



Integrity on BIG Ideas, Differences on Fleeting Policies: a GOOD Alliance For Voters to See.

Every VP candidate subordinates some ideas to those of the presidential candidate. With Stein-Greenstein, the subordination will be frequent.

As a candidate, I am not trying to publicly change my president; I will not disparage my president or my president's views. My president is building a following because those views resonate with at least some voters. With good media attention, those views would resonate with a large number of voters. Without the obtuse-media blinders, the views, the resourcefulness, the energy, and the passion that Jill Stein offers could command **a plurality of voters**, and thus the presidency. Remember, in a four-way race, 35% of the vote wins **100%** of a state's delegates.

Getting that attention, and finally **breaking the hegemony** of the two "Old Parties", is paramount. Helping Americans ascend economically, spiritually, and healthfully transcends fleeting policy differences. Helping a truer democracy again flourish in this republic is more important than differences I may have over campaign issues.

As for governing issues, should voters select my president and me in November, there is no important difference here either. The Vice President has only one ongoing role: to preside over the U.S. Senate. I can do that fiercely, in a way not seen since Charles Dawes (Coolidge's Vice President, in the 1920s). Reining in the U.S. Senate from proposed legislation that is outside the Constitution helps my president. Encouraging some additions to constitutional powers (such as environmental protection, international protections against cyber-crimes, and possibly federal child protections) helps my president and future presidents govern well.

The Vice President has traditionally taken on some short-term projects. I'm hopeful that I can be assigned the task of dis-integrating many federal functions. Our all-too-big federal government needs to be reduced, controlled at the state and municipal levels, with many functions totally privatized. Success here gives my president the ability to work with remaining federal agencies WELL. For the last 60 years, even strong presidents (Eisenhower, Kennedy, Reagan, Obama) have been resigned to "we can't" because the government is too turgid. I expect that in a short time (I give myself at most 14 months) I can help the next president say "we CAN".

I'm unabashedly Liberty-Minded. That means I'm allied with those in ANY PARTY who seek to reduce government shackles, elevate individuals, and improve personal choice. It fits with even the agenda of Jill Stein and Bernie Sanders: liberty-minded governance (I call that "Jeffersonian") means those who want a high level of government welfare, restrictions on business, retirement regimes, and regulations for health care have them! So long as the government is not using force or threatening force against others, all social arrangements are fine. Whether it's a majority or a minority of Americans who prefer government control is an experiment that **deserves** to be in play. Local "laboratories of democracy" are good for individuals. They can join or withdraw, and it's up to different locales to "compete" for the governance that increases happiness, health, and/or prosperity.

Thus, any president other than a totalitarian can welcome Mark Stewart Greenstein as VP. This president, and the voters, can know that I'm a placeholder, committed to resigning by March 2018. I don't want four years, and relish running to become Connecticut's next governor less than two years from now. Local here is decidedly more important than national, and my state desperately needs better government (bad government is the only thing wrong with Connecticut). Yes, I would even limit a presidency to two years, should my president be unable to serve, and have written a contract doing so. I can set a very good example for VPs to come.