



THE SOCIALIST DEMOCRATIC PARTY

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest dangers to be feared." --Thomas Jefferson

Paraphrasing the esteemed classical liberal economist, Friedrich von Hayek, Future Freedom Foundation President Jacob Hornberger wrote, "There is no difference in principle, between the economic philosophy of Nazism, socialism, communism, and fascism and that of the American welfare state and regulated economy." British historian, Dr. John Joseph Ray, noted further, "The Big Lie of the late 20th century was that Nazism was Rightist. It was in fact typical of the Leftism of its day. It was only to the Right of Stalin's Communism."



Socialist Evolution

Not only is there little distinction between Soviet and German socialist systems of the 20th century, but there is no consequential distinction between Marxist Socialism, Nationalist Socialism, or the most recent incarnation of this beast, Democratic Socialism. The objective of socialism by any name, is to replace [Rule of Law](#) with the [rule of men](#), and the terminus of this transformation is tyranny.

Vladimir Lenin wrote of the application of Marxism in Russia, "Marx said that the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat lies between capitalism and communism [Read: "socialism"]. He noted, "Political institutions are a superstructure resting on

an economic foundation," and that foundation must be destroyed in order to bring down those institutions.

Following the Marxis-Leninist models, in Adolf Hitler's 1925 autobiography "Mein Kampf," he wrote of his Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (National Socialist German Workers' Party or NAZI), "The party should not become a constable of public opinion, but must dominate it. It must not become a servant of the masses, but their master." On the the socialist state versus individual Liberty, he wrote, "The unity of a nation's spirit and will are worth far more than the freedom of the spirit and will of an individual; and that the higher interests involved in the life of the whole must here set the limits and lay down the duties of the interests of the individual."

Hitler's regime was founded on his premise, "We are Socialists, we are enemies of the capitalistic economic system...and we are all determined to destroy this system under all conditions." His Minister of Propaganda, Joseph Goebbels: "To be a socialist is to submit the I to the thou; socialism is sacrificing the individual to the whole."

This is precisely the principle upon which Barack Hussein Obama and his contemporary cadres of Socialist Democrats are following as they endeavor to [raise a socialist government](#) by undermining [free enterprise](#).

Indeed, Democratic Socialism, like Nationalist Socialism, is nothing more than Marxist Socialism repackaged. It seeks a centrally planned economy directed by a dominant-party state that controls economic production by way of taxation, regulation and income redistribution. The success of Democrat Socialism depends upon supplanting [Essential Liberty](#) -- the rights "endowed by our Creator" -- primarily by refuting such endowment.

Noted Russian dissident Alexander Solzhenitsyn, no stranger to the consequences of statism, wrote, "Socialism of any type leads to a total destruction of the human spirit."

Notably, regardless of the [populist variant of Socialism](#), the consequences of all three are tyranny. For those who are offended by the comparison of Democratic Socialism to Nationalist and Marxist Socialism, neither Stalin nor Hitler were guilty of exterminating "enemies of the state" until they had ascended to political positions affording consolidation of power in their respective Socialist states. The terminus of Socialism under any label, is tyranny. As Von Hayek observed, "Many who think themselves infinitely superior to the aberrations of Nazism, and sincerely hate all manifestations, work at the same time for ideals whose realization would lead straight to the abhorred tyranny."

So what do these observations have to do with the current state of economic and political affairs in our great nation? Unfortunately, more than most Americans currently realize.

However discomfiting this fact might be, there is abundant and irrefutable evidence that Barack Hussein Obama and his [socialist cadre](#) are endeavoring to "fundamentally transform the United States of America" with a [debt bomb](#), the future shockwave of which, they surmise, will [break the back of free enterprise](#). From the ashes of that cataclysm, Obama and his ilk envision restructuring our national economy as a [Democrat Socialism State](#).

If you think such assertions are just rhetorical hyperbole, think harder.

As the direct result of Obama's "[economic recovery plan](#)," the central government budget forecast for the current fiscal year includes a historic \$1.65 *trillion* deficit. Given the [economic consequences](#) of continued growth in unfunded government spending (including ObamaCare), the potential inflation on our immediate horizon (prompted primarily by increasing energy costs), and diminished confidence in the U.S.

dollar, the deficit proportion of fiscal-year 2012's \$3.73 trillion budget will set yet another appalling record.

More perilous for consumers is the potential for "stagflation," a remnant from the Carter era that combines static or decreasing wages (stagnant economic growth) with increasing commodity prices (inflation).

In February alone, Obama's central government accrued a record \$223 billion deficit for one month. To put this in perspective, that single-month deficit exceeds the entire 2007 budget deficit under George W. Bush -- you know, the one that was Demo-gogued during the 2008 campaign cycle.

Republicans scraped together a few more cuts for their [feeble \\$61 billion](#) in proposed 2011 budget reductions, but Obama and his Senate Democrats declared they would approve only \$4.7 billion in additional cuts. "Do we want jobs?" asked Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV). "If we do, then we simply cannot pass the plan the Tea Party has already pushed through the House."

What is needed, if we're to have jobs in five years, is \$4.7 billion in additional cuts for every *day* of this year's budget, and those that follow.

Indeed, the Senate voted down the House budget, which was to be expected. Reid went so far as to declare it "mean-spirited." Obama's Senate protagonist, John Kerry, defined the meager Republican cuts as an "ideological, extremist, reckless statement" that "would contribute to the reversal of our recovery. It might even destroy our recovery."

Since Democrats have lambasted and voted against *any* cuts proposed by Republicans, the Republican "leadership" should stand true to last fall's elections and propose those deep cuts promised on the campaign trail. There *are* [budget solutions](#), but these require political courage and resolve, a rare commodity in our nation's Capital.

As it stands now, Congress is borrowing 40 cents of every dollar it spends and our national debt is \$14 trillion, which is about 97 percent of our nation's gross domestic product (economic production) in 2010.

"Deficit spending," concluded Alan Greenspan, former chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors (1987-2006), "is simply a scheme for the hidden confiscation of wealth." And that is precisely the prescription necessary to establish Democratic Socialism.

If the future shock of this debt bomb set by Obama and his [Useful Idiots](#) does not yet cause you considerable heartburn, consider the implication of these statistics: Of total U.S. wages and employee benefits paid in 2010, 35 percent were paid by the central government as wages, or in fulfillment of entitlement programs. Read that again and let it sink in.

In 1960, wages and entitlement program distributions by the central government were 10 percent of total U.S. wages and benefits. Over the next 40 years, that figure doubled to 20 percent. In just one decade since, that figure has increased to 35 percent, with the baby boomer wave yet to fully draw on government income and social services. This explains, in part, why federal spending has increased from \$1.86 trillion in 2001 to \$3.82 this year. Social welfare spending alone has increased by \$514 billion since Obama took office.

Some 8 percent of the total work force is government employed, which is to say that the remaining 27 percent is wages and benefits for mostly unfunded government programs.

Obama's proposed spending levels and the resulting debt are unsustainable -- by design.

In 2010, central government spending in the U.S. was almost 41 percent of our nation's GDP -- by far the highest it has been since WWII. It will exceed that in 2011. For the record, in the last decade of the Soviet Union's existence before its collapse, the USSR's central government spending peaked at 49 percent of

GDP. When their economy collapsed, it was clear that socialism had failed, and they have attempted to move toward a free market system.

However, once Obama's debt bomb has collapsed the U.S. economy, his Leftist successors will "never let a serious crisis to go to waste," in the words of his former White House Chief. Rather than restore proven free market principles, they envision the full state implementation of Democratic Socialism, which they have been incrementally instating for a generation.

Currently, both political parties are resorting to tired old political formulas when asked about the challenge of balancing the national budget. Both suggest that it will take more than a decade -- a pathetic excuse that we have heard for decades. (As for those claims of surpluses in the Clinton years resulting from the economic growth set in motion during the Reagan years: not so when one takes into account the Social Security "lock box IOUs.")

House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA) concludes, "It is very difficult to balance the budget within 10 years without cutting seniors' benefits now, and as I said before, our vision of entitlement reform will protect today's seniors and those nearing retirement."

House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-MD) insists, "We're not going to [have a balanced budget] in 10 years, but we have to be on a very considered path to get there, certainly, within the next decade and a half or two decades."

Any pretense that Obama has any intention of balancing the budget is spurious, as the smallest estimated annual deficit that his budget will run during the next decade is \$615 billion.

Meanwhile, he continues to recycle these prevarications: "Not only were we able to yank this economy out of the recession, not only were we able to get this economy going again, but in the last 15 months we've seen the economy add jobs. We didn't

just rescue the economy; we put it on the strongest footing for the future."

So what are the political consequences when the money runs out, when the lenders withdraw, when the smoke clears and the mirrors shatter from the debt bomb shockwave?

Some will settle for the institution of Democratic Socialism.

However none should underestimate the potential groundswell of protest across our nation, composed primarily of legions of Patriots fully capable of intervening on behalf of the Rule of Law enshrined in our Constitution.

If those elected to national office, regardless of political affiliation, fail to abide by their oaths [to Support and Defend](#) our Constitution, particularly its limitations on the central government which have been disregarded for much of the last century, then

we, the people, will restore the integrity of our Constitution, as is [our right and obligation](#). Rest assured, there will come a [time for choosing](#) as outlined by [Ronald Reagan](#), and that [time must come](#).

One might recall that our Declaration of Independence and Constitution were the product of civil disobedience and revolution against a lesser form of tyranny than that imposed today. In the words of Founding Father Thomas Jefferson, "The tree of Liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants."

For those whom such notions offend, I offer these words of parting from Samuel Adams: "If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude than the animated contest of freedom -- go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsels or arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains sit lightly upon you, and may posterity forget that you were our countrymen!"