



FAITH AND FREEDOM

THE MONTHLY JOURNAL OF SPIRITUAL MOBILIZATION

MARCH 1951

HOW NOW SHALL WE BEHAVE?

GARET GARRETT



THE EDITOR COMMENTS

IN ENGLAND, shortly before Christmas, a Lancashire firewood seller, who lived alone in a hut, was refused admission to the hospital by the British government. The reason: he was not ill, properly speaking, but only suffering from cold, hunger, and neglect. He was also refused admittance to a hostel (relief homes also administered by the English government) because he was unable to walk without help and was, therefore, too ill to be admitted to an institution with no nursing staff. He died a few hours afterwards.

This pitiful story represents, we would hope, an extreme case of what can happen in emergencies under the rigidities of Socialist governmental regulations. But when you read the report on page 6 and see how injustice also creeps into situations where hasty decisions are not necessary, the result strikes deep at your sense of decency and morality.

FULL EMPLOYMENT has long been the watchword of the Socialist. With the publication of these statistics, the Soviets have just recently announced the attainment of their goal:

	1928	1940
Population (in millions) - -	154.2	170.5
Workers (percentage of total population) - - - - -	93.5	99.2

Eight-tenths of one per cent short of their goal in 1940, there is no doubt but what the gap has closed somewhat during the intervening decade. What this means is that in the USSR the entire population, including old people almost to the day of their death and infants almost from their first day on earth, are workers.

FAITH AND FREEDOM

Published monthly by Spiritual Mobilization,
1521 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles 17, Calif.

VOLUME II, NUMBER 7, MARCH 1951

WILLIAM JOHNSON, *Editor*

IN THIS ISSUE

How Now Shall We Behave?
The Snake of Eden
Peace On Earth
A Lesson in Socialism
Jefferson's Philosophy
The Policy of Korban

Apparently the Soviet slogan, "Who does not work, does not eat," is followed to the letter.

RUSSELL CLINCHY'S article on page 12 deals with the vital nature of Christian responsibility. In a booklet just published, entitled *Charity - Biblical and Political*, Reverend Clinchy elaborates on this theme as well as other basic areas as he studies the question: Is charity a proper function of government? This study will soon be available to the readers of *Faith and Freedom*.

SOME HAVE ASKED what could be done to stem the rise of socialism now that it is being sold to us in a different package - a package labeled "war preparation." Perhaps not all will agree that such is the case, but we believe Mr. Garrett's article (on the facing page), discussing the strategy of the liberal, will be of interest, even to the skeptic.

THE JANUARY ISSUE incorrectly credited Dr. Harry K. Eversull with the Executive Secretaryship of the Council of Churches of Greater Cincinnati. The incumbent is Bruce Whittemore.

As a journal of opinion, *Faith and Freedom* opens its pages to expressions of thought and belief on controversial questions. In publishing the magazine, Spiritual Mobilization, as an organization, does not necessarily endorse its contents.

Subscription rate: one dollar per year.

How Now Shall We Behave?

GARET GARRETT

With the advent of war, what means are available to those who wish to resist the progressive socialization of American society?

After every war, until the last one, the people took their liberty back. It was understood that they would; it was understood, in each case, that the government would surrender its extraordinary wartime powers and return to the form that was before. But during World War II, as we know, the planners at Washington were writing the enlarged design for a controlled world — enlarged, that is, from the New Deal design. They thought they had learned all they needed to know about controls, and they said: "You see that the economy has to be planned for war — prices, production, distribution and all. What is good for war is good also for peace. Unemployment can be planned away. Prosperity can be planned. The full life forever, with security and social justice — that can be planned."

And the people, remembering the unplanned depression, answered saying: "Why not?"

No Retreat

For the first time in our history, there was no intention on the part of government to return to the form that had been before, and from what followed we know that if a government is bent upon extending its power over the lives of the people, war is a wonderful occasion. During the war it can invoke the laws of necessity and appeal to the spirit of unity; and even while pretending to be tolerant of criticism, it can insist that criticism shall be constructive, not destructive, as if there could be any point in criticism that did not aim to destroy something. Then after the war it says, as it said the last time, that the problems of transition from war

to peace are more than the people can solve for themselves; they need the aid and guidance of government much more than they need their liberty back.

These are not cynical reflections. They rest upon experience. One would have to be stupid, indeed, not to realize that with the political climate what it is, and has been for twenty years, you could almost as soon imagine putting the chicken back into the egg as to repack in a tight Constitutional box the powers of government that are released by total war.

A Question That May Fairly Tear You Apart

So it is war again, and the question comes: How now shall we behave?

We, of course, means those who have been fighting the rise of the Welfare State and, in its name, the progressive socialization of American society. Shall they go on with it? In war as in peace, shall they continue to say what they think of a government that tells the people socialism and liberty may dwell together amicably in the same house?

It is a question that may fairly tear you apart. Waiving the point as to whether they could if they would, some who are asking the question are not sure they would if they could. They know that the conditions of total war are so extreme and the perils so great that unity may be imperative. They know how easily going on with the fight could be construed as disaffection and how it might in fact implement disunity. Only in a war that calls for less than the utmost exertions of the whole people may disaffection be tolerated. In total war there arises almost at once a demand that disaffection shall be suppressed; and if it is too large to be suppressed, as for example in the case of powerful pressure groups like organized labor, it may have to be bribed, and public opinion will con-

GARET GARRETT'S booklet entitled *The Revolution Was*, a masterly description of how collectivism captured America, is a modern-day classic.

done the bribing of it. This, of course, means nothing to those whose convictions might lead them to defy hostile public opinion and who could not at all be bribed. Nevertheless, under stress of common danger, herd compulsions are very strong. Divisive ideas may be forgotten. If the price of survival is solidarity, the feeling for solidarity will be almost irresistible.

To begin with, therefore, the degree of peril, according to each individual's estimate of it, must affect his decision about how to behave. He may say: "Of what avail are my private political principles if my country falls? Am I justified to insist upon them or to fight for them if thereby I tend to create disunity, which could be fatal?"

On the other hand lies the certainty that if the fight is broken off, the government, in default of opposition, will occupy new ground from which afterward perhaps it cannot be dislodged. So you have the terms of the dilemma.

An Ideological Truce

The decision would be easy to make if the government would say: "In all the fields of social controversy let there be truce for the duration of the war." It will not say that. On the contrary, it is already evident that totalitarian neo-liberalism is riding the war. Having promised that the government would practice extreme economy in nondefense spending, a staggering defense budget was brought on with, at the same time, further demands for the Welfare State; such as, increased unemployment compensation at a time when there are more jobs than men, greater subsidies to agriculture at a time when high farm prices are immunized by law from the effects of inflation, compulsory health insurance, federal aid to education, larger grants-in-aid to the states, and the distraction of a Fair Employment Practices Commission. A budget, said a responsible Senator, that was "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

The government, you see, cannot ever have thought to ask itself the question we discuss here; that is, whether for the duration of the war there should be a truce between, on the

one hand, those who are resolved to extend much further the political regulation of our lives, and those, on the other hand, who very bitterly resist it.

The answer we seek must be found by each individual in himself alone. That also is freedom. A man must be free to surrender his freedom if he will, or to give it in hostage for any other value he may set above it—the survival of his country, for example. But for any whose minds may be in suspense it would certainly seem that the government's attitude should resolve the doubt.

Well then if you say, "Yes, the fight must go on," there is the next question: How?

Selective Targets

It is probably true that the fight cannot be continued in war as it was conducted in peace, if for no other reason than that the minds you want to reach are not the same. They will be inflamed by passion and slanted by propaganda, and above all they will be greatly distracted by many new cries of "Attention, people! Attention!"

The mind's capacity to give attention is very definitely limited, and as the demands upon it multiply in wartime it is bound in self-defense to become more selective and a little deaf. In this competition the normal disadvantage of the evangel for freedom is naturally worsened, since by its very nature it requires people to think attentively. Extremely few people like to do that. On first reflection this seems a discouraging fact, and yet it might turn out to be a gift if only it would cure the freedom-spokesmen of their principal weakness, which we may call the shotgun method. They sit in their towers writing many things in different ways, each on his own impulse, competing with one another for the people's attention—and they have no *line*. By contrast, look at the totalitarian neo-liberals who are moving the Welfare State. They say the same things over and over, all as with one voice, and the cumulative effect of their reiterations is tremendous. They have a *line*. They got the idea from the Communists.

Is there not a lesson there?

To continue the fight successfully in wartime, it must be focused on relatively few points,

such, for example, as to clarify the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights or the Genocide Convention, with intent to show the appalling danger of government by international treaty above the Constitution; or the fantastic nature of the federal budget; or the implications of any act of usurpation by the President, leading to government by executive discretion—and to do it in every case on the

wartime. He cannot conduct the war, nor can he refuse to risk his life for it if that is required of him. And though he may take to the soap box and lift his voice in the street, that will be only worse frustration.

But there are a few great voices left, and others not so great that are still telling the truth, and these the individual may amplify prodigiously. In his speech entitled, "Think It



level of ordinary understanding, in every man's language, even as the *Daily Worker* would do it.

An Ominous Sound

The scattered current literature of economic education, of free enterprise, of freedom's heritage, of Constitutional government, and so on, is in the aggregate enormous; but it is the work of many warriors discharging buckshot at many targets. If it could be organized and trained on a few selected targets—and targets in the news—its effect could be cannon-like. This would require collaboration, liason, a clearing intelligence somewhere, a board of strategy perhaps—but what of that? There now is a science of propaganda. The other side is using it. When will the conservatives learn it?

There will be something still for the individual to do. He cannot refuse to pay taxes, no matter how absurd the budget may be. He cannot attack the credit of the government—not in

Over," and again in his startling speech calling for our own defense first, Mr. Hoover got several thousand letters and telegrams. Suppose he had got ten million, so that it had been in the news that the delivery of them blocked traffic in the neighborhood of Park Avenue and Forty-ninth Street. After a speech on the catastrophe to which the government's gaiety with billions is leading the country, Senator Byrd gets a few hundred letters, whereas if one-half of those who believe with him responded, the Senate Office Building would be swamped with them. Notable speeches by Senators and Representatives fighting against socialism are ill-reported in the news—often, in fact, omitted—yet it would be little enough for one who wished to do his part to find them in the *Congressional Record* and react in a manner to help boost their muzzle velocity. The running together of many voices, even yours and mine, makes a very ominous sound.

The Snake in Eden

DIOGENES

**Good intentions plus coercive methods
did not equal benevolence or justice.**

I like the little town of Hythe in Kent. It isn't precious and it is certainly not pretentious: it is sincere and small. Its promenade has no bandstand or fun-fair. Children can play safely on it because the main road for traffic runs at the back of the town. It is a town which has grown naturally to the conformation prescribed by the sea, the hills in the rear, and the flat ground between. The hallmark of the town is a kind of level peace. I conceive — or rather I did conceive — that the lives of the inhabitants pursued quietly an uneventful course, kind, quiet, and unremarkable. I say, "did conceive," for alas! the snake was devised with Eden. The snake has been in evidence at Hythe recently.

Not that I wish to abuse snakes. Sometimes when they coil themselves about another animal it may be out of affection, not from hate. The bite may be accidental — or at least incidental. As much harm is done in the world by the blundering well-meaning as by the hurt-intending. Doubtless all that was done at Hythe sprang from good intentions, but the road to Hell, we have been assured, is paved with such things.

Half-Century's End

In a little cottage on the canal bank at Hythe live an old couple. They are husband and wife, and for some forty years they have shared the joys and sorrows of the strange pilgrimage of life. When they met they were twenty — now they are seventy. Seventy is, or was, assumed to be the natural span of life, and doubtless neither Mr. nor Mrs. Barton are quite the

spruce and sprightly figures they were at twenty. But, as Mr. Barton said in the course of the proceedings with which I shall deal, "I have my health and strength, and my wife has hers." All they asked was to be let alone.

However, the Welfare State will be kind to us, whether we will or no. Mr. and Mrs. Barton are in receipt of help under the National Assistance Act of 1948. Into that Act there was smuggled a little clause — unremarked amongst hundreds of others — which gave local authorities, in the case of people receiving national assistance and who became old and feeble, power to apply for an order for their removal to a state institution.

The Lot of the Aged

In my childhood we did not have state institutions; we had merely the workhouse, and a lot of old people were driven to the workhouse by poverty. But unless so driven they were not obliged to go, and no court had the power to compel them. Authority in those days was less "kind" and less ubiquitous.

I do not suggest that when, on May 30 last, the local authority applied to the court for an order to compel this old couple to leave their little home and go to St. Mary's Hospital at Lyminge they were animated by any other motive than what they thought was good for the old couple. It is not that authority is deliberately cruel. It is that authority is impersonal and does not understand that men and women do not live by bread alone. Doubtless the little cottage is not quite so spick and span as it was. At seventy the passion for sweeping and brushing and polishing is apt to be less marked than, say, at thirty in the case of a woman. Doubtless, also, Mr. Barton cares less for personal appearance than when he was a young buck fifty years ago. Maybe — I don't know — some neighbor complained. Maybe the welfare officer thought

DIOGENES is a columnist for the British *Time and Tide*. The October 1950 issue of *Faith and Freedom* carried his "There Goeth That Leviathan."

that this old couple had reached the stage when they ought to be cared for.

But neither Mr. nor Mrs. Barton wanted to leave their little cottage and the few sticks of furniture which to them constituted home. Mr. Barton said, "My wife and I are not ill, we do not want to go into any hospital. I can do a day's work." And Mrs. Barton said, "I do the best I can to keep the place tidy and as clean as I can." But authority knew better than Mr. and Mrs. Barton—the order was made.

Now this order meant not only the breakup of the Barton's little home but the separation of Mr. Barton from Mrs. Barton, for St. Mary's Hospital at Lyminge has no accommodation for married couples. The order ran that Mr. and Mrs. Barton should be "detained and maintained apart."

Until this order was made neither Mr. nor Mrs. Barton had ever come into conflict with authority. Their names had figured in no police records. Until this thing befell them they had constituted units in the "great anonymous" of the nation, but now they rebelled. They refused to comply with the order.

Of course, it is stupid of old people to dislike and dread hospitals, but poor folk often do. Doubtless it is absurd for old people to prefer the possibly unhygienic discomforts of their own little home to the scrupulously clean walls and polished floors of a hospital or other state institution, but many do. Doubtless only obstinacy could explain their wish to live out what was left of life together and to dislike being "maintained apart." But old folk get curious fancies and sometimes even a little pixilated. Anyway, Mr. and Mrs. Barton refused to go.

The Law is the Law

It is impossible to blame the Kent County Council for what then happened. As Mr. Eric White, for the County Council said, "The Bench, having made the order, had no alternative but to see that it was enforced." Law is not law unless it is obeyed or, if necessary, enforced. If the consequences of enforcing it were that an old couple of seventy years were to be hounded out of house and home, forced into a state institution and there "maintained apart," that was unfortunate, of course. At all events

the legal dignity of the law must be maintained. So early in September the old couple were hauled before the Hythe Borough Court and there publicly charged with an offense under the National Assistance Act, Section 2, 1948—



that they had refused to comply with an order to leave their home and be "maintained apart."

Nor do I blame the Hythe Borough Court for fining this old couple. "Dog don't eat dog" and different branches of the law must stand together, otherwise the whole system will break down. The court, as courts go, was merciful; as mercy goes — which is not far. They could have fined the bewildered couple ten pounds apiece. They let them off with twenty shillings apiece, plus a little good advice. Said Mayor Harry Fisher, Chairman of the Bench, "Well, Barton, we advise you to change your mind about that hospital."

I do not know, by the way, why Mr. Barton should be addressed as "Barton." I suspect that the dignity of the court would have been outraged had Mr. Barton addressed Mr. Fisher as "Fisher," not that he did so. Dignity transferred itself from the Bench to the Dock, and the old man replied, "I shall not, sir. I have my health and strength and my wife has hers."

I do not know yet how this case is going to end. The Bartons were given a week to find two pounds; we do not have to worry about that for the fine was paid by me. But maybe the end is not yet; by some oversight it was not provided in the Assistance Act, 1948, that old people of seventy who, having lived together for forty years, declined to be deprived of their home and to be "maintained apart" should be hanged, drawn, and quartered, or even put into jail. But I don't know whether, from time to time, new

REPORT

orders may not be applied for and this sad and sorry story repeated.

I say again that, of course, I blame nobody. Doubtless the motive of the 1948 Act was good. Doubtless the decision to apply for the order was inspired by the consideration of what was "best" for the old people. Doubtless the Court of First Instance, which gave the order, acted on the best evidence it could get. Doubtless the Hythe Borough Court had no alternative but to uphold the order, once it was given, and to punish the Bartons for disobeying it.

But I have a mental picture of the bewildered distress of an aged couple, the quiet tenor of whose inoffensive lives was thus interrupted by

alien, impersonal, well-meaning authority and who, in the late evening of their day, are told that they must be "maintained apart" and haled into court when, against the verdict of the law, they assert the primitive instinct to end their lives — as they have lived them — together. I think that all the legal arguments of the case, however unanswerable in the courts of this world, will command no assent in higher courts than these. I think that Justice has a bandage around her eyes, not only because she is blind, but because she weeps. I think that if things like these be the outcome of the Welfare State it would be better to have less of the state and less welfare and more simple humanity. And I think that Parliament should do something about the Bartons.

OPINION

Peace on Earth

Nineteen hundred and fifty years ago, Christ brought to a dispirited world the doctrine of human dignity—the dignity of *every* individual. And with this doctrine came the promise of peace on earth.

His lesson is still to be learned.

How can there be peace when mankind still has not learned that an individual cannot make war by himself; that wars are made only by men who have power over the people—power, through the coercive force of government, that was either given to or taken by those men?

Wars are made by men who use the coercive force of government to destroy the justice which government is supposed to maintain; to destroy the rights it is supposed to protect. How can there be peace when, all over the world today, governments are so deeply immoral; when governments give special privileges to some at the expense of others?

How can there be justice when governments, through taxes, take away the earnings of some and give them to others; when government, through *legalized stealing*, can do what the individual himself cannot do without committing crime or sin?

How can there be peace when government is

used as a weapon of injustice instead of checking injustice? How can there be peace on earth until there are more men of good will, and until, even with good will, those men understand the purpose of government?

Natural Right

Every individual, in receiving the gift of life from God, is given the responsibility of preserving, developing, and perfecting that gift. So every person is given individuality—different faculties, different and various amounts of talent with which to assume the responsibility for his own existence.

Every individual is endowed by his Creator with the liberty to use his God-given faculties for their intended purpose—and through the free use of those faculties to acquire property. Every individual also has a natural right, from God, to protect his God-given life, liberty, and property from the interference of any other individual. These three gifts of God *precede* all man-made laws and are superior to them.

Therefore, in order not to interfere with God's intended purpose, all individuals must have equal political rights and equal political duties. One group cannot claim certain rights for itself, while placing the duties on others.

The purpose of government must be to equally protect every individual's life, liberty, and property from the interference of any other

individual, and from government itself.

When a government fails to accomplish this, does it not become immoral?

How can there be justice when government attempts to change your God-given individuality into the various personal ideas of man-made equality? How can there be justice when government destroys the God-given liberty of so many people, by giving special privileges to some businessmen, farmers, labor leaders, and political officials? How can there be justice when government takes away the earnings, the property of some people, and gives them to others — property that has been acquired through work, through the use of the God-given faculties of man?

How can America help bring peace to the world when we have allowed our own government to become so definitely immoral; when both Democrats and Republicans have passed laws which destroy your gifts of God; when these laws have curtailed individual freedom and the right to enjoy the fruits of your labor, and conversely to suffer the evil results of your errors?

How can representatives of a group of nations bring peace when all of their respective governments have constantly destroyed the God-given liberty and human dignity of their people?

Discover and Resolve

We will have peace on earth only when the people of *all* nations discover and use God's purpose for government: to equally protect every individual's person, liberty, and property from the interference of any other person.

Only then can the real spirit of Christ be cultivated in the hearts of men.

This takes more than wishing. It might take years to achieve. But a start can be made now by every American with good will in his heart. Let's resolve to take a vital interest in seeing that our own government becomes a *moral* one.

FREDERIC W. OVERESCH

A Lesson in Socialism

As a teacher in the public schools, I find that the Socialist-Communist idea of taking "from

each according to his ability," and giving "to each according to his need" is now generally accepted without question by most of our pupils. In an effort to explain the fallacy in this theory, I sometimes try this approach with my pupils:

When one of the brighter or harder-working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points and give them to a student who has made only 55 points on his test. Thus each would contribute according to his ability and — since both would have a passing mark — each would receive according to his need. After I have juggled the grades of all the other pupils in this fashion, the result is usually a "common ownership" grade of between 75 and 80 — the minimum needed for passing, or for survival. Then I speculate with the pupils as to the probable results if I actually used the socialistic theory for grading papers.

The Results

First, the highly productive pupils — and they are always a minority in school as well as in life — would soon lose all incentive for producing. Why strive to make a high grade if part of it is taken from you by "authority" and given to someone else?

Second, the less productive pupils — a majority in school as elsewhere — would, for a time, be relieved of the necessity to study or to produce. This Socialist-Communist system would continue until the high producers had sunk — or had been driven down — to the level of the low producers. At that point, in order for anyone to survive, the "authority" would have no alternative but to begin a system of compulsory labor and punishments against even the low producers. They, of course, would then complain bitterly, but without understanding.

Finally, I return the discussion to the ideas of freedom and enterprise — the market economy — where each person has freedom of choice and is responsible for his own decisions and welfare.

Gratifyingly enough, most of my pupils then understand what I mean when I explain that socialism — even in a democracy — will eventually result in a living-death for all except the "authorities" and a few of their favorite lackeys.

THOMAS J. SHELLY

Jefferson's Philosophy

MURRAY N. ROTHBARD

His contributions cover the whole range of human thought, but it was in political philosophy that he produced his one great lesson.

Jeffersonian or Hamiltonian? Every college student, indeed every literate person, is expected to choose up sides and pin a label on himself in the Great Debate. Most people today consider themselves as Jeffersonians. Groups as diverse as the States' Rights (or Dixiecrat) movement and the Communists consider themselves heirs to the Jeffersonian mantle. At one and the same time, conservative southerners refer to themselves as "Jeffersonian Democrats," while the leading revolutionary Marxist school in the country is called the "Jefferson School of Social Science." Amidst this welter of confusion, to find the true picture of Jefferson the man and political philosopher is an extraordinarily difficult task.

A Bewildering Mosaic

Analysis of Jefferson is made far more difficult by the complex nature of Jefferson's personality and career. A man of brilliant intellect, keenly interested in the whole range of human thought, from economics to architecture to scientific farming; active, dynamic, and spirited in an amazing multitude of enterprises, and moreover a political leader the greater part of his life, necessarily presents to posterity a bewildering mosaic. Politics itself is a day-to-day affair, imposing by its very nature on the politician a series of shifts and compromises. Thus, Jefferson combined within himself the qualities of a soaring intellectual spirit, searching for political principle, busy man of affairs, and political boss. When it is further remembered that Jefferson dominated the stage during

the most vital years of the Republic (Revolution Independence, Constitution, Growth, War, etc.), it becomes more understandable that so many contrasting groups can pick out of his immense record of writings and actions support for their own ideologies.

A Mere Scribbler?

But to an unbiased observer who explores Thomas Jefferson, his principles stand out indelible and crystal clear. His political philosophy has been imbedded deep into the very soul of America, and has imprinted itself on the minds of innumerable Americans of later generations. His achievement has been sneered at by Hamiltonians of our day as well as his. Hamilton, they claim, was a constructive and practical man of action. He funded the national debt, reformed the administration of government, established a national bank, etc. Jefferson was a mere phrase-maker and scribbler. These "practical men" fail to grasp that the forces which generate the actions of men, and therefore human history, are, for good or bad, the ideas of men. It is ideas, political, economic, ethical, esthetic, religious, that have prime significance for human action in the present and over the centuries. It is ludicrous to claim that Hamilton's financial measures were of comparable importance to the Declaration of Independence or the Kentucky Resolutions.

The battle between Jefferson and Hamilton, however, is of very great significance, and precisely because it represented a clash between two fundamentally contrasting systems of political principle. Jefferson's political philosophy is summed up in the phrase: "That government is best which governs least." It received its finest expression in our own Declaration of Independence: man is endowed by God with certain natural rights; "to secure these rights,

MURRAY N. ROTHBARD'S previous appearances have given us a review of the book *Human Action* and two fine case studies describing the adverse results of inflation in the past.

governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," and when government becomes destructive of that end, the people have the right to change the form of government accordingly. Thus Jefferson, as John Locke had done a century before, drastically shifted the moral emphasis from the State to the individual. In the absolutist and feudal era from which the world was beginning to emerge, divine right settled only on the kings, the nobility; in short, the State and its rulers. To Jefferson, the divine rights were conferred on each and every individual, not on rulers of government.

The Great Jeffersonian Lesson

What were these natural rights? The fundamental right, from which all others are deduced, is the right to life. Each individual has the moral right to live without coercive interference by others. To live, he must be free to work and acquire property, to "pursue happiness." In political terms, the one important natural right is self-defense; defense of one's life, liberty, and property from invasive attack. Government's function, then, is to use its power of force to prevent and combat attempts to use force in the society. If the Government extends its powers beyond this "cop-on-the-corner" function, it in itself becomes the greatest tyrant and plunderer of them all. Since the Government has virtual monopoly of force, its potentialities for evil are far greater than that of any other institution. The people must constantly keep their Government small and local, and even then must watch it with great vigilance lest it run amok. That is the great Jeffersonian lesson, and it is one that all Americans must begin to learn again.

From this basic cornerstone, the rest of the Jeffersonian edifice is easily deduced. It explains his passionate, lifelong adherence to States' Rights, his determined opposition to John Marshall in the latter's successful campaign to make the Constitution more elastic so as to permit wider extension of federal power, his very distrust of the Constitution itself and insistence upon incorporating a Bill of Rights.

Jefferson's position on foreign policy

stemmed from the same source. He did not believe that our government, or any government, is equipped to remake the world by force to our own liking. He was frankly a wholehearted patriot, whose natural love of the soil and his country was reinforced by the fact that America constituted the Great Experiment in Liberty. His foreign policy was expressed in this classic phrase: "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none." Particularly marked was his perceptive distrust of the wily imperialism of Great Britain.

The Fundamental Cleavage

In the economic sphere, Jefferson was not anti-capitalist, as his enemies charged. He believed in genuine freedom of enterprise, unencumbered by government regulation or grants of monopoly privilege. His opposition to paper money and a central bank were based on profound insight into the then new science of economics. Jefferson's almost unknown writings on banking, money, and depressions demonstrate that he was head and shoulders over the allegedly "practical men" who opposed him. What has since been interpreted as anti-capitalist rhetoric, was simply expression on Jefferson's part of a personal preference for the soil and a distaste for the life of the cities.

The importance of the Jefferson-Hamilton struggle has been unfortunately obscured. It is a struggle which, in one form or another, has continued to mark our country since its inception. Hamilton and the Federalists believed in ever-expanding power of the federal government, a myriad of governmental regulations, controls, and special privileges in economic life, the crushing of the states, and limiting the rights of the individual. Their ideal was the British model—a strong monarch ruling the country in behalf of the "general welfare"; failing the adoption of a monarch, a strong President to act as benevolent despot. In foreign affairs, the Federalists looked to the British Empire as friend and ally. Hamiltonian Federalism was, in the profoundest sense, un-American; it represented a conscious harking back to the imperial British mode, a retention of the typically European forms of strong central govern-

ment and semi-socialist "planned economy." Our Constitution was forged as a compromise between the Jefferson and Hamilton forces, with James Madison acting as the eternal tightrope-walker and fence-straddler between the two camps. The trappings, the rhetoric, the specific issues have changed, but the fundamental cleavage remains, unresolved, on the American scene.

The Policy of Korban

The Christian doctrine of life demands that Christians construct a free society in which each individual is regarded as receiving his personality as an inalienable gift from God, and whose freedom of action, resulting from this gift of God, must be received and held with responsibility. The Gospels and Epistles emphasize and declare that in Christ we become free children of God and that the acceptance of freedom includes an acceptance of our social responsibility.

But it also needs to be made crystal clear that the acceptance of our personal social responsibility means that we cannot relieve ourselves of that responsibility by passing it over to either God or the State. One of the most pointed directions that Christ ever gave was that of His condemnation of the use of the policy of *Korban*. He said that there was a tendency abroad to use the device of uttering the word *Korban*, which meant that one's resources were thereby dedicated to God, through which one secured release from personal responsibility for the care of the aged in his family. Christ said that when this was done, "Ye leave the Commandment of God, and make void the word of God."

An Unsatisfactory Solution

We recoil from the hypocrisy of that effort to be released from the care of aged fathers and mothers by the device of repeating a word which turns over the responsibility to God, but it is now a common custom for many Christians to do just that — only the responsibility is not turned over to God, but to the State. It seems

incredible, but it is true, that the major trend in Christian social work today is to join with the plans of secular Socialists in seeing how much Christian social responsibility can be turned over to the State.

It is hard to admit, but the fact is that the word *Korban* is the real word that is being used in the name of Christianity to take the burden of personal responsibility from those who should bear it if they are to remain Christian and free persons, and make it a function of the secular State.

We can see, if we will think of it in the context in which Christ used it, how this use of the device of *Korban* would destroy all spiritual and social responsibility, but it is more difficult to see that it is also true that those who give away this responsibility also give away their personal freedom of action. If we give this responsibility to the State, then we have also given the State the right to demand it from us, in any form or measure the State may decree. It is the claim of socialism, collectivism, and communism that this is the inherent right of the State, and the duty of the individual. It is the claim of Christianity that the freedom of the will is a gift of God to man, and that to be a child of God man must accept that freedom and use it with personal and social responsibility.

Thus Confronted, We Must Choose

Those two interpretations of life and work confront the mind and soul of mankind today, and again the hour of decision is upon us, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." When we read the Bible we can understand how clear those choices were in the Biblical period. But can we see that they just as truly confront us today? We are confronted with the choice between God and mammon, between the high calling of the personal responsibility of those whom Christ has set free, or that of the craven who obtains release from duty by using the device of *Korban*. We are confronted with a choice between those who would move forward with the one new concept that society can rest upon the consent of the free or those who, through fear, would return to the decadent forms of the relation of the lord and the vassal.

RUSSELL J. CLINCHY

THE DIRECTOR'S PAGE

DURING these past years, I have had deep convictions about the growing dangers in America and the world but have undertaken to speak with restraint. Because of my respect for some of the high offices in our government, I have not been willing to believe the things which I actually saw.

But now our boys are dying in the mountains and valleys of Korea. We can no longer sit back.

I have visited a number of military establishments where I have talked with both officers and privates. The morale in the army is the lowest in the history of our country.

It is the custom in our church for the minister to have a little visit and prayer with the men who go from our parish into the armed forces. When they ask me, with complete sincerity, why they are being drafted and what they will be fighting for, I do not have an easy answer. Last week, one asked me if it was to win another military victory to be thrown away irresponsibly at the peace tables.

However we may feel about what has happened in Korea, in China, and in other areas of the world where our nation has determined its responsibility, we as Christian ministers and laymen can certainly face the problem within our own country and realize that it is increasingly serious. It gives us a very much expanded, yet carefully defined, responsibility.

Many are now finding, as Spiritual Mobilization has long contended, that the basic issues are moral and spiritual—not just political, sociological, or economic. Throughout history, every effort to ignore the Christian code has failed. Various individuals and groups have established programs based upon coercion and violence in an attempt to achieve their purely

personal or social objectives. At present, our country, both in domestic and foreign decisions, is violating the Christian moral code. Unless we correct this situation, religion will be destroyed and our civilization will fall.

Even some of our most thoughtful people have lost their sensitivity to moral issues and ideals. When common good and freedom are threatened by government controls or other courses of action, we ministers must speak out courageously and forthrightly to point out the moral and spiritual issues involved. We must again champion the ideals and principles of Christianity—even when it might not be popular to do so.

But I believe the American people are awakening. We are beginning to realize that the great threat to America is not Russia or the A Bomb but ourselves. A great groundswell of righteous indignation is developing. People are concerned about how the affairs of our country have been mismanaged. May the groundswell, with God's help, become a tidal wave through effective spiritual mobilization.

As this wave grows, worthy leadership will emerge from its ranks. As God's conditions for securing His help are fulfilled, it will no longer be implored in vain but will be available at the determinative moment. America's soul calls out for redemption! Her immoral practices must cease! She must regain her lost way — must reclaim her freedom under God — and we as clergymen have unique opportunities and responsibilities to broaden and accelerate the process. My associates at Spiritual Mobilization and I stand ready to help in this cause. Our booklets, weekly radio broadcasts, and this magazine are dedicated to this purpose.



CURRENT READING

Psychoanalysis and Religion

ERIC FROMM

[Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut]

Whatever you read these days, you are bound to have psychoanalysis dished up to you. Even the comic strip informs you that the bad girl got twisted up because she saw her mamma practice mayhem on her papa. Nor do you have to read anything to meet up with the subject; psychoanalysis slaps you in the face at a cocktail party or creeps up on you as you listen to a "soap opera." You cannot get away from it.

The rage of the times is something called the "subconscious." It is unfashionable to hold anybody accountable for his behavior; nobody sets out deliberately to do a thing, nor is he responsible for having done it. Our bodies are puppets dangling from our complexes, which are controlled by a prankish and self-operating subconscious. When somebody stands on his head or kicks out his wife's teeth, the thing to do is to follow his controlling complexes to their source, the subconscious, and there we will find an environmental cause for his unusual behavior. The thief is a thief because his old man took him to the barn too often; the failure fails because his mother did not properly cut the umbilical cord with which he was born. Once you understand these environmental influences, you have no trouble in explaining Napoleon, Thoreau, or the bum in the gutter.

Mortal Clay

Psychoanalysis began shedding its light on mankind some fifty years ago, and it is interesting to note that about that time the world was becoming conscious of the virtues of socialism. This is probably pure coincidence—there is no evidence of a conspiracy between psychoanalysts and collectivists—but it is a certainty that the two lines of thought are complementary. For a fundamental principle of socialism

holds the individual to be a product of environment, pure and simple, and that is what most psychoanalysts maintain. The Socialist, for instance, says that private property is a habit acquired from a capitalistic environment, and if it were abolished by law the individual would soon cease wanting to own anything; in short order he would adjust himself to the institution of common property. Similarly, the psychoanalyst insists that the norm of mental health is what the crowd thinks, and if the individual will accept the crowd opinion for his own he will be rid of his mental quirk. In both lines of thought the basic premise is that the individual is a sort of protoplasm that can be shaped. Both reject the concept of inflexible instinct, or unchangeable personality. Everybody can be "conditioned."

Socialist Alchemy

The suggestion that psychoanalysis — or psychology, for that matter—might be only hifalutin socialistic propaganda is emphasized in the shop-talk of those who pass as "practical psychologists." They are the boys and girls who "major in psychology" and are intent on putting their new-found magic to the making of a brave new world; they call themselves "social workers." Since the advent of welfare-ism these molders have just about taken over the human race; they are as ubiquitous as the locusts that plagued our biblical ancestors; there is no escaping the monotonous drone of their psychological palaver. If you listen closely to their buzzing noises you discover a thought, or a pattern of thought, and it comes to this: all men are made of psychological putty; the perfect man is a matter of perfect shaping; we "majors" are trained for the job, and when we get the power to do so we will turn out the perfect race.

The emphasis put by these "practical psychologists" and the psychoanalysts on the curative power of adjustment is all too suggestive of the socialistic concept of the indefinite pliability of the human, and one is inclined to cover them with one blanket. Self-examination and observation of the behavior of your neighbors tells you that this putty-principle of human action is untenable, to say the least, and you are

This review is reprinted from the Economic Council Review of Books, January, 1951 which is published by the National Economic Council, Inc.

for dismissing psychoanalysis as a form of socialistic alchemy.

Then, you pick up a book called, *Man for Himself*, written by Eric Fromm, who is reputed to stand high in psychoanalytical circles; the title appeals to you. You sit up and take notice. Here is a psychoanalyst who refers to something basic in human personality, a psyche or a soul that stands firm regardless of the environment in which it finds itself. He even pronounces the heresy (according to the "adjustment" psychoanalysts) that environment is the product, not the cause of, personality, and points out that if this were not so we would still be living in caves. Furthermore, if the individual is out of kilter with his environment, adjustment to it may not be the cure for him, but may rather make him worse. It is not good therapy to treat the patient as a mote in the social beam; rather, he is a whole "laboratory" in himself.

This divorcement of psychology from socialism is further developed in Fromm's latest book, *Psychoanalysis and Religion*. There is a deep-rooted quarrel between priest and psychoanalyst, for it is obvious that the former can hardly accept the materialistic doctrine of man's indefinite pliability. Since Fromm discards this theory, he can also discard the explanation of religious experiences, which the "adjustment" psychoanalyst resorts to, as emotional enigmas that have not as yet been fathomed. On the other hand, he finds in his human "laboratory" a constant need of religion; not a particular religion, and surely not a particular ritual, but a "system of thought shared by a group which gives the individual a frame of orientation and an object of devotion."

The Nature of Things

This need for religion stems from the very gift of reason, which even the "adjustment" psychoanalysts must accept as a basic human attribute; after all, these practitioners use reason in their art and presuppose it in their patients. The function of reason is to probe experiences to find causes. But man has found that his reason leads him only so far; he comes to a "why" he cannot answer and it is a big "why." It is a pattern of relationships and forces

over which he can exercise no control. He must obey it in order to get on in life. Its grandeur and magnitude overawe him. It becomes his ideal; his God.

This need of an ideal to adore is the substance of religion, a need that in the nature of things is constant and unsatisfiable. Ritual is the means by which he tries to satisfy it, but ritual is not religion. Imbedded in the psyche of all men, even those who profess freedom from all religious beliefs or practices, there is this everlasting craving for and adoration of the perfect. It is a humility before the undefinable "nature of things"—or "the word of God."

Authoritarianism and Humanism

The religious systems man has invented to give expression to this craving fall into two main categories: authoritarianism and humanism. In the authoritarian religions, God is the symbol of *power over men*; in the humanistic religions, He is the symbol of *man's own powers* "which he tries to realize in his own life." Primitive religions are characterized by the urge to submission, by obsequiousness, while the monotheistic religions, and particularly those in the Judeo-Christian tradition, are marked by the urge for self-realization. In the one, man's worth consists in the very denial of his worth and strength; in the other, man is presumed capable of developing "his power of reason in order to understand himself, his relation to his fellow man and his position in the universe."

Fromm pays his respects to modern primitivism, the worship of the Führer or the State. Those of us who have tried to understand this worship have suspected that in some way it is related to totemism or fetishism, but has been thrown off balance by the worshippers' pretensions to reason. We argue with them because they use the language of logic. In fact, in other respects they display a marked power of reason, and we cannot assume that they lose it completely when discussing their political ideas. But, as Fromm points out, this capacity for reasonableness is frequently shown by paranoids also and presents a like difficulty for psychoanalysts.

"We talk to an intelligent Stalinist," writes Fromm, "who exhibits a great capacity to make

SPIRITUAL MOBILIZATION

1521 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles 17, California

U. S. POSTAGE

PAID

Los Angeles, Calif.

Permit No. 12208

Sec. 34.66, P.L.&R.

POSTMASTER: Please send undeliverable copies and notices to above address. Return postage guaranteed.

CURRENT READING

use of his reason in many areas of thought. When we come to discuss Stalinism with him, however, we are suddenly confronted with a closed system of thought, the only function of which is to prove that his allegiance to Stalinism is in line with and not contradictory to reason. He will deny certain obvious facts, distort others, or, inasmuch as he agrees to certain facts and statements, he will explain his attitude as logical and consistent. He will, at the same time, declare that the Fascist cult of the leader is one of the most obnoxious features of authoritarianism and explain that the Stalinist cult of the leader is something entirely different, that it is the genuine expression of the peoples' love for Stalin. When you tell him that is what the Nazis claimed too, he will smile tolerantly about your want of perception or accuse you of being a lackey of capitalism."

To Straddle Impulses

This counterfeit of reason makes it hard to deal with the collectivist. Fromm finds the explanation for it in the composition of man. He is both a herd animal and a reasoning animal. He has an instinctive urge to follow the leader and an awareness of his independence from the herd. Our capacity for taking thought leads us to believe in ourselves, while our allegiance to the herd enslaves us to it. We have an inner impulse to both freedom and bondage. Rationalization is the process of bridging these opposites.

"The unfolding and full emergence of reason is dependent on full freedom and independence. Until this is accomplished, man will tend to accept for truth that which the majority of his group wants to be true; his judgment is determined by his need of contact with the herd and by fear of being isolated from it. A few individuals can stand this isolation and say the truth in spite of the danger of losing touch. They are the true heroes of the human race but for whom we would still be living in caves."

It is the business of priest and psychoanalyst, maintains Fromm, to free man from his bondage to the herd, to make him aware of his potentialities, so that he might the better prosper in his efforts to be "the image of God."

FRANK CHODOROV

QUOTES

"The hope of ultimate peace rests on the espousal of the precepts of Christianity by all peoples. So long as national leaders and the masses from which they spring regard human life as freely expendable, the individual as nothing, might as right, morals and ethics as weaknesses, the means to every end as immaterial, solemn commitments as voidable, liberty and justice as meaningless — just so long will the threat of war becloud this earth. The work of the ministry is not yet finished!"

PAUL E. BELCHER

"A thousand years scarce serve to form a state; an hour may lay it in the dust."

LORD BYRON

FAITH AND FREEDOM