

Yankee Steve's Column
for the Week of May 27, 2010

The Office of His Holiness the Dalai Lama
Thekchen Choeling
P.O. McLeod Ganj
Dharamsala
Himachal Pradesh (H.P.) 176219
INDIA

Dear Sir,

I have written you because you have recently delivered a series of lectures in New York City, and I would like to let you know what I am thinking. Before I begin please believe that I do not place any blame on you because tickets to your speeches are in some instances selling for thousands of dollars. At the same time I believe that you should be held accountable for some of the things you said which as a Christian and a Capitalist has disquieted me.

I beg your indulgence as I express my concerns.

With no fear of contradiction I can say that I am both a Christian and a Capitalist. What I could never say is that I am both a Christian and a Marxist. The two are polar opposites. As a matter of fact if I feared contradiction I would never have mouthed the following words that fell from your lips, "(Marxism has) moral ethics, whereas capitalism is only how to make profits,"

It appears that you have misunderstood the true nature of both Marxism and its extreme opposite Capitalism. What bothered me about this statement is that it doesn't fit the facts. *Marxism is not ethics clothed in political garb. It is totalitarianism dressed up to look like altruism or religion.*

Let me explain further.

If the fruit of a tree is rotten then the tree must be bad. So consider for a moment. Is it not true that wherever Marxism goes suffering and impoverishment follow? You will admit, won't you, that Marxists are knee deep in blood? Some Marxists have tried to prune the Socialist tree but the fruit of Marxism continues to be noxious because the tree itself is ruinous. Marxism is rooted in an idea that is fundamentally unsound, one that must inevitably lead to bloodshed and a standard of living that does not compare well with Capitalism.

Marxism is state-ism. What the all powerful state says is good must define the nature of good for the individual, and a Marxist state will always stand behind one idea more than any other, namely what is mine is not mine; it belongs to the state. If the state wants to collect it, it can do so. On doing so it can give what it has pilfered from me and give it to someone else. Now if I object to this I will be forced to acquiesce. To resist the state is to invite trouble. If a Marxist state decides to redistribute the wealth it has collected from its citizens the private rights of the individual must not be allowed to interfere. What really counts is not the individual but the moral posturing of the state.

Of course this is legalized thievery. So I ask, "Can any lasting good come of this?"

You see do you not that Marxism begins on the wrong footing. It acts as if individuality is a chimera. A person is defined not by who they are but by their *participation* in the state. What counts is not the individual but the commune.

Marxists are predictable. History shows that when the occasion calls for it a Marxist state will come down hard on those who would dare to assert their rights. You said in your speech that what the Communists are doing to your native country of Tibet is wrong. You should have used the word Marxists in place of the word Communists. Ugly and cruel Communism is the branch, and Marxism its root. Let us put the blame where it belongs. Tibet is suffering today because of applied Marxism. Wasn't it Marx who complained that the Paris Commune of 1871 didn't do enough killing, but chose instead to educate people about Marxism. Sir, can any lasting good come from a man like that? As Jesus was the incarnation of all that is good, the very Light of God, true God and true man, Marx was the incarnation all that is evil.

I hasten to add that Capitalism, like Christianity, is rooted in the dignity of each and every individual no matter how weak or powerless. This is so apparent that the philosopher Ayn Rand [1905-82], even though an atheist, could argue on behalf of Capitalism on the grounds that it worked better than Marxism. You admitted this in your speech when you brought up China saying that Capitalism ". . . brought a lot of positive to China. Millions of people's living standards improved" on the grounds that Capitalism itself is rooted in the freedom and dignity of the individual.

Rand took this to its logical conclusion when she opposed conscription. It is abundantly clear Capitalism is based on human dignity and liberty. This is why the Protestant Reformer John Calvin [1509-59] if he were here now, would blushing have to accept the opinion of many erudite thinkers who name him as midwife to Capitalism and modern democracy. Christianity, which I'm certain you would acknowledge is based on human dignity, invariably leads away from Marxism and toward Capitalism.

Sir, permit me to quote a French writer who for almost two centuries has been revered by all freedom-loving Americans who like him have shared a common dislike for Marxism/Socialism. While addressing those who were trying to turn France into a Marxist/Socialist state he asked his fellow countrymen to look at what to him was an undeniable fact, Socialism is unyielding in its devotion to an irreligious hardcore brand of materialism. After mentioning this obvious fact, this statesman went on to discredit Marxism on still another count by showing that it always opposes liberty because of the way it tries to meld and even melt the individual into the state so that it, the state, reduces the individual to complete subservience or what we could call slavery.

"[Socialists] hold that the State must not only act as the director of society, but must further be master of each man, and not only master, but keeper and trainer. For fear of allowing him to err, the State must place itself forever by his side, above him, around him, better to guide him, to maintain him, in a word, to confine him. They call, in fact, for the forfeiture, to a greater or less degree, of human liberty, to the point where, were I to attempt to sum up what socialism is, I would say that it was simply a new system of serfdom. Alexis de Tocqueville [1805-59]

Now it is very lamentable that America is at this time moving in the direction of Marxism. You know we now have a president in America that has been influenced by Karl Marx. Consequently and true to form President Barack Obama has come out against liberty. Obama has in fact found a way to enforce one of his collectivist schemes. If I for example refuse to buy health insurance he will see to it that I am punished by an agency of the federal government, the Internal Revenue Service.

Now it seems appropriate to me that I tell you in advance about my plans. I am going to resist Obama's state-ism. You have my word on it. So let me ask you, when I am fined or even imprisoned will you help me? Be assured that when that day comes I will write you again. I hope by that time that you will have re-thought the virtues of Marxism and that you will with all speed come to the defence of liberty.

Best wishes,

Rev. Steve Cakouros

oldlineconservative.com