

Closely Watched Trains

“Obama is not a socialist! He hasn’t confiscated your house, has he? Give me one example where Obama has not protected your property rights!”

That is the kind of response I get from Obama’s defenders when I bring up his socialist policies. To them, the term socialism can be used only to refer to a scenario in which the government owns *everything*. Because they don’t see Obama pursuing *that*, he is not a socialist: “Case closed, you racist!” To the Obots, society should operate not on the principles of liberty and law but with a mixed bag of “whatever works.” To them, a “single payer” health care system “works” because it means relieving them of one of life’s many responsibilities.

But it is obviously a mistake to argue that not confiscating someone’s house or business means property rights are being protected. Kicking a family out of its house to give it to someone else, as the Nazis did to the Jews, is certainly a gross violation of property rights, but there are many other violations of a lesser degree. The income tax is technically a violation of your property rights. Whether you are taxed at 39.6 percent or 10 percent does not alter the fact that your property—a portion of your paycheck—is being confiscated. Regulations that limit what you can buy or sell or how you may engage in trade are also property rights violations. To order a baker to produce a wedding cake for a homosexual couple is a violation of that baker’s property rights. One may disagree with his beliefs, but that does not give anyone the right to *force him to produce for others*. Make no mistake, that is *precisely* what is being ordered. That the baker is being paid for his services is irrelevant. *He is being forced to produce for others*. For the government or a court to state, “You *must* bake cakes for gays” is arguably no different, *in principle*, than rounding up Jews and forcing them to manufacture munitions. (Those who believe bakers *should* be forced to bake cakes for homosexual couples should be asked if it is appropriate to *also* force a gay, abortion-supporting owner of a printing company to produce placards denouncing gay marriage and abortion for protest marchers.)

It is easy for Obama defenders to say, “If Obama didn’t kick you out of your house then he is not a fascist,” or “If Obama didn’t fully nationalize the auto industry then he is not a socialist.” But the fact that violations of one’s rights may be imposed *gradually* does not mean they are not violations. Hitler did not confiscate *everyone’s* property or nationalize *all* industries and businesses, but that does not mean he was not abrogating the rights of millions or that his regime was not immoral and brutal. The Soviet Union tolerated black market activities, but that did not make it any less of an evil empire.

Those who claim Obama is not trying to impose “socialized medicine” on the nation immediately point to what he is *not* (yet) doing. But we need to look at what he *is* doing, along with his past actions and statements—which make clear his agenda and motives. Obama has publicly endorsed a nationalized health care system as recently as 2007 but

told audiences, with no small amount of disappointment in his statement, that he could not get there “right away.” He said what he wanted in 2007 and there is no reason not to believe what he said. Such statements have also been made by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV), House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), and a number of members of Congress, including socialist Jan Schakowsky (D-IL).

That ObamaCare currently permits a limited health insurance market via Healthcare.gov is irrelevant and most certainly does *not* mean Obama endorses free market capitalism. His “market” gives you a choice of four plans: bronze, silver, gold, and platinum (all of which are essentially the same as far as coverage, and vary mostly in cost and provider networks), whereas the partially free market that existed before ObamaCare likely gave you a choice of hundreds of plans—and you would have a choice of thousands of plans if health insurance could be sold across state lines.

ObamaCare will most assuredly cause providers to lose money. Obama’s “solution” is to bail out those insurers with taxpayer-funded subsidies via “risk corridor” language in the Affordable Care Act. Obama knows that the public strongly opposes such subsidies, and he knows that the House Republicans will not go along with requests for the larger bailouts he will be forced to request. Thus, Obama has (intentionally) created a problem, the partial solution to which the public opposes, and his scheme will only make the situation worse. *Why did he do that?* Because he expects to be able to propose a single payer solution to the problems he caused. That will also be ineffective, and will also increase the federal deficits. Obama will then offer to resolve *those* problems by nationalizing the hospitals and turning doctors and nurses into government employees. The scheme has the Cloward-Piven strategy written all over it. Obama learned his community activist lessons well.

The leftists who still have their houses will claim, “But he didn’t violate our property rights; I still have my house; doctors make too much money anyway; and why should hospitals make a profit?”

Then the government will move on to the *next* target industry. No, Obama may not be engaged in a Soviet-style revolution, attempting to take over every industry and business in one fell swoop, but that does not mean he is not a revolutionary or that he would not do so if he could. (Nor does it mean he is not a Marxist, although he might more accurately be called a Leninist.) That Obama engages in some elements of fascism, some elements of socialism, and some elements of crony capitalism is irrelevant. That he is not trying to do everything immediately is irrelevant. In fact, *that is what makes him all the more dangerous*, because it is easier to abrogate individual freedoms gradually than all at once. Revolutionaries can be evil but they can also be quite patient. Reid’s use of the “nuclear option” in changing Senate rules to make it easier to place extreme judges on the bench will not give the revolutionaries everything they want right away, but they can wait. It may take years to wholly construct the network of leftist judges that enable them to fully “transform” the nation. But they accept those time constraints, just as they understood

that it would take decades to infiltrate the universities and the news media with committed leftists.

Fortunately, what is working in America's favor is the fact that Obama is not a patient revolutionary. He overreached with ObamaCare. His impatience, along with the incompetence of those surrounding him at the White House (e.g., Valerie Jarrett) and in the Department of Health and Human Services (e.g., Kathleen Sebelius), have made it clear to many Americans that Healthcare.gov and ObamaCare are not the end; they are merely among the many means to Obama's socialist end.

Before and during World War II some people warned that Hitler planned on exterminating Jews, gypsies, homosexuals, and other "undesirables," but few believed them—and many chose to ignore them—until it was too late. Few may have seen the concentration camps, but they certainly saw the packed trains headed to Auschwitz and Treblinka and Dachau and Sobibor. Today, some are warning about the socialist future Obama and his comrades have in store for us. Many refuse to believe the warnings because they cannot see the concentration camps. *But the ObamaCare trains are right in front of their eyes.* The sooner Americans recognize the purpose of those trains, the less difficult it will be to halt Obama's "fundamental transformation" of the United States of America.

Don Fredrick
December 8, 2013