

Yankee Steve's Column
for the week of June 18, 2009

Part Three in the series Communism among Blacks, Jews, and Anglo-Saxons in America
Section two, Socialism among the Anglo-Saxons of America
(Conclusion of a seven-week column series)

The New World

The Puritans landed in America in the year of our Lord 1620.

The most notable experiment with Communism was carried out by these God-fearing Separatists, as they were called, who did not know what to expect when they arrived in America.

Every year at Thanksgiving children honor them calling them the Pilgrims or the Pilgrim fathers when in fact they should be called the Puritans. The second governor of their colony William Bradford, records in his journal that the Puritans experimented with of all things, Socialism, only to draw the conclusion later that Socialism is tantamount to slavery. They tried Socialism because it held out the promise of a full belly. Bradford concluded that sometimes you must choose between freedom and a full belly. He quotes one of the ancients. "That a great part of liberty is a well governed belly, and to be patient in all wants." [Seneca, Epistle 123]

Bradford recorded in his journal that when the experiment with Communism had come to an end that no one shed a tear. Ridding Plymouth Plantation of Socialism met with little if any resistance. The Puritans realized that the Communism of Sir Thomas More and of Plato fed off jealousy and bitterness, and that it is a type of slavery. Bradford wrote,

The experience that was had in this common course and condition, tried sundry years, and that amongst godly and sober men, may well evince the vanity of that conceit of Plato and other ancients, applauded by some of later times; - that the taking away of property, and bringing in community into a common wealth, would make them happy and flourishing; as if they were wiser than God. For this community [so far as it was] was found to breed much confusion and discontent, and retard much employment that would have been to their benefit and comfort. For the young-men that were most able and fit for labor and service did repine that they should spend their time and strength to work for other men's wives and children, without any recompense. The strong, or man of parts, had no more in division of victuals then he that was weak and not able to do a quarter the other could; this was thought injustice. The aged and graver men to be ranked and equalized in labors and victuals and cloths etc., with the meaner and younger sort, though it seemed indignity and disrespect unto them. And for men's wives to be commanded to do service for other men, as dressing their meat, washing their cloths, etc., they deemed it a kind of slavery neither could many husbands well brook it.

Bradford was forced to deal with the objection that Plato's Communism had failed because we are by nature corrupt, and that if we were not so selfish Communism would be able to satisfy all

our wants. Bradford thought this idea to be totally without merit. He says that things “would have been worse” for the Plymouth community “. . . if they had been men of another condition. Let none object this is men’s corruption, and nothing to the course it self. I answer, seeing all men have this corruption in them God in his wisdom saw another course fitter for them.”

In other words Communism, or the kind that is based on atheism or something akin to atheism, will lead to disaster because it runs counter to human nature. If it fails when good men try it, it will fail when the likes of Vladimir Lenin and Hugo Chavez try it. Communism cannot change human nature. We have every right to believe that working for ourselves is not wrong. Instinctively we know this to be true. Aristotle, when denouncing the Communism of Plato says the same thing. There is nothing wrong with self-interest. We will work harder and longer for ourselves than we will if we work for the community. That in turn will have to benefit the community at large.

Bradford says that when the Puritan Separatists did away with Socialism, and when they put in its place something approximating Capitalism, the people worked harder, were happier, and they prospered. They felt that they had the right to have things for themselves without sharing them with some sort of collective. Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev [1894-1971] understood as much as anyone that Collectivism does not appeal to human nature. He knew that having an interest in ourselves is a part of what we are, and that it a part of us which Communism does not honor as legitimate.

“There will always be a psychological problem in the peasant’s soul: no one is born a communist (Socialist). In the Soviet Union, farmers keep looking into the barn for their horses even after they have given them to the collective . . . it is easier to wipe out the anopheles mosquito than the virus of individualism, the irrepressible cult of property.” [cited by Lee, Francis. *Communist Eschatology*, Craig Press, Nutley, NJ, 1974, p. 657-9]

Aristotle says that working for yourself is not wrong. The Greek sounds like the economist Adam Smith who said that the desire to benefit yourself is in accord with human nature and that societies based on altruism rarely if ever prosper like the ones based on competition. Bradford relates what happened when the Puritans gave up on Plato’s Socialism.

This had very good success; for it made all hands very industrious, so as much more corn as planted then other wise would have been by any means the Governor or any other could use, and saved him a great deal of trouble, and gave far better content. The women now went willingly into the field, and took their little-ones with them to set corn which before would allege weakness, and inability; whom to have compelled would have been thought great tyranny and oppression.

Socialists of the Industrial Revolution and Later

The most important sources of Socialism in America have been 1) the Fabian Society of England which began in 1884 one year after the death of Karl Marx, and 2) the emigration to America of a number of Europeans who failed to bring about a Communist revolution in their part of the world.

A number of experiments based on social engineering have been conducted throughout history. The names associated with these experiments are Robert Owen, Thomas Spence, Joseph Fourier, John Bellers, Gerrard Winstanley, William Thompson, and the members of Brook Farm just to mention a few. These societies were formed in order to alleviate want among those who had either been neglected by society, or who lacked the opportunity to better themselves. In the case of Brook Farm it was nothing more than an experiment carried out by bored New England Unitarians (Transcendentalists) who had nothing else to do. The experiment lasted only two years. These efforts at creating the ideal society should not be confused with the way in which the Fabian Society of England gained control of the Labor Party of England in an attempt to promote Collectivism first in Britain and then around the world, using when necessary surreptitious methods. The Fabian Society is the KGB of Socialism.

1) The Fabian Society of England

Marx lived the latter part of his life in London. When he was not womanizing or drinking Marx spent the majority of his time frequenting libraries. His teachings which caused him to be expelled from his native country found their way to a group of London dissidents who decided to ferment a world-wide revolution. The society was called the Fabian Society after the Roman Fabius Maximus who employed tactics in warfare which did not call for a direct or all out confrontation with the enemy. This appealed to the Fabians. From its inception the Fabian Society has been willing to work behind the scenes. An example of what I mean can be found in a memo sent by the Fabian Roger Baldwin of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to his staff.

“Do steer away from making it [ACLU] look like a Socialist enterprise. We want to look like patriots in everything we do. We want to get a good lot of flags, talk a good deal about the Constitution and what our forefathers wanted to make of the country, and to show that we are really the folks that really stand for the spirit of our institutions.” [cited by Martin, Rose. “Revolutionary Radicalism,” Vol. 1, *The Fabian Freeway*, Western Islands, 1966, p. 222]

Rose Martin commented, “Such deceptive practice was in the classic Fabian tradition - symbolized by the wolf in sheep’s clothing that decorates the Shavian stained-glass window at Fabian meetinghouse in England. Promptly adopted by Baldwin’s associates, the tactic has succeeded in deluding not a few well-intentioned Americans.” [Ibid, p. 222]

The Fabian credo, the Basis, drawn up at the beginning of their exploits leaves nothing to doubt. The Fabians wanted to bring about an international revolution. If Capitalism had blanketed the world then Socialism could do the same. The Fabians had high hopes: the complete transformation of society, a United World built around the idea of collectivism.

The Basis reads as follows,

It [the Fabians] therefore aims at the reorganization of society by the emancipation of land and Industrial Capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit . . . The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land . . . The Society further works for the transfer to the

Community of such Industrial Capital as can conveniently be handled socially. For the attainment of these ends the Fabian Society looks to the spread of Socialist opinions, and the social and political changes consequent thereon . . . It seeks to achieve these ends by the general dissemination of knowledge as to the relation between the individual and Society in its economic, ethical and political aspects.

The Fabians gathered for tea and they talked. Most observers would have thought that the Fabian Society was little more than a think-tank made up of middle-class Brits. They never let on for a moment that they were trying to bring about a revolution. Revolution would now look respectable. However Fabian leadership showed its true colors when their two most prominent leaders Sidney Webb and George Bernard Shaw joined the Communist Party.

After visiting Russia, Webb and Shaw returned with glowing reports about how happy the peasants of Russia were because of Socialism. This same kind of misinformation was propagated by Roger Baldwin of the ACLU and also by Vic and Walter Reuther who rose to prominence in the United Auto Workers Union (UAW). They put into writing their love of the Soviet Communism which they were certain would some day replace Capitalism. In a letter to their friends Melvin and Gladys Bishop they had nothing but praise for the Soviet system. How happy the peasants were! However, all this was disproven at a latter time.

Later when the UAW propaganda machine got underway the two travelers said that they had actually been “disillusioned by the workings of bureaucracy” while they were in Russia. But that is not how the letter reads. The letter fell into the hands of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Its last sentence is chilling. It reads, “Carry on the fight for a Soviet America” and is dated January 21, 1934.

The Reuthers were not the only ones used by the Soviets to spread misinformation.

Additional reports from other sources filed which the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) also made it look as if the Soviets had laid the foundation to the Utopia of Sir Thomas More. The CIA swallowed these reports hook line and sinker. Finally however an enormous pile of misinformation was exposed for what it was. But before that many Americans bought into the idea that serfdom had finally ended in Russia, and that the Soviet Socialist Republic headed up in the Kremlin had found a cure for man’s troubles. One of the Americans who must have believed that was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who tried to implement Socialism in America complaining all the while that the American people were holding him back.

Later the truth about Soviet Russia and the ineffectual nature of Socialism were discovered.

“The fall of the Soviet Union brought about a major revision of economic history under communism. Based on research coming out of the previously secret KGB files in Moscow, historians confirmed von Mises’s negative views about socialist central planning. In her work about Soviet Russia in the 1930’s entitled *Everyday Stalinism*, Sheila Fitzpatrick countered the old conventional view held by the Sidney and Beatrice Webb and George Bernard Shaw that the Soviet system during the 1930’s was a glorious “new civilization.” On the contrary, Fitzpatrick wrote, ‘With the abolition of the market, shortages of food, clothing, and all kinds of consumer

goods became endemic. As peasants fled the collective villages, major cities were soon in the grip of an acute housing crisis, with families jammed for decades in tiny single rooms in communal apartments . . . It was a world of privation, overcrowding, endless queues, and broken families, in which the regimes promise of future socialist abundance rang hollow . . . Government bureaucracy often turned everyday life into a nightmare. [Skousen, Mark. *The Making of Modern Economics*, Sharpe, 2001, p. 423]

However the Fabian Society reached its tentacles across the ocean. Using an alias whenever it was deemed necessary, Fabians managed to infiltrate all of American life. Industry, education, politics, economics, and religion felt the icy fingers of the Fabians. Harvard University was one of the first to honor the Fabians becoming thereby the Mecca for Socialists in North America. It would be well nigh impossible to determine how many front organizations, fronting for Communism, have been spawned by the Fabians.

2) The Saxons Came with their Political Baggage

In 1869 a number of émigrés with utopia on their minds, mostly German, formed the first American branch of the First International, an organization that under the guidance of Marx had begun in five years before in London. The New World was going to receive Communism even if the old world had for now rejected it. Theodore Draper wrote that “These German immigrants brought with them a degree of trade-union and political consciousness then unknown in the United States. No sooner had they arrived than they set about duplicating their old-world allegiances in their new homeland.” [*The Roots of American Communism*, Viking, 1957, p. 11]

What happened to the First International? Scholars tell us that it lasted only 12 years. We can accept that if we realize that Marxists change names as easily as some kinds of chameleons can change their colors. Socialism never goes away; it just changes its clothes. What came to America with the Saxons in 1869 is alive and well in America no matter what you call it.

Jacob Spolansky wrote that Socialists “. . . have entrenched themselves solidly in our industries, labor unions, and in governmental institutions.” And I would add in our churches, synagogues, and schools. This explains why the door has been closed to conservatives in a number of educational institutions in America. Jekyll must become Hyde.

Conclusion

It is time to list a few of the names that come to mind when we think about those who are guilty of promoting Socialism in America who are of Anglo-Saxon or Western European descent. Sometimes they cannot be labeled as Communists, but they were or still are Socialists, which has to mean that they have paved the road ahead with good intentions, but nevertheless it is still a road that will inevitably lead to serfdom.

In government:

Presidential candidate Eugene V. Debs [1855-1926]

Ambassador to Russia Joseph E. Davies [1876-1958] [author of *Mission to Moscow* served under Roosevelt in 1941. His film by the same name [1943 directed by Michael Curtiz and starred Walter Huston] puts a positive spin on Communist Russia. Screenwriter Howard Koch was black-listed. The House Committee on Un-American Activities targeted it along with two other films, *The North Star* and *Song of Russia*

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt [1882-1945] [opened the door to Socialism in America through his New Deal and Works Progress Administration (WPA) programs]

Political activist John Reed [buried in 1920 at the Kremlin]

Harry Hopkins [1890-1946] [one of the architects of New Deal Socialism and the WPA]

President Lyndon B. Johnson [1908-73] [designed entitlement programs such as Medicare and Medicaid - showed his authoritarian side, which accompanies Socialism, when he bootlegged a law that prohibited churches from promoting a political candidate]

Vice President (VP) under Johnson, Hubert Humphrey [1911-78] [openly confessed that he believed in a strong central power in the government. The Socialist will always lust after centralized power]

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. [1917-2007] [adviser to President John F. Kennedy]

President Jimmy Carter [1924-] [never has understood economic and educational freedom, and thinks that if we schmooze communists that they will learn our ways. He is hopelessly naïve]

VP under Carter, Walter Mondale [1928-]

President Bill Clinton [1946-] [ideologically a Leninist]

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton [1947-] [fully supports the feminist movement derived from Marxism, also supports socialized medicine that at one time was called Hillary Care. HC is a Leninist like her husband, but more so]

VP under Clinton, Al Gore [1948-] [promotes myths about global warming in order to develop a system of taxing industry called Cap and Trade. This fits in with his Marxist agenda]

In religion:

Rev. Walter Rauschenbusch [1861-1916] [proclaimed the social gospel or collectivism by subverting the term the Kingdom Of God which he equated with Socialism]

Theologian Dr. E. Stanley Jones [1884-1973] [dedicated Socialist who effectively sold his fellow Presbyterians on Socialism]

Theologian Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr [1892-1971] [outspoken and belligerent Socialist who dreamed of a one world government]

Theologian Dr. John C. Bennett [1903-95] [from Union Seminary like Jones and Rauschenbusch. He thought that Christianity and Socialism had something in common and that the two could be reconciled]

In activism:

Activist Florence Kelley [1859-1932] [translated into English a major work by Friedrich Engels]

Activist Margaret Sanger [1879-1966] [Determined Marxist who founded Planned Parenthood]

Activist Roger Baldwin [1884-1981] [member of Communist Party and secretary to ACLU]

Activist Norman Thomas [1884-1968]

Whittaker Chambers [1901-61] [Communist who testified against Hiss]

Alger Hiss [1904-96] [spy who served in the government during the Roosevelt administration]

Activist Arianna Huffington [1950-] [employs Internet to promote Socialism, however, not much of a thinker considering she is Greek. Maybe babies were switched at the hospital!]

In Arts:

Author Jack London [1876-1916]

Author Upton Sinclair [1878-1968] [dedicated Fabian]

Editor Henry A. Wallace [1888-1965] [*The New Republic* a publication inspired by Socialism]

Actor Humphrey Bogart [1899-1957] [Hey, Bogie weren't those Socialists with whom you were in conflict in *Casablanca*?]

Actor Lee J. Cobb [1911-76] [unrelenting supporter of Chairman Mao]

Singer, songwriter Pete Seeger [1919 -] [member of the Communist Party USA]

Actors Warren Beatty [1937-] and Annette Bening [1958-] [husband and wife]

Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com