

ESSAYS ON LIBERTY

VOLUME II



THE FOUNDATION FOR
ECONOMIC EDUCATION, INC.

IRVINGTON-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK

1954

EDITOR'S NOTE

This is the second volume of essays on liberty published or promoted as separate releases by the Foundation for Economic Education. The first volume appeared in 1952 and is still available. Each of these essays may be obtained in pamphlet or single-sheet form. Samples and prices will be furnished on request.

A brief biography of each author appears on pages 421 to 426.

Permission is hereby granted to reprint these essays in whole or in part, except the following:

The America We Lost by Mario A. Pei

Conscription by B. H. Liddell Hart

Education for 1984 by Arthur E. Bestor, Jr.

Equality by Richard L. Evans

Isaiah's Job by Albert Jay Nock

Published April, 1954

Copyright 1954, by Leonard E. Read.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Preface	7
Combating Statism, Leonard E. Read	9
The America We Lost, Mario A. Pei	23
Personal Practice of Freedom, Ed Lipscomb	27
Life on the Reservation, R. J. Rushdoony	49
Isaiah's Job, Albert Jay Nock	51
Freedom from Want, Starr Daily	62
Where Karl Marx Went Wrong, Samuel B. Pettengill	65
Equality, Richard L. Evans	77
Property Rights and Human Rights, Paul L. Poirot	79
Why Prices Are High, Henry Hazlitt	90
Gaining the Free Market, F. A. Harper	93
The Fallacy of Controlled Prices, Herrell De Graff	118
Bargaining, Paul L. Poirot	121
Gun Play in the Market Place, E. W. Dykes	166
The Price of Price Controls, Irving S. Olds	169
Two Paths to Collectivism, Russell J. Clinchy	175
When We Socialize Kilowatt-Hours	181
A Just Price and Emergency Price Fixing, F. A. Harper	184
The Vital Margin, Francis Adams Truslow	202

	<i>Page</i>
Two Ways to Stop Strikes, Leonard E. Read . . .	205
The Power of an Idea, Raymond Leslie Buell . . .	214
To Communism: Via Majority Vote, Ben Morrell . . .	218
Gaining Recruits for an Idea, F. A. Harper . . .	249
Do You Dare To Be Different, Kenneth W. Sollitt . . .	252
Why Don't You Propose Something Constructive? Frank Chodorov	259
Conscription: Part I, Daniel Webster; Part II, B. H. Liddell Hart	261
Patrick Henry's Choice, Ben Moreell	277
Victims of Social Leveling, Leonard E. Read . . .	279
How Government Grows, W. C. Mullendore . . .	294
Human Rights and the United Nations, Russell J. Clinchy	298
Cause of Corrupt Government, Clarence Manion . . .	334
Equality and Security, Dean Russell	338
Discrimination, F. A. Harper	365
Two Kinds of Exchange, Leonard E. Read . . .	376
Education for 1984, Arthur E. Bestor, Jr. . . .	380
A Libertarian's Platform, James C. Ingebreetsen . . .	395
My Freedom Depends on Yours, Dean Russell . . .	398
About the Authors	421
Index	427

PREFACE



It is doubtful that any cause ever prospered for long without a literature. Nor is it enough that there once existed a literature. Any cause, good or bad, is dependent on a living, dynamic, current literature. Failing this, the movement atrophies and dies.

Liberty has had a literature — the writings of Locke, Smith, Ricardo, Mill, Spencer, Jay, Madison, Hamilton, and a host of others. It was adequate for their times. At least, it could and did lay the intellectual base for history's greatest revolution, the revolutionary idea of a sovereign people and a servant government. Also, it could and did release the greatest outburst of human energy ever known to man. But this literature, by and large, became "past tense," and repetition of it, regardless of how loud or often, cannot and does not stop the American Revolution from revolving toward an upside-down position of sovereign government and servant people. The literature of America's past does not speak in the terms of the current scene; and, as right as much of it is, it is not heeded.

Friends of liberty are obligated to help each other. The Foundation for Economic Education was formed to serve as a clearing house for this mutual effort. Its purpose is to rewrite the best of the past in current grammar, to probe deeper into a philosophy never too well understood, to find new forms of clarity in explaining the freedom thesis, and to make its findings available in printed form to whoever asks for them.

Some of the Foundation's publications are in the form of books and booklets. But much of the work is released in single-sheet tracts, leaflet or pamphlet essays. This second volume of Essays on Liberty is a compilation of these smaller publications — a progress report, so to speak, for friends of liberty.

LEONARD E. READ
of the Foundation staff

COMBATING STATISM

by Leonard E. Read



How can a person best prepare himself to combat trends toward statism? Finding the right answer to this question became an obsession with me in the early 1930's, and the obsession has in no way abated. I hope it never does.

The answer, it seems to me, can be put in five words: "Know statism and know freedom." That answer, however, is easier to express than it is to accomplish. And it is easier to make this admonishment than it is to prove its correctness.

First, what is statism? It has many names: Fabianism, nazism, fascism, communism, socialism, state-interventionism, the welfare state, the planned economy, and all sorts of "deals"—new, fair, and otherwise. These labels, rather careless generalizations, have a common characteristic that identifies each and every one as essentially the same thing: *the use of government—the organized police force—as the means to direct the creative activities of the people.*

A careful examination of these so-called progressive ideologies will reveal that their philosophical justification rests on this use of the legal force of government as an alleged means of doing good. They are founded on and exist by coercion, this alone and nothing else. Any dif-

ference in any of them has to do with organization details as to how the coercion shall be administered.

The question that primarily concerns me is the control, or the taking, of life and livelihood without consent; I am only secondarily interested in whether life and livelihood are controlled or taken by a Robin Hood, a Malenkov, or a gang of voters legally ordering the cop into action.

How did statism in America begin? We need to know this in order to identify and to understand it.

The American Idea

The American society originally set up a government founded on the basic premise that each citizen has an inalienable right to life. It follows that if a person has a right to life, he also has a right to defend that life and to sustain that life (livelihood) by his own productive efforts. The right to life without the right to protect that life and without the right to sustain that life is utterly meaningless. Livelihood being only the fruits of one's labor or property, the American premise clearly said that each citizen has an inalienable right to life and property. This fact is proved in the Fifth Amendment to our Constitution where life, liberty, and property are listed in the same phrase on an equal basis.

It is one thing to adopt such a premise. It is quite another matter to put this premise into practice.

Two ways suggest themselves. First, let each citizen carry his own defensive weapons to protect his life and property. This is a risky and unpredictable business, sub-

ject to individual moods and capriciousness. Short of a perfect citizenry, this could be the worst possible form of authoritarianism. There would be millions of governments, each one changing as the moods and capriciousness of the individuals changed. Rejected!

Second, why not appoint an agent and, in effect, give the agent all of our weapons—that is, give him a monopolistic control of all defensive powers? Ask of this agent only one thing: Protect or secure the rights to life and property of all citizens, equally. Accepted!

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights were aimed, primarily, at prohibiting our agent from doing more than this. The prohibitions were stipulated because governments had theretofore gotten out of hand.

Well and dandy! The idea worked for a time. And because the American society succeeded better than had any other society in limiting our agent of force—government—there was in this country a greater release of human energy and a wider acceptance of personal responsibility than had been known before. These facts account for the American miracle!

There wasn't, for all practical purposes, much statism in this arrangement. Indeed, there was none except for certain compromises or infractions of the American principle, such as slavery and tariffs, which were admitted into the Constitution. But what happened?

Our agent, government — federal, state, and local, composed of persons not unlike the rest of us — perhaps became tired of performing the merely negative function of defending life and property. Or, perhaps, the citizens re-

verted to the ideas of their European forebears and called on the agent to do things beyond the defensive function. Regardless of cause, irrespective of whether the agent usurped powers or received additional granted powers, the agent turned the defensive weapons into coercive weapons.

A weapon is a weapon. A gun or a force that can be used to defend life and property can also be used to take life and property. *Statism begins at precisely the point where the defensive function is turned to coercive activity of a positive nature.* Statism begins, for instance, when the state leaves off protecting one's income and begins taking one's income for others. It begins when the state traffics in *coercive* or *initiated* force instead of sticking to *defensive* or *repellent* force.

Statism is coercion. Coercion (initiated force) is evil in every instance of its application. There are no exceptions.*

A Test

If one will relate what aspects of his life he will willingly concede to another's control, it becomes obvious, in logic and equity, what his views on the limit of the state ought to be. Quite likely he will make only one concession because he will want others to make the same concession to him: the right to defend (repellent force) his life and property against the aggression (coercive force) of an-

*The collection of taxes for purely defensive purposes deserves a more complete treatment than space here permits. Such collection, in my view, does not classify as coercion.

other. No person on the face of this earth has any moral right to use other than defensive force against any other person on earth. Rights which we as citizens do not possess cannot properly be delegated to any agency—even the state. The state, then, cannot, in good reason, be in possession of rights that do not inhere in the citizens. For the state to go beyond this is to argue that its extracurricular rights come from somewhere else. Where? From God, as the Divine Right of Kings theory argues?

Here is my own radical belief—radical in the sense that it is shared by only a relatively few individuals: I believe that you are better able to control your life than I am. I believe this about every adult person regardless of wealth status or occupational level. I believe you and others are better able to control your lives than is the head of any government, whoever he may be, or than anyone he can appoint.

The above belief is self-evident to the point of appearing silly. Yet, let it be tested against all personally held beliefs. How many can claim that they place no reliance on coercive force, as distinguished from repellent force? The few who can make such a claim are free of statist beliefs.

A Contradiction

Only now and then is there a person who does not advocate coercion in one way or another. A study by Link and Freiberg showed that 75 per cent of the American people believed themselves opposed to socialism (statism). Yet,

66 per cent of them favored governmental actions which fell within their own definitions of socialism! There is not, to my knowledge, a single businessmen's organization—chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, or others—whose minutes won't reveal support of statism in their resolutions on public policies.

No person can ever combat statism unless he knows precisely what statism is. Without such understanding, he won't even recognize statism in its numberless forms. This understanding is the first requirement. All other requirements are secondary—by far.

Now, let us assume that one knows and measures statism as a guide for his own actions. Then what? Know also the potentialities of freedom if one is to have any effect on others.

Two Types Of Influence

Influencing others *against* statism and *for* freedom is a complex problem. Influence divides into two types, the nonrational and the rational. All we need to know about the nonrational is that it is useless for our purpose.

A slogan, for example, is a nonrational device. It is effective for destructive purposes. "Kill all the Jews" effectively influenced millions of people to follow a madman. Clever clichés and phrases like "Human rights are above property rights" or "What would you do, let them starve?" have effectively influenced Americans to vote for charlatans and to advocate legal thievery.

The solution of the statism problem by those of us who

love freedom is not a destructive project. Rather, it is creative. It has to do with the advancement of understanding—just plain *learning*.

The learning process presupposes the existence of two things:

1. A person with the desire to learn.
2. A source of knowledge from which the learning can be drawn.

No person will ever learn any particular subject or how to make any particular object unless he has the desire to learn. Advancing the cause of freedom requires that thousands of individuals have the desire to learn about freedom and its potentialities.

Source Of Knowledge

The question, then, is how does any general desire to learn about freedom begin? What sets it off? *It is the source of knowledge that creates the will to learn.*

At this point it might be logically asked: "From whence comes this source?" John Baker, the eminent English scientist, answers the question: "The desire to know is widespread among men: the desire to know specifically that which is not known is on the contrary very rare." The few derive their desire to learn from a source higher than other persons.

It is the source of knowledge that creates the will to learn. For example, only a short time ago there was no general desire to learn about nuclear fission. But the moment that one person discovered how to release atomic energy,

the moment that such knowledge existed and was communicated, there was automatically created the desire to learn among tens of thousands of persons all over the world who had an aptitude for that subject. The presence of this knowledge and its existence in the mind of a human being served attractively, magnetically. They created the desire to learn on the part of many.

The Fault

The problem of knowing freedom is, quite obviously, a learning problem. The reason for the growing belief in coercion as a means to direct the creative activities of citizens within society is erroneously laid to "the ignorant masses." We could, with as much logic fifty years ago, have laid the lack of understanding of nuclear fission to "the ignorant masses." The real fault is an inadequacy of source of knowledge about freedom.

Bluntly, there simply is no one today who is making an adequate explanation of liberty—the free market, the voluntary society, and a state limited to defensive functions—to serve sufficiently as an attractive magnetic source, which in turn serves to create the desire to learn in effective proportions.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The proof that source is inadequate is the fact that the belief in coercion continues to grow. It grows because there isn't enough of the freedom philosophy standing as an intellectual bulwark against it. The freedom philosophy is lacking in understanding and acceptance, not because many Americans

cannot learn it, but because there isn't any considerable desire to learn it. The shortage of desire derives from a dearth of source.

An Example

To contrast the distinction between the learning approach and the popular propaganda approach—between improving the source of knowledge and disseminating existing knowledge—let me illustrate thusly:

Suppose you belong to a golf club composed of 200 "dubs," among whom you are a distinguished incompetent. Let's assume you become obsessed with the idea that all of the members should become scratch golfers and that you proceed to exhort and admonish your colleagues—you, a "dub," one who doesn't know how to be a scratch golfer! Such action, consistent as it is with popular propaganda techniques, would be obnoxious and, if persisted in, would bring a request for your resignation.

Now then, assume you take the opposite approach—the one here advocated as a method of knowing freedom—and that you go to work on the only person in the world over whom you have control creatively, namely, yourself; that you try desperately to become a scratch golfer. Now make the assumption that you succeed. This action, obviously, would be attractive, magnetic. Many members of the golf club would come to you inquiring how you had made such an achievement. What you could do, they could do. You would have created the desire to learn by reason of your own competency. You would have quali-

fied in their eyes as a teacher, one who could with profit be drawn on.

Explanation

The second item, then, in preparing to combat statism is to understand and learn better how to explain the potentialities of the freedom philosophy.

Explanation is important. For instance, had only one man learned how to release atomic energy and had he been unable to explain what he knew in terms intelligible to others, atomic energy would still remain unreleased. Right principles do not change. But very often, if new generations of people are to understand them, new explanations become necessary.

It may be that some persons at certain periods in history understood all they needed to know about freedom and were able to make proper explanations of what they knew—that is, proper and adequate explanations for their times. But, *we are not making proper and adequate explanations for our times*. Indeed, one of the faults may be that we are using terms and expressions and explanations useful in a period that has had its end. Our very words have changed their meaning, and new influences have made their mark on our thinking.

The understanding and the explanations of freedom I am arguing for are as yet unknown to me. They have not, to my knowledge, appeared on today's scene. They can be ours only by the processes of invention, imagination, research, probing, discovery. It is as much one person's ob-

ligation as it is another's to think through and to write the answers as to why man should be unrestrained, except for infringing on the rights of others. It is as much your obligation as mine to explain why there should be a free, uninhibited flow of all creative human energy. We must invent or discover ways to write this thesis dramatically, scientifically, logically, compellingly, morally—for it is a moral problem.

Any person with a high sense of procedure can readily see the distinction I am arguing—the distinction between the methods used to disseminate existing knowledge and the methods necessary to develop new sources of knowledge.

Actually, the latter calls for a trend toward self-perfection in the understanding of freedom and statism. Another way of saying this is: The problem of combating statism must be approached qualitatively by individual persons in order to find a solution quantitatively. In short, I must improve my own understanding before I can be of any help in improving anyone else's understanding. There is, in my view, no short cut to this process.

Facing The Facts

There are other things one can do, important steps in combating statism. But such activities should be based on the recognition of several facts:

1. There is only one person in the world that one can do something *to* in the creative sense, namely, one's self;
2. So far as others are concerned, we will be well advised

to confine ourselves to what we can do *for* them in the way of knowledge that they can tap;

3. Combating statism does not necessarily involve getting any substantial percentage of voting citizens to understand the problem. Knowledge is never general on any subject. We are all followers in most respects, leaders only rarely and momentarily, if at all;
4. The leaders in any subject are the ones at "the head of the class" on that subject;
5. All movements in history, good or bad, have had their intellectual leaders, persons who could not have been predicted ahead of time. One, I recall, was born in a manger. Another, the leader of a bad movement, was, only a short time ago, an Austrian paper hanger;
6. The leaders against statism and for freedom, the one or ones who will lay down the intellectual basis for statism's overthrow and the ascendancy of a free society, are unknown to you or me. Keep an eye on everyone as potentially that person. He may well be the machinist rather than the corporation president.

Our Approach

Our approach in the Foundation for Economic Education, based on these ideas, is simple. Nor can I see wherein the approach of any other person or group of persons should differ in principle. We here, as individuals, are searching for a better understanding of this subject and are trying to find refinements in explaining what we uncover in the way of understanding. Not only do we send our own find-

ings to all persons who want them, but also we search for the works of others and pass those on, too.

Stated another way, we are trying to get as many persons as possible to join with us in a search for the answers. The law of probability suggests that there is a better chance of some one or several persons, coming up with answers and explanations if many are trying to find them than if only a few are at the task.

An important feature of our approach is that we do not regard the ones who want our studies as objects for our indoctrination. It is not up to me or any of my associates to indoctrinate anyone. Our only task is to develop our own skills as relating to the freedom philosophy. If we know enough, our understanding will be drawn upon. If we don't have anything rather special to offer, what purpose is served so far as others are concerned?

In the case of cancer projects, for example, we citizens do not set up a program where all the doctors tell the people how to cure the disease. To our knowledge, no doctor knows that answer yet. Instead, we citizens set up research efforts, get as many interested as possible, and hope that someone, someday, will make the essential discovery. And only one is required. The knowledge the one gains will never become general, but the benefits will be immediately generalized.

Summary

In preparing ourselves to combat our country's growing trend toward statism, we keep these objects ever in mind,

objects that appear as appropriate for others as for ourselves:

1. Know statism.
2. Become better students of the freedom philosophy and personally practice it at all times.
3. Pass on our findings, orally or in writing, to those who can be interested in them—especially to those within our own circles of activity.
4. Pass on the ideas or works of others which in our judgment are free of all statist ideas and which have proved helpful to our own thinking. (The approval of any one statist idea, no matter how minor, is to make the case for the whole kaboodle of statism.)
5. Use such educational means as we possess to identify statist ideas as they arise.

In short, we do everything in our power to create a desire on the part of others to develop an understanding of liberty, knowing that such power can derive only from our own advancement in understanding. We then try, as befits our means, to satisfy whatever desires we succeed in creating.

Some there are who make the pessimistic observation that there is nothing one can do as a lone individual. I should like to counter with the hopeful idea that there is really nothing that can be done except by an individual. Only individuals learn. Only individuals can think creatively. Only individuals can cooperate. Only individuals can combat statism.

THE AMERICA WE LOST

by Mario A. Pei



WHEN I first came to America, forty-four years ago, I learned a new meaning of the word "liberty"—freedom from government.

I did not learn a new meaning for "democracy." The European country from which I came, Italy, was at that time as "democratic" as America. It was a constitutional monarchy, with a parliament, free and frequent elections, lots of political parties and plenty of freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly.

But my native country was government-ridden. A vast bureaucracy held it in its countless tentacles. Regardless of the party or coalition of parties that might be in power at the moment, the government was everywhere. Wherever one looked, one saw signs of the ever-present government—in the uniforms of numberless royal, rural, and municipal policemen, soldiers, officers, gold-braided functionaries of all sorts. You could not take a step without government intervention.

Many industries and businesses were government-owned and government-run — railroads, telegraphs, salt, and tobacco among them. No agreement, however trivial, was legal unless written on government-stamped paper. If

you stepped out of the city into the country and came back with a ham, a loaf of bread, or a bottle of wine, you had to stop at the internal-revenue barriers and pay duty to the government, and so did the farmers who brought in the city's food supply every morning. No business could be started or run without the official sanction of a hundred bureaucrats.

Young people did not dream of going into business for themselves; they dreamed of a modest but safe government job where they would have tenure, security, and a pitiful pension at the end of their plodding careers. There was grinding taxation to support the many government functions and the innumerable public servants. Everybody hated the government—not just the party in power, but the government itself. They had even coined a phrase, "It's raining—thief of a government!" as though even the evils of nature were the government's fault. Yet, I repeat, the country was democratically run, with all the trappings of a many-party system and all the freedoms of which we in America boast today.

America in those days made you open your lungs wide and inhale great gulps of freedom-laden air, for here was one additional freedom—freedom from government.

The government was conspicuous by its very absence. There were no men in uniform, save occasional cops and firemen, no visible bureaucrats, no stifling restrictions, no government monopolies. It was wonderful to get used to the American system: To learn that a contract was valid if written on the side of a house; that you could move not only from the city to the country but from state to state and

never be asked what your business was or whether you had anything to declare; that you could open and conduct your own business, provided it was a legitimate one, without government interference; that you could go from one end of the year to the other and never have contact with the national government, save for the cheery postman who delivered your mail with a speed and efficiency unknown today; that there were no national taxes, save hidden excises and import duties that you did not even know you paid.

In that horse-and-buggy America, if you made an honest dollar, you could pocket it or spend it without having to figure what portion of it you *owed* the government or what possible deductions you could allege against that government's claims. You did not have to keep books and records of every bit of income and expenditure or run the risk of being called a liar and a cheat by someone in authority.

Above all, the national ideal was not the obscure security of a government job, but the boundless opportunity that all Americans seemed to consider their birthright. Those same Americans loved their government then. It was there to help, protect, and defend them, not to restrict, befuddle, and harass them. At the same time, they did not look to the government for a livelihood or for special privileges and handouts. They were independent men in the full sense of the word.

Foreign-born citizens have been watching with alarm the gradual Europeanization of America over the past twenty years. They have seen the growth of the familiar European-style government octopus, along with the van-

ishing of the American spirit of freedom and opportunity and its replacement by a breathless search for "security" that is doomed to defeat in advance in a world where nothing, not even life itself, is secure.

Far more than the native-born, they are in a position to make comparisons. They see that America is fast becoming a nineteenth-century-model European country. They are asked to believe that this is progress. But they know from bitter experience that it just isn't so.

THE PERSONAL PRACTICE OF FREEDOM

by *Ed Lipscomb*



GRADUALLY this nation of ours is making up its mind on the greatest question it has faced since the decision was made which brought it into being. It is a question from which there is no escape. It is this: Shall we modern Americans accept the pagan principle of the all-powerful state and insignificant citizen in place of the Christian concept on which this nation was founded and by which it has grown—the concept that the single function and purpose of government is to secure and protect the inalienable God-given rights and sovereignty of each individual man as the temporary, physical, personal embodiment of an immortal soul?

Call it by any name we please, put on it any tag we can find—that is the fundamental issue before us. We say we are fighting communism, and certainly that is right; but Karl Marx, the daddy of communism, is said to have stated: The democratic concept of man is false, because it is Christian. The democratic concept holds that each man is a sovereign being. This is the *illusion*, *dream*, and *postulate* of Christianity.

Adolf Hitler in his bid for the socialization of Germany

said: "To the Christian doctrine of infinite significance of the individual human soul, I oppose with icy clarity the saving doctrine of the *nothingness and insignificance of the human being.*"

On the home front we call it Fabianism or the welfare state or the planned economy, but the war minister in the recent socialist government of Great Britain joins us in the assurance that the difference is one of degree and not of principle.

Those who laid the foundations of this nation thought of it in terms of a new type of representative government based upon principles of individual dignity, independence, and responsibility which were set forth by Abraham, codified in the Ten Commandments by Moses, taught and amplified by Christ. From the time of the Mayflower Compact in 1620, through the Declaration of Independence, the federal Constitution, and the adoption of our state constitutions, every key document which went into the building of this country acknowledged that same philosophy and pledged fidelity to it. Throughout our history the individual has been sovereign, and throughout our history the state has been servant.

Outward Signs Of Progress

In material things we have done well under such a banner. Here we are—six per cent of the world's population on seven per cent of its land, a heterogeneous hodgepodge of races and blood lines, with no more natural resources than some other areas of the globe—creating more new in-

dustrial wealth than all the other 94 per cent together. One hundred and fifty million of us own nearly six times as many automobiles as the other two billion people on earth combined. We produce and consume more steel than all the rest together, and own similarly incredible proportions of bathtubs and telephones and most of the other manifestations of luxurious living.

We could go on and on with such a recitation of our tremendous material advantages. Our accomplishments are indeed fabulous. And yet we know that we will not risk "our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor" for bathtubs and automobiles. America had no such advantages in 1776; and when the day comes that our nation must defend itself with an army made up of men whose only motive in fighting is the defense of their bank accounts, it will surely disappear from the earth in overwhelming defeat.

We know that the spirit which makes and is America—the spirit which has inspired and made possible our amazing achievements—has been able to flourish only because of a system of government deliberately established to protect the right of the individual citizen to make his own decisions, to accept the responsibility for them and the consequences of them, and to establish his own personal pattern of life within the limits of trespass upon the rights of his neighbor.

The question we face and which we cannot escape is whether or not we are going to abandon that principle of national life. Are we going to turn over to the state the job of making our decisions for us? Are we going to forsake

political principles and economic practices which brought 40 million immigrants to our shores in the greatest voluntary migration in history, and adopt instead the political ideas of the countries they left?

Are we, above all, going to abandon here at home the liberty and freedom which constitutes the greatest single difference between us and those we are preparing to fight abroad? There are good reasons to think that we are—good reasons which cannot be blamed on Korea.

Lost Liberty

We already have come a long way. We have come a long way in the creation of a central state so gigantic and unmanageable that neither its budget nor the complexity of its bureaus is within the understanding of men we elect to handle them in our behalf.

Even before Korea, the entire credit structure of the United States rested upon administrative decisions, and more than half of all private homes were being built under federal guarantee.

Over 20 per cent of all electric power was being generated by government, and plans were being pushed which would more than double this amount.

Approximately 15 million individuals, who with their families and dependents represented nearly a third of the total population, were receiving government checks of one kind or another.

The level of farm commodity prices was determined or influenced by federal action—the exports of industry were

largely financed by federal appropriations—all scarce imported metals were being stockpiled by government—all silver production was being bought by government—and government was steadily increasing its holdings of land through purchase or condemnation.

We have likewise come a long way in the loss of individual economic freedom and the power of personal economic decision. You need no reminder of the fact that you no longer have the power to decide what you will do with 30 per cent or 40 per cent or—if you have been exceptionally effective—even 80 per cent of the money you earn in return for your total productive hours and energy and initiative. The chances are you cannot decide whether or not to buy insurance—and certainly not where to buy it—until you have first bought from government the amount it specifies, at a rate it establishes, and have had the premium deducted from your pay check whether you like it or not.

Think it over—the wages you must pay, the prices you can charge, the compulsory payments and contributions you must make, the hours you can work, the interest rate you can earn, the rent you can ask, and on and on—and you will find that the principal freedoms you still have intact are those of speech and worship—and that a major threat has recently been made to one of those.

Debauched Currency

We have come a long way in the debauchery of our currency, which Lenin said was the best way to destroy the American system. We have been smug in our conviction

that nothing could be more solid, more stable, more safe and secure than an adequate supply of good old American dollars. Yet, in ten years those dollars have shrunk at a rate which, if continued for 12 additional years, will leave them worth exactly their weight as scrap paper.

Most of what I have mentioned regarding the distance we have traveled down the road to statism has had to do with situations and conditions which predate the war in Korea. I would remind you that the effect of war is greatly to hasten and excuse the further concentration of power, further surrender of individual freedom, and further debasement of currency.

In the last year we have seen new billions tossed about with a casualness that is frightening. We have seen our unwieldy bureaucracy increased at the rate of 1500 new civilian employees per day, with plans already made for a total 50 per cent higher than that of a scant two years ago (April, 1950). Those plans call for approximately as many federal employees as the total membership of the Communist party in Russia.

Such a federal establishment plus the employees of our local governments means that there would be more civilians on the public payroll than in the grand total manpower of our Army, Navy, and Air Force—including combat units, supply troops, and the armchair corps.

Yes, we have come a long way—a long way in the creation of an unmanageable central state—a long way in the loss of our power of personal economic decision—a long way in the debauchery of our currency.

The Federal Lobby

A second major reason for thinking that we will continue down the road we are traveling is the fact that the trend is being promoted by a powerful group of professional governmentals with tremendous resources of manpower and money at their disposal.

There is no question but that the greatest lobby to which any legislative body has ever been subjected is that operated today by federal bureaus and officials. So confident have they become that they no longer hesitate deliberately to circumvent the intent of Congress through far-fetched interpretations of legislative phraseology. They openly threaten individual congressmen with retaliation in their home districts, and wage vicious war in public print against minority groups who oppose them.

We have had no more alarming illustration than the slanderous campaign of official misrepresentation through which the Office of Price Stabilization has recently sought to make the meat industry an example of what it can and will do to those who do not willingly go along with its own ideas of what a price control law should be. After issuing voluminous regulations impossible of exact interpretation or accurate practical fulfillment, this new addition to bureaucratic confusion sent its agents into packing plants across the country to split whatever hairs they could find in order to "prove" its predetermined conclusion that a "shocking" proportion of packers were unpatriotic law-breakers—enemies of the people—who were turning heaven and earth to rob the housewife and her working husband.

Screaming headlines told of 1,849 violations. Within a week, however, after the meat industry had called its hand, OPS admitted that there were only 89 cases which its own agents thought warranted injunctions, and just two which warranted criminal charges.

There is cause for goose pimples among free men in the spectacle of a powerful federal bureau writing its own regulations, interpreting them through its own legal department, conducting its own investigations, serving as its own judge and jury, and unjustly condemning and violently denouncing a major American industry in wild and determined efforts to force Congress to rewrite a law which does not quite suit it.

Far from being a handicap, the Korean War has been a godsend to disciples of the superstate. On the one hand they are able to disguise their demands in terms of emergency needs, and on the other to wrap themselves in the flag and shout "Obstructionist!" and "Traitor!" at those who disagree with them.

The makers of "crises" tell us that the answer to every difficulty is new legislation—that we need only to turn over our problems, our pay checks, and our independence to political agents and appointees; and everything we need will be provided. May the Lord protect us from men in public office who feel it is their mission in life to do good things for us with our own money.

May we never permit ourselves to be persuaded that any politician can give you or me anything whatever. He hasn't got it to give, and there is but one way in which he can get it. That is by taking it away from us. What he "gives" is

what he takes under the compulsion of taxes or through bonded mortgages on our future earnings, less the amount necessary for maintenance of the bureaucracy and overhead of government operation.

There is, indeed, cause for discouragement in the distance we already have come. There is further cause for concern in the aggressiveness with which we are being shoved or lured, as the case may be, ever further and further by militant and often well-intentioned men who have at their disposal a tremendous bureaucracy plus unlimited power to tax and borrow and buy their way under the name of social welfare into complete centralized control of our personal lives.

Finding A Stopping Place

A third reason for pessimism is the extreme difficulty in many instances of finding a definite place at which to stand and fight—the problem of finding a clearly defined line where any substantial number of people are willing to agree that “this is it—they shall not pass.” In occasional instances, like the open proposal for socialization of medicine, it is relatively easy; but such cases are the exception rather than the rule.

Do you believe, for instance, that government should protect the individual citizen from deliberate exploitation of his physical body—from sweatshop hours and sweatshop pay—by imposing wage and hour regulations which assure minimum animal subsistence under conditions of work not ruinous to safety and health? And if you do, then at

what point does protection against exploitation cross the line into socialistic use of police power to equalize or redistribute income—40¢ per hour? 75¢? \$1.00? Where?

At what point does public charity for those too old to work cross over from protection against starvation into the communistic doctrine, "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs"?

Where does taxation cease to be a method of raising necessary funds for the legitimate purposes of a representative republic and become the tool of professional governmentals bent on multiplying the power of the state and bringing about political domination of the daily life of the individual citizen?

Where would you draw the line? At what point would you stop and fight? Unquestionably there is always a point at which the decision should be made, but agreement on it will vary so widely from case to case and from group to group as to create a serious handicap for defenders of American fundamentals.

Don't Start With Me

The fourth and last source of discouragement I shall mention here is the fact that almost nobody is 100 per cent opposed to the trend that threatens to engulf us. If you ask, you will find that practically everybody is against communism and socialism and even welfare-statism. Practically everybody is also against the government extravagance and inflation which can so easily bring them to us. At least practically everybody says he is, and the chances are

he really is—except the part that may be putting a few temporary extra dollars into his own particular personal pocket.

Even if a man is really at heart opposed to all statism—including the part that promises personal profit—the chances are he can think of a lot of reasons why his particular part should not be eliminated until many other things are done first. I have heard real estate men denounce socialized housing with eloquence and intelligence who had not made a sale in five years which you and I as taxpayers had not been forced by the authority of the state to underwrite through the Federal Housing Administration. I recently saw a classroom of young bankers criticize a farm speaker about government crop loans, and then act hurt and offended when he asked about the tremendous contribution they were making to inflation and to the undermining of their own depositors' dollars by filling their vaults with government-pegged bonds.

All of us howl for a return to some sort of sanity in government spending; yet how many instances do you know of in which any group in this whole nation has been willing to suggest a cut in any fund from which its own members derive benefits? Perhaps the most recent instance was the suggestion of the American Farm Bureau that soil conservation payments to farmers for the current year be reduced from \$285 million to \$150 million. Do you remember what happened to that one? Congressmen took the floor to protest that the Farm Bureau was not truly representing the interests or the sentiment of its membership, and finally reduced the appropriation less than one-fifth as much as the farmers themselves recommended.

You may remember the dramatic effort of one Senator several months ago to bring about a cut in some of the pork-barrel portions of the Rivers and Harbors Bill. After careful study, he proposed 84 immediate and specific cuts in the bill then under consideration, and 50 additional specific cuts for the future. Without exception, the group interested in each item screamed so quickly and so loudly that the Senator's economy program was defeated—not in 5 or 15 or 50 of the 134 cases, but in all 134 of them. It was one more illustration of the fact that the number of individuals and organizations who refuse to fight that part of statism which yields them immediate benefits is so large as to bring discouragement and at times dismay.

Here, then, are four reasons—all powerful and all easy to prove—why it seems that we are voluntarily about to abandon our original Christian concept of American government in favor of the same pagan philosophy which we openly denounce and greatly fear from abroad. First, we have already come a long way. Second, we are being pushed steadily further by political professionals who promise all material things to all people, and who have tremendous public power and payrolls at their disposal. Third, it is extremely difficult to find a clear and easily recognizable line on which to make a concentrated fight. Fourth, almost nobody is 100 per cent against the trend.

We Can Look And Learn

If this were the entire story, the future indeed would be forbidding. There would be little point in discussing it.

There are definite reasons to believe, however, that we are not going to accept in this country the pattern of life and government which has wrought such havoc in other lands throughout the world, from which our forefathers fled, and from which uncounted millions would flee today if they could.

First, we have had ample opportunity to see and to know beyond all possible doubt the results which follow the replacement of personal sovereignty and responsibility with dependence upon the state. In our own generation we have seen a number of centrally planned economies reach full maturity. Every one of them has produced terror, cruelty, and insecurity. In every one, force became the dominant element in national life. Every one of them found it necessary to shut itself off from the world, to lie to its own people about what was happening abroad, and to lie to the world about what was happening at home. Free speech was forbidden and criticism became crime. Men's minds and souls and self-respect shrank as the state expanded and they submitted to its tyranny.

In not one case has a central government eliminated poverty or achieved its promises of increased welfare. It has always offered Utopia in the future in exchange for ever-greater sacrifices today. But Utopia has never come closer. The sacrifices have never diminished. So far as actual experience and records go, the depths of human wretchedness and a centrally planned economy have invariably gone together.

We have seen the whole sordid story in Russia, in Germany, and in Italy. We have looked at part of it in Britain.

Britain—the great coal nation—no longer exporting coal, but needing millions of tons from us to keep her factories going. Britain—the birthplace of the Magna Charta—fining four farmers \$4,800 for growing canary seed without government permission. British planners—so confused that they find themselves with a surplus of shaving mugs and a shortage of vegetable dishes, plenty of pants for women and not enough for men, and 100,000 more publicly trained construction workers than could possibly find materials with which to construct. British citizens — thought of around the world as law-abiding models of propriety—so frustrated, so disgusted with the complexity of new rules and new laws, that their unashamed patronage of black markets causes a member of the cabinet to wail in public: “We cannot have a policeman behind every hedge.”

What does it take to get us to accept in this field a universal law which we readily admit to be inviolable in so many others—the law of cause and effect? If we plant cottonseed, we don’t expect to get tulips. If we breed white-faced Herefords, we don’t expect baby lions. It is just as clear that if we sow the seeds of socialism, call it welfare or what you please, we are going to reap exactly the same harvest that has been reaped by every other people that has sown the same seed. We have had abundant opportunity to observe both the planting and the harvest.

We Are Spreading The Truth

A second cause for optimism is the fact that we are making history’s greatest effort to learn the economic facts of life.

Literally dozens of programs are under way—by volunteer national committees, by foundations, by national business organizations, by farm groups and labor groups—to bring to the individual citizen in terms he can understand the story of this nation's fundamental structure and the secret of its progress.

Probably more books have been written on this subject in America in the last five years than in the entire world outside, in the previous century. Colleges and universities are organizing special campaigns to carry the story beyond the campus; preachers are telling it from pulpits; hundreds of corporations are bringing it to their employees; and organizations are giving of the time of staff members to serve a cause which mutually affects us all.

The same economic and political system which has given us more newspaper and magazine circulation than all the rest of the world combined, which has given us half of all the world's radios and telephones, and which has made us virtually the only nation with a television industry, has in so doing given us the means, if we will but use them for that purpose, of saving it from destruction.

Our second reason for optimism, then, is our relatively recent but intensive and continuing crusade for better public understanding of economics and the meaning of freedom.

We Are Basically Christian

Another reason for optimism is the fact that America is essentially a Christian nation. That statement may suggest

immediately some of the front page headlines of recent months—shady dealings by top-flight political figures—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation hearings—the internal revenue racket—the honor system exposé at our national Army school—the basketball scandal among college teams—and many more. Yet the very diligence with which some of these evils were sought out, the fullness with which they were exposed, and the revulsion they created in the public consciousness bear witness to the fact that we are basically a Christian people.

The record is clean and clear. The evidence is overwhelming. During the lifetime of some of us, the U.S. Supreme Court has reviewed all of the charters, commissions, proclamations, and constitutions which have gone into the creation of this nation and has written into an official decision the finding that “there is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning. They affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation.”

Despite all the evil and corruption we see about us, America today still merits that designation. A higher percentage of its population belongs to some church than ever before in its history—55 per cent as against 20 per cent in the good old days of 70 years ago. We are setting new records for attendance at religious services. We are giving more than ever before to Christian causes.

As Christian citizens, examining the programs and proposals of those who promise economic Utopia in exchange for votes, we know that we are forbidden to take our neighbor's property against his will for our own use and welfare, whether we employ the force of a blackjack or the

force of a ballot box. We further know that there is no defense in the fact that individually we may be only one voter among millions who band themselves together to take away the property of their neighbors through an instrument of force we call "government."

The fact that we are essentially a Christian nation, the fact that we are seeking increased economic comprehension, and the fact that we have had ample opportunity to see the results of rampant statism in other lands—in these lies our hope that we may yet see in our nation a conclusive victory over the political paganism which has engulfed so much of the world in our time.

A Personal Matter

America has not yet made known its answer to those who—because they do not understand, because they do not care, because of ambition for personal power, or for purposes of deliberate political gangsterism—would see us join the parade of states which have traveled the road from paternalism to dictatorship to destruction. The answer still is in the making. The decision still is being worked out.

What can you and I do about it? What can we do personally about anything so big and broad and hard to get hold of as the decision which the world's foremost nation must make on so fundamental an issue?

The answer to that question contains the heart and core of the whole problem we are facing. Insofar as this fight is concerned, it doesn't matter what you think if you don't do something about it. St. James was right when he de-

clared that faith without works is dead, and Edmund Burke was equally right 17 centuries later when he said that all that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in this world is for enough good men to do nothing.

The average person, when he thinks of his part in this problem, is inclined to do so in a spirit of frustration or cynicism which implies that he would like to do something but that the situation from his individual standpoint is helpless and hopeless. He is inclined to think immediately of great campaigns and national movements, and to forget the all-important fundamental truth which Whitman expressed when he said: "The whole theory of the universe is directed to one single individual—namely, You."

He is inclined to forget that freedom has no hands with which to work, no eyes with which to see, no funds with which to fight, no mind with which to discern and plan and guide, no voice with which to speak, but yours and mine. There is no such thing as doing nothing on a problem of this kind, for inactivity itself is the result of a personal decision *not* to help.

To say we are helpless, or that our cause is hopeless because it involves resistance to a worldwide trend, is to attempt to escape personal responsibility which cannot be escaped. Since Adam ate the apple, man whether he likes it or not has lived under a system of natural law which forces him to make decisions and to suffer the consequences or enjoy the fruits of them. The condemnation of the unfaithful servant who buried his talent did not come because of evil-doing. It came because of his failure to do anything.

What, then, can we do? There are two things. There are only two. They are all that are expected, and I can guarantee by the promises of scripture and the proven experience of the human race that if you will do them you will achieve a position of personal invincibility which no conceivable amount of security legislation could bring.

Personal Job No. 1

First, you can practice what you profess to believe. There never was a salesman who really went to town if he didn't believe in his product enough to use it himself. You can't sell Fords effectively if you ride up to see your prospect in a Chevrolet. You can't sell Camels convincingly with a package of Chesterfields sticking out of your pocket.

Your friends and acquaintances may not always believe what you say, but none will question for one moment the fact that your personal conduct and consistent personal practices speak the truth as you see it. You cannot convince your neighbor by word of mouth that you are a believer in temperance if he sees you staggering around your house each Saturday night. You cannot convince him that you are in favor of government economy and then sign resolutions calling for federal funds with which to build your town a bathing beach or even a hospital. You cannot convince him that you believe in economic freedom and independence for the individual and then ask that Washington underwrite your personal or business risks.

The first step, then, is to make certain that we actually believe in this thing. We have got to want it enough to

practice it personally. If not, the answer is already given as far as we are concerned.

Personal Job No. 2

The second thing you can do is to initiate among those about you, in your own particular area of personal influence and knowledge—as large or as small as that area may be—an opinion-moulding program of your own.

You and I individually may not be able to do a thing on earth about the attitude of people in Cleveland or New York or Seattle. We may not be able to handle our own home state, or even our own home town. But there is not one of us who cannot concentrate on the job of reducing this whole problem into terms of the people we see and talk to every day. I can assure you that one good, careful, analytical look around, just one good evening of thought and study, will bring to light more opportunities than you can hope to meet.

Perhaps your own most effective program is through a civic club or business association to which you belong. Perhaps it is through a class you teach, a pulpit you occupy, or through employees in your office or plant. Perhaps it is through writing or speaking or conducting a campaign of personal contact. Certainly there is no printed plan or program or idea on earth which has half the conviction which you can achieve among your own friends and neighbors by your own personal influence. Your voice among those you know has possibilities with which ink and paper and radio waves cannot successfully compete.

Whatever your program is, one thing is sure—there is a part of this job you can do. Out of 150 million people in this country, there is some part of it that *only* you can do, and which isn't going to get done unless you do it. There is another thing which also is sure—the Lord himself is going to hold you responsible for but one record—your own. Neither He nor your conscience nor your country is going to hold you responsible for my record, for opportunities you do not have, or for results beyond your capacity to achieve.

Personal Answer

No, America has not yet made known its answer. The decision is still in the making. It is slowly and inexorably being worked out—not by Congress, or state legislatures, or labor leaders, or politicians, or heads of industry—it is being worked out by you and me.

Freedom rests, and always will, on individual responsibility, individual integrity, individual effort, individual courage, and individual religious faith. It does not rest in Washington. It rests with you and me.

Two things you and I can do, and two only. First, we can practice what we profess. Second, we can each preach, from our own personal pulpit, the principles we practice, whether that pulpit looks out upon a continent, a country town, or a single cottage.

As we thus prove our faith by our works—as we accept with diligence and devotion the responsibility for areas within our reach—as we inspire those about us and send

them in turn to inspire others—we shall find that we are making an ever-increasing contribution to the accomplishment of our century's most challenging job.

Over and above all else we shall find—you and I, individually—that ours have become unconquerable souls.

LIFE ON THE RESERVATION

by R. J. Rushdoony



The reservation Indian is becoming less self-sufficient and more dependent upon what he calls "the Great White Father in Washington." Instead of freedom, the Indian has government-guaranteed "security." Instead of individual responsibility, he has a government bureau to handle his personal affairs. There are special laws governing his right to own land and to spend tribal money. Under that system of bondage it should surprise no one to find that many thousands of Indians have remained uneducated, hungry, diseased, and mismanaged.

FROM *Wards of the Government*

As a missionary to the Indians, I find your warnings underscored by my daily experience. One of the surest consequences of a government of "welfare" and "security" is the rapid decline and death of responsibility and character.

Whatever the pre-reservation Indian was—and his faults were real—he was able to take care of himself and had a character becoming to his culture and religion. He was a responsible person. Today he is far from that. The wretched security he has had, beginning with the food and clothing dole of early years, designed to enforce the reservation system and destroy Indian resistance, has sapped him of character. The average Indian knows that he can

gamble and drink away his earnings and still be sure that his house and land will remain his own; and, with his hunting rights, he can always eke out some kind of existence.

Government men too often hamper and impede the man with initiative and character. This is because their program inevitably must be formulated in terms of the lowest common denominator, the weakest Indian. In addition, the provisions of the government for the "welfare" and "security" of the Indians remove the consequences from their sinning and irresponsibility. The result is a license to irresponsibility, which all the touted government projects cannot counteract.

And I believe the results would be no better for the best hundred or thousand persons selected from any society, after a generation or so of the same kind of "welfare" and "security" government.

There are many men in the Indian Service who are sincerely and earnestly trying to improve the Indian's welfare. They are, however, faced with this constant dilemma: All their zealous and patient efforts to help the Indian simply tend to become another crutch that the Indian depends on. Those Indians who have become progressive and independent apparently have done so because of personal and religious factors totally unrelated to the government program.

ISAIAH'S JOB

by Albert Jay Nock



ONE evening last autumn, I sat long hours with a European acquaintance while he expounded a politico-economic doctrine which seemed sound as a nut and in which I could find no defect. At the end, he said with great earnestness: "I have a mission to the masses. I feel that I am called to get the ear of the people. I shall devote the rest of my life to spreading my doctrine far and wide among the populace. What do you think?"

An embarrassing question in any case, and doubly so under the circumstances, because my acquaintance is a very learned man, one of the three or four really first-class minds that Europe produced in his generation; and naturally I, as one of the unlearned, was inclined to regard his lightest word with reverence amounting to awe. . . .

I referred him to the story of the prophet Isaiah. . . . I shall paraphrase the story in our common speech since it has to be pieced out from various sources. . . .

740 B.C.

The prophet's career began at the end of King Uzziah's reign, say about 740 B.C. This reign was uncommonly

long, almost half a century, and apparently prosperous. It was one of those prosperous reigns, however—like the reign of Marcus Aurelius at Rome, or the administration of Eubulus at Athens, or of Mr. Coolidge at Washington—where at the end the prosperity suddenly peters out and things go by the board with a resounding crash.

In the year of Uzziah's death, the Lord commissioned the prophet to go out and warn the people of the wrath to come. "Tell them what a worthless lot they are," He said. "Tell them what is wrong, and why, and what is going to happen unless they have a change of heart and straighten up. Don't mince matters. Make it clear that they are positively down to their last chance. Give it to them good and strong and keep on giving it to them. I suppose perhaps I ought to tell you," He added, "that it won't do any good. The official class and their intelligentsia will turn up their noses at you, and the masses will not even listen. They will all keep on in their own ways until they carry everything down to destruction, and you will probably be lucky if you get out with your life."

Isaiah had been very willing to take on the job—in fact, he had asked for it—but the prospect put a new face on the situation. It raised the obvious question: Why, if all that were so—if the enterprise were to be a failure from the start—was there any sense in starting it?

"Ah," the Lord said, "you do not get the point. There is a Remnant there that you know nothing about. They are obscure, unorganized, inarticulate, each one rubbing along as best he can. They need to be encouraged and braced up because when everything has gone completely

to the dogs, they are the ones who will come back and build up a new society; and meanwhile, your preaching will reassure them and keep them hanging on. Your job is to take care of the Remnant, so be off now and set about it."

* * * * *

What do we mean by the masses, and what by the Remnant?

As the word *masses* is commonly used, it suggests agglomerations of poor and underprivileged people, laboring people, proletarians. But it means nothing like that; it means simply the majority. The mass-man is one who has neither the force of intellect to apprehend the principles issuing in what we know as the humane life, nor the force of character to adhere to those principles steadily and strictly as laws of conduct; and because such people make up the great, the overwhelming majority of mankind, they are called collectively *the masses*. The line of differentiation between the masses and the Remnant is set invariably by quality, not by circumstance. The Remnant are those who by force of intellect are able to apprehend these principles, and by force of character are able, at least measurably, to cleave to them. The masses are those who are unable to do either.

The picture which Isaiah presents of the Judean masses is most unfavorable. In his view, the mass-man—be he high or be he lowly, rich or poor, prince or pauper—gets off very badly. He appears as not only weak-minded and weak-willed, but as by consequence knavish, arrogant, grasping, dissipated, unprincipled, unscrupulous. . . .

A Job For Sale

As things now stand, Isaiah's job seems rather to go begging. Everyone with a message nowadays is, like my venerable European friend, eager to take it to the masses. His first, last, and only thought is of mass-acceptance and mass-approval. His great care is to put his doctrine in such shape as will capture the masses' attention and interest. . . .

The main trouble with this [mass-man approach] is its reaction upon the mission itself. It necessitates an opportunist sophistication of one's doctrine which profoundly alters its character and reduces it to a mere placebo. If, say, you are a preacher, you wish to attract as large a congregation as you can, which means an appeal to the masses; and this, in turn, means adapting the terms of your message to the order of intellect and character that the masses exhibit. If you are an educator, say with a college on your hands, you wish to get as many students as possible; and you whittle down your requirements accordingly. If a writer, you aim at getting many readers; if a publisher, many purchasers; if a philosopher, many disciples; if a reformer, many converts; if a musician, many auditors; and so on. But as we see on all sides, in the realization of these several desires, the prophetic message is so heavily adulterated with trivialities, in every instance, that its effect on the masses is merely to harden them in their sins. Meanwhile, the Remnant, aware of this adulteration and of the desires that prompt it, turn their backs on the prophet and will have nothing to do with him or his message.

Isaiah, on the other hand, worked under no such disabilities. He preached to the masses only in the sense that he preached publicly. Anyone who liked might listen; anyone who liked might pass by. He knew that the Remnant would listen. . . .

The Best You Have

The Remnant want only the best you have, whatever that may be. Give them that, and they are satisfied; you have nothing more to worry about. . . .

In a sense, nevertheless, as I have said, it is not a rewarding job. . . . A prophet of the Remnant will not grow purse-proud on the financial returns from his work, nor is it likely that he will get any great renown out of it. Isaiah's case was exceptional to this second rule, and there are others—but not many.

It may be thought, then, that while taking care of the Remnant is no doubt a good job, it is not an especially interesting job because it is as a rule so poorly paid. I have my doubts about this. There are other compensations to be got out of a job besides money and notoriety, and some of them seem substantial enough to be attractive. Many jobs which do not pay well are yet profoundly interesting; as, for instance, the job of the research student in the sciences is said to be; and the job of looking after the Remnant seems to me, as I have surveyed it for many years from my seat in the grandstand, to be as interesting as any that can be found in the world.

What chiefly makes it so, I think, is that in any given

society the Remnant are always so largely an unknown quantity. You do not know, and will never know, more than two things about them. You can be sure of those—dead sure, as our phrase is—but you will never be able to make even a respectable guess at anything else. You do not know, and will never know, who the Remnant are, nor where they are, nor how many of them there are, nor what they are doing or will do. Two things you know, and no more: first, that they exist; second, that they will find you. Except for these two certainties, working for the Remnant means working in impenetrable darkness; and this, I should say, is just the condition calculated most effectively to pique the interest of any prophet who is properly gifted with the imagination, insight, and intellectual curiosity necessary to a successful pursuit of his trade.

Right-Thinking Must Exist

The fascination and the despair of the historian, as he looks back upon Isaiah's Jewry, upon Plato's Athens, or upon Rome of the Antonines, is the hope of discovering and laying bare the "substratum of right-thinking and well-doing" which he knows must have existed somewhere in those societies because no kind of collective life can possibly go on without it. He finds tantalizing intimations of it here and there in many places, as in the Greek Anthology, in the scrapbook of Aulus Gellius, in the poems of Ausonius, and in the brief and touching tribute, *Bene merenti*, bestowed upon the unknown occupants of Roman tombs. But these are vague and fragmentary; they lead him nowhere in his

search for some kind of measure of this substratum, but merely testify to what he already knew *a priori*—that the substratum did somewhere exist. Where it was, how substantial it was, what its power of self-assertion and resistance was—of all this they tell him nothing.

Similarly, when the historian of two thousand years hence, or two hundred years, looks over the available testimony to the quality of our civilization and tries to get any kind of clear, competent evidence concerning the substratum of right-thinking and well-doing which he knows must have been here, he will have a devil of a time finding it. When he has assembled all he can get and has made even a minimum allowance for speciousness, vagueness, and confusion of motive, he will sadly acknowledge that his net result is simply nothing. A Remnant were here, building a substratum like coral insects—so much he knows—but he will find nothing to put him on the track of who and where and how many they were and what their work was like.

The Remnant Counted

Concerning all this, too, the prophet of the present knows precisely as much and as little as the historian of the future; and that I repeat, is what makes his job seem to me so profoundly interesting. One of the most suggestive episodes recounted in the Bible is that of a prophet's attempt—the only attempt of the kind on record, I believe—to count up the Remnant. Elijah had fled from persecution into the desert, where the Lord presently overhauled him and

asked what he was doing so far away from his job. He said that he was running away, not because he was a coward, but because all the Remnant had been killed off except himself. He had got away only by the skin of his teeth, and, he being now all the Remnant there was, if he were killed the True Faith would go flat. The Lord replied that he need not worry about that, for even without him the True Faith could probably manage to squeeze along somehow if it had to; "and as for your figures on the Remnant," He said, "I don't mind telling you that there are seven thousand of them back there in Israel whom it seems you have not heard of, but you may take My word for it that there they are."

At that time, probably the population of Israel could not have run to much more than a million or so; and a Remnant of seven thousand out of a million is a highly encouraging percentage for any prophet. With seven thousand of the boys on his side, there was no great reason for Elijah to feel lonesome; and incidentally, that would be something for the modern prophet of the Remnant to think of when he has a touch of the blues. But the main point is that if Elijah the Prophet could not make a closer guess on the number of the Remnant than he made when he missed it by seven thousand, anyone else who tackled the problem would only waste his time.

The Approach

The other certainty which the prophet of the Remnant may always have is that the Remnant will find him. He may rely

on that with absolute assurance. They will find him without his doing anything about it; in fact, if he tries to do anything about it, he is pretty sure to put them off. He does not need to advertise for them nor resort to any schemes of publicity to get their attention. If he is a preacher or a public speaker, for example, he may be quite indifferent to going on show at receptions, getting his picture printed in the newspapers, or furnishing autobiographical material for publication on the side of "human interest." If a writer, he need not make a point of attending any pink teas, autographing books at wholesale, nor entering into any specious freemasonry with reviewers.

All this and much more of the same order lies in the regular and necessary routine laid down for the prophet of the masses. It is, and must be, part of the great general technique of getting the mass-man's ear—or as our vigorous and excellent publicist, Mr. H. L. Mencken, puts it, the technique of boob-bumping. The prophet of the Remnant is not bound to this technique. He may be quite sure that the Remnant will make their own way to him without any adventitious aids; and not only so, but if they find him employing such aids, as I said, it is ten to one that they will smell a rat in them and will sheer off.

The certainty that the Remnant will find him, however, leaves the prophet as much in the dark as ever, as helpless as ever in the matter of putting any estimate of any kind upon the Remnant; for, as appears in the case of Elijah, he remains ignorant of who they are that have found him or where they are or how many. They do not write in and tell him about it, after the manner of those who admire the

vedettes of Hollywood, nor yet do they seek him out and attach themselves to his person. They are not that kind. They take his message much as drivers take the directions on a roadside signboard—that is, with very little thought about the signboard, beyond being gratefully glad that it happened to be there, but with very serious thought about the directions.

Rewards

This impersonal attitude of the Remnant wonderfully enhances the interest of the imaginative prophet's job. Once in a while, just about often enough to keep his intellectual curiosity in good working order, he will quite accidentally come upon some distinct reflection of his own message in an unsuspected quarter. This enables him to entertain himself in his leisure moments with agreeable speculations about the course his message may have taken in reaching that particular quarter, and about what came of it after it got there. Most interesting of all are those instances, if one could only run them down (but one may always speculate about them), where the recipient himself no longer knows where or when or from whom he got the message—or even where, as sometimes happens, he has forgotten that he got it anywhere and imagines that it is all a self-sprung idea of his own.

Such instances as these are probably not infrequent; for, without presuming to enroll ourselves among the Remnant, we can all no doubt remember having found ourselves suddenly under the influence of an idea, the source

of which we cannot possibly identify. "It came to us afterward," as we say; that is, we are aware of it only after it has shot up full-grown in our minds, leaving us quite ignorant of how and when and by what agency it was planted there and left to germinate. It seems highly probable that the prophet's message often takes some such course with the Remnant.

If, for example, you are a writer or a speaker or a preacher, you put forth an idea which lodges in the *Unbewusstsein* of a casual member of the Remnant and sticks fast there. For some time it is inert; then it begins to fret and fester until presently it invades the man's conscious mind and, as one might say, corrupts it. Meanwhile, he has quite forgotten how he came by the idea in the first instance, and even perhaps thinks he has invented it; and in those circumstances, the most interesting thing of all is that you never know what the pressure of that idea will make him do.

FREEDOM FROM WANT

by *Starr Daily*



The author of the following statement was an inmate of a prison, assigned to work in the prison hospital. He attempted for a year to apply and interpret the Twenty-third Psalm in his everyday life. He recorded his thoughts in his private journal (*Through Valleys to Victories*, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1952). This is from his entry for February 6, 1928, under the text: "I shall not want."

SUPPLY for my creature needs and comforts is no problem in my life here in prison. Food for my body is of good quality and is plentiful. I wear a regulation white uniform, which is always clean and fresh. If I wish, I may change my clothing every day. I am well-sheltered. My room is fairly large and airy. It is somewhat cluttered with an accumulation of many personal things which seem to add to my enjoyment. Economically speaking, the state is doing a good job looking after my wants.

I have no bills of any kind to pay. The barber comes over three times a week to look after my beard and hair. My laundry goes out and comes back with automatic regularity. If I become ill, I'm assured of excellent medical attention. I am exempt from all forms of taxes, federal, state,

local. I'm never called upon to contribute to worthy causes. I have no home and family responsibilities, worries, fears, anxieties. There are no civic or other obligations in my life.

It is the philosophic theory of Marx, Engels, and Dewey that economic security is the first and last law of life; that if you make the people economically secure, you will have solved their major problems. National and international peace, say these philosophers, depends upon making the people free from the fear of want, hunger, and lack—being the oldest and greatest fear in the world. They also hold economic insecurity as the primary cause of crime, and that economic security is the cure of crime.

I know how false this theory is. I have perfect creature security here in prison. But man shall not live by bread alone. Poverty is not the cause of crime, nor is prosperity the cure of crime. There are no typical paupers confined in this institution. If I depended upon my bodily securities to heal my criminal personality, it would not be healed. My peace and life-gladness are not governed by the amount of food I put into my stomach or the brand of raiment I drape over my frame. My airy room and good bed, in themselves, cannot give me a contented mind and a tranquil soul.

The reason is an obvious one, namely, that any mental contentment and tranquility of soul produced by worldly means alone puts an end to growth. Except for an active dissatisfaction, I should now be adapted to this prison environment, institutionalized, a helpless victim to state security. Such inmates we call *stir bums*. They are the *adapted* individuals. They are content, satisfied, arrested.

It is not yielding to world security that builds character, redeems personality, and releases soul. The reverse is true.

EDITOR'S NOTE: It may be said that the Welfare State is not comparable to prison life; that in the Welfare State, government only guarantees minimum needs to its subjects, but without the controls of a prison. Such a distinction is invalid both in fact and by judicial interpretation:

It is hardly lack of due process for the government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
Wickard v. Filburn, 317 U.S. 111, p. 131, Oct., 1942

WHERE KARL MARX WENT WRONG

by *Samuel B. Pettengill*



Now that the whole nation is talking about the communist threat to the country—at home and abroad—it seems a good time to ask what is really wrong with Marxism.

In 1848, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels wrote *The Communist Manifesto*, which begins with these words: “A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of Communism.” This reads like today’s newspaper. Yet the words were written one year before gold was discovered in California, before the covered wagons began to roll across the plains. Please keep this date in mind. It is significant to what I shall say.

In London a few years later, Marx wrote *Das Kapital*—the “bible” of the Communists and Socialists. As a reporter, Marx was accurate. The conditions of the workers in England a century ago, as he pointed out, were very grim. Women with ropes over their shoulders pulled canal boats along the towpaths. Women were harnessed like beasts of burden to cars pulling coal out of British mines. Children went to work in the textile mills when they were nine or ten years old, and they worked 12 to 15 hours a day. It was said that the beds in which they slept never got

cold as one shift took the place of the other. It was said that they were "machines by day and beasts by night." Tuberculosis and other diseases killed them off like flies.

Yes, conditions were terrible. Not only Marx, but other warm-hearted men — Charles Dickens, John Ruskin, Thomas Carlyle — poured out a literature of protest, which was read around the world.

On his facts, Marx can scarcely be challenged. But his diagnosis was wrong; and, therefore, the remedy he prescribed was wrong also.

A Gospel Of Hate

Marx said that these terrible conditions were due to greed, exploitation, and the theft by the owners of the mines and mills of the "surplus value" produced by the workers. That was his diagnosis. And to some extent, it was partly correct. Man's inhumanity to man has always been a factor in human affairs. Greed can never be defended—whether in business or in government. Sympathy for the underdog will always have its work to do—always, certainly, in the communist nations with their forced labor camps and human slavery.

The remedy advanced by Marx was to preach the gospel of hate, of the class struggle, of the redistribution of wealth, of the confiscation of property and its ownership and management by the state—which always means the politicians. But greed and exploitation are not cured by socialism. Stalin and Molotov live like oriental potentates, giving state dinners that would make Nero and Caligula

green with envy—all this in the name of the down-trodden proletariat!

Greed, however, was not the main reason for the conditions which Marx described. If all the wealth of the owners of the mines and mills had been redistributed to the workers, it would have relieved their condition but slightly, and for but a short time.

So, the class struggle, as the remedy for these conditions, was wrong. What then was the *real* trouble, and what is the *true* remedy?

Low Productivity At Fault

The real trouble was the low productivity of the workers. And, as workers can be paid only out of production—whether in England a century ago or in Russia today—wages must be low and hours of work long when production is low.

Production was low because tools and equipment were poor; because human backs had to do what slaves of iron and steel do today here in America; because capital had not been accumulated to buy better tools; because freedom had so recently emerged from centuries of feudalism that the inventors and scientists and businessmen had not had a chance to dream and to plan. They have had that chance today here in America.

Listen. In 1940, before war increased our production, it was estimated that electric power alone in this country was performing work equal to the labor of 500,000,000 men, each working eight hours a day. This is equal to

nearly ten times the total human labor force employed in America and 50 times the number employed in manufacturing—and that leaves out steam power and gasoline power and windmill power, with their tremendous contributions for increasing the productivity of workers and thereby lifting burdens from human backs.

No wonder America outproduced the world in this last war! No wonder wages are higher here than anywhere in the world! While Marx preached the gospel of hate and the class struggle, America gave the green light to the Edisons, the Whitneys, the Burbanks, and the Fords.

James Watt, the inventor of the steam engine which revolutionized the modern world, and those who followed him in the competitive struggle to make a better engine and sell it for less, did more to take women out of the coal mines and off the towpaths of the canal boats, more to take children out of the factories, than did all the Socialists and Communists and politicians of the world combined.

Yet Watt's name would be unknown today if one of these despised capitalists, a man named Matthew Boulton, had not risked \$150,000 on Watt's invention. Would he, by the way, dare take that risk under today's taxation?

A Measure Of Progress

One measure of the progress of civilization is the extent to which mechanical horsepower and tools supplement human labor. The steam engine did more to outlaw slavery, both in England and America, than did all the political humanitarians put together.

The laboratories do far more for mankind than do the legislatures. If modern Americans were to go back to the same tools and horsepower that were available when Benjamin Franklin was trying to capture lightning from the sky, our production of wealth would at once go down 90 per cent; wages would go down in proportion; hours of labor would increase to the limit of human endurance; the population would necessarily decrease drastically; and nothing that governments or humanitarians or labor unions or Communists could do would prevent it.

Terrible Conditions

I mentioned the discovery of gold in California in connection with *The Communist Manifesto* of 1848. With pick and shovel and a pan in which to wash gravel from gold, didn't men work long hours for a meager return, or for none? Didn't they sleep in filthy cabins and live on jerked meat, and weren't they often covered with lice?

If you saw that great motion picture, *The Covered Wagon*, you will recall the scenes of terrible toil—of men and women and children pulling the wagons across rivers and the trackless desert and over the Continental Divide; of families, on foot, pushing handcarts from the Mississippi to Salt Lake.

Yet, were those conditions due to greed and exploitation? No, the people were working for themselves. What was wrong? The answer is *poor tools*. The plow of the pioneer was a wooden plow, constantly breaking, constantly needing repairs.

Poor Transportation

In Vermont where I was raised, a man back in my great-grandfather's time dug some iron ore out of a hill. He put 100 pounds in a bag on his back and walked 80 miles through the wilderness to sell it to an iron foundry in Troy, New York; and then he walked home—an infinite expenditure of human energy for an insignificant return.

What was wrong? Greed? Exploitation? The class struggle? No—he was working for himself. There was no relationship of employer and employee; no one was stealing the “surplus product” of his labor. He kept all of it—and it was little indeed.

What was wrong? Why did he have to work so hard for so little? The answer is *poor tools*. Today the steam engine, in the form of the modern locomotive, could move his 100 pounds of iron ore 80 miles for four cents—or a ton, one mile for one cent! Railroads, paved highways, motor trucks, and automobiles have solved his problem and will do it even better in the days to come, *if we stay American*.

The Profit Motive

Let us say that James Watt and the man who financed his project were not humanitarians. Let us say that they put their brains and money together in a common enterprise for the profit motive. What of it? Was the result good or bad? Did *they* take the women out of the coal mines or did Karl Marx, with his gospel of hate and the class struggle?

What did the profit motive do? It made Watt and his partner, and all who followed them, work to make better engines and to offer them at a lower price to get the market from their competitors.

Was the result good or bad? The profit motive is just as honorable and useful to mankind as is the wage motive. Both do infinite good.

The wage motive prompts men to become skilled and efficient so they can produce more and earn higher wages; and because they do, all mankind benefits.

The profit motive prompts men to make better tools and to cut costs in order to sell cheaper; and again, all mankind benefits.

Competitive Effort Needed

The radio which only 25 years ago sold for \$300 now sells for \$30 or less, and it is a better radio.

Has the result of the competitive struggle in the field of radio been good or bad? The result has been good—humanitarian, if you please. It brings the news of the world, good music, and discussions of public affairs to the remotest farmhouses and to people on their sickbeds.

Not many centuries ago, starvation was a common occurrence—even in England, where 90 per cent of the people lived on the land. Was the conquest of starvation a humanitarian thing? What conquered it? Who conquered it? Karl Marx? No!

In America, the time in the field required to raise an acre of wheat has gone down from 60 hours of human labor in

1830 to two hours or less in 1930. What caused this decrease? The steel plow, the tractor, the harvester, better seed, the conquest of insects and plant diseases, and cheap transportation were responsible. Today, American wheat feeds millions in a Europe that is adopting the philosophy of Karl Marx!

Aluminum was so expensive in 1870 that Napoleon III of France had an aluminum table set—more valuable than gold—for state dinners. Today, aluminum is commonplace in the American kitchen.

The Answer

No, my friends, Karl Marx did not have the answer—he lifted no burdens from human backs. The answer is not in the class struggle. The answer is in competitive free enterprise. The answer is in the cooperation of inventor and investor; in the cooperation of the manager and the worker with his know-how. The answer is to substitute slaves of iron and steel for the strength of human backs. The answer is constitutional liberty, which sets men free and says that what any man honestly makes is his “to have and to hold.”

Wages can be paid only out of the product; and the larger the production, the higher the wage. The more money that is invested in horsepower and equipment—the more capital that is put to work—the less will children and women and men have to work at killing toil. The *true* remedy for our troubles is *more* capitalism, not *less*.

* * * * *

EDITOR'S NOTE: Benjamin F. Fairless, in *The Great Mistake of Karl Marx* from which the following is extracted, points out still another idea.

KARL MARX completely rejected the only economic system on earth under which it is possible for the workers themselves to own, to control, and to manage directly the facilities of production. And shocking as the news may be to the disciples of Marx, that system is capitalism!

Here in America, ownership of our biggest and most important industries is sold daily, in little pieces, on the stock market. It is constantly changing hands; and if the workers of this country truly wish to own the tools of production, they can do so very simply.

They do not have to seize the government by force of arms. They do not even have to win an election. All in the world they have to do is to buy, in the open market, the capital stock of the corporation they want to own—just as millions of other Americans have been doing for many decades.

Figure It Out

Now I imagine that some persons may say: "Oh, that's all very good in theory; but, of course, it isn't possible in practice. No group of workers could ever purchase the great multibillion dollar corporations that we have today."

Well, the other day I did a little simple arithmetic. The results may be as amazing to you as they were to me. At today's market prices, the employees of U. S. Steel could buy every share of the outstanding common stock of the

Corporation just as easily and just as cheaply as they can purchase one of the higher-priced automobiles.

We have approximately 300,000 employees. That is not just steelworkers, of course. It is all our workers—including me. And together, they could buy all the common stock of the Corporation by purchasing just 87 shares apiece. At today's prices, the total cost of 87 shares is less than \$3,500. And at today's wages, the average steelworker earns that much in approximately ten months.

Ten Dollars

By investing \$10 a week apiece—which is about what our steelworkers gained in the recent wage increase—the employees of U. S. Steel could buy all of the outstanding common stock in less than seven years; and—except for the relatively small fixed sum that is paid in dividends on the preferred stock—our employees would then be entitled to receive all of those so-called “bloated profits” they have heard so much about. But here, I'm afraid they would be in for a disappointing surprise. At current rates, the total dividend on 87 shares is only \$261 a year.

But in order to control U. S. Steel, the employees would not even have to purchase 87 shares apiece; they would need only to purchase enough of the stock to give them a voting majority. Then they could elect their own Board of Directors, fire the present management, put their own president in my job, and run the business to suit themselves.

Before they become too overjoyed at this prospect, how-

ever, they should be warned that they still would not be their own bosses; for the true bosses of every American business are its customers. And unless those customers are satisfied as to the quality and price of the product, there will be no business and there will be no jobs. But as long as the new owners of the company could keep the customers happy, they could run the show exactly as they pleased.

If the workers of America ever did own the tools of production, all of us would quickly learn a few fundamental and simple economic truths that have somehow escaped a great many of our people. We would learn that this endless conflict between owner and worker over the division of income is the sheerest, unadulterated folly.

Of the total sum which the employees and the owners of U. S. Steel divided between them last year, more than 92 per cent went to the employees, while less than 8 per cent went to the owners. Yet that small share which went to the owners was the total "rent" we paid them for all of the billions of dollars worth of plants and furnaces and facilities we used in making steel. And without these facilities, of course, our men could not have made any steel at all.

A Startling Fact

Suppose the workers take everything the owners receive for the use of these tools—suppose they wipe out all of the dividends completely and forever—what would each get? Less than a dollar a day! And meanwhile this process would destroy the company, destroy our jobs, work infinite

harm upon a vast segment of our national economy, and wipe out the savings which more than 275,000 of our fellow Americans have invested in our business. And for what? For the price of about three cartons of cigarettes a week, apiece!

American workers will never improve their standard of living by grabbing the meager share which the owners get. They will improve their position only by producing more; for if we produce more goods, we shall have more goods to divide among ourselves. If we produce fewer goods, we shall have less to divide and less to live on.

And there we have the simple, economic truth of the matter. To live better, we must produce more; but production is the result of teamwork, not of conflict. We cannot produce by fighting each other and hating each other; for by doing that, we destroy ourselves. And we shall only achieve our fullest measure of production when we begin to understand that the interests of worker and owner are *not* antagonistic, but identical—that under our American system of enterprise, it is impossible over a period of time for one to prosper while the other suffers.

EQUALITY

by Richard L. Evans



"WE hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." Thus wrote the patriots of America in 1776. And now the question arises, and has often arisen: What is the meaning of equality as applied to men? Does it mean that all men shall be alike? Does it mean that all men shall be leveled arbitrarily to a common plane? Does it mean that those who have endowments beyond the average shall be restrained from making a better place for themselves and for others? Does it mean that those who are content with idleness and indolence shall be lifted artificially to an estate beyond what they deserve or could enjoy? Surely it does not—and cannot—mean any of these things. For if it did, there would be no reward for the man who looks beyond the present. There must be equality, yes; equality in the right to voice our views; equality in the right to worship according to the dictates of conscience; equality before the law; equality at the ballot box; equality in the right to work without paying tribute to anyone for the privilege—an equality not circumvented by political pressure, not denied to minority groups,

not withheld from the humble, the friendless, or the needy—but not that warped and mistaken “equality” which would push down the able and push up the indolent; not the kind of “equality” that would retard willing men to the pace of the unwilling, or that puts unsteady props beneath backsliders; not that “equality” which would reward them who “toil not, neither do they spin.” No doubt all the trees in the forest fundamentally have equal rights and privileges. But they don’t all grow to the same height, and it would seem rather foolish to cut the tall trees down to the level of the lesser ones to satisfy the theoretical demands of an unnatural formula. And it would seem just as preposterous ruthlessly to pull the short trees up to the height of the tall ones. If we did, it would mean their uprooting—they would wither and die, as all things do unless they grow up by themselves from their own roots. And so, to those who would like to eliminate differences among men, it should be said that if it were possible to do so, progress would cease. Equality cannot therefore mean to bring all men low. It must mean opportunity for each man to rise to those heights to which his energies and abilities will take him—“and allow all men the same privilege”—to the end that progress may continue, and that thereby all will find benefit. Equality which means less than this is not equality at all—it is slavery.

PROPERTY RIGHTS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

by Paul L. Poirot



TRICKY phrases with favorable meanings and emotional appeal are being used today to imply a distinction between *property* rights and *human* rights.

By implication, there are two sets of rights—one belonging to human beings and the other to property. Since human beings are more important, it is natural for the unwary to react in favor of *human* rights.

Actually, there is no such distinction between property rights and human rights. The term *property* has no significance except as it applies to something owned by someone. Property itself has neither rights nor value, save only as human interests are involved. There are no rights but human rights, and what are spoken of as property rights are only the human rights of individuals to property.

Expressed more accurately, the issue is not one of property rights versus human rights, but of the human rights of one person in the community versus the human rights of another.

NOTE: Excellent articles on the subject of human rights are contained in the July, 1952, *Monthly Letter* of the National City Bank and the October, 1952, *Guaranty Survey* of the Guaranty Trust Company.

Those who talk about two sets of rights apparently want to discriminate between property income and labor income—with the implication that the rights to rental and investment income are inferior, as a class, to the rights to income from wages and salaries. Actually, this is an unwarranted assumption. It must be evident that all persons have rights which are entitled to respect. Safeguarding such rights is essential to the well-being of all. This is the only just principle.* Thus, the problem is not to establish priorities on human rights in the community, but rather to determine what the respective rights are in the particular cases under dispute. This is the real problem in human relations, and it is one that calls for the exercise of wisdom, restraint, and true administration of justice under law.

What Are Property Rights?

What are the property rights thus disparaged by being set apart from human rights? They are among the most ancient and basic of human rights, and among the most essential to freedom and progress. They are the privileges of private ownership, which give meaning to the right to the product of one's labor—privileges which men have always regarded instinctively as belonging to them almost as intimately and inseparably as their own bodies.

The ownership of property is the right for which, above

* For further clarification of this point, see *Morals and the Welfare State* by F. A. Harper, especially page 18. (Foundation for Economic Education; single copy available upon request.)

all others, the common man has struggled in his slow ascent from serfdom. It is the right for which he struggles today in countries emerging from feudalism. The sense of this right is so deep-rooted in human nature, so essential as a stimulant of productive effort, that even totalitarian regimes have been unable to abolish it entirely.

It is a mistake to belittle the importance of property rights. Respect for these rights is basic to organized society, and the instinct of individuals to acquire property is at the root of all economic progress. Unless people can feel secure in their ability to retain the fruits of their labor, there is little incentive to save and to expand the fund of capital—the tools and equipment for production and for better living. The industrial development of this country, which has given us the highest standard of living in the world and has made possible a miracle of production in war and peace, is dependent upon the observance of property rights. Who is going to work and save if these rights are not recognized and protected?

The right to own property means the right to use it, to save it, to invest it for gain, and to transmit it to others. It means freedom from unreasonable search and seizure and from deprivation without due process of law or without just compensation. It might also be fairly taken to imply a limitation upon taxation because “the power to tax involves the power to destroy.” For a like reason, it should imply assurance against governmental dilution of the money whereby the government takes property which otherwise could be claimed by wage and salary checks and other credit instruments. Further, it should insure against

other measures so burdensome or restrictive as to prevent the employment of savings in legitimate productive enterprise with a reasonable prospect of gain. Violation of any of these rights can nullify, in whole or in part, the right to property.

The Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution recognizes no distinction between property rights and other human rights. The ban against unreasonable search and seizure covers "persons, houses, papers, and effects," without discrimination. No person may, without due process of law, be deprived of "life, liberty, or property"; all are equally inviolable. The right of trial by jury is assured in criminal and civil cases alike. Excessive bail, excessive fines, and cruel and unusual punishments are grouped in a single prohibition.

The Founding Fathers realized what some present-day politicians seem to have forgotten: A man without property rights—without the right to the product of his own labor—is not a free man. He can exist only through the generosity or forbearance of others.

These constitutional rights all have two characteristics in common. First, they apply equally to all persons. Second, they are, without exception, guarantees of freedom or immunity from governmental interference. They are not assertions of claims against others, individually or collectively. They merely say, in effect, that there are certain human liberties, including some pertaining to property, which are essential to free men and upon which the state shall not infringe.

To many people, the expression "putting property rights

first and human rights second" brings to mind the oft-drawn political picture of a struggle between a few "rich plutocrats" and "soulless corporate monopolies" on the one hand and the great body of humble citizens on the other. Much of what the public reads and hears about the recurring steel wage controversy conveys the same impression, with emphasis almost entirely on "the workers" versus the "big companies." John L. Lewis' blast against what he called the "rapacious and predatory" steel industry illustrates the point. In a message to Philip Murray, president of the United Steelworkers, offering a loan of \$10,000,000 of coal miners' dues from the union treasury to back up the 1952 steel strike, Mr. Lewis said:

"We are conscious of the strength of the vast array of adversaries which confront you. Rarely has a union membership faced such a formidable grouping of financial and corporate interests as now oppose the steel workers of the nation in their long-standing struggle to achieve their rightful aims and objectives in the industry."

In all such talk about "big companies" and "formidable groupings of financial and corporate interests," hardly anything is said about the shareholders, little and big, who are the real owners of the business and whose money, plowed into plant and equipment, has made possible the large employment and the record output.

Who Are The Propertied Classes?

Actually, ownership of property cuts across those imaginary lines between economic classes in the United States;

and in no other country is the stake in property rights so great and so widely distributed. While we hear much about large corporations with thousands of employees and millions of dollars in assets, it is probably not generally realized that there are over 4,000,000 nonfarm business enterprises in this country. Of these, over nine-tenths are classified by the Department of Commerce as "small business" on the basis of their number of employees or dollar volume of sales. The importance of "small business" in the economy of the country is further shown by the fact that it accounts for 45 per cent of the total employment of all business enterprises.

One of the largest of our "propertied classes"—the farmers—includes nearly 4,000,000 farm owners whose lands and buildings are valued at \$55,000,000,000.

Even among large corporations, the ownership of stock is widely distributed; there are now 75 American companies each having over 50,000 registered shareholders. The Bell Telephone System, in its 1951 annual report, showed 1,092,000 shareholders, with no individual owner holding as much as 1/20 of 1 per cent of the total stock. Only five cities in this nation have as large a total population. General Motors, with greater sales volume than any other industrial corporation, has 479,000 shareholders.

A study entitled *Share Ownership in the United States*, just completed by the Brookings Institution of Washington, reaches the conclusion that there are about 6,500,000 individual shareholders of investor-owned corporations. It was found by the survey—contrary to the opinions often heard—that 32 per cent of the shareholders were from fam-

ilies having incomes under \$5,000 annually; 44 per cent had incomes of \$5,000-\$10,000; and only 24 per cent had incomes over \$10,000.

What Are Human Rights?

Now what about the so-called human rights that are represented as superior to property rights? What about the "right" to a job, the "right" to a standard of living, the "right" to a minimum wage or a maximum workweek, the "right" to a "fair" price, the "right" to bargain collectively, the "right" to security against the adversities and hazards of life, such as old age and disability?

The framers of the Constitution would have been astonished to hear these things spoken of as rights. They are not immunities from governmental compulsion; on the contrary, they are demands for new forms of governmental compulsion. They are not claims to the product of one's own labor; they are, in some if not in most cases, claims to the products of other people's labor.

These "human rights" are indeed different from property rights, for they rest on a denial of the basic concept of property rights. They are not freedoms or immunities assured to all persons alike. They are special privileges conferred upon some persons at the expense of others. The real distinction is not between property rights and human rights, but between equality of protection from governmental compulsion on the one hand and demands for the exercise of such compulsion for the benefit of favored groups on the other.

The Right To A Job

To point out these characteristics of the so-called human rights is not to deny the reality nor belittle the importance of the social problems they represent. Some of these problems are real and important. They are also complex, and in this further respect they are different from the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

There is no great difficulty nor danger in declaring that certain individual rights shall not be tampered with by the government—and in adhering to that principle. It is quite another matter to say that the government shall seize the property or curtail the freedom of some of its citizens for the benefit, or the supposed benefit, of others. To adopt this view is to cast both the government and the citizen in radically new roles, with far-reaching effects on economic behavior, political practices, and individual character.

Consider, for example, the so-called *right to a job*. This is a fine-sounding phrase that evokes an emotional response. It creates a mental image of an unemployed worker and his family suffering hardship through no fault of their own. No one would deny the reality nor the seriousness of that, especially when the unemployed worker is multiplied by millions. To find the best remedy, however, is a difficult matter; and it is not made easier by the use of such misleading catchwords as the “right” to a job. One man’s “right” to a job implies an obligation on the part of someone else to give him a job. Who has any such obligation?

An economy of private enterprise functions by means of voluntary contracts entered into for the sake of mutual

advantage. Jobs arise from such contracts. The obligation to fulfill his contract is the only right any person can have to a job. Both sides of the contract have to be fulfilled. The employer's job—his side of the contract—is to anticipate what the consumers will want in the market place. His capacity to offer jobs to employees depends upon how well he understands the market pattern of consumer preferences. He has no right of control over the market. There is a limit to his capacity to provide jobs. And in the final analysis, an employee's so-called *right to a job* is determined by what consumers think the product or service is worth to them.

As with the "right" to a job, so with the other so-called human rights. These are not rights in the constitutional sense of respect for privacy; they are, instead, social programs which the government has undertaken or has been asked to promote. These programs, unlike true rights, are selective, coercive, complex, and experimental. Hence, they need to be carefully considered each on its own merits with due regard to the serious threats they may involve to the real and basic human rights that have enabled free men to build a society with the highest level of material well-being ever achieved anywhere.

Triple Threats

On the economic side, the gravest threat is that productive enterprise will be so burdened and impeded by high taxes, prohibitions, red tape, and controls that industry will stagnate. Without the products of industry, social

programs of any kind become empty promises. New political powers and functions increase the cost of government and drain manpower from farms and factories into administrative bureaus. The great bulk of the money for benefit payments to favored groups must be taken from those who produce by putting forth their own efforts or by investing their savings. Minimum-wage rates wipe out the entire lower range of job opportunities in the business world. Only the government, with the power to tax, can pay more for labor than it is worth. Maximum-hour laws further limit the opportunity to be productive. Artificially pegged prices and wage rates interfere with the normal market process of gearing production to the maximum satisfaction of consumer wants.*

On the political side, the increase of power multiplies the opportunities for the abuse of power and the harm that can be done by such abuse. High tax rates expose taxpayers and collectors to strong temptations. The disbursement of billions of dollars in public funds opens new avenues for favoritism and corruption. This system of political distribution of the wealth of a nation encourages government by pressure groups, with the favors flowing toward the groups with the most votes. Demands for more liberal benefits on the one hand and for tax relief on the other converge upon the public treasury. Deficit financing and currency depreciation tend to become national habits

* See other publications by the Foundation for Economic Education: *Inflation* by F. A. Harper; *The Price of Price Controls* by Irving S. Olds, on page 169; *Economics in One Lesson* by Henry Hazlitt.

which feed upon the savings of individuals and wipe out the means of production and progress.

On the human side, the individual citizen discovers that it is increasingly difficult to get ahead by enterprise and thrift—increasingly profitable to join in the scramble for governmental favors and handouts. The sense of relationship between services rendered and payment received grows weaker. Personal initiative and self-reliance give way to an attitude of: Let the government do it. Free citizens tend to degenerate into wards of the state.

These are not imaginary effects, but real ones. They are visible here and now. They are the consequences of placing social programs, mislabeled “human rights,” above the *real* human rights, disparagingly called “property rights,” which underlie the productive strength of free men.

WHY PRICES ARE HIGH

by Henry Hazlitt



No subject is so much discussed today—or so little understood—as inflation. The politicians in Washington talk of it as if it were some horrible visitation from without, over which they had no control—like a flood, a foreign invasion, or a plague. It is something they are always promising to “fight”—if Congress or the people will only give them the “weapons” or “a strong law” to do the job.

Yet the plain truth is that our political leaders have brought on inflation by their own money and fiscal policies. They are promising to fight with their right hand the conditions they have brought on with their left.

Inflation, always and everywhere, is primarily caused by an increase in the supply of money and credit. In fact, inflation *is* the increase in the supply of money and credit. If you turn to the recent *American College Dictionary*, for example, you will find the first definition of inflation given as follows: “Undue *expansion* or increase of the currency of a country, especially by the issuing of paper money not redeemable in specie.”

In recent years, however, the term has come to be used in a radically different sense. This is recognized in the second definition given by the *American College Dictionary*:

"A substantial *rise of prices* caused by an undue expansion in paper money or bank credit." Now obviously a rise of prices *caused* by an expansion of the money supply is not the same thing as the expansion of the money supply itself. A cause or condition is clearly not identical with one of its consequences. The use of the word "inflation" with these two quite different meanings leads to endless confusion.

The word "inflation" originally applied solely to the quantity of money. It meant that the volume of money was *inflated*, blown up, overextended. It is not mere pedantry to insist that the word should be used only in its original meaning. To use it to mean "a rise in prices" is to deflect attention away from the real cause of inflation and the real cure for it.

Let us see what happens under inflation, and why it happens. When the supply of money is increased, people have more money to offer for goods. If the supply of goods does not increase—or does not increase as much as the supply of money—then the prices of goods will go up. Each individual dollar becomes less valuable because there are more dollars. Therefore, more of them will be offered against, say, a pair of shoes or a hundred bushels of wheat than before. A "price" is an *exchange ratio* between a dollar and a unit of goods. When people have more dollars, they value each dollar less. Goods then rise in price, not because goods are scarcer than before, but because dollars are more abundant.

In the old days, governments inflated by clipping and debasing the coinage. Then they found they could inflate

cheaper and faster simply by grinding out paper money on a printing press. This is what happened with the French assignats in 1789, and with our own currency during the Revolutionary War. Today the method is a little more indirect. Our government sells its bonds or other IOU's to the banks. In payment, the banks create "deposits" on their books against which the government can draw. A bank in turn may sell its government IOU's to the Federal Reserve Bank, which pays for them either by creating a deposit credit or having more Federal Reserve notes printed and paying them out. This is how money is manufactured.

The greater part of the "money supply" of this country is represented not by hand-to-hand currency but by bank deposits which are drawn against by checks. Hence, when most economists measure our money supply, they add demand deposits (and now usually, also, time deposits) to currency outside of banks to get the total. The total of money and credit so measured was \$64,099,000,000 at the end of December, 1939, and \$174,200,000,000 at the end of June this year. This increase of 171 per cent in the supply of money is overwhelmingly the main reason why wholesale prices rose 135 per cent from 1939 to June of this year.

GAINING THE FREE MARKET

by F. A. Harper



WHEN your Program Committee invited my views on the freedom of persons to work and to trade their wares, I was tempted beyond my power to resist. The subject is a vital one to me, not only as a member of this Association but also as a member of mankind which today faces one of its gravest issues.

In the United States, the high level of economic welfare we have long enjoyed is in immediate and serious danger. What is more, I believe that the only moral base on which any high civilization can be sustained is being subverted. As one looks around with a detachment of historical perspective, it is clear that the last vestiges of economic freedom are fast crumbling and that if the trend is not reversed, the demise of all our other hallowed freedoms will follow in the immediate wake of this lost economic freedom.

I propose to speak with what some persons may call a bias. But I offer no apologies for having a viewpoint. Why is the holding of certain specific beliefs in social science scorned as "bias," "prejudice," and "lack of objectivity"? This attitude is not taken toward other fields of contemplation—arithmetic (2 plus 2), geography (the shape of the world), chemistry (the composition of water). Why treat

social science differently? True, the views one holds in either social science or chemistry may be wrong, but it should be evident that a person's opinion on any subject can't possibly be right if he holds no opinion at all.

So I should like first to offer some basic assumptions as a working hypothesis and then, with them as a background, discuss the present plight of the free market and what can be done about its re-establishment.

The Right To Life

If I should, at this instant, draw a gun from my pocket and shoot our esteemed Chairman, everyone here would be duly shocked. Furthermore, newsmen would photograph the corpse and the culprit and spread the shocking story across the land.

Why would people be shocked by the murder? It must be because they accept my first assumption: *A person has the right to life.*

I am here using the term "right" in the sense of a person's natural or inherent right as opposed to statute law or social custom; in the sense of having divine origin rather than of stemming from a permit or prohibition designed by one's fellow men; in the sense of a recognition that sovereignty rests with God rather than with any collective of humanity, and that the individual person is therefore directly responsible to God rather than to any collective of humanity which may presume to grant him rights. This concept of rights assumes the existence of a divine law that controls the consequences of men's acts in a manner

which no one of them, nor any group of them, can alter at will. Man can break divine law and suffer the consequences, but he cannot rewrite divine law in any degree. The nature of rights, as I use the word, is reflected in what one means when he says: "This above all *I* believe to be right in the eyes of God." One is bound under this concept of moral rights to proclaim for others the same rights that he claims for himself.

Each of us was born with a right to life and a right to continued life. And why do I believe that? Because I think it is logical to assume that the event of birth is itself purposeful—that a purpose is implied in the very fact of birth. We see this innate right to life reflected even in the infant's instinctive struggle for continued life. As the infant grows into adulthood in a free society, his every act of planning and building toward a better future for himself and for those he loves and respects seems predicated on the glorious fulfillment of this right to life.

It is this same right to life that underlies the Commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*, and its likeness in other moral codes which have guided civilized man.

The Founding Fathers, in the early history of this nation, incorporated this concept of the right to life into the Declaration of Independence by proclaiming the rights to "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." They declared these rights to be self-evident. But time seems to have blurred their self-evidentness, or it would not now be necessary for us to be concerned about them.

My second assumption is: *A person has the right to all proper means of sustaining his life.* Life is sustained only

if, in addition to agents of health like the inborn antibodies of the blood, one has sufficient food and protection. These are economic goods and services with which we are concerned in marketing.

What Are Proper Means

Now how can a person obtain these economic means of sustaining his life? And what is meant by *proper* means?

If a person existed alone, rather than as a part of society, there would be only one way:

1. He would have to produce them himself.

But, since he is a person in a society of persons, these three additional ways are possible:

2. He may receive them in free exchange from someone who has produced them.
3. He may receive them as a gift from someone who has produced them.
4. He may steal them from someone who has produced them.

The last of these—theft—must be eliminated, along with cannibalism, as a proper means of sustaining one's life in society. If, for instance, our Chairman and I constituted a society, we could not sustain our lives on the fruits of theft from one another, any more than we could do so by eating each other in cannibalism. It is improper, then, to exist on either the *life* or the *livelihood* of another against his will.

When the Founding Fathers spoke of rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, were they not speaking of life and livelihood as being essentially the same? If I were

to murder our Chairman, you might be more shocked than if I were to pick his pocket. But you would still be shocked at the thievery, for the reason that the two are closely similar in the sense of the rights which have been violated.

Martin Luther aptly expressed the connection between theft and murder by saying that whosoever eats up, robs, and steals the nourishment of another commits as great a murder as he who carves a man or utterly undoes him. That, as I see it, is the logical and moral basis for the Commandment: *Thou shalt not steal*. It is why theft as well as murder must be ruled out, leaving only production, exchange, and gifts as proper economic means of sustaining one's life in society.

I have retained gifts, in contrast to theft, as a proper source of sustenance because giving is voluntary and derives from the will of the one who has produced the gift. The spigot controlling the volume of voluntary gifts is self-regulating, in the sense that the producer himself decides the rate of flow. Voluntary giving does not have the suicidal effect on production that theft has. In fact, production is stimulated by the urge to give—witness the stimulus from the desire to care for the members of one's family.

The Right To One's Own Product

The right to sustain one's life would be meaningless without the right to a source of sustenance, for to deprive a man of his sustenance is to deprive him of his life. If we add the specification that sustenance must be from a *proper* source—a source other than theft in any of its forms—my

third assumption follows: *A person has the right to what he has produced.*

The contribution of this right to the peaceful relations of mankind can be perceived if one will reverse it and assume that nobody has any right to what he has produced, which is the concept of socialism or communism. One immediately wonders why—to what end—anyone would then produce anything at all. But let us assume that a person would go on producing, even though he has no right to what he has produced. To use it himself would, by this code, be improper. How, then, could one subsist? Only by theft—only by taking what others have produced—would it be possible for him to continue to live. Fantastic? Yes, so fantastic that such a state of affairs is difficult to visualize. But that is the meaning of the absence of the right to what one has produced. That is the meaning of socialism-communism, which denies these rights of man. And it shows how theft—the only alternative of this third right—is immoral and therefore destructive of the very person who practices it.

Once a thing has been produced and has acquired worth in the market place, it becomes the property of *someone* until it has been consumed or loses its worth for some other reason. Under the right to have what one has produced, it is the producer who becomes its rightful owner initially, at the instant of production. He may keep it for a minute or a month or longer before consuming it or disposing of it to some other person who then becomes its rightful owner. The producer may have sold it or given it away, but each of the three proper types of private property which sustain

life—(1) what one has produced for his own consumption, (2) what he has received in exchange for what he has produced, and (3) what others have given him from what they have produced—is founded in the right to have what one has produced.

The Right To Property

If a person is entitled to what he has produced, he is also entitled to keep it. So, closely akin to the right of a person to what he has produced, but different in an important respect, is my fourth assumption: *A person has the right to private property.*

I would make a definite distinction between the right to what one has produced and the right to private property although the latter is clearly founded on the former. The distinction arises from the fact that ownership may pass from one person to another, and I shall speak further of that in a moment. So whatever is obtained through free exchange and voluntary giving, as well as what one has himself produced, is properly the object of private ownership of property.

How about ownership of things in the name of a corporation? Does not this type of ownership violate personal rights to property? No. This is not a violation of private property rights because corporation officials, under a revocable grant of consent, act as agents for the individuals who own the corporation.

What, then, about government ownership? Is it not like corporate ownership? No. Ownership by government is a

violation of private property rights because, although seemingly acting as agent for the individual persons, government is in this respect quite different from a corporation. A person can sell his share of a corporation whenever he desires, sever his participation, and buy oatmeal with the proceeds. But he cannot do so with what is owned by the government. Can a person in Russia or anywhere else sell his "share of ownership in common" in the collective? No. After being forced against his will to invest the fruits of his labor in what the government owns, he is then prohibited from withdrawing his contribution at will. If one is not free to sell a thing, he really does not own it. That is the test of ownership which should be applied; and by this test, government ownership fails to meet our requirements of personal rights to property.

So, we must conclude that private ownership of property is the only moral basis for ownership in society. As Dr. D. Elton Trueblood has aptly said: "Stealing is evil because ownership is good." The right of private property and the right to have what one has produced are clearly implied in the Commandments about thievery and coveting. They are also implied, though less directly, in the Commandment about taking the life of another person. Just as I could not kill you if you did not have life, neither could I steal from you nor covet what is yours if you did not have private property.

Based on this concept of the right to private property and the sources of things which may be owned, this definition on theft evolves: *Morally, theft is the taking from another person, against his will, of anything which he has*

produced and has chosen to keep, or which has come into his possession by voluntary exchange or voluntary giving. That is the test of theft to be applied in any instance under survey by any person who really believes in private property and in the chain of rights from which it is derived. And it allows of no modification without renouncing belief in these rights.

The Right To Dispose Of Property

My fifth assumption is: *Inherent in the right to private ownership of property is the right of the owner to dispose of it at will—to sell it, trade it, or give it away.*

And if this right is to be admitted, it requires the existence and operation of a free market. A market, as I understand it, is any place where owners sell or exchange their private property at will. And it is this selling or exchanging in a free market that comprises marketing.

Marketing is not to be confused with production. The two are not synonymous. One widely used marketing text says: "Marketing is the business of buying and selling." Production is the bringing about of any change that will command a price—that can be bought or sold. It is true that if there were no production, there could be no marketing. But that does not make them the same. Similarly, there could be no electricity from a water-power generator unless there were a waterfall, but that does not make the electricity and the waterfall the same thing. Marketing—willing exchange—can take place only *after* production has occurred.

The free exchange of goods and services—the essence of marketing—should not be confused with some of the devices commonly used to move goods from one place to another, or otherwise to better fit them to the wishes of a buyer. Let me illustrate.

If you were to visit all the markets of the world, you would find a variety of transportation aids—jinrikishas, camels, trucks, and the like. But the use of these, in and of itself, does not comprise marketing; they are only facilities which may be used where trading—marketing—is being carried on. They may also be used where no marketing is being done—by a farmer hauling his product from the field to his own barn, or by slaves performing some task on a plantation or slaving at the salt mines as political prisoners in a completely communized state. In none of these latter instances was any marketing involved because all vestiges of a free market and willing exchange between private owners were lacking.

As another illustration, I do not consider the constant repainting of the George Washington Bridge to be marketing, even though it helps maintain transportation of persons and things. This occupation might be continued with labor under orders of a dictator, if the United States were to become completely communized. The presence or absence of marketing is to be judged solely by whether or not there is free exchange of goods and services, not by the motions people may be going through.

If we do not want to contribute to the destruction of marketing, it is necessary to understand clearly what is marketing and what is not and to understand why free-

dom is as essential to marketing as apples are to apple pie.

* * *

So, I offer you these five assumptions: (1) the right to life, (2) the right to sustain life by means consistent with moral conduct in a society, (3) the right to what one has produced, (4) the right to private ownership of property, and (5) the right to sell or trade or give away whatever one owns without restraint or interference from non-owners. These are the rights spoken of 175 years ago as the rights to "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness"—which phrase, incidentally, was originally written in this form: "Life, liberty and property." Anyone who rejects these assumptions may also reject everything else I have to say. But anyone who accepts them as "self-evident truths" should then be willing to test the present plight of the free market against this background of rights by considering a few significant figures.

The Present Plight Of The Free Market

About 35 cents of every dollar of personal income, as nearly as I can derive the figure, is now being taken by the government.* What is more, the funds appropriated by the government to be spent during the current year—if all spent—would amount to over 40 cents out of every dollar of personal income. This figure represents the proportion of the productive effort of this nation that is being removed by direct means from the area of free choice. Those who produced it and earned it—like the slaves in our

* Details of this calculation will be supplied on request.

earlier history and the present victims of Stalin's rule—are denied free choice in its use to whatever extent their product and property are taken from them against their wills. A test of whether or not you have lost your freedom of choice would be to refuse to pay your taxes—in whole or in any part.

If these figures of 35 to 40 cents lack meaning as to their full import, they may be compared with some similar figures for other countries in 1929-30, at a time when a comparable figure for the United States was only about 14 cents out of the dollar:

	Taxes as per cent of national income*
USSR	29
Germany	22
France	21
United Kingdom	21

This means that government in the United States is now removing free choice from a far higher percentage of the livelihood of the people of this country than were the governments of Russia, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom two decades ago. And the proportion in the United States today is more than double what it was two decades ago. If the tide cannot be turned, may not the present plight of citizens in those four countries foreshadow our future here?

Let me interpret the meaning of these figures in another way. I spoke of the popular resentment that would be

* Edmund E. Lincoln, "Sobering Realities Regarding Tax Burdens," *The Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, April 1, 1948. Figures expressed as nearest per cent.

aroused by my murdering our esteemed Chairman or by my picking his pocket. But this taking of about one-third of the average life (livelihood) of 150 million persons is equivalent to taking in full the economic life of upwards of 50 million persons each year.

Upwards Of 50 Million Slaves

In speaking of upwards of 50 million persons each year, I mean an uncertain number up to a possible maximum of 50 million persons each year. It will be said that in return for these taxes, we get back certain services we need or want. True. But included in one's tax bill are many things he would not buy at any price—for instance, the use of subsidies to bribe some persons to refrain from producing what other persons are willing to buy. Also included are many things which, though appealing to him at some price, are forced upon him by the governmental monopoly at excessive prices—prices higher than he would pay for those services in a free and competitive market. Say, for instance, that you would willingly pay, in a free market, one-tenth of your yearly income—and no more—for all the services of government, and that the average of all the other citizens valued them the same. This would mean that, by the test of the free market, the present tax-cost for these services is an overpricing by more than three times the worth. The only way to determine the degree of overpricing would be to put these services to the test of appraisal by citizens in a free market.

My reason for speaking of life and livelihood as equiva-

lents to be thus compared is that whatever one produces, and his property, can quite appropriately be called the economic extensions of the individual. A person who is totally a slave—a person who enjoys no powers of free choice, who has no liberty to develop his own potential and to do what he thinks is best according to his own wisdom and conscience, who is prohibited from having what he has produced for his own use or for whatever trade or charity he deems wise—such a person should be considered dead economically, politically, and morally, even though he seems still to be alive by the test of a stethoscope. He is dead so far as the free market and marketing are concerned. I have already quoted Martin Luther's excellent statement on this point of similarity between lost economic liberties and murder. And Hamilton once said that control over a man's subsistence amounts to control over his will. Most certainly!

This is not just a theory of Luther's and Hamilton's; it stands also as a legal interpretation of the United States Supreme Court: "The power to dispose of income is the equivalent of ownership of it."* One who is deprived of the right to spend his "income" as he wishes never really owned it. And to deprive him of it is to deprive him of his livelihood—his economic life—to that extent.

Yet, in contrast to the indignation caused by the outright physical murder of one person, this taking of upwards of 50 million economic lives each year frequently is lauded as a public service, and the persons in charge of the operation are generally honored and revered.

* *Helvering v. Horst*, CCH—U. S. Tax Cases 40-2, p. 10,959.

If I have given anyone a new feeling of partial economic rigor mortis, I have accomplished one of my purposes. And if you don't yet sense that feeling clearly, please try it again when you fill out your next tax return.

Indirect Losses

But that is not the only loss of a free market. In addition to the income taken from citizens by government in the form of taxes, nearly all of the remaining two-thirds is now either actively under wage and price controls—as well as other controls—or is daily threatened under latent powers of control. For instance, the one-third of your income taken by the government includes only certain costs of administering wage and price controls. Your personal budget must carry all the added costs of meeting their burdensome requirements—to say nothing of the adverse effect on your income of the controls themselves.

Then there are many other long-standing controls, such as those on railroad fares and freight rates, and the “emergency control” by which the government recently took over the railroads for nearly two years. Yet the budget for running the railroads of the nation during these periods is thought of as private business and free choice when, in fact, it is not.

And, then, there are innumerable other laws and licenses. The United States Department of Commerce itself has said:

“Practically every business, large or small, is affected by some form of governmental licensing con-

trol. A license is a permit or authorization to engage in some business or activity.”*

Licenses are power, otherwise, they might as well be dispensed with.

Controls that are at the moment inactive—“stand-by”—are no less controls in the sense of power over the person. When the power is there but inoperative, it is like a noose around the victim’s neck that has not yet been drawn tightly by the person holding the other end of the rope. The victim must not confuse the slackness of the rope with its absence. He should bend his every effort toward its removal rather than let his attention be diverted by the “freedom of choice” of who shall hold the rope and serve as his hangman later.

Now I ask you, in view of all this: What is the status of the free market and marketing in the United States today? This important aspect of freedom seems to me to be practically nonexistent. Unless things are changed drastically, I say in all seriousness that we might as well abandon the American Marketing Association and join the American Historical Association—or perhaps even better yet, join either the American Foundation for the Blind or the American Prison Association.

The Great Hypocrisy

When, at the start of my discussion, I spoke of how shocking it would be if I were to draw a gun and shoot our Chairman, I was not merely trying to be dramatic. My purpose

* *Small Business and Government Licenses*, U.S. Department of Commerce (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950) p. 1.

was to focus one side of this professional hypocrisy: The taking of only one life in a certain manner causes a rightful upsurge of resentment against the murderer, whereas if the same person were to administer an infinitely greater crime of a similar nature, he would be called a public servant, lauded as a hero, honored and revered.

We all recall that during World War II a leading advertising executive became the administrator of price controls, and that in World War II½ a former top executive in the communications and transportation equipment field participated in the attempt to force all his countrymen to abandon the free market.

Such positions of power are probably accepted with good intentions, but intentions do not determine the consequences of one's acts. One who professes a faith in the free market while engaging in its destruction is like one who murders a person while claiming to be his friend. He is engaging in sheer hypocrisy. Perhaps he did not know that the gun was loaded; but one who cannot tell, or will not take the care to find out, is not to be entrusted with a weapon of power because no plea of ignorance nor carelessness will bring the victim back to life.

Realizing this, it is one's individual obligation to refrain from "honor" and "public service" in this sort of hypocrisy and to refrain from doing homage to those who are practicing it. If homage there must be, let it be showered, instead, on persons like Donald R. Richberg who in the early thirties was engaged in a tremendous effort to control prices, and who now says: "In retrospect I can only explain, as did the man who threw a champagne bottle into

the chandelier, that it seemed to be a good thing to do at that time."

Emergencies Not The Time For Weakness

I realize full well the contention that there seem to be times of emergency when the free market seems unable to take care of the situation. In answer, I would only repeat my earlier assumptions and observe that if these are truly our rights, they are likewise justice; that justice is strength, not weakness; that it is during an emergency, of all times, when the strength of justice is most needed. What is good should not be rationed. There is no more sense in our substituting weakness for the rules of justice in an emergency than for an engineer to lay aside the rules of strength when he is constructing a bridge to be used for the emergency of heavy loads. One who believes that there is strength in violating the free market must believe that control will yield strength and justice. And if he believes that, why does he not advocate the same measures for all time, not merely in emergencies?

It must be that the proposal of abandoning the free market during emergencies really stems from the belief that the free market is a sort of immoral luxury—that whatever may be said economically for the free market in the course of normal events, there is somehow a moral virtue in its violation during emergencies. On the contrary, the free market is both economic and moral. Its abandonment is both uneconomic and immoral and, therefore, constitutes a weakness when strength is most needed.

If the consumer is to be king in a free market, nobody else can be crowned king over prices and the market—*nobody, at any time, because duplicate rule by overlapping ownership is impossible even in an emergency.*

Gaining The Free Market

Our chairman earlier today spoke of the free market as being the world's greatest democracy. Isn't it, then, an empty pride that espouses political freedom when it means only the right to vote for who shall have the dishonor of administering the destruction of what he spoke of as the greatest democracy—the free market? How, then, is freedom of the market to be brought about?

I like very much the concept in Patrick Henry's famous remark: "I know not what course others may take, but as for me . . ." It is my clear responsibility to so conduct myself that there is no avoidable conflict between what I profess to believe and how I conduct myself. And if anyone should care to know the reasons for my beliefs and my conduct, I would try to explain them as best I can.

If we are engaged in some national error—such as violating the rights of free men in the market place—it is because of our individual errors. A nation does not err; it is people who err. And the collective error is no more or no less than the summation of individual errors. My part of that problem, then, is my own conduct.

First, in order to erase from view all these confusing details of the problems that confront us, I must understand that freedom is not a thing to be created because the

disposition toward freedom is something inherent in man. Along with the basic rights listed at the beginning of my remarks, it may also be assumed that man is created in harmony with these rights. Even the small child evidences this innate harmony with freedom, as all of us know who have watched children assert their individuality.

Freedom exists naturally in the absence of man-made restrictions, or violations of rights. In this sense, it is like the force of gravity moving water along an incline unless barriers are placed in its way. All that need be done is to let freedom reign.

Viewed in this light, then, my part of the task of regaining the free market is simply to do everything within my power to remove the barriers to free exchange of property at a rate of exchange mutually agreeable to the two parties to the deal. No third person has the right to intercede in the exchange nor to prohibit it nor to dictate its terms; if he does so, he is practicing the moral equivalent of theft and murder and deserves to be dealt with accordingly. If one would feel more comfortable with some Biblical reference for these charges of theft and murder, it can be found in Matthew 20:15, which proclaims: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" The answer is to be found among the Commandments.

Two Types Of Catalogue

But just where shall I take hold of this tremendous problem? What, specifically, are the obstacles to a free market in the form of laws, of administrative rulings that have the

power of law, of practices condoned and protected by law-makers and their hired agents? Just what can I do?

I hesitate on this occasion even to begin to deal with specifics. To illustrate the reason for this hesitancy, I have brought with me two sources of information which portray the nature of the problem:

EXHIBIT A. Here are two mail order catalogues representing the free market. Together, these two companies last year handled nearly \$4 billion in orders. You are familiar with the use of these catalogues. In them, you will find almost any item you want, from pins to insurance—and soon, automobiles. If you don't want something they offer for sale, the solution is simple—you don't order it.

EXHIBIT B. Here are some "catalogues" of another sort, which are outside the free market. They are the budgets of various governmental units. Their goods and services are supplied under a monopoly granted by the government to itself, with bills for the cost being sent to users and non-users alike—bills payable under compulsion of law.

If there is something in the governmental kit of offerings that you do not want, its rejection is not so simple. You must arrange to have it removed from the catalogue completely, so that not even those who want it can get it from that source. This requires power enough to control government—you must be able to plead your case well enough so that a controlling majority becomes convinced. Immediately after you have succeeded in doing this, the defeated minority has before it the same task to accomplish—reversing *your* action. Always minorities to do battle! Always a struggle! And there is no escape from this sort of

conflict so long as there is prohibition of free choice by individuals in a competitive market. This is what happens when the design of social affairs is one of a monopoly power forcing its offerings on the citizens at its own price.

Clue To Battle

Here is the clue to the cause of the ever-presence of battle over the affairs of government, in contrast to competitive business where free choice prevails—as among the grocery stores in any town. It is not customary for a citizen to throw bricks through the window of the grocery store at which he does not choose to trade, nor at his neighbor who does choose to trade there; but there seems to be a temptation toward violence wherever there is a “monopoly grocery” where everyone must trade and where everyone’s business thereby becomes the business of everyone else.

Assume that you start the task of redesigning the offerings of government. You must first study the whole “catalogue” to learn the business and its parts. Suppose you were to start with the federal budget. Devoting one working hour to each \$1,000,000 of this budget (which is far less careful scrutiny than your wife gives to her spending), you would finish the study of this one year’s federal government appropriations in about the year 2000. Then you would be ready to start studying the other governmental budgets which affect you—state, city, county, etc. There are some 120,000 other governmental units in the United States.

This illustrates, I believe, why I hesitate here to even

start listing details. The governmental budgets which affect me comprise about 3,000 pages of detailed figures.

No Easy Choice

So, what I am confronted with in the present situation in the United States is a matter of choosing between moral law and statute law—a choice which not one of us can escape. Isn't it a strange paradox that when government—the presumed servant of the people and guardian of their liberty—removes the right of free choice from the citizens, it automatically creates another unavoidable choice between being immoral and being illegal? If I choose the one, I can be at peace with my conscience and my God; but I shall be at war with my political ruler. If, on the other hand, I throw my choice the other way, I may be at peace with my political ruler; but I shall be at war with my conscience and with what I believe to be right and good. Since, to many of us, the political ruler seems closer than God—at least for today—we bow to the law rather than follow the moral course when the two are in conflict. And we call it expediency. I wonder if eternal justice will excuse our acts on this basis.

The choice is not an easy one, but it is the price we must now pay for our past sins in relinquishing the rights of free men. Perhaps this is what Emerson had in mind when prophetically he said in his famous essay on *Politics*: "Every actual State is corrupt. Good men must not obey the laws too well." Perhaps this is what Patrick Henry had in mind when he questioned the bargaining away of one's freedom.

Perhaps this is what our forefathers had in mind when they dumped tea into the ocean and otherwise openly defied an unjust and immoral rulership. We are faced with an equally serious plight now.

An Epidemic Needed

I believe it is inadvisable to seek the solution by a highly organized and bloody violence. History tells us that the outcome of such an attempt on behalf of freedom, even though seemingly successful in overthrowing a tyrant, has often been merely to crown another tyrant. The danger inherent in trying to use force to wrest freedom from the grip of power is that victory goes to whoever is most adept in the use of violence; it does not necessarily go to whoever is right on the issue over which the battles are fought—because victory is judged according to the use of the weapons chosen. The advocates of freedom are certainly not assured of being superior in the use of violence. And even though their side wins the battles, its leaders are liable to choose, for personal reasons, to retain the power that has been given them—as happened after the French Revolution—leaving the cause of freedom still the loser in the end.

People fight only when they have something to fight against. When they find out what it is, and if it be an idea, physical force and bodily battle can be avoided. In fact, the use of force to battle an idea tends to generate it rather than to kill it. I doubt if an idea has ever been killed by means of force. The enemy of the free market is an idea—the belief that controls can serve the freedom of man.

No, the educational approach is not only the safest road to success, but the only sure one to lasting success. This may seem like cowardice, but is it cowardice for one to choose the best weapons for victory in any cause? This we know: Any law or regulation will be nullified whenever enough persons judge it to be unwise and improper, and not until then. Not every person needs to become convinced that it is unwise. Not even 51 per cent of them need to become convinced. All that is necessary is for a few thought leaders in all walks of life to become convinced because they are the ones to whom many others turn for guidance and advice. It is this understanding among the thought leaders that we now lack and that we must have for success in regaining freedom to trade.

Each of us can, to this end, dedicate himself to the task of convincing several thought leaders among his friends of the reasons why this freedom is morally just and why the free market is the most efficient source of economic livelihood, liberty, and happiness. If this view of the justice and purpose of free exchange is right and if each of us becomes sufficiently well informed as to why it is right, we should then be able to convince others. And they, in turn, would become able to convince still others in an ever-widening circle. The question is: Do we have the intelligence to master the understanding required of teachers, as well as the patience necessary to allow an educational epidemic to develop? If we do have enough intelligence and patience, the free market—a vital bastion defending our right to life—can in that way be gained.

THE FALLACY OF CONTROLLED PRICES

by Herrell De Graff



ON January 4th of this year, Michael DiSalle, at that time price-boss in charge of the Office of Price Stabilization, issued an order setting dollar-and-cents ceiling prices on potatoes. In one of our January broadcasts in this series, we reviewed the potato situation and suggested the possibility that—as a result of the price control order—we were likely to have a potato famine before a new crop of potatoes could be harvested. The famine is now a reality.

This is another lesson on the importance, and the function, of freely fluctuating prices. Prices have a job to do! When we forget that fact, and either by price controls or price supports prevent prices from doing their job, we invariably get into trouble. This now has happened again—with potatoes.

In the fall of 1951, we had an unfortunately small potato harvest—more than 100 million bushels less than the year before. The reasons for the small crop were, first, that farmers had planted a smaller acreage, and second, that weather conditions resulted in a lower yield per acre than in the previous year. Apparently, no one realized quite how small the crop was until the harvest season was well along.

Then, because the yield was disappointingly small, the price of potatoes began to go up.

Of course, consumers do not like to pay higher prices for their essential purchases. But it was logical and proper for potato prices to rise sharply last fall. At the higher price, everyone who used potatoes would use them more sparingly and carefully. In that manner, the short crop could be stretched across the winter and the spring until new potatoes from the southern states could be harvested.

But when, in December, potato prices reached the minimum level at which price control would be legal, Mr. DiSalle had a ceiling price order prepared which was issued on January 4th. What that price control order did over the last three months was to hold down the price of potatoes to a lower level than otherwise would have prevailed. And at this lower price, we have eaten up our potato supply faster than we should have. We are still several weeks away from any considerable volume of southern new-crop potatoes, and we are almost out of potatoes to eat.

Table-stock potatoes are almost nonexistent. All that are now available are being sold as seed-stock. Seed potatoes in states like New York and Maine are selling at farms at a cent to a cent and a half a pound above the ceiling price for table-stock—but much of what is called “seed” is actually going into consumption instead of being planted.

Let me hasten to add that farmers selling “seed” potatoes at these prices are not selling in the black market, because the ceiling price does not apply to seed potatoes. If they are being sold to consumers, it is because some people are willing to pay seed-potato prices to get some to eat.

No doubt, OPS will argue that if it had not been for their ceiling, the price of potatoes would have gone "too high." This simply cannot be so, because at a higher price consumers would have used a smaller quantity—and then if the total supply did not move fast enough, the price would have had to drop to clean up the old crops before new potatoes captured the market. It is always true that high prices slow up consumption—and low prices increase consumption. This is one of the most important functions of prices. When supplies of any commodity are large, prices go down, consumption is increased, and the market is cleaned up. Likewise, when supplies are small, prices go up, everyone uses the product more carefully, and the supply on hand is stretched to the time until more can be produced.

In the present potato situation, the price has been held too low during the last three months—and now we are out of potatoes. The price ceiling that was to hold down our cost of living turns out to have been a fraud—a fraud because we cannot buy potatoes. And a low price is a meaningless quotation when you cannot buy anything at that price.

From the point of view of our food supply, this potato famine is not serious, because we can eat rice and macaroni and noodles and other good substitute foods. But this is one more lesson that we cannot artificially meddle with prices without having to pay the consequences. It is one more illustration that price controls are a fraud, because they neither hold down our cost of living nor assure us of adequate supplies of the things we want to buy.

BARGAINING

by Paul L. Poirot



ONE of the first requirements of society is a method for determining "what is mine and what is thine." Such a determination is necessary because there never has been available to the members of any society an unlimited supply of things which individuals want.

Production—which includes either the creation or the conservation of scarce but useful goods or services—depends upon an expenditure of human effort in one form or another, whether it be strictly manual labor or the mental effort of planning or any possible combination of the two. Most human relationships involve some kind of an exchange of property or services with intent to increase production or to arrange a more satisfactory distribution of whatever it is that human beings think they want. The way to save human energy is to store it up in the form of property. Property is primarily a time link or medium of exchange between past, present, and future efforts of human beings; it is the product of past efforts and the raw material of further efforts. Therefore, it might be said that the basic problem of social relationships has to do primarily, if not entirely, with the exchange of services. The problem is to find an exchange price or wage rate which is

satisfactory to those who are involved in the transaction. This is the province of bargaining in a free society—the market method of price and wage determination. Though the term “bargaining” is most frequently used with respect to wage negotiations, the concept is one which applies at every stage of the relationships among free people.

This inquiry into the subject of bargaining is based upon the belief that individual responsibility for choice is preferable to compulsion as a social regulator of human action.¹ Trying to fix the value of goods or of services through coercion of one person by another is an antisocial practice with all the earmarks of a master-slave arrangement.

If ours is not intended to be a slave society, then there should be no law compelling any person to offer his services to others. In a free society the individual may work for himself if he chooses. In that case, he sets his own wages, measurable in terms of his own personal satisfaction with the product he has created. But if the individual believes that he might fare better by cooperating with others, then he may try to find a market outlet for some of his product or services; he may offer them for sale. This does not mean that he has a right to force anyone else to buy his product or to hire his services. A free man's responsibility to society is that he live and use his property in a manner not injurious to others. A free market exists only in the absence of coercive practices, either by individuals, or by minority groups, or by the government. A free market depends upon mutual respect among the participants for the right of each individual to the control of his own services and

¹ For this and all other references, see page 164.

his own private property. If there is such a thing as a right to bargain, it derives from this respect for a man's bargaining ability—namely, his life and his property.

The Reason For Trade

Individuals try to look after themselves and their families and their friends. They seek food, shelter, companionship, and all sorts of things. That is why a person works—to satisfy those wants. And the reason why people voluntarily exchange goods and services with one another is that such trading helps to satisfy personal wants. In other words, the trading of goods and services with one another is really a part of the creative or productive process among free men.

Individuals have differing aptitudes and skills. Some of these differences seem to be inherited. And we know that individuals develop their aptitudes at differing rates through training and practice. A person generally likes to specialize at the work he does best and doesn't want to be told to do something else. But in order to live in his own way, he needs some cooperation from other people. And he bargains for that cooperation. He offers to trade some of his specialized services or some of what he produces, in exchange for what he wants from them. By this process, he soon learns the advantages of producing something which has value to other persons.

The bargaining capacity of individuals or of any organized group of workmen—as distinguished from the anti-social power of seizure—thus grows out of their production of goods or services which are valuable to others. That

principle is basic to the personal practice of freedom. It describes a free market economy, and there is no other proven method of tolerating personal interests or allowing the expression of individuality by all persons within society. Whether or not the members of a society will conduct their affairs in a free market depends upon how well individuals understand this basic principle of bargaining: Earn what you want by giving the other fellow what he wants from you.

The Nature Of Bargaining

Bargaining means trying to negotiate a contract or to arrange a trade on terms satisfactory to both the buyer and the seller. That's why it takes two to make a bargain, and only two—a buyer and a seller, higgling over terms. If it's true bargaining, there is no interference by anyone else and no threat or suggestion of coercion or violence in any form.

Anyone who has been caught in a Christmas shopping rush or who has witnessed the operations in a public market on a busy day may question the idea that only two persons can take part in the bargaining procedure. At the time, it always seems as though several persons are involved. But this is merely an example of competition at work. The competing sellers offer their different lots of goods and services and the competing buyers bid for ownership of these various things. The presence of more than one potential buyer or seller widens the range for bargaining. But the actual bargaining is carried on between one buyer and one seller at a time, each of whom is free to

accept or to reject the other fellow's best offer. The whole concept of bargaining presumes that there will be alternatives from which to choose—alternatives offered by competition as well as the alternative of rejecting all offers.

The satisfaction from bargaining, whether it leads to a trade or not, lies in the feeling of each party that he has obtained the best deal possible without resort to force or fraud. Competition helps each person decide what is best. Since competition and bargaining are so closely related, the two ideas may well be merged within the term "competitive bargaining" — competition between persons who recognize the rights of individuals to use what they have as a means of bargaining for what they want. Mankind has never discovered a basis for human relationships, other than competitive bargaining, which so encourages a person's own self-interest to operate to the benefit of others.

When a person voluntarily offers his goods or services for exchange, and when another person voluntarily agrees to the terms of the offer, exchange will take place. Both parties find satisfaction. It's not a question of one's gaining at the other's expense. The exchange works to their mutual benefit. Both gain. How much will each gain? Leave that to the judgment of those who practice competitive bargaining and who are directly involved in any specific transaction.

Trade occurs when both parties agree as to the price—when both see an advantage in trading. The terms of such trade are not anyone else's business—at least, not within the framework of truly competitive bargaining. There is no third party; even the government is supposed to keep

its hands off except where someone tries to substitute violence for free choice in the market. Any other test of fairness for prices or wages is an abandonment of the private enterprise system.²

The Right Of Refusal

One of the important features of truly competitive bargaining is that a person has the right of refusal. He doesn't have to trade at another person's price. A man may keep what he has if he isn't satisfied with the other fellow's best offer. Such a refusal to trade is quite a common thing in any market place. It is typical of the competitive system. It is a vital part of the bargaining procedure. It is as fair and just as the day is long. But a refusal to buy or to accept the terms offered certainly is no excuse for violent retaliation against the rightful owner or against any other person who might be willing to accept the owner's terms of trade.

A person may choose to quit a job if the wage or other conditions of employment are not satisfactory, just as a shopper returns a can of peaches to the shelf if the price is too high for her. Yet the housewife, by that act, does not pretend to have acquired a claim of ownership to the peaches. The next shopper who wants them may claim them at the price agreeable to the seller. An unhampered market will function in exactly that same fashion with respect to opportunities for employment.

Competitive bargaining has brought many benefits to the creative and highly productive men and women of America, just as all men and women can gain if they are

willing to assume the responsibility of being free. But freedom to bargain is being forfeited by Americans who do not perceive that such freedom is based upon respect for the rights of others.

The advantages of bargaining and trade are not to be found in the kind of collective action which calls for the suppression of individual freedom of choice. The only alternative to bargaining is compulsion. To exercise compulsion is to govern. In the final analysis, the alternative to competitive bargaining is government control—the government in command of all property and all lives—individuality surrendered to the state—compulsory collectivism.

The Right To Life

A man must have control of his own life before he can bargain. Patrick Henry said his life wasn't worth living without liberty. And other men of that day wanted to be free. Each, of course, wanted the freedom to produce for his own use. But they also recognized that bargaining with one another might help each of them fulfill a wider range of needs or desires.

These men wanted a chance to try to get along with others in society by the peaceful means of bargaining. They thought that men could freely trade goods and services to their mutual satisfaction and progress; that it was not necessary to rely on force—either governmental or private—as the guide for human conduct; that there was something basically wrong with the old concept that might

makes right. So they argued that each man should have control of his own life.

A person who has control of his own life may work for himself if he chooses. This is simply another way of saying that a free man has the right to reject the other fellow's best wage offer. Not only must the person be free to work for himself, but he must also be free to keep the products of his labor and his bargaining—free to own and control what is properly his own private property.

The Right To Property

Private property may be the product of a job done to one's own satisfaction, or it may be something acquired through voluntary exchange, or it may be something received as a gift. In any case, the tangible evidence of past production or service—the product of yesterday's service now held as property—is as much a part of a man's life as the services he renders today or might render tomorrow. So it is that your own freedom calls upon you to respect the right of every man to own property, for use as he chooses, just as you would respect his right to the life he fashions for himself with his own hands and through his own intellect. Life and the means of livelihood are too closely related for logical separation.³

A person must have this exclusive right or claim to a thing, whether it be tomorrow's effort or property saved from yesterday's effort, before he can use it for purposes of bargaining. Respect for individual rights to life and property is the basis of private enterprise or capitalism, a

respect which does not exist under the various systems of compulsory collectivism. An individual can't bargain in a collectivized country because he is not permitted to claim anything as his own; property is "owned in common," which simply means that no man can say with conviction that any part of his livelihood—or even his life—is his own. There is little opportunity for competition or for bargaining with respect to anything which has been brought into "public ownership" through the compulsory processes of government.⁴

The first requirement for bargaining, then, is the possession of something which has value and which may be offered in exchange. How valuable is it? Well, that's the whole purpose of bargaining—to find the answer to that question, peacefully and without using coercion against anyone. There isn't any other peaceful method of determining the value of anything. Just bargaining! Voluntary trade in an unrigged competitive market! Any other system presumes that might makes right.

Employer And Employee

It is easy to lose oneself in the crowd at a popular market place. And the size of the crowd sometimes blocks out the view of the actual market procedure—the bargaining between one buyer and one seller. The employer-employee relationship, for instance, becomes exceedingly complicated if one looks upon it as a battle between opposing groups, or—as Marx put it—a class struggle.

The true nature of the employer-employee relationship

may be understood by those who see that individuals are involved—two individuals—each of whom owns and controls something of value. These two individuals are not warring competitors; their object is cooperation in an honest effort to arrange a trade to their mutual advantage.

The employee is an individual who has a right to offer his services for exchange—a right which is or ought to be recognized by the employer. Labor, thus voluntarily offered by any person, is a form of property—his property—and he may offer it as a marketable commodity. If a man voluntarily offers his services for sale, that doesn't make him a slave. It is simply an expression of his right to his own life.

The employer also is a worker who has a right to offer his services for exchange. In some instances, it may happen that the employer is also the owner of capital goods—land, plant facilities, raw materials, and tools. A man has a right to own private property—as much of a right as any man can claim to the product of his services. But whether or not the employer also is the owner of productive tools and facilities, he doesn't create job opportunities for others except as he offers his own managerial services in the competitive effort to please customers. The manager offers his services, just as any other employee offers services, and the object of their bargaining is to determine a satisfactory exchange rate for what each has voluntarily offered. Their object is to combine their efforts to their mutual advantage.

The theory of the free market is that anyone who pleases may compete with other buyers and sellers. There are not to be any arbitrary barriers to competition and

trade. It is recognized that many employees may be competing against one another for job opportunities. And the job-creating owners and managers of productive tools and facilities are competing against one another for the services of employees. The function of the market is to find a level of wages which will allow these competing forces to work toward a balance—a wage rate for every job which will satisfy both the employee and his employer without compulsion against any person.

That's really all there is to bargaining, just trying to find that point on the wage scale which satisfies both the employer and the employee, and which will continue to satisfy both of them throughout the life of their voluntarily arranged contract. An employer hurts his own interests just as much by paying less than the free market wage scale as he does by paying more. His objective should be to find the scale of wages which just "meets the market." And that is, or ought to be, the employee's objective, too. The employee who holds out for a higher than market wage deprives himself of a chance for employment; and if he agrees to work for less than the market wage, he may thereby lose a part of his bargaining power as a consumer.

The Value Of A Service

Much of the dissension about wages arises from a failure to distinguish between the worth of an individual as such, and the value, for purposes of exchange, of the services offered by the individual. Among free men, the worth of an individual is not a matter to be determined in an eco-

conomic sense. Certainly that problem is beyond the scope of this study, for we are not discussing the buying or selling of human beings. The purpose of bargaining, in this respect, is to arrive at the market value or exchange price of specific services voluntarily offered by individuals. A man offers to sell eight hours of his day in order that he may better utilize the balance of his day according to his own choice.

According to the expressions of preference in a free market, a higher exchange price may be offered for the services of one person than for another's services. There is great variation in the productive capacity of different individuals. This is as true among so-called hourly workers as it is among managerial workers. The efficiency of the capitalistic system stems from its tendency to concentrate the management of productive operations under the direction of the most capable managers. So it happens that a good manager may serve to coordinate the productive services of a large number of employees.

The control of capital also tends to be concentrated in the hands of the best managers. The owners of property—and to a large extent, they are simply those workers who have spent less than they earned—sometimes find it desirable to pool their property so as to attract the managerial services of an expert. Stockholders thus hire corporation management—agree to pay a manager for his services to them.

In order to best serve the interests of stockholders, the manager must be capable of coordinating the services of many individual employees in a way that is sufficiently

satisfactory to each employee to attract that employee from alternative opportunities for the use of his services. So it is that a good manager serves a group of property owners as well as a group of employees, all in the interest of better service to customers. He serves to the extent that he is able to improve the productivity of all the property and all the labor which has voluntarily sought his management.

Labor And Capital

In many instances, employees voluntarily purchase shares of stock in the corporation which employs them. This is sort of a double vote of confidence in the hired management. The hired manager is obliged to try to satisfy consumers and at the same time to look after the interests of stockholders as well as the interests of employees. If he begins to respond overgenerously to employee demands, to the detriment of stockholder interests, the stockholders may fire the manager or, at least, refuse to place any additional capital under his direction. On the other hand, if the manager thinks he can favor his stockholders by paying less than going market wages, he will also be mistaken because his best employees will begin moving to the better job opportunities offered by other employers. Thus, the market will not tolerate arbitrariness on the part of management.

A business manager, interested in preserving his own job, is obliged to meet competitive bids for the use of capital and for the services of employees. He faces constant

competition from other managers. It is this competitive bargaining which determines a manager's salary, an employee's wages, a stockholder's return on his investment. This is the market method of determining the rates at which free men will voluntarily exchange goods and services with one another.

Many persons seem to agree that the market method of price and wage determination is fine in theory. But they then reject the theory as being impractical, because they say we do not have conditions of "perfect" competition. It seems to be their belief that competition isn't effective unless every person in the world is actively competing with every other person relative to the possession of every piece of property or to the performance of every creative task in the world. But to suggest that all of us ought to be competing as opera singers, regardless of our abilities or desires, is to take the whole concept of competition out of its frame of reference to a free market. Competition is as "perfect" as it needs to be whenever those who want to compete are free to try it.

Stockholders Are Organized

There is no room for a bully in a free market. The market can be destroyed by a person who will not respect life and property. But the test of a bully is not necessarily a matter of his size. The fact that a number of competitors have pooled their resources under a single management does not necessarily make a bully out of the manager. He can still bargain in the market place if he is willing to abide

by the rules for bargaining, that is, refrain from the use of coercion. However, the pooling of resources by competitors has a tendency to worry other participants in the market. For instance, many employees sincerely believe that when stockholders pool their savings to form a huge corporation, then the employees must organize to defend themselves—that a lone workman could not possibly bargain with a giant corporation such as General Motors or the A. & P.

By this reasoning, the housewives of America ought to be organized to defend themselves when they go shopping in supermarkets. What chance has a lone, frail woman to bargain with the power behind a chain of supermarkets for her family's supper? But such stores *are* patronized by women who lack organizational backing, yet show no visible signs of fear. If one storekeeper won't bargain to a housewife's satisfaction, she shops elsewhere — an elsewhere provided in competition for her patronage. She might buy some other product. Or, perhaps, she will buy nothing. And neither the stockholders nor the management of any grocery chain have the power to compel her to accept their groceries on their terms. Successful businessmen understand that "the customer is always right." That happens to be the formula for survival in a competitive market.

Nor do the stockholders of a chain store have any coercive power over the hired manager of one of their local stores, beyond such terms as the manager might voluntarily accept as a condition of his employment there.

So far as the individual employee is concerned, he bargains for his job with only one person—a person who is in a

supervisory capacity within the hired management of the company. That supervisor either needs help in his store or he doesn't.

Job Opportunities

Let us assume that a store manager believes he could improve the net earnings of his store by adding a meat department. The customers want meat. The manager, then, needs the services of a meat cutter. And no matter how many stockholders may stand behind him, the store manager must either find a slave or else compete with all other employers for the services of a free man. Let's assume again that it takes a wage offer of \$100 a week to attract a good meat cutter away from alternative job opportunities. If the manager believes that this employee can bring enough added business to the store to cover costs, including the \$100 weekly wage, and still leave a profit for the store, then it is to the manager's own interest to hire the man. If the manager doesn't operate his store profitably, someone else will soon be serving the customers. It doesn't make the slightest difference, so far as the dealings with the meat cutter are concerned, whether the store is entirely owned by the manager or whether the manager is in turn the employee of hundreds of stockholders.

Some persons, as we have observed before, want to abandon the competitive system of bargaining because they say there is not "perfect" competition. They fear for the meat cutter, and for other workmen, because they say there is not a "perfect" mobility of labor. And it certainly

is true that some persons do not move as quickly as do others in response to an opportunity for higher wages. Home and family and church and community and all sorts of ties influence any decision to move. There may be a loyalty to one's present job which isn't measurable in dollars and cents. And there may be other barriers to mobility, such as seniority privileges and tied-up pension rights, which in many instances have grown out of a perversion of the free market. Both management and labor have been guilty of thus abandoning the market method of wage determination, and now the critics want to discard the competitive system completely because of those perversions. They forget that the market system, even in the absence of perfect mobility, has afforded individuals in America a greater freedom to move than others have ever known under any other system. Some of those other systems allow the "workers" no choice at all.

In the business world, if there is a job vacancy to be filled, it must be filled by an individual workman, a laborer for whose services other employers are free to compete. And if a corporation already employs 10,000 persons, and needs one more workman to fill a specific job, that corporation has no more power of coercion over an applicant than has a small business in the process of trying to hire its first employee.

The Risks Of Ownership

Approximately 480,000 stockholders have voluntarily pooled their savings to provide the tools and facilities

which are operated under the management of America's largest manufacturing corporation. Each stockholder is free to sell his interest in that corporation to anyone else who is willing to buy it. At what price? At a price agreeable to both. The corporation management cannot force any stockholder to sell his interest. Nor have individual stockholders or any combination of stockholders a right to force anyone else to buy their shares at a fixed price. Such transactions are negotiated by competitive bargaining rather than by force. The idea that there is a coercive feature to the "combined power" of corporate stockholders is an overworked myth. They can't even "draft" a manager. They can bargain for the services of a man who will manage their capital for them.

The management hired by the stockholders of America's largest manufacturing corporation offers employment to about 470,000 individuals—nearly as many employees as there are owners of the business.

Now, quite probably every stockholder as well as every employee understands that no one of them has a claim to the entire output of the business. They expect to share the product in some fashion. One of the problems is that no one knows the exact exchange value of this product until that figure has been determined by competitive bargaining in the market place. Meanwhile, someone must assume the risks of ownership of the product.

This corporation has no powers of monopoly pricing—it has competitors, actual and potential. So, the consuming public can't be forced to underwrite the risks of loss. The employee who accepts employment in return for a specific

wage takes few risks relative to marketing the product. Each payday the employee gets a certain return for his efforts, which he can readily use as a yardstick against all alternative opportunities for employment.

The hired manager, of course, risks his reputation upon his capacity to manage a business successfully. But the real risks of financial loss have to be borne by the owners of the business. As an incentive to bear such risks, stockholders expect to share any profits the company might earn.

The risks of ownership, whether it be ownership of goods or of one's own services, are borne by the owner; that is the concept of those who believe in private ownership of property. If that concept is correct, it should apply regardless of the total amount of property owned by one individual, or the amount voluntarily pooled by several owners under one management. It also should apply regardless of the number of employees who might have bargained for the opportunity to use the property in order to improve their own productivity.

If 480,000 individuals have pooled their savings to provide the tools for use by any one of the employees of a corporation, that fact does not give those stockholders, either individually or collectively, any coercive advantage over anyone else who wants to bargain for the services of that employee. It would be quite another story if the stockholders should attempt to compel all employable persons—or even one person—to work for their corporation. If that should ever happen, one might reasonably expect the employees to organize a counter force.

The Worker's Reserve

It is frequently argued that an employee is at a bargaining disadvantage when he seeks a favorable employment contract because he has less of a reserve to draw upon than does an employer. It is said that the employee needs bread for his family's supper, whereas the employer needs nothing more urgent than a new yacht. The effect of such dramatization is to draw attention from the subject of the employer-employee relationship. The employee wants the use of tools and managerial services, and the employer wants the workman's services so that together they may create something useful in exchange for bread, yachts, or whatever else either of them may choose to buy with his part of the product.

It is true that some employees have little except their weekly wages as a buffer against bill collectors. And if the loss of a week's wages is that serious to a man, it may be a sign that he isn't a good enough manager or, for some other reason, prefers not to try to make a living by working at a business of his own. Thus, he is in this sense dependent upon job opportunities created by others. But in a competitive society, a person is not bound to continue working for others, nor is he bound to depend upon any one employer for an opportunity to work. Some employees, of course, prefer not to change jobs; free men have that choice. Unless competition has been strangled by coercive intervention, employers will be competing against one another for the productive services of employees. This competition between employers for an employee's productive

capacity is the thing that constitutes the employee's reserve, just as the reserve value of capital depends upon the competition for the use of that capital.

In this connection, it may be interesting to speculate for a moment as to just how an employee's reserve compares in dollar value with a reserve fund of capital. For instance, let us assume that the meat cutter of the previous illustration is a young man who might reasonably expect to find regular employment for a period of forty years at an average weekly wage of \$100. For a nonworking person to draw a comparable income from a trust fund—assuming that it earns interest at the rate of three per cent and that the principal also is to be used up over the period of forty years—an original capital investment of \$120,000 would be required. A person's capacity for productive work is truly a valuable reserve, equal in worth to the inheritance from quite a "rich uncle." A young man has quite a stake in maintaining the kind of a competitive society in which such reserves are recognized as being private property.

Unemployment Compensation

The fact is that a man who is willing and able to work does have a kind of reserve—in a sense, a better reserve than is available to the man who has nothing except money or capital. Robinson Crusoe could have salvaged the ship's silver, but as a nonworking capitalist, he would have starved. According to the story, he saved his life by digging into his reserve capacity to work.

This same principle applies in our own kind of a com-

plex society where each of us depends more or less upon exchange for his livelihood. If a man owns a million dollars, yet refuses to offer it in trade, he may go hungry, just as an employee may be faced with hunger if he refuses to turn his services to productive use. The market does not automatically guarantee subsistence to those who stop producing and trading while waiting for a better opportunity to present itself. An employee who chooses not to work may properly complain that he has no other means of support, but he ought to confine his complaint to the person who is solely responsible for his sad plight—himself. No one else has any right to make him work, nor any moral obligation to support him in his voluntary idleness.

The employee who wants to sit until an employer comes forth with a more attractive job offer may say that he doesn't have the reserve to enforce his demand, but what he means is that he doesn't have control over other employees who are willing to accept the jobs which are offered. To describe such circumstances as a lack of reserve is just another way of saying that competition exists.

Inequalities Of Fortune

The relationship between property rights and equality of bargaining power is primarily an economic rather than a political or judicial issue. But there is evidence that at least some judges have understood the relationship. When the Supreme Court of the United States reversed a prior decision by the Kansas Supreme Court, Justice Pitney explained:

“As to the interest of the employed, it is said by the Kansas Supreme Court to be a matter of common knowledge that ‘employees as a rule are not financially able to be as independent in making contracts for the sale of their labor as are employers in making contracts of purchase thereof.’

“No doubt, wherever the right of private property exists, there must and will be inequalities of fortune; and thus it naturally happens that parties negotiating about a contract are not equally unhampered by circumstances. This applies to all contracts, and not merely to that between employer and employee. Indeed, a little reflection will show that wherever the right of private property and the right of free contract co-exists, each party when contracting is inevitably more or less influenced by the question of whether he has much property, or little, or none; for the contract is made to the very end that each may gain something that he needs or desires more urgently than that which he proposes to give in exchange. And since it is self-evident that, unless all things are held in common, some persons must have more property than others, it is from the nature of things impossible to uphold freedom of contract and the right of private property without at the same time recognizing as legitimate those inequalities of fortune that are the necessary result of these rights. But the Fourteenth Amendment, in declaring that a State shall not ‘deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law’ gives to each of these an equal sanction; it recognizes ‘liberty’ and ‘property’ as co-existent human rights and debars the States from any unwarranted interference with either. The liberty of making contracts does not include a liberty to procure employment from an unwilling employer, or without a fair understanding. Nor may an employer be foreclosed by legislation from exercising the same freedom of choice that is the right of the employee.”

Coppage vs. Kansas, 236 U.S. 1 (1915)

Real Wages

The free market allows a person the opportunity to be both an employee and a stockholder under a single corporate management. The market offers the opportunity, though it does not guarantee any individual an unlimited supply of personal ability or capital with which to take advantage of all opportunities. The fact that an employee has the opportunity to invest capital in the corporation is a protection to him. If he feels that the stockholders are getting more than a fair share of the corporate product, he may protect his interests by purchasing some of the stock. Most of the industrial corporations pay out in wages and salaries each year more than enough money to buy a controlling interest in their voting stock—if the employees wanted to use their earnings for that purpose.

Aside from the possibility of dividends, there are at least two other reasons why employees might want to invest more or less of their savings in the common stock of the corporations which employ them: (1) This is a proper method of gaining control over management; and (2) Such investments may help to increase the supply of raw materials, tools, and plant facilities which are necessary if there are to be more and better job opportunities. It would not serve the interests of employees if all corporate earnings were dispersed as wages, to the neglect of those who provide the capital. For that would inevitably deplete the supply of tools, the consequence being diminished employment opportunities and lagging production.

This is not the place for a full discourse on inflation; but,

at least, mention may be made of the difference between money wages and real wages. High money wages depend upon an abundance of money which an unrestrained government can print into circulation. High real wages depend upon an abundance of consumable goods and services. Such abundance is the product of individuals working with adequate tools and facilities under the incentives of private ownership and personal freedom. How much a day's wages will buy depends upon how productive and creative have been the efforts of individuals.⁵

The Consumer's Role

In the foregoing analysis of the market relationship between an employer and an employee, little was said of the important role which each plays as a consumer. When owners and users of specific tools cooperate in a productive venture, their success depends upon how highly the product of their joint efforts is valued by consumers. The direct concern of the consumer pertains to the price and the quality of the product rather than to the welfare of any employer or employee who might have helped produce it. As a consumer, each of us tries to buy cheaply. We compete for the "best buy," and thus encourage competition throughout the world of business.

An employee in an automobile plant is obliged to bargain, in competition against other employees, for the tools and raw materials he uses, but the fact that he is willing and able to help produce a finished automobile constitutes his real bargaining ability. And the value or strength of

that bargaining ability depends in the final analysis upon what other employers and employees — consumers — are willing to offer in exchange for automobiles.

The purpose of production is to create something which may be consumed—which may have exchange value because it is wanted for consumption. If men of varying skills and with varying amounts of tools and other capital can improve their productivity by working together, let them bargain, for they have something constructive about which to bargain. But if they can't work together to increase their total productivity, then obviously neither could gain in bargaining power except at the other's expense. And life is too short for that kind of antisocial "bargaining." The opportunities for personal gain by giving something valuable in exchange are far more abundant and more rewarding than are the chances of taking advantage of the other fellow and getting away with it. The process of voluntary exchange for mutual gain leads to growth and progress, while the process of compulsion is restrictive and deadly.

Reluctance To Compete

A person in search of employment usually tries to explain what he has to offer, hoping to make it sound attractive to the prospective employer. The bargaining ability of an individual is broadly recognized as depending upon his creative or productive strength—his capacity to be of service to others.

What seems obvious enough with respect to an indi-

vidual's bargaining ability often loses clarity when employees organize for purposes of bargaining. The organizational process seems to relieve the individual of a sense of responsibility for producing something as a condition of his employment. Instead, he claims a right to a job by reason of his union affiliation.

It is worth remembering that fellow employees are primarily competitors. They are competing for the services of a manager and for the use of the tools and other capital which stockholders have voluntarily placed under that manager's supervision. And many of the employees are also competing for better-paying managerial jobs. This is the process of competitive bargaining which affords promotion on the basis of capacity to perform.

Competing is not an unmitigated joy to all persons. There are many who seem to prefer to duck such pressure when possible. They feel that their own lives might be more comfortable if they could only exercise a little control over others—enjoy certain monopoly privileges.

Monopoly Power

Monopoly power is the power to govern—to force compliance. Such is the power of a monarch over subjects who will accept the concept of the "divine right of kings." People submit to such monopoly power because they see no alternatives.

The European cartel system of industrial organization is another kind of attempt at monopoly power. Supposedly competitive business managers agree among themselves

not to compete for consumers. Usually, they try to persuade the government not to license any new businesses which might become competitive. As a rule, the cartel does not have the power to force consumers to buy the products of the industry, so its monopoly power fails if consumers decide to get along without that particular industry. If the private owners of coal mines form a cartel, they may say to consumers: "If you want coal, you must buy from us at our price." This is a less vicious kind of monopoly power, of course, than that of a king or of a nationalized coal industry under which the taxable consumer is obliged to pay for coal whether or not he wants to use it.

Industrial monopoly is not generally a popular thing, as far as the citizens of America are concerned. American consumers do not like to be bullied in the market place. They want business managers to compete against one another, thus affording every consumer various alternatives from which to choose. If one seller begins acting like a king or a bully, Americans want the freedom to transfer their patronage to a more reasonable competitor. Thus through the facilities of a free market, consumers can put a bully in his place by the simple process of refusing to associate with him. Competition invites a bully to mend his ways, as a matter of self-interest.

Although the market is fully capable of handling bullies in this manner, there are always opportunists at hand who claim that the market process of control is inadequate, and that they have a better protective plan. They will point to a successful businessman and say: "See how big he has grown in the market place; therefore, he must be a mo-

nopolist. Join with me and organize a countermonopoly." It is dangerous to entrust one's own freedom to such opportunists, for they are potential bullies themselves.

There are strong reasons for believing that monopoly power is the major objective behind at least a part of the organizational efforts of employees in America. Any person who would defend the "right to organize" for such purposes of compulsion cannot place a very high value on his own life, liberty, or property. Monopoly is a power concept which denies the rights of individuals and which destroys the opportunity for peaceful bargaining in the market place.

One reason for believing that monopoly power may be the objective of some union activities is to be found in the measures advocated by many of the union spokesmen. If increasing their own productivity is the central aim of labor union members, that aim is highly camouflaged, if not entirely wiped out, by featherbedding, bogus type-setting, stand-by orchestrations, slow-down and make-work innovations, various rewards for *not* working, fringe items not even supposed to be of a productive nature and in no wise designed to give added values to consumers. According to any reasonable concept of competitive bargaining, the foregoing practices can only be described as monopolistic interference with consumer choice.

Union Security

A second reason for believing that monopoly power may be the objective of some union activities is apparent in the

nature of the drive for union security. Why does a labor union, or any other organization for that matter, need security? Security from what, or against what? And who is to provide the security?

Before examining those questions, it might be well to recognize the distinction between "union security" and "job security." The former has to do with protection of the union organization through means such as the closed shop or the union shop. The term "job security" is more commonly used in the sense of "personal security," the implication being that a job ought to secure an individual against the hazards of life, and that every human being has a right to such security as though he has a property right to a given job. This is the theory behind the provision for "seniority rights" which is to be found in many union contracts. Some persons go so far as to say that an employer who offers any opportunity for employment is under obligation to see that the wage he pays is sufficient to insure the employee and his family against every hazard of life. This seems to say that the so-called employer class is under obligation to supply a job to any union member who wants to be employed, and at whatever wage the job-seeker might ask.

In a competitive market each employee and each employer—as a consumer—takes the responsibility for satisfying his own needs from the returns the market affords for the job he performs. The market which reflects the judgment and tolerance of consumers, does not deny an employer the right to help an employee beyond the terms of their contractual agreement. But the market does not con-

fer upon the employer either a responsibility to totally satisfy, or a right to determine, the "needs" of the employee. Such a transfer of rights and responsibilities from an employee would amount to his virtual enslavement—"job security" stripped of all its false wrappings.

"Union security" deals with something other than the personal security of union members. If there is any implication of personal security in the term, it has to do with the security of the union officers in their positions of power. When they ask for a union shop or a closed shop, with a check-off system for collecting dues, like taxes, they are asking for the preservation of their union organization and their own positions of control. What they really seem to want is security from a fear that their union couldn't last as a strictly voluntary organization. There would seem to be a lack of good faith between union leadership and union membership—a fear that a majority of members might quit the union if given a chance. When a man asks for the power to collect dues from everyone, just as the government collects taxes, when he complains bitterly about "free riders," he is saying in effect that he wants to govern individuals with a monopoly power equivalent to that of government.

Compulsory Unionism

A third reason for believing that monopoly power may be the objective of some union activities appears in the drive for a union shop or a closed shop. Competitive bargaining encourages men to act voluntarily in cooperation with one

another, but not for the purpose of coercing someone else to act against his will. Though employees are essentially competitors, this is not to deny that they also have common interests which might serve as an object of cooperation. It may well be that a majority of the employees in an area want to build a church. Surely this is a worthy object of cooperation. Employees might also be interested in improving the safety and comfort of their working conditions—a project calling for cooperation among themselves as well as with management. There probably are many other objectives which could be cited as meriting the voluntary cooperation of competing employees.

However, the fact that a number of employees may work at the same place of business or within the same industry does not mean that all of their interests are identical. In other words, some members of a union may seek action which other employees deem detrimental to their interests. One alternative, under such a situation, is to compel the dissenters to follow the leader; demand what amounts to a closed shop, the union holding the power to fix wages and working conditions, not only for members, but even for those employees who might prefer to bargain individually. There appears to be no other reason for compulsory unionism. The object seems to be a monopoly power to push through an action which lacks unanimous approval.

No doubt many union members are led to believe that the purpose of the closed union shop is to bring pressure to bear upon the employer. But the means to this end is to bring pressure to bear upon the “scab”—that competing employee who would go ahead and cooperate with the

employer if he dared exercise his own judgment in the matter. To thus force a man to join a labor union, or at least bow to its authority, as a condition of eligibility for employment in any type of work, or in any plant, or in any industry, or in any geographic area, diminishes that person's right to live his own life. Compulsory unionization destroys the opportunity for the employee to bargain individually concerning conditions of an employment contract. Such compulsory unionization does to the individual workman just what the industrial cartel does to the consumer. One is as bad as the other, for each is a form of monopoly power.⁶

Industry-Wide Bargaining

A fourth reason for believing that monopoly power may be the objective of some union activities is apparent in the trend toward industry-wide "bargaining"—the idea that all the competitors, both the competing employees and the competing employers, in an entire industry ought to "bargain" through a single union.

The modern trend seems to be away from the independent plant-wide or company-wide union which used to be characteristic of the American labor movement. The company-wide union idea has been losing ground, and along with it is disappearing the "old-fashioned" notion that each individual has a right to manage what he owns. The plant-wide or company-wide union concept is economically sound in that it calls for the voluntary cooperation, not of competitive employees, but of two cooperators—

the employer and his employee—who have a common interest in producing something which may be valuable to consumers. If a company employs several persons, it is necessary that their work be supervised and coordinated.

The independent company-wide union coincides in scope with the natural bounds of business organization, and it has potentialities as a valuable part of the voluntarily cooperative procedures of competitive private enterprise.

This is not to say that a company-wide union will function perfectly or that it might never be perverted. Many independent company-wide unions have failed, just as there have been and perhaps always will be failures in any general field of human endeavor. The only point is that unionization along plant or company lines is not automatically precluded, by the nature of its organization, from functioning as a useful instrument of voluntary cooperation.

A company-wide labor organization might attempt certain coercive practices within that particular company, such as requiring every employee to pay membership dues, or forbidding the employer to hire nonmembers. But the worst such a union can do, beyond its intimidation of dissenting employees, is to hurt the business of its own employer. The company-wide union cannot lawfully interfere with any worker who wants to leave and seek employment elsewhere. It cannot regulate the hiring and firing practices and working conditions of another company, except by the noncoercive methods of successful competition—out-producing any rival organization. The seekers of ex-

tensive monopoly power cannot achieve it by means of an independent company-wide union; for that purpose they need industry-wide labor unions with compulsory membership provisions. This affords centralized control over all possible competitors in a given industry.⁷

Joint Monopoly

There is little point in debating the role of company management in the development of industry-wide labor unions. It is undoubtedly true that some of the business managers, who have not realized the ultimate consequences, have actually welcomed the "security" of industry-wide control over wages and hourly output per employee and other variables which might otherwise provoke keen competition. The compulsory industry-wide union can pretty well guarantee a manager that no competitor will be able to achieve superior labor efficiency. It is possible to believe that in some instances company management works closely with labor union management to tighten the grip of their joint industry-wide monopoly. The consequence is that whole industries—all competing employers and all competing employees—can be called out on strike by one man who has a closed-shop grip on all manpower authorized for employment in "his" industry. Consumers can thus be squeezed between the alternatives of paying more or of doing without the products of an entire industry. Competition gives way to compulsion. No employer is allowed to continue productive operations; the union won't let him hire employees. Nor can any employee stay on his job at

the old wage, or bargain individually for a wage that might satisfy him; he, too, is compelled to strike until the demands of a single union official are met. That a union official may sometimes impose his will upon the consuming public without actually calling a strike does not modify the basic fact that such imposition constitutes monopoly power.⁸

The monopoly power which is growing out of industry-wide bargaining is the power to govern America. The union, in effect, licenses each employer to operate and guarantees him against competition—if the employer will submit to the union scale of wages and the other terms of the union contract. The bill for all this control goes to the consumer. The consumer, of course, may refuse to buy the products of a union-controlled industry, though the cost in terms of self-sacrifice may seem exorbitant. But there is a portion of the product of many industries in America which the consumer is obliged to pay for, whether or not he chooses. This is the portion represented by defense contracts and other government purchases. In these cases, the union leader, in effect, exercises the power to tax consumers. He is indeed the government.

In one other manner, also, the power of the government has been granted to the officialdom of organized labor. Taxpayers are obliged to provide unemployment benefits for those who have been forced into idleness by the tactics of exclusion which labor unions practice. This is monopoly power in its most terrible form.

To blame union organizers for usurping power and for exercising the authority which has been granted to them

by law, is to miss the important point. The fact is that the power of compulsion cannot be thus exercised until it has first been delegated by our individual selves to the agency of government.

As the government increases its power over the individual citizens, this means a corresponding decrease in the personal freedom to compete and to bargain. If the government, either directly or through its authorized agencies of compulsion, achieves control of food, banking, transportation, steel, coal—the basic industries—it is then able to force individuals to its own terms. Those who depend upon the government for the necessities of life have lost all means of regulating that government. Such a government is a real monopoly, one to which an individual must pay tribute—or else. If the right to compete is lost, bargaining is out of the question. The noose is drawn upon freedom when “collective bargaining” comes to mean monopoly and tyranny.

A Labor Government

It may seem unnecessarily harsh and unrealistic to compare the practices of “big labor” with the practices of dictatorial government, but no other comparison is possible. There are only two basic methods of organization. One way is illustrated by the voluntary cooperation seen within a local church group, or by the satisfaction of consumers who patronize a successfully competitive businessman. This is the way of personal choice as manifested in a free market. The other way calls for the power of coercion—the

force of government. And in such a struggle for power, whatever group succeeds *is* the government. Those who lend their support to the struggle for compulsory unionism ought to realize that they are asking for a "labor" government in America. Donald Richberg has aptly described the situation:

"The present and future intentions and desires of the unions have been plainly stated. Their authorized spokesmen argued recently in the Supreme Court of the United States that labor monopolies through a union shop were 'indispensable.' They said that 'workers can not thrive but can only die under competition between themselves,' and that therefore union membership must be 'a condition of employment.'

"They said that 'the worker becomes a member of an economic society when he takes employment,' and that '*the union is the organization or government of this society*,' with the '*powers and responsibilities of a government*,' and that union membership must be '*compulsory upon individuals*.'

"Thus it has been made plain beyond all argument that the goal of the union closed shop advocates is a complete monopoly control of all jobs and the compulsory submission of all workers to government by the unions."⁹

In theory, a "labor" government would be supposed to promote the interests of laborers, but no "labor" government has ever worked out that way in practice. Every move to destroy the foundations of the private ownership and accumulation of property, on the humanitarian theory that property ought to be divided more equitably, has worked in practice to destroy the worker's security—his right to the product of his labor and his right to offer his services as he pleases in exchange for what he wants. Such

a compulsory socialization quickly depletes the supposed vast reserves of the owners of capital; and then the government finds that it must either abandon its position or else start digging into the working man's reserve, directing each to the work planned for him. The history of such movements is too consistent to allow reasonable hope for any other result under any "labor" government.

Some persons, at this point, may insist that these evils will exist whether the government favors "labor" or not. And there is a wealth of evidence to support such a view. We know that the citizens of other societies have felt the yoke of oppression, as in ancient Greece and Rome, in the Russia of the czars and then of the Communists, and particularly in those situations where the church has held the monopoly powers of government. It was not a "labor" government from which the early American colonists sought independence.

Perhaps the truth is that governmental planning and compulsion, as a substitute for the market, is in itself the evil which wrecks lives and makes for bad relationships within a society. If so, then it is wrong to give any person, or group, or so-called class, the right to plan and govern the social relationships of individuals. The self-interest of those who work and of those who have saved and accumulated capital is not detrimental to peaceful progress within society; rather, the thing to be feared and guarded against is the reckless abandonment of self-interest to a supposed class interest with the power to govern. And, if such power has developed and is being used to oppress other persons and groups within a society, the solution would seem to

involve the displacement of such coercive power, not with a new "class" of governors, but with a new reliance upon freedom. The lifting of restraints and restrictions upon personal choice—the freeing of the market so that each may bargain with what is properly his own—is the only assurance of justice to every individual.

Government Wage Control

Efforts at government wage control in the United States have proven unsatisfactory; and, of all people, perhaps the wage earner is most conscious of that failure. Such control interferes with production. It robs individuals of the incentive to produce because it forbids employers to pay higher wages for added service. Freezing wage patterns tends to freeze production in all lines of industry, which has the effect of stunting the growth of the economy. Such wage control destroys the market process of wage determination. It makes bargaining illegal. It rules out the only possible method of finding that market wage which best satisfies both the employee and his employer.¹⁰

These are some of the reasons why governmental wage control doesn't work. And in a rising market, at least, employees generally seem to understand the value of the flexibility afforded through bargaining. If this lesson can only be retained, so that employers and employees will also recognize the advantages of wage flexibility in a declining market, then it may be truthfully said that the American people have made progress toward the prevention of mass unemployment. All that is necessary is that the employer

and the employee cooperate to find a wage which is agreeable to both.

Bargaining Representatives

Any employer or any employee who feels that he is personally unqualified to gauge the conditions of the market owes it to himself to seek the services of a qualified bargaining representative. And a qualified bargaining representative will be one who understands that his job is to find the right wage level—the one which just clears the market without bringing compulsion against a single person.

Bargaining has indeed helped to provide many of the material blessings available to American consumers today. And some of this bargaining has been of a “collective” nature in the sense that one party to the bargain has spoken in behalf of a number of cooperative individuals whose common and unanimous interest is in a specific action not designed to hurt someone else. However, much of what has passed for bargaining in America has not been bargaining at all, but a kind of compulsory collectivism which prefers coercion to voluntary agreement.

Bargaining is not facilitated by a powerful membership organization of competitors, whether they be competing for wages or for profits or for anything else which is scarce enough to have market value. It is a highly risky thing to delegate one's own right to bargain to any representative who pretends that such organizational control of competition is either necessary or desirable. A bargainer is one who cooperates with those who are willing; for that pur-

pose, he needs no power of compulsion. He doesn't need coercive control of competitors. Such controls are the tools of persons who will use force if bargaining doesn't go to suit them. Those who are still free to bargain, and who like it that way, will think carefully before placing in the hands of others those personal rights and responsibilities which might be perverted into weapons of coercion.¹¹

The Eternal Struggle

Life always has been a struggle. Always, some of the people have had to work in order that they or anyone else might live. A whole society of nonworkers is inconceivable. The great social problem has been to determine how the products of human effort are to be shared within the society. And closely related to this problem has been the matter of encouraging as much production as possible.

Throughout most of the world's history, the popular answer to these questions has been: "Might makes right." Issues were decided by force, by the power of military might, or by the political force of majority will. Rarely, as in America's past, have individuals been allowed to decide these matters for themselves, in the market place, competing and bargaining for the necessities and luxuries of life. Though material abundance and luxuriant living have been the results of competitive bargaining in America, the people of other nations seem reluctant to practice such freedom. And, indeed, we in America seem to be abandoning our own individual rights to bargain, in a backward flight to the old system of determination by force.

The modern backward trend in this country probably is not deliberate so far as most of us are concerned. We would not consciously abandon the private enterprise system which has afforded so many blessings. But we are slipping backward, and will continue to slip until there is a renewal of understanding of individual rights and responsibilities under a system of competitive bargaining which functions according to the willingness of individuals to respect the lives and the private property of one another. There must be self-respect of such a high quality that a person is willing to compete peacefully with his neighbor, each using his own skill and his own property as the means of producing or trading for the things he wants.

Professional men and businessmen and other working men all must realize the inherent dangers of binding themselves into special unions as a means of acquiring political power over other persons and other groups within the society. For when any one group becomes powerful enough to sway a whole society by force, then that force is the effective government of the society. The goal of government, no matter how nobly constituted, is to govern. A government with the power to govern in small ways seems bound to seek additional powers. Apparently it can't help itself; it is incapable of limiting itself in the struggle for power. The limitation can come only from the outside. The early American concept was that individuals, in their desire for independent lives and in their respect for private property, would keep the government within bounds.

Those who promote and condone the principle that might makes right can have no logical quarrel with the

methods which dictators employ. All such methods lead to the same end, and the fighting is simply to determine who will be the man in charge of that slave society. Such issues will be resolved by fighting unless individuals voluntarily choose to work and live according to the peaceful alternative of competitive bargaining.¹²

FOOTNOTES

(Except as otherwise noted, these are references to Foundation publications which are available upon request.)

¹ To try to set forth here a detailed explanation of the case in favor of freedom might seem to involve too much of a departure from the subject of immediate interest—bargaining. Those who want a more detailed explanation may find it in the book, *Liberty: A Path to Its Recovery* by F. A. Harper.

² The unhappy results of interference with the market method of price and wage determination are documented in *A Just Price and Emergency Price Fixing* by F. A. Harper on page 184, and *The Price of Price Controls* by Irving S. Olds on page 169.

³ For further explanation as to why the right to life and the right to property amount to the same thing, see *Gaining the Free Market* by F. A. Harper on page 93, and *Property Rights and Human Rights* by Paul L. Poirot on page 79.

⁴ The consequences of government ownership and control are further explored in *Ownership in Common* by Dean Russell.

⁵ Details of the process by which money is diluted appear in *Inflation* by F. A. Harper.

⁶ Professor James R. Morris of the University of Illinois in Chicago has offered a comprehensive analysis of *Compulsory Union Membership and Public Policy*, published in the *Southern Economic Journal*, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, July, 1951.

A case study of the compulsory or violent aspects of union control is presented in *The Unstoppable*, the story of the Harvester strike of August 21 to November 15, 1952; International Harvester Company, Chicago, Illinois.

⁷ *Industry-Wide Bargaining* by Professor Leo Wolman discusses the origin, causes, and effects of this trend.

⁸ Other valuable discussions of the monopoly aspects of unionism include:

Iserman, Theodore R. "Unsolved Problems of Labor Law" in the *Temple Law Quarterly*, Vol. XXI: 334-356, April, 1948. Also his testimony before Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, August 2, 1949.

Machlup, Fritz. "Monopolistic Wage Determination As a Part of the General Problem of Monopoly." An address before the Economic Institute on *Wage Determination and the Economics of Liberalism*, Washington, D. C. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1947.

Scoville, John W. *Labor Monopolies—Or Freedom*. New York: Committee for Constitutional Government, 1946.

⁹ Richberg, Donald R. "Free Men vs. the Union Closed Shop" in *The Freeman*, July 16, 1951.

¹⁰ For a clear distinction between the methods of coercion and the method of the market place, see *Two Ways to Stop Strikes* by Leonard E. Read on page 205.

¹¹ The danger of permitting organizations to speak for their members is carefully explained in the pamphlet, *On That Day Began Lies* by Leonard E. Read.

¹² Students who would further pursue the subject of bargaining may wish to refer to the excellent book by Charles E. Lindblom, *Unions and Capitalism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949.

GUN PLAY IN THE MARKET PLACE

by E. W. Dykes



WE have an informal group here which meets frequently to discuss and learn the basic principles of liberty. Each of us wants to steer himself, as best he can, away from the pitfalls and fallacies of socialistic doctrine. It seems as though the violations of liberty are most generally found in the field of economics. Therefore, we spend a considerable amount of time on economic questions. At one of our recent meetings, we decided to *demonstrate* one of our economic lessons.

The stage is occupied by several persons who are identified in a group as *society*. A narrator helps to explain the action. A farmer enters with a bushel of wheat, and a consumer steps forward to bargain for it. After some haggling, they agree upon a price of \$1.00.

The farmer has tried hard to get \$1.50 and isn't too happy as he starts to leave. Suddenly he turns back, whips out a gun, and demands another 50 cents from the consumer. The consumer suggests they call off the deal, but the man with the gun insists on—and gets—another 50 cents.

Society observes this action—duly shocked. Then someone calls to the farmer and invites him to discuss his prob-

lem with society. After considerable discussion and voice voting, society persuades the farmer to return the 50 cents, promising to work out a more satisfactory solution to his problems. The obvious leader in this scene of social action is one of the members who wants to do "good" things to everyone.

The next scene opens with the farmer and consumer bargaining over another bushel of wheat, arriving as before at a price of \$1.00. As the farmer looks questioningly at the do-gooder, the latter nods his head; and a man steps from the group wearing a sign, "Tax Collector." He is carrying the same gun previously used by the farmer. Without explanation, he takes 60 cents from the consumer, pockets a dime, and gives the other 50 cents to the farmer. The farmer is pleased. The photographers ask him to pose, shaking hands with the beaming do-gooder. The rest of society is told to align itself as background for the picture.

Meanwhile, the puzzled consumer has stepped to one side and is being quietly interviewed by the narrator.

NARRATOR: You seem dissatisfied with this transaction; yet you have a bushel of wheat which cost only a dollar—a price you were willing to pay.

CONSUMER: Yes, but there was a 60 per cent tax on the transaction, which means that the wheat cost me \$1.60.

NARRATOR: But, surely, you do not object to a legal tax!

CONSUMER: Legal, perhaps, but it appears to me to be remarkably like the other transaction that was deemed illegal. The tax collector also used a gun to take 60 cents from me—the same gun the farmer used before when he robbed me of 50 cents. Now that robbery has been legal-

ized, it costs me even more money; and society no longer seems concerned in helping to protect my money or property from the robber.

NARRATOR: How can you describe this democratic action of society as legalized robbery? The people voted for it.

CONSUMER (*shaking his head and slowly walking away*):

I only know that in both instances my money—the product of my labor—was taken from me against my will and given to a person who did not earn it.

(*Then he turns to address society*): You have taken some of my property to do “good” to one or more members of your group. But you have deprived me of further incentive to work and to accumulate property through service to others. Mark well these words: *Your loss is far greater than mine.*

THE PRICE OF PRICE CONTROLS

by Irving S. Olds



THE whole recorded history of man is strewn with the wreckage of the great civilizations which have crumbled under price controls; and in forty centuries of human experience, there has never been—so far as I can discover—a single case where such controls have stopped, or even curbed for long, the forces of inflation. On the contrary, in every instance I can find, they have discouraged production, created shortages, and aggravated the very evils they were intended to cure.

Yet the controls under which we are laboring in America today do not differ materially and fundamentally from those which have been tried and have failed in virtually every great nation of the world.

4,000 Years Ago

About 4,000 years ago, the Hammurabi Code imposed a rigid system of controls over wages, prices, production, and consumption. Those controls blanketed the entire economy of Babylonia; in fact, smothered it completely.

In Athens, during the fourth century B.C., the government subjected the grain trade to an ironclad system of price controls, and it sent a small army of grain inspectors into the port to regulate every transaction. If, under the watchful eyes of these government agents, a dealer succeeded in violating the ceiling price and was later caught, both he and the negligent inspector were put to death. But nothing did any good, and ultimately the system collapsed.

1,650 Years Ago

Among the most elaborate and disastrous attempts at price control, of course, was the famous Edict of Diocletian which was promulgated in the Year of Our Lord 301 and which impoverished the whole Roman Empire.

That Edict was full of such trenchant words and phrases as "avarice," "extortion," and "lust of plunder." It spoke of "keeping profits within bounds," and it denounced merchants who, possessing "immense fortunes," sought "private gain" and "ruinous percentages."

A Familiar Ring

Does that language have a familiar ring to the modern ear? Well, so would the regulations themselves.

The Emperor put an absolute maximum price on almost every individual item that was sold in Rome in those days, and he fixed the exact wage of every individual worker in every trade and profession—including even the lawyers. Then, in accordance with the custom of his day, he prescribed the death penalty for all offenders.

The Result

What happened after that is known to you all. Dealers, refusing to sell at a lower price than they had paid, simply hid their commodities under the counter. Producers no longer brought their wares to market. People in the cities suffered dire want, and brawls and riots filled the streets. And so another noble experiment collapsed. Diocletian abandoned his throne and spent the rest of his days in a cabbage patch, there to brood upon the consequence of folly and the waywardness of man.

But experience, it seems, can teach us nothing.

At the end of the twelfth century, England put a ceiling on the prices of bread and fish and wine; and for the next five centuries, that law was revised, amended—and ignored. Finally, Parliament repealed it on the grounds that such action was necessary “in the interest of the public welfare.”

A Fatal Blunder

During the Dutch Revolution when Antwerp was besieged by the Duke of Parma, the authorities of the beleaguered city promptly clamped price controls on almost everything within its walls—which may have been a stroke of genius from a political point of view, but which proved to be a fatal blunder from the standpoint of military logistics. Because prices were so low, the people inside the city consumed its stores both speedily and wastefully, and the people outside the city could not be induced to smuggle

in new supplies for such a small reward. So, Antwerp, by its own stupidity, blockaded itself far more effectively than the Duke of Parma ever could have.

Common Sense

Only in India, in fact, do we find a comforting glimmer of common sense. In 1770 a famine struck the province of Lower Bengal, and the government immediately instituted price controls. So the rice that remained from the previous harvest was quickly eaten, and fully one-third of the population starved to death before another crop could be grown. But sixteen years later, when famine again struck the province, the government reversed its tactics. Instead of turning to controls, it deliberately encouraged speculation by publishing nationally the price of grain in every section of the country. Everyone knew where grain could be bought most cheaply and sold most profitably. Supplies, therefore, flowed promptly and naturally from the areas where food was most plentiful to the drought-stricken regions where it was most scarce—and disaster was averted.

The Dirty Maximum

Now there are some, of course, who might be unkind enough to say that another comforting glimmer of common sense was shown by the people of France during the French Revolution. The fixing of maximum prices had become one of the characteristic features of the Reign of Terror, but in this case it was the instigators of the con-

trols who were ultimately put to death. And when Robespierre and his councilors were being trundled through Paris in the carts of the executioners, the street mobs jeered and shouted: "There goes the dirty maximum!"

Evil Consequences

Here in America, our forefathers were fully alive to the lessons of history and were far more ready than we are to profit by experience. Price controls had been widely attempted on many occasions and in many of the colonies, but never with success; and in 1778 the American Continental Congress adopted a formal resolution which declared:

"... it hath been found by Experience that Limitations upon the Prices of Commodities are not only ineffectual for the Purposes proposed, but likewise productive of very evil Consequences to the great Detriment of the public Service and greivous Oppression of Individuals . . ."

Great Britain

That statement is even truer today than it was when the Continental Congress originally made it. England, for example, has now established what is probably the most successful system of price controls this world has ever seen. And certainly no government in history has ever enjoyed a greater measure of compliance from its citizens. These controls have been in effect continuously for thirteen years, and they are still in effect today. Yet the latest in-

formation I have on the subject discloses that prices in England have gone up exactly as far and exactly as fast as have prices in the United States where we have had a comparatively free market during most of this period.

Road To Disaster

For nine years, beginning with World War II, France also tried to stop inflation by the imposition of price controls. Yet today the franc is worth only one-tenth as much as it was when that war began, and the cost of living in France has risen nearly twenty times as much as it has in the United States.

So the evidence is clear and overwhelming. Throughout forty centuries of human experience, price controls at their best have always been a miserable failure. At their worst, they have led to famine and to bloodshed—to defeat and to disaster.

TWO PATHS TO COLLECTIVISM

by Russell J. Clinchy



Were we directed from Washington when to sow, and when to reap, we should soon want bread. THOMAS JEFFERSON

Two announcements were recently made by governments 3,000 miles apart—the United States and England. A study of these communications reveals the frightening rate of speed at which the revolution toward state socialism is taking place in the two great democracies.

Let us study the American announcement first because our government has stated that its aim is not socialism. The gist of the government's proposal for a long-range agricultural program was a sweeping new system of subsidies that would guarantee a high price to producers and a low price to consumers on the same product at the same time.

This, of course, is one of those promises that bewilder the beholder at first glance, and one asks, "How is it done? How are high prices to be guaranteed to the farmer, and low prices to be guaranteed to the consumer?" The answer is subsidies. A subsidy is money paid by the government, and the only money a government possesses is that raised by taxing the people in one way or another. Apparently the government hoped that the majority of the people would not understand the device that would take their

money by taxation to pay the difference between what the farmer would receive and what the public would pay.

The second of these two announcements was made by the British Chancellor, Sir Stafford Cripps, in his presentation of the new budget. In regard to it, he made two statements:

First, he said that the food subsidy program in Britain had grown beyond anything that had been contemplated. The government buys the basic foods from the farmers and producers, and sells them to the people at a loss. The cost of this loss, the subsidy, for the coming year is estimated at two and one-quarter billion dollars. "That," said Sir Stafford, "just cannot go on."

An Unpleasant Fact

Second, he pointed out that "social services expenditures will inevitably increase over the next ten years, and we must recognize the unpleasant fact that the services must be paid for by taxation, direct or indirect." He went on to say, "When I hear people speak of reducing taxation, when at the same time the cost of the social services is rising in response to the demands of these same people, I sometimes wonder whether they understand the old adage that we cannot eat our cake and have it too."

A Lesson From History

Then Sir Stafford told the British people that because of these facts there would be a rise in prices, and that the

tax rate must remain at the same devastating level, 40 per cent of the pay of an average worker. In commenting upon this, *The Economist* of London stated that no people in history had ever paid out such an amount of their income in taxation and survived.

Two observations can be made about this lesson in economics that was presented to the British people by their Chancellor: First, it is an honest, straightforward statement that subsidies granted from the national treasury must be paid by consumers. Second, it is a forthright affirmation that this program is socialism in action.

The subsidy program of the American government parallels that of the British Labor party in almost every detail, with only this difference: The truth about American subsidies is obscured behind carefully formed phrases which tend to disguise the fact that the subsidy program is, in effect, the creation of national socialism in America as in England.

Truth

It is unfortunate that this issue was not presented to the citizens of America in the same open manner that it was presented to the subjects of Britain. Because of this, it becomes necessary for others to proclaim the truth which is missing from these subsidy pronouncements by the American government: The payment of subsidies is the foundation of the welfare state, and the welfare state is the foundation of socialism.

The American proposal was a request that Congress, in

effect, give to the administration absolute power to control the kind of crops and produce, and the amount of them, that could be raised on American farms. Beyond that, it would have allowed the government to dictate whether the land could be used for farming or grazing, or whether it must remain idle.

Control Of Persons

This was a program for a planned economy to an extent never before seriously proposed in America. But it was not merely a plan for the control of farms; it was, of necessity, a plan for the control of persons, the farmers. Nothing was said about this, but it is actually the first consideration. Before the government can control the land and its produce, it must first control the man who lives and works upon the land. That means control over his mind and spirit. That is exactly what the Soviet leaders found when they decided to collectivize the Russian farms; they had to collectivize first the minds and spirits of those who had been independent kulak farmers.

It is also vital for us to remind ourselves that no such plan for the control of farms can stop there. The products of the farms go on to processing and distributing businesses, and so control must be extended to those areas if the plan for the control of farms is not to break down.

This proposed program contained twin evils—the evil of persons receiving unearned benefits, and the evil of attempting to control the minds and wills of men by controlling their actions and property. Both are evils which

can ultimately destroy the spirit of man and his basic integrity as a human being. The arrest of a cardinal in Hungary, and of ministers in Bulgaria, are not foolish moves of a perverted official. They are the logical outcome of the granting of increased power to the state as the price for government-guaranteed benefits. For if the actions and wills of men are to be controlled, how can such controls possibly be maintained if the minds of men are allowed to be free?

The Rights Of Man

The American government was founded on moral and natural laws by persons who had a deep understanding of the principles and the philosophy of freedom. The concepts of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution were not formed by expediency, but upon the philosophical and religious concepts of the rights of man. Jefferson was a student of the principles of Hobbes, Locke, and Milton; and his writings, such as the Declaration of Independence and the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom, were founded upon these precepts. He accepted the premise of Hooker that "all authority is derived of God and resides in the free consent of the governed," and so the rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are not grants of a sovereign or of a state, but are inalienable because they are received of God. Then, as a matter of course, these rights demand the assumption of personal responsibility upon the part of the receiver. And these personal responsibilities cannot be allocated to the ruler or to the state

without the loss of the moral and spiritual integrity of the person.

The Day Of Decision

The day of decision is upon us. We must now begin to retrace our way to that place where we missed the road to our destiny. We do not belong on this road to serfdom that leads to a land wherein men sell their souls for what they call security, but which turns out to be a nightmare in which man is a lost soul without a home. Instead, we belong to a land of those who have learned that where the spirit of the Lord is, there also is liberty.

Let us determine that we shall not allow the state to be our master, but that we shall be the masters of the state. The long road of history is lined with the ruins of those states which bought the souls and wills of their peoples by the lure of a granted security, and then led them to ruin by that same mirage. The world does not need one more such ruin. It needs, for the first time in all the twenty-four civilizations, a people who will be really secure and enduring, as far as mortal life is possible—secure and enduring because each member of the society is a person who accepts his and her responsibilities as duties, and asks only that the state act to keep the avenues of freedom open. That will come, not by copying the ruins of the past, but by a free people rising to meet the challenge of a free society, putting their trust in freedom because their faith is in God.

WHEN WE SOCIALIZE KILOWATT-HOURS



EDITOR'S NOTE—The following, except the table, is extracted from the proceedings of the New York Public Service Commission granting a rate increase of 18.84 per cent to the government-owned power system of the City of Jamestown, New York (Case 15896, Dec. 9, 1952). There is nothing surprising about this report—many of these same facts apply to the Tennessee Valley Authority and other government-owned power systems. But so far, most of them have managed to use their tax exemptions, Congressional grants of capital from the general tax funds, low interest rates or no interest at all, and various other special privileges and subsidies to spread the delusion that government ownership is cheaper than private ownership.*

“No product or service so intimately affecting the lives of so many people and so directly influencing the costs of so many products has been more resistant to the inflationary trend of our times than electricity. It is only recently, due mainly to the impact of heavily increased corporate taxation, that the trend toward lower rates for electricity has been halted . . .”

“In the year 1949, this Commission granted six general increases to electric utilities. Two were municipally owned and the average increase was 16.6 per centum. Four were privately owned and the average was 2.8 per centum. During the following year one municipality was granted a general increase in electric rates of 10.5 per centum and a private utility received 6.0 per centum. In 1951, two privately owned electric utilities were granted general in-

* See *The TVA Idea* by Dean Russell.

creases of 10.6 per centum. To date, during the present year, five general electric rate increases were approved—two to municipally owned utilities averaging 6.4 per centum [plus Jamestown at 18.84 per centum] and three to private utilities averaging 6.9 per centum.”

INCREASES IN ELECTRIC RATES

(Granted by the N. Y. Public Service Commission, 1949-1952)

YEAR	PUBLICLY OWNED		PRIVATELY OWNED	
	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Average increase</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>	<i>Average increase</i>
1949 -----	2	16.6%	4	2.8%
1950 -----	1	10.5%	1	6.0%
1951 -----	—	—	2	10.6%
1952 -----	3	10.5%	3	6.9%

“The City [of Jamestown] had the advantage of issuing tax exempt bonds at an interest rate of 1.6 per centum. While legally absolved from the payment of real estate taxes, both city and county, [the utility] pays the City of Jamestown \$175,000 annually in lieu of taxes although city officials admit that such payment is \$45,000 less than a privately owned utility would pay for State and County, School and City real estate taxes based upon identical assessed valuations.”

“In common with all municipally owned utilities, the operation is exempt from the New York State gross earnings tax of 3 per centum and a like percentage on dividends in excess of 4 per centum on paid-in capital stock employed in the State. It pays no taxes toward unemployment insurance or social security. The federal income tax, which ab-

sorbs 52 per centum of the net income of privately owned electric utilities . . . does not apply. The foregoing are decided advantages in the operation of any business . . .”

“Production costs [of the new Jamestown power plant], excluding depreciation, are 6.93 mills per kwh, whereas a nearby private utility generates at a cost of 4.40 mills per kwh, in a comparably small 30,000 kw station . . . The proposed residential rates to be paid by residents of the City of Jamestown will be \$61,600 (11.4%) in excess of rates now being paid by the customers of a private utility serving adjacent territory. While exact figures and percentages are not available, both Commercial and Industrial schedules also appear substantially higher . . .”

“It appears, to date, that all the benefits which flow from either partial or complete tax exemption have been dissipated and the residents of Jamestown must pay higher electric rates in all classifications than the neighboring customers of a privately owned utility which bears its allotted share of the burden of supporting government.”

A JUST PRICE

AND

EMERGENCY PRICE FIXING

by F. A. Harper



It was a cold winter's night, and our child was seriously ill with virus pneumonia. His temperature had soared to $104\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$, and he was fitfully sleepless. What the doctor prescribed by telephone happened to be in our medicine cabinet. So in a moment's time, we were able to apply the treatment. My wife and I were mighty glad that we had provided a "stand-by" supply of medicine.

Such an experience is common to many of us, I suspect. It has been used to illustrate the purpose of stand-by governmental controls over wages and prices—including rents—now being proposed to replace active controls when the present law expires. What position should one take on this issue? Should it be thought of as a stand-by economic first-aid kit, like the medicine cabinet in one's home, ready for quick use in the event of a possible emergency? Or is there a catch somewhere, so that the analogy is not the parallel that it seems?

Essentially, the question is this: Is the medicine any good for curing the illness? If it is, then it should be in the first-aid kit, unless it is too expensive or deteriorates too quickly.

If, on the other hand, the medicine fails to cure, or even aggravates the illness, the expense is foolish and it would be the height of folly to rely upon it in an emergency.

So we shall explore the question: Are wage and price controls effective medicine for the illness? Does the bottle contain a potent remedy, or is it filled with the false potions of quackery?

A doctor diagnoses illness from his knowledge of a healthy body and how it functions. The economic doctors must do likewise. So our first step is to study the anatomy of a healthy trading economy.

The Anatomy Of Trade

Ours is a nation of 158 million persons. Like any other giant and complicated machine, its operation can best be seen by focusing our attention on its small, integral, and essential working parts, so that we may clearly observe how they relate to one another.

So let's start with Jones, a pioneer in the primeval forest. He hunts and fishes and grows some crops in his little clearing. He tames a few animals and uses them for toil or to provide food.

Then along comes Smith to be Jones' neighbor. He, too, hunts and fishes and farms. But Jones is the better hunter, and Smith is the better farmer. As they follow their respective abilities, Jones comes to acquire an abundance of furs, but is short of corn for his meal; Smith has a goodly supply of corn, but is short of furs. So one cold day in winter, Jones—warm in his furs, but hungry—wanders over to

see Smith, who is well-fed but shivering in his cave. Jones proposes to trade some furs for some corn.

The two men may higggle and haggle over the terms of the trade. The margin for bargaining may appear to be wide in this instance, in contrast to real life in our complex economy. No alternative market exists for the product each has in surplus, except to keep it himself.

But on closer scrutiny, we find that each has an effective bargaining tool against the other: Each knows that the other realizes the advantage of making a trade, as compared with keeping his surplus product. Each knows that there is little sense in driving so hard a bargain that it kills off a trade. Each realizes the absurdity of continuing to suffer for want of what the other has for trade. So we may assume that a trade will somehow be arranged between them.

Now, what terms of the trade between Jones and Smith might be called fair and just?

The question of a just price presumes certain antecedent questions. Says who? In whose judgment? By what right to speak? Justice always presumes a judge with some principle by which to judge. Who is to be the judge, and what is the principle involved?

Would it be fair to make Jones the sole judge, empowered to force upon Smith whatever terms of trade he shall dictate? Hardly; for to do so is to deny Smith all rights of ownership of the corn he has labored to produce. It would allow Jones to confiscate Smith's property.

Would it be fair to make Smith the sole judge? No—and for the same reason.

The Historical Concept

Historically, the concept of a "a just price dictated by a disinterested third party" has usually been offered as the solution of this seeming dilemma. This concept has persisted in the affairs of man since earliest times—since ancient man first congregated into groups of three or more, thus making it possible for one person to interject himself into the economic affairs of two other persons. Let us say that the third party in this instance is Joe Doakes, a new and distant neighbor. Joe seems to be qualified to render justice since he is "disinterested, impartial, unprejudiced, and objective." He might be called the "public representative." Shall it be left to Joe to decide what is a fair price?

Joe's presumed qualifications for judging what price is fair—being disinterested, and all that—are precisely the reasons why he is not really qualified at all. He has not one iota of right to speak as an owner because he has done nothing to produce either the furs or the corn. He has no relevant information except what he might obtain from Jones and Smith. They alone can know their own wants, and whether, at each specified price, they should keep what they have produced or exchange it. At best, Joe knows less about it than does either Jones or Smith.

Bluntly and in simple terms, Joe is unqualified for the job of determining a fair price; and furthermore, it is none of his business. To empower him to throw the bargain this way or that is to grant him the equivalent of ownership of both products; and by the test of who has produced them and who owns them under private property, he de-

serves no such right. At best, he is an interloper; at worst, he is an outright racketeer, holding a power by which he can demand a bribe from either or both parties.

What is wrong with this theory of an impartial judge determining what price is fair? Why is this any different from a judge in a court of law who presides, let us say, in a civil suit concerning an alleged violation of contract?

Such a civil suit involves an impasse of conflict in which one or the other side must lose by a judgment of "guilty" or "not guilty." A judgment is rendered based on the evidence: Was there a contract? Was it valid? What were its terms? Were the terms violated by the actions of the person?

Yet none of these conditions exist in the instance of Jones' and Smith's trade. There is no impasse which must be resolved *against* one party or the other; each may keep his property and maintain his status the same as it was before they met. In that sense, neither must lose. If they trade voluntarily, both will be better off than before. And the ownership of what is his own gives to each the right of veto—the right to decree that there shall be no trade between them. As was said above, to violate this right by allowing Joe to force a trade at terms he dictates is to violate the right of ownership.

Dual Judgeship

How, then, is the problem to be resolved? Jones has been disqualified as the sole judge. And so has Smith. And so has Joe. Since that excludes all who comprise this society,

the problem may appear to be insolvable. But it seems that way only if one persists in looking for a single judge—some one person qualified to make the decision.

There is the appeal of simplicity, among other things, in having authority reside with *one* person—some Joe—empowered to establish a just price. Throughout all history, this practice has been in evidence. In Medieval times, for instance, kings or lords fixed prices for goods, and thereby supported the traditional thought of the time, which presumed a just price according to the powerful church influence and the ecclesiastical “logic” of the time. More recently, various arrangements of government have done likewise. But always there has been some Joe occupying the seat of authority, like our own heads of OPA and OPS. There has always been the urge, in other words, to find some *one* person who should be empowered, as the all-wise, to decide the price that would be just. And therein lies the error of the search.

Under the beginning concept that Jones owns his furs and Smith owns his corn, it is clear that no rights are violated if no trade occurs and each keeps what he has. There is no conflict in that sense. The only sense in which a conflict can arise is if either Jones or Smith—or some third Joe—presumes ownership of what is *not* his, and acquires a power to dictate the terms of a trade beyond his own rights as owner. But so long as the basic right of ownership is preserved, a contemplated trade is never a conflict; it is an attempted act of cooperation under which *both* parties, not merely one, stand to benefit. Each has a voice in the decision. Since both reserve the right of veto,

their voices are equal in a decision that must be unanimous or else there is no "case in court" and no verdict.

The exchange process involves two persons, not just one. There is no free exchange unless and until *two* persons, serving as judges, agree on what the price shall be. The only persons who qualify as judges are the owners of the goods to be exchanged. This dual judgeship seems to be an abstraction difficult to contemplate, yet it is really quite simple. Is it not strange that men have mastered the intricate mathematics of modern physics and engineering, and still seem unable, in economic affairs, to conceive of a dual judgeship rather than one authority as the determinant of a price that will be fair and just?

Yet this same principle of dual judgeship is accepted in a couple's decision to enter matrimony. In the modern Western world, we have raised this matter from the level of an act decreed by an outsider, up to the level of a joint and voluntary agreement between the two parties involved. What would we think of the argument that the only "just" matrimonial arrangement is one where the selection and terms are arranged by some "disinterested" party—some Joe—appointed to his post by a political figure selected by majority vote? Here again, where willing cooperation rather than conflict is the objective, the fact that he is disinterested—and that it is none of his business, anyhow—totally disqualifies him in the prescribing of justice. Letting the participants in the matrimonial contract serve jointly as judges in the matter, with unanimous agreement requisite to a decision, is accepted as justice. That is also the way "justice" is decreed in the free market.











The 158 Million Traders

In our 1953 economy, there are some 158 million Joneses and Smiths. The ebb and flow of their trade and exchange is too complex for any human mind to fully grasp. What is a just price for shoes or wheat or a day's work in this economy?

There is no one just price for all shoes sold today. Justice, as already analyzed, rests on freedom of exchange for *each* pair of shoes, between the store which offers it for sale and the consumer who considers buying it. So the only way to have justice in the price for shoes today is to have free trade and free terms of exchange for each and every separate deal. Justice in prices, then, precludes any legal or authoritative decree of price for any trade of anything.

Justice on a large scale cannot be composed of subsidiary injustices. Justice in the aggregate comes only from justice in each of its parts—free and voluntary terms of exchange for each buyer and seller. That demands the preservation of private property rights, above all else. Justice resides in the right to keep what is one's own, if all buying offers are unsatisfactory; in the right of every offerer and bidder to resist coercion—even by the government, the presumed agency of legal justice. Once the search for justice ceases to focus on individual buyers and sellers and scans the national "price of wheat" or "hourly wage," the hound is off the trail. In a free economy where personal rights are preserved, there is no national price of anything; there are innumerable prices, trade by trade.

When prices are freely arranged between each buyer and seller, an over-all condition develops which is one of almost miraculous balance. Both surpluses and shortages disappear. Peace appears where otherwise there would be chaos and conflict. "Who shall have what?" is resolved in the only way possible if a person's time is to remain his own; if what he has produced is to remain his; if he may give his property to whom he wishes, or trade it on whatever terms are satisfactory to both him and the buyer.

EFFECTS OF PRICE CONTROL			
If the price is fixed at	these quantities will be		
	wanted	offered	traded
50c	I	 SURPLUS	
40c	II	 SURPLUS	
30c (= free market price)	III		
20c	IIII	 SHORTAGE	
10c	IIIIII	 SHORTAGE	

The manner in which this balance occurs is revealed by the chart above. It combines two simple economic facts:

1. Consumers will buy less of a thing at a high price than at a low price.
2. Producers will produce more of a thing in anticipation of a high price than of a low price.

Another economic fact, not shown in the chart, is important in interpreting it: For a society as a whole, the consumers are the producers, and the producers are the consumers. This fact, coupled with the simple truth that we cannot consume what is not produced, necessitates a balance between consumption and production.

As the chart shows, a balance in this instance is found at the free price (at 30¢), where neither surplus nor shortage exists. The free price also generates a maximum amount of trading; and the terms of trade will have been accepted by every seller and every buyer as benefiting himself—as evidenced by their having traded willingly. *The only just price is the free price.*

Economic Illness

Against this background of the anatomy of a sound economic body, we may now proceed with its pathology. What is the economic illness for which the stand-by controls are intended? What are the symptoms that will signal a rush to the economic medicine cabinet for the presumed remedy?

“It will be when wages and prices soar due to war or inflation or some other serious disruption; when some emergency causes acute shortages of certain things.” These, in

the minds of those who favor stand-by controls, are the symptoms of the illness.

Appearing before Congress, a former Defense Mobilizer said: "I am always delighted to see a return to the free market, but I must be sure that circumstances permit it."*

The same view has been expressed recently in a release from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in saying: "In case of a serious new national emergency, a price and wage freeze would be the most effective way of dealing with the situation, as we learned in both the World War II and Post-Korean periods."†

Such persons believe that the free market with free exchange is a pleasant luxury—a lovely thing to be enjoyed only in those happy times when the economy is sailing over untroubled waters. At all other times, the government should prohibit the citizens from such wasteful indulgence, and should dictate prices and wages under the control of administrative law. Freedom of exchange, by this reasoning, should be considered a pleasant pastime—a privilege granted to us and bestowed upon us by the government only when officials of government consider that the circumstances warrant it.

Weakness In Emergencies

As clearly implied in the Defense Mobilizer's statement, those who favor stand-by controls for emergencies look

* Hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Eighty-second Congress, Second Session on S.2594 and S.2645, March 4, 1952, p. 27.

† *Economic Intelligence*, Number 55, U. S. Chamber of Commerce, February, 1953.

upon controlled prices as strength and upon free prices as weakness. Why, otherwise, would they prescribe the medicine of controls in emergencies?

Any price either above or below the point of a free price, forced by some "Joe" armed with political authority rather than with rights as owner, is *injustice*. As prices depart from that point, more and more trading is killed off, to the detriment of both buyers and sellers. Then further controls over the affairs of workers and producers are likely to be added in order to obfuscate the new difficulties brought about by the first injustice. Error is piled on error in an inverted pyramid of interferences, until eventually the monument of mistakes must be dismantled or collapse under its own unstable weight. Whenever a false premise is adopted for medication, the "cure" is likely to aggravate the condition; then there is the temptation to apply more and more of it under the assumption that the dosage was inadequate or that the area of application was too narrow. Nothing—not even the famous guinea pig—is as prolific as controls in the hands of political authorities, during so-called emergencies.

In the light of the previous analysis, enacting stand-by controls of wages and prices amounts to having a medicine cabinet stocked with injustice to be used in times of emergency; to creating surpluses and shortages, rather than balanced distribution, when emergencies arise; to giving a poison as an antidote for itself. If justice is strength and injustice is weakness, it amounts to prescribing weakness at precisely those times when strength is most needed. Goodness and justice, it would seem, are luxuries to be

tolerated during an indulgent binge; but when the going gets rough and sobering realities must be faced, it seems that the emergency bottle should contain *injustice*.

Historical Failure Of Controls

For those who find the proof of the pudding only in the eating, history affords continuous and ample evidence, since the first known price control laws were enacted in Babylonia 3,800 years ago. They failed of their purpose, as has every similar attempt in recorded history since that time.

It is ever the same. When a government inflates the money or some other cause pushes prices upward, attempts are made to conceal the symptoms, rather than to attack inflation at its source or otherwise get at the root-cause. The attempt is made to adjust the scale on the thermometer by edict, rather than to cure the fever that causes the mercury to rise—so to speak. The treatment applied to the fever victim is to throw him into a deep-freeze.

National Socialism Via Controls

The evidence against controls, even during emergencies, is so overwhelming—by logic, and as revealed in the historical record—that one wonders how their enactment has gained so much credence in this “land of the free.” Could it be that we have been so busy manning the machines of physical defense that an intellectual mass attack upon our bastions has gone unnoticed? Sometimes our perspective

on such matters is helped if we back away from the illusory belief we have embraced and look at the evidence from a distance.

Lassalle, the German Socialist, in a letter to Bismarck on June 8, 1863, wrote: "The working class instinctively feels attracted to dictatorship, if they can first be convinced that it will be practiced in their interests." Spengler accurately forecast an age of governmental demagoguery when he wrote:

"What is truth? For the multitude it is that which they constantly read and hear. . . . What it [the press] wants, is true. Its commanding officers engender, transform, and exchange truths. Three weeks' work by the press, and all the world has perceived the truth."

In the early forties, when we were at war with national socialist Germany, the United States Department of State published a revealing treatise on these ideologies of our then enemy. It is revealing because it shows that we embraced, and are still embracing, the ideologies of our enemy in national socialism.*

This source warned us that as the plan of national socialism progresses, an authority is to be made supreme; his decisions are to be final and always right; his followers are to owe him the duty of unquestioning obedience. This is the same concept that was advocated by the ardent nationalistic philosopher, Johann Gottlieb Fichte.

But under the influence of Napoleon's repulsive example, Fichte later opposed absolutism in the state, foretelling the

* Raymond E. Murphy and others, *National Socialism: Basic Principles, Their Application by the Nazi Party's Foreign Organization, and the Use of Germans Abroad for Nazi Aims*, Department of State Publication No. 1864 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1943), pp. 11, 12, 15, 22.

character of a future Führer and describing how he might come to attain his power: The future Führer would educate his people in cool and deliberate piracy; he would encourage extortion; robbery would be made the honorable token of a fine reason; the state should virtually eliminate private enterprise, setting up a rigidly planned corporate economy—including, of course, price controls and other controls of various sorts; there would be strict governmental control of labor and production, concealed inflation and blocked currency, international barter agreements, and intensive armament as a prelude to territorial expansion.

Those are the concepts embodied in controls, whereby legalized looting of some persons by others is authorized under guise of fighting inflation. It is the blueprint of national socialism as told by our own State Department. We should read it again and again now—a decade later—and judge our own acts by its measure.

Goering's Advice

This quotation from Henry J. Taylor, of what Goering said in an interview long after Goering, Ribbentrop, and others had been jailed following the surrender of Germany, is revealing:

"Your America is doing many things in the economic field which we found out caused us so much trouble. You are trying to control people's wages and prices—people's work. If you do that, you must control people's lives. And no country can do that part way. I tried it and failed. Nor can any country do it all the way either. I tried that too and it failed. You are no better

planners than we. I should think your economists would read what happened here.

"Germany has been beaten, eliminated, but it will be interesting to watch the development of the remaining great powers, the stupidities they practice within their home lands, their internal strife, and their battles of wits abroad.

"Will it be as it always has been that countries will not learn from the mistakes of others and will continue to make the mistakes of others all over again and again?"

This same view—believe it or not—was confirmed by the then Vice President of the Council of People's Commissars and People's Commissioner of Foreign Trade, in an interview printed in all Soviet newspapers on May 18, 1945.* In explaining the serious food situation in Germany, he blamed the Hitler regime for having forbidden free trade of all articles of daily consumption. He stated that the trouble was due to the closing of all markets and the forced delivery of all farm products to the government, thus killing the incentive to produce.

It is not, perhaps, entirely a coincidence that the man who was the administrative head of German Price Administration until 1923, when their inflation exploded, came to the United States, wrote the book entitled *Price Control in the War Economy* in 1943, and became chief consultant in the Office of Price Administration.

Now, rather than being at war with a national socialist Germany, we are involved in a "cold" war with communist Russia. Let's take a look at the advice from that quarter. Not that there is much difference between the communism

* Supplied through the courtesy of Professor Jacques Rueff, of the Institut d'Etudes Politiques, Paris, France.

of Russia and the socialism of Germany prior to World War II. Communism is merely socialism in a hurry. Even Marx spoke of what we now label "communist" as being socialist, and the Soviet state was named the Union of Soviet *Socialist* Republics. Moreover, the Communist party in the United States, in its advice about recruiting new members, says that it should be easy to recruit a Socialist by showing him that the Communist party is the only real fighter for socialism; that the most effective way to help attain his ideals is to join the Communist party.*

In 1848, Karl Marx, the "father" of communism, listed ten measures for a successful communist-socialist revolution. Among them are several which specify controls by the state of prices in their various forms, and also the confiscation of private property.

In 1950, Earl Browder, former leader of the Communist party in America, discussed the American trend toward communism. He listed 22 specific attainments which he said had furthered the communist program in this country even beyond that attained in Britain under their much-maligned Labor government. Among those listed were controls over prices, credit, money, laborers, and businesses; also bribes, in the form of special privileges to various groups. The program is so far advanced already that the government owns nearly one-fourth of all wealth other than land, and has licensing and other controls over practically every type of business.

The most kindly charge that can be made against one who favors stand-by controls for emergencies, it seems to

* See *Gaining Recruits for an Idea*, on page 249.

me, is that he does not understand the workings of a free market and that he lacks confidence in the performance of free men working with private property in a voluntary exchange economy. And if that be his belief, why does he not propose government controls of everything, *all the time*? Why not use the “strength” of controls all the time, not just in emergencies?

Stand-by Controls For What?

Stand-by controls? For what? Not, to be sure, for the purpose of either productive efficiency or justice! Not to maximize trade, nor to balance distribution so that shortages and surpluses will disappear! Not to further the freedom of man in this land which we claim will be the last bastion of freedom in the world struggle in which we are now engaged!

To enact stand-by controls would mean putting into the law of the land a permanent endorsement of a basic tenet of socialism—the principle that control of the vital main-streams of commerce and confiscation of the rights of private property are sound and just practices. A nation of freedom cannot enact even stand-by controls and remain basically free.

“... it hath been found by Experience that Limitations upon the Prices of Commodities are not only ineffectual for the Purposes proposed, but likewise productive of very evil Consequences to the great Detriment of the public Service and greivous Oppression of Individuals . . .” June 4, 1778, *Journals of the Continental Congress*, (1908 ed.), p. 569, Vol. XI.

THE VITAL MARGIN

by Francis Adams Truslow



IN our economic basis for freedom, countless men own the productive enterprises—the mines, the farms, the factories, the wells, the offices, and machinery—tools for the production of those goods and services which they and all others need and use. They created and own these tools and will retain them so long as they can be used on a self-sustaining and profitable basis—that is, so long as they are productive of more than they consume. When governments, to meet their expenditures, seize part of this difference between production and consumption, they reduce the margin by which these enterprises exist, the margin necessary to induce men to take the risks or expend the energy to create more. Taxation is a tide in the stream which laps at the foundation of our freedom.

But taxation is a result and not a cause. Governments do not tax in order to store up resources. They tax to pay expenses. Strong currents of taxation which threaten our freedom are not necessarily our most dangerous enemies. The extravagances and ill-considered expenses of government should receive first consideration. We should fear taxation and attack the spending which generates it.

These are complex enemies. If we spend and do not pay

our debts through taxation, then our money loses its value; and our earnings and savings disappear in the vast fraud of inflation. What we collectively spend must be paid for, regardless of the tax required; therefore, our public spending must be tested by the same stern scrutiny we apply to our individual spending. Even though that spending is planned in the name of our inherent desire to help others, it must not be allowed to rise and swamp the sources of our freedom.

There is a by-product of high public spending, and consequent high taxation, which should not escape our fears. If taxes are high, then the power to exempt income from taxes becomes a potent weapon of those who would build an all-powerful government. In recent years we have seen vast public works supplant vast private projects through the simple device of financing those works by the strong attraction of tax-free "investment." Government has, by the device of tax-exemption in times of high taxation, induced individuals to "lend" it their savings with which to acquire great chunks of private enterprise.

Here is indeed an insidious enemy of free men. When we in the securities business expend our efforts in the sale of tax-exempt bonds, we are often accepting attractive immediate compensation for work which can ultimately destroy our freedom. I think we pay too little attention to this problem.

Failure to understand what makes our economy work serves to undermine private ownership and personal freedom. The wage earner who disregards the property rights of those who provide his tools, and demands all of the

product as his "rightful share" is like blind Samson. His freedom will die in the ruins of the Temple whose pillars he has pulled down.

The public official who fails to realize that government cannot spend anything except a share of the margin between the production and the consumption of its people is a man to be feared as an enemy of liberty.

The citizen who calls on government to supply him with security from the cradle to the grave, thereby encouraging government spending, is a danger to himself and his fellow citizens. If his pleas are successful, he can lose his freedom and gain no security in exchange.

Men of greed and arrogance, who exercise their individual power as businessmen, labor leaders, or politicians to create dissension, ill feeling, and dissatisfaction within our system of private ownership and personal initiative and competition, are men to fear and abhor. They can both destroy our freedom and take control of our lives.

TWO WAYS TO STOP STRIKES

by Leonard E. Read



ANY one of numerous labor leaders in America today is able to cut off the supply of essential goods and services to millions of people. This can be done by the power and authority of labor leaders to destroy delicate exchange mechanisms and to create mass unemployment by "calling a strike." The authority for the exercise of such power is to be found in our laws which the government is obligated to enforce.

Whether these labor leaders have usurped the powers of government or have received them as a grant is important only in determining where the fault lies. The fact to be reckoned with is that, in effect, they do possess both the power and the authority to force the nation to conform to their wishes.

The question, then, of how strikes can be stopped is one of serious import and calls for well-considered answers. There appear to be two answers—one being the collectivist answer, the other being the libertarian answer.

The collectivist method of stopping strikes is primitive; it is the normal emotional response, the animal solution to the problem. It is the use of violence and compulsion. And compulsion is, of course, the essence of collectivism as we

now know it. Practically, in the world of today, this collectivist answer would require that strikers be drafted into the army, or that they be regimented under some other part of an all-powerful government—for example, through nationalization of the railroads or the steel industry. To be effective, this requires an enormous and brutal police force, as in Russia; there were no strikes in Stalin's U.S.S.R.

The Cure That Kills

Mere brute effectiveness in stopping strikes, however, is not the answer sought by men of justice and intelligence, for the cure may be more deadly than the strikes. If strikers can be put under compulsion as to where and how they work, what assurance can other citizens have against the same enslavement? Being enslaved by government has little, if anything, to commend it over being enslaved by strikers.

The libertarian proposal for stopping strikes can be stated in three words: *Free the market.*

In order to grasp this idea, it must first be recognized that there is nothing ethically or economically wrong with a person's quitting his job. Nor is there necessarily anything wrong if a number of persons quit their jobs in unison—which is to say, there is nothing wrong, per se, with a "strike" in this sense.

Wrong begins when coercion is introduced—that is, when freedom of choice is denied, when violence or intimidation is used either to keep a satisfied employee from remaining on the job or to prevent a nonstriker from taking

the job that has been struck.* If there is no coercion, the market is automatically free; for by definition a free market means "a condition of unrestricted competition"—no coercion or violence whatsoever!

Free the market, and the matter of job-quitting will be of no more concern to the general public than is the non-buying of buggy whips. If one or more workers choose not to remain at their jobs—if they step out of the market at that time and place—the situation is precisely the same as if one or more consumers choose not to buy buggy whips. In the one case, an employer may have to look elsewhere for workers and perhaps offer a higher wage. In the other case, the person who has a stock of buggy whips may have to lower his asking price or perhaps even junk his entire supply. But the general public need not be greatly concerned in either case. Those who really believe in freedom of choice will admit the right of any person to turn down any job opportunity or to reject anything offered for sale. But by the same token, the person who rejects a job opportunity or refuses to buy a product should desire no authority to keep others from accepting the job or from buying the product.

Freeing the market would end strikes which exist by reason of coercion; it would, of course, still permit job-quitting. But the market will not be freed until certain concepts are more generally understood and supported than they now are. These concepts will require a great deal of study to win any general understanding and favor. Freeing the

* It is equally wrong if coercion is used by employers or by the government to force workers to stay on jobs they want to quit. This essay, however, purports to deal only with strikes.

market is impossible unless libertarian principles and concepts be substituted for collectivist concepts enforced by violence or by the threat of violence. Four of these libertarian principles are briefly outlined here.

Principle No. 1

No person has any natural or logical right to control the productive actions of any other person unless the latter consents. This principle was accepted in America with the abolition of slavery. A person does have the right—that is, he has the *responsibility*—to defend his person and his property against the aggressions of others. Individuals cannot properly delegate to *any* agency—government or otherwise—rights which they themselves do not first possess as individuals. But since individuals do possess the natural right of self-defense (by force, if necessary), they may transfer it to government if they wish.

Governments limited in authority to the defense of the life and property of all citizens equally—in short, limited to invoking a common justice—must, therefore, acknowledge and defend the right of anyone to produce what he chooses. And, likewise, a just government must acknowledge and defend the right of the producer to use his product—to consume it or to give it away or to offer it for exchange on whatever terms he chooses, so long as he does not infringe on the equal rights of others. This also includes the acknowledgment and defense of a person's right to offer his services for hire as he chooses. Government's function is to defend the freedom of the market,

which is to say, freedom of choice. Stated negatively, the government's only function is to help suppress any interference with life or trade or property which involves fraudulent or coercive means.

Under this concept, government would tolerate no interference with the freedom of anyone willing to work at a struck job, and would protect him in his working. Government has no legitimate right to abandon its protective functions by permitting strikers to rule in its stead.*

Principle No. 2

An individual's services, whether performed with his hands or with his head, are properly his own personal property. His services—his labor—are the extension of his being, his life. They are as much his life as the beat of his heart. Likewise, the fruits of one's labor, be they in the form of oats or manuscripts or pay checks, are one's personal property—merely a further extension of his life.†

* It should be said that unions have the same potentialities outside the field of compulsion as does any other type of voluntary association. The widespread practice of unions imposing their collective will on management—and thus on consumers and the economy—is a perversion of justice in association.

† Karl Marx used almost this same terminology to claim all wealth for the "proletariat." Such a claim has been widely accepted as valid only because of confusion as to what are properly "the fruits of one's labor." An extreme example of this error would be to conclude that auto fenders coming from a million-dollar stamping machine are the fruits of the attendant who pushes the buttons. In simple fact, those fenders are the fruits of the labor of thousands, not the least important of whom are the persons who save their earnings for the purchase of the machine. In a free market economy, the attendant can properly regard his pay check as the fruit of his labor, to use in any manner he chooses, to buy fenders or whatever.

In brief, insofar as the market is concerned, there is no distinction whatsoever between one's services and one's products. Each is for his own use or for exchange as he chooses, and any restraint of choice with respect to either—from whatever source—is an infraction of the free market, an infraction that any person has a moral right to oppose as being a hazard to his own freedom. This moral right to oppose any and every infraction of the free market is part and parcel of the right to defend life itself. For if a person loses freedom of choice and responsibility for his own decisions and actions, life becomes meaningless.

Under this concept, the unsupportable distinctions between services and commodities would disappear. There can be no freeing of the market as long as services are not subject to free market processes—free to be offered at the owner's choice.

Principle No. 3

The value of the fruits of one's labor is determined by what others will willingly exchange for what he has to offer. Argument on this fact would not arise if a person consumed only what he himself produced. The question originates with exchange: What part of the fruits of the labor of others am I to obtain in exchange for the fruits of my own labor? This is another way of asking: What is the value of my labor, be it in the form of services or commodities? Clearly, this question must go beyond my own person for its answer. I must allow others to judge the value to them of what I have to offer, if there is to be free exchange.

But suppose I used government—either in the form of the organized police force (as in NRA or OPS) or in the form of a coercive strike (government in one of its numerous forms)—to force others to give me more in exchange than they would give of their own free will? Then I would have substituted a form of dictatorship for the right of free men to exchange their labors and their products. I would have used violence to destroy the freedom of the market. I would have resorted to compulsion and denied to others that their livelihood is their own—which is to deny, in principle, the very grounds upon which I would defend my own life and liberty.

If a person understood the results of violence in the market place, he would never attempt to force his own subjective opinion of value upon others. The market can exist—and exchange can thrive—only as other persons (the market) decide how much they will offer in exchange for my offering. Under this concept, contracts must be mutually acceptable without any intervention of force whatsoever.

Principle No. 4

Coercive strikes cannot be logically rationalized on the grounds of balancing the low bargaining power of workers with the great economic power of large corporations. In discussing the validity of this principle, let us assume that government is performing its function of exercising collectively the right of all citizens to the defense of their lives and livelihood; let us assume that government is restraining and penalizing all fraud, all violence, all predatory

practices; let us assume that government has given to corporations no special privileges in the form of tariffs, subsidies, and the like. Under these assumptions, it follows that no citizen nor any aggregation of citizens could exercise coercion over any other citizen or citizens. Monopoly would have no way of manifesting itself. *The market would be free*, for anyone could compete if he so desired. The government—the police force—would always be available to prevent skulduggery and the use of violence.

In such a circumstance, the largest corporation could exercise no more economic power over my employment than could the one-man-owner of a grocery store. Either could offer me a job on whatever terms he laid down. I could accept or refuse the offer of either one. And I could bargain with one as easily as with the other.

Persons holding this concept would be rid of the erroneous and damaging theory that employers have economic power or bargaining power not possessed by individuals who have services to offer. We would no longer rationalize and justify the very real coercive power of most present-day unions as a means to offset or balance the presumed power of anyone who has developed an enterprise to the point where he needs more hands than his own.

In summary, it would appear that the citizens of this country have only one real alternative to the present arrangement whereby a labor leader is able, at will, to choke the economy until his demands are met. (The proposal to “cure” the disease by making it general—that is, to use force and continue the trend toward an all-powerful government with serfs instead of citizens, as in Russia—can

hardly be called an alternative.) The only reasonable choice is to free the market. This would deny to anyone any special privilege from government. It would permit a tremendous release of human energy and would result in higher production and more goods and more services for all.

The free market is the only system of economic justice known to man.

THE POWER OF AN IDEA

by Raymond Leslie Buell



IN spite of the popular belief that the world today is dominated by new and terrible problems, the fact is that the latter part of the eighteenth century bears certain similarities to the present time: The continent of Europe, as well as Britain, was then dominated by "mercantilism"—a form of "planned economy" arising out of feudalism. National governments narrowly prescribed the rules for trade and labor, and fostered exports while discouraging imports except for gold.

In Britain, the semi-feudal Statute of Artificers imposed the obligation to work, fixed wages in relation to cost of living, allocated the supply of labor, and prescribed apprenticeship rules. Although Britain was then primarily an agricultural country, it supported the "ancient trade" of woollens and worsteds. This trade was strong enough to induce Parliament to require everyone to wear woolen caps on Sundays and Holy Days and to prohibit the wearing of printed or dyed calicoes, all to "protect" wool against East Indian cotton.

The American Revolution was in the main a revolt against mercantilism, against the exploitation involved in the Navigation, Molasses, Sugar, and Stamp acts. Britain

denied the right of the colonies to develop trade, manufactures, and even land when they did not directly enrich the merchants of the home country. The same revolt against mercantilism was going on in Britain. It was led by the Whigs, whose greatest leaders (including the elder Pitt) pleaded for conciliation with the American colonies.

In 1776, the year of the Declaration of Independence, a Scotsman named Adam Smith published his *Wealth of Nations*. This was a powerful attack upon the whole theory of mercantilism. He demolished the contention that a nation profited by a favorable balance of exports, and argued that prosperity could best be secured by encouraging competition and initiative in the largest market possible. Describing the free market, he said: "Every man, as long as he does not violate the laws of justice, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interest in his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man, or order of men."

But before the ideas of Adam Smith became its dominant economic policy, Great Britain was destined to wage a long war against Napoleon. When the war finally ended in 1815, Britain plunged into a series of depressions.

In this period of stress and widespread suffering, reform movements arose. The most radical were the Owenites and the Chartists. Robert Owen, a reforming employer who preceded Marx, denounced the evils of competition and of organized religion and demanded a collectivist society. Chartism moved also into the economic field. "Social Equality" became its motto. "All shall have a good house to live in with a garden back or front, just as the occupier

likes; good clothing to keep him warm and to make him look respectable, and plenty of good food and drink to make him look and *feel* happy." Chartism was the first class movement in modern history.

An entirely different type of reform movement arose in the Anti-Corn-Law League led by Richard Cobden and John Bright and financed by Manchester. Its central point of attack was the Corn Laws, which aimed, unsuccessfully, to keep up the price of grain by prohibitive tariffs. But the League's philosophy was much broader and held that the welfare of Britain depended upon expanding its markets through individual competitive effort. Free trade meant cheap food and new employment for the workers; it meant new markets for the employers. Free trade would also lay the basis for a more prosperous and peaceful world.

The free-trade campaign started under the most difficult odds. Four-fifths of the members of Parliament represented landlords benefiting from protection—even though the average farmer and the farm laborer did not. The Chartist movement also opposed Corn Law repeal, charging that the League wanted the reform in order to reduce wages. Nevertheless, as a result of Cobden's energy, Bright's eloquence, and the influence of Adam Smith and his disciples, Parliament finally repealed the Corn Laws in 1846—under the leadership of the great Tory statesman, Robert Peel. Britain now gradually abandoned protectionism in favor of free trade.

The ideas of Adam Smith had triumphed over mercantilism; the appeal of the Anti-Corn-Law League, stressing individual effort and increased production, had triumphed

over the collectivist movements represented by Owenism and Chartism.

As a result, Great Britain now entered into its greatest period of prosperity, which lasted, except for cyclical interruptions, until World War I. Large areas of the world profited materially. The British workers profited as much as the employers.

TO COMMUNISM... VIA MAJORITY VOTE

by Ben Moreell



THE American Petroleum Industry, with vital interests dispersed in all parts of the world, must be concerned about current trends in forms and procedures of government everywhere but, most particularly, in our own country. Therefore, I am glad to have this invitation to speak to you today because it gives me the opportunity to discuss with you what I consider to be the most vital problem of our times. It is this: "How can you and I best fight communism?"

I believe that communism is an evil thing, every trace of which should be rooted out of American life. Most Americans are of the same mind. In fact, the American people are now aroused against communism as they have seldom been aroused before. They fear the danger to our freedoms. And they want to do something about it.

As one who has spent most of his adult life in our military service, I want to enlist for this battle, too. So, over the past few years I have been studying our enemy—communism—in order to prepare myself for the struggle. During the course of those studies I made a shocking discovery, which I am now going to share with you, in the hope

that we can help each other solve this problem. But first let me give you the step-by-step account of that discovery.

Ten Points Of Communism

Like most Americans, I began by hating communism because of its methods. I linked communism with outright lying, subtle deception, treason, allegiance to a foreign state, hatred of religion, and contempt for the God-given rights of individuals. Wherever the Communists achieved power, there followed murder, slave labor, concentration camps, and despotic control of every phase of human life.

But I found that these are only the methods and by-products of communism. I then asked myself these questions: "What is communism itself, as distinguished from its methods? Are not these cruel methods the inevitable result of autocratic rule? Can any *good end* ever be achieved by *evil means*?"

If a person intends to fight something, he should know his enemy in order to plan his strategy. Otherwise, he may do more harm than good. I had heard of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the founders of communism. And I had been told that their book, *The Communist Manifesto*, published in 1848, is the "bible" of the communist faith. So I bought the book and read it. And I have been greatly disturbed ever since. You will understand the reason for this when I read to you the ten steps of the communist program as set forth by Marx. They appear on pages 32, 33, and 34 of the One Hundredth Anniversary edition of *The Communist Manifesto*. I shall now read to you from that

book; I assure you that I am not reading out of context:

"We have seen . . . that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class; to win the battle of democracy.

"The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie [i.e., the property owners]; to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State . . .

"Of course, in the beginning this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property and on the conditions of bourgeois production . . .

"These measures will, of course, be different in different countries.

"Nevertheless in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:

"1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

"2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

"3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

"4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

"5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

"6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.

"7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

"8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

"9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries: gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.

"10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc., etc."

Those ten measures were the battle plan of communism, formulated by Marx and Engels one hundred years ago. And the same plan is still pursued by present-day Communists. When this plan was drawn, none of their ideas was popular in America. Now, let us see how they have progressed during the past century.

By Democratic Means

It is important to recall that Marx did not say that these measures should be put into effect by armed revolt, but, using his own words, by "winning the battle of democracy" and by "raising the working class to the position of the ruling class." Once this has been accomplished by legal and democratic elections, the "political supremacy" was to be used as follows: "to wrest, *by degrees*, [again, not by sudden revolution but by the slower democratic process] all capital from the bourgeoisie;" and "to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State . . ."

Because communism came to Russia by violent revolt,

most of us have thought that the Communists would try the same method in the United States. The fact is that Marx taught only the "slow-decay-from-within" method. It was not until about 1903 that Lenin broke with the Fabian socialists and adopted violence as the means to be used in Russia, where capitalism had not developed to the point where its decay could be significant. But the rest of the communist-socialist thinkers continued to follow the strategy of Marx. These included the Fabians and Labor party of England and the Socialists of Western Europe. Even the Russian Communists have not abandoned the methods and strategy of Marx in most countries other than Russia.

If this century-old strategy of Marx—what today we call "creeping socialism"—sounds familiar to you in the light of current events in America, you will understand why I am disturbed. You see, I had believed that communism would come by violence. Now I discovered that the goal was to be achieved *not by bullets*, but by *ballots*; *not by illegal*, but by legal means; *not by a few evil persons*, but *by vote of the majority*.

This throws a new light on the problem. It appears that in our struggle against communism, we Americans may well be choosing the wrong battlefield at the wrong time and against the wrong enemy. It may be that while we are fighting communist armies thousands of miles away, communism itself is marching steadily forward under the stimulus of easy triumphs here at home.

In view of vows of fidelity by Communists throughout the world, we must assume that *The Communist Manifesto*

is still authentic communist doctrine. Let us, then, examine the ten "planks" of their platform in some detail.

Ownership Of Land

The first plank is government ownership of land. Now, it is true that our government has always owned land. But early American policy was to get this land into the hands of private owners as quickly as possible. Sometimes it was sold at very low prices. Sometimes it was given away. But always the idea was to get it into the hands of private owners, whether it be a railroad, a college, an individual homesteader, or others.

That practice is followed no longer. The policy now is for government to take land from private owners and, in strict accord with Marxist doctrine, to use it "for public purposes." The public purpose may be an irrigation or flood control district, a Tennessee Valley Authority, a Bonneville power project, forest land, an oil reserve, or any one of a number of others. The federal government now owns 24% of all the land within the continental limits of the United States, and its holdings are increasing steadily. During the past thirty years 45 million acres of land have been taken from private owners by the federal government, which now owns more than 69% of the area of Arizona, 71% of Utah, and 85% of Nevada. Most of the current acquisitions are east of the Mississippi River. There isn't too much left to acquire west of the Mississippi. And the trend is steadily upward. The claim of dominant interest in the tidelands, always until now considered the

property of the States, is a striking example of current policy.

As stated, the federal government now owns one-fourth of all the land. How long will it be before it owns one-half—and then all of it?

The Income Tax

The second communist plank is: "A heavy progressive or graduated income tax." That iniquity was first imposed on Americans in 1913 with the ratification of the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution. The tax was described by its proponents as a modest levy, with a normal rate of 1% on personal income up to \$20,000, a surtax up to a *maximum* of 6% at \$500,000, and a flat corporate tax rate of 1%. The sole purpose, they said, was to produce revenue. When a Senator protested that the normal rate might some day rise to the confiscatory level of 10%, he was shouted down in derision! But now the personal tax has progressed to better than 90% in the highest brackets and is being used, *as originally intended by Marx*, as a punitive measure to achieve equalization of status; i.e., to take from the thrifty by force, if necessary, in order to give to the thriftless—and to act as a powerful deterrent to the formation of private capital, thus making it easier for government to step in with public capital. To the federal income tax should be added the various state income taxes. This process of progressive confiscation of income is, of course, in complete accord with the communist plan to "wrest, *by degrees*, all capital from the [owners of private property]."

Let me give you a specific example of how this works. In 1951, the total of the income tax payments *to the federal government* by the largest company in each of the twenty largest industries was three times the total amount that was paid by them to the owners of the businesses. That is, for every dollar set aside for federal taxes and dividends by these companies, 75¢ went to the federal government and 25¢ went to the stockholders. After that, an additional generous cut of the dividend payments was taken directly from the stockholders by the government for personal income taxes. How long will American investors be willing to save and to risk their savings in American industry in the face of such powerful discouragement?

The Inheritance Tax

Plank 3 of the communist platform is the inheritance tax, a most effective way of removing capital from private ownership and placing it in the hands of government. And to this we have added the gift tax, a device which Marx apparently overlooked! I hold that these taxes are no more American than is the progressive income tax. The three have become as one—and for the same reason—“to wrest, *by degrees*, all capital from the bourgeoisie.” As an example: One of the Du Ponts died recently and left an estate of \$75 million. Of this, \$56 million, or approximately 75%, must be paid out in inheritance taxes. The disruptive effect of the liquidation of such an estate is readily apparent. Surely those who are now responsible for managing this productive capital are better able to handle it to the ad-

vantage of our whole economy than are political adventurers. You may condone this action, saying, "Oh, well, there is plenty left." But I speak here of a basic moral principle, the right to retain private property, which applies to all of us, regardless of the amount involved. Those who wish merely to "soak the rich" should know that the history of the income tax—in our country as elsewhere—shows clearly that once it is established, the tax collector quickly moves into the lower income brackets. His appetite for more revenue is insatiable!

Confiscation Of Property

Plank 4 of *The Communist Manifesto* provides for the confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels. In America, this is usually done only under the emotional stress of war. When the war is over, the property may or may not be returned to its rightful owners. In the last war, American citizens of Japan, who, it was thought, might possibly *become* rebels, were deprived of their property and placed in concentration camps. The government compensated these people for the loss of their property by a pitifully small percentage of its real worth. Speculators and political favorites got the rest!

Control Of Credit

Plank 5 is, "Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank . . ." The trends of our Federal Reserve System and government controls of credit

and interest rates would appear to be exactly what Marx had in mind. Recently there have been recurring expressions of a growing desire on the part of "new" and "fair dealers" to have the Executive Branch of government exercise control over the policies and actions of the Federal Reserve Board. They have proposed that the government buy the stock of the Federal Reserve Banks and that all new government money requirements, including those for retiring outstanding bond issues, be provided by delivering noninterest bearing bonds to those banks, which would then establish corresponding credits on their books. These proposals, coupled with repeated recommendations for the issuance of printing press money, recall the dictum attributed to Lenin, that the surest way to destroy the capitalist system is to debauch its currency, which prompted the late Lord Keynes, high-priest of the "easy money" cult, to state: "Lenin was certainly right. . . . The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose."

Control Of Communication And Transport

Plank 6 of Marx' program is, "Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State." Our Federal Communications Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission seem to have made a good start toward the achievement of that objective. At various periods the federal government takes over and operates the railroads. At other times it merely controls them. In any case,

our railroads are so strictly controlled and directed by government that they cannot, with propriety, be pointed to as examples of private ownership and operation. Federal loans and subsidies for highways, bridges, steamship lines, truck lines, air lines, airports, etc., are added evidences of the encroachment of government on this area of private enterprise. And it is pertinent to recall here the dictum of our Supreme Court in a decision handed down in October, 1942, that "It is hardly lack of due process for the government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Government Planning

Plank 7 of the platform is the "Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of wastelands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan." I believe you are aware of the many factories and other "instruments of production" now owned by the government. And I am sure that the examples of government planning for the improvement of deserts, swamps, and river valleys are known to you.

A noteworthy case is electric power generation. On January 1, 1952, the federal government owned 10.7% of the total generating capacity in the United States. Construction now in progress or scheduled by both government and private utilities will result in federal government ownership of 15.4% of the total capacity by the end of 1955. The corresponding figure for *all* public ownership (federal, state, and local) is 23.8%. One can easily foresee what

will happen when the production of electric power by atomic energy is economically feasible, as atomic energy is now a complete government monopoly.

In passing, it is worth noting that the federal government now owns \$750,000,000 worth of synthetic rubber plants. In the first six months of 1952 these government-owned plants produced 62.3% of the country's total consumption of new rubber.

Labor Corps For Agriculture And Industry

Plank 8 of the communist program is the establishment of labor corps for agriculture and industry. Fortunately, that plan has not yet gained wide acceptance in America, although the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) of the early New Deal years made a good beginning on this program. And the recent recommendations by government agencies for the institution of compulsory unionism certainly contains the nucleus of the idea. In fact, in February, 1921, the Central Executive Committee of the American Communist Party published a statement which suggested that the closed shop is essential to give communism the control of industrial power necessary to create a Red America.

Many of us have lost sight of the strenuous effort made by the federal government, in 1946, to draft all striking railroad workers into a labor corps, a genuine "slave labor act" which was barely averted.

Because of its importance to our subject, I believe a brief review of that incident is in order. As the result of a special

message from the President, a bill entitled "Temporary Industrial Disputes Settlement Act" was introduced in the House on May 25, 1946.

The bill provided that if management or labor, including unions, refused to return to work in an essential industry after an emergency had been declared *by the President*, the President would have the power to draft *workers, labor leaders, and management* into the Army, on such terms and conditions as *he* might prescribe, following seizure of the struck or locked-out facilities by the government.

The House of Representatives, acting under the alleged stress of a national emergency, suspended its rules and passed the bill, practically without debate, by a vote of 306 to 13.

In the Senate the bill was amended to eliminate the section providing for the draft powers, referred to above. The bill was passed by the Senate but died in Conference Committee.

Senator Taft

In the light of current events, it is interesting to note that the removal from the bill of the draft section was the result of a vigorous attack by Senator Taft, who denounced that section as follows: "... I object in peace time to giving the President power under which, during an emergency, he could requisition every industry in the United States, put every workman in the United States in the Army, and set up a Fascist state within the United States of America.

. . . I wish to say that it seems to me that Section 7 goes further toward Hitlerism, Stalinism, and totalitarian government, than any provision I have ever seen proposed in any measure. . . . What is the purpose of including the drafting of labor union leaders? Does that not make this purely a punitive measure, rather than a measure in good faith intended to obtain workmen to operate the company?"

Senator Taft pointed out that the President's authority to fix the terms under which individuals could be drafted into the Army gave him absolute and sole power to fix compensation and all other terms and conditions of service *without regard to the general statutory provisions applicable to the Armed Services*.

Is it not ironical that the man who is now proclaimed by union leaders as the great friend and protector of labor should have proposed such a dictatorial measure, while the man who is being denounced by those same leaders as the enemy and oppressor of labor should have prevented its passage?

It is pertinent, also, to note that we now have federal laws regulating the wages and hours of labor and other conditions of employment. It is almost inevitable that once the precedent is set for the exercise of government power in this area, it will eventually be used to *oppress* labor as it is now used to *favor* it; political winds shift easily, and sometimes quite rapidly. We appear to overlook the fact that what the government gives, it can take away; and when it chooses to do so, the taking is usually in increased measure.

Government Planning In Agriculture And Industry

Plank 9 of the communist program is the listing of other ideas for government planning in agriculture and industry and population controls. In one form or another we seem to have accepted the fundamentals of all of these.

A series of proposals have recently been made for the decentralization of industry by use of the emergency powers granted under the Defense Production Act.

Certainly no one can deny that the notorious Brannan Plan for aid to both farmers and consumers is a vicious scheme to lock a large segment of agricultural production in the vise of bureaucratic controls. And the entire scheme of agricultural subsidies based on "parity," or a percentage thereof, thus linking farm prices to industrial wages, is certainly part and parcel of that "combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries" envisaged by this plank of the communist platform.

Government Controlled Schools

Plank 10 is government ownership of schools, with compulsory attendance and compulsory support. It is quite clear that Marx intended that government ownership of schools should be exclusive; i.e., its fundamental purpose was clearly government *monopoly* control of the minds and bodies of our children. We have already taken important steps in that direction. Recently one of our most eminent educators, the president of Harvard University,

frankly advocated the abolition of all privately operated grade and secondary schools.

Now the federal government is moving into this area by means of its Federal Aid to Education Program. In a study recently published by Columbia University, the author, Dr. James Earl Russell, traced the many ramifications of federal financing of higher education and reached this important conclusion: The federal government, in a typical postwar year (1947), spent just about 500 million dollars of the one billion dollars that it cost the colleges to operate—50¢ of every dollar that the colleges took in came from the federal government. And not all of this came in the form of payment of fees for the veterans under the GI Bill. Much of it came from research contracts, direct federal grants, and for other services. Dr. Benjamin Fine, education editor of *The New York Times*, who appears to favor participation by the federal government in education, seems pleased to report: “The Russell study plainly shows that higher education has become a major concern of the Federal Government.”

Let us here again recall the dictum of the Supreme Court that “It is hardly lack of due process for the government to regulate that which it subsidizes.” The history of totalitarian governments indicates clearly that when government moves into education there is great danger to freedom of opinion and true liberal education for our children.

The ten planks which I have discussed briefly above could, of course, be discussed in greater detail. I have listed only the most familiar and obvious examples. But

this startling fact cannot be denied: Since Marx enunciated his doctrine slightly more than 100 years ago, we Americans have adopted in varying degrees—practically his entire program.

No Name-Calling

Please note that I have not called any one of those specific measures communism. Nor do I call any person who believes in them a Communist. I am not interested in name-calling. I am interested only in fighting communism. But the fact remains that, according to the father of communism, all of the measures I have listed are communistic ideas. And so long as I support any of them, I am—according to Marx—supporting the communist program as set forth in his Manifesto. That is what disturbs me, and that is why I bring this vexing problem to you.

After having studied *The Communist Manifesto*, the thought struck me that perhaps the fundamentals of communism have changed over the past 100 years and that this program of government controls, directions, prohibitions, and coercions—this movement toward the ultimate objective of state capitalism—is *no longer* communism. So I turned to the present-day writings of Earl Browder, the former leader of the communist movement in America.

Browder And Communism

In his 1950 pamphlet entitled *Keynes, Foster & Marx; State Capitalism and Progress*, Browder lists 22 specific

items of present-day governmental action in the United States. These include government housing, social security, tariffs, foreign loans, deficit financing, insurance of bank deposits, guaranteed mortgages, credit and price controls, subsidies, R.F.C. loans to business, and others of a similar nature. Then he states: "They have the single feature in common, that they are, in the main, particular aspects of the tendency to concentrate in the hands of the State the guiding reins of the national economy—i.e., they express the *growth of state capitalism* . . . [which] is an essential feature of the confirmation of the Marxist theory. . . . [This] makes socialism inevitable . . ." And by "socialism" Browder means "communism," because he is well aware that they are the same thing. He then goes on to make this startling statement: "State capitalism, in substance if not in formal aspects, has progressed farther in America than in Great Britain under the Labor Government. . . . the actual, substantial concentration of the guiding reins of national economy in governmental hands is probably on a higher level in the U. S. A."

Thus I find no escape from my dilemma by turning from the "old masters" of communism to the "new." Browder tells us that the ultimate goal of communism has not shifted in any respect since Marx defined it more than a century ago. And, according to Browder, communism has "leaped forward to a new high point in America in the decade 1939-1949. It became overwhelmingly predominant in every major phase of economic life, and changed the face of politics." Let me remind you that it is not I—but Browder—who calls these measures communism.

Communism Defined

Finally, in desperation, I referred to my dictionary. It defines communism as "Any theory or system of social organization involving common ownership of the agents of production, and some approach to equal distribution of the products of industry."

This definition serves to confirm what Marx and Browder said. The writings of Lenin, Stalin, and other communist leaders are in agreement. Thus, nowhere could I find an easy way out. The definition of communism always emerged as government ownership of industry or rigid government controls over industry, the professions and the people in general.

If this is true—and I see no way around it—then we are indeed in serious straits. We have already noted the great proportion of the total land area owned by the federal government. Now let us examine the amount of wealth, *other than land*, which the government owns. The National Bureau of Economic Research, in its 1950 "Studies in Income and Welfare," puts the figure at 21% of the total national wealth in 1946, an increase from only 8% in 1929. I have no later figures, but my guess is that it would be even higher today. And it should be noted that the government has more or less control over much land and other forms of wealth that it does not directly own. In fact, in the report of the United States Department of Commerce entitled, "Small Business and Government Licenses," for 1950, the department states: "Practically every business, large or small, is affected by some form of governmental

licensing control. A license is a permit or authorization [from government] to engage in some business or activity."

Now, let us look at some other areas in which we find significant indicators of the extent to which government ownership of capital has encroached on the domain of private enterprise and the rights of the States.

On July 1, 1952, the population of the United States was $1\frac{1}{4}$ times the population on July 1, 1932, twenty years earlier. But during this same period the total *federal* revenue from all sources, excepting trust fund receipts, increased from \$1,924,000,000 to \$62,129,000,000, or 32.3 times.

At the same time the nontax revenues of the federal government increased from \$111,000,000 to \$1,814,000,000, or $16\frac{1}{2}$ times. Of these nontax revenues, approximately 53% were derived from what might be termed government operations of industry, such as sales of electric power, interest on loans, dividends, rentals, sales of minerals and other products, etc.

As a corollary, it is interesting to note that for 1951, government payments (federal, state, and local) accounted for 15.3% of the *total of all income payments throughout the United States*. These government payments were more than *double* the country's total agricultural income and two-thirds of the total manufacturing payrolls!

Against the increase in population of $1\frac{1}{4}$ times, the total federal civilian employment increased from 622,000 in 1932 to 2,600,000 in 1952, or 4.2 times. Of special significance, as indicating the transfer of power from the states to the federal government, is the fact that in October, 1950,

the date of the latest available figures, federal civilian employees *located in the states themselves* outnumbered state employees in 36 of the 48 states. The totals for the 48 states were as follows:

State civilian employees 1,077,000

Federal civilian employees 1,980,000

i.e., there were almost twice as many federal employees located in the states as there were state employees. It is important to recall, at this point, that Lenin stated in 1917 that political power must be completely centralized before communism can successfully take over; i.e., power must be transferred from the states to the federal government.

A corollary of this is that in 1932, of the total tax take (federal, state, and local), the federal government received only 22%. But in 1951 the federal take had increased to 74% of a much larger total.

A statement of the grocery manufacturers of America is to the effect that the taxes we pay are costing us more than the food we eat. They estimate that in the current year the average family will spend about \$900 for food, but will pay approximately \$1,100 for taxes, both direct and indirect.

In this connection, it is pertinent to note that in recent years there have been major government interferences with the distribution of the country's food supply. For example, from 1945 to 1951 the government purchased \$478,209,000 worth of Irish potatoes, or 14.4% of the total national production. Practically all of these were wasted or given away. There was negligible cash return to the government. From 1945 through the first half of 1952, the government purchased \$318,000,000 worth of eggs, and

from 1949 through 1951, \$158,000,000 worth of butter. Almost any businessman will testify to the inflationary effects on living costs of these capricious interferences with the free market economy.

It is said that Jefferson declared, "That government is best that governs least." It appears that the Socialists have appropriated this dictum to their own use, in this corrupted form: "That government is best which spends most."

I will not cite the many other examples of the constantly lengthening steps toward complete government ownership of our capital. But I would like to invite your attention to two outstanding illustrations of how originally well-intentioned schemes for "doing good for the people" rapidly deteriorate into vote-buying or purse-lining activities.

The first is Federal Social Security. This started out in 1937 purporting to be a well-conceived plan for old age benefits on a sound actuarial basis. With the passage of only 15 years, it has lost its original character. In 1939 the name of the plan was changed from "benefits" to "insurance," although the plan moved far away from ordinary insurance principles. The 1939 amendments, coupled with those of 1950, justify the opinion that the plan is becoming a vast vote-buying scheme, admitted by some recognized experts to be unsound actuarially. For example, at a cost to them of only \$54, a couple could receive a pension totalling \$12,000, based on their life expectancy. Even federal actuaries have indicated that, under existing law and current procedures, the fund could be "broke" in 48 years! It is no secret that the revenues are spent for current expenses of government, so that the payments, when due, will have

to be provided by current taxation. The amount which the government states is held in the reserve fund of this account is \$16.6 billions; but \$16.3 billions of those moneys have been spent for general expenses of government and there is nothing in the till to show for it except government IOU's! If you would like a long vacation—and "total security"—at government expense, I recommend you adopt that practice in your own business!

Parenthetically, other government trust funds (unemployment insurance, national service life insurance, civil service retirement, etc.) have been handled in the same manner, so that, at present, there is a total of \$39.3 billions of government IOU's in the treasury as reserves for these funds. This represents more than 15% of the entire federal public debt of the country.

These trust funds are putting into the hands of government vast financial powers which constitute an open invitation to government officials to increase the scope of their "squander lust."

The federal government is now in the insurance business in a big way. The Tax Foundation reports that as of the end of 1950, the figures for "life insurance in force" were as follows:

By private companies and organizations	\$244,000,000,000
By government agencies	252,000,000,000

Also, the Tax Foundation estimates that by the end of 1952 the figures will be:

Private insurance	\$296,000,000,000
Government insurance	325,000,000,000

The tremendous financial power concentrated in the hands of government by this business is far greater than that held by all of the private life insurance companies, fraternal organizations, assessment organizations, and savings bank life insurance departments combined.

The second illustration is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The R.F.C. started operations under President Hoover in 1932. Its purpose was to afford temporary relief to distressed businesses and financial institutions in a period of serious national economic emergency. As with all schemes of this kind, the *objective* was good. But when government plays with other people's money, the temptation to become careless or dishonest appears to be irresistible. Progression from conservative management in the public interest to carelessness, to political domination, to downright corruption *followed the usual pattern for activities of this kind.*

We started with the conservative administration of men like General Charles Dawes and Jesse Jones. But, in later days, we have had the malodorous prefabricated housing case, in which the government sank about 40 millions in a scheme which many experts predicted could not possibly succeed; an automobile company of dubious antecedents, now defunct; racetracks, barrooms, gambling joints, snake farms, and recently, offices for chiropractors and dentists, with mink coats, deep freezers, and questionable legal fees providing the general aroma for the entire operation.

As a corollary to be expected, the government penetrates into the managements of those companies which it aids and in several instances has placed government agents in

strategic executive positions or on the Board of Directors of the companies concerned. Thus does the government camel get his head into the tent of private enterprise!

That the government's appetite for control of private business is insatiable is indicated by the recent illegal seizure of the country's entire steel industry, an iniquity which was erased by the narrow margin of two votes in the Supreme Court.

I know it is not necessary for me to tell you gentlemen of the various interferences by the federal government in the oil and gas business. A recent tabulation indicates that well over 30 federal government agencies intrude into your business in one way or another.

I could cite other examples. The fact is that we are now mobilizing to fight a communist enemy who is supposedly thousands of miles away. But, in truth, we need not travel so far to find him.

Communism Is An Idea

This is not so surprising if one but stops to reflect. Communism is not an army, nor even a dictatorship. Communism is an idea. It is a belief that individual freedom, as a way of life, will not work—a belief that certain ordinary mortals like you and me, who, mostly by fortuitous circumstance, happen to occupy the seats of government for a short time, are far more capable of running your life than you are. It is a fear that if we, the people, are left free to manage our own affairs, most of us will go hungry and be cold; it is a repudiation of the free market where

willing buyers and willing sellers voluntarily arrive at a figure agreeable to both; it is a false thesis that employers and employees belong to different classes and are natural enemies; it is a process whereby some people use the power of government to make other people conform to their views and desires; it is a coerced debasement of the intelligence and integrity and dignity of the individual human being, who must bow his head in deference to the views of political masters.

I maintain that, contrary to current beliefs, the destruction of the Russian Army and the Russian State would not stop the growth of these communistic ideas in the United States or anywhere else. We could imprison every card-carrying member of the Communist party in America, and these communistic measures would continue on their merry way. I fear that we are deeply infected at home with the virus we intend to fight abroad. It appears that we are resolved to prove that our system and our philosophy of life are better than those of the communist state and that, in order to do so, we are willing to adopt their system for the contest; that we are determined to show them that we can run communism better than they can; that we are willing to carry more weight in the belief that our strength, *acquired under freedom*, will permit us to win even with this added handicap!

We cannot imprison or shoot an idea. We can only study it and try to understand it. If the ideas we sponsor—knowingly or unknowingly—are communist ideas, democracy will be of little help. It is just as much a communist idea if the majority imposes it upon a minority in a democracy

as it is if done in the name of an outright dictatorship.

Now I know that those who disagree with me will say that this is a democracy and that we can vote for anything we please; that, in fact, we can vote to turn all industry and all income over to the government, if we so desire.

That is true, but consider this: It is also true that we could vote, by constitutional amendment, to re-establish slavery in America. Would that make slavery "right" or "democratic"? We could democratically vote to have a state religion and to force everyone to conform to the majority decision, but that would make a mockery of democracy and the right to vote. We can democratically vote to print enough money to give every person a million dollars, but would such exercise of the franchise help anyone except those who wish to destroy America?

Inalienable Rights

All these measures—and others of a similar nature—could be enacted legally and democratically under the concept of majority rule. But would any person be so foolish as to say that they *should* be enacted? Will any thinking person say that a law is "right" merely because a majority has voted for it? *We must always remember that our Constitution was designed to protect the freedom of the smallest possible minority—one person—against the demands of the greatest possible majority—all other persons combined.* That single idea of inalienable rights of the individual person is—or, at least, was—the fundamental spirit of the

American tradition of government. And *if* we lose that concept of government, by force or by our own votes, the American dream of liberty will be ended. *And we will not be any the less communistic merely because the majority favors it.*

I am very glad that we have a form of government that requires voting, because so long as this condition exists, there is nothing to prevent us from voting against these immoral measures that are leading the American people into bondage to their own government. It is still possible to achieve freedom. If we really want to face the responsibility, to pay the price, we can still have it!

Many of the advocates of the various measures which add up to Marx' program justify their actions by pointing with horror to instances of the misuse of human and natural resources under the capitalist system, as it developed in the western world. I freely admit and decry those abuses, although I am sure that for each such case I can show many other cases of unselfish and generous use of time, energy, and money for the public welfare. Furthermore, in any discussion of abuse of human resources, it is pertinent to mention the cruel and inhuman acts which have occurred, and are still occurring, under the socialist regimes of Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and others. But let that pass. I am sure few will deny that, at least in the United States, there has been a steady, substantial and voluntary improvement in our social consciousness and behavior. I hold that our sole hope for continued progress in this area lies in improving the moral stature of men, so that they will know what is right and want to do it—not in

granting, by votes or otherwise, ever-increasing power and dominion to our federal government to regulate and control our morals, our lives, and our property.

A Program

Now you may ask: What do you propose to do about all this? What is your program?

The first thing I propose to do about it is exactly what I am doing now—to present the problem to you for your thoughtful consideration.

The second thing I propose to do about it is to be *for* an idea instead of *against* an idea. I propose to be for *freedom*—instead of merely against *communism*. And I define freedom as the right of any person to do as he pleases so long as he does not interfere with the equal right of any other person to do as he pleases. To me, freedom means absolute equality under the law for all persons; i.e., I believe the law should never mention a race, or a color, or a particular religion, or a business organization, or a labor organization, or any other group or person. The law should state that no person may steal from another person or defame or defraud him; no person may force another person to pay a certain wage or to charge a certain price; each person must fulfill his voluntary contracts, whether they be in business, marriage, or elsewhere; no person is to have access to the power of government to force his will or his opinion upon any other person; government is to serve as the impartial arbiter of justice when any person tries to force his viewpoint about prices, wages, or religion upon

any other person; the force of compulsion should not be used except in defense against another person who has initiated the use of force.

These ideas I believe to be sound and progressive. I believe that they would bring peace and prosperity to our nation and to any other nation that adopts them. In my opinion, the communistic ideas of government ownership and controls are evil and reactionary. I am convinced that their progression will inevitably result in the moral and material degradation of the individual human being.

I intend to continue my studies of freedom and communism. My understanding of the subjects convinces me that I must defend the ideas of freedom and private ownership and reject the ideas of communism and government ownership. This I intend to do. I sincerely hope that you, too, will give your thoughtful consideration to these matters that are of such vital importance to all of us.

I believe the dominant influence in the minds of the founders of our Republic when they prepared the Constitution of the United States and our Bill of Rights was an overwhelming fear of the power of centralized government. I have seen no finer statement of this than that contained in the following resolution proposed by Thomas Jefferson:

“It would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights: that confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism — free government is founded in jealousy and not in confidence; it is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions, to bind down

those whom we are obliged to trust with power: that our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence may go; . . . In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.”

Many years ago a great philosopher asked:

“If men use their liberty in such a way as to surrender their liberty, are they thereafter any the less slaves?”

The answer to that question lies in the solution of this communist threat to our freedom. Let us, then, resolve to revive that heritage which was handed down to us by the Founding Fathers at such great cost in blood and treasure. Let us join with them in their resolve to be free and independent, to which end, we, too, as did they, should “. . . with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, . . . mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.”

GAINING RECRUITS FOR AN IDEA

by *F. A. Harper*



As communism-socialism has gained acceptance over the years—usually under other names in the Western world—it is often asked: “Why don’t the advocates of freedom use the same mass approach that has been used so effectively by the Communists?” The question implies that the way to win adherents to the cause of freedom is, in effect, to get up on a soapbox and beckon a crowd to gather ’round.

The following advice, extracted and condensed from a copy of *Recruit*—a handbook of advice on gaining recruits to the Communist party in the United States—shows how mistaken is this notion.

List Prospective Recruits. Take a sheet of paper and write down the names of every one you know. Start with the people you know best—your relatives, close friends, shopmates, fellow unionists, neighbors. Then search your mind for the names of other people you know and put them down—perhaps a member of an organization, or anyone whom you meet occasionally and can make it your business to meet more often.

List Facts About Each. Go over these names carefully. Jot down everything you remember about each one. What is his economic condition? What issues interest him? What does he read? To what organizations does

he belong? Are you familiar with any personal or family problems he may have? Could you invite him to your home, to a party, or to the movies?

Focus On Special Approach. Every prospective recruit has certain special problems. He requires an *individual* campaign. Therefore, once your general survey has been made, plan a special approach for *each* person. Select those phases of the program which would most likely appeal to that particular individual. Convince him in terms of *his own experience*, *his own special interests*. *Then Go To Work.* Go to these people. Don't wait until you meet them accidentally. Organize your time so that you can spend several hours every week with each prospect. Make them your friends! Keep track of each one of them in an organized way and — keep following through!

Talk to them about anything that interests them. Listen more than you talk. Be patient and understanding. Explain and answer their questions calmly, slowly and simply. Talk their own language. Stick to one idea at a time—the one that's bothering them now. Don't try to explain everything in ten minutes. And, above all, *know what you are talking about.*

Stress Path To Socialism. Some prospects may already believe in Socialism. These should be easy. Show them that the Party is the only fighter for Socialism in America. Convince them that the most effective way they can fight for Socialism is within the ranks of the Party—not outside of it.

Sure, you'll get red-baiting arguments. Don't get angry or excited. Take it easy. In addition to lists of suggested general literature for prospective recruits, special literature is provided for recruiting needs. Use it! This is your final clincher. It will do most of your work for you. Use it discriminately. Select specific literature for specific people.

And Finally. This advice won't recruit anybody. These are just the tools. Pick them up and go to work. *Remem-*

ber every recruit is an individual campaign! You must hand-tailor your approach to the particular person you are trying to recruit. Keep after it. Don't get discouraged. Don't forget, it took you quite a long time, too.

Thus, in recruiting new members to the Communist party, they concentrate on the individual approach. The beliefs, prejudices, and individuality of each prospective recruit are carefully considered. The communist ideas and beliefs are then imparted on a person-to-person basis.

The individualistic approach, with its respect for individuals and their rights, seems educationally sound. But a recruit to communism, once he has been caught in the web, is forced to surrender these same personal rights. This is deception, of course, but it does not bother those who have embraced the code: "The end justifies the means."

The Libertarian, on the other hand, continues to respect the beliefs and rights of individuals, even after the educational courtship. For him, the end is consistent with the means.

DO YOU DARE TO BE DIFFERENT?

by *Kenneth W. Sollitt*



FROM Greek mythology comes the story of Procrustes, the grisly bandit who was not content merely to rob and plunder and despoil. His eccentricity was to make each of his victims lie down on an iron bed and be fitted to it. If they were too short, he had them stretched on the rack. If they were too long, he lopped off their extremities at just the right point, for he was insistent that no one should be any taller nor any shorter than he. Procrustes was his own standard of perfection.

In the realm of *things*, standardization is wonderful. I never fail to be fascinated by that marvel of our scientific age, the rotary meat cutter, as I watch it cutting sandwich meat—every slice the same size and shape and thickness. But I can't help wishing for my friends and myself something different than that we all resemble slices of bologna—each an exact duplicate of the other.

Cogs In A Wheel

My greatest desire for you graduates is a world in which you can amount to something as individuals and not just

be cogs in a wheel, numbers on a Social Security record, names on little white crosses in some distant cemetery. I wish for you a world in which you can become the individuals God intended you to be. But I would certainly be over-optimistic to promise you such a world—for the spirit of Procrustes is abroad, and replicas of his iron bed are now in mass production.

The standardization of human beings is known as regimentation. The results of regimentation have been witnessed only recently in Japan, Italy, Germany, Russia and her satellite countries; and those with eyes to see can witness it going on in these United States.

There is ample evidence to show that in America we are following, slowly but surely, the pattern of the fascist, communist, and socialist countries of the world. We are putting a premium on conformity, regimentation, and group action; a penalty on originality, ingenuity, and personal initiative. The greater tragedy is that we are following the pattern blindly—even willingly—because it is the path of least resistance, because a whole generation has arisen in the past 20 years that knows nothing different, and because there is a mirage on down the trail which beckons to us.

We seem oblivious to the fact that this same mirage has beckoned many a nation to its doom. Nor can we seem to understand that a social group which does its thinking by ear and its acting by imitation can never do more than travel in circles—like elephants in a circus ring, tail to trunk and trunk to tail. Coerced conformity is a sure road to national suicide, and the blind acceptance of the role of

an exact duplicate of everyone else is self-condemnation to mediocrity and oblivion.

A Look Into The Future

Consider what the insistence of our leaders that we all be forced to fit *their* standards of perfection—their little iron beds—means in terms of your future. Perhaps you have noted how, in your school life, you readily conform to the latest fad in dress, manner, or speech. You adopt the latest slang because if you do not, you're an "odd ball"—somebody will think you've "flipped your lid" if you fail to conform to the prevailing patterns. But that is only a minor symptom of the disease; the conformity in those examples comes from social pressure rather than from force of government.

At a given age, however, you boys are all expected to wear the same uniform, learn the same habits, acquire the same attitudes, and learn to do whatever a "brass hat" tells you. Here begins your real training in conformity and regimentation. Presumably the purpose of this training is to make you stanch defenders of our glorious democracy; but other countries have used this same means to destroy belief in, or desire for, democracy. Many persons fear that even in America a serious consequence of militarization would be to teach you to conform—to lie down on a standardized "iron bed" when you're told to do so, and without any back talk.

Those of you who are permitted to go to work in civilian occupations—if and when you are—will discover that there

again you will be expected to conform to the generally accepted pattern of the employees. If you join with the rest in demanding more pay and shorter hours, you're a "good Joe"; if you figure out a better way to produce more in less time—so your employer can afford to pay you more—you may get lynched.

When you get your first pay check, and every check thereafter, you will find that a part of it has been deducted for the purchase of a number of things which no one asked you if you wanted to buy—Social Security, old age assistance, and maybe bonds and medical benefits. You will conform to this practice for approximately 47 years in order that the government can pay you a pension after you reach the age of sixty-five.

If you go to work in industry, your union will tell you when to work, when to strike, and how much to produce when you are working—and you will conform, or else!

Like Baby Robins

If you go into business for yourself, the chances are that an FEPC will tell you whom you can hire and whom you can't; the WSB and the unions will tell you how much you shall pay each man; the OPS will tell you what you may charge for your goods and services; and if you can make any money, the Bureau of Internal Revenue will relieve you of it—to take care of your less ambitious classmates who sit like baby robins with their mouths open, waiting for someone to bring them their food.

In other words, while we insist that you get an educa-

tion, we don't give you credit for having brains enough to use it. So we arrange to have all your decisions made for you in Washington!

Finally, when you reach sixty-five, you will be expected to retire, whether you want to or not, and to try to live on dollars which may then buy only half as much as those Uncle Sam has withheld from your pay checks through the years.

Paths To Destruction

Those are some of the ways in which you will be under tremendous pressure to conform. They are the same paths that other nations have followed to their destruction. And the thing that makes it all possible is the widely accepted and utterly ridiculous idea that individuals do not count—only groups; that people have no brains—only governments; that it is undemocratic to act like a citizen of a democracy and to express yourself on important issues; that it is un-American to be “taller or shorter than Procrustes.”

The world's progress always has been started by individuals, not by groups. And these individuals have always been nonconformists—people who had a vision of something better than the status quo and had intestinal fortitude enough to fight for it—people who bearded Procrustes in his den and did battle with him, instead of letting themselves be cut down to his size. Progress is never made by those who merely follow the crowd, but by those who dare to show the crowd a better way.

A Cage Of Apes

Blind conformity, regimentation, and loss of the individual in the mass are both national and individual suicide. When we have reduced the world to a cage of apes, each imitating the other, we may be perfectly sure that we will be apes and nothing more. For leadership does not develop in an atmosphere that provides no opportunity for change, growth, and self-determination.

God gave you legs on which to stand, and may He forgive you if you use them only as something with which to run away from reality. Yet he who takes a stand on anything today is in danger of being torn to pieces by those who run with the pack. *Do you dare to be different?*

Despite all interpretations of the Constitution to the contrary, man still has innate and inalienable rights. One of these is the right to be an individual. But this right is also a responsibility. If you refuse the responsibility, as so many people today are doing, you will be deprived of the right—as has happened in almost every other country in the world. The hour calls for people who dare to be individuals in a world where it is fast becoming improper to be anything but apes.

Free Men Or Slaves

My prayer for you is that you may not succumb to the false notion that people as individuals no longer count. Someone has said that most of the world's problems are attributable to one per cent of the people. Wars are traceable to

individuals and small groups. Strikes are traceable to the acts of a few individuals.

Communists, though too numerous in America, comprise but a small percentage of the total population. They just work harder at being effective Communists than we do at being good Americans. Now, if one per cent of the people working against the rest can produce such havoc, can it be that individuals do not count? No—as they count for evil, they also count for good.

Now, there may come a day in America when most individuals will not count. That day has come in other countries. If we have another generation of Americans tolerating a political Procrustes and his little “iron bed,” there may be no tall men left to lead. It is the fate of your generation to decide whether we shall have a world of free men or of slaves.

Value Your Freedom

IN spite of all I have said, you American young people still have the largest measure of freedom of any group in the world. You do not need to be regimented into collective nothingness and pushed into individual oblivion—if you do not want to be. People are still the most important force on earth, especially young people. Whether or not you lose your freedom depends on how you use it now.

WHY DON'T YOU PROPOSE SOMETHING CONSTRUCTIVE?

by Frank Chodorov



FROM time to time, readers of *analysis* urge upon me the espousal of some program they are pleased to call "constructive." Some say that reform of our monetary system is the one essential for a healthy economic, and therefore social, order; single taxers are convinced that all things evil will vanish with the shifting of the incidence of taxation from production to privilege; for the pacifists, the cure-all is the abolition of war. I have been urged to take up the cudgels for decentralization, while those who see in "world government" the hope for human happiness have tried to press me into their service.

Every one of the proposed reforms has something to commend it, while the sincerity of the proponents makes one wish that they might succeed. The fact remains, however, that the reform invariably rests its case on the goodwill, intelligence, and selflessness of men who, invested with the power to do so, will put the reform into operation. And the lesson of history is that power is never so used. Never. I am convinced, on the other hand, that all of the evils of which these honest people complain can be traced to the misuse of power, and am therefore inclined to dis-

trust political power of any kind. . . . The only "constructive" idea that I can in all conscience advance, then, is that the individual put his trust in himself, not in power; that he seek to better his understanding and lift his values to a higher and still higher level; that he assume responsibility for his behavior and not shift his responsibility to committees, organizations and, above all, a superpersonal State. Such reforms as are necessary will come of themselves when, or if, men act as intelligent and responsible human beings. There cannot be a "good" society until there are "good" men.

CONSCRIPTION

by Daniel Webster



PART I

It has been said of Daniel Webster (1782-1852), the great American statesman and orator, that his massive mind needed the spur of a great national crisis to make him render his best with words befitting a nation hanging in the balance. Such a situation, he felt, was that of the closing months of 1814, shortly before the end of the conflict with England. Under the pressure of war needs for men and money, a conscription bill was then before Congress, backed by the Secretary of War, in order to further the conflict for the conquest of Canada. Except for the headings, the following is extracted from his speech in the House of Representatives on December 9, 1814, a copy of which is on exhibit at the New Hampshire Historical Society.

THIS bill indeed is less undisguised in its object, & less direct in its means, than some of the measures proposed. It is an attempt to exercise the power of forcing the free men of this country into the ranks of an army, for the general purposes of war, under color of a military service. It is a distinct system, introduced for new purposes, & not connected with any power, which the Constitution has conferred on Congress.

But, Sir, there is another consideration. The services of the men to be raised under this act are not limited to those cases in which alone this Government is entitled to the aid of the militia of the States. These cases are particularly stated in the Constitution—"to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, or execute the laws." But this bill has no limitation in this respect. The usual mode of legislating on the subject is abandoned. The only section which would have confined the service of the Militia, proposed to be raised, within the United States has been stricken out; & if the President should not march them into the Provinces of England at the North, or of Spain at the South, it will not be because he is prohibited by any provision in this act.

Recruit By Draft

This, then, Sir, is a bill for calling out the Militia, not according to its existing organization, but by draft from new created classes;—not merely for the purpose of "repelling invasion, suppressing insurrection, or executing the laws," but for the general objects of war—for defending ourselves, or invading others, as may be thought expedient;—not for a sudden emergency, or for a short time, but for long stated periods; for two years, if the proposition of the Senate should finally prevail; for one year, if the amendment of the House should be adopted. What is this, Sir, but raising a standing army out of the Militia by draft, & to be recruited by draft, in like manner, as often as occasion may require?

The question is nothing less, than whether the most es-

sential rights of personal liberty shall be surrendered, & despotism embraced in its worst form.

I have risen, on this occasion, with anxious & painful emotions, to add my admonition to what has been said by others. Admonition & remonstrance, I am aware, are not acceptable strains. They are duties of unpleasant performance. But they are, in my judgment, the duties which the condition of a falling state imposes. They are duties which sink deep in his conscience, who believes it probable that they may be the last services, which he may be able to render to the Government of his Country. On the issue of this discussion, I believe the fate of this Government may rest. Its duration is incompatible, in my opinion, with the existence of the measures in contemplation. A crisis has at last arrived, to which the course of things has long tended, & which may be decisive upon the happiness of present & of future generations. If there be anything important in the concerns of men, the considerations which fill the present hour are important. I am anxious, above all things, to stand acquitted before GOD, & my own conscience, & in the public judgments, of all participations in the Counsels, which have brought us to our present condition, & which now threaten the dissolution of the Government. When the present generation of men shall be swept away, & that this Government ever existed shall be a matter of history only, I desire that it may then be known, that you have not proceeded in your course unadmonished & un-forewarned. Let it then be known, that there were those, who would have stopped you, in the career of your measures, & held you back, as by the skirts of your garments,

from the precipice, over which you are plunging, & drawing after you the Government of your Country.

Challenge To Congress

It is time for Congress to examine & decide for itself. It has taken things on trust long enough. It has followed Executive recommendations, till there remains no hope of finding safety in that path. What is there, Sir, that makes it the duty of this people now to grant new confidence to the administration, & to surrender their most important rights to its discretion? On what merits of its own does it rest this extraordinary claim? When it calls thus loudly for the treasure & the lives of the people, what pledge does it offer, that it will not waste all in the same preposterous pursuits, which have hitherto engaged it? In the failure of all past promises, do we see any assurance of future performance? Are we to measure out our confidence in proportion to our disgraces, & now at last to grant away every thing, because all that we have heretofore granted has been wasted or misapplied? What is there in our condition, that bespeaks a wise or an able Government? What is the evidence, that the protection of the country is the object principally regarded?

Conscription is chosen as the most promising instrument, both of overcoming reluctance to the Service, & of subduing the difficulties which arise from the deficiencies of the Exchequer. The administration asserts the right to fill the ranks of the regular army by compulsion. It contends that it may now take one out of every twenty-five

men, & any part or the whole of the rest, whenever its occasions require. Persons thus taken by force, & put into an army, may be compelled to serve there, during the war, or for life. They may be put on any service, at home or abroad, for defence or for invasion, according to the will & pleasure of Government. This power does not grow out of any invasion of the country, or even out of a state of war. It belongs to Government at all times, in peace as well as in war, & is to be exercised under all circumstances, according to its mere discretion. This, Sir, is the amount of the principle contended for by the Secretary of War.

Freedom Denied

Is this, Sir, consistent with the character of a free Government? Is this civil liberty? Is this the real character of our Constitution? No, Sir, indeed it is not. The Constitution is libelled, foully libelled. The people of this country have not established for themselves such a fabric of despotism. They have not purchased at a vast expense of their own treasure & their own blood a Magna Charta to be slaves. Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained, that you may take children from their parents, & parents from their children, & compel them to fight the battles of any war, in which the folly or the wickedness of Government may engage it? Under what concealment has this power lain hidden, which now for the first time comes forth, with a tremendous & baleful aspect, to trample down & destroy the dear-

est rights of personal liberty? Who will show me any constitutional injunction, which makes it the duty of the American people to surrender every thing valuable in life, & even life itself, not when the safety of their country & its liberties may demand the sacrifice, but whenever the purposes of an ambitious & mischievous Government may require it? Sir, I almost disdain to go to quotations & references to prove that such an abominable doctrine has no foundation in the Constitution of the country. It is enough to know that the instrument was intended as the basis of a free Government, & that the power contended for is incompatible with any notion of personal liberty. An attempt to maintain this doctrine upon the provisions of the Constitution is an exercise of perverse ingenuity to extract slavery from the substance of a free Government. It is an attempt to show, by proof & argument, that we ourselves are subjects of despotism, & that we have a right to chains & bondage, firmly secured to us & our children, by the provisions of our Government.

Supporters Of Conscription

The supporters of the measures before us act on the principle that it is their task to raise arbitrary powers, by construction, out of a plain written charter of National Liberty. It is their pleasing duty to free us of the delusion, which we have fondly cherished, that we are the subjects of a mild, free & limited Government, & to demonstrate by a regular chain of premises & conclusions, that Government possesses over us a power more tyrannical, more ar-

bitrary, more dangerous, more allied to blood & murder, more full of every form of mischief, more productive of every sort & degree of misery, than has been exercised by any civilized Government, with a single exception, in modern times.

But it is said, that it might happen that an army would not be raised by voluntary enlistment, in which case the power to raise armies would be granted in vain, unless they might be raised by compulsion. If this reasoning could prove any thing, it would equally show, that whenever the legitimate powers of the Constitution should be so badly administered as to cease to answer the great ends intended by them, such new powers may be assumed or usurped, as any existing administration may deem expedient. This is a result of his own reasoning, to which the Secretary does not profess to go. But it is a true result. For if it is to be assumed, that all powers were granted, which might by possibility become necessary, & that Government itself is the judge of this possible necessity, then the powers of Government are precisely what it chooses they should be. Apply the same reasoning to any other power granted to Congress, & test its accuracy by the result.

Despotic Thinking

If the Secretary of War has proved the right of Congress to enact a law enforcing a draft of men out of the Militia into the regular army, he will at any time be able to prove, quite as clearly, that Congress has power to create a Dictator. The arguments which have helped him in one case,

will equally aid him in the other. The same reason of a supposed or possible state necessity, which is urged now, may be repeated then, with equal pertinency & effect.

Sir, in granting Congress the power to raise armies, the People have granted all the means which are ordinary & usual, & which are consistent with the liberties & security of the People themselves; and they have granted no others. To talk about the unlimited power of the Government over the means to execute its authority, is to hold a language which is true only in regard to despotism. The tyranny of Arbitrary Government consists as much in its means as in its end; & it would be a ridiculous & absurd constitution which should be less cautious to guard against abuses in the one case than in the other. All the means & instruments which a free Government exercises, as well as the ends & objects which it pursues, are to partake of its own essential character, & to be conformed to its genuine spirit. A free Government with arbitrary means to administer it is a contradiction; a free Government without adequate provision for personal security is an absurdity; a free Government, with an uncontrolled power of military conscription, is a solecism, at once the most ridiculous & abominable that ever entered into the head of man.

A Sacrifice

Sir, I invite the supporters of the measures before you to look to their actual operation. Let the men who have so often pledged their own fortunes & their own lives to the support of this war, look to the wanton sacrifice which

they are about to make of their lives & fortunes. They may talk as they will about substitutes, & compensations, & exemptions. It must come to the draft at last. If the Government cannot hire men voluntarily to fight its battles, neither can individuals.

Into the paradise of domestic life you enter, not indeed by temptations & sorceries, but by open force & violence.

Nor is it, Sir, for the defense of his own house & home, that he who is the subject of military draft is to perform the task allotted to him. You will put him upon a service equally foreign to his interests & abhorrent to his feelings. With his aid you are to push your purposes of conquest. The battles which he is to fight are the battles of invasion; battles which he detests perhaps & abhors, less from the danger & the death that gather over them, & the blood with which they drench the plain, than from the principles in which they have their origin. If, Sir, in this strife he fall—if, while ready to obey every rightful command of Government, he is forced from home against right, not to contend for the defence of his country, but to prosecute a miserable & detestable project of invasion, & in that strife he fall, 'tis murder. It may stalk above the cognizance of human law, but in the sight of Heaven it is murder; & though millions of years may roll away, while his ashes & yours lie mingled together in the earth, the day will yet come, when his spirit & the spirits of his children must be met at the bar of omnipotent justice. May God, in his compassion, shield me from any participation in the enormity of this guilt.

The operation of measures thus unconstitutional & ille-

gal ought to be prevented, by a resort to other measures which are both constitutional & legal. I express these sentiments here, Sir, because I shall express them to my constituents. Both they & myself live under a Constitution which teaches us, that "the doctrine of non-resistance against arbitrary power & oppression, is absurd, slavish, & destructive of the good & happiness of mankind." With the same earnestness with which I now exhort you to forbear from these measures, I shall exhort them to exercise their unquestionable right of providing for the security of their own liberties.

A military force cannot be raised, in this manner, but by the means of a military force. If administration has found that it can not form an army without conscription, it will find, if it venture on these experiments, that it can not enforce conscription without an army. The Government was not constituted for such purposes. Framed in the spirit of liberty, & in the love of peace, it has no powers which render it able to enforce such laws. The attempt, if we rashly make it, will fail; & having already thrown away our peace, we may thereby throw away our Government.

PART II

by *B. H. Liddell Hart*

The following extract is from the notable book *Why Don't We Learn From History* by B. H. Liddell Hart (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1944). The author, a distinguished British military authority, is the Military Historian and Critic for *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

WE learn from history that the compulsory principle always breaks down in practice. The principle of restraint, or regulation, is essentially justifiable insofar as its application is needed to check interference with others' freedom. But it is not, in reality, possible to *make* men do something without risking more than is gained from the compelled effort. The method may appear practicable, because it often works when applied to those who are merely hesitant. When applied to those who are definitely unwilling, it fails, however, because it generates friction and fosters subtle forms of evasion that spoil the effect which is sought. The test of whether a principle works is to be found in the product.

Efficiency springs from enthusiasm—because this alone can develop a dynamic impulse. Enthusiasm is incompatible with compulsion—because it is essentially spontaneous. Compulsion is thus bound to deaden enthusiasm—because it dries up the source. The more an individual, or a nation, has been accustomed to freedom, the more deadening will be the effect of a change to compulsion.

History Speaks

These logical deductions are confirmed by analysis of historical experience. The modern system of military conscription was born in France—it was, ironically, the misbegotten child of Revolutionary enthusiasm. Within a generation, its application had become so obnoxious that its abolition was the primary demand of the French people following Napoleon's downfall.

Meanwhile, however, it had been transplanted to more suitable soil—in Prussia. And just over half a century later, the victories that Prussia gained led to the resurrection of conscription in France. Its re-imposition was all the easier because the renewed autocracy of Napoleon III had accustomed the French people to the interference and constraints of bureaucracy. In the generation that followed, the revival of the spirit of freedom in France was accompanied by a growth of the petty bureaucracy, parasites feeding on the body politic. From this, the French could never succeed in shaking free; and in their efforts they merely developed corruption—which is the natural consequence of an ineffective effort to loosen the grip of compulsion by evasion.

It is generally recognized today that this rampant growth of bureaucratically-induced corruption was the dry-rot of the Third Republic. But on deeper examination the cause can be traced further back—to the misunderstanding of their own principles which led a section of the creators of the French Revolution to adopt a method fundamentally opposed to their fulfillment.

It might be thought that conscription should be less detrimental to the Germans, since they are more responsive to regulation, and have no deeply rooted tradition of freedom. Nevertheless, it is of significance that the Nazi movement was essentially a voluntary movement—exclusive rather than comprehensive—and that the most important sections of the German forces—the air force and the tank force—have been recruited on a semi-voluntary basis. There is little evidence to suggest that the ordinary “mass”

of the German army has anything like the same enthusiasm; and considerable evidence to suggest that this conscripted mass constitutes a basic weakness in Germany's apparent strength.

A Conviction

Twenty-five years spent in the study of war, a study which gradually went beyond its current technique to its well-springs, changed my earlier and conventional belief in the value of conscription. It brought me to see that the compulsory principle was fundamentally inefficient, and the conscriptive method out of date—a method that clung, like the ivy, to quantitative standards in an age when the trend of warfare was becoming increasingly qualitative. For it sustained the fetish of mere numbers at a time when skill and enthusiasm were becoming ever more necessary for the effective handling of the new weapons.

Conscription does not fit the conditions of modern warfare—its specialized technical equipment, mobile operations, and fluid situations. Success increasingly depends on individual initiative, which in turn springs from a sense of personal responsibility—these senses are atrophied by compulsion. Moreover, every unwilling man is a germ carrier, spreading infection to an extent altogether disproportionate to the value of the service he is forced to contribute.

The System

Looking still further into the question, and thinking deeper, I came to see, also, that the greatest contributory

factor to the Great Wars which had racked the world in recent generations had been the conscriptive system—the system which sprang out of the muddled thought of the French Revolution, was then exploited by Napoleon in his selfish ambition, and subsequently turned to serve the interests of Prussian militarism. After undermining the eighteenth century “age of reason,” it had paved the way for the reign of unreason in the modern age.

Conscription serves to precipitate war, but not to accelerate it—except in the negative sense of accelerating the growth of war-weariness and other underlying causes of defeat. Conscription precipitated war in 1914, owing to the way that the mobilization of conscript armies disrupted national life and produced an atmosphere in which negotiation became impossible—confirming the warning, “mobilization means war.” During that war its effect can be traced in the symptoms which preceded the collapse of the Russian, Austrian, and German armies, as well as the decline of the French and Italian armies. It was the least free States which collapsed under the strain of war—and they collapsed in the order of their degree of unfreedom. By contrast, the best fighting force in the fourth year of war was, by general recognition, the Australian Corps—the force which had rejected conscription, and in which there was the least insistence on unthinking obedience.

Freedom Impaired

A system of conscription entails the suppression of individual judgment—the Englishman’s most cherished right.

It violates the cardinal principle of a free community: that there should be no restriction of individual freedom save where this is used for active interference with others' freedom. Our tradition of individual freedom is the slow-ripening fruit of centuries of effort. To surrender it within, after fighting to defend it against dangers without, would be a supremely ironical turn of our history.

An argument in favor of conscription has long been the rule in the continental countries, including those which remain democracies, we need not fear the effect of adopting it here. But the deeper I have gone into the study of war and the history of the past century, the further I have come towards the conclusion that the development of conscription has damaged the growth of the idea of freedom in the continental countries, and thereby damaged their efficiency, also—by undermining the sense of personal responsibility. There is only too much evidence that our temporary adoption of conscription in the last war had a permanent effect harmful to the development of freedom and democracy here. For my own part, I have come to my present conviction of the supreme importance of freedom through the pursuit of efficiency. I believe that freedom is the foundation of efficiency, both national and military. Thus it is a practical folly as well as a spiritual surrender to "go totalitarian" as a result of fighting for existence against the totalitarian States. Cut off the incentive to freely given service, and you dry up the life-source of a free community.

We ought to realize that it is easier to adopt the compulsory principle of national life than to shake it off. Once

compulsion for personal service is adopted in peacetime, it will be hard to resist the extension of the principle to all other aspects of the nation's life, including freedom of thought, speech, and writing. We ought to think carefully, and to think ahead, before taking a decisive step towards totalitarianism. Or are we so accustomed to our chains that we are no longer conscious of them?

PATRICK HENRY'S CHOICE

by Ben Moreell



IN 1775, an American patriot stood before his neighbors in a small church in Virginia and challenged the tyranny of government—his own government—in a ringing statement on liberty and death.

While I subscribe wholeheartedly to Patrick Henry's choice of death in lieu of slavery to government, I would like to call your attention to another thought in the same sentence wherein he defied governmental encroachment upon the natural rights of man. Here are the familiar words with which he concluded that memorable address: "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

It is important to note that Patrick Henry did not say that he wanted a law to force everyone else to do as he wished. Nor was he trying to stampede a mob into following him. When he said, "I know not what course others may take," he was stating the very essence of liberty; for he was respecting the right of each person to be free to follow the dictates of his own conscience. And when he added, "but as for me," he was declaring for himself the same freedom of choice that he acknowledged for all others. Thus, having indicated that everyone should be

free to decide for himself, he announced his own decision: "Give me liberty or give me death." And let us remember that when he spoke of liberty, he meant *freedom from the injustices imposed by his own legally constituted government which he had previously supported.*

This philosophy of Patrick Henry—his belief that individual liberty is more sacred than life itself—seems to be forgotten in America today. Now our leaders seem to direct their energies primarily to acquiring power over their fellow men through government office. And once such political power has been obtained, the possessors of it seem to say to the rest of us: "We do not know what course you would follow if government were to leave you free to pursue it, but we strongly suspect that you would act in ignorance of your own best interests. Therefore, we will take no chances—we will pass a law that will force you to follow the course that we have decided is best for you. But as for us—give us more power to impose controls, rules, and regulations upon you for your benefit, and for our glory."

That philosophy is a far cry from the ideas that prevailed when Americans were demanding freedom from governmental dictation over their daily lives and business. And I believe that if we do not return to our original concept of a government of strictly limited functions, freedom in America will eventually be as dead as it now is in Russia and other totalitarian countries.

VICTIMS OF SOCIAL LEVELING

by Leonard E. Read



THE Marxian ideal is: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs."* This standardizing process was to be accomplished by governmental action. That is, the individual's need was to be determined *for* him rather than *by* him. These "needs" were to be fulfilled through the confiscation of privately owned property, plus governmental control and distribution of future production. True, Karl Marx said he hoped for the eventual withering away of the state; but in the meantime, his "proletariat" was to assume the police powers necessary to bring about the desired leveling of society.

The "meantime" appears to be quite a stretch in Russia where the advertised goal was to put these Marxian ideas into practice. The Russian state shows no signs of withering away; nor does compulsion, the essential ingredient of state action, seem to be on the decline. On the contrary, reliance upon the compulsory powers of government seems to be on the increase all over the world—here in America, as elsewhere.

* "In a higher phase of communist society . . . society [can] inscribe on its banners: 'From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs!'" (Karl Marx, *Capital and Other Writings*. New York: Modern Library, Inc., 1932. p. 7.)

Before Marx

Social leveling by compulsion was in no sense original with Marx. This form of social organization is to be found throughout recorded history. Indeed, our own Pilgrim Fathers disastrously employed it as a way of life for a brief period after setting foot on Plymouth Rock. Regardless of what any individual produced, all of it had to go into a common storehouse. The meager proceeds were then doled out in accord with the authority's idea of the need. The scheme was abandoned because the authority's power ran out when the food supply was exhausted. This was more than two centuries in advance of the Marxian expression of the formula for communism.

Persons who call themselves Marxists or Communists are not the only ones who support social leveling by compulsion. This process is implicit in nazism, fascism, Fabianism, socialism, state interventionism, the planned economy, the welfare state, and new and fair dealism. Indeed, many persons who call themselves conservatives or free enterprisers are unwitting sponsors of this process—at least, in part. All who advocate subsidies for special groups—such as price supports for farmers, below-cost mailing privileges, wages based on violence or the threat of violence, rent control, TVA, public housing, tariffs, subsidies to plane and ship companies, and a host of other similar measures—stand as daily, living testimonies to this fact. The Marxian ideal, whether understood or not, is being advocated in numerous ways by vast numbers of adult Americans!

The fact that Marx sponsored this "ideal" does not of itself condemn its practice. Nor does the fact that social leveling by compulsion is communism, sufficiently condemn it in the eyes of most people. If condemnation is in order, it should be justified on grounds more persuasive than a prejudice against a man or against the name given to his ideas. Condemnation, to be valid, must be based on the fact that persons are being impaired in their material, intellectual, and spiritual progress. It is my purpose in this essay briefly to examine these impairments.

A Lesson In Socialism

Perhaps the best simplified version of this thesis was made by a high school economics teacher to his class. Abbreviated, it is this:

"John, you received a grade of 95. Dick, you received a grade of 55. I am going to take 20 from you, John, and give the 20 to you, Dick. Each of you will then have 75, sufficient for passing. That will be applying the principle of 'from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs.' Now, let's see how this would work in practice. You, John, would quit working because there would no longer be any incentive. You, Dick, wouldn't work because you would be provided something for nothing. In short, we would end up with a nonworking society. Work must be done, or we can't live. So we will require an 'authority' to try to induce work."

But this version, excellent as it is, emphasizes only two-thirds of the havoc wrought. It fails to show the impairment to the authoritarian himself.

The Marxian ideal presupposes the existence of three classifications of persons, the archetypes of which are:

(1) the person with "ability"—that is, the one from whom honestly earned property is taken, (2) the person with "need"—that is, the one to whom someone else's property is given, and (3) the person in command of the instruments of compulsion—that is, the authoritarian.

If my contention is correct that all persons, in all three categories, suffer from social leveling by compulsion, then it follows that the whole caboodle of what are called "social gains" not only fail to benefit anyone but also must have a deteriorating effect on everyone. Here are the effects as I see them:

ON THE PERSON WITH ABILITY

There isn't much need to belabor what happens to the person with "ability." Almost everyone can clearly see the obvious injustice done to the person who has the fruits of his labor taken away from him by force. The point is easy enough to comprehend when one thinks of his own property or income instead of the property or income of someone else. One both sees and feels the injustice of force used to deprive him of his own livelihood.

Suppose that I want to practice some act of charity. Millions of individuals have judgments on such matters, judgments based on intimate experiences and relationships which cannot be known by any governmental agency. But this voluntary act of charity—one of the highest expressions of brotherly love—is thwarted when my honestly acquired property is taken from me by government. What was mine has been declared not mine. Some usurper of authority over me has decreed a "social" claim upon my labor. Indeed, government now operates on the theory that it has

a first lien on my income and property—even on my life itself. My freedom of choice is severely restricted. As a consequence, I am restrained from practicing the precepts of my own religion as reflected in my desire to be charitable. The state will practice charity for me! The state is to superimpose the principle of love! Love, through some quirk of reasoning, is to become a collective act of compulsion!

Then again, I may want to save that part of my income over and above my requirements for current living. Perhaps I may even want to put it “under the mattress!” Who has any legitimate right to forbid it? Do strangers who didn’t earn it have any right, in logic or in justice, to what I have honestly earned?

More than likely, however, I will not hide it under the mattress. Rather, I will invest it productively in the hope of obtaining some reward for my saving. This, beyond doubt, is one of the finest ways to become a benefactor of mankind; for this is the process of capital formation. This capital is turned into tools and factories and power—aids which help workers to produce more with their labor. This increased production can, in turn, be put to savings and family security.

No, it isn’t logically possible to see other than harm done to the person with “ability” by the compulsory taking of his property.

ON THE PERSON WITH NEED

Does any able adult person in need really benefit by living on the confiscated production of others? Does this ever improve his character or his mental and spiritual growth?

Does anyone ever benefit by the removal of the responsibility for his own welfare?

The something-for-nothing idea grows out of failure to see the purpose behind the struggle for existence. The fullest possible employment of one's faculties is what makes for strength of body, of character, of spirit, of intellect. Nonuse of faculties leads to atrophy. The story of the wild duck that joined the domestic ducks, was fed, but later couldn't fly above the barn; of the gulls that fattened up at a shrimp plant but starved when it shut down; of the cattle that became accustomed to pen-feeding and died rather than forage any more; of the hand-fed squirrels that laid up no nuts for the winter but bit the hands that had fed them when they no longer held food—these and other stories of nature attest to principles of biology which are as applicable to persons who won't use reason as they are to animals which haven't the faculty of reason.

The Purpose Of Struggle

Life's problems—obstacles—are not without purpose. They aid the process of self-development, as well as of selection and evolution. They encourage a person to gather new strength and to hurdle the obstacles and to develop his inherent potentialities to their fullest. It isn't an accident that the vast majority of top-ranking Americans, whatever their walk of life, are men whose careers have been associated with hardship and struggle. Bounties not associated with one's own effort tend to weaken the sinews which make for a full life. Such bounties remove the necessity for

production and invite a potential producer to be a non-producer. In short, there is an ever-present danger that they may encourage a person to become a parasite living on those who produce. Parasites are not associated with man's upgrading.

Anyone who studies the principles of organization will soon learn the elementary fact that responsibility and authority must always be equal to be effective; obviously, they must go hand in hand. When the responsibility for one's own welfare is transferred from one's self to the state, it follows that the authority over one's life is transferred along with it. This fact is not an accident. Nor is it by anyone's choice. It is a consequence that cannot be otherwise.

The Meaning Of Life

The idea that each person has an inherent and inalienable right to life becomes meaningless when a person loses the authority for his own decisions and must act according to someone else's decisions. Unless a person holds the power of self-control, his life is not truly his own. Before a life can be valued for its own sake—and not just as a means to someone else's goal—that life must have its own power of choosing, its own quality, its own dignity. Without such a basis for love, respect, and friendship, the needy person is soon regarded as a puppet or a millstone around one's neck. Unless it is voluntary, even a mother's love in caring for an invalid child cannot exist. Aged persons and others who have come to depend for their survival upon the state's

power of confiscation become merely numbers in the confused statistics of political bureaus. Statistics and bureaus have the capacity for neither love nor charity.

We should realize that the end pre-exists in the means. An evil means inevitably leads to an evil result. Related to the thesis under discussion, evil, not good, must come to persons who attempt to benefit from the confiscated property of other persons.

Double Standard Of Morality

Actually, we are dealing here with a problem arising from a double standard of morality. Comparatively few persons will take private property without the owner's consent. We think of that as stealing and frown upon the practice. Yet we will gang up into a political group and take billions of dollars worth of property without consent. Many citizens think of that as "doing good," and they encourage the practice.

But doing politically what we frown upon doing individually does not in any sense deny the immorality of the act. It merely makes the act legal. Actually, the only thing changed by legalizing the taking of property without consent is to gain social absolution for the theft. We keep ourselves from being tossed into jail. But to anyone who does not believe in the authoritarianism of a majority any more than of a Stalin—to anyone who believes in the right to life and the right to honestly acquired property—no moral absolution is gained by legalization. Taking the fruits of someone else's labor without his consent is evil.

Shortsighted View

Those who think only materialistically will argue that the stealing of a loaf of bread is a loss to the person from whom it is taken but a gain to the thief, if the thief "gets away with it." This is a shortsighted view. The person from whom the loaf of bread is taken loses only a loaf of bread. But the one who takes the loaf without the owner's consent loses the respect of all mankind—loses the only claim he had to freedom: his integrity! Man's meaning, his chance of realizing those potentialities peculiarly his—civilization, evolution, the trend to Godliness—all are founded on integrity. Without integrity, all else is lost.

Unless one believes in authoritarianism, unless one believes that man should rule over men, unless one believes that some men should cast other men in their little images, it isn't possible to see other than harm done to the person with "need" by the compulsory taking of someone else's property.

ON THE PERSON USING COMPULSION

Of the three classifications of persons involved in social leveling by compulsion, the authoritarian—the one who administers the compulsion—has been too little diagnosed. It isn't difficult to understand the discouragement and the destruction that come to the person from whom honest gains are confiscated. It is hardly less difficult to understand the eroding of the moral fiber of those who become the "beneficiaries" of confiscated property. But what about the "humanitarian with the guillotine"? The well-meaning social reformer who uses the police force as his means of

persuasion? The dictator who grabs power illegally or the leader who strives for "a mandate from the people"?

The person who attempts by force to direct or rearrange the *creative* activities of others is in a very real sense a slave-master. And here is the crux of it: A slave-master becomes a slave himself when he enslaves others. If another person is pinning me on my back, he is as permanently fastened on top of me as I am under him. True, he can, by force, keep me from being creative; but in so doing, his own energies must be diverted from creative actions to destructive actions. One who only destroys is himself destroyed. This is the same as saying that he who practices only evil is himself evil. Man's usefulness to himself, to other men, to God's creative purpose is to be achieved only by personal upgrading. To be truly helpful, one must rise to the point where he has something to offer to others.

Materialistically, the valuable person is the one who has money or tools to use or to lend, or potatoes or skills to sell. Intellectually, the valuable person is the one who has knowledge and understanding which are available to others in search of knowledge and understanding. Spiritually, the valuable person is the one who, by reason of a love of righteousness, discovers some of the divine principles of the universe and becomes able to impart to others that which he has perceived—by deed as well as by word.

All aspects of upgrading are creative in character. Necessarily they first demand an attention to self, that is, self-cultivation. Nothing creative is induced by compulsion. With the possible exception of a low form of imitation,

compulsion has only the power to restrain, repress, suppress, destroy. By the use of sufficient force, I can keep you from acting creatively; but no amount of force can compel you to think, to invent, to discover, to attune yourself to the Infinite, the source of all knowledge and understanding. Compulsion is antagonistic to creativeness.

The point here under discussion is this: I cannot indulge in my own upgrading at the same time I am inhibiting someone else's creative action. Therefore, to the extent that one's life is spent in using force to direct others, to that extent is one's life destroyed, its purpose frustrated.

In a reference to political authority, Lord Acton stated: "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely." This warning is not to be taken lightly. One does not have to look far for the evidence nor to think deeply for the reason.

Inevitable Consequence

Probably you have noted the profound change that comes over men when they are given power over others. When acting as responsible, self-controlled beings—when attending to their own affairs—they were admirable both in their thinking and in their behavior. Then comes power through some office of governmental control. In due course—usually soon—they begin to think like authoritarians; they talk like authoritarians; they act like authoritarians; for, indeed, they are authoritarians. It is as if a chemical change had taken place.

Power or authority over the creative activities of others—

that is, a responsibility for the behavior of others—is an assignment with an inevitable consequence. Thus overburdened, a wielder of power eventually comes to be intolerant, quick-tempered, irrational, disrespectful, and unrespected. How could he be expected to function as a strictly self-responsible person under such an assumed burden?

Further, when in possession of political power over others, it is almost impossible for a fallible human being not to mistake this power for infallibility. The obeisance paid to a person in authority, the drooling of the weak-willed who like to be led, the lies told by those who seek the favors he has the power to dispense—all only aid and abet the degrading process. It is not easy to reject something flattering said about one's self, regardless of its source. Indeed, the authoritarian loses his capacity to discriminate among sources. The authoritarian mentality must be directed to directing others. Therefore, it cannot simultaneously attend to the art of discrimination—a purely personal, introspective accomplishment of the intellect. This is why it is often said of the authoritarians: "They surround themselves with 'yes men.'" The authoritarian cannot abide dissenters. The authoritarian must act authoritatively. His job—running the lives of others—makes it impossible for him to run his own life. Thus the authoritarian process spells inferiority for the very life that claims superiority.

A clue as to what happens to the person who accepts dictatorship in any of its many forms can be obtained by reflecting on daily experience. For example, observe two

persons rationally discussing some subject of common interest. Each offers the other his most intelligent ideas on the subject. Their friendship, their mutual confidence, the privacy of the occasion—all combine to elicit from each the best that he has to offer. The exchange of intellectual energy is mutually beneficial, and the awareness of this fact encourages thinking and understanding.

An Instant Change

Now, force these same two individuals on a stage before a multitude, or suddenly place a microphone between them and announce that 50 million people are listening in. Instantly, their mental processes will change. Thoughtfulness and the desire to understand will practically cease. No longer will they function as receiving sets, drawing on the expansible capacities of their own and each other's intellects. They will change into sending sets—if they aren't so horrified by the situation that they can't even transmit. At best, however, their actions will be outward. And what they say will be frustrated by such nonintellectual influences as how they sound to their public, the impression they are making on others, and the competition between them for applause.

In short, they will become different persons, for the simple reason that the processes which go to make up their behaviors will have changed. The person who changes from a process of self-improvement to the compulsory "improvement" of others experiences changes in his mental processes as profound as the above. The authoritarian act

is always an outward act that is directed at other persons.

The directing of, or the meddling in, the creative activities of others—the dictator role—is so compellingly corrupting that no person should ever accept the role. If he has made the error of acceptance, abdication for his own mental and spiritual health would seem advisable. The likelihood of eventual corruption is so great, perhaps inevitable, that no man need really concern himself about the weakness of others in this respect. It is sufficient that he recognize: “Even I could not escape the corrupting influences of this role.”

All Are Harmed

The three classifications discussed above are merely archetypes. In America, at least, it is almost impossible to find a person who is purely representative of any one of the three types. By reason of the universal scope of social leveling by compulsion, and by reason of our general participation in power politics, most of us are more or less combinations of all three types. For these reasons, no one of us is entirely one or the other. And for the same reasons, no one of us is completely immune.

In summary, all of us are, to some extent, in this thing together. And all of us are degraded to the extent that social leveling by compulsion is practiced, whether we are primarily the ones with “ability,” the ones with “need,” or the ones who act as do-gooders or levelers. The only way, then, that we can avoid personal degradation is to avoid

social leveling by compulsion. Not a single person is truly benefited. Instead, all are harmed.

A positive suggestion? Let government confine itself to defending the life, liberty, and property of each of us equally. Leave all *creative* action to men acting freely, all *creative* energy flowing unrestrained and uninhibited. Only the release of energy can produce abundance, be it material, intellectual, or spiritual. Given abundance and unrestrained freedom to act creatively, there will be as much good done by each for others as can be done.

HOW GOVERNMENT GROWS

by *W. C. Mullendore*



THE power of government usually grows in this manner: A specific situation attracts the sympathy or disapproval of one or more sincere citizens. They, in turn, call this situation to the attention of one or more sincere legislators. The situation so impresses the well-intentioned citizens and legislators that they jump to the conclusion: "There ought to be a law."

Seldom does the particular problem or situation apply to each of the 156 million American citizens. But the law that deals with the problem *does* apply equally to all. The results which flow from this fact are not always what the authors and proponents of the particular law had in mind.

In the hands of its interpreters and administrators, a new law—a grant of power to government—becomes an invitation to expand. As soon as the law is passed, the question arises as to whether or not it applies in this or that particular situation. Some of these may be like the original case, and others may not. But decisions must be made. The executive—or, more likely, an administrative clerk or junior legal counsel—generally decides that it does apply. This is understandable; not only is he a "hard-working and patriotic public servant upholding law and order,"

but also the scope of his bureau, branch, or department of government is thereby increased. It is the accepted political way "to get ahead." Liberal interpretations of new grants of power mean more work and more jobs for more administrators—at the expense of the freedom and the income of the forgotten taxpayers.

If the law happens to be one under which certain citizens can qualify for some "benefit," these citizens are all too willing to help the administrator expand his job and power. And the minds and imaginations of many hundreds of thousands of other citizens are stimulated to invent ways and means of also "qualifying for the benefits"—and then increasing them. Thus the force arising from the creative imaginations of millions of citizens is added to the force that is created by the natural desire of government administrators to increase their power. All join in seeking to enlarge the scope of the law because each sees a way of gaining from it. This hope of gain is the most powerful expansive force on earth. It is this force that can conquer a wilderness and create the greatest industrial society ever known. But if this natural hope of gain is turned by law in another direction, it can—and will—create the largest and most powerfully concentrated government ever devised by man. In fact, *it has*—in our own country as well as abroad.

The maximum flow of creative human energy and the utmost in voluntary cooperation among individual free men are called forth only when government is limited to the equal *protection* of the inherent rights of free and responsible human beings. To the extent that this basic life

principle of a free society is implemented and safeguarded within a nation, the people of that nation will achieve balanced development and growth. Most of our reform laws violate this basic principle in that they penalize the producer and reward the "free rider" who consumes more than he produces. Thus the flow of creative human energy is increasingly inhibited as "liberal" laws authorize more and more unearned withdrawals from the stream of goods and services provided by the producers.

The citizens of America are now entrapped in a vicious circle. The administrators must necessarily have more and more tax money if they are to enlarge the scope of their activities under new laws to "help the people." The increase of taxes causes the citizens to try even harder to qualify for the benefits, in order to regain some of the money that was taken from them to finance previous laws.

Hence it is that *additional* problems initiated and intensified by each new law almost always exceed the problem which the law was designed to alleviate in the first place. This could continue until the taxpayer is extinguished and the government is in complete control. It has happened several times before in history.

The only way to avoid this end result is to avoid passing the law that starts it on its way or—if it is already in existence—to get rid of it. We must remember that the principal instrument of government is coercion and that our government officials are no more moral, omnipotent, nor omniscient than are any of the rest of us. Once we understand the basic principles which must be observed if freedom is to be safeguarded against government, we may

become more hesitant in turning our personal problems and responsibilities over to that agency of coercion, with its insatiable appetite for power. The hour is late, and we have much to learn.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE UNITED NATIONS

by Russell J. Clinchy



FOR many months the United Nations organization has been trying to enforce its decision in Korea. The results would seem to show quite clearly that this organization of national governments is incapable of forcing its ideas upon any unwilling nation—even a small one or a “backward” one. And any attempt of the United Nations to use coercion upon us in this country to accept a form and concept of government that are completely alien to our experience and tradition would also be readily resisted. Yet such a change is being undertaken through the indirect and little-understood method of domestic legislation by international treaties, and through the questionable manipulation of public opinion by those who fear an adverse decision on the part of the people.

This fact can be seen most clearly in an examination of the International Covenant on Human Rights which the United Nations will submit to the various member nations for ratification. If adopted, it will become the “over law” of the adopting nations. In the case of the United States, it will become the national law because the American Constitution provides that a treaty adopted by the Senate

shall become the supreme law of the land and of the states.

Students of liberty, therefore, are presented with a mandate for the study of this Covenant on Human Rights; for by adopting it, we would change our form of government without the consent—or even the knowledge—of the people.

The Term Defined

Since we are here discussing *human rights* rather than *political rights*, let us attempt to define the term. Human rights are founded upon considerations of justice and morality; they are ordained by natural law. And while they may be defended by political law, no government brought them into existence; human rights existed before formalized government and are superior to it. Thus, no government can grant them, and no government can legitimately abolish them. The sole purpose of government should be to defend them.

In speaking of rights, we are here concerned with rights in the sense of relationships between individuals in society—rights of individuals which will be acknowledged, accepted, and defended by other individuals. More precisely, we are concerned about the morality of persons, because there alone can be found a firm foundation for any concept of rights and justice. In the final analysis, the laws of nature are comprehended—and the resulting laws of man are perfected and respected—only within the general framework of the moral standards of those individuals who find themselves living together in society.

America is a religious nation; the overwhelming majority of the people recognizes the concept of God. Our present form of government was devised by men whose understanding of natural law and moral philosophy made it obvious to them that all men are endowed by their Creator with equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. While their idea was "that to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men," they rejected the old-world concept that rights of individuals are grants from government. As we study the proposed United Nations Covenant on Human Rights, let us note the moral philosophy of those who designed that document.

Differing Concepts

It is on record in the debates of the Commission on Human Rights that scores of compromises had to be made to secure the assent to the Covenant by nations which radically vary one from the other in their concepts of the purpose of human activity. These compromises have resulted in the grafting of qualifications on to each declaration of a right in such a way as to obscure or nullify the intended right.

The provisions of the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights follow the pattern of thought found in the constitutions of dictatorial governments. For purposes of comparison, consider this sample from the Russian Constitution:

"Art. 125. In conformity with the interests of the working people, and in order to strengthen the socialist system, the citizens of the USSR are guaranteed by law: (a)

Freedom of speech; (b) Freedom of the press; (c) Freedom of assembly, including the holding of mass meetings; (d) Freedom of street processions and demonstrations.

“These civil rights are ensured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organizations printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, communications facilities and other material requisites for the exercise of these rights.”

A Second Glance

At first glance this seems to be as complete as any devotee of freedom could wish. But the words say that the freedoms are granted, guaranteed, and insured by decree of the government. You can assemble and speak in a hall—but only in a hall which the state has decided to give. You can travel—but only in facilities supplied by the government. You can express your thoughts in a book or a newspaper—but only if the state consents to your using its printing presses and its paper.

The Soviet Constitution is explicit in the expression of the belief that human rights are—and by right ought to be—the gift of the state. The members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights seem to have operated on this same theory. What kind of a moral philosophy underlies such a concept? Surely it is not the faith that rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are personal endowments from God. Persons who understand and believe in liberty know that their government does not have, and cannot have, any legitimate power to grant or to abridge

the freedom of man to be a person and to express the meanings of his personality, because such freedom exists solely in the nature of man.

The unique contribution of America is not dynamic expansion, the use of natural resources, technological ability, nor creative insight in art or literature. All nations and peoples of history have had more or less comparable experiences. The uniqueness lies in the precept upon which America was founded; persons possess freedom and natural rights at birth—before they become part of any government—and these rights are not merely part of the biological process but are implanted in the soul of man as a birth-right. Inherent rights belong to the people, not to government; for the state has only *functions* which are granted to it in limited measure by the consent of free people. The American concept is that government cannot grant nor abridge these natural rights; it can only protect them. If this fundamental concept should be denied, or even diminished, the true meaning of the American Revolution would disappear.

Freedom Of Religion

The articles of the United Nations Covenant relating to the freedom of religion and of the press are most pertinent for our discussion. Article 13 of the Covenant states:

“(1) Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion . . . (2) Freedom to manifest one’s religion or belief shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable

and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.”*

Study carefully the list of limitations. A person may manifest (it does not say practice) his religion, only if such manifestation is considered by the government not to be against the order, health, morals, or public safety of the community.

If a dictator wished to circumscribe or prohibit the practice of religion, what other shackles would he need than these? The charge made against Jesus of Nazareth before Pilate was that “He stirreth up the people.” Under the Covenant on Human Rights, could not Pilate have said that, in order to protect the public safety, he would have to deny Jesus the right to manifest His religion? Certainly he would have had a legal justification for doing so under this Covenant.

Or what about public morals and order? Could not any dictator, totalitarian government, or church say that the teaching of any unpopular, minority religion was an offense against the morals and order of the community? In fact, that has been the custom of rulers throughout history when they wished to suppress the development of a new or

*The quotations from the Covenant used throughout this article are from the “Draft International Covenant on Human Rights” as revised at the Seventh Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, April-May, 1951.

It was announced on February 5, 1952, that the General Assembly of the United Nations, meeting in Paris, adopted a resolution to divide the Covenant into two sections, each to be presented as a treaty. One would contain the political and civil provisions (Articles 1-18); the other would contain the social and economic provisions (Articles 19-73). This action is merely procedural and will have no bearing on the issues involved in this discussion.

unpopular religion. Which morals will be endangered? Obviously, the morals endorsed by the party in power. That is just the charge that was made against the early Christians in Rome by successive emperors. It was the charge made against the Jews by Hitler. It is literally true to say that the qualifying words used in this document, which purports to be a covenant on *human* rights, could be used to destroy religion in every corner of the world.

The American Religious Concept

In contrast, one of the early—and one of the best—expressions of the American concept of religious liberty is found in the Statute of Religious Freedom of Virginia as written by Thomas Jefferson in 1786:

“Be it enacted by the General Assembly, That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinion in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

“ . . . the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present, or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right.”

This statute came into being because of an effort by certain persons in Virginia to restrict freedom of religion only

to the practice of "the Christian religion in general." To this, because they believed it to be a restriction upon the freedom of religious expression, both Madison and Jefferson were opposed.

In 1785, James Madison had stated in his famous *Memorial and Remonstrance against Religious Assessments*:

"The Religion then of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. . . . We maintain therefore that in matters of Religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of Civil Society, and that Religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance."

It is clear that both Madison and Jefferson based their arguments for religious freedom upon the concept of natural law—that which is discernible to reason as originating in the nature of the world.

Their thesis has four parts:

1. No man shall be compelled to comply with any form of religion.
2. No man shall be molested nor made to suffer because of his religion.
3. The profession of religious conviction shall not diminish civil rights.
4. Any act which attempts to repeal or narrow the operation of these rights shall be considered as an infringement upon the natural rights of man.

These concepts are the tenets of the American belief and practice regarding the freedom of religion. But the restrictions outlined in the article relating to religion in the

United Nations Covenant would supply the legal sanction for full and complete destruction of the freedom of religion now possessed and enjoyed by Americans.

The Covenant on Human Rights of the United Nations would give to government the power to limit the freedom of religion, under pretext of the protection of the public safety, order, health, and morals. This is a clear and present danger to the life and liberty of every American citizen, for the First Amendment to our Constitution states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Freedom Of The Press

The Covenant is just as destructive of freedom when it comes to its declarations concerning the status of the press.

This wording is found in Article 14 of the Covenant:

"Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.

"The right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities and restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or of the rights, freedoms or reputations of others."

Let us study the implications of these words as they re-

late to an actual incident. A short while ago all believers in the freedom of the press were shocked by the suppression of one of the great newspapers of the world, *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires. The dictator shut down the paper and ordered the arrest of the editor. But why? Because he had decided that the kind of material which was being printed should be subject to penalties and restriction for the protection of his concepts of national security, public order, and safety—not to mention his own reputation.

Such a study of the civil and political rights written into this Covenant clearly indicates the inadequacy of the definition of their nature, and also presents the danger to their continued possession by American citizens through the restrictions placed upon these rights by the words of the Covenant. It should be noted that in the First Amendment to the American Constitution, the restrictions are placed only upon Congress.

If the American delegates to the United Nations, and to the Commission on Human Rights, are zealously devoted to the interpretation and the protection of these rights, and truly desire an extension of the same measure of these rights to other peoples in the world, they will demand that Articles 13 and 14 of the Covenant be rewritten in this manner:

The States Parties hereby involved shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion, nor abridging the freedom of speech, of the press, and of the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition for a redress of grievances.

No mandate to do any more, or any less, than this ever

has been given—or ever could be given—to representatives of the American government who take part in international discussions of the rights of worship, speech, and assembly. No other statement than this is needed to preserve the rights already possessed by Americans and protected by their Constitution. No other statement than this can ever extend these rights in their full and complete meaning to other peoples of the world.

Economic Objectives

Let us now consider the list of social and economic objectives which this United Nations Covenant would elevate to the status of human rights. You may again be struck by the remarkable similarity of these ideas in the Covenant and the same ideas in certain totalitarian constitutions:

ARTICLE 19

The States Parties to the present Covenant,

1. bearing in mind the link between the rights and liberties recognized and defined above, and the economic, social and cultural rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
2. resolved to combat the scourges, such as famine, disease, poverty, the feeling of insecurity and ignorance, which take toll of or degrade men, and prevent the free development of their personality;
3. resolved to strive to ensure that every human being shall obtain the food, clothing, shelter essential for his livelihood and well-being, and shall achieve an adequate standard of living and a continuous improvement of his living material and spiritual conditions;
4. undertake to take steps, individually and through interna-

tional co-operation, to the maximum of their available resources with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in this part of the present Covenant.

ARTICLE 20

Work being at the basis of all human endeavor, the States Parties to the Covenant recognize the right to work, that is to say, the fundamental right of everyone to the opportunity, if he so desires, to gain his living by work which he freely accepts.

ARTICLE 21

The States Parties to the Covenant recognize the right of everyone to just and favourable conditions of work, including: (a) safe and healthy working conditions; (b) minimum remuneration which provides all workers: (i) with fair wages and equal pay for equal work, and (ii) a decent living for themselves and their families; and (c) reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

ARTICLE 22

The States Parties to the Covenant recognize the right of everyone to social security.

ARTICLE 23

The States Parties to the Covenant recognize the right of everyone to adequate housing.

ARTICLE 24

The States Parties to the Covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living and the continuous improvement of living conditions.

ARTICLE 25

The States Parties to the Covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest standard of health obtainable. With a view to implementing and safeguarding this right each State party hereto undertakes to provide legislative measures to promote and protect health and, in particular: (i) to reduce infant mortality and provide for healthy development of the child; (ii) to improve nutrition, housing, sanitation, recreation, economic and working conditions and other aspects

of environmental hygiene; (iii) to control epidemic, endemic and other diseases; (iv) to provide conditions which would assure the right of all to medical service and medical attention in the event of sickness.

ARTICLE 26

The States Parties to the Covenant recognize that: (1) special protection should be accorded to maternity and motherhood; and (2) special measures of protection should be taken on behalf of children and young persons, and that in particular they should not be required to do work likely to hamper their normal development.

ARTICLE 27

The States Parties to the Covenant recognize the right of everyone, in conformity with Article 16, to form and join local, national and international trade unions of his choice for the protection of his economic and social interests.

ARTICLE 28

The States Parties to the Covenant recognize:

1. the right of everyone to education;
2. that educational facilities shall be accessible to all in accordance with the principle of non-discrimination enunciated in paragraph 1 of Article 1 of this Covenant;
3. that primary education shall be compulsory and available free to all;
4. that secondary education, in its different forms, including technical and professional secondary education, shall be generally available and shall be made progressively free;
5. that higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit and shall be made progressively free;
6. that fundamental education for those persons who have not received or completed the whole period of their primary education shall be encouraged as far as possible;
7. that education shall encourage the full development of the human personality, the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the suppression of all in-

citement to racial and other hatred. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial, ethnic or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society;

8. the obligations of States to establish a system of free and compulsory primary education shall not be deemed incompatible with the liberty of parents to choose for their children schools other than those established by the State which conform to minimum standards laid down by the State;

9. in the exercise of any functions which the State assumes in the field of education it shall have respect for the liberty of parents to ensure the religious education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

A List Of Desires

At least this can be said about the above declarations: They constitute almost the entire list of what might be called "The Desires of Mankind." But desires are never rights, nor are they in any sense essential freedoms. Food, clothing, and shelter were not demanded by our ancestors as grants of the universe nor as rights they could claim from their Creator. The only right they had was the right to be free. The only grant they received was the knowledge of reality. With only the possession of this right and this grant, men and women began the struggle of survival and of development, rising and falling in the strange alchemy of human life in the changing periods of history, but growing strong and creative in spirit in those eras when life was relatively unshackled and free. Now, in the middle of the twentieth century, we are confronted with the astounding

proposition that the "States Parties to the Covenant" somehow believe that the simple device of voting for this Covenant can relieve the individual of the responsibility for his survival and the gratification of his desires.

The American Idea

It might be easier to accept the Covenant on Human Rights as an honest effort toward human freedom and progress if Section 3 of Article 19 had been written in this form:

"The States Parties to the Covenant shall make no law nor provision that will prevent any human being from making full personal effort to obtain the food, clothing, and shelter essential to his livelihood and well-being, to keep what he thus produces, to strive for an adequate standard of living and continuous improvement of his material and spiritual condition, and voluntarily to help others."

That would be a proposal in full keeping with the spirit and words of the American concept of human rights as set forth both in our Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights. Those documents are based on the concept that each human being is endowed with the right to seek his own development to the fullest extent of his ability and ambition, within the limited natural resources of the environment in which he happens to be. This concept of freedom stems from a source above and beyond any man-made government under which a person happens to be born. It is a religious concept which categorically denies to the state any characteristics of God.

Will the communist and socialist nations accept that idea of human rights? Can the American representatives, or the American Congress, accept anything less than that?

Not Fantasy

Before we are tempted to say that all of the proposals suggested in these articles of the Covenant appear to be entirely in the realm of fantasy—comparable to the one which declares that governments should insure a continuous improvement of the spiritual condition of men—let us remember that such a program of life has been formulated and attempted in practice in varying degrees in the welfare states of the world. Social contracts have been enacted into law in those countries which state that each individual in the community is entitled to the privilege of receiving a share of all the social and economic benefits which the state can assemble through its coercive powers of taxation and confiscation.

Let us examine in more detail these so-called rights of the United Nations Covenant.

Article 20 states that the governments must recognize the right to work, which it defines as the fundamental right of everyone to the opportunity to gain his living by work which he freely accepts. There is obviously no objection to the possibility of work since work is a necessity of life. What this article really means, however, is that a cooperating nation must accept the obligation to provide full employment within its borders, because everyone in the country has the right to a job. If it does not mean that the state

is obligated to provide the job, it is a useless declaration. It is obvious that everyone, if he is alive and free, has the opportunity of going out to try to find employment; and if there is no position that suits him, to develop something at which he can be self-employed. The United Nations statement, however, is in a different category. It says that there is a state-declared right to work, which means that the state must supply some job whenever any person applies for it.

Invitation To Slavery

Article 21 states that the parties to the Covenant also recognize the right of everyone to just and favorable conditions of work, with a minimum remuneration which will provide all workers with fair wages and equal pay; to a decent living for themselves and their families; to limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay. If this right is to come from the state, then the government must control the standards of all employment and set a minimum wage which becomes the "fair" wage which provides what those in political power decide is adequate for a "decent" living. That, of course, would plunge the government into every phase of the economy. According to Sir Stafford Cripps, who should know what he is talking about in this area: "No country in the world . . . has yet succeeded in carrying through a planned economy without the direction of labor."

Are we then to accept the governmental direction of labor as the meaning of "the right to work"? Is this a rea-

sonable and desirable substitute for the American tradition of letting each man work as long and as hard as he likes at the task of his choice for as much return as others will voluntarily offer him for his product and services? How can the state promise a job to every applicant unless it controls all the means of production? If the state promises jobs, can it permit aggressive competition among workers for any one job? Can it permit private employers to compete for the services of the more efficient workers by offering higher wages? Is such a giant state cartel or monopoly suddenly to refute all history and become a blessing of efficiency and abundant production? Is this the kind of opportunity toward which responsible men would struggle? Is this to be the new goal for inhabitants of the land of the free?

Housing

Let us pursue these questions relative to the matter of housing. Article 23 says that the governments must recognize the right of everyone to adequate housing. This means that the state shall build "adequate" housing for each person who claims the need. Of course, a representative of the state will determine what is "adequate." But visualize his problem by asking yourself if your own housing is "adequate" today. Adequate in terms of what? Your need for housing? Or your capacity to provide housing, in addition to satisfying more urgent needs for other things?

Will some public official do a better job than you can in determining the relative urgency of your various needs? Are you going to be happy some morning when you are

informed that you shall spend so many days providing adequate housing for someone—quite probably someone unknown to you? Yet that is the inevitable consequence—whether done directly or indirectly—if the state takes cognizance and control of everyone’s “right to work” and his “right to adequate housing.”

Medicine

The health and medical care of the community are dealt with in Articles 25 and 26. A re-study of these articles will show that the Covenant fails to acknowledge that it is now the right and privilege of each person—by his own efforts or through voluntary cooperation with others—to provide such health, medical care, and good standards of living as he and his family can afford. Instead of that, it states that everyone has the right to the highest standard of health obtainable and that, therefore, each nation must undertake to provide *by legislation* measures to promote and protect health all through life.

Article 25 states that each government must provide legislation which will reduce infant mortality and promote the healthy development of the child. It says it must improve nutrition, and also that it must provide conditions which will assure the right of all to medical service and medical attention in the event of any kind of sickness.

Those statements can be characterized either as political catch phrases or as social and legal contracts enacted into law upon which the citizen can lay claim. In Great Britain,

these provisions have been written into the law; and each individual citizen can claim his legal right to these benefits.

An Untenable Stand

What the people of Britain have not yet acknowledged—and what many of us in America do not seem to understand—is that the so-called middle way is untenable. Our welfare-statists promise a *limited* amount of public housing, a *minimum* amount of medical care, a *little* of this or that state control—but *no* loss of freedom! They talk as though it were possible to be half-communist and half-free. They ignore the fact that under such an arrangement the “free” areas of human activity are only *tolerated* by government. That is not freedom but communism of the variety of the New Economic Policy of Russia during the 1920’s.

The “middle way” theory moves inevitably from freedom into communism in this manner: The first public housing project justifies the second which, in turn, brings the third. This advance of government housing builds the case for an advance by government into other areas—for example, public feeding. And the further encroachment of government into either of these activities builds the case for public clothing. For once there is acknowledged a need for a little government ownership or control—a little force to make people better than they are—then the door is opened for complete state ownership and control of all property and all persons.

If the people demand “free” medical care, then the doctors and hospitals have to be nationalized. If it is stated

that everyone has the right to a house and to a job, then the construction industry and all the methods of employment must be controlled by the state. If to this should be added the items of food and clothing, then the state would have to move inevitably into all these areas of life and nationalize them because the legislation converting these desires into legal claims would demand the nationalization and the collectivization of the nation.

Education

But let us go a step further. In Article 28, there is the statement that all persons have a right to education, and that all education—elementary, higher, and professional—shall be equal and accessible. There is a further statement that, while primary education must of necessity be free, all further education through the graduate schools shall be progressively free until it is entirely free. This means that the complete education of the child from infancy to maturity shall be at the cost of the community and under the control of government. And even our own Supreme Court has now acknowledged the fact that: “It is hardly lack of due process for the government to regulate that which it subsidizes.”*

But the statement regarding the political right of education goes even further. The article states that education shall encourage the full development of the human personality, the strengthening and respect for human rights and freedoms, and the suppression of all incitement to racial

*Wickard v. Filburn, 317 U.S. 111, p. 131, Oct., 1942.

and other hatred. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial, ethnic, or religious groups.

A Perverted Phrase

When one remembers the way in which the phrase in the American Constitution, "to provide for the general welfare," has been perverted to include the responsibility of the state to take over practically every form of social endeavor, one can understand how easily the seemingly humanitarian and enlightened motives of this paragraph in the Covenant could be construed to allow the state to indoctrinate its children with the mind, morals, and the mores of the dominant political power of any given time. In fact, it would have been possible for Adolph Hitler to have accepted these words as the basis for the educational program of national socialism in Germany. His party had control of the educational system of Germany. This educational system extended throughout the entire educational life of the child and young person. He also had a philosophy of national socialism with definitions describing what he thought the full development of the human personality should be, and what, in the Nazi concept, human rights and fundamental freedoms are. We should remember that in an area controlled by such a process as national socialism, or any similar philosophy of governmental direction, the question and definition of what human personality is, and what human rights and fundamental freedoms are, rest with the dominant political power.

The leaders of the collectivized, totalitarian governments always give their own definitions to words such as democracy, freedom, hatred, tolerance, and rights. Recall the Soviet definition given to such a term as "peace-loving people's democracies." This United Nations Covenant of educational rights would provide legal sanction for any dictator or any totalitarian government—any government at all to which the people had given control of education—to frame the definitions of the meanings of words, and then to control education and the educational system according to its will.

Two Conclusions

There are two conclusions which must be drawn from a consideration of these articles relating to the social and economic life of the world.

One is that these phrases describe possible achievements of freedom rather than freedom itself. Freedom is the opportunity to act according to one's wisdom and conscience. The opportunity to act and to be creative is the right and obligation of a free man. Medical care, or any other product of human action, is the result of man's right to be productive; it is not a right in itself. Education is not a human right; it is the process by which a free person achieves enlightenment. The freedom to learn—not the educational equipment and forms—is the fundamental human freedom. The Covenant actually endangers and imperils the existence of the fundamental freedoms by this tragic confusion of equating them with the results of freedom.

The second conclusion is that when the social results of the expression of freedom are declared to be legal rights, then the collectivization of the whole social order is thereby demanded in order that the state may attempt to produce and distribute these political claims. If Congress should declare that each baby has a right to a silver spoon, each father can lay claim to that right for his baby. On the basis of this Covenant, each nation becomes liable for the payment of these benefits to all who make their legal claims to them. The liability of any nation would be upheld by the international tribunals. The state, therefore, would have to attempt to produce and distribute these benefits and so would inevitably move to the control and nationalization of all forms of production. The change from private ownership and free enterprise to collectivism would be automatic.

The Covenant on Human Rights is such a program, and if adopted would become the sanction for the world-wide collectivization of man.

No Common Values

The members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights seem to assume that a concept of human rights can be evolved without a common consent to the meanings of language, human existence, government, or the mores of individual societies.

Among the peoples of the world there is a veritable Babel of languages, many with entirely different definitions to the words denoting certain concepts, and many

with no words which define convictions of life and values held by others. Phrases such as "right of recognition as a person" are impossible of definition in any but small areas of the world; and because this definition partakes of the nature of religion and philosophy, it is tempered by the background of various historical cultures.

Man is as he is in the Western world partly because of the history and culture of the Greek, Roman, and Christian civilizations. Eastern man is different because of the history and culture of the East. How can a phrase unite them? Try to discover a commonly accepted meaning of crime, conscience, or peace—words used quite often in the Covenant. In the area of religion, the gamut runs all the way from natural humanism on one side to the incantations of the witch doctor on the other; from the activism of Christianity to the negative of Buddhism.

Among the peoples of the world, the philosophies of life and freedom vary from the extremes of nationalistic collectivism to individual freedom, much in the manner of two streams flowing in opposite directions, with many tributaries feeding into each. Economics is a hodgepodge of confusion with no possibility of a generally accepted definition of the economy as practiced in any one nation. Ethics is so confused that a common definition of it might be: That action which best suits the fulfillment of desire at the moment. Political systems of government range from totalitarian communism through tribalism, feudalism, absolute and constitutional monarchism, fascism, socialism, democracy, and republicanism.

Forced Uniformity

The very inharmonious nature of the heterogeneous peoples, corralled together under the term "united," constitutes the fundamental peril to the rights of man—first, because there can be no voluntary agreement upon their meaning or validity; and second, because this lack of agreement would give the most powerful unit in the association the legal means to impose its definitions of these rights on everyone. No law nor concept has any real power or effect, no matter what it may be, unless there is such a general acceptance of it that no police force is necessary to bring about its acceptance by the vast majority. There is not the slightest possibility of any declaration made by any constituent body of the United Nations today receiving such dominant acceptance; and therefore the end result of any attempt to impose this code upon the nations could only be greater disunity and strife. Only a unifying faith in the dignity of man, with the inevitable diversities of expression of individuality, enables man to accept the assumptions of the good life. No imposed code can ever attain any measure of this.

A Case History

The history of the Roman Empire should illustrate to us the impossibility of imposing a uniform structure of governmental control, and a mode of life, upon various forms of national units.

At first glance, it would appear as though the formation

of that Empire were a great success, indicating the possibility of creating a unified government across a diversity of peoples today. An imperial government, centered in Rome, set out to bring the world under one unity of control and command. Within two centuries it had imposed its rule upon the whole of the Western world, and the common system of government extended from the Rock of Gibraltar to Persia and from North Africa to Britain. Every form of culture, religion, and ethics known to the world at that time was encased within the borders of this Empire.

It is true that this system developed a surface appearance of order, and the people achieved some material benefits. War between the units ceased for a time; highways, aqueducts, dams, and many other public works were constructed; a unitary code of Roman law ruled the world; Latin became the universal language of formal and official speech and writing.

But the fact of history is that this surface uniformity never went below the surface. Within another 200 years the great Empire had crumbled. Yet the individuality of the conquered groups, which the Empire had endeavored to stamp out, persisted. The centers of Athens, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Canterbury, and Constantinople were still individualistic producers of concepts. Only Carthage was nonexistent. It had been swept off the earth. An over-all pattern of supergovernment had been imposed upon a diversity of culture, religion, and forms of mores and governments. Because there was no unity beneath the uniformity, even an imperial power could not endure. But while the supergovernment, with power to enforce its dic-

tates, could not exist, the individual areas of unity did exist. Only true unity within any society can exist without compulsion. And if compulsion is necessary, then the superstructure is an evil deception. *Only those who will unite can unite.*

A code of ethics, which the United Nations Covenant pretends to be, must follow, rather than precede, the existence of those common beliefs upon which society rests. A code of ethics can only serve as a record of what is, rather than as a formulation of what should be imposed by a majority.

There have probably been no greater disasters in the course of civilization than those which have arisen from the attempts of well-intentioned people to enforce ethical codes upon societies which had no common acceptance of the base of the codes. Athenian democracy could not even be forced upon the Spartans, a day's walk away. The attempt to do this sort of thing has always resulted in strife and conflict, as those who felt that their way of life was being coerced by an alien have rightly resisted in mind and spirit, as well as with the body.

An Ancient Error

This attempt through the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights repeats the ancient error of seeking to impose a code upon peoples before the common values and principles exist which make voluntary acceptance possible. The inevitable result can only be greater disunity, resentment, and violence—until the yoke of such a superstate is

thrown off and the freedom to unite voluntarily with those of a common mind and spirit is restored.

The Covenant offers no clear meaning of these human rights of which it speaks. There is no unequivocal definition of these rights which would protect their value; nor is there a recognition of the moral aspects of rights that inhere in the nature of man.

Society can—and in some instances should—restrict the freedom of action of the individual. But when the rules of society conform to the laws of nature or to the moral order of the universe—that is, when the government of man is in harmony with higher laws which no man can change—then the individual is essentially free. Any loss of that freedom is in reality the consequence of his failure to understand and abide by the higher law. This higher law insists that each one of us shall exercise his freedom in such a way that he will have no occasion to interfere with the equal freedom of others. In such a society, only the illiberal person who attempts to restrict the liberty of another would be punished.

But society can, and often does, impose rules which are not in harmony with the laws of nature—man-made rules that are designed to benefit some persons at the expense of others. These rules do not change the laws of nature; and they do not abolish the status of the rights of man to life and physical liberty, and to that freedom of mind and spirit which even shackles cannot deny.

This sense of innate freedom, ingrained in the very texture of the life of man, removes from any government the possibility or responsibility of making either grants or

restrictions concerning his right to speak, to assemble with companions, or to worship according to his conscience. If ever it be accepted that man has to seek such rights from the government of the nation of which he is a citizen, he would find himself at the mercy of that government; for then the power to grant or deny such a right would also have been deposited with the state.

The American Constitution and Bill of Rights declare that the government is without power to make any abridgment of these personal expressions of freedom. To this concept, American citizens have pledged allegiance. Congress did not invent the concepts of natural rights and freedoms, and Congress did not grant them. In fact, Jefferson acknowledged them before there was an American Congress; and others had announced them even before him, so they have nothing to do with Congress. That should rid us of the delusion that we need to look to Congress, or to any Parliament, or to the United Nations, for the announcement or validation of any of these rights.

Treaties And The Constitution

Let us briefly examine the effect that the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights would have on our own body of law if our Senate should ratify it.

Article 6 of the Constitution of the United States declares in part: “. . . all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitu-

tion or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."

This is a vital issue which merits thorough airing by the authorities in the field of international jurisprudence. But it is important to note here that if the Covenant on Human Rights should be adopted by the United States Senate as a treaty, its provisions would automatically become the fundamental law, not only of the federal government but also of each of our states, cities, counties, towns, and school districts, with all local laws being superseded.

There are certain factors concerning this process which should be recognized.

One is that this method could accomplish a change in the laws of the American federal, state, and local governments which Congress and the state legislatures and the local units of government have all refused to make. For instance, a program of socialized medicine would become "the supreme law of the land" if the Senate should ever adopt this Covenant as a treaty. Surely it cannot be argued logically that the constitutional provision providing for agreements upon international relations should be used for the purpose of internal legislation. But that is exactly what this proposal would do to the American structure of government.

There is another important consideration. The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution reserves to the states all those powers of government not delegated by the Constitution to the federal government. But if this treaty should be adopted—becoming, in effect, a part of the Constitution itself under Article 6 — it would supersede the Tenth

Amendment and would thus invalidate the original purpose of the Bill of Rights.

Trial By Jury

Further, the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution states: "... the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed." There is no such provision in the Covenant; if this treaty should become the supreme law of our land, there would be no guarantee to an American accused of any violation of the Covenant by any member of the United Nations that he would have either a trial by jury, or would be tried in the state and district in which the alleged crime was committed. This, of course, would violate traditional American concepts of criminal law.

The Declaration of Independence, in its listing of the grievances of the people against a sovereign whom they were about to repudiate, included that of "depriving us in many cases of the benefits of Trial by Jury: For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses." Are we now to deny the moral philosophy and ideals behind that basic American concept?

The Covenant states in Article 52 that if one nation considers that the citizens of another nation are not obeying the provisions of the Covenant as adopted in treaty form, then those citizens, or the nation itself, can be brought to international trial before the International Committee on Human Rights. It is important to understand that this

Committee on Human Rights will be a supra-international authority of nine persons which will have the powers of final interpretation and decision on all complaints and trials relating to charges of infringements of the code of morals and action described in this Covenant.

The Price Of Freedom

In the study of a document such as this Covenant, we are confronted by the paradox of representatives of the nations emotionally desiring that all the benefits and freedoms of the free peoples of the world should be extended immediately to all those who are bereft of them, while advocating means to this end that would destroy the very things they wish distributed. These people see the mass misery of several areas of mankind and wish they could see instead a picture of the mass betterment of mankind. But they do not see nor understand that these material advantages of freedom must be earned and bought with the price of personal achievement, else the recipients are subservient to the power which granted them.

The productivity of freedom in what is left of the free world today, which is the great prize that is so coveted by all the rest of humanity, was not a grant to our ancestors which they passed down to us as an inheritance. The price of liberty is personal effort, as well as eternal vigilance. It can never be a gift, even from one generation to another, any more than an education can be transmitted as a legacy from parents to children. The desire to be free is the natural heritage of all mankind. But each inheritor of the

concept must develop the context of freedom himself.

No one has better expressed this situation which confronts all believers in the rights of man than Ortega y Gasset, the Spanish philosopher, when he wrote in his book, *The Revolt of the Masses*:

“The very perfection with which the 19th Century gave an organisation to certain orders of existence has caused the masses benefited thereby to consider it, not as an organised, but as a natural system. Thus is explained and defined the absurd state of mind revealed by these masses; they are only concerned with their own well-being, and at the same time they remain alien to the cause of that well-being. As they do not see, beyond the benefits of civilisation, marvels of invention and construction which can only be maintained by great effort and foresight, they imagine that their role is limited to demanding these benefits peremptorily, as if they were natural rights. In the disturbances caused by scarcity of food, the mob goes in search of bread, and the means it employs is generally to wreck the bakeries. This may serve as a symbol of the attitude adopted, on a greater and more complicated scale, by the masses of to-day towards the civilisation by which they are supported.”

The Price Of Production

We shall not see the problem presented by this Covenant until we understand this thesis: If the good things of life—which were achieved only through the travail of the souls and minds and bodies of those who dedicated themselves

to such achievement—are demanded as benefits to be given upon demand, as rights, to those who have not earned them, then even the bakeries which produce bread will become abandoned in pursuit of a false hope. Bread is brought into existence by the toil and thought and persistence of those who understand its source, not by the crowds who demand bread and who give no concern and devote no effort to the wheat fields or the flour mills. Material goods and the resulting welfare are possessed by those who, knowing the value of those goods of life, know also that they belong only to those who earn and buy them with a great price of personal achievement, not to those who demand them as a grant without effort.

The American Principle

The American government was established on the principle that men are endowed with the right to be free persons, and that this natural right was ingrained into the very texture of the life of man before any form of community organization or government began. To that should be added its corollary: No state, nation, nor association of nations can legitimately make any abridgment of this inherent freedom. Upon this foundation of freedom, man is enabled to make contractual relations voluntarily through association with his fellow men.

This concept of human rights rests upon a valid heritage—the heritage of the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights. Each of these expressions of moral philosophy, tested by

time, presupposes the inherency of the natural rights of man as a gift of life itself, wherever and whenever it began. The stars need no human declaration of their reality, inviolability, and grandeur. In the nature of the universe, the rights of man to life and freedom are as one with the stars.

This moral concept, which makes the universe intelligible and rational, declares that no person can rationally be deprived of his life, liberty, or property—his expression of being a person—except through his own denial of the same rights to any other person.

The Enemy Of Liberty

Within five years after its founding, the United Nations—the announced purpose of which was that of being a limited authority to prevent war—is attempting to control the minds of men! No greater danger to the freedom of man has arisen since the days of the claim of the divine right of kings. This danger is a greater threat to the citizens of the United States of America than the danger from any foreign military foe; for it might be that this control, together with the abrogation of the Bill of Rights, would be thrust upon the American people, accomplishing by treaty that which the Constitution would prohibit being accomplished by legislation.

Only a new birth of the understanding of the true nature of our freedom can save us.

CAUSE OF CORRUPT GOVERNMENT

by Clarence Manion



A PRECISION tool designed for one purpose will be entirely ineffective—nay, it may even be destroyed—in an attempt to use it for another purpose. Every housewife knows that you cannot use an electric dishwasher as a garbage disposal unit. Yet, the same American people who know so much about tools and the use of tools have completely lost sight of the purpose, object, and use of the tool of government. Government is not now regarded merely as an instrument to restrain men from injuring one another but as a sort of all-purpose, around-the-clock device to make men happy and secure from the cradle to the grave. It is this perversion of government that now makes it both ridiculous and corrupt. Government does not create liberty; on the contrary, government is the one persisting danger to human liberty. Forty years ago, Woodrow Wilson said: "The history of Liberty is a history of limitations of governmental powers, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

This role of government as the enemy of liberty was

well understood by the Founding Fathers of the Republic. They wished government to have sufficient power to "restrain men from injuring one another." But beyond that, they tied it down securely with constitutional limitations, separation of powers, bills of rights, and other legal barriers and barbed wire entanglements. When somebody asked James Madison, the father of the Constitution, how such a crippled and restricted government could be expected to function, he replied: "But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary." And he further stated that our government is based on "the capacity of mankind for self-government"—in other words, upon the ability of each man to control and govern himself according to the commandments of his Creator. As men lose the power and the desire for self-control and self-reliance under God, government moves in to take up the slack. One hundred years before the Declaration of Independence was written, William Penn anticipated the foregoing conclusions of the Founding Fathers when he said that the people who will not be governed by God will be ruled by tyrants. This was true in Penn's time, and it is true in our own time. The growth of government evidences the shrinkage of the American people in their capacity and in their desire to control and govern themselves.

A swelling is one of the infallible signs of a sickness underneath, and the swelling of government in America today merely evidences the moral sickness of the people under it. Big government is for little people. The better the people, the less necessity there is for government. This

simple, vicarious relationship between the citizen and his government is obscured today in the fog of our confused political councils. It is unfortunate that we regard the growth of government as "progressive liberalism" and the so-called "natural evolution of the democratic process." This is the great error that has fabricated the fog which causes our confusion. This is the error that interrupts the peaceful process of American production and confounds our purpose in fighting the Communists at home and abroad.

We cannot defeat communism abroad by the simple device of giving government more and more power at home. Remember that communism is merely the climax of despotic governmental power; and as the concentration of the powers of our own government becomes greater and greater, we rapidly take on the likeness of the enemy we are trying to defeat. In this process, we are not defeating communism; we are rather surrendering to it.

Government is no longer contained behind the walls of the Constitution. It roams where it pleases, throughout every walk of life and throughout every department of business. From workers to wages to materials to products, the government is everywhere. We no longer have a government of laws; we have government by 100,000 roving all-powerful agents of government. In sheer desperation, the American citizen now tries to appease these representatives of government with blandishments—sometimes with bribes and corruption. Governmental corruption is not the fault of the administration nor of any man nor group of men in government. Governmental corruption is a neces-

sary consequence of the unreasonable, unconstitutional, and scandalous concentration of power which Woodrow Wilson warned us about 40 years ago. Unless this scandalous concentration of power is dissolved, corruption will not only continue, it will grow worse—and this regardless of the political complexion or personal honesty of the President of the United States.

EQUALITY AND SECURITY

by Dean Russell



IT WAS June of 1934 when I left the orphanage where I was reared—the Odd Fellows Home in Lynchburg, Virginia. In July of 1951, I was invited to return as the speaker at a Home-Coming Day celebration the following September.

As I considered whether or not to accept the invitation, my thoughts wandered back to the place where I had lived until I was eighteen. My memories of milking the cows on cold mornings when I wanted to stay in bed were not so pleasant. But my memories of the smell of fresh earth as it was turned by the plow—and of walking barefooted in the furrow—were most pleasant. There was threshing time with its heat and dirt and dust, but there were also baseball and chapel and the library.

That wonderful library! I wondered if my Horatio Alger favorites were still there: *Do and Dare*, *Work and Win*, *Ragged Dick*, *Strive and Succeed*, and many others of the same general nature. Those are the once-popular novels for children that tell of an America where the poor boy from the other side of the railroad tracks could become the president of the bank, where the penniless orphan could become a great scientist, where there was no legal nor traditional caste system to hold a person back, where virtue

was its own reward, and things of that general nature.

As those memories came flooding back, I decided to accept the invitation to return to my boyhood home as a speaker. I also decided that my speech would be mostly a discussion with the children about the perplexing problems of economic equality and material security in a world where most people have come to demand them as a birth-right rather than as a reward for hard work and intelligent thinking.

In writing the formal part of my talk, I began with an ardent defense of the American form of representative government. And, unashamedly, I mentioned God and the traditional American way of life in the same paragraph. I did this because I have a deep faith in what both of them mean and represent.

But in writing about these things, I kept firmly in mind a few basic assumptions that seem to me perfectly obvious: No two persons are equal in ability or ambition; nor should they expect equality in their resulting material possessions. Security is mental and spiritual, even more than material. True and lasting security is to be found only in the privilege of each person to be responsible for the welfare of himself and of those who are logically dependent upon him. The primary purpose of government is to prevent any person from using force to impose his will or viewpoint upon any other person, thus leaving all persons free to seek and retain whatever security, possessions, and happiness they desire and are able to earn. Every person has a moral responsibility to voluntarily help his less fortunate neighbor who is in need.

Compulsory Equality

But how was I to give a convincing explanation of the realistic but now-unpopular concept of inequality in an admittedly insecure world to a group of boys and girls ranging in age from six to eighteen? Then I thought of an approach that might help them to understand it. I remembered from my own experience that children in orphanages are generally reared under a system of absolute equality. They have equal clothes, equal food, equal housing, equal medical care, equal security, equal education, equal work, equal play, and all other such equalities. In fact, they already have, on a temporary basis, what many Americans demand from the government as rights for themselves and their children on a permanent basis.

When I lived under that system as a child, I distinctly remember that I didn't consider it at all desirable as a permanent arrangement. And I am happy to report a definite trend toward more individualism — less equality and more recognition of personal effort — in most private orphanages and similar nongovernmental institutions today.

When I entered into another form of forced equality and regimented security during my five years in the Army during World War II, I found no new evidence to convince me of their desirability. Quite the contrary! I was exceedingly happy to return to a realistic life of inequality and responsibility for my own decisions and welfare.

And so it is with most children in orphanages. While we are usually sincerely grateful to the people who have voluntarily provided us with a home while we are unable

to care for ourselves, most of us look forward to the birthday that ends our guaranteed security; that terminates our unrealistic status of equality; that begins our complete responsibility for our own decisions — for better or for worse.

Two Types Of Education

It can be stated, though, that children in orphanages may have one advantage — probably the only one — over children who are reared in normal homes where the parents so often use their votes to elect representatives who promise them government-guaranteed equality and security. Children in most orphanages receive a realistic education in the direct connection between working and having. For example, in my orphanage, we knew that the cows had to be milked before we could have milk to drink. Before we could eat potatoes, we actually had to prepare the land, plant the seed potatoes, cultivate them, and harvest them. And we were early encouraged to save some of our few pennies for a future “capital investment,” such as a college education.

Possibly that concept is indeed old fashioned. At any rate, more and more American parents are teaching their children that the government should guarantee them — from the cradle to the grave — adequate housing, free education, equal medical care, an acceptable job with adequate wages, old age benefits, subsidies, protection against competition and reality, and many other so-called progressive social measures by government. Nevertheless, I be-

lieve that all children would have a better chance of a successful adulthood if their parents — each in his own way — would teach them the vital and inescapable lesson that this “something for nothing” philosophy is false. For if any person — whether a child of nine, an adult of thirty, or an older person of sixty-five — can get what he wants without working for it, the evidence seems overwhelming that he won’t do much work. And a person with that training and philosophy naturally believes he is quite justified in voting for the political candidate who promises him the greatest amount of government-guaranteed security — including protection against any adverse results of his own freedom of choice.

A Philosophy Of Government

My experience has been that if one is so bold as to question that modern philosophy of government, he will frequently receive some such answer as this: “It is my patriotic duty to vote for the candidate who has the interests of the people most at heart. This is a government *for* the people. Its officials are my servants; they should do things *for* me and for all the other people who need help.”

Those people honestly seem to believe that the phrase “government as servant” means that government should give them material benefits — directly or through special laws. They don’t seem to realize that when the servant gains the power to support the master — and when the master becomes dependent upon the servant — the former relationship becomes completely reversed. Nor do they

seem to realize that when democracy becomes merely a device whereby the people petition government for material benefits, the right to vote has then degenerated into a mockery and a fraud and a generator of class warfare between the more successful and the less successful.

Persons And Groups

Those were the ideas I wished to discuss with the children who now lived in the orphanage that once was my home. Above all, I wanted to share with them my experience and conviction that most persons in their relationships with each other are almost always honest and charitable. If it were the other way around, we would long ago have destroyed ourselves!

It is mainly when persons combine into mobs and other militant pressure groups that tolerance and an instinctive respect for others are lost in an illogical and mad attempt to force peaceful individuals and minorities to conform to the viewpoints and prejudices of the herd. When this happens, love and charity and respect for one's fellow man receive a mortal blow.

But, fortunately, most of our everyday relationships with each other are still on a purely individual and voluntary basis — ministers and doctors and lawyers serve persons who are voluntary parishioners and patients and clients, the grocer voluntarily sells his produce to the willing purchaser, most employees still voluntarily work for willing employers at a rate of pay acceptable to each, bankers still prefer to lend money to a person at a mutually acceptable

rate of interest, most neighbors still live in peace with each other without a policeman to patrol the property lines, and so on and so on.

As long as these transactions and relationships are left to the people themselves, there is a maximum of peace and progress. In a free society, it is only rarely that government — the organized police force — has to restrain some antisocial person from imposing his will upon others. But when various peaceful persons themselves join groups to force others — legally or illegally — to conform to their ideas and desires, peace is immediately destroyed and civilization is imperiled. This is as true between groups within a nation as it is between nations. The only difference is in the size and degree of conflict.

Helping One's Neighbor

It has been my observation and experience everywhere I have lived that almost everyone is willing to help his neighbor who is truly in need — if the receiver respects the giver's right to do it voluntarily and in his own way. So far as I can now recall, no person has ever refused any sincere and logical request of mine for help, whether my need was medical, legal, spiritual, financial, educational, or whatever. In fact, so many hundreds of persons have given me assistance at various times and in various ways that I cannot now possibly recall all their names!

This principle of helping one's neighbor does not, of course, necessarily hold true if the neighbor is one who claims that the world owes him a living. The vicious and

greedy people who are always advancing their "rights" to a share of other people's money are to be ignored if possible. If necessary, they should be opposed as a simple matter of self-defense.

There is another group of persons who also claim "rights" to your property, but for a different reason: They are sincere and charitable persons who truly want to help their less fortunate fellow men; but they want to perform their charitable acts on a large scale with other people's money, instead of on the basis of their own individual capabilities and with their own money! Their sincere but misguided idea of helping people is to pass a law to force everyone to contribute to government which, in turn, will distribute the money "to those who need it most." This concept is sometimes called the "service state" or "welfare government." The people who hold this concept are especially dangerous because their intentions are so good. The purity of their motives tends to obscure the ultimate evilness of their acts.

Freedom Rejected

Whether they are aware of it or not, these well-intentioned people have lost their faith in free men. Obviously they no longer believe that freedom will work — otherwise they would not restrict or abolish it by law in so many areas of human activity. They fear that, in a free society, a great number of people would starve or, at least, remain ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed. Since they truly don't want this to happen, they naturally reject the voluntary

society in which they have lost faith, and turn for help to the force that is government. And as they advocate laws to force all of us to conform to their own concepts of human behavior, they attempt to justify their actions by claiming that compulsion by government is the only path to economic security for most people in many essential areas of life; that true liberty is to be secured only through force; that most people will not do the right thing if they have freedom of choice in the matter; that charity should be public and impersonal instead of private and personal; and that it shouldn't be called charity anyway. They will tell you that the main purpose of government is to guarantee equality and security for all, and that our aspirations and needs can be settled better by law than by love.

The Return Home

As I began to write my thoughts on these controversial ideas, I visualized the 130 or so boys and girls who would be sitting so stiffly and uncomfortably before me in the auditorium of my orphanage. I smiled as I remembered the cleaning and scrubbing and coaching that had always preceded such an occasion when I was living there.

I worked especially hard on this particular speech. I wanted to offer something of value that would be within the reach of all — something of true importance that could be appreciated and shared by the children, the visiting Odd Fellows and their sister Rebekahs, and the now-grown men and women who, like me, would be returning to our former home for this reunion.

The day arrived. I was there with happiness in my heart and my notes in my pocket. But I was bitterly disappointed.

I wanted to see again the room in which I had lived and dreamed. I could not — the building was closed and locked. Other buildings had also been closed — including the library that I had especially wanted to visit again. Most of the fields where we once labored so hard to plant and reap were unused and overgrown with weeds and bushes. Where I had remembered a lively activity of life and work and hope, there was now the appearance of decay.

The Reason

There was, of course, a reason for this. The buildings were closed and the land was unused because there were only 26 children in the Home! But what is the reason, I asked, for this decrease from 130 to 26? Are there now fewer orphans? Do homeless children now need less help than formerly?

No, neither of these was the reason. It seems that government has now almost completely taken over the responsibility for child welfare. It is a combination of local, state, and federal governments. There is the appearance of local administration, but the money comes from both the state and federal governments. The state governments have the direct control, but they must conform to the various "suggestions" from the federal government if they expect to continue to receive federal funds.

Widowed mothers may now receive money from govern-

ment if they keep their children at home. The government may also pay a yearly bonus to unwed mothers for every child produced. And children who have lost both parents — or, for that matter, children with living parents — may now be “warded out” by government to relatives and nonrelatives who will maintain a home according to government specifications in return for government money. In each instance, the welfare workers have the legal right to inspect the children and mothers and foster parents. The government sees to it that the children are housed and clothed and fed and educated according to government standards. The government, under the various state laws, even has the legal right to enter the home and to take the children from the parents or foster parents if the children are not being reared in a manner acceptable to the government authorities.

The Result

This movement began in some of our states as long ago as 1911. But it received its real impetus when the federal government moved in during the 1930's with its aid to dependent children. The end result of this solution to an admitted problem can be visualized by this specific example from a “question and answer” column by Dorothy Dix:

Question: “I asked the state to board my children out two years ago as I was ill and couldn't take care of them. Now we are trying to get them home, but are told we can't provide a proper living for them. They have let two of them come home, but are keeping the other three. I am heartsick about it and

can't sleep nights. The welfare says they will put them out for adoption. (Mrs. G. H.)"

Answer: "Though local laws differ in this matter, I doubt very much if your children can be put out for adoption without your consent. See a lawyer to learn your rights in getting the youngsters back. If you have no money, get in touch with the Legal Aid Society in your nearest big city. You will find their address in the telephone book. Then, by scrupulous care of the two children you have with you, convince the authorities of your fitness as a mother, so they'll have no alternative but to return the other children to you."

She must convince the government of her fitness as a mother before she can have her own children! Defend, if you will, government aid to homeless and helpless and innocent children. Point out all the horrible suffering that this government money may have stopped. Condemn the admitted evilness of some parents. Proclaim the admitted efficiency and compassion of highly-trained government social workers. Admit the good intentions of the advocates of government aid to dependent children. Yes, recite all of the points favorable to government-guaranteed equality and security for innocent children. Then look again at your own children — and realize the harsh fact that you may keep them only as long as your government considers you to be a fit parent according to government standards. It is true that the iron fist may as yet be gloved in thick velvet, but this does not deny the reality of the situation.

It seems to me that any law to determine the fitness of parents to be the guardians of their own children is a sure road to injustice and disaster. When government has the

power to direct or control the family, the basis of our society is in danger; for the only alternative to parental responsibility is some form of compulsory communal control. Human dignity and love cannot long survive under such a system.

Protecting Children

I can think of no reason why the government should ever step between parents and children *as such*. Children are, of course, persons. And under a government of law, they are entitled to the protection of law like any other person, regardless of age. If a parent commits a crime against his child—such as “cruel and unusual punishment”—he should be restrained by law in exactly the same manner as if he had done the injury to any other person.

If parents are criminals, put them in jail — not as parents but as persons. If parents are criminally insane, confine them. Only when both parents are dead or confined should any other person or group of persons consider the problem of what to do with their dependent children.

If no one has the legal responsibility for such destitute children — or if those who have it refuse to fulfill their legal and moral obligations — then the children may logically and justly be left with some person or group of persons who choose to recognize their moral responsibility to care for abandoned and helpless children. And if there are no persons who will accept such moral responsibility — individually or by voluntary group action through their churches and other charitable organizations — then God

has been rejected, and it is pointless to haggle over the fate of a few children when all humanity is lost.

No person has any moral right whatsoever to interfere between parents and children *as such*, nor to determine the parents' right to have children and to rear them according to their own beliefs and convictions. The person who claims otherwise is saying, in effect, that his is the only standard by which other persons shall live and rear their children. It is not at all surprising to find that a few persons with that belief carry it to its logical conclusion by advocating that the state shall be empowered to sterilize persons who do not measure up to some arbitrary standard that some persons wish to impose upon other persons.

Contemplation

After I had learned the reason for the present circumstances of my former home, I wandered away by myself into the grove of magnificent oak trees that I remembered from my childhood. I sat on the ground and thought about the future of private charity and personal compassion, and about the speech that I was soon to make.

I did not wish to debate the merits of institutional care for children versus grants-in-aid to mothers and foster parents to help them rear the children in a home atmosphere. I wanted only to discuss whether the government should use its taxing powers to force its citizens to support *either* method.

My belief is that there is no clear-cut answer to the question of institutional care versus home care for orphans and

children from broken or incomplete homes. Probably there is need for both, with the decision to be based on the circumstances of each individual case.

On an over-all basis, I believe that I received sound training and excellent care in my orphanage. And most of my fellow-orphans to whom I have talked have told me they feel the same way.

Of course, none of us consider an orphanage a perfect place to live. And, of course, we who were reared in the Home cannot know for sure that we were better off there than we would have been with relatives or foster parents. We have no true comparison. Nor can any other person say with complete assurance that a child will have a better chance in a broken or incomplete or foster home than in an institution with other children of like circumstances. *That is why I feel so strongly that no law should be passed one way or the other.*

The True Test

The problem is how best to help destitute children from incomplete homes. I may decide that the small amount of money I have available for this purpose will do the greatest amount of good if I give it to an institution for the care of children. Other people may think differently than I do in this respect. They may prefer to give their money to help support children in foster homes. Good! Let them devote their money and time to helping their fellow men in their own way. And let them accord me the same privilege! Let the test be on the realistic basis of what

a person voluntarily does with his own money, *not on the unrealistic basis of what he is willing to vote to do with other people's money.*

It seems to me an evil and immoral thing for a person to try, in any manner, to force others to conform to his ideas of Christianity and the helping of one's neighbor in need. Why do so many people advocate laws to do it? I am convinced that no lasting good can come from such a use of force. I wonder how Jesus would have handled the story of the Good Samaritan if the good deed had been performed by an agent of Caesar who had legally taxed a proportionate amount of the necessary money from the priest, the Levite, and the Samaritan! Under those circumstances, there could hardly have been a message to inspire men of good will down through the centuries.

Moral Principles

Those were the disturbing and controversial ideas that entered my mind as I sat alone shortly before I was to speak. In line with what I had been thinking, I jotted down several thoughts on the subjects of morality and moral principles, and their relationship to the idea of helping one's fellow men.

There were several hundred people in the audience. Ironically, the children to whom I had planned to talk were not present; they were elsewhere practicing their parts in the day's program. So my speech, instead of being offered as friendly advice to a group of orphans about to face the world on their own, was switched to a discussion

with adults about some of the basic moral principles which underlie the standards they might want their own children to follow.

I began by stating my conviction that a moral principle has the same value in the area of human relationships that a physical principle has in the area of physics, or a chemical principle in the science of chemistry. For example, the moral principle summarized in the Commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," is just as true and timeless as is the physical principle known as the law of gravity. Both have always been true, both are true today, and both will remain true forever — they are a part of eternal truth.

Eternal Truth Denied

All of us are aware of the workings of natural law in the fields of physics and mathematics. But few persons yet seem to understand the operation of natural law in the field of human relationships. In fact, many prominent persons deny that there is any such thing as eternal truth in relationships between persons. A Justice of our present Supreme Court has stated in an official opinion: "Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes." The statement was contained in a majority decision!

Admittedly, we don't yet know as much about moral law — natural law in the area of human relationships — as we know about natural law in science. But it seems to me that the only conclusion properly to be drawn from this fact is that we have much to learn.

We discover the existence and operation of moral laws in much the same manner that we discover the existence and operation of the laws of any other science — by experience, by observation, by trial and error, by deduction, by experimentation, and, possibly, by intuition or revelation. And since the relationships between persons are vital to society itself, the leading philosophers and students of ancient times apparently devoted considerably more time to the study of moral laws than they did to the study of physical and mathematical laws. It was only some 250 years before Christ that Euclid formulated the natural laws of geometry. But the natural laws of human relationships that are summarized in the Ten Commandments were formulated at least 1200 years before Christ.

Ignorance Is No Excuse

Moral and physical principles may, of course, be ignored. But the principles themselves continue to exist and to operate and to be completely oblivious of human desires. For example, I still remember most vividly a certain winter's day when I was fourteen years old and living in the Home. I decided to go skating. I decided that the ice would hold me. But it didn't.

My ignorance of the natural laws of physics and chemistry was no excuse; it didn't prevent the ice from breaking. Even when an innocent baby tumbles from a window, its ignorance of the law of gravity is of no help. Nor is there any use in cursing or denying the law of gravity, or in claiming that it isn't fair. There is nothing we can do about

natural law — be it moral or physical or economic or whatever — except study it and conform to its mandates.

I also remember another episode that happened while I was in the Home. I stole two new sheets and sold them for a quarter. I can still recall my feeling of guilt and fear when I took the sheets from the supply room and hid them in a closet — took them late at night from the closet and hid them in the barn — took them the next day from the barn and sold them to a poor family for two dimes and a nickel — took the money and bought seven candy bars. Yes, I can still recall it and other episodes like it. That is a part of my punishment.

You see, I had broken a natural law in the field of morality when, without the owner's consent, I took something that did not belong to me. And the consequences of breaking the moral law against stealing are just as certain as are the consequences of ignoring any other natural law. The only difference is in the form of punishment. The consequences of breaking physical or chemical laws are instantaneous and frequently dramatic. They are usually obvious to everyone because we know so much about the direct connection between the act and the result. The consequences of breaking the moral laws against coveting or stealing your neighbor's property may not be so obvious and dramatic.

For example, one of the punishments for breaking a moral law is the mere remembering of it. That lasts for varying periods of time, depending upon the circumstances of the theft and the sensitiveness of the thief. And that is what a person means when he speaks of his conscience —

the guide that he must follow if he is to have any real happiness in life.

Retribution for the breaking of moral laws — such as those summarized in the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule — may assume many other forms. Among them — and depending upon the kind or degree of immorality — may be revenge from the persons wronged, social ostracism, loss of character, bestiality, a guilt complex and various other personality complexes, the development and encouragement of greed and gluttony, parasitism or dependence, ever-increasing laziness, the destruction of one's creative ability and the failure to fully develop one's potentiality, mental ills and physical diseases brought on by vice and corruption, injury and disgrace to one's family, worry, fear, poverty, degeneracy, and finally, whatever judgments there may be after physical death.

Judas Iscariot betrayed a trust — violated a moral law — and he felt the enormity of his guilt so much that he killed himself. A murderer or an embezzler may take his own life for the simple reason that he can no longer bear to face his family and friends nor, for that matter, even himself. Others don't go to such lengths, but their punishment is still certain in various other forms.

Do all of these undesirable things automatically happen to every person who breaks a moral law? Indeed not, or mankind would long ago have destroyed itself completely! But when I ignored the physical laws governing the results of skating on thin ice, I did not die either. I did, however, get chilled and wet and catch a cold, and I ran the risk of death. So it is with the natural laws of morality; every

violation of the moral code leaves its inevitable mark in one way or another, and repeated violations will surely lead to complete degeneration.

The Eighth Commandment

If this is true — and who will deny it? — let us examine again the moral principle, “Thou shalt not steal,” and its bearing on the problem of helping our less fortunate neighbors.

Natural law decrees that no one is immune to death from accidents or from various ills of the flesh. So there will always be orphans and widowed mothers with small children. And, frequently, these unfortunate persons may need assistance. The only disagreement among persons of good will would seem to be in the appropriateness of the means used to accomplish this desirable end.

It is my belief that an attempt to accomplish a good deed by evil means is no more logical than trying to grow wheat from tare seeds. Evil begets evil, just as surely as night follows day. And I am equally sure that if I always knew the right thing to do — and always did it — good, not evil, would always be the result. Any seeming evidence to the contrary is probably due to my ignorance of what is right, or to my incomplete knowledge of the inevitable workings of moral law, or to my inability to recognize that a result displeasing to me may still be a good result in spite of my temporary unhappiness.

But, apparently, the vast majority of the American people believe that good ends can be achieved through evil

means, thus justifying the means; that it is perfectly all right to take another person's money by force, or by threat of force, if the proceeds are to be used to alleviate human suffering — provided, of course, that the taking is done with the sanction of the majority of the people.

Our Criminal Code

As individuals, most of us reject theft in our personal relationships. I doubt that any of us would consider it morally correct to pick his neighbor's pocket in order to help another person. And our criminal code is based on the theory of natural law that the number of persons involved in a robbery — and the use made of the loot — does not excuse anyone; the person who plans the robbery, the person who drives the get-away car, and the person who wields the gun are equally guilty. Nor is their theft justified because they decide to give some — or even all — of the money to an orphanage or to a poor widow with small children. Our criminal law states clearly — and in complete harmony with moral law — that the good end for which the money is used does not excuse the evil means of getting the money. If this were not true, our robbers and thieves could justify their evilness by giving some of their loot to charity. In fact, many of them do attempt such justification!

Our criminal code also recognizes the natural law concept that each member of a "lynch mob" is as guilty as the person who handles the rope. But it is in this area that most people seem to become confused concerning the operation of natural law. Apparently it is the fact of the large number

of people involved that causes the confusion. It is thought that if enough people believe a thing to be right, then surely it must be right!

Each of us can see the moral justice in punishing the individual robber who wields a gun. Many of us are not quite sure that all of the participants in a robbery are as guilty as the one robber among them who murders the cashier during the holdup. Most of us attach no guilt whatever to the hundreds or thousands of individuals who are in the mob that destroys or loots property, or murders. And it seems that almost everyone will deny that any possible immorality is involved when millions of people vote to have their representatives and policemen and tax collectors take money from some people and give it to others.

And yet the same principle or natural law is violated in each case; force, or the threat of force, is used against persons to make them surrender their honestly acquired property against their wills.

Democracy

At this point, most persons will use the word "democracy" to justify this procedure. They will maintain that it is morally correct to take another person's money if the majority of the people are in favor of it.

It seems to me that legalities and moralities are here being confused. Apparently we have now drifted so far from the concept of eternal truth that we have come to believe that the way to determine "right" is to vote on it; that what is legal is automatically morally right; that what

is illegal is thereby automatically morally wrong; that truth is determined by majority decision; *that might makes right*.

But legalities do not determine moralities. Might does not make right. The fact that 51 per cent of the people may vote to take other people's money and give it to poor widows with children, does indeed make that act legal. But the act itself is still thievery — the taking of a person's property without his consent — and all the man-made laws in the world cannot change its immorality.

Robin Hood and Jesse James were common robbers, even though in our literature and movies they have been pictured as heroes because they sometimes shared their loot with the poor. Admittedly, the robber who takes my money at the point of a gun and gives part of it to a worthy charity should not be condemned any more than the people who elect an agent to do the same thing to me on some sort of a percentage basis.

No person has a moral right to satisfy his charitable instincts with money taken by force from its rightful owner. Theft is theft, and the number of persons involved — or the mechanism used to relieve a person of his money against his will — does not change that fact.

Render Unto Caesar . . .

A long time ago, Jesus Christ indicated that a person should render unto government that which properly belongs to government, and unto God that which properly belongs to God. Unfortunately — or maybe fortunately — He did not choose to say which is which. Ever since then,

much as they had before, men have argued and fought and killed in an effort to determine the proper functions of government. A hundred years ago, Karl Marx, the father of communism, advanced his famous solution to that problem. He said that government should take "from each according to his abilities" and give "to each according to his needs." And, as Marx then predicted, every nation in the world has now accepted his principle of government. The only difference between the various nations is in the degree to which the principle is applied.

Almost all of the American people deny, of course, that they — through their government — operate on the theories of Karl Marx. But while they continue to deny it vociferously, they continue to vote to have their agents take the honestly acquired property and income of some people against their wills and give it to other people who have not earned it. In Russia, this process is called communism. In England, it is called socialism. In America, it is called social welfare. In the field of moral law, it is called thievery — taking by force or stealth that which rightfully belongs to another person.

Choice And Consequence

No one will deny that relationships among the peoples of the world are bad. Few will deny that our own country is in serious internal trouble. What is the reason?

Most of us have rejected the concept of an absolute moral law. Probably this rejection is due more to lack of understanding than to deliberate design. But in either

instance, the consequences are the same. In the place of moral law, we have chosen to substitute the force of government as the proper means to deal with the problems of human relationships at home and abroad. The inevitable result of such a choice is visible to anyone who cares to see.

And before we engage in a war to free the people of Russia or of any other country from the compulsions and prohibitions and regimentations of their evil governments, let us reject the equally evil compulsions and prohibitions and regimentations that are developing within our own government here at home, where the state is increasingly assuming control of all of us — children and adults, orphans and non-orphans — under the guise of providing for our welfare. This seems to me an evil thing, because we are shirking our moral duty to God, to ourselves, and to our fellow men by turning over to Caesar that which properly belongs in the religious and moral areas of personal responsibility.

An Unanswered Question

Those were the disturbing and controversial ideas that I presented to the people who were gathered last September at the orphanage that was my boyhood home. I ended my talk by recalling that beautiful June day in 1934 when I had stepped so confidently into a life of my own. I remembered the man who had given me a lift in his car to the city where I was going. I remembered the person who gave me my first job the next day. I thought about the thousands of individuals I had met in various parts of the world —

Russians and Germans, Chinese and Japanese, Negroes and Whites, Christians and non-Christians, executives and machinists, rich and poor. Individually, I got along well with them. Seldom have I been disappointed in my relationships with individual persons who had no power over me.

I left my audience with this unanswered question: Why is it that when these same peaceful and charitable individuals combine themselves into a group with a "cause," they immediately begin advocating some plan to force their ideas upon me and upon other persons who think differently? Why?

DISCRIMINATION

by F. A. Harper



WHEN a child is born, his development is watched with anxious anticipation by those who wish him well. He begins to laugh and scream with pleasure and displeasure about more and more things, as his capacity for discrimination increases more and more. This is not a tragedy; it is a blessing. A child without any sense of discrimination is cursed with the threat of self-destruction.

The case of Beverly Smith, as reported by Dr. Frank R. Ford of Johns Hopkins Hospital, is interesting and significant. Due to some defect or short circuit in Beverly's central nervous system, she has no sense of pain. When she falls down, or bumps her head, or puts her hand on a hot stove, or cuts herself with a knife, there is no pain. A blessing to Beverly? No. This censoring of Nature's important warnings may save her some initial pains, but it exposes her to the terrible consequences of ignoring the danger signals of pain from heat, broken bones, or appendicitis. All this because Beverly can not discriminate in feeling. She is a tragic care to her mother, who can protect her in some ways but who has no way of protecting her against all those dangers where Nature sends a private warning only to the threatened victim. The results would be exactly

the same if a person capable of discrimination were to fail to act on its guidance.

Another child fails to develop any discrimination for sound. He is deaf and dumb, and destined to suffer all the tragedy which that implies. He is spared the alarm of startling noises, whether it be an explosion or the warning of a rattlesnake. He is protected from having to endure an off note in a symphony; but in being relieved from suffering off notes, he is also prohibited from ever enjoying a harmony. In being saved the alarm of noises, he must forego the sound of warnings. He is victimized by his own inability to discriminate.

Wisdom Means Discrimination

Discrimination was said by Gautama Buddha to be the greatest essential human virtue. Truly it is a blessing — a blessing that is also in harmony with Judeo-Christian ideals. It is necessary to progress and to the advancement of civilization.

Many of the leading problems of our day, I believe, stem from a thought-disease about discrimination. It is well known that discrimination has come to be widely scorned. And politicians have teamed up with those who scorn it, to pass laws against it — as though morals can be manufactured by the pen of a legislator and the gun of a policeman.

What is this thing, this discrimination, which has become so widely dubbed as an evil?

Discrimination is the exercise of choice. It necessarily

arises from knowledge and wisdom. And the greater the knowledge and wisdom, the higher the degree of discrimination. Visualize a person who can discriminate nothing. He would be as a stone! He would have no capacity for choice, no ability to guide any of his own affairs or to be in any degree his own master through self-controlled and independent acts. He would be utterly and wholly dependent, if indeed he could live. He would be as much the slave of others as is a stone the slave of the winds, the floods, and chemical changes — incapable of any selective control of his place in the universe.

Nature Demands Discrimination

Man was obviously intended to be a discriminating being. But the animals, too, have this capacity for discrimination. We know how certain animals have one or another of the senses developed to an even higher degree than *Homo sapiens*.

The outstanding thing about discrimination in man, in contrast to other forms of life as we know them, is his capacity for choice beyond the direct application of his senses to his immediate surroundings. He is sometimes called the reasoning animal because of his capacity for thinking in the abstract, or reasoning. It is this quality that makes possible all invention, all discovery, all advancement. The discovery of something new obviously means that someone has explored possibilities beyond the direct observing and sensing of what is present.

We may properly, then, take pride in the development

of the power of discrimination in the child. The more the better, especially when it takes the form of reasoning and abstract thinking. Unusual powers of discrimination are the tools by which he may become a great scientist, or a creator in some other form. He is able to develop something notable only as he is capable of, and exercises, choice. He then becomes able to contribute to the advancement of human welfare, rather than merely to exist in civilization in such a manner that human welfare is no better for his having been here.

It is the power of discrimination which makes it possible for the child to exercise that blessed capacity for choice. Yet when the child grows to adulthood, because of some peculiar twist of "modern thought," he is confronted on every hand with the idea that discrimination is a sin. At its ultimate and logical conclusion, this concept flowers into governmental prohibition of choice, because government is the principal agent of force used to rob men of their right of choice. Carried to its ultimate, a controlled society removes choice from every sphere of human conduct, including religious practice, place of work, whom one will hire, with whom one will trade, and at what price. Let us now take a closer view of one or two forms of this thought-disease about discrimination.

Discrimination In Employment

The "fair employment practices" laws are of this type. According to these laws, one is prohibited from discriminating against the employment of a person because of his

race, color, and the like. This type of law reveals, on closer scrutiny, the dangers inherent in the "nondiscrimination" thinking of our time.

Not everyone can work at every job. Only one person can work at each job, which means that nobody else can have it at the same time. Such is the nature of things — a natural law which no man-made law can revoke. It follows, then, that there must unavoidably be a selection of the person who is to work at any one job. There must be discrimination in this situation. The only remaining question is: Who shall have the right of decision? He must somehow choose the one for the job; he must somehow discriminate.

The method used in a free and voluntary society is to allow agreement between the two persons concerned — the employer and the employee. No one else is rightfully concerned. If A wishes B rather than anyone else to work for him; and if B wants the job, there is a meeting of minds by choice and agreement of the only two persons who merit a vote in the matter.

If it were to be said that C has a right to claim the job, it would mean that the right of decision, which properly belongs to A and to B, has now been confiscated by C. Not only that, but D and E and all the others who might want the job should, in justice, have rights equal to those of C; the result would be innumerable equal claims to the one job. This is a nonequation, subject to no solution. A decision must somehow be reached.

If there continues a denial to A and B of their rights in the matter, so that the question persists of who shall have the job, it becomes necessary to select an arbitrator. Under

socialism in any of its forms and by any of its names, arbitration becomes the business of government, since government is supposed to be the unquestioned reservoir of justice. But the government has no basis for selecting the man who shall have that job, except as some one bureaucrat renders the decision arbitrarily and exercises his own personal choice or preference. Discrimination has not been eliminated; it cannot be eliminated, by the very nature of things. All that has happened has been the transfer of the rights of discrimination to a bureaucrat who has no basic concern — and no fundamental right of choice — in the matter. He now becomes the discriminator, under a scheme supposedly designed in the first place to eliminate discrimination by the employer.

The Right To Choose

The claim is made, of course, that an employer is “unfair” or “discriminatory” if his choice is on some basis that is said to be unwise. It is charged, for instance, that A hired B instead of C because he did not like C’s race or color or religion or something. But the basis for A’s considerations in his choice, or his motives, cannot possibly be known with certainty by any other person. How can any law like these “fair employment practices” laws, then, be fairly administered? How can a judge render a wise decision on the basis of unknowns?

And in any event, what difference does it make how A arrived at his choice? One cannot question the basis for a choice without questioning the right of choice itself. There

isn't much sense to saying that I have the right, for instance, to select any kind of cheese I wish, but that I have no right to select one in preference to another because it tastes better, or has a more appealing color, or is made from the milk of better cows. The right of choice is the right of choice; the reasons therefor become a sacred part of the right of choice itself. This same analysis should apply also to B's discriminating choice of the job offered by A.

If there were no discrimination in employment — no rights of choice — there would be no means by which persons could find their best place to work; no means by which persons could develop and use their best talents; no means by which management could be good rather than bad; no means by which accomplishment and merit could find reward.

Discrimination In Association

One of the leading areas for charges of discrimination is that of association. It would seem that if one is to be non-discriminating, he must share his company equally with every race, every shade of color, every nationality, every religion, every age, each sex, and every one of innumerable other differences which comprise the means of discrimination. One cannot help but wonder in this connection what would comprise nondiscrimination, for instance, in the realm of matrimony. Monogamy would certainly disappear — unless, again, the state were to take over all matrimonial affairs, and then it would be a bureaucrat who would become the discriminator for the victims.

All friendship is founded on discrimination. Are we to conclude that friendship is an evil thing? Should attempts be made to communalize friendship?

There comes to mind the story of one ne'er-do-well who selected his friends on the basis of their individual merits as he judged them, not on the basis of their race, nationality, or religion. The following conversation ensued with a new acquaintance:

"Do you like the Jews?" he was asked.

"No," he replied.

"Do you like the Japanese?"

"No."

"The Chinese?"

"No."

"The Italians?"

"No."

"Who, then, do you like?"

"My friends, just my friends!"

Nondiscrimination And Conflict

The prevailing attitudes about discrimination in employment, in friendships, or in anything else, are based on the assumption that discrimination leads to conflict, and that legislation against it is necessary to keep order and the peace. On the contrary, I believe that laws against discrimination generate rather than quell disputes and conflict.

Note if you will, in the illustration about employment, the peaceful decision when A decides to hire B for a job, and B decides to take the offer. Compare it as a peaceful

decision with the situation that arises when all others who might want the job are made to believe that they have a right to that job. Nor does the chaos and conflict subside when a nondiscrimination law is passed to give legal backing to all these impossible claims to rights — when a bureaucrat takes over and rations the job to one of his friends, perhaps with a view to vote-getting.

Fallacy And Fact

Trouble over discrimination against Negroes seems to have become intensified in this country in recent years, under an acceleration of accusations and after passage of nondiscrimination laws. We have been led to believe, for instance, that lynchings of Negroes have been on a long-time increase and that such legal measures have become necessary to keep order and the peace. The fact is, on the contrary, that there has been a long-time decline in the number of lynchings, which had all but disappeared a quarter of a century ago; this decline from its peak in the nineties applies to the lynching of Whites as well as Negroes.

Promoters of the communist ideals have generated chaos and class conflict by generating this phobia about discrimination and persecution. This has led to false claims of rights. Part of the same kit of communist tools is the idea that private property is the consequence of discrimination against those who do not own it. If nonowners can be made to believe this and to help pass laws to correct it, they will fight to have it corrected by "fair ownership laws"

whereby all private property is confiscated for the "ownership of all." This is the essence of communism itself, and it is already far advanced in the United States under devious and subtle devices.

Wherever personal rights to discriminate and choose are violated, either by a sweep of emotional sentiments or by law, peaceful solutions to Nature's law of limitations are replaced with chaos and conflict.

When the attempt is made to widen rights and create claims in excess of what is available to fulfill these claims, conflict becomes inevitable and persistent. Two or more claims to one job cause conflict. Two or more claims to the same land cause conflict. Two or more claims to the same husband or wife cause conflict.

The Solution

Conflict in all these areas can be curbed only by some device which will restrict rights or claims to any desired object, so that there is the necessary equality between the supply of a thing and the valid claims against it. There must be only one right to one job; only one deed to one piece of property. The function of the device of private property, in contrast to the impossible socialist-communist concept that everyone owns everything under "ownership in common," is to equate ownership with the property to be owned. The function of price in a free market, in contrast to a controlled price with rationing of an artificial shortage created by a governmental bureaucracy, is likewise to equate supply and demand for what is available.

The Judeo-Christian admonitions about the brotherhood of man and about loving one's fellow men can hardly mean that man-made laws should be allowed to interfere with these methods of peaceful adjustment to human preferences and to the scarcities of desired things. Man should be allowed to continue his self-improvement on earth through the exercise of judgment and freedom of choice according to his conscience. When this concept of rights is combined with conduct according to the familiar guides of Judeo-Christian ethics, I believe the destiny of man will best be fulfilled and that peace will reign at its maximum.

If man is to continue his self-improvement, he must be free to exercise the powers of choice with which he has been endowed. When discrimination is not allowed according to one's wisdom and conscience, both discrimination and conscience will atrophy in the same manner as an unused muscle. Since man was given these faculties, it necessarily follows that he should use them and be personally responsible for the consequences of his choices. He must be free to either enjoy or endure the consequences of each decision, because the lesson it teaches is the sole purpose of experience — the best of all teachers.

When one's fellow men interpose force and compulsions between him and the Source of his being — whether by the device of government or otherwise — it amounts to interrupting his self-improvement, in conflict with what seems to be the Divine design. Man must be left free to discriminate and to exercise his freedom of choice. This freedom is a virtue and not a vice. And freedom of choice sows the seeds of peace rather than of conflict.

TWO KINDS OF EXCHANGE

by Leonard E. Read



BOILED down to its essence, the economic issue between the Libertarians and the Socialists is one of willing exchange versus unwilling exchange.

The Libertarians stand for free trade or voluntary or willing exchange. The Socialists stand for compulsory or unwilling exchange.

There are not many 100 per cent Socialists. Even if they could, no more than a few would socialize or communize or collectivize all human activities. The meaning of the socialistic position becomes apparent to nearly everyone if socializing is carried to its ultimate and logical conclusion.

In the practical politics of our day, the Socialist presses for socializing (sometimes called "nationalizing") the more important means of production. He insists that all of us, regardless of interest, must give of our substance to aid "classes" or "categories" of the citizenry —

THE METHOD: subsidies and controls.

THE RATIONALE: society has a first lien on the fruits of everyone's labor.

THE DEVICE: the agency of organized force — government.

There are not many 100 per cent Libertarians. Few persons, even if they could, would go so far as to relegate government's part in the market to the suppression of fraud, misrepresentation, predatory practices, and violence — to the use of repellent or defensive, as distinguished from initiated or coercive, force. In short, there are few persons who believe that government can properly have no rights not possessed by individuals. The person who really believes that others can control their creative activities better than he can control them is rare indeed.

In the practical politics of our day, the 100 per cent Libertarian presses toward desocialization. He looks to conditions and the time when government will grant no special privileges; when government will defend the life and livelihood of all citizens equally; when anyone can do precisely as he pleases as long as he does no injury to others; when the fruit of one's labor is one's own to use, to give away, or to exchange.

Socialists — believers in organized force as a means of directing creative activities of citizens — are believers in unwilling exchange. As examples: Regardless of my unwillingness, they believe that I should be forced to exchange some of my earnings for the "prosperity" of Tennessee Valley residents; or for a government promise of benefit payments in my old age; or for the rehabilitation of alcoholics in Washington, D. C.; or for "free" wheat to India and Pakistan; or for the public ownership of butter, in order that the dairymen's price may be sustained; or for — the list is beyond comprehension. These unwilling exchanges run into the hundreds of millions annually.

Their number could be tabulated only if all government "benefits" and "services" were put on a shelf, so to speak, as in a grocery store, and then a count made of the ones not bought. What an inventory there would be!

Two persons are involved in every exchange. If it is to be willing exchange, obviously each party to the exchange must be a willing participant. This is the kind of exchange Libertarians favor.

The Socialist seems to look upon government as an end in itself, while the Libertarian looks upon government merely as the means to counteract the evil of anyone's practicing violence, fraud, and so forth. The Socialist tends to look upon government as the major source of "the common good." The Libertarian distrusts government and watches it closely at all times to make sure that it does not itself become predatory under the guise of defending the life, liberty, and property of the citizens.

The Socialist puts his trust in the force of government. The Libertarian puts his trust in himself and other free men who meet in a market place where no person has the power to force any other person to conform to his viewpoint or desires in any respect except "Don't aggress against me."

Socialists believe that if services and goods were exchanged only if and when mutual willingness prevailed, society would suffer; that people, by and large, would not attend to their own interests; that they would not make the "right" decisions. Socialists are fallible folks, even as you and I. But in spite of that obvious fact, Socialists believe that society is improved when their wills are imposed on

the rest of us; that society is menaced if you and I and others go without controls over our affairs. They believe they can direct my life in ever so many areas "better" than I can direct my life myself. Socialists have little faith in what free men can and would accomplish.

Libertarian beliefs are quite the opposite. They have faith in the potential accomplishments and the moral rightness of willing exchange. Indeed, a Libertarian cannot be an authoritarian. He limits his own belief in force to repellent or defensive force against those who aggress against him. And he believes in a government limited to the use of this same force, administered equally and justly for all. The Libertarian leaves all else to private initiative and to willing exchange.

EDUCATION FOR 1984

by Arthur E. Bestor, Jr.



No belief is more firmly held in the United States than belief in education. But belief is not enough. We must understand education as well as believe in it. The thing that counts, after all, is not the number of schoolrooms we have, but what goes on in them.

Our civilization requires of every man and woman a variety of complex skills which rest upon the power to read, write, and calculate, and upon sound knowledge of science, history, economics, and other fundamental disciplines. Intellectual training is essential for the survival of our civilization, because civilization itself has been built by intellectual effort.

Consider how the disciplines of science and learning came into being. The world is first known to us—and was to mankind—as a great tangle of confused perceptions. Before man can deal with it at all, he must differentiate one experience from another; and he must discover relationships among them: similarity and diversity, cause and effect, and the like. Gradually he discovers that one kind of relationship can best be investigated in one way (by controlled experiment, it may be), and another in another way (by the critical study of written records or of fossil

remains, perhaps). Thus the separate disciplines were born, not out of arbitrary invention, but out of evolving experience. Trial and error, prolonged over centuries, has resulted in the perfecting of these tools of investigation. The methods can be systematized and taught; hence the intellectual power that mankind has accumulated throughout its entire history can be passed on to successive generations. Thereby each generation is enabled to master the new environment and the new conditions of life that surround it.

Enslaving Men's Minds

In that terrifying novel by George Orwell, *1984*, the Party of Big Brother developed the ultimate in ruthless dictatorship precisely because it devised the means of enslaving men's minds. It began by undermining the discipline of history, setting all men adrift in a world where past experience became meaningless. It continued by undermining the discipline of language, debasing speech until it could no longer be the vehicle of independent thought. And the crowning triumph of its torture chambers was the undermining of the disciplines of logic and mathematics, by which it finally brought its victims not only to assert but actually to believe that two plus two equals five.

As yet, fortunately, it is only through fantasy that we can see what the destruction of the scholarly and scientific disciplines would mean to mankind. From history, we can learn what their existence has meant. The sheer power of disciplined thought is revealed in practically all the great

intellectual and technological advances which the human race has made. The ability of the man of disciplined mind to direct this power effectively upon problems for which he was not specifically trained is proved by examples without number. This ability to solve new problems by using the accumulated intellectual power of the race is mankind's most precious possession. To transmit this power of disciplined thinking is the primary and inescapable responsibility of education.

A Concept Repudiated

The concept of education that I have just stated is *not* guiding the American public schools today. An alarming number of professional educators—school superintendents, professors of education, and members of the state educational bureaucracies—have repudiated it in favor of something which is apt to be called “life-adjustment education.” As an example, let us examine a study sponsored by the superintendent of public instruction in Illinois, looking toward the reorganization of the public-school curriculum in that state. Its starting point is a document entitled *Problems of High School Youth*, prepared by a professor of education. Questionnaires based upon it have been widely circulated, and the answers are supposed to “be helpful in ‘engineering’ an improved, broadly based consensus regarding what the local high school should be doing for its students.”*

*Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program. Bulletin No. 13, p. 14. Subsequent quotations are from Bulletin No. 11, pp. 30-32, 33, and 10, and from Bulletin No. 1, p. 25, and Bulletin No. 9, pp. 14 and 5.

The first thing that strikes one on reading the list of problems is the grotesque disproportion among the different matters presented. Trivia are elaborated beyond all reason, and substantial matters are lumped together in a very small number of separate items, thus reducing them to relative insignificance in the whole. Among the 55 points are these: "the problem of improving one's personal appearance," "the problem of selecting a 'family dentist' and acquiring the habit of visiting him systematically," "the problem of developing one or more 'making things,' 'making it go,' or 'tinkering' hobbies," and "the problem of developing and maintaining wholesome boy-girl relationships." Not a whit more weight or emphasis is placed upon the following, each of which constitutes but a single point among the 55: "the problem of acquiring the ability to distinguish right from wrong and to guide one's actions accordingly," "the problem of acquiring the ability to study and help solve economic, social, and political problems," and "the problem of making one's self a well-informed and sensitive 'citizen of the world.'"

No Place For Disciplines

Needless to say, the scholarly and scientific disciplines have no place among these "real-life problems." Arithmetic has sometimes been considered of importance; but, although "athletic games," "camping," "collecting art objects, etc." and "doing parlor stunts" are mentioned by name, each in a separate item of the list of 55, not one of the branches of mathematics is even hinted at. The word

"science" occurs nowhere in the list, nor any term synonymous with it or descriptive of its various branches. That history and foreign languages are absent, even by remotest implication, goes without saying.

If these basic things are left out, how can we possibly rely on the educators' vague promise that they will deal effectively with "the problem of acquiring the ability to study and help solve economic, social, and political problems"? The question for the educator is not *whether* the school should do anything in the matter, but *how*. The traditional curriculum offered a clear-cut answer: through careful and systematic study of history, political science, philosophy, economics, sociology, and other relevant disciplines. The aim was to cultivate sound judgment based upon critical thinking and thorough knowledge. To the new pedagogical medicine man, however, all this is sheer pedantry, just as bacteriology is so much learned nonsense to the happy faith healer.

Short Cut To Wisdom

Political, economic, and social problems that have taxed the intelligence of the best-educated men from antiquity to the present are to be solved, so the educator blithely assures us, through a "common learnings course" in the high school, wherein "materials from science, literature, history, mathematics, industrial education, homemaking, business education, art, music, and all other areas of the curriculum would be included."

We must not detain him to ask for proof that his short

cut to wisdom will actually produce it. After all, he has 54 other problems to wrestle with; and he must hasten on to the next—"the problem of acquiring the ability to select and enjoy good motion pictures," perhaps, or "the problem of acquiring the social skills of dancing, playing party games, doing parlor stunts, etc."

If men and women prefer the latter things to intellectual training, the educator will argue, should they not have them? The question is really irrelevant; for the questionnaires do not provide, and cannot provide, one iota of evidence that the public is making any such choice. The most damning part of the whole study is that the questionnaires used are patently dishonest. They purport to ask parents, citizens, teachers, and pupils what they "think is the job of the secondary school." But the persons questioned are not permitted to give the slightest indication that they believe the job of the secondary school is to give intellectual training.

In the entire battery of questionnaires, there is not a single blank that one can check in order to express the view that the schools should offer sound training in mathematics, in natural science, in grammar and composition, in foreign languages, or in history. The citizen may respond in the negative to every question implying the substitution of frivolous aims, but he cannot indicate in any manner whatever the kind of positive program he would favor. The questionnaires are so rigged that the results are predetermined from the beginning. However overwhelming the public sentiment in favor of disciplined intellectual training may be, the professor of education who constructed

the questionnaires has taken care that this sentiment shall not appear anywhere in the answers.

An "Engineered" Consensus

The *Follow-Up Study* is not an attempt to ascertain public opinion; it is a cynical effort to manipulate public opinion. It is obviously designed to manufacture the appearance of public support for curricular changes that professional educators have determined upon in advance.

This purpose comes out stark and clear in the official statements explaining the questionnaires: "Given the American tradition of the local lay-control of public education, it is both necessary and desirable that a community (patron, pupils, teachers) consensus be engineered in understanding support of the necessary changes before they are made." I find difficulty in following some of the involved syntax of this sentence, but I have no difficulty whatever in grasping the significance of a "consensus" that is to be "engineered." We approach here the real meaning of what these educators euphemistically describe as "democracy in education." It is the democracy of the "engineered" consensus.

The lighthearted prospectus of these curriculum engineers contains this exhortation: "There are many ways of getting under way in a program of curriculum revision. The important thing is that we need to pry ourselves loose from the present situation. Maybe one lever will do the prying loose; perhaps, it may require several. . . . Pick your lever(s) and let's get started." The metaphor is apt.

The kind of lever that one uses for prying things loose is sold in hardware stores as a wrecking-bar.

Prying The Schools Loose

Pry loose from what? The answer is implicit in the entire program. The secondary school curriculum must be pried loose from the established disciplines of science and scholarship. The public school must be pried loose from its relationship to institutions of higher learning. College entrance requirements are a thorn in the side of this public school directorate, for they give some support, feeble though it may be, to intellectual training in the secondary schools. To deal with this menace to "real-life" education, it is recommended "that the colleges adopt admission policies which do not specify the courses the students are to take in high school." College entrance requirements in the basic intellectual disciplines of "English, foreign language, mathematics, science, and social studies" are "particularly limiting for smaller schools." These, alas, cannot afford to offer both the fundamental courses that scientists, scholars, and citizens believe in, and also the gilded fripperies after which the new pedagogues hanker. College entrance requirements must go, so that the schools may be free to eliminate intellectual training.

The Three R's Outmoded

Uncontrolled discretion will at last be vested in up-to-date school administrators like the author of the following

remarks, which were addressed to the National Association of Secondary-School Principals and published in its official proceedings:

"Through the years we've built a sort of halo around reading, writing, and arithmetic. We've said they were for everybody . . . rich and poor, brilliant and not-so-mentally endowed, ones who liked them and those who failed to go for them. Teacher has said that these were something 'everyone should learn.' The principal has remarked, 'All educated people know how to write, spell, and read.' When some child declared a dislike for a sacred subject, he was warned that, if he failed to master it, he would grow up to be a so-and-so.

"The Three R's for All Children, and All Children for the Three R's! That was it.

"We've made some progress in getting rid of that slogan. But every now and then some mother with a Phi Beta Kappa award or some employer who has hired a girl who can't spell stirs up a fuss about the schools . . . and ground is lost. . . .

"When we come to the realization that not every child has to read, figure, write and spell . . . that many of them either cannot or will not master these chores . . . then we shall be on the road to improving the junior high curriculum.

"Between this day and that a lot of selling must take place. But it's coming. We shall some day accept the thought that it is just as illogical to assume that every boy must be able to read as it is that each one must be able to perform on a violin, that it is no more reasonable to require that each girl shall spell well than it is that each one shall bake a good cherry pie. . . .

"When adults finally realize that fact, everyone will be happier . . . and schools will be nicer places in which to live. . . .

"If and when we are able to convince a few folks that mastery of reading, writing, and arithmetic is not the one road leading to happy, successful living, the next step is to cut down the amount of time and attention devoted to these areas in general junior high-school courses. . . .

"One junior high in the East has, after long and careful study, accepted the fact that some twenty per cent of their students will not be up to standard in reading . . . and they are doing other things for these boys and girls. That's straight thinking. Contrast that with the junior high which says, 'Every student must know the multiplication tables before graduation.'

"Such a requirement attaches more importance to those tables than I'm willing to accord them."*

These professional educators are fond of talking about the complexity of modern problems. They speak oracularly of "education for the atomic age." And *this* is how they propose to train citizens to cope with the vast technical questions that are posed by science, by an intricate industrial system, and by international anarchy. After nine full years of formal schooling, a student need not be expected to read his native language or to know the multiplication table. And in college, according to another proposal, he is doing well if he can "read long numbers and . . . round them off."†

The Source Of These Ideas

Where did these preposterous ideas come from? Who originated them, and who is propagating them? They are obviously not the ideas of scientists, scholars, and professional

*A. H. Lauchner, *How Can the Junior High School Curriculum Be Improved?* Bulletin, National Association Secondary-School Principals 35:299. March, 1951.

†K. L. Heaton and G. R. Koopman, *A College Curriculum Based on Functional Needs of Students*. University of Chicago Press, 1936, p. 148.

men. The evidence that the public supports them is manufactured evidence. Under compulsion from their administrative superiors, a few public-school teachers have given approval; but a number of able and courageous classroom teachers are expressing the sense of outrage that vast numbers of their intimidated colleagues undoubtedly feel. None of these groups can be held responsible for the anti-intellectualism that is wrecking our schools.

Given the size and complexity of the American public-school system, the existence of a vast educational bureaucracy is unavoidable. Into it have rushed the "experts" from state departments of education and colleges of education, the curriculum doctors, the integrators, the indoctrinators—the specialists in know-how rather than in knowledge. Out of their overflowing minds, they have offered to furnish ready-made a philosophy to guide the entire educational system.

They are glad to point out to the teachers—whom they treat as dullards—the relationships that exist among the great fields of knowledge. They are happy to draw the really vital generalizations from the data which grubbers in laboratories and libraries have so obligingly collected. All that teachers need do is teach what they are told to teach. All that scientists and scholars need do is supply little facts to fill up the blanks in the great schemata which the educators have devised. "We have decided to teach a unit on industrialism," they say to the scholars. "Will you as a historian assist us by telling us who invented the power loom? And will you as a scientist show us how to connect up a buzzer?"

The Education Of An Educator

Consider for a moment the training and qualifications of the men who have seized this stranglehold upon American intellectual life. Ordinarily, the professional educator does not hold an advanced degree in any one of the established scholarly disciplines, but merely in the teaching of them, or in the supervising and administering of school systems. His training in the various parts of his omnibus field has been kept to a bare minimum, in order that he may take full advantage of the rich variety of courses offered by the training schools of education: "Supervision in Home Economics Education," "Public School Business Management," "Elementary School Core Programs."

Throughout his entire career, such a professional educator can have only the most fleeting glimpse of the great world of science and learning. At worst, he may have no contact with it at all. His first 12 years of schooling may be in a system run by these educators. His undergraduate work may be done in a normal school or teachers' college, dominated again by these educators. If he is fortunate enough to receive his undergraduate training in a college of liberal arts, teacher certification requirements may reach out to thwart him, diverting his effort to pedagogical trivialities at the very moment when he is ready to buckle down to serious advanced work in one of the disciplines. His graduate work is directed by professors of education, most of it in courses labeled "Education." His professional life is apt to be lived in close association with this educational bureaucracy and in an environment that is almost

completely isolated from the realms of scientific and scholarly research and higher learning.

An Educational Iron Curtain

Across the educational world today stretches the iron curtain that these professional educators have fashioned. Behind it, in virtual slave-labor camps, are classroom teachers, whose only hope of rescue is from without. On the hither side lies the free world of science and learning, menaced, but not yet conquered. This division is the great reality that every citizen must recognize and understand. Such a subversion of American intellectual life is possible because the first 12 years of formal schooling (from the elementary grades through the high school) are likely to have fallen under the policy-making control of those who have no real place in—who do not respect, and whose learning is not respected by—the world of science, of scholarship, and of the learned professions.

There are notable exceptions, of course, but professors of education as a group have sold their position in the learned world for a partnership in the public-school directorate. They serve their partners faithfully, laboring assiduously to enhance the power of the educational bureaucracy and to free it from the last vestige of responsibility to the world of science and learning. In return, the public-school directorate renders valuable assistance to departments and colleges of education in building up their empires within the universities. Teacher certification requirements, fixed by the state's educational bureaucracy, insure a steady flow

of students through the courses given by professors of education. Experienced teachers who return to the university for advanced work are all but compelled by their administrative superiors to take that work, not in the subjects they are teaching, but in endless courses in pedagogy. A ludicrous inflation of departments of education results from this ingenious protective tariff.

If the workings of this great public-school directorate are called in question at any point, an "educational survey" can be initiated, and the educators then cheerfully investigate each other, like a treasurer auditing his own books.

Objective Of Education

The disciplined mind is what education at every level should strive to produce. And the years from six to eighteen are the years in which young men and women must learn to think clearly and accurately if they are to learn to think at all. Command of written English, foreign languages, and mathematics—to say nothing of the abstract processes of analyzing, generalizing, and criticizing—cannot be acquired in a year or two when a student or a citizen suddenly finds himself in desperate need of them. The seed must be planted at the beginning and cultivated continuously if the crop is to be ready when it is required. And these intellectual abilities *are* required, not merely as a prerequisite for advanced study, but also and especially for intelligent participation in the private and public affairs of a world where decisions must be made on the basis

of informed and accurate thinking about science, about economics, about history and politics.

The real evidence for the value of liberal education lies where educational testers and questionnaire-makers refuse to seek it, in history and in the biographies of men who have met the valid criteria of greatness. These support overwhelmingly the claim of liberal education that it can equip a man with fundamental powers of decision and action, applicable not only to boy-girl relationships, to tinkering hobbies, or to choosing the family dentist, but also to all the great and varied concerns of human life—not least, those which are unforeseen.

A LIBERTARIAN'S PLATFORM

by James C. Ingebretsen



THE platform of the libertarian candidate is simple. It has only one plank in it: *No special privilege for anyone.*

He concerns himself with only two methods of achieving this worthy objective:

1. The free market.
2. Government limited to the defense of life and property.

There is no way known to man to determine prices of goods or rates of wages or where man should travel or where he should work or how long he should labor or in what manner he should exchange the fruits of his efforts, except in a market free of coercion or by some measure of authoritarianism. There is no possible way of determining value except by what an unfettered people will offer—of their own free will—in exchange for any product or for any service. But governmental authoritarianism can, and does, curtail and destroy this freedom in the market place by granting special privileges to various persons and groups.

Special privilege cannot be granted, however, except by a government that is out-of-bounds. Government, limited to the defense of the life and livelihood of all citizens equally, has no special privilege within its power to grant.

A government cannot grant anything to anyone which it does not take from someone else.

The libertarian candidate, regardless of how great his competence may be, reasons thusly: "You as a person are better able to control your life than I am. Your life is your personal affair, for better or for worse, except as in the living of your life you may impair or endanger the life and livelihood of others. No person nor set of persons on this earth has any logical right to interfere with you except as you may do injury to them."

No person, without an element of authoritarianism, can argue otherwise. Libertarians—nonauthoritarians—recognize that they have no logical rights, with respect to other people, beyond the defense of themselves. Nor do they grant to an agency—government in any of its forms—any rights which they themselves do not possess. A libertarian's government has nothing to dispense except equal protection against, or equal penalizing of fraud, misrepresentation, predatory practices, and violence.

The variations among men—in their intelligence, their talents, their inheritances—are the handiwork of God; and the Libertarian accepts this fact. He refuses to play the role of god-man and to attempt a coercive readjustment of that which God has provided. He stands on the single platform of no special privilege for anyone, insofar as his dispensing of it is concerned.

The Libertarian goes on the political stage more to present his views than to seek office. For special privilege will prevail unless its error is understood at least by those whom others follow. Votes, the concern of those who cast them,

are not to be sought at the expense of integrity nor by concessions to authoritarianism.

The Libertarian has faith in free men. He is conscious of their natural inclination to cooperate for their own benefit and he knows that only in the release of their energy is good accomplished. He, therefore, does not want power. He wants only freedom from power, the mark of civilization. And he reasons that he cannot correct uncivilized man by becoming uncivilized himself.

MY FREEDOM DEPENDS ON YOURS

by Dean Russell



My grandfather fought for freedom while he continued to own slaves. His concept of freedom permitted him to direct and control the activities of other men. And when he was denied the legal right to take for his own use the fruits of other people's labor, he was honestly convinced that his freedom had been curtailed to some extent.

An absurd concept of freedom? Well, he was no different in this respect from Jefferson, Washington, Patrick Henry, and others of our Founding Fathers. It is true that they had developed a better understanding of freedom than had any political group before them, and I respect them highly for their revolutionary and magnificent concepts of inalienable rights which come from God instead of government. But even so, they still believed that liberty permits some men to use violence to control the actions and to own the production of other men. Our Forefathers believed, of course, that these controls over other men should be permitted only if they were sanctioned by a government based on the democratic or republican processes. But while rejecting the concept of hereditary rulers, they did not entirely reject the "Old World" idea that it is permissible for some

persons to use the powers of government to aid them in controlling the actions and disposing of the production of other persons.

A discredited idea of freedom? Well, that same concept of freedom is still widely held throughout the United States today. The reasons advanced to defend the fact that some men have the authority to control the productive actions of other men have changed. And the modern way of taking and distributing the fruits of other people's labor is seldom called slavery. But the legal right of some men to control the productive activities of other men continues to exist as before. And the present-day tax of more than 80 per cent of some persons' incomes is probably a far greater percentage of their production than was ever withheld from any slave.

Is this present-day taking of other people's production legal? It is. But so was outright slavery once legal! Did that make it right? Let us hope that we Americans never delude ourselves into the belief that *right* is properly determined by a show of hands. For if we do, we are lost.

The extent and type of the legal controls over persons, and the degree of the taking of other people's production, have varied greatly throughout the history of the United States. But the overwhelming majority of the American people have always believed that freedom includes the right of some persons to use the legal authority of government to control the productive efforts and incomes of other persons.

Abraham Lincoln recognized this dilemma in 1864 when he stated: "The world has never had a good definition of

the word liberty, and the American people, just now, are much in want of one. We all declare for liberty, but in using the same *word* we do not all mean the same *thing*. With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men, and the product of other men's labor. Here are two, not only different, but incompatible things, called by the same name—liberty.”

Both Lincoln and Jefferson Davis announced themselves for freedom. So did Stalin and Hitler. So do you and I and almost everyone else. And I have no reason to doubt that each is sincerely in favor of freedom—*his concept of freedom*.

Just as I hope you will give careful consideration to my ideas on freedom, just so will I be most pleased to give careful consideration to yours. For unless there is a common understanding of the meaning of freedom, we will continue to fight each other in its name.

Individual Freedom

It seems to me that much of the confusion over the meaning of liberty and freedom begins with an incomplete or inadequate explanation of what the phrase “individual freedom” really refers to.

While human freedom necessarily concerns the individual, it does so only in the sense that *freedom always refers to a relationship or condition between two or more persons*. While it is necessarily always individuals who understand,

practice, and advance freedom, the concept applies only when there is some sort of contact between two or more of them. The *idea* of freedom would be useless to a person isolated forever from any contact with any other person. Contrasted with the ideas of food and shelter—which can be applied to one person alone—the idea of human freedom has no meaning except in society.

Reference to the concept of freedom, then, always applies to a condition or relationship between two or more persons. Just what is that relationship? Certainly it would be nonsensical to describe freedom as a relationship of violence, where some persons are trying to impose their wills upon other persons. Probably the best word to describe that condition is tyranny.

Freedom Defined

Freedom is a relationship or condition of nonmolestation. The word “molestation” is here used to include murder, defamation of character, theft, libel, fraud, violence or the threat of violence, or any other act of aggression by one person against another person’s life, liberty, good name, or property. And the fact that the molestation may be legal—slavery, restrictions against trade, *compulsory* unionism, and so on—does not deny that freedom is infringed.

Since freedom describes a relationship of nonmolestation *between persons*, it is misleading to speak of freedom as though it applies to one person alone. This is misleading because it is incomplete; because it refers to only part of a necessary relationship; because it tends to obscure the

fact that one or more other persons are necessarily involved.

Yet, the idea of freedom is almost always used in the sense that *one individual* can be free and have his freedom, even though he may be exercising legal authority over the productive activities and incomes of others—up to and including complete slavery. That seems to me an unfortunate concept of freedom. But such has always been the popular concept and still is.

Unrestrained Freedom

When I speak of freedom, I mean a condition of *mutual* nonmolestation, with no person molesting any other person. Under that concept, I fully endorse “unrestrained freedom”—a society based on the idea that no one has the right to molest anyone else; a society wherein everyone is legally forbidden to molest anyone else.

Now, I am aware that many millions of persons within our society do not share my faith in the principle of mutual nonmolestation. And there seems little likelihood that the various types and degrees of molestation which now exist will disappear over night. But regardless of what others say or do, it is obvious that those of us who believe in *mutual* nonmolestation must take the first and necessary step toward it by personally following the ideal of no molestation against others. There is no other way for freedom to begin except through its practice by individuals who understand what it is.

When Hitler spoke of freedom, he merely meant a con-

dition in which no one molested him. His concept actually *required* that some of the German people molest others of the German people. The only condition that freedom described to Hitler was one wherein he could do as he pleased. To him, freedom was strictly a one-way street.

You shouldn't be surprised at Hitler's concept of freedom. He didn't invent it and he had no monopoly upon it. It was, and is, held almost universally. As stated above, our Forefathers fought and died for freedom. And they were sincere about it. Yet, they did this while they themselves continued to violate freedom by controlling the productive activities and incomes of other persons.

The vast majority of our current state and federal officials believe sincerely in what they understand as freedom. Yet, so far as I know, few if any of them fully accept the idea of freedom as a reciprocal relationship of nonmolestation among persons. On the contrary, most of them look upon freedom as a condition wherein some persons are *obligated* to molest other persons. The candidates of all political parties in our last elections said they believed sincerely in freedom. Yet almost all of them endorsed specific issues that undeniably molest persons by forcing some to conform to the viewpoints and ideas of others.

Liberty And License

Our legislators are honorable men. They are sincerely trying to do what they consider to be a necessary and not-always-pleasant job. But I wonder if many of them are not confusing liberty and license.

In order better to understand the reason for this possible confusion, let us consider the following example: A person uses his own honestly acquired money to build a house for \$10,000. In the process, he molests no person or group of persons—neither defames them, defrauds them, breaks his voluntary contracts with them, nor uses violence or the threat of violence against them.

Upon completion of the house, the owner decides to offer it for rent. For a reason known only to himself, he sets a rental price of \$500 a month. At that price, the house stays vacant—even though there may be many persons who would like to live in the house at a rental price which would pay the owner a four or six or eight per cent return on his investment.

Would not the word “freedom” be the proper term to describe such a condition of nonmolestation wherein no person would be using violence or the threat of violence to impose his will or viewpoint upon any other person? Since no one would be forced to buy and no one would be forced to sell, would that not be freedom?

Most of our governmental officials, backed by the vast majority of the American people, would surely reply to that question somewhat as follows: “No! You have described a condition of license wherein the people would be robbed and exploited or forced to remain in substandard housing, wherein freedom would be destroyed. In order to restore freedom, we would have to molest such unreasonable property owners to the extent of forcing them to conform to our idea of a proper price.”

And so it would go as it almost always has. During the

days of NRA, a merchant was accused of license if he sold *below* the government-set price. During the days of OPS, he was accused of license if he sold *above* the government-set price. Under "Fair Trade" laws, he is accused of license if he sells either above or below a price which is approved and enforced by government.

Freedom—a condition of nonmolestation in the market place and everywhere else—is often called license! While license—a condition wherein some persons molest other persons—is all too frequently called freedom! The popular concept of freedom has always described a condition in society wherein some persons use legal violence or the threat of legal violence to compel other persons to conform to their wishes. The degree of molestation has varied from time to time and from government to government. But at no time under any government has the popular concept of freedom ever been used to describe either an actual or potential condition of nonmolestation among persons.

A Mutual Concept

Freedom is destroyed between two persons to whatever extent either one uses violence or the threat of violence to impose his will or viewpoint upon the other. Regardless of who is the aggressor and who is the victim—or whether the violence is legal or illegal—freedom is still infringed.

If you have rendered me helpless by throwing me to the ground and sitting on top of me, everyone understands clearly that my freedom has been severely curtailed. But what is not generally understood is that your freedom is

also curtailed as long as you must spend your time and effort to hold me down. You thereby restrict your own progress and improvement just as you do mine.

Freedom is a *reciprocal* relationship based on *voluntary* agreements and actions. This applies in all human relationships, even though they are seldom as clear and dramatic as person-to-person violence. The only real possibility for complete freedom for yourself as an individual is for you to refrain from initiating violence or the threat of violence against anyone else. This is the vital first step toward a condition of mutual nonmolestation—a step that any one of us can take as soon as he is ready.

A Question

“But,” someone may ask, “since I am holding you down by my own free will, how can it possibly be said that I am thereby interfering with my own freedom? I am doing exactly what I want to do!”

Maybe so. But if the man on top understood the full significance of such a course of action, he would not deliberately follow it nor use the word freedom to describe it.

The reality of this thesis that no person can really have complete freedom for himself while he is imposing his will—legally or illegally—upon the creative activities or incomes of others may possibly be more easily understood if approached from another angle.*

*While examples given herein deal primarily with material prosperity, this is not to say that economic well-being is the most important aspect of freedom. Actually, it is a by-product of something more important. The examples deal mostly with production because it is generally familiar and appears to be the most restricted freedom of all.

If all persons in the world except you were suddenly to die, it is most unlikely that you would live out your normal span of life as you would want to do. That is true because the increased material prosperity resulting from specialization and division of labor has encouraged you to depend upon other persons for the things you want and need—the things you *want* to do. Imagine what would happen to you if you had to build your own house from virgin timber with no axe or saw or nails, raise your own food without hoe or plow or seeds, be your own surgeon without instruments or medicines, construct every item of your own electric system without tools of any kind, and so on and so on. You would soon perish.

If half the people in the United States were suddenly to die, you would, for the same reason, no longer be able to do many of the things you have been doing and wish to continue to do. And although it is difficult to trace directly, the same sort of thing happens when even one productive person dies. This fact is easier to visualize if you think in terms of the “key man” of whatever business you are most interested in.

The Result Of Controls

Now let us transfer this same idea over to the concepts of controls and slavery instead of death. If the records of history are to be given any value at all, they offer conclusive proof that the slave doesn't produce as much as the person who is working of his own free will. Nor can the slave contribute as much to one's spiritual and mental development

as he could if he were released from the physical controls over him.

If all mankind were enslaved or controlled by one person or a small group of persons, literally millions of people would starve to death as a result of the tremendous decrease in production that would automatically follow.* The rest would sink slowly back into darkness and savagery. Yet, the people who hold the popular, one-sided concept of freedom will still say that the slave master, at least would have his "individual" freedom under those circumstances because no one would be controlling *him!*

It is true that the slave master might be able to confiscate a large share of the available production for himself at the expense of others. But, with the exception of a few brilliant fanatics who honestly believe that slavery is the best possible form of society, slaves seldom produce literature or printing presses or new methods for increasing production and distributing it more widely. The man whose activities are directed by violence or the threat of violence doesn't ordinarily invent and increase the production of television sets, better surgical instruments and medicines, great sermons and studies in philosophy, and such. The slave master cannot take for his own use and advancement that which has not been invented or produced! He might honestly believe that he himself has complete freedom, but the decreased rate of development—or even the degeneracy—of his moral, mental, social, and physical well-being would offer conclusive proof of the shortcomings of such a concept of freedom.

*The truth of this fact is proved by both the ancient and modern histories of various European and Asiatic nations.

If only half of all mankind were enslaved, this same thing would happen to the slave master in some proportion. If a person uses violence or the threat of violence—legal or illegal—to control the productive activities or income of even *one person*, he himself will thereby suffer diminishing opportunities for the development of his own potentialities. And most unfortunate of all, his action against freedom also does great harm to many innocent bystanders who desire to live in peace with their fellow men.

Suppose that someone had tried to control the creative activities of an individual like Edison, or Aquinas, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare, or a hundred other producers in various fields that come readily to mind. The opportunities for peaceful pursuit of the things you now do and wish to continue to do—the real meaning of freedom—would have been decreased immeasurably if the activities and incomes of those individuals had been controlled by some outside authority with the power to direct and restrain them completely. Unfortunately, there *were* some controls upon the creative activities and incomes of those persons. Thus it seems reasonably certain that you and I today are missing many opportunities which would have been available to us if those men had enjoyed complete freedom—if they had lived in a society organized according to the idea of mutual nonmolestation.

Future Leaders

The present and future productive leaders of mankind are now being severely controlled, directed, and restricted by

governmental authority. And it is being done because most of us honestly but mistakenly believe that freedom *demands* that some men control the creative activities and incomes of other men! The vast majority of the world's people still sincerely believe that they themselves can have complete freedom even though they use violence or the threat of violence to direct the activities and control the incomes of others! They do not accept the idea that freedom is a mutual relationship of nonmolestation among persons.

Now someone may say: "This is all very well in theory, but there is no possible way of measuring what might have been or, in this case, even what might be. I still can't see specifically how I lose any of my freedom merely because some person in this or some other country might be controlled by his own government."

Communist Freedom

Well, let's apply the test to the communist nations of today. Several hundred millions of individual Russians, Chinese, and others are forbidden to trade with you or to visit you or to exchange ideas with you or to worship with you. Our periodicals and newspapers devote much space to the telling of how those persons have lost most of their freedom.

But what has this to do with your freedom? Well, can you visit with those individual Russians and trade with them or exchange ideas with them or worship with them? No, you have lost a great deal of your own freedom even

though you may not be aware of it. If any person anywhere in the world is deprived of his freedom to trade or to communicate with you, automatically you thereby lose your freedom of opportunity to trade or to communicate with him. That fact is as undeniable as two plus two equals four.

A Comparison

Legalized violence is already being used to deprive almost half of the world's people of their freedom of opportunity to trade or to worship or to communicate or to visit or to exchange ideas with you. To visualize how this affects your own freedom, just imagine what would happen to you if the other half of the world's people were also deprived of their freedom to have any contact with you. Under those conditions, you would soon die from lack of food or shelter or clothing or medical attention, or from sheer boredom or frustration. Yet, the persons who hold the popular idea that freedom can be applied to one person alone would still say you would remain free because no one would be molesting you! Such a concept of freedom would appear to be the sheerest nonsense.

It is true that we Americans enjoy more freedom — less legal and illegal molestation — than the people of any other nation. But no person in America is completely free as long as violence — under the power of government or otherwise — is used to restrict or to control or to direct the activities or income of even one peaceful person. To whatever extent any person is forbidden to trade or to exchange ideas with you, to the same extent you are thereby deprived

of the opportunity to trade or to exchange ideas with him.

To repeat, freedom is a relationship of mutual non-molestation among persons. Yet, the overwhelming majority of the world's people have always thought of freedom as being the legal right of some persons to impose their wills and viewpoints upon other persons. And they still do. Let us examine a few popular examples of this at home and abroad.

Houses And Subsidies

When the Russian government builds houses for some persons at the expense of other persons, it always does it in the good name of freedom. But it cannot logically be called freedom because the process of governmental housing describes a relationship among persons wherein some persons are undeniably molesting other persons against their wills at some point within the process.

When the English government grants subsidies to certain manufacturers or farmers or other favored groups, it claims to be advancing freedom for the English people. Actually, complete freedom ceases to exist among the persons involved when government rewards some persons at the expense of other persons.

It may be alleged that while a subsidy decreases the freedom of the persons from whom the money is taken, surely it doesn't decrease the freedom of the persons who get it. This is the ever-popular "Robin Hood" concept of freedom — a person can be "free" even though he exists by doing violence to others. The person who accepts that idea

of freedom can sincerely advocate complete government ownership and control in the name of freedom. And it is worth noting that the advocate of government ownership — whatever the degree — is always happy to specify who shall do the taking, whom it shall be taken from, and who shall be rewarded with the confiscated production.

Controls And Democracy

When the government of Argentina initiates price controls, wage controls, rent controls, tariffs, government-owned hydroelectric projects, and other similar compulsive devices, it claims to be doing these things to preserve freedom. And apparently the vast majority of Argentineans believe it. Yet, in each instance, some persons obviously are using violence or the threat of violence to impose their wills upon other persons who believe differently. That process should not be described as freedom. And the fact that the molestation is legal has no bearing upon the fact that freedom has thereby been decreased.

When our own government takes our money from us against our wills and gives it to Tito, Franco, Peron — Germany, Italy, Japan, and other nations — our officials sincerely believe that they are doing it to preserve peace and freedom. Yet, this entire process is based on violence or the threat of violence against our own citizens. In most instances, we are compelled to do what few of us would do with our own resources if we were free to decide for ourselves directly. This is the exact reverse of a condition of nonmolestation among persons. Such a transaction,

founded upon violence, should never be called freedom.

It is true that our officials were duly elected by the people. But so were our slave-holding officials! Did that fact change slavery into freedom? Directly or indirectly, the American people have the legal right to vote for either a policy of molestation or a policy of nonmolestation. An examination of the record shows quite clearly that the vote is almost always for a program of molestation. The various campaign platforms differ only in the degree of molestation and which group is to be molested and which group is to be in charge of doing the molesting.

Self-Defense

But what about self-defense? Admitting that freedom is decreased between them when one person molests another, what is the innocent victim of the lost freedom to do?

First, the person who fully understands freedom will never knowingly abolish or diminish it. That is, he will never knowingly initiate or advocate any action or law that imposes his ideas or viewpoints upon any other person against that person's will.

Any person who is aware that he is the victim of molestation will always use whatever measures he deems best and most suitable to gain freedom. This is an instinctive reaction; for, obviously, no person wishes to be molested against his will. If he understands freedom, he himself will never knowingly be the aggressor. But whether he understands it or not, he will at least strive for a condition of minimum molestation against himself.

Means To An End

The means he uses to gain this end may be persuasion, argument, prayer, nonresistance, non-cooperation, guile, counterviolence, politics, or whatever. Most probably it will be a combination of several of these and similar measures, depending on circumstances and his understanding of moral principles.

My goal is freedom — a condition of nonmolestation among persons. To the best of my ability, I will strive toward that goal. I will use the means which seem to me to be both morally right and tactically effective.

For example, I would prefer to persuade the would-be murderer to let me live. But if that doesn't work, I believe that I am morally right and tactically correct in using counterviolence to defend myself against him. And that is probably what I will do if the occasion should ever arise.

I believe that I am morally right and tactically correct when I choose to join my fellow men of a like mind in resisting aggression from the gangster at home or the marauding army from abroad — so long as we ourselves don't deny our own principle by using violence or the threat of violence upon our peaceful neighbors who do not choose to join us; so long as we confine our actions to defense against a *direct and unquestionable* threat to our lives, liberty, or property. I believe that this can be accomplished more effectively by voluntary and coordinated group action than by involuntary group action or isolated individual action. I believe that it is morally right and tactically correct to advocate and support a government dedi-

cated to the proposition of preserving freedom — a society wherein no person is permitted to molest any other person; a society wherein every person is legally forbidden to molest any other person. And, of course, I believe it is morally right and tactically correct for society's political agent to use the necessary degree of legal counterviolence required to stop any person from molesting any other person. It seems to me that the sole purpose of government — the social agency of coercion — should be to defend equally all of its citizens against whoever molests them.

A Doubt

Thus do I advocate and support the use of purely *defensive* violence as an integral and necessary means toward the preservation of maximum freedom in a world where many persons are not yet willing to live in peace with their fellow men. But it should be noted that I have no way of knowing with absolute certainty that my endorsement of even defensive violence is the best principle to follow. I now believe it is. But when I study the lives of Christ, Gandhi, and others who seemed to endorse a policy of turning the other cheek and of not using violence even for defense, I prefer not to become too dogmatic on the subject. Their moral policies appear to have been quite effective.

Whether or not I am justified in my endorsement of defensive violence, this much is certain: I cannot logically claim to favor freedom when I am *initiating* violence or the threat of violence — legal or illegal — to force any person to conform to my ideas, beliefs, or viewpoints. Thus,

come what may, I will never knowingly and deliberately initiate violence against my fellow man. I have too much respect for him (and for myself) to do such a thing.

If what my neighbor is doing with himself and his own property appears wrong or illogical to me, then it would seem certain that what I am doing with myself and my property appears equally wrong or illogical to him. Thus we have the choice between neither one's molesting the other, or fighting it out to determine who shall conform to whom. I choose to follow the course of freedom, to take the first and necessary and logical step toward a relationship of mutual nonmolestation.

An Epilogue

Here follows what seems to me a most encouraging thought for those among us who despair of liberty.

Freedom will never disappear completely and forever — in Russia or anywhere else. The popular, one-way, "individualistic" concept of freedom will at least serve to prevent that. Since no person wants others to molest *him*, almost every person will rebel against molestation somewhere along the line, even though he may foolishly continue to molest others while he is rebelling against those who are molesting him.

At one time or another, the people of all nations have rebelled against excessive molestation from their own governments. This is as true of the United States as it is of Russia.

These rebellions sometimes bring an increased degree of

freedom — that is, a decreased degree of molestation — for a while. Then the rebels, not fully understanding that freedom is a condition of reciprocal nonmolestation, seem inevitably to begin to initiate the same sort of laws against which they themselves rebelled.

They rebel against a tea tax, and then put a tax on tea! They rebel against price controls, tariffs, and other restraints on trade; then they re-establish price controls, tariffs, and the various other restraints on trade! They rebel against the idea of government-granted special privileges to certain persons and groups, and then demand special privileges from government for themselves and their particular groups! They rebel against Siberia for political prisoners, and then send political prisoners to Siberia! They rebel against the Bastille, and then put the guillotine in its place!

Even so, the ideas of human freedom which have been loosed throughout the world during the past 500 years are now too strong to be completely lost again. While the trend of the past 50 years has been toward more government and less freedom, there is no reason to assume this will continue forever.

A Slow Process

In order for the highest ideas and ideals of mankind to prevail generally, it seems obvious that a condition of peace and freedom is required — a society wherein no person molests any other person; a society wherein no person prevents any other person from developing his creative poten-

tialities to the fullest extent of his understanding and ability.

This desirable state of affairs will not occur all at once. It will grow only as freedom is understood and as faith in it is restored. If one person decides today to practice freedom, the evolutionary process in human relationships will move forward one more step. That is the only possible path to freedom—a peaceful change in thought and understanding and action among individual persons.

Anyone can begin the practice of freedom whenever he chooses to do so. It is easy, and one need not wait upon other persons to agree before he begins. No committee resolutions or elections or laws are needed for a person to begin the practice of freedom. One need merely resolve not to impose his will — legally or illegally — upon his peaceful fellow men in their religions, their economic theories, their attitudes, their morals, their mores, or whatever. And then start to practice it.

A Groundless Fear

But suppose that “scoundrel next door” takes advantage of your faith in freedom and begins molesting peaceful you? Well, you will discover two things: First, your neighbor is just as convinced that you won’t voluntarily “do the right thing” as you are convinced that he won’t voluntarily “do the right thing.” Second, when your words and your actions have convinced your neighbor that you have no designs upon him or his, he will admire you so much that he will eventually ask you questions to find out how you got that

way — and then he is ready to hear out your ideas on freedom. A clear and simple and consistent explanation from you may cause him also to practice freedom — that is, to stop advocating laws to force other people to do what *he* believes they should do.

Might there not be exceptions? Probably so. But it isn't too important. If a person is busily engaged in minding his own business instead of imposing his ideas and viewpoints upon others, he will be pleasantly surprised at the increase in his own spiritual and physical and material well-being. In addition, if he recognizes a moral obligation to be a good neighbor and citizen, this personal practice of freedom would also seem to be the most effective approach to that desirable goal.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ARTHUR E. BESTOR, JR. is a lecturer and presently professor of history at the University of Illinois. "Education for 1984," a condensation of his "Aimlessness in Education," first appeared in *The Scientific Monthly*, August, 1952. This condensation was published by the Foundation in 1953.

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL (deceased) was an outstanding author, lecturer, professor, and student of history and international relations. "The Power of an Idea" was extracted from an article in *Fortune*, May, 1942. The condensation was published by the Foundation in 1951.

FRANK CHODOROV is president of Intercollegiate Society of Individualists and associate editor of *Human Events*, Washington, D. C. "Why Don't You Propose Something Constructive?" was first published in *analysis*, July, 1949, and was republished by the Foundation the same year.

RUSSELL J. CLINCHY, minister in the Congregational Church and former Foundation staff member, is assistant to the chairman of the League to Uphold Congregational Principles. "Two Paths to Collectivism" was published in 1949; "Human Rights and the United Nations" was published in 1952.

STARR DAILY was an inmate of a prison. While there, he attempted for a year to apply and interpret the Twenty-third Psalm in his everyday life. He recorded his

thoughts in his private journal, *Through Valleys to Victories* (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1952). "Freedom from Want" is from his entry for February 6, 1928, under the text: "I shall not want." It was published by the Foundation in 1953.

HERRELL DE GRAFF is professor of economics in the School of Nutrition, Cornell University. "The Fallacy of Controlled Prices" is taken from a broadcast over Liberty Radio Network at Cornell on April 9, 1952, and was published by the Foundation in 1952.

E. WILLIAM DYKES is a partner in the architectural firm of Lawrence & Dykes, Canton, Ohio. "Gun Play in the Market Place" is from his March 30, 1952, letter to the Foundation and was published later that year.

RICHARD L. EVANS is editor, lecturer, author of several books and articles as well as the producer, writer, and "voice" on the "Spoken Word" portion of the Sunday radio program of the Salt Lake City Tabernacle Choir and Organ. "Equality" is taken from *The Spoken Word*, pages 94-96 (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1945) and was published by the Foundation in 1952.

FLOYD A. HARPER, former professor of marketing at Cornell University, has been on the Foundation staff since it began operations in 1946. "Discrimination" was published by the Foundation in 1951. "Gaining the Free Market" was published in 1952. "A Just Price" and "Gaining Recruits for an Idea" were published in 1953.

HENRY HAZLITT is director of the *Freeman Magazine, Inc.* and contributing editor to *Newsweek*. "Why Prices Are High" first appeared as a column in *Newsweek*, September 3, 1951, and was republished by the Foundation the same year.

JAMES C. INGEBRETSEN is executive vice-president of Spiritual Mobilization. He wrote "A Libertarian's Platform" as a contribution to a column in *The Daily Oklahoman*, May 10, 1952. It was republished by the Foundation later that year.

BASIL HENRY LIDDELL HART, a distinguished British military authority, is the military historian and critic for *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. "Conscription" (Part II) is extracted from the book, *Why Don't You Learn from History* (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1944) and was republished by the Foundation in 1953.

ED LIPSCOMB is director of public relations of the National Cotton Council of America, Memphis, Tennessee. "The Personal Practice of Freedom" was published in 1952.

CLARENCE MANION, dean emeritus of the College of Law, Notre Dame University, is a partner in the Doran & Manion law firm, South Bend, Indiana. "Cause of Corrupt Government" is extracted from an address before the National Small Business Men's Association, Washington, D. C., April 1, 1952. It was published by the Foundation in 1952.

BEN MOREELL is chairman of the Board of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation. "Patrick Henry's Choice" is extracted from an address before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, December 11, 1951, and was published by the Foundation in 1952. "To Communism . . . Via Majority Vote" was an address delivered before The Marketing Division of the American Petroleum Institute at Chicago, Illinois, November 10, 1952, and was published by Jones & Laughlin in 1953 and promoted by the Foundation the same year.

WILLIAM C. MULLENDORE is president of Southern California Edison Company, Los Angeles. "How Government Grows" was published by the Foundation in 1952.

ALBERT JAY NOCK (deceased), editor of *The Freeman* (1920-1924), wrote *Jefferson, Our Enemy the State*, and many other books and articles on the philosophy of government and human freedom. "Isaiah's Job" is extracted from chapter thirteen of his book, *Free Speech and Plain Language*, 1937. This book, now out of print, was published by William Morrow & Company, New York; and the extract was reprinted by the Foundation in 1952.

IRVING S. OLDS is retired chairman of the United States Steel Board. "The Price of Price Controls" is extracted from an address given for the Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce, February 21, 1952, and was published the same year by the Foundation.

MARIO A. PEI came to this country from Italy in 1908 and is an associate professor of Romance Philology at Columbia University. "The America We Lost" appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* of May 31, 1952, and was republished by the Foundation in 1952.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL is a former member of Congress from Indiana (1931-1939). "Where Karl Marx Went Wrong" was first delivered as a radio address (ABC network, April 6, 1947) and was revised for the 1953 publication by the Foundation.

PAUL L. POIROT is a former economist with the Office of Price Administration and with the Cooperative Grange League Federation, Inc. "Property Rights and Human Rights," published by the Foundation in 1952, is based on articles on the same subject in the July, 1952, *Monthly Letter* of the National City Bank and the October, 1952, *Guaranty Survey* of the Guaranty Trust Company. "Bargaining" was published by the Foundation in 1953.

LEONARD E. READ, former manager of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and vice-president of National Industrial Conference Board, organized the Foundation for Economic Education in 1946 and has been its president since that time. "Combating Statism" is a condensed version of an address delivered before the Pacific Coast Gas Association at San Francisco, September 10, 1953, and was published by the Foundation later that year. "Two Ways to Stop Strikes," "Two Kinds of Exchange," and "Victims of Social Leveling" were also published by the Foundation in 1953.

ROUSAS JOHN RUSHDOONY, formerly with the Western Shoshone Mission, Owykee, Nevada, is now pastor of Santa Cruz Trinity Church in San José. "Life on the Reservation" is from his letter to the Foundation, published in 1950.

DEAN RUSSELL, a veteran of World War II, had just finished his graduate work in economics and journalism when he joined the Foundation staff in 1947. He is translator of Bastiat's *The Law*. "My Freedom Depends on Yours" is the text of an address delivered before the Public Utilities Association of the Virginias, September 18, 1953, and was published later that year by the Foundation. "Equality and Security" was published in 1952; "When We Socialize Kilowatt-Hours," in 1953.

FRANCIS ADAMS TRUSLOW (deceased) served as president of the New York Curb Exchange. "The Vital Margin" is from an address before the Texas Group, Investment Bankers Association of America, San Antonio, Texas, May 4, 1950. It was also published in 1950 by the Foundation.

DANIEL WEBSTER was the famous American statesman, orator, lawyer. "Conscription" (Part I) is extracted from his speech in the House of Representatives on December 9, 1814, in which he voiced a warning and prophecy to his fellow countrymen regarding the draft. It was published by the Foundation in 1953.

INDEX

A

- Ability, 282
- Absolution
 - denied, 354
 - social, 286
 - state, 197
- Acton, John (Lord), 289
- Adoption, child, 349
- Aggression, resistance to, 415
- Agriculture
 - American program, 175
 - communism and, 221, 229
 - crop control and, 178
 - distribution of food, 238
 - government planning in, 232
 - potato prices and, 118
 - propertied class in, 84
 - Russian, 178
 - subsidy and, 118, 175, 232
 - supply of food and, 118, 199, 238
- Alger, Horatio, 338
- Aluminum, 72
- America, *see*, United States
- Analysis*, 259
- Anti-Corn Law League, 216
- Antwerp, price controls and, 172
- Archetypes, 281, 292
- Army
 - drafted, 265
 - standing, 262
- Athens, price controls and, 170
- Atomic energy, 15, 18
- Australian Corps, 274
- Authority
 - belief in, 376
 - compulsion and, 85, 279, 282, 287
 - governmental, 208, 410
 - Hooker, Richard and, 179
 - importance of, 189, 195, 197, 395
 - limited, 333
 - production and, 205, 399
 - responsibility and, 285
 - see also*, Coercion; Force; Government; Power

B

- Babylonia, 169, 196
- Baker, John, 15
- Banks, national, 226

Bargaining

- ability, 146
- competitive, 124, 126, 135, 138, 147, 163
- freedom and, 123, 162
- individual capacity for, 122, 123
- industry-wide, 153, 156, 164
- nature of, 124, 161
- power, 127, 211
- representatives of, 161
- requirement for, 129
- right to, 122
- wheat, 166
- Bell Telephone System, 84
- Benefits
 - guaranteed, 49, 64, 179, 341, 345
 - qualifying for, 295
 - taxation and, 296
 - unearned, 178
 - unemployment, 156
 - view of, 378
- Bestor, Arthur E., Jr., 380
- Bill of Rights, 11, 82
- Boulton, Matthew, 68
- Bourgeoisie, 220
- Brannan plan, 232
- Bright, John, 216
- Brookings Institution, 84
- Browder, Earl, 200, 234
- Buddha, Guatama, 366
- Budgets, 113, 176
- Buell, Raymond Leslie, 214
- Bulgaria, 179
- Bureaucracy
 - American, 32, 272
 - education and, 390, 392
 - Italian, 23
- Burke, Edmund, 44
- Business
 - control of, 242
 - large and small, 83, 84
 - ownership, 72, 237
 - risks in, 68, 133, 137
 - see also*, Control; Interventionism; Production

C

Capital

- control of, 132, 236
- investments, 73, 134, 144, 203, 282

- Capital (*Contd.*)
 - labor and, 133, 236
 - ownership of, 72, 237
 - process of, 283
 - stockholders and, 74, 133, 134, 137, 144
 - see also*, Money; Production
- Capitalism
 - basis of, 128
 - communism and, 73
 - destruction of, 227
 - ownership under, 72, 237
 - standard of living and, 71, 76
 - state, 235
 - unions and, 165
 - see also*, Market economy
- Cartel system, 147
- Catalogues, mail order and government, 113
- Centralization
 - communication and transportation, 70, 220, 227
 - communism and, 220, 226, 227
 - credit and, 220, 226
 - industrial, 155
 - production and, 220
- Chamber of Commerce, U. S., 194
- Charity, 282, 344, 361
- Chartists, 215
- Children
 - adoption of, 349
 - aid to, 347, 349, 352
 - care of, 338, 351
 - guardians of, 348
 - welfare of, 347
- Chodorov, Frank, 259
- Choice
 - coercion and, 122, 135
 - exercise of, 366
 - freedom of, 206, 283, 375
 - Henry, Patrick and, 277
 - power of, 375
 - responsibility for, 122
 - right of, 368, 370
- Christianity
 - American, 27, 41
 - Hitler and, 27
 - Judean, 375
 - U. N. Covenant and, 300, 303, 306
 - see also*, Morality
- Citizenship, government and, 336
- Civilian Conservation Corps, 229
- Civilization, 52, 397
- Class movements, 82, 216
- Classroom teachers, 399
- Clinchy, Russell J., 175, 298
- Closed shop, 151, 165, 229
- Cobden, Richard, 216
- Code of ethics, 324
- Coercion
 - freedom and, 122, 135, 206, 211
 - function of, 11
 - growth of, 16
 - instrument of government, 296
 - methods of, 160, 165
 - power of, 157
 - trade and, 189, 191
 - weapons of, 162
- Collectivism
 - American, 175, 177, 178
 - British, 176
 - compulsion and, 205
 - concept of, 56, 129, 161, 217
 - human rights and, 321
 - paths to, 175
 - Russian, 177, 200, 222
 - see also*, Communism; Socialism
- Commandment, 95, 97, 100
- Commission on Human Rights, 300
- Common stock, 144
- Communication, control of, 220, 227
- Communism
 - agriculture and, 221, 229
 - American, 23, 258
 - Browder, Earl and, 234
 - capitalism and, 73
 - centralization and, 220, 226, 227
 - closed shop and, 229
 - concept of, 36, 65, 242
 - confiscation and, 220
 - defined, 236
 - education and, 221, 232
 - equality and, 221
 - fight against, 246
 - formula for, 279
 - freedom and, 317, 410
 - growth of, 294
 - industry and, 229
 - prediction of, 362
 - production and, 220
 - program of, 219
 - promoters of, 373
 - recruits to, 249
 - Russian, 200, 222
 - socialism and, 73, 98, 199, 200, 374
 - surrender to, 336
 - via majority vote, 218
 - see also*, Marx, Karl
- Communist Manifesto*, 65, 219, 222
- Compensation, unemployment, 141

- Competition**
 bargaining and, 124, 126, 135, 138,
 147, 163
 British, 215
 compulsion and, 155
 fear of, 135
 labor and, 140
 need for, 71
 perfect, 134, 136
 production and, 124
 reluctance to, 147
Compromise, United Nations, 300
Compulsion
 alternative to, 127
 antagonistic to creativeness, 289
 army, 264
 authority and, 85, 279, 282, 287
 British, 176
 competition and, 155
 education and, 340
 effect of, 271
 equality and, 340
 peacetime, 276
 strikes and, 205
 union, 151, 155, 158, 164
 unity defied, 325
 see also, Authority; Coercion; Force;
 Government
Conflict
 market economy and, 189, 343, 344
 nondiscrimination and, 372
Conformity, 252
Congress
 conscription and, 264, 267
 grants of, 181
 production and, 177
Conscription
 bill, 261
 British, 274
 Congress and, 264, 267
 duty and, 263
 force and, 262
 French, 271
 German, 272
 government and, 261, 267
 outside U. S. A., 271, 272, 274
 peacetime, 276
 power and, 265
 Prussian, 272
 responsibility and, 273
 slavery and, 266
 voluntary, 272
Constitution
 United Nations
 general welfare and, 319
 treaties and, 298, 327
Constitution (Contd.)
 United States
 affected by U. N. Covenant, 327
 concepts of, 179
 libeled, 265
 monarchy and, 23
 power of, 261, 267
 religion and, 306
 rights granted, 82
 Russian, 300
Consumers and producers
 British subsidies and, 176
 control of, 156
 interference with, 149
 monopoly power and, 114, 147, 153
 potatoes and, 118, 119
 preferences of, 87
 production and, 185, 191, 199
 role of, 145
 see also, Market economy
Control
 administrative, 177
 bargaining alternative to, 127
 business, 242
 capital, 132, 236
 centralized in industry, 155
 coercive, *see, Coercion*
 communication and, 220, 227
 concepts of, 198, 376, 398
 consumer, 156
 credit, 220, 226
 crop, 178
 democracy and, 413
 education and, 232
 failure of, 196
 farm, 178
 growth of, 30, 32, 334
 income, 236
 individual and, 49, 178, 338, 340,
 346, 409
 labor, 313
 legal, 399
 licensing, 107, 403
 minimum assured, 317
 prices
 American, 33, 164, 173
 Antwerp, 172
 Athenian, 170
 British, 173
 control of, 33, 118, 164, 169,
 184, 194, 199
 fallacy of, 118
 Holland, 171
 Indian, 172
 Reign of Terror and, 172

Control (*Contd.*)
 prices (*Contd.*)
 Roman Empire and, 170
 trade and, 170
 prison, 64
 production, 205, 399
 property, 178
 result of, 164, 407
 Roman Empire and, 323
 socialism and, 196
 stand-by, 184, 193, 195, 200
 state, 317
 wage, 160, 185, 194
see also, Interventionism

Cooperation
 voluntary, 126, 146, 152, 153, 157, 295
see also, Freedom; Market economy; Trade

Corn Laws, 216

Corporations
 economic power of, 211
 employer-employee relation to, 133, 135, 144
 status of, 84
 taxation and, 181

Corruption, 289, 334

Cost of electricity, 183

Counter-monopoly, 149

Covenant and human rights
 collectivism and, 321
 religion and, 302
see also, Human rights

Covered Wagon, 69

Creativeness, 288, 293

Credit
 control of, 220, 226
 inflation and, 90
 supply of, 91

"Creeping socialism," 222

Crime
 cause and cure of, 63
 code of, 359

Cripps, Stafford (Sir), 176, 314

Crusoe, Robinson, 141

Currency
 debauched, 31, 227
see also, Money

Curriculum
 criticism of, 387
 discipline and, 383
 investigation, 382
 questionnaire, 382
 revision, 386
 traditional versus "life-adjustment," 384

D

Daily, Starr, 62, 64

Das Kapital, 65

Davis, Jefferson, 400

Day of Decision, 180

Debt, public, 37, 176, 202, 204, 240

Decentralization, 259

Declaration of Independence, 179, 329

Defense, 232, 261, 269, 339

Defense Mobilizer, 194

Defense Production Act, 232

De Graff, Herrell, 118

Demand, potato, 118

Democracy
 controls and, 413
 in education, 386
 Italian meaning for, 23
 majority belief and, 360
 Marx, Karl and, 27
 process of, 222

Desocialization, 377

Despotism, forced, 263

Destruction, paths to, 256

Dewey, John, 63

Dictatorship, 197, 198, 381, *see also*, Authority

Diocletian, Edict of, 170

Directorates, public school, 392

DiSalle, Michael, 118

Discipline
 curriculum, 383
 undermined, 381

Discrimination
 association and, 371
 capacity for, 365
 employment and, 368
 friendship and, 372
 man and, 367
 meaning of, 366
 nature of, 367
 Negroes and, 373
 power of, 368
 thought disease and, 366

Distribution
 food, 238
 population and, 221

Divine law, 94

Divine right of kings, 147

Dix, Dorothy, 343

Draft, forced, 262

Draft International Covenant on Human Rights, 303n

Due process, 64

Duke of Parma, 171

Dutch Revolution, 171

Duty

congressional, 264

conscription and, 263

see also, Responsibility

Dykes, E. W., 166

E

Economic Intelligence, 194n

Economics

American, 198, 339

British, 214

emergency, 193

freedom and, 31

Germany, 199

lesson in, 187

objectives of:

Russian, 317

U. N. Covenant and, 308

progress and, 81

security and, 63

stand-by, 184

Economics in One Lesson, 88n

Economist, The, 177

Edict of Diocletian, 171

Education

belief in, 380

bureaucracy and, 390, 392

communism and, 221, 232

compulsion and, 340

control of, 232

democratic, 386

dictatorial, 387

eliminated, 381

iron curtain and, 392

liberal, value of, 394

life-adjustment, 382

objective of, 393

process of, 15, 17

responsibility of, 382

survey of, 382

teachers and, 390

types of, 341

U. N. Covenant and, 310, 318

see also, Curriculum

Efficiency, 271

Eighteenth century, present and, 214

Eighth Commandment, 358

Electricity

cost of, 183

power of, 67, 228

rate increases of, 182

socialization of, 181

subsidy and, 181

Elijah, 57

Emergency, 110, 194

Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 115

Employment

advantages, 74

discrimination and, 368

federal, 32, 237

investment and, 144

opportunities, 135

relations, 87, 129, 133, 135, 140,

144, 150, 205, 207, 209, 220

rights, 86

Soviet, 300

U. N. Covenant and, 313

see also, Labor

Engels, Frederick, 65, 219

England, *see*, Great Britain

Enslavement of mind, 381

Enthusiasm, 271

Equality

communist program and, 221

compulsory, 340

economic, 339

meaning of, 77

security and, 338

Ethics, code of, 324

Europe, socialism in, 222

Europeanization of America, 25

Evans, Richard L., 77

Evils

control of people and property, 178

forces of, 44, 259

Exchange

freedom of, 112, 117, 133, 185,

191, 194

kinds of, 376

labor, 210

of goods and service, 121, 132, 133

property, 185

voluntary, 125, 129, 146, 191

willing versus unwilling, 376

see also, Market economy; Money;

Trade

Experience, differentiated, 380

Exploitation, 66

F

Fabians, 222

"Fair employment practice" laws, 368,

370

Fair prices, 186, 187

Fairless, Benjamin F., 73

Faith, 43, 58, 179, 397

Fallacy and fact, 373

Famine

avoided in India, 172

potato, 118

Farm Bureau, 37
 Farms, *see*, Agriculture
 Fears, 63, 419
 Federal aid to education, 232
 Federal Communications Commission, 227
 Federal Reserve System, 226
 Feudalism, 214
 Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 197
 Fifth Amendment, 10
 Finance, public, 37, 176, 202, 204, 240
 Fine, Benjamin, 233
 Food, *see*, Agriculture
 Force
 conscription and, 262
 evil, 39, 44, 259
 growth of, 295
 inflation and, 169
 initiated, 12
 military, 270
 uniformity of, 323
 violence and, 269
 see also, Authority; Coercion; Interventionism; Power
 Ford, Frank R., 365
 Foster homes, 352
 Foundation for Economic Education, 7, 20
 Founding Fathers, 398, 403
 Fourteenth Amendment, 143
 France
 conscription and, 271
 revolution in, 172, 272
 Free market, *see*, Market economy
 Free trade
 anatomy of, 185
 balance of, 192
 British, 214, 216
 defined, 215
 exchange and, 191
 German, 199
 see also, Exchange
 Freedom
 achievements of, 312
 American, 25, 148, 399, 411
 bargaining and, 123, 162
 case for, 164
 choice and, 206, 283, 375
 closed shop and, 151, 165, 229
 coercion and, 122, 135, 206, 211
 collectivism and, 321
 communism and, 317, 410
 concept of, 93, 361, 398, 403, 411, 417
 creative, 15

Freedom (*Contd.*)
 dangers to, 87, 202, 275, 333
 defined, 23, 246, 320, 399, 401, 406
 denied, 49, 262, 345
 destroyed, 395
 economic, loss of, 31
 exchange and, 112, 117, 133, 185, 191, 194
 faith in, 379, 397
 foundation of, 179, 202, 332
 from want, 62
 individual, 27, 122, 157, 203, 253, 400
 lack of, 16
 Libertarian and, 206, 208, 251, 336, 376, 395
 license and, 107, 403
 literature of, 7
 means to, 415
 need for explanation of, 18
 personal practice of, 27
 philosophy, 20
 plight of, 103
 press and, 306
 price of, 115, 329
 property rights and, *see*, Property
 religious, 302, 304
 responsibility for, 47, 122, 128, 180
 "Robin Hood" concept of, 361, 412
 slavery and, 257, 407
 society and, 296, 326, 369
 taxation and, 167, 202
 unrestrained, 402
 value of, 112, 278
 vanishing, 25
 see also, Cooperation; Market economy
 French Revolution, 172, 272
 Friendship, discrimination and, 372
 Führer, 198

G

Gasset, Ortega y, 331
 General Motors, 84
 Generations, inheritance of, 381
 Germany
 conscription and, 272
 food situations and, 199
 price administration and, 199
 socialist, 197, 199, 319
 Goering, Hermann, 198
 Gold, discovery of, 69

Government

- administration, 177, 279, 289
- aid to education, 233
- aid to needy children, 347, 349
- bargaining, *see*, Bargaining
- benefits, 178, 378
- British subsidies and, 175
- budgets, 113, 176
- bureaucracy, 23, 32, 272, 390, 392
- challenged, 277
- citizens and, 336
- compulsion, *see*, Compulsion
- conscription and, 261, 267
- control of:
 - capital, 132, 346
 - credit and interest rates, 220, 226
 - labor, 313, 323
 - responsibility and, 43
 - schools, 232
 - wages, 160, 185, 194
 - wealth, 236
- corrupt, 289, 334
- Creed, 326
- decision about, 27
- defense of, 339
- endangered, 270
- finance corporation, 241
- form of, 179, 339
- free, 247
- functions of, 334, 362
- goal of, 163
- growth of, 30, 32, 294, 334
- guaranteed security, 49, 64, 179, 341, 345
- housing, 315, 352, 404, 415
- human rights and, 299
- Indian welfare and, 49
- inflation and, *see*, Inflation
- interference, 149, 195, 255
- IOU's, 240
- Italian, 23
- labor, 157, 314
- licensing and, 107, 403
- limited, 11, 295
- majority rule in, 218, 244, 360, 414
- medical care and, 184, 193, 316
- monopoly, *see*, Monopoly
- ownership, *see*, Ownership
- philosophy of, 342
- planning, 159, 178, 228, 232, 314
- power, 87, 157, 189, 195, 197, 214, 220, 278, 294, 296, 377
- principles of, 294
- private, 182
- purpose of, 339, 416
- ruling class of, 220

Government (Contd.)

- sovereign, 7
- spending, 37, 176, 202, 204, 240
- strikes and, 164, 205
- subsidies, *see*, Subsidies
- taxation, *see*, Taxation
- totalitarian, 275, 320
- views of, 378, 398
- violence, 269
- wards of, 49, 348
- welfare, 345
- world, 259
- see also*, Authority; Capitalism; Communism; Control; Socialism
- Gravity, law of, 355
- Great Britain
 - budget of, 176
 - competition and, 215
 - compulsion and, 176
 - conscription and, 274
 - expenditures in, 176
 - free trade and, 214, 216
 - labor conditions of, 65
 - Labor party of, 177, 222
 - lesson in economics, 176
 - price controls and, 173, 176
 - prosperity in, 217
 - semi-feudal, 214
 - socialism and, 176, 177
 - subsidy program and, 175
 - taxation in, 176
 - trade and, 214, 216
 - woolens of, 214
- Great Mistakes of Karl Marx*, 73
- Creed, 66
- Guardians of children, 348
- Guilt, 355

H

- Hamilton, Alexander, 106
- Hammurabi code, 169
- Harper, Floyd A., 80n, 88n, 93, 164, 184, 249, 365
- Harvester strike, 164
- Hate, gospel of, 66
- Hazlitt, Henry, 88n, 90
- Health, 62, 184, 193, 316
- Heaton, K. L., 389n
- Helvering v. Horst, 106n
- Henry, Patrick, 111, 115, 127, 277, 398
- Historian, 57
- History
 - influence of, 381
 - lesson of, 259, 271

Hitler, Adolph, 27, 90, 199, 319, 402
 Hobbes, Thomas, 179
 Holland, price controls and, 171
Homo sapiens, 367
 Hooker, Richard, 179
 Hoover, Herbert, 241
 Hospital, prison, 64
 Housing, 315, 352, 404, 412
 Human energy, 295
 Human relationships, 65, 80, 121, 354, 363
 Human rights
 defined, 85
 collectivism and, 321
 commission on, 300
 compromise and, 300
 concept of, 79, 143, 312, 332
 definition of, 299, 325
 International Covenant on, 298
 property, *see*, Property
 religion and, 302, 304
 Soviet Constitution and, 300
 United Nations and, 298
 Hungary, 179
 Hypocrisy, 108

I

Illinois Secondary School Curriculum Program, 382n
 Inalienable rights, 244
 Income
 controlled, 236
 curtailed, 411
 division of, 75
 inequalities of, 142
 property and labor, 79
 taxation and, 103, 224
 India, price controls and, 172
 Indian, American, 49
 Individuals
 control of, 49, 178, 338, 340, 346, 409
 decisions of, 43
 differences among, 123
 discrimination and, 367
 faith in, 396
 freedom and, 27, 122, 157, 203, 253, 400
 responsibility of, 47, 122, 128, 180
 rights of, 13, 22, 27, 122, 128, 179, 209, 299, 377
 security of, 49, 180, 348
 state and, 28
 welfare of, 49, 347, 368

Industry
 bargaining and, 153, 156, 164
 communism and, 229
 government planning in, 232
 meat, 33
 monopoly of, 148, 229
 power of, 229
 Inequalities of fortune, 142
Inflation, 88n, 164
 Inflation, 90, 169, 181, 196
 Ingebretsen, James C., 395
 Inheritance tax, 225
 Injustice, 195
 Institutional living, 62, 338, 351
 Insurance, federal, 240
 Integrity, 180, 287
 Interest rates, 226
 International Covenant on Human Rights, 298
 Interstate Commerce Commission, 227
 Interventionism, 149, 195, 255, *see also*, Communism; Government; Socialism
 Invasion, 269, *see also*, Revolution
 Investigation, curriculum, 382
 Investments, 73, 134, 144, 202, 203, 282
 IOU, 240
 Iron beds, 252
 Iron curtain, educational, 392
 Isaiah, 51
 Iserman, Theodore R., 165
 Israel, Remnant in, 58
 Italy
 bureaucracy of, 23
 Nazi movement in, 272

J

James, Jesse, 361
 Jamestown, N. Y., 181, 183
 Jefferson, Thomas, 175, 179, 239, 247, 304, 327, 398
 Jobs
 opportunities, 135
 quitting, 207
 right to, 86
 security, 150
 see also, Employment; Labor
 Judas, 357
 Judean masses, 53
 Judeo-Christian ideals, 375
 Judgeship, dual, 188
 Justice
 assurance of, 160
 in prices, 191, 195
 versus injustice, 195

K

- Kansas Supreme Court, 142
- Keynes, John M., 227
- Keynes, Foster and Marx; State Capitalism and Progress*, 234
- Kilowatt-hours, socialized, 181
- Knowledge, 15, 19, *see also*, Education
- Koopman, G. R., 389n
- Korea, 30, 32, 34, 298

L

- Labor
 - capital and, 133
 - closed shop and, 151, 165, 229
 - communist program and, 220, 229
 - competition and, 140
 - conditions
 - American, 69
 - British, 65
 - control, 313
 - drafting of, 230
 - equalization, 221
 - exchange, 210
 - government, 157, 314
 - incentive destroyed, 168
 - income, 80
 - law, 165
 - management, 130, 132, 135, 155
 - monopoly, 165
 - opportunities in, 135
 - party of England, 177, 222
 - power of, 156
 - relations, 87, 129, 133, 135, 140, 144, 150, 205, 207, 209
 - revolution, 220
 - Russian, 300
 - taxation in Britain, 176
 - unemployment in, 141, 156
 - value of, 210
 - see also*, Employment; Unions
- Land
 - capital and, 133, 236
 - ownership of, 223
- LaPrensa of Buenos Aires, 307
- Lassalle, Ferdinand, 197
- Lauchner, A. H., 389n
- Laws
 - man-made
 - Com, 216
 - fair employment, 368, 370
 - growth of, 294
 - labor, 165
 - parenthood and, 348
 - power of, 205

Laws (Contd.)

- man-made (Contd.)
 - statute, 115
 - trial by jury and, 329
 - moral, *see*, Morality
 - natural, 44, 304, 305, 354
- Leadership
 - freedom philosophy and, 20
 - future, 409
 - political, 90
 - Soviet, 178
 - thought, 117
- Lewis, John L., 83
- Libertarianism, 206, 208, 251, 336, 376, 395, 396
- Liberty, *see*, Freedom
- Licensing, 107, 403
- Liddell Hart, Basil Henry, 270
- Lincoln, Abraham, 399
- Lincoln, Edmund E., 104n
- Lindblom, Charles E., 165
- Lipscomb, Ed, 27
- Literature, liberty, 7
- Lobby, federal, 33
- Locke, John, 179
- Lord
 - Elijah and, 58
 - message to Isaiah, 52
- Losses, indirect, 107
- Lower Bengal, 172
- Luther, Martin, 97
- Lynchburg, Virginia, 338
- Lynchings, 373

M

- Machlup, Fritz, 165
- Madison, James, 305, 335
- Majority rule, 218, 244, 360, 414
- Management, 130, 132, 135, 155
- Manchester, 216
- Manion, Clarence, 334
- Margin, vital, 203
- Market economy
 - American, 148
 - basis of, 128
 - conflict and, 189, 343, 344
 - defined, 101
 - employment and, 144
 - exchange of goods in, 112, 117, 133, 185, 191, 194
 - gaining, 93, 164
 - gun play in, 166
 - income and, 103
 - Libertarians and, 395
 - method of, 165
 - moral right in, 13, 94, 206, 210, 351

Market economy (*Contd.*)
 principle of, 295
 privilege of, 122
 theory of, 130
 trade and, 125, 129, 146, 185
 unhampered, 126
see also, Capitalism; Exchange;
 Property
Marx, Karl
 communism and, 200, 219, 362
 democracy and, 27
 economic security and, 63, 73
 employment relations and, 129
 ideal of, 279
 wealth and, 209n
 writings of, 65, 219
Masses
 definition of, 53
 Judean, 53
 mind of, 331
 prophet of, 59
Masters versus state, 180
Matrimonial contract, 190
Meat industry, 33
Medicine, 184, 193, 316
Memorial and Remonstrance *against*
Religious Assessments, 305
Mental hygiene, 62
Mercantilism, revolt against, 214
Middle way, 317
Militarization, 254, 270
Militia, forced, 262
Milton, John, 179
Mobilization, 274
Molestation, 401, 414, 417
Monarchy, 23
Monetary system, 259
Money
 credit and, 90
 investments and, 73, 134, 144, 203,
 282
 subsidy, 175
 use of, 359
 wages, 145
see also, Capital; Exchange; Prices
Monopoly
 counter, 149
 credit, 220
 in education, 232
 industrial, 148, 229
 joint, 155
 labor, 165
 power, 114, 147, 153, 229
 unions and, 149, 164
Morality
 belief in, 415

Morality (*Contd.*)
 concept of, 333
 law of, 115
 principles and, 353, 355
 public, 303
 responsibility and, 339
 right, 13, 94, 206, 210, 351
 standard, 286, 299
 stature, 245
 thievery and, 362
 unions and, 149, 164
 wages and, 165
Morals and the Welfare State, 80n
Moreell, Ben, 218, 277
Morris, James R., 164
Mullendore, W. C., 294
Municipally owned utilities, 182
Murder, 97, 269
Murphy, Raymond E., 197n
Murray, Philip, 83

N

Napoleon, 72, 197, 215, 272
National Association of Secondary-School Principals, 388
National bank, 226
National Bureau of Economic Research, 236
Nationalization of production, 376
Natural law, 44, 304, 305, 354
Nature, discrimination and, 367
Nazi movement, 272
Negroes, discrimination and, 373
New Hampshire Historical Society, 261
New York Public Service Commission, 181
 1984, 381
Nock, Albert Jay, 51
Nondiscrimination, 372
Nonmolestation, 401, 406
Nuclear fission, 15

O

Obstacles, purpose of, 284
Odd Fellows Home, 338
Office of Price Administration, 199
Office of Price Stabilization, 33, 118
Olds, Irving S., 88n, 164, 169
Organization, methods of, 157
Orphanage, 338, 340, 346
Ownership
 business, 72, 237
 electricity and, 181

Ownership (*Contd.*)

- land, 223
- private vs. government, 99, 129, 158, 182, 203
- property, *see*, Property
- public, 23, 129, 164, 289, 413
- rights, 101, 189
- risks of, 68, 133, 137
- Orwell, George, 381
- "Over law," 298
- Owen, Robert, 215

P

- Pacifists, 259
- Pain, 365
- Parenthood, 341, 348
- Parity, 232
- Parliament, repeal of Corn Laws, 216
- Parma, Duke of, 171
- Peace, 63, 375
- Peacetime conscription, 276
- Peel, Robert, 216
- Pei, Mario A., 23
- Penn, William, 335
- Pessimism, 30
- Pettengill, Samuel B., 65
- Philosophy
 - freedom, 20
 - government, 342
 - moral, 299
 - "something for nothing," 342
- Pilate, 9
- Pilgrim Fathers, 280
- Pitney, Mahlon, 142
- Planned economy, 177, 178, 214, 228, 232, 314, *see also*, Government
- Poirot, Paul L., 79, 121, 164
- Population
 - distribution of, 221
 - increase of, 237
- Potatoes, 118, 119
- Power
 - administrative, 178
 - bargaining, 127, 211
 - conscription and, 265
 - constitutional, 267
 - corporate, 211
 - corruption and, 289, 334
 - discrimination and, 368
 - economic, 211
 - effect of, 87
 - electric, 67, 228
 - evils of, 259
 - governmental, 87, 157, 189, 195, 197, 214, 220, 278, 294, 296

Power (*Contd.*)

- industry, 229
- labor, 156
- laws and, 205
- Libertarians and, 395
- monopoly, 114, 147, 153, 229
- of choice, 375
- of an idea, 214
- police, 279
- state, 179, 220
- taxation and, 88, 156, 238
- union, 149, 156
- President, U. S., 230
- Press
 - freedom of, 306
 - truth and, 197
- Pressure groups, 343
- Price Administration, German, 199
- Price Control in the War Economy*, 199
- Price of Price Controls*, 88n
- Prices
 - arrangement of, 192
 - ceiling, 120
 - control of, 33, 118, 164, 169, 173, 184, 194, 199
 - determination of, 126, 134
 - fair, 186, 187
 - fluctuating, 118
 - functions of, 119
 - German administration and, 199
 - Great Britain and, 173, 176
 - guaranteed, 175
 - high, 90, 175
 - inflation and, 90, 196
 - justice and, 191, 195
 - low, 175
 - potato, 118
 - production and, 331
 - trade and, 170
 - United Nations and, 331
 - wage freeze and, 194
- Prison life, 62
- Private property, *see*, Ownership;
Property
- Private utilities, 182
- Privileges, libertarian platform and, 395
- Problems of High School Youth*, 382
- Procrustes, 252, 256
- Producers, *see*, Consumers and producers
- Production
 - American, 28, 30, 41, 67
 - communism and, 220
 - competitive, 124

Production (*Contd.*)

- Congress and, 177
- consumption and, 185, 191, 199
- control of, 205, 399
- defense of, 232
- evidences of, 67, 220
- human effort and, 121
- nationalization of, 376
- of new Jamestown power plant, 181, 183
- penalized, 296
- price of, 331
- profit motive and, 70
- purpose of, 146
- restricted, 407
- right to, 97, 399
- socializing means of, 376
- threat to, 87
- United Nations and, 331
- value of, 76
- Profit motive, 70
- Progress
 - checked, 256, 281, 408
 - economic, 81
 - signs of, 28, 68
 - understanding, 41
- Proletariat, 220, 279
- Property
 - classes, 83
 - confiscation of, 226
 - control, 178
 - defined, 121
 - exchange of, 185
 - private, 80, 128, 209, 373
 - rights, 10, 13, 79, 80, 97, 99, 101, 128, 143, 164, 220, 225, 295
- Prophet
 - Elijah, 57
 - Isaiah, 51
 - of the masses, 59
 - of the Remnant, 58
 - reward to, 60
- Prosperity, British, 217
- Prussia, conscription and, 272
- Public debt, 37, 176, 202, 204, 240
- Public school
 - directorates, 392
 - curriculum, 382
 - see also*, Education
- Public Service Commission, 182

Q

- Questionnaire
 - curriculum, 382
 - Illinois, evaluated, 385

R

- Read, Leonard E., 9, 165, 205, 279, 376
- Rebellions, 417, *see also*, War
- Reconstruction Finance Corp., 241
- Recruits for an idea, 249
- Reform movement, 216, 259
- Regimentation, 253, 363
- Reign of Terror, 172
- Religion
 - Christian, *see*, Christianity
 - Judeo-Christian, 375
 - U. N. Covenant and, 302
- Remnant
 - care of, 53, 55
 - counted, 57
 - definition of, 53
 - impersonal attitude of, 60
 - knowledge of, 55
 - prophet, 58
- Reservation Indians, 49
- Responsibility
 - authority and, 285
 - conscription and, 273
 - decline of, 49
 - educational, 382
 - government control and, 43
 - individual, 47, 122, 128, 180
 - moral, 339
 - rights and, 257
- Revolt of the Masses*, 331
- Revolution
 - against mercantilism, 215
 - American, 214
 - Dutch, 171
 - French, 172, 272
 - labor, 220
 - socialism and, 175
- Rewards to prophets, 60
- Richberg, Donald R., 109, 158, 165
- Rights
 - abolition of, 220
 - choice and, 368, 370
 - concept of, 13, 94, 398
 - decision, 369
 - employment, 86
 - guaranteed, 81, 86
 - human, *see*, Human rights
 - inalienable, 244
 - individual, *see*, Individuals
 - limited, 396
 - moral, 13, 94, 206, 210, 351
 - natural, 277
 - of free contract, 143
 - ownership and, 101, 189

Rights (*Contd.*)

- production and, 97, 399
- property, 10, 13, 79, 80, 97, 99, 101, 123, 143, 164, 220, 225, 295
- refusal of, 126
- responsibility and, 257
- seniority, 150
- to life, 10, 94, 127
- veto, 186
- Risks, 68, 133, 137
- Rivers and Harbors Bill, 38
- Robbery, legalized, 167, *see also*, Stealing
- Robin Hood, 361, 412
- Roman Empire, 170, 323
- Rueff, Jacques, 199n
- Ruins, 180
- Ruling class, 220
- Rushdoony, Rousas John, 49
- Russell, Dean, 164, 181, 338, 398
- Russell, James Earl, 233
- Russia
 - collectivization in, 177, 200, 222
 - constitution of, 300
 - economic policy of, 317
 - labor and, 300
 - leaders in, 178
 - see also*, Communism; Marx, Karl

S

- St. James, 43
- Satisfaction, 62, 125, 131
- Savings, *see*, Capital; Corporations; Investments
- Science and learning, 380
- Scoville, John W., 165
- Secondary school curriculum, *see*, Curriculum
- Security
 - economic, 63
 - equality and, 338
 - employment, 150
 - guaranteed, 49, 64, 341, 345
 - individual, 49, 180, 348
 - qualities of, 339
 - search for, 26
 - social, 239
 - union, 149
- Self-control, 285
- Self-cultivation, 288
- Self-defense, 414
- Seniority rights, 150
- Serfdom, *see*, Slavery

Share Ownership in the U. S., 84

- Shareholders, 83
- Single taxers, 259
- Sixteenth Amendment, 224
- Slavery
 - conscription and, 266
 - invitation to, 314
 - master of, 288
 - of mind, 381
 - or free men, 257, 407
 - results of, 398, 407
 - road to, 180
 - subsidy and, 105
- Slogans, 14
- Small Business and Government Licenses*, 108n, 236
- Smith, Adam, 215
- Smith, Beverly, 365
- Social Equality*, 215
- Social leveling, 279
- Social pressure, 254
- Social security, 239
- Socialism
 - American, 177
 - British, 176, 177
 - communism and, 73, 98, 199, 200, 374
 - compulsory, 159
 - controls and, 196
 - "creeping," 222
 - electricity and, 181
 - European, 222
 - foundation of, 40, 177
 - German, 197, 199, 319
 - lesson in, 281
 - meaning of, 98
 - production and, 376
 - revolution toward, 175
- Society
 - freedom and, 296, 326, 369
 - "good," 259
 - identification of, 166
 - requirements of, 121
 - voluntary, 343, 369
 - see also*, Market economy
- Sollitt, Kenneth W., 252
- Something-for-nothing, 284, 342
- Speculating, *see*, Investments; Risks
- Spending, public, 37, 176, 202, 204, 240
- Spengler, Oswald, 197
- Standard of living, 71, 76
- Standardization, 252
- Stand-by controls, 184, 193, 195, 200
- Standing army, drafted, 262

- Starvation, 71
- State
- absolutism, 197
 - capitalism, 235
 - control, 317
 - government-guaranteed benefits and, 49, 64, 179, 341, 345
 - individuals and, 28
 - power of, 179, 220
 - prisons and, 62
 - requests of, 180
 - versus masters, 180
- Statism
- American idea of, 10
 - combating, 9
 - defined, 9
 - overcoming, 21
 - road to, 30
 - support of, 14
- States Parties to U. N., 308
- Statute law, 115
- Statute of Artificers, 214
- Statute of Religious Freedom, 304
- Stealing, 97, 100, 286, 356, 358, 362
- Steelworkers, 74, 83
- Stockholders, 74, 133, 134, 137, 144
- Strikes
- compulsion and, 205
 - harvester, 164
 - ways to stop, 165, 205
- Studies in Income and Wealth*, 236
- Subsidies
- advocates of, 280
 - agricultural, 118, 175, 232
 - aid to citizens, 376
 - American, 175
 - British, 175
 - definition of, 175
 - electricity and, 181
 - housing and, 412
 - potato, 118
 - prices guaranteed, 175, 177
 - prison, 64
 - program, 175, 233, 347, 349
 - slavery and, 105
 - transportation, 228
 - use of, 105
- Supply
- credit, 91
 - food, 118, 199, 238
 - prison needs and, 62
- Supreme Court
- Kansas, 142
 - United States, 42, 106, 142, 354
- T
- Taft, Robert A., 230
- Tax Foundation, 240
- Taxation
- according to *The Economist*, 177
 - benefits and, 296
 - British, 176
 - corporate, 181
 - exemption, 183
 - expenditures, 177
 - graduated, 224
 - in market place, 167, 202
 - inheritance, 225
 - investments and, 202
 - labor payments through, 88
 - national income and, 103, 224
 - power of, 88, 156, 238
 - progressive, 220, 224
 - purpose of, 224
 - single, 259
- Taylor, Henry J., 198
- Teachers, classroom, 390
- Temporary Industrial Disputes Settlement Act*, 230
- Tennessee Valley Authority, 181
- Through Valleys to Victory*, 64
- Tools, 67, 69
- Totalitarianism, 275, 320
- Trade
- British, 214, 216
 - coercion and, 189, 191
 - grain, 170
 - justice and, 191
 - of goods and services, 121, 131, 133
 - price controls and, 170
 - reason for, 123
 - refusal to, 126
 - restricted, 410
 - voluntary, 125, 129, 146, 185
 - see also*, Exchange; Free Trade
- Transportation, 70, 220, 227
- Treaties, U. S. Constitution and, 327
- Trial by jury, 329
- Trueblood, D. Elton, 100
- Truslow, Francis Adams, 202
- Truth
- denied, 354
 - in the press, 197
 - spreading of, 40
- Twenty-third Psalm, 64

U

- Unemployment
 - benefits, 156
 - compensation, 141
 - see also*, Employment; Labor;
- Wages
- Uniformity, forced, 323
- Unions
 - capitalism and, 165
 - closed shop, 151, 165, 229
 - collective will and, 209n
 - company-wide, 153
 - compulsory, 151, 155, 158, 164
 - monopoly and, 149, 164
 - objectives of, 149, 158
 - power of, 149, 156
 - security of, 149
- United Nations Covenant
 - compromise of, 300
 - economic objectives, 307
 - education and, 310, 318
 - employment and, 313
 - forced uniformity and, 323
 - general welfare and, 319
 - health and, 316
 - housing and, 315
 - human rights and, 298
 - Korean decision and, 298
 - labor and, 313
 - press and, 306
 - price and, 331
 - production and, 331
 - religion and, 302
 - States Parties and, 308
 - treaties and, 298, 327
 - trial by jury and, 329
- United States
 - agricultural program in, 175
 - bureaucracy and, 32, 272
 - collectivism and, 175, 177, 178
 - communism in, 23, 258
 - Constitution, *see*, Constitution, U. S.
 - contributions of, 302
 - creed of, 326
 - economics and, 198
 - Europeanization of, 25
 - form of government, 339
 - freedom and, 25, 148, 399, 411
 - fundamental issues of, 27
 - government foundation of, 179
 - lost, 23
 - planned economy and, 177
 - price controls and, 173
 - principles of, 24, 332
 - production and, 28, 30, 41, 67

United States (Contd.)

- religious nation, 300, 303
- revolution in, 214
- risks, 68, 133, 137
- socialism in, 177
- subsidy program of, 177
- see also*, Consumers and producers;
- Government; Market economy
- United States Steel, 73
- Utilities
 - government owned, 181
 - municipally owned, 182
 - private, 182
- Utopia, 39
- Uzziah's reign, 51

V

- Valuation
 - conscription and, 273
 - freedom and, 112, 278
 - labor, 210
 - production, 76
 - U. N. Covenant and, 320
- Veto, right to, 186
- Violence
 - defensive, 416
 - government, 269
 - legalized, 411
 - use of, 405, 413
- Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom, 179
- Votes
 - buying, 239
 - Libertarians and, 396

W

- Wages
 - controls and, 160, 185, 194
 - controversy of, 83
 - determination, 126, 134, 137
 - money, 145
 - monopolistic, 165
 - real, 144
 - scale of, 131
- Want-satisfaction, 62, 125, 131
- War
 - American, 214
 - "cold," 199
 - Dutch, 171
 - encouraged, 274
 - French, 172, 272
 - rebellions and, 417
- Wards, government, 49, 348
- Warfare, modern, 273
- Washington, George, 398
- Watt, James, 68

Wealth, 142, 236
Wealth of Nations, 215
Webster, Daniel, 261
Welfare
 child, 347
 general, 319
 government, 345
 individual, 49, 347, 368
 State, 64, 177, 313, 317
Wheat, bargaining for, 166

Whigs, 215
Whitman, Walter, 44
Wilson, Woodrow, 334
Wisdom
 discrimination and, 366
 short cut to, 384
Wolman, Leo, 164
Woolens in Great Britain, 214
Works Progress Administration, 229
World government, 259