

Socialism is Slavery

People are not animals (i.e, sheep or lap dogs, etc.). People can own animals. But some sheep and dogs are not owned by a person. Those sheep and dogs are free, and they are free to fend for themselves. Free range sheep and feral dogs typically don't want to be captured and owned by people.

However, if a sheep or a dog is owned by a person, that person then has a moral obligation to provide food, water, shelter and medical care to their animal. On the flip side, the sheep and the dog (because they are not free) have a right to expect to receive the food, water, shelter, and medical care from the person who owns them.

(Hopefully, by now, you are beginning to see where this whole line of thinking is heading).

The US federal government was set up under the philosophy that individuals (aka We-the-People) are in charge. The Constitution stated that We-the-People established **our** federal government to ensure our own individual peace and future prosperity. The Declaration of Independence also explicitly states that governments are set up to be subservient to the people, and whenever a government becomes tyrannical, it is the obligation of the people to overthrow that government and replace it with something where the people are back in charge.

The Declaration also states that people have an unalienable right to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. These unalienable rights come from our Creator, not from a government. Under our Constitution, the government has a structure and a set of (limited) responsibilities. The government doesn't have any "rights" other than what the people grant to it via the electoral and legislative process. Similarly, the people don't have any guaranteed government-granted rights other than whatever might be bestowed upon them by the government via the legislative process. And, accordingly, any of those government-granted rights can similarly be taken away via a subsequent legislative process.

Now... Back to sheep and dogs (and slaves). Socialists have always believed that a government (i.e., its elites and career politicians) should rule over a country's citizens. Democratic Socialists also share this world view (provided that the majority of the mob agrees). They rationalize this view because (after all) that is what the democratic majority voted for. Accordingly (and unfortunately) this is also the rationale for the "progressive" movement - - prioritizing the government's will over the will of the individual - - which is the exact opposite of the Declaration's contention that individuals have the unalienable right to Liberty.

Many people inherently understand that Socialism is exactly opposite from the original intent of our country's founding. However, the members of the "progressive" / Socialist movement righteously proclaim that the government should provide Security to the people, and therefore, it must provide the food, water, shelter, education, Medicaid, Social Security, etc. etc. to its "subjects". (Ah, the siren song of "utopia"). The flip side of this equation then becomes the fact that the people do not have a personal responsibility to acquire these necessities of life for their own consumption. After all, those commodities will be provided to them for "free" (similar to the sheep and dogs mentioned above).

OK - So let's finish connecting all the dots. The government cannot magically produce the food, water, shelter, medical care and retirement funds that it must provide to its subjects. The only way the government can distribute these commodities is to coerce some of its subjects (under the threat of IRS legal action) so they provide the commodities to the government, so that the government can then re-distribute those necessities to its subjects as it sees fit. And what do you call the unfortunate souls who must provide these commodities to the government? Simply put, they are slaves. And most people (and hopefully, even most Socialists) will acknowledge that slavery is immoral. The means - Slavery - does NOT justify the ends (the intended "utopia").

Despite its immorality, the Democratic Socialist Party of America continues to double-down on its attempts to implement Socialism. That is why conservatives in the country are trying to lead a movement to have the slaves leave the Democrat plantation. Unfortunately, the plantation owners hold a lot of power, and have acquired that power by simply buying the votes of the majority of their slaves.

So here is the conundrum - - people are faced with a choice between Security (food, water, shelter, medical care, etc. provided by the government) or Liberty, which requires a heavy dose of Personal Responsibility. Sadly, it is very easy to sell your vote to the Socialists, especially if you can avoid being one of the unfortunate slaves who must produce not only the commodities you and your family need for your own survival, but also the commodities the government coerces from its slaves to benevolently bestow upon someone else.

A final conceptual question about morality concerns the issue of altruism. Compassionate conservatives believe whole-heartedly with the concept of benevolent (uncoerced) altruism. This is why America is the single most compassionate country in the world as measured by the amount of uncoerced charitable contributions its citizens provide.

Socialists believe in government-mandated, government-coerced, and government-controlled altruism. This is because the government's elites believe they can more effectively manage people's lives, spend their money more "wisely", and provide the Security they know people desire. After all, the only cost people have to pay is the cost of their vote (and a lot of their Liberty).

Benjamin Franklin summed it up very succinctly - "Those who surrender Freedom for Security will not have (nor do they deserve) either one." Those are very wise and profound words from one of our country's Founding Fathers, and a truism that every American should seriously consider today.