



## POPULIST SOCIALISM ON THE RISE

"99 Percent"? More like "20 Percent" but their Red cadres are growing

"The moment the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the laws of God, and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence. If 'Thou shalt not covet' and 'Thou shalt not steal' were not commandments of Heaven, they must be made inviolable precepts in every society before it can be civilized or made free." -- John Adams, 1787

The populist message of the Occupy Movement, the agelessly adolescent class warriors who make up Barack Hussein Obama's [Red October Uprising](#), now has the support of some 35 percent of Americans, mostly urbanites.

The Occupiers have now infested cities from coast to coast, including [Oakland](#), [Seattle](#), [Denver](#), [Austin](#), [Chicago](#), [Atlanta](#), [Baltimore](#), [New York](#) and [Boston](#). (For more on the Occupier movement visit our [\[YouTube Channel\]](#).)

Their mantra is simple (by necessity): "We are the 99 Percent, and we're all victims of the 1 Percent." By any objective standard, the [99 Percenters](#) are not the brightest bunch, and they really represent the roughly 20 percent of Americans who are irrevocably [dependent upon government subsidies](#) and pay *no*

**EAT THE RICH  
FEED THE POOR**



**ONE SOLUTION  
CLASS WAR**

income tax. Thus, this 20 percent has no vested interest in the cost of government and is predisposed to vote for the redistribution of others' incomes rather than work for their own. The underlying assumption is that it's easier to confiscate wealth than create it.

This "entitled" 20 percent combines with the 10 percent of American labor who are collectivists and another 5 percent who are perpetual malcontents to thus form Obama's entrenched socialist constituency of [Useful Idiots](#).

The intellectually challenged Occupy morons have built their movement around the errant assertion that if the assets of the 1 Percent were redistributed, everyone would live happily ever after. Unfortunately, what the 35 Percenters really want is "redistributive justice," Obama's euphemism for socialism, which would actually require the redistribution of income from the *other* 65 percent of Americans families who live on earned income, so that everyone could be equally impoverished.

However, there's a problem with liquidating the assets of the 1 percent (comprised of more celebs and pro athletes than Wall Street bankers), or even the top 25 percent of income earners: Most of their assets are on paper, and the rest of that "wealth" is in the form of small businesses and real property that support the jobs of tens of millions of Americans who, unlike the Occupy crowd, actually work for a living -- and take pride in their occupations.

So what happens with liquidation? First, government deficits would almost double because 40 percent of all tax revenues are collected from "the rich": No more income, no more tax revenue. Shortly thereafter, the economy would collapse, because half of all employers in the nation would have been liquidated. Then the government steps in to "nationalize" what is

left of the private sector, leaving everyone under the same statist tyranny as Obama's 35 Percenters -- equally miserable, equally dependent upon the government, and that much closer to Obama's mandate to implement [Democratic Socialism](#).

The irrefutable fact remains, socialist economies always fail, as history has recorded with lucid repetition. In the inimitable words of former UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, "Socialist governments ... always run out of other people's money. They then start to nationalize everything." Indeed, in the words of 19th century classical liberal Frederic Bastiat, "The state is the great fiction by which everybody seeks to live at the expense of everybody else."

Of course, socialists never let reality intrude upon their [classist fantasies](#) of universal equality and happiness. Nineteenth-century historian Alexis de Tocqueville once observed, "Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word: equality. But notice the difference: while democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude."

If you have any doubt about the socialist motives of the Occupy Movement, consider this proclamation from my daily American Communist Party communiqué (yes, I subscribe to certain leftist publications, so, yes, I *know* my enemy): "We Are the 99%! The AFL-CIO has taken another step to embrace the Occupy Movement by creating their own [We Are the 99%](#) website. Also, CPUSA Chair Sam Webb has an article on the movement at the People's World: '[Occupy: embrace the new, build the movement](#).'"

Next, I suggest you review the official list of [Occupy supporters](#), including Marxists, Nationalists, Fascists and even Islamists. What a sorry lot for a supporting cast. In an astounding demonstration of abject ignorance, some [Leftmedia "journalists"](#) and political hacks have attempted to draw like comparisons between [Tea Party Patriots](#) and the radical Occupy movement. Obama even asserted, "in some ways

they're not that different." To set the record straight, we invite you to [compare their respective rallies](#) and decide for yourself!



Occupy v Tea Party

about how our financial system works. ... I think it expresses the frustrations that the American people feel. ... The American people understand that not everybody's been following the rules. These days, a lot of folks doing the right thing are not rewarded. A lot of folks who are not doing the right thing are rewarded."

As to the Occupy Movement's momentum, Obama says their agenda "will express itself until 2012 and beyond until people feel they are getting back to old-fashioned American values. That's going to express itself politically in 2012 and beyond."

By "old-fashioned" we suspect he's merely re-warming some propaganda from one of the most notable of 20th-century socialists, that inheritance welfare liberal Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was FDR, after all, who channeled Karl Marx when he proclaimed, "Here is my principle: Taxes shall be levied according to ability to pay. That is the only American principle." For sure, Obama is modeling his reelection campaign after FDR's 1936 campaign, when Roosevelt won on a class warfare strategy and avoided accountability for his failed socialist economic policies which sustained double digit unemployment until WWII.

Given all this, it's not surprising that the Occupiers' highest-profile support emanates from Obama himself, who proclaimed to a group of Occupiers, "You are the reason I ran for office."

Obama claims, "People are frustrated and the [Occupy] protesters are giving voice to a more broad-based frustration

Roosevelt issued a collectivist "[bill of rights](#)" in which he said that the government should ensure "the right to a useful and remunerative job ... the right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation ... 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 ... the right to a good education."

For his part, Obama has been clear in his collectivist rhetoric: "[T]he wealthiest Americans have made out like bandits. ... It's not that I want to punish your success. I just want to make sure that everybody who is behind you, that they've got a chance for success too. I think when you spread the wealth around, it's good for everybody."

However, Obama's silence on the growing civil unrest, is deafening!