

The Power Road to Power

Admiral Ben Moreell

Socialism via Taxation

Samuel B. Pettengill


The League of Women Voters

Bettina Bien

No Firecrackers Allowed

James Burnham

THOMPSON RADIOACTIVE TESTS REVEAL ENGINE WEAR—POINT WAY TO LONGER CAR LIFE



This sketch shows how Thompson engineers use atomic energy to measure piston ring side wear while it is taking place. Radioactive piston rings are installed in a test engine . . . as tiny particles wear off, in much the same manner as they wear off rings in your car's engine, they are carried through a highly sensitive scintillation counter which keeps a continuous record of wear conditions.

THE DAY MAY NOT BE too far away when the engine in your car will last twice as long as it does today.

Important progress toward that goal is being made by Thompson Products engineers who have uncovered new discoveries in wear patterns of car, truck and tractor engines. To do so, Thompson put man's most modern "tool" . . . atomic energy . . . to work in new testing techniques.

Here's how Thompson does it...


Engine parts to be studied for wear are irradiated in an atomic pile. These radioactive parts are then placed in a test engine. Tiny radioactive metal particles, torn loose by wear, are picked up by lubricating oil and circulated through a scintillator, a measuring device 50 times more sensitive than a Geiger counter.

From these radiation measurements, Thompson engineers are learning *how* parts wear, *where* they wear, and *when*

they wear. For example, Thompson is now hard at work studying the side wear tendencies in piston rings after new discoveries about this little-known subject resulted from the new radio-isotope tests.

Other tests to follow involve such vital engine parts as bearings, valves, tappets, rocker arms, connecting rods, gear teeth and pistons.

This important new development typifies the thoroughness and ingenuity of research methods, development skills, and manufacturing facilities that have made Thompson Products one of industry's leaders for more than 50 years. Today such industries as automotive, aviation, agricultural, appliances, metallurgy, hydraulics, pneumatics, electronics and many others count on Thompson. Thompson Products, Inc., General Offices, Cleveland 17, Ohio.



A Thompson engineer installs a radioactive piston ring in a test engine using special tools designed to protect personnel from over-exposure to dangerous radioactive rays. A second engineer closely observes the radiation count to be sure that safety limitations are maintained.

You can count on
**Thompson
Products**

MANUFACTURERS OF AUTOMOTIVE, AIRCRAFT,
INDUSTRIAL AND ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS.
FACTORIES IN SIXTEEN CITIES.

THE Freeman

*A Monthly
For
Libertarians*

Editor
Managing Editor
Business Manager

FRANK CHODOROV
MABEL WOOD
IVAN R. BIERLY

Contents

OCTOBER 1955 VOL. 5, NO. 16

Editorials

In Need of an Issue	678
The Busy Termites	679
"Processing the Mails"	679
Atomic Certainty	680
Random Notes	680
Incomprehensible	680

Articles

The Power Road to Power	ADMIRAL BEN MOREELL	681
No Firecrackers Allowed	JAMES BURNHAM	684
A Note on Academic Freedom	PARK CHAMBERLAIN	687
Socialism via Taxation	SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL	689
Will England Go Communist?	REGINALD JEBB	694
The League of Women Voters	BETINA BIEN	696
Right Dukes of the Left	M. STANTON EVANS	702

Books

A Reviewer's Notebook	JOHN CHAMBERLAIN	704
Key to Our History	WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN	706
Terror on the Docks	SUZANNE LA FOLLETTE	706
Warren Agonistes	M. STANTON EVANS	707
Soak the Poor	F. A. HARPER	707
Fromm and Capitalism	HELEN CARTIER	708
Pragmatism's Best	E. MERRILL ROOT	709
Gem of the Ocean	F. R. BUCKLEY	710
Well Worth Reading		712

Washington, D. C. FRANK C. HANIGHEN 700

Readers Also Write 674

An Editor Dreams

—of the manuscripts he'd like to have;
—of the short story that tells of the human side of freedom and yet is all story, without preachment; not more than 3,000 words (some of the best of Maupassant are half that length);
—of the lilting Gilbertian ballad, pricking the bubble of political pomposity, bringing the bureaucrat down to his true size and exposing the bedbug character of the social uplifter; kindly but well barbed, and above all singable;
—of satire as Mark Twain wrote it, so that readers can enjoy the humor even if they miss the subtle meaning behind it;
—of essays in economics that make liberal use of the parable, free of didactics and constructed of square-toed Anglo-Saxon words and phrases, quite unlike the gobbledegook professors of economics affect to cover up their ignorance of economic realities;
—of the humorous anecdotes pointing up the foibles of political demigods and the inanities of those who would improve everybody except themselves; for example, Artemus Ward or Finley Peter Dunne.
—of the poem that, like "The Prisoner of Chillon," arouses the spirit of freedom that is in all of us, even the Socialist, or, like "Ozymandias," shows up the vacuity of political power.
—of commentaries on the current of thought and manners, written with the critical scalpel of a Matthew Arnold or from the lofty viewpoint of an Albert Jay Nock;
—of analyses of current affairs that do not resort to logic-chopping and yet are as convincing as an Aristotelian syllogism;
—of inspirational pieces that really inspire and therefore do not shriek or scold or point the finger of scorn, and are only mildly and inoffensively hortatory; as, for instance, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address;
—of factual information in the field of public affairs that gets down to the evidence without a long and unnecessary introduction and without a tiresome peroration;
—of easy continuity for easy reading, each sentence leading logically to its successor, each paragraph called for by its predecessor;
—of brilliance of expression without conscious precocity;
—of the editorial millenium.

Among our contributors:

M. STANTON EVANS is of the class of 1955, Yale, where he was something of a conservative rebel. He recently joined the staff of the *FREEMAN* and, among other chores, edits the "Well Worth Reading" page.

JAMES BURNHAM, author of *The Managerial Revolution*, comes back to the pages of the *FREEMAN* after an absence of many months. His other books are: *The Struggle for the World*, *Containment or Liberation?* and *The Web of Subversion*.

PARK CHAMBERLAIN is a California lawyer who, without literary aspirations, wrote something on academic freedom worth publication.

The *FREEMAN* is published monthly at New York, N.Y., by the Irvington Press, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y. Copyrighted in the United States, 1955, by The Irvington Press, Inc., Leonard E. Read, President; Fred Rogers Fairchild, Vice President; Claude Robinson, Secretary; Lawrence Fertig, Treasurer; Henry Hazlitt and Leo Wolman.

Re-entry as second class matter pending at Irvington, N.Y. with an additional entry at New York, N.Y.

RATES: Fifty cents a copy; five dollars a year; nine dollars for two years.

SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE: Send subscription order, correspondence and instructions for change of address to:

The *FREEMAN*
Subscription Department
Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS: Send old address (exactly as printed on wrapper of your copy) and new address, with zone number, if any.

EDITORIAL AND GENERAL OFFICES: Address the *FREEMAN*, Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y. The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Manuscripts must be typed double-spaced. Articles signed with a name or initials do not necessarily represent the opinion of the editors.

Printed in U.S.A. by Blanchard Press, Inc., N.Y., N.Y.



**WE'RE
LOOKING**

for freedom-loving men and women who would like to be reading the FREEMAN each and every month.

Send us their names and we'll be pleased to send them a copy of a recent issue with your compliments.

If possible send issue of

Name _____

Street _____

City _____

Zone _____ State _____

Name _____

Street _____

City _____

Zone _____ State _____

My Name _____

Street _____

City _____

Zone _____ State _____

Readers Also write

Loaded Terms

I am not sure that the commentaries on current sociological terms (editorial, "Loaded Terms," September) really are a service to the cause you espouse.

If the author of the piece, "Capitalistic Society," had restricted his observations to the *economy*, thus ending with the words—"there is no other kind of economy"—he would have a couple of legs to stand on. As it is, however, the writer of the article is blowing the horn of the Marxists because he reveals a purely economic inner approach to social and historical problems.

Human society, I am sure you will agree, vastly extends beyond the realm of Economics and Business. It must be nourished inwardly and rejuvenated by fresh ideas, not stemming from business instincts at all, but from man's higher inner life; and this, in turn, needs for its healthier growth the existence of an independent, *second* domain of society, one in which human thought has a chance to create institutions of learning, art and religion, entirely free from either commercial or political subservience . . .
New York, N. Y. H. J. RITSCHER

A healthy phobia makes a man a strong fighter, but a blind phobia may lead him only to run upon his adversary's pike. I wonder sometimes whether the editor of the FREEMAN is not in danger of that fate. This reflection is emphasized in my mind by the paragraph on "collective bargaining" under "Loaded Terms" . . .

What is a corporation but a collection of investors to buy, *inter alia*, labor? And if these investors may associate together to buy labor, certainly those who have labor to sell may associate together to sell it. If collective bargaining is something other than "a meeting of minds among men actuated by reason and mutual respect," it is due to the fact that most men will corrupt any function if they have the opportunity to gain what they believe to be an advantage for themselves.

The evils presently associated with collective bargaining are not inherent in collective bargaining, but it seems to me, are due largely to resistance by collective buyers of labor to collective sellers of labor, in trying to deny to wage earners a privilege which they themselves were exercising.

If we should attack and destroy

every method which men have sometime or another managed to corrupt, there would be no methods left to us.
New York, N. Y. MURRAY T. QUIGG

Passion for Suicide?

I have read the article in the FREEMAN for August entitled "The Fashion for Fear," and I should like to say that in my opinion the article is dangerous to the security of the United States . . . it would consign millions of people living in the American target cities to certain doom because it seems to the author like just too much trouble to figure out how they can be safely moved elsewhere.

Moreover, the article makes the fundamental error that somehow a dead American citizen who didn't try to run away from destruction and who accepts certain death is more patriotic than the person who takes thought to save himself and to be an asset . . . to the nation.

I cannot quite understand how those of you who are so anxious to have an atomic war with the Russian and Chinese Communists are also so violently opposed to civil defense measures that will be effective. I can only conclude that you are motivated by some strange passion for national suicide.

FRANK P. ZEIDLER, Mayor
Milwaukee, Wisc.

I want to thank you for publishing the article, "The Fashion for Fear," by Paul Jones. It is most timely.

I was living in Paris at the time of its occupation by the Germans in June 1940. The mass evacuation by the inhabitants was most deplorable. It was reported that fifty thousand of the fleeing populace were bombed from the air by the enemy as they moved south. Many more perished en route and were buried where they fell.

MRS. BELLE TRACY SMITH
Los Angeles, Calif.

Paul Jones . . . forfeited his opportunity to contribute to straight thinking when he dismissed, as a minor irritant, the thing which gave rise to the CD plan of which he disapproves.

Dr. Ralph E. Lapp has written a series of articles in which he pleads for more candor from the AEC and at the same time utilizes the meager data released by the AEC to outline the probable magnitude of the fall-out hazard. His calculations do not support Mr. Jones' views, even though later releases from the AEC make Dr. Lapp's picture seem a little conservative.

Regardless of the political overtones of the moment we *must* face reality—

(Continued on p. 676)

Does a machine ever think like a man?

You bet! Many business machines can out-calculate a normal, quick-thinking man. It's a good thing they do, or business would never get its bookkeeping done.

These machines are collections of small machined steel parts, working smoothly under cover of sheet steel housings.

They are marvels of accuracy that sometimes actually seem to think.

And many of them are made of J&L cold finished steels and J&L sheet and strip steel.



**J&L
STEEL**

Jones & Laughlin
STEEL CORPORATION

Look to J&L... for the steels that work for modern industry

(Continued from p. 674)
a reality which includes land, build-
ings and machinery made unusable
for periods of time much longer than
"48 hours."

Fullerton, Calif. JOSEPH A. FULLER

With His Own Petard

In demonstrating how some modern Americans have thrown ethical principles overboard, "The Education of King Jerk" (July) relies on an assumption largely spread by a hostile press, that the followers of McCarthy embraced wrongful means in their commendable fight against subversion. Here it appears that Professor Tenney has given some evidence of the un-discriminating thinking he is complaining about. He accepts as factual what was probably the greatest canard against McCarthy and his support-

ers: that his methods were immoral. In short—the Professor has betrayed himself by falling for the "consensus."

One wonders how many street corners the good professor frequented to learn that the populace voiced themselves for the attainment of McCarthy's objectives, while knowingly giving approval to his evil methods. Professor Tenney will have to give us further proof of his ability to think objectively before he can expect his readers to accept him as a competent critic of sophistical thinking.

Long Island, N. Y. MICHAEL J. YORKE

Encourage Politicians

The editorial, "Midsummer Madness," was very aptly named. It was, to say the least, midsummer madness to include it in the FREEMAN at all, much less to give it a front-page position . . .

The one big thing that now keeps good and capable people from seeking public office is the present tendency of the general public to class anyone in politics as crooked or insincere.

If at the polls we have only inferior persons to choose from, then it must follow that our public offices will be filled with inferior people. We cannot conscript good persons for our political jobs. They must first be encouraged to seek those jobs. Can we do this by downgrading anyone who enters political life to a point, as the author puts it, where "a decent girl would hesitate to date a young man whose father is in the political business"?

The front-page position given to "Midsummer Madness" has one good point: anything that follows should be an improvement.


Henderson, Ky. WILL M. LUCAS

AMERICA'S LARGEST FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION Offers You

- A LEGAL INVESTMENT FOR YOUR TRUST FUNDS
- 3½% PER ANNUM CURRENT RATES
- RESERVES OVER \$19,000,000.00
- ALL TRANSACTIONS HANDLED BY MAIL
- RESOURCES OVER \$200,000,000.00
- INSURED SAFETY


WRITE TODAY FOR FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BOOKLET
COAST FEDERAL SAVINGS, DEPT. H, 9th AND HILL, LOS ANGELES 14, CALIF.

Member—Federal Home Loan Bank—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corp.



It seems to me . . .

by Philip M. McKenna
President, Kennametal Inc., Latrobe, Pa.



When you are already wet, do you carry an umbrella?

Would you carry an umbrella to protect you against a shower, if you were already wet while surf bathing?
Of course not!



But that is, figuratively speaking, what our Government insists on doing.

The United States Treasury is "swimming" in a sea of demands by foreign banks for gold in exchange for the dollars they hold. This demand runs in

waves that reach as high as 17% of the total U. S. gold supply. Yet, at the same time, our Government insists that the Treasury retain a *protective umbrella* against a small shower of gold demands from U. S. citizens, who commonly circulate—or rather used to circulate—only 2% to 3% of the supply when it was legal for us citizens to handle gold coins.

Why does our Government fear a shower when already wet while swimming?

It can't be a question of gold supply. The U. S. Treasury gold stock amounts to almost \$22 billions worth, and the 2 to 3% that Americans might ordinarily demand cannot possibly affect this total to any appreciable extent . . . especially when the fluctuating demands by foreigners obviously have not.

No, it must be that the Government fears we, the citizens, will force the monetary authorities to return to sound financial practices by *withdrawing larger amounts* when we fear the Government's action.



It seems to me that we have lost too much time already on the wrong side of that "protective umbrella." And we've lost more than time. We've lost many benefits that could have been ours. Take Kennametal* for example. The great savings that Kennametal tools have made possible by speeding up machining of steel and steel alloys have not been passed along to ultimate consumers but have merely slowed the rate of inflation.

The re-establishment of a Gold Coin Standard will make it possible to pass such savings on to consumers in the form of lower prices, thus increasing purchasing power. It's worth consideration and discussion with your neighbors, including public officials and candidates for office.

*Kennametal is the Registered Trademark of a series of hard carbide alloys of tungsten, tungsten-titanium and tantalum, for tooling in the metal-working, mining and woodworking industries, and for wear parts in machines and processing equipment.

7203

One of a series of advertisements in the public interest



THE *Freeman*

OCTOBER 1955

In Need of an Issue

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY is in dire need of an issue—or at least a slogan with which to go to the electorate in 1956. For an entirely different reason, the country could do with an issue. Let us first consider the plight of the party.

The “outs” generally pick up their battle cry from the alleged malfeasance or misfeasance of the “ins.” In the present instance, however, the Democrats are stopped from finding basic fault with the stewardship of the Republican Administration. For the Administration has been following closely the tax-and-spend pattern designed by its Democratic predecessors, and any attack on it, except in minor details, would amount to a repudiation of the Roosevelt-Truman policy. That would hardly do. Hence their plight. The situation is so difficult that one of the leading Democrats inferentially concedes the Presidency to the Republicans by suggesting that Mr. Eisenhower would be in better position to carry out the Democratic-Republican program if he had more Democrats in Congress next term; the Democrats, he maintains, gave him better support than did the members of his own party in the last session.

Since adjournment, according to reports, the Democrats have been toying with a perennial issue—lower taxes. This is always a good vote-getter, almost as good as buying up the votes of some influential bloc by way of a subvention. The inconsistency of a tax-reducing program by the party that consistently and precipitously raised taxes during its twenty-year regime will not bother its vote-hungry leaders; with consistency a politician simply cannot have anything to do, and besides, the voters can be depended upon to forget the past in a promise for the future.

The hint that the Democrats will enter the campaign with a tax-reduction promise was not accompanied with any suggestion that spending will be reduced—the only way that taxes can be lowered. Such a suggestion would cost as many votes as the promise to lower taxes would gain; it would be foolish for the party that profited so handsomely from subsidization to think of abandoning it.

So the question is, if and when taxes are to be lowered, while handouts are to be continued and increased, how is the cost to be met? No answer is forthcoming, nor is one needed; for the government is skilled in spending more than its income. The trick is deficit financing. It is really a process of “borrowing” through the government-controlled banking system; in this way the government converts its deficit into cash.

Thus, government creates additional money, which becomes a claim on production, in competition with the stock of money already in existence. This infusion of new money into the market necessarily reduces the purchasing power of each monetary unit. Every dollar buys less than it did before. This is inflation, which is an underhanded, despicable and mean form of taxation.

Taxes transfer money from the citizen to the government; inflation diminishes the purchasing power of the money the citizen retains. In either case, the citizen may claim fewer goods and fewer satisfactions from his earnings. His standard of living is as much lowered by inflation as by taxation. Taxation is a bit more honest in that it takes the bread out of his mouth in a straightforward manner, while inflation does the same thing without his knowing. That is why the politician is for inflation.

So the Democrats are currently scratching the bottom of the barrel for an issue. (The Republicans, incidentally, are not in need of one; barring exigencies, they will ride into the campaign on a “name.”) It may be, of course, that the next two years may provide them with some fortuitous scandal issue. There seems to be a disposition now to look for a subversive cell in the higher echelons of the Administration; if they find one, they can shout “two years of treason.” Then, there is this delving into the business connections of Republican higher-ups, and the effort to find something fishy in the Dixon-Yates affair, so that they can trot out the good old “throw the rascals out” issue.

Meanwhile, the real issue of our times is as-

siduously kept out of the political arena by both parties: shall the country continue to be propelled into socialism, or will freedom be given a chance? Since both Democrats and Republicans are committed to the tax-and-spend way of keeping in power, it is idle to expect either one to present the question to the electorate. Politicians never lead; they only make noises that sound like leadership. If and when there seems to be a considerable demand for freedom, some aspirant for office will rise to the occasion. Meanwhile, it is the function of dissidents—like the FREEMAN—to keep iterating and reiterating the story of freedom, so that the issue may be ultimately brought to a head. As it will be. Maybe mass hunger or the disillusionment of a disastrous war will be the prelude for a show-down. Who knows? But it is a certainty that the spirit of freedom never dies.

The Busy Termites

MISS BETTINA BIEN did a lot of ferreting to come up with her article on the League of Women Voters, in this issue. Ferreting is the right word, for there is no other way of describing the job of ascertaining from the literature of such organizations the purposes of their leaders or the methods by which they pursue these purposes. The very obscurantism of their publications is inherent in their techniques, and one must do a lot of reading, cross-checking and analyzing to get to the bottom of these organizations.

When one finally deduces a pattern from their by-laws, statements of policy, instructions to members and interpretations of former recommendations, the whole thing is quite simple. It then becomes clear that these organizations consist in fact of a small managerial group, who decide all questions of policy, and that the membership serves only to give this group a semblance of stature. They can claim to “speak for” somebody besides themselves. The claim is made plausible by another claim, that the management is “representative,” having been selected by the “democratic process,” and that their stated policies have been arrived at similarly. A study of the organizations’ procedures, however, indicates that the management manages everything, even their own selection. The members pay dues and get some kind of vicarious glory from belonging.

The larger the membership of an organization, the more distance there is between the ruling hierarchy and the dues-payers, and therefore the surer is its autonomy. This is true of any organization. The preoccupation of the members with their personal affairs makes it possible for the “leadership” to pursue their purposes unhindered; and since they are on the job all the time, with nothing else to do, the managerial clique can devise ways

and means of manipulating the organization to their ends.

For the Socialist, the man with a plan to remake the human race, as well as for the fellow in search of a privilege, this organizational authoritarianism is made to order. It provides him with a means for inflating his scheme into a “social purpose,” for protecting it from criticism by giving it the force of a “general will”; a hundred thousand members can’t be wrong, especially since they are voters. Politicians cannot ignore this manufactured roar.

Thus the organization becomes a threat to society. While the rest of us are too busy with our personal problems to pay more than passing attention to public affairs, the indefatigable termites keep everlastingly at their purpose of shaping public affairs to their liking. Thanks to their dues-paying dupes, they can devote all their time, energy and ingenuity to their self-appointed mission.

If they succeed in imposing their will on society, by way of a law, their expanded egos impel them to new ventures in social reorientation; they are never without theories.

There is only one kind of organization from which society can derive any benefit—one that is specifically bent on repealing laws. If you can find one, join it.

“Processing the Mails”

SOMETIMES our foreign subscribers complain that delivery of the FREEMAN is irregular. We had no explanation. We mail on the 25th of each month—a day one way or the other—and are careful that our subscribers’ plates are in good order.

The *Economist* (London) has been receiving similar complaints from its American subscribers. The publisher made inquiry of the U.S. Post Office and learned something that was news to us. “It appears,” says the British weekly in its issue of August 6, “that all foreign publications are forwarded to the Bureau of Customs for review under the Customs Tariff Act of 1930 as possible propaganda matter . . . a backlog has accumulated and it is understood that at times the examining unit has been considerably in arrears in ‘processing the mails.’ ”

The *Economist* does not say whether the British government is similarly apprehensive about propaganda from America, but, since protectionism is the order of the day, it is reasonable to assume that the FREEMAN comes under scrutiny when it reaches London. Indeed, censorship of the FREEMAN by the British makes more sense than censorship of the *Economist* by our government. For this eminent weekly has long been favorably disposed toward the socialistic measures which our government has borrowed from theirs, while the FREEMAN has been consistently guilty of *lèse-majesté*.

Atomic Certainty

IF YOUR mental equipment, like mine, cannot cope with the scientific jargon of atomic energy, let it pass. A fellow can't know everything. We can accept without cavil the promise of the experts that nuclear power will exceed by far that produced by coal, oil, waterfalls; and that as a result man will be able to produce more things with less labor.

And we can predict with certitude that a big chunk, if not all, of this increased production will be absorbed by taxes, and that the lot of the bureaucrats (whose number will vastly increase) will improve at a rate far in excess of yours and mine. In fact, there is no assurance that yours and mine will improve at all.

Yes, whatever else atomic energy is, it is certain to be a new source of taxes.

Random Notes

THE EXPERTS, military and political, are telling us that the Russians are manufacturing more and better instruments of war than we are. If their estimates are correct, it follows that a controlled economy is more efficient than a free one. And if that is true, why not adopt their methods at once? Maybe communism is more efficient!

* * *

Everybody's doing it. Now the Brooklyn Dodgers are asking the citizens of New York to provide them with an adequate plant for their business, just as the merchants in a number of cities are demanding city-operated parking lots for their customers. Soon the theatrical impresarios will be after the authorities for cheap-rent show houses. Why not? After all, the Roman Empire, just before it flopped, did provide entertainment for its citizens.

* * *

Senator Wayne Morse, the vari-colored Socialist, is after the government to build Hell's Canyon dam in Idaho, so that Idahoans can get cheap electric power. The project would cost the government \$465,000,000—toward which the people of Idaho would contribute a little over a million, while New Yorkers would be milked for nearly seventy times that much, and other states in proportion to their population. Incidentally, a private power company has offered to build the dam for less than a third of the estimated cost to the government. Ain't socialism grand?

* * *

"Skilled and senior workers at Ford and GM," reports *Newsweek*, "are complaining that GAW doesn't help them because only younger and unskilled workers are actually laid off in low-production periods." They'd rather have the com-

panies' contributions to GAW in their weekly envelopes. Apparently, they are learning that the union's principal concern is for the marginal workers; the skilled ones do not need the union.

* * *

We are promised a spate of congressional investigations come January. (One Senate committee will investigate the prizefighting business.) One wonders whether these committees will be fishing for vital information or for headlines that can be turned into political capital.

* * *

The money-lending agencies of the government are doing a land-office business in the flooded areas of Connecticut, Pennsylvania and New York. Yet, in the center of this devastated section—at Hartford, Connecticut—is the largest aggregation of insurance companies in the country, with an untold amount of money begging for borrowers. It is money belonging to policy holders, private citizens, and handled by experts in the lending business. The government is in direct competition with its own citizens, its taxpayers, using their money to prevent them from getting a share of the trade. Why? For political reasons only. The tragedy provided the bureaucrats with an opportunity to improve their position. The fact that they do not know the difference between a sound loan and a gratuity did not deter them from plunging in; the emergency was made to their order. They could prove that the country simply cannot get along without them. But what about the insurance companies and their policy holders?

* * *

Since the opening of the school term last month a spate of articles on the shortage of teachers, classrooms and school equipment have appeared in the public press. All are larded with statistics. And all, significantly enough, point to the need of getting the federal government more deeply into the education business. The assumption is that the inadequacies of our school system will vanish if it is placed in the hands of political job-hunters. Who, do you suppose, have sponsored these "objective" articles? The job-hunters?

Incomprehensible

THE RUSSIAN AGRICULTURISTS visiting our farms, it was reported, were unable to understand our crop control and price support program. Who does? Perhaps it would have helped if they had been told that the program is a hybrid institution (like hybrid corn)—made up of unequal parts of free and collectivized economies. If that did not clear up the matter for them, they should have been informed that our agricultural program is a step in the direction of what they have in their own country.

The Power Road to Power

By ADMIRAL BEN MOREELL

Public power projects are wasteful, and the claims made for them are exaggerated, reports the chairman of the Task Force on Water Resources and Power.

The Second Hoover Commission, which was set up on July 10, 1953, differed materially from the first Commission of 1947. The latter was limited to studies and recommendations to improve the then existing functions of government. The second Commission, however, was authorized to enter the field of policy—that is, to determine not only whether an existing function is being performed efficiently, but also whether it should be performed by government at all. Actually, the second Commission had an implied mandate to suggest ways and means of getting the country out of the socialist mess it is in.

One of the thirteen subdivisions of the Commission was called the Task Force on Water Resources and Power, of which Mr. Hoover appointed me chairman. We were charged with the duty of making studies to be used by the Commission as a basis of carrying out its mission in the field of water resources and power. We covered four principal areas:

1. Power Generation and Distribution, including atomic power.
2. Reclamation and Water Supply, including domestic and industrial water supply, irrigation, stream pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, and drainage.
3. Flood control, including water retardation and upstream watershed treatment.
4. Improvements to water navigation, including inland water transportation and beach erosion.

Since 1824, when the federal government first started to develop our water resources, it has spent a total of \$14.3 billion, of which \$11.6 billion were for capital outlay and the rest for planning, maintenance and operation. Projects already authorized call for an additional capital outlay of \$18.5 billion. Other projects now in process of authorization or specifically scheduled total \$52 billion. Thus, with no allowance for cost increases, which experience indicates always occur, the total water resource program—built, building, authorized or scheduled—amounts to \$82 billion.

The rate of expenditures is most significant. From 1824 to 1920, nearly a century, only 8 per cent of the present \$14.3 billion total had been spent. Between 1920 and 1930, 6 per cent was spent. And since 1930, 86 per cent of the spending has taken place, with the bulk of it, 68 per cent, crowded mostly into the postwar years. The current per-

formance indicates that unless something is done to decelerate it, the rate will double every ten years.

In 1954 there were 43 offices and bureaus of the federal government involved in water resources and power developments. Their 1954 expenditures were \$1.5 billion and they employed more than 70,000 persons.

From these figures, and having in mind the rapidly mounting federal debt, it is evident that a critical appraisal of the entire program was long overdue.

The 26 members of our Task Force were recruited from twenty different states of the Union, representing all parts of the country. None of the members was actively associated with either public or private power or any other interested parties. Only men prominent in their communities, of unassailable integrity, and in the top ranks of their professions were selected. No inquiry was made as to their political affiliations.

A Hodgepodge of Contradictions

The Task Force began its labors early in November, 1953, and continued until its report was handed in on March 31, 1955. During those seventeen months, public hearings were held in five cities, 186 witnesses were heard, 78 written statements from governors were received, 200 federal reclamation and power systems were studied in detail, 81 meetings of the Task Force or its subgroups were held. The completely documented report consists of 1,783 printed pages of text, supported by tables, maps and charts.

It is impossible, in the space available, to give more than a bird's-eye view of the mass of data we collected, the conclusions reached, and our recommendations.

I believe our most important conclusion is that the activities of the federal government in this vital and costly field have grown like Topsy, with no central supervision except a "once-over-lightly" by the Bureau of the Budget. Huge sums have been spent without benefit of any clear-cut, unified body of federal policy. Instead, each agency established its own policies and, within each agency, there are different policies for different types of development. The current federal policies, taken together, are a hodgepodge of contradictions which generate

conflicts among agencies, overlapping of functions, competition for position, and wasteful expenditures.

I will mention very briefly some of our other conclusions:

First, with respect to Public Power: this is the king-size hot potato. It is important for two reasons; first, because the left-wing groups have found that this issue has a strong popular appeal which can be used as a powerful political vehicle; secondly, because socialized power can easily lead to socialized industry.

They Never Mention Taxes

There is no logical reason for the popular appeal of the public power issue. Actually, the cost of electric power to the average householder is about 1 per cent of his family budget. *A reduction of only 3 per cent in his tax bill would pay for all of his power.* But the demagogue conveniently forgets to mention taxes.

As for industry, except for the electro-chemical and electro-metallurgical industries, the cost of power averages about 1 per cent of the total manufacturing cost. For the two industries mentioned it runs between 10 and 15 per cent. The importance of public power to the average small industry lies principally in the fact that a local market of uncertain stability is artificially created by the generous expenditure of public funds in a particular area; in the case of the electro-metallurgical and electro-chemical industries, they are able to obtain a cost advantage over their competitors who must use private power.

Public power has already become a potent political issue; it is growing in importance every day.

In 1933, the installed capacity of federal power projects was less than 1 per cent of all electric utilities in the country. By 1953, the federal government had become the largest single manufacturer of power, producing 13.1 per cent of the kilowatt hours generated. Federal projects now under construction and authorized will, by 1960, more than double the 1953 capacity and, when all are completed, will triple it, reaching a total of 35 million kilowatts at a total cost of \$10 billion. If subsidizing public power continues, the situation will be worsened by the development of atomic power. Competent authority has estimated that by 1975, atomic power alone will have an installed capacity of between 40 and 60 million kilowatts, and will be increasing rapidly. Our present total capacity of all kinds of power is slightly over 100 million kilowatts.

Technically and financially, there is no present nor prospective need for federal power activities. There is no lack of ability on the part of private power to finance and install needed generating, transmission and distribution facilities. Since the end of World War Two, investor-owned electric companies have spent approximately \$18.5 billion

for such facilities, as against an approximate *total expenditure by the federal government from the very beginning of \$2.5 billion.*

All federal power is subsidized, more or less. The subsidy takes one or more of the following forms in the establishment of rates:

1. Interest rates which are lower than the actual cost for long-term money.
2. No federal income taxes or comparable contribution to the cost of the federal government.
3. No state and local taxes (with two exceptions).
4. Charging large parts of the initial capital costs to wholly subsidized federal activities, such as flood control, navigation, fish and wildlife, etc.
5. Charging administration costs, insurance and pensions to other government accounts.
6. No charge for interest during construction.

Our Task Force concluded that if all federal power rates had been based on power values computed in accordance with Federal Power Commission methods (so applied to private producers), the rates would be increased by 30 to 50 per cent and the government would have received \$130 million more in power income in 1953, alone. If present federal rates are continued for power projects now programmed, this revenue loss—which, in its effect, is a subsidy—could amount to \$400 million a year.

This may seem a modest sum in these days of super-colossal federal government budgets. But there is another important effect of such subsidies which should be weighed. It is that they set the pattern for greedy scrambles for federal largesse in all other segments of our economy. We never get something for nothing. We pay for these hand-outs with our votes, which means ultimately with our freedoms.

The construction of federal power projects as a so-called "yardstick" to control the rates charged by investor-owned utilities is a "phoney." I was taught that there are 36 inches to the yard. But by virtue of failure to include taxes and because of low-interest financing and other hidden subsidies, the so-called "yardstick" proposed by public power proponents has about 24 to 27 inches.

The improvement in recent years of regulatory techniques and the successful administration of controls instituted by the states and the federal government over both operations and investments have provided adequate safeguards for both consumer and investor. No "short-change" yardsticks are needed.

There is much more that I could say about public power, as, for example:

1. That the only areas in the United States which face a current or prospective power shortage are those now served predominantly by public power.
2. That federal agencies have frequently described projects as flood control, reclamation or navigation measures (all of which are heavily

subsidized) when their real and obvious purpose is to produce electric power.

3. That private companies, by their tax payments, are forced to subsidize competing public power.

4. That 80 per cent of our people who obtain their power from private companies subsidize, in large measure, the 20 per cent who are served by public power.

5. That private power cannot compete with subsidized public power for obvious reasons, which means that as long as the general taxpayer is willing to foot the bill for the subsidy, the areas served by public power will expand at the expense of areas served by private power. There is the equivalent of Gresham's Law on money here—bad power chases out the good!

The Task Force concluded that no additional federal projects which are exclusively for power should be built and that an early start should be made on selling federal power projects or the power portions of multi-purpose projects to private industry, or, if this is not feasible, to the state and local governments.

Wasting the National Wealth

Another important conclusion is that, in many instances, politically motivated development of our water resources has resulted in permanently committing precious water to uses which are uneconomic and wasteful.

The much-discussed Upper Colorado River Storage Project is a prime example. Here is a political boondoggle of purest ray serene, which would develop power at localities far from where it is needed, and would commit the water to irrigating lands useful, for the most part, only for the uneconomic growing of forage crops. Once water is committed to such uses, even though they be wasteful, it would be political suicide to try to take it away.

There are vast deposits of oil and oil shales, coal, uranium, titanium and other minerals in this area, as well as other industrial potentials, all of which will need much water for their development. It has been estimated that a thousand gallons of water will grow ten cents worth of crops here, but would permit the production of five dollars worth of industrial products. The first increment of this project, now being actively processed through Congress, is estimated to cost \$1.7 billion, more or less, and the ultimate cost of the complete project, \$4 to \$6 billion.

We found, too, that there is great reluctance on the part of government to make people pay for the benefits they receive. I have indicated the subsidies for power. With respect to irrigation, the general range of payment required from beneficiaries has been between one quarter and one third of the capital costs, and a few are as low as

10 per cent. In no case have they been required to pay interest. Some projects have a payout period of as much as four hundred years.

The Task Force concluded that the federal government has planned, constructed and paid for projects which are economically unsound and, hence, waste the national wealth; that project costs are frequently underestimated; that estimated direct benefits are often exaggerated; and that unsupported and unsupportable claims are made for so-called "indirect benefits," such as, for example, tax revenues resulting from increased business activity, increases in the population, and many other credits claimed as resulting from the project.

This overestimating of "indirect benefits" is a favorite maneuver of the promoter of unsound projects. In many instances, their evaluations can be classified as pure fantasy. When the evaluator of indirect benefits hits his stride he finds no difficulty in assigning specific dollar values for the mental, moral, physical, intellectual, psychic, global and cosmic satisfactions which will be derived by individuals, groups and the nation-at-large from the project he is justifying!

There seems to have evolved in this country a belief that the expenditure of federal government funds to promote the interests of a favored area, or of a favored group, is justified, provided it can be shown that the resulting benefits to the national economy (which are usually grossly overestimated) will *probably* exceed the initial costs (which are usually woefully underestimated). The question whether this is the best expenditure of public funds in the interest of all the people of the nation, who pay the bill, seems to have been bypassed. And I am sure that anyone who would dare raise a question as to the *morality* of forcibly taking money from all the people for the private benefit of a favored few, would be branded a "black reactionary."

And this points up what I consider to be the basic issue involved in the work of the Hoover Commission. It is whether those who would socialize America will be suffered to continue on their way without hindrance, as they have been doing during almost all of the past twenty-two years, or whether those of us who believe in individual freedom and individual personal responsibility will be able to stop them. The difficulty is that most of us are what Mr. Hoover calls "dinner-time conservatives." But when the gong taps for the opening of business the next day, we become pseudo-liberals, who believe in government intervention in the economic lives of the people, especially where there is a preferred position to be gained for ourselves.

Reprints of this article may be secured from the FREEMAN, Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y. at the following prices: 10 copies \$1.00, 25 copies \$2.00, 50 copies \$3.50, 100 copies \$6.00, 1,000 copies \$45.00.

No Firecrackers Allowed

By JAMES BURNHAM

The passing of yesterday's noisy, patriotic Fourth of July celebration is symbolic of the erosion of individual liberties today.

Last Fourth of July was a good day for meditation in our locality. The hot holiday quiet was unbroken by snap of firecracker, boom of daybomb, or whish of rocket. The torpedoes and cap pistols were silent. In the evening there were no pinwheels, Roman candles, or even hand-waved sparklers to contend with the late-settling summer darkness.

This was the first year of our state's total prohibition of the manufacture, sale, purchase, possession or use of fireworks by individual citizens. We are in style, though a little late. There are now forty-two states in which fireworks are totally prohibited or sharply restricted. Only six outlaws are left—Nevada, Oklahoma, Missouri, Mississippi, Louisiana, and of course Texas. No doubt these mavericks will soon be brought into line by the forces of Progress.

I estimate ("guess," I'd better say, since I've had no help from the Gallup, Roper or any other Scientific Poll) that in these forty-two states, under these prophylactic regulations, two or three score children did not die from careless handling of six-inch cannon crackers; a dozen did not lose the sight of one eye by looking to see why a fuse wasn't burning after the match had been applied; thirty fires were not started; and eight babies escaped stomach-aches from eating firecrackers under the impression that they were Tootsie Rolls.

I am not quite so sure about the net casualties for the day. I put at seven million minimum the number of children who, finding nothing to do around the firecrackerless house and neighborhood, insisted on drives in the holiday traffic; and of these, x were killed and y injured in the normal percentage of automobile accidents. Still, I won't deny that the decrease in burns and fires was a good thing. When the State restricts liberty, everyone knows that it is always for our own good.

Our town—which dates back into colonial times and was a hotbed of the Revolution—also omitted the Fourth of July parade and the speeches at the War Monument this year. With the fireworks silent, the spirit seemed to have gone out of the rest of the ceremonies. (The month before, in compensation, the League of Women Voters did arrange a very tasteful celebration of United Nations Day.)

So it was restful here on the Fourth. A time for reflection. It was much more restful than the Fourths of my childhood, just before and during the first World War. We used to wear ourselves

out with all sorts of foolish, wasteful, reactionary behavior, enough to bring a blush to the cheeks of any progressive school teacher, if there had been one around. The Fourth, in fact, ranked just next to Christmas in the holiday roster. The first early morning firecrackers and cap pistol shots were like the early presents in the Christmas stockings, opened before breakfast.

Flag-Waving Americanism

Later in the morning came the parade, a big parade with everyone in the village taking part. It was trouble to prepare, that parade: carriages and cars elaborately decorated with flags and bunting; bicycles covered with red, white and blue; the smaller children dressed as Uncle Sam, Minute Men, drum-and-fife boys. The parade ended in the traditional manner, with the singing of *The Star Spangled Banner*, the reading of the Declaration of Independence by one of the teachers, and a speech by the village's leading politician. It was never a very elegant speech by New Deal standards: full of flag-waving phrases, talk about the Father of His Country and patriot blood—100 per cent Americanism, in short, the kind of barbarian prejudice that is going to stop forever when the UN Declaration of Rights gets adopted.

When the speech was over, all the children rushed home to their caches of fireworks, and the afternoon was spent in noise and pickup ball games. My father was a railroad man. He used to bring home a batch of spiked railroad "fuses." In the evening we would surround the yard with them, and they would burn for half an hour with their special kind of red and green glowing light. We would then go down to the Lake Michigan shore half a mile away, to set off rockets. As the day's final act we would send into the night sky, far across the lake until they twinkled out of sight, a flock of those wonderful great paper balloons that were inflated with hot air from the paraffin-impregnated wood shavings that burned at the bottom of their delicate frames.

For the children the speech was a bore, and even the parade got pretty tiresome. They waited impatiently through the ceremonies for the fireworks to come. But somehow the whole day fitted together. Didn't *The Star Spangled Banner* itself mention "the rockets' red glare, bombs bursting

in air"? It had taken a lot of bangs to fix history's seal on the Declaration of Independence. Even the danger, what there was, from the fireworks seemed appropriate. After all, the talk was about liberty, and has there not always been some risk, some danger in getting—or keeping—liberty?

We are apt to think of the loss of liberty as the sudden consequence of catastrophe: war, invasion, revolution, the march of primitive hordes or of disciplined gangsters in red or brown shirts. So it often is. But liberty can also be eroded away, small grain by grain, a structural undermining that is hardly noticed before the final fall becomes determined.

How many of us know, or in the least concern ourselves if we do know, that until the first World War—so brief a while ago in the vast calendar of history—no passport or papers of any kind were required for travel over nine tenths of the earth? Well understood, how precious a right is the right to go where I want to go. Liberty means to be able to choose. The existence of passports, visas and similar documents means that I cannot choose freely when and where to travel. But perhaps what is most disturbing is not that we must have a passport but that we are not indignant that this should be so.

From our pay checks—before we receive them—there is deducted a regular, and not inconsiderable, sum for "social security." I as an individual do not authorize this deduction nor can I prevent it. This sum is extracted from me through a process backed not by the puny pistol of a lone and private robber but by the full coercive power of the State, by all its armies, police and jails. It is all for my own good, I am told, for the protection of myself, my wife and my children against the hazards of injury, old age and death. Naturally, this is what I am told: this is the song that always accompanies the rape of a liberty. And what if I do not wish to provide in this manner for my own and my family's protection? What if I think that I can do better with my money in other ways, or don't give a damn about security, or even consider the whole State program of social security a fraud and a delusion? That will make no difference. I will have to pay anyway. I have no choice: that is, no liberty.

The Internal Revenue Bureau—and You

The leviathan State of our time is fed by money, rivers and oceans of money. Nothing sets the State into such furious activity as its ravenous appetite for money. How many of us realize that an organ of our State—the Internal Revenue Bureau—can at any moment (on the merely alleged ground, for example, that he has underpaid his income tax and is planning to skip the country) impound and block all of a man's assets? That is, the Bureau can prevent him from making any use of his bank accounts, credit, securities or whatever, and thus

can as a consequence quickly destroy his livelihood and his future. No matter how fantastic the Bureau's charges, it will be up to the accused individual to prove them wrong—by procedures that are painful, lengthy and frustrating; the Bureau is under no obligation to prove itself justified. In tax matters, a man is guilty until he proves, irrefutably, his innocence. More: through the Declaration of Estimated (and not yet received) Income, he must "confess," and confess concerning a future about which he may have no rational grounds for any prediction whatever. If his confession is more than a fraction inaccurate, though made with all the sincerity of a true penitent, he will pay the penalty as for a crime.

The draft board does not ask my sons whether they wish to register for military service, nor will it consult them, a few years from now, about calling them up. During the period of their liability



for service, moreover, their occupation, residence and travel will be ultimately subject to the draft board's control and veto. This may be necessary for the nation's defense, but however necessary, it is a long detour from liberty. And it is noticeable that in recent years there does not seem to be much effort to convince young men to volunteer, or to explain the national goals and interests that might inspire patriotic citizens to enlist of their own free will. The mechanical State prefers to solve its problems by impersonal coercion.

May I hire whom I choose? By no means. My potential employee must belong to this or that

union, be free of subversive taint, have his social security card in good order, be in line with various "fair employment" rules . . . And, if I am looking for a job for myself, my freedom of choice is similarly narrowed. Besides, in most cases I cannot accept a job (or offer one) if it pays less than a dollar an hour. Now I may not be worth a dollar an hour to anyone, and I may be perfectly willing to work for less; but I am not allowed to. I'll just have to sit around in demoralizing idleness and subsist off government handouts. As an employer I may be so fixed that I could make a profit if I took on a dozen extra workers at eighty cents an hour but no higher, and I will therefore be glad to do so; but I cannot, not even if my town has hundreds of unemployed workers who would much prefer genuine jobs to relief checks.

Controls and Restrictions

If I am a farmer, I cannot freely decide, on the basis of my judgment concerning the best and most profitable use of my own land, what seeds to sow and where. If I violate the controls and restrictions and allotments handed down to me by the agricultural bureaucracy, I'll end up bankrupt if not in jail.

It goes without saying that I can't hang out my shingle as doctor, lawyer, barber, pharmacist, dentist or saloon keeper unless I have applied (in quadruplicate) and paid for piles of permits, licenses and authorizations covering everything from pulling teeth to selling hair oil. Nor, of course, do I dare try to interest the public in financing a new business venture unless I have first paid my long and expensive obeisance to the SEC. My tenants may be perfectly willing to pay higher rent if I can assure them redecorating and better service. I as landlord may be happy to give them the redecorating and service if I can break even on my investment. But the fact that both tenants and landlord are willing is in many towns not sufficient: the rent control board remains; it orders and we must obey.

Perhaps I am old-fashioned, and would like to make my own corn whisky in a homemade still in the basement. If the revenue agents find it, they

will not wait to prove even that it has ever been in operation. Trembling at the thought that a bottle of untaxed liquor might find its way down a citizen's gullet, they will swing their axes to smash my poor still on sight.

Maybe I have decided that, rather than trouble myself constantly over something that I can't help anyway, I will take my chances with H-bombs and forget about them. What I may have decided doesn't matter. I *must* protect myself, whether it affects anyone else or not, and whether I want to or not, as a hundred or so New Yorkers found out a few months ago when they ended up in jail after remaining in the open air during a trial alert.

Compared to a concentration camp, most of these examples are trivial, granted. By a long shot, America is not a "slave State." All of the restrictions on our liberties are alleged to be for our own or society's good; and many of them doubtless are, or, if not, are unavoidable under conditions of mass industry, swollen population and international tension. But they are restrictions none the less, justified or not. Each of them narrows the field of our freedom of choice. I comment again that what is chiefly disturbing is not so much that the restrictions exist as that they are so generally taken for granted. A free citizen who proposes to remain free ought to be irritated that he *must* get an official document before he can travel where and when he wants, or that he *cannot* choose freely what kind of insurance he wishes to buy. Over and above the time and money they cost him, a businessman ought to resent his mounds of governmental paper work as an invasion of his God-given freedom to make his own choices—for good or ill. Most workers may think themselves well advised to join a union, but as free men they ought to be acutely and consciously annoyed when they are *compelled* to join.

I have been wondering about next Fourth of July. Maybe there was too much silence this year. Maybe my neighbors and I ought to find a bootleg fireworks maker, conceal a cracker or two behind an old copy of *The Federalist*, and at an agreed hour set off a big bang all over town, just to remind ourselves what made the Fourth of July noteworthy in the first place.

Looking Multi-Ways at Once

The multi-valued orientation shows itself, of course, in almost all intelligent or even moderately intelligent public discussion. The editors of responsible papers, such as *The New York Times*, *New York Herald Tribune*, *Chicago Sun-Times*, *Milwaukee Journal*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Louisville Courier Journal*—to name only a few—and the writers for reputable magazines such as *Fortune*, *New Republic*, *Harper's*, *Atlantic Monthly*, *Commonweal* or *The Nation*, almost invariably avoid the unqualified two-valued orientation. They may condemn communism, but they try to see what makes Communists act as they do. They may denounce the actions of a foreign power, but they do not forget the extent to which American actions may have provoked the foreign power into behaving as it did.

S. I. HAYAKAWA, *Language in Thought and Action* (Harcourt, Brace)

A Note on Academic Freedom

By PARK CHAMBERLAIN

A free press is a press uncontrolled by government. Free enterprise is enterprise uncontrolled by government. Free speech and free religion are speech and religion uncontrolled by government. These propositions are self-evident; only by deliberate change of definition can doubt be cast upon their validity. One can say, as in fact General Franco did say in a recent interview, that the press cannot be free as long as it is left uncontrolled by government—meaning that any press is controlled by its owner, from whom it may be freed by government action. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding General Franco's views, the words "free" and "freedom" when used in the above context have and always have had in this country but the one meaning—freedom from government.


To these well established American concepts of freedom has been added in recent years a new one—"academic freedom." What is it? Surely, the freedom from government of an "Academy"—an educational institution—and of course including only those privately owned, for those owned and operated by government must by definition be excluded. Such a private institution, in the name of "academic freedom," must enjoy rights analogous to those enjoyed by a newspaper in the name of "freedom of the press," or a church in the name of "freedom of religion." Specifically, this must mean that individuals who so desire may found or support an "academy" where their ideas may be promulgated and their ideals perpetuated, free of government interference. Indeed, upon analysis, academic freedom plainly consists of a kind of bundle of the familiar rights of speech, press, religion and assembly, all of which are necessary to the free operation of the Academy.

A Natural Right

Academic freedom, then, like its constituent parts, is a natural inalienable right, stemming from God and fully guaranteed by the Constitution against government interference. And like other natural inalienable rights, it must not only not be interfered with by government, it must be made secure by government, for the purpose and only purpose of the establishment of government is to secure the inalienable rights of the individual. The activities of government necessary to the security of such rights are simple: they consist of the maintenance of order and the enforcement of

contracts. The former is probably all that is necessary to protect my right to freedom of speech; the latter—enforcement of contract—will also be necessary to the preservation of my right to freedom of the press. By this I mean that I may limit by contract the rights of all who deal with me and my press, and that government must enforce such contracts; government in particular must uncompromisingly secure my right to break with a printer, to refuse space to an advertiser, or to dismiss an employee, if any such should attempt to dictate my editorial policy.

The same is true of freedom of religion. That great doctrine means simply this: that the individual may join what church he pleases, or no



church if he pleases, and practice any ritual. In no case may government interfere; to do so would be a violation of freedom of religion. Government's only obligation is to make this right secure against hostile persons who may be either *within* or *without* such church. As in the case of the other freedoms, the maintenance of order will protect the church and its personnel against physical violence, and the enforcement of contract will protect it from enemies within itself. In the latter case, if a minister of a certain religion should become hostile to it, government must protect the right of the church to oust him—by force if necessary.

And so with academic freedom. The God-given right of individuals to found an academic institution and to dedicate it to desirable ends must not be interfered with by government; it must, however, be maintained by government, not only as against physical violence, but also in the enforcement of the right of the institution to dismiss employees who desire to teach doctrines inconsistent with the ideals of the Academy, and without the terms of their contracts of employment. Only thus can academic freedom be secured.

Self-evident as the above truths may be, there are those who would destroy academic freedom by wresting it from the Academy and vesting it in

the employee *as against the Academy!* Thus, where a teacher is dismissed for teaching matter unacceptable to the Academy, these persons insist that the doctrine of academic freedom means that the employing Academy must continue the teacher in his job, whatever he may teach! This perversion of academic freedom, if extended to the doctrine of freedom of religion, would mean that a church must retain a minister who became converted to and preached atheism. Just as freedom of religion would be erased by such extension, so academic freedom likewise would be irrevocably lost.

Nothing in this determination means that the teacher or other employee of the Academy does not have a full right to academic freedom; he does, but as against government, and not against his employer, the Academy. Government may not interfere with his teaching; on the contrary it must make secure his right to be employed by whom he pleases and to teach what he pleases, limited only by the customary laws of libel, sedition and the like, and by the terms of his contract of employment. Finally, government must secure his right to teach independently, or to join with others to found an Academy to his liking.

A Contradiction in Terms

Although the above conclusions are incontestable, the state of education in this country is such that there might be this rejoinder: "Your analysis is correct as far as the press and the Church are concerned, because both are privately owned, but a different view of academic freedom must be

taken, inasmuch as most educational institutions are publicly owned."

The rejoinder is apt, and must be met, because it is true that the difference exists. What would be meant, for instance, by freedom of the press if the press were owned and operated by the government? The answer is simple: the term becomes meaningless. Within the framework of our traditions the concept of freedom of the press does not and cannot apply to the government-owned press; the phrase "free government-owned press" is a contradiction in terms.

So also the phrase academic freedom as applied to the publicly owned institution is a contradiction in terms. There is no such thing; there can be no such thing. The public university is a part of government; it is government; it therefore cannot be free from government. Its employees are government employees; their rights as such are limited to the terms of their contracts. How paradoxical to claim, as some do, that academic freedom should give such employees the right to teach subversion of their employer! Their rights as citizens they retain, but their rights with respect to the public Academy are defined by the conditions under which they accept their salary checks.

The public Academy itself, as I have shown, has no academic freedom; its employee has none unless he leave and teach independently or for a private employer. As in all cases of freedom, the extent of it can be measured by that part of it free of government. Those who would enlarge the area of academic freedom can do so to the extent that they remove the State from education.

A Handy Way to Subscribe

THE
Freeman

Irvington-on-Hudson, New York

Please enter my subscription to the FREEMAN.

One year (\$5.00)

Two years (\$9.00)

Check enclosed

Bill me later

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Please check here if renewal subscription

Socialism via Taxation

By SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

When left-wingers are charged with taking us down the Old World road, their stock reply is "But it isn't *socialism!*" To them nothing is socialism that is not covered by the dictionary definition, "government ownership of the means of production." They know that the word "socialism" has a bad odor in American nostrils.

But words change meaning, political tactics evolve, and dictionaries grow old. The sum and substance of socialism is the abolition of the reality, if not the name, of privately owned property. And what easier way is there for abolishing private property in the means of production than by taxing it out of the owner's pocket? That is just as effective as confiscating the titles, and sounds less brutal. One of the means of production is money—tax money.

For hundreds of years, taxes were collected *in kind*, by taking so much physical property. Now that we have a money economy, the effect remains the same; only the appearance is changed.

For example, government could either take so many cattle from a farmer, or let him sell the cattle, and then take the money he gets for them. As we know, the word "pecuniary" comes from the Latin word for cattle. That's the way it was done when ". . . there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed" (St. Luke 2:1).

Where taxes are used not for the purpose of supporting the historic functions of government, but for *social* purposes, such as the redistribution of wealth, then to the extent that the money is so used, the substance of socialism can no longer be concealed by the use of sweet-smelling words.

There is another way by which property is taken. That is government debt which inflates the money supply and cheapens the purchasing power of the dollar. It is estimated by the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy that since 1939, inflation has transferred one hundred billion dollars from private pockets that were represented by government bonds, life insurance policies, savings accounts and similar dollar savings.

By taxes, unbalanced budgets and government debt the Republic of the United States is being changed into a socialistic set-up. We have had a quarter century of unbalanced budgets. We have been told, and millions act on the belief, that public debt is of small importance because "we owe it to

Some startling statistics show how our government's growing power to tax and incur debt can mean the end of freedom.

ourselves." According to Senator Byrd, the debt of the federal government has now grown to the point where the total, direct and indirect, equals the tangible wealth of the nation. The doctrine of full employment to be maintained by the federal government, regardless of cost or unbalanced budgets, has gripped the public mind.

The Boy and the Calf

Such a climate of thinking obscures whatever dangers lie ahead, like fog on a highway. If we do at times doubt the wisdom of full speed through the fog, a siren song sings sweetly that we should not be too much concerned with unbalanced budgets, or the growth of government debt and taxes for the reason that our advancing productivity and increasing wealth will soon make the burden relatively light. This assumes, of course, that people ten or twenty years hence *will then rigidly live within their incomes*, when for a quarter of a century we have told them that this is quite unnecessary!

This is like the boy who lifted a newborn calf and said to himself, "If I lift the calf every day, I will be able to lift him when he is a steer." He found that the calf grew faster than he did. The day came when he could not lift it.

The fact is that the burden of taxes and public debt—federal, state and local—is growing much faster than our ability to pay. This fact has been obscured by the mirage of fifty-cent dollars through which we gaze in awe at our figures of national income.

The relationship of the growing calf to the growing boy is shown by the percentage which total taxes (federal, state and local) bear to net national product, which is, of course, the only resource out of which taxes can be paid.

In 1929, this percentage was 10.7. With no interruption of importance, it had steadily grown to 27.6 per cent by the end of 1953.

Going back further to include World War One, we find that from 1902 to 1953, taxes increased:

	Percentage
Federal taxes	11,765
State taxes	6,657
Local taxes	1,244
All taxes, combined	5,846

It will be seen that in good times and bad, in war and in peace, the calf has grown faster than the boy for more than fifty years—as a per cent of net national product.

It should also be noted that all taxes are considerably less than all government spending. There are other sources of government revenue, such as borrowing, veterans' insurance premiums, tariffs, profits from state liquor dispensaries, etc. For example, in 1953, total tax revenues (federal, state and local) were \$93.2 billion in current dollars; government expenditures (federal, state and local) were \$102.5 billion. All government spending as a per cent of net national product is now considerably above the 27.6 figure. The burden of government is getting more difficult to carry, despite our advancing technology, productivity and growing population.

When the government debt—federal, state and local—is converted to *uniform* dollars (considering the dollar from 1947 through 1949 as 100), we find that from 1929 through 1953 this debt has increased 386 per cent; all taxes have increased 410 per cent; all government spending, per capita, has gone up 320 per cent; all government debt, per capita, has gone up 271 per cent.

On the ability to pay side of the picture, during these same years, the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production has gone up only 127 per cent; agricultural production, only 46 per cent; population, only 31 per cent; net national product only 98 per cent, and corporation profits, after taxes, only 21.5 per cent.

Business Already 54 per cent Socialized

In 1929, corporations had \$85 left out of each \$100 of net income after paying their taxes—federal, state and local. In 1953 they had only \$46 left. One might say, therefore, that government has already socialized 54 per cent of corporate privately owned business without becoming the title owner, as in nationalized Britain or communized Russia. At least it is in a financial position equal to owning 54 per cent of all corporate stock. And this does not include taxes on dividends. If these are included, "government ownership of the corporate means of production" is now over 60 per cent.

While all taxes have risen 410 per cent, corporation taxes have been boosted 768 per cent. In short, "soak the corporation." This illuminates the mumbo-jumbo with which the political medicine men have infected public thinking. Corporations do not "pay" taxes. They *collect* taxes either from customers or shareowners—practically all from customers in the sales price unless the business is running at a loss. Only *people* pay taxes.

Taxes as a part of net national product in 1929 were 10.7 per cent. That left \$89.30 out of each \$100 of all goods and services produced yearly for private enterprise to use as it thought best. In 1953,

as stated, the percentage of taxes to product had gone up to 27.6.

An astonishing fact is that *in dollars of the same purchasing power*, the total of all dividends paid in 1953, then the all-time peak year for "prosperity," was actually *less* than in 1929, despite the advances in technology and productivity since that time.

These figures prove not only that socialism via taxation proceeds apace but that the vitality, initiative and flexibility of the private sector of our economy are being sapped. When will it pass the point of no return, as it seems to have done in France and other countries? To quote Mr. L. L. Colbert, the president of the Chrysler Corporation, "No government can be sound which challenges in size the economy that is expected to sustain it."

The Prospect for 1980

If the proportion of taxes to net national product maintains its average rise in the future as it has since 1929, taxes will reach 100 per cent of net national product by 2042 A.D. At that point our incomes would be completely socialized. Perhaps we will never go that far. But *when* and at what point will we stop this constantly rising upward march to socialism via taxation?

Based on the experience of 1929 to 1953, the curve of rising taxes will reach 50 per cent of net national product in 1980, only 25 years from now. If this rising curve continues upward, at some point—long before the year 2042—the American people will have lost their economic, if not their political freedom and become socialized in practical effect, even if they are still permitted to hold the nominal titles to farms, factories and homes.

Taxes as a percentage of product need not go much higher than they are now before the political machines in control of our national and state governments will dominate American life. Businessmen, voters and home owners will be so dependent on government purchases and financing that business and citizens generally will become supplicants at the political throne, and the balance of power will be held by those on government payrolls and their political allies and beneficiaries.

The pressure for "federal aid" for highways and schools is an example. Federal taxes have pre-empted the sources of state and local revenues to the point where the busy beavers on the Potomac point the finger of shame at our schools and highways and demand that we hire them to aid us with our own money sent to them. This is like the policeman who stole the clothes off a man and then arrested him for indecent exposure!

It is possible, of course, that some future rebellion against rising taxes will take the form of increasing tax evasion and bribery of officials, until the morale of the nation, and the honor and character of its people rots away—again, as seems

to be the case in France and in Italy today.

Another possibility is that the weakening of initiative and willingness to work hard and take risks, by reason of government's seizing more and more of the fruits of one's toil, will gradually level off or even turn down the rising curve of national product. In that case the percentage of taxes to product might rise much faster than it is now doing.

A British prizefighter after two or three bouts refused to fight again that year because the government would take 97 per cent of his purse. "Why risk my neck for three cents?" Or, as Calvin Coolidge said, "If the government takes 20 per cent of what a man makes on Monday, 30 per cent on Tuesday, 40 per cent on Wednesday, 50 per cent on Thursday, he won't show up for work the rest of the week."

Repudiation of Government Bonds

Leading students of government finance believe that when taxes absorb more than 25 per cent of national product, as they now do, for any long period of time, taxpayers will demand even cheaper money and higher prices as an *apparent* way to ease their tax burden. With reference to other burdens, this was the motivating force behind the growth of the Greenback and Populist parties, the "free silver" campaign of 1896, the devaluation of the dollar in 1934, and similar movements throughout the world.

Such a demand, expressed in continuing unbalanced budgets and the growth of debt at all government levels, would inevitably lead to further repudiation of government bonds in terms of their real value. This we have already witnessed to the extent of nearly half their former real value. The resulting distress would inevitably lead to more and more government intervention in the economy. There is no major country in the world which has not repudiated its debts in whole or in part, including the United States.

Aside from war, there are fiscal reasons for this concentration of political, economic and financial power at Washington which need to be much better understood.

Many, if not the majority of the 48 states limit the borrowing power of themselves or their municipalities by constitutional restrictions. The federal

government has none. In addition, many states, by constitution or statute, limit the taxing power of either the state or its municipalities, or both. Under the Sixteenth Amendment, the federal government can tax or confiscate incomes without limit. It is the only sovereign power which is not limited by the Constitution and Bill of Rights. The federal estate tax is a capital levy—also without limit.

Second, states and municipalities cannot print, or coin, or devalue money to enlarge their functions and spending. They have to get their funds the hard way—by taxing their voters. Or, if they borrow money, they have to pay interest rates established in a free market and satisfy the lender that the loan is sure to be paid on its due date—from taxes. They cannot make the money markets their creatures nor depreciate interest rates at their caprice. This puts a brake on their borrowings, and creates resistance to socializing the capital or income of their taxpayers.

Another brake on state or local taxes and debt is that taxpayers and industries can move elsewhere. They have the benefit of political competition, state versus state, in keeping taxes at a somewhat reasonable level. But with respect to federal taxes, there is no escape.

The federal government, however, is under none of these legal or practical restrictions. It can force interest rates down; borrow huge funds cheaply, either from the savings of the people, or by monetizing its debt through the commercial banks, and then pay interest on the debt by converting still more of its promises into Federal Reserve notes, or bank deposits, or by devaluing its gold and silver hoardings, or by outright greenbacks.

The federal government can print what is called "money"; the states can not. The federal government has the easy money route to do the bidding of vast pressure blocs eager to raid the treasury and "vote themselves rich," and thus also the federal government has become their prisoner.

It has not yet been proved anywhere in the history of the world that freedom can long endure when the government has the unlimited power to tax or incur debt.


A limitation on the taxing power of the federal government is a necessity if we are to preserve private capitalism, the states of the Union and freedom itself.

The system of plundering each other soon destroys all that it deals with. It produces nothing. Wealth comes only from production, and all that wrangling grabbers, loafers and jobbers get to deal with comes from somebody's toil and sacrifice.

Whenever we try to get paternalized we only succeed in getting policed.

WILLIAM GRAHAM SUMNER

WHY RAILROADS SUPPORT AN UP-TO-DATE TRANSPORTATION POLICY



Consider the extraordinary situation that the railroads of this country face today.

Here is a fundamental industry, performing a service essential in peace and irreplaceable in war; which directly employs over one million people; which provides, maintains and improves, at its own expense, the roadways and other extensive facilities which it uses — and which pays taxes on those roadways and facilities. Here is an industry operating with constantly increasing efficiency; which is conservatively financed, with a steadily decreasing total of fixed charges.

Yet here is an industry which earns a return on investment of only about 3½ per cent — among the very lowest of all industries; an industry so restricted by the application of laws governing transportation that frequently it is not permitted to price its services on a competitive basis.


How can such a situation have arisen in a nation devoted to the classic concepts of free enterprise and equal opportunity?

An important part of the answer is clearly indicated by the recent report of the Presidential Committee on Transport Policy and Organization created last year by President Eisenhower. This Committee consisted of five members of the President's Cabinet and two other high government officials. It was charged with responsibility for making "a comprehensive review of over-all federal transportation policies and problems."

The report of the Committee, released by the White House in April, opens with this sentence:

"Within the short span of one generation, this country has witnessed a transportation revolution.

"During this same period," the report continues, "government has failed to keep pace with this change . . . regulation has continued to be based on the historic assumption that transportation is monopolistic despite the . . . growth of pervasive competition. The disloca-



tions which have emerged from this intensified competition, on the one hand, and the restraining effects of public regulation on the other, have borne heavily on the common-carrier segment of the transportation industry . . .

"In many respects, government policy at present prevents, or severely limits, the realization of the most economical use of our transportation plant."

To the end that all forms of transportation should be developed to their greatest economic usefulness, the Cabinet Committee recommended, among other things, that:

"Common carriers . . . be permitted greater freedom, short of discriminatory practices, to utilize their economic capabilities in the competitive pricing of their service . . ."

☆

Legislation to give effect to Committee recommendations has been introduced in Congress.

Passage of this legislation would not give railroads any rights that other forms of transportation do not already

have or would not receive. The legislation recognizes that each of the competing forms of transportation has advantages in handling different kinds of shipments, moving between different points and over different distances. It proposes that each type of carrier be given the freest opportunity to do the job it can do best, at the lowest reasonable cost.

That's the way toward the best and most economical service, to the benefit of businessmen and taxpayers — and of the consuming public which, in the end, pays all transportation costs.

☆

For full information on this vital subject write for the booklet, "WHY NOT LET COMPETITION WORK?"

Association of American Railroads

844 Transportation Building
Washington 6, D.C.

Will England Go Communist?

By REGINALD JEBB

Not if she can avoid an economic breakdown, the author predicts from observation of the Welfare State tendencies in Britain today.

The logical end of socialism is communism. Socialism is, in essence, State ownership and control of the means of production. If this control is not complete, the State is unstable. There is need of absolute obedience on the part of the subject, and obedience cannot be made absolute so long as the subject can make a livelihood independent of governmental administration. But control of a man's life by others conflicts with human nature. Therefore, if the State is to ensure obedience, it must resort to force. But that is tyranny, the latest and most efficient example of which is communism. Therefore socialism, if it is to succeed, must develop into communism.

That is the logical sequence, but it does not follow that every country that has adopted socialism will necessarily become communist. Logical ends are not always reached in practice. New conditions are apt to arise which alter the trend of events.

As regards England, the first question to be asked is, how far is she socialist? And the second, do the socialistic tendencies apparent in her government look as though they would develop in the direction of communism? In answer to the first question, it may be affirmed that for a considerable number of years government has been becoming more centralized and assuming greater powers over the community. For example, State Planning for the whole country, with the consequent loss of control by local bodies, is largely taken for granted. There has been nationalization, or semi-nationalization, of a number of industries. The Welfare State is in full swing, and is officially approved by all political parties. These are signs that England has been moving toward conditions in which it would be easy for the State to assume ownership of all the means of production and thus become fully socialist.

But that is far from having happened. Free enterprise at present predominates over nationalized industry, and it is significant that the Labor Party, which is the principal, though not the only, agent of increased State controls, is as a whole somewhat shy of calling itself socialist. Moreover, even orthodox Socialists, like Mr. Bevan, have for the most part shown their dislike of communism in recent years.

There are, too, other straws in the wind. State Planning has been found in many instances to be inefficient (for example in the coal industry, in the groundnuts scheme, in agricultural returns which

take so long to collate that they are practically useless); uneconomic, in its expenditure on bureaucratic supervision of State concerns, in bulk buying, and in subsidies that make no differentiation between rich and poor; and unpopular, through the high-handed manner in which it makes mistakes, as in the recent affair of Crichel Down. Nor has nationalization, which raised such hopes among organized labor, satisfied the wage earners.

The Trend Away from Marxism

Then there is a tendency among some of the intellectuals of the Labor Party to interpret socialism in the terms of Robert Owen rather than in those of Karl Marx. Here, for example, is a statement made by Mr. Crossman: "The job of the Socialist in the next ten years is not to centralize power any more—on the contrary, it is to decentralize power whenever it is possible . . . so as to ensure that in all walks of life people feel that they have power to decide something about themselves."

Mr. Strachey, too, who has been in turn a follower of Sir Oswald Moseley, a near-Communist, and a Minister in the Labor Government, wrote not long ago in a letter to the *Times*: "Socialism itself is, surely, about the restoration of the means of production to those who operate them—namely, the workers by hand and brain. . . . In this debate [between the different traditions of socialist thought] the Webbs, Fabianism in general, and, on the whole, Marx have represented the tradition which has stressed State ownership, while . . . Owen, Proudhon, Cole, the Guild Socialists, and the cooperative movement have represented the other tradition, the tradition that has sought to approach a direct restoration of the means of production to the workers by means of various forms of industrial democracy—of 'the self-governing workshop' and without State ownership as such."

Finally, Mr. Crosland writes: "We can at once dismiss certain lines of policy which are sometimes put forward as constituting the essence of good socialism, 1) the continued extension of free social services, 2) more and more nationalization of whole industries, 3) the continued proliferation of controls, 4) further redistribution of income by direct taxation." All this goes to show that the roots of true socialism do not strike deep in England.

Yet there is a danger which may make nonsense

both of the theories of politicians and of the disappointments felt by organized labor at the results of socialistic experiments. An economic breakdown that would wreck the Welfare State would play straight into the hands of extremists. Communism would take full advantage of a catastrophic collapse. If that be avoided, the advent of communist rule in England is extremely unlikely. The two main reasons for this lie in the decline of socialism and in the character of the English people.

There is a considerable amount of evidence that points to a decline of socialism in western Europe. The disappearance of left-wing Popular Fronts and the return in the principal European countries of right-wing or center-party governments are noticeable features of the postwar period. Then there is widespread fear of Russia as a military power and of communism as judged by its results; and socialism has not been able to erase its record of support both for the Soviet Union and for its philosophy. It is therefore suspect.

Socialism Is Unstable

Furthermore, in a world that is craving for some spiritual guidance, socialism offers nothing. In this respect it differs from communism, which provides a religion—perverted though it is—that has inspired many of its adherents. It is only to be expected, therefore, that a man who is a rebel against traditional methods of government should be attracted toward communism, with its logical strength and fanatical incentives, rather than toward socialism, which has neither.

There is a growing recognition, too, that socialism does not know its own mind, that it falls between two stools, that it is in essence unstable. But socialism has always been one of the principal breeding grounds of communism. Even in England, where the Labor Party has never been more than a dim reflection of European socialism, there have been many converts from it to communism. So, if socialism fades out, the loss to communism will be considerable. In England especially, where communism is abhorrent to the general character of the people, the loss will be severe.

It is a trait in the English character to dislike violence. Though the English can be cruel, as their religious quarrels and their dealings with some subject peoples in the past show, yet on the whole

they are law-abiding, kindly and not easily roused. Their acceptance for many years of an aristocratic form of government has accustomed them to a certain measure of State paternalism, particularly when this is presented to them under the guise of democratic institutions. But they react strongly against certain forms of compulsion that are inseparable from communism, and which a socialist government must adopt if it is to be stable.

To attempt to prophesy the political future of England would be a perilous venture, particularly at a moment like the present when many new ideas are coming into play from more widespread—if often superficial—acquaintance with other nations through war service, travel and an ever-increasing area of the world covered by the press and the radio. But, as has been seen, there are some possible pointers. If socialism continues its present ebb or disintegrates into a number of fragments in which Owenism predominates, we may see a new and invigorating move in the direction of personal responsibility and a diffusion of private property, which would put an effective brake upon excessive centralized control. Such a move is beginning to take shape in the minds of organized labor, and both the Conservative and the Liberal parties seem to be encouraging it. On the other hand, the power of finance (not only in England but on a world scale) or the dominant position that technical experts are acquiring in the modern world may produce new controls and a loss of personal independence among the general populace, on the sort of lines adumbrated in Hilaire Belloc's *Servile State* or James Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution*.

Or again, in the event of a war against the Soviet Union in which England was engaged, there might occur such chaotic destruction that totalitarian forms of government would become almost inevitable. And, though the war was in origin a struggle against just that kind of tyranny, yet the result might well be that communism, or something like communism, would be its outcome. Chaos (as the Kremlin well knows) breeds governmental control, and the bonds of control, once tied, have a way of becoming tighter instead of looser when the emergency has passed. That, however, is a state of things that might happen to any country.

But it does not seem likely that our diluted English socialism will of itself lead us into the particular tyranny called communism.



*Sue examines its publications and program,
and finds that Big Government has a friend in*

The League of Women Voters

By BETTINA BIEN

Bill looked up from his newspaper. "Sue, I see your beloved League of Women Voters is in the news again. It says here that a spokesman for the women voters appeared at a congressional committee hearing to argue against the Bricker Amendment because, and I quote, it 'strikes at the very heart of the principle of international cooperation.'"¹

"What do you mean, *my* 'beloved League'?" asked his wife. I just joined to meet some of the women in this town when we moved here last year. But yes, I know the League is against that treaty law amendment. They say it would interfere with the President's dealings with foreign diplomats."

"Now, Sue. What do you mean when you say 'the League is against the amendment'? Was a poll of its members taken?"

"No, not that I know of. But then, they didn't have to. Mrs. Lee wrote a letter about it—just a minute, I'll get my copy."

Back with a stack of circulars, Sue leafed through them and handed the letter to Bill. Signed by Mrs. John G. Lee, League President, it was dated January 13, 1954. He read:

The League of Women Voters of the United States is opposed to the Bricker Amendment. During the past year Leagues throughout the country have studied the issues involved and the weight of opinion expressed is clearly against the Bricker Amendment as not only unnecessary but as dangerous for the future security of our country.

"Mrs. Lee says the local leagues studied the issue," Bill observed, "and that opinion was against the amendment. So, Sue, there must have been some sort of a poll of members."

"Not necessarily. In the first place, Bill, if you read that over again you'll see that it doesn't say the League members studied the Bricker Amendment. It says we studied 'the issues.' I guess most every local league in the country has studied the United Nations, international trade agreements, foreign aid, etc., off and on, for several years. And in the fourth paragraph of her letter, Mrs. Lee says the Bricker Amendment would interfere with these programs which call for 'international cooperation.' So, I guess we *have* been studying 'the issues' involved. Anyway, the League officials must have decided that we members had studied the issues and

that we concluded the Bricker Amendment was opposed to the League's stand on international affairs."

"But," Bill persisted, "there must have been some kind of a survey, Sue, to find out the 'opinion expressed.'"

Not So "Grass Roots"

"Maybe I can explain how the League operates. It is not as 'grass roots' as many members think. There is a system set up so that National Headquarters doesn't have to ask the members every time it takes an official position. As a matter of fact, this was planned so the League could take a stand when an issue is 'hot,' without having to wait to poll League members. This gives a better chance to be politically effective. . . ."

Bill interrupted. "I thought the League made a big issue of the fact that it is nonpartisan."

"That's right, according to its own definition. It never endorses candidates—only issues. Here—see what it says in *The Local League Handbook* [LWV Publication #41, 1955]:

The League takes a position on issues, but never on candidates. . . . A League position is arrived at independently and bears no relation to the positions of candidates, factions, or parties.

"But," Sue continued, "even so, the League has had lots of influence, judging from the programs it has endorsed since it was started. It was founded in 1920.² The League sort of grew out of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, which had worked for passage of the Nineteenth (Woman Suffrage) Amendment. The League's organizers aimed to furnish information about public affairs to the new women voters so they wouldn't parrot their menfolk's opinions all the time."

"I must say, Sue, if you are typical, the League certainly wouldn't have been at all necessary, if that was *all* it was trying to do!"

"Please try not to interrupt, or you'll never get the answer to your question."

"The new League, as I said, set out in 1920 to try to interest women voters in politics. It was

¹ *New York Times*, April 30, 1955.

² Sue's information about the background of the League is largely taken from *A History of the League Program* by Kathryn H. Stone (LWV Publication No. 133, 1949).

logical to start with problems already familiar to women, such as child welfare, education, standards of cleanliness for food preparation, working conditions for women, etc. The League's aim was to show how conditions in these fields could be improved *through government*, and then to work for political action through legislation 'in the public interest.'

"Bill, I know you don't approve of the government's having a finger in every pie, so to speak. But the League certainly does, for every time a question is raised, the League asks, 'What can government do about this?' As a result, the League has supported all sorts of laws. Apparently they are quite proud of the contribution they have made to their passage. For instance, they take some credit for social security, public housing, TVA, federal aid programs to the states for various purposes, public employment agencies, state unemployment relief, public works projects, and during the war they were in favor of price controls and rationing.

"And now I'll try to explain how the League determines its 'official position.' As I said, the system doesn't seem as 'democratic' as I thought when I joined. It claims to operate on the principles of 'representative government.'"

Not Easy to Change the National Program

Sue then summarized the operation of the League of Women Voters of the United States as explained in its by-laws, as amended at its 1954 convention. Members of the National organization belong to local leagues at the community level. The local leagues are, also, organized at the state level into state leagues, which take action at the state level.

Officers of the National League are elected by delegates from the local leagues who assemble every other year in a National Convention. Each league (local, state and national) has its Board of Directors, made up of its elected officers, six elected directors, plus not more than six directors appointed by the elected Board members. The Board of each league (local, state and national) decides when and how to take action on issues included on its program. The timing is up to the Board at the appropriate level of government.

It is at the National Convention, also, that the national program and principles are decided upon. Six months before the convention is scheduled, the National Board meets to work up a "proposed program," taking into consideration suggestions it has received from member leagues. This "proposed program" is then submitted to the member leagues for discussion and consideration, but no recommendations for changes may even be considered at the National Convention unless there is a *two-thirds* vote on the floor of the convention. And any additions or amendments to the program require a *two-thirds* vote of the delegates.

"Therefore," Sue pointed out, "I would imagine the National Board's program, requiring the ap-

proval of *only a majority* of the delegates, generally goes through pretty much intact.

"The program is made up of two parts—the 'Platform' and the 'Current Agenda.' Included in the 'Platform' for 1954-56 are eighteen so-called *Platform Principles* and eight *Continuing Responsibilities*.

"This is getting rather complicated." Sue interrupted herself. "Are you still with me?"

"Yes, I think so."

"Well, these *Platform Principles* and *Continuing Responsibilities* are brief statements of general principles based on conclusions reached through studies by League members in past years. For instance, since World War Two, League members have studied the United Nations, UNRRA, FAO, ERP, the International Bank for Reconstruction, the British loans, the 'Truman Doctrine,' the Greek-Turkish loan, export-import controls, etc., all of which League officials have evidently looked on with favor. I guess the members of the local leagues have studied treaty law briefly—anyway, National Headquarters put out a bibliography on it several months before Mrs. Lee wrote her official letter to President Eisenhower. These studies led the delegates at the 1954 National Convention to include in the 'Platform' several statements on international affairs. For instance, they expressed support of the UN, regional defense pacts, foreign aid and international cooperation.³

"Apparently, these general principles calling for support of the UN and 'international cooperation,' as interpreted by the National Board, were the basis of the League's official position in opposition to the Bricker Amendment.

"Incidentally, Bill, you might be interested in seeing some of the other *Principles*. For instance, they call for 'measures to counteract inflation or deflation . . . the principles of representative government and individual liberty established in the Constitution of the United States . . . a system of federal, state and local taxation which is flexible and equitable . . . adequate financing of government functions and services,' and 'domestic policies which facilitate the solutions of international problems.'"

"Gee whiz! Those principles are broad enough to suit either a saint or a devil."

"Yes, I know. But, as I understand it, these general principles are the source from which the Na-

³ Of the eight *Continuing Responsibilities* in the 1954-6 Program, the first three pertain to international affairs:

1. U.S. support of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, including adequate financial contributions, increased use, and improved procedures.
2. U.S. support of measures designed to keep the peace through the United Nations and regional defense arrangements.
3. U.S. support of measures to promote international economic development and technical assistance.

The last two of the eighteen *Platform Principles* relate to international affairs:

17. Cooperation with other nations in solving international problems and promoting world peace.
18. Development of international organization and international law to achieve permanent means of cooperation.

tional Board derives its authority 'to make certain timely decisions on behalf of the League.' And when the National Board decides it is 'Time for Action,' it calls on members all over the country to support the League's official position by various means: radio, TV, newspapers, letters to Congressmen, etc. Look, Bill. Read this word of instruction to local leagues:

A League shall respond to a *Time for Action* sent by a national or state Board. If a local League does not agree with the position of the state or national League on an issue, or if it feels its membership is not prepared on the subject, it may choose not to take legislative action. However, it shall inform its members of the *Time for Action* so that they can act as individuals if they wish to do so. A report as to why no action was taken shall be sent by the [local] Board to the state or national Board for its information. A local League shall not take official action contrary to a state or national stand. . . .

"How's that for democratic procedure?"

Membership Polls Considered "Not Sound"

Bill started reading over Sue's shoulder. "Look at this section, above that one you're reading. That answers my question about polling the members:

Determining consensus should be an interpretive process. The Board should take into account areas of agreement expressed in general membership meetings, in unit meetings, and in Conventions and the annual meeting when the Program was selected. The Board should give continuous attention to the development of membership thinking throughout the year as each Program item is discussed. In this way the Board is in touch with membership thinking as it develops *and does not need to seek it when an emergency arises . . .* [italics supplied.]


"And here's the clincher:

Polling the membership, particularly by mail or phone, to arrive at an agreement, is not sound. It tends to force crystallization of opinion without benefit of deliberation. Moreover, it does not allow for variation of opinion.

"So, I guess it is official League practice, as you say, to determine the majority opinion of its members by *interpretation*, rather than consulting the members and asking them point-blank what they believe on a particular issue. You must have been right," Bill went on. "There *was* no poll on the Bricker Amendment. And yet when Mrs. Lee announced the League's opposition, the implication was that she spoke for all 127,000 members."

Sue was thoughtful for a moment. "You know, this discussion makes me wonder about the subject on the present *Current Agenda*, and whether or not the League 'opinion' which evolves from this current study, as interpreted by the National Board, might one day form the basis for an official League position in favor of more government, or perhaps the UN's 'bill of rights.'

"Remember, the League's two-year program is



Reprinted by special permission of The Saturday Evening Post. Copyright 1955 by The Curtis Publishing Company

"Sometimes I think this club is run by a clique."

made up of two parts, the 'Platform' of general statements of principle, based on studies made during previous years, and the 'Current Agenda,' which is composed of 'items for concentrated study and concerted action.' The current subjects for study under this heading are 1) U.S. international trade policies and 2) individual liberty. The League is already on record in favor of governmental control of international trade, so it is the second subject, 'individual liberty,' that has me guessing!"

"I can't imagine," Bill broke in, "how ideas of individual liberty could *possibly* be used as an excuse for advocating more governmental power!"

"Yes, I know—I couldn't either, until I had been to some of our study units. But let me explain.

"At the first few meetings we talked about the struggles for freedom, how the Magna Charta was written, and the risks men took, facing imprisonment, physical torture and even death, to fight for the right to worship as they pleased, to write and publish books, to gain trial by jury, and so on. Their successes, over the centuries, resulted in a number of 'rights' which Englishmen thought their due, and the American Revolution was fought by men who believed they were entitled to these 'rights.'"

"What's wrong with that?" Bill asked.

"Nothing! What makes me question the purpose of this study (if there was a *purpose* in the selection of this topic) is the general point of view, and, yes, even slant or bias which is apparent in the League-recommended literature by modern authors. It is true that they tell about this early history of the freedom fight. But when they try to apply the principles of freedom to current problems—that's where they go off base, in my opinion.

"The League is pushing a series of pamphlets, *Freedom Agenda* booklets,⁴ and they have also put out a mimeographed bibliography on 'Individual Liberty.' Of course, the officials of the League can't

⁴ Published, with funds provided by the Fund for the Republic of the Ford Foundation, by Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund, Inc., a research and educational organization created by the League.

be held responsible for every statement in books whose publication they had nothing to do with. And in fairness I should say that the *Freedom Agenda* booklets all carry a disclaimer of responsibility on the part of the sponsors. Nevertheless, League officials are answerable for the fact that *certain* books and writers, and *not others*, were selected for recommendation. And when they all present more or less the same viewpoint it would seem they must reflect the League's position.

"One after another, the League-recommended authors advocate some kind of government planning and control over commerce and industry. They all seem to look on government as a *friend*, not as a possible threat to freedom. Some of the authors fear newspaper monopolists, one advocates a national educational system for 'democracy,' and a number of them give the impression that the right to own property is a sort of lesser right. They criticize especially nineteenth-century Supreme Court decisions as too strictly limited to the protection of private property and contracts, and imply that the Supreme Court judges were out-of-step with the times. The constitutional checks and balances, they say, create rigidities and place obstacles in the path of efficient government."

Bill interrupted. "Of course! The men who wrote our Constitution were *afraid* of efficient government."

"Well, the authors of the suggested readings wouldn't agree, Bill—they want *more* efficiency. They imply that the President should have wide latitude in using his own discretion to act, especially in emergencies. They say he has vast powers unspecified in the Constitution. When the President assumes added powers, it is not 'undemocratic,' because he is an elected official. On the other hand, to grant to the judges, who are appointed to office, the right to overrule legislation, tends to violate the principles of 'democracy.'"

Criticism of the Legislative Branch

"Sue, this reminds me of something Hayek said in *The Road to Serfdom*. Remember what he wrote about the Socialists and the Nazis? He said they always objected to the idea of 'merely' formal justice and equality under the law, and especially attacked an independent judiciary system such as our Constitution had sought to provide."

"Yes," answered Sue, "I remember. That's one of my reasons for wondering why these particular books and authors were recommended."

"There is another idea running through the *Freedom Agenda* pamphlets," she continued. "The writers seem to be afraid the Legislative branch is getting too powerful, and they criticize congressional investigations, governmental loyalty programs and laws aimed at preventing subversive activities. They're sort of 'anti-anti-communist,' I would say. But they *do* give some interesting facts.

Maybe the women who study them will learn something about freedom anyway."

"Perhaps," Bill replied. "But if League officials interpret member opinion to mean 'there ought to be a law,' will their study be helping the cause? I'm not opposed to studying freedom, Sue—not at all. But why be the tool of a national organization that seems always to interpret member opinion as an endorsement of more government?" He paused a moment, then continued. "Sue, you have read a lot of League publications, as well as books they refer to. Tell me, generally speaking, do they recommend socialism?"

"What do you mean by 'socialism'?"

"Do they promote Big Government?"

"Yes, I think so. But you can see for yourself. Here's one of their publications about the United Nations.⁵ In this pamphlet, the UN is considered practically synonymous with 'international cooperation.' It advocates strengthening the UN and its specialized agencies like UNESCO and ECOSOC.

"Here's another League publication called 'Big Government and the Citizen.'⁶ 'What we have to fear is not big government so much as government out of control. . . . Authority should be decentralized to the greatest extent feasible, with centralized control and supervision.' So it recommends efficiency, good management and a clear line of command.

"And, Bill, according to the National Board (August 1953) the League is opposed officially to limiting income taxes to 25 per cent because 'it would virtually eliminate "progressive" rates of taxation and thus violate the principle of ability to pay.'"

Bill was stunned. "Just what kind of women voters are they turning out? Do your friends in the League realize what kind of propaganda it puts out?"

"Some do, of course. They're pretty smart."

"Then, why did they join?"

"For all sorts of reasons. Some joined for the same reason I did—to meet folks. Others wanted to learn about their local government. And many women join because they're stirred up about the horrible mess the world is in and they want to do something. They join because they approve of action and, of course, the League is set up to act!"

"But do they approve of the way the League acts? From what you have said, Sue, the League of Women Voters has lent support continuously, from the time it was founded, to programs which have led to ever-increasing governmental powers, higher and higher taxes, and more and more interference with the private affairs of citizens. Sue, perhaps you had better ask yourself just *why* you continue to add weight to official statements of the League by letting it appear to speak for you."

⁵ *The Citizen and the United Nations*. (LWV Publication No. 177, 1951).

⁶ LWV Publication No. 164, 1951.



WASHINGTON, D.C.

by Frank C. Hanighen

As the tumult of the last congressional session retreats into the dim recent past, some echoes linger. One is of the constitutional fight over the Status of Forces Treaty—an issue that, by reason of parliamentary restrictions, found vent in bitter debate on an amendment of the military reserves bill. In the House, Representative Frank Bow (See the FREEMAN, July) battled for the constitutional rights of American servicemen abroad—from Tokyo to Turkey—endangered by the abdication of those rights (from habeas corpus to trial by jury) under the Status of Forces Treaty. But in the Senate, the great constitutional case against this surrender was argued by Senator William E. Jenner, Republican from Indiana. For some years, both on Capitol Hill and out through the country, the Indiana Senator has been attracting increasing interest. It is time to examine his philosophy and actions.

In the Senate, Jenner has deservedly won the name of the “militant constitutionalist.” The Eastern metropolitan press, of course, has long stamped him as a “wild isolationist” and “right-wing reactionary,” and several “roundups” on Washington by “liberal” commentators have rated him as among the ten “worst” senators (with Morse and Humphrey, naturally, as the “best”). The “isolationist” epithet is patently as absurd as if it were applied to Herbert Hoover, and “reactionary” in the “liberal” lexicon now signifies “constitutionalist.”

“Wild”? Certainly not with the facts or the statements of traditional American doctrine. But definitely audacious in voicing what he considers the truth too long concealed from the American people. One story on the Hill about Jenner is illuminating. When, in 1949, he was the first (even before McCarthy) to debunk the legend of the “great” General George C. Marshall, actually the gravedigger of our policy in the Far East, Jenner was approached by a friendly Southern conservative. “Your speech on Marshall, Bill—,” warned the friend, “the Eastern gang will destroy you for that.” Jenner, mindful of the money and propaganda jobs expended to defeat Wheeler, La Follette, Shipstead and others, knew well what his colleague meant. But he never pulled his punches, and he won re-election in 1952.

Born in Southern Indiana in 1908, raised in a middle-class small-town atmosphere (his father was an auto dealer), he was graduated from the Indiana University Law School just as the great depression started. Almost immediately, he entered politics and was elected as a Republican State Senator in 1934, rising to the position of Majority Leader in the State Senate in 1941. After the war (in which he served as an Air Corps officer), he ran for U.S. Senator in 1946 and came to Washington in the same “class” as many other GOP visitors in the famous “had enough?” defeat of the Democrats in that year. He supported Taft in 1952, holding the Indiana delegation to the Ohioan until the literally bitter end in the GOP convention.

In short, a Hoosier, with all the stubborn individualism and tenacious adherence to the traditional principles of the Republican Party which characterize the politics of the state of Indiana.

In 1951, the Indiana Legislature (Republican) passed a law that opened welfare rolls for publication. Since the federal government had entered the welfare picture, Indiana’s costs had gone up fantastically. The federal government, disapproving of the Legislature’s move, threatened to withhold millions of dollars which it had been contributing to the state exchequer. Citizen groups were aroused and urged defiance of “federal bureaucratic dictation.” They wanted the state to pay entirely for its own welfare system, under strict local supervision.

Senator Jenner leaped into national prominence when he introduced into Congress an amendment to the Revenue Bill in 1951 to prohibit the Federal Security Administration from withholding federal funds from any state which, by legislation, opened relief rolls to public inspection. The amendment was adopted. Other states followed Indiana’s example and found not only that the system reduced sharply the number of fraudulent relief cases, but also that the fact did not bear out the claims of welfare workers that needy persons were humiliated or exploited by publication. Since then Jenner has been known in the Senate, not only for this defense of state autonomy in such matters, but also for his constant interest in states rights.

“The Welfare State,” said Jenner in a speech on May 7, 1952, “is a trap with iron jaws to seize and

hold the liberties of the people. It is always covered with pretty leaves and flowers to look like a bit of woodland scenery, so that the innocent victims will not be aware of any danger until they are caught and held so tightly they cannot move. Every step taken by the Welfare State has been a step in the direction of pure executive power, unhampered by law. Every step has been camouflaged by gifts the government gives each class or group to win its electoral support until the trap is closed."

This utterance came in a speech the Indiana Senator made about the Truman seizure of the steel industry in 1952. He perceived in the President's step another example of executive "despotism above the law," camouflaged by the plea that it was for the "welfare of the people." But Jenner called it a mistake to assume that when another President (that was what the Republicans were hopefully talking about in that spring) replaced the assertive Truman, the problem would be solved. "No President," he declared, "can dismantle the Colossus on the Potomac. From the moment he was elected, any President would be a prisoner of the forces which are working for absolute power. We have in this body men who would make good Presidents, but we do not have in this body or outside it anyone who, as President, could dismantle the Colossus." Today, the statistics on federal employees, only a tiny bit fewer than in 1952, bear out the Indianan's prediction.

The Hoosier constitutionalist went on: "Neither the courts, the Constitution, nor the law enforce themselves. When the Executive is not bound by the law, who is to enforce the law? The Executive operates by power . . . There is no answer to power but power." The power, he emphasized, resides in the Legislative branch: "I say Congress is responsible for the twenty-year erosion of our liberties. Without the means voted by Congress, the New Dealers and Fair Dealers would appear for what they are—men of straw."

Those in the Senate Cloakroom know that Jenner has made an intensive study of the bureaucracy, questioning former bureaucrats and ex-New Dealers, accumulating a store of knowledge on how the bureaucracy thinks and works, how it formulates strategy and tactics. On June 6 of this year, speaking in Minneapolis, the Indiana Senator described the "rule of the elite," the "fourth house" (additional to the Executive, Judiciary and Legislative branches), "the planning bureaucracy," with such "loose powers and vast funds that it virtually escapes control by the Congress, the President and the courts." He says the elite have "banded together out of self-interest, in time of crisis, to seize power and make themselves a permanent governing class." This elite which we have been training for over twenty years "under the New and Fair Deals and the present Administration . . . have been learning how to handle the high-tension

wires of big government and hiding from us how much they have learned." Our government, Jenner concludes, "is now operating through two rival centers of power competing for sovereignty, one under the Constitution, one against it. Every issue and every problem of politics and government must be judged in terms of this irrepressible conflict."

Did the defeat of the Democrats reduce the power of the elite? Jenner declares: "In 1953, the revolutionary elite went underground while the Republicans took over the constitutional offices. In 1954, the elite surfaced again. They were sure we had been put to sleep." Then, he points out, the Berlin conference, the 1954 Geneva conference, the Indo-China debacle, the violations of the Korean truce followed—"were the 'line' of the same hidden revolutionists who had seized control of the Democratic Party."

The process develops in 1955. "Disarmament is obviously a key proposal in this revolution. . . . International plans for disarmament not only limit American sovereignty but they add to the power of civilian appointees over our fighting forces," says the Indiana Senator, who regards the appointment of Harold Stassen to the Cabinet as a major development. Stassen, as Jenner sees it, "outflanks the State Department, the Defense officials, and the American delegates to the UN, not to mention Congress!" And what does Stassen want and intend to do? "To divide our resources with the rest of the world, while our ablest minds are integrated with those of other nations, so they can do little or nothing for the United States."

In a speech in 1951, Jenner said we were being governed by a "blueprint for our destruction." Today, he says, "the blueprint is so perfect, the whole system is controlled by automation. There are only a few key switches and the members of the revolutionary elite have the switches in their own hands."

This, indeed, is a dismal diagnosis. Has Senator Jenner no remedy? The course he recommends emerges in recent speeches. "If we will organize political action, to support the pro-Americans in our government and in public life, the world conflict will soon be over. We can win true peace for all the world if we will gird ourselves to defeat the enemy within. . . . We need a drastic cut in taxes. We can never dismantle the elite until we revive the Tenth Amendment which insures that all powers not delegated to the federal government by the Constitution or prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states or the people."

His finale—"I hope yet to see the House and Senate suspend all work on legislation, appropriations, treaties and appointments, and form themselves into a committee of the whole, to end the appropriating of our money to a government within a Government, whose purpose is to abolish the Constitution."

Right Dukes of the Left

By M. STANTON EVANS

*Modern critics tell us that *The Tempest* is really the "most mature" of Shakespeare's plays, and so forth. Why? This author thinks he has an answer.*

The recent revival of *The Tempest* in Stratford, Connecticut, and the ensuing ecstasies over the play (if not the acting), pose a question: Why are modern critics so ga-ga over this, of all Shakespeare's plays?

A good reader, I think, were he to encounter *The Tempest* without advance notice, would not be inclined to class it among Shakespeare's best. It is in many ways a very pleasant kind of a play. The story is simple and charming. Prospero, "right Duke of Milan," as Shakespeare calls him, is visited on his exile's island by unfriendly castaways. Because he has supernatural powers he is able to manipulate the acts of his visitors so that all turns out to suit his desires. It is obviously a fantasy, and it is underscored with typical Shakespearean ambiguity. On a superficial level, however, its moral lesson does not seem so ambiguous; which is the cause, I believe, of the exaggerated admiration which the play elicits.

The Tempest has nothing of the magnitude of *Lear*, or *Hamlet*, or of the less-known but compelling *Coriolanus*. It is a fantasy in miniature, and is not, in the light of Shakespeare's gigantic creations, a "great" play. And yet it is the darling of nearly every modern critic or professor of English. We are constantly told that this play represents the "mellow" Shakespeare; it is the play of his mature years; it is really the most profound of his plays, etc., etc.

Here, for instance, is an excerpt from a review by Brooks Atkinson, acknowledged spokesman for up-to-date attitudes about the drama:

There is some horrifying stuff in the earlier works of Shakespeare . . . signifying a man whose good sense had broken down under the infliction of betrayal or disaster. All this *The Tempest* blows away.

As lyric poetry it is superb—not merely in the limpid phrasing of lines but in the creating of an idealized world where things are ordered with grace, spontaneity, and affection . . . It is the work of a man happy in his command of the language. He is now so mature that he can write without artful self-consciousness.

This appraisal is typical of the current critical and professorial binge of enthusiasm for *The Tempest*. Similar remarks will be found in any discussion of the play you come across. Why? Just what is it about this particular work of Shakespeare's that sends "us moderns" into an automatic swoon?

Max Eastman maintains that trends in literary and political thought are closely allied. Literary and political preferences, after all, are merely the same sensibility viewed from different angles. While this does not imply any general validity for politically-based literary analysis, I think that the rage for *The Tempest* can be adequately understood if we consider it in connection with its magnifiers' political predilections.

Shakespeare's most infuriating habit was a penchant for ambiguity. At the same time, it was the consummation of his art. He posed, but seldom answered, questions of colossal import—setting the reader's or viewer's mind to do some independent work. Among other great attributes, this faculty for stirring the mental processes of his audience is the kind of thing that helps to jolt him up several qualitative notches above his competitors. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, for instance, the question is raised of whether or not Antony's world is well lost; Dryden's rewrite, *All for Love*, settled the problem with no doubts. Whether this ambiguity is craft or cowardice, its provocative exploitation is the stuff of greatness.

The "Large Significance"

Thus it is strange that in *The Tempest* Shakespeare seems to depart from his formula of equivocation. In the clear outline of Prospero's character we seem to see, by object lesson at least, an "answer." Not an answer to a specific problem so much as to a generalized question: namely, *What would be the most ideal method of coping with the problem of evil in human affairs?* Shakespeare's stance on this question is not altogether clear; but the modern critic has little trouble in accepting superficial appearances and going on from there. Professor Hardin Craig remarks approvingly that "when one reads the large significance of the play as the delineation of ideal power and justice in the world, one is disposed to think that . . . of itself is a sufficient motive for its composition."

While modern literature and modern political thought seem to be in many ways poles apart philosophically, their real affinity is apparent in a predominant trend which they share: a movement toward authority. The authority in each case is a central elite, which covers its concentrate of

power by propounding a relativistic and meaningless individualism—the only purpose of which is to exempt the elite itself from being referred to any objective standards. Also, in each case, the proponents of this sickly school of thought are not disingenuous. The majority of them are both intelligent and well-meaning. In fact, the only real bar against granting them the power they desire is that they are, after all, human.

The main character in *The Tempest*, Prospero, has as many excellent qualities as you could want in a human being. He is a captivating figure. Wise, judicious and all-powerful, he manipulates all forces to his ends. He is able to implement his perfect wisdom by the exercise of his absolute power. He is, in fact, a kind of miniature god. "Kind of," that is. He is still a human being.

As an omnipotent human, Prospero is merely the final extension of the deified leader. He is the Prince, raised to the ultimate power. It is his wisdom and beneficence which differentiate him from the "Fuehrer" types that rise again and again the world over. But it is exactly these kindly qualities which make him the philosophical danger that he is—a luminous and justifying archetype for the Egghead of today.

As one reads the play and sees Prospero in action, controlling everyone on the island to bring



The all-powerful and all-benevolent Prospero (Raymond Massey, standing), commands his servant from the supernatural, Ariel (Roddy McDowall). Scene is from presentation of *The Tempest* at the American Shakespeare Festival held in Stratford, Connecticut.

about the happy denouement, the natural thought is: "Wouldn't it be nice if someone could do that?" From here the simple and logical step is "Wouldn't it be nice if I could do that?"

And there you have the modern liberal.

The intellectual biography of the modern liberal is, by this time, fairly well-known. His piquant charm has been set before us in numerous books by conservative critics; and he has revealed himself several times in his franker moods. At his best, he is a good-hearted egg, merely eager to arm himself in the panoply of the State, and thus empowered, to manipulate everything and everybody to fit his will and his conception of justice. He can hardly wait to play the role of Prospero, for which he is type-cast. As an example of this aggressive do-goodery, and in line with my consideration of political and literary trends together, I offer the following poem. This piece of verse, penned by the eminent New Dealer, Rexford Tugwell, is an excellent example of how the worst elements of modern literary and political techniques can be drawn together in only a few lines:


I am strong.
I am big and well made.
I am sick of a nation's stench.
I am sick of propertied czars.
I have dreamed my great dream of their passing.
I have gathered my tools and my charts.
My plans are finished and practical.
I shall roll up my sleeves—and make America over.

It's merely Prospero, you see, institutionalized. Mr. Tugwell and *The Tempest* both conjure "an idealized world where things are ordered with grace, spontaneity, and affection," the grace, spontaneity and affection, that is, of a benevolent tyrant. "We are such stuff," says Prospero, "as dreams are made on, and our little life is rounded with a sleep."

Brave New World

What these aspiring right Dukes fail to realize is that, while the power of the State enables them to approach Prospero's omnipotence as a limit, there is no assurance that they will proportionately approach his wisdom. Human beings simply cannot be as benevolent and judicious as Prospero, a fact which the liberal refuses to recognize. He's much too busy rounding his little life with the sleep of collectivism. If he could be aroused slightly, he might see that—power and wisdom aside—no one has the right to be Prospero. At least until he can prove that he is something more spiritual than an ordinary human being.

Thus it is fitting that Prospero's daughter, Miranda, exclaims: "O brave new world, that has such people in it." For a world constructed by the self-appointed Prosperos who revel in the "large significance" of *The Tempest* would be a *Brave New World* indeed, accepting a definition slightly more modern than Miranda's.



A Reviewer's Notebook

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

A standard jibe against those who go hunting for Communists is that there aren't enough of them in this country to do any harm. Robert Hutchins, former President of the University of Chicago, once said he had never seen a communist professor, and he may have been right if he was thinking in terms of party card-carriers. Again, both Elmer Davis and Granville Hicks have said that the very idea of the thirties being a "red decade" is nonsense; the Communists, while they were undoubtedly around, were vastly outnumbered by everybody else.

On the score of simple arithmetic, the Messrs. Hutchins, Davis and Hicks are obviously right. They are also obtuse, or contrarious, or maybe just enamored of old-fashioned debaters' tricks. For the point about the Communists, as those who have encountered them in labor unions can attest, is that one man who knows what he wants is worth a hundred, maybe even a thousand, waverers. A single communist editor or publicity man in a publishing house could, and frequently did, dominate a whole office of mild liberals. In the *Time, Inc.*, unit of the American Newspaper Guild, to which I once belonged, a mere handful of Stalinists (none of whom probably carried a party card) dominated the show until some equally determined people caught up with them and began to caucus and utilize the arts of cajolery, persuasion and blandishment as one must in politics to beat a determined enemy.

All of this is prelude to a consideration of E. Merrill Root's excellent *Collectivism on the Campus: The Battle for the Mind in American Colleges* (New York: Devin-Adair, \$5.00). And there is one more thing that must serve as prelude: communism is only important because it is

a rather extreme symptom of a disease that has many other contemporary symptoms. The disease itself is collectivism, and it takes many guises. Professor Root's name for the disease is "State liberalism"—and those who have it include Fabians, New Dealers, Socialists, Fascists and ordinary centralizing authoritarians as well as Communists.

Professor Root has written a most persuasive book because he is both a man of passionate beliefs and a firm advocate of free and open debate. He does not ask that "State liberals" or even theoretical Marxists be banished from the campus, or the faculty house, or the office of the university president. All he asks is that students should have the opportunity to hear the case for individualism, or for voluntarism, or for non-State liberalism, on an even-up basis. He is perfectly willing to allow Keynesian professors to extol their economics from the rostrum. But he insists that the student who is exposed to Keynesian doctrines shall also have the opportunity to hear from a disciple of Von Mises or Hayek.

The trouble with virtually all of the American colleges, according to Professor Root, is that they have lost touch with the heritage of radical individualism that distinguished an Emerson or a Thoreau. Our whole educational hierarchy tends to believe that environment makes people, and not vice versa. The modern educator believes in masses, in statistical aggregates, in economic determinism, in the social conditioning of man. The Great Man theory of history went out with Carlyle; the doctrine of the moral responsibility of the individual disappeared when the fire went out of our religion.

A professor doesn't have to be a Communist, or a Socialist, or even a New Dealer, to persuade his students

to be "State liberals" in any contemporary university. Indeed, the whole social climate conspires to make the professor unaware that there is such a thing as individual moral autonomy or natural rights. He teaches State meliorism because it hardly occurs to him that there can be anything else. True, he may think that free enterprise is a good thing in its place. But the doctrine that the State must take care of the aged, or aid people who have been hit by a hurricane, or "balance" the purchasing power of industrial workers and farmers, or conscript boys into the armed forces, is so pervasive today that a teacher is generally accounted a screwball if he speaks to the opposite point.

Naturally, in a climate of general belief in State liberalism, a number of Communists managed to get themselves good jobs in certain colleges. They could do this easily by pretending merely to be rather advanced exponents of a doctrine in which practically everyone believed. The first part of Professor Root's book consists of an elaborate documentation of actual cases of communism on the campus. He tells the story, for example, of Dirk J. Struick, the brilliant teacher of mathematics at MIT who performed the neat trick of indoctrinating his students with Marxism while explaining the binomial theorem or the nature of the hypotenuse. Another professor, Alexander St. Ivanyi, who had escaped with his life from the Communists in eastern Europe, had the nerve to oppose Struick. Instead of being rewarded for his patriotism and common sense, Professor St. Ivanyi was rather neatly purged because an expected "drop in enrollment" made part-time teachers a "luxury" the university could not afford. The university made no haste

to get rid of Struick until the State of Massachusetts itself moved against him. But St. Ivanyi disappeared without benefit of indictment.

If the Struick-St. Ivanyi confrontation were an isolated instance, Professor Root could be legitimately accused of seeing Marxist devils under the bed. But the Communists were elsewhere—at Harvard, at the University of Washington, at Chicago. Dr. Harry Noble Wright, now President Emeritus of the City College of New York, knew how to handle them, but few other college prexies did. Professor Root lists so many addlepatates among the heads of our great universities that it would be invidious to single any one of them out for mention here.


As a phenomenon, the communist professors could be dismissed as mere scum on the top of the pot. But, as Professor Root demonstrates, the broth itself is suspect. The really telling parts of Professor Root's book are those devoted to the fellow-traveling professors and the "State liberal" professors. Professor Root proves conclusively that it is much easier to be an Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. on a campus than it is to be a William Couch (once head of the University of Chicago Press) or a Thomas Nixon Carver. The conservative—or the individualist liberal—professor may manage to keep his job if he has "tenure," but it can be mightily unpleasant for him, as a number of Professor Root's case histories attest.

As for the students, they have naturally had an easier time of it when they have conformed to the trend. The occasional individualist—Nancy Fellers at Vassar is a good example—has all too often discovered that heterodox opinions bring low marks. Nancy Fellers, as readers of the *FREEMAN* will remember, was forced out of Vassar by an English professor who accused her of arguing by "innuendo." Well, I have been a journalist for thirty years, not a few of which I have spent as an editor, and it is a fact that in the last half of that span of time only two really good manuscripts by students either in or just out of college ever crossed my desk. One was by William F.

Buckley, Jr. and the other was by Nancy Fellers.

When Nancy Fellers' article about her Vassar experiences appeared in the *FREEMAN*, it provoked her former teacher to answer. A comparison of Nancy Fellers' prose with that of her erstwhile instructor was all in Nancy's favor. (Incidentally, do they bother to teach college students to write any more? Magazine editors are having the devil's own time staffing their publications with writers under forty. If Johnny can't read, it is apparent that he can't write, either. All of this makes it easier for older writers, but for editors it is bound to create ever-increasing difficulties as the years go by. The whole question is worth exploring, and I hereby recommend it to Professor Root as the subject of his next book.)

Since Professor Root is both a poet and an activist, he does not limit his book to the mere documentation of a theme. He has a program in mind. At the heart of his program is the adjuration to see the world poetically as well as statistically. It is hard to "liquidate" a class or a group if you see it not in terms of a statistical aggregate but in terms of individuals with various idiosyncrasies and characteristics, some lovable, some humorous, and some crabbed and obstinate in a very human way.



The statesman who sees the world from Professor Root's poetic point of view must think twice before he tries to play God with any group of people.

Beyond this, Professor Root suggests that the way to cut John Dewey, for example, down to size is to teach him along with Plato and Spinoza. The student must see for himself that Dewey is a woolly and frequently befuddled writer when stacked up against the philosophers of old.

As for changing the contemporary "State liberal" climate of opinion, Professor Root urges college trustees, alumni and the parents of students to get behind his "fifty-fifty" idea. Let them yell and scream until college faculties are at least 50 per cent staffed with anti-Statist liberals, or with conservatives who have "fire in their bellies." Let them rip and roar and make themselves objectionable to university administrations until at least half the textbooks are written from the individualistic point of view. The trouble with colleges today is that department heads seek to find teachers who agree with them, not teachers who will create internecine intellectual war. The department head wants it easy and soft. But the student frequently needs a vital, even a violent, clash of opinion in the faculty to stir him out of his lethargy.

Professor Root's book will probably be ignored by the big cultural media, and it is doubtful that academic circles will welcome it even as an irritant. Nevertheless, the book will make its own way. Professor Root can take comfort from the fact that a doctrine—in this case the doctrine of collectivism—is on its way out when virtually everybody agrees with it. When a doctrine ceases to be in competition, its devotees grow slack. Their arguments become insipid and flabby, and the reaction of the audience is boredom. The State liberals have lacked competition for so long that they have lost whatever dynamic appeal they had in the thirties. In ten years they will be pushovers for a whole new individualistic generation.

Key to Our History

A Dangerous Freedom, by Bradford Smith. 308 pp. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott Company. \$3.95

Known for his historical studies of Governor Bradford of the Plymouth Colony (an ancestor) and of John Smith of Virginia, Bradford Smith in his latest book offers "voluntarism" as a key to American history and temperament and a constructive alternative to statism and socialism.

Americans are known as a people of joiners. Especially in small communities, if one is not an Elk, a Moose, a Lion, a Rotarian or a Kiwanian, he is likely to be an Odd Fellow. All this multiplication of societies with picturesque and zoological names has been a source of spoofing for irreverent novelists and essayists. But Mr. Smith digs into the records of these clubs and fraternal organizations and finds that, amid the horseplay and ceremonial ritual, a good deal of sound community betterment is done under their auspices.

Going far back in American history, the author finds the seed of voluntarism in the psychology of the Pilgrims, who, as settlers in a new world, carried over their ideal of a free religious congregation into the political institutions which they set up. Coming down the generations, Mr. Smith sees this principle of free voluntary association finding expression in a variety of ways and strongly influencing the course of American history. He recalls that one of the most popular slogans of the American Revolution was "Liberty and Property," an association that is not as widely recognized as it should be today. A common trait of all modern tyrannies is encroachment, by various methods and in varying degrees, on the rights of private property.

De Tocqueville furnishes the title and the central thought of the book. This wise observer of the early American Republic remarked: "Thus it is by the enjoyment of a dangerous freedom that the Americans learn the art of rendering the dangers of freedom less formidable."

This "dangerous freedom" was that of voluntary association, for purposes as varied as those of the New England lyceums which were

the progenitors of our modern "forums," of the "underground railway" which nullified a law that seemed to many people immoral, of such experiments in communal living as Brook Farm and the Oneida Community. Sometimes the author lets himself be carried a little far in his enthusiasm for group action. It is one of the merits of a free society that the individual may go his own way, in solitude as well as in company, if he chooses. But there can be no reasonable doubt that voluntary association for some common purpose is far preferable to centralized state dictation. The element of free choice is all-important.

It is one of the striking paradoxical lessons of this book that communism in the sense of a group voluntarily sharing equally the fruits of their labor is most feasible in a free, or capitalist society. American history is full of communist experiments which failed, not because the police stepped in and closed them down, but because they ran counter to deep human instincts for individual family life and private property.

On the other hand, an idealistic experiment like Brook Farm would not be possible in any communist dictatorship today, with its prescribed economic inequality and its rigid thought control.

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

Terror on the Docks

Waterfront Priest, by Allen Raymond. 269 pp. New York: Henry Holt and Company. \$3.50

The port of New York, greatest in the world, is on the decline, partly because of antiquated facilities but chiefly because of corruption. It is plagued by organized theft of cargoes, labor racketeering, smuggling of dope and aliens (often criminals), mayhem, murder, and the wildcat strikes of waterfront workers in desperate revolt against collusive exploitation by employers and their own gang-ridden union.

This situation, which is of long duration, has been thoroughly publicized in recent years—first through newspaper articles such as Malcolm Johnson's Pulitzer Prize-winning series, "Crime on the Waterfront"; then through the investigation by the New York State Crime Com-

mission in 1952 and 1953; most widely by last year's outstanding film, *On the Waterfront*. Contributing largely to these revelations was a wealth of information painstakingly amassed since 1947 and generously, even eagerly dispensed to all who needed it by a crusading priest who has become famous as the friend and champion of the chief victims of waterfront corruption, the longshoremen. He is the Rev. John M. Corridan, S.J., known on the waterfront as Father John.

When Father Corridan—no stranger to the millions who have seen the film—was assigned to the St. Francis Xavier Labor School on New York's West Side, he found himself, according to Allen Raymond who has written his story in *Waterfront Priest*,

... involved in a war . . . against an enemy far more powerful than the dull-witted gunmen roving along the piers, an enemy formed by a corrupt alliance between dishonest elements of big business, crime-ridden labor unions, and irresponsible politicians in both New York and New Jersey. It is this evil alliance that has used gunmen to its advantage—an alliance that has made push-button murders its stock-in-trade. The alliance still exists.

Against this evil alliance Father Corridan has conducted the crusade which is the subject of this book. Thanks largely to his work, the alliance was at last officially exposed, including the identities of its most powerful members (the most powerful of all, the "Mr. Big" of the waterfront, is a rich, religious and "respectable" industrialist) as well as those of the mobsters who rob and terrorize the waterfront workers.

Mr. Raymond tells the story of the struggle in which the priest has played so important a part: the wildcat strikes of 1948 and 1951; the investigation of 1952 and 1953; the unprecedented expulsion of the International Longshoremen's Association by the American Federation of Labor and the attempt to establish a new AFL union. That attempt failed by a narrow margin; it would have succeeded if John L. Lewis had not moved in with financial support for the old ILA, and Dave Beck had not tried to grab pierhead loading and unloading for his Teamsters Union and thus antagonized many ILA members. In other words,

the move to set up an honest union on the New York docks was thwarted, not by "Mr. Big" and his cohorts but by the ambitions of powerful union heads.

The fight was lost, and the picture today is dark. Yet one cannot read the story of Father Corridan's crusade without thinking of the time-worn saying that nothing is ever settled until it is settled right. Certainly this reviewer is moved to echo the words of the film's author, Budd Schulberg, in his excellent introduction to the book:

One will close this book, I feel certain, not only with a fresh and more profound knowledge of the inner workings of political-management-union corruption in the great harbor of New York, but with a fresher sense of our moral, social and national obligations.

SUZANNE LA FOLLETTE

Warren Agonistes

Band of Angels, by Robert Penn Warren. 375 pp. New York: Random House. \$3.95

In an age when so much confusion is being propounded as to just what freedom is, Robert Penn Warren has not cleared the air appreciably. The heroine of his new novel, *Band of Angels*, is seeking for identity and for its meaning; once this is achieved, the assumption is that she will have freedom. Now the trouble with this as a stated theme is that it is somewhat less than clear. What is freedom? Amantha Starr constantly asks, and the answer seems to emerge: *freedom is identity*. But Amantha is simultaneously asking, what is identity? So all we have is a correlation of two unknowns—X equals Y—which doesn't help much.

In attempting to elaborate this basic problem, Warren has meshed several themes, which together run as a kind of leitmotif through his book. On the one hand, we have the subjects of "freedom," "love," and "spirituality," all of which Amantha quests after. The sum total of these themes, evidently, is "identity." On the other hand, we have "determinism," "dislocation" (Amantha, a mulatto, is caught between two worlds: physically, white and black; emotionally, North and South), and "betrayal." These would all seem to represent denials of "identity,"

but Warren proceeds to lose the distinction.

Warren's story, which is the background for this agonized philosophizing, is straight out of Frank Yerby. Amantha, daughter of a plantation owner, discovers upon her father's death that she is actually the daughter of a slave, and consequently is herself a slave. She is purchased by a mysterious Yerby-like figure named Hamish Bond, an allegorical representative of determinism. Bond reiterates his own lack of responsibility for his life, which is a bizarre and incongruous series of episodes, comprising slave-trade, several killings and the like. He repeatedly blames his *mother* for everything he has done. This blatant denial of individualism is nowhere countered by the narrator (Amantha), which throws rather a strange light on Warren's conception of freedom. Amantha's history, in fact, seems to buttress this psychological deterministic view. She is plagued, it is intimated, by her father's indiscretions; and the book's head note is Housman's: "When shall I be dead and rid/Of the wrong my father did?" Following her set-to with Hamish, Amantha moves on to a liaison with a noble figure named Tobias Sears. Tobias is the standard idealist, crying out against the "Moloch of Thingism," for which anti-Babbitry he is accordingly punished. While the story moves with a good pace, it is so extravagant and implausible that it hardly compensates for Warren's fuzziness on the philosophical level.

Stylistically, Warren occasionally has some good passages to offer. But as in his philosophy and in his narrative, he again seems to be riding the tiger of indecision. Briefly, he cannot make up his mind to whether he is Faulkner or Hemingway. On the one hand, we get such obviously Faulknerian strokes as this: "I do not mean my recognition of Rau-Ru, the man, standing there, I mean the recognition of the fact that he was there, the recognition that somehow I had been waiting for that fact to emerge from the realm of undifferentiated possibility into which, as into woods and darkness, Rau-Ru had walked that afternoon at *Pointe du Loup*, etc." And then again we are treated to such blunt Hemingwisms as this: "Agbome is in a plain, where there is drinking

water from mud-holes, but way off, you can see the blue where the King mountains begin. They say it is cool there, with water, and the wind blows fresh."

Out of this hodgepodge—metaphysical, narrative and stylistic—it is evident that the reader is meant to draw almost any philosophical conclusion. For Warren's fiction, as is his criticism, is itself a spokesman for freedom. But if the reader attempts to follow the narrative closely, he will most likely come to the conclusion, indicated at the close of the book, that true freedom is to be found in being possessed by someone, and in turn possessing him. This is a strange credo of liberty, but it jibes with the group-oriented secular humanism which Warren has pushed elsewhere. It is a new, and from the point of view of true libertarians, a dangerous kind of freedom indeed.

M. STANTON EVANS

Soak the Poor

Welfare and Taxation, by Colin Clark. 80 pp. Oxford, England: Catholic Social Guild. 3/6

I don't know when I have found in so few pages such a wealth of happy surprises for poorly informed libertarians who have been falsely accusing somebody of being an extreme authoritarian Socialist. The person involved here is Dr. Colin Clark, former Australian Government Economist who recently became Director of the Institute of Research in Agricultural Economics at Oxford. Those who still think of Dr. Clark in terms of his having been long ago a Labor Party candidate will find surprises galore in his little book, *Welfare and Taxation*.

He points with acute alarm at the current tax rate in Britain which takes 40 per cent of the net national income. This, he says, is the highest of any country. Some others are trying not too successfully to collect as much as 30 per cent. And Britain leads, consequently, in the sluggishness of production, aside from some undeveloped countries in Asia and South America.

For some persons in Britain the composite tax exceeds 100 per cent of income. Clark says, quite properly: "The rich man, who has obtained

his fortune by legitimate means . . . is not an offender deserving punishment; and those who support or advocate any form of confiscatory taxation are guilty of the sin of theft." Strange words from one accused of being a Socialist!

But even so, the "rich" (income over £ 750 a year) now pay only about two-fifths of all British taxes. On the average, the poor manual workers, who think they are escaping the tax collector, have 25 per cent of their income confiscated. The "free services" of their Welfare State are hardly free, it seems.

With a sympathetic eye toward those of low income, Clark reminds us that ". . . we have been trained by the politicians of all parties to regard the State as a benevolent Father Christmas. Whatever you want, they say, be it education or medicine or orange juice or false teeth, ask the State for it and, like a delighted child on Christmas morning, you will find it in your stocking at no expense to yourself. Are we such children as all that?"

Clark then admonishes the wise man to ". . . give the State, not the maximum, but the minimum of powers and duties."

Where does this leave the British social services? Out in the cold. But it doesn't leave the wage earner's real welfare out in the cold, because Clark has made careful estimates to show how *through voluntary, competitive sources*, a family of low-income persons could, on the average, ". . . obtain all the services it wanted in respect of health, education, insurance against unemployment, old age, accident and widowhood, by setting aside some 13 per cent of its income. . . ."

Clark estimates that this relief from taxation would raise production 10 per cent within two or three years. Taking this into account along with the saving in the cost of these services by voluntary and competitive agencies, even the low-income persons would be from one-eighth to one-sixth better off. They could increase their welfare by junking their Welfare State.

One would feel small to quibble over some points about which I would raise real question — even some pretty important matters—in a book where the author concludes, as Clark did: "Concentration of politi-

cal power is always dangerous. . . . We should realize that, if we go on building up the power of the State . . . giving it more and more control over every detail of our lives . . . we create a State which will not merely tax us to excess but eventually enslave us completely."

Change the details, and isn't Clark talking about the United States, as well as Britain, in all this?

F. A. HARPER

Fromm and Capitalism

The Sane Society, by Erich Fromm.
370 pp. New York: Rinehart & Company. \$5.00

As a diagnostician of the individual in modern society, Erich Fromm has no peer. To the clinical and detached view of the psychoanalyst, he brings the perceptions of the philosopher, historian and humanist.

In *The Sane Society*, Fromm draws a picture of modern man which shows him alienated from himself and the world. It is an accurate and frightening picture. Man in modern society tends to become a "thing," a mere automaton, whose chief function is to serve as a unit in the Consuming Society, *i.e.*, the mass market. Removed from involvement in the *complete* process of modeling and recreating nature, confined to the most elementary and routine of tasks, his skill never realizes fulfillment and is reduced to that of a mere push-button mechanism, with no comprehension of the purpose and end of his production, nor of himself and his destiny.

This results in what Fromm calls man's alienation from himself. And such alienation, says Fromm, is madness. "Instead of the machine being the substitute for human energy, man has become a substitute for the machine. His work can be defined as the performance of acts which cannot yet be performed by machines." Thus he becomes "part of the equipment hired by the capitalist"; a "part" whose intelligence is inferior to the machine's, yet whose reason has produced the machine; and this reason lies dormant and idle, threatened with decay from disuse. Inevitably, this reduces him in dignity and produces a sense of loss and helplessness which he tries to overcome by submerging himself

in the mass. The mass, in turn, looks to "authoritarian" (outer) guidance instead of to "humanitarian" (inner) guidance.

So far, so good. Fromm has depicted the plight of the individual in modern society with unerring clarity. But when he ventures into the realm of economics, the picture becomes blurred. He is plainly out of his depth here. For he lays squarely at the door of capitalism the responsibility for this state of affairs. Which is not to say that Fromm is against capitalism; he seems to understand the difference between capitalism (by which, I take it, he means the open, competitive market) and communism—giving capitalism by far the best of it. But he sees in it inherent evils which tend to reduce the individual to the automaton described above, and claims this to be a consequence of the system. Capitalism, he argues, tends to develop bigness and monopoly in industry, which not only depend upon a mass market but must continually develop techniques that will shape a mass frame of mind. But since capitalism is otherwise desirable, the thing to do is to change it so that it is productive of better results. Fromm then proposes a management-labor-consumer relationship which seems not only impossible of achievement, but if attempted would either thrust us back into primitivism or "advance" us to collectivism.

What Fromm fails to see is that the Consuming Society is unnaturally accelerated, not by the inherent nature of business to monopolize the mass market, but by government intervention. Its pressure, exerted on business—via taxes, controls and restrictions—forces industry into bigness in order to survive, at the same time narrowing the field for the small enterpriser. In like manner, intervention in the life of the individual destroys his self-reliance, fostering a dependent attitude toward government, and tightens the vise on the mechanical world in which he is trapped—a world already distorted by that government's power misapplied in the field of industry.

It does not occur to Fromm that industry, left alone, might not sprout such malevolent features; that monopoly is as much a result of privilege tendered by government as of pressure exerted by government;

and that a market, free of both privilege and pressure, might cope with monopolistic tendencies with the aid of a very basic economic law: the law of diminishing returns. Big-ness, unaided by privilege, tends to become topheavy. It cannot, in the long run, compete successfully with more flexible enterprises. Excellence would then be the standard for success.

This is the only serious flaw in an otherwise remarkable book. If Fromm were as well versed in economics as in psychology and philosophy, he might have achieved in this book the same wonderful synthesis as in his earlier work, *Psychoanalysis and Religion*.

HELEN CARTIER

Pragmatism's Best

The Pragmatic Humanism of F. C. S. Schiller, by Reuben Abel. 207 pp. King's Crown Press, Columbia University. \$3.50

Pragmatism — the philosophy of haste and use—reminds one of other modern exploitations. Pragmatists are like farmers who, for a huge immediate crop, abandon contour plowing and rotation, and thus waste the good earth of philosophy by overuse and eventual erosion.

The famous trinity of pragmatism were William James, John Dewey, F. C. S. Schiller. James was a minor great man, a genius by driblets; Dewey was a schoolman who thought and wrote with the bumping angularity of a concrete-mixer; Schiller, never even a minor genius, was the most talented of the three and the most persuasive. Unlike James, he could think consecutively; unlike Dewey, he could write English.

This book is an excellent, largely sympathetic yet softly critical résumé of Schiller's "pragmatic humanism." Guide, diluted philosopher and critical friend, it prepares us for a final acceptance or refusal of pragmatism at its most persuasive.

Schiller was always appealing and sometimes valid. His distrust of abstract "intellectuals," his insistence that truth is concrete, his realization that "facts" are only the raw material of truth, his emphasis on will as a factor in reality are excellent. If pragmatism had been content to jolt the Bradleys and Hegels into a reali-

zation of the man of flesh and bone, of the concrete substance of the world's tigers that burn bright and trees that flow like individual slow green bubbles out of the Absolute, it could have been the beginning of something great.

Its falsity lay in its inability to stop with criticism of abstraction. It had to extend itself into a denial of absolutes, which is the destruction of the bases of all criticism. Because


Bradley or Hegel idealized the Absolute is no basis for denying that the Absolute exists, or for reducing "reality" to a *flux quo* of relativity. Consequence was judged in terms of fulfilment of man's needs, not by its consonance with reality's meaning. Consequence, *flux quo*, human use, were to usurp the place of the inexplorable *I am* of God. To the good pragmatist there is no stubborn destiny in things: earth is a fluid grab-

THE UNITED NATIONS: PLANNED TYRANNY

Comments on the Dream and the Reality

By V. ORVAL WATTS

Foreword by Clarence Manion



"This book," says the author, "is for all those who revere the American way of freedom rather than the UN way of benevolent despotism, and who place the inalienable rights of individuals ahead of World Government." With simplicity and sincerity, Dr. Watts argues that the UN is not liberal but reactionary; that it is a blueprint for perpetual war instead of an instrument for peace. With half a hundred books available praising the UN to the skies, the present volume is badly needed to balance the scales. His book may be said to place the UN in true perspective for the first time. Son of a North Dakota minister, a Harvard Ph.D. in economics and history, former college professor, Dr. Watts is now an economic consultant on the West Coast.

In his foreword, Clarence Manion writes:

"... a world that is starving for peace has built passionate defenses around the imposing, highly publicized organization formed ten years ago 'to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.' . . . Consequently, any writer takes his literary life in his hands when he seeks to thread his way through the fraudulent pretenses, around the false analogies and finally on past the emotional barricades to the startling truth that the United Nations is a road to Universal Despotism. Dr. Watts has taken the risk and reached the goal. The result is this desperately needed book of revelations. . . . This book describes how perilously close we are now edged up to the permanent loss of our liberty in the despotism of World Government. If a clinching argument is needed for the speedy adoption of the Bricker Amendment, Dr. Watts has supplied it. . . ."

Give a copy of this book to a "Liberal" friend. 160 pages, \$3.00

THE DEVIN-ADAIR COMPANY

23 East 26th Street, New York 10, N.Y.

Gentlemen: Please send me copies of THE UNITED NATIONS: PLANNED TYRANNY by V. Orval Watts

\$3.00 per copy enclosed Please send list of your books

Name (please print)

Street

City Zone State

bag where you put in your thumb and pull out a plum. Fact becomes only a fulcrum of choice; truth a bridge to what you want when you want it. The great philosophers know that reality is not like that: "Before Abraham was, I am."

Schiller's humanism was the old anti-Platonic doctrine of the sophists: man is the measure of all things. His *bête noire* was Plato: "wherever words lure and delude, stupefy and paralyze, there Truth is sacrificed to Plato." Man "makes" truth. "Truth is that manipulation of [objects] which turns out upon trial to be useful, primarily for any human need, but ultimately for that perfect harmony of our whole life which forms our final aspiration." Thus truth is "primarily an issue of action."

Values, also, are primarily an issue of action. This degradation of reality into a grab-bag where you pull out a peanut and call it a plum if it meets your need is as pernicious as it is false. It destroys a hard necessary realism; it dissolves the world into an as-you-like-it of all things to all men. The pragmatists were too vital to share the *rigor mortis* of collectivists; yet their acid destruction of absolutes, values, firm reality, destroys the power of the mind against the closed systems of the *collectivist* Right (fascism) or the *collectivist* Left (communism). After pragmatism, the mind is flabby against collectivism's cynical belief that truth is only the most convenient lie.

Mr. Abel is critical, but too gently critical, of all this. But where Schiller's incidental insights were wisest, Mr. Abel is more critical, unfortunately. Schiller's interest in psychical research, his "belief in immortality as a psychological postulate," his distrust of the politics of the masses, his belief that eugenics is more important than economics,

were refreshing (and quite distinct from his pragmatism). As a literary artist of incidental wise insights, he was far superior to the Schiller who tried hard to be a philosopher but failed because pragmatism was always breaking in.

The critical mind, seeing pragmatism steadily and whole, must conclude that its appeal and popular success were possible only because the modern mind is a babe in the woods of philosophy. That, one must add, is the most tragic thing about the modern mind: unphilosophic, it swallows pragmatism or existentialism as college boys used to swallow goldfish.

E. MERRILL ROOT

Gem of the Ocean

Christopher Columbus, Mariner, by Samuel Eliot Morison. 224 pp. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. \$3.75

Prejudiced, vain, capable of cruelty, Christopher Columbus suffered under a delusion his entire life. Paradoxically, had it not been for the dreams which grew out of his delusion; had he not possessed the determination whose excess was marked in unfeeling exploitation of the natives; and had he not had the sublime self-confidence of an egoist, America might have remained undiscovered for years to come.

Samuel Eliot Morison has reworked his famous seaman's history of the world's greatest explorer. He shows that while Columbus made a hash out of celestial navigation and applied irrelevant passages of Holy Writ to geography, he was yet a seaman unexcelled. "As a master mariner and navigator, Columbus was supreme in his generation. Never was a title more justly bestowed than the one which he most jealously guarded — *Almirante del Mar Oceano*, Admiral of the Ocean Sea."

His mistakes, like his achievements, were cinemascopic. The world, being a sphere, is divided into 360 degrees. Each degree is 60 nautical miles. It was typical of Columbus that he should dismiss, correctly and intuitively, Ptolemy of Alexandria's estimate of 50 nautical miles to a degree. Instead, he chose to believe one Alfregan, a Moslem geographer whose guess was 66 nautical miles. But in equally typical

fashion, Columbus managed to misread Alfregan, believing him to have put the length of a degree at 45 nautical miles. By so doing, Columbus underestimated the world's circumference 25 per cent.

Salting this blunder with a combination of other errors (some of them inherited from Marco Polo, who may have been the world's most mendacious charlatan), Columbus figured the distance from the Canaries to the coast of Japan as 2,400 nautical miles. Actual airline distance is 10,600 miles.

Of course, his great boo-boo was his stubborn belief that he was knocking on the walls of old Cathay. No evidence could shake this notion; all signs, supernatural and natural, served to confirm him in his fancy. He was not only a master seaman of the past but a past master at tacking from partial truths to erroneous conclusions. Admiral Morison is not direct on this point, but we can't help think that save for luck and God's grace, Columbus might never have found anything on his first voyage but blue water. He was an intensely religious man; and God seems to have rewarded his faith, throwing an island in the way of his ships a few hours before they were scheduled to turn back.

The irony of his life is not that Columbus was hailed for a discovery he did not make or ignored for his real achievements; it lies in the fact that contemporary estimation of Columbus and his visionary schemes was close to the mark. History proves that his critics were correctly commonsensical in disparaging his plans on grounds both nautical and geographical. The New World was to raise Spain from poverty to incalculable wealth, but neither Columbus nor his masters would settle for anything less than the imagined cornucopia of Asia. Columbus and his critics were shortsighted: both ignored the possibilities of the new continent. But at least the critics realized that tepees did not look like pagodas.

The four voyages were monumental. Extraordinary difficulties were met and surmounted, colossal feats in dead reckoning were achieved. His faults withal, Columbus possessed that uncompromising spirit found only in men of magnitude.

F. R. BUCKLEY

**FOR Any BOOK
IN PRINT**

Write

THE BOOKMAILER
P.O. BOX 101,
NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

WE PAY THE POSTAGE
ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD
Send for Free Catalog

is this student alone?



NO—Like most young people, he is an idealist. As such, he can never be alone. Countless forces contend for his mind, to convince him that they can answer his many questions. The answers that sway him today are the decisions which will guide America tomorrow. For years the forces of the Left have understood this—and acted accordingly. As a result, yesterday's rebels are now entrenched. If they are ever to be routed—if collectivism is ever to be defeated—the voice of freedom must make itself heard on the campus.

YES—For in another sense this student *is* alone—terribly alone. He is a Conservative. There is no sparkling young professor to buttress his beliefs, no host of undergraduate sympathizers surrounding him. This student is the rebel of today. Will you help give him access to the philosophy of freedom? Will you show him that he is not alone?

Through the **FREEMAN**, you can do this. A gift subscription to a college student will bring the libertarian philosophy to someone who otherwise might never know it. This is a project which cannot wait until tomorrow. Tomorrow is already here, on America's campuses.

FILL OUT THE COUPON TODAY

THE FREEMAN

Subscription Department
Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y.

Enter a subscription to the **FREEMAN**
at the special student rate of \$4.00
a year, for the student listed below:
\$_____ enclosed _____ Bill me later

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____


College _____ Year of graduation _____

(Use similar form for additional names)

My Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____



TIME

“. . . we are doing precisely what Russia and Red China want us to do. We are giving them the lifesaver of time . . . If America is to avoid smashing defeat at the hands of the communist powers sometime between 1965 and 1970, when they have surpassed us in war potential, we must either have a total show-down now, or we must continue to arm ourselves for 1970 on a scale of unimaginable magnitude. We cannot weakly escape our destiny by . . . gabfests with Bulganin.”

We are Losing the Battle for Time in the Far East; by Harold Lord Varney; from the *American Mercury*, August 1955; 6 pp. 250 W. 57 St., New York, N.Y. Single copy .15

SEGREGATION

Disregarding, as has become customary, the plain language of the Constitution, the Supreme Court has at last totally repudiated the idea that ours is a government of laws, not men. In the segregation decision, “the great issue is whether alien-minded pressure groups shall be permitted to force a fundamental change in our form of government. Public education has always been a function of the states and localities. The segregation decision . . . would force federal control in a vitally important field.”

Of Laws and Not of Men, Economic Council Letter, July 15, 1955; Empire State Building, New York 1, N.Y.; 4 pp. Single copy .15

AMENDMENTS

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people [Tenth Amendment to the Constitution].” “The government of the United States can do anything not specifically prohibited to it by the Constitution [Former Attorney General Francis Biddle].” This head-on collision, occurring across the pages of 160 years of American political his-

tory, illustrates the complete inversion that has taken place in the function of the federal government, and in the politician’s conception of it. Because this has happened, we need a twenty-third constitutional Amendment, stating explicitly that “the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specific in the Constitution.”

Amendment to Preserve Free Enterprise System; statement of Gordon Fox before the Wisconsin Senate Judiciary Committee. Reprinted in *American Progress* for May. 6413 Franklin Ave., Los Angeles 28, Cal. Single copy .10

“In 1848 Karl Marx issued the Communist Manifesto. This contains ten points regarded as preliminary objectives to be accomplished before the governments of the world are overthrown by force and violence and the dictatorship of the proletariat is established. Not one of these preliminary objectives could have been accomplished in the United States under the Constitution as it stood in 1848 or in 1910. Now every one of them can be accomplished by legislation or by treaty.”

The Bricker Amendment, by Robert H. Montgomery. 15 pp. Write the author, 30 Federal Street, Boston, Mass. Single copy free

PRISONERS

Robert Ingersoll, a true liberal of the nineteenth century, was a fiery defender of the rights of the individual. “The government that does not defend its defenders,” he said, “is a disgrace to the nations of the world. The flag that will not protect its protectors is a dirty rag that contaminates the air in which it waves.” The Chinese Reds magnanimously decided to release *some* of the Americans they brazenly hold as prisoners. The two and a half years of anguish that these men suffered, the same anguish which an untold number of their fellow Americans continue to suffer, is for-

gotten as President Eisenhower dubs the token release a “humanitarian gesture.” Has our flag indeed become nothing but a “dirty rag”?

If We Cannot Protect Our Soldiers, Then Let Us Bring Them Home; a radio broadcast by Dean Clarence E. Manion, August 21, 1955. 4 pp. Manion Forum of Opinion, South Bend, Ind. Single copy .10

WOMEN

Attempting to focus the impact of feminine opinion on certain measures, an organization called the Women’s Joint Congressional Committee acts in the name of several women’s groups in this country. This committee is nothing more nor less than an agency for pushing left-liberal programs of the federal government at critical times. The influence in the hierarchy operates from top to bottom, not vice versa. The millions of women supposedly represented are never asked for their opinions.

Packaged Thinking for Women, by Lucille Crain and Anne Hamilton. 30 pp. P. O. Box 380, Grand Central Station, New York, N.Y. Single copy .10

FREEDOM IN MEXICO

The Institute of Social and Economic Research believes in freedom. Quoting from President Cortines, this organization concurs in his statement: “And I must add that I feel certain that less harm is caused to the Republic by the abuse of public liberties than by the slightest exercise of dictatorship.” The Institute calls for help in its job of defending liberty, making it abundantly clear that liberty is not license, that freedom to get rich is not freedom to impoverish others, that the consumer pays the bills and must therefore receive value; that, in fact, freedom depends on the moral stature of the people who enjoy it.

The Greatest Good for the Greatest Number. 8 pp. Institute of Social and Economic Research, 16 de Septiembre 53 (403), Mexico 1, D. F. Single copy free

AN OSCAR to DuPont
The Freeman's badge of excellence
for free enterprise advertising



What's
DU PONT
got to do
with
DA VINCI?



Du Pont is a business and industrial organization.

Da Vinci was an artist, famed for paintings like the "Mona Lisa" (above).

Business and art are two different things, people often say.

But are they? Dr. Will Durant's new book, "The Renaissance," devoted to the period spanned by Da Vinci's life, points out they're not so far apart as you might think.

The great wave of culture of which Da Vinci, Michelangelo, and others were a part came about, says Dr. Durant, only because flourishing commerce and manufacturing provided the leisure and the funds to nurture the genius of the age.

It's always been that way, in fact, and always will be. Cultural gains can take place only when people are spared the necessity of eking out a bare living—when there is a margin between what we make and what we need to spend for subsistence. This comes about only through business and industry. Tools and processes developed and financed by industry give us the means to support a high level of culture.


So in the end, Du Pont and Da Vinci have something in common after all.

Business is Art's greatest patron and supporter—without business, in fact, there wouldn't be room for much art at all.



BETTER THINGS FOR BETTER LIVING . . . THROUGH CHEMISTRY

This year for Christmas
Give the FREEMAN to a friend...



show him what Freedom means!

If you rebel against the serpentine creepings of socialism — if your mind and spirit go forth to sustain the cause of free enterprise, individual rights, and limited government — no doubt you recognize how necessary it is to share these views with others.

Here is a way to do it: for Christmas, give your friends subscriptions to the *Freeman* — the one magazine which most consistently and uncompromisingly rejects State intervention in the affairs of free men.

Order several Christmas subscriptions now—and then, twelve times in 1956, you'll give your friends this dynamic message of freedom to remember you by!

P.S. — Besides your personal friends, you may want to send subscriptions to your local library, to teachers, a minister or a newspaper editor.

Payment enclosed Bill me later

Send gift cards in my name

Rates: One subscription \$5.00 Two to nine, \$4.50 each. Ten or more, \$4.00 each.

1. Name..... Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....	5. Name..... Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....
2. Name..... Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....	6. Name..... Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....
3. Name..... Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....	7. Name..... Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....
4. Name..... Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....	8. Name..... Street..... City..... Zone..... State.....