

Yankee Steve's Column
for the week of October 22, 2009

prepared Wednesday, October 14, 2009, 3 p.m.

The Case Against Filmmaker and Critic Michael Moore

From Yankee Steve to my faithful readers,

It is impossible to comment on the film works of Mr. Michael Moore [1954-] without having to address at least two issues which jump out at you.

First of all we have to deal with the problem of Moore's duplicity. A caution flag goes up the moment any of his films unreel. It is a red flag appropriately.

Moore makes films that after a fashion bend the truth. In some respects this is very nearly understandable because he moves in Liberal circles where bending the truth has never gone out of fashion. Liberals more often than not are Marxists, and Marxists lie.

It is through lying and misrepresentation that the Marxist economic system has been able to survive so many blows and ignominious defeats. Its rate of failure stands at one hundred percent! But no sooner do you bury it then it shows up again in some banana republic, and even in America where it was once thought that President Ronald Reagan had slain the Gorgon.

In Moore's case truth-bending is particularly evil because he produces film documentaries. If he was bringing to the screen historical novels he would be permitted, with some restraint, the right to embellish stories. But a documentary is supposed to be strictly factual. Movie-goers are after truth when they go to a documentary and they have the right to expect that those filmmakers they have paid to see are men of honor.

Second, it is apparent that Moore is a masked crusader. He has come to save the day. I do not use the word mask unadvisedly. That down-home look that Moore sports around town can be disarming. At first glance you might think him to be a Detroit version of a good ole boy. Don't be fooled, he is nothing of the kind. Moore is a willing conspirator in an attempt to bring America around to Marxism/Socialism. And what is that?

Socialism simply stated is the heavy-hand, the over regulation of industry, burdensome taxes collected so that entitlement programs can be paid for by the "haves" who are supposed to take care of the "have-nots." In particular, it is the planning of the economy by a central committee, whose bureaucratic members may have never operated a lemonade stand.

Yes, there should be planning, but not by the government.

Anti-capitalist

The problems facing America at this time are serious indeed; we are in the midst of a financial crisis, at war on two fronts, and plagued by claims of global warming. But speaking for myself, none of this would overly concern me if I thought that the man sitting in the Oval Office was a real American and not a Che Guevara Democrat like the kind that you meet in Beverly Hills. Those in Hollywood highly regard Michael Moore who now has launched what amounts to an infantile attack on capitalism. Michael Moore is no thinker.

Moore's current film *Capitalism: A Love Story* is what one writer has called "dorm room Marxism." In other words don't anticipate learning much (Moore knows that his audiences do not want to expend much energy thinking) and definitely don't expect to feel proud to be an America where capitalism has enriched the average citizen beyond calculation.

In *Capitalism* Moore calls your attention to a pilot who though overworked is also underpaid. Deduction: capitalism must be blamed. What then shall we do? We must point the finger at America because it has an ongoing love affair with greed brought on by private investing, i.e., capitalism. We are greedy and would not have taken place had we not been capitalists. Capitalism must be at fault. It has made sinners of us all, and we must mend our ways!

Capitalism: A Love Story goes all the way with Socialism. It is the same old message we have been hearing from Socialists for some time now: capitalism exploits workers. Moore pits the proletariat, i.e., the workers against the owners or the bosses. That is classic Communism. If things were fair in our society, we would all be co-owners, and everyone would have what everyone else has.

Moore reminds me of something my father, an earnest Communist, told me when I was a child. He said, "Everyone in Russia is the same." In other words the proletariat revolution had succeeded. There was only one class of people; economic equality under the Soviets had been achieved because they had done away with capitalism and the free market system, the source of our love affair with greed.

Had my father studied the subject he would have discovered that in the very same year that the Soviets had been forced out into the open. It became known that a factory manager was paid a salary at 12 times the rate of a lowly truck driver.

Economic equality is not possible nor is it to be desired. If it came we would not like it.

Moore's Utopia

In *Capitalism* Moore alludes to what looks like a hastily re-write of a speech by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. We have always known and disapproved of it but we never thought that anyone would want to bring it out into the open again for fear of being branded a Leninist. Apparently Michael Moore has no such compunction. The great defender of the proletariat wants us to know where he stands.

The speech in question proves that FDR had always been a radical - much too radical for America. FDR went so far as to demand rights for citizens not guaranteed them by the U.S. Constitution. Would you believe it, FDR called for a “**Second Bill of Rights!**”

This has to be understood.

Socialists have always believed that the founders of America did not finish the job; they did not go far enough. All they cared about was liberty. Not only that, these men (whom they believe were much too religious) agreed that human nature grasping and rapacious as it was then, would never and could never change. Therefore they would have to construct a system of government that would keep in check our natural tendency to abuse power.

But to the Socialist who looks to government for solutions, checks and balances are not what is important. In fact the Socialist wants to empower the government to bring about a utopia. When utopia arrives those who tend to strike out on their own, who think they should be allowed to shape their own destiny, irrespective of what others may be doing, will at last be put in their place. A giant kibbutz will stretch from shore to shore. We will be commune-ists. Surely, we are told, this is our manifest destiny.

Many Progressive “Americans” want us to think of the Fourth of July as if it is just another day on the calendar. Leaders of the French Revolution called for a “second revolution,” and today Progressives are doing the same thing.

On January 11, 1944, FDR spoke to the nation so as to identify himself with the most extreme elements of the Progressives. He said,

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all - regardless of station, race, or creed. Among these are -

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens.

*What FDR and the Progressives call rights I call (with one exception- -the right to be free of monopolies) **wants** or **opportunities** that are **not** guaranteed under the Constitution.*

I have a better list of rights:

The right to life from the womb to the grave;

The right to develop grassroots movements without oversight from the government;

The right to cast a secret ballot in union meetings;

The right to refuse membership in the union;

The right to refuse insurance of any kind that is imposed on citizens by the government;

The right to prevent the government from raiding my estate so that I can pass on my wealth;

The right to transparency so that I know what the government is doing and planning to do;

The right to criticize ideas as well as people's behavior;

The right to allow local communities to decide for themselves what is morally acceptable;

The right to work for the removal of the personal income tax;

The right to educate my children and if I so choose keep them out of the public school system;

The right to launch out on business ventures without undue interference from the government.

Cutting the Mustard

I do not wish to be cruel but it looks as if Michael Moore eats lots of hot dogs. If he is not careful those filthy capitalists at Southwestern Airlines may want to charge him two fares when he flies, or does he have a private jet?

How ironic, Moore has become an outcast, a leper among his own clan, the Marxists. He is, of all things, at least as far as they are concerned, the quintessential capitalist. What an embarrassment! Only the best is good enough for Mr. Moore, and it does not look as if he ever misses a meal. How interesting, he has only capitalism and the free market system to thank for his wealth and for the comfortable lifestyle he seems to thoroughly enjoy.

Hot dogs make me think of mustard. I wonder if Michael can cut the mustard. I want to know if he is the real deal.

Moore has produced a film dealing with economics, but does he own a copy of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, the Bible of free trade and conservative economics? This is a book that all of us should read, one that the founding fathers were quoting from before the end of the War for Independence; Smith's ideas were ones that surfaced in the papers of Alexander Hamilton.

And if Moore does own a copy of Smith's classic when did he read in it? Unlike Karl Marx's tome *Capital*, Smith's *Wealth of Nations* does not rely on dubious and outdated statistics. Smith approached the subject of economics as if he were a scientist. So before Moore produces another movie, I want him to come front and center and answer me, has he read and comprehended Smith?

Talk to me, Mr. Moore! Have you read the papers of Milton Friedman and Anna Schwartz who thrashed John Maynard Keynes? And Michael, who is Ludwig von Mises? And what do you think of Jean- Baptiste Say or Carl Menger? Have you even heard of these economists?

I also want to ask Moore if while he was in Castro's Cuba making his 2007 movie *Sicko* (a plea for socialized medicine which was misleading) if he visited any of the political prisoners who have been incarcerated since Castro seized power. Moore has spoken out against the wrongs he sees in America; he wants to be our conscience and critic. However, from what I understand, he has not as yet denounced Castro whose crimes against humanity continue unabated just 90 miles off our coast.

A Different Kind of Critic

If I were to ask America to reconsider how important money is and whether it has allowed greed to replace compassion, which is what Michael Moore has been saying, I would not consult him. I would rather ask Alexis de Tocqueville [1805-59].

Unlike Moore, Tocqueville never campaigned against our country. Moore only wants to highlight what is wrong, or what he thinks is wrong with America. His films are by my

interpretation hate films. “Hate America” is their theme. Progressives like Moore will not be happy until we are filled with self-loathing.

Tocqueville on the other hand wanted to caution us against a *preoccupation* with money-making because democracy fares better in a country that has spiritual values. He knew that the U.S. Constitution had not been written for an amoral or irreligious people.

The great Frenchman would have been able to distinguish between a preoccupation with material gain, and the way in which Socialists, like Michael Moore, exhibit a youthful hatred of those who are **unequal** to them, who because of their industry, thrift, and good fortune enjoy the good life.

According to Tocqueville those who call for change are not always lovers of freedom. “But liberty,” says the great wordsmith, “is not the chief and constant object of their desires, equality is their idol . . . Nothing can satisfy them without equality; and they would rather perish than lose it.” Certain individuals will bear with the loss of their freedoms, he thinks if by that they can be assured that no one will be above them.

Moore appeals to that kind of person. **Therefore it is no accident that *Capitalism* looks back at the good old days when the rich were taxed at a rate of 90 percent.**

Conclusion

I finish with the ironic. Michael Moore in order to save money while making *Capitalism: A Love Story* used non-union workers. In other words he snubbed the unions because their wages are too high. Apparently he has been guilty of exploiting the proletariat.

By the way, didn't Barbra Streisand, another outspoken Socialist who cries out on behalf of the proletariat, do the same thing?

Examples of this kind could easily be multiplied. I will stop now because I think you get the point. But just one more example; Karl Marx the bitter enemy of capitalism kept a working girl in his house for years and never paid her a farthing. She was by all accounts a slave inherited from his mother-in-law. Now I ask you?

Ever yours,
Yankee Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com

Coming Soon! Look for these new postings under the History and Religion Archives
<http://oldlineconservative.com/archives.php>

“Islam: Why It Exists?”
“Holiness: The Right Way and the Wrong Way”
“The Parker Principle”
“The ABC's of the U.S.A.”