

Elizabeth Warren says Government should be Allowed to Confiscate Citizens Property

ADMIN | October 24, 2019



Elizabeth Warren is one of the most dangerous politicians to emerge on the national stage in modern American history.

She is taking the ideas of socialism and bringing them to the mainstream, hoping to imbue them with a Harvard faculty lounge academic pedigree of respectability along the way.

Panam Post reported that under the terms of Warren's new proposed "Wealth Tax" the American government would do something that it has never done before, something that is characteristic of fascist, Communist, and totalitarian governments: the actual confiscation of assets, as opposed to the mere taxation of income.

The government would start off by taking 2% of all assets from Americans with a net worth of over USD \$50 million, and 3% of assets on the net worth of Americans over USD \$1 billion, every year.

"IF WE PUT THAT 2 CENT WEALTH TAX IN PLACE ON THE 75,000 LARGEST FORTUNES IN THIS COUNTRY," SHE SAID, "WE CAN DO UNIVERSAL CHILD CARE FOR EVERY BABY 0 TO 5, UNIVERSAL PRE-K, UNIVERSAL COLLEGE AND KNOCK BACK THE STUDENT LOAN DEBT BURDEN FOR 95% OF OUR STUDENTS AND STILL HAVE NEARLY A TRILLION DOLLARS LEFT OVER."

But there is no promise that the government will not seek further confiscations targeted towards the rest of American citizens, regardless of income.

Before even addressing the Constitutionality of such a proposal (or the public policy merits), Warren's ludicrous legislation presents a bureaucratic headache right off the bat: who, exactly, is supposed to be in charge of valuing these assets?

Assets, particularly of high-income individuals, are particularly volatile, The Washington Post noted.

The left believes your income, or property, belongs to the government and it is up to Washington to determine how much of it you can keep.

It's troubling that Warren is reviving a dusty old policy idea that has failed almost everywhere it has been tried.

But it's much more troubling that she has decided to focus her agenda on a proposal that almost certainly cannot be implemented without getting three-quarters of the states to vote for a constitutional amendment — or a Supreme Court that skews to the left.

It's no way to run a government, but in the current times, it is, sadly, a pretty good way to run a Democratic presidential campaign.