

Yankee Steve's Column

for the Week of November 20, 2008

Are Americans Red Blooded or Blue?

Visitors to America in the first half of the 19th century realized immediately that they had left Europe. America has its own culture, one that the Europeans would do well to emulate.

African-Americans, whether racists or not, sometimes refer to white Americans as Europeans. However, the quintessential American is not a European. We are a different people.

On coming to America, the brilliant statesman Alexis de Tocqueville [1805-59] discovered that Americans are a people unto themselves. Our ancestry was for the most part European, but unlike the Europeans we never subscribed to the idea that society is to be made up of peasants and aristocrats. Tocqueville, himself an aristocrat, fell in love with American democracy.

Democracy in America, the fruit of his travels among us, has become a classic. Like the *Iliad* it will never go out of print. Every American who wishes to be considered learned should read it.

Tocqueville knew that Americans were freer than any people on earth, and that this was due in part to their never having lived in a feudal society, one in which the people were entirely dependent on the good will of a ruling aristocracy. He recognized that aristocracies have always operated from the same presupposition - some people are fundamentally superior. They are the blue bloods who know better than to mingle their blood with that of commoners.

In the mid-19th century this same idea received the support of scientists like that of Charles Darwin and Ernst Haeckel, the difference being only that they said that certain races should not intermingle.

Tocqueville knew that in a democracy like ours (which holds to the principle that all men are created equal) that it was highly unlikely that America would subjugate its will to an aristocratic class. If, he said, that were to happen, it would be the first time in history that a democracy had given birth to an aristocracy.

Tocqueville brought up the subject of aristocratic rule because he experienced a direct reaction to a conjecture circulating around the country at that time. He said, "There are people among us who expect to see aristocracy arise in America, and who already foresee the period in which it will take possession of power." In response he foretold, ". . . the current movement of American society seems to me to be more and more democratic."

The gifted Frenchman may have taken exception to this warning, but he was a scholar of history, and was therefore cautious. He wrote, "**. . . I do not claim that Americans will not come, one day, to restrict the sphere of political rights among them, or to confiscate these same rights**

to the profit of one man; but I cannot believe they will ever entrust their exclusive use to a particular class of citizens or, in other words, that they will found an aristocracy.”

True or false - no insider clique will ever takeover America? Didn't America write the book on equality? And if that is the case, no clique made up of elite blue bloods will ever seize the reins of government. We wouldn't surrender, would we?

Mayday! May Day!

Americans have just turned out in droves to do the unthinkable or what has to be thought of as the forfeiture of the one idea that defines America, the idea that all men are created equal. America did this by electing to our highest office a Socialist. Doesn't America know that Socialism stands for inequality? What is Socialism other than the empowering of a certain upper-class?

Many believe that the recent election of our first black president was a vote against inequality. However, by voting for a Socialist, America cast its net on the wrong side of the boat. The historic election will turn out to be a vote for inequality.

Socialists do not follow Alexander Hamilton who tried to abolish slavery. They follow Plato who in the *Republic* awarded the government to intellectuals. As far as he was concerned the common man was something of an idiot. Socialism, the gift of Plato, equals aristocracy, which equals inequality, which equals inequity, which equals iniquity.

Socialism rides the coattails of democracy whenever it has to, but when it comes to power, we will hear less and less from the people and more and more from the insiders, those blue bloods who will refuse to mingle with the self-reliant, red blooded Americans who accept traditional mores.

That being said I have to quote Tocqueville once more, because he shows us that if Socialism equals aristocracy then it needs to be instituted by subterfuge and if necessary by force. **“An aristocracy, in order to last, needs to found inequality in principle, to legalize it in advance, to introduce it into the family at the same time that it spreads it over society: all things so strongly repugnant to natural equity that one can obtain them from men only by constraint.”** [emphasis added]

Since we have lived in freedom, Socialists will induce us to think that some individuals are better suited to be in control of our government, and that we can no longer empower a government that is of and by and for the people. Certainly, if they cannot convince us of this, they must use constraint.

But why is there all this lust for power? The answer is simple. Socialists think a certain way about government.

In a nutshell, as far as Socialists are concerned, all decisions made by the government which may affect the economy, the rights of citizens, or the call to war, are supposed to be informed by one

concept more than any other - we must create a society in which there are no more have-nots, only haves.

The utopian dreamer not only wants everyone to have an equal opportunity. He posits the idea that we can also have equal results, and that if we do not have equal results, it must be the fault of the state and not the individual. It couldn't be that the poor have had a rash of ill fortune or that the poor are lazy, or they overspend on addictive lifestyles, or they have slipped into profiting from their poverty.

No, no, no – Socialists blame these inferior conditions on a neglectful government. Government, we are told, can right every wrong. And if government is at fault for our problems we must have more government, so that it can get on with assumed task of fixing people. And if need be, when people do not want their lives arranged, the government may force them to be fixed.

Where is Andy Rooney when you need him?

Mr. Fix-it

Barack Obama has said that he will do whatever is necessary to fix the U.S.'s economy. It is very likely that he would like to put in place a no-nonsense ruling class. However, in order to install his gang, he will have to do something about the Constitution.

Socialists are fully conscious of the fact that the Constitution marches to the beat of a different drummer, one that is so distant that many of them have never heard it for themselves. All they have ever known is Liberalism. Liberals are like Al Capp's square-eyed people who live in square houses and eat square donuts.

Leading British Socialists, the cloak-and-dagger types which for years held FDR in their grip, have always complained about the fact that the U.S. Constitution stands directly in the pathway of Socialism. Liberals have always wanted to do away with the Constitution or more particularly constitutionalism because it habitually defers decision-making to the people, the people who they consider too stupid and slow to be allowed to decide policy.

There is of course more than one way to skin a cat.

Obama could invite America to a bonfire. He could set a match to the Constitution just as the caliphs did when they burned the ancient Egyptian library in Alexandria. However, that would be too obvious.

Obama could simply go on his way acting as we have no Constitution which is what Liberals often do. Have you ever noticed that they rarely or never quote the founders of America?

Last but not least Obama could follow the example of George W. Bush who surrounded himself with Constitutional lawyers like David Yoo. Yoo "interpreted" the Constitution in such a way that the chief executive acquired powers never dreamed of by the founding fathers. It is this final

approach to the Constitution that deserves our fullest attention and it brings to mind Sir Thomas More [1478-1535].

More wrote about a place called *Utopia* (Greek “good place”). What made it such a good place? Well for one thing lawyers were banished. It was discovered that these lawyers had made a living out of taking what was simple enough for any one to understand, and with sleight of hand they complicated it for obvious reasons.

When Constitutional lawyers, like those sometimes appointed to our highest courts and Obama’s likely nominees, are finally banished, America will once more be a good place. There is a plain meaning to the Constitution, and we should hold to it. Be warned, Mr. Barak Fix-it may already have his sights on revising our timeless, priceless document.

The ruling class, the aristocracy that Tocqueville said would never materialize, is already here. It is the Supreme Court which for decades has acted as if it was all powerful. Now then, all Obama has to do is control that court from within his inner circle. If he can do that, it will mean that America did not elect a president; it started a politburo.

Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com