

Yankee Steve's Column

for the Week of October 23, 2008

THE NEW MESSIAH

Americans should stay as far away as they can from Farrakhan, Louis that is.

One of his more earth-shaking and memorable expostulations demonstrates why a lot of us think that the well-known Muslim leader is about as close to a sage as Wiley Coyote. Consider for example the following - Barack Obama is the Messiah.

I am not making this up; many of us actually heard him say it. What do you do with such a remark? Apparently Farrakhan can't distinguish between things scatological and eschatological! I do know the difference so I know what I should do with that remark.

Nevertheless many people think that Farrakhan has seen the light. Those taken with Obama would like us to believe that their man can walk on water. What they will find instead is that he will drown us in a sea of debt. I don't have to be a prophet to know that is what happens whenever Socialists like Senator Obama take charge of government.

Obama and Socialism

What is Socialism? Socialism is authoritarianism. It is Henry Paulson, Secretary of the Treasury, summoning to his office some high-flying bankers only to inform them that they have been grounded. Looking straight at them Paulson told them that whether they liked it or not the government had just purchased (better yet, seized) a large chunk of their business, and that if they wanted to complain their complaints would get them nowhere.

This display of unmitigated power leading to the takeover of the credit institutions would have thrilled Karl Marx, the wellspring of modern Socialism. Marx hoped for the **“Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.”**

Socialists are the “Samurai” of H. G. Wells *Utopia* who believed that they were better qualified than others to run the state.

Interestingly, the framers of the U.S. Constitution knew all about utopians, dreamers who believed that the reins of government should be placed in the hands of the more enlightened and that no harm would result. Alexander Hamilton would have shouted down their blind optimism. He stated, **“A fondness for power is implanted, in most men, and it is natural to abuse it, when acquired.”** Utopians have always acted as if human nature is either good or becoming good, and if so, past abuses will not be repeated. It is safe to say that no one is more seducible than a utopian Socialist.

Enter Obama, an utopian strategist if ever there was one. His campaign is fueled by credulity. What is his campaign all about if not giving the impression that he is the very incarnation of ethics and that he is above corruption? This is what he is saying when he promises that there will be “change.” In that one-word slogan plastered all over America, we can read that Obama is promising everyone that he will never be corrupted.

Now look closely. Discover if he is not liable to corruption. He is already telling us what he is going to do with our money when he becomes president. There is no reference to the House of Representatives or Senate, and no idea that the powers belonging to the presidency must at all times be subject to the will of the people. But why mention underlings? Is he not the Messiah? And if so, should we not grant him all the power he wants because the Messiah cannot be corrupted?

But alas Obama cannot be the Messiah. According to Holy Scripture, “the righteous will flourish” when the Messiah makes his appearance. [Psalm 72:7a] Do we see the righteous gathering around Obama or is he surrounded by those who hope for the day when America becomes an open society? This is a far cry from the *free* society left us by our founding fathers.

But who are the righteous, so that we may know them for sure? The righteous are those who beat their chests, who believe that they have no right to even look toward heaven. Are these the kind of people who are attracted to Obama? I think not. Journalist P .J. O’Rourke fully understands the kind of people lining up behind Obama. They are liberals who reek of self-righteousness.

The principle feature of American liberalism [Socialism] is sanctimoniousness. By loudly denouncing all bad things - war and hunger and date rape - liberals testify to their own terrific goodness. More important, they promote themselves to membership in a self-selecting elite of those who care deeply about such things . . . It’s a kind of natural aristocracy, and the wonderful thing about this aristocracy is that you don’t have to be brave, smart, strong or even lucky to join it; you just have to be liberal.

Once upon a time Socialism was something with which a politician could be charged. That changed with the presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In essence FDR offered the American people a promise that the government will take care of them, and if necessary their corporation, if they would only forfeit a little of their hard-won freedoms. Herein began the decline of America. Listen to Alexis de Tocqueville, a towering sage from another era, “**The American Republic will endure until the day Congress discovers that it can bribe the public with the public's money.**”

In spite of the sentimentality that may be attached to FDR, perhaps because he died in office, I want to resort to name-calling: Obama is an FDR Socialist, and then some! Permit me to underscore how important this is. Obama has admitted to using cocaine; he has mob connections; and he has been able to raise unusually large sums of money for his presidential bid because he was willing to break his promise regarding campaign financing. So what, if he is a Socialist? To say that he is a Socialist is the same as saying that at some point Obama is going to *demand* that we forfeit some of our freedoms in exchange for governmental protections. I ask

you, is there anything worse than the loss of our freedom? Is not freedom better than a full stomach?

I would sooner find out that this man, who might be our next president, is an embezzler than discover that he is a Socialist. An embezzler after being caught might show remorse. Socialists on the other hand will never put on sack cloth. How can they when their motives are as pure as the driven snow? They only want government to take care of people!

You know of course what this means. Once a Socialist comes into power, he cannot be reasoned with for if he were to change it would mean that his basic philosophy, namely that the government is supposed to take care of people, could be called into question. This is why Socialists are impervious to change. **Socialists would sooner bankrupt the entire nation than reevaluate their philosophy of government.**

The Old and the New

Socialism is an old world attitude; one that steals over the minds of elected and appointed officials without their knowing it. I would imagine that there was a time when President George W. Bush believed in free market economics. Now he is being called “**Comrade Bush**” by President Hugo Chavez of Venezuela. It’s as if one day an official wakes up to find that he or she has adopted an approach to government that is closer to Prussian Socialism than it is to American Capitalism.

However that would not be the case with Obama. He was schooled from early on in the ways of Socialism. His mentor, a contributor to the communist *Honolulu Record*, was none other than Frank Marshall Davis. Davis like Obama was a third-rate poet preoccupied with racial issues. But of course that means very little when we remember that Davis, who was on the FBI watch list, cast a political mantle over the young Obama. His presence in the life of Obama may explain why the junior senator from Illinois proudly displays a picture of Che Guevara on his office wall.

Sooner befriend communist Alger Hiss than be close with Davis, sometime pornographer and all-the-time Communist. At least Hiss kept his communism under wraps. Obama’s association with Davis explains why he was chummy with liberal radicals when attending Harvard, and why he was the friend of Chicago radicals in and outside of the church he frequented for no less than twenty years, a church which was presided over by an outspoken Marxist.

Government and Freedom

Socialism is big government, the kind of government that over time has managed to seduce George W. Bush, John McCain, and a host of others. Governments under the leadership of Socialists become enormous in size creating what economist Ludwig von Mises called “alphabet agencies.” These agencies will always operate from the premise that America needs them. That is why the task of limiting the size of government is the largest hurdle any president can face.

Recently an outspoken British Socialist said that without the government we would be “all alone.” That was immediately countered by someone representing the British Conservative Party. Demonstrating a flare for the forthright, he declared that if government were not around

that we could manage quite well, thank you! A conservative American audience would have leapt to its feet, when with emotion, the Brit continued by saying that if there were no government he would still have his work, family, friends, church, and community.

Those who act as if their life should be tied up with the government will be in for a rude awakening. After coming to power in 1945, the Socialists of Great Britain decided that it would be best for everyone concerned if they passed a number of innovative laws. We may be assured that none of these laws came about through referendum.

Some of the new laws amounted to a reversal of the Glorious Revolution [1688] which had assured the British of their basic rights. One of the new laws went so far as to require that no one leave their employment without permission from the government. Look this national about face - after defeating Nazi Socialism, the English sat motionless and silent before this grandiose abuse of power, and all because they felt that their government should take care of them.

In physics no two things can occupy the same space. In politics we cannot have both Socialism and freedom. Those who want to spread palm fronds before Obama should remember that truism, and they should pay heed to the wisdom attributed to Thomas Jefferson. **“Any government that is big enough to give you what you want is big enough to take it away”.**

Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros
OldLineConservative.com