

Charles R. Coombs

April 2, 1995

Your Views
The Oklahoman
P. O. Box 25125
Oklahoma City, 73125

To the Editor:

How interesting that our leading socialists should be calling people like Newt Gingrich “Nazis.”

National Socialism occupies the middle, or moderate, portion of the socialist spectrum between Communism and Fascism. The goal of all three systems is to take money from people who have earned it and to redistribute it to people who haven't: Everyone contributes according to ability; everyone receives according to need.

Communists do this by simply confiscating all property and giving the money out as paychecks.

Fascism as Mussolini built it leaves most property in private hands, but redistributes individual wealth through taxation, regulation, and confiscation. It's a partnership between government and industry much like that between the Mafia and shopkeepers who pay protection.

National Socialism acts like Fascism until an industry reaches a certain size, at which point the government confiscates, or “nationalizes,” it. For nationalized industries, National Socialism resembles Communism. Hillary Clinton followed this scheme when she tried to nationalize the heavily-regulated, heavily-taxed health care industry. It's people like her who have earned the sobriquet “Nazi,” not Mister Newt.

Clearly, if you're a socialist you're a Communist, a National Socialist, or a Fascist. Of course, if you're a liberal, you're a socialist, and if you're a Democrat, you're a liberal. The rest of us should point out what these people really mean when they spew their ridiculous epithets.

Charles R. Coombs

Charles R. Coombs

November 26, 1992

Your Views
The Oklahoman
P. O. Box 25125
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

To the Editor:

You've published a spate of letters exhorting us, now that we've elected a Moderate, to become good Moderates ourselves and to bend our shoulders to the task of extending Moderation to all the peoples of the earth.

The problem, of course, is that there is still greed in America. Greed is the prime obstacle to Moderation.

We need to empower the government to collect all wealth, not just part of it, in taxes. Each citizen thus contributes to the good of all according to his or her ability. The government can then determine what each person's needs are and redistribute the wealth in accordance with those needs. The economic theory is called "Communegalitarianism," because all Moderates are equal under the system it delineates. The governing body is called "The International Moderate," which is destined to become the human race, hence to make us all equal in the end.

Getting there won't be easy. We can begin, however, by nationalizing all businesses in America that have a gross annual revenue of, say, \$200,000 or more. This policy of "Sociable Nationalization" will remove economic and political power from the hands of the greedy and restore it to the actual producers of wealth — the workers — who can use it as a bridge to true, Communegalitarianistic Moderation.

There are those well-intentioned souls, alas, who have been manipulated into imagining a fundamental conflict between Sociable Nationalization and Communegalitarianism. I call to witness the millions of people, mostly deceased, who never saw a dime's worth of difference between the two philosophies in action.

So let us begin.

Charles R. Coombs

Charles R. Coombs

July 21, 1992

Your Views
The Oklahoman
P. O. Box 25125
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

To the Editor:

A politician was stumping in a small, agrarian community.

“We’re gonna take all the money from the rich guys, like Magic Johnson and Arsenio Hall, and we’re gonna give it to poor saxophone players from Arkansas!” he shouted. “From each according to his ability! To each according to his need!”

“Hillary billary! Hillary billary!” the crowd responded boisterously.

“Then we’re gonna invest the rest in the real people of this country — the homeless, the gay, the addicted, the fay, the crooked who slay, and the people whose love affairs get into the newspapers! Unite! You have nothing to lose you haven’t worked for!”

“Hillary billary! Hillary billary!” returned the mighty shout.

“Remember! A vote for me is a vote for Robin Hood! No more greed! No more hypocrisy! ’Cause I’m gonna bleed this big, fat Democracy, and take it away from the WASP aristocracy to give it back to you!”

And from deep within the heart of the crowd came the enormous, rumbling chorus: “Hillary billary! Hillary billary! Hillary billary!”

Descending from the stump, his wife or spousal equivalent tightly clinging to his side like a growth or an appurtenance, the statesman laughed. “Boy! Can I tickle these hicks, or what?” Then, sobering, he said, “I sure could use a rest, though.” He danced uncertainly from foot to foot.

The town mayor, overhearing, said, “There’s a restroom down by the bullpens. Be careful. Don’t step in the hillery billary.”

Charles R. Coombs

Charles R. Coombs

December 11, 1994

Your Views
The Oklahoman
P. O. Box 25125
Oklahoma City, 73125

To the Editor:

I think there's a relationship between the recent elections and the "habitual incivility and random violence" you decry in your editorial of December 10.

The people elected a congress more closely aligned with what they believe. But the executive branch remains powerful, extremist and liberal and so do the courts.

Say, then, that the 104th Congress does legislate some of the Contract with America. Big deal. The people of Colorado voted not to make homosexuals a special, privileged class, and the 10th Circuit Court flouted their manifest will with perfect impunity. Puerto Rico's Supreme Court struck down a school choice law, despite the citizens' desire for it. Oklahoma's people voted in a law restraining abortion. Our courts negated it. And so on.

The FDA raids health food stores for mailing out literature about vitamins. The BATF decides what shall or shall not be permissible religious practice. HUD punishes citizens for mailing politically incorrect opinions to their newspapers. The EPA decides who may own a business or hold a job. And so on.

The election of a conservative congress will change none of this, but may make it clear to those millions of voters that, in today's America, they don't count.

I'd like to be wrong, but I think we're looking at a lot more habitual incivility, random violence, and unofficial terrorism (as opposed to the Waco variety) as people despair of changing things peacefully.

Let's hope not.

Charles R. Coombs

Charles R. Coombs

December 26, 1993

Your Views
The Oklahoman
P. O. Box 25125
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

To the Editor

NOTE: David Walters was governor of Oklahoma when this was written. He was indicted on eight felony counts, which he bargained down to a single misdemeanor under the aegis of District Attorney Robert Macy, a fellow Democrat. He now works in private industry, sort of.

The Duncan Banner article you quote in your "Around the State" column on December 26 asserts that people like David Walters violate campaign laws because campaign costs are too high.

This is like saying that people violate theft laws because food or drugs or boomboxes or videogames are too costly. I think most of us know better by now. If the affordability of things really determined crime, the Great Depression would have been the most lawless era in our history.

People like David Walters violate the law 1.) because they are lawless by inclination and upbringing, and 2.) because they get away with it. It is as deeply rooted in Walters' character to break campaign laws as it is in a thief's to steal.

He would do it if air time were free.

Charles R. Coombs

Charles R. Coombs

January 11, 1995

Your Views
The Oklahoman
P. O. Box 25125
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

To the Editor:

House Democrats attacking Newt Gingrich for his publishing deal have drawn a ridiculous comparison between him and disgraced ex Speaker Jim Wright.

Gingrich was no more guilty of ethics violations than Al Gore, who as a congressman negotiated a \$100,000 book advance of his own. Wright deceitfully flouted a law forbidding him to accept honoraria from special interests. He would appear before, say, a labor union, a trade association, or whoever else had him in their pockets at the moment, then "sell" them enough ludicrously overpriced copies of his book to make up the fee. Since there was and is no law against writing for money, he felt he should get away with this.

Wright's downfall was not his writing, but his dishonesty. The scurrilous likening of Wright to Mister Newt is not to be suffered gladly.

Charles R. Coombs

Charles R. Coombs

March 3, 1995

Your Views
The Oklahoman
P. O. Box 25125
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

To the Editor:

Our ruling Democrats feel they have a mandate to thwart everything we voters demanded last November. As they were in fact elected to office, they may have a point.

Nevertheless, Governor Keating should lay his entire program before the people as a series of initiative petitions. If our imperial Democrats are right, we'll vote the whole thing down and make them heroes. If they're wrong, we can push them out of the way, govern ourselves by petition for a couple of years, then try again to hire people who will do the job we specify.

We Oklahomans are blessed with the right to make our own laws when arrogance and greed distract our lawmakers from their duties. It's time we gave that right more exercise.

Charles R. Coombs

Charles R. Coombs

January 18, 1997

Your Views
The Oklahoman
P. O. Box 25125
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

To The Editor:

I'm envisioning a political thriller about a character named G. ("Fat Man") Plummer who taps phone lines for his party. He intercepts a politically useful conversation between an influential House member and several colleagues, one of whom is using a cellular telephone.

Plummer launders the information by getting party loyalist and Society of Paedagogues stalwart Lug Wren to testify that he accidentally intercepted the cellular transmission on his new 20-channel scanner. To assure Wren's cooperation, Plummer gets Nip Yorkshire, a House member of his own party, to promise Wren immunity from any prosecution that might ensue.

Plummer then gives Wren a copy of the taped conversation. Wren takes it to his congressperson who refers him to Propriety Furbelow, Chair of the House Ethics Committee.

Things unravel when Furbelow gives the story to the New York Times, sparking a criminal investigation. Eventually, the FBI discovers that Wren's scanner was never modified to intercept cellular calls. In desperation, Plummer calls Yorkshire with a threat to reveal the whole plot, then, repenting, fatally shoots himself in the back with an assault rifle. Yorkshire and Furbelow end up in the slammer, but Wren goes free when his lawyer convinces a jury that he's too stupid to intend anything, let alone premeditate a criminal act. I won't share the ending with you, but it's a humdinger.

What do you think? Too farfetched?

Charles R. Coombs