

# PRESS ARGUS-COURIER

## View from the bottom rung

Vander Atwell

May 14, 2016

Lately, with a socialist candidate running for president there's a lot of talk about Socialism vs. Capitalism.

But, do you know that during the last 100 years Socialist-introduced and managed programs, which consistently stress human compassion and equality have been responsible for more inequality than any type of governmental system ever devised by human fancy outside the archaic systems of ancient history's barbaric practices? Why do you wonder that is the case, after all socialism designs a — societal commonality of comfort where all are afforded the same benefits regardless of contribution, or lack of it, to the cause.

The answer is that socialism is predicated upon the precept that uniformity of human comfort, which hitherto may only be found in small tribal or family like units, can be achieved on a universal basis. In other words that political, economic and social utopia can actually be achieved - apparently for the first time ever - amongst large populations as right here in the good old US of A.

Such idealistic rumination resulted in the rise of Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot, Kim Jong-Un of North Korea, and yes of Cuba's Castro, all of which found violence and imprisonment convenient tools in pursuit of their idealistic dreams of achieving social parity. The 20th century history is littered with enough "collateral damage" from idealistic men employing brute force in a frenzied attempt at driving square pegs into round holes, to populate a sizable nation; all for naught there being not much social equality between those lying below the turf and those above it. Think about it next time someone angsts about the horrors of American capitalism. The wealth it produce's, has produced, not only has kept us free from tyranny and given us a comfortable standard of living, but in my own time has kept the Nazi swastika and the hammer and cycle from dominating the nations of Europe and the flag of the rising sun from gracing the skylines of Honolulu.

Not all socialistic systems fall to the hands of despotic monsters, still its conducive to the cant. A progressive system with a centralized government is half way there already. With each small tightening of the screw, here a little, there a little, people become accustomed to social restrictions, while the freedoms of yesterday are compromised and the lack of them eventually accepted as common to the culture. Meanwhile the younger generation feels no sense of loss at all having never experienced the rights and freedoms that were a part of their fathers America. Chances are, they will remain ignorant of the concept because U.S. colleges and universities have not identified their heritage or informed them those freedoms were a part of their birthright or if so, they should not have been.

While apologists for socialism points to the success of two or three small Scandinavian countries as a template for their progressive societies, gone begging are reference to socialisms sobering 20th century debits which were centralized in the more populous nation's which first fancied and then copied from the doctrines of Marx/Engle's.

The glories of the European socialist experiment which presidential candidate Bernie Sanders wishes the U.S. to emulate can hardly be featured as an economic choice over capitalism. Why? Should most European countries including Germany, Sweden, Denmark and Belgium join the U.S. as states they would be among the poorest one third on per capita GDP basis. The UK, France, Japan and New Zealand would all rank among America's very poorest states, below No. 47 West Virginia and only slightly above No. 5 Mississippi. Italy, South Korea, Spain, Portugal and Greece would each rank below Mississippi as the poorest states in the union. On the other hand, Hong Kong and Singapore were once the poor jurisdictions but free markets and small governments have produced strong growth and now these places are among the richest on the planet, richer not only than Europe, but more prosperous than the U.S. (April 2, Daniel J Mitchell Cato Institute).

If by some quirk of human nature Europe attained the "equity" of heavens bright shore it would be gained under the protective political, economic and military umbrella of America not the idealistic fancies that Marx/Engle's instilled in their adherents.

Rather than heaven today, heaven now, socialism creates a drag on a nations economic output as happened with communist Russia, where the only social equality was an equality of poverty among the masses that offered a comfort index far below, not only the socialist concept, (that which socialism promised) but on a level below the overall quality of life we know and enjoy in America then and now.

But for a true picture of Socialisms weaknesses one may need neither to reflect upon the systems economic frailty nor its despotic history, it may be found in the story of Brazil, steeped in corruption and now in deep recession who's President, former Marxist guerrilla Dilma Rousseff, is being impeached for a variety of criminal grievances pertaining to major political scandals that include thievery bribery and money laundering. 27 of Rousseff's Workers Party members are charged with some form of graft, while 86 people have been convicted, most of them well connected political figures and businessmen.

And the mess is not just confined within Brazils national borders. Brazil is the world's eighth largest economy and the effects of its recession reaches across the entire community of nations making it one of the top ten risks for the globe in 2016. Considering this modern version of the glories of the worlds great socialist experiments perhaps one should view with cynicism those who decry American Capitalism as hard-ass and corrupt, and that our "unfair" economic and social polices and practices should be replaced by a pure and "incorruptible" system of governance run by pure and in-corruptible men.

Though not all socialist systems are despotic or tyrannical however, empirical evidence indicates that capitalism consistently out performs in that department, so why keep pushing, especially as we witness that only the wealth provided by a capitalistic economy allows for our relatively high quality of life, which, if the proposition of Mr. Mitchell is correct is far better than that of our

socialistic European neighbors? Yet, one supposes that “fairness” (for fairness sake) is the name of the game because its better that everyone be at the same, or near the same social “grade level” even if that level results in less wealth produced along with a diminished overall living standard the ideological concept being that its better or “fairer” that everyone be at the same economic level than some having more and some having less.

Under the purest of socialist theory the state stands to adjust whatever disparity exists between the two; that the apogee of parity is reached when an individual’s prosperity or standards of living are adjusted to that of his neighbor, a goal that is not necessarily achieved by individual initiative but rather meted out by the government at whatever level of comfort a nations GDP—and its credit rating will afford; that being “equal” is a given, guaranteed by government not reward of private initiative.

That said, the real bite here is the knock that Capitalism is an especially corrupt system of government.

Whatever capitalism is, it’s the most robust producer of wealth ever’ whereas socialism has never been a good creator of wealth, rather, has always been an excellent system for siphoning wealth once wealth has been accumulated. Even at this stage of the debate, our social programs have expanded beyond our ability to pay for them in a fashion timely or otherwise, forcing a culture of deficit spending driving the national debt ever upward to astronomical levels, where beyond the steady growth of our current liabilities, Contender Bernie Sanders suggests ten trillion more of debt over the next 10 years. Add to it the present growth rate of national debt and that figures to be about \$40 trillion by the year 2030. Then there are all those unfunded liabilities the progressives (socialist oriented societies) won’t even discuss.

I think that corruption has not one, but many forms and faces. Yet, come hell or high water the drive for more governmental control of our lives not only rolls on, it compounds at each and every step; despite its vision of “a wonderful world of tomorrow” socialism in various forms, its bloodshed, its trials errors and tedious failures has shown as its face, the most grotesque political caricature of modern times.