

Yankee Steve's Column

for the Week of February 12, 2009

Dear Valued Reader,

Pericles said to his nephew Alcibiades, "Where there is no democracy, there is tyranny." I hope you agree.

In order to preserve democracy we will devote the next few columns to the way in which Socialists always conflict with our traditional view of democracy. I will do this because the president of our country is a Socialist. The leopard cannot change his spots. The Socialist must show himself for what he is. Barack Obama will call for measures that do not appeal to the traditional American, one who has been influenced by the founding fathers. This is inevitable.

Yankee Steve

Textbook Government

What Is Socialism Essentially?

Socialism is the authoritarian spirit run riot; it is the takeover of a government by those who feel that they are better suited to manage the affairs of state. Socialists are elitists.

The basic ideology of Socialism is revolutionary. Because it runs counter to everything in us, it is often accompanied by a violent confrontation of forces. Most of the time however, Socialists would prefer to avoid conflict. If given their chance they will install those of like-mind on important government committees so that they can conjure from the inside. The aim is to transform the government into something that is no longer "of the people." Once it is separate from the people it will no longer be accountable to the people; the people will be accountable to it.

In ancient Rome during times of crisis a chief magistrate could be appointed as dictator [L. *dictatus*] for two years. During those two years the dictator was granted absolute authority. This was always precipitated as you might expect by a catastrophe.

Right now, according to Obama, America is facing an "unprecedented crisis." This is another one of his lies. America has weathered worse storms than the one she is facing now. Obama is trying to furnish himself with political capital. He needs this capital because he has an agenda. Obama wants power and he wants power because he is a Socialist.

Witness for example his attempt to take over the operation of the census so it can be made to say what he wants it to say. Do we have another Albert Kinsey on our hands? If this does not jar Americans then what will?

Democracy

Where did democracy come from? Democracy as we know it came from Greece. All scholars agree, the Greeks were not the only people or the first people necessarily to have experimented with self rule. So why do we identify democracy with them more than the Celts for example, who elected their chieftains.

The Greeks are said to have given us democracy because they wrote, spoke, and argued about the subject more than any other people, and because a democratic explosion took place among the various city states in Greece during the 5th century B.C.

Political experimenting was taking place all over the Greece and out from there to what is called Pan Hellenism, some 200 or more cities founded by Greeks. Democracy seems to have agreed with the Greeks because each and every Greek citizen could express his opinion.

Not everyone liked democracy. Plato, who wrote the first broadside on behalf of Communism/Socialism in his immortal and immoral *Republic*, ridiculed democracy because it called in many instances for universal suffrage. This he said would lead to the establishment of a poor man's oligarchy.

Still and all democracy made a name for itself. Athens in particular could look back to men like Solon and Cleisthenes. They were influential in politics when Athens began the ascent toward self governance. Athenians accepted the one idea that goes to the heart of democracy - the state is a collection of individuals because individuals must never be thought of as the creation of the state. The former is democracy; the latter is Socialism.

Democracy never lasts in any one place unless the people who have been exposed to it have a strong sense of individual worth. This is why those who have done the most to overturn or resist democracy in modern times have always mocked the idea that the state is a collection of individuals. This brings us back to our original question, "Why Greece?" The Greeks have been identified with democracy more than other people in the classical world because they seem to possess a strong sense of individuality. This is in fact their true legacy. If America wants to hold on to democracy, it must hold on to individuality.

The Children of Plato

In modern times there have been two political movements that have strongly opposed democracy. Both of these movements pit the state against the individual so that if it were at all possible individuality itself would disappear altogether. We know these two movements as Nazi Socialism (fascism) and Soviet-style Socialism (Bolshevism or Trotskyism).

The Nazis wore brown shirts, the Soviets red. The only real difference between them was the color of their shirts. Both movements were dedicated to erasing the significance of the individual. Both were hoping to establish a world-wide commune in which the individual is defined by the state.

It is true that the Nazis did not place as much emphasis on the economy as the Soviets, but their goal was the same, to create “a new man,” a new society in which individuality would be swallowed up by state-ism. In both types of Socialism the individual is treated as an expendable commodity. Nothing is allowed to get in the way of the state. However Bolsheviks believe that the state will some day wither away of itself.

When that happens the state will no longer be necessary; everyone will share and do what is right, and selfishness will come to an end once and for all. Here is where the Nazis differ somewhat. In Nazi Socialism the state will have to continue to operate on behalf of the all important commune so that it can function like a well oiled machine.

In both cases what counts is not the individual but the state.

The American view point is very different. To demonstrate the way we think permit to quote from Henry David Thoreau’s [1817-62] *Civil Disobedience*.

The authority of government . . . is still an impure one; to be strictly just, it must have the sanction and consent of the governed . . . The progress from an absolute to a limited monarchy, from a limited monarchy to a democracy, is a progress toward a true respect for the individual . . . There never will be a true and enlightened State, until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly.

Hitler

Nazi Adolph Hitler’s ideas are an echo of what can be found in the most important Soviet-style communist Vladimir Lenin. We may quote these two demagogues side-by-side in order to demonstrate this point.

Hitler framed his dislike for individuality in a racial mode, based as you might expect on Darwinism. He not only had in mind the Jews but all who did not place the state above their own interests. Individual worth is not a given. What counted was the state which Hitler thought should be allowed to dabble in eugenics. Only in that way will the collective whole, the state, remain strong.

He wrote, “The stronger must dominate and not blend with the weaker, thus sacrificing his own greatness. Only the born weakling can view this as cruel, but he is after all is a weak and limited man; for if this law did not prevail, any conceivable higher development of organic living beings would be inconceivable.” [*Mein Kampf*, ch. 11]

But who are the weak? The weak are all those people who place their interests above the interest of the state. What should interest us is the commune or the state. For the state we must sacrifice everything, even our lives. The state is always more important than the individual.

Hitler said the following about the true Socialist, "Our own German language possesses a word which magnificently designates this kind of activity: *Pflichterfulling* [fulfillment of duty]; it means not to be self-sufficient but to serve the community." [ch. 11]

Hitler considered a person who seeks his own happiness along individual lines a "thief." The commune is what should be important not the individual.

Lenin

Let us take a quote from Lenin whom the Russians called "the savior of the world."

He said, "All our lives we fought against exalting the individual, against the elevation of the single person, and long ago we were over and done with the business of a hero, and here it comes up again: the glorification of one personality. This is not good at all. I am just like everybody else." In other words I must not stand out from others. I am to define myself by the commune.

But wait a minute, didn't Karl Marx the father of modern Socialism and Lenin, his most important disciple, (though they never met) insist that could rely on democracy. And since democracy is not possible without individuality, what could this mean when Marx and Lenin say that they favor democracy, especially since their actions prove otherwise?

Lenin's *State and Revolution* provides us with insights.

As a student of Marx, Lenin based the final triumph of Communism on Darwin's theory of evolution. We are, he thought, evolving toward Communism. Democracy is a stepping stone; it is not an end in itself. Therefore you can embrace it. In other words there is something after democracy. This is why leading Socialists in America are only too glad to tell you that they believe in democracy. They plan on using it like a paper towel. Once done with, it can be discarded.

Now we see why Marx was against interventionism (bail-outs) because it slowed down the collapse of capitalism, whereas we would say it speeds up the advance of socialism. Lenin said,

The whole theory of Marx is the application of the theory of evolution - in its most consistent, complete, well-considered and fruitful form - to modern capitalism. It was natural for Marx to raise the question of applying this theory to the *coming* collapse of capitalism and to the evolution of *future* Communism . . .

Democracy is of great importance for the working class in its struggle for freedom against the capitalists. But democracy is by no means a limit one may not overstep; it is only one of the stages in the course of development from feudalism to capitalism, and from capitalism to communism." [ch. 5, *emphasis in original*]

Once more we hear from Lenin who tells us that Marx owed nothing to the capitalists.

The state will be able to wither away when society has realized the rule: “From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs,” i.e., when people have become accustomed to observe the fundamental rules of social life, and their labor is so productive, that they voluntarily work *according to their ability* . . .

Consequently, for a certain time not only bourgeoisie rights, but even the bourgeoisie state remains under communism, without the bourgeoisie! This may look like a paradox, or simply a dialectical puzzle for which Marxism is often blamed by people who would not make the least effort to study its extraordinarily profound content. But, as a matter of fact, the old surviving in the new confronts us in life at every step, in nature as well as in society. Marx did not smuggle a scrap of bourgeoisie rights into communism of his own accord; he indicated what is economically and politically inevitable in a society issuing *from the womb* of capitalism. [ch. 5, *emphasis in original*]

This statement demonstrates that Lenin realized that before the utopia arrives the remnants of capitalism will remain. That being the case those who support Obama can act as if they really embraced private enterprise. Time will show us that this is not the case.

No matter what Obama wants, hold on to your individuality. And do not let educators program your children so that they always agree with the state.

Ever Yours,

Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com