

## Yankee Steve's Column for the week of June 11, 2009

Part Five in the series Communism among Blacks, Jews, and Anglo-Saxons in America

### **Socialism among the Anglo-Saxons of America**

Socialism is winning. Conservatives are in full retreat. However, the impressive victories gained by the Socialists should not be blamed altogether on blacks and/or Jews, for neither has ever wielded the influence it would take to bring about so many changes in the way Americans think about entitlement programs which eventually will lead to a dictatorial government. Socialism, or the idea that the government is your parent, is intermittently authoritarian. That is the nature of the beast.

I blame the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) for the rise of Socialism. The WASP still runs the country be he a Midwest dirt farmer or a New England industrialist. The real money in America is old money, and more often than not it will be discovered that that money is under control of WASPs.

In particular, the triumph of Socialism ought to be blamed for the most part on upper-class Americans who during the 19th century began to think of themselves as Progressives who need to find a way of expunging their guilt for being a "have" and not a "have not." George Bernard Shaw, a flaming Communist [1856-1950], understood that communism appeals to the upper classes more than it does to the poor. He said that Marx did not understand that Socialism is a top-down movement led by the upper classes as for example the Kennedys and the Shrivvers. Shaw wrote,

Marx's *Capital* is not a treatise on Socialism; it is a jeremiad against the bourgeoisie . . . it was supposed to be written for the working class; but the working man respects the bourgeoisie and wants to be bourgeoisie; Marx never got hold of him for a moment. It was the revolting sons of the bourgeoisie itself, like myself that painted the flag Red. The middle and upper classes are the revolutionary element in society; the proletariat is the conservative element. [Henderson, Archibald. *George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century*, an authorized biography, 1956, p. 219]

Socialism is the rich man's solution to what ails us. Most of the leading Socialists in our history have come out of middle-class families. William Ayers, the confidant of President Barack Obama and a terrorist bomber, and John Reed [1887-1920], who was portrayed in the 1981 movie *Reds* by actor Warren Beatty, are examples of what I mean. Reed was no closet Communist and certainly he was no Lazarus lying at the gate. Reed is the only American buried in the Kremlin. Socialism is to those who have a way of fixing the problems of those who do not have. Or it is their way of cleansing the guilt they feel for being rich, case in point Nelson D. Rockefeller, the most dedicated and fool hearty liberal of modern times.

A long list of WASP names could be presented to the reader that would prove the way in which people of Anglo-Saxon heritage, or if you prefer, those of more general western European heritage, have contributed to the rise and infestation of Socialism in modern America. However certain names could not be left off, like that of Roger Baldwin secretary to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) or that of the Rev. Walter Rauschenbusch who abandoned Christianity for pantheism and what is usually referred to as the social gospel or Socialism, or that of author Upton Sinclair whose virile hatred of Christianity and Capitalism have always been apparent to his readers.

New England has coughed up more influential Socialists than any other part of America. Their aim has been to perpetuate an old stale myth; namely that Socialists have done bad things, but that in spite of that they have always wanted to do noble things.

Russian-born Alisa Zinov'yevna Rosenbaum, known in America and around the world as Ayn Rand [1905-1982] explains how that this myth must be gotten rid of if Socialism is to be exposed for what it is,

When, at the age of twelve, at the time of the Russian revolution, I first heard the Communist principle that Man must exist for the sake of the State, I perceived that this was the essential issue, that this principle was evil, and that it could lead to nothing but evil, regardless of any methods, details, decrees, policies, promises and pious platitudes. This was the reason for my opposition to Communism then - and it is my reason now. I am still a little astonished, at times, that too many adult Americans do not understand the nature of the fight against Communism as clearly as I understood it at the age of twelve: they continue to believe that only Communist methods are evil, while Communist ideals are noble. All the victories of Communism since the year 1917 are due to that particular belief among the men who are still free.

In "Plain Talk" she says,

The Communists' chief purpose is to destroy every form of independence - independent work, independent action, independent property, independent thought, an independent mind, or an independent man. Conformity, likeness, servility, submission and obedience are necessary to establish a Communist slave-state.

In other words if Socialism or Progressivism, is enabled to act in accord with what it is in its essential self, it must at some point become authoritarian. The old liberals who used to say "I do not agree with what you say, but I will defend your right to say it," now we have noticed that they no longer say that. Some of us are wondering why. It is easy to see why. Jekyll must become Hyde. What is in the root must at some point show up in the branches. Socialism breeds Communism and slavery because they are of the same root.

Rand's comment brings to mind a statement made by Mr. Anti-Communist J. B. Matthews. While discussing the liberal philosopher John Dewey, Matthews suggests that we refrain from calling men like Dewey Communists. They may be Marxists but they should be called

Progressives. Dewey, he thinks, could never fit in with Communism because it tries to swallow the individual completely. He is much too liberal for Communism.

At the same time Matthews does not deny that Communist authoritarianism begins to take shape when some well-meaning Progressives (probably middle classed and morally loose like Baldwin and the people of his circle) begins to get ideas about how they can fix society. Communism begins to take root when Progressives say that all who disagree with their schemes, which are intended to alleviate suffering, are going to hinder the progressive of evolution. Progressives think that if their plans are implemented then they will bring war to an end, and maybe even war also because their will be a one world government. Obviously, those who disagree with this must be moved to one side, for if they are allowed to stand in the way they will impede progress. What it will take to move them aside is yet to be determined. Whatever it is it will not meet with approval on the part of those who think that Socialism equals coercion.

### **At Last Utopia**

Sir Thomas More of England presents a case for Communism in *Utopia* which was first published in 1516. It has been published continually from that time to the present. Communism has always proven attractive to those who think that with the right materials they will be able to build a paradise on earth. Communists are very often referred to as Utopians or those who are building something that will never need replacing. It will speak the final word on economics, family life, and the rights of the individual. We must never forget that Socialism or Communism is an outworking of a presupposed eschatology.

*Utopia* has been called the first manifesto favoring Socialism that was written in modern times. Others have followed. The Socialist H. G. Wells, whose *Outline of History* is tinctured through and through with advertisements for Socialism, wrote *A Modern Utopia* which by the way is not modern at all; it sounds the same tired message of Socialism that dates back to antiquity, not that everyone understands this. U.S. Senator Patrick Leahy [D-VT] and Representative Dennis Kucinich [D-OH] will I am sure include the *Utopia* of Wells on their list of books to read right next to Marx's *Communist Manifesto*.

Wells in his attempt at writing about a utopia demonstrates that Socialists are one-worlders or trans-nationalists who do not in the long run care a fig for their nations' sovereignty. Wells writes in his *Modern Utopia*, "Now these Utopian statesmen who founded the World State put the problem of social organization in the following fashion - To contrive a revolutionary movement that shall absorb all existing governments and fuse them with itself, and that must be rapidly progressive and adaptable, and yet coherent, persistent, powerful, and efficient." Does this not sound like Reinhold Niebuhr from section four of this series?

More was one of the most learned men of his age. After its publication, *Utopia* would have made the rounds in all the courts and universities of Europe. Socialism would have become a topic for discussion in spite of the fact that the author knew full well that the monarchs in Europe would never try to create anything like his utopia. I wonder if Sir Thomas More wrote the *Utopia* as an exercise.

*Utopia* is about an imaginary kingdom that sits offshore with laws that only some people could embrace. Obviously the laws of this kingdom are more important than the name of this kingdom. However, and for the sake of clarity, the word *utopia* in its original Greek setting means “good place.” Interestingly, one is given the impression that this imaginary kingdom is a good place because everyone conforms to the laws, and that individuality is not highly prized. Now if you think that Sir Thomas More was Latinizing his Greek, then it is likely that “utopia” means “no place.” I would have preferred that this imaginary kingdom ruled over by king Utopos be called “Maze.” Once you are in a kingdom like this it is not likely that you will be able to find a way out; Communism always begins by pleading for a chance to be heard but after it assumes the podium it will drown out all voices but its own.

This is a book about a kingdom where the rulers act as if they are your parents and guardians because they are Socialists who frown in individuality. As such they know what is best for you. This is not a democracy where people claim that they know what is best. However, and in spite of that, the rulers of Utopia make one point that it would be good for us to take note of in our modern world. I have to mention it because it goes to the heart of a contemporary problem, one that humanists do not appreciate.

In Utopia no one is entrusted with any kind of leadership position who thinks that we are no different from the animals that as soon as they die cease to exist. Such a person, the Utopians believed, could not be trusted with supervision. He would have no one to answer to after death. He has reduced us to the level of the beasts.

In *Utopia*, well-wishers advise traveler Raphael to seek employment as a counselor to kings. However, Raphael thinks that this may not be advisable. He believes that his views are too radical for the princes of Europe. We soon discover why: Raphael is a follower of Plato, whose *Republic* books 1-4 and 8-12 vigorously promote Communism.

On mentioning Plato we are brought face to face with the real source of Communism. Step aside Marx; step aside Lenin! This is not to say that Plato invented Socialism (study Crete and Sparta) but he did place his imprimatur on it in what has to be one of the most important works ever written. Plato was not just any philosopher. What he advocated went a long way beyond the ancients. Even the Suphi Muslims have taken a liking to him.

Many of the laws, and the culture that prevailed in Utopia, are very much up-to-date. Leftists and radicals would feel at home in More’s imaginary kingdom, especially because no one there is said to have the final word on religion. It seems as if the people are still searching. You can believe what you want but it seems as if you can’t believe it with any conviction.

<p>I would suppose that the one thing that ACLU finds most annoying about Christians is that they believe that the search for the truth has ended. How dare they be so self-assured? Why if they are allowed to think that they may even ask others to become Christians. Columnist Charles Krauthammer thinks that when people are afraid of those who propagate truth it is because any religion they might have had, that was passed down to them, has been deracinated.</p>
---

Utopia is a welfare state where hospitals are free, divorce is easy, and euthanasia is lawful. No one goes hungry in Utopia because food comes from one source only, government storehouses. All you have to do is ask.

In *Utopia* intellectuals are segregated early on and given special schooling so that they can rule (just like they were in Soviet Russia right after the Revolution when the control of the revolution passed from the proletariat to a politburo made up of intellectuals. This Lenin knew, represents a departure from Marx.)

Women in Utopia are liberated because it is assumed that they have been the victims of a social order that has not allowed them to rule like men. In the Republic, Plato allowed women to be Guardians (thought police) just like men were. Plato said that women differed mainly in one respect, they could have children. However since children were raised communally, in a kibbutz-like society, women did not according to Plato have to spend their time mothering.

Mores' liberation of women brings to mind the musings of another Communist Simone de Beauvoir [1908-86] who believed that motherhood led to slavery. Her *The Second Sex* became a textbook for modern feminists. Though she was not a scientist, she took it upon herself to say that there was no such thing as a maternal instinct with the inference being that women must have the same role in life as men. To stay at home and be a mother is to admit that one has allowed men to defraud you. Communism which does not admit of the difference between men and women has opened the door to a genderless society, where men may look like women and women increasingly look and dress like men.

In the kingdom of Utopia dress must be simple and without adornment. Slavery or something akin to it is permitted just like it was in the Russian Gulag. Note: The British Socialist Marvin Laski, who taught for five years at Harvard, would not rule out slave labor in a Socialist society.

Most important of all is the fact that in Utopia travel around the country is not possible unless you have been given an internal passport. An internal passport in Utopia meant that movement was regulated by the government. Democrats, because they are left leaning Socialists, were ready to comply with the wishes of George W. Bush who had the temerity to suggest that Americans apply for a National Identification Card. That was too close to Stalinism when an official could ask for "your papers." Once upon a time we were promised that if we were given a Social Security number that it could not be used for purposes of identification, but that law has either been neglected or overruled altogether.

In Utopia there is no private ownership. All things, especially land, are owned by all the people. In Russia you could own a house but not the land on which it sat. I hasten to add that one of the things that distinguished the Americans from the Europeans was that Americans felt that they had a right to own property.

We see that about 500 years ago a broadside favoring Communism was published in England. Sir Thomas More an Anglo-Saxon got the ball rolling. Strange as it may seem, from the same locality, Great Britain, a book was published in 1776 by the author, Adam Smith, called *The Wealth of Nations*. It discredits Socialism at every turn. One of its contributors was Benjamin

Franklin. Within a hundred years of its publication America became the most prosperous nation in history. The American worker lived better than any other worker in the world. And he did this without having to rely on the government in the way Socialists do.

So I ask you which book should be read to your children, *Utopia* by More or Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*? Need I ask? What was the Rev. Walter Rauschenbusch reading when he wrote in his *Theology for the Social Gospel* [1917] that "baptism is not a ritual act of individual salvation but an act of dedication to a religious and social movement." Certainly he was not reading the Bible!

What was John C. Bennett reading in 1970 when he was the president of Union Seminary in New York? In the following remark he proves that J. B. Matthews was right when he said that the Communist cause received the widest support in America from clergymen. Listen to Bennett who is apparently drunk on some new wine -

First, the time has come to free ourselves from the combination of residual national messianism and anti-communist crusading. Our more thoughtful readers know that this whole picture of an international Communist movement that threatens the "free world" from many sides is out of date. We should abandon the idea that there is a worldwide communism that constitutes a unified threat and is, by definition, the greatest evil that can befall any country regardless of the alternatives. Who are we to say that communism may not be better for some nations than generations of stagnation in poverty, then decades of civil war, then a rightist tyranny that cares nothing about the welfare of the people? It would be a rational policy to allow various kinds of communism to find their own level . . . [Alger, Bruce & Colby, Roy. "Revolutionary Actions . . . USA . . . In Retrospect," Citizens Evaluation Committee, 1971, p. 60]

Ever yours,

Steve Cakouros  
oldlineconservative.com