



"Tea party" activists marched in Washington on April 15 to protest what they see as excessive taxes and government spending.

BILL O'LEARY/THE WASHINGTON POST

# Tips for a proper tea party

BY RICHARD A. VIGUERIE

As an active participant in the conservative movement for more than 50 years, I've long thought that, even at the peak of our strength, conservatives could only slow the growth of government, not reverse it.

That was the case under Ronald Reagan, who didn't have a sympathetic Congress and whose administration was plagued with officials who did not share his vision. It was the case in the era of Newt Gingrich and Tom DeLay, who came to power claiming that Washington was a cesspool, but later acted as if it were a hot tub. DeLay's K Street Project, which pressured lobbyists to contribute to Republicans, was but one example of how their early ardor for reform was replaced by a desire to hold onto power.

But with the emergence of the "tea party" movement, for the first time in my life I sense that it may be possible for conservatives to actually shrink the federal government.

This moment has been a long time coming. Back when Barry Goldwater became the first member of the conservative movement to be nominated for president, the movement had just two legs — free markets and a strong national defense. After religious conservatives became the third leg, conservatives won three landslide presidential elections in the 1980s. But even that was not enough to stop the expansion of government.

The tea party has added a fourth leg — an emphasis on limiting government through fidelity to the Constitution and our nation's founding principles, without being operationally aligned with either party. With this addition, we conservatives now find ourselves sitting at a large four-

legged table and outnumbering liberals by almost two to one in a recent Gallup poll.

Yet some of the tea party's greatest strengths also present formidable challenges. How does a leaderless movement (and our lack of a single leader is very much one of our strengths) continue to grow and gain power?

More specifically, how can we make sure that we stay focused on a central set of causes? We must define ourselves — or our opponents will. And they are working overtime to do so. Proverbs 29:18 tells us, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

As a longtime member of the movement for smaller government, I've seen political causes, both liberal and conservative, rise and fall and disappear. From that vantage point, I have five suggestions for my fellow tea partiers, advice that can help the movement endure for years to come and make it the main vehicle of change in America.

## Be independent.

Most important, tea partiers must remain distinct from both political parties. The GOP would like nothing better than to co-opt the movement and control the independent conservatives who are its members. But we must keep in mind that perhaps the single biggest mistake of the conservative movement was becoming an appendage of the Republican Party.

In his 1976 presidential primary campaign, Reagan said we needed new leaders unfettered by old ties and old relationships. The tea party does not have the old ties and old relationships with Republican politicians that Reagan was talking about and that caused so many conservative leaders to lose their way. Remember that most conservative leaders and organizations in Washington were silent when George W. Bush and congressional Republicans were expanding government at a record-breaking pace. Even today, too many conservatives are willing to overlook the fact that the GOP's leaders in Congress, Sen. Mitch McConnell and Rep. John Boehner, were willing accomplices of Bush's spending policies and that Mitt Romney was for Obamacare before Obama was.

## Go on a policy offensive.

We must take on policy initiatives that will fundamentally change America but that, because of crony politics, neither political party will touch. Tea partiers already know that promoting complete adherence to the Constitution, and particularly to the 10th Amendment — which reserves the powers not explicitly granted to the federal government for the states and the people — is the way to change policy. Using this approach, we need to move major proposals to the center of debate and action, among them audits of the Federal Reserve, a restructured tax code and an end to corrupt gerrymandering. We must also pursue constitutional amendments mandating term limits, a balanced budget with tax limitations and an end to automatic citizenship for the children of illegal immigrants.

## Pressure institutions to change.

We must expand our cause beyond anger at politicians. Wall Street banks once operated with the knowledge that individual integrity is essential to the functioning of a free market, but now we have Goldman Sachs executives cheering the housing market collapse. So, rather than focus solely on government, we also need to train a spotlight on the failed leaders

of other major American institutions from Hollywood to Wall Street, including big business, banks, mainstream media, labor unions and organized religion (notably my own Catholic Church).

## Get involved, then stay involved.

Tea partiers must make ourselves a constant presence and conscience in the lives of those we elect. Once politicians get into office, they are surrounded by lobbyists and special interests that want more, not less, from government. We must push back by making our influence felt at a steady procession of meetings, breakfasts and dinners, and we must speak up via letters, phone calls, e-mails and town hall meetings. Too often after we send people to Washington, we hear from them only through their fundraising appeals. We need face-to-face contact to remind them that we're here to support them when they do right, and that we'll vote them out when they do wrong.

## Avoid the third-party trap.

Just as the tea party movement must not be co-opted by either of the major parties, nor can it yield to the temptation to start a third party. In 2008, Republicans lost three Senate races because of conservative third-party candidates. Those losses have made it more difficult to oppose and defeat liberal judicial nominations, Obamacare, cap-and-trade legislation and other policies that, even in a best-case scenario, will take conservatives years to undo.

As a practical matter, the two major parties have rigged the rules against third parties, all but ensuring defeat. If conservatives fall into the third-party trap, they will split the right-of-center vote, thereby guaranteeing the left's control of America for at least another generation. The opportunity of a lifetime will have been wasted.

This doesn't mean we should automatically support whatever candidates Republicans put up. The tea party electoral strategy should be simple and consistent: We must run principled conservatives in the primaries and then throw our support behind the most conservative major-party candidates in the general election.

Richard A. Viguerie, a pioneer in the use of direct mail for political advocacy, is the author of "Conservatives Betrayed: How George W. Bush and Other Big Government Republicans Hijacked the Conservative Cause."

# Britain's post-American election

BRITAIN FROM B1

"special relationship" between Washington and London is that this overtly American-style election has potentially rearranged Britain's political furniture and pushed our island further from America and closer to Europe.

The increasingly presidential style of British parliamentary elections is in large part a legacy of American darling Tony Blair, the former prime minister who frequently appealed directly to the electorate at large, over the heads of his skeptical Labor Party. He paid the price when he was ushered to the exit in favor of Brown, who now is desperately clinging to the keys of 10 Downing Street — especially after his on-mike, off-camera comment calling a constituent "bigoted," a gaffe that highlighted the chasm between the prime minister's public schmoozing and his private grumpiness.

Much as in America, incumbency in Britain has become a ball and chain that candidates drag around on the campaign trail, which is why this year's bat-

nedy in 1960, signaling that British elections were finally and truly entering the television age. Live-streaming on the Internet was accompanied by televised focus groups of Britons wired to machines that recorded every reaction to every word, noting every wince with the precision of an EKG. The debates, governed by 76 separate rules, were more choreographed than a medieval step dance, and the candidates rehearsed them to death. That, too, should feel familiar to American audiences.

As it turned out, television ended up trumping all the gadgets of social media. This was gladiatorial television at its best, not least because it created the campaign's biggest surprise: "Cleggmania."

Emerging from a distant third place in the polls, the 43-year-old Clegg wowed the unsuspecting public in the first debate, a forum that granted him equal billing and airtime. While the two major-party candidates glowered at each other, Clegg was the first to look straight into camera and address the millions of people watching at home: "Don't let them tell you that the only choice

fied Europe would play a much bigger role on the world stage, gaining more respect not just from the United States but from China as well.

In America, by the time the Republican and Democratic presidential candidates joust with each other on television, the electorate has already seen them both in numerous primary debates. But the British debates — the first and only opportunity for most citizens to watch their party leaders spar — went a long way in a short campaign to accentuate the candidates' good traits and exacerbate their bad ones. Until these forums, few voters even knew what Clegg looked like. As the Economist magazine put it, it was less a case of the devil you know (Brown) or the devil you don't know (Cameron), but who the devil is Clegg? Thanks to Clegg's combination of eloquence and urgency, the debates worked on his bid like a performance-enhancing drug.

And that is why an election that should have been the Tories' to lose has become a three-horse race. The polls consistently predict what is charmingly called a hung Parliament — that is, no party wins an overall majority, and an informal pact or a formal coalition may have to be formed in order to govern. The markets don't like it. The pound wobbles at the mere thought of it. Washington, too, is used to something less complicated from its closest ally.

Despite Clegg's growing popularity — at the moment he is narrowly behind Cameron in the polls — the British electoral system makes it virtually impossible for his party to dominate. But the likely horse-trading would hoist Clegg into the position of kingmaker. He has already stated his price: electoral reform that allows his party to win a number of parliamentary seats more reflective of its popularity in the polls.

If that happens, the duopoly of British politics will be history, and coalition governments will become as normal as they are in Germany and the Netherlands, nudging Britain a lot closer to the continent. And that is just one more way that the most American election we have ever held in Britain could lead to the most un-American consequences.

# The True Facts!

About Traditional Jews and the State of Israel



Recently, self-proclaimed Jewish leaders launched a provocative campaign of newspaper advertisements regarding the policies of the American administration on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Perhaps some are left with the impression that these individuals indeed represent American Jewry.

The fact is, they represent only themselves.

We, traditional Torah Jews, are distressed and appalled by these ads, as well as by the Zionists' tactic of abusing American Jewry to advance their agenda. Therefore, we hereby publicize the following facts:

## Fact: Zionism is not Judaism.

The Zionist ideology is fundamentally anti-Torah. Zionism has not only denied the fundamental Jewish belief in Heavenly Redemption; it has created a pseudo-Judaism which replaces the Torah with nationalism.

Thus, the State of Israel cannot — and should not — claim to represent worldwide Jewry, nor should the Zionist State be identified as a Jewish State.

Certain groups may argue that Jerusalem is "higher than politics." However, according to the Torah, Jerusalem has no relation to politics at all. The holiness of Jerusalem is divine and does not depend on who governs it.

True Torah Jews are outraged by this ongoing ploy, in which the Zionists attempt to create the impression that the holy Torah is behind their

hard-line, nationalistic goals. It is not!

**Fact: Traditional Jews are loyal to the United States government.**

At the time of the destruction of the Holy Temple and the exile of the Jewish People, the great Biblical prophet Jeremiah proclaimed G-d's message to all Jews: "Seek out the welfare of the city to which I have exiled you, and pray for it to G-d, for through its welfare will you have welfare." (Jeremiah 29:7) For millennia, this has been a cornerstone of Jewish conduct.

**As American Jews, we pray for the wellbeing and prosperity of the government of the United States of America, headed by Honorable President Barack Obama.**

And of course, we continue to pray for the safety and wellbeing of Jews all over the world, including those in the Holy Land.

The blurring of the boundary between Judaism and Zionism jeopardizes the safety of Jews living all over the world, including our brethren in the Holy Land.

True Torah Jews

www.truetorahjews.org

This message is paid for by True Torah Jews headquartered in Brooklyn, NY

## Washington is used to something less complicated from its ally.

tle of "hope and change" vs. "grizzled experience in a time of crisis" should seem familiar. The Labor Party has been in power for 13 years, and voters want to know why in all that time it has failed to act on many of the impassioned promises it is making once again. Last year's agonizing parliamentary expenses scandal — in which lawmakers were found to have billed the public for everything from moat-cleaning to ornamental ducks — has become a symbol of abuse and arrogance, and Britons' dim view of their elected representatives and their institutions rivals Americans' low esteem for Congress.

The first-ever prime ministerial television debates are perhaps the most obvious symbol of the Americanization of our campaigns. The first one, on April 15, was heralded by a front-page picture in the London Times of Richard Nixon debating John Ken-

is between two old parties who have been playing pass the parcel with your government for 65 years now — making the same old promises, breaking the same old promises." Cameron must have been kicking himself. It was his idea to include Clegg.

Cameron recovered a bit in the subsequent debates. The consensus scorecard for the final set-to on Thursday had Cameron the winner, Clegg a close second and Brown — the biggest loser in the Clegg boomlet — a distant third.

Clegg, whose wife is a Spanish lawyer and whose sons are named Alberto, Antonio and Miguel, is half-Dutch and wholly wedded to the concept of a more unified Europe, in which Britain plays a leading role rather than orbiting as a subversive moon. His special relationship would probably be with Brussels, the EU's de facto capital, not Washington. He has repeatedly said that a more uni-