INDEPENDENT AMERICA

Daniel IMPERATO

FOR PRESIDENT 2024

Paid for by Imp 2020 Inc

WE MUST CHALLENGE AUTHORITY AND HOLD OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS ACCOUNTABLE BY RUNNING AGAINST EVERY IMCUMBENT REGARDLESS OF POLITICAL ORIENTATION…

INDEPENDENT AMERICA

Daniel

IMPERATO

FOR PRESIDENT 2024

Paid for by Imp 2020 Inc

With Joseph Oddo

i1 PUBLISHING
West Palm Beach, FL. USA

Copyright © 2006 by i1Publishing.
All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, by any means, including mechanical, electric, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written Permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles or reviews.

For information, address i1 Publishing, 529 S. Flagler Dr.
29F, West Palm Beach, FL 33401.

CONTENTS

–Mission Statement by Daniel Imperato
–Introduction by Joseph Oddo
–One
–Two
–Three
–Four
–Afterword
–About the authors
–APPENDIX – Platform

Mission Statement by Daniel Imperato

SHE needs fresh air.

–Social Security

–Health Care

–Education

Same old issues you say, but not the same solutions. We have tried all the half-hearted measures that have failed to provide answers. I offer sound solutions to these and many other problems facing our country. But the most important aspect to my solutions is the perspective from which they were arrived at.

If you had all of the prospective 2008 presidential candidates line-up and present only their credentials – education, expertise, the understanding of cultures and the complexities of human interaction – you would find very few with true credentials to run the country. The fine weaving of diplomacy in international relations does require a true understanding of different people. Of how life and business is conducted in other parts of the world. None of which can be learned by textbooks. It requires being there. It means living there, speaking native tongues, doing business in non-American methods, and really listening to what motivates and infuriates our fellow global citizens.

I stand out from this crowd of candidates in the line-up because I am a man of the globe. I have logged more hours overseas than all of them put together. I have studied the intricacies of human thought, and the philosophy of Christ with Pope John Paul as my mentor. The Vatican anointed me as a Papal Knight. I built multi-national companies and negotiated cooperation among our global neighbors while some of the others in this line-up were behaving inappropriately toward their own spouses.

Further examination of those who were in power would reveal a mayor and a president who failed to act on the first attack on the World Trade Center. Now two so-called frontrunners have that legacy of failure on their credential sheet. Others either have too little experience, or have already lost elections for higher office.

Again, I ask you to take a closer look. You will see that simply having money or good looks (the pocketbook and the pose) do not weigh in on the qualifications scale. For the next criteria, let's review which of the candidates was publishing press releases telling America what was really going on and not what she wanted to hear. Campaigning for two years is such a short time to be so accurate on predictions of global consequences of our actions. I took the political risk of going on record calling for a cease-fire two years ago. We cannot stop the bleeding while we are still engaged in combat. I told the world that we should be negotiating with our adversaries, eventually this administration began to do just that. I told the world to track where the money to underwrite terror operations was going – South America – and now that we have foiled a plot to wreak havoc at the JFK airport, I was right again.

These incidents of accurate predictions are not accidents. If you want to know America, and how to run America, you have to know the world. Why? Because America has become the world. We are far from a homogenous society. We have become a merging of hundreds of cultures – many of whom did not get the manual instructing them on what it means to become American. Modern immigration is not conducted as it was during the twentieth century, when English was taught to all, the pathway to citizenship was established and orderly, and millions went through the process of learning about becoming American. Now immigration is painted as though there is one group that is overwhelming the US, and that is false. The only reason the Big Two parties court the idea that immigrants from Spanish-speaking countries are more important, is to try to earn that ethnic groups voting block. That ends up alienating all other ethnicities that make up America now.

Every time leaders of our country declare another country to be evil – not a very logical posture considering the militaristic adventures we have engaged in lately – we are angering a large section of the population of not only the offended nation, but of the relocated members of that nation that live here now. A continuous barrage of insults combined with a crumbing economic crises could trigger large blocks of ethnic populations to revolt against the incredulity and cause havoc and civil disturbances such as those that occurred in France a few years ago.

It is hard require immigrants to learn about American democracy and our rule of law, when we have an Administration so determined to rewrite the longtime understanding of the Constitution. We ask new immigrants to join our military to defend our documents of democracy, but we allow our government officials to get away with abuses of power. The media tends to ignore the fact that Bush uses presidential power-grabbing signing statements that violate the very law he is signing. The Clinton Administration set the tone by issuing 140 signing statements in four years, but Bush has challenged the constitutionality of more than 1,000 laws during his first six years. Part of the reason Bush has only vetoed one law in his first six years was that he could simply ignore a provision of a law for which he does not wish to comply. The most glaring was a bill sponsored by Republican senators McCain, Warner and Graham to outlaw torture. Bush signed the measure into law, but "announced that he did not, and would not, have to abide by it." {Gore, 2007}

Introduction by Joseph Oddo

Leaving the Freedom to connect conference in March of 2007, I summarized my overall impression of what we covered as follows:

In America we have a passive citizenry not burdened by the dangers of reality. Perhaps citizens are smug in knowing that we have the tools to react to government overreach, and therefore tolerate abuses. But how long will those tools made available by a free and open Internet remain totally free? The Freedom to Connect conference did a great job of addressing the threats to our civil and open society that severe regulation and government control would impede. Let's hope the momentum generated here spreads deeper into the American consciousness.

I tune in to politics all year round, not just during a presidential election. The complexity of tracking legislation and regulation that affects our daily lives is not easy. That is by design. The more I study, the more apparent it becomes that a government that does not function in the open is not to be trusted. A government that does not operate with sincere openness must have something to hide.

According to our Founders the power of Congress was to be the single most important check and balance against the unhealthy exercise of too much power by the executive branch. To this date, congress is still allowing executive overreach by not demanding a free flow of information. By making policy decisions in secret the Administration continues to obfuscate, delay and withhold information reducing Congress into subservience.

Without a legislative counterpart, not to mention the judicial favoritism that has come to light in early 2007, the George W. Bush Administration has set the rules of executive conduct and civil liberties back to nearly prerevolutionary times. Living in Washington and watching this occur up close makes it impossible to stand passive.

That is why I have joined with the only independent presidential candidate willing to put up a fight to the end. It helps that Daniel Imperato, with his 30-year history of international business and intellectual understanding of global cultures is more experienced and qualified to be president than the dozens of our recent presidents.

2007 will be the most active year of presidential politicking in over 50 years. What we propose in Independent America will take years to implement, so if you pick this book up after the 2008 campaign, keep reading. We propose an alternative to the cosmopoliticians who appeal to the small slither of swing voters that determine which of the Big Two will get elected.

The 2007-08 campaign season presents political activists with a troubling reality. The talking heads, the glitz and glimmer media, the new wave communications that will employ ipods, youtubes, video podcasting, on top of what has become traditional e-mail, websites and blogs.

What is unseen is the competition for the political dollars that will be thrown around. Old media is struggling to embrace new technologies while they are losing network viewers, print readers and even cable subscribers. If it takes screaming propaganda to make people tune in, most networks will follow Fox's lead. Unfortunately the oneway medium of television prevents the back and forth dialogue that is so critical to a functioning democracy. And because television still dominates the public domain, it is still going to be where the bulk of campaign dollars will be spent on the 2008 presidential campaign in hopes of influencing the outcome with 30-second infotainment.

None of that helps improve our democracy. And that is why we run as independents. Imperato for President, Oddo for Congress. We will be asking you to join us. Study with us. Discover the real facts that are leading our country into a dangerous course. Like us, you will be stunned at what you discover.

In chapter one we will discuss the issues of the day and highlight much of what the media will never tell you. Nor will they ever promote our solutions since we are not the ones that will be placing ads on their networks. Our objective is to turn up the heat. To act. To elicit others to act with us. One of the most troubling realities is the number of people that claim believe their actions cannot effect change. It is not that they do not care, but because they are conditioned by the Big Two political parties to believe that only they can effect change. The twisted reality of that is they are the ones hampering change. Being bought and paid for by their corporate donors and lobby interests, the Big Two are indistinguishable from one another. That is why we are going to make the case for a new movement. For reviving America with broad citizen participation, we will be asking 33 million Americans to stake a claim in the election process by doing two simple things. Refuse to vote for one of the Big Two, and send in one dollar each to our campaign to secure your promise. Our vision of an America that offers fresh choices and new voices, and that includes yours.

By the time the New Hampshire primary rolls around in late 2007, we would have already been campaigning for president for two years. We are traveling the country, but getting very little media attention. By offering a competent global scholar to put our country back on square footing with the rest of the world, we offer the people of the United States hope that we can restore our fiscal condition and nurture much more respected international diplomatic relations.

Prominent independent voices have spoken truth to power over the years. These voices get drowned out by the intoxicating power of money. We aim to restore the people's voice, one vote and one dollar at a time. In the following text you can read about our mission. But we will need you to pull it off. So read, contact us (after all it is your country), send in your dollar, and commit your vote for Imperato in November 2008.

-ONE-

Some of the problems we address are complex like labor, immigration and health care. These will require a study period to evaluate the proposals being introduced. Others have solutions that keep running into stumbling blocks set in place by the entrenched status quo of Washington politics. These include election reform, education and the restrictions of No Child Left Behind, addressing our infrastructure and manufacturing needs.

Our attempt to shatter the hold of the lobbyists, and other political action figures will send ripples of discontent among the Washington elite and be vigorously attacked.

It is our intention to ask the tough questions that representatives from the two larger parties will not. First, shouldn't government work for the people, rather than be our adversary? We think that any branch of government that serves an adversary role such as that of the IRS is misguided and needs corrected.

Government operating in the red is an ominous promise to leave for our children and grandchildren to inherit. Who is going to bail them out when the bills come due? The deficit would be even larger if not for the $230 billion Social Security surplus that gets absorbed into the general budget. Without the trust fund that was originally promised, a major and very costly bailout will be necessary to meet our obligations to our aging population.

When social security was created there were 16 working people for every retiree. Now there are three and soon that will be reduced to two. It is time we make political sacrifice and challenge the stern objections of the AARP to recalculate the way benefits are paid.

The Imperato campaign is going on record to challenge the status quo. Every issue will be on the table and should be reexamined.

We said everything will be on the table. That means we question things that Americans have been conditioned to believe are unchangeable. Our targets will range from whether corporations have the same rights as people in this country. Whether the Federal Reserve should be entrusted with the government's money. Whether income tax is really the best way to raise revenue for the federal government. And whether special interests should run our congress. The complex tax code is the perfect example of how the rich get richer. Only those who can afford tax lobbyists are able to tweak the code by inserting loopholes on their clients' behalf.

For instance, there are movements afoot in this country that would have us scrap the tax code, and come up with a better, more efficient system. How did we end up with a branch of the federal government that by necessity has to be put in an adversarial position with our citizens? We support efforts to dismantle the IRS and will address them during the campaign.

Our platform points will are summarized in the appendix. We could not address all the issues, nor do we claim to have an answer to all. The intention of the Revive America platform is to put the issues on the table and solicit citizen input as the only way to resolve them.

We have to make an end around the political operatives who currently stand in the way of progress. A connecting of the dots will point directly to where blockage is occurring. Who was saying no to raising the minimum wage for so long? Obviously the party supported by corporate CEO's who retire with $400 million in bonus. How does it hurt them to help raise the living standard of the average American worker? Wouldn't it make sense to put more wages into the pockets of Middle America? Americans are prolific consumers. Eventually they will give their money back by consuming more goods.

As it stands, our population is forced to buy the cheapest goods we can get our hands on, which is ultimately hurting America. Consider that the billions of dollars Americans spend at Wal-Mart alone is more money going to China than Great Britain, France and Russia send to China combined. How does it help America when China can then turn around and spend that hard currency in buying up America, buying up the natural resources around the world that we also compete for and increasing their military spending to record level?

Some will say this money is going to private business enterprises in China and that the resulting economic growth is stirring dissent. Is that enough to reduce the threat of the CCCP's desire to quash Taiwan and take control of Southeast Asia? Doubtful since the Chinese Communist government controls the banks and nearly all the instruments of the economy. They restrict the Internet with help from American companies. They nationalize any industry they want. The government will control any aspect of life; just ask the farmers who lost large swaths of land that was flooded to build dams.

This vicious cycle of American money propping up the communist Chinese is making it more costly for our society by forcing the United States to expend billions of dollars on military excursions to secure oil. China and the rest of the world outspend us and outmaneuver us in many areas of the world that have national security implications. Our chapter on foreign policy will show why an Imperato presidency would bring a more qualified Commander-inchief with logical common sense solutions to solving these dilemmas. Finally we need to maintain the American way of liberty and justice for all. One of the most glaring double standards rests with our criminal justice system. The burden of affordability for your defense if you are charged with a crime should not be the criterion that determines the verdict. We personally know innocent people that have been acquitted of major crimes, that without the financial resources the verdict could have easily gone the other way. That is wrong in America, and something we intend to address.

All of America is pro-life in a pure self-defined way. Yet abortion crosses from ethical to governmental involvement in people's lives. Finding a solution remains elusive because we are not addressing the social issues that make people want to abort a child. Before such a decision is made, both parties should be involved with the parents of those deciding brought in for sound mature advice. Solutions as to what to do once the child is born can be worked out with an emphasis on adoption. In most circumstances prospective adoptees would be willing to cover medical care and other needs of the biological parent. Right now the alternative usually includes shame, anger or isolation. This is not a conducive environment for making such a critical life and death decision.

The states are each applying their own restrictions on abortion. Our two candidates are split on whether to overturn Roe vs Wade. I am one-hundred percent pro-life. Ultimately though we do not expect this to be an executive decision, since it will land in the Supreme Court again. This is an issue that concerns us, and we will pay careful attention to the American public in how to proceed.

Religion

Joshua S. Anderson writes "we should never blindly or unconditionally support any political figure regardless of the power our support for them might in turn, appear to give us." When casting your vote, consider it as fulfilling the work of God, just as you do your vocation in life. If you deem a third-party candidate as faithful, but possibly weak, remember the numerous examples in the Bible of God using the weak to defeat the strong.

New regulatory digital broadcast legislation should be considered once an endorsement of Christian and faithbased television broadcast programming is included.

It is a mistake for the United States Congress to ease Christian Broadcasting out of the digital medium, yet allow pornographic, violent, and several other disgraceful television programs that are not suitable for our children or anyone for that matter.

Our campaign is committed to restoring faith back to the people of the United States of America and will do everything in my power to do so. We spoke out in early 2006 to congress, the administration, and the President to see to it that more Christian broadcasting would be made available over the new digital network. We appreciate the efforts or the Christian Coalition for reaching out for our support. We are on record of supporting them in their mission.

Poverty

Independence from poverty usually occurs when American workers can parlay their earnings into home ownership. For those that don't work, we should give them a broom.

There are ways to create homes for even the lowest income earners. It is with government subsidized prefabricated housing developments. Rarely does an area present such a perfect place to practice such a technique, but the tragedy in New Orleans can be an incubator for such a program. These displaced residents are in the same strait that immigrants are when they arrive in the US. They are looking for work where work is scarce, and housing is tight. But they work at whatever wage they can get. Some even below the minimum. So they seek to live close to work to reduce costs. This is not a new concept. In the early years of factory expansion in the United States, many communities were built around the workplace to reduce travel time.

Here is how to apply a similar concept in the early 21st Century.

First a collaborative effort between government and industry can emphasize bringing heavy industry back to the US with careful attention paid to keeping labor costs competitive with the world market. This serves the dual purpose of improving national security as well as employing those who are willing to work for reduced wages. With the proper incentives productive workers will fill the least desirable jobs, especially if housing is included. That is where zoned housing is introduced.

Right around the industrial employment centers should have tracts of land set aside for smart development. It will serve as a place for the underprivileged or immigrant workers to live in the community where they work. Affordable food will be available in the community shops. Nearly all workers of the community will agree to work

below the minimum wage in order to allow the US to bring back competitive industries providing an American made alternative to the cheap imported goods.

Through government cooperation with organizations like Habitat for Humanity, homes can be strategically placed around the new industrial facility to form zoned housing. Anyone that agrees to work for less than minimum wage would qualify to own.

The employers in these smart communities would be required to pay directly into employee's bank accounts. Workers in turn would have to prove legal immigration status or citizenship. We may eventually invite workers to emigrate here, but only by legal means. In doing so, half of the current illegal population would return to their country in order to apply for proper entry.

Community-based organizations, tenant organizations, low-income housing providers, and unions can help administer the program, so government agencies do not have to be involved.

Each of these new communities should offer mechanisms to improve the social conditions and prospects for prosperity among zoned housing residents. For instance, free broadband online service should be installed right away. A special waiver of the minimum wage would be allowed especially to assist immigrants seeking any work they can get.

This is the best way to reverse the growth of entitlement payments while finally reducing poverty. The lack of money is not the problem. It is the government spending

the money badly that causes failure. If ordinary, hardworking people are given the opportunity to improve themselves, they will make smart life-changing decisions, and America will reemerge as the land of opportunity.

Social Security

{4} In April 2006, the Congressional Quarterly reported that billions of Social Security dollars were lost in overpayments and payments to ineligible beneficiaries. The Social Security Administration's inspector general estimated the total from October 2003 to November 2005 would reach $14.2 billion. Procedures to recover the money are being put in place, but as Sen. Charles E. Grassley, R-Iowa noted that $5.3 billion in improper payments - or 4.8 percent of fiscal 2004 Social Security disability insurance benefits - may never be recovered. The report was based on a review of 1,532 sample cases, of which 292, or 15 percent, were overpaid.

This is just one reason that our campaign calls for a "feet on the street" enforcement effort as one way to correct this improper waste in taxpayer dollars.

Lawmakers refusal to touch Social Security for fear of backlash is a guise for their real fear of losing campaign dollars. Our administration will consider all possible scenarios and conduct a real dialogue with America on how to maintain the long-term solvency of Social Security. The could mean indexing new benefits to increases in the consumer price index, instead of today's system of pegging benefits to average wages. That could mean raising the retirement age to receive full benefits. Or that could mean creating a Social Security safety net for low-income workers with federal matching contributions or full contribution equivalent to mandated accounts.

"Affluence testing" to determine benefits may be a workable solution, but not a preferred option. Plus we will propose mandated retirement accounts for all workers at two percent of wages, to help build a privately held nest egg. These accounts should be personally owned and managed. The combination we arrive at with your help will be morally sound and should be achieve the objective of restoring long-term solvency to the system without raising taxes or cutting benefits.

Right now the method of collecting social security funds is plain wrong. There should not be a cap on the amount of income that is subject to tax, plus there should be a tax deduction allowed for any additional voluntary contribution that an individual wants make.

Our social security system should be partially invested in public financial markets including the stock market as long as stock losses are installed, and the government insures the funds.

Retirement

We will propose mandated retirement accounts for all workers at two percent of wages, to help build a privately held nest egg. These accounts should be personally owned and managed.

All private retirement funds or pension funds should be set aside requiring a signatory of corporate and government accountability board before releasing funds. This is to ensure that corporations cannot touch funds at all for any reason. They should be held in a federally insured account to guarantee the retiree receives what he or she is due.

Browne eloquently presented the argument against the income tax that has grown from a 1% rate on the highest income earners in 1913, to an unreadable, 10,000-page behemoth. This complexity generates a $300 billion burden on business each year just in compliance costs. That is money that could be put to much more productive use. Just try one time to get two different tax preparers to work on your taxes. It is nearly 100% certain that they will come out with two different assessments. A code this complex is an embarrassment and an enormous burden on the entrepreneurs of America who drive our economy. So our campaign will ask the question: Why have we become so conditioned to "taking on the taxman" that we accept this inefficiency?

A review of the recent past serves up the New Orleans fiasco after the gulf storms of 2005. Government simply was not up to the task, while commercial entities like Wal-Mart were. Why can't we run the government like a business ought to be run – efficiently? It traces right to the top. The manner that federal political jobs are filled seems to have always been done to protect cronyism.

Many managers and heads of agencies, even cabinet officials in our government were unqualified for the position they accepted. Hiring should accomplish first and foremost the chance to obtain the most qualified individual based on skill and experience. The task of overseeing a department's employees and expenditures should be done by specialists who bring specific expertise to the job. Under any business job search, it comes down to the most qualified individuals who get hired. It should be that way for government as well.

It makes sense to be efficient with the public's money. Our tax dollars are wasted in so many other ways. Putting a stop to the political appointee favors system will save untold billions. We saw first hand what happens when the wrong, unqualified political appointee runs an important government entity. Was the most qualified person in charge of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) when Hurricane Katrina pounded the Gulf? Absolutely not. Safeguarding the life and safety of our population is where government really matters.

Federal Debt Must Cease!

Three times in the past quarter-century, conservative leaders have promised to restrain wasteful government spending. President Ronald Reagan tried it and showed he was at least half-serious by vetoing the pork-laden 1987 transportation bill. House Speaker Newt Gingrich tried it and risked his party's electoral standing by battling to restrain the growth in programs such as Medicare. George W. Bush tried it, declaring that he expected spending restraint from Congress. None of these efforts proved politically sustainable. In an appropriately titled 2005 editorial called Big-Government Conservatives, the Washington Post challenged Mr. Bush's attempt at spending discipline:

{C11-21}"Back in 1987, when Mr. Reagan applied his veto to what was generally known at the time as the highway and mass transit bill, he was offended by the 152 earmarks for pet projects favored by members of Congress. But in 2005 Mr. Bush signed a transportation

bill containing no fewer than 6,371 earmarks. Each one of these, as Mr. Reagan understood but Mr. Bush apparently doesn't, amounts to a conscious decision to waste taxpayers' dollars. One point of an earmark is to direct money to a project that would not receive money as a result of rational judgments based on cost-benefit analyses.

Mr. Bush, who had threatened to veto wasteful spending bills, chose instead to cave in. He did so despite the fact that in addition to a record number of earmarks the transportation bill came with a price tag that he had once called unacceptable."

The theme continued in 2006. A bill to cover the looming war costs combined with hurricane relief passed through the House costing over $100 billion. Barely two weeks later in May 2006, the House passed another famous Bush tax cut reducing federal revenues by a projected $70 billion. This is, after all, an election year for members of congress. What troubles us is – with an aging population who will be expecting their Social Security entitlement in a few years – how can this president believe that the federal government should keep spending like drunken sailors? We are waiting to see if Congress will top the 2005 figure of over $24 billion worth of earmarked projects.

Taxes

Republicans, while totally in control of the purse strings in Washington raised the limit on the national debt so the president could borrow more money to pay for tax cuts. This almost religious dedication to tax cuts cannot be considered conservative in the least. 2006 marked the fourth increase in the national debt ceiling in the last five years, with Congress raising the national debt ceiling by $781 billion to $9 trillion. That makes it an aggregate increase of more than $3 trillion since George W. Bush became president. Bush and the modern Republican Party plainly have no interest in cutting federal spending, and the resulting massive deficits will eventually force "the largest tax increase in American history" as predicted by Barltett ({15}Source: Drum).

The current tax code is simply not sustainable, University of Michigan tax economist Joel B. Slemrod said in a May 2006 Washington Post article. The biggest policy change over the past six years has been the imbalance between tax collections and federal expenditures. These “are very large fiscal imbalances in the government. It's very clear we've made no progress. In fact, we've made the problem worse."

{7} Nobody is paying any attention to this budget deficit crisis that has been going on for years. In a 2003 piece in the Washington Post called “Delusional on the Deficit,” Senator Ernest Hollings wrote, “When [former OMB Director Mitch] Daniels left two weeks ago to run for governor of Indiana, he told the Post that the government is ‘fiscally in fine shape.’ Good grief! During his 29-month tenure, he turned a so-called $5.6 trillion, 10year budget surplus into a $4 trillion deficit – a mere $10 trillion downswing in just two years.”

As Independents our philosophy differs dramatically from the two “establishment” parties, who we view as exhibiting towering similarities. Our team will be more conservative than our two rival parties because we will balance the budget, and eliminate – not just reduce – the deficit.

This runaway debt is a scary prospect for the American people tricked by W. Bush shortly after he took office in 2001, when he stated, “Future generations shouldn't be forced to pay back money that we have borrowed."

Nice sentiment. But on our current course, if you add deficits that will skyrocket after baby boomers retire, and the long-term unfunded commitments to entitlement programs such as Medicare and Social Security, every man, woman and child is saddled with $156,000 in debt.

That is roughly three times the average American household's net worth.

Returning to Slemrod’s warnings, he expounds on the tax burden looming after Bush is gone, “by the time the next president comes into office in 2009, he or she will be staring at a startling deadline, Jan. 1, 2011, when taxes would rise sharply and suddenly on every American who pays income taxes, has children, is married, owns stocks and bonds, or is expecting a large inheritance.” This does not take into account our current obligations to the elderly, which will require the average family to pay $7,000 a year more in taxes by 2030.

Deficits are such a large and growing problem that eventually we will have to come up with additional tax revenues and well-targeted cuts in spending. The big entitlement programs must be fundamentally reformed so that ever-rising healthcare costs, in particular, can be contained.

Democrats have been no better than the Republicans, recall that they were characterized as the party of big government when in the majority. In the minority, they have been cowed and intimidated by Bush, and offered little resistance to his running up record deficits, while proposing spending increases themselves. A dose of Michael Moore’s satire puts it all in perspective:

Most of the conservatives, except for the terminally bigoted, lunatic right can be shown the error of their ways. They see nothing wrong with asking for a clean environment or questioning our latest reasons for war. They sense the danger of an economy driven to the ground and a deficit looming for years to come. Yet when asked why they keep voting Republican, the response is, “Because the Democrats will raise my taxes”. (Source: Moore)

The "Independent America" team has vowed to restore sanity to the government spending policies. Our early start for the 2008 presidential campaign aims to bring independents into understanding and acting upon the importance of restoring sound fiscal policy.

Legislation forbidding deficit spending for a war should also be enacted. The cost of a war would have to be paid as a surcharge on all taxpayers in the year the fighting takes place. This way, nearly every citizen would have both a personal and financial stake in a war. If such were the case today we would not be in this situation - and if we were, there would certainly be calls for impeachment. (Source: Bamford)

Defense Budget Under Control

If you don't know where most of your tax money is being wasted you can turn to the government's own reports that identify the source. The Department of Defense. One of every four of your tax dollars gone into the Pentagon vacuum with no auditable accounting system, as told by the U.S. Comptroller General (Federal Financial Report 2003 page 32). Imagine depositing $650 billion and they can't tell you where the money went.

That's our Pentagon. $650 billion in tax dollars up in smoke. That's more than the rest of the world spends on Defense. $650 Billion? You may have read that defense budget was $419 billion. Yes, but then come the supplemental appropriations. Like the drunk, budgeted one beer, drank a case.

This big government republican president and congress ran a tab of $2.5 trillion last year. Net costs are in the Federal Financial Report. See for yourself: www.gao.gov/finance/04frusg.pdf (page 60).

It's a dubious record in fiscal irresponsibility, unmatched by any previous president or congress. For even more disturbing "facts", check out this excerpt from the financial report:

{4} Improper Payments
(formerly known as Waste, Fraud and Abuse).

While agencies have made progress in implementing processes and controls to identify, estimate, and reduce improper payments,28 such improper payments are a longstanding, widespread, and significant problem in the federal government. Congress acknowledged this problem by passing the Improper Payment Information Act (IPIA)29 in 2002.

The IPIA requires agencies to review all programs and activities, identify those that may be susceptible to significant improper payments,30

estimate and report the annual amount of improper payments for those programs, and implement actions to cost-effectively reduce improper payments. Further, in fiscal year 2005, OMB began to separately track the elimination of improper payments under the President's Management Agenda.

Significant challenges remain to effectively achieve the goals of the IPIA. From our review of agencies' fiscal year 2005 Performance and Accountability Reports (PARs), we noted that some agencies still have not instituted a systematic method of reviewing all programs and activities, have not identified all programs susceptible to significant improper payments, and/or have not annually estimated improper payments for its high-risk programs. For example, 7 major agency programs with outlays totaling about $280 billion, including Medicaid and the Temporary Assistance For Needy Families programs, still cannot annually estimate improper payments, even though they were required by OMB to report such information beginning with their fiscal year 2003 budget submissions. In addition, two agency auditors that tested compliance with IPIA cited agency noncompliance with the act in their annual audit reports.

Federal agencies' estimates of improper payments, based on available information, for fiscal year 2005 exceeded $38 billion, a net decrease of about $7 billion, or 16 percent, from the prior year improper payment estimate of $45 billion.31 This decrease was attributable to the following factors. In fiscal year 2005, the Department of Health and Human Services reported a $9.6 billion decrease in its Medicare program improper payment estimate, principally due to improvements in its due diligence with providers to ensure the necessary documentation is in place to support payment claims. However, in fiscal year 2005, this decrease was partially offset as a result of more programs reporting estimates of improper payments.

Footnotes:

28 Improper payments include inadvertent errors, such as duplicate payments and miscalculations, payments for unsupported or inadequately supported claims, payments for services not rendered, payments to ineligible beneficiaries, and payments resulting from fraud and abuse by program participants and/or federal employees.

29 Pub. L. No. 107-300, 116 Stat. 2350 (Nov. 26, 2002).

30 OMB defines the term "significant improper payments" as "annual erroneous payments in the program exceeding both 2.5 percent of program payments and $10 million."

The interesting thing about these findings are how they have become cleverly disguised as "improper payments" for the 2005 report, after being referred to as "waste, fraud and abuse" on page 60 of the 2004 report. We had to go to the next to last page of this 158-page report to find out about these "improper payments". Time for an audit system?

As we said we are more fiscally conservative than our two major party opponents because we will balance the budget, and pay off the deficit by starting where the money is being wasted: at the Pentagon. Here's how:

First, Install an auditable accounting system at the Defense Department, which saves $100 billion in contracts being paid without bids or receipts – those nobid, sweetheart contracts that you may have heard associated to Halliburton or Bechtel.

Second, Close bases in Germany and Japan, which saves $130 billion that can be invested in our domestic economy, just the infusion needed to raise living standards for a significant segment of the population. Isn't sixty years of peace a long enough time to keep our peacekeepers there?

Third, Stop outdated weapons programs like the Osprey - which Cheney wanted stopped in 1990 - and the new attack submarines, saving another $100 billion.

This is OUR tax money. Why are outdated weapons systems still being built? Because munitions makers are campaign donors. Remember the testimony by Steve Ellis in the US Senate? This Administration warns us to be afraid. Be very afraid. Look at the potential threats, not at the waste, fraud and abuse of a mismanaged Defense Department.

Our tax dollars even fund the federal marketing that uniformly drops the 9/11 bomb to justify every action that requires expenditure. Prominent Independent Greens including 2006 US Senate candidate Gail Parker of Virginia – herself a retired Air Force Major, and former Pentagon budget analyst – have called for base closings and realignment for years. It is time to take stock of ALL of our tax dollars.

Government computer systems need to be integrated to generate savings. Most government agencies can be operated like a business where evaluations are scrupulously conducted and dead weight personnel are dismissed. Consolidating government services across agencies can be accomplished with less brains, but more smarts. Less personnel reduces costs, confusion and improves efficiency among those who respect their job. It was never an objective of our forefathers to have the public either work for the government or find themselves without work.

Workforce

We can recommit to a war on poverty by putting Americans to work on infrastructure improvements like high-speed rail and port security with the money saved from wasteful spending alone. The economy will expand while increasing prosperity for middle and lower income families. We will boost our long-term security and clean our environment by putting our citizens to work on major infrastructure improvement – measures that have always had a very positive impact on our economy.

We want to be on record as supporting the initiatives that AFL-CIO President John Sweeney's attempt to bring youth into the labor movement during the nineties. Student activism joined with labor to address issues ranging from anti-sweatshops to living-wage struggles. In 2006 these struggles were still being pressed by a student shut-in at the University of Virginia which resulted a living wage for university employees.

Despite a few successes, the labor movement is struggling for survival in the United States. Our population should take a moment and remember what the unions have done for our country. The forty hour work week; the end of child labor; unemployment insurance, social security and medicare would not have become standard in America without the unions.

The AFL-CIO and Sweeney may have come under fire for the allocation of political funding, but without political clout many projects - including the massive work performed on bridges and roadways - would not have come into fruition. These projects have been the livelihood for millions of hard-working, blue-collar American families. Unions must be recognized a driving force that has kept our economy strong, and will be embraced in our Imperato administration.

After all, the AFL-CIO and organized labor supported the struggle for freedom in the eastern block. In collaboration the Vatican's support for Poland's Solidarity movement lead by the late Pope John Paul II, we saw the Berlin Wall come down. We must not forget that organized labor and freedom to work, was one of the most important issues concerning the breakup of the Soviet Union.

Remembering the value of unionized labor organizing for change in the eastern block should serve as an example to expand to other parts of the world that need a modern labor push for worker's rights and expanded freedoms for their citizens. This can happen with collaboration with the AFL-CIO in countries that ask for it. China, Cuba and countries in South American could benefit from the strength and expertise of the American labor movement.

Having said that we still suggest that the unions work to improve themselves from within. Mr. Sweeney stated the need in his book ten years ago citing the shortcomings of the modern labor movement. He noiced that they failed to organize workers in the fastest-growing industries. That in general, "we all share some of the blame for letting corporate America drive down our living standards, and distort our democratic process."

One objective of the Revive America platform will be to include the work of union members recognizing that they have been the meat and potatoes of our country, and in many cases have been the driving force for progress in our country during difficult times.

Immigration

The failure of either party to come up with a much needed immigration solution in spring of 2006 is another example of the ping-pong prattle that our elected elite engages in. Then Majority Leader Bill Frist aimed to strengthen the border security and immigration enforcement while rejecting any guest-worker proposals. That prompted {3} Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-N.Y.) to declare that Republican efforts to criminalize undocumented workers and their support networks "would literally criminalize the good Samaritan and probably even Jesus himself," as reported by Jonathan Weisman and Jim VandeHei of the Washington Post.

Our administration will recognize the important work being done by think tanks across the country in trying to formulate a solution. For instance, {2} Scott Bates, vice president of the Center for National Policy believes an aggressive border security strategy should be implemented within two years to protect America. His suggestions:

First, we should double the number of Customs inspectors and Border Patrol agents on America's southern border. More inspectors and agents would allow for faster processing of friendly travelers, a freer flow of commerce and quicker investigations of illegal crossings.

Second, we should enhance databases and merge terrorist watch lists to make sure that border inspectors have real-time information on the potential terrorists trying to cross the border.

Third, we would deploy technology in the form of cameras, sensors and unmanned aerial vehicles to ensure 24/7 monitoring of the southern border. In these days of the al-Qaida threat, unknown trucks with unknown cargo should never drive across our desert border.

He writes this in response to the debate about what to do about the 10 million illegal immigrants that have made it here. Our suggestion is to quit referring to immigration as something that is illegal. Defining it in that manner ruins the chance for a meaningful dialogue on how to solve it. Our administration will keep open the doors to our country to all who wish to apply legally from their country. We will allow you to stay for a five-year work period, after which each period, you would be required to return to your home for at least one-year.

At the same time, we have to toughen the rules for those that do not apply correctly. It is true that human beings are not illegal as some of the immigration protestors have declared during the May 2006 marches, but those who use illegal means to enter the US have broken the law, and will have to face the consequences. Simply put: if you are caught sneaking in, we will send you back. But if you go through the proper channels, then you will be permitted in, and you will qualify for education credits based on your tax contribution.

We will encourage union participation while here so you can carry skills back to your homeland trained to offer opportunities to your native citizens. Union organizing can be conducted in your home country and you can serve as liaison to help everyone improve his or her employment opportunities, which can help raise living conditions back home.

Trade

The hundreds of billions that the US has spent on the Iraq war has debilitated our country's ability to fortify natural resources and has enabled other countries to acquire American assets.

It is disgraceful for us as Americans to see our country financially strapped and in such great debt. We cannot watch our administration spend billions on war with no repayment while other superpowers of the world are buying up all the resources and positioning oil and gas sectors in Nigeria, India, Kuwait, and now South America.

We are also concerned with the trade deficit that results from the cheap goods we import. Not only has that practice cost us jobs in manufacturing, but it allows other countries to use our money to buy up our properties. US hard currency from China for instance may get circulated back through our economy, but they are careful not to put any in manufacturing that would compete with their home industries. As Thom Hartmann writes, "Third World nations … are buying us, the USA, chunk by chunk. In particular, they want to buy things in America that will continue to produce profits, and then to take those profits overseas where they're invested to make other nations strong".

This is a dangerous cycle that our nation has to address. It may be too late to save our manufacturing base, but that is a challenge that our administration intends to address. We are facing an ever-increasing competition for global resources that has significant national security implications.

On Energy

Understanding international reality, we do not expect to rely on foreign energy sources indefinitely. Nor can we expect alternative energy sources to bridge the burgeoning demand anytime soon. Therefore we will have to drill for oil in every conceivable place we can find large quantities. There is no conserving it. Every other country is competing for the same dwindling resource, and while we can, we must use what is available to keep our economy growing.

At the same time, the idea behind protecting the environment should serve as a catalyst for growing the economy. Spawning new industry based on the rapid technological advances in environmental science will generate thousands of new jobs. Why should NASA and the Pentagon be the main research instruments of this country? We have studied space. We have built enough weapons to annihilate any nation on earth. It is time we channel our dwindling dollars into more productive energy research. The kind that will pay off in reduced health costs as a result of cleaner air and water, and better food with less chemical additives. The ultimate result should be less poverty.

Global Warming

We are distressed about the mounting evidence that the Bush Administration is suppressing the growing scientific link between monstrous hurricanes and human-induced global warming. A flurry of peer-reviewed scientific studies has consistently linked planetary warming to storms like Katrina. Three of the six most powerful hurricanes ever to hit America in the past 150 years, occurred within 52 days in 2005. Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. The result from Katrina alone was 1,500 dead, two million Americans displaced, and at least $200 billion in damages.

According to the Chesapeake Climate Action Network (www.chesapeakeclimate.org):

Since August 2005, no fewer than four major scientific studies – one conducted by NOAA itself – have shown that warmer sea-surface temperatures created by atmospheric warming are increasing the frequency, power, and lifespan of major hurricanes. Yet there is no mention of these studies at the National Hurricane Center (NHC) web site despite the agency's official mission "to save lives, mitigate property loss, and improve economic efficiency by issuing the best watches, warnings, forecasts and analyses of hazardous tropical weather, and by increasing understanding of these hazards." And NHC director Max Mayfield denied any substantive connection between global warming and hurricanes before a US Senate panel last fall.

Even more troubling are reports by The Washington Post and other media documenting the ongoing campaign to cover up global warming data. Under the directorship of Bush's friend and political appointee, Vice Admiral Conrad C. Lautenbacher Jr., NOAA climate scientists are being intimidated from talking to the press and their papers are being withheld from publication.

Lautenbacher did say, "The president's recent budget request includes approximately $1.7 billion for climate change science." That's another BILLION tax dollars with no real return for the American public.

By ignoring the science and denying the warming on behalf of Exxon Mobil, the Bush Administration is condemning millions more Americans to the suffering and loss seen throughout the Gulf Coast in 2005. The cover up must stop now!

Independent Education

We need an educated society. The world is more competitive than ever. With our shift away from a heavy industry based economy to one the does not produce raw materials, we must generate work with our minds. That's why we believe everyone should have free access to a four-year college education.

We plan to revise access to public universities through the Independent Education Studies Initiative. Our goal is to expand accessibility and provide affordable tuition for all of America's students who want to pursue higher learning by providing any citizen the opportunity to compete and progress toward any degree, from nursing to engineering to the arts.

The United States government will coordinate a program to pool online courses that are currently being offered at the nation's major universities and make these unbranded courses available to all who want to complete college – this will include graduate coursework. College classes being given now at major universities will be donated for reduced fees allowing more students to afford them. Course work credits taken online can be combined with other accredited university credits and count toward a national university degree.

Many colleges are conducting their classes online already. The technology is rapidly making interaction more instructive. The quality of the studies is dependent on the individual's dedication toward learning. Individuals will still receive the benefits of higher education with the opportunity for continuing education as needed.

Corporations benefiting from a much higher educated populace anywhere in the country will be called on to underwrite some of the costs.

Anyone with high speed internet, regardless of their where they live can work on a degree with courses taught at the finest institutions of higher learning. This proposal will not affect the quality of our universities, since schools are already under pressure now to compete in new business-like environments. Competition exists for universities like any other businesses or institutions that operate in the more compact global marketplace.

The 21st-Century marketplace is defined by responsiveness and flexibility. As Charles Steger of Virginia Tech declares, "To compete and attract the brightest minds, colleges and universities need to foster entrepreneurial environments to create joint ventures, adjust personnel packages, acquire goods and services, or build new laboratories." The new economy has shifted from machines, cheap labor, and plentiful natural resources to a knowledge economy. "Ideas, innovations, and highly skilled people - the products of our nation's universities - fuel this new economy."

Steger adds, "Now more than at any time in our history, higher education is a key force behind the quality of modern American life, our economic competitiveness, and indeed our democratic form of government."

Transition credits can begin to be accumulated based on performance while still in high school. Working and studying can help a student earn credit in their education account. Then their private account will be used to pay for attending with their pre-paid education card. This should allow anyone that wants an education to be able to work for one.

The unbranded university level courses will add up to specific degrees that are common at our nation's universities now. Other infrastructure requirements will be evaluated. For instance, to provide a broader opportunity for educating the public, we will ensure libraries, laboratories and vocational training are improved around the country.

Our economy depends on a highly educated populace and unfortunately budget priorities have forced the administration to cut financial aid without putting an alternative learning method in place. The Pell Grant program created in 1972 by Sen. Claiborne Pell has proven to be immensely popular, with about a third of college students receiving some aid. Reductions in this program prevent qualified students from attending college. But according to a December 2004 CNN report, the program, which costs $13 billion per year, is in deficit. Its costs to the federal treasury jumped several years ago, during the burst of the dotcom bubble, when a number of people opted to return to school rather than try to compete in a tight job market.

The average student graduates from college with $17,000 in debt, said Sarah Flanagan, vice president for government relations of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.
(Source: CNN)

The question being asked by former commerce secretary Peter Peterson is how huge must the deficits grow before the public screams for relief? Across the country teachers are being laid off, there are more kids per classroom, the school year is shorter, and tuition is up at state colleges. Bus service is being cut off, volunteers are running park systems, prisoners are being released, and subsidies for the working poor are being slashed.

Peterson, a lifelong Republican, says that every time this administration faces a choice, it chooses tax cuts. Between fiscal responsibility and tax cuts, it picks tax cuts. Between preserving Social Security and tax cuts, it picks tax cuts. Between providing necessary funds to fight the war on terrorism and tax cuts, it picks tax cuts. "Again and again," Peterson says, "they choose tax cuts." (Source: Hollings, Post)

Recognizing the impact of higher education on the state's economic success, Michigan Governor Granholm has recommended guaranteed financial support to help open up post-secondary education for all students, and tougher high school course requirements among other changes to raise the state's education level. According to the Detroit News, the basics include: universal, high quality pre-school and access to health care and nutrition programs so children come to school ready to learn, well trained and certified teachers, smaller classes in early grades, safe and modernized schools, quality after-school programs and affordable college education for all who earn it.

(Source: The Detroit News, Granholm pushes for higher education)

As Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has said, "The most significant challenge facing our universities is to ensure that teaching and research continue to unleash the creative intellectual energy that drives our system forward." (Source: Steger)

The goal succeeds in several ways. First funding the academic research creates new, well-paying jobs. University research promotes better health by creating new medicines, life-saving medical equipment, and procedures. Former Virginia Governor Mark Warner lauds university researchers for helping to protect our environment, finding ways to feed more people, and securing our country's safety. For example, $6 million in grant funding from the U.S. Department of Defense enabled William and Mary scientists to enhance the effectiveness of radar and sonar, a development that will significantly strengthen our state and national security.

For more than a decade the nation has experienced a new economy built not on machines, cheap labor, or plentiful natural resources. We now have a knowledge economy, and it is in full bloom. Ideas, innovations, and highly skilled people - the products of our nation's universities - fuel this new economy. (Source: Steger)

Diverse language courses are in short supply. During the Cold War, there were many colleges pumping out Russian and Slavic area studies and language majors. But now there are virtually no colleges teaching such key dialects as Urdu, Pashtu, Dari and many others among the more than 6,500 languages in the world. {104}

We also have some catching up to do in the inner cities. Somehow we should find a way to offer an education even to those incarcerated, expanding the opportunity to become prosperous citizens for life – a better alternative than committing crime.

Independent Health Care

{6} Massachusetts has enacted a law that requires health insurance be purchased by all citizens similar to buying auto coverage. Compensation for low-income earners will be offered so they can afford it. We have advocated a similar approach to solve our national goal of ensuring everyone has health care they can keep regardless of their employment.

Once again, we should look to some of the research being advocated by prominent think tanks. New America Foundation writer Michael Lind, is the co-author of The Radical Center, a 2002 book that described a mandatory health plan similar to the one Massachusetts enacted offered details when asked what should the federal government do to ensure that everyone has access to affordable health care?

I promote a system of mandatory health insurance for all Americans, combined with public subsidies for those who need them. This approach – premised on the principle of "universal coverage in exchange for universal responsibility" – represents the most promising avenue for achieving universal health insurance in the United States. Designed and implemented correctly, it would provide fully portable coverage to all Americans, while lowering insurance costs, expanding consumer choice, raising the quality of care, and freeing businesses from the burden of administering complex benefit plans. {6}

This is the best summary we have seen to offer health insurance for all. It would be much more affordable because besides reducing administrative costs, it would also stop the practice that forces the taxpayers and other health consumers to foot the bill to pay hospitals that treat the uninsured. Plus everyone would have the means to afford the co-pay needed for preventive care, routine health exams and early diagnosis of serious medical conditions that if caught too late require exorbitant treatment costs.

Minimizing cost shifting and uncompensated care, while bringing millions of relatively young and healthy individuals into the insurance risk pool, would reduce average premium costs for rates based on market forces.

{7} A study by researchers at Harvard Medical School and Public Citizens study estimates that national health insurance could save at least $286 billion annually on paperwork, enough to cover all of the uninsured and to provide full prescription drug coverage for everyone in the United States. According to U.S. Congress' General Accounting Office, administrative savings from singlepayer reform would total about 10% of overall health spending, or about $100 billion annually. So as the evidence displays single-payer plans could solve the nations outrageous health care costs without increasing total health spending.

What have they gotten in return? A health care system that is in the business of moving dollars, not treating patients. Leadership of the two parties that colludes to keep the wasteful system in business by refusing to institute a national health care plan that allows individuals to pay and keep their policy when they switch jobs.

Some refer to it as a single-payer formula. It is proven to be cost-effective in a number of ways. First you insure everyone, even if that means requiring people to buy affordable insurance. In this instance the government should help low-income earners afford to purchase coverage. Second, by adding younger and healthier people to the insured pool, you spread the risk and lower costs. Third, you improve everyone's health by paying attention to prevention. Plus early detection will result in lower overall costs. Fourth, you reduce the emergency room visits by the uninsured – another huge factor in driving up costs. Finally, you restrain to the duplicative administrative costs that are contributing to waste. Plus with everyone covered you reduce the opportunity for fraud and abuse. The result: affordable, comprehensive health care for all.

The only Americans that have no concern about health care are those who feel they have a stable job, an employer who pays for it, and are healthy. Though that may be a majority of Americans, it is something that in this economy should not be taken for granted. Remember 30,000 Ford factory employees who lost their jobs, their benefits and their stability in 2006. I'm sure health care will be a primary concern for all of them as they seek new employment. The point is that all of us should be concerned about the lack of affordable, comprehensive health care for all Americans.

We have a proposal to help pay for the policies needed for those that can't afford it. Since so much of the drug companies' focus goes into providing designer over-thecounter cures for inconveniences in human appearance or sexual performance, all over-the-counter bottles of medicine sold should be taxed with the money funneled directly into a health care fund. Plus all the approvals that the FDA grants to allow a drug to go to market will be accompanied with up to $100 million surcharge (based on company sales) to be reserved for malpractice and adverse reaction drug lawsuits. These costs are staggering and contributing to the imbalance of health care costs in relation to American wage increases.

Getting health care costs under control now before a new wave of aging citizens reach their fragile health years will increase life expectancy, reduce the stress of poor health and contribute to the general health and prosperity of the nation. Healthy people can work longer, earn more, and contribute more to society as consumers and producers.

A main desire for many elderly is to retain their independence. They are concerned about their home, about buying food, and obtaining the medicine that they will need. So we as a society should be providing guaranteed health care that will cover home care when the need arises. It should also guarantee their food and nourishment needs can be met. Much of these guarantees can be implemented without the government being the main apparatus of control. By implementing health care for all, other institutions would spring up to take care of other needs.

Voluntary discounts already exist for many seniors, and we would encourage food merchants to offer the similar incentives for our elderly. Same with clothing and other essential needs.

One additional health care initiative we will present to help the elderly is to create a US Old Age Fund as an emergency measure for those whose fixed income may not be enough to live on. We are calling on our fellow citizens and noteworthy groups like the AARP to work out the details on this plan.

The overall focus of our administration will be to improve the living conditions where needed in America. That means paying particular attention to those living with inadequate shelter, food, clothing or in poor health. It means taking care of our aging baby boomers. Better conditions, better health care and attention to keeping our social security system solvent are objectives that Imperato will implement in his first term.

Common sense foreign policy

We are deeply concerned about a United States foreign policy that tends to emphasize war as an objective to achieving its strategic goals. America policies that tend to promote war for personal agendas or to drive our defense dependent economic engine presents a dark image to the world. We cannot cure souls or promote peace if we are so willing to commit to militaristic adventures wherever our quest for the world's resources takes us. The implications of using our military might as a foreign policy apparatus is misguided. We should be actively seeking peace in the world. In doing so we would earn the respect of our allies, and enhance our economic and international political status.

In stating our displeasure with our American foreign policy, we must point out that it is not just the current administration that has failed. The war-making racket has gone on long before Eisenhower made his infamous warning of the influence of our military-industrial complex. U.S. Marine Major General Smedley Butler summed it up this way, "there are only two things we should fight for. One is the defense of our homes and the other is the Bill of Rights. War for any other reason is simply a racket." That was in the 1930s. Since then, the profit motive for war has been well concealed.

Since World War II, the United States emerged as superpower. Until the fall of the former Soviet Union, they shared that title. But in reality, the Soviets could not keep up with our industrial and economic might. Therefore we ended up as the world's only superpower. Since the early nineties we experienced huge economic and technical growth and were fortunate to avoid major combat. We had small invasions in Grenada, Panama, and in the former Yugoslavia. During that time our global neighbors offered great support for the USA, and many were rewarded by our sharing leading technologies and financial systems.

A gradual shift is occurring that sees the world shifting away from the superpower model and moving towards one of integration, alliances and strategic partnerships. But rather than embrace this model, the US has allowed other nations to pair their resources while alienating us for our questionable military doctrine that more closely reflects the pursuit of empire, rather than strategy.

Being a savvy international businessman, our leader Daniel Imperato has noticed firsthand what happens to the US when we change our tone of leadership. America has been kind to the globe as an open and friendly business society. We helped bring up foreign countries from infancy to maturity, economically. However, we are becoming more bellicose in our modern dealings in a time when we should be maintaining a delicate balance with our economically mature neighbors, without being demanding. This approach of mutual respect was Imperato's plan for dealing with China. "Being in business in China with Chinese partners, I have learned their culture," asserted Imperato, "They are the most hospitable people, and people of peace, not war. But when push comes to shove, they are the quiet horse and have more power, strength, endurance, and intelligence than most. I have great respect for China and its people."

We have come to notice that the world is becoming less dependant on the United States. Now, because of integration, countries are more self-sufficient and less dependent upon one particular partner, which changes the matrix of US strategy in the global marketplace.

In the global marketplace, it is necessary to deal with China and its people with mutual respect. Having learned this with firsthand business dealings with the Chinese, Imperato is one of the most qualified individuals to be considered chief executive in charge of foreign policy that we have had since Dwight Eisenhower.

Imperato was warning about China's bid to purchase UNOCAL in the summer of 2005. He saw China's attempt at squeezing an American consortium out of that deal as a chance to angle for a better global position over control of the world's natural resources. Calling it a legitimate business pursuit, nonetheless Imperato was quick to realize the strategic importance of the deal and tried to warn our president that we need to retain ownership of that California-based multinational corporation.

This is the kind of insight that is needed in Washington now. Rising oil prices, and the build-up of oil reserves in other countries does not bode well for our economy or our American working class. Oil prices go up because of certain countries stockpiling their reserves, and not using their own reserves or exploration capabilities in their own land. Which brings us back to the original discussion about

foreign policy. It really is a simple matter of conducting honorable business, developing strategic alliances and not threatening to exploit others because our superpower status lets us get away with it.

Errors in foreign policy ultimately hit the common worker when prices at the pump start taking food off their tables, or educational tools away from their children. That tells us it is time for a change in leadership.

What will follow is a discussion of the foreign policy points that will have to be addressed when we get sworn in to lead the United States of America.

National Security

The Bush Administration states that the war against terrorism constitutes the greatest risk to U.S. national security. We consider that misguided. First, because you don't declare war on a tactic of war. As a strategy terrorism is very effective for arousing fear. It was precisely that fear that the Bush re-election campaign employed as the October surprise in 2004 – by releasing the latest Bin Laden tape to the media..

The real threat to America's national security remains the threat of a nuclear attack on the U.S. That's why reducing the number of nuclear weapons, and preventing a nuclear attack on the United States will be our highest national security priority.

The U.S. should lead the international effort to substantially modify the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. The NPT is an outdated Cold War treaty that does not comport to today's global realities. The goal has to be reducing nuclear proliferation and the dismantling of existing nuclear weapon stockpiles, along with preventing the spread of nuclear technologies to more nation-states. Solving this dilemma will reduce the threat of terror organizations gaining access to nuclear devices.

Terrorism

The war on terror and the war in Iraq should be considered two separate issues, but are constantly linked by the administration to milk more dollars from the American public.

While the people of the United States and the rest of the world are against the war in Iraq, they do want to stamp out terrorism. These are two separate issues. Though no country likes to lose troops, it will take a more unified world effort to seek and destroy true terror threats at the source. Should this president be commended for bringing democracy in Iraq at the cost of over $300 billion? Why should it cost the American taxpayers this much money – enough to rebuild the city of New Orleans, with new levies and have some change remaining?

The people of the United States of America are not being shown the truth of the after effects of the war in Iraq. Bush has lowered his own expectations for Iraq because of the mistakes that he's made. This president has come to realize that great mistakes but did not admit to them until January 2007. By that time any modicum of credibility has been lost dating back to his decision to deploy our troops based on intelligence that even the unintelligent could figure out suspected was faulty.

Yet even though mistakes have been made in Iraq, we reject the notion of some Democratic senators that we need a complete withdrawal of US troops from Iraq. Yes it's true that we cannot pullout because it might send the wrong message. As our president says, the rest of the world will see us as cowards, and the Iraqi people will feel like they've been left high and dry. This is true Mr. President but the fact is that the people of the United States of America cannot provide an open checkbook being spent like a drunken sailor on everybody else's issues.

We need to come up with an oil for war-and-democracy program to pay back the United States and its taxpayers for our open checkbook habits. One of our first major policy decisions, when in office will be to demand repayment of US war expenses from Iraq with oil. This is likely the scenario that the Bush Administration originally envisioned, but like so many other mistakes, they failed to enforce it. So a deal should be cut to unconditionally secure the repayment of any additional spending in rebuilding the Iraqi infrastructure that was lost at our hand. Time will prove that George W. Bush's plan is to coordinate the withdrawal of our troops in conjunction with his departure of the White House. Our country needs to know about our leadership's plan pertaining to the real business at hand, which is oil. Family ties, according to Imperato, are at the root of the Bush agenda for the rest of his presidency.

It is disrespectful to associate Muslims with terrorists and we ask the world leaders to acknowledge the real perpetrators of terrorist attacks are radical extremists of all sorts. It is time that the world separates radical people from the societies of the world.

Radicals exist in every part of the world, in every culture, and in every religion. It is our duty as human beings to protect our neighbors, respect each other, and watch out for one another. Reducing tensions and mistrust through cooperation, understanding and pray will force these acts of violence to stop. Eventually even radical people could be brought to their senses and realize that they are wrong.

So we are not going to attack the president personally. But we do want to deplore some actions as bordering on terror tactics. The fact is that terrorism could actually be thinking that your phones are tapped and that people are listening to your private conversations. This act creates fear, and fear is the very root of terrorism.

If a young girl or boy is assaulted, that person along with their family is devastated and feels terrorized. For families of soldiers that are dying in Iraq, this is their form of terrorism. Essentially then the definition of terrorism can be that it affects the families who lose their loves ones and are experiencing fear, hurt, distress and loss. So not only is a suicide bomber blowing up a street café, or a sniper shooting innocent citizens considered forms of terror, but any country whether it is the Israelis or the Palestinians suffering from an attack from their perceived enemies – lives are being lost because of terrorism.

While Clinton was wrong to bomb Africa and Afghanistan as a deflection from his domestic affairs, our current president George W. Bush has not made the situation with Bin Laden any better. It appears that the Bush administration catapulted a terrorist attack into a major global war on terror. He identified Iraq as a sponsor of terror and attacked Iraq for ulterior motives. We believe that these motives were ill-advised and the repercussions not carefully analyzed. It is time the people of the United States be told the truth.

In pursuit of a lasting peace, we must understand why people harbor hatred towards Americans. We must ascertain the intentions of people who are trying to create chaos and destruction of the free world so that we can educate them and work to bridge the mutual distrusts and misunderstandings. As humans, we have a common calling to peaceful relations with our brethren, regardless of our religious differences; we are all children of God.

Differences of opinion are guaranteed in such a diverse world. Which is why more tolerance of opposing viewpoints should be emphasized. Our country needs to lead by example. Too often we want to impose our way of life or thinking on other people, and that is a poor way to establish rapport. We all agree that there is no place for terror in a global society. The only way we can stop it is with a collective effort.

We ask for the authority and opportunity to apply our education and knowledge of people, their families, and their customs to enable us to come to a peaceful solution. We must stop this maddening potential for a nuclear catastrophe that would infect all nations of the world and disrupt life on the planet as we know it. Bickering between the two parties has failed to stop military attacks on other nations. Which leaves us playing into the hands of the terrorists, indirectly aiding and abetting their desire to destroy the free world.

The so-called war on terrorism is a dummy operation now against radicals who are smart enough to keep us centered on Iraq, while Bin Laden is loose to organize the rest of the world's terrorist cells.

The Bush administration and US officials are not responding accordingly. While we support our president, we also have to ensure that dissenting opinions are being aired and thoughtful preparation for the long-term implications are not viewed with blurred vision. We trust our president George W. Bush is a smart man, and hopefully receiving advice from his father Bush. But it is obvious that the problems in the Middle East are in danger of escalating out of control under this administrations watch.

We once again reach out for the leaders of the world and their countries to demand a cease fire in Iraq, a pull back of massive troops, and a collaborative, uniform, global taskforce of Special Forces to be able to proceed with the fight against radicals. We need to fight collectively as a unified group of concerned countries and citizens that are against the terrorist activity. Our presence in Iraq will continue to fuel al-Qaeda who has decoyed itself to be insurgents in Iraq and have positioned themselves with Hamas and Hezbollah to create a wedge in the Palestinian conflict that will spur more attacks.

An attack on terrorism has to become a unified global coalition, and not a burden placed solely on the shoulders of American taxpayers. $250 billion spent on our infrastructure, our own security, our own intelligence capabilities, upgrading our technology, airline communications capabilities, shipping and cargo inspection capability, our telecommunications infrastructure, and creating a strong a wall around our country may have been more important in the long run to protect our citizens and to protect our nation against further intrusion by any and all parties.

The Independent America Foreign Policy Primer We had a war on drugs; war on poverty; war on welfare. Now this never-ending war to strip our civil liberties and antagonize our global rivals to the point of aggressive revenge.

Our one-day of homeland terror does not help us relate to other nations that live under the fear of a possible terror strike on any given day.

We have not had our country invaded, or thousands of civilians killed as collateral accidents, missed or misidentified targets.

Yet we are nationalistic enough to think that the Patriot Act is unable to be a threat - that would be "unpatriotic". We are consumed with the success of the Marshall plan that rebuilt Germany and Japan we think it will work in Iraq. This ignores the failure of such invasions in Panama, Lebanon. Our adventurism in Iran (under the Shah), Cuba (Bay of Pigs), and Vietnam failed, though we did manage to establish ourselves in the resource rich South China Sea, thanks to maintaining a huge base of military operations in the Philippines - one of our few victories.

We as a united citizenry must see through the clever marketing of the terror war. The lack of proving facts or discovering outright falsehoods does not sink in. How could over 40 percent of the public still believe Saddam had weapons of mass destruction? We knew where they were. Destroyed by the weapons inspectors. They not only destroyed them during the nineties, but they thwarted Saddam's means of producing them with no-fly zones and sanctions. Another justification for the war proven untrue.

The whys are not going to be answered. Why Powell spent four days preparing his UN pitch and did not discover the discredited documents? Why did Congress roll over without a fight and vote for the PATRIOT Act – one of the worse pieces of legislation ever written? How did the names of all 19 September 11 hijackers become so quickly determined, almost as though pre-known? What about the reports that several are still alive and another was dead before 9/11?

Why has the Defense Department so adamant about being the interim authority in Iraq when clearly the State Department and USAID had the personnel and expertise to carry out a reconstruction effort more effectively?

Why was the 15,000-page Iraqi arms declaration sequestered when we already know that it named at least 20 American companies that provided chemical, nuclear and biological technology to Saddam Hussein? Why the 9/11 incident itself was not openly investigated, as any other criminal act would have been? Why the Air Force stood down rather than intercept the missing planes once discovered? Why the intelligence reports repeatedly refuted the Administrations claims though only Joe Wilson would come forward - at great person risk to his family. He paid the ultimate price once the Administration decided to seek revenge and out his wife's undercover activities.

-TWO-

We don't think our forefathers intended for incumbents to dominate elections to the point that they drive off competition. It is antithetic to the republic that 50% of all elected officials run unopposed. Has our society become so apathetic that we accept one name on the ballot for election – whether it is school board, state house or congress?

Accepting that means that we also accept increased gap between the rich and poor. It means we are content to watch the middle class shrink with large numbers of our population denied health care in a world made unhealthier by toxic pollutants and dwindling natural resources. Why should we accept these conditions, especially since it is our children who will inherit a more violent society thanks to declining moral values and lack of long-term vision?

Daniel Imperato challenges these assumptions because he knows that as a nation we can do better. Other prominent Americans understand the dilemmas our country faces and are addressing them. We want to join forces with people like Peter G. Peterson, a former cabinet officer who titled his book: "Running on Empty: How the Democratic and Republican Parties are Bankrupting Our Country and What Americans Can Do About It." The title alone sparks our support because it pinpoints one of the main challenges we face as a nation: the lack of spending discipline from the so-called "conservatives" in Congress. As Peterson stated, "this administration and Republican Congress have presided over the biggest most reckless deterioration of America's finances in history."

America finally woke up and realized there was nothing conservative about the reckless spending that the GOP presided over during the first six years of W. Bush. The same political operatives who attacked their opponents as "tax and spenders" had become "borrow and spenders".

Cutting taxes while increasing deficits where nothing more than high interest credit advances that will haunt our future Americans for generations to come.

His mission is to spur a movement toward an "Independent America". What will follow is a thorough discussion of politics in America as we see it after the 2006 elections. We aim to address each issue important to setting America straight. We offer solutions based on your suggestions and on simple logic. Many of these solutions will not happen in a vacuum, or because we wish them to. Many of these have been in the works or introduced by good people - with good intentions - years ago. That is why we will be asking for your help.

Occasionally we are blessed with leaders who understood the broad spectrum of our political plight. Some have understood and attempted to address the gravity of the health crises only to be shot down by the corporate health, insurance and pharmaceutical interests. Anyone making this quote would be considered a maverick and the attack machine would go after him:

A fundamental principle of a people's platform must be to establish citizen control over the public and private medical-industrial complex.

Citizen control – good concept. People's platform – as independents you have our interest. Could that be Hillary Clinton in 1992? Actually backup another twenty years to 1972 and read it from a book called Citizen Power by Senator Mike Gravel of Alaska. You see our health care crisis is not new. A United States Senator recognized the pending crisis the early seventies, and six years into the twenty-first century we still have not solved the problem. Instead it has escalated completely out of citizen control.

That is just one item we intend to address during this historic quest for reviving America. We will discuss the validity of pulling together a centrist movement involving of all things: our citizens. It is going to require a broad citizen movement that is independent of Washington money and power.

To restate our purpose:

1. to reaffirm the positive solutions that have merit;
2. pull together the pieces that solve our long-standing issues;
3. ask you to join us in moving forward.

The challenge will be made more difficult considering those whom we are trying to dislodge from their powerful stoops. An entrenched cabal of influence peddlers has succeeded in putting their own narrow interests ahead of the public. Collectively they prevent our most serious social issues from being resolved.

The movement we are going to describe started long ago. The difference now is that we have the technology to engage a larger portion of the population than ever before. We have the capacity. We have the people's interest in joining us to do the right thing. We have leaders who are willing to withstand the personal sacrifice necessary to carry out the plan. Now all we need is YOU.

A synergy of diverse minds have developed this blueprint for America's next great revival. Independent America will lay out the vision of a gifted and determined individual with the courage and conviction to conduct a hard charge for returning the White House to the people.

I started this campaign three years before the election to get the message to those in the center who seek candidates that actually represent their moderate positions. I challenge you to contribute ideas and energy to ensure that Middle America is not subjected to the whims of the special interests.

It is essential that our citizens join in this effort. Give one hour a week toward your favorite cause. If you share our concerns, and agree with the value of independents engaged as equals in political discourse, then apply your talents toward electoral politics with us. With your help we can deliver our message. Then help us turn out the votes on November 4, 2008. Your vote will translate into this constructive revival.

I have been asked if it is our intention to form a new third party. The answer is no, because enough parties already exist. Are we going to create a coalition of third parties to pass NERP? Yes, but after that voters should have choices at least determined by instant runoff voting that will infuse our system of government with citizens not career politicians.

Any party in existence is only as active as the numbers they can generate each year working to execute the persuasion politics that wins elections. By generating volunteers to fill the positions in each existing party, we will pave the way for independents to run for office. It really does not matter which party label an individual chooses to carry. They can do as the Independent Greens did in Virginia and keep running candidates as a way to grow. Each candidate is still independent. These greens did not really create any platform beyond four key issues. But they provided the tools for their candidates to get started, the most basic of which are petition signatures.

Our campaign will be starting the same way, reaching out to each state that may already have for instance two green parties, a libertarian party, some constitution members and some lingering reformists. All of us should band together to get candidates from each party on the ballot.

Shouldn't our political leaders reflect the true values of America? Why is it that political discourse drives away its most talented with negativity and character attacks? Can we get the media to do a better job of covering issues and not so obsessed with sensationalism? These are challenging questions, but questions that our campaign is not afraid to answer.

We will continue to challenge whether it is good for our republic to have carved out legislative districts that allow a one party monopoly every election? Even in 2006 midterm election twelve percent of the incumbent members of Congress faced no major party opposition. This proves that we cannot rely on the Big Two political parties to challenge every seat.

In one state legislative race after another, over 50% of the incumbents face no opposition. It happened in Virginia in 2005, North Carolina in 2006. That alone makes a compelling case for a consistent third party presence. Ease the burden for people to run and there is a good chance we can get citizens to make the ballot and contend. Why most citizens don't participate now has to do with ballot access restrictions and the financial barriers. As we progress we will make a case for easing these and many other burdens.

It is time that a legitimate third party answer exist in every corner of America. With our campaign associating itself with emerging centrists, just filling the ranks of the third parties would be accomplishing a major improvement in getting people involved. This is why we promote Action Against Apathy, a theme developed by Virginia's Independent Green Chairman Carey Campbell. Now is the chance for independents to band together to form a loose coalition. We need a diverse field of independent candidates to emerge and challenge for the US Senate and House in 2008.

The diverse range of views is healthy for our republic. We share common political aspirations regarding the conduct of elections. The desire for fair ballot access. Most of us would like to see the Electoral College scrapped. Instant runoff voting is high on our agenda. Plus the dysfunctional campaign finance laws need to be simplified. To achieve these goals, our campaign must become the groundwork for the formation of viable third party momentum to carry beyond 2008.

It is time for the creation of more local independent micro-parties and statewide parties. For a national third party to gain mass appeal, it will need defectors from each of the major parties. Our campaign could spark that scenario by exposing the shortcomings of the two-party duopoly for all America to see.

Americans will eventually shy away from the current two-party duopoly because of all of the damage that they've caused our country. We see a slow crumbling of respect and credibility for the United States around the world, and with that a loss of security. We know the truth has been stretched by many politicians and have been misrepresented by both parties. The ideological divide is forcing big money to be spent on swaying opinions to win a majority vote, and that is draining America's resources.

The United States is being squeezed by the ping-pong game that spreads blame between the democrats and republicans. It has expanded to a similar scenario between our allies and adversaries. We try to involve Russia in negotiations with Iran, then we turn around and attack Russia's President Putin. Iran offers an olive branch in the form of a letter from their leader, the first in over 26 years, and our leadership rejects it. This unwillingness to change course, or to exercise open-minded diplomacy to head off an inevitable conflict only increases the fear of our electorate and pushes the US into the brink of another quagmire, that will be worse than the one we are struggling to solve in Iraq.

I want to appeal to independents and existing third parties: help us find common ground. We are flexible enough to align with most of the positions you already promote. Collectively we can take the fight to our entrenched members of congress who enjoy a 90% reelection rate thanks to the gerrymandered one party legislative district carving they perform every ten years. The money-grubbing and PAC-written bill passing that goes on is staggering.

As witnessed by the ethics scandals that drove Duke Cunningham to jail and Tom DeLay out of the House, the weight of corruption is sagging the high standing that Capitol Hill once held.

Former Congressman Joe Scarborough – a Gingrich freshman who actually honored his term limit promise – spells it out: "the fact is, both the Democratic and Republican Parties are equally beholden to corporate America. And they find all kinds of ways to disguise what they are doing." That is one reason why the Republican Congress was turned out as the majority party after displaying a half-hearted attempt at lobby reform in 2006.

{100} The American people has shown a glimmer of political will to fix things, but it is doubtful that with their new majority the Democrats will "fix" the system beyond travel perks and free tickets or meals. That is why it is time for the independents to band together under a unified banner to enter electoral politics to stay. We can save ourselves a great deal of watered-down news watching, and deflect the spin that will be clubbing us leading up to the 2008 election.

We can silently and confidently decide to get involved early and commit to voting independent. If the growing independent and third party movement is to be consequential in electoral politics, we must not only act with a sense of urgency, but also develop new tactics and strategic approaches that can move us from the margins to the mainstream.

Our strategy will consist of coalition building to press for reform from outside. We will apply our energies to win NERP.

Our government will raise its voice in protest when onesided elections occur in Egypt or Belarus, yet here at home, we shrug it off when half of the seats are uncontested.

So our campaign will be arriving in your town to help find candidates for every ballot position in 2008. We will be asking you to step forward and demand fair and competitive elections. We will be encouraging you to run for office because the basic values of our country are at stake, and it is the citizens who should be running government - not career politicians.

On Raising Money

{C14 -7} John B. Opdycke, the development director for the Committee for a Unified Independent Party, wrote one of the best summaries of money in politics we have found. He justifies the need for people to treat politics as they do their other philanthropic ventures. Here is an excerpt from his February 2003 white pager entitled “Getting the People in”:

For democracy to flourish, the citizenry must be active and work continuously to develop and improve it. We must invest our time, our energy - and our money.

Unfortunately, few Americans do so. They have been fooled into thinking that they don't need to invest in the development of our greatest national treasure: our democracy.

Of course, there are justifiable reasons why we don't give politically. Democrats and Republicans alike use funds on distasteful negative campaigns, attack mailings and manipulative "issue" ads.

But if we want to improve the conduct of political campaigns and ensure that vital issues are debated and discussed, then ordinary Americans must apply our philanthropic know-how to the political arena.

They could finance candidates, initiatives, petition drives, debates, civic forums and grassroots campaigns that develop the American democracy and shift control away from the special interests.

Today's "dumbed down" campaigns will not change overnight. Nor will the power and influence of special interests vanish immediately. But any positive change in our electoral system will require the philanthropic participation of the American people. The impulse to “get the money out of politics" is understandable. But the biggest issue is not getting the money out; it's getting the people in.

In a conversation with Mr. Opdycke, he made it clear that his United Independent Party was going to be more involved in intellectual pursuits than electoral work. Whatever role his group can conduct to further the cause of independents is welcome. We hope those of you reading this will heed his call for you, the people, to get "into" politics. Bringing a little money with you will help.

Independent Models to Build On

Those of us in the independent political world are obviously thrilled anytime one of us gets elected. So to be represented for a few years by Jesse Ventura as Governor of Minnesota was quite an honor. He was much more coherent and in touch with the realities in the state capitol than most expected. And of course he was lampooned by the media, which constantly plays "gotcha" in attempting to make non-career politicians appear novice at their craft.

Ventura served with dignity, and discovered so many of the unpleasantries that go with public life including the verbal threats to his family, the mean-spirited campaign rhetoric, and the media's disinterest in accuracy. As he puts it, "there's big money in character assassination."

In his well-written book about the political system he exclaims, "The greatest threat to our political freedom is not the career politicians, the partisan gang wars, or the power-hungry lobbyists. It's the apathetic public that allows them to flourish!" {C14-1}

It is true that Americans are lazy about offering themselves for public service. We have found this true while recruiting others to volunteer to join us, or any candidate they like. It is interesting how many told us they don't vote while we circulated petitions.

It is no longer difficult to stay informed on the issues. Modern resources from the Internet to Podcasting to MySpace videocasting are filling the gaps left by our TV "candy news" as Ventura calls it. We as Americans need to be open to diverse viewpoints, and use the variety of sources available to us to develop an intelligent opinion for ourselves. Then when the opportunity arises to consider running for civic office, we can be prepared to jump right in.

Plenty of local government positions are flexible enough to allow us to continue with our private-sector jobs. It is critical that we ask you to get involved in your local elections and to do so as a third party candidate or independent.

The question is, are we challenging ourselves enough to think intelligently? Modern media is about entertainment. It is easy to laugh when being entertained. It is hard to conjure a smile when reviewing current events. Yet it is vital that we are diligent. Groups that monitor how the government treats liberties raise concerns because if they were not watching, the surveillance society would already be achieved.

New blood is needed in the independent world of politics as much as it is in the traditional parties. As Ventura points out the Reform Party crumbled because it was tied too closely to the ideology of one individual. "Parties and the ideas they stand for shouldn't be dictated by a single personality."

So for those who do join our Independent America movement, we want you – the people – to retain the power. It does not matter what political stance you bring. We need a broad scope of independent thinkers in order to grow. This movement for an Independent America will grow in the reverse manner than Perot's did. It will originate from the grass-roots, rather than from the top down.

Many political experts suggest that as much as 40% of the electorate declare themselves independent. Yet obviously they continue to vote for one of the Big Two political parties out of frustration of having no other choice. Nearly half of the elections left up to the Big Two candidates in fact do not provide any opposition candidate.

That is the precise reason that independent candidates are vital to the health of our political system – to ensure that opposition exists. Also widely accepted is the fact that movements that have generated the most productive elements for change – the forty-hour work week, women's right to vote, civil rights and social security – started outside of the framework of the Big Two political machines. History showed resistance to those ideas when first proposed. Yet the political entity that adopted these policies are the ones that earned a long-term governing majority.

Gradually self-declared independents have become as important to the outcome of elections as mobilizing one's base is to the Big Two. These independent minded voters have swung back and forth between the Big Two, usually voting for change – any change as seen by the default choice in the 2006 congressional outcome.

The questions to ask in 2007 and early 2008 is: are we as Independents willing to put aside our ideological differences and unite behind someone who financially independence from the Big Two? Are we willing to accept that someone even if we do not totally align with their ideological baggage? Can we unite our diverse third-party groups behind one alternative even if that means temporarily suspending our own idealistic goals to the greater good of election reform? The answer should be yes. If collectively we lend our voice to this fundamental platform, we can win the chance to openly debate our ideological differences and implement solutions in the interest of the American public.

Many of the so-called party loyalists are really only claiming allegiance in name only. They regularly vote against their own self-interest and even against their own values. So if we present our candidate running on the burning issue to once and for all expand citizen input via eased ballot requirements and fixing our instruments of electoral democracy, then we would have ordinary, working class citizens representing us in government. They would be in touch with our concerns and not beholden to the elites that run the country now.

By allowing election reform to take center stage in our quest for fairness and broader participation, then we can move on to address the real issues of the day. Though many citizens have a skeptical impression that we will never solve the big problems that face our country today, we need only borrow some of the rhetoric of the frontrunners of the Big Two: the United States is blessed with a "can-do" mentality that has allowed us to achieve other lofty goals in the past.

That means that independents can also change their thinking toward realizing our shared goals. It is vital now that for the first time in over fifty years the presidential selection process is so wide open to possibilities. The only argument we should have as independents now is in what order to address our platform items.

-THREE-

Self-interest is the rule in Congress as evidenced by the campaign rules that allowed one frontrunner – a sitting Senator – to move $10 million from her Senate campaign funds into her presidential campaign committee. Governors running for President do not have the same advantage.

Last year emergency legislation to initiate a voting papertrail was within two months of the November 2006 election. Of course there was no chance it could actually have been implemented in time for the election. So the real question is why did it sit on the shelf so long? Why didn't those who introduced the legislation do so much sooner? The answer is apparent. Incumbent advantage.

People need to take a closer look at what really goes on in Washington and stop saying we can't do anything about it. As our pastors tell us, we either operate on fear or on faith. Voters are suspicious of campaign financing because the politicians and the media tell us it would be too expensive. But considering what it is costing us now in bloated federal budgets that are nothing more than payoffs to the top political donors, it is time we had the faith that the people can in fact, make a change for the better. Upon close examination, it becomes obvious that the cost of allowing business as usual to continue in Washington far outweighs what public financing of campaigns would cost. The debt that our government is racking up to support these rackets amount to a criminal act being perpetuated on our descendants' future. And we stand before you now to stop it.

People pay taxes, not corporations. Any taxes that corporations pay are passed on to their consumers. When the federal government is one of the largest consumers feeding corporate profits, these profits are not filtering back tot eh people – at least not to the general population. Shareholders and investors make out.

That means those without the means to share in wealth creation that the government underwrites are left to watch the rich get richer. Is that what America is all about now?

We believe in capitalism and the ability for individuals to earn a piece of the American pie. But we also believe that everyone should have an opportunity to make America great. That means a country that creates enough opportunity for all to share. We are a very generous people but you wouldn't know it by our budget priorities. Why? Because collectively we have allowed the corporate mindset to value greed, and think and make decisions in very stark economically calculated terms.

Government budgets that squander resources, or are divided up among those who can afford the best lobbyists is not a good reflection of our nation's integrity. We can do better. Some have argued we ought to just vote for the lobbyists since they do the research for their industry position, then draft legislation to present to Members of Congress. But who are these lobbyists? Most of them are former staffers, former congressman and women and even former government or military personnel.

Here is one example of getting what we vote for when we empower one of the Big Two to control the national budget. Hear what Steve Ellis, vice-president of a budget watchdog nonprofit testified in the US Senate about a pending lease deal between Boeing and the Air Force:

"Taxpayers for Common Sense has been disturbed by the U.S. Air Force's exceptionally close relationship with the Boeing Corporation throughout the negotiations on this lease. As you read the recent stories detailing the efforts to seal this $30 billion deal, it becomes increasingly hard to figure out where the blue Air Force uniform ends and the pin stripe of Boeing executives begins. In effect, the Air Force officials became the silent business partners of Boeing."

It sounds like some good jobs will be waiting for key "Boeing" Air Force officers when they retire from the United States military. A May 2006 settlement with the Justice Department prevented evidence of this type of hiring practice from being be brought to court after the. According to the Washington Post, the Department of Defense will be levied record fines of over $500 million. It is unlikely to have an impact on a defense contractor that made $2.57 billion in profit last year? Sounds like they are getting a good return on their lobby investment.

But with so much of our tax dollar going to defense, and so many Defense Department decisions being made by the contractors, it becomes easy for lobbyists to accomplish their mission of passing favorable legislation.

It is practices like this that are threatening our democracy. During the period of 2000-2006 when one party dominated both the legislative and executive branch of government, the wealth of our nation was squandered. Hundreds of sweetheart no-bid contracts were awarded on a scale of which we will never know. Why? Because there is no auditable trail. A few do come to our attention – usually only when allegation of abuse are exposed – but in general, we have no idea how much of our money is being wasted.

This is one cause for the exorbitant deficit. Accepting the mindset that deficits are okay prevents a serious analysis of the waste, fraud and abuse in this government. The misnamed Government Reform Committee in the US House of Representatives gives lip service to reform. They held hearings on the abuses of Halliburton contract cheating, but nothing resulted of it. Later they chased Major League ballplayers who were accused of using steroids – an issue that has nothing to do with government reform or national security.

By offering the American public an alternative, indepenents across America running for both the White House and Congress, we will be directly challenging the status quo – and will likely face untold risks for doing so. These are powerful institutions that have emerged. But their arrogance and abuse gives us justification for our cause. Some suggest that new leadership within the Big Two will fix things. We doubt it.

{7A} In the words of Senator John McCain the U.S. electoral system is "nothing less than a massive influencepeddling scheme where both parties are conspiring to sell the country to the highest bidder."

Fingering Texas Congressman Tom Delay at the peak of his power in November 2004, the New York Times stated:

{C11-13} "House Republicans did not rise up to denounce DeLay because they sensed he represented some of the political tendencies they came to Washington to reform. Though none of them is pure enough to cast the first stone. They've all voted for the big deficits they vowed to combat. They've all watched the walls between the public servants and the private lobbyists get washed away."

The truth is that both the Big Two parties lost any reformist spirit long before they succumbed to the influence of Tom DeLay. After gaining the majority, and serving as Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich wielded considerable pressure on his party members. It quickly became apparent that the main promises of the Contract for America were going to be broken. We are still awaiting term limits for instance.

Some of the best accounts of the downward spiral that started befalling the GOP can be tracked in Joe Scarborough's book. He did the honorable thing that only a few of his colleagues elected as freshman during the 1994 change in power agreed to – resign from Congress after serving the term limit as promised.

We suspect it is only a matter of time before the new majority under House Speaker Nancy Pelosi perform the same strong-arm tactics to protect their majority.

Now is the time for unifying the wide spectrum of American voters who do not identify with the extremes of either of the Big Two. The prospect of the independents actually uniting to get elected would inspire an historic ripple in America politics that could be felt for generations.

We have little doubt that a credible Independent, Green or Libertarian could govern as well if not better than our current choices. No single-minded declarations of "I am the decider." No intern-bait distractions.

Even with the best interest of our citizens in mind as a new band of Independents lead, it would not take long for the Big Two to rally their bases to create havoc and undermine the governing coalition's credibility. That attempt will fail as long as our citizens' remember the pillaging of our Treasury that occurred under their watch. Author David Sirota characterized it as a Hostile Takeover. As Independents, we intend to govern with a peoplefriendly takeover – handing power back to the real owners of this country.

That means our new governing coalition will have to act fast on our promises. Starting with our cabinet selections, we will reach out to diverse, qualified Americans who can commit to cleaning up government.

We know it would take years to weed out cronyism, quid pro quo, and payola tendencies that characterize the current two-party duopoly. But think of how refreshing it would be to pass a budget that reflects our nation's values. Right now Members of Congress tally their ability to muscle through earmarks as a statement of success and a justification for reelection.

At the risk of getting ahead of ourselves, we want to begin the discussion of the platform that even a slim Independent victory would mandate. Later we will go back to address the strategy to achieve victory. Articulating the platform answers the why question. Why all independents should finally step away from their propensity to settle for the lesser choice and cast a vote for someone to actually represent them boils down to two words: election reform.

Instituting election reforms will have a long-lasting effect on getting the cheating, deception, negativity and misinformation practices out of our elections. Plus election reform that standardizes ballot access and levels the field for all who want to run will ensure that the right to govern exists for all citizens – the true owners of our country – not just those with the loudest voice by virtue of the size of their checkbook.

True election reform consists of ten interrelated legislative improvements to the process of conducting elections today. The objective is to close the loop on that promise of a more perfect union that our founding fathers envisioned. It does no good to rehash exactly how the drafters of our constitution where able to see past their limited idea of who could be included in the decision making of our government. But there are stark parallels between the elite class then that set up the hypocritical "We the People" pledge to include only white males and the current crop of government underwriters. Today's campaign donors who can bundle millions for their favorite candidate are a small group that eerily resembles the founder's elite status.

Though Independents could never part with such an outrageous sum of money, we must extol our independent brethren to financially support their third-party candidates with a philanthropic zeal. That's right. Money will have to pour in at some fraction of the Big Two to compete. What fraction is needed for success is hard to determine. Which is why we argue for the need to have a top-of-the-ticket candidate who can be self-financed.

Accomplishing that, we can focus on raising funds have to support our down ticket candidates to get out the vote in November 2008. We know the strength of our movement will still rely on the grassroots. It is critical that we have candidates on the ballot in all 468 house and senate districts. "Feet on the street" campaigning will support our independent wave.

Ballot access then becomes the first plank of the platform. The clichés of the first 100 days of a new administration aside, we will have to act fast on the election reforms that we are asking voters to demand. Knowing that neither of the Big Two would ever accept such ideas – they have certainly been asked for years and refused – then we have to implement them right away to at least give them a fair trial period before the establishment regains its footing and begins to dismantle the gains we might make. Again, we are getting ahead of ourselves, but the cyclical nature of the political world in Washington, we should anticipate the worse. All we ask of independents in November of 2008 is to give reform a chance. We will deliver with a sweeping victory and a mandate for change even if we do not gain a majority in Congress.

What have independents have been asking for? Fair ballot access; participation in the debates; public campaign financing; secure voting machines for reliable election results; universal voter registration; instant runoff voting; equal media access; and congressional representation for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Why have we asked for these items? Because the agenda that the people ask for is legitimate. Just allowing us in the debates would stir the American public to want to hear more from the third-parties. We would have a chance to articulate why we would best represent the interests of our citizens. Voters will hear something they can relate to since we propose long-term solutions. We want to offer real solutions to health care, education, transportation, the environment, immigration, trade, labor, race relations and foreign policy.

But as long as voters have in the back of their mind that independents cannot win and they have to pick one of the Big Two against their own interest, then we will never break-through.

Now let's say you like the platform we present on those issues. Your natural response is: who is stopping the Big Two from implementing these ideas? The answer can be found following the money. Who prevented the minimum wage from going up for so many years? The corporate high-rollers whose pay went up 400 times that of the lowwage earners. These are the same people who donate to campaigns by the millions to give their industry an edge.

Would the oil and gas industry donate millions if it were not going to get government subsidies? Would the pharmaceutical companies pad the coffers of their favorite congressmen if they were satisfied with the prescription drug programs that were in place prior to 2005? Would corporate carmakers donate to any elected official who insisted on raising the CAFÉ regulations to force higher gas mileage on domestic built vehicles?

All these examples point directly back to why we need election reform. Because as long as both of the Big Two go after the same constituency – the wealthy class, the industrialists, the corporatists, the elitists – other voices and alternate choices do not exist. Shades of difference may exist. But two glaring examples point to what you get when you rely on just these two.

First, the fact that 50% of the electoral races are uncontested across the country – and have been for over thirty years – means we cannot rely on either party to be a consistent opposition party. Second, we do not so easily let the minority party off the hook for authorizing the president to conduct perpetual war.

While most of us not privy to intelligence were smart enough to figure out that the claims this Administration was selling were bogus, then that means the Members of Congress in the minority – some now running for president claiming they regret their vote – were complicit. We the people should not allow such poor judgment to be rewarded with higher office.

Then there are the activists, the so-called independents or members of a third-party who also felt the need to cross over to vote for one of the Big Two because they were in "Anyone but Bush" mode. The most glaring failure of this strategy is the pro-peace movement suspending their fervor in deference to Kerry in 2004. They did the same thing in 2006. Impeachment came off the table in deference to Nancy Pelosi. These were not victories for the third-party, other than it weeded out those with questionable loyalties and poor judgment. Anyone unable to see what a disaster and wasted vote it was to cast for either of the Big Two before, certainly have their proof now.

As of this writing, small steps were being made toward some of the NERP items. DC voting rights was close to a vote just before a Federal Appeals Court ruled the firearm bill was unconstitutional triggering a rider to address the subject being added to the bill. Another delay resulted.

Other states are taking up various provisions of the legislation. Iowa is proposing Universal Voter Registration. Maryland is agreeing to tie their Electoral Votes to the result of the national popular vote. Virginia had enacted a papertrail provision to begin in 2007, but the State Board of Elections managed to get it moved back a year on the grounds that more time was needed to comply.

Instant Runoff Voting was enacted in a number of locales in 2006 including San Francisco, Oakland and Minneapolis.

One of the frontrunners of the Big Two has already support for instant runoff voting (IRV).

What is IRV?

Sometimes called rank voting or choice voting, it gives voters a chance to select their candidate choices in rank order. They can just vote for just one, or rank all the selections in order of desired choice. Rather than just picking one, they would then pick a second and third choice if available. If the candidate with the most first choice votes does not gain a majority of over 50% of the first place votes on the first count, then the second place votes would be tallied. Each round eliminates the last place candidate. In the second round of counting the second place votes get added to the first place votes to continue until there is a majority winner.

Presently in a three way race, a candidate with only 34% of the vote can win the election even though 66% of the voters wanted a different candidate. Not only did Jesse Ventura win the Minnesota Governor's race with 37%, but three of the last four presidential elections did not produce a winning majority of 50% of the national popular vote.

Independents would never be called spoilers again with this system. A more natural competition would ensue, rather than the bitter tension like that between Gore and Nader in 2000; Perot and Bush in 1992. Fierce competition is one thing, but the opportunity to form a compatible and governing coalition either conscious or implied would be healthier for our republic. Big Two challengers would be more receptive to inviting Independents to debate if they were angling to earn the second choice voters of their rivals – or forming an alliance to make a unified challenge to an incumbent officeholder.

So there are members of the Big Two would are beginning to accept IRV. Others are using it as an excuse for exclusion. Independents often find themselves blocked from debating for no other reason than sheer arrogance of one or both of the Big Two. In 2006 a repeat challenger who lost to the incumbent two years earlier with 37% of the vote wanted a solo rematch. When an independent entered the race, the repeat challenger did all he could to block participation.

Surprisingly the incumbent congressman made a case for debate participation - which in later events was permitted. But while debating the issue at a senior center with the Independent relegated to a table in the back of the room, the subject was addressed by the Congressman who insisted that the Independent be allowed in. This would not normally be worth a mention since incumbents are likely to use this strategy as a distraction. But the statement uttered by the Democratic challenger was a showstopper. Asked why he was opposed to allowing the Independent in the debate, Al Weed, a challenger for the 5th District congressional seat in Virginia in 2006, stated, "I hardly think he is a serious candidate and it wouldn't be worth your time to hear what he has to say."

We thank Mr. Weed for getting our third party candidate free press that day, since that quote was published in the local paper. It sums up the arrogance that the Big Two parties display toward Independents. One could question his thinking of what exactly make a "serious" candidate. The petition signatures were turned in and the rules for making the ballot were met. One could almost use those criteria for the challenger who only raised $500,000 to date. Doesn't it take at least a million for one of the Big Two to challenge an incumbent in Congress?

After successfully blocking the Independent from participating in a second forum, the challenger was asked under what conditions he would debate the third-party candidate. Part of his answer was included IRV. So he turned out to be an ally on that plank of our platform. He publicly endorsed IRV soon after.

Will his party sponsor and pass IRV? Unlikely, even with his party in the majority. Which is why we have to wait until enough Independents make it to congress.

Debate us!

In 2004, Libertarian presidential candidate Michael Badnarik summarized why there were two empty chairs during his debate with the Green Party candidate David Cobb. He noted the Big Two nominees were invited, and refused. He surmised that they must be afraid, yet how could they be afraid of us little independents? "Because the American public may actually hear something that they may like." That is what happened when Ross Perot was the last third party contender allowed in. Television ratings for presidential debates reached an all-time high.

Since then the restricting entity has been the so-called bi-partisan Commission on Presidential Debates (CPD). It is essentially a monopoly enterprise owned and operated exclusively by the two dominant political parties for the sole benefit of those two parties and their corporate sponsors, not the American public. The purpose for setting up this front group allows them to control the debate and provide them plausible deniability. Opposing non-party challengers are not even permitted as spectators in the auditorium where the debate was conducted. Ralph Nader found that out in 2000 when after securing a ticket, he was denied entry.

Universal Voter Registration

Some independents are skeptical that this would work. It works fine now in several areas of the country. Many of our systems have honor codes. We know more people will cheat on their taxes than commit a voting felony. Despite the myth of busloads of illegal immigrants voting, the fact is that most illegal immigrants would not show up at places that would put them at risk of detection and deportation.

The method for ensuring accuracy on voting day will be all but guaranteed with the already mandated Real ID legislation that has already been passed by congress and due for implementation by May 2008.

This form of secure national identification (which was based upon the 9-11 Commission recommendations) will ensure those who show up at the proper polling place on Election Day should be able to register and vote on the spot. The address on that ID will not allow them to vote anywhere else. It is that simple.

Universal voter registration would add nearly 50 million more Americans to the voting rolls immediately. It would be one of the most significant civil rights accomplishments since the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We can pre-register 17-year-olds in high schools, others at colleges while registering for classes. Complement that with a "voter's ed" curriculum, just as many schools have driver's ed, and we'll have a whole new generation of citizens empowered to take an interest and get involved in civic affairs. The alternative would be the continued creep toward apathy as evidenced by low voter turnout and higher numbers of uncontested elections.

Universal registration offers the promise of both clean and complete voter rolls. It solves the problem of conservatives worried about fraud and liberals concerned about low turnout. This should be easy in modern times since each state can merge existing data sources, namely census, social security, driver's license and others to generate a statewide voting database.

Universal voter registration also solves the usual surge that occurs when voter registration drives overwhelm registrars offices. Election offices rarely have enough equipment or personnel to handle the uptick in voters, nor enough time to inform new registrants where to vote.

Six states currently use Election Day registration and there have never been incidents of busloads of voters fraudulently voting again and again in different precincts as opponents warned would result.

Fair-minded attempts at expanding voting have been thwarted in partisan politics. Because generalizations (which repeated enough make people believe as true) suggest that minorities, young people and the poor will vote more for Democrats, it has been difficult to build bipartisan consensus for this initiative. As Steven Hill writes, "The partisans don't care about what is right for our country, only how to seal their next victory.

Election Day Holiday

Ross Perot suggested making Election Day a holiday or having it occur on the weekend. Early voting has allowed more time for people to vote, but it will not significantly increase voter turnout until we give people the day off of work to vote.

Other countries that give voters Election Day off have a much higher voter turnout than we do. To protect their positions, it is not surprising that Congress has been stubborn, even though the impetus has existed since the proposal was suggested by a post-2000 election commission co-chaired by former president's Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford..

DC Voting Rights

The second is to give the residents of Washington DC a voting representative in Congress. It is embarrassing that we try to export democracy when we have denied DC their voting rights for over 200 years.

Our developing national Election Reform platform.

As Independents we are not convinced that we can rely on the Big Two parties for correcting the mess they have gotten us in to. Fixing democracy is vital and must be implemented to increase citizen involvement in solving the issues of war, immigration, health care, environment, education, trade, etc.

Here are ten key points of our national Election Reform platform that we are developing with the intention of asking all candidates to pledge their support...

1. Standardized ballot access for federal candidates. Rather than candidates for president having 51 different rules for making the ballot, we make the criteria the same throughout the land. That means those running for Senate and House also have the same criteria in each state.

2. Force states to untie ballot access to past election results. Without fair ballot access in place now, the thresholds to become a recognized third party are too difficult to achieve (by design of the Big Two). Currently only 37 states have at least one recognized third party and that changes based on election results.

3. Allow universal voter registration. Legislation has already been passed that will require government standardized identification cards which should be acceptable to election officials to allow anyone who shows up at the right precinct on Election Day to vote on-the-spot whether registered or not.

4. Extend the number of days for Election Day, or move it to a holiday like Columbus Day in October.

5. Allow third party contenders equal media access time and inclusion in the debates.

6. Institute Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) which allows voters to rank their choices. If no candidate gets a majority of the vote – over 50% - then the lowest number of first place votes is eliminated and the votes are recounted for how many second place votes came in. This continues until a candidate is declared a winner of a majority.

7. Ensure the security of our voting instruments whether it is via a papertrail or some better method. Six years after the Florida debacle and we still do not have secure voting machines – considering the fact that electronic machines are subject to manipulation.

8. Institute a fair and equitable method of public campaign financing. It costs the country more now under the current system that forces candidates to raise exorbitant sums of money from corporate and private donors (read: elitists). The winner is then beholden to the group of financiers that paid for that victory which creates a corrupt system of paybacks and legislation that raids our Treasury – at an enormous cost to the real owners of our country – the people.

9. Direct election of the president. Get rid of the Electoral College.

10. Voting rights in congress for the citizens of the federal District of Columbia.

Possible # 11. Proportional representation (may have to start within the states to prove its worthiness). May not fit due to difficulty in describing and impossible for federal government to enforce.

2008 will provide a different opportunity for independents. Many lack the motivation to vote when presented with limited choices, a tendency that is counted on by campaign strategists knowing that they can only tag so many people directly asking for a vote. The teethgnashing choices of politics-as-usual offered by the Big Two will turn into a motivating factor for independent voters to show up in 2008 if they are presented with a viable alternative. Voters are tired of the acceptance of low voter turnout, and the enjoined attitude by the Big Two that the less that show up the better.

That has most all of the third-party loyalists – from Green to Libertarian – salivating at the chance to see yet another president decided without a majority. In the mind of the third parties, that 40% of independent voters can be offered a viable third choice and decide the election away from the least desirable choices, even if it means those vying for independent votes totally ignores the 60% Big Two party loyalists. Seeing that base split at thirty each, draws up victory – at least on paper.

-FOUR-

That we hear that everywhere we go seeking votes does not bother us. At some point, nobody heard of George W. Bush either. Who would have predicted the aggressive nature that the marginally effectively businessman would bring to his job at the White House?

Could you image if we had a leader who actually knew how to run a successful international enterprise? We contend that the United States is in far worse condition than when "W" took over. But we realize it is not all his fault. The political dynamics that allow money to rule our world have been going on long before his grandfather Prescott Bush was in the US Senate.

We want to conduct a dialogue with you – the real owners of this country. We offer this book to be the opening of our discussion. What follows is an introduction to our candidate for president in 2008: Daniel Imperato of West Palm Beach, Florida.

You will hear Mr. Imperato's philosophy on how the diverse social fabric of our country can enrich us rather than split us apart. We will discuss how inept our Administration in collusion with congress has been over the last 20 years, and which countries are putting the squeeze on America. Plus we will make proposals to Revive America and make it the best it has ever been.

We, referring to the team that Daniel Imperato has assembled to begin his historic mission, understand what the issues are and have suggested our answers to the twenty most pressing questions in the appendix. Realistic solutions to our problems will take citizens working hand-in-hand with our government officials to revive America. Therefore the proposals we offer are a combination of logical solutions and thought-starters.

As we tour the country presenting our ideas, we want to hear from you, the citizens of our great country. You will be our source of energy and wisdom to set America back on the right track.

We would not expect you to vote for us in 2008 if you do not know what we stand for. That is why we have prepared this text to inform, excite and empower you to join us. Declare your independence from the political operatives who reside in the shadows of our government. Some have suggested we should just vote for lobbyists directly since they are the ones that really run the government. Our forefathers did envision this danger by spelling out what the federal government was authorized to do. They set limits on government. They did not set limits on the citizens.

We present our independent campaign to return the American political system to the people. We only ask that you keep an open mind to some of our suggestions, ideas, and formulas that are intended to revive America. Give us your feedback, because that is how our republic is supposed to work. We are applying for the job of representing you. Someone has to revive America. It will not happen if we sit on our duffs and lament about all the ills of the world. It takes action. Silence is complicity. We will not be silent. Daniel Imperato will embark on an historic run for the White House as an outsider with a mission.

It starts with a vision from a our leader Daniel Imperato, an international businessman respected for his ability to succeed in challenging circumstances, his adept delegation skills and his negotiating expertise. It is complimented by the capable team he has assembled to form Independent America – a movement dedicated to empowering American citizens to independently get involved in the critical government decisions that affect their everyday lives.

In the past twelve months Imperato has been laying the groundwork for this new revival. Traversing the country and the globe, listening to voters as well as respected world leaders, he has come to understand the unique challenges that face America. Daniel is much better equipped than any elected official who loses touch with the grassroots, and becomes blinded by the perpetual posturing for reelection.

The historical early start by Imperato over 30 months in advance of the 2008 election will restore the voice of the people and reinvigorate independent-minded citizens to commit to voting for something new, rather than against something. In his words, "Giving the White House back to the American people is the only way we can restore the independence that our veterans have secured for our citizens."

The historical vehicle for this drive to victory for Independents is the Imperato campaign for the White House. We welcome new members to our team now. Plus we are taking applications to select our team to head the government agencies. Our cabinet will consist of the most qualified individuals – not those whom are owed a political favor.

We have a wish for America. One of peace and prosperity. That every family in America can realize the promise of freedom and take advantage of the gift of opportunity. We need a vibrant economy buoyed by an educated society; renewed focus on the family; a respect for the diversity of faith; unconditional support for our troops – which includes restoring the faith that serving in the military will not result in losing lives for securing natural resources, but for true national security concerns.

Consider this – though we will not be quoting many polls in this text – polling data indicates that there are a growing number of people that do not believe that the two major parties are capable of solving our nation's challenges. This tells us that there is not only a basis for a credible independent ticket, but also a political need.

As independent candidates, we owe no favors to special interest groups of any kind. The American people have our special interest. Our campaign will not waste time trashing the two major parties. No doubt they will continue to engage in stone throwing and heaping verbal assaults on each, which further drags our country down both here, and in the eyes of the world.

The Imperato 2008 campaign will serve notice that there is political competition. No two parties should corner the American political market any longer. From this point forward, Americans will gain a renewed respect for third party efforts and demand that we be treated as equals in the debates, in ballot access requirements, and in campaign financing rules. If they refuse to clean up their act, they will do so at their own peril.

The rising forces in American politics are independent and self-identified moderate voters. They represent the wave of the future. We aspire to give voice to this growing majority, and are designing a campaign that will be unique in the annals of this nation's electoral experience. By remaining true to our principles, we will earn enthusiastic support for our campaign and make Imperato 2008 a force to be reckoned with.

I am a man of faith. I have been blessed with the strength to lead. Just because we have been conditioned to vote for one of two parties, does not mean that is what God intended.

When I become president of the United States of America, I will Revive America and I will bring back the faith that the forefathers of this country implemented. With His power we will overcome inappropriate language being used against His Word by people who just need to be educated. I hope the people of the United States of America give me that chance and I stand ready willing and able to defend His word, protect the American people, and to revive faith in our country.

The fact that my candidacy is a long-shot should not influence your decision to vote for me. Remember the words of the angel of God to Zechariah, whose prophesy of a rebuilt temple seemed nearly as absurd in his day as a third party president does in ours.

The Case for Faith Based Legislative Initiative

I understand the balance needed in upholding the constitution to preserve our republic.

I ask you to pray with me that God will channel support and endorsements from Christian leaders to make my quest as leader of the free world a reality. I will do my best as President of the United States of America to govern in accordance with good Christian morals and principles.

American Political System: The Case for New Blood

The question we should ask ourselves as a consumer is: shouldn't we be smarter shoppers? Do we really buy Bud Light because of the commercials? Well some young men do as marketing studies show. But when it comes to choosing the leaders of the free world – and the staff they will appoint from the cabinet to the Supreme Court – shouldn't we be far more careful about that purchase? There is a reason they spend millions on elections. It is because they think we can be bought. It is time to prove them wrong. That is why Daniel Imperato provides a fresh chance to evaluate the people making decisions for you.

Due to the splits within both parties, we feel that going independent is the most appropriate way to promote our progressive conservative agenda. We will outline a centrist belief that American politics should represent the broad middle of the American people's ideals and issues, independent from either major party.

Thus, we invite you to bring your diverse ideas and unlimited energy to the formation of "Independent America".

America's affinity towards a third party will have a vehicle now via the Imperato independent ticket. Our platform for 2008 will be titled: 'Revive America'. The opportunity has presented itself for a third strong party to present a challenge to the two established parties.

Due to America's political divide, it is obvious that going independent is the answer to bring America back together. Therefore we intend to create and establish the strongest independent party that's ever bid for the White House. I respect the old school method of doing business on the strength of your word.

I was brought up as a proper Bostonian, walked with and supported the Kennedy's as a Democrat, and then grew up and supported the Bushes as a Republican. But my allegiance is to America, its people, and what's best for the USA. I have made it my word that this campaign will be the most serious and sophisticated campaign that our team can deliver to the best of our human abilities. I stake my claim as a winner and a leader and a die hard old school man of principle, integrity, and faith that never quits, never gives up, and won't stop until I Revive America.

Americans dissatisfied with the leadership of both parties can protest by staying at home on Election Day, as many do, or voting for "the lesser of two evils." Given a choice, most Americans want to vote for something, not against something. Our campaign intends to give Americans a unique opportunity to become engaged in the national discussion and to certify my credentials as an enlightened and forward thinking citizen.

Our platform does not reside on the far left or right flank of the mainstream. As a centrist independent candidate, our Revive America platform is representative of the majority of the electorate that occupies the center of the political spectrum.

Slim chance of winning you say? It is likely that the 2008 presidential contest will be decided by a few electoral college votes, and only a couple of states as happened in the last two elections.

Imperato on the Budget

We lay out a proposed budget that will get war spending under control and reverse our climb toward the newly raised $8.96 trillion debt ceiling by finally ending the drain of wasteful spending.

Domestic budget issues must receive the urgency it demands. It cost our country, our citizens, and our economy, $250 billion to line up voters in Iraq. And it may cost our taxpayers another $100 billion or so, to keep them doing so. Our response to terrorism should become a unified global coalition, rather than a burden resting solely on the shoulders of American taxpayers. An Imperato Administration will collaborate with our allies to keep global Special Forces at the ready to fight terrorism.

Once elected, we will negotiate for repayment of at least $200 billion worth of war expenses as one of the first major initiatives. In our first 100 days we will strike an agreement with Iraq to acquire repayment in oil. For our part we will protect their oil resources and be responsive to the environmental impact in the region. This will start a long-term partnership that will help forge mutual respect among our nation-state partners, and to prove that we can be a fair world leader.

However this initiative will require accountability. With one of every four tax dollars being diverted to the Pentagon, we need a serious attempt at tracking these funds. That is why we will insist on installing an auditable accounting system. That is the only way to get a handle on the waste, fraud and abuse that we know exists, especially in the war contracts.

We make an appeal to voters to consider voting independent in 2008. As a legitimate independent voice in America, we ask that the voters demand accountability. Force your President and Congress to come up with a plan for the United States to repay our debt,

to pull our troops back to American soil, to close bases in peaceful areas like Germany and Japan, and get serious about reviving America. If not, then by November 2008, vote them all out!

No more slight-of-hand budgets either. The current congressional budget wrangling is a one-party affair. The reigning party spends big, raises taxes. Their so-called adversary spends big, raises deficits. Rather than take action to avoid reaching the debt ceiling, congress is more than willing to go along with the Administration's questionable practice of deferring requests for war dollars until after the election. This must stop! The only way to stop it is to create a real opposition. That is what the Imperato ticket offers.

Developing policies that produce meaningful reductions in the deficit requires political will and bipartisan compromise. We have to lead by example. The first act we will institute to downsize government is reduce the presidential entourage. That means the millions spent on political galas, fancy dinners, and Air Force One and Two travel must be reduced.

-CONCLUSION-

So we are left with these questions as the W. Bush legacy. A war effort that will cost $400 billion, only onefifth of which will be recovered by all that precious oil. A deficit in not only our federal budget, but our social conditions as a result. We intend to rebuild a country we bombed, but the dual destruction of our own inner cities, manufacturing belts and farms do not rate as a priority. Unless you are outside of Washington it is hard to see the results of the jobless recovery. We know unemployment numbers do not tell the accurate story. So many are either dropped off the government roles or simply not counted. Countless others have started companies or worked parttime after getting laid off, causing our debt to increase faster than our income. Sure there is work for some – those who live in the regions being blessed with homeland security contracts. The reality is that many workers are falling ever closer to the poverty status with a living wage still a distant dream.

This is a grim picture to paint, but it is just grim enough to see that Neo-Con corporate raiders who currently "own" and run this government could be turned out next year. Unless of course, they have already programmed all the new electronic voting machines to guarantee victory.

Rather than successfully tighten up the intelligence information, we have added new bureaucratic layers. We have given the authority for the justice department to grab more information, when they did not have the manpower to decipher what was already available that pointed to the impending plans for destruction.

A curious thing about the method of carrying all these polarizing events out is just how isolated decision makers will be once they need coalition partners in passing legislation. To quote E.J. Dione Jr., "If Bush genuinely wants to create a new foreign policy, ...does he not need to build bipartisan bridges?" By failing to diplomatically involve the global community and potential allies this President has left himself no political net to fall into if something went wrong.

The debate about homeland security turned into a bonanza for special interests who will be expected to return the favor during the next round of presidential fundraising. Shameless provisions will keep cropping up like one that protected Eli Lilly from lawsuits pertaining to a mercurybased vaccine additive that plaintiffs claimed caused their children's autism.

It is not liberal fantasy to contend that Bush has done all he can to benefit the economic elite and undercut government commitments to the least fortunate. By saddling our children with the biggest deficit ever and cutting taxes at the same time, columnist Donald Lambro notes, "he has initiated a stealth initiative to curb future spending". By pushing these fiscal problems so far down the road he has insulated himself from the political costs of these choices.

An odd irony of the Bush isolation if that he has not really asked the American public to sacrifice anything for this time of war. His rally to war was without sacrifice, which calls into question our true patriotism. What price or burden or hardship will America pay for years to come for her role in reordering the world?

Here is where patriotic liberals can help. Rather than be accused of being unpatriotic for opposing the war – Lincoln opposed the Mexican War as a Congressman in the 1840s – liberals can be a contrast for radical individualism.

We can place a renewed emphasis on teaching government and history in the schools. We can highlight both rights and responsibilities, open up service opportunities for youth, and encourage short-term enlistment in the military.

We can be more open in our security concerns and engage the public in fighting a war on terrorism. As Senator Warren Rudman states, “secrecy is a haven for covering up mistakes.”

U.S. foreign policy should be informed by the desirability of promoting democratic practices, by example, and not by imposing it militarily on countries that have insufficient middle-classes and poorly educated majorities. Our overall foreign policy strategy should be to connect more disadvantaged countries into the emerging global economic network, that help change the internal conditions of nation's to grow into democracies.

Foreign Aid should be targeted towards education, healthcare, and programs that support self-reliance and growth for developing countries.

International Relations

The United States should not withdraw from or withhold funding from the United Nations. Instead the U.S. should push the United Nations toward systemic reform of its financial structure with controls and accountability. The U.S. along with other nations should also negotiate to restructure and professionalize the U.N.' peacekeeping forces and humanitarian aid missions. Short of these reforms, the United Nations will experience steady decline. An intractable culture has evolved in sixty years of being a marginal world bureaucracy. Any attempts at changing the objectives from that of peacekeeper to peacemaker is impossible to achieve.

The United Nations is still a valuable international organization once we determine what it can be good at. If we improve the reliability of the humanitarian delivery of services and root out the corruption that inevitably creeps into an institution when large sums of money change hands, then we can press for additional roles for the United Nations. In the meantime we are left to hope for systemic reforms in the U.N's management, financial and peacekeeping operations.

Other international alliances can be established. For instance, NATO should expand to other and continue to develop an International Security Assistance Force (ISAF).

The United States must assume a leadership role in the international community to show a serious commitment to end the genocide in Sudan and work for a more permanent political solutions to these types of conflicts. Additionally, the US should open a dialogue with Cuba to expand trade relations. Current and previous administrations have neglected a key strategic country because of an ideological dispute that is no different that that of China. It's time that regional security around the United States incorporates the Caribbean islands and Cuba. Now is the time to embrace Cuba and help them become democratic.

Our administration will reach out to Fidel Castro, or whoever is running Cuba in 2008. There is a better chance that we can affect change and extend an invitation for Cuba to rejoin the rest of the world in seeking prosperity for there citizens. Just as democracy is intended to help our relations in the Middle East, certainly we should be able to affect positive change in our neighbor to the south, Cuba.

We believe a breakthrough is possible, but this administration refuses to budge. It is long overdue for us to establish stronger relations with our island neighbor. Whatever our objectives where with Fidel Castro, his people, and his government over that last 40 years, it is time we liberate that stale thinking. We the people of the United States America have a duty and obligation to support democracy in the free world and that includes the isolated country closet to us: Cuba.

The Caribbean and Cuba have become investment hubs for foreign nations around the globe, which could very well jeopardize our security. Because if the United States doesn't take action with Cuba, someone else will.

The U.S. should become more involved and seek to play a leadership role in the G-8 Millennium Project commitment to eradicate extreme poverty in Africa.

The United States should continue to push for integrating Central European countries into NATO, and expanding NATO's role as a peacekeeping force.

Share UN/global commitments w/ allies

New doctrines have justified pre-emptive strikes and wiped away international codes of conduct that relied on diplomacy and strategic alliances. Our analysis of how to become independent of the need for war is a change the world needs.

Afterword

In the years to come, scholars will likely look back on the 2004 election as a seminal moment in 21st Century American history; not because it signaled the genesis of an American renaissance, or the recovery of our national sense of purpose, or the defeat of a global menace. Rather this election is an exclamation point that marks the transition to a period of profound international upheaval and deepening domestic turmoil.

From the war torn streets of Baghdad to the unfinished Russian revolution: from the turbulent battles on the West Bank to the veiled nuclear intrigue unfolding in North Korea, the flashpoints of global crisis are smoldering. And while "The War on Terrorism" and the Bush doctrine of pre-emption masquerades as the sum total of U.S. foreign policy, it is but a matter of time before the looming conflict with China invites a maximum crisis that could usher in a new world order.

On the home front, the economy is increasingly saddled with deficits, foreign and national debt, not to mention the slide of the dollar in international markets. In the aftermath of September 11, Bush's tax cuts have failed to jump start a sluggish economy and soft job market. Although the economy is not likely to lapse into a serious recession it could stagnate for extended periods of slow growth, thus giving rise to simmering disenchantment. Under these conditions, the forty year window of relative domestic tranquility may give way to increased polarization as the partisan divide deteriorates into an ever more balkanized society.

The real vulnerability of the economy resides in the fact that it is so heavily interwoven into the global marketplace. Any severe international shock like that of 9/11, (for example the collapse of the Saudi royal family) could throw the economy in chaos overnight.

Our campaign is committed to a "new politics of truth." That means being honest with the public and treating them like adults. It means explaining to them the real situation at hand regarding the state of the US economy and our foreign policy, and not being afraid to tackle the big controversial questions like Immigration, Social Security, and the deficit. It also means that our positions will be grounded in the principles and morals that reflect our heritage, our constitution and the frontier spirit of optimism that has marked our country since its beginning.

There is a real feeling that our nation is adrift, and that the two parties are more interested in maintaining their privileged status than solving the problems people sent them to Washington to address. Only by waging an open and candid campaign in which we both listen to and respect the views of our citizens, can we revive Revive America. As this campaign unfolds over the coming weeks and months, I believe it will become clear to the American public that some of the solutions that we advance have already taken root, and with interest and participation from the American electorate we can return America to the people.

If this text was useful, great. We appreciate your interest. Feel free to use what we put in here, as well as what we post on our web site: IndependentAmerica.org.

We hope you found this educational and inspiring. We tried to stay positive, and induce you to engage in some of the most positive action you could do for the good of our country.

We are open to feedback. We want to hear from you because that is what the people's campaign is all about:

YOU.

Please tell us, if this book doesn't move you to action, what will?

About Daniel Imperato

Daniel Imperato who grew up the hard way in the Boston streets. His journey is full of inspiration and wisdom learned by being willing to roll up his sleeves and get the job done the old fashioned way. His family taught him the value of a buck which led to the tight vested policies and spending habits that he incorporates in his business.

He is the type of American, that can truly represent the people having been there in blue-collar, middle America. He can share the workers concerns because he has always been a worker, not a politician whose tools are just words.