

Chapter 1 : Socialism Quotes - BrainyQuote

The very core tenet of Marxism and its two versions called socialism and communism is to actually replace the family structure. In Russian communism, Stalin was paranoid about any possible resistance. Children were taught that the state was their parent instead of their biological parents, and if.

Pelican Books, ; Transcribed: Sally Ryan Sally Ryan. WHEN promising new liberties, Socialists are apt to forget that people object even more strongly to new liberties than to new laws. If a woman has been accustomed to go in chains all her life and to see other women doing the same, a proposal to take her chains off will horrify her. She will feel naked without them, and clamor to have any impudent hussy who does not feel about them exactly as she does taken up by the police. In China only Manchu ladies dared defy fashion with uncrippled feet. It is easier to put chains on people than to take them off if the chains look respectable. In Russia marriage under the Tsars was an unbreakable chain. There was no divorce; but on the other hand there was, as with us, a widespread practice of illicit polygamy. A woman could live with a man without marrying him. A man could live with a woman without marrying her. In fact each might have several partners. In Russia under the Communist Soviet this state of things has been reversed. If a married couple cannot agree, they can obtain a divorce without having to pretend to disgrace themselves as in Protestant England. That shocks many English ladies, married or unmarried, who take the Book of Common Prayer literally. But the Soviet does not tolerate illicit relations. If a man lives with a woman as husband with wife he must marry her, even if he has to divorce another wife to do it. The woman has the right to the status of a wife, and must claim it. This seems to many English gentlemen an unbearable tyranny: In countries and sects where polygamy is legal, the laws compelling the husband to pay equal attention to all his wives are staggering to a British husband, who is not now, as he was formerly, legally obliged to pay any attention to his one wife, nor she to him. Now marriage institutions are not a part of Socialism. Marriage, of which we speak as if it were one and the same thing all the world over, differs so much from sect to sect and from country to country that to a Roman Catholic or a citizen of the State of South Carolina it means strict monogamy without the possibility of divorce; whilst to our high caste fellow subjects in India it means unlimited polygamy, as it did to the Latter Day Saints of Salt Lake City within my recollection. Between these extremes there are many grades. There are marriages which nothing can break except death or annulment by the Pope; and there are divorces that can be ordered at a hotel like a bottle of champagne or a motor car. There is English marriage, Scottish marriage, and Irish marriage, all different. There is religious marriage and civil marriage, civil marriage being a recent institution won from the Churches after a fierce struggle, and still regarded as invalid and sinful by many pious people. There is an established celibacy, the negation of marriage, among nuns, priests, and certain Communist sects. With all this Socialism has nothing directly to do. Equality of income applies impartially to all the sects, all the States, and all the communities, to monogamists, polygamists, and celibates, to infants incapable of marriage and centenarians past it. Why, then, is it that there is a rooted belief that Socialism would in some way alter marriage, if not abolish it? Why did quite respectable English newspapers after the Russian revolution of gravely infer that the Soviet had not only nationalized land and capital, but proceeded, as part of the logic of Socialism, to nationalize women? No doubt the main explanation of that extravagance is that the highly respectable newspapers in question still regard women as property, nationalizable like any other property, and were consequently unable to understand that this very masculine view is inconceivable to a Communist. But the truth under all such nonsense is that Socialism must have a tremendous effect on marriage and the family. At present a married woman is a female slave chained to a male one; and a girl is a prisoner in the house and in the hands of her parents. When the personal relation between the parties is affectionate, and their powers not abused, the arrangement works well enough to be bearable by people who have been brought up to regard it as a matter of course. But when the parties are selfish, tyrannical, jealous, cruel, envious, with different and antagonistic tastes and beliefs, incapable of understanding one another: Why is this unhappiness endured when the door is not locked, and the victims can walk into the street at any moment? Obviously because starvation awaits them at the other side of the door. As Socialism would place them in this condition it would infallibly

break up unhappy marriages and families. This being obviously desirable we need not pretend to deplore it. But we must not expect more domestic dissolutions than are likely to happen. No parent would tyrannize as some parents tyrannize now if they knew that the result would be prompt disappearance of their children, unless indeed they disliked their children enough to desire that result, in which case so much the better; but the normal merely hasty parent would have to recover the fugitives by apologies, promises of amendment, or bribes, and keep them by more stringent self-control and less stringent parental control. Husbands and wives, if they knew that their marriage could only last on condition of its being made reasonably happy for both of them, would have to behave far better to one another than they ever seem to dream of doing now. There would be such a prodigious improvement in domestic manners all round that a fairly plausible case can be made out for expecting that far fewer marriages and families will be broken up under Socialism than at present. Still, there will be a difference, even though the difference be greatly for the better. When once it becomes feasible for a wife to leave her husband, not for a few days or weeks after a tiff because they are for the moment tired of one another, but without any intention of returning, there must be prompt and almost automatic divorce, whether they like it or not. At present a deserted wife or husband, by simply refusing to sue for divorce, can in mere revenge or jealousy, or on Church grounds, prevent the deserter from marrying again. We should have to follow the good example of Russia in refusing to tolerate such situations. Both parties must be either married or unmarried. It is on marriage that the secular State is likely to clash most sensationally with the Churches, because the Churches claim that marriage is a metaphysical business governed by an absolute right and wrong which has been revealed to them by God, and which the State must therefore enforce without regard to circumstances. But to this the State will never assent, except in so far as clerical notions happen to be working fairly well and to be shared by the secular rulers. Marriage is for the State simply a licence to two citizens to beget children. To say that the State must not concern itself with the question of how many people the community is to consist of, and, when a change is desired, at what rate the number should be increased or reduced, is to treat the nation as no sane person would dream of treating a ferryman. And, obviously, the ten already aboard will help him for their own sakes. When Socialism does away with the artificial overpopulation which Capitalism, as we have seen, produces by withdrawing workers from productive employments to wasteful ones, the State will be face to face at last with the genuine population question: To get rid of the million or so for whom our capitalists fail to find employment, the State now depends on a high deathrate, especially for infants, on war, and on swarming like the bees. Africa, America, and Australasia have taken millions of our people from us in bee swarms. But in time all places comfortable enough to tempt people to emigrate get filled up; and their inhabitants, like the Americans and Australians today, close their gates against further immigration. If we find our population still increasing, we may have to discuss whether we should keep it down, as we keep down the cat population, by putting the superfluous babies into the bucket, which would be no wickeder than the avoidable infant mortality and surgical abortion resorted to at present. The alternative would be to make it a severely punishable crime for married couples to have more than a prescribed number of children. But punishing the parents would not dispose of the unwanted children. The fiercest persecution of the mothers of illegitimate children has not prevented illegitimate children from being born, though it has made most of them additionally undesirable by afflicting them with the vices and infirmities of disgrace and poverty. Any State limiting the number of children permitted to a family would be compelled not only to tolerate contraception, but to inculcate it and instruct women in its methods. And this would immediately bring it into conflict with the Churches. Whether under such circumstances the State would simply ignore the Churches or pass a law under which their preachers could be prosecuted for sedition would depend wholly on the gravity of the emergency, and not on the principles of liberty, toleration, freedom of conscience, and so forth which were so stirringly trumpeted in England in the eighteenth century when the boot was on the other foot. Joseph Smith did what Abraham did: He had been brought up to regard polygamy as a mortal sin, and did sincerely so regard it. In his perplexity, he tells us, he found himself, when a funeral passed in the street, envying the corpse another mortal sin: Yet Brigham Young got over his horror, and was married more than thirty times. And the genuinely pious Mormon women, whose prejudices were straiter than those of the men, were as effectively and easily converted to polygamy as Brigham. Though this proves that

western civilization is just as susceptible to polygamy as eastern when the need arises, the French Government, for very good reasons, has not ventured to propose it as a remedy for underpopulation in France. The alternatives are prizes and decorations for the parents of large families families of fifteen have their group portraits in the illustrated papers, and are highly complimented on their patriotism , bounties, exemptions from taxation, vigorous persecution of contraception as immoral, facilities for divorce amounting to successive as distinguished from simultaneous polygamy, all tending towards that State endowment of parentage which seems likely to become a matter of course in all countries, with, of course, encouragement to desirable immigrants. To these measures no Church is likely to object, unless indeed it holds that celibacy is a condition of salvation, a doctrine which has never yet found enough practising converts to threaten a modern nation with sterility. Compulsory parentage is as possible as compulsory military service; but just as the soldier who is compelled to serve must have his expenses paid by the State, a woman compelled to become a mother can hardly be expected to do so at her own expense. But the maintenance of monogamy must always have for its basis a practical equality in numbers between men and women. If a war reduced the male population by, say 70 per cent, and the female population by only one per cent, polygamy would immediately be instituted, and parentage made compulsory, with the hearty support of all the really popular Churches. Thus, it seems, the State, Capitalist or Socialist, will finally settle what marriage is to be, no matter what the Churches say. A Socialist State is more likely to interfere than a Capitalist one, because Socialism will clear the population question from the confusion into which Capitalism has thrown it. The State will then, as I have said, be face to face with the real population question; but nobody yet knows what the real population question will be like, because nobody can now settle how many persons per acre offer the highest possibilities of living. There is the Bass Rock ideal of crowding as many people on earth as it can support. There is the bungalow ideal and the monster hotel ideal. Neither you nor I can form the least notion of how posterity will decide between them when society is well organized enough to make the problem practical and the issues clear.

Chapter 2 : Socialism and the Family

*Socialism and the Family [Herbert George Wells] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. This is a reproduction of a book published before This book may have occasional imperfections such as missing or blurred pages.*

That is hardly a surprise. It clearly reflects growing interest, especially with the remarkable surge of lifetime socialist Bernie Sanders, who won a pile of states in pursuing the Democratic Party presidential nomination. He earned over 13 million votes nationwide. American interest in socialism was growing well before Bernie Sanders. What those voters might not realize, but which I know for certain, is that socialism undermines marriage and family: What I learned from mining the origins of the movement is that this is not an accident: The founders of socialist movements always intended their system to have this effect. Intended Consequences Most obviously, socialism undermines the family economically. Socialism is ineffective, unproductive, and impoverishing. It creates not economic prosperity but backwardness, and often genuine deprivation see Venezuela. Actually, they believed that it did—and in one sense it does: It weakens families for the benefit of the state, exactly as its creators meant it to. Since at least the early s, when the effort began in earnest, extreme-left radicals have sought to undermine the natural-traditional-Biblical family—the Western Judaeo-Christian model anchored in a man and woman as parents of a household. Socialists on American Soil A glance at this list of dubious characters reveals a mangled mosaic of the wide-ranging left. Among them, the earliest and maybe most revealing of the socialists specifically—at least from a family-focused perspective—was perhaps Robert Owen. Owen was an English utopian-socialist who made his way to American soil. I now declare to you and to the world that man up to this hour has been in all parts of the earth a slave to a trinity of the most monstrous evils that could be combined to inflict mental and physical evil upon the whole race. I refer to private property, absurd and irrational systems of religion and marriage founded upon individual property, combined with some of these irrational systems of religion. Mussolini and Pol Pot would later follow suit. Owen established what the s hippies would call communes. His socialism was cultural as well as economic, as socialism and its enthusiasts always would be. The New Harmony colony floundered within just two years, with Owen curiously absent from his creation for sustained periods, thus setting the standard for future leftist-utopian chieftains: They rarely live according to the rules and systems they create for others. Castro, Stalin, Pol Pot, Mao—given the choice, they never lived the same way with the same rules and equal salaries as the serfs. Indeed, how could they? Their socialist-communist cocoons were always intolerable because they were bankrupt and unnatural. No one chooses that misery. But the unnatural is what so many leftist utopians pursued then and in the years and centuries ahead. Rarely did any of them last more than four years. An uphill stream of Owen-like dreamers on the left would keep the flame alive, from the s to the s in their own communes, and into the 21st century with their own versions of marriage and family. When they implemented their commune, their utopia, their more enlightened and modern view of marriage and the family, it would surely work this time around. Such is the socialist faith. Polyamory and Lemonade Seas Charles Fourier was another merry socialist who reviled property, marriage, and religion. He dreamed of collectivizing the masses in communes where they could undergo fundamental transformation. He also believed that human efforts would someday turn the seas to tasty lemonade. There were probably forty some such communes that sprung up around the country in this period, and quickly dissolved. No matter, leftists never give up. It is the governing spirit of their ideology. Just wait for their better, more enlightened ideas on marriage, family, sexuality, gender, and on and on. On the heels of Fourier came John Humphrey Noyes and his Oneida colony and their newfangled designs for the family, which included group marriages that shared both intimacy and children. Socialist Ancestors of the Gender Wars All of these nature-redefiners plowed new ground for new versions of the family according to each of their ideological conceptions. They all shared in common, then and today, the rejection of any notion that there is a single natural, traditional and Biblical model for the family. Article originally published at VisionandValues.

Chapter 3 : 10 Reasons to Reject Socialism - The American TFP

Socialism comes into the middle-class family offering education, offering assurances for the future, and only very distantly intimating the price to be paid in weakened individual control. But far profounder disintegrations are at work.

This article first appeared at Stream. That is hardly a surprise. It clearly reflects growing interest, especially with the remarkable surge of lifetime socialist Bernie Sanders, who won a pile of states in pursuing the Democratic Party presidential nomination. He earned over 13 million votes nationwide. American interest in socialism was growing well before Bernie Sanders. What those voters might not realize, but which I know for certain, is that socialism undermines marriage and family: What I learned from mining the origins of the movement is that this is not an accident: The founders of socialist movements always intended their system to have this effect. [Click here to learn more and RSVP!](#) Intended Consequences Most obviously, socialism undermines the family economically. Socialism is ineffective, unproductive, and impoverishing. It creates not economic prosperity but backwardness, and often genuine deprivation see Venezuela. Actually, they believed that it did—and in one sense it does: It weakens families for the benefit of the state, exactly as its creators meant it to. Since at least the early s, when the effort began in earnest, extreme-left radicals have sought to undermine the natural-traditional-Biblical family—the Western Judaeo-Christian model anchored in a man and woman as parents of a household. [Socialists on American Soil](#) A glance at this list of dubious characters reveals a mangled mosaic of the wide-ranging left. Among them, the earliest and maybe most revealing of the socialists specifically—at least from a family-focused perspective—was perhaps Robert Owen. Owen was an English utopian-socialist who made his way to American soil. I now declare to you and to the world that man up to this hour has been in all parts of the earth a slave to a trinity of the most monstrous evils that could be combined to inflict mental and physical evil upon the whole race. I refer to private property, absurd and irrational systems of religion and marriage founded upon individual property, combined with some of these irrational systems of religion. Mussolini and Pol Pot would later follow suit. Owen established what the s hippies would call communes. His socialism was cultural as well as economic, as socialism and its enthusiasts always would be. The New Harmony colony floundered within just two years, with Owen curiously absent from his creation for sustained periods, thus setting the standard for future leftist-utopian chieftains: They rarely live according to the rules and systems they create for others. Castro, Stalin, Pol Pot, Mao—given the choice, they never lived the same way with the same rules and equal salaries as the serfs. Indeed, how could they? Their socialist-communist cocoons were always intolerable because they were bankrupt and unnatural. No one chooses that misery. [Click here to learn more and register today!](#) But the unnatural is what so many leftist utopians pursued then and in the years and centuries ahead. Rarely did any of them last more than four years. An uphill stream of Owen-like dreamers on the left would keep the flame alive, from the s to the s in their own communes, and into the 21st century with their own versions of marriage and family. When they implemented their commune, their utopia, their more enlightened and modern view of marriage and the family, it would surely work this time around. Such is the socialist faith. Polyamory and Lemonade Seas Charles Fourier was another merry socialist who reviled property, marriage, and religion. He dreamed of collectivizing the masses in communes where they could undergo fundamental transformation. He also believed that human efforts would someday turn the seas to tasty lemonade. There were probably forty some such communes that sprung up around the country in this period, and quickly dissolved. No matter, leftists never give up. It is the governing spirit of their ideology. Just wait for their better, more enlightened ideas on marriage, family, sexuality, gender, and on and on. On the heels of Fourier came John Humphrey Noyes and his Oneida colony and their newfangled designs for the family, which included group marriages that shared both intimacy and children. [Socialist Ancestors of the Gender Wars](#) All of these nature-redefiners plowed new ground for new versions of the family according to each of their ideological conceptions. They all shared in common, then and today, the rejection of any notion that there is a single natural, traditional and Biblical model for the family.

Chapter 4 : Socialists Then and Now Agree: The Traditional Family is the Enemy of Socialism | The Stream

*Socialism And The Family () [Herbert George Wells] on calendriredelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. This scarce antiquarian book is a facsimile reprint of the original.*

Family is the Enemy of Socialism In recent decades, eager socialists in the West have been ripping down the traditional family from Scandinavia to Ireland. The spectacle in Ireland was especially disturbing. It was one of the few places where marriage was redefined not by unhinged judges or a left-wing Parliament but by national referendum in a one-time Catholic country where the majority no longer cares about the 2,000-year Christian teaching on the sanctity of marriage. Even in countries like Italy and France, where the populace was not demanding same-sex marriage, socialist politicians are hell-bent on giving it to them anyway. Still, even there we can mainly blame the electorate. Italian citizens, after all, voted for the socialists. They voted for cradle-to-grave freebies and never-ending pensions from the nanny state, not for the redefinition of family and marriage. If you are addicted to the welfare the socialist doctor provides, then you also accept his cultural brew. You want the fat pension? Okay, fine, but you also must give a thumbs-up to gay unions. Time to pay the socialist piper, kiddies. Obama and the Democratic Socialists of America As for America, our situation is not wildly different. Certainly, the record number of millions of African-Americans historically the most religious voting demographic in the country who enthusiastically voted for Obama did so for reasons that had nothing whatever to do with transgender bathroom edicts. But alas, the fundamental transformation they are getting is a White House literally illuminated in the rainbow colors of the gay-rights movement. We should not delude ourselves that Barack Obama, the most far-left president we have ever had, is not a socialist of some sort. As Stanley Kurtz showed several years ago, we know that Obama was actually for a time in the 2000s a member of the socialist New Party. If Obama remains a socialist, he remains one from a cultural perspective as much as an economic one. But moving away from Obama, look at the platforms of the dominant socialists in America today when it comes to family-sexuality issues. It passed a resolution at the annual convention in November DSA calls for the legalization of same-sex marriages in all the States and Territories of the United States of America; the enactment of anti-discrimination laws in housing, jobs, education, and health care; and the repeal of state sodomy laws and anti-lesbian and gay restrictions. Once upon a time, when we worried about socialists undermining the family, our concern was the economic destitution wrought by the ideology and its counterfactual theories about property and wealth confiscation and redistribution. In the old days, socialists harmed the family by leaving a dad jobless or the household scratching for income in a decimated economy. They are, in short, fundamental transformers not just economically but culturally. And they operate a giant wrecking ball that is wreaking havoc in millions of lives. This article was originally posted at the Stream.

Chapter 5 : Illinois Family Action Â» Socialism Attacks the Family, Just as Its Inventors Intended

Socialism is still in vogue, regardless of its sorry record all over the world for the last century. The Free Stuff Army is on the march, especially in the United States.

A Handbook for Speakers and Candidates By the London Municipal Society That Socialism is to be accompanied by sweeping and drastic changes as regards the existence of the home, the rights and duties of parents, and the upbringing of children, in view of Socialist writings and utterances, can admit of no doubt. Hyndman predicts under Socialism "the complete change in all family relations," which must issue in "a widely extended communism. It has the merit of being the most perfect specimen of the complete sham that history has presented to the world. What right has any man to usurp one woman? What right, further, have parents to regard their offspring as private property, or in any way as belonging to themselves and not to the State? Once again, what right has a family to home joys not shared in equally by the community at large? One and all of these sentiments inherent to Socialism are begotten of malignant jealousy, and spring from that ultra-individualism which, as Dr. Schaffle has so frequently stated, is one of the fundamental characteristics of Socialism. Jules Guesde"was useful and indispensable in the past, but is now only an odious form of property. It must be either transformed or totally abolished. Guesde conjectures that the time may come when the family relationship will be reduced to the relation of the mother to her child "at the period of lactation, and that, moreover, the sexual relations between man and woman, founded on passion or mutual inclination, should be enabled to become as free, as changeable, and as diverse as the intellectual or moral relations between individuals of the same or different sexes. Wells, the well-known English Socialist, in an article on Socialism published in The Fortnightly Review for November , thus summarises the position of the family under Socialism: Socialism, in fact, is the State family. William Morris and Mr. They inform us that under Socialism "property in children would cease to exist. Its Growth and Outcome, p. According to individualism, the State exists for the family. Under Socialism the individual is "to think, speak, train his children or even beget them, as the State directs or allows, in the interest of the common good. Robert Blatchford, for example, in his celebrated Merrie England, provides us with kaleidoscopic views of Socialist life spent in public dining-rooms, in public this and public that. We set up one great kitchen, one general dining-hall, and one pleasant tea-garden. Blatchford describes as "much more sociable and friendly. Annie Besant in Industry under Socialism furnishes us with a picture of "public meal-rooms," "large dwellings," which are to "replace old-fashioned cottages; " [Fabian Essays, p. What is this but a sort of resurrected Socialist State of Peru, where "the people were required to dine and sup with open doors, that the judges might be able to enter freely. See further as to this the chapter on the " Socialist State," p. Snowden, in regard to the upbringing of children, "will take charge of the very early years. Guesde, would reduce the custody by the mothers of their children to a still shorter period from the date of birth. Plato, in depicting his Socialistic State, speaks of the State taking every precaution to prevent any woman from recognising her own child. From this, modern Socialist teaching appears to differ but little, if at all. Belfort Bax, writing in conjunction, in Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome, assure us that under Socialism, " In so doing Socialism would, in fact, replace the existing obligation by a system infinitely less just than that which to-day prevails. No one, in a word, is to be called upon to maintain his own children, while from every one there is to be exacted the support of the children of the other members of the community. One of the fundamental changes in connection with this branch of the present subject which Socialism would effect concerns the education of children. In lieu of supplementing family education by State education, Socialism would bring about an entire substitution of the former by the latter. The Socialist regime "would not simply supplement family upbringing; it would of necessity weaken and ultimately supersede it. SchSffle, translated by Mr. Schaffle, in robbing "the overwhelming majority of the people, whose well-being it is designed to secure, of the highest and purest form of happiness, and of that very form which differences of outward circumstances down to the very lowest conditions almost entirely fail to touch. Professor Woolsey in his valuable history treating of Communism [Communism and Socialism, p.

Chapter 6 : Socialism at war with marriage, family - Washington Times

Socialism cannot for an instant brook intolerance of the conscientious expression of belief, nor of conscientious conduct, where such does not directly and unmistakably affect the welfare of society. The breeding of unhealthy children, the neglect of children physically and mentally, does affect the welfare of society.

Whatsapp At a time when conservative governments, the Murdoch press and their corporately funded think-tank supporters run down university departments of history in this country , the need for careful interpretations of the past has never been more evident. At stake is nothing less than the meaning of twentieth-century history and the historical origins of modern ideologies. Whether out of ignorance or on political grounds, the shape of the political spectrum - from left to right - is being challenged by revisionists backed by vested interests that seek to undermine the welfare state. This revisionism has been gaining ground for years in the right-wing parallel universe in the United States. It is now going mainstream in Australia courtesy of Sky News, which recently hosted a self-identified Nazi , instigating a predictable controversy. Thus, last week, Paul Murray complained that young people tempted by left-wing politics fail to understand that the Second World War was waged against socialism. This bizarre view fails to consider the inconvenient fact that the Allies included among its number the communist Soviet Union, the state that bore the brunt of the conflict in lives and domestic destruction. But inconvenient facts should not get in the way of a convenient narrative. Well, thankfully, not "everybody" is an adherent to the jejune News Corp view of history, despite the fact that Sky News streams into public places across the continent. Feeling exposed, he quickly composed an opinion piece on the "Socialist Roots of Nazism" for the Australian, which duly appeared online the next day. Emboldened, van Onselen also took to Twitter to promote his intervention, but confused readers by sending mixed messages: And in another tweet agreeing with a U. People are reactionary and vile. Only posting links from now on, not reading or engaging with mentions, ever". But is it really fair to call the response van Onselen received "hostile abuse"? His position was criticised, to be sure - and for good reason. He blamed "mainstream socialists" for misconstruing his words. He then went on to note that the left-right spectrum is actually "more of an incomplete circle," with the extremes of both ends almost connecting with one another. As a rarefied theory of political science, such sweeping revisionism might pass muster somewhere, but it has nothing to do with the history of Weimar or Nazi Germany, where both Nazis and socialists understood perfectly well where they stood in relation to one another. Any analysis of the electoral platforms, internal party dynamics and political actions of the Nazis between and makes this clear. Perhaps the German Workers Party - the party of around members led by Anton Drexler that preceded the Nazi Party NSDAP - might have sought to cobble authoritarian anti-capitalism which is not the same as socialism onto biological racism. The early, pre-Nazi party that Hitler joined toyed with forms of market control to benefit small businesses and to halt ostensible "foreign" - that is, Jewish - control over markets. But such dalliances would not last long. Yes, Mussolini had been a socialist early during the First World War, but broke with his comrades to support Italian expansionism, and then formed his fascist party to crush them. As in fascist Italy, Nazi ideas were self-consciously formulated to negate those of the left, not to imitate them. This was a politics forged in the late days of the German revolution, when Hitler began to imagine Germany assailed by a double threat of Jews and Bolsheviks emanating from the Russian east: Far from supporting anti-colonial movements at the time, as did socialists around the world, he admired the British Empire as a paragon of "Aryan" rule over inferiors, and hoped to cooperate with the British in rescuing Western civilization from Soviet "Asiatic" barbarism. Under Hitler, the party looked squarely to the middle classes and farmers rather than the working class for a political base. Hitler realigned it to ensure that it was an anti-socialist, anti-liberal, authoritarian, pro-business party - particularly after the failed Beerhall Putsch of The "socialism" in the name National Socialism was a strategically chosen misnomer designed to attract working class votes where possible, but they refused to take the bait. The vast majority voted for the Communist or Social Democratic parties. The minority anti-capitalist strand of Nazism Strasserism on which van Onselen fastens was eliminated well before , when Gregor Strasser and the Storm Trooper SA leader Ernst Roehm were murdered with over eighty others

in the "Night of the Long Knives. Here, Hitler brought the dissidents back into line, denouncing them as "communists" and ruling out land expropriations and grassroots decision-making. A struggle over socialism in the Nazi party played absolutely no role in the purge of On 20 February , Hitler and Goering met with a large group of industrialists when Hitler declared that democracy and business were incompatible and that the workers needed to be dragged away from socialism. He promised bold action to protect their businesses and property from communism. The industrialists - including leading figures from I. Farben, Hoesch, Krupp, Siemens, Allianz and other senior mining and manufacturing groups - then contributed more than two million Reichsmarks to the Nazi election fund, with Goering tellingly suggesting that this would probably be the last election for a hundred years. Business leadership happily jettisoned democracy to rid Germany of socialism and to smash organised labour. After fighting four elections between and on an anti-left and anti-Jewish platform that pledged to slay the mythical beast of "Judeo-Bolshevism," Hitler became Chancellor in and made good on his promises to business and his voters to destroy socialism in Germany. Most of was spent persecuting socialists and communists, liquidating their parties, incarcerating and in numerous cases killing their leadership and rank-and-file members. He had witnessed the striking workers and vowed that never again would organised labour prevent the right coming to power. It was the left trade unions and Jews , after all, that he and others on the right thought had "stabbed" the nation in the back on the home-front to cause the loss of the First World War. By early May , the trade unions had been destroyed. German socialism was in tatters. Not for nothing did Nazis say that the "ideas of " their national-racial "revolution" had vanquished those of "" - namely, the French Revolution and its ideals of equality, fraternity and liberty that have animated the left ever since. For all the Nazi talk of "four-year plans" and the "guidance of the state," the sanctity of private property and freedom of contract was always preserved under the Nazis, even during the war years. Socialism - in particular, Bolshevism - on the other hand, were pernicious, "Jewish" imports that threatened the vitality of the German Volk. So if the Nazis were so obviously anti-socialist, and believed so ardently in the virtues of private property and entrepreneurship, and if socialists were among the earliest and hardest hit victims of the Nazi party prior to the Second World War, why is Hitler being proclaimed by some as a socialist? Peter van Onselen may not equate democratic socialism with national socialism, but his argument makes precisely this association: If the absurdity of this style of reasoning is all too apparent, it is nonetheless widely believed. Exposing the Nazi Roots of the American Left published in the United States last year to predictable applause from the right-wing parallel universe. It inverts the left-wing case that Trumpism is an incipient form of fascism a view with which neither of us agrees, and that Dirk Moses has explicitly criticised to argue that the Democrats and left in general are the true heirs of fascism. Hayek, who conflated fascism and communism as forms of collectivism inimical to the market economy and freedom it claims to represent. Peter van Onselen makes a related point by trotting out the venerable theory of totalitarianism to equate fascism and communism as similarly illiberal. Herewith we come to the effect, if not the point, of the revisionist exposition: They reason by means of a simplistic, ahistorical syllogism: The war against welfare states Needless to say, this is a perverse and pernicious misinterpretation of historical facts. The Atlantic Charter , declared by U. President Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Churchill in , set out the principles of the post-war order, which included the "advancement of social welfare" and working "for a world free of want and fear. They have now been under concerted attack since the s. Governments across the Western world are still deregulating, imposing austerity and attacking unions to further increase business profit margins. The emergence of leaders like Trump around the globe signals an intensification of this tendency. Worried by the popularity among young people of politicians like Jeremy Corbyn and Bernie Sanders who oppose these tendencies, however, the corporate and media sponsors of the attacks on the welfare state now seek to discredit the social democratic platform by disparaging it as historically fascist. That is also why they attack reputable sources of news like the ABC, and why they seek at once to discredit universities as "politically correct" and to pervert their mission by inserting into them privatised think tanks espousing Hayakian ideology. So, too, they proffer the perverse thesis of fascism-as-socialism, finding ready adherents in right-wing corners of the twittersphere and in business circles. The collective ignorance displayed by this revisionist commentariat is proportionally related to the outlandishness of its historical interpretations and its sophomoric ignorance of the recent history

of Western civilization. The revisionists likely neither know nor care that the monument erected to the German strikers who lost their lives confronting the Kapp Putsch was ritually destroyed by the Nazis in 1933. Whether those who remember the past can confront the slow-motion putsch against welfare states and the historical experiences of the catastrophic twentieth century that spawned them remains an open question.

Chapter 7 : Socialism Attacks the Family, Just as Its Inventors Intended | The Stream

Recently, there was a problem with the issue of land ownership in the state of New York. Without going into details of the territorial dispute court case, I will dwell on its essence.

Socialism and the Family, Justice, 17th November, p. Transcribed by Ted Crawford. Wells, after having entered the outer courts of Socialism in the shape of the Fabian Society about a year ago, seems to consider himself competent to pronounce as something like an authority on matters connected with human relations under Socialism. Accordingly he expands himself in the November numbers of the Fortnightly and the Independent Review. Wells arrives at the ex cathedra conclusion that the endowment of maternity is the most salient point in the Socialist view of the sexual relations. The Christian ascetic ideal must of course have its incense. This, however, by the way. Now it is quite certain that a large number of Socialists would place a large note of interrogation against Mr. Wells proposes, but which has been as yet not even discussed in Socialist circles, would meet with the approval of any considerable section of Socialists. Hence the implied claim of Mr. Wells to speak for Socialists generally may seem to many a trifle overshooting the mark. For the rest Mr. Wells does not even seek to lay down any general principles governing the relations of the sexes as such. This part of the subject he shirks. And yet this is the point in which he has been specially attacked. Besides, there are such things as lending libraries and circulation in families in this vale of tears. But let us really look this sex-question boldly in the face and see what implications a Socialistic view of the subject involves. This is noticeable in every discussion of the subject, conversational and otherwise. These two sides are always assumed to be mutually inseparable and the first is always judged in the light of the second. Now the first side of the question is the direct personal relation of the man and woman, the second is the question of offspring. My contention is that these two sides should be kept rigidly separate. The first, I contend, is purely self-regarding, and society has no more locus standi in the matter than it has with the question whether a man spends his hours of relaxation in reading fiction, playing chess, or writing poetry. With the second, on the other hand, society has everything to do, the bringing into the world of new citizens being a social act of the highest importance. The interference of society, whether juridically or morally, between what otherwise ought to be a purely private and personal arrangement between individuals should, in reason and justice, begin and end with the appearance of children. Society, in its corporate capacity, has an undoubted right to regulate, or at least to take strict cognisance of, the procreation of children. But the current theory, even among persons priding themselves upon being superior to prejudice, invariably assumes that cohabitation and the begetting of children are virtually one and the same thing. Hence the children's difficulty is continually being trotted out in all arguments where the modification of existing marriage institutions is in question. As a matter of logic, I repeat, the question of cohabitation per se, and of the raising of a family, can, and ought, to be kept severely apart. It is well-known that, at least, one-third of the existing marriages are childless, and with the advance of medical knowledge the begetting of children is likely to become more rather than less a voluntary matter. It is so in the Latin countries in the present day already to a great extent. If the above be true, it follows that even though society be justified in hedging round the family, where such exists, with every necessary legal safeguard, and even possibly in exacting certain public guarantees, though this is a difficult point, where the intention of raising a family is declared, yet any relation outside these conditions is i. Indeed, more so, for as regards religion it may be a moot point whether, under certain forms, it can be considered a purely private matter. But as regards the sex question the issue is, I think, perfectly plain. All that Socialism can legitimately require in the judgment of sexual practice at least where the question of off-spring does not arise, as in the judgment of speculative belief, is mutual toleration. Socialism cannot for an instant brook intolerance of the conscientious expression of belief, nor of conscientious conduct, where such does not directly and unmistakably affect the welfare of society. The breeding of unhealthy children, the neglect of children physically and mentally, does affect the welfare of society. Of this there can be no doubt. Whether a man say, without having children lives with one woman for the term of his natural life, or changes his companion every month, is, other things equal, his own affair and not that of society. I know that many will affirm that

monogamy is a much higher form of sexual practice than any other. They may be right. Others again think the theory of the continuance of personal consciousness after bodily death a much more exalted belief than that of its extinction at death. They are welcome to their opinion. But in both cases we have to do with private speculative belief, and not with unmistakable objective facts. In this sense I say that the proper answer to those who allege that Socialism favours free love is to point out that Socialism is expressly neutral in the matter. Free love belongs to the domain of those concerns in which experiment will, as a matter of fact, decide for the majority of men and women what is the better way. Meanwhile, each, subject to the law of mutual toleration, should be free to hold his own opinion, and to follow his own way of life. The only question with which society is concerned is the direct welfare of offspring.

Chapter 8 : Family is the Enemy of Socialism

Socialism is a distortion, in a collectivist direction, of human beings' natural need for familial connection with others. But socialism and the family are incompatible.

That is hardly a surprise. It clearly reflects growing interest, especially with the remarkable surge of lifetime socialist Bernie Sanders, who has won a pile of states in pursuing the Democratic Party presidential nomination. He will eventually have earned over 10 million votes nationwide. American interest in socialism was growing well before Bernie Sanders. What those voters might not realize, but which I know for certain, is that socialism undermines marriage and family: What I learned from mining the origins of the movement is that this is not an accident: Intended Consequences Most obviously, socialism undermines the family economically. Socialism is ineffective, unproductive, and impoverishing. It creates not economic prosperity but backwardness, and often genuine deprivation see Venezuela. Actually, they believed that it did "and in one sense it does: It weakens families for the benefit of the state, exactly as its creators meant it to. Since at least the early 1800s, when the effort began in earnest, extreme-left radicals have sought to undermine the natural-traditional-Biblical family " the Western Judaeo-Christian model anchored in a man and woman as parents of a household. Socialists on American Soil A glance at this list of dubious characters reveals a mangled mosaic of the wide-ranging left. Among them, the earliest and maybe most revealing of the socialists specifically " at least from a family-focused perspective " was perhaps Robert Owen. Owen was an English utopian-socialist who made his way to American soil. I now declare to you and to the world that man up to this hour has been in all parts of the earth a slave to a trinity of the most monstrous evils that could be combined to inflict mental and physical evil upon the whole race. I refer to private property, absurd and irrational systems of religion and marriage founded upon individual property, combined with some of these irrational systems of religion. Mussolini and Pol Pot would later follow suit. Owen established what the hippies would call communes. His socialism was cultural as well as economic, as socialism and its enthusiasts always would be. The New Harmony colony floundered within just two years, with Owen curiously absent from his creation for sustained periods, thus setting the standard for future leftist-utopian chieftains: Castro, Stalin, Pol Pot, Mao " given the choice, they never lived the same way with the same rules and equal salaries as the serfs. Indeed, how could they? Their socialist-communist cocoons were always intolerable because they were bankrupt and unnatural. No one chooses that misery. But the unnatural is what so many leftist utopians pursued then and in the years and centuries ahead. Rarely did any of them last more than four years. An uphill stream of Owen-like dreamers on the left would keep the flame alive, from the 1800s to the 1900s in their own communes, and into the 21st century with their own versions of marriage and family. When they implemented their commune, their utopia, their more enlightened and modern view of marriage and the family, it would surely work this time around. Such is the socialist faith. Polyamory and Lemonade Seas Charles Fourier was another merry socialist who reviled property, marriage, and religion. He dreamed of collectivizing the masses in communes where they could undergo fundamental transformation. He also believed that human efforts would someday turn the seas to tasty lemonade. There were probably forty some such communes that sprung up around the country in this period, and quickly dissolved. No matter, leftists never give up. It is the governing spirit of their ideology. Just wait for their better, more enlightened ideas on marriage, family, sexuality, gender, and on and on. On the heels of Fourier came John Humphrey Noyes and his Oneida colony and their newfangled designs for the family, which included group marriages that shared both intimacy and children. Socialist Ancestors of the Gender Wars All of these nature-redefiners plowed new ground for new versions of the family according to each of their ideological conceptions. They all shared in common, then and today, the rejection of any notion that there is a single natural, traditional and Biblical model for the family.

Chapter 9 : Nazism, socialism and the falsification of history - ABC Religion & Ethics

Socialism would further alter the social nature of the family by undermining its relationship to reproducing relations of property. Inheritance may be a concept which predate capitalism (so are imperialism and racism) but like imperialism it plays a specific role in capitalism.

Socialism and the Family Author: English Date first posted: Jun Most recent update: Jun This eBook was produced by Roy Glashan. Project Gutenberg of Australia eBooks are created from printed editions which are in the public domain in Australia, unless a copyright notice is included. We do NOT keep any eBooks in compliance with a particular paper edition. Copyright laws are changing all over the world. Be sure to check the copyright laws for your country before downloading or redistributing this file. This eBook is made available at no cost and with almost no restrictions whatsoever. You may copy it, give it away or re-use it under the terms of the Project Gutenberg of Australia License which may be viewed online at <http://www.gutenberg.org/licenses/australia/>: Together they state pretty completely the attitude of Modern Socialism to family life. The first is to me a very great thing indeed, the form and substance of my ideal life, and all the religion I possess. Let me make my confession plain and clear. I am, by a sort of predestination, a Socialist. I perceive, I cannot help talking and writing about Socialism, and shaping and forwarding Socialism, I am one of a succession of one of a growing multitude of witnesses, who will continue. It does not matter in the larger sense how many generations of us must toil and testify. It does not matter, except as our individual concern, how individually we succeed or fail, what blunders we make, what thwartings we encounter, what follies and inadequacies darken our private hopes and level our personal imaginations to the dust. We have the light. We know what we are for, and that the light that now glimmers so dimly through us must in the end prevail. To us Socialism is no piece of political strategy, no economic opposition of class to class; it is a plan for the reconstruction of human life, for the replacement of a disorder by order, for the making of a state in which mankind shall live bravely and beautifully beyond our present imagining. So, largely, I conceive of Socialism. But Socialism and the Socialist movement are two very different things. The Socialist movement is an item in an altogether different scale. I must confess that the organized Socialist movement, all the Socialist societies and leagues and federations and parties together in England, seem to me no more than the rustling hem of the garment of advancing Socialism. For some years the whole organized Socialist movement seemed to me so unimportant, so irrelevant to that progressive development and realization of a great system of ideas which is Socialism, that, like very many other Socialists, I did not trouble to connect myself with any section of it. Socialism is still essentially education, is study, is a renewal, a profound change in the circle of human thought and motive. The institutions which will express this changed circle of thought are important indeed, but with a secondary importance. Socialism is the still incomplete, the still sketchy and sketchily indicative plan of a new life for the world, a new and better way of living, a change of spirit and substance from the narrow selfishness and immediacy and cowardly formalism, the chaotic life of individual accident that is human life to-day, a life that dooms itself and all of us to thwartings and misery. Socialism, therefore, is to be served by thought and expression, in art, in literature, in scientific statement and life, in discussion and the quickening exercise of propaganda; but the Socialist movement, as one finds it, is too often no more than a hasty attempt to secure a premature realization of some fragmentary suggestion of this great, still plastic design, to the neglect of all other of its aspects. As my own sense of Socialism has enlarged and intensified, I have become more and more impressed by the imperfect Socialism of almost every Socialist movement that is going on; by its necessarily partial and limited projection from the clotted cants and habituations of things as they are. Some Socialists quarrel with the Liberal Party and with the Socialist section of the Liberal Party because it does not go far enough, because it does not embody a Socialism uncompromising and complete, because it has not definitely cut itself off from the old traditions, the discredited formulae, that served before the coming of our great idea. They are blind to the fact that there is no organized Socialism at present, uncompromising and complete, and the Socialists who flatter themselves they represent as much are merely those who have either never grasped or who have forgotten the full implications of Socialism. They are just a little step further, a very little step

further in their departure from existing prejudices, in their subservience to existing institutions and existing imperatives. Take, for example, the Socialism that is popular in New York and Chicago and Germany, and that finds its exponents here typically in the inferior ranks of the Social Democratic Federation—the crude Marxite teaching. It still awaits permeation by true Socialist conceptions. It is a version of life adapted essentially to the imagination of the working wage earner, and limited by his limitations. It is the vision of poor souls perennially reminded each Monday morning of the shadow and irksomeness of life, perpetually recalled each Saturday pay time to a watery gleam of all that life might be. One of the numberless relationships of life, the relationship of capital or the employer to the employed, is made to overshadow all other relations. Get that put right, "expropriate the idle rich," transfer all capital to the State, make the State the humane, amenable, universal employer—that, to innumerable Socialist working men, is the horizon. The rest he sees in the forms of the life to which he is accustomed. A little home, a trifle larger and brighter than his present one, a more abounding table, a cheerful missus released from factory work and unhealthy competition with men, a bright and healthy family going to and fro to the public free schools, free medical attendance, universal State insurance for old age, free trams to Burnham Beeches, shorter hours of work and higher wages, no dismissals, no hunting for work that eludes one. All the wide world of collateral consequences that will follow from the cessation of the system of employment under conditions of individualist competition, he does not seem to apprehend. Such phrases as the citizenship and economic independence of women leave him cold. Nor does he realize for a long time that for Socialism and under Socialist institutions will there be needed any system of self-discipline, any rules of conduct further than the natural impulses and the native goodness of man. He takes just that aspect of Socialism that appeals to him, and that alone, and it is only exceptionally at present, and very slowly, as a process of slow habituation and enlargement, that he comes to any wider conceptions. And, as a consequence, directly we pass to any social type to which weekly or monthly wages is not the dominating fact of life, and a simple unthinking faith in Yes or No decisions its dominant habit, the phrasings, the formulae, the statements and the discreet omissions of the leaders of working-class Socialism fail to appeal. Socialism commends itself to a considerable proportion of the working class simply as a beneficial change in the conditions of work and employment; to other sections of the community it presents itself through equally limited aspects. Certain ways of living it seems to condemn root and branch. To the stockbroker and many other sorts of trader, to the usurer, to the company promoter, to the retired butler who has invested his money in "weekly property," for example, it stands for the dissolution of all comprehensible social order. It simply repudiates the way of living to which they have committed themselves. And to great numbers of agreeable in intelligent people who live upon rent and interest it is a projected severing of every bond that holds man and man, that keeps servants respectful, tradespeople in order, railways and hotels available, and the whole procedure of life going. They class Socialism and Anarchism together in a way that is as logically unjust as it is from their point of view justifiable. Both cults have this in common, that they threaten to wipe out the whole world of the villa resident. And this sense of a threatened profound disturbance in their way of living pervades the attitude of nearly all the comfortable classes towards Socialism. When we discuss the attitude of the middle classes to Socialism we must always bear this keener sense of disconcerting changes in mind. It is a part of the queer composition of the human animal that its desire for happenings is balanced by an instinctive dread of real changes of condition. People, especially fully adult people, are creatures who have grown accustomed to a certain method of costume, a certain system of meals, a certain dietary, certain apparatus, a certain routine. They know their way about in life as it is. They would be lost in Utopia. Quite little alterations "put them out," as they say—create a distressing feeling of inadequacy, make them "feel odd. And you will find, as a matter of fact, that your middle-class Socialists belong to two classes: Rest assured that to make any large section of the comfortable upper middle class Socialists, you must either misrepresent, and more particularly under-represent Socialism, or you must quicken their imaginations far beyond the present state of affairs. Some of the most ardent and serviceable of Socialist workers, I have said, are of the former type. For the most part they are philanthropic people, or women and men of the managing temperament shocked into a sort of Socialism by the more glaring and melodramatic cruelties of our universally cruel social system. They are the district visitors of Socialism. They do not realize that Socialism

demands any change in themselves or in their way of living, they perceive in it simply a way of hope from the failures of vulgar charity. Chiefly they assail the bad conditions of life of the lower classes. Much less can they conceive of a time when there will be no governing class distinctively in possession of means. They exact respect from inferiors; no touch of Socialist warmth or light qualifies their arrogant manners. Perhaps they, too, broaden their conception of Socialism as time goes on, but so it begins with them. Now to make Socialists of this type the appeal is a very different one from the talk of class war and expropriation, and the abolition of the idle rich, which is so serviceable with a roomful of sweated workers. These people are moved partly by pity, and the best of them by a hatred for the squalor and waste of the present regime. Talk of the expropriated rich simply raises in their minds painful and disconcerting images of distressed gentlewomen. They have an admirable sense of sanitation. They are the philanthropic and administrative Socialists as distinguished from the economic revolutionaries. This class of Socialist passes insensibly into the merely Socialistic philanthropist of the wealthy middle class to whom we owe so much helpful expenditure upon experiments in housing, in museum, and school construction, in educational endowment, and so forth. Their activities are not for one moment to be despised; they are a constant demonstration to dull and sceptical persons that things may be different, better, prettier, kindlier and more orderly. Many people impervious to tracts can be set thinking by a model village or a model factory. However petty much of what they achieve may be, there it is achievedâ€”in legislation, in bricks and mortar. Among other things, these administrative Socialists serve to correct the very perceptible tendency of most working men Socialists to sentimental anarchism in regard to questions of control and conduct, a tendency due entirely to their social and administrative inexperience. For more thorough-going Socialism among the middle classes one must look to those strata and sections in which quickened imaginations and unsettling influences are to be found. A mind habitually directed to beauty as an end must necessarily be exceptionally awake to the ugly congestions of our contemporary civilization, to the prolific futile production of gawky, ill-mannered, jostling new things, to the shabby profit-seeking that ousts beauty from life and poisons every enterprise of man. And not only artistic work, but the better sort of scientific investigation, the better sort of literary work, and every occupation that involves the persistent free use of thought, must bring the mind more and more towards the definite recognition of our social incoherence and waste. But this by no means exhausts the professions that ought to have a distinct bias for Socialism. The engineer, the architect, the mechanical inventor, the industrial organizer, and every sort of maker must be as one in their desire for emancipation from servitude to the promoter, the trader, the lawyer, and the forestaller, from the perpetually recurring obstruction of the claim of the private proprietor to every large and hopeful enterprise, and ready to respond to the immense creative element in the Socialist idea. To too many of these men in the constructive professions the substitution of a Socialist State for our present economic method carries with it no promise of emancipation at all. They think that to work for the public controls which an advance towards Socialism would set up, would be worse for them and for all that they desire to do than the profit-seeking, expense-cutting, mercenary making of the present regime. This is, I believe, a temporary and alterable state, contrary to the essential and permanent spirit of those engaged in constructive work. It is due very largely to the many misrepresentations and partial statements of Socialism that have rendered it palatable and assimilable to the working men and the administrative Socialist. Except for the quite recent development of Socialist thought that is now being embodied in the New Heptarchy Series of the Fabian Society, scarcely anything has been done to dispel these reasonable dreads. I should think that from the point of view of Socialist propaganda, the time is altogether ripe now for a fresh and more vigorous insistence upon the materially creative aspect of the vision of Socialism, an aspect which is, after all, much more cardinal and characteristic than any aspect that has hitherto been presented systematically to the world. An enormous rebuilding, remaking, and expansion is integral in the Socialist dream. We want to get the land out of the control of the private owners among whom it is cut up, we want to get houses, factories, railways, mines, farms out of the dispersed management of then-proprietors, not in order to secure their present profits and hinder development, but in order to rearrange these things in a saner and finer fashion. An immense work of replanning, rebuilding, redistributing lies in the foreground of the Socialist vista. We contemplate an enormous clearance of existing things. We want an unfettered hand to make beautiful and convenient homes,

splendid cities, noiseless great highways, beautiful bridges, clean, swift and splendid electric railways; we are inspired by a faith in the coming of clean, wide and simple methods of agricultural production. But it is only now that Socialism is beginning to be put in these terms. So put it, and the engineer and the architect and the scientific organizer, agricultural or industrialâ€”all the best of them, anyhowâ€”will find it correspond extraordinarily to their way of thinking. Not all of them, of course.