



CaesarRodney.org

## Why? To Shut the Door on Utopia

By Richard Spencer, Ph.D.

Not long ago one of President Barack Obama's senior White House aides professed her admiration for China's most notorious Communist leader, Mao Tse-Tung. I, for one, do not consider that a small matter for anyone serving in any capacity for any U.S. President, or in any capacity within the U.S. government. Any kind of remark that remotely extols Mao, Stalin, or any of their worldwide cadres of butchering despots should be immediately rebuked. For those whose knowledge of history begins only in the very near past and are thus apt to take the communist movement lightly, they may ask, "Why?"

Let us review some history that they seem not to have been privy to during their schooling, especially their higher education. Naturally, older readers, who were actively involved in the containment of Communism during both 'hot' and 'cold' wars from the end of WWII until the fall of the Berlin Wall are quite familiar with this most evil period of aggressive criminality. Their experiences included military and certain civilian service where many of their compatriots gave the nation their last full measure of devotion.

I would refer those lacking such appreciation of this era to *The Black Book of Communism* by Stephane Courtois, et al, which outlines how Communism was the great and evil story of the twentieth century and at its zenith, ruled a third of mankind. Communism seemed poised to spread indefinitely and then it collapsed like a house of cards. It violated one of the basic tenets of civilization: "Thou shalt not kill."

The authors of *The Black Book*, all former acolytes of communism, attempt to answer some fundamental questions: Why did Communism immediately turn into a system of bloody dictatorship and criminal activity? Why could its aims only be achieved through extreme violence? How could such crimes be thought of as a part of normal governing procedure for so many decades? Why does Socialism seem to beget violence; and its power achieved and held through the terrorizing of its citizens?

Within the pages of *The Black Book* are truths so brutal and so revealing of the crimes, terror, and repression of this world wide totalitarian movement, that the authors, all past proponents of Communism, "ten years before would not have believed what they then had to write." Their tipping point came with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the opening of its archives. Advocates could run, but they could no longer hide from the hideous and devastating falsity of their beliefs. They were overwhelmed by the enormity of the evidence and personally indicted by the facts.

Official documentation appears throughout Communist history that supposed enemies of the state were pejoratively labeled as leeches, rats, enemy agents, and capitalists. Such derogatory classifications created the circumstances for state terror, as totalitarians need enemies to survive. There was no need for citizens to actually have done anything at all; extermination was in order to discipline and punish; enemies were to be killed. Trials, famine, and concentration camps were organized in the strictest secrecy and legitimized as a method.

The scale and gravity of Communism's crimes against humanity is estimated at over 100 million civilian deaths alone. Mao was one of the mega-murderers responsible for over 35 million only to be outdone by the Soviet Gulag State that amassed over 60 million. The 20<sup>th</sup> Century was filled with human catastrophes and bloodthirstiness beyond all others fueled by the underlying deceptive promises supporting several variations of Socialism. R. J. Rummel, in *Death by Government*, estimated that Democide accounted for over 160 million civilian murders. I would argue that these are hardly political movements for which White House officials should hold the leaders in high esteem.

Many wonder why so many on the Left are still unwilling to admit to Communism's cruelty and its abject failure along with its terrifying human costs. One has to be curious about the energy of their neglect concerning the facts, especially, since continuing revelations make this period of totalitarianism look more despicable every day. Why do they insist on quietism or neutrality? Why do Lenin, Mao, Ho Chi Minh, and even Stalin enjoy a surprising reverence among them? Is it because so many of them were sympathetic to building a utopian socialist society here and abroad?

The emerging evidence outlining these acts of state criminality was largely dismissed by the Left as "right-wing, anti-Communist rhetoric" and further explained by the authors as encountering one intractable obstacle: "That any realistic accounting of Communist crime would effectively shut the door on Utopia." The Left seemed to be willing to check their moral outrage at the door and then loudly ridicule traditional historians by mocking them as "preoccupied with questions of moral judgment." They were willing to suborn in order to keep their dreams of a Utopian society alive. If those in positions of political and academic power are unwilling to confront this truth of history or the absurdity of Soviet totalitarianism and other communist regimes, then that, again, is no small matter for the safety of our citizenry.

The world is now reacting to the post war justification by scholars to neglect the shameful crimes committed by the Communists. Were their insidious acts not as heinous as the infamous Himmler and Eichmann's final solution? Such initial inattention by traditional scholars lies in the nefarious methods of concealment of the misdeeds by the Communist perpetrators and the systematic attacks they declared against all who dared expose the crimes. But now, the continuing indifference by contemporary academics concerning the criminal dimensions of Communism and to their fellow man is not to be forgiven. It may be considered among the great intellectual scandals of our time.

As one scholar so aptly noted, "Democracy is hard or everybody would have it." We live in jeopardy of our liberties if citizens believe Democracy as being too onerous and not a joy of life that is to be protected to the last man.

I believe the above would be a respectable adult sentiment to hear from current officials rather than utterances of worthiness for some of the most mega-murderous that ever lived among us. Neglect the political history of the 20<sup>th</sup> century with its hard earned lessons at your own risk.

*Richard L. Spencer, Ph.D. is a member of the Caesar Rodney Institute's Board of Advisors. He resides in Frankford, Delaware.*

*The Caesar Rodney Institute is a 501(c)(3) non-partisan research and educational organization and is committed to being a catalyst for improved performance, accountability, and efficiency in Delaware government.*

© Caesar Rodney Institute, December 8, 2009