



An Uncomfortable "Thought Experiment"

TYRANNY OF THE MAJORITY #2 -- SLAVERY, NAZIS, AND SECESSION

If you vote Democrat and are a fan of centralized state planning, high confiscatory taxes on our most productive workers and support ACORN and **OhMyGod! Obama's** income redistribution schemes, then you will likely perceive this essay to be beyond mere heresy. You will probably think of it as treasonous sedition.

If on the other hand you vote Republican and especially if you're a fan of individual freedom and are far more concerned with what our federal government is doing *to you* than *for you*, then you'll probably be disturbed by -- but ultimately attracted to -- the sad logic underlying the points and arguments which follow.

“Just” Enslavement

Many Democrats might argue that America's Bracket Slavery today is actually somewhat “just” in that it's only the most successful, highest-earning minority of people (or more accurately, the minority with the highest legal and reported incomes) who have roughly half or more of their labor in thrall to The State. In effect, only those who can most readily withstand it are enslaved today, albeit at the point of a gun. This perspective on “equity” is clearly akin to Marx' famed principal that The State is owed “!from each according to his abilities!” and indeed probably derives from that fundamentally Marxist world view.

This is an “enlightened” sense of justice in the same way that an enlightened Vampire would suck blood only from the most physically fit, or like a “progressive” parasite leaching only from the healthiest hosts (or at least, healthiest prior to infestation).

But even if we accept this fundamentally Marxist perspective of equity at face value purely for the sake of argument, it's interesting to see what develops when one applies this same logic and perspective on America's slavery prior to the Civil War.

Analogy Between Today's American Slavery and Yesterday's

The archetype of this prior mode of enslavement in America was the Plantation, with dark-skinned slaves toiling in the heat to pick cotton, which has been described as physically arduous in the extreme. The *exact* analogy to today's Bracket Slavery would be (a) if The State owned the cotton fields instead of the private plantation owner, (b) only the largest and strongest individuals -- i.e. the largest and strongest 20% or 25%* or so of the people with both white and black skins most capable of picking the most cotton -- were so enslaved and (c) instead of toiling in the fields for others' benefit all the time, they only had to do this half the time, with the other half of their lengthy work-week available for themselves.

*Per the IRS' own statistics, this is the approximate percentage *or less* of our income tax filers who pay 95% *or more* of our government's total tax revenue.

In this exact analogy between today's American Slavery and yesterday's, the arbitrary criterion for enslavement is not skin color and race, but size and strength. It's just as unfair, just as arbitrary, but simply based on another set of physical characteristics.

This hypothetical analogy underscores two truths. First, America's 50% (or more) aggregate Bracket Slavery today is a better deal for the enslaved than for the American

slaves of over 150 years ago. That's pretty clear, in that the enslaved minority is only half enslaved today, and enjoys a higher standard of living as well (consistent with the comparatively high economic value of their labor). Second, instead of racial criteria for enslavement, the enslaved minority today is defined by reported income level instead of race. It's still a minority that's still enslaved (albeit only by half) with the criteria defining that minority to be enslaved simply being different.

But regardless of these clear (and mitigating) differences, it's still very, very wrong. And just as America by the mid-1800's could not resolve the conflict between a minority's enslavement then with America's ideals of Freedom and Liberty without a Civil War, so will the similar structural contradiction between these ideals and the aggregate 50% (or more) enslavement of today's High Bracket Slave minority most likely lead to similarly unforeseen political cataclysm and upheaval.

Flawed Attempts at Justification

Interestingly, one of the hypocritical rationalizations for the enslavement of Africans for the cotton and sugar-cane fields of the New World was that being from tropical Africa these people would be able to endure the hot summers toiling in the fields more readily than whites. Slavery's apologists also argued in particular that Africans' dark skin would protect them better from the hot sun. (Indeed, we now know that melanin, which produces dark skin, is basically evolution's sun-screen).

Most interestingly, this is essentially the exact same underlying logic employed by **OhMyGod! Obama, Baronet Biden the Blowhard (Gargoyle of Gaff), Lord Levin of Lenin Likeness, Lord Waxman (Count of Kleenex, Cap and Trade)** and the rest of the Noble Democrats regarding taxing the "evil rich" at 50% or more.

That is, slavery's apologists of over 150 years ago argued that African slaves could endure it better than whites, by virtue of their racial characteristics. Likewise today's **Democrat Plantation Masters** reason that today's 50% Bracket Slaves can likewise endure their enslavement better, by virtue of their income.

Both rationales are (a) equally accurate in a narrow, technical sense, (b) equally hypocritical and (c) equally inadequate as "justification" for enslaving a minority.

The First Civil War

When Abraham Lincoln became the presidential favorite, the Southern states saw the hand-writing on the wall and concluded that their way of life was at risk. So, they attempted to secede from the union. In a technical sense they had every right to do this, since their agreeing to join America in the first place was conditioned on their ability to withdraw whenever they wanted. This was the deal the Southern States made with the rest of the States (i.e. the government in effect during our Nation's creation) when they agreed to join the Union. Lincoln reneged on that deal, and thus even many committed Democrats in the South today still call the Civil War the "War of Northern Aggression."

So, technically they surely had a point, but it was only technical and legalistic. The moral imperative informing the Civil War was, of course, Slavery. Clearly, the reason the Confederacy wanted to secede was to exercise their freedom by totally denying other

human beings their freedom, on the superficial (but prejudicially potent) technicality of their skin color. As noted elsewhere this was an awful institution which could command no moral traction whatsoever, notwithstanding slavery's apologists' attempts to justify it on grounds of (a) Africans' presumed greater ability to endure slavery's (horrible) conditions and (b) this legalistic technicality which attempted to place the morality of "a deal" above the morality of treating people like livestock.

The North's Moral Traction

So, the Confederacy withdrew from the Union in order to preserve this clearly unjust and horrible institution. Their intellectual attempts to lamely justify this did not come close, however, to matching what gradually evolved to become the moral focal point of the North's going to war to prevent this withdrawal, which was to end slavery in America. While certain white supremacist groups nowadays might get excited over the South's lame racial arguments, and while many members of today's tort bar would likely find righteous justification (depending on retainer or contingency fees, that is) for going to litigation war over the legalistic "broken deal" aspect of the South's position, the South's moral cause compared with that of the North was even less than their comparative industrial capacity. For both reasons the Confederacy lost the war, despite having better generals (at least at first) and better individual soldiers, generally.

To summarize, the Confederacy seceded to preserve slavery, and the North went to war, in the final analysis, to prevent slavery -- at least, that's how the Federal government "sold" the war to its citizens (and that, sadly, is why some black people were lynched and some black orphans were even burned alive in New York City's draft riots -- when the rioters set fire to a black orphanage -- since many Civil War draftees didn't want to risk live and limb for this cause).

The Case for Secession Today – Slavery, Tyranny and Nazis

A majority of the historically literate citizens in most of the red states accurately perceive that today's Federal government has waxed in power to such an extent as to make the British government's unfair taxation extractions from the Colonists seem like a mild irritant in comparison. Many citizens in these red states are outraged over this, and view today's bloated Leviathan in Washington as a blend of Bracket Slave Master, Tyrant and Baby Killer.

The Slave Master aspect of The State, and its enslavement by ballot (backed by bullet) of our 50% Bracket Slave minority, has already been discussed at length both herein already and elsewhere.

Regarding Tyranny, as also noted previously many of the 50% (or more) Bracket Slaves might well perceive Washington's orchestration of a Tyranny of the Majority against them to be highly reminiscent of Stalin's attitude toward the Kulaks, another well-off minority (or at least, well-off for a while).

And while my personal feelings about abortion in general are admittedly ambivalent, late-term abortions are entirely different and it is impossible to ignore the eerie similarities between late-term abortions (like those which that "doctor" in Kansas specialized in) and "Doctor" Joseph Mengele's famous instance of literally throwing at least one freshly born Jewish baby alive into the furnace(s) of Auschwitz.

That is, from the baby's perspective is it difficult to tell the difference between being simultaneously burned and suffocated in a high-tech furnace, and being simultaneously burned and suffocated in the womb from a generous injection of salt water? According to those closest to the late-term abortion process, this is basically what happens. Indeed, scientists' recent findings in regard to the apparent cognitive abilities, memory capacity -- and likely ability to feel pain -- of the about-to-be-born do make this a disturbingly trenchant question. In fact, the high-tech ovens of Auschwitz possibly got the job done quicker than the Kansas womb-scaldings, thanks to fine German engineering and the Nazis' efficient focus on volume of killings rather than volume of billings.

Technical Qualifiers and Eugenics

Moreover, one is struck by the fine technical discriminations which characterize both sets of activities. For, a critical technical criterion that separated one in early 1940's Germany from Auschwitz or October-fest was the actual percentage of one's "Jewish blood" (i.e. degree of separation between you and your possibly problematic progenitors). Likewise, in the minds of especially progressive liberals in Washington such as **Baroness Bader, Ruth the Red** or **OhMyGod! Obama** is the equally weighty technicality as to whether the living baby has, or has not, actually emerged on its own from the body of the mother by the time of the late-term abortion appointment. In both cases the difference between (a) murder and (b) legal process approved by The State depends on fine, basically technical distinctions.

Ginsberg's recent comments in support of the way abortion "helps control" the numbers of certain undesirable segments of the population would be enthusiastically supported by Mengele, though he would have objected to the inefficient self-service aspect of the eugenics favored by Ginsberg.

Ivan and Barack

In an equally (or more) disturbing parallel, Barack Obama voted on multiple occasions to prohibit any effort to save babies who happened to survive botched late-term abortions. This is intriguingly reminiscent of the similar philosophical position of the infamous Concentration Camp Guard nicknamed Ivan the Terrible, who was said to have been careful to shoot those few children who were discovered to be still alive in the Treblinka gas chamber (which was not high-tech and a bit leaky), as it was being cleaned out for the next batch.* In both cases (i.e. Obama's late-term abortion votes and Ivan's thoroughness) those unwanted children who miraculously survived a murderous process were still to be expunged, per Ivan and Barack.

- Ivan is said to have orchestrated "all children" batches for the Treblinka gas chamber, in order to maximize their terror by gassing the adults, whose presence might otherwise have comforted the children, separately.

Finally, one can observe that the Kansas Doctor's late-term abortion activities were, in most cases, about as vital to saving the life of the mother as the Nazis' efforts to exterminate Jews were vital to saving Germany.

In short, there are many, many US citizens -- mostly in red states -- who perceive our Federal Government as having grown like a cancerous tumor beyond all hope of repair both economically and morally, to a pernicious extent far greater than the British ever

were to our Founding Fathers and even with parallels to two of humanity's most odious institutions. They are disgusted with how America has (a) fulfilled de Tocqueville's gloomy prediction and (b) in the process of doing so has re-created partial analogues to Slavery and Nazis. They are, admittedly, only partial analogues since the slavery is clearly only around 50% (though growing by leaps and bounds) and our Nazi-like late-term abortions are clearly far less extensive and pernicious than the Nazis' eugenics (unless of course you're the about-to-be-born baby experiencing the salt water asphyxiating womb-burn).

An Uncomfortable "Thought Experiment"

If you had to pick one, which would you rather be: (a) a freshly born Jewish baby tossed alive into the high-tech Auschwitz furnace by Joseph Mengele, (b) an accidental survivor shot by Ivan the Terrible in the low-tech Treblinka gas chamber or (c) an accidental survivor of a botched late-term abortion in Illinois condemned per Barack Obama's three late-term abortion votes to die slowly by "natural causes," who by law cannot receive medical treatment for either saving or mercy-killing? The last option clearly takes the longest, and may even be the most excruciating -- especially if the pain is "duration-weighted" -- depending on details such as the nature of the physical damage produced by the botched late-term abortion process, whether or not anesthetic is provided, etc.

Secession?

Several months ago Texas was talking about the possibility of seceding from the Union. This may be superficially reminiscent of how the Confederacy likewise attempted to withdraw from the Union over 150 years ago, but now the moral shoe would be on the other foot.

First, if one compares The State's 50% (or more) Bracket Slavery taxation with the British Crown's relatively modest level of sequestrations, one would have to equate those wishing to secede with the similar motivations of the Founding Fathers' wanting the British tax boot removed from their economic neck (even though that boot was much smaller than Washington's boot's massive size and crushing weight today).

Second, if one equates the labor confiscation enforced at government gunpoint of our 50% Bracket Slavery today to the 100% slavery (times .5) of the plantations, one might be similarly desirous of an ability to escape today's admittedly kinder, gentler partial slavery. A state with no income tax like Texas or Alaska could both secede and simultaneously (a) adopt the Fair Tax, (b) re-create the truly limited, small government structure established by our Founding Fathers and (c) thereby become the golden "last stop" on today's political Underground Railroad.

Finally, while the author's personal feelings about abortion in general are admittedly ambivalent, he professes no ambivalence whatsoever regarding late-term abortions for spurious reasons and the legislated slow, probably agonizing death of about-to-be-born babies who miraculously survive the abortion attempt. Just like our 50% bracket slavery is a diluted version of its historical plantation antecedent, so are late-term abortions in Kansas, Illinois (at least as per Obama's votes) and elsewhere seemingly little but less widespread versions of Mengele's activities and Ivan's approach to the issue of unwanted children's accidental survival.

So, What Would Happen?

If one or more of the red states such as Texas, Alaska or others were to secede out of disgust at how Washington's Federal Leviathan has perverted our Founding Fathers' once-great creation, what would happen? How would the Leviathan react?

There are basically only two alternates: the Leviathan would accept it, or would invade militarily by force like it did 150 years ago when the Confederacy seceded.

In this dialectic however, it's vital to bear in mind that the seceding states would be doing so to escape Slavery and Washington's Tyrannies of the Majority and the Tax Bracket, as well as Supreme Court ukases which lead to frivolous late-term abortions reminiscent of Mengele.

That is, the Confederate States' first attempt to secede was to *preserve* slavery, and the Federal intervention was to *end* slavery. The *exact reverse pattern* would apply today, were Texas, Alaska or others to secede and if today's Federal Leviathan were to act like it did last time. Today's secession would, in 180 degree contrast, be to end -- at least in the seceding states -- modern American Slavery and Nazis. Likewise, a Federal military response (or the threat of one at the negotiating table) would be to preserve them, also in reverse to the moral pattern 150 years ago.

It would, indeed, be the *exact* moral equivalent of the Confederacy's having invaded the North in order to impose its vision of race relations on the entire country.

Damocles
July, 2009