

AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE MOVEMENT OF THE TEA PARTY IN 2009: A CONCEPT OF FOUNDING

*Didik Murwantono**

ABSTRAK

Kebangkitan pergerakan kelompok konservatif Amerika seperti The Tea Party pada awal tahun 2009 menjadi suatu fenomena atas reaksi perlawanan terhadap kebijakan pemerintahan Obama. Kemunculan pergerakan kelompok konservatif Amerika tidak pernah sama namun tetap mempertahankan tradisi mereka. Menurut sejarah, kelompok ini muncul dan tenggelam. Penelitian ini menawarkan suatu konsep mengenai founding yang berhubungan dengan perubahan sosial serta transformasi politik terhadap fenomena The Tea Party tersebut. Secara metode, penelitian ini menitik beratkan pada jenis penelitian kualitatif deskriptif dengan pendekatan urutan peristiwa dalam sejarah melalui teori Pendiri dan teori Perubahan Sosial. Pergerakan kelompok konservatif ini biasanya tidak pernah sukses dalam pencapaian targetnya; bagaimanapun kelompok ini memberikan pengaruh terhadap kebijakan pemerintah dan partai politik yang ada di Amerika. Pergerakan kelompok konservatif dikenal tidak konsisten merupakan hal yang nyata dan kelompok ini akan tetap terus ada di masa mendatang.

Kata Kunci: *Obama, pendiri, pergerakan konservatif Amerika, perubahan sosial, the Tea Party*

ABSTRACT

The awakening of American conservative movement like The Tea Party in the beginning of 2009 was a phenomenon as a reaction against Obama's Democratic presidency. American conservative movements have never been the same but they maintain a strong tradition. Historically, they have emerged and then died out. This research offers a concept of 'founding' for dealing with social changes and the political transformation of The Tea Party phenomenon. It adopts descriptive qualitative methods and applies Event Structure Analysis supported by Founding and Social Change theories. In general, American conservative movements have never been successful; however they have affected policy changes within the government and the political parties in the United States. They are known to be inconsistent, yet it seems likely that they will continue to evolve.

Keywords: American conservative movement, founding, Obama, social change, the Tea Party

INTRODUCTION

Conservatism has long been embedded in the hearts of Americans. They have used this term since the beginning of the eighteenth century to refer to traditional conservatives like strong work ethics and Christian-Protestant. Some prominent

events in American history gave deep impacts on the movement of American conservatism. Therefore, the term 'conservatism' has had different implications in varying historical contexts. It denotes a preference for institutions and practices that have evolved historically and that are thus

* English Department, College of Languages, Sultan Agung Islamic University, Semarang

manifestations of continuity and stability. They aim to preserve traditional political arrangements, but only those that are conducive to what they consider good lives.

The concept of maintaining traditional values such as Christian-Protestant, small government, and strong work ethic and customs inherited from generation to generation, rather than creating and adopting new values is the tradition of conservatism. Therefore, American traditions from the settlers were derived from Puritans, 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. Maru (2012:28) says that "the jeremiad filled the Puritan tradition in its role to preserve the value of the community and to guide them to arrive at the shared-dream." This can also be inferred from the etymology of the word 'conservative', which comes from the Latin '*Conservere*', which means to maintain and keep. Robert W. Cox (1967:23) notes that "the strength of conservatism has strong roots in a society that values the rules and customs."

Conservatives are most content with the status quo. They are pleased with the system and are not interested in a great deal of change. They will support extremely slow and very superficial alteration of the system, but often will resist even seemingly minor changes. In relation to the changes, Leon P. Baradat (1979:12) states that "conservatives are seemingly closed to retrogressive change referring to a return to a policy or institution that has been used by that society in the past." Conservatives tend to see an intrinsic value in existing institutions and are unwilling to tamper with them, claiming that to do so might seriously damage that which tradition has perfected.

Since tradition is humanly, 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 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. If 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.

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 Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, both of whom played a major role in the American Revolution, American political parties, and the writing of the American Declaration of Independence and the United States' Bill of Rights.

American founding fathers both Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson are viewed more than an authoritative event--signing a Constitution, government offices, and historical buildings--, they are a continued process of contestation, construction, re-appropriation and struggle. Bernal (2008:2) states that "a founding lives not in the past, but in the present. It is not a birth, but a conflict-ridden beginning." In short, a founding has continued life because it is a central part of the self-understanding of a political community. And as this self-understanding and the composition of the community changes, so does the founding.

Therefore, a founding is not merely an event, but also a concept. As a concept, founding is an idea made up of many other ideas. To adopt two insights, one from the philosopher Immanuel Kant and another from the sociologist Max Weber, founding, I will argue, operates simultaneously as a regulative type and an ideal type. As a regulative ideal, founding can serve as a metric by which

individuals may judge existing practices or orient their actions or expectations (Gruyer and Wood 1996:6). As an ideal type, founding may affix itself as a dominant model for political practice (Mills and Gerth 1946:65). Based on Kantian and Weberian concepts, founding is a historically situated idea, comprised of other contested and ever changing ideas, some more dominant than others, but all fighting to be heard (Bernal, 2008:2-3).

Based on the description of founding above, founding can serve as a tool for change. It is hence not just a single regulative ideal or ideal type, but also a historical construct, an idea that is constructed according to the changing social and political needs of a particular society. And as a historical construct, it takes form primarily as narratives and imaginaries, that is to say, it occurs through the narratives, which live in the political imagination of a people. According to Taylor (2004:23), the social imaginary consists of “the ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normatively met and the deeper normative notions and imagines that underlie these expectations.” This social imagination is transmitted through images, stories and legends.

American conservatism is itself as a cultural artifact. It is a product from cultural work and cultural ideas. Therefore, American conservatism follows the characteristic of culture as a dynamic pattern. Therefore, ideas of conservatives can be traced from founding with a holistic view from politics, economy, sociology, and culture.

Furthermore, American conservative movement can be traced by studying phenomena in American society like the Tea Party in 2009. The movement of American conservatism consists of a situation in which two or more people are in relation to each other. In most, if not in all, situations, people react as complete human beings, they react as members of a given society and of particular groups within it, as holders of certain beliefs, values, and ideas. Therefore, ideas from American founding like Thomas Jefferson as Anti-

Federalist and Alexander Hamilton as Federalist are very necessary to describe the American conservatism movement.

This research adopts descriptive qualitative methods. Two types of data were used: primary and secondary. The primary data included literary works, observations, interviews, and discussions with some experts in USA, whereas the secondary data included books, journals, articles, essays, newspapers, websites and other theoretical writings dealing with the research topic. Three prominent works –*The Notes on Virginia*, *Democracy in America*, and *The Federalist Papers*—are used to investigate the ideas of American conservatism from founding to the Tea Party as the culmination of the development of American conservatism under Obama’s administration

This research employs Event Structure Analysis (ESA) to analyze changes brought about by government. The change from traditional society to industrial society brought some social and cultural changes, mainly from traditional conservative to modern conservative. The analysis is focused on Obama’s policies towards life, politics and government, society and culture, and economics in line with the movement of American conservatism. Moreover, government programs often involve a structured set of procedures in which problem definition, planning, implementation, and evaluation are undertaken.

Therefore, this research approaches the American founding from a critical historiography perspective. Mainly, it connects with the ways in which the American founding has been studied in order to understand not what the American founding is, but instead what it might have meant at different points in meanings. Such an analysis entails foremost changing the terms with which Americans conceptualizes the American Founding: from an historical event and a set of facts fixed in the past, towards conceptualizing it as a dynamic and contested idea that is constructed in different ways to serve different political and social needs.

Founding can be acted as a mythology figure while his ideas can be used as a model to overcome

some crisis. The Economic Downturn of 2008 forced Obama to take bailouts along with some policies causing the existence of the Tea Party movement. This conservative movement like the Tea Party is very similar to past unsuccessful political parties and will eventually meet the same fate as its predecessors. Another uniqueness is that American conservatism has never been the same but maintains a strong tradition.

FOUNDING, IDEOLOGY, AND CONCEPT

This section deals with a major thesis that founding can not be separated from ideology. They are inter-related. Ideologies emerged from the Age of Reason or the Enlightenment era in America, which in turn, developed from the early stages of the Industrial Revolution in Europe as well as in America. The birth of Enlightenment leading to Industrial Revolution and modernity changed the roles of government toward economics like the ideology of capitalism. The United States also had the same experiences. America entered into the modernity with the same characteristic that every modern political system is motivational; that is, the leaders attempt to mobilize their citizens to accomplish the political, economic, and social goals of the society. The United States is all intensely interested in involving their citizens in efforts to accomplish the objectives of the state. Consequently, modern ideologies call upon people to join in collective efforts.

The social changes in the Industrial Revolution were from a modern society in America in the early nineteenth century. It changed from traditional agricultural society to modern industrial society. In relation to the ideology, modern society is complex and often contradictory. Hence, individuals within a society may not accept a single ideology; they may appropriate parts of several ideologies, or they may become completely attached to a single idea system. Sargent (1972) approaches the definition of ideology differently. He sees ideologies as based on the value systems of various societies. In any event, Sargent makes the point that ideologies are simplistic in their approach to solving problems.

According to Sargent (1972: 1), “Ideology provides the believer with a picture of the world both as it is and as it should be, and, in so doing, ... organize the tremendous complexity of the world into something fairly simple and understandable.”

One of the major themes of this research is that ideologies actually attempt to develop political accommodations to the economic and social conditions created by the Industrial Revolution. At first, ideologies were made necessary by the Renaissance belief that people could improve the conditions in which they lived through taking positive action instead of passively accepting life as it came. This new belief was accompanied by the great economic and social upheaval caused by the mechanization of production. Social class and social status dominated in an industrial society around the eighteenth century. In order to get better understanding about the ideology, it would better compare it with philosophy (see Table 1 below).

Table 1

The Difference between Ideology and Philosophy

(Source: Leon P.Baradat. *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*. 2nd ed.

New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1984:9-10)

Ideology	Philosophy
Stresses more on political meaning	Focuses more on morality exaggeration
Is simplistic and shallow. Usually, ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ are made very clear, and people are simply asked to believe in them and act accordingly	Tends to be profound. It tries to analyze the totality of human experience to find the meaning contained therein
Interprets present and views the future	Interprets past and present and views the future.
Has specific steps to improve people lives. It is egocentric and change-oriented The universe must be modified and molded better conform to the people.	Tends toward introversion. It is to explain the universe and to help people find their places in it as well as harmony in the universe.
Is Oriented toward masses, for the mass mobilization	Can be set of principles upon which an entire society or by a single individual
Simply stated can be understand by ordinary people	It is rather complex in comprehending the meaning

According to the French scholar Destutt de Tracy, ideology is also a study of the process of forming idea. He also believed that ideas are stimulated by the physical environment. There are two aspects of Tracy's theories should be noted here. They are materialism and social as well as political improvement. Tracy claims that thought is stimulated by material things only with the formation of an idea as a physical rather than a spiritual or mystical process. If we correlate Tracy's ideas with some big cases, mainly in the U.S., it is noted that materialism is a dominant theme in the concept of ideology. And the second significant aspect of Tracy's idea is that social and political improvement was its main goal. Hence, ideology has been closely thereby attempt to improve human life. Therefore, there is a closed-relationship between ideology and political connotation.

The theory above can be correlated with a prominent political figure in Europe, Alexis de Tocqueville and American founding fathers, –Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton– The study of founding as an idea, concept, and construct is closed to the definition of founding as the birth or origin of a human political community and its authority through deliberate establishment. By using this definition, then various conceptions of founding can be differentiated with the main division being classical against modern visions as expressed in the dominant narratives of founding in Western and American political thought. Here, the word concept is used to denote a generalized, trans-national and trans-historical idea that we call 'founding.' Conceptions of founding are also ideals. As an ideal, a conception of founding is given to determine value-content through a set of idealization. For instance, in classical conceptions, these idealizations consist of specific definitions of will and authority: "founding as the act of God and a mythic leader. These figures are the will behind the act of creation, grounded in an authority outside the community that they create" (Arendt, 1963:23).

In contrast to the classical ideal of founding, the modern ideal of founding posits the founding as a democratic act. The movement of American

conservatives processes of political change is said to be legitimated through the deliberate founding of a constitutional state. This American founding is said to be the apex of democracy, a non-violent moment of self-creation by the people, a new beginning which demarcates the coming into being of a democratic community. This means that a founding has emerged as a democratic ideal, a desired political good. Like other contemporary political values such as democracy, equality, and freedom, founding in the contemporary context has become an object of longing, something to strive for.

Founding as a democratic ideal is a specific vision for establishing and ordering political communities, a vision which is based on a set of idealizations largely shaped by a conception of the American founding as an authoritative event. Bernal (2008:26) said "The idea of the imagination is a key component of the conceptual transformation of founding. Positing the founding not as an act but as an object of imagination allows us to more critically engage with this concept than traditional approaches afford."

American conservative movement of the Tea Party offered the concept of imagination to depict the term of social imagination. It focuses on ideas of traditional conservative and liberal classic tradition from three prominent figures from history: Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, and Alexis de Tocqueville. 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 1930s. 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 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 the American presidential election of 2012, the existence of the Tea Party split conservative intellectuals and splintered the Republican Party.

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 (2012:69) state “It was a group of colonists, calling themselves the Sons of Liberty, gathered to protest the Tea Act and other moves by the British government.” 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” He joked that he was trying to plan a “Chicago Tea Party” in protest (O’hara 2010; Street and Dimaggio 2011; Patten 2012; Reynolds 2009; Whittell 2012). 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). 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 identifying themselves as tax and spend conservatives regardless of their party affiliation,” as stated by 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.

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 super-opulent, arch-reactionary capitalists and polluters Charles and David Koch, and Richard Armey as director of reactionary advocacy group Freedom Works), 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 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). In 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 Barack 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 (2012:6) 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.”

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 Afghanistan) 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” (Ibid).

A question for Republicans is whether they will go deeper into the blame game than simply scapegoating their nominee. The party coaxed and prodded its candidate into damaging positions on immigration, abortion, gay rights, and more. 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 that 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 be 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 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. 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. This research also finds that the existence of the Tea Party split conservative intellectuals and splintered the Republican Party.

CONCLUSION

There are some significant American phenomena, which have greatly had great influences on the development of social and political thoughts. The goals of studying American conservative movement include understanding the origins and evolution of today's dominant values and beliefs, what these mean. The Tea Party movement has given a concept of founding as mythology figures influenced by some variables --government's roles, economic crises, top-down policies, and political parties' strategies-- American conservative movement 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. 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 like the Tea Party 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 conservative 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.

REFERENCES

- Arendt, Hannah. (1963). *On Revolution*. New York: Viking Press.
- Baradat, Leon P. (1979). *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- , (1984). *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bernal, Angelica Maria. (2008). *The Concept of Founding*. ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis A&I. gp.n/a. UMI Number: 3317259. USA.
- Cox, Robert W. (1981). "Sosial Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory". *Millennium*, Vol. X, No. 2.
- Coleman et al. (2012). *The Colonists Rebelled Against Taxes Imposed Unilaterally by the British Government.* Understanding American Politics and Governments. USA: Pearson.
- Coughlin, Alex T. (2011). *The Challeges of populism: An Analysis of Tea Party Structuring Narratives*. Thesis. USA: Colorado State University.
- Drehle, David Von. (2012). *A Subtle Message About Things to Come May.* "For Obama, Survival is the New Winning." *TIME*. Nov. 19.

- Formisano, Ronald P. (2012). *The Tea Party: A Brief History*. Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gruyer, Paul and Allen W. Wood. ed. (1996). "Regulative Ideal": *Critique of Pure Reason*. Immanuel Kant. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, R., and Barrett, K. (2012). "Anti-Tax Tea Parties Protest President Obama's Tax and Spending Policies." Retrieved on December 1, 2009 from <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/story?id=7337117&page=1&page=1>.
- Krajacic, Zach. (2012). Republicans Should Use Targeted Marketing Strategies. Retrieved on Decemebr 5, 2012 from http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/12/republicans_should_use_targeted_marketing_strategies.html#ixzz2EUQaYeWf
- Locke, John. Second Treatise of Government. Ed. Thomas P. Peardon. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1952.
- Maru, Mister Gideon. (2013). Jeremiad Frames in Reagan's Inaugural Address. *Humaniora*. Vol. 25. No. 1 February 2013.
- Mills, C. Wright and C.C. Gerth. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Muccigrosso, Robert. (2001). *Basic History of American Conservatism*. Florida: Krieger Publishing Company.
- O'hara. (2010). *A New American Tea Party: The Counterrevolution Against Bailouts, Handouts, Reckless Spending, and More Taxes*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Patten, D. (2012). "Conservative Grassroots Movement Ignited by Obama's Policies on Healthcare, Economy". NewsMax.com, 2009. Retrieved on December 1, 2012 from http://www.newsmax.com/headlines/heathcare_obama_beck_9_12/2009/09/13/259525.html.
- Pethokoukis, J. (2009). Rick Santelli: "The man who talked back." *US News & World Reports*, Retrieved from <http://www.usnews.com/money/blogs/capital-commerce/2009/02/23/ricksantelli-the-man-who-talked-back>
- Reynolds, G. (2009). Tax Day Becomes Protest Day: How the Tea Party Could Change American Politics. *The Wall Street Journal*, 2009. From <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123975867505519363.html>
- Sargent, L.T. (1972). *Contemporary Political Ideologies*. rev.ed. Homewood: Dorsey Press.
- Street, Paul Louis and Anthony Dimaggio (2011). "Making Tea from the Top Down". *Crashing the Tea Party: Mass Media and the Champaign to Remake American Politics*. Ed. Paul Street and Anthony Dimaggio. USA: Paradigm Publishers.
- Whittell, G. Rick Santelli (2012). The journalist who called for a "Chicago tea party. *TimesOnline*. 2009. Retrieved on December 1, 2012 from http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us_and_americas/article6826712.ece.
- Younge, Gary. (2012). "Can Barack Obama Win Again?" in *US Election.. The Guardian Weekly* 28 Sep. 2012. 1 Dec. 2012. p.6