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Archer, Alfred. “Community, Pluralism, and Individualistic Pursuits: A Defense of Why Not Socialism?” *Social Theory & Practice*, vol. 42, no. 1, Jan. 2016, pp. 57–73. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.5840/soctheorpract20164213.

 In this article titled, “Community, Pluralism, and Individualistic Pursuits: A Defense of Why Not Socialism?” Archer supports Cohen’s arguments in “*Why Not Socialism?*” He speaks of common objections to Cohen’s arguments and responds to them with how he interpreted Cohen’s words. First, Archer mentions the objection of Van Schoelandt, who claims that Cohen’s bus example could be considered similar to “the differing life experiences of someone who is strictly kosher and someone who loves eating bacon or those of a math genius and a skilled manual laborer” (Archer 61). Later, Archer offers a rebuttal to this objection, explaining that Cohen meant that there was a lack of community between two people with differing levels of monetary freedom, and that this was due to left-liberal inequality of opportunity rather than one’s own personal choice (unproblematic); there was a misinterpretation on Van Schoelandt’s part. Second, Archer confronted Miller’s objection about this same example as before. Miller assumed that the “lack of shared experience” (Archer 65) is what “Cohen takes to be community-undermining” (Archer 65). However, Cohen actually meant that the lack of shared experience did not directly affect the community; it is the lack of communal caring that does this. Archer expands on this in the rest of his paper. There is a significant amount of time spent on explaining why he interpreted Cohen as relying on communal caring rather than the presence of shared experience.

Hayek, F. A.. *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism*, edited by W. W. Bartley III, Stephen Kresge and Gene Opton, 1988. Routledge, 1992.

 After reading the introduction to *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism*, one can see that the author feels very strongly about how uninformed and naïve socialists are. Several times throughout the introduction, it feels as though he attacks socialists and there point of view. I read the introduction, some of the first chapter, and a section of the subtitle, “Our Intellectuals and Their Tradition of Reasonable Socialism” found on page 52. Hayek speaks about how “human conduct” (Hayek 12) has been taught through generations, and with it, how the desire to survive has caused humans not to “respond to all charitable appeals that bombard us through the media” (Hayek 13) so they do not waste their resources and make surviving more difficult on them. He then speaks of Jean Jacques Rousseau and his original mistake of convincing people that they should be free to do as they please—because this would persuade them to be unproductive (Hayek 49). Later in his work, he explains that, quite surprisingly to me, intellectuals usually lean toward socialist ideals; they value knowledge and desire others to have the knowledge as well (Hayek 53-54). Overall, Hayek has a very capitalist point of view. He implies that socialists are uninformed or too naïve quite often in the introduction. For my discussion, it is good to have access to other points of view and to figure out how I would address those.

Schumpeter, Joseph A., *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. 1943. George Allen & Unwin, 1981.

 For this source, I read “Clearing Decks” (pp. 167-171) and “The Socialist Blueprint” (pp. 172-186). In the “Clearing Decks” chapter, Schumpeter defines words were used in the book to make sure that there is no misinterpretation. First, he describes “commercial society” as “an institutional pattern of which we need only mention two elements: private property in means of production and regulation of the productive process by private contract (or management or initiative)” (Schumpeter 167). Then, he explained that socialist societies usually involve central authorities to be in control of aspects of property and production (Schumpeter 167). After this, Schumpeter mentions his classification of centralism and how it does not mean that the “Central Board . . . is necessarily absolute or in the sense that all the initiative that pertains to the executive proceeds from it alone” (167). Then Schumpeter explains that socialism is a matter of culture, not economics or religion. In the following chapter, the first point that Schumpeter acknowledges is that the logic behind socialism is perfectly acceptable (172). However, there is one notable person who disagrees with Schumpeter’s opinion—Professor L.von Mises—who wrote that the economic part of socialism would not work because no one would know how to price goods because of the lack of competition and complete change in economic procedures (Schumpeter 172). Secondly, Schumpeter proposes a rule that could be used by a socialist society to fix the problem that Mises suggested would happen—which is to hand out vouchers to get consumers’ ideas about desired products. The third topic he covers is that there should be certain authorities who would determine production laws—like how much of a particular good should be produced; the fourth idea is that production laws may change when necessary due to the growth of the economy. The fifth subject he mentions is what wages the workers should get paid, and the last topic he discusses is how the market can stay uncompetitive. To conclude, Schumpeter defines important words related to the text, acknowledges issues that socialism could have, and then offers ways to avoid these obstacles.