

Yankee Steve's Column
for the week of August 20, 2009

Always love your country, but never trust the government.

Robert Novak [February 26, 1931-August 18, 2009]

A Moral Issue

Would anyone dispute that fact that slavery is a moral issue? Not if he were an American. America did away with slavery not because it was expedient to do so, or because George Mason of Virginia had proven on paper that slavery was counter-productive, or that Alexander Hamilton said that slavery was a waste of manpower. But America did away with slavery because it was unthinkable, immoral in fact, sort of like abortion-on-demand.

What about Socialism? Can I as an American reject Socialism because it, like slavery, contains with it the seeds of immorality? Would an American be able to adopt the tenets of Socialism and still think of himself as an upright and moral person? Socialism is immoral because it is forced charity. What I mean is that Socialism is not bad when it goes wrong. It is not bad because it can be abusive. No, it is innately bad, or bad to the bone. It does not ask me to give. It reaches into my pocket and takes what it wants from me. And that is immoral.

So I ask, should I think of Henry Waxman [D-CA] as a moral and upright man? I have the right to ask this because Waxman like President Barack Obama is a confirmed Socialist. Now please don't confuse Waxman with the likes of Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi. She is little more than an opportunist who never swims upstream. If her party swings to the right she will follow the latest trend. Waxman on the other hand is an ideologue which is frightening. I am not afraid of opportunists. They come; they go, and a lot of the time they manage to stay. When they stay we call them "incumbents." Of course I still can hope. Journalists have put together a long rap sheet on Pelosi which the voters of California would do well to read. If they do read, it she will have to go.

Ideologues like Waxman on the other hand wear a halo and the light beam coming off that halo blinds his constituents into thinking that he is a righteous man. But is he? What are his real motives? On the surface it looks as if Socialists like Waxman are humanitarians. Socialists, and especially Waxman, believe that they have been prompted by some saintly inspiration; and if that is the case anyone who stands in their way must be removed because they are warring against evil itself. I am sure that Waxman lays awake at night thinking about how his job would be much easier if he could just get rid of, or at least silence, the conservatives in Congress and their supporters.

Someone will ask, "How can Socialism be thought of as a moral issue when it is just an economic scheme?" But is that all it is? Once upon a time many people thought that Socialism is nothing more than a dispute over our right to hold on to private property. I would assure you that it is much more than that. **"It is not alone that property, in all its forms, is struck at, but that liberty, in all its forms, is challenged by the fundamental conceptions of socialism."**
[Winston Churchill]

If Socialism is just about economics then I want to know why it is always followed by repression of one form or another. Why do Socialists always prove in the long run to be oppressive? What is their about this economic system that makes it so predictable, consistently, and manifestly authoritarian? Again I quote Churchill, **"Socialism is inseparably interwoven with totalitarianism . . . No socialist system can be established without a political police."**

Let us be clear about one thing. If given the chance the people on the left, the Socialists, will be the only game in town. Lenin used the word "democracy" as much as Lincoln and Jefferson. What he meant by it was another thing. Democracy meant that he would hear your opinion, and after hearing it, would decide on what he wanted Russia to do. It was not the voice of the people or even the voice of the politburo that Russia heard, but the voice of one man.

Socialism on the Couch

The dictatorial spirit of Socialism can be explained, but we must put Socialism into psychoanalysis. In that way we can explain why it does what it does. This should interest conservatives who have of late begun to speak up in town hall meetings, and who seem to have realized that unless they speak up European-style Socialism, or even Soviet-style Socialism will come to America.

Interestingly, once upon a time Pelosi called on the left to send "disrupters" into various political meetings around the country. Now she says that people from the right who are attempting to hold back the tide of Socialism are nothing more than odious "disrupters."

One of the funniest men in America is the comedian Jackie Mason. Mason has a routine about a psychiatrist. His psychiatrist says to him, "I am looking for the real you." At the end of the session he says, "That'll be one hundred dollars." But then Mason disputes his fee saying, "You didn't find the real me."

Now pretend that you are a shrink. Invite Socialism to lie down on the couch. Look for the real person behind all the polite talk and the promises of what will happen if to be more comfortable we install Socialism. Go behind what the Socialist is saying to what he is really thinking and feeling. A good counselor will do this, and do not think for a moment that Socialism is all that hard to understand. It is relatively simple. You can find the real person in Socialism without a great deal of effort. You don't have to be a Freud or a Jung.

Those of us who have done counseling know that some people will talk a lot just so that they do not have to face up to what they are and what they have done. Socialism is like that. It will go on endlessly about the plans it has for mankind, about healthcare, etc. In that way it can keep

from admitting how many times it has failed. What a track record! **Socialists will not let you bring up the fact that its rate of failure stands at one hundred percent!**

And remember Socialism will make many promises that cannot be kept because it really believes that circumstances will be better the next time their energies are unharnessed. We might suggest that this is self-delusion. Socialism will go on about its bright future even though it suspects that we know that this is all wind. Edmund Burke said, **“Hypocrisy can afford to be magnificent in its promises; for never intending to go beyond promises; it costs nothing.”**

When it comes to Socialism something will pop out at you; you will discover that a Socialist thinks a certain way about thinking. He is convinced that there is only one way to think, and that is the way he thinks. Thinking is for intellectuals, the people who will sit on the politburo. And if that is the case no one else should be given the floor except the Socialists because every other viewpoint is the product of unenlightened reason. Socialism says that it has a handle on the truth. And what is that truth?

Socialists believe that the greatest evil is for you or me to think that we have the right to say that charity is a voluntary thing.

The Socialist says the government has the right to take what is mine and give it to you because the state is not a collection of individuals it is a commune whose members should be called commune-ists. The members of this commune have come to believe that taxation should remain in force in every age. In that way the tax code and the measure of our giving will be one and the same thing. You will now have a stock answer for the next homeless person who asks you for a buck, you can wave your pay stub with its list of deductions at him and say, “I gave at the office.” You did not give voluntarily but you did give, or should I say you stood by and watched your money be taken from you because an all-wise government does not think that charity should ever be voluntary. The government wants to see to it that you are charitable, and if Obama has his way we will give through the IRS. Note: **Americans in 1928 freely gave \$2 billion to charity which at that time was half of the money in circulation.**

The End Justifies the Means

Anything goes if you are right and righteous. Force and trickery are not outside the realm of possibilities for Socialists because they want nothing more than to do good for others, or so they tell themselves. The end justifies the means. This explains why Obama has tried to sell his health care plan by using what is called bait-and-switch. Unfortunately for him he has been found out, and not a moment too soon. Obama says, “Trust me!” and sign up for something even before Congress has decided on what a healthcare reform package should look like. Would I deceive you? In other words do what no street-wise person would ever do, buy a “pig in a poke” (unopened bag). What is in the poke wriggles just like a pig but after you put it under your arm and carry it home you will find an inedible cat.

Subconsciously Obama is saying:

“All I need is your permission to do one thing; allow me to force all of America to use the government plan when I sign it into law. You see it is that problem of voluntary charity. Please understand, Socialists do not approve of voluntary charity. We think that nothing should be left to chance. I know it sounds like Soviet Russia but trust me I will not be heavy-handed. As a matter of fact those who take my place some day in the oval office will be as gentle as I am. Just trust me, and sight unseen. Trust me even though I ran for president on a broken promise. (Forget like most Americans that promise of campaign financing.)”

What must not be missed is that Obama is dead-set on installing a healthcare plan that would force every American into the plan (with the exception of the lucky few in Congress) whether they liked it or not. Is that the American way? As noted in the past the Socialist will turn out in the end to be a bully. If Obama is backtracking on his desire to *force every American* to use a Government Operated Health Plan now it is because **his Socialism has begun to stink in the nostrils of Americans. Thank God for those who are showing up at these town hall meetings! They know that freedom is at stake. They know that it is always right to oppose Socialism.**

The Subconscious

Socialism is still on the couch. What do we find? Socialists are always sitting on a volcano. Socialists want to blow something up or walk into a parliament with guns blazing. South America is unstable because Socialism and Socialists have managed to keep it that way. Conservatives when they are fed up, just walk away. This is to be expected because conservatives do not think that the government holds the solution to our problems. Socialists on the other hand feel they must act because they think that government is the solution to all earthly problems. The state is their God.

With Socialists you never know what is going to happen. The pot is always about to bubble over. Rage, not love, is the emotion most commonly felt by Socialists. The Socialist thinks to himself, “How dare anyone think that charity should be a voluntary thing?” People who think that way must be heartless and if so we must rescue society from their grip. In time this causes them to boil over.

I am reminded of a senior at Dartmouth who was delivering copies of the *Dartmouth Review* (a conservative newspaper known for its opposition to Socialism) when he was attacked by a black middle-age upper-level college official. The attack led to bloodshed. The official bit the student in the chest leaving a wound that required medical attention. This is the kind of thing that Socialists will do because to disagree with them is to upset their world, a world they have constructed around the idea that they are the best thinkers and that they have the right to be indignant when those who think differently about the meaning of charity can freely express their opinion.

Three days after the incident the faculty assembled and voted 113-5 “to censure not the assailant but the newspaper the senior was distributing” which just happened to be one of the best written college papers in the country. Following this the student in question, Benjamin Hart, wrote a

book about Dartmouth which turned out to be more of a book about the way Socialists think than about Dartmouth. In it Hart asked what the faculty would have done had things been different.

“Imagine, for a moment, that the administrator had been white and the student he attacked was a black editor of a Trotskyite publication. The moral indignation on the part of the faculty would have cut in the other direction. Or think of it in another way: When student dissenters of the Sixties were burning flags, taking over administration buildings, and destroying private property, we got only silence from the academic establishment. Where was the faculty outrage? I suspect there is a political agenda behind this selective indignation, especially since, at an earlier meeting, the Dartmouth faculty, in a formal vote denounced the election of Ronald Reagan - a peculiar item of business for educators.” [*Poisoned Ivy*, Stein and Day, p.19, 1987]

What we see here is what we have always known. The people on the left see themselves as the guardian of people’s opinions. This is to be expected since they are intellectuals. And as such they have concluded that deception, bullying, out-right violence, and what most of us would call a betrayal of American values should be permitted because forced charity is the wave of the future if Obama has his way.

Conclusion

Let’s send Socialism a psychiatric bill. We can honestly say to it that “We have discovered the real you.” It is a pedantic, self-righteous, unpredictable, hazardous thing that will use any and all means to accomplish its ends. It has made a liar out of more than one politician.

Let’s be done with it.

Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com