

Yankee Steve's Column

for the Week of January 8, 2009

Will THE People Remain Sovereign?

The Year That Was

I look back with regret over the past year. 2008 contained serious setbacks for the American people and democracy. I can hear a death rattle.

The Republican Party in order to curry favor with liberal voters turned a deaf ear to its conservative base in order to nominate John McCain. The senator from Arizona, predictably, went down to defeat. The nation elected a Marxist Socialist in the person of Barak Obama. Our next president is what one must call a *redistributive Socialist*.

To one degree or another he would have us believe that the purpose of the state is to see to it that there is the equal distribution of products and services.

Obama's kind of Socialism, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels would have snickered at as not revolutionary enough. The founders of America on the other hand would have said that it is much too radical.

Marx had bigger fish to fry. He would have thought that Socialists like Obama are reformist and not revolutionary. Obama knows that 70 percent of the U.S. economy is consumer-driven, and that if capitalism can do anything it can get products to the market quickly and cheaply. Naturally he will embrace capitalism up to a point because it can be of use to his agenda and his followers. It helps them redistribute products and services through the power of the state to those they believe have a right to them. In other words the government does not exist to protect liberty; it exists to promote economic equality. The government is an ATM machine. Should this interpretation of the role of government lead to the use of force, most Socialists would yell in solidarity, "Let her rip!"

The state exists they know for a number of reasons, but they act as if it exists principally to see to it that everyone has what everyone else has. The term for this is one that Obama has used publicly, "**economic justice.**" Watch for it in his inauguration speech, or his first state of the union message.

Marx on the other hand said the Communist revolution intends to go all the way and that real Socialism is not just a pandering to consumerism. As a matter of fact, he declared, we need to transform the way we think about ourselves. Now that is a real revolution! Currently we are slaves of a ruthless system called capitalism. Therefore the system has to go, root as well as branch, if I am to be liberated as a person. I have through capitalism been reduced to being a producer through wage labor, a system which Marx said was truly evil.

R. C. Tucker said that Marx believed that “. . . It is man as frustrated producer rather than man as a dissatisfied consumer who makes a revolution, and the need of man as producer is to freely express his manifold powers of productive activity.”

In other words, and according to Marx, a real revolution will end up liberating the way we think about what we are producing. We are at this time alienated from our creative side. Right now we are mere automatons that do nothing but produce for others. We are creators trapped in a producing, capitalists' body.

To change this we will have to abolish the old system of one hour's labor for one hour's pay. **The wage labor system Marx says is the real culprit; it is dehumanizing, a form of cruel slavery.** He would spit on it. The wage labor system must be smashed!

Engels said the before all else Marx was a “revolutionist.” And that he called for an explosion of human creativity. He was going to change humankind itself. **And the only way to do away with it is to forcibly socialize all private property. There will be no more owners and no more workers.**

Where will this lead us? Tucker summarized Marx's outlook, “. . . men will finally become creative individuals, accomplished in a multitude of activities, who produce without being driven to it by the forces of need and greed and who arrange their world according the laws of beauty.”

Now this kind of pie in the sky utopianism is **not** what Obama is on about.

He appears to be intelligent enough to know that Paradise has been lost. But he does like the idea of redistribution. And from what I can see he is going to take from some and give to others. His consumerism hides his Socialism, but still it is Socialism, and it can lead to only one place. Socialism is a threat to liberty, and this is why we must oppose it.

A Principle at Work

No sooner does a Socialist government begin planning the economy than it runs headlong into the U.S. Constitution, a document that was written by men who had little, indeed no patience, with centralized power and economic planning.

The best example of an Obama-type Socialist is Franklin Roosevelt, the Typhoid Mary of Socialism. However, it is possible that Obama will go beyond his tactics while trying to stimulate the economy with methods reminiscent of FDR.

Socialism operates along the lines of a principle. It is a lead weight thrown from a rooftop. Once thrown into the air the lead weight must at some point follow the prescribed laws of gravity. Socialism begins with a lot of talk about economics but it ends up with the suspension of our liberties. One of the most successful investors, Warren Buffet says, “Beware of geeks bearing economic proposals.”

Socialism conflicts with liberty, not some of the time, but all of the time. It starts out as forced charity, mingled with promises about what the state will do for us should we falter along the way, but it ends up with the right to order us about as if we (along with our family and our church) are the property of the state. **This has happened every time Socialists have come to power.** There is inevitability here. Case in point: Hugo Chavez in Venezuela, or if you prefer Fidel Castro's Cuba which just celebrated 50 years of political tyranny.

Interestingly, Puerto Rico, which has a share in the American dream, shines like a brightly polished pearl when compared with Cuba, which by comparison resembles a rusty nail. Socialism fails all of the time. Beautiful, colorful Cuba is no because of Socialism.

Power to the People

Once the lead weight is tossed from a roof, gravity takes over. This means that whenever push comes to shove the Socialist favors the state and its rights over the rights of the individual.

That phrase "power to the people" which encompasses the opening thought of the Constitution has of late been associated with Nancy Pelosi the speaker of the House of Representatives. I am convinced that she has never plumbed its meaning. If so, she certainly would have objected to a radical like Obama. When Obama purges from Congress moderates like Pelosi (moderates by comparison to himself) she will realize that she sided with extremists.

In consequence of what is on our horizon it would be appropriate to quote the words of George Washington who knew how some politicians garner favors with voters, only to deprive them over time of their rights. This is an excerpt from his farewell address on September 19, 1796.

And of fatal tendency...to put in place of the delegated will of the Nation, the will of a party; often a small but artful and enterprising minority...they are likely in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the Power of the People and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion...

But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism---the disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of the individual...[who] turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of Public Liberty...

The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism...

By unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill-will, and disposition to retaliate...it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens...facility to betray, or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity: gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of

obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation...

Ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foment occasionally riot and insurrection It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the Government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

So spoke the first American president.

Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com