



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

Can You Be Kind, Caring, & Liberal?

Liberalism is portrayed by most “progressives” as caring and compassionate — helping the oppressed and downtrodden — while conservatism is dubbed mean-spirited, racist, money-oriented, etc. Though I do my very best to remain open-minded about beliefs — whether they are religious, scientific, or political — open-mindedness notwithstanding, even with reading about politics every day as part of my job and trying my utmost, I am having a difficult time in figuring out how increased progressivism, in general, in the country is supposed to be an improvement and, on a related note, how any American who considers himself/herself to be caring — especially Christians in this country — can back the liberal agenda.



I'll tell you what I see, and you tell me how I am wrong.

First, however, let's go through the stated goals of progressivism/liberalism: Stop intolerance and bigotry, aid the poor and people of color, provide well-paying jobs, clean up and protect the environment, provide for the elderly, reduce crime, give youth a good education, provide equality between the sexes and eliminate sexism, encourage free speech, improve public health, protect animals (both wild and domestic), use science to guide public policy, and, to top things off, increase individual freedom. All in all, a list of admirable goals that most Americans would agree with — including me.

So, you might wonder, why can't I find “caring” in liberalism, and why am I stumped in looking for societal improvements in liberalism? In short, it's not the goals I find fault with; it's the actions perpetrated in the name of achieving the goals that prove bothersome.

As a former public-school teacher, I'll start with education. According to liberal pronouncements, a good education is a must, and it can best be attained via strong, abundant affirmative action programs, national standards (versus local ones), keeping religion out of schools, and government financial backing of public schools — including high pay for teachers and funding for preschool programs.

Response: Those beliefs are not based in science — here defined as a “systematically organized body of knowledge on a particular subject” — but rather, they are based upon either biased self-interest or political chicanery. In fact, besides maybe the fact that “a good education is a must,” the other assertions could be deemed lies. First, high teacher pay very definitely doesn't equate to “learning.” Some of the highest-paid teachers in the country — in Detroit and Washington, D.C. — have students with the lowest achievement levels, with only four percent of Detroit eighth-graders ranking proficient in math in 2016 (and ranking almost as bad in science, social studies, and English), while homeschooled children tend to do better on SATs than either private- or public-school kids. And not one of 114 tests



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

administered to first-graders showed a significant positive effect of child enrollment in the Head Start program.

This is in a country that is among the top spenders in the world on education. (Liberals always say that the fact that America spends so much on healthcare yet doesn't have the top-ranking healthcare in the world is virtually criminal, and means we must radically change the system, yet defend year-after-year failure in public education in the face of proven fixes.)

Liberals' financial backing of schools means being *against* allowing parents to use tax monies (which those parents pay into the system) to put their kids in the schools of their choice — part of this is founded on the notion that religious schools shouldn't get money and part on the idea that it takes money from public schools, hurting the schools — yet a gold-standard study by the leftist Brookings Institution found that “using a voucher to attend private school increased the overall college enrollment rate among African Americans by 24 percent,” showing *once again* that people who care about kids' education should back such programs. (As public schools deteriorate yearly in terms of making students more capable — approximately 50 percent of public-school students in California scored in the lowest category for reading and comprehension on state tests, and the tests aren't rigorous — stopping kids from using school monies to go to higher-performing schools is virtually criminal; it's also against freedom of choice and personal liberty, which liberals constantly say they are defending. Arguments claiming that vouchers take money away from public schools are really arguments to retain failure and are, inarguably, political paybacks for teachers' Democrat votes.) And by the way, it's likely all schools teach some form of religion, usually secular humanism or atheism.

Too, both college affirmative-action programs and national standards have proven to be disasters. In their book *Mismatch: How Affirmative Action Hurts Students It's Intended to Help, and Why Universities Won't Admit It*, self-professed ultra-liberals Professor Richard Sander and journalist Stuart Taylor point out that allowing minorities into programs that their qualifications don't merit sets the kids up for failure in school and the workplace, with abundant proof to back it up, such as that blacks with relatively low qualifications who were allowed into selective law schools had much lower rates of passing the bar exam and worse on-the-job performance than equally qualified blacks who went to less-selective law schools. The two men are all for prestigious colleges recruiting *qualified* minority candidates, but not for allowing minorities into programs where they would be so far behind that they would be plagued by self-doubt, high drop-out rates, and negative stigma — and likely college loans that they will never be able to repay. The two find such consequences abominable — as should we all. Additionally, affirmative action programs center on racial preference based on the color of one's skin, and are clearly racist — go figure.

As to national standards, they are no panacea either. As the Heritage Foundation pointed out in its article “Why National Standards Won't Fix American Education: Misalignment of Power and Incentives”:

While the countries that outperform the United States on international tests have national standards, so do most of those countries that score lower than the U.S. In further defiance of the hypothetical rule, Canada handily outscores the United States on international exams but has no national standards.

And the Common Core national curriculum being implemented across the nation in response to federal threats to take away Title I funding for not obeying is clearly a disaster, notably lowering standards for



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

many school districts, including all districts in the state of Massachusetts (a fact with which even the very left-wing Chicago Teachers Union and New York Teachers Union agree).

On a related note, the way schools teach “anti-bullying” lessons is via demeaning one group to build up another: At the present, public schools across the country have as part of their anti-bullying campaigns lessons that teach that homosexuality and transgenderism are normal and that anyone who doesn’t believe such things are normal is a mean-spirited, small-minded, intolerant bully. Ironically, though anti-bullying campaigns teach the idea that if you hurt someone’s feelings or make them feel bad about themselves, you are a bully, they at the same time tell Christians that the moral code they have been taught (and that most Westerners fervently believed in for the better part of 2,000 years) is wrong, trying to make Christians feel bad about themselves. For those who don’t get the hypocrisy, let me be plain: Even if one believes that anal sex between men is normal and that a male believing he is female isn’t exhibiting signs of a mental disorder, by liberals’ own definition of bullying, schools are bullying Christian kids because they try to make the kids feel bad about themselves. It is noteworthy that it is possible for schools to stop kids from hurting each other physically or verbally without promoting one lifestyle or another, but they don’t.

It should also be noted that since I was a teacher (and proud of it), I am not anti-education; I am pro-education. But expelling the federal government from the schoolhouse is clearly the path to student academic success, and allowing parents to choose their kids’ educational paths — whether that be homeschooling, locally controlled public schooling, or private schooling — is the route of improvement and freedom, both supposed goals of liberalism.

Not Too Tolerant

Then there is the stated liberal goal of stopping intolerance and bigotry. Liberals mainly promote “tolerance” in the area of homosexuality (and other aberrant sex practices), and they fight bigotry in the same arena, as well as defending minorities from “white privilege.”

Since “tolerance” means to quietly put up with behavior or beliefs with which one disagrees, and to recognize and respect others’ beliefs and practices without sharing them, it seems more than a little hypocritical of liberals to try to penalize businesses — such as stopping them from opening new outlets — if the business owners disagree with homosexuality (as happened with Chick-fil-A in the cities of Chicago and Boston and on several college campuses because it supports the Christian belief in marriage — though it willingly hires and serves homosexuals). The actions of the Left are clearly hateful and punitive, not tolerant.

Moreover, punishment dealt out by liberals is not applied equally across sub-groups of people. While Christian photographers and cake makers have been fined hundreds of thousands of dollars and driven out of business for not servicing a homosexual wedding, because it is against their religious beliefs and how biology (science) says sex is supposed to work, homosexual cake makers have refused to make cakes for Christians without penalty, as have Muslims — so much for equality. One Christian group called 13 bakers to get them to make a cake with the words “Gay marriage is wrong.” Each said “no,” often after cursing at or otherwise disparaging the caller. And multiple bakeries in Northern California refused to make a cake in the shape of a hat that said “Make America Great Again.” If you listen, you can hear crickets over concerned liberals’ calls for lawsuits.

To justify their actions, liberals lay claim to being upset that homosexual persons aren’t treated equally



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

by businesses, saying that a refusal of service is like choosing not to service someone based on skin color: It's prejudiced and it's wrong. Let's examine that.

First, no store serves all groups of Americans equally, meaning that the argument should be a complete non-starter for thinking Americans of all political affiliations. For example, there are many stores that discriminate against me by not catering to my needs and wishes: women's clothing stores and women's-only exercise facilities (I'm a guy), expensive jewelry stores (I am not rich), Muslim bookstores (I'm not Muslim, yet I read extensively), barbershops (a trim of my balding head costs as much as for someone with a full head of hair), pet stores (I am allergic to most dogs and cats, and pet shops often don't sell non-allergenic varieties), and more. Likewise there are women-specific clothing stores that discriminate against some women. Some stores refuse to sell revealing clothes (discriminating based on women's lifestyle — sound familiar?); there are stores that don't sell clothes for obese women (some don't even sell to average women, only women built like models). This is clearly discrimination against a protected class — women — and should be against federal law, if liberals were consistent, because federal laws protect overweight people from discrimination when the obese have an underlying disability that causes them to be overweight, which assuredly applies to many obese women. The list goes on. Most hat stores don't sell Jewish yarmulkes (religious discrimination). And there are dating sites for minorities only, as well as many scholarships for minorities only (racial discrimination).

Where are the lawsuits and the huge pay-offs? The answer is that the lawsuits are nowhere to be found because liberal judges would dismiss them out of hand, even though every one of these cases is as egregious — or worse — than not providing wedding cakes for an event that someone finds morally intolerable. Better question, where is the concern and the care of liberals for the oppressed Christians since it is fact that *all businesses discriminate when choosing their clientele (no business serves everyone equally)*, so nothing makes cake-store discrimination worse than that done by any other business? In no case have I found that a homosexual couple could not find another business to cater their functions. And the cake companies have usually noted that they would sell cakes to homosexuals for other functions — such as birthdays — so the bakers are not discriminating against a *segment of society at all*. It is akin to fining Jewish printers for not printing pamphlets that deny the Holocaust happened or that call for the annihilation of Israel. Giving awards to homosexual couples in such cases makes about as much sense as awarding a plaintiff a large sum from Sears because the store sells Fruit-of-the Loom underwear, but not crotchless panties. It is clearly evident that penalties against Christians are bigoted, reflect inequality and hate, and are hypocritical — hence uncaring, and intolerant.

And those aren't the only intolerable actions taken. The hypocrisy and hatefulness ramp up from there: Liberals claim they are *against* forcing individuals to participate in events that they find personally objectionable, such as when someone prays in school thereby “forcing” atheists to pray along (actually praying in school merely exposes someone to religion, it doesn't force atheist students *to do* anything — so much for “diversity”), but liberals have no problem forcing Christians to actually participate in an atheistic/humanistic wedding ceremony. The same is true of abortion, wherein liberals demand that everyone help pay for abortions, though Christians and many others consider abortion to be murder. Ironically, the entire pro-LGBT movement was originally predicated on not discriminating against individuals; now liberals cheer discrimination against Christians. Such hypocritical, one-sided enforcement of the law should anger all people because it is un-American and flat-out wrong; it should especially anger anyone who professes to be caring and tolerant.



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

Moreover, the harsh arbitrary penalties meted out to Christians who don't cater to homosexual events, penalties that should be found illegal under the First Amendment's "freedom of religion" or the Eighth Amendment's "cruel and unusual punishment" clauses if liberal judges were consistent and actually followed the law's clear wording, aren't hateful enough for liberals. Many has been the time when liberals have called for businesses whose owners have opposing viewpoints to be burned down or the owners killed, such as teacher Jessica Dooley, who called for others to join her in burning down an Indiana pizzeria, Memories Pizza, merely because its owner expressed the opinion that he was against catering homosexual weddings. The owner of the pizzeria, Kevin O'Connor, had to temporarily close the establishment because of the massive numbers of threats he received after expressing his opinion.

Bigots Against Bigotry?

Liberals' anti-bigotry is equally fraudulent. Since a bigot is someone who intolerantly holds to a narrow-minded, prejudiced opinion, liberals are prime purveyors (they themselves qualify). Most anti-bigotry action nowadays is aimed at stopping the abuse of blacks by police; instituting hiring policies, such as raising the minimum wage to \$15 an hour; or creating educational equality for minorities (overlapping with the supposed liberal goals of aiding the poor and people of color and providing well-paying jobs). Yet in trying to attain these goals, liberals are guilty of racism, hurting the poor, and, of course, exhibiting narrow-minded, prejudiced opinion.

Pertaining to racism, Black Lives Matter even says blatantly on its website:

We are unapologetically Black in our positioning. In affirming that Black Lives Matter, we need not qualify our position. To love and desire freedom and justice for ourselves is a necessary prerequisite for wanting the same for others.

In other words, they aren't helping anyone else until they help themselves. (Of course, liberals then try to change the accepted definition of racism from "a program or practice that upholds the political or economic domination of one race," and "hatred and bigotry toward a person or persons because of their race" to a new version that meets their needs: "oppression of a marginalized group in a society that's based on white supremacy." So a black person could hate all whites for simply being white — maybe even kill a few for no reason — and not be racist, according to them.)

Another black group is clear in its racist goals. The Black Youth 100 Project had this to say about what it wants:

Together, we're organized to demand that our lives, our communities and our futures be made a priority. The police chiefs who belong to the IACP, and their local departments have a debt to pay for the lives and the resources they've stolen and we're here to collect.

From Chicago to Oakland, New Orleans to New York City, Black people live under police occupation everyday.... This must end.

Among the many measures we believe are needed:

We demand all local, state and federal budgets to defund the police and invest those dollars and resources in Black futures.

We want reparations for chattel slavery, Jim Crow and mass incarceration.

We want to end all profit from so-called "criminal justice" punishment — both public and private.



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

We want a guaranteed income for all, living wages, a federal jobs program, and freedom from discrimination for all workers.

We want the labor of Black transgender and cisgender women (unseen and seen, unpaid and paid) to be valued and supported, not criminalized and marginalized.

We want investments in Black communities that promote economic sustainability and eliminate the displacement of our people.

As well as being a completely illogical list of demands, the calls “for justice” are almost exclusively about payoffs and preferences for blacks and blacks only. Again, that’s racist and wrong, though it would serve them right if they were to see their demands met: The crime against blacks caused by such actions would be immense. As *Wall Street Journal* editor Jason Riley — who happens to be black — points out:

The left is selling a false narrative here. We have too many dead black bodies in this country. But cops are not the reason. The black homicide rate is much too high. It is the leading cause of death for young black men. But blacks also commit seven to 10 times more violent crime in this country than whites do, and 90 percent of their victims are other black people.

Since the great majority of violent crime in this country is committed by blacks against other blacks, removing police from black communities and giving each black person who lives there a few thousand dollars more per year in welfare for “reparations” likely wouldn’t even cover the expenses of the funeral, hospital, vandalism, arson, and robbery expenses the populace would soon incur. And no amount of “investments in Black communities” would bring back job opportunities because few businesses want to operate in high-crime neighborhoods.

What’s more, “a guaranteed income for all” would mean that the calls for living wages (meaning high minimum wages — which most economists, even liberal ones, agree cause large-scale unemployment mainly among poorly educated blacks) would be unnecessary because few people would likely work if they received all the money they needed to live a comfortable life without working. Incentive to work would be completely gone. It’s nearly gone now under present welfare schemes.

Of course, spending to pay off the discontented would likely soon bankrupt the country (more on that later), but when one doesn’t allow reality to limit one’s imagination, there’s no problem with impoverishing the country as a whole.

Additionally, first-generation immigrant minorities are often more successful than minorities who have been here for a long time — note that Indian immigrants are the richest ethnic group in the United States, and Asians as a group are the richest race in the country — providing more proof that it isn’t likely white racism that is keeping blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians down. It is undoubtedly government policies, welfare, ignorance, and inner-city culture (developed by leftist policies). Making the point is Columbia Business School: “Indian-American households have the single highest income level of any group in the country — more than twice as high as the general US population.”

Anti-family Animus

Making the situation even worse is another one of Black Lives Matter’s goals:

We are committed to disrupting the Western-prescribed nuclear family structure requirement by supporting each other as extended families and “villages” that collectively care for one another,



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

and especially “our” children to the degree that mothers, parents and children are comfortable.

In the black community, where more than 70 percent of children are already born to unwed mothers, even further “disrupting” the traditional nuclear family — a married mother and father under the same roof with children — would assuredly add to the problems blacks have with poverty, crime, unemployment, lack of education, etc.

Single-parent, female-headed households are the most reliable predictor of poverty in the United States, and children raised outside the nuclear family are more inclined to be anti-social, do poorly in school, abuse drugs, etc. Before President Johnson’s Great Society unrolled a host of new welfare programs, only 22 percent of black children lived in mother-headed households. Of course, after it was implemented, welfare provided more money to single mothers than married ones — especially to single black women, who made less than single white women — so husbands and male role models were dumped, and up went misbehavior, violence, crime, and illiteracy (again, especially in black communities). And down went responsibility, morality, wealth, respect, self-respect, etc.

In contrast, married nuclear families thrive, as Alex Newman reminded in his article entitled “Decline in Moral Values Costing Millennials Big”: “Just 3% of millennials who followed the so-called ‘success sequence’ [getting married and then having kids] were poor by their late twenties or early thirties. On the other hand, more than half of those who did not follow the ‘sequence’ are under the poverty line, the researchers explained.”

More of the same family breakup would give us more of the same dysfunction, which one would only intentionally do if one hated blacks.

As economics professor Walter Williams, who also happens to be black, stated:

I think the way we treat poor people — we would not treat our own loved ones that way. That is, not many people would say, you know, their 16-year-old daughter gets pregnant, and the family says, “Okay, here’s \$500. Come back next week, same time, same place, sit on your a**, watch TV and we’ll give you another \$500. And if you have more kids, you make another mistake, you get \$700.” Anybody we cared about, we would not do that to them.

Politically Correct Payoffs

When it comes to race and bigotry, liberal politics are topsy-turvy in terms of intent and action. To cure racism, liberals aver, white males, who have supposedly succeeded and prospered on the backs of black laborers (even if almost no blacks lived in the area and the whites’ families moved to this country after the end of slavery), must pay exorbitant tax rates to fund abundant welfare programs (despite the 13th Amendment’s proscription against “involuntary servitude”), make reparation payments for past black slavery and Jim Crow laws, and institute hiring and college-entrance preferences for blacks and Hispanics, to the detriment of Asians and whites (again racist).

Aside from the fact that in 2014, 2.7 percent of Americans paid 51.6 percent of the taxes and 45.3 percent of Americans either paid no federal income taxes or got more back in tax credits than they paid in taxes (which is hardly equitable or fair), the idea of reparations is racism, pure and simple, not justice. First of all, most whites’ ancestors did not own slaves. According to the History Channel, “The 1860 census shows that in the states that would soon secede from the Union, an average of more than 32 percent of white families owned slaves.” In the Northern states, there were few states with more



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

than a percent or two of citizens holding slaves. With 21 million people living in the North during the Civil War and just 5.5 million whites in the Southern states and with the immigration explosion to the United States after the war, a minority of whites would likely have descendants who owned slaves. And let's not forget the more than 360,000 union soldiers who were killed in the Civil War, as opposed to the estimated 388,000 blacks who were brought to this country as slaves; do the soldiers' ancestors get to pass on payment — or get reparations themselves? And what about whites who have been victimized by blacks — those who had a relative killed by a black criminal or those, such as my mother-in-law, who grew up on the south side of Chicago and were forced, along with their families, to move from the houses and neighborhoods that they loved when blacks repeatedly vandalized their houses (her Italian family did not participate in the large-scale “white flight” when blacks first moved into their neighborhood — because blacks “were just people too” — but when most whites had fled, some blacks made it very clear that whites weren't welcome there). Do they get reparations from blacks or at least not have to pay up?

Also who would decide who gets how much? For instance, many blacks in this country are descendants of blacks who came here after the time of slavery, of their own volition for the opportunity this country provided. Do they get anything? What about if one ancestor came here as a slave and another came willingly? Too, let's face it, virtually every culture has been oppressed and even enslaved at one time or another in history (with many Europeans being captured and sold into Africa as slaves and thousands of Irish being enslaved and sold to plantations in the Caribbean). Where do we draw the cut-off line? Moreover, if we're going to offer reparations based on past abuses, there likely wouldn't be anything left for blacks anyway because it could be argued that American Indians suffered vastly worse abuse than blacks (as the Indians were nearly wiped out en masse, and the entire country was stolen from them, with blacks taking part in dislocating Indians). Finally, assigning present blame for ancestors' sins is blatantly unjust to people alive now who took no part in any atrocities. Think about it: It would be like arresting a murderer's family and throwing them in jail because of guilt by association. Two wrongs still do not make a right.

Race-based programs — reparations, affirmative action, etc. — divide rather than unite, and actually create more hatred in the name of ending racism.

So much for stopping intolerance and bigotry, aiding the poor and people of color, providing well-paying jobs, reducing crime, and giving youth a good education.

Healing Healthcare

Other supposed liberal goals fail at least as greatly — for instance, providing healthcare to all equally through a federal takeover of the healthcare sector. Government-run healthcare does not equate to abundant healthcare for everyone, it means rationed care (not being able to get care because the government doesn't allocate enough resources to the disease), inefficient care, and poorer care — not care for the poor.

Take, for instance, the liberal healthcare “success story” dubbed ObamaCare. President Obama repeatedly promised before it was enacted that family healthcare premiums would drop \$2,500 per family, that it would be inexpensive enough to be accessible to most any American (providing near universal coverage for Americans, if not illegal immigrants), and that we could keep our doctors and standard of care. The promises were grossly false. As reported by healthcare expert Sally Pipes in a



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

2015 article entitled “Shreds of Doubt About Obamacare,”

Yet premiums have skyrocketed under Obamacare. A recent report from HealthPocket — an online insurance marketplace — revealed that 23-year-old men who have not chosen to stay on their parents’ plans have seen their premiums increase by as much as 78 percent under the law. Premiums for 63-year-old men increased 23 percent.

Women suffered a similar fate....

Even premiums for those who received subsidies have jumped — by 23 percent in the last year. That’s after taking those subsidies into account.

And deductibles shot up, often more than doubling. The left-leaning Kaiser Family Foundation reported about the deductibles for ObamaCare’s *silver plan* that “less than one-fifth of low-income families can afford such high deductibles, while just over half of middle-class families can afford them.” That means that even when non-wealthy Americans could afford ObamaCare’s insurance, they often still couldn’t afford to go to the doctor because the deductibles were too high. Statistically speaking, those people should have been added to the millions of Americans who remained without health insurance (ObamaCare only reduced the number of uninsured to 2006 levels, even counting the many who went on Medicaid under the law).

The disaster that is ObamaCare was worsened by the unemployment and underemployment its rules have caused, as employers laid off workers or lowered their hours to avoid some of the harsh consequences of the law.

Healthcare that is totally run by the government or paid for by the government (single-payer healthcare) has fared as badly.

It is common knowledge that three years ago large segments of the Veterans Administration had wait times for patients that were so long that patients were literally dying while waiting. It is less well known that the wait-time scandal is still ongoing and that virtually no consequences have been meted out to those who committed fraud to cover it up, while whistleblowers have been badly treated. (Though President Trump has reputedly recently fired several hundred VA workers.) Also less known is that VA doctors have a fraction of the workload of a private physician, VA hospitals have a fraction of the cases of private hospitals, and the wait-time scandal is merely one of a long string of regularly recurring atrocities: unsanitary conditions, poor care, corruption (including bribes and kickbacks), enormous waste, denial of services, physicians with suspended and revoked licenses, unnecessary surgeries, and more. Because it’s a bureaucracy and bureaucracies cater to the politically connected — in this case usually VA unions — large-scale reforms inevitably fail. The other U.S. government-run program, the Indian Health Service, is even worse. (To learn more, see our series of online articles beginning with “Healthcare: Which Fix Should We Follow?”)

The U.K. suffers from similar problems: Healthcare expert John Goodman noted in his book *Priceless* that the U.K. has initiated several studies that showed that healthcare deteriorated after government took over and created the National Health Service. He says about one such study:

In Britain, 50 years after the National Health Service was formed to rid the country of healthcare inequality in the country, a government task force released the Atcheson Report, which found that inequality was worse than when NHS began, noting that there are vastly differing survival rates,



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

depending on whether a person lives in a wealthy neighborhood or a poor neighborhood.

As for single-payer healthcare, countries with such systems keep them affordable by denying appropriate or timely treatment to many of the sickest populations in the countries.

Even then “affordable” isn’t really the correct word. The very left-wing Politicususa says the following in its article entitled “Why Americans Can’t Have Universal Healthcare Like Europeans”:

Britain has a relatively well-regarded universal healthcare system that every citizen pays for through national income tax. The tax rate for income tax and National Health Insurance in the United Kingdom (England) in 2015-16 for all citizens earning between zero and £31,785, considered basic-rate (flat rate) taxpayers, is a whopping 20 percent of their entire income. It is a full 15 percent more than America’s middle class tax rate and would entail a 20 percent tax hike for 45 percent of Americans who pay nothing now.

To be sure, Politicususa believes that Americans just don’t care enough about fellow Americans, or themselves, to sacrifice more tax money to gain its idea of an ideal healthcare system. But that group is not likely correct about the reasons Americans are fighting single-payer healthcare or some other version of government-run healthcare. It’s really about the high costs and the rationing inherent in the systems.

As to economics, even the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s “Health Expenditure and Financing” report shows that European countries are experiencing the same type of breakneck increases in healthcare spending as we see in the United States, costs that are quickly bankrupting those countries.

Don’t think that government-run will mean “more inexpensive.” According to the Veterans Health Administration’s own report entitled “VHA Workforce and Succession Strategic Plan 2016,” in 2015, the VA spent in excess of \$8,523 per patient on average — an amount that *does not include* patient out-of-pocket payments — while according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, per-capita healthcare spending in the United States in 2015 was \$9,451. And hospitals outside the VA system provide a *far larger percentage* of inpatient care than the VA does, meaning complicated, costly care.

The Big “B”: Bankruptcy

Note that national bankruptcy from Big Government spending is already on the foreseeable horizon in the United States because of liberal generosity with other Americans’ money. In healthcare, as in other areas of the economy, more evil has surely been done in the name of doing “good” than has ever been done with the intent of being bad.

As Bob Adelman reported July 5 for The New American online as to the fiscal repercussions of the welfare/warfare state,

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) just revised its January report with new data on spending, revenues, and economic growth. The revision isn’t good:

The projected rise in [annual] deficits would be the result of rapid growth in spending for federal retirement and health care programs targeted to older people, and to rising interest payments on the government’s debt, accompanied by only moderate growth in revenue collections.



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

In other words, ... the government programs on autopilot — Social Security, Medicare, and especially debt service on the country's \$20 trillion national debt — will eat up nearly 80 percent of the government's total budget in less than 10 years.

Unless an economic miracle happens, such as an American inventor or two creates something as universally desired and valuable as the iPhone (and builds them all in this country) or the government begins cutting spending dramatically, we could safely expect large-scale inflation in the near future and the impoverishment of most Americans, as well as the implosion of all welfare systems to the point that many Americans starve to death, much as is happening in Venezuela presently.

Moreover, even now — prior to the country's insolvency — because the country is essentially printing money to pay its bills, which causes price inflation, the purchasing power of people on fixed incomes, such as the elderly and disabled, jumps downward each year, impoverishing them.

Isn't Big Government grand?

And taxing the rich isn't going to solve our problems. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the total federal budget in 2016 was \$3.9 trillion. If government taxed away all of the Fortune 500 companies' global profits in 2015 (\$945 billion), taxed every cent of salaries in the NBA, MLB, NHL, and NFL (\$13 billion), taxed away every cent earned above \$250,000 per year (using income data from 2015) and taxed those same incomes at a 33-percent rate up to \$250,000 (\$1.031 trillion), and eliminated foreign aid (\$42.3 billion), we would come up with a paltry \$2.031 trillion — far short of funding what the U.S. government already spends. In short, there's no way that taxing the rich is going to dig us out of any fiscal hole. Even if all of the approximately \$600 billion a year in Defense spending was literally eliminated, the federal budget would still only drop to \$3.3 trillion, and taxing the rich would fall short by more than a trillion dollars of paying federal bills. (Hat tip to David Burge, who pointed this out on his Iowahawk blog in 2013.) More incredible is this: If the federal government taxed away every cent over \$150,000 and taxed the remainder of that \$150,000 at a 33 percent rate (\$2.27 trillion), and taxed every cent of profits from Fortune 500 companies, and eliminated foreign aid, the country still couldn't pay its present bills, garnering just \$3.256 trillion. Even eliminating Defense spending would leave us roughly \$45 billion short.

Yet liberals want to add more spending, not cut it — make sense to you?

Note, such taxes would leave the richest Americans with \$100,000 to pay all their bills, as well as pay their state income taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, etc.

And if politicians actually tried to enact the preceding draconian taxes, not only would every major company flee this country en masse, causing wholesale job losses (and less tax monies), but you can be sure that Hollywood's liberal glitterati would become overnight conservatives — because they surely can't live their jet-set lifestyles on under \$100,000 a year.

Even as the situation stands now — without adding any new government spending on programs — unless government spending is drastically cut, or taxes on the middle class are raised dramatically, or the country sees a huge economic boom, which virtually no one expects because of the preponderance of red tape, unneeded regulations, and taxes discouraging business investment, this country will see in the foreseeable future real-time total bankruptcy and hyperinflation of the currency. And that fact does not even take into consideration all of the more than a hundred trillion dollars' worth of welfare/Social Security promises that the U.S. government has made to Americans but does not acknowledge in its



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

figures on the deficit, and doesn't have money socked away to pay.

Ironically, despite liberals' supposed support for reason and education, it certainly seems as if their present spending and future spending proposals aren't mathematically sound.

Perverse Political Stances

Also logically unsound (or at least completely hypocritical) is a host of other liberal political views, which reflect liberals' hateful attacks on other groups.

In the area of free speech, pornography is defended by liberals and celebrated as free speech (though it is clearly not speech), and its funding via government grants is lauded, yet liberals want to outlaw conversion therapy (the ability of a person to go to a counselor to get rid of *unwanted* homosexual feelings). Liberals are supportive of in-your-face campaigning and yelling loudly at conservative speeches so that speakers can't be heard, even regularly disrupting and physically threatening conservative speakers, but they want to ban pro-life sidewalk counselors, who merely talk to passersby. They are also both for fining churches through taxes if the church leaders speak about politics and for condemning and punishing "hate speech" — which is speech they merely find disagreeable, though their own hateful words go uncensored and the concept of "free speech" was meant to protect unpopular messages, because sometimes those messages just might be correct. Liberals regularly accuse conservatives of being racists because conservatives want to clean up election fraud via voter-ID measures (supposedly poor blacks can't obtain IDs, thus keeping them from voting), though they have no problem requiring IDs to obtain federal welfare and to buy certain medicines. Finally, liberals are vehemently against corporate money being used for political advertising (corporations are entities that represent groups of people), yet they support liberal newspapers, magazines, and television and online media being able to promote certain candidates, as well as Democrat-supporting unions, such as the teachers union. And they had no problem with Google manipulating search results to aid Hillary Clinton in the last election.

Even if, and this is an *extremely big if*, the country would not go broke from Democrat welfare policies, the policies are still harmful to the poor, to women, to men, to children, to the disabled. The policies have horrific track records of hurting the downtrodden; discriminating against Christians, Asians, whites, and males; enriching the politically connected at the expense of the middle class and poor; limiting individual freedom (except sexual freedom) and rights; and causing job loss — and everyone should be against them, unless they are monsters. (Not covered here but equally harmful are the Left's strategies to supposedly aid the environment and fix immigration — for an introduction to those problems see our online articles "How to Protect Our Environment" and "Counting the Costs of Amnesty.")

In short, any liberal who thinks he/she is on the side of the angels is clearly misguided, and only could be considered to be technically correct because Satan was an angel, too.



Written by [Kurt Williamsen](#) on November 6, 2017

Published in the November 6, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 21

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.