

Richard L. Peterson, (Economics)PhD

Professor Emeritus (Finance)and former holder of the Briscoe Chair of Bank Management,  
Texas Tech University

This paper is a result of my papers describing various political systems and their effects upon economic growth rates and on the welfare of their leaders and citizens, respectively. In writing these papers I realized that many of the current leaders who emphasize socialistic policies, once they gain power, may act like previous fascist leaders. While they campaign by disparaging corporations and the wealthy and claim to want to serve the common man, once in power, just like fascist leaders of the past, they tend to favor industries and wealthy people who support them and penalize industries and companies that do not support their policies. In addition, while in power, like previous fascist leaders, they often become personally wealthy even though history shows that ordinary citizens do less well in socialistic economies than in free market oriented economies.

In recent years many politicians have obtained popularity and votes by advocating socialistic policies--such as universal welfare payments, high minimum wage requirements, free or minimal cost healthcare for all, free higher education and/or forgiveness of higher education debts, increased control of private business operations, and higher tax rates on those who earn significant income. Those policies are essentially socialistic in nature as they essentially require governmental control of most economic activities in the economy.

Many young people seem to be attracted to socialistic politicians since they evidently don't know much about the history of prior socialistic experiments.

If people were truly aware of the history of socialistic experiments, they would not so easily accept the blandishments of would-be socialist politicians.

However, after World War II, many economic and political systems took different paths. I have discussed some of these in more detail in papers I did on [www.theconstitutionalistsociety.com](http://www.theconstitutionalistsociety.com). In two cases, Germany and Korea, a country was split in half so the people on each side had similar histories and cultures. In each case the half that adopted free market economic policies and its people prospered while the half that adopted socialistic policies and its people did poorly at the same time.

In other socialistic experiments that occurred over a period of time, the British Labor Party adopted many socialistic policies and nationalized many industries. Britain suffered slow growth, inflation, bloated government, and a "brain drain" of the most highly educated and highest earning citizens until Margaret Thatcher was elected and adopted more free market policies. Something similar happened in Chile where the Allende government adopted socialistic policies and the economy suffered until Allende's government was overthrown by Pinochet, who subsequently adopted free market economic policies and the economy did much better. Free market policies were also adopted, without violence, by Hong Kong and Singapore after WWII and both economies developed from extreme poverty after the war to become some of the wealthiest countries in the World at the present time.

More recently, all but the totally ignorant should be aware that the "Bolivarian socialist" policies adopted in Venezuela have led to economic stagnation and suffering for most of the Venezuelan people. However, it is also clear that the leaders in socialistic societies such as North Korea and Venezuela have prospered and grown fat while many of their people have suffered greatly.

Socialistic policies have been adopted widely and most have achieved poor economic results, especially for the average citizens. Thus many as in Britain, and even in Sweden have been scaled back or, as in Chile, been forcibly replaced.

What many people do not realize is that "Fascism" was developed by Mussolini to appeal to the working class by promising benefits to workers (the proletariat) just as Communism did. However, it differed from Communism in three main ways. First, it was nationalistic rather than internationalist in approach. Second, it did not call for abolishing all private ownership and private property as long as that ownership and property was used for the benefit of the national state. Third, the

interests of the national state were to be determined by the chosen "elite" rather than by a "dictatorship of the Proletariat." Hitler adopted similar "fascist" policies for Germany, as shown by the fact that the acronym, NAZI, stands for the National Socialist German Workers Party. Under the Nazi party, Germany allowed key industries to be privately owned as long as they cooperated with the state. Thus, the steel industry and weapons industries thrived under the Nazis and their leaders prospered.

The question that arises now is how the politicians that advocate socialistic policies are similar to those that advocated "fascist" policies in the past. They are similar in that they have run for election by advocating socialistic policies and once elected they have used government powers to favor industries and industrialists who have cooperated with them. In the process, like previous socialistic leaders, they often have become personally wealthy. Favored industries have helped enrich such politicians through campaign contributions, favorable investment opportunities, and (once they step down) lucrative speaking and consulting contracts.

Examples of prominent politicians who have been elected after advancing socialistic ideas are President Barack Obama and Senator Bernie Sanders, both of whom were "community organizers" in Chicago and were familiar with the works of Saul Alinsky, an avowed "Marxist," who wrote the book, Rules for Radicals, which many community organizers and other progressives use as a guide. Senator Hillary Clinton also was familiar with Alinsky's work. Under Obama's presidency, firms, such as "green" firms received perks and subsidies from the Federal government, even though many, like Solyndra, subsequently failed. In addition, pharmaceutical firms and various other healthcare firms were sufficiently tempted by potential rewards under Obamacare that they spent large amounts advertising in favor of their proposed legislation. Conversely, other firms, such as energy firms who did not support Obama, suffered from excessive government regulation. In short, Obama adopted policies that favored firms that favored his view of the world and punished firms that did not. Government regulation was used as a way to force private firms to comply with government objectives whether they wished to or not. However, firms that were supportive of the government were allowed to merge and gain greater monopolistic powers which they could use to advance their profits at the expense of others.

Mergers of firms often occurred under the Obama administration and have continued under Trump. One type of merger that is of considerable concern from a political standpoint is a merger that allows a limited number of individuals or firms to dominate the political discourse and news exposure of the public. It is questionable whether Facebook should have been allowed to acquire other "network" oriented firms, such as Instagram and WhatsApp or if Google should have been allowed to acquire YouTube, for the same reason. In addition, it is questionable whether extensive consolidation should be allowed in the communications industry—particularly among content providers and content distributors, as network consolidation may limit consumer choice and the marketplace both for ideas and for competitive products. The danger is that politically correct "groupthink" can result and communications channels may all carry the content dictated by "Big Brother" as described by George Orwell in his novel, "1984."

But I digress. The bottom line is that President Obama, Senator Sanders, and (former Senator) Clinton have all advocated socialistic policies, have all tended to favor industries that further their policies, and are all multi-millionaires (unless Sanders is only a single millionaire). Their advocacy of socialistic policies has helped their elections, has generated benefits (as in fascist economies) for favored industries that cooperate with their policies, and has helped contribute to their personal wealth and economic well-being.

Given that the evidence shows that socialistic policies have not done as well as free market policies for furthering the wealth of the common man, we now have a clue to why many politicians continue to advocate them. It helps them get elected and, post-election, socialistic leaders often gain substantial personal wealth, even if the general public does not.