDOMITES; those who favor totalitarianism—TOTALISTS.

Global Warming, nee Climate Change—triumph of Platonic “what ought to be” over Aristotelian “what is”. First, no reputable scientist would say that any scientific verity is “settled”—ask physicists about dark matter or multiple universes, see the latest salt-is-not-good-for-you refutation. Science is not done by consensus—ask Galileo pre-Einstein physicists. Gore would not know (BS, political science, flunk out law school, drop out divinity school) unless he mastered the math of physics on his own.

Here are scientific method steps:

Identify phenomenon to study; construct model (verbal, image, math) of it; deduce operational hypotheses from model; assemble by accepted methodology data to test the hypotheses; analyze data by accepted methodology; publish data, analysis and results; accept comment/criticism civilly.

Global warming enthusiasts (GWs) ignore/dismiss scientific method, and attack those who do. Example (Hayward, WS 6/16/14): grad students(!) read 11,000 abstracts of climate science articles; found 2/3 of articles expressed no opinion re “anthropogenic global warming”; 97% of remainder endorsed AGW. In my expert opinion, getting 97% agreement via expressed preference is per se grounds to question study (you cannot get 97% agreement that sun will rise tomorrow!, or any other opinion). But this study is the basis for the oft-expressed TOTALIST assertion that the science is settled. And other GW cheerleaders have made even worse transgressions against science—remember the “hockey stick”?

The difficulty here is that GWs cannot design a sufficiently comprehensive model of climate behavior—clouds, deep ocean currents, sunspots, non-linear relationships, etc, etc. Einstein: “solutions should be as simple as possible, but no simpler.”

Four Indicators of Losing Argument: decibel level up; ad hominem attacks up; logic down; evidence down. GWs exhibit all of these—in spades (threat of physical harm, refusal to publish descents, fudging data, etc.). Understandable, since virtually all of these cheerleaders are on public (university) payrolls, and/or have government funded grants. See Buchanan “Public Choice” theory, in which he rigorously proved common sense: government funded people behave just like the rest of us—they try to maximize their own perceived self interest; who among them would have the moral courage to stand against the “consensus”?