

# Motif's Angry Outlier Talks About the Issues

Being Libertarian-leaning, I am not overly interested in what a political hack promises to do for me or my causes. I am more interested in what a candidate can do to get government out of my life. Having a candidate tell me what government can do about any issue is an assault on my own choices and freedoms.

I do not really care what a candidate promises about social issues since social issues should not be government business. Government doesn't create jobs, smoke pot or appreciate the arts — people do. Think of it this way: If abortion is a personal choice, then why is government involved in it?

My premise is that politicians manipulate a disengaged and politically handicapped electorate by focusing on social issues.

What a candidate thinks or promises about any issue is meaningless. Read my Lips, Hope and Change, Trust Chafee — all a bunch of cheery, positive, Pollyannaish garbage lacking either substance or genuineness, or both. People buy into this shit and then have buyer's remorse. Are the lying politicians to blame?

I posit that no one has ever lost an election underestimating the stupidity of the electorate. Using social issues to fragment an already vulnerable population is what needs to end.

I really don't see the role of government beyond its constitutional responsibilities. Why should government care if a person smokes cigarettes, has an abortion, gambles or has a big soda? Making government a parent simply creates a dysfunctional family.

Consider this: If legalizing marijuana was so important to the operation of government, why don't candidates spark one up at a press conference? Maybe candidates should get high before the debates. Hell, it would be far more interesting. Someone might actually come up with a great idea (as inevitably happens when you're high) and there will be people there to write it down.

Legalizing marijuana as an issue — really? I never understood why it was illegal in the first place. It was probably a social issue in the 1938 gubernatorial race. I appreciate and actually support legalization, if only because it demonstrates how government has regulated our existence.

Social issues come and go, but the government restrictions they encourage is a boot stomping on your face, forever. Involvement in any issue other than the operation of government at its leanest is little more than an assault on everyone's personal freedoms and choices.

Real economic growth occurs when government gets out of its own way, not when a candidate floats some half-baked plan. Instead of listening to a candidate talk about creating jobs, consider it a better use of your time to get high and start an art project.

The bottom line is this: A candidate can do squat about jobs, other than promote an environment conducive to business. Like it or not. Any other thought is just creative big government expansionism.

As to the issue of support of the arts, ask yourself this: What candidate is going to say that the arts are a

complete waste of social resources? You want your candidates to tell you that they are in favor of the arts, yet you find the chirping bird sounds so annoying when you are going to the Kent County courthouse to face a possession charge or a tax foreclosure.

If the arts were the key issue, then we should have candidates produce stubs from concerts, art exhibits and performances. Then you would see who actually supports the arts and who only attended the posh events. This would tell me more about the candidate's interest in the arts than merely mouthing some platitude.

Hell, why not go to the debate and have the candidates write a 300-word essay about the impact of the Dada movement, the role of Caliban in *The Tempest* or whether Harrison's "My Sweet Lord" is a theft of The Chiffons' "He's So Fine"? Show me you support (or at least, understand) the arts. Just asking if you support the arts is asking whether having a mother is a good idea.

As voters, we are a selfish lot, conditioned to listen to candidates who promise us what we want. Wake up, folks, government is not a department store Santa (although who would not elect Santa if he promises to fix this mess?).

We have money-controlled politics because we want candidates who agree with us on social issues, largely unrelated to actual governmental operations. A chicken in every pot is a great idea if you are not the chicken and if you didn't have to pay for the chicken some day by selling your grandchildren into government-sponsored economic slavery.

I agree repealing marijuana laws is long overdue, that jobs are a good idea, and that the arts are important in society, but I don't vote because the candidate promised me such. If a candidate promises you more, put that promise in one hand and spit into the other. What do you have?

Elections should be more than a vote for superlatives in a high school yearbook, but even then, who would you want to run your life, the Most Popular or the Most Likely to Succeed?