

Eagle Forum Report

successor to The Phyllis Schlafly Report

200 W. Third St., Ste. 502 • Alton, IL 62002 • (618) 433-8990 • Eagle@EagleForum.org • EagleForum.org

December 2019

Volume 3/Number 12

Seduced by Socialism

IS SOCIALISM BIBLICAL?

Carolyn McLarty, DVM. Republican National Committeewoman for Oklahoma and Eagle Forum Board Member.

The short answer to this title question is, “No.” Social engineering, also known as Socialism, done for the “greater” or “common good,” results in slavery to the government, not individual freedom.

The Democrat Party is embracing Socialism. The top tier Democrat Presidential candidates have sold out for making America into a Socialist nation. This threatening movement is a “wolf in sheep’s clothing” to many unsuspecting American citizens.

Socialism does not mean being sociable. Socialism does not mean social media. All generations from X, to Millennials, to Generation Y, to Gen Next, Gen Z, etc., need to know that Socialism is inherently un-sociable.

Under Socialism, no private property is allowed. The means of production and the means of distribution of goods and services are all controlled by the State. Communism is an extension of Socialism where the system is enforced by a totalitarian regime. All these things are done in the name of the “common good.”

A big part of why Socialism is palatable to many unsuspecting Americans, especially our younger generations, is that it is peddled as

a loving and caring way for the government to provide for the needs of everyone, regardless of any circumstances. However, this utopian ideal diminishes individual responsibility, value, and self-esteem.

In fact, Socialism is often sold as the Christian, or Biblical way of doing things, even though the entity people would then depend upon is the government, not God.

Socialism has the opposite effect in social, economic, and government structure than that of Biblical principles. Socialism is a humanistic (atheistic and materialistic) system that leads to the forced redistribution of wealth, with economic and social control of everyone’s life as a result.

An education vacuum exists on this topic (on purpose by progressives who really are Socialists). A 2016 Gallup poll found 69 percent of millennials say they would be willing to vote for a “Socialist” candidate for president. They do not realize, if you want any freedom and you want to own your own stuff (think designer jeans or the next iPhone), then you are *not* a Socialist.

Socialism loves a graduated income tax system that eventually reaches 100 percent for everyone.

That means you own nothing. The deception of today is further illustrated by the statistic that 87 percent of those who want Socialism have a favorable view of free markets. Free markets do not exist in Socialism. Clearly people are deceived by the re-definition of and thereby hidden consequences of Socialism.

The majority of national media, entertainment, and education systems are controlled by progressives and are complicit in the social engineering



scheme to idealize the tenants of Socialism. Everything from television commercials, movies, song lyrics, and even some churches are pushing the left’s agenda of Socialism — aka “Social Justice.” They push Socialism as an intrinsic good like fighting for social issues of equality, fighting racism, and discrimination. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The term “common good” has also evolved to become synonymous with Socialism. “Common good” is touted as that which benefits society as a whole, in contrast to the private

(Continued on page 2)

good of individuals. The one major problem with “common good” is who decides what the “common good” is? Is the “common good” just for those who agree with you politically?

The ugly truth is that Socialism and Communism have been responsible for at least 65,000,000 deaths around the world just between 1917 and 2017. Communist regimes have killed huge numbers of people intentionally. Many more victims have died from starvation as a result of its cruel projects of social engineering. Historians note that Marxism legitimates violence without any limit because it rejects traditional moral and ethical norms. Marxist theory demanded genocide.

The media would like us to think that Nazism is far-right wing and communism is left-wing. No. The NAZIs were the National *Socialist* Party. The USSR was the Union of Soviet *Socialist Republics*. Those movements were on the political left.

Venezuela is the current example of the consequences of Socialism. It is estimated that more than three million people have fled the country (more than 400,000 have come to the U.S.). Journalists say 90 percent of the oil rich country is now in poverty. The country has hyperinflation, food shortages, scarce medical supplies, and soaring violence because of the desperation of the people.

On the opposite side of the political spectrum from Socialism stand Biblical principles, the principles on which America was founded. Biblical principles hold a positive view of the individual, the family, the church, private property, the rule of law, and economics that promotes freedom and calls for minimal government interference.

These principles promote a positive attitude and bring authentic hope for the future. This authentic hope is

seriously lacking from a large swath of the population who are in despair for various reasons today. Some of the reasons for despair are purposefully manufactured by the left to move people into dependency upon the government.

Deceptively, many Socialists promote the idea of “common good” as coming from the Holy Scriptures of the Bible. For example, The Book of Acts describes the early Church in Jerusalem immediately after Pentecost.

sives infiltrating mainstream churches will disagree.). Check the context of these verses. This was not a compulsory abolition of the right of individual ownership. The sharing of property was an act of Christian brotherly love and unity in the church. It was Biblical charity.

The act of selling was the owner’s choice and the act of giving the proceeds to the Church was the owner’s choice. The people sold pri-

Capitalism vs. Socialism for Dummies

	“CAPITALISM”	“SOCIALISM”
What Socialists think it means	A system of greed and selfishness where people do nothing except try to rip off other people. The only motivating factor to do anything is money.	A system where everyone is completely selfless and will labor voluntarily for the common good. The only motivating factor to do anything is because it might help someone else.
What it really means	A system where people keep what they earn and trade voluntarily for what they need. Individuals are left to pursue their own agendas so long as they don't directly harm others.	A system where all property is controlled by a small group of individuals. They determine what the common good will be and force everyone else to comply.

In Acts, Chapter 4, the early Christians did sell their lands and goods to help each other.

Acts 4:32 ESV says, “Now the multitude of those who believed were of one heart and one soul; neither did anyone say that any of the things he possessed was his own, but they had all things in common.” The key words here do sound like Socialism.

Verses 34 and 35 read, “Nor was there anyone among them who lacked; for all who were possessors of lands or houses sold them and brought the proceeds of the things that were sold and laid them at the apostles’ feet; and they distributed to each as anyone had need.”

These verses are often used as an argument to support Socialism. “From each according to his ability and to each according to his need.” Karl Marx the theologian, right? No. (Beware, current progres-

sive property over which they had control. The distribution was not by “equality,” but by the *need* of the recipient. The result was *not* that everyone had a ‘share and share alike’, but that “none lacked.” Biblical charity does discriminate *by need*.

Again, this was not a forced “redistribution of wealth,” It was Biblical charity. In this early Church, the member’s donations were given to the Church, not to the civil government. The donations were given voluntarily by the influence of the Holy Spirit, not involuntarily taken by the power of the government.

In Socialism/Communism, the underlying plan is to destroy the power and influence of churches, especially of the Judeo-Christian religions. Often churches are taken over from the inside or are controlled by the state. Self-de-

————— (Continued on page 3)

termining churches are a threat to the power of the government. If people care for each other independently and trust in God for their provisions, they do not need the government as much and the government loses power.

In the New Testament mode of Godly giving, God never commanded people to make a complete dispersal of property to the Church, to the civil government, nor to anyone else. Not in Acts, nor anywhere else in the Bible, was a Socialist model ever commanded by God.

In 2 Corinthians 9:7 says, "Each one must give as he has decided in his heart, not reluctantly or under compulsion for God loves a cheerful giver." God loves a cheerful giver. Personal generosity is commended.

In Matthew 19:21 when Jesus spoke to the rich young ruler, He asked him to sell all that he had and give to the poor. In this case Jesus was testing his heart. The young man failed the test.

Jesus could ask us to sell every-

thing and follow Him, but still is *not* an endorsement of Socialism.

Giving in the Old Testament times was by the system of the tithe. God's basic required donation was 10 percent of your income and that was the same for everyone. The tithe was used to support the priests who did the work of the Temple. There was also a Temple Tax for all. The Temple Tax was one-half (½) shekel for each person no matter what their wealth or status was. (A day's pay for a laborer was one shekel in Bible times).

Exodus 30:15 says, "The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less, than the half shekel, when you give the LORD's offering to make atonement for your lives." Both the tithe and Temple Tax are good examples *against* a graduated income tax.

Biblical Principles apply to life today and they can work for anyone who is willing to apply them. These Principles protect us from behavior harmful to ourselves and others. They

represent God's Covenants with us and are for our own "individual good".

Individual worth is a key Biblical principle. In the lost sheep parable, in Luke 15:4, Jesus said, "What man of you, having a hundred sheep, if he has lost one of them, does not leave the ninety-nine in the open country, and go after the one that is lost, until he finds it?"

Biblically, each individual has eternal value to God, and God, the Good Shepherd, does seek each one of us. Socialism devalues individuals, for the "common good." Biblical principles are best for the individual first. The result of an individual doing well effects what is best for society as a whole.

No Socialist Shepherd would go after only one lost sheep.

Now is the time for us to choose. Either we *stand* for preserving American individualism built on Biblical principles or we will *fall* under unbiblical Socialism for the "common good." 

CANCEL COLLEGE OR CANCEL COLLEGE DEBT?

by Anne Schlafly Cori, Chairman, Eagle Forum

In an extraordinary act of generosity, a successful businessman, Robert F. Smith, while speaking at Morehouse College commencement exercises last spring, promised to pay the student loan debt of the 2019 graduating class. Everyone cheered.

Those who did not cheer were the ones who just missed out: the previous graduating class, the next graduating class, and any student who had dropped out of that class. I am sure that plenty of schools have asked Mr. Smith to speak at their commencement exercises next year.

Of course, Mr. Smith is free to donate his money as he wishes. That's capitalism. Under socialism, the government confiscates Mr. Smith's

money and then the bureaucrats decide who will receive the hand-out.

Senator Elizabeth Warren has proposed an annual "Ultra-Millionaire Tax" of 2 percent on the net worth of taxpayers with over \$50 million, which would then be used to cancel \$50,000 of debt for each student loan. Under her plan, 75,000 Americans would be forced to pay money to 44 million Americans, plus her plan would turn the private student loans into government loans. Yes, that is socialism.

College today is too expensive and the loans that students get are huge for only one reason: the U.S. government is involved. Many student loans are subsidized by the government.

Everyone agrees that student loan debt is out of control, but disagrees on the solutions. The Democratic presidential contenders have promised to forgive student loan debt in the hopes that students and young adults will take the bribe and then vote for the Democratic candidate.

Student loan debt now stands at \$1.5 trillion. Who should pay? Should American taxpayers be forced to bail out students? Or should the students take the responsibility for their own education?

For most Americans, college is



(Continued on page 4)

not worth the price tag. But colleges have made big money by milking the student loan industry, because the college is always paid the money even if the student does not receive the education.

Colleges continue to raise tuition prices because higher education is not a truly competitive marketplace. Some colleges have amassed very large endowments, yet they force their students into debt for their services. Life would be so much better if the federal government got out of the loan business and stopped giving student loans to anyone who asks. If colleges did not have a pool of students with easy money, then tuition costs would drop and the cost of college would become competitive.



The reverse course of action, a debt cancellation, would inevitably cause tuition to increase. Inflation is always the result when the government throws money at the problem.

College is not for everyone. Less than a quarter of Americans complete college, but two-thirds of American students attempt to go to college. “Some college” never appears on a resume. Attending college is only worthwhile for employment if there is a diploma. To unlock the higher-wage benefits of going to college, the student must earn the degree. So many young Americans have been scammed, because they were told that

they “ought” to go college and they “must” go into debt.

What about the students who drop-out? Every year, two million students drop out of college. The student loan debt does not disappear if you do not graduate. Even if the student never takes a single class, but signed for the loan to pay the college, the student is still liable to repay the loan. Thus the young person on the cusp of life has been marked as a failure: failure to complete school and loaded down with a debt burden, in addition to the time lost. The student loan debt then delays adulthood, including marriage and home-ownership. Thirty percent of freshmen drop out during their first year. Without a college degree, it is much harder for

the former student to repay a loan. Taxpayers who have subsidized the education grant money have also seen their money wasted with the high dropout rate.

Since college today is a debt sentence that is crushing the next generation, should college be free? If the next president could make college free for all, then what would happen to education? Would the quality of education improve? Would students be able to choose their studies or would quotas be set for each major? Free college tuition would likely mean no freedom of choice for the students. College would become a socialistic command-and-control type of economy as students would be placed in majors.

College is not for everyone and nor should we insist that everyone go to college. Today, 41 percent of students who start college do not finish and graduate. If the tuition dollars were not guaranteed by the government, then schools would not accept

students who are likely to drop-out.

Would making college free increase the number of drop outs? Free college could produce perennial students. Students should have a personal and financial stake in their own education. When students put their own money and sweat equity into getting a degree, then they value the degree much more. To work hard and achieve goals that earn money because others value what you offer is what makes for a happy and productive society.

The college admissions scandal — where wealthy people paid bribes to have their children accepted at elite schools — shows the fantasy of a college education. Certain college admissions are prestigious. If the student cannot legitimately gain acceptance to the elite school, then the student will likely fail the scholastics. But for many parents, the true goal of prestigious schools is the social: so that their children will have the right kind of friends. Elite schools push applications so that their acceptance rate is as low as possible and thus the school is even more exclusive and even more desirable as bragging rights to parents.

Good education benefits both the individual and the society. No one, not the individual nor the society, benefits from setting up students for failure. Fixing the college drop-out rate is a better solution than confiscating wealth and throwing more money at universities. 

EAGLE FORUM

President: *Eunie Smith*

Report Editor: *Anne Schlafly Cori*

Yearly membership \$25.00

Call 618-433-8990 to subscribe

Extra copies available:

1/\$1, 50/\$15, 100/\$25