

## The Killers Elite – Part 2

*Under Socialism, you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught, and employed whether you liked it or not. If it were discovered that you had not character and industry enough to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner; but whilst you were permitted to live, you would have to live well.*

—George Bernard Shaw, *The Intelligent Women's Guide to Socialism*, 1928

Ah, yes, George Bernard Shaw, that wonderful wit who produced *Major Barbara* and *Pygmalion*.

Yes, it is this George Bernard Shaw who was completely in his element writing such a statement as that above.

You have no idea, people, the reprehensiveness that the world's elite have for most of humankind.

This attitude has been kept under wraps for over a century, but it's always been there for us to find, given that we took the time, but most of us haven't, and that, too, is understood as well.

Life's got everyone busier and busier all the time.

Understood.

But, then, when someone like myself does the leg work and produces the goods, why should I be labeled a *conspiracy theorist*.

Once again: It IS a conspiracy. However, it is NOT a theory.

What follows is Shaw's contribution to the conference that discussed "Eugenics: Its Definition, Scope and Aims" and whose remarks were chronicled in *The American Journal of Sociology*, Volume X; July, 1904; Number 1.

*I agree with the paper, and go so far as to say that there is now no reasonable excuse for refusing to face the fact that nothing but a eugenic religion can save our civilization from the fate that has overtaken all previous civilizations.*

*It is worth pointing out that we never hesitate to carry out the negative side of eugenics with considerable zest, both on the scaffold and on the battlefield. We have never deliberately called a human being into existence for the sake of civilization; but we have wiped out millions.*

*We kill a Tibetan regardless of expense, and in defiance of our religion, to clear the way to Lhasa for the Englishman; but we take no really scientific steps to secure that the Englishman when he gets there, will be able to live up to our assumption of his superiority. It is quite true, as the lecturer suggests, that the violent personal preferences on which most plays and novels are founded are practically negligible forces in society. They can be, and are, circumscribed by political and social institutions as successfully as the equally violent antipathies which lead to murder. In spite of all the romancers, men and women are amazingly indiscriminate and promiscuous in their attachments: they select their wives and husbands far less carefully than they select their cashiers and cooks. In the countries where they are not allowed to select at all, but have their marriages arranged for them wholly by their parents, the average result seems to be much the same as that of our own more promiscuous plan of letting people marry according to their fancies. In short, for all sociological purposes, it may safely be assumed that people are not particular as to whom they marry, provided they do not lose caste by the alliance. But we must not infer from this that they will tolerate any interference with their domestic life once they are married. Political marriages are perfectly practicable as far as the*

church door; but once the register is signed there is an end of all public considerations. If the selection is eugenically erroneous, there is no remedy. If it is so brilliantly successful that it seems a national loss to limit the husband's progenerative capacity to the breeding capacity of one woman, or the wife's to an experiment with one father only, our marriage customs and prejudices will stand as sternly in the way as if no selection had been exercised at all in the first instance. Eugenics under such limitations lose their interest and relapse into mere Platonic speculation. I am afraid we must make up our minds either to face a considerable shock to vulgar opinion in this matter or to let eugenics alone. Christianity began by attacking marriage; and though the attack utterly failed, the Catholic church still regards the marriage of a priest as an abomination. Luther would never have dared to marry a nun if his opinions on the question had not gone much farther than any Protestant community now dares to hint. But a merely negative attitude toward marriage is foredoomed to failure. Celibacy is so clearly an impossibilist doctrine that even St. Paul could not press it to its logical conclusion. Luther's views are anarchic, and suggest mere profligacy to the ordinary Philistine. Now, marriage is profligate enough in all conscience; but it is not anarchic. Consequently marriage holds its own in spite of the revulsions of the higher sexual conscience against the open claim of married people to be exempt from all social obligation and even self-respect in their relations with one another. And as this very licentiousness serves the all-important purpose of keeping the race recruited, it has never been possible to challenge it seriously until the popularization, about thirty-five years ago, of the sterilization of marriage. This practice had, for decency's sake, to justify itself as a eugenic one: it was said that when there were fewer children each child would receive more care and nourishment, and have a better chance of surviving to maturity. But a mere reduction in the severity of the struggle for existence is no substitute for positive steps for the improvement of such a deplorable piece of work as man. We may even allow, without countenancing for a moment the crudities of neo-Darwinism, that it may conceivably do more harm than good. What we must fight for is freedom to breed the race without being hampered by the mass of irrelevant conditions implied in the institution of marriage. If our morality is attacked, we can carry the War into the enemy's country by reminding the public that the real objection to breeding by marriage is that marriage places no restraint on debauchery as long as it is monogamic, whereas eugenic breeding would effectually protect the mothers and fathers of the race from any abuse of their relations. As to the domestic and sympathetic function of marriage, or even its selfishly sexual function, we need not interfere with that. What we need is freedom for people who have never seen each other before, and never intend to see one another again, to produce children under certain definite public conditions, without loss of honor. That freedom once secured, and the conditions defined, we have nothing further to say in the matter until the necessarily distant time when the results of our alternative method of recruiting will be able to take the matter in hand themselves, and invite the world to reconsider its institutions in the light of experiments, which must, of course, in the meantime run concurrently with the promiscuity of ordinary marriage.

Isn't that loving?

The promiscuity of ordinary marriage.