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Abstract

This paper presents the first result of ongoing research on American conservative movement in the United States. It investigates the relationship between social change and political transformation while the American Tea Party represents the culmination of the development of the American conservatism movement under Obama’s administration. This research is based on ideas of aristocratic conservatism and liberal classic tradition from two prominent figures from history: Alexis de Tocqueville and Thomas Jefferson. From the founding to the 1870s, American conservatism was a nuance of traditional conservatism with a bit of modern conservatism, especially in transitional conservatism around the 1870s to the 1920s. The transitional conservatism was greatly influenced by the Industrial Revolution and the Gilded era (1870s-1901s). These eras characterized a new economic order that old conservatives became factory owners and old liberals became factory workers. Furthermore conservatives and liberals changed their minds about government involvement in the economy. The Classic liberalism (1800s) of the right-winger with traditions of economic freedom from government involvement changed into the modern liberal (1890s-present) and tended to government involvement in economics on the left of the political spectrum. Meanwhile the traditional conservatism (the beginning of the 1800s) on the left, shifted to the right of the modern conservatism (1930s-present), which wanted limited government in the economy, but was still interested in government being used to enforce certain traditional (Christian) values. More recently, the other characteristics of modern conservatism are as follows: still Christian-but more likely to be Catholic, no government regulation, Laissez-Faire in terms of the economy, government cannot be trusted, oppose abortion and the legalization of same-sex marriage, engage and promote U.S. economic interests in foreign policy, and against the women’s movement. The following years after the conservative political philosophy: New Conservatives (1960s), New Right (1970s), and Neo-conservatism (1960s, 1980s, 2002s), conservative activists started what is now commonly known as the Tea Party movement (2009s) reacting against the Democratic presidency of Obama since 2009. In short, American conservatism has never been the same but maintains a strong tradition. But, inconsistency is the real story and American conservatism will continue to evolve. Hence, conservatism involves a Theory of Change. Conservatives emphasis touches in various ways the idea of what is changing, how it is changing, and what out to change from one period to another. This research also uses historical and literary approach as well as an interdisciplinary approach to American Studies.
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INTRODUCTION

In political terms, ‘radical,’ ‘liberal,’ ‘moderate,’ ‘conservative,’ and ‘reactionary’ are among the most commonly used. Each has a specific meaning in political science. There are some prominent values in shaping those definitions. Commonly, change and value are two important issues to illuminate the explanation of those political terms. Furthermore, political
change is fundamental to any society. By learning the attitude of each group towards change, we will be taking a large step towards understanding what the above terms mean. It is noted that change is only one of the concepts with which we must deal in defining these terms, and the definition will be complete only when we have also considered the basic values of the groups.

Some prominent events in American history gave deeply impacted the American conservatism movement. Therefore the term of ‘conservative’ has had different implications in varying historical contexts. It denotes a preference for institutions and practices that have evolved historically and that are thus manifestations of continuity and stability. Conservatives are aim to preserve traditional political arrangements, but only those that are conducive to what they consider good lives.

The concept of maintaining traditional values and customs inherited from generation to generation, rather than creating and adopting new values is the root of conservatism. This can be inferred from the etymology of ‘conservative,’ which comes from the Latin Conservere, meaning to maintain and keep. Anthony Giddens (2002:42) stated that “tradition is the pulse of conservatism.” Moreover Robert W. Cox noted that “the spread of conservatism has strong roots in a society that values the rules and customs.” (23)

Since tradition is a human thing, it may reflect human vices as well as virtues. The issue, therefore, is not whether tradition is perfect but its appropriate place in human life. Tradition will be benefit Americans by linking their thoughts and actions to a steady and comprehensive system in which they can correct each other. It will secure and refine their acquisitions while hampering antisocial impulses. To the extent they consistently aim at what is evil, then tradition can not help them much, but neither can anything else short of Divine intervention. Conservatives do not reject thought but are skeptical of its autonomy. They believe that tradition guides and corrects thought, and so brings it closer to truth, which has no special connection with any private view.

The traditional conservatism was respect for traditions and customs, and reactionary to change. American traditions derived from Puritan, not aristocracy, England. The tradition was informed by the experience of an essentially homogenous people governing themselves under God’s ultimate authority by their deliberate sense. Among those traditions were strong work ethic, small government, and Christian-Protestant. Meanwhile, custom was used as a primary check against wholesale change of experiences. The birth of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century was a threat for the fate of Christendom and tended to reform society by using reason for spawning materialism, secularism, and totalitarianism of the modern era. Even the French
Revolution (1789-1799) with old ideas about tradition and hierarchy of monarchy, aristocracy, and religious authority was abruptly overthrown by new Enlightenment principles of equality, citizenship, and inalienable rights. In response to the changes, traditionalists emphasized other virtues: close family, morality, and social order. In government issues, they were against women’s movement, isolationism in foreign policy, and government support for the less advantaged.

In the eighteenth century, the Western world faced the phenomenon of the Enlightenment. It was a cultural movement of intellectuals which tended to reform society using reason, challenged ideas grounded in tradition and faith, and advanced knowledge through the scientific method, first in Europe and later in the American colonies. It was sparked by philosophers John Locke (1632-1704), Voltaire (1694-1778), Montesquieu (1689-1755), and Rousseau (1712-1778). It influenced American founding fathers including Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, both of whom played a major role in the American Revolution, and the writing of the American Declaration of Independence and the United States Bill of Rights.

The American Revolution (1775-1783) was waged more to preserve an existing way of life than to create something new. As Edward S. Greenberg and Benjamin I. Page (2012:28) states “By and large, American colonists in the 1760s and 1770s were proud to be affiliated with Great Britain and satisfied with the general prosperity that came with participation in the British Commercial empire. When the revolution broke out, the colonists at first wanted only to preserve their traditional right as British subjects. These traditional rights of life, liberty, and property seemed to be threatened by British policies on trade and taxation.”

The “unalienable” rights of life, liberty, and property were devoted to the principles of Republicanism from Thomas Jefferson. It stressed on “liberty” and “unalienable” rights as a central value, made the people as a whole sovereign, rejected aristocracy and inherited political power. Thomas Jefferson was also an eminent representative of the classic liberalism tradition. Classic liberalism was a political ideology, advocated civil liberties and political freedom with limited government and generally opposed government interference with economic freedom. In the 1790s Jeffersonian democracy arose in opposition to the elitism of the Federalist Party, Jeffersonians opposed a strong federal government and interventionist judiciary—themes later picked up by conservatives.

In the absence of a crown and nobility, conservatism has centered on the Constitution and the institution of private property. Meanwhile, Europe on conservatism was greatly influenced by
monarchic nuance and institution. Hence, American conservatism is different from European conservatism. American conservatism is not the throne and altar conservatism that once defined European conservatism, and that is still characteristic of many Europeans on the right of the political spectrum. American Revolution were true reactionaries. They sought to preserve the ancient regime and the prerogatives of Church against the arrival of modern science, modern capitalism, and modern democracy.

According to Russell Kirk (1985) “American Revolution was no revolution at all. It was fought by the colonists to protect the rights of Englishmen against the encroachment of a centralizing and usurping Parliament” (295). Early America was not a state of nature but a settlement of Englishmen. There is little evidence that American founding generation even read Locke’s political works, and certain “liberal” drafts of the Bill of Rights were consciously rejected in favor of historical English rights.

In relation to European conservatism, the French Revolution and the ideas of Edmund Burke, a British statesman, became cornerstones for understanding early conservatism. For Burke, society represented a permanent contract. As a conservative, Burke feared rapid change, especially revolution, which threatened to undermine the permanent contract of society. “Change was necessary, of course, but its pace needed to be gradual and take into account the unwritten imperative that liked past, present, and future generations into an organic whole.” (Muccigrosso 2001:6)

In his classic Democracy in America, Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859) tried to explain to Europeans the novelty of American civilization. For Tocqueville, the difference between America and Europe came down to social equality. Many Europeans suspected that a democratic country like the United States would endure frequent political revolution and social turmoil, but Tocqueville pointed out that American society was quite conservative and resistant to radical change. He wrote, “Not only are the men of democracies not naturally desirous of revolutions, but they are afraid of them. All revolutions more or less threaten the tenure of property: but most of those who live in democratic countries are possessed of property; not only are they possessed of property, but they live in the condition where men set the greatest store upon their property” (264).

America had a feudal present. It was reflected on its countrymen. They have a natural contempt for the multitude and form a “corps” that is opposed to “the revolutionary spirit.” They prize “order” and “authorithy”; they have “a liking and respect for what is ancient” and they
make a ritual of the following “the legal decisions of their fathers” (Wolin 2001:233). The crucial element of Tocqueville’s feudalism was aristocracy. American aristocracy was represented as the instinctive opposition to any from of massed power, monarchical or popular. As Tocqueville stood between the aristocratic past and the democratic future, so he saw infusing aristocratic elements from the old regime into modern politics. In his great work, “Democracy in America” was the first publication in 1835 and the second in 1840. Tocqueville focused on an analysis of why Republican representative democracy succeeded in the United States while falling in so many other places. He pointed out that American society was quite conservative and resistant to radical change.

MODERN CONSERVATIVE

The Gilded Age (1870s-1901s) was a relevant era connected with the beginning of modern conservatism. This era was the period of American history stretching from the end of Reconstruction to the presidency of William McKinley (1897-1901). It was a time of change and contrast as America rapidly transformed from a provincial and largely agrarian country to a modern nation with a continental reach and awe-inspiring potential.

After 1865 Americans moved westward in large numbers, opening new lands and building permanent settlements west of the Mississippi River, eventually adding over 430 million more acres to the United States. The modern American industrial society was also born within these years. Early reliance on the heavy industries permitted a vast manufacturing base to grow. Industrialization brought enormous and unrivalled wealth for some, but also created social problems and dangerous working conditions for those who toiled in these new industrial environments. Per capita income steadily rose, as did production to the point that by the 1890s, America had become an industrial giant pressing to overtake the British Empire as the leading economic power in the world. This rapid growth demanded workers, who came by the millions, principally from Europe, to fill the labor demands of an emerging economy. (Carlisle 2009:1-2)

There are some significant values, which were popularized in the Gilded Age, still effects Americans. Some of them include the Self-Made Man, Darwinian Theory, and Laissez-Faire. The “Self-Made Man” embodied by the drive to pursue the American dream. It is closed to American Individualism. Recently, the term individualism has been associated with some issues considered as representative American cultural traits. They include individual freedom, self-reliance, equality of opportunity, competition, material wealth, and hard work.
Moreover, Conservatives need Charles Darwin’s theory of “Natural Selection” through a process of competition along with “survival of the fittest,” as an alternative description of natural selection. In Herbert Spencer’s terms, competition resulted in ensuring the progress of the human race. As Greenwood (2003:21) stated from Spencer’s Principles of Biology “This survival of the fittest, which I have here sought to express in mechanical terms, is that which Mr. Darwin has called 'natural selection', or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life.”

However, by the turn of the century, many middle-class Americans saw dangers in the road ahead. They felt America was a great nation, but it still had flaws, gaps in opportunity, and poverty. They saw the great industrial giants wielding too much economic power over the country, as trusts limited competition. They saw political corruption at every turn, from their local city governments to the halls of Congress. Soon, various reform interests found one another and launched a political movement that historians have since labeled “progressivism.” (McNeese 2010:90).

During much of the nineteenth century, liberalism and conservatism stood as polar opposites, bifurcating the political spectrum. Then, the growing appeal of socialism to the Left and of authoritarian ideologies to the Right caused both relations to fracture. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, many liberals moved leftward into the halfway house. L.T. Hobhouse called "social liberalism," while many conservatives moved further to the Right, embracing integral nationalism, imperialism, and anarchy. It was familiarly named the transition of conservatism (1870s-1920s) between the left and the right. More recently, disillusionment with socialism among liberals and with right-wing extremism among conservatives has led to a rapprochement (Lakoff 1998:435).

Franklin Roosevelt, through the accidents and opportunities created by the Great Depression, helped to create one of the most powerful and seemingly impregnable voting blocks in American history. Angry over the growing concentration of power in the federal government, a process that began with the development of modern liberalism during the Depression years and accelerated with American involvement in World War II, classical liberal scholars and journalists resurrected the domain ideas of limited government and individual rights. At the same time the horrors of World War II helped engender a conservative viewpoint that saw little to admire about a civilization, The Nazi extermination of the Jews and the barbarity of war sparked a traditionalist conservative rebirth critical of the modern age.
Fundamental social and cultural changes in the United States since World War II led to the disintegration of New Deal liberalism and the rise of new conservative currents. Neoconservatism and New Right conservatism no longer reflect traditional political cleavages between social classes and socioeconomic interests but focus on values and the "new social issues" of the 1970's-80's. It denotes the consequences of these ideological changes on the US party system. At the level of party elites and campaign politics, new liberals and neoconservatives, most notably the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, have struggled to move the Democratic Party either further left or back to the center, while the New Right has increasingly pushed the Republican Party to the right. At the public level, traditional Democratic constituents like the white South have begun to realign with the Republican Party, and Republican conservatism has gained strength on the basis of the new social issues. “This is demonstrated on the basis of public opinion data from the General Social Surveys (1972-84) and the second wave of the Political Action Survey (1981). As a result of these developments the United States party system is becoming more ideological and polarized". (Michael 1991:377).

Beginning in the sixties, several factions such as the anti war movement, the feminist movement, and the gay rights movement, attacked that moral consensus as narrow and oppressive. They fought for a new ethic that would be based not on external authority but on the sovereignty of the inner self. To the American founders’ list of freedoms, Rousseau added a new one: inner freedom, or moral freedom. Rousseau argues that we make major decisions—whom to love, what to become, what to believe—not by obeying our parents, teachers, or preachers. Rather, we make such decisions to the voice of nature. This is the idea of being “true to yourself.” It is the new liberal morality (D’Souza 2002:4).

In foreign policy, conservatives theorized the exhaustion of the Soviet Union and looked ahead to new geopolitical challenges. In line with the changing era, at the beginning of the twenty-first century American conservatives had a dream to continue ‘Pax-Americana’ where the power over the world had been dominated by one superpower. Therefore some conservatives wanted a vast defense establishment able to nullify all threats, to take on opponents anywhere in the world, and to spread the gospel of democratic capitalism worldwide. In American domestic policy, some conservatives favored a drastic reduction of the federal government.

Neo-conservatives, or neocons, rose to prominence under President George W. Bush. They believe that the United States has a moral and practical responsibility to intervene in international matters because America is the sole great power capable of stabilizing foreign
affairs. They feel we have a moral imperative to spread democracy, and they advocate a more aggressive foreign policy than do paleo-conservatives. “Compared to realists, neocons are more ideological, willing to fight even when immediate national interests aren’t at stake” (Conrad 2008:62).

During 2009, as the newly elected administration of President Obama pushed the Democrats’ agenda for economic recovery and health care reform, a right-wing movement that was “mad as hell” emerged in passionate opposition to expanded government. It came to call itself the Tea Party. By the end of 2010, particularly in the midterm elections of that year, the Tea Party had made a powerful impact on both the Democratic and Republican parties. “Tea Party voters helped create the new Republican majority in the House of Representatives and during 2011 quickly exerted influence on the Republican legislative agenda. The Tea Party, acting largely as a pressure group, has profoundly shaped the content of national political debate and has had a transforming impact on the Republican Party” (Formisano 2012:6).

In the twenty-first century, modern conservative emphasizes some virtues: no government regulation, still Christian-but still more likely to be Catholic, laissez faire in terms of the economy, against women’s movement, in sense of traditional values (anti-abortion, no gay marriage, and no separation of church and state), engage and promote the United States economic interests in foreign policy, and government can not be trusted.

Recently, in America, the political spectrum is dominated by two major political parties. They are the Democratic and Republican Parties. The Democratic Party tends to attract liberals, while the Republican party (also called the GOP, for “Grand Old Party”) appeals to conservatives. However, liberals and conservatives will take the position of “wait and see” depended on some crucial issues offered by those political parties. As stated by Samuel Huntington, the American conservatism movement is situational and conditional. In relation to this case, some prominent factors including politics, economy, social, and culture will be a major by which to analyze the movement. From a holistic view, those aspects are inter-related in response any case.

THE TEA PARTY

In December 1773, some fifty to sixty men of the town of Boston, supported by virtually the entire community and by many people from surrounding towns, took an action that in the space of about three hours changed the course of American history. John J. Coleman et al (2012)
states “It was a group of colonist, calling themselves the Sons of Liberty, gathered to protest the Tea Act and other moves by the British government” (69). Americans were protesting their lack of representation in Parliament and challenged not only Britain’s levying of taxes but also Parliament’s broader assertions of sovereignty. They raided trade ships in the Boston Harbor, throwing imported tea overboard. This incident has taken on the status of an iconic event in American history; an example of when patriots banded together to battle against an oppressive government. The cycle of action and reaction that followed the “Boston Tea Party” led to the Declaration of Independence and the creation of the United States.

Approximately 236 years later, it was political tea time yet again. The Tea Party movement that emerged in 2009 is the latest in a long line of protests that use Boston Tea Party imagery to link back to this iconic event. On February 19, 2009, after much conservative frustration with Obama’s stimulus package, CNBC’s Rick Santelli attacked Obama’s plan as “promoting bad behavior” (5). He joked that he was trying to plan a “Chicago Tea Party” (34) in protest (O’hara 2010; Street and Dimaggio 2011; Klein and Barret 2009; Patten 2009; Reynolds 2009; Whittell 2009). Thus, the New Tea Party Movement was born. The video of Santelli went viral on YouTube receiving more than a million downloads within a week of the original broadcast (Pethokoukis 2009; Viral Video Chart, 2009). Soon thereafter tea party protests started being held in cities throughout the country drawing thousands.

The Tea Party movement, an acronym for “Taxed Enough Already,” is a “grassroots movement primarily consisting of individuals who identifying themselves as tax and spend conservatives regardless of their party affiliation,” as stated by O’hara (2010: xxvi) and Street and Dimaggio (2011: 5), and Klein and Barret (2009). The Tea Party calls for limited government, debt reduction, no higher taxes, and no new spending. It reveres the Constitution, interpreting it as limiting the powers of the federal government, and argues that Congress has far exceeded its rightful boundaries. The reasons for protesting have gone beyond just the stimulus package. For instance, the tea partiers also argue against Obama’s health care package and big government in general (Formisano 2012: 1).

The Tea Party movement is many different things to many different people. The name itself is not a traditional political party. It is also not a prototypical political protest movement. The movement does not have a clear leader, no central headquarters, or even a unifying political platform. Put simply, the Tea Party movement is a decentralized community of citizens upset with the status quo. From the beginning, the Tea Party sparked no end of debates.
Traditional print media, talk radio, network, cable television, and copious blogs opined endlessly about the Tea Party.

The Tea Party Movement is the evolution of social networking, which first began with Howard Dean in 2004, then Barack Obama in 2008, and again in 2009. Twitter has played a critical role in the communications and organization of the movement (Greenley 2009). Self-proclaimed Tea Party members commonly declare that the group does not have a particular leader and have even turned down opportunities to have politicians speak at events. Rather the movement is led by various online groups and a network of individuals across the country communicating, sharing information, and organizing via social networking platforms (Greenley 2009; Reynolds 2009). According to David All, a leading new media political strategist, “They have [conservatives and liberals] seen the potential of read-write web as opposed to the top down communication model, and they’re trying to harness it in service of their ideologies” (Stirland 2007).

In the aftermath of a potentially demoralizing 2008 electoral defeat, when the Republican Party seemed widely discredited, the emergence of the Tea Party provided conservative activists with a new identity funded by Republican business elites (e.g. the superpopulent, archreactionary capitalists and polluters Charles and David Koch, and Richard Armey as director of reactionary advocacy group FreedomWorks), and reinforced by a network of conservative media sources like FOX news (Street and Dimaggio 2011:viii) . The emergence of the Tea Party Movement after the election of President Barack Obama is the result of increasing anxieties, fears, and anger in a predominantly White middle class and working class constituency. Starting as a project of elite conservative strategists, the Tea Party movement quickly developed an actual mass base, and turned into the type of right-wing populist movement seen previously throughout US history.

Riding a wave of conservative dissent following 2009’s American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the Tea Party exploded onto the political scene and helped to the Republicans to score 680 legislative seats (Coughlin 2011:3). By the end of 2010, particularly in the midterm elections of that year, the Tea Party made a powerful impact on both the Democratic and Republican parties. Tea Party voters helped create the new Republican majority in the House of Representatives and during 2011 quickly exerted influence on the Republican legislative agenda. The Tea Party, acting largely as a pressure group, has profoundly shaped the content of national political debate and has had a transforming impact on the Republican Party (Formisano 2012:6).
OBAMA AND THE TEA PARTY

In the late winter and early spring of 2009, just months after Obama’s inauguration, consumers of American news and politics were presented with a purportedly great and novel protest phenomenon—a supposedly new “third force,” in the words of the Wall Street Journal, in the nation’s political life—“the Tea Party”. Wrapped in the potent historical symbolism of the American Revolution, this swiftly emerging movement spoke the traditional national language of “freedom” and “liberty” against the supposedly “left”, “big government,” and even the “socialist” and “Marxist” agenda of the president and his fellow “radical” Democrats. They were in the streets because of the “out-of-control spending” and statist agenda of Obama. (Street and Dimaggio 2011: 1-2)

The Tea Party was in large part a reaction. In its own public relations and according to its own supporters, the Tea Party represents a great independent, nonpartisan, grassroots, insurgent, and anti-establishment uprising of the people against concentrated power and wealth (Street and Dimaggio 2011: 5). By O’hara’s account in his book, “the Tea Party is a powerful grassroots movement that has involved millions of Americans in the political process like never before and has permanently changed the political landscape of our time”. It is genuinely a grassroots movement—something quite rare on the left or right (2010:xxvi).

In the American Presidential Election of 2008 Barrack Obama ran, with considerable rhetorical force, on a promise of hope and change in the midst of an economic crisis- and on his ability to bring consensus to a divided political class. But for many, things have changed for the worse, and the country is even more polarized than he started. So the substantial benefits of his presidency are not fully apparent—particularly to those most likely to have voted for him. Meanwhile, the symbolic significance of his candidacy is largely spent. Younge (2012) wrote “Obama can only be elected the first black president once. His presence remains a source of great pride to many, particularly African Americans and the young” (6)

Shortly after his inauguration, Obama told NBC: “Look, I’m at the start of my administration. One nice of thing about the situation I find myself in is that I will be held accountable. You know, I’ve got four years. And a year from now I think people are going to see that we’re starting to make some progress. But there’s still going to be some pain out there. If I don’t have this done in three years, there’s going to be a one-term proposition.” The pain is still out there, and that is precisely the proposition the Republican are now making. There are several
ways Obama can counter this. When he first ran, few understood the depth of the economic crisis, and few could have predicted the implosion of the euro-zone and the subsequent drag on the world economy. Roughly, two-thirds of the country still blame Bush for the state of the economy, while only half hold Obama responsible (Younge 6).

More recently, Obama’s re-election and the continued split in Congress confirmed a reality that has been forming for a generation: no matter how passionately the true believers in each party make their case, no matter what new technologies arrive to amplify their voices, no matter how high the alps of campaign cash lavished on data mining, hyper-targeted ads and voter mobilization become, Americans refuse to give a governing mandate to one side or the other. True, Republicans got control of the government in the early years of George W. Bush’s presidency, and the Democrats had their turn when Obama swept into office. Some big things got done, first under the Republicans (tax cuts, a Medicare expansion, wars in Iraq and Afganistan) and then under the Democrats (restructuring of the health care and automotive industries, new banking regulations, a jump-start for green energy) (Drehle 2012:50).

As the losers, the Republicans now assign blame. Start with the blame game and the easiest gambit of all, which is to blame the candidate. No time was wasted in skewering Romney. Without doubt, the former Massachusetts governor made an easy target. Jenny Beth Martin of the Tea Party Patriots groused that “What we got was a weak moderate candidate, handpicked by the Beltway elites and country-club establishment wing of the Republican Party, the presidential loss is unequivocally on them” (Drehle 50).

The question for Republicans is whether they will go deeper into the blame game than simply scapegoating their nominee. If they are honest with themselves, they will recognize that the party made Romney’s job more rather than less difficult. “Beginning with the almost comical anybody but Romney spectacle of the GOP primaries, where a parade of has-beens, not-yets and never-warees competed to flank Romney on the right, the party coaxed and prodded its candidate into damaging positions on immigration, abortion, gay rights, and more” (51). It was not enough for Romney to stand on a broadly appealing platform of fiscal responsibility and free enterprise. He was expected to somehow compete for Latino votes while denying undocumented immigrants a path to citizenship, even members of military. He was supposed to vie for women’s votes while down-ballot Republicans parsed the meaning of rape. The Tea Party movement can be credited with electrifying a body that flat lined after 2008, but what rose from the slab this year was a sort of Frankenstein’s monster, a toxic patchwork of once buried ideas (Ibid).
A party interested in winning future presidential elections would ask itself why candidates who might have been more adept campaigners than Romney chose to stay on the sidelines this year. There was a message for the right wing in that surge. As strategist Karl Rove put it on Fox News, "If we are going to win in the future, Republicans need to do better among women, particularly single women" (51). But with no President Romney to remind them of it, the lesson is likely to ignored. Should Republicans point fingers at Romney without also pointing a few at the mirror, they will likely emerge from defeat convinced that the path to victory lies even further to the right. They will go deeper into the quagmire of the culture wars. They will double down on anti-immigrant rhetoric that helped turn California from the land of Reagan into an automatic 55 electoral votes for the Democrats. The failure to beat a hobbled incumbent should remind the GOP that politics is a game of addition, not exclusion (Ibid).

The big difference in the 2012 election was not that a growing Latino voting base presented a problem for Republicans; rather it was that Republicans failed to properly articulate to that base the conservative solutions and way of life that solve many of the issues they're experiencing. Now that the election is over and the Republican Party has been condemned as a flop, the prevailing wisdom seems to be, even among some high ranking Republicans in Congress, that conservatives are now supposed to simply prostrate themselves and submit to the will of the winning party.

In fact, the American presidential election of 2012 is like a marketing, mainly to sell a person (his or ideas) rather than a product or service. During the recent presidential election, the Democrats effectively used the same marketing techniques that businesses use -- market segmentation, targeted messaging, and emotion-based selling. The Republicans should consider adopting a similar model to win future elections. Businesses understand that no matter how good their product or service, some people will never buy. For this reason they target their marketing and advertising toward people who would likely be persuaded by their messages to buy their product or service. In addition, the messages need to create visual images that appeal to the emotions. The same is true in politics (Krajacic 2012).

The Democrats followed this strategy and won. Thus, contrary to the rhetoric, it is the Democrats and not the Republicans who were not inclusive. Like any successful marketer, the Democrats divided potential "buyers" into demographic groups -- African-American, Hispanic, women, young people -- and tailored their advertising messages to each of these groups. The Democrats ignored some market segments, such as white males. They knew a given percentage
of them would vote for Obama, that their marketing efforts would not change this number substantially, and that it would be enough as long as their targeted marketing strategies are successful. The Democrats then developed a single message for each group, incorporated the theme into an advertisement, and ran the ad in an area with a high concentration of people from that particular voting bloc. Each message addressed the single issue that many members in that group care about deeply -- amnesty for Hispanics, marriage for gays, abortion for women, union support and company bailouts for autoworkers. These issues are based on emotion and group-interest, not the general welfare of the country (Ibid).

CONCLUSION

It is rather difficult to define the meaning of conservatism literally. Conservatism itself has meant different things at different times and there is no consistency in conservatives’ beliefs about what should be conserved. American conservatism moreover, has often been reactive, responding to perceived political and intellectual challenges. If the challenges and threats change, the nature of the conservative movement will respond. In general terms, the meaning of conservatism is straightforward. It refers to the reality of a flawed humanity and a hierarchy in which human abilities are unequally distributed. It teaches that political positions should be prudently considered in the context of historical precedent. It opposes radical ideologies based solely on perfectionist ideals and it is skeptical of rationalist politics of abstract theoretical principles that produces fanaticism and a all-or-nothing approach to public life. The institutions of society –political, religious, educational, family, and so forth—are understood to develop slowly with much trial and error and must be viewed as containing considerable wisdom, especially when defending liberty, the rule of law, and rewards based on merit. In a long debate of American conservatism, In short, America can be called a fundamentally liberal country. Americans will wait and see the changes in tradition as checks and balances are reflected in American government.

Americans have a high level of discontent and anger toward government and social institutions. This anger is directed at the Democratic party and the Republican party. In an effort to break the duopoly that has existed over several decades, many third parties have come into existence. Some have just had a major impact locally or statewide, but not nationally. Their most important political function is to affect policy making and potentially transform the two-party system. The American conservatism movement has historically emerged and died out. Ballot
access restrictions, media coverage, and financing are many obstacles that prevent the party from being successful. It is known that American conservatism movements have not been successful; however they have affected policy changes like in the presidential election as Obama was re-elected as the 45th President of The United States of America. Simply, American conservatism has never been the same with a strong tradition. But, inconsistency is the real story and American conservatism will continue to evolve.
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