

the

AUGUST 13, 1951 25 CENTS

FREE MAN

AP
12
F86
V.1
no. 23

1# 23

Clergymen and Socialism

REV. STEWART M. ROBINSON

Africa—and Our Security

GEN. BONNER FELLERS

It Started With Plato

S. HARCOURT-RIVINGTON

Man of the Half Century

JULIEN STEINBERG

How to Bring About Inflation

HAROLD LOEB

Our Avant Garde Illiterates

EDWARD DAHLBERG

Editors: John Chamberlain • Henry Hazlitt • Suzanne La Follette

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY

FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
GENERAL LIBRARY

the FREEMAN

with which is combined the magazine, PLAIN TALK

Editors, JOHN CHAMBERLAIN HENRY HAZLITT
Managing Editor, SUZANNE LA FOLLETTE
Business Manager, KURT LASSEN

AUGUST 13, 1951

CONTENTS

VOL. 1—NO. 23

Editorials

The Fortnight.....	707
The Southern Rebellion.....	710
Stalin's Bad Checks.....	711
An Economy Based on Swindle.....	711
How Dead is Pétain?.....	712
Africa and Our Security.....	BONNER FELLERS 713
Planning That Perished.....	BEN RAY REDMAN 716
Clergymen and Socialism.....	STEWART M. ROBINSON 717
Worth Hearing Again.....	720
Man of the Half Century, I.....	JULIEN STEINBERG 721
It Started With Plato.....	S. HARCOURT-RIVINGTON 724
How to Bring About Inflation.....	HAROLD LOEB 725
This Is What They Said.....	726
From Our Readers.....	729

Books

Our Avant Garde Illiterates....	EDWARD DAHLBERG 727
A Reviewer's Notebook.....	JOHN CHAMBERLAIN 731
The Terrible Illusion.....	EUGENE DAVIDSON 732
Good Ore.....	MADELINE MASON 733
How Strong Is Russia?.....	CRAIG THOMPSON 735
Calvinist Believer in Zion.....	MORROE BERGER 735

Poem

The Unregimented Heart.....	E. MERRILL ROOT 735
-----------------------------	---------------------

The Freeman is published fortnightly. Publication Office, Orange, Conn. Editorial and General Offices, 240 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. Copyrighted in the United States, 1951, by The Freeman Magazine, Inc. John Chamberlain, President; Henry Hazlitt, Vice President; Suzanne La Follette, Secretary; Alfred Kohlberg, Treasurer.

Application pending for second class entry at the Post Office at Orange, Conn. Rates: Twenty-five cents the copy; five dollars a year in the United States, nine dollars for two years; six dollars a year elsewhere.

The editors can not be responsible for manuscripts submitted but if return postage is enclosed they will endeavor to see that manuscripts rejected are promptly returned. It is not to be understood that articles signed with a name, pseudonym, or initials necessarily represent the opinion of the editors, either as to substance or style. They are printed because, in the editors' judgment, they are intrinsically worth reading.

A WORD ABOUT OUR CONTRIBUTORS

BRIG. GEN. BONNER FELLERS (Ret.) knows Africa at first hand from his experience as military observer there in 1940-42. Later he was a member of General MacArthur's staff in the Far East, and in 1946 was Secretary General of the Allied Council for Japan.

REV. STEWART M. ROBINSON is pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Elizabeth, New Jersey. A chaplain in World War I, he served as chairman of the chaplains' committee of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. during the later world war, and is now chairman of the General Commission on Chaplains.

JULIEN STEINBERG is managing editor of the *American Mercury*. His recent book, "Verdict of Three Decades" is a round-up of facts and historic statements on the Soviet dictatorship.

S. HARCOURT-RIVINGTON, a British economist, contributes to the *Daily Mail* and other London publications, and also to French and South American journals. His books include "The Evolution of Industry" and "The Great Menace," an exposition of the evils of collectivist regimes.

EDWARD DAHLBERG has written a book on American literature, "Do These Bones Live?", "Bottom Dogs," for which D. H. Lawrence wrote the preface, and a recent volume of poems, "The Flea of Sodom."

MADELINE MASON has contributed critiques, poems and short stories to the *Saturday Review of Literature*, *Coronet* and other magazines. Among her books are "Hill Fragments" and "Riding for Texas."

CRAIG THOMPSON is a free-lance writer who contributes primarily to the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Colliers*. For his latest book, "The Police State," he drew on his experience as Times bureau chief in Moscow, 1945-47.

Forthcoming

William Henry Chamberlin, who recently returned from Europe, has written "Winning Germany for the West" for our next issue.

the FREEMAN

NEW YORK, MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1951

THE FORTNIGHT

The reversals and contradictions in our Korean policy have now become completely bewildering. President Truman publicly announces that the Communists "have no respect for signed treaties or their given word." Yet at the moment he was speaking our negotiators were trying desperately to get from the Communists just such a worthless "given word." The Army announces that the "cease-fire" negotiations are simply being used by the Chinese Communists to build up their forces for another attack. Yet we continue the negotiations while permitting this build-up. Our military leaders tell us that we must not let down our guard for a moment. Then they admit that they slowed up their drive in Korea, because of the present negotiations, when we already had the foe on the run. Our leaders have been extremely solicitous at every point that we should say or do nothing that would imperil the "cease-fire" negotiations by causing the Chinese Communists to lose face. By doing this we ourselves have lost tremendous face.

The climax comes from Secretary Marshall. Ignoring his own disastrous record in China, and the present almost hysterical anxiety of his own group to make a worthless agreement with the Communists, he announces that he is ashamed of the American people. "It is unthinkable to me," he says, "that the American people would react as they have to one Soviet statement. It is very sad." Perhaps the saddest thing of all is that the American people should tolerate such arrogance from an appointed official who has started to confuse himself with God.

As we go to press, some Republicans in the House of Representatives have failed in their bid to get rid of Secretary of State Dean Acheson by cutting off his salary. We are glad they failed. We yield to no man in the intensity of our desire to get rid of Acheson, but we can not say that we approve of trying to chop him down by indirection. It's too much like getting Al Capone or

Mickey Cohen on a roundabout income-tax rap, not for gangsterism. The method is Acheson's own method; it is precisely what we most object to in Acheson's own cast of character and habit of mind.

The State Department finally got so mad that it is now requiring Soviet diplomats to meet the same requirements for a driver's license here as any American must. What finally made it so angry was the following situation, as described by Anthony Leviero in the *New York Times*:

In Moscow an American attaché has to be able to disassemble and assemble an automobile engine and be able to name every part and describe its function in order to qualify for a license. The result has been that all but one of the American Embassy automobiles have to be driven by Russians and it is assumed the drivers are secret police who shadow all Americans.

How can Stalin have any respect for a country whose diplomatic representatives and State Department will submit to such cynically humiliating conditions? And exactly what do we achieve, except humiliation and loss of face, by maintaining diplomatic relations under such conditions?

Jean Cattier, the international banker who was chief of the American ECA mission in Frankfurt, Germany, and economic adviser to High Commissioner John J. McCloy, recently retired from his job with a blast directed at Germany's Chancellor Konrad Adenauer for fostering a free enterprise economy. That's one for the scrapbook kept by Count Screwloose of Toulouse, the comic strip character who preferred the sanity of the insane asylum to the insanity of the outside "sane" world. The incongruity of an American criticizing Adenauer for championing free enterprise has not been lost on the Germans. It is this sort of thing that makes foreigners believe that America stands for nothing in the world of ideals, principles, ideology or philosophy. No wonder the Voice of America is so feeble; the brutal truth

is that America these days has nothing specifically American to say.

So now we know that in 1938, when he was editor of *Pacific Affairs* (the magazine of the Institute of Pacific Relations), Professor Owen Lattimore was indiscreet enough to write a letter to Edward C. Carter, the Institute's secretary-general, describing the line that the IPR ought to follow. Mr. Lattimore wrote:

I think you are pretty cagey in turning over so much of the China section of the enquiry to Asiaticus, Han-seng and Chi. They will bring out the absolutely essential radical aspects but can be depended on to do it with the right touch. . . . For China, my hunch is that it will pay to keep behind the official Chinese Communist position—far enough not to be covered by the same label—but enough ahead of the active Chinese liberals to be noticeable. . . . For the British, scare the hell out of them. . . . For the USSR—back their international policy in general, but without using their slogans and above all without giving them or anybody else an impression of “subservience.”

Isn't the policy that Mr. Lattimore so capably followed and advised in 1938 a perfect description of the policy he has continued to follow and advise since then? Hasn't he demonstrated how well he himself can be depended upon to do it all with just “the right touch”? Or is it Ordeal by Slander even to ask such questions?

One group of controllers acts upon wages and another group acts upon prices and each one is innocent of what the other one does. Eric Johnston, the economic stabilizer, appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture. He was asked what relation the rollback of beef prices had to an increase of wages for the packing house workers. He said:

Prices and wages are not exactly related in this particular case. I referred the matter to the Wage Stabilization Board. They approved the increase. Now whether that will eventually reflect itself in a price increase, I can't answer you. I don't know.

Mr. DiSalle, the price stabilizer, was asked the same question. Did the price rollback have any relation to the wage increase? Mr. DiSalle said: “No, it did not.” Was it then purely coincidental? Was the wage increase not considered at all when he ordered the rollback of beef prices? Mr. DiSalle replied: “We gave it no consideration whatsoever. I would not know what effect the increase in wages would have.” In the language of pure economic theory, prices are the pig, and wages are the grease. Mr. Eric Johnston, who runs this county fair, will take your bets on the pig.

At the request of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, seven economists have made a report on what's the matter with New England. They find, among other things, that the benign intentions of the Federal government toward New England have been somewhat frustrated by

Yankee contrariness, and they recommend that “State and local governments should exploit all Federal programs that contribute toward the improvement of the New England economy and improve the standard of living in the area”—this on the ground that the Federal government anyhow is taking more out of New England than it puts back, and if New England does not grab her share of grants-in-aid and other benefits, competitive regions will get it. Regional studies like this, said the President, will aid “planning for the economic growth and progress of the nation.” So grows the Tree of Life in the Welfare State. Only the clinging fruit may flourish.

Senator Wherry read to the Senate a report entitled, “Reclamation Under the Marshall Plan in Italy,” by W. E. Corfitzen, the ECA's reclamation specialist in Rome, who wrote:

The reclamation project in Italy involved considerably more than new reclamation projects in the United States. In the United States generally flood control, drainage, irrigation and incidental power development are included, while the Italian program includes not only these aspects but also many others which would be required to develop land from a raw state to a fully going concern. Such features are highways, farm centers (including churches, schools, post and telegraph offices, police stations and other civil services) farm buildings, transmission lines, etc.

Another essential difference in the two programs is that in the United States, water users' organizations in general must repay to the Federal government the cost of reclamation works over a period of forty years. The Italian program is based upon the premise that reclamation works are a national benefit and that the cost will be repaid the government through taxes on the land developed.

So the money may eventually get back to the Italian government as income from taxes on the increased value of the land, but if it does the Italian government will keep it. None of it will ever come back to the United States. The American taxpayer will have already paid for the new wealth created in Italy with American dollars—that is, if the American government took it away from him directly in the first place. On the other hand, if the American government borrowed the money, the burden of it will lie on the taxpayer forever. And that raises the question: When, where and how will there be a Marshall Plan for the American taxpayer?

One of the unpredicted effects of the government's foreign aid program has been to make Congress more sympathetic to appropriations for domestic public works, like dams and irrigation projects, on the ground that if we can do so much for other countries we can afford to do something for ourselves, or, to say it bluntly, that if we are going to ruin public credit, let there be somewhat to show for it here as well as abroad. Senator Wherry, for one, recently justified his vote in favor of eight

reclamation projects by saying that if we were going to continue building towns, roads, school-houses, dams, irrigation works and power plants in Italy, Portugal, Africa, the Belgian Congo and elsewhere, he could see no reason why we shouldn't be building some like things for ourselves. He could not understand Senators who had voted everything the government asked for in the way of aid to foreign countries and then hammered appropriations for similar projects in their own country. He said:

There are reclamation projects in nineteen or twenty foreign countries which are receiving ECA (Marshall Plan) funds. What we are giving away in Italy and elsewhere in the world we are denying to our own people.

Senator Mundt said:

If we are going to do it, the only way we can possibly escape national insolvency is to expand our tax base. We must develop new sources of wealth in order to carry on such programs in foreign countries.

That meant voting for more reclamation projects at home. Thus, the more we give away the more we must spend on public works in order to create more wealth to give away.

What social scientists can accomplish when they really go to work has just been shown by a group of German "sociologists" who have spent years on a thorough analysis of Hitler's recorded utterances. According to the *New York Times*, which was impressed to the tune of almost a column's worth of precious space, the editor of their recently published findings, Professor Gerhard Ritter of Frankfurt University, has emerged with a tremendous discovery. "He finds that anti-Semitism was primary in Hitler's political thinking," reports the *Times*. In other words, though "sociological" research may be expensive, it certainly pays off with new vistas.

"The *Freeman* never laughs or smiles," says the *New York Post* on page 9 of its Sunday magazine section for July 15. On page 2 of the same section of the *Post* for the same day Alfred Kohlberg, a frequent *Freeman* contributor, is characterized as an "affable man" who "smiles readily" and "enjoys his present role as agitator, prophet and Cassandra." Well, boys, which page of the *Post* d'ya read? Which page does the *Post* editor read?

Mr. Nathaniel Spector, manager of the New York Joint Board of the Millinery Workers Union, AFL, presented on his return from Europe what he called, "a moral counterpart of the Marshall Plan": a joint union-management campaign of the U. S. hat industry to high-pressure Europeans into wearing hats. "Tourists who visit the great European centers of culture and fashion and find no one wearing hats," Mr. Spector complained, "are likely to come back to the U. S. feeling that they should go without hats, too." Though we could think of con-

siderably more dangerous infections U. S. tourists might contract abroad, we gladly concede that Mr. Spector has attained a profound insight into the economic philosophy which underlies the Marshall Plan: The consumer is born, and dies, to fit planned supply.

The Houghton Mifflin book catalogue for the autumn contains this statement about a book called "Dean Acheson and American Foreign Policy": "We see . . . how the strength of our moral position today rests upon the fact that we made every effort to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union." That, if we may say so, is a dilly. If it is true that the strength of our moral position rests upon our attempt to placate the Communists, then it is equally true that the strength of Great Britain's moral position in 1939 rested on Neville Chamberlain's appeasement policies, not on Churchill's refusal to kowtow to a proven monster. Would the Houghton Mifflin catalogue writer be willing to stand on that?

It is with great sorrow that we note the death in New Haven of Professor Edwin M. Borchard, who taught international law at the Yale Law School for more than thirty years. Professor Borchard was a firm believer in many of the so-called "old-fashioned" things for which the *Freeman* stands. He believed in the inalienable rights of the individual, including the inalienable property right, at home. In the realm of foreign affairs he believed in the eighteenth century international code known as the "law of nations." What he objected to in the Franklin D. Roosevelt foreign policy methods was the slyness and indirection that sought to find "legal" ways of doing illegal things. No doubt Ed Borchard's uncompromising rectitude was too "quaint" for effectiveness in a lawless age. But that is something to be tallied up against the age, not the man. The world will not be a decent place in which to live until Ed Borchard's principles have become fashionable once more, as well as true.

A pertinent bit of information was hidden away in Section IV of the *New York Herald Tribune* of Sunday, July 8: "Herb Shriner will pinch-hit for Arthur Godfrey tomorrow night on 'Talent Scouts' (CBS-TV, 8:30) while Mr. Godfrey goes to Paris to join Bernard Baruch in a conference with Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower." Well, we always suspected that our foreign policy decisions are reached in some such way. But though the industrious *Herald Tribune* has now clarified the processes by which we arrive at an European policy, we are still in the dark as to Asia. When did Milton Berle go to Tokyo?

Stuart Symington, says *Barron's Magazine*, is engaged in a war against tin, and Eric Johnston in a war against wool. In our own naive way we had thought the war was supposed to be against the Communists.

The Southern Rebellion

SOME of our friends who are disgusted with the me-too politics of the average Republican politician have been perking up of late. Not that they expect any coherent doctrine of Republican anti-Statism to emerge in time to affect the 1952 elections; that would be too much to hope for. What cheers their weary hearts is not the possible redemption of the Wayne Morses, the Javitses and the Tobeyes but the increasingly probable emergence of a real rebellion of the Southern Democrats against continued party domination by Fair Dealers in league with the Missouri Mob.

True, we have had Southern uprisings before. The Dixiecrat rebellion of 1948 was touted and huzza-ed, but it had more effect on the Gallup and Roper polls than it had at the real polls on election day. This time, however, the brewing revolt in the Southern ranks is being stirred by the seasoned campaigners of the Dixie Democracy, not by such marginal political figures as Wright and Thurmond. The party rebellion against Truman was first brought into the clear a month ago by Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia, whose speech attacking the Truman policies was that of a man prepared for a wide-open and continuing party split. And behind Byrd, egging him on, were the honored Democratic figures of Senators Walter George and Dick Russell of Georgia and Governor James F. Byrnes of South Carolina.

Will anything come of this promising beginning? The ordinary political arguments are all against it. Since the two-thirds rule no longer dominates Democratic conventions, it is hard to see how the Southerners can wrest control of their party from Harry Truman and the Fair Deal in 1952. The Southerners could, of course, march out of their party, claiming (and not without good reason) that the Fair Dealers have abandoned all the true Jeffersonian principles. But as a factional, or rump, group the Southerners would automatically lose all their important committee assignments in Congress, not to mention such politically profitable things as patronage and pork.

The answer to the ordinary political arguments is that these are not ordinary times. When political passions run high, as in the days of the Taft-Roosevelt split in 1912 or the Bryanite-Gold Democrat rift in 1896, normal considerations of patronage and pap can go out the window. Frank Hanighen, an astute commentator, has suggested in *Human Events* for July 11 that the Southerners may actually be girding themselves to put a separate sectional ticket in the field in 1952. This might split the Democratic vote sufficiently to throw a few border states to the Republican nominee for President. It could lead to a minority Republican national administration, as in 1861. Only this time

the Southerners would welcome such an administration; if there were to be any Fort Sumter incidents, they would take place in Democratic New York or Pennsylvania, not in Jimmy Byrnes's South Carolina.

Mr. Hanighen does not actually predict a separate Southern Democratic ticket. But he quotes a "candid Democratic friend" who thinks it may be in the cards. For ourselves, we remain skeptical; we recall the report that Senator Byrd once nerved himself to the actual point of preparing a magazine article titled "Why I Will Not Vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt." According to the story, which we have reason to think true, the article was all set for publication when Senator Byrd, in a frantic last-minute change of mind, called the whole thing off. Like the late Senator Borah of Idaho, Byrd simply couldn't bring himself to be irregular during the eleventh month of the fourth year.

There remains the possibility that Southern Democrats might be persuaded to support a set of Democratic electors who would throw their votes in the electoral college to a Republican. Senator Mundt has suggested a coalition deal which would enable the Southern Democrats to name the Vice President on the Republican ticket and preserve their seniority rights on Senate and House committees. The Mundt plan makes good philosophical sense. But from the psychological standpoint it is doubtful that a coalition could be worked out between Southern Democrats and Republicans in time for 1952. Since the Republicans can not even agree among themselves on candidates in advance of the nominating convention, how can they guarantee Senator Byrd or anybody else the consolation prize of the Vice Presidency? There have, indeed, been fruitful periods of realignment in American politics in the past. But they have developed out of party disaster, not out of party planning to prevent disaster. The trouble with the Mundt plan, from a practical political standpoint, is that it proceeds from the rational mind, not from the emotions that ordinarily dictate political behavior.

If we are skeptical of the possibility of a complete realignment for election day, it does not mean that we think either the Byrd 1951 revolt or the Mundt plan to be meaningless phenomena. No matter whether Byrd, Byrnes, Russell and George choose to be Democratic Borahs or Democratic Theodore Roosevelts in 1952, the intensity of their rebellion means it will be a long time before the Fair Deal ever has a working majority again in Congress. The more the Mundts and the Byrds can be encouraged, the more the chances that there will be an effective change in the ideological climate of the United States as a whole. Who knows, maybe the continued split of the Democratic Party

in Congress will some day actually encourage the Republican voters to put the bee on the more ar-
rantly collectivist Republican senators and repre-
sentatives.

If nothing succeeds like success, it is also true that nothing fails like failure. To put over such things as the Ewing plan for federalized medicine, or complete Federal domination of education, or a radical extension of the principles of public housing, the Fair Deal needs a momentum that it can not get out of a party bedeviled by a Byrd or a Russell. If the Southern Democratic rebellion merely goes far enough to stir certain Republicans out of a despairful or a calculated me-tooism, it will have achieved a fair and ponderable success.

Stalin's Bad Checks

IN ITS own infallible way the State Department chose the second week of the negotiations for a cease-fire arrangement in Korea to release a transcript of Mr. Acheson's speech to a group of book and magazine editors. He said:

In Korea the Russians presented a check which was drawn on the bank account of collective security. The Russians thought the check would bounce. They thought it was a bad check. But to their great surprise the teller paid it. The important thing was that the check was paid. The importance will be nothing if the next check is not paid, and if the bank account is not kept strong and sufficient to cover all checks drawn upon it.

Note first that the simile is upside down. A check "bounces" when the bank returns it marked, "no funds," which means that the person who wrote the check has no money in the bank. In this case, according to Mr. Acheson, the check was bad. Stalin knew it was bad when he wrote it, and expected it to bounce, not for that reason but because he thought the bank would be unable to pay a bad check for want of funds. How extraordinary! And what is Mr. Acheson saying, really? He is saying to Stalin that the United States will pay all the bad checks he can write. Then he exhorts us to keep the bank strong in order to be able to pay Stalin's bad checks. How strong? He does not know. But he is scornful to those who say we should keep our commitments within our capacity:

Nothing could be more erroneous. What we must do is to be conscious of our national interests. I have no doubt there is a point beyond which the United States can not go, but I am equally sure that we are not anywhere near that point.

How does he know? Has the State Department, the government or anybody ever tried to determine what our capacity is? Unlimited commitments against an undetermined capacity. Write your checks, Mr. Stalin. We won't let them bounce.

To be consistent, Mr. Acheson should have recom-

mended that we pay the bad check we got from Czechoslovakia. Instead of paying that one, however, Mr. Acheson's Voice of America beamed the following message to the President of Czechoslovakia:

Sleep well, Gottwald, sleep soft if you can, while an innocent man sleeps hard in your Prague cell. Dream well, Gottwald, of the taste of polish on the boot of Stalin. You have done his bidding and done it well, and in the process held up for shame every freedom-loving Czech. Hitler escaped our hand by death, but those who had done his bidding, those who thought the basic morality of man such a joke, we caught up with them. They were known as war criminals. Now I have a name for you, Gottwald, a name which I freely give with the well wishes of 150,000,000 of my countrymen—I christen you a peace criminal. For an act such as you have allowed to be perpetuated on William Oatis is a criminal act. The fact that there is peace between your country and ours only makes it more criminal, more reprehensible.

A more pusillanimous sound from the greatest power on earth could not be imagined. Either we could do something about it, or, in Mr. Acheson's wisdom, we could not; and if we couldn't, then was it necessary besides that we should have to be humiliated by this burst of juvenescent rhetoric, wishing bad dreams on the Communist conscience of Gottwald?

An Economy Based on Swindle

THE EMINENT professor of griefless economics, Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard, thinks the three principal inflationary policies of government are irreversible, namely, (1) the policy of supporting farm prices, on which it spent nearly \$7.5 billion in the last four years, (2) a labor policy that gives unionism the power to keep wages rising, as fast or faster than prices, and (3) the anti-deflationary policy, which means that all the resources of government will be employed to keep prices from falling, i.e., to avert depression. Thus he expects inflation to continue for political and social reasons, not in a headlong manner, but happily in a soft-shoe manner, so that the buying power of the dollar will fall at the rate, say, of 2 per cent a year. And he likes the prospect, for he says:

Let us not overlook the fact that an economy with slowly rising prices has advantages as well as disadvantages in comparison with an economy that has a stable price level over the long run. It has more employment, more output and a higher standard of living than an economy with a stable price level. Consequently, the prospect that the dollar will slowly drop in purchasing power is not to be viewed with alarm. When one is compelled to choose between two kinds of economy, each of which has certain disadvantages, one is

naturally inclined to select the economy that produces the higher standard of living. Therefore, as between an economy with a stable price level and one with a slowly rising price level, the latter is to be preferred. [Applause]

The applause is to be noted. The quotation is from a speech delivered in May before the Academy of Political Science.

There will be hardship and injustice for some, he concedes; but there will be hardship and injustice also in an economy governed by the fetish of sound money. Then he adds:

At this rate the dollar will lose one-third of its present purchasing power in another twenty years and a little more than half at the end of forty years.

Why does he stop at forty years? Shall we all be dead by that time? Or must one suppose that the dollar is infinitely divisible by two—if not infinitely, then at least to the point at which the cost of printing a dollar will be more than the dollar is worth, the national debt will be wiped out, and we can start all over again? One of the terrible evils of inflation, once it has been embraced as a national policy, is its effects upon people's minds and morals.

What Professor Slichter so calmly contemplates is that the government shall deliberately defraud everyone who has believed its word engraved upon a bond or a piece of money. Even if it were true that for a while it should be able to raise the people's standard of living, an economy based upon swindle is an immoral, criminal economy, and will not endure, all the Harvard economic books to the contrary notwithstanding.

How Dead is Pétain?

SOME of the Parisian market women who had danced at Marie Antoinette's beheading were still alive when Henri-Philippe Pétain was born. This is perhaps the most meaningful fact of his pathetic career: it spanned 95 of the 162 years that have passed since the French Revolution. And no matter what the conscious motives of Marshal Pétain's defections may have been, his strange life reflects a great national tragedy which Americans were hardly ever told about: France consists of two nations which were separated by the Revolution of 1789.

Now it could of course be said of every nation, with some truth, that it is divided against itself by some historical conflict not wholly resolved. If, however, our own Southern Rebels seem still to despise their Yankee brothers, most of them are playing a facetious game. But the atmosphere of fratricide that has pervaded French History for the last two hundred years is deadly genuine. Try as they may, French politicians and American his-

tory teachers (always inclined towards "liberal optimism") can not camouflage for long the rift in the French body politic; the wound keeps breaking open, sometimes farcically, sometimes tragically, but always for the same reason: an essential part of the French people refuses to accept the Revolution of 1789.

Napoleon I, Louis-Philippe, Napoleon III, *La Commune*, Boulanger, *l'Affaire Dreyfus*, Clémenceau, *l'Affaire Stavisky*, Laval, Pétain—at the bottom of all the murderous unrest which shakes and mutilates and dishonors the magnificently gifted French race, is considerably more than just an accident of events. A century of "liberal" historiography has produced the generally accepted and dangerously untrue portrait of France as a nation formed by rationalism, egalitarianism, agnosticism. But for every Frenchman who worships Progress, and makes "enlightened" cracks about the clergy, there is one who remains sullenly rooted in romantic paternalism and hates the *laicists* more than he hates the devil (or Hitler, for that matter).

It is one of the misfortunes of American foreign policy that the men who have shaped it (from Jefferson to Franklin D. Roosevelt) were enthusiastically Francophile and just as enthusiastically insensitive to the lasting schism within the French people. Their two-dimensional picture of France as a homogeneously "liberal" nation resulted only too often in catastrophic policy advice, because France simply refused to live up to the accepted legend of Marianne, married to *liberté, égalité et fraternité*. When the chips were down, the lady usually proved to be a bigamist, in scandalous bondage to two exactly opposite characters.

In recent years, particularly, America's European policy has centered upon the fallacious assumption that the motley "third force" represented the true France, and Pétain nothing but a negligible anachronism. But once Moscow has contracted the firm allegiance of France's former Left (the Communist one-fourth of the French electorate which General de Gaulle so correctly calls "the separationists"), France can neither recover nor resist unless Marianne's eternal two husbands form a partnership somewhat beyond dueling over the same girl.

Far from being an argument against de Gaulle's "Rally of the French People," it is an element of promise in it that he perceived the need for a reconciliation between the heirs and the foes of 1789. Perhaps there can never be a real reconciliation; for sometimes it seems as if the violent conflict between traditionalism and "enlightenment" were man's eternal schizophrenia, and particularly the Frenchman's. But only when the two agreed at least on a temporary truce was France ever really strong. And as a strong France is of such vital interest to the U. S., our European policy, now that the Pétain embarrassment is buried, should support any truly promising effort to rally the whole French people.

Africa and Our Security

By BONNER FELLERS

With the present explosive situation in the Middle East, air bases in Africa are essential to the defense of the free world, says Brigadier General Bonner Fellers, who was a United States military observer with the British forces in Africa during the last war.

THE Iranian-British oil dispute is sinister. Nationalism, fanned by Communist agitators, is sweeping the Middle East. Under State Department guidance we are aligned with the British whom we grant primary interest in this area and whose policy we have followed blindly. It is to be hoped that the Harriman mission may succeed and thus mark our first deviation.

The Arabian-American oil arrangements have been so satisfactory that it would be logical if the Iranians, who lack technicians and oil know-how, turned to American oil operators to find the experts they urgently need. But the British anticipated this. And our State Department, contrary to America's best interests, let it be known to our oil men that they should extend no help to the Iranians. The Iranians have asked for West-German oil technicians. But here also the British can and doubtless will prevent this aid by insisting that the Allied powers refuse exit visas.

The explosiveness of the oil dispute is magnified by the fact that a British token-force intervention might also prompt the Red Army to move. Once in the Middle East, Soviet forces would be inclined to remain, for there lies an estimated 50 per cent of the world's known oil reserves. The annual production is 60 million tons.

World Contest for Oil

Europe's economy is dependent upon oil from the Middle East. If this were denied to Europe, we would be sure to supply the deficit. Last year the United States consumed 300 million tons of oil, some two-thirds of the world's production. The Western Hemisphere can meet our peacetime oil demands, but if we were compelled to supply the oil for Europe, rationing would be necessary. And in time of war, oil from the Western Hemisphere alone could not meet the needs of ourselves and our allies.

Russia's oil position is more precarious than that of the United States. So far as can be determined, her annual production, including that of satellite Rumania, totals about 36 million tons; by restricting civilian consumption, she could meet her wartime requirement.

While both the East and the West could fight a war without oil from the Middle East, it is to the best interest of each to see that the other is denied this rich prize.

Oil is the lifeblood of modern war. It would be naive for us to expect that Russia does not have a program to seize the oil fields of the Middle East either on the pretext of preserving peace or as the initial act of hostilities. It is to be hoped that the State Department will not permit the British-Iranian dispute to develop into a deadlock which would "invite" the participation of the Soviet Union.

Our problem therefore—in peace or war—is to prevent Russian seizure of the Middle East with its great oil resources, its freedom-seeking people, and its vital lines of communication. We must seek closer relationships with this strategic area. At present Administration leaders seem to entertain a pious hope that our Allies, or possibly just fate, will do this job for us.

Safeguarding the Middle East

Some argue that a heavily armed Turkey—whose eastern frontier juts halfway along Caucasasia's southern border—could threaten Russia's supply line south through the heart of the oil lands. The fallacy of this lies in the fact that, if Russia strikes, Turkey's forces could be destroyed or paralyzed by the Red Air Force.

Others hold that our Mediterranean or Red Sea fleets, with carrier-borne aircraft, could destroy Russia's rail transportation or pipe lines leading from the oil fields. It is also suggested that Marines could be landed to hold oil installations for our own use. But in World War II, because of enemy air action, Britain was unable to use the Mediterranean supply route for her desert campaigns. On May 22, 1941, the German Luftwaffe struck the British eastern Mediterranean fleet and all but destroyed it. On the basis of this experience we can not count on effective Allied fleet operations in the Mediterranean or the Red Sea until the Soviet Air Force is defeated.

Should Russia strike Europe, the Red Army, with strong air support, would be able to attack in such overwhelming numbers that it is doubtful whether European air bases could be held for any appreciable time. Such United Nations air forces as were based in Europe when the war started would be largely tactical and engaged in supporting our ground forces. Thus they would be unable to intervene in the Middle East.

There are some who argue that from air bases

in England, strategic air forces could deny Middle Eastern oil to Russia by striking oil installations. But England would be subject to heavy attack by the Red Air Force V-1's and V-2's (new version) and possibly even to airborne invasion. There is always the possibility that, to save her population centers from atomic assaults, England understandably may be forced into a position of neutrality.

Sound military planning can not place complete reliance upon bases in England and Europe. The vital principle of flexibility in planning demands we make extensive use of bases in Africa.

In relation to the Middle East, Russia enjoys a decided military and geographic advantage. With her primary trust in a vast land army, Russia's technique is to expand her borders by means of Red Army tanks and bayonets supported by a tactical air force. Red Army forces in Caucasia can move quickly toward the adjacent oil fields of the Middle East; there are and there will be no Allied ground forces sufficient to stop them.

Air power offers the only effective counter-measure against Russian occupation of the Middle East. The deeper the Red Army moves into this priceless strategic area, the more its supply lines can be disrupted by air strikes. In addition, air power can deny the oil of the Middle East to Russia by destroying the refineries, pumping stations and storage tanks, by breaking pipe lines and by disrupting any rail or truck transportation that might be attempted.

Until full-scale, intercontinental air warfare develops into a reality, overseas air bases are essential. It would be terribly costly, if not impossible, to hold air bases on the continent of Europe. Our ground forces, along with those of our Allies, would have to be expended in an effort to stop the full weight of the Red Army, and there is every indication that such a sacrifice would prove to be futile.

Africa's Natural Barriers

It is much easier to hold bases which have the protection of natural barriers—bodies of water, mountain ranges, or deserts, or combinations of these barriers. Relatively small ground forces can hold these naturally protected bases because only a fraction of the Red Army could be thrown against them. Bases protected by bodies of water would force the Red Army into airborne or overseas operations. Bases protected by deserts or mountains make supply difficult for the enemy, and the terrain limits the size of his forces which can be transported over or across the barrier.

A small, highly trained and mobile ground force, with adequate air protection and support, can defend air bases in Africa. The Mediterranean and the Red Sea, joined by the Suez Canal, are formidable barriers against land invasion of Africa. Russia is inexperienced and ill-equipped for amphibious operations. *If we can achieve air supremacy*, no large expeditions across the Mediterranean or the

Red Sea could reach the coasts of Africa intact.

Crossing of the Suez Canal by a land army could be effected, but the isthmus of Suez is so narrow and exposed that concentrations highly vulnerable to air attack would be necessary. The supply route from Russia for such a force would lead across hundreds of miles of desert. Air power could find and destroy vehicles in this bright and open terrain with very little difficulty.

Our own air supremacy—if we were to have it—and small ground forces defending African bases, could defeat enemy airborne invasions. Our fighters could shoot down most of the troop-transport craft. Those which did get through would be highly vulnerable to anti-aircraft fire in the vicinity of our bases. Paratroopers could be disposed of by small ground forces, especially trained and equipped for mobile warfare across the open desert.

Nor would the Russian occupation of Europe necessarily threaten our African bases. Advocates of the ground defense of western Europe often claim that we must hold Europe to secure Africa. There is a fallacy in this reasoning. The Russian forces are prepared to expand on the land mass of Eurasia. Their best avenue of approach to Africa leads directly from Russia into the Middle East, not to Africa via Europe.

Even if all Europe were to fall to the Red Army, the natural barriers which protect Africa would remain. Russia's possession of Europe would improve her chances for success in an airborne invasion of Africa, but airborne invasions are never possible against a strong air force.

Land Invasion Unlikely

If we control the air over Africa, there is little likelihood that Russia would attempt land invasion of that continent. We are now planning a series of bases from Morocco along the north coast of Africa, to include the Suez Canal and Bagdad. Engineer troops have been assigned to putting these bases in readiness to serve air combat units. But France is reluctant to permit American ground defense forces to be stationed on the bases. If war comes, and France is forced to become neutral, our best North African bases might also be neutralized. The south fringe of the Mediterranean could be reached by Russian light bombers as the Red Army moved into Europe. But such bases would be very useful for strategic and tactical missions at the outbreak of hostilities and in winning the battle for air supremacy. It is in the direct defense of these bases that our own meager ground forces should be employed.

In a war against Russia we would do well to consider Africa as a vast north and south corridor offering bases from which air power could strike and destroy Russia's war potential and prevent the consolidation of Soviet strength in Europe. An air route with limited facilities already exists from Takaradi on the Gold Coast to Khartoum on the Upper Nile. This route is some 2000 miles south of

the nearest base Russia might acquire in Europe and is therefore relatively safe from fighter and medium bomber attack. Only Russia's best strategic bombers—unescorted—could strike this line of bases. Although air supply through these bases would be feasible, it might be possible to build a railway from the Gold Coast to Khartoum. Such a line would have enormous commercial value.

Sea communications from the United States to the Gold Coast will be much safer from submarine attack than routes to European bases. Soviet submarine bases initially will be in the Baltic—a round trip distance of some 12,000 miles from the Gold Coast.

As the line of air bases is advanced north down the Nile, the Red Air Force might be compelled to strike. If we have built air supremacy—as we must if we are to keep the peace or win the war—the battle of the air might be won in African skies. Once we win the battle of the air from bases in Africa, a shield of protection can be extended over the people of the Middle East and Europe, and a Red attempt to occupy and exploit these areas would be doomed.

From these African bases, our bombers can reach the Baltic. Across the area from the Baltic to the Black Sea are four main rail routes leading from Russia into Europe. It is these lines of transportation on which the Red Army must rely if the invasion of Europe is attempted. They could be readily severed—and kept severed—by air strikes from African bases. With American air supremacy established in Africa, it is most doubtful whether Russia would dare to attempt the invasion of Europe. If she did attempt it, her entire Red Army could be cut off from its home base.

From African bases, if we build air supremacy, a war against Russia can be won.

European Reluctance

Force of circumstances may compel us to turn to Africa for our most effective overseas air bases. In Europe there is reluctance, if not outright opposition, toward preparation for war. Many Europeans admit willingness to do almost anything to keep out of World War III. Nor can we really blame them. The lessons of Korea are still vivid. Collective security failed to save the South Koreans. In spite of our good intentions and 150,000 American casualties, Korea has been destroyed. Can the UN in ground combat do better against the Red Army of Russia than against the Red Chinese? Why should European cities and populations be ground to destruction by Russia's vast land army, if Allied air supremacy can prevent it?

France has hesitated to make air base sites available to us. She also has refused to allow American troops, sent to protect her frontiers, to be stationed within her borders. For political reasons we have refused until recently to seek bases in Spain and made no effort to take advantage of Spain's spiritual and geographic strength. Greece and Turkey offer

base sites so far forward that even if any aircraft could be held on the ground, they would suffer heavy losses from Red Air Force strikes.

Our Diplomatic Blunders

With the most extensive and defensible air-base sites lying in Africa, the United States unfortunately has done nothing to make its forces welcome there. On the contrary, we have shortsightedly supported European imperialism which has turned the local populations against us. This bitterness arises largely because we deal with North African and Middle Eastern peoples through the French and British rather than directly.

In Morocco, we have enjoyed friendly relations for a century. Both France and the United States, under the Protectorate Treaty of 1912 have recognized the sovereignty and independence of the Sultan and the territorial integrity of Morocco. But in arranging for American air bases in Morocco, obviously to enhance France's prestige locally, we have dealt with the French and bypassed the Sultan. Unless the Sultan signs the agreement giving us the use of these bases, in the eyes of the Arabs we are committing aggression.

The situation in Egypt—a sovereign power—is somewhat similar. Here the occupation of the Suez Canal area by British troops, and the stationing of foreign troops in the Egyptian Sudan, causes mounting bitterness among the people. We have made arrangements with the British to use the Suez air base without asking the consent of the Egyptian government. As a sovereign power, friendly to the United States, Egypt deeply resents this.

In Bagdad also, we have dealt with the British and put the Government of Iraq second in matters affecting the security and welfare of Iraq and its people.

The creation of the State of Israel, which resulted in nearly a million Arab refugees, has added to the turbulence. Fear that economic considerations may compel Israel to expand her tiny borders by force aggravates this complex problem, for which the Arabs hold the United States considerably to blame.

Communist propagandists make the most of the trying Palestine situation, disseminating such slogans as "American Aggression through Israel," "The Coming War for Oil," "More U. S. Dollars for Israel—More Trouble for the Arabs."

To all this our representatives in the Middle East make little or no reply. Our government can not be unaware of this problem, for our official and business representatives in the Middle East have clearly and fully reported these Arab-Moslem sentiments. But no adequate remedial action has been taken.

Saudi Arabia is one happy exception. There our government has dealt directly with the local government. There American oil companies have made mutually beneficial business arrangements. There

we have the important Dhahran air base. There Communist penetration has failed. This situation could be duplicated elsewhere in the Middle East were we to establish the same forthright relationships.

If war is thrust upon us, to secure American aircraft from the sabotage of hostile local populations near our bases would require more ground forces than we can spare. Yet all we need to do to insure the friendship of the Arab and Moslem peoples is to revert to our traditional American attitude toward peoples who, like ourselves, love freedom.

The Arab world would normally turn toward the United States. Its religion rejects communism. The Moslem faith is founded partially upon the teachings of Christ. It teaches freedom, individual moral responsibility, sacredness of private property, and an abiding conviction that in all things the Divine Spirit knows best.

Yet, as communism makes heavy inroads in the Middle East, we make no attempt to use these spiritual values in the struggle. Rather, we try to combat communism only with dollars and other material assistance. While we rely upon the indirect approach through European colonialism, Russia fans the flames of nationalism as she furthers her own imperialistic expansion. The Communist leaders are too clever to preach communism. They have gained their hold on the people by offering to help them achieve freedom from "imperialistic domination" and "economic exploitation."

Africa's Hidden Resources

The solution is simple. Merely by recognizing the political independence of the various Arab States of Africa and the Middle East, we can reestablish a firm and lasting friendship. What these people want is not the ECA giveaway program. Their good will can not be bought. They want political equality. Economic aid alone will not satisfy; they welcome help which will help them to help themselves. Unless we recognize national aspirations, the Middle East and Africa will be lost to the free world.

The economic development of Africa and an increasing flow of oil from the Middle East are essential ingredients to a flourishing European economy. Africa's population of 100 million is, and will be for generations, predominately agricultural. Thus raw materials of Africa complement the manufactured goods of industrial Europe. Under free enterprise development, both Africa and Europe can be made to thrive.

It is high time that the Europeans took themselves off the American dole. They can help to unlock Africa's hidden treasures to the mutual benefit of themselves, the Africans and the American taxpayers. The advent of refrigeration, of air conditioning, of air transportation, and man's victory over tropical diseases, all help to make Africa ripe for development.

The best air force in the world based in a friendly Africa can be the key to peace. It would be neither provocative nor vulnerable. It would be a constant and dependable deterrent to any aggressive move by Russia.

But Africa must be regarded as more than a military opportunity. A friendly, open-handed and direct approach to the peoples of Africa and the Middle East can make possible the development of long-neglected human and natural resources for the benefit of all mankind.

Planning That Perished

By BEN RAY REDMAN

THE MEN of the Middle Ages were great social planners. Commerce has been subject to regimentation of one kind or another in many lands and ages, but it has seldom if ever been controlled as completely, and with such an attention to details of practice, as it was under the medieval guild system. Masters and workmen alike were bound by a strict, all-embracing code. Business was entirely in the hands of the guilds, which governed all trade within their towns; and non-guild members who wished to engage in commerce had to pay a fee for the privilege and submit to guild regulations.

There was neither competitive buying nor selling; indeed, such a thing as an open competitive market was wholly alien to the economic philosophy of the age. Prices of raw materials were fixed, and methods of manufacture were so standardized that prices of finished articles could be fixed as well.

Wages and hours of labor were regulated and uniform, and relations between masters and employees were established by guild law. An apprentice slept beneath his master's roof and was under his moral as well as technical control. No employer could discharge an employee without just reason, while an employee who broke his contract or quit his job before a particular working agreement had expired was thereafter denied the right to work at all.

Consumers were protected by a conscientious inspection of materials and a high standard of workmanship. Unfair trade practices, such as individual advertising or competitive sales promotion, were immediately suppressed by the hand of authority; while the relations between various guilds great and small—wool merchants, stone masons, leather workers, doctors, etc.—were rigorously ordered and zealously controlled.

It was a marvel of economic planning. There was only one thing that the planners had overlooked; the fact that social regimentation means not life but death for the society upon which it is fastened. The guild system perished of its own internal poisons—and the modern world was born.

Clergymen and Socialism

By STEWART M. ROBINSON

UNKNOWN to most American laymen, the Protestant clergy are approaching an intellectual crisis. The pressure of events—national and international, ideological, political and economic—has placed before the clergy the inevitable necessity of making a choice: between individualism and socialism, between fundamental Biblical truth and the “social gospel.”

Most Protestant laymen, especially the businessmen, think that collectivism among the clergy is a fruit born from revolutionary seeds planted by agents of the Kremlin since the Bolshevik uprising in 1917. This conviction stems, no doubt, from the generous publicity given “Protestantism’s Pink Fringe,” from the cases of clergymen like the Reverend William Howard Melish, and from the strident voice of the Communist *Daily Worker*, which features clergymen who sympathize with “peace” movements manufactured in Moscow.

Now that the cold war has turned hot, and with the anti-religious goals of Marxian socialism plain to see, American laymen are prone to think that clergymen are aware of the dangers of socialism, are reaching out to embrace political, economic and religious freedom with equal fervor, and are ready to root out the Reds among them—a task deemed easy, on the assumption that “pinko” clergymen are now a very small minority.

This assurance of the laity can be traced, in part, to the consistent anti-Communist campaign of the Roman Catholic Church which some Protestant laymen assume is transmitted, by osmosis, as it were, to Protestant preachers. It derives more importantly, however, from the formal rejection of communism by the Protestant Federal Council of Churches as an ideology incompatible with Christianity.

If the Protestant clergy are aware of pitfalls on the left, if they are keeping the faith of their forefathers in individual freedom—political and economic, as well as religious—then that fact is important, for the clergy make one of the most articulate and influential groups in all America.

There are approximately 100,000 Protestant clergymen in the United States—about one for every 500 laymen. Most of them are pastors, spiritual shepherds of some 50 million church-going Americans in more than 250,000 religious congregations. Of the rest, who are not in charge of local parishes, or serving as officials, the great majority are engaged in religious education. Thus, America’s clergy comprises—second only to the 950,000 public school and non-sectarian college teachers—the largest single group of men influencing by personal contact the public opinion of the nation.

That this influence is widespread is indicated by a survey conducted by Princeton’s Opinion Research Corporation in 1949, showing that 56 per cent of the nation’s clergymen say they have preached on “Christian principles as they affect business,” “social responsibilities of business,” and “employer-employee relationships.”

Individualism vs. Statism

What are the clergy telling the churchgoers? Admitting—at least for the Protestant clergy, and to a surprising degree for Roman Catholic priests and Jewish rabbis—that there may be many different conceptions of religious, political and economic freedom among men wearing the cloth, the conclusion one may draw from reading the religious press and from attending the clerical conclaves is that the clergy are now going through a struggle with their own consciences—a struggle to make the choice, consistent with Christian philosophy, between socialism and individualism.

For, despite the fact that organized clerical bodies have gone on record against communism, they have, in the same breath, condemned the “evils of capitalism.”¹ They seem to be striving for a “middle-of-the-road” position which is at best highly skeptical of the free market and at worst completely devoted to the virtues of “social planning,” as practiced in Socialist Britain.

This is a paradox, for clergymen are the greatest living examples of the virtues of capitalism. Clerical income is wholly received from capital. Clerical maintenance comes from the free-will offerings of the people (via savings out of earnings) and from endowments, which are the product of savings. The clergyman is proof of the power for good in the American free enterprise system. His substance is supplied without compulsion from the state, without legislation, without pressure on the people—albeit with persuasion. Financial support of churches and their missions, totaling many, many millions of dollars, is American individualism and voluntarism in their purest forms.

Why, then, do the Protestant clergy so often bite the hand that feeds them?

They do not organize to exert pressure in their own interest. They have no Philip Murray or Walter Reuther to beat the drum and keep their heads above the rising waters of inflation. Instead, they

¹ At Amsterdam, in 1947, the World Council of Churches (Protestant) issued a resolution “rejecting the ideologies of both communism and laissez-faire capitalism.” The adjective “laissez-faire” was inserted in the resolution only after strenuous objections on the part of a minority against the original sweeping condemnation of capitalism, pure and simple. Late last year His Holiness, Pope Pius XI, issued a statement along similar lines.

are the victims of the vicious circle of wage-increase and price-increase policies. The clergy have no union, nor do they go on strike. While clergymen's salaries are sometimes set by contract, the contracts are largely informal, "mutual consent" agreements. Clergymen are among the lowest paid of all groups—and, among groups with technical education, the very lowest.

Upon such a low salary, the clergyman must "keep up appearances," and from his own meager income he often contributes to the needs of the destitute or troubled who turn to him for help. More than any other "worker," he sees the seamy underside of life. This alone would be enough to make him listen to the social planners, but there are other and more important reasons for his dalliance with the dreams of socialism. Clergymen have too often been sold socialism at the theological seminary.²

The "Social Gospel"

Protestant theological education during the last half century has steadily drifted away from emphasis upon scriptural knowledge and has sought, rather, to inculcate a "social gospel" whose tenets have been drawn from Fourier, Owen and Marx. Socialism in the Protestant seminaries was imported from England long before the prospect of a successful Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. It became popular as German "higher criticism" evacuated the dynamics of Revelation, serving as a refuge for those who had "no gospel to preach."

Christian socialism got its start in America in the late seventies. By 1893 it had been installed officially, with the Right Reverend F. D. Huntington of the Episcopal Diocese of Central New York as president of the Christian Social Union, an offshoot of the Christian Socialist movement of Kingsley and Maurice, both priests of the Church of England. In 1906 the Christian Socialist Fellowship was organized as an inter-denominational group. It had more than fifty branches and published a monthly, the *Christian Socialist*, millions of copies of which were distributed in thousands of churches.

By 1914 one of religion's best-known leftists, Dr. Harry F. Ward, was writing: "It is for the churches to . . . recognize and proclaim the religious values in industrial democracy . . . some socially-controlled method of distribution must be found . . . collective ownership is a movement for the protection of the individual." As Professor of Christian Ethics at Union Theological Seminary for more than twenty years, Dr. Ward influenced hundreds of ingenuous young clergymen. In 1924 he went to Moscow "to see whether the New Economic Policy meant a return to capitalism." He returned apparently satisfied that it didn't. Seven years later

he went back to Russia, and came home hailing the "cultural revolution" there as "one of the epochal events in the story of men." He promptly told capitalism where to get off in a book, "In Place of Profit":

The democratic, money-making society of the traders and financiers . . . can be generally expressed only in emergencies like war or shipwreck.

By 1935 Dr. John C. Bennett, faculty member at Auburn Theological Seminary, (at Union) could say without, apparently, shocking the laity:

. . . Kari Marx has a contribution to make to theology, for he saw, if in a one-sided way, in the manner of prophets of his race, the nature of the process which is smashing the capitalistic system in the interest of its present victims, and through them in the interests of all.

Further evidence that the gospel had undergone considerable socialization came in 1938, when Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick declared, on an NBC Sunday vesper hour: "From Isaiah to Karl Marx the prophets have spoken with one voice."

The pastor who has stuck to the fundamentals of his Bible and taken the "social gospel" with a large grain of salt, however, usually finds that he has not had the time to master the refutations of Marx or Keynes. Probably he has never even heard of Mises's "Human Action" or Knight's "Risk, Uncertainty, and Profit," or Bastiat's "Harmonies of Political Economy." The Socialists tell him Adam Smith is out of date, and when he reads Adam Smith he is obliged to agree.

Clergymen Need Guidance

Do businessmen help the clergy to understand their work in the economic system? Clergymen did not think so in 1949. The Opinion Research Survey quoted 77 per cent of them as saying that businessmen should do more to acquaint the clergy with their business problems.

Nor is the current religious press much help. Much of it, Protestant and Roman Catholic, demands "social action" for the "solution" of economic problems.

And when the clergyman turns for guidance to the literature of his educational boards or seminaries, he finds, again, a mass of "official material" that is weighted with specious pleas to enter into "planning for social change." This social gospel has permeated even Sunday School class material. As a result many informed laymen have refused to use it, and, lacking specialized theological training, have given up teaching Sunday School.

Said one disgusted layman:

They teach sociology, political science, economics, and international relations, all with an assurance of divine authority. . . . The Bible, particularly the New Testament, serves largely as a grab bag of arguments for or against whatever current ideology the writer is defending or attacking. . . . The dominant tone of much of this material is argument rather than explanation, indoctrination

² This statement refers to Protestant seminaries. Discussion of socialism in the teaching and the preaching of the Roman Catholic faith should, appropriately, be undertaken by a Roman Catholic priest. However, interested laymen of all faiths may wish to consult *America* or *The Catholic Mind* for evidence that large segments of the Catholic clergy favor social planning and collectivist economic measures. (The author)

rather than education, propaganda rather than teaching, all with an assumption of absolute truth.³

Where, then, can the intellectually earnest clergyman turn to seek a *rapprochement* between St. Paul's "glorious liberty of the children of God" (Romans 8:21) and the chains proposed by Union Theological Seminary's Reinhold Niebuhr? Dr. Niebuhr writes:

The social power which inheres in the ownership of the means of production is so irresponsible and so irrelevant to the necessities of a technical civilization that its destruction has become a primary prerequisite of social health.

How can the clergyman reconcile the siren song of Marx: "to each according to his need" with the words of Christ: "Who made me a divider over you? And He said unto them, Take heed and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." (Luke 12:14-15)

He can turn to his Bible where his clergymen forefathers in the days of the American Revolution—a time fraught with crisis as is this day—found truth and light. He may be surprised at the courage of the colonial clergy in scourging the all-powerful state. Colonial sermons bear unequivocal witness that the most influential body of men in America, which colonial clergymen were, was both informed and vocal on the fundamental issues of liberty under law and the necessity for a government of laws, not men.

The Reverend David Jones, preaching at Tredyffryn, Chester County, Pennsylvania for a "Continental Fast" in 1775, sharply focused the whole issue in one paragraph:

When a people are oppressed, insulted, and abused and can have no other redress, it then becomes our duty as men, with eyes to God, to fight for our liberties and properties. . . . At present it seems like a house divided against itself, our dispute is with administration . . . laws are not good except they secure every man's liberty and property and defend the subject against the arbitrary power of . . . any body of men whatsoever . . . there is none but God suitably qualified to rule according to his own will and pleasure.

The Reverend John J. Zubly, Swiss by birth, but a stalwart servant of liberty in the colonies, and for a time seated from Georgia in the Continental Congress, proclaimed:

The Americans have been called a "rope of sand," but blood and sand will make a firm cementation, and enough American blood has already been shed to cement them together into a thirteenfold cord, not easily to be broken . . .

On June 4, 1775, the Reverend John Carmichael spoke before Captain Ross's company of militia at Lancaster, Pa.:

Dread nothing that can befall you, so ruinous to yourselves and your prosperity in this life as slavery . . . if they beat down our . . . cities . . .

we will have our woods and liberty, for as we are the descendants of Britons, we scorn to be slaves.

The colonists were never in doubt as to where the colonial clergy stood in the ideological battle before and during the Revolution. The colonial clergy had no more use for the socialism of the early Plymouth and Jamestown colonies than it had for the fascism of King George III. In the crisis of 1776 its preaching was controversial—and more. It was so vital to the needs of the people that no public gathering was complete without a sermon.

True, all the clergy did not endorse political independence in the final decision. Some Anglicans stuck to the Royal cause because they had taken oaths of allegiance to both Bishop and King. More than a dozen, however, signed the resolutions passed by the evicted House of Burgesses in Virginia in May 1774, declaring sympathy for the plight of Boston and refusing further commerce with Britain as a protest against the unconstitutional action of Parliament.

The Tide Is Turning

Today there are signs that the Protestant clergy are again awakening to the threat of statism. All over America powerful voices are rising against the growing authoritarianism of the American government. They have no national organization, no publication, no press bureau. But they are finding support from two groups organized to help them: Spiritual Mobilization, under the guiding hand of Dr. James Fife, Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Los Angeles, and the Christian Freedom Foundation, under the direction of the well-known Quaker, Howard E. Kershner, in New York. Both of these organizations have on their boards Protestant clergymen of national reputation. They publish tracts and periodicals interpreting fundamental Biblical truths from the point of view of individualism: the dignity of men having souls as contrasted with the soullessness of "social units" in governments.

Neither of these groups has the financial power or political prestige that has belonged to the Federal Council of Churches. But that body itself may be undergoing some change in its organized outlook upon the social and economic issues of the day as a result of its absorption into a larger and more imposing Protestant group—the new National Council of Churches. As late as a year ago, the Federal Council's National Study Conference on the Church and Economic Life showed a leaning to statism. It expressed itself as favorable to the idea that the state should "reduce inequalities that now exist" by taxation; that the state should enforce "a price system," strengthened and corrected by "various social controls"; should extend and enlarge state-operated social security; that the "democratic machinery" of the state should bring the various "interests of consumers, farmers, employers and labor" into more equitable balance.

³ Atlantic Monthly, December 1950.

The recent Cleveland meeting of the National Council of Churches seems encouraging, and may signal the creation of a really great voice for liberty in the land. The special services and Christian devotion of the countless servants of the eight component parts of the new Council have made a priceless contribution to the spiritual life of the world. Under the system of checks and balances now contemplated in the issuance of economic and political manifestoes, the new Council envisages the use of a National Lay Committee which is "to advise with and make recommendations to the General Board, and to the General Departments . . . as to policies and procedures which will make the most effective use of the abilities and skills of lay people in the new council, and will provide an effective partnership between lay people and ministers in the future work of the Council and its several units."

Today's Challenge

The Protestant clergy can—and ought to—regain the place of prestige they once held in the making of American liberty. Most clergymen have the capacity, and they still have the reputation for leadership. The American people are still influenced mightily by ministers, and they will follow the call to high dedication to personal liberty, the dignity of man, and freedom for each man from the deadening hand of the state.

Will the clergy meet the challenge of socialism? I think it will. It is a libel to say that the bulk of the Protestant clergy are leftist. But they need facts. They need economic education.

Economic freedom will not be saved, however, if the spiritual leaders can not raise the people to a moral level worthy of it. It is the clergy's job to supply moral leadership and the intellectual conviction that individual liberty is a law of God.

As Rabbi James G. Heller of the Isaac M. Wise Temple in Cincinnati puts it:

Judaism stands diametrically opposed to the principles that underlie . . . the all-dominating state, a cynical view of the individual, disregard for the sanctity of human life. Feeling that we are of the spirit and blood of the prophets we denounce these policies as unpardonable under . . . God.

Christian clergymen can subscribe to these brave words. More and more of them are doing so, turning from the "social gospel" to the fundamental Bible truths that souls are saved *one at a time*, that people do not gain the Kingdom of God in "social groups"—that there is no "society," only individual human beings; no "justice," only just or unjust actions; no "freedom," only *free men* or slaves.

In today's complex world, Protestant clergymen will not find it easy to make their decision between socialism and individualism. Certainly they will have to learn more about economics. Then, if they follow the Bible and conscience, we can leave the decision to God and history.

Worth Hearing Again

On Serving One's Country

"LETTERS," said the Duke, sitting down. [The Duke of Omnium is speaking to his son, Lord Silverbridge.] "My grandfather must have kept every letter he ever got. These are some that his father . . . wrote to him when he was going to stand for Silverbridge. . . . One of them struck me so much that I think you ought to see it. . . . I'll just read you the passage that I thought so good.

"And then I would always have you remember the purpose for which there is a parliament elected in this happy and free country. It is not that some men may shine there, that some may acquire power, or that all may plume themselves on being the elect of the nation. You are there as the guardian of your fellow-countrymen, that they may be safe, that they may be prosperous, that they may be well governed and lightly burdened, above all that they may be free. If you can not feel this to be your duty, you should not be there at all. Gradually, if you will give your thoughts to it and above all your time, you will find that there will come upon you the ineffable delight of having served your country to the best of your ability. It is the only pleasure in life which has been enjoyed without alloy by your affectionate father Omnium." . . .

"I know," said his father. "It's pretty bitter. The least free country in the world and all within four years. . . ."

ANGELA THIRKELL in "County Chronicle," Alfred A. Knopf, 1950

The Dreaded Corporation

BUT Sir, I have said I do not dread these corporations as instruments of power to destroy this country, because there are a thousand agencies which can regulate, restrain and control them; but there is a corporation we may all dread. That corporation is the Federal Government. From the aggression of this corporation there can be no safety, if it is allowed to go beyond the bounds, the well defined limits of its power. I dread nothing so much as the exercise of ungranted and doubtful powers by this government. It is, in my opinion, the danger of dangers to the future of this country. Let us be sure we keep it always within its limits.

If this great, ambitious, ever growing corporation becomes oppressive, who shall check it? If it becomes wayward, who shall control it? If it becomes unjust, who shall trust it? As sentinels on the country's watchtower, senators, I beseech you watch and guard with sleepless dread that corporation which can make all property and rights, all states and people, and all liberty and hope, its playthings in an hour and its victims forever.

SENATOR BENJAMIN HARVEY HILL in the U. S. Senate, March 27, 1878

Man of the Half Century

By JULIEN STEINBERG

This is the first of two articles by the author of "Verdict of Three Decades." In the next issue Mr. Steinberg will complete his estimate of the man he believes did most to fashion the shape of today's world—a man whose true history and character are little known to most Americans.

SINCE January 1950 there has been much playful and earnest speculation on the figure most worthy of being named the "man of the half century." Some didactic souls, probably needing more time for deliberation, declared convincingly that the second half of this century would begin in 1951. The debate still goes on. But there is no need to delay a moment in awarding the dubious nod. The man of the half century is unquestionably Vladimir Ilich Lenin, born Ulianov, and often referred to mistakenly as Nikolai Lenin, a name he never used.

Time's choice of Winston Churchill was evasive. I share the free world's respect for the stalwart statesman and warrior of Britain. I maintain less than none for the father of Bolshevism, but the choice of Churchill is not just. The only meaningful criterion for selection is: who did most to fashion the shape of today's world? Who did most to set upon the stage the crucial questions that mankind must decide? Lenin, as the man who brought the new barbarism into existence, who created the state that today threatens the world with extinction, as the man who is the father not only of Bolshevism but of the modern totalitarian state, is the choice.

There are many, it should be noted, who are determined not to give the man his due. And here is one instance in which the Kremlin is not the culprit. Stalin's monster state knows to whom it owes most. Lenin's detractors are of another kind, those who slander him by asserting that he was a humanist, that he believed in a free Russia, that he abhorred force and violence or only reluctantly accepted such methods.

Who are these people who would detract from our Man of the Half Century? They are, in one camp, those who confuse masochism with liberalism and who harbor unto death the obsession that "despite everything" there is something progressive about communism. They are compelled by events (and a changing national mood) to take a stand, nominally or sincerely, on Stalinism, but they will not—regardless of what conditions will oblige them to say—renounce communism. Another camp is composed of a not insignificant number of alienated Communists (by no means all) who, in their unceasing infancy or senility, need a plausible

rationale for their break. They still need an explanatory myth for why they joined in the first place. And that myth, told in a disturbing number of books and articles, starts: in the beginning it was different . . . Why did they break? Communism changed, not us . . .

Still others contribute to the myth of the Glorious Beginning. Among them are academicians and writers whose major contribution to scholarship and political understanding is the notion that, in appraising a totalitarian state and its leader, you grant fifty per cent to totalitarianism and the other half to its opponents. (A method they notably, and rightly, failed to apply to Nazism.) And then there are the men of "taste," prideful of their anti-Stalinism, who strive for the appearance of "fairness" by limiting their opposition to Stalin and starting the indictment of the Soviet dictatorship *in medias res*. And then there is the peculiar contribution of Leon Trotsky—whose testimony has been accepted by the democratic camp with an incredible lack of critical acuity—who, in his partisan fight, sowed at least one myth in defense of communism for every one he uprooted in opposing "Stalinism." And, given the various foregoing sources of misinformation, and others, it is not surprising that there should have arisen a great number of commentators on Soviet history who disseminate error quite honestly out of ignorance.

BUT let us not cheat Lenin of his rightful due. What is his record that qualifies him for our Man of the Half Century Award? His sycophants aside, what did he do?

He overthrew the Russian Revolution, for one thing. That this statement should still cause, as it undoubtedly will, any astonishment or doubt is perhaps the most dramatic demonstration of the extent to which even anti-Communist audiences do not appreciate the significance of Lenin's successful contributions to history in the year 1917 and after.

But first it is necessary to clear up one absurd myth that the Communists have labored so hard to spread, and that is that the Communists overthrew the Tsar and made the Russian Revolution. This, of course, never happened. In 1917, when the Russian people overthrew the Tsar and made the Russian Revolution, Lenin was in exile in Switzerland. Trotsky was abroad and not yet even a Bolshevik. Stalin was in a penal colony in Siberia. The tiny Bolshevik group did not free the Russian people; on the contrary, the "backward" Russian people freed those of them who were jailed as well as all other prisoners of Tsarism.

This occurred in March 1917. But if the Bolshe-

viks did not make the Russian Revolution they did achieve, eight months later, in November 1917, a feat fully as remarkable. They overthrew it. This accomplishment, under the leadership of Lenin, was performed in two steps, the armed coup d'état of November 1917 and the armed dispersal of the All Russian Constituent Assembly on January 18, 1918.

WHEN Lenin returned to Russia in April 1917 he found his followers, the tiny Bolshevik camp, in a conciliatory mood. They—Stalin among them—favored cooperation with the other socialist parties. All Russia awaited the Constituent Assembly, a longtime dream, to be elected by universal suffrage. Such a mood soon proved intolerable to Lenin. He found Russia at this time, under the democratic regime, to be “the freest country in the world,” but nevertheless soon declared war on the young democracy.

He made an abortive putsch in July 1917. The call for the uprising was under the slogan of “All Power to the Soviets.” But the ungrateful soviets themselves helped to down the revolt! Lenin thought the game was up. “Now,” he said, “they will shoot us all. It is their moment.” But he did not count on the talents of his opponents for vacillation. Some Bolsheviks, including Trotsky, were arrested; Lenin went into hiding. This was the point at which, had the government acted decisively, the Bolshevik conspiracy could have been crushed, and the fate of Russia—and the world—thereby altered. But the Bolsheviks were not even outlawed in the soviets.

Thus, Lenin was able to take advantage of the next opportunity. It came in the fall in the form of a blow from the Right against the democracy. This attempt to set up a military dictatorship collapsed when all the socialist organizations—including the Bolsheviks—came to Kerensky's support. Following this the arrested Bolsheviks were released, and they set about preparing for the third, and final, blow against the Provisional Government.

Lenin had discarded the slogan “All Power to the Soviets” after his July failure; he had chosen instead “All Power to the Bolshevik Party.” Now he shrewdly dragged out again his cynically manipulated and too soon abandoned slogan. He prepared to take power in the name of the soviets. He regrouped his lines, he promised everything under the sun (a state without police, without privileges, etc.). When he met with opposition in his own Bolshevik ranks, he set in motion a bitter campaign against his dissident colleagues. Finally he made his historic bid, seizing power by armed force in November 1917. Later he said: “It was easy to begin a revolution in such a country. It was easier than to lift a feather.”

When immediately after he had seized power, there emerged in his Bolshevik camp another movement of opposition (predicting that Lenin's actions would lead to one-party rule of terror), he quashed that. After achieving power, he held on to it as to

life itself. He slandered, he vilified, he broke promises, he outlawed and he jailed and he terrorized. All aims became subordinate to one: the retention of power. He held power, and he ruined Russia.

What about the Constituent Assembly? In his pre-power statement he shrieked for it, as Communists always clamor for free parliaments before they take power. He accused the democratic Provisional Government of deliberately postponing the elections. And then Lenin, speaking in the name of the “masses,” made certain to seize power less than three weeks before the elections were to be held. In his infinite wisdom he did not choose to wait. His first comment to his inner circle—Trotsky tells us long after—is that the Bolsheviks must postpone the elections. He is told that it would not look right. And so the elections, as scheduled by the now overthrown Provisional Government, are held. More than 36 million Russians vote in universal suffrage, by secret ballot. This is the first free election in Russia's history, and it is held under the Bolsheviks. Lenin's party receives a smashing defeat.

The “masses” in whose name he seized power repudiate him overwhelmingly. On January 18, 1918 the Constituent Assembly—representing the united will of the country—meets in Petrograd. What does a brave Bolshevik do? He disperses the first democratic parliament in Russia's history, at bayonet point. The Assembly—which met for one day—is to remain Russia's first and last democratic legislative body, from that time until today. Later the Communists will have more experience in holding elections. They will teach the Fascists and Nazis—who will study them closely—how it is done.

HOW DOES Lenin look to non-adoring contemporaries? Two weeks after his coup in 1917, Maxim Gorky (later a front man for Soviet dictatorship) calls Lenin “not an all-powerful magician, but a deliberate juggler, who has no feelings either for the lives or the honor of the proletariat.” He writes:

The working class must not allow adventurers and madmen to thrust upon the proletariat the responsibility for the disgraceful, senseless and bloody crimes for which not Lenin, but the proletariat will have to account.

In 1918, Rosa Luxemburg, the German revolutionary (now a patron saint of the Communists who have banned her strictures on their state), already knows that Soviet communism is:

at bottom then, a clique affair—a dictatorship, to be sure, not the dictatorship of the proletariat, however, but only the dictatorship of a handful of politicians. . .

Later, in the next three decades, there will be much sophisticated-sounding speculation on when Bolshevik rule “degenerated,” when it “got off the track.” The Communist world will split wide open in 1936-38, during the maniacal period of purges and

trials, and following the Stalin-Hitler Pact of 1939. Stalin—whose villainy needs no embroidering—will be named as the culprit who “betrayed” communism, the mysterious Being (to followers and opponents alike) who dropped out of the heavens after the death of Lenin and almost single-handedly “betrayed” the glorious state of Lenin. From the Western world will be hidden the fact (because all the contending Communists were guilty of complicity in killing Russian democracy) that by the time the “betrayed” took over, Stalin had everything in his arsenal that he needed.

Soviet communism, under its chief prophet, Lenin, our Man of the Half Century, provided for him almost everything that resides in Stalin’s grab bag today. Stalin’s contribution, in the main, has not been to invent, but to enlarge (as Lenin was desperately anxious to enlarge, an ambition frustrated only partially and by the youth and weakness of the young dictatorship), to make what was horrible, monstrous.

Two events, the armed coup and the armed dispersal of the Constituent Assembly slightly more than two months after the coup, and we have not only the birth of the dictatorial Communist state, but almost, in conjunction with other actions and teachings of Lenin, the entire blueprint for its future, from which Stalin—also a creation of Lenin, but a most willing one—will build the greatest totalitarian society in the history of the world.

Once, in a single paragraph, the great German socialist Karl Kautsky—at one time idolized by Lenin and an opponent of Soviet dictatorship from the start—showed more wisdom about the fictitious “degeneration” of Soviet rule in Russia than many pundits have yet to show in entire books. Kautsky wrote in “Bolshevism at a Deadlock”:

Only a few people at once understood the counter-revolutionary significance of the coups d’état of November 1917 [when the Communists seized power] and January 1918 [when they dispersed the Constituent Assembly]. There are still Socialists today who have quite forgotten that there was a March Revolution in Russia through which the democratic Republic was founded. Not a few even think that the real revolution only began with the coups d’état which gave the death blow to the democratic Republic.

SOON after his ascension to power, Lenin created the organ without which Stalin—and communism—could not hold power for very long. The notion that the Soviet gestapo is an invention of Stalin’s is ludicrous. In December 1917, one month after seizing power, Lenin sends a memo to Felix Dzerzhinsky which leads to the creation of the All Russian Extraordinary Commission, soon to be known as the infamous Cheka. (To this very day the Russian people refer to Stalin’s police as chekists.) In the next three decades this gestapo—born a decade and a half before Hitler’s—is to be given many names (GPU, NKVD, MVD), but its character does not change; its functions merely grow larger.

From the start the regime terrorizes its opponents. But in August 1918 its golden opportunity comes. Dora Kaplan, a Socialist Revolutionary, shoots at and wounds Lenin. She is executed. But the regime does not stop there. It demonstrates its culture, its superiority, as well, to Tsarism which, when Lenin’s brother participated in an assassination attempt against Alexander III, executed only those directly involved. Specifically, the Soviet regime sets in motion a mass system of terrorism—and the Communists themselves proudly find a name for this policy. They label it “Red Terror.” The brutal repression is felt throughout Russia. Thousands are seized, thousands are shot. How many no one will ever know. Hostages are taken.

Lenin’s prized underling, Dzerzhinsky, a professor of murder, becomes the most feared man in Russia. On June 9, 1918 this humane representative of Soviet communism states:

We stand for organized terror—this should be frankly admitted. Terror is an absolute necessity during times of revolution. Our aim is to fight against the enemies of the Soviet Government and of the new order of life. . . .

We judge quickly. In most cases only a day passes between the apprehension of the criminal and his sentence. But this does not mean that our sentences are groundless. . . . When confronted with evidence criminals in almost every case confess; and what argument can have greater weight than a criminal’s own confession . . . ?

Latsis, a leader of the Cheka, does not even concern himself with “confessions.” (Shades of the Moscow Trials!) In *Pravda*, on December 25, 1918, he orders:

Do not ask for incriminating evidence to prove that the prisoner opposed the Soviet Government either by arms or by word. Your first duty is to ask him what class he belongs to, what were his origin, education and occupation. These questions should decide the fate of the prisoner. This is the meaning and essence of Red Terror.

Missives From India

Receipt

To: U. S. A.

For wheat you’re sending:

Payment pending.

NEHRU

Cracked Wheat Bread & Butter Note

JOSEPH STALIN, Most Honorable Sir:

We pay

salaam

defer

concur.

Your obedient servant,

nehru

CASMI STEFFIN

It Started With Plato

By S. HARCOURT-RIVINGTON

OUR modern civilization is ravaged not only by the aftermaths of a global war but by a political controversy. This latter concerns the proper functions of government—a subject of crucial importance to human welfare. No other national problem has ever produced so deep and unbridgable a cleavage in public opinion.

The issue is, to use a sporting metaphor, whether in the game of life the government shall captain the national team or shall act as referee. That is to say, whether the government shall take the principal part in the activities of the community and control with plenary powers the movements and welfare of the members, or whether it shall stand apart from the struggle, arbitrating upon its issues, guaranteeing fair play to all, and insuring that the rules of the game shall be faithfully carried out.

To be more specific, whether the government shall take upon itself the power and functions of the old-time slave-owner, or should leave the community free to sort themselves out into employer and employed, while the government acts as the judge, ready in the community interest to use its influence and authority against the wrongdoer.

Plato, the First "Planner"

Many people believe that this issue arose with the advent of socialism a century or so ago and was given its impetus and virulence by the communist class-war dogma of Karl Marx. That is not so. The controversy is almost as old as civilization. It began in ancient Greece, more than four thousand years before the Christian era, with the doctrines of Plato. He was the first of the "planners" and the true founder of the communist economy which deifies the state. In his "Republic" the Athenian philosopher set out a virtual blueprint for the evolution of what has come to be called the "Welfare State."

Plato's ideal Republic was founded upon two primary assumptions (1) that the community must be comprised of only two classes—those who govern and those who are governed (the latter owing implicit obedience to the former) and (2) that human qualities are mainly hereditary and therefore that rulers must beget future rulers. (It should be noted that Plato belonged by birth to the aristocratic governing class who hated the democracy no less than the principles upon which the democratic system is founded.)

The ancient philosopher's proposals followed logically from these assumptions. They were simple, albeit sensational. He advocated the procreation of

a privileged governing class—a sort of brain trust—to be produced by a system of selective breeding which approximates stud-farming and the rearing of pedigreed prize stock. The "wise men" so born and trained would be the backbone of the state administration.

To secure a virile race and to keep the population within predetermined limits, Plato counseled the segregation of the sexes, state-arranged cohabitation, communism in wives, and the state ownership of children. From birth onward children would be reared in public nurseries where mothers would have to feed whatever child the state officials directed, to assure that no mother would be able to identify her own child, and no child would know its own parents.¹

State Direction of Labor

To secure maximum economic progress, Plato advocated the specialization of labor under state administration. Each person would be given work according to, and commensurate with, his proven abilities. The choice of work would, however, not be the individual's own: it would be decided by the "wise men." Rewards in prestige, property in trust, and material assets generally would be determined by the rulers following the individual's needs—these being fixed according to his preordained status in the regime. To give effect to these proposals the philosopher argued logically that property must be held by the state, that is to say, there must be over-all "nationalization" of production, including labor as well as materials and finance.

This epoch-making conception of the state control of all human activities was the inspiration of all subsequent "welfare" schemes. It was the philosophy upon which Sir Thomas More evolved his fantasy "Utopia"; it was the basis of Bacon's economic system as set out in his "The New Atlantis." It was the prime source of the socialist nationalization doctrine and the foundation of the class-war dogma of Karl Marx, which was merely Platonism in reverse, with the revolutionaries as rulers. Moreover, it was the fount from which both Hitler and Mussolini imbibed their system of totalitarian planning—although those dictators may conceivably have been unaware of their indebtedness to the old Platonic philosophy. The methods differ but the final objective is always the same: state planning and control of all human activities from the cradle to the grave.

¹ See Plato's "Republic," as translated from the original Greek by Professor Lindsay, Master of Balliol College, Oxford, in Everyman's Library, pp. 146-151.

None of these schemes has ever won universal acceptance because each embodies ideas that are contrary to some of the deepest concepts of human intercourse. Moreover, all such proposals constitute a frontal attack upon private initiative. They can be brought into practical shape only by an intolerable intervention of compulsion. Such state control of activities is the *antithesis of the democratic ideal* which assumes that the individual shall be the arbiter and architect of his own career, and be thus free to organize his life and that of his family in any manner which suits his needs.

Two Irreconcilable Ideologies

If I read aright the implications of modern events, particularly in view of the aggressive developments of Soviet Russia, this issue between *individual responsibility* and *state direction of human effort* is the main one before the world today. Ideas concerning it seem to be in a chronic state of confusion. Let us therefore be clear about the full meaning of these opposing ideologies.

Now, the democratic system makes the state the servant of man; the socialist system makes man the servant of the state. One preserves the liberty and independent action of the individual; the other annihilates it. One allows the myriads of transactions which make up the national life to be the respective affairs of the individuals who compose the nation; the other makes them into a vast monopoly over which no one has any jurisdiction except the head of the state and the officials he appoints and controls. In the one, man is free; in the other he is a prisoner of the regime.

These ideologies are irreconcilable. A prisoner has no real freedom. An animal in a zoo is a captive. His compound may be large and his surroundings may simulate his natural conditions. But for all that he is a prisoner. He can not seek his own destiny. He is not free to lead the life for which he was created.

Now, in these days nearly all peoples, even in the so-called democracies, live in a sort of national zoo. They are captives of a state planned economy. Their "compound" is their country. They can not leave it except under financial conditions which compel their speedy return. They are rationed and regulated and have to endure the restrictions which the authorities impose, since the alternative is to starve.

Nobody objects to that state of affairs in time of national emergency and peril, but it is one thing to submit voluntarily to captivity during a grave crisis and quite another to be forced to endure it forever. All these restrictions have arisen since the outbreak of the first World War. The choice at base, therefore, is whether the world shall go back to the principle of freedom (not necessarily the conditions) of pre-1914, which unhappily no one under forty years of age remembers, or on to closer confinement in captivity as the socialistic system develops.

The two systems have nothing in common. They can not co-exist since no one can be a prisoner and a free man at the same time. Attempts have been made to combine the individual freedom of a democratic society with state direction in a "socialist planned economy," but they have failed. Like fire and water they can not be united. As soon as they come into mutual contact the qualities of both are destroyed.

That being so, we have to weigh the pros and cons of each of these radically different ideologies and decide under which we prefer to live. Having made our choice we must, so far as is humanly possible, free the system we prefer from its inherent disadvantages and probable abuses. To that course there is no alternative unless it be anarchy and chaos.

How to Bring About Inflation

By HAROLD LOEB

A GREAT deal of attention is being given to inflation. Hardly a day passes without some bureaucrat, politician or labor leader proposing measures designed to arrest it. Little thought is given to the other side of the problem. Yet situations often change rapidly, and sometimes the reverse side illuminates a difficulty. It may therefore be helpful to list several measures which might reasonably be expected to touch off an inflationary cycle, if exerted when the economy was in approximate equilibrium.

1. *Wide publicity should be given to prospective shortages.* This stratagem would send the public scurrying to the stores, would persuade merchants to double their orders, and would induce manufacturers to increase their stocks of raw materials. Effective demand, supplemented by bank loans, would expand rapidly. The supply of many items would, as a result, prove inadequate. Prices consequently would rise.

2. *Price ceilings should be imposed on everything but foodstuffs.* This measure would prevent the excess purchasing power from being absorbed by higher prices and thereby being returned to the government by way of income and profit taxes. Instead, part of the surplus money would bid up the uncontrolled price of foodstuffs, and part of it would seek out black markets, thereby intensifying the shortage of goods in legitimate channels. Furthermore, price ceilings would effectively cut off the importation of copper, lead, wool and other short commodities when their prices rose above the ceiling prices, as well as the output of marginal producers. As a result, domestic production would be reduced and the shortage of manufactured goods would be augmented.

3. *Wages should be tied to the cost of living.* Since the largest item in the cost of living consists of food, this measure would insure rising costs and thereby multiply the number of producers who would be unable to make ends meet. Supply, as a result, would be further curtailed in relation to demand. Were the disemployed rehired at their increased rate of pay for armament or other public work, demand would be further increased in relation to supply.

4. *Corporation and profit taxes should be raised.* This measure would hamper the efforts of businessmen to increase production, since corporative income and profits are the sources from which much of the money used to expand the plant is usually drawn. Thus capacity and the supply of finished goods would be held down. Other taxes should *not* be raised appreciably since most of them curtail purchasing power and consequently the demand for goods and services. And demand, it need hardly be recalled, must be increased in relation to supply in order to insure a cumulative inflation.

5. *Government bonds should be purchased from the banks on demand.* This is to make certain that the banks will always have the means to expand credit when called upon.

Other measures can be envisioned. For example, farm products could be purchased whenever good weather or other cause threatened to lower their price. And the government could spend more money than it recovered by way of taxation. But were the measures cited above enacted, these further steps hardly seem necessary.

I Will Become A Communist—

when members of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations shall return to Moscow without American electric refrigerators, washing machines and television sets;

when our American fellow-travelers stop calling themselves progressives;

when a Soviet general recalled for disagreeing with Stalin is given a tumultuous reception by the people all along the streets of Moscow;

when the following advertisement shall appear in the Soviet press: "Spend your vacation abroad. Special reduced rates to London. See the inspiring Festival of England";

when a Soviet citizen accused of pro-Western sympathies shall publish a book entitled "Ordeal by Slander";

when the *New York Daily Worker* shall criticize a Soviet composer two weeks before Moscow condemns him, and not two days after.

ARGUS

This Is What They Said

THE VITAL interests of the United States and the Soviet Union conflict at no point on the earth's surface. . . . There is no necessary reason in the logic of geography, or in the logic of economics, or in the logic of national objectives, why the United States and the Soviet Union should ever find themselves in conflict with each other, let alone in the kind of conflict reckless and irresponsible men have begun now to suggest.

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH, then Asst. Sec. of State, Department of State Bulletin, May 27, 1945

The vast moral achievements of the Soviet Union are in no small measure due to the removal of fear. Fear haunts workers in a capitalist land. . . . Nothing strikes the visitor to the Soviet Union more forcibly than the absence of fear.

REV. HEWLETT JOHNSON, Dean of Canterbury, in "The Soviet Power," 1941

Our participation in this organization's work [the UN] is aimed at making it effective in preventing fresh wars.

MOLOTOV, February 6, 1946

"The Vigil of a Nation" by Lin Yutang libels some of our best allies among the Chinese people, allies who happen to be led by Chinese Communists—who happen to have renounced, years ago now, any intention of establishing communism in China in the near future, and have an administration which is, according to most people who have seen it, more nearly democratic than any China has yet known.

EDGAR SNOW in the *Nation*, February 17, 1945

How's That Again, Mr. Truman?

The law of supply and demand, operating in the market place will, from now on, serve the people better than would continued regulation of prices by the government. . . . I am convinced that the time has come when such controls can serve no useful purpose. Their further continuance would do the nation's economy more harm than good. Accordingly I have directed immediate abandonment of all controls over wages, salaries, and prices.

HARRY S. TRUMAN, November 9, 1946

These people who say we should throw out price controls and rent controls are wrong. They are just as wrong now as they were back in 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN, June 14, 1951

[We are indebted for the juxtaposition to the Mansfield, Ohio, News-Journal.]

The Freeman invites contributions to this column, and will pay \$2 for each quotation published. If an item is sent in by more than one person, the one from whom it is first received will be paid. To facilitate verification, the sender should give the title of the periodical or book from which the item is taken, with the exact date if the source is a periodical and the publication year and page number if it is a book. Quotations should be brief. They can not be returned or acknowledged.

THE EDITORS

Our Avant Garde Illiterates

By EDWARD DAHLBERG

THERE is no more unlettered writer than the naturalistic novelist; in the name of bread, reason and enlightenment he has created a humdrum cage for simians. Garnett, the critic, once said that the Oscar Wilde trial had set English poetry back fifty years; the retarding influence of Zola's "La Terre" and "Germinal" on American literature has been even more disastrous.

The American naturalist, whose fount is Zola, is prurient, and his *homo economicus* is inert and without will; his anti-hero is a mediocre, fatalistic Colossus governed by the dreary wage god of economic determinism. This god employs the shears of Atropos, Greek Necessity, with the same sadistic violence that Popeye uses to cut up kittens in Faulkner's "Sanctuary." Environment, poverty and wanton, wart-like illiteracy are the nemesis and the fate of the Popeye anti-hero. In the Faulkner and Caldwell fiction there is no difference between the sick stupidity of the protagonist and that of the author. It was Gauguin who said that when the washerwoman in a Zola novel spoke, Zola wrote as she talked, and that when she ceased speaking, Zola still wrote like the washerwoman.

The American Popeye-hero is impotent, and the Popeye Faulkner novelist is a medieval corn-cob poet of everyday banalities that have a Rasputin odor. The product of the Popeye school of writing is a black, corrupt sacrament of bread and violence, a decayed, sham saviorism. Faulkner, the Nobel Prize winner, gives us a diseased world, a moldy poor white class—and all in the name of truth and humanity. His idols recall the dog-relics which, according to Gorki, the Russian monks used to sell to ignorant peasants as the sacred remains of a saint. There is neither health nor sun in Faulkner, and his readers are compelled to witness the spectacle of fetid, dying people who are dour and wicked. There is no wit, or good ripe bawd, in him as ease or balm for the suffering, ailing mind. The ear is never quieted by the "faint sound of the trumpet of justice" coming from a Georgia cracker's ram's horn. Horus is the Egyptian god of writing and of the moon, but Faulkner's novels are moon-madness unworthy of Horus, and his language is a ruined and half-lost speech like the abc divisions of "she," "he" and "I," the characters in "The Sound and the Fury."

Faulkner never bothered to learn how to write, as is evident in his amateur child-cult primitivism,—"Twilight ran in like a violet dog"—or in that guttering infantile anthropomorphism in the "bearded watching trees" or the "sourceless . . . suspirant . . . moon." The baby cult speech quickly passes over into nausea and the impotency obses-

sion. Faulkner's desiccated Taliaferro in "Mosquitoes" looks like an "extracted tooth," Jennie has "soft, wormlike fingers," and Cecily Saunders an "epicene chin and sexless knees." Faulkner's Januarius Jones contemplates his beloved with "yellow eyes, warm and clear as urine."

THERE is that nihilistic, ungovernable nausea in all the naturalistic or Marxist novelists who write with a pen that is a muckrake. Frank Norris's intellectual retching is plagiarized from Dr. Swift. The rodents in "Gulliver's Travels" are the results of hopeless, cruel revulsion against human flesh. When Gulliver returns home he faints when his wife kisses him, and he reels with queasiness as his son touches the bread on the table with his fingers. Swift regarded sex as abominable, and Norris in "McTeague" had the same misogynistic qualms; for when that ugly bulk of stupor, the quack dentist, McTeague, looks at the young, delicate Trina Sieppe, her hair reminds him of ordure. After Trina has left his ursine, suety arms, she goes home, opening the door just as her mother is setting the mouse traps. Dr. Swift was at least a man of honest letters and recognized his malady no less than Thoreau, who did not even like the sex habits of cabbages. But Norris and the other American naturalistic novelists have no comparable self-knowledge.

Dostoevski was very troubled about human odors: In "The Brothers Karamazov," Christian Aloysha has real atheistical misgivings when he confronts Father Zossima's corpse. The odor of decay is hard evidence to refute, and those who depend entirely upon the evidence of their noses are likely to lose their reason, for as Thoreau (whose Puritan olfactories were much too agile and precise) said, "The imagination is wounded long before the conscience." Poor Aloysha Karamazov, who tries desperately to heal the injury done to his spirit, sits on the tomb of a saint whose body was said to have given off the remarkably good fragrance of a budding lemon branch.

There is no budding lemon-branch fragrance in the American naturalistic novelists; sadism and revulsion and communism have one miserable, cankered skin. Erskine Caldwell was a gifted, picaresque necrophile in his first book, "American Earth." This early Caldwell book is a Georgia cracker prose-poem on fungused trees, an infected, puce-colored evening sky, a dismembered hand, an amputated leg. Later on Caldwell made a Marxist proletarian rite of his corpse-lust, trying to palm off as communistic compassion a scene in which hogs devour an oppressed Negro sharecropper's

throat. Miss Josephine Herbst, a sensitive author, writes of the sickness in the novel "where the worms are stroked with loving."

Hemingway, too, has always been swinging a sacramental gore-censer in such books as "Death in the Afternoon," "Green Hills of Africa" and "A Farewell to Arms." The constant Hemingway quest has been for horror, crime, war and cataclysm; whether he is shooting a doe or acting as a spectator of the Spanish civil war, he always stresses his fierce martial olfactories. Hemingway betrays the exquisite, murdering scent of the animal pursuing prey. His passion is best characterized by a Mexican insurrectionist in Azuela's "Underdogs" who shouts, "Villa, Carranza, Obregon! What do I care, so long as it is the revolution!" Or by Herzen, the Russian revolutionary who cries, "Long live destruction!"

Hemingway can not write sharply unless a man is shooting an elephant or performing a caesarian operation with a jackknife. He has no intellectual virility and is a slack gawk in an amorous scene, of which there are many to attest to this debility in "A Farewell to Arms" and in his most recent book, "Across the River and Into the Trees." But Hemingway can break the slim flowing neck of a kudu in a firm, thrusting sentence, or cause an Indian to slash his throat with a razor in a remorseless, compressed phrase. He can paint the willowy quiver of a deer, or the Goya-like wound of a gored horse with Caligulan art. He is the most artistic assassin in the literature business.

Frank Norris's successors, Faulkner, Hemingway, Caldwell, for all their avowed social purposes, are vandals who pour bile upon nature, the human seed, women. Hatred of women is dominant in Faulkner; this is wantonly revealed in "Sanctuary" by Popeye, who ravishes Temple Drake with a cornucob. The Faulkner males are traumatic impotents who commit violence for erotic shock, very similar to Poe's wan Roderick Usher, the ancestor of the satanic ballerina male of today. Practically every Poe tale is about a feminine male who fears the "gigantic volition" of a Ligeia, a Madeleine Usher, or a Berenice. Every marriage bed in Poe is a catafalque. Baudelaire, who prayed to Edgar Poe before beginning to write, thought of sexuality as the lyricism of the masses—a revealing commentary on both Poe and Baudelaire.

UNDERNEATH the naturalistic novelist's text is the beast: Norris, Faulkner, Caldwell, Hemingway, have the same brute undercrust. The main fault with these writers is not a lack of talent; it is niggard character. Nietzsche said that creating is self-willing. Faulkner is a will-less artist whose words are made up of the paste and blood out of which the Aztec god of war was composed. Faulkner, like the others, has never had enough volition to educate his gift; he is an unlettered monk with the most sadistic medieval superstitions. The Faulkner gothic shocker is set for a Faustian drama, but across the stage stalks not Mephisto

but Mickey Mouse—the "Colossus of the little," to use Wyndham Lewis's phrase.

Another in the brute tradition is James T. Farrell. Farrell's Studs Lonigan has the same sickness as Popeye, for how can Lonigan be a real stud in Farrell's unpigmented prose? As for Farrell's later books, the reader is tempted to ask: Why is it that when an author writes the same book often he acquires a reputation? Maybe, as Samuel Butler once surmised, dullness is so much further advanced than genius because it is so much better organized.

The mediocrity fetish was also strong in Dreiser, the erotica business writer whose books remind one of the Mt. Kisco mansion he built to look like a Log Cabin Syrup can. It was Dreiser who, after visiting the Tolstoy home at Yasnaya Polyana and seeing nothing on the shelves but almanacs, said that even he had read more than Tolstoy.

FAULKNER and Hemingway are disciples of Sherwood Anderson, who on alternate days worshipped the literary baby prose of Gertrude Stein's "Melantha." The primer grammar sentences of Anderson and Hemingway (born of a mixture of the McGuffey readers and Stein) are the signs of infantile preoccupations. A poet does not have to write his confessions; his style betrays him. Kierkegaard once said that genius is sin; if so, then our American naturalistic novelists don't know how to commit it. In the Aztec religion the goddess of justice is a woman and a serpent, but there is no serpent knowledge of women in the American artist. The lack of such knowledge is traditional; it dates back to Melville, Poe and Whitman. Whitman's "Leaves of Grass," a remarkable manifesto on physiology, is an erotic Shaker poem composed by a celibate. When Mrs. Gilchrist, widow of the celebrated William Blake biographer, suggested coming to America to be near the good, gray poet, he shook with fear!

Melville's "Moby Dick" is satanism washed in the innocent blood of the lamb. Ahab is not wicked; he is fissured, lonely, like the whole *Pequod* crew crying out for the marriage-pillows that were never to be theirs. The only hymeneal in "Moby Dick" is the "wedlock" friendship between Queequeg and Ishmael, and though this reminds us of the love Hamlet has for Horatio, Queequeg is such a virgin cannibal that he has to crawl under the bed to put on his shoes because Ishmael is present. "Billy Budd," Melville's last work, is as epicene as the name suggests. Indeed, an almost exclusive male friendship was dominant in nineteenth-century America; it was not Melville's Plymouth Rock marriage to Elizabeth Shaw but his affection for Hawthorne that mattered; Whitman's circle were men, and though Henry Adams went to Samoa for the "mulatto lily," his real affinity was for John Hay and Clarence King.

In the Old Testament Jehovah is Father, male morals and anger, but our authors believe in the feminine ethics of "smite me on the other cheek!"

Sherwood Anderson is the apostle of Whitman's semi-female conception of Christ. In "Many Mariages" there is no difference between Christ and Mary, and John Webster stands nude before the two images, Jesus and the Virgin. Anderson brooded a good deal over his masculine nature, and Wyndham Lewis once assured him that he was as manly as anybody else. Anderson must have had a deep fear of his own nature, as the story "Hands" in "Winesburg, Ohio" shows. In "Hands" Wing Biddlebaum, a school teacher, is driven out of an Ohio town because his affection for the little boys in his class is misunderstood. Wing's hands had to be hidden from himself because they reminded him of that dark Bible sin of Ham. This is a very teachable American fable, for now that most of the manual arts are extinct, what will the American do with his hands?

The image of Christ as a meek and maidenly milksop is dominant in Anderson and in other Americans who followed after him. For example, Nathaniel West in "Miss Lonely Hearts" writes that Jesus is a maiden, and the boys in a mock Catholic sacrament buy a lamb and torture the poor bleating thing to death. Skipping to England for the moment, we notice that the same maiden-Christ image is in the D. H. Lawrence novels; in Lawrence masculine art decays considerably. It is true that Lawrence introduces into his tales a rooster, a fine and dandy cockcomb whose phallical crowing leaves no doubt as to his gender. But only the rooster crows in Lawrence; the human males make no such virile celebration.

Ezra Pound demanded a male art, the male verb, which Huysmans had asserted was the central force of the sentence. There is much to be said for a hard, stratified, exterior sentence. The greatest enemy of the imagist poet was the adjective which so mothers the noun as to emasculate it. There is that kind of mothering adjective in Hart Crane, and in the early books of Waldo Frank, "City Block" and "Rahab." The objectivists, begun by Louis Zukofsky, the learned poet, demanded the craggy, obsidian line, which should have been the paradigm for such wanton satyrs as Dreiser, Crane, Frank and Rosenfeld.

DON'T be duped by the national plaint that the American people is a new people. We are an old race, with seasoned vices more antique than the Pharoahs' or the Amorites'. The American is more concerned with time and space than with man; he finds the European man-tragedy archaic. In Poe locality takes the place of being; and Melville is a geographer. "We are the 'first' last people," writes Charles Olson in "Call Me Ishmael."

The old parent orthodoxy is abhorrent to the Atlantic mind. Pound, detesting the Judaic-Christian "Thou shalt not," which is Father-Fear, broke the mosaic tablets for American poetry. It is this "fear," writes William Carlos Williams, "that drives us to the homosexual out of dread of our fathers." This fear has corroded and ruined the

American novel; our novelists can not write of passion, only of the senses. To make the difference clear, let us recall that Herbert Read makes a lucid distinction ("Phases of English Poetry") between passion and the senses. Lawrence, a poet of the senses, weighs sensation like a shrewd exacting hedonist belonging to the school of Wilde, Pater, Gide, the Greek votaries of male love.

How different from this sort of epicureanism is Chaucer's verse: "Her mouth was sweet as bragot." (Bragot was a beverage made of honey and ale.) It is this direct male spirit of Chaucer that the artist must recover; if he does not, we are doomed to a continuing succession of novels for the bored city Gothics and the pretty he-darlings of Gommorah.

From Our Readers

The Stages of Surrender

I am quite desirous to see how the *Freeman* will treat the surrender to Red China. I now see that as soon as it was secretly communicated to Trygve Lie that MacArthur would be removed (for addressing the Chinese as defeated and for stating to Joe Martin that China should be defeated by the usual military methods), Lie, on April 6, issued a statement that the UN's appeasing offer of January 15, 1951 (ending that a seat in the UN for Red China and the disposition of Formosa would be decided by UN formula—by a committee consisting of Red China, the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States and another, presumably India) would be the future policy of the UN.

That is, Lie told the world that the declaration of aggression had been repudiated, and that the above loaded committee method would be used by the UN to get Red China into the UN and give her Formosa, provided China would permit a "cease-fire."

Marshall and Acheson used the MacArthur Hearings continually to address Red China to the same effect. They did so repeatedly. No matter what Acheson said about . . . Formosa and U. S. policy, he always ended with the statement that Formosa should be disposed of by the UN (which meant according to the loaded UN committee formula of January 15, and the USSR readily grasped that). Regarding the seat in the UN, Acheson of course left that to the UN, but Lie had already named the loaded committee method. Marshall made it clear to the Communists that no genuine attempt would be made to defeat them, denying the power to the U. S. to drive Red China's very inferior forces (inferior in combat quality) from Korea. Acheson stated the sole objective to be the 38th Parallel. Ridgway, in Tokyo, stated, as he was doubtless told to do, that to reach the 38th Parallel would be "a tremendous victory."

Bradley, Collins and Vandenberg also apparently

testified as they were told to do—to support Marshall and Acheson.

Malik's oracular hint was arranged through Trygve Lie. Then Ambassador Kirk, in the manner of a defeated nation's agent, hurriedly sought Gromyko for directions. Marshall, obeying Gromyko, had Ridgway seek an armistice, if the Communists might "wish" to give him one. For 39 hours this offer was broadcast, advertising to all East Asia (where there are many radio receivers) that the U. S. was pleading for cessation of hostilities. Then the Communists changed the appointed place so the U. S. would have to come to them, and in a bored way, named ten to fifteen days.

The sum of it all is that the U. S. appears to be surrendering to Red China. The fact of surrender will be evident as time goes on. The Marshall-Acheson axis prevailed over MacArthur, as stated, using the MacArthur Hearings as the means of offering U. S. surrender to communism.

The question remains: what will MacArthur now do?

Mexico, Missouri

DAVID A. ROBERTSON

A Fictitious Issue

Whatever the merits and circumstances of the dismissal of General MacArthur, it is worthy of note that the opponents of the General and/or his policies are relying largely, to justify their position, on the fictitious issue as to whether the civilian or military establishment is to reign supreme in the Land of the Free. However, this issue does not exist in the United States. It would arise only if there were even the wildest—or mildest—conceivable possibility that the "military" would at any time attempt to seize power in the country.

Such things have, indeed, happened before. They happened in Poland and Hungary and in Nazi Germany, in France and Italy, in Spain, Portugal and some South American countries. But even his worst enemies do not suggest that MacArthur is a Pilsudski, a Horthy, or a Hitler. The danger, if any, would appear to be the other way round. Yet such is the power of catch phrases that the argument is not only advanced, but listened to. Incidentally, in dismissing MacArthur, President Truman was acting in his capacity as Commander in Chief, which, after all, is no civilian rank or title, and the Secretary of Defense who presumably advised him was a general.

Realizing that the unprecedented popular demonstrations welcoming MacArthur were not only extended to the man and hero but also endorsed the ideas inseparable from him, his opponents adopted the subterfuge of implying that the welcome was only for the warrior home from the fray. President Truman, realizing that nobody would listen to his planned speech on that day, nobly retired "to leave the day to MacArthur." Such tact is touching, all the more so since it is not in character.

One reads slimy "regrets" at the "unavoidable humiliation" of the General—as if a MacArthur

could be "humiliated" by the condoners of a Hiss.

It is consoling to note that General MacArthur committed himself to fade away only as an "old soldier." For he is much more than a standard-bearer. He is a *standard*.

New York City

H. C. FURSTENWALDE

The Impractical UN

Fortunately for humanity, the United Nations Organization is not the world's only hope for peace, in spite of the protestations of the adherents who still so regard it. On the contrary, the UN idea is probably among the least practical that could be devised, human nature being what it is. We may yet recognize the virtues of a policy of minding our own business, looking after our own selfish—yes, selfish—interests, and returning to the standards of morality and ethics which guided our conduct of foreign affairs in times past.

However, since the UNers still hold power; since they can't seem to grasp the idea of attaining their announced peaceful objectives by practical means; and since, with the blindness of those who will not see, they remain oblivious to the dismal failures of their dream baby and will never willingly yield to the proponents of a more sensible policy, I suggest it would be appropriate to have inscribed over the main entrance of the United Nations building these words of Dante:

"All Hope Abandon, Ye Who Enter Here."

Delta, Utah

RICHARD S. MORRISON

Recommended to Legislators

May I compliment you on William Henry Chamberlin's article, "Fallacies About Communism" (the *Freeman*, July 2)? If possible, this should be sent to every open-minded editorial department in the United States for copy, as it is much needed by far too many people who still do not know how to combat communism. This article does a job, and I wish that the 6000-odd legislators in the United States could read it.

Chicago, Illinois

HARLEY L. CLARKE

Midsummer Madness

Literary and political notes, July 1951:

". . . 'A Violent Innocence' . . . is a higgledy-piggledy book about a seemingly higgledy-piggledy upbringing."

John Chamberlain, the *Freeman*, July 16

"The Higgledy-Piggledy Nature of Bertrand Russell," article by Hugh Stevenson Tigner

the *Freeman*, July 16

"Nevertheless, the book [Senator Kefauver's] has much of the appalling, higgledy-piggledy, grimly humorous American cinema quality of the hearings. . . ."

Lewis Gannett, *New York Herald Tribune*, July 12

New York City

J. V. JONES

a Hiss.
acArthur
an "old
standard-
ENWALDE



A REVIEWER'S NOTEBOOK

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

ions Or-
or peace,
ents who
idea is
could be
We may
minding
elfish—
e stand-
our con-
r; since
ng their
means;
will not
ures of
ield to
suggest
ver the
g these

If anyone really wants to know what has made America tick, let him read "Miracle at Kitty Hawk: The Letters of Wilbur and Orville Wright," edited by Fred C. Kelly (Farrar, Straus and Young, \$6). Strung together with commentary by Mr. Kelly, these letters are eloquent reminders that the way to get creative results out of human beings is to leave them alone. The airplane could hardly have come into being in an economy or a nation that was even so much as fifteen per cent "planned"; a mere couple of years spent in compulsory universal military training, for example, would have so disrupted the intimate and intricate collaboration of the Wright brothers that they never would have discovered the principles that underlie successful human flight. Let General Marshall, Mrs. Roosevelt and other proponents of compulsory peacetime "national service" take note.

RRISON

amber-
(the
e sent
in the
ed by
ow to
and I
United

ARKE

ledy-
gledy

ly 16

rand

y 16

er's]

ledy,

the

ork

12

INES

The Wright brothers had virtually nothing by way of promising substance when they started thinking about gliding through the air. They had no "capital" beyond their small Dayton, Ohio, bicycle shop, which provided them with a barely sufficient living. They had no formal education beyond high school; indeed, Wilbur Wright never bothered to pick up his high school diploma. What they did have was uncoerced possession of their own time and energy, plus an environment that enabled them to follow where their curiosity led them. The pragmatic results of such freedom may have made wars more extensive and more horrible than they might otherwise have been. But who can read these letters of the Wright brothers and doubt that it is *laissez faire*, not state planning, that has permitted America to keep ahead of coerced societies both in the arts of peace and in the creation and elaboration of complex and winning instruments of war?

The double portrait that emerges from Mr. Kelly's collection of Wright letters is most remarkable. Neither brother could have invented the airplane singly. Orville Wright had a little the edge on Wilbur in the importance of suggestions offered. It was Orville who first thought of the basic principle of presenting the right and left wings of the plane at different angles to the wind for lateral balance. But it was Wilbur who first hit upon the practical device of warping the wings. The one brother invariably picked up where the other left off. Wilbur, in the early years, seems to have been the better businessman of the two. But after Wilbur's death from typhoid in his mid-forties Orville proved to

be just as shrewd in practical affairs as his older brother had been; it seems that he had merely deferred to Wilbur in the matter of business judgment because of a kid brother's natural reluctance to put himself forward. In any case, nobody ever rooked either of the Wright brothers out of anything no matter which one was taking charge of things. They dealt successfully with governments, with patent offices, with military men, with litigious patent infringers, and with all manner of leeches and scoundrels. If it is the normal fate of the inventor to be mulcted of his product, the Wright brothers were certainly exceptions to the rule.

The Wrights carried their understanding about proper energy relationships into spheres that normally baffle those of a purely mechanical turn of mind. At one point their good friend Octave Chanute, himself a profound student of gliding, offered to help bear the expense of the Wright brothers' experiments. But the Wrights refused to accept the money "because," as Wilbur put it, "we would be led to neglect our regular business too much if the expense of experimenting did not exercise a salutary effect on the time devoted to [the experiments.]" "Creative" individuals who insist that society has a duty to support them while they are busy creating will probably be nonplussed by the Wright brothers' attitude. For here were a couple of "creators" who didn't need the help of government grants and who stood ready to pay their own way. The Wright brothers did get aid in carrying out their experiments; a Dayton bank president named Mr. Huffman let them use his pasture for practice flights. But that was all the tangible outside help the Wrights received. The total cost of their first successful power plane, the one that flew at Kitty Hawk in 1903, was less than \$1000, which the Wrights took out of their own bicycle shop business.

As is usually the case with something drastically new, human beings everywhere were slow to grasp the significance of what the Wright brothers did when they put the first power plane into the air. The city editor of the hometown *Dayton Journal* didn't think a flight of less than one minute worth recording. But the Board of Ordnance and Fortification of the U. S. Army exhibited the real obtuseness. As late as October 19, 1905, this Board was answering letters from the Wright brothers which proved the inability of an army captain to read simple English. To stir even rudimentary curiosity

about their product in Washington the Wrights had to carry on a long series of dickers with European governments. Finally it began to penetrate the bureaucratic mind that the plane might be a useful instrument for war purposes. Since bureaucrats can not afford to make mistakes with the taxpayers' money, it is not to be argued that the U. S. Army should have rushed to take the Wright invention without ample investigation of its potentialities. On the other hand, it should never be asserted by anybody that invention itself should be put under the control of governments. For state control is an absolutely foolproof way of stopping primary scientific innovation in its tracks.

"Miracle at Kitty Hawk" deserves the widest possible reading. But one could wish that Fred C. Kelly, the editor, had seen fit to point the anti-Statist moral of the tale. One could also wish that someone, sometime, would make a philosophical study of what constituted the society of Dayton, Ohio, in 1903. In a short span of time this town in the American midlands produced the world's first plane, the automobile self-starter and a number of other innovations and inventions. There was something in the atmosphere of the place that released human energy and called forth human ingenuity. What was it? If social "scientists" were really scientific (which they are not) they would get busy and find out.

THE TERRIBLE ILLUSION

The Burned Bramble, by Manès Sperber. Translated by Constantine Fitzgibbon. New York: Doubleday. \$3.95

The burned bramble, says the author in a preliminary legend, is consumed root and branch, although it was once a mighty beacon and refuge against the night and cold. It is now nothing but ashes and people live in misery around it, but witnesses are forced by the new masters and their serfs to testify to its lasting fires and the beneficence of its heat; and they are killed for denying that it still burns. Humanity's task, say the voices that still dare to speak, is to find a new bush, the one that this time will blaze forever, although the people say they are weary of these endless quests. Thus Mr. Sperber, in his beginning.

The novel itself is a searching story, by turns violent and philosophical, of European communism in the years dominated by Hitler. The hero is Herbert Soennecke, head of the German Communist Party and, until the Nazis took over, a Reichstag deputy. He and two of his lieutenants, Vasso and Doino, bear the weight of the book, and the score of minor characters completes the author's intention to show what manner of men these leaders were, how they compared with the European intellectuals of other faiths, why they made the decisions they did, and how they came to ruin. Scenes

of pursuit and rapid action alternate with long discussions among the Communist leaders and a whole gallery of the opposition, so a wide variety of opinions is presented—Catholic, Socialist, Nazi, bourgeois, professorial, grass roots—and the paradoxes, assertions, and dialectics buzz endlessly around the heads of the characters. Since this loquacity appears to be immanent among the intellectuals of the movement, the author could scarcely have written his novel without offering large doses of it; but such is the facility with which proofs are made and unmade that there is often more breathlessness than spirit in the debates.

Sperber is unmistakably writing this book after a total immersion in his subject. The details of the apparatus, its signs and passwords, its infiltration of the Gestapo and vice versa, the doublings and twistings of men on the run, the secret meetings, the doubts and the resolutions of doubts, fill out the pictures of other accounts in fiction and history of the underground and its methods. But these, while exciting, are not the most difficult things for a practiced writer to describe. What is more difficult to make clear is the theme of this story, the account of the Revolution betrayed. What went wrong, Sperber asks himself, as have the other devoted ones who came to leave the party and lived to write about it.

Here are two dramatic summarizing scenes. In the first Soennecke has finally been arrested in Russia, having survived Hitler's goon squads and having kept the cadres of the party going despite all the Gestapo could do. His interrogator, who himself has just returned from a forced labor camp in Siberia, tells Soennecke that if the Nazis had killed him the Russians would have named a town after him, a steel works, a school, and hundreds of streets, but Soennecke lived to dispute at long last some of the fatal decisions made in Russia and now it is his turn to be liquidated. The party, says his interrogator who wants him to sign one of the groveling, self-accusing confessions of having been leagued with Hitler, plotting to kill Stalin, and committing many other fantasies, can acknowledge no mistakes. When it does make mistakes, as it must, sacrifices have to be found to expiate the errors the party can not officially commit. Soennecke, however, will not sign anything, although other methods of persuasion are used, including bringing his children to plead with him. He refuses to announce his fake depravity to the thousands of men who believed in him, and in this at least he triumphs over the savagery of the party.

In the second scene Vasso, who has also been arrested, is interrogated by a former student who is now secretary to the Leader himself. The secretary explains—and his voice is the voice of Stalin—that the old order of revolution has changed, that only one thing counts now and that is power. The former revolutionaries are automatic mutineers against this new concept, which maintains that the masses under present conditions can never capture power but that they can be captured without revo-

lutions by the Red Army. Vasso declines to accept his party's offer—in his case to return to his country to lead the rebuilding of the party—and he is shot. Before this happens, though, his former student's sympathy for him almost shakes his determination, the accents of pity and friendship being stronger than pain and fear.

Doino, the last of the three leaders, survives to live quietly for a time of spiritual recovery with his old university professor but not to speak out, for that would give aid to the Francos and Hitlers who were still to be conquered. With returning strength he will begin his labors again, but under what banner is left undetermined.

It is a well-constructed and powerful novel despite its tendencies to wordiness. The story's powers are undoubtedly stepped up manyfold for those who shared the dogmas and emotions of Mr. Sperber and his companions. It is perfectly clear to them why the sacrifices of the common people in the wars of the bourgeois countries are meaningless, and it is also clear to them why many of their number have had to be sacrificed in the struggle for the future earthly paradise. But why did the party have to destroy its own, the men who came bloody and torn from the wars in its behalf, the men who led the struggle toward the burning bramble and who wanted it to blaze for all time and for all humanity? The answer can not occur to revolutionaries; nevertheless, it should be recorded that even at the beginning of the Revolution there were those who saw past the imaginary bushes to the killings and the innumerable brutal means being used for the tender ends. Terror was a trusted weapon of Lenin's before it became Stalin's, and the true bramble of Mr. Sperber's legend never existed, even in the years of Bolshevik innocence. Sperber's book reflects the power of the myth and his disillusion, from neither of which he is wholly free.

The translation is an especially good one, giving the book no trace of its foreign origins.

EUGENE DAVIDSON

GOOD ORE

Comstock Bonanza, collected and edited by Duncan Emrich. New York: Vanguard. \$3.75

Duncan Emrich is no stranger to those who collect Americana, and readers of his earlier: "It's An Old Wild West Custom" will find even richer ore in this book. He is the perfect editorial explorer, for he has the exuberance and patience of those whose indelible trail he is bent on rediscovering.

The writers he gathers together are for the most part those journalists who wrote and had their being in and around the great silver ridges of Nevada three quarters of a century ago. The air and accent of the mining camp: the lusty raucousness, the courage, the bold adventure, live again in these vital pages.

The Comstock Lode, Virginia City—the names still evoke the image of John Mackay and Jim Fair flinging away their last silver dollar with a shout: "Let's go down like gentlemen without a cent in our pockets." Here Fred H. Hart, whose humor enlivens the selections reprinted from his "Sazerac Lying Club," aroused Mackay's indignation by referring to his partner as "Slippery Jim" in the course of an editorial in *The Territorial Enterprise*, of which Hart was the short-lived editor. He had too irrepressible a tendency to editorialize his private, unflattering opinions, as when he titled another outburst "The Alta Steal," although the Alta Mining Co. was among his best customers.

Tact was not part of Hart's makeup. He was kin to the character in his "Story of an Ear," who told his wife that she had an ear like a shell. All might have been well but for her probing as to what kind of shell, which necessitated his answer: "Abalone." And the storm still might not have broken if there had not been a "Condensed Treatise of Conchology" on the parlor table, in which she looked the abalone up, and found its size therein described as about that of a wagon wheel.

Another *Enterprise* contributor was James W. Gally, who wrote for many of the famous West Coast papers. Mr. Emrich is the first to reprint him since his death sixty years ago. He is proud of his "discovery," and rightly so, for Gally's vivid and witty "Big Jack Small" is a little masterpiece. So is "Hualapi," a whodunit that for suspense and atmosphere can take place with the best.

Gally is a word-artist of rank; his eye is true, his pen is the tool of a poet. It is surprising that temporary oblivion should have been the lot of so excellent a writer, though of course literary history has parallels to offer. But fame is kind to the children of the muses, and soon or late is bound to take up their trail again.

Another star of the Emrich literary rodeo is J. Ross Browne, Irish-born and smitten with wanderlust. His "Etchings of a Whaling Cruise" antedated Melville's "Moby Dick" by five years and was known to Melville. Similarly, his "Peep at Washoe" and "Washoe Revisited," which are among the delights of the present volume, foreshadowed Mark Twain's "Roughing It." Mr. Emrich also credits Browne's "Yusef or a Voyage of the Frangi" with having influenced "Innocents Abroad."

Joseph T. Goodman, discoverer of Mark Twain, is not left out. Owner of the *Territorial Enterprise*, he was the first to hire the youthful Clemens as a reporter. He it was, too, who first printed those rollicking hexameters of Bret Harte's "Stage Driver's Story." His own "Virginia City" served as a kind of "theme song" of the period and might have been seen hanging framed in many a Nevada home and office.

Then there is Dan de Quille, Twain's protégé and colleague whose "Snowshoe Thompson" preserves the memory of one of the greatest of those pioneers without whose staunchness and generosity of spirit

this country could not have come into being. The Norwegian, John A. Thompson, in de Quille's words:

was one of those unfortunate persons whose lot in life it is to do a great deal of work and endure many hardships for very little pay. For twenty winters he carried the mails across the Sierra Nevada Mountains on showshoes, at times when they could have been transported in no other way.

The Washington politicians suffered Thompson to work without contract or pay and in the end gave the contract to another man. With his own oxen Thompson kept the roads open for this man, and when he failed Thompson took once more to his snowshoes and never received a dime for it. Read this story and learn once again of the magnificence of the human spirit.

Listen to "that strong American, calm and humorous in the hardest struggles," the bull puncher, Jack Small:

What I'd like to be shore of is this yere: Kin an American citizen die, when his time comes, satisfied that he leaves a republic behind what'll continue as it was laid out to; an' that he's goin' to sech a country as his mother thought she was goin' to. Now them's two of the biggest pints in Ameriky.

A good book for these times. May it have wide reading.

MADELINE MASON

HOW STRONG IS RUSSIA?

Russia's Soviet Economy, by Harry Schwartz.
New York: Prentice-Hall. \$6.65

When a nation blocks the normal channels of communication between its people and those of other countries, listening posts spring up. A listening post is a man or group, who, denied the opportunity for travel, first-hand observation and contact with primary sources of information, seeks to substitute for them the books, magazines, newspapers, official reports and speeches obtainable from within the curtained area. From these, in the manner of a jigsaw puzzler, the listening post builds up a picture of the obscured regions. In essence, a listening post is a military intelligence operation carried on by scholars or journalists for purposes of general enlightenment.

One of the most assiduous of listening posts concerned with the Soviet Union today is Professor Harry Schwartz, economist of Syracuse University and regular contributor to the *New York Times*. In the *Times*, his many items are a sane and healthy antidote to the naive, misleading and frequently trivial dispatches that paper receives from its censor-bound Moscow correspondent. This book, which the publishers describe as "the only comprehensive, up-to-date survey on the Soviet economy available in English," is also a product of his listening.

Unfortunately for Professor Schwartz, and all other listening posts attuned to Moscow, the theory of the listening post has a serious flaw. The theory

assumes that what is written and said within the Soviet Union is, at least, basically factual. But the fact is that those who enjoy the privileges of public utterance there are not only engaged in lying to the outside world, they also double-talk each other. Thus conclusions put together outside the blocked area are subject to an indeterminable quantity of error.

Refreshingly, Professor Schwartz clearly recognizes the nature of the flaw, and confesses his inability to measure its size accurately. He quotes official figures on industrial production and development, and warns us that these are probably higher than the truth. But how much higher, he frankly can not say. On the basis of some two years of personal, but severely limited, observation during the years 1945-1947, I incline to the belief that Professor Schwartz, cautious as he is, has somewhat overestimated the Soviet Union's rate of development, and its present productive capacity.

Granted that the Soviet Union would ultimately have achieved the atom bomb, we know now that not only did it obtain basic theoretical information through its espionage agents, but also a blueprint of the mechanism of the bomb itself. A nation relying on spies for its technological progress, soon or late must find itself at a fatal disadvantage.

In these times of bellicose tensions, overestimation, rather than underestimation, is certainly the safer course to follow. Even so, on the basis of Professor Schwartz's compilations, when the maximum Soviet figures are compared to minimum U. S. figures, this table emerges:

Commodity	Unit	U.S.	USSR
Coal	Mil. Metric tons	433	260.6
Pig Iron	" " "	49	19-20
Steel	" " "	71	25-27
Petroleum	" " "	252	37.5
Electric Power	Billion kwh	291	90.3
Motor Vehicles	Million units	6.2	4

When he turns to Soviet agriculture, Professor Schwartz becomes more abrupt and incisive in dismissing official Soviet data as untrustworthy. In what is without doubt the most clearheaded and comprehensive analysis of this phase of Soviet economy, he points out that the Soviet Union is subject to very large crop fluctuations because of weather; that mechanization alone is not the answer to greater production, but the skill with which farm machinery is employed; that big farms, by themselves, are not necessarily efficient ones. Despite the tragic price in lives paid for collectivization, and despite the fact that in 1949 some 40 million metric tons more grain was produced than in 1913, the last normal year of the Tsarist regime, Soviet agriculture has in fact failed to keep abreast of population growth. The Soviet Union lives on its grain crop. In 1913, production equalled about 3.80 pounds per inhabitant per day. In 1949, the figure was 3.60 pounds. More than that, 1949 was, weather-wise, a good crop year.

In dealing with the Soviet labor force, and its

living standard, Professor Schwartz has devised a formula for reducing ruble wages—the money which Soviet workers receive for their labor—into “food rubles” which measure what these wage rubles will buy. Applying this formula to wage scales between 1928 and 1948, he shows that the real wages of the Soviet worker have shrunk by nearly two-thirds—from an index figure of 703 to 250.5—in the twenty years of enforced industrialization. Russians are a patient, police-ridden people. But the question which must bemuse Stalin, as it would the West, is how patient?

Professor Schwartz is meticulous in detailing the laws and practices by which the worker is chained to his machine. But, I think, he kisses off the extent of slave labor a little too brusquely, because, he says, “of the great paucity of basic information.” But no one, except of course Communists and their perniciously “liberal” fringe, can disagree with his statement that “state compulsion is an important element in all Soviet labor relations, and . . . the difference between ‘free’ and ‘unfree’ workers there is one of degree rather than necessarily of kind.”

Professor Schwartz's book is, as the publishers bill it, comprehensive. But it has another value for our times. Since the beginning of the winter reverses in Korea our so-called leaders, both in Washington and at Lake Success, have trembled in fear of the Soviet Union. What Professor Schwartz shows is that, by all the yardsticks of power, there is far more real reason for timidity in the Kremlin than in the White House. Relentless exploitation of that fact is the key to peace, and should be the foundation of policy.

CRAIG THOMPSON

CALVINIST BELIEVER IN ZION

Jerusalem Calling!, by Pierre van Paassen. New York: Dial Press. \$3.00

In “Jerusalem Calling!” Pierre van Paassen has written a peculiar book. It begins with a history of the Jews, their development of monotheism and their ancient journey to the Holy City. The author then traces the great religious events which are associated with Jerusalem, including the teachings of the Hebrew prophets, the advent of Jesus and the growth of Christianity, and finally the rebirth of a Jewish state in Israel. He moves next to a consideration of the current political problems of the new state. In the last section of his book Mr. van Paassen discusses the crisis in East-West relations and the danger of another world war.

The transition is, clearly, from the sublimity of religious history to the most sordid details of world power politics. It's a curious mixture for one book, but Mr. van Paassen brings it off well enough and with considerable interest for the general reader as well as the specialist in religion or politics. Much of this interest is sustained by Mr. van Paassen's own fervor and moral power, not unlike that of the

Hebrew prophets he admires and whose stories he sympathetically tells.

Mr. van Paassen has several interests which arouse his deepest emotions and evoke some eloquent writing. First, he wants to make religion more than a matter of belief and ritual; he wants to make it a social force for economic and political progress. This at once raises the specter of the obtuse “peace-loving,” fellow-traveling theologian who sees Stalin as the leader of the “true” Christians. This is not Mr. van Paassen's kind of religion or theology. He knows what Stalinism is, and he never confuses it with anything even remotely resembling religion or democracy. He is, rather, an anti-Communist leftist who thinks continuing poverty and degradation one of totalitarianism's instruments for further weakening democracy.

Long a Zionist, Mr. van Paassen asserts that in the rebirth of Israel “the Watchman of Israel, the Holy One Himself, is at work in history.” You will seldom find such fervent Zionism or such laudatory statements about the Jewish people, their past and their potentialities in Israel, even in the writings of the most ardent Zionists and Jewish spokesmen. “In Israel,” he says, “will live a prophet people, a people that, small as it is, will raise its voice in the councils of the nations for justice and humanity because it has itself been so long a victim of injustice and inhumanity . . .” This sort of faith can prove embarrassing in the real world of compromise and bargaining, where things are shades of gray, rather than pure black and white.

While “Jerusalem Calling!” thus has a slightly otherworldly tone in spots, it is on the whole a book about the Holy City in the world of men and women on this earth. Though deeply religious, Mr. van Paassen is no salesman of the cheap “religious” cures that you can find in the best-sellers of those professional healers who are known as “popularizers” and “humanizers” of religion.

MORROE BERGER

THE UNREGIMENTED HEART

These are the things that shall remain:

A boy and his dog in a country lane;
Fawn-brown Jerseys in purple clover
Where bees drift by and suns drift over;
Buds that travel up from the root
Toward the journey's-end of the sunny fruit;
Clouds that tower like a citadel
Where the rainbows and the lightnings dwell;
The corn that grows despite the crow;
The full moon churning the tides to snow;
Lovers who wander two-by-two
In the ancient tryst that is always new. . . .

*The dullards fashion their Master Plan—
Always ignoring the heart of man.*

E. MERRILL ROOT

~~50,000~~

~~60,000~~

~~70,000~~

~~80,000~~

~~95,000~~

~~110,000~~

150,000
COPIES SOLD

... and orders are still pouring in for

Free Men
vs.
The Union Closed Shop

By DONALD RICHBERG

The demand for copies of this eight-page supplement have far exceeded our expectations and the supply of our second printing is near exhaustion. You will want copies to send to friends, associates, and employees in order that they may better understand the dangers whenever an overbalance of power is vested in the hands of any labor leader. Order your copies NOW!

the FREEMAN

Dept. R

240 Madison Avenue

New York 16, New York

PRICE LIST

Single copy	.10
12 copies	1.00
100 copies	8.00
Larger quantities	.07 per copy

AP
F86
V. 1
no. 2

Ed
PUBLIS