

1950

A Freedom Forum Presentation: What Is Socialism?

James D. Bales

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Comparative Politics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bales, James D., "A Freedom Forum Presentation: What Is Socialism?" (1950). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 488.
http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/488

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU. For more information, please contact dc@acu.edu.

A
Freedom Forum
PRESENTATION...



WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

by

Dr. James D. Bales

Professor of Christian Doctrine, Harding College

Presented to Freedom Forum

Searcy, Arkansas 72143

Distributed By
THE NATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
American Heritage Center
Harding College Campus
SEARCY, ARKANSAS 72143

FOREWORD

For more than 20 years the National Education Program has been recognized as outstanding in the development of American citizenship materials and tools. Its Freedom Forums have drawn thousands of thought-leaders to Searcy for week-long seminars designed to prepare citizen leadership capable of upholding our basic American ideals and resisting the expanding power of international Socialism and Communism.

Americans are living today in one of the most decisive periods in history. Many thoughtful observers believe the actions of the United States in this 1960 decade will decide the fate of mankind for centuries. Without committing a single division to military action, the Soviet Union has extended its reach onto every continent, and the United States to a dangerous degree now is encircled. Within our nation the trend toward centralized government continues. The decisions determining the course we shall take in the critical days ahead are to be made by American citizens. Shall these momentous decisions be made through ignorance, apathy and inactivity, or through informed, intelligent citizenship actions?

This is a grave challenge laid upon the shoulders of every American. Will we accept it in the spirit of our founding fathers, or will we default? The American people have the inherent capacity to meet the challenge. But most of them are presently inadequately informed or misinformed on the merits of the issues involved. That is why they are apathetic.

We must reach them with facts, stimulation and inspiration.

Dr. George S. Benson, President
The National Education Program

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

By Dr. James D. Bales

Freedom Forum, Searcy, Arkansas

Socialism is far more than just an economic system. It is a world view which includes a particular concept of human nature, of morality, and of the nature and function of government. We shall give several definitions of it and then show how it works in practice. Some of the things which are true about Socialism are also true about all governments. Socialism is *total government*; and thus it shares certain features with *limited government*. Thus one may agree with Socialists on certain matters without being a Socialist. It is also true that some people may want what the Socialists want, in the way of government, and yet not be Socialists in philosophy. Then, too, it is likely that there are more people who are Socialists in our country who do not wear the name Socialist than there are who claim the name.

Definitions

In a Socialist journal Robert V. Daniels said, "Accordingly, I take as my general working definition of socialism, 'any theory or practice of social control over economic activity.'

"This definition is purposely vague. It embraces any degree of social control in the economy, from the U. S. Post Office to the completely nationalized economy of the USSR. It covers both state socialism and non-state (cooperatives, syndicalism, etc.). It permits democratic as well as dictatorial forms of political control."¹

Social control means governmental or political control. R. N. Carew Hunt said of socialism and communism that: "The essence of both is that the means of production should be in the exclusive control of the organized community. As, however, no one has yet discovered how the community can control these resources, they are administered on its behalf by the State, or by such bodies as it may appoint for the purpose. Hence public ownership comes in practice to mean State Capitalism, of which soviet Socialism is simply the most ruthless and consistent version."²

As a part of the statement which the Fabians adopted in 1919, and which was to be signed by its members, said: "It therefore aims at the reorganization of Society by the emancipation of Land and Industrial Capital from individual ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit. In this way only can the natural and acquired advantages of the country be equitably shared by the whole people.

"The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land, with equitable consideration of established expectations, and due provision as to the tenure of the home and the homestead; for the transfer to the community, by constitutional methods, of all such industries as can be conducted socially; and for the establishment, as the governing consideration in the regulation of production, distribution and service, of the common good instead of private profit.

"The Society is a constituent of the Labour Party and of the International Socialist Congress; but it takes part freely in all constitutional movements, social, economic and political, which can be guided towards its own objects."³

Oscar Jaszi regarded socialism as the all inclusive term under which communism is a special variant. To him, socialism involved an entire way of life. Thus in his article on socialism, he wrote: "For the purposes of this article, therefore, the definition of Socialism must embrace the characteristics common to all these ideologies throughout

history and to the organized socialist movements of the more recent period. These are: first, a condemnation of the existing political and social order as unjust; second, an advocacy of a new order consistent with moral values; third, a belief that this ideal is realizable; fourth, a conviction that the immorality of the established order is traceable not to a fixed world order or to the unchanging nature of man but to corrupt institutions; fifth, a program of action leading to the ideal through a fundamental remodeling of human nature or of institutions or both; and, sixth, a revolutionary will to carry out this program. The fact can scarcely be over-emphasized that no true socialist is satisfied with merely economic reforms but advocates also a distinct educational, ethical and aesthetic policy."⁴

Socialism Is An International Movement

Norman Thomas, who for decades has been Mr. Socialist in the United States, wrote that: "Socialism, theoretically, at least, insists on a comradeship of the workers which transcends racial or nationalist lines. It is therefore international in outlook."⁵ In line with this the Fabians wrote: "Further, Socialism is international in tradition and sentiment. The appeal to popular jealousy of the foreigner jars on the Socialist instead of exciting him. Neither Mr. Chamberlain nor Lord Rosebery would be received in a congress of English Socialists as cordially as M. Jaures or Herr August Bebel."⁶

We do not believe that jealousy or suspicion of foreigners should be cultivated. However, we do believe that patriotism is a good thing. The attitude of these socialists toward internationalism, and their anti-capitalism, can help explain why some groups in America which work for the preservation and improvement of capitalism, and the revival of patriotism, are opposed by some socialists and smeared as being extremely radical rightwingers, or ultrarightists.⁷

We cannot see that it is a contribution to our security nor to the world for individuals to decry a healthy nationalism in a world

in which even a rabid nationalism is on the rise. For the United States to undermine its own autonomy at the time when some fanatical, anti-American nationalists are coming to power in several countries hardly seems reasonable.

The Socialists, however, have more than once found that national feelings override so-called class comradeship. Thus Norman Thomas wrote: "In practice, as Paul-Henri Spaak once observed, the first thing socialists have learned to nationalize was socialism. For that fact there are many explanations which serve as good excuses if not justification."⁸

Since socialism is usually a form of internationalism, it is not surprising that such Socialists will work with Socialists of other nations to further socialism; and to change their own government if it is not a Socialist government. Their allegiance is to an international movement. Such Socialists oppose patriotism when and if it hinders international socialism.

Communism represents a form of socialism and of internationalism. Socialists believe that communism is on the right track in so far as abolishing free enterprise, national sovereignty, and patriotism are concerned. They think that the Communists have committed certain excesses, and have been wrong about certain matters, but the Communists have made the basic change from which all other changes follow. This change is the change from the private property system to socialism in the production and distribution of goods, of banking, of the communication media, and such like. Since they believe that the change of the economic system changes the nature of man, they believe that communism will get over its excesses and become the type of socialism which they believe in. Thus Socialists who are consistent with their own theories do not want it defeated, for this would be to defeat the basic change which has already been made under communism. Instead, they want its aggression by force contained until communism changes, supposedly, from within.

Socialists of this type will often be silent

concerning the crimes of communism, or will play them down, while they continually find excuses for attacking the free enterprise system.

World Government

Since their supreme loyalty is to international socialism, Socialists work for a world Socialist government. Marxian and non-Marxian Socialists are for world government. World planning, it should be obvious, will involve a World State with the power to enforce the plan. Norman Thomas, in commenting on the Russian Gosplan or State Planning Commission, said: "Ultimately we shall have to come to a world Gosplan to assure world peace and prosperity."⁹ Thus many Socialists today work for the transmutation of the UN into a World Government, contrary to the present Charter of the UN. This is the reason why they aspire to see the UN as the World Police Force with the nations of the world disarmed down to the domestic police level. Of course, the domestic police force would be of no value if Communists and Socialists controlled the UN.

In line with this, Erich Fromm wrote: "According to its basic principles, the aim of socialism is the abolition of national sovereignty, the abolition of any kind of armed forces, and the establishment of a commonwealth of nations."¹⁰ Such a community of nations would not need to abolish national sovereignty if they shared basic beliefs and values. And without such basic beliefs the idea of world government is a dangerous delusion.

It is not without significance that the Labour Party in Britain and the Socialist Party in America both view *The Communist Manifesto* as a classic Socialist document.¹¹

Socialism Is A Misunderstanding Of Human Nature

All socialism either states or implies that the nature of man is shaped by the economic system. Thus they believe that if one changes the economic system from private ownership to public, or state, ownership the nature of man will be changed. By establishing the cooperative Socialist system, the

nature of man will be changed so that he will be cooperative. They believe that all power in the hands of businessmen under a free enterprise system is evil. We who believe in free enterprise do not believe that all power should be concentrated in businessmen, or in labor leaders, or in government. However, Socialists believe that it is good to concentrate all economic and political power in the hands of Socialist politicians. Man's nature will be changed so that he will no longer be greedy and grasping, but will be kind and cooperative. While Socialists may believe that power tends to corrupt they do not believe that absolute power corrupts; much less corrupts absolutely. They are convinced that if you turn over all power to them, or to those of like mind, they will use the power for the good of all men. While some of them will not affirm in so many words that all power should be given to the politicians, they affirm it in effect because they want all power to be given to the State.

Although Reinhold Niebuhr has been a Socialist for decades, and thus is left of center, he did recognize that there is sin in the heart of man which cannot be explained away as simply the fault of social institutions. After all, if there is no sin in the heart of man, how could there be sin in the institutions of man? He wrote: "Rauschenbusch, in his *Theology for the Social Gospel*, devotes a chapter to 'Original Sin' in an effort to rehabilitate a doctrine which had become odious to his generation. He does this by attributing the universality of sin to the Transmission of egoistic tendencies through faulty institutions. This leads inevitably to the Marxian hope of a radical change in the evil institutions, particularly the institution of property. Rauschenbusch never took the step toward Marxism except by implication. But many of his followers did, including many of us. A few even got caught in the toils of Stalinism. They did not realize that the nationalization of property would make for a monopoly of power for the oligarchy which managed the socialized property — a monopoly of power which the capitalist oligarchs possessed in

the day when we were exercised about social injustice."¹²

The assumption that man's nature will be changed for the better by the change from capitalism to socialism underlies some of the misunderstanding by most Socialists of communism. They believe that since Russia has abolished private capitalism, and has substituted State Monopoly Capitalism (although they may not like to word it this way, this is what it is), the nature of man must change for the better. Therefore communism will mellow, and instead of trying to defeat it in the various wars which it has forced on us, we should try to keep it contained until it changes from within. In the meantime, they work for socialism in our country so that finally the two systems will meet and merge. They want the Communists to move some toward the center, and for us to move greatly to the left; finally we shall be able to embrace one another as comrades in socialism.

Related to this is the idea that industrialization begets liberalism. If this is the case, we should not be surprised at Socialists who want us to help speed up the industrialization of the USSR. Although they may not think that fat criminals are better than criminals with a low standard of living, they do believe that fat Communists are better than lean ones.

What proof is there that industrialization must lead to liberalization of the rule of government? If this hypothesis were true the less industrialized a civilization the more dictatorial its government. Industrialization cannot explain the freedom in America, for certainly our forefathers in America did not have less freedom than we because they were less industrialized. The USSR is more industrialized than Czarist Russia, but is there more liberty in that land today under the Communists than there was under Czars? Was Hitler any less than a dictator because he ruled over a highly industrialized nation?

In a Socialist publication Professor Robert Daniels said: "In point of fact, stable democracy is a product of the pre-industrial commercial societies of Western

Europe of the 17th and 18th centuries, and wherever industrialization has commenced without a *prior* liberal political base — i.e., outside of the North Atlantic community — democracy has not been able to achieve a stable existence. Far from laying the groundwork for democracy, the Soviet development has accomplished a profound bureaucratization of political and economic life.”

Those who said that a dictatorship was necessary temporarily for “primary socialist accumulation,” are now confronted with the fact that the dictatorship in the Soviet Union has persisted. “Systems of organized power can — Marx to the contrary notwithstanding — perpetuate themselves for long periods of time after the conditions which brought them into being have disappeared.”¹³

Socialism’s misunderstanding of human nature is revealed in their view that crime is bred by the private property system, and that it will more and more disappear as one has more and more socialism. Communists have maintained the same thing, but they not only have on their books laws against crimes just as we do, but they have many laws we do not have; and the death penalty is more widely prevalent in the Communist than in capitalist countries. It is demanded also in connection with what are called economic crimes. The USSR has had to admit, however, that they have not solved the problem of crime.

Socialist Sweden thought that crime, alcoholism, and such like would gradually be cured as socialism progressed in Sweden. One police official in Sweden said recently. “Those among our political leaders who thought that serious crime and other anti-social excesses would be easy to control in a modern welfare state have been bitterly disappointed. It has become increasingly clear over the past 10 years that the welfare state we live in is anything but an ideal society.’”¹⁴ Crimes of certain types, and other manifestations of immorality, are on the increase in Sweden. Sweden, however, has not yet fully ripened in socialism. It still has a heritage of freedom. As socialism

increases, however, freedom decreases.

Socialism is blind to the fact that men will work harder for themselves, for their families, and for causes in which they personally believe, than they will work for the abstraction called the State. One may not like this fact, but to attempt to build an economic system on the denial of it will not make the system productive.

Socialism does not seem to understand that men do not like for others to put something over on them; once they realize that it is being done. If they see someone else getting the same reward, although he does not really try to work, they will seek, as a general rule, the same reward for less work. If consumption has no real relationship to production, men will tend to produce as little as possible and to consume as much as possible.¹⁵ Men will tend to figure out how to get more from the government, instead of how to produce more. Instead of trying to produce a bigger economic pie, they will seek to get a larger slice of the pie which now exists.

Socialism Is An Inefficient System Of Production and Distribution

If socialism were very efficient as a system of production and distribution, the author would still oppose it because of what it does to human freedom and character. However, socialism is notoriously inefficient. Socialism is destructive of human initiative. Communists are beginning to realize this, and are trying to do something about it. However, it cannot be dealt with adequately within their system. A Communist in the USSR wrote: "The administrative methods of management which predominated for so many years have left a deep imprint on the psychology of production executives. Regulation of all aspects of economic activity, the setting of all tasks from the top, and endless consultations at the various rungs of the administrative apparatus, far from promoting initiative, tended to efface the personal responsibility of managers.

"Principles of scientific planning were often violated and elements of subjectivism,

causing disproportions between branches of the economy, slowed down the launching of new capacities.

"Material incentives too were inadequately developed to encourage people to improve the performance of their enterprise or shop or to raise the quality of output.

"Some managers, seeking at whatever cost to meet gross output targets, continued to turn out goods for which there clearly was no demand and which were bound to pile up in the warehouses.

"The new measures call for a radical improvement in management, for the use of such economic levers as cost accounting, prices, profit, credits, and more incentives for workers.

"Needless to say, economic levers will produce results only if they are properly used, if our cadres are well versed in economics. Otherwise they are apt to have a contrary effect, as, unfortunately, happened in the past."¹⁶

Another Soviet Communist recognized that there is a need for at least some of the profits to be used to reward the workers. He said: "Profit, too, will play a role. While the bulk of the profits go to the state for use in the overall interests of society, the remainder is left at the disposal of the enterprise to be used to stimulate the production efforts of its workers."

"The profit of the socialist enterprise, its net income, is the measure of its efficiency, of the benefit accruing to society from its operation. The fact that part of the profit remains at the disposal of the enterprise fully harmonizes with the objective economic laws governing socialist commodity production. Through profit the most effective use can be made also of the mechanism of material responsibility for rational organization of production and managerial endeavor."¹⁷

In Yugoslavia the need for some steps toward a market economy and competition with other countries, was indicated in the statement that: "Given a stable price structure based on balanced demand and supply and on adequate export opportunities, every

enterprise and industry will have objective conditions for efficient operation. If despite these conditions an enterprise cannot keep accumulations at the present level or even maintain its income, something must be wrong with its labor productivity and it had better not count on high prices or on subsidies. Because of its poorer quality, our bacon, for example, is sold in Britain 10 to 15 per cent cheaper than Danish bacon. In Vienna and Munich, our fruit sells 10 to 20 per cent cheaper than Italian fruit because of its poor quality and packing. Many of our machines and other manufactured goods also sell 10 to 20 per cent cheaper because their design is obsolete or their quality lower. This shows the real value of our goods, and artificial prices at home will get us nowhere — they will only breed errors and imbalances.”¹⁸

These things do not mean that they have turned to free enterprise; but they do indicate some of the inherent weakness of socialism, and the fact that they are being forced to at least tinker with their system in an effort to try to make it productive.

In writing against collectivism, Walter Lippmann said: “We have renounced the wisdom of the ages to embrace the errors the ages have discarded. The road whereby mankind has advanced in knowledge, in the mastery of nature, in unity, and in personal security has lain through a progressive emancipation from the bondage of authority, monopoly, and special privilege. It has been through the release of human energy that men have lifted themselves above the primeval struggle for the bare necessities of existence; it has been by the removal of constraints that they have been able to adapt themselves to the life of great societies; it has been by the disestablishment of privilege that men have risen from the status of slaves, serfs, and subjects to that of free men inviolate in the ways of the spirit.

“And how else, when we pause to ponder the matter, can the human race advance except by the emancipation of more and more individuals in ever-widening circles of activity? How can new ideas be conceived?

How can new relationships, new habits, be formed? Only by increasing freedom to think, to argue, to debate, to make mistakes, to learn from those mistakes, to explore and occasionally to discover, to be adventurous and enterprising, can change be more than the routine of a recurrent pattern."

"This was the faith of the men who made the modern world. Renaissance, Reformation, Declaration of the Rights of Man, Industrial Revolution, National Unification — all were conceived and led by men who regarded themselves as emancipators. One and all these were movements to disestablish authority. It was the energy released by this progressive emancipation which invented, wrought, and made available to mankind all that it counts as good in modern civilization. No government planned, no political authority directed, the material progress of the past four centuries, or the increasing humanity which has accompanied it. It was by the stupendous liberation of the minds and spirits and conduct of men that a world-wide exchange of goods and services and ideas was promoted, and it was in this invigorating and sustaining environment that petty principalities coalesced into great commonwealths.

"What reason, then, is there for thinking that in the second half of the nineteenth century the tested method of human progress suddenly became obsolete, and henceforth it is only by more authority, not by more emancipation, that mankind can advance? The patent fact is that soon after the intellectual leaders of the modern world abandoned the method of freedom the world moved into a era of intensified national rivalry, culminating in the Great War, and of intensified domestic struggle which has racked all nations and reduced some to a condition where there are assassination, massacre, persecution, and the ravaging of armed bands such as have not been known in the western world for at least two centuries.

"We belong to a generation that has lost its way. Unable to develop the great truths which it inherited from the emancipators,

it has returned to the heresies of absolutism, authority, and the domination of men by men. Against these ideas the progressive spirit of the western world is one long, increasing protest."¹⁹

Socialism, by its governmentally planned economy, destroys the freedom of men to dream their dreams; and deprives them of the wherewithal to venture and to try to make their dreams come true.

Socialism is unproductive because instead of trying to produce more, it encourages the tendency of the people to look to the government as the source of wealth. It also encourages them to try to figure out ways of getting something from the government, instead of ways to produce more.

The unproductiveness of socialism is seen in the shortages in Cuba, in the USSR and other fully — or almost fully — socialized economies. Burma, now under socialism, has a shortage in Rangoon, for example, of local foodstuff which was once plentiful. In the USSR where around two or three per cent of the farm land is permitted to be farmed privately, there is produced around forty per cent of the potatoes, vegetables, milk, and meat.²⁰

Myth That More Complicated A Thing Is The Easier For A Few Bureaucrats To Run It

Socialism is the myth that the more complicated something is, the easier it is for a few individuals to run it. This is the assumption which underlies the oft-heard statement that our Constitution, and the free enterprise system, were good enough for an agrarian and uncomplicated society which our forefathers knew, but that today society is so complex that the free enterprise system and the Constitution have been antiquated. What we need, therefore, in the words of Senator Fulbright, is more Presidential power.²¹ The President is supposedly the only one who is good enough and wise enough to know how to run everything.

As a matter of fact, the more complicated a system is, the more impossible it is for a few individuals to run it. As the liberal Walter Lippmann has pointed out, "There is no possibility, then, that men can under-

stand the whole process of their social existence."²² "The thinker, as he sits in his study drawing his plans for the direction of society, will do no thinking if his breakfast has not been produced for him by a social process which is beyond his detailed comprehension. . . . But the intricacy of one breakfast, if every process that brought it to the table had deliberately to be planned, would be beyond the understanding of any mind. Only because he can count upon an infinitely complex system of working routines can a man eat his breakfast and then think about a new social order."²³ And yet in America an abundant breakfast is on the table each morning as a result of the countless decisions made by a multitude of individuals and without the direction and control of a central planning bureau.

Omnipotence, Omniscience, And All Goodness

Socialism is the myth that one can marry omniscience, omnipotence, and all goodness. They believe that if one gives all power into the hands of the rulers these men will possess all knowledge and all goodness so that they will not merely be good enough to work for the welfare of all, but also will know enough to do it. As Walter Lippmann once put it, concerning the assumption that the rulers will be able to combine all power and all knowledge, "any government is composed of mortal men," and "it is evident that there must be limits to the degree in which a social order can be planned and deliberately administered." Regardless of whether the rulers are elected, or inherited the position, or took it by force, they "are men, and so their powers are limited." They are neither all powerful nor all knowing.²⁴ As a matter of fact, to repeat a quotation, Lippmann said: "But the intricacy of one breakfast, if every process that brought it to the table had deliberately to be planned, would be beyond the understanding of any mind."²⁵

Even if the planners achieved the impossible, and were all knowing and all powerful, who is to assure us that they will be good enough — or that their successors will be good enough — to use this power and

knowledge unselfishly instead of selfishly?

Socialism is the myth that under socialism all politicians are unselfish individuals who will work for the welfare of the people. A survey once showed that some of the same people, who thought that businessmen could run business better than could the politicians, thought that the government could run business better than the businessmen. Are politicians politicians only on the local or state level, but cease to be politicians just because they go to the central government in Washington? If they are utterly unselfish, and work only for the good of the people, are they transformed into business experts just because they have gone to Washington?

Socialism Is A System Which Tends To Lower Morality

Socialism claims to be a system which is more moral than capitalism. It maintains that capitalism is competitive while socialism is cooperative. This assumes that competition is immoral and that socialism gets rid of competition. Are sports wrong because they are competitive? While the author thinks the ideal type of competition is to better one's own record, and not to aim to defeat someone else, it is not wrong to try to do a better job, a more efficient job, to be more productive, than someone else. When we do this, others benefit; regardless of how selfish may be the motive of such a competitor as he tries to excel.

Socialism does not eliminate competition. Under it men compete with one another for state aid; and for the favor of those who control jobs, purse strings, and advancement. One cannot get rid of undesirable types of competition by changing from free enterprise to State monopoly capitalism. Furthermore, socialism on a governmental scale, in contrast with small voluntary groups, is not a system of cooperation but of coercion. The people must be forced to obey the planners when they will not yield to persuasion. The planners with their varying plans must have the police to force the people, whose lives have been planned by the planners, to conform to the plans.

Do you think they will long continue to persuade when they have the power to force conformity? Some think they want the power, but not in order to use it. Why else do they want the power than to use it when and if they deem necessary? Capitalism has a multitude of voluntary plans and associations, and if a person does not like one he can go to another. But where can one go in the total state where one's life is planned by the planners who have the police power to enforce their plans? Socialism becomes the coercive state which turns from persuasion and moral principles to naked as well as gloved force.

Socialism lowers the moral tone of society by minimizing individual responsibility. Although he was a Socialist, Albert Einstein recognized that "Communities tend to be guided less than individuals by conscience and a sense of responsibility."²⁶ Men, none of whom as individuals would take your property, will combine as the Socialist state and vote to take your property.

By discouraging individual responsibility socialism discourages helping men to help themselves. Socialism thinks that money can cure the basic ills of man if one just spreads enough of it around. And yet Einstein said: "I am absolutely convinced that no wealth in the world can help humanity forward, even in the hands of the most devoted worker in this cause. The example of great and pure personages is the only thing that can lead us to fine ideas and noble deeds. Money only appeals to selfishness and always irresistibly tempts its owners to abuse it.

"Can anyone imagine Moses, Jesus or Gandhi armed with the money-bags of Carnegie?"²⁷ Socialism says that the State should seize the money-bags and let the politicians distribute it according to their own will. There is nothing wrong with money itself, although some people get it in wrong ways and use it for wrong purposes.

Socialism discourages individual responsibility and encourages parasitism. The apostle Paul said that if a man will not work, neither should he eat. (II Thess.

3:10) But under socialism or the Welfare State it is permissible for a man to quit his job and to be fed by the community. The community is forced to do it by the State. Of course, the time may come when there is not enough food to eat because too many are becoming parasites. And then the iron hand of the dictator will force the people to work when, where, and as long as he pleases. Einstein maintained that: ". . . I most seriously believe that one does people the best service by giving them some elevating work to do and thus indirectly elevating them."²⁸ While socialism wants to mail them a check whether they will work or not, capitalism as the most productive system known to man provides the largest possible number of jobs which makes it possible for men to have the greatest amount of work available.

It is a lower moral system in that it confuses means and ends. They seem to think if the ends are good, the means which they use must be right. The means advocated by the Socialist is the concentration of all power in the federal government. This supposedly will bring about the desired end of a society of peace and prosperity. If you are opposed to their means, they assume that you are opposed to the ends they want; that is, a peaceful and prosperous society. If, for example, you are opposed to their way of looking after the aged, education, and everything else in society; you are against the old, you are against education; you are, in other words, a cruel, heartless, selfish brute.²⁹

Socialism tends to lower morality in that it encourages man in his tendency to minimize his duties while magnifying his rights. "In *Attitudes toward History*, Kenneth Burke tells of an episode in the Assembly at the time of the French Revolution: 'When a "bill of rights" was being drawn, some members of the Assembly suggested that a "bill of obligations" be included to match them. The proposal was voted down by an overwhelming majority.'"³⁰

Even a Socialist, Frederick Harrison said: "Duty is always plain; right is a verbal mystification. A man can always and every-

where do his duty. He seldom can get his supposed rights without trampling on the rights of others. Men wrangle incessantly as to rights. They easily agree as to duties. The performance of duty is always ennobling, a moral, a religious act. The struggle for rights calls out all the passions of self and of combat." While duty may not always be plain, socialism does emphasize the idea that such and such have rights, and that society must guarantee them everything from cradle to grave. This leads men to overlook their duties and concentrate on getting their rights. But rights imply that others have duties toward us — if they do, we also have duties.

Lying and cheating tend to become a way of life, as the planners bind heavier burdens and the people become more and more desperate. Surprisingly enough there are some in Communist societies who recognize this and on occasions have an opportunity to speak out. Professor Ota Sik in Prague has depicted something of this situation in the publication *Hospodarske Noviny*. He pointed out that the central planners were inflexible, that conflict raged between the planners and the planned, and that interest in the quality of the end-product was lost. He was critical of "bureaucrats who think more of their position and their power to decide on every trifling detail" than they did of anything else. He asks: "Why should central bodies demand detailed operational plans, which are then sent back to the enterprise concerned as binding directives with arbitrarily increased quotas regardless of local conditions?" "These central boards invariably assume that enterprises always keep some hidden reserves untapped, anyway — which encourages plants to hide as much as they can. The result is a struggle, with all concerned bargaining and cheating."³¹

Socialism Is The Police Or Garrison State

Socialism is the illusion that the overwhelming majority are not able to direct properly their own lives within the general framework of constitutional government and the free enterprise system. The few elite in

government should control their lives. The fundamental assumption in all socialistic or collectivistic systems is, as Walter Lippmann pointed out, that "government with its instruments of coercion must, by commanding the people how they shall live, direct the course of civilization and fix the shape of things to come. They believe in what Mr. Stuart Chase accurately describes as 'the overhead planning and control of economic activity.'" This, of course, means the planning by the government, and the control of human beings since economic activity does not exist in a vacuum but consists of the activities of people. As Lippman observed, if one does not accept this view of things, he is viewed as "a moss-back, a reactionary, at best an amiable eccentric swimming hopelessly against the tide."³²

Socialism is a mania for planning and controlling the lives of men. Although there are some who have been converted to socialism as a theory, without realizing what it involves; and although there are others who have rationalized their desire to control others so that they think that they are working only for the good of others, socialism is a mania for controlling the lives of men. This desire, of course, may be manifested in other systems than in socialism, and in these systems it helps pave the way for socialism. This desire is strongly operative in the lives of some, while not very strong or not present at all in the lives of others. To illustrate, in our country today the financing of education is an ever present problem. Are most of the politicians interested in the financing of education or in the control of education? They are interested in financing it in such a way that they can control education. Take one simple demonstration of this fact. I have five children in private schools. In addition to the tax which I pay to support the public schools, but which I do not utilize, I pay tuition to support my children in private schools. Congress had the opportunity, and can have the opportunity any time it so wills, to vote on whether or not to give me and others a tax write-off on the amount

or a portion of the amount which we pay each year, in addition to our taxes, for the education of our children. They have not done so; and they will not do so unless they think that doing so will keep them in office longer. Instead, they increase our taxes, so that they can have "Federal Funds" — a misnomer for taxes taken from the people — to give Federal aid to education. If I had a tax write-off, then they could not control this money. But through the taxation process, they can not only control the money, and control to the extent they deem possible the educational system itself, but they can always deduct some of the taxes after they get to Washington for whatever other purposes they desire. Their aim is to control education, and not just to aid it. They aid it in order to control. There may be some exceptions in the cases where a few may not really understand what is going on; or vote this way for other selfish reasons.

Socialism, when in full bloom, is the Garrison State because it is not a system of planning a small, or even a considerable, portion of life called economic activity. It is a system of planning the lives of people. Not only is this true because people are the ones who engage in economic activity, but also because economic activity is a vital part of our entire life and is affected by everything else and it effects everything else.

Although there are unselfish individuals who have been duped by socialism, the Socialists who aspire to governmental positions and power have usually used socialism as a rationalization of their desire for power. As Paul Avrich in a review of *Political Heretics* by Max Nomad, a radical, pointed out, amongst the Socialists, Communists, anarchists, and syndicalists there have been "but few unsullied servants of the people." "The chief beneficiary of almost every design for a new social order is not the common man, says Nomad, but a new privileged aristocracy. . ." Those who got power were intoxicated by it; and there is no guarantee that those who did not get power would not also have been intoxicated

by it.³³ Walter Lippmann said: "Throughout this book I have maintained that the active contenders for power in the modern world are engaged in an indecisive, and, therefore, an incessant struggle for supremacy because at bottom they all believe the same thing: that by the exercise of their own unlimited authority they can make themselves secure and that by the coercive direction of human affairs they can shape the destiny of great societies."³⁴

"This is the cardinal heresy of the modern generation. I call it heresy because it rejects the supremacy of equal law and proclaims the supremacy of particular men. The idea of arbitrary power exercised at the willful discretion of any man is alien to the very conception of a civilized society. It is the legalism of the barbarian, and the instinctive political philosophy of all who have not been disciplined to, or are in reaction against, the usages of civilization. For every man, until he has been taught differently, is predisposed to believe that what he wills should have the force of law."³⁵

Socialism Is Governmentally-Decreed Conformity

Socialism is the society of conformity. The planned society must be one in which the plans are carried out; but if the plans are carried out, people must conform to the pattern established by the governmental bureaucracy and their freedom to dissent and to work apart from the plan must be denied. The planning at the best is too complicated to be done successfully; and certainly a wide variety of ends, purposes, and plans cannot be tolerated. As Lippmann observed, variety must give way to uniformity.³⁶ In the Socialist government in Britain in the 1940's it was suggested that having a wide variety of cheese was too wasteful; and, of course, it took too much planning to decide how much of a wide variety to make available; for who knows exactly how many people want a certain variety, and for how long.³⁷

Socialism Is Reactionary

Socialists accuse conservatives of being reactionary, of wanting to turn the clock

back, of wanting to return to the "good old days." Constitutional conservatives, however, want to make progress through continuing in those principles which have brought such great freedom and progress in the past. On the other hand, the Socialists are the reactionaries for they want to go back to the total state. Most of the history of man has been the history of the domination of the life of man by the all-powerful state. Free enterprise and constitutional government have existed but for a short time on the clock of history. The Socialist is really turning his back on that which is progressive and returning to that which is repressive.

Socialism Is Anti-Labor

Although socialism claims to speak in the name of and for the laboring man, in reality it is a system of forced labor. To the degree that the country is socialized to that degree labor is coerced by the government. The Socialist government in England, after World War II, did not plan to coerce labor but before they were turned out of office they had introduced the principle of industrial conscription in that the government was given the power to direct labor.³⁸

Socialism is anti-labor in that it makes impossible free labor unions which represent the workers. As Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. pointed out: "The trade union movement is as clearly indigenous to the capitalist system as the corporation itself, and it has no particular meaning apart from that system. In a Socialist society its functions are radically transformed: it becomes, not a free labor movement, but a labor front. Even in England, as Sir Walter Citrine remarked on joining the Coal Board, strikes can no longer be trade union instruments in a nationalized industry. Unions inevitably become organs for disciplining the workers, not for representing them."³⁹

Socialism is anti-labor in that the employer is the State. This employer has not only all economic power but also the police power to enforce his will. And a strike against the State can be labeled treason if the State so desires.

One of the examples which shows that socialism, or the welfare state, does tend toward forced labor is revealed in our own country, which is not yet a Socialist government but has adopted many Socialist measures and is on the road to socialism. Today millions of citizens are forced, without compensation, to work for the government as tax collectors. Although they are not paid, they can be imprisoned if they do not collect taxes for the government. In this way, the Government not only forces the employer to work without compensation, but the Government also tends to escape the responsibility for the fact that the wage received by the employer is not as high as it would be otherwise. The worker tends to think of his wage as being what he actually gets, and not what it was before taxes were deducted. If the worker had to dig down in his pocket and return to the government money after he had already received and spent his salary, he likely would be more conscious of the need to keep the government from getting more and more of his salary.

Socialism Produces The Intimidated Society

To the extent that socialism — or state control of the lives of the people — grows, to that extent the government is more and more able to intimidate the people. The society which is becoming increasingly socialistic is a society with so many laws, rules, and regulations that no one can know all of them. It is doubtful that any one lawyer, or anyone in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, knows all of the income tax laws; to take but one area. Under socialism there are so many rules and regulations, that no one citizen can be acquainted with all of them, and every citizen sooner or later violates some of them; either consciously or unconsciously. Thus the citizens are at the mercy of bureaucrats. If for any reason a bureaucrat gets it in for one, or wants to make an example of one in order to further intimidate others, if his authority is sufficient he can conduct with a fine-toothed comb an investigation of one's life. He can find what law has been violated. He can

then prosecute the citizen.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue itself already has both the authority, the machinery, and the power, to harass an innocent citizen for months and years if it so wills. And for one to say that there have been no such cases is to be blind both to human nature and to actual cases.

Columnists, such as Jack Anderson, have spoken of "A New and Frightening Trend: Intimidation by Government."⁴⁰ By the mere threat of investigation, the Federal Communications Commission, for example, contributed to a slump in the stock of A.T. & T. "to a two-year low in a market that overall has soared to alltime highs."⁴¹

With the government becoming more and more the source of orders for many businesses, the threat of a cancellation of contracts can intimidate many businessmen. Since these things are true in America where we still have freedom, what would it be under full-bloom socialism?

Socialism Is The Society Of Snoopers

In our free enterprise system, there are far more than enough snoopers. The bureaucrats will pay informers to tell whether or not others are keeping the regulations. Informers, with reference to income tax evasion, are paid in this country today; what will it be like as the bureaucrats assume more and more control of our incomes and our lives? The Big Brother of 1984 may not be too far off. *The U. S. News & World Report* for May 16, 1966 reported that snooping by government is increasing, and our privacy is being constantly challenged by government.

Socialism Can Soften Up A Society For Communism

Regardless of what the intentions of Socialists may be, more than once socialism has helped soften up a society for a takeover by communism. It has not been, as Ivor Thomas pointed out with concrete illustrations, a barrier to communism.⁴² Winston Churchill indicated the same thing.⁴³ Communists maintain that socialism is a basic step to communism;⁴⁴ and thus they now work for socialism in non-Communist countries.⁴⁵ G. D. H. Cole, one

of the top Socialists in the Fabian Society in Britain, stated that there was much common ground between Socialists and Communists and that they ought to cooperate against capitalism.⁴⁶ Norman Thomas for decades has cooperated in various projects with Communists, either directly or indirectly; even though he has criticized Communists from time to time.⁴⁷

Socialism softens the attitude of Socialists toward communism. They both believe in the governmental control of the lives of the people; and they both believe that the change of the economic system changes the nature of man. This does not mean that they may not oppose one another from time to time. This they may do, as Walter Lippmann has pointed out, even though they have the same basic position that "the government with its instruments of coercion must, by commanding the people how they shall live, direct the course of civilization and fix the shape of things to come."⁴⁸

Socialism Is A Destiny Which Can Be Reached By More Than One Road

Some do not seem to realize that socialism may be reached by more than one road; and that the road does not even have to be labeled "a road to socialism." First, socialism can be reached through the violent seizure of power. Second, socialism can come through gradualism as measure after measure is voted for by the people. Third, socialism can come through a misguided compassion which thinks that the way to solves human ills is through more governmental power. Fourth, socialism can come through a war on poverty. Vincent P. Rock, in the liberal Phoenix Papers which reveal many illusions concerning communism and how to deal with it, wrote concerning the stomach theory of communism: "The idea that 'poverty breeds communism' is largely an accident of history. Poverty — and an attempt to overcome it through the mechanism of the state — breeds authoritarianism, and communism happens presently to be the most popular form of authoritarian system."⁴⁹ Fifth, socialism can come through the gradual encroachment of the govern-

ment on the rights of the people. This can be furthered by judicial interpretations. Sixth, socialism can come through the income tax, without any other means being used, if it becomes high enough. Some Socialists undoubtedly think that it will be better to let businessmen run business, while the Socialists and others socialize the country through socializing income. As income tax increases the people are left with less to do what they want to do, and the government is given more to do what the politicians decide should be done. Through this means, for example, they can destroy the system of private education in this country, for they can dry up the resources that people give to the private education system; or which they use to send their children to these schools. Seventh, socialism can come by default. When people cease to exercise vigilance over their government through the power of their vote; when they default on moral principles and want the State to take care of everything; when they fail to take care of their own responsibilities; when the local community fails to take care of its responsibilities; and when the States fail to take care of their responsibilities; they are inviting, as it were, the Federal Government to step in and to carry out the responsibility, and to exercise the control. Eighth, socialism can come through the greed of individuals as more and more people want to vote themselves benefits from the treasury which is fed by the dollars of the productive taxpayers.

In effect, socialism is almost unlimited trust in unlimited government. This is in contrast with our constitutional, and thus limited, government which while recognizing that government is necessary, yet does not trust it with unlimited power over the lives of the people. Socialism wants us to assume that government can be all wise, all good, all powerful, and all knowing; without at the same time being dictatorial. In fact, it cannot be all wise, all good, all powerful, and all knowing; but it is dictatorial to the extent that is socialistic.

FOOTNOTES

1. *New Politics*, Vol. I, No. 4, p. 111.
2. R. N. Carew Hunt, **The Theory and Practice of Communism**, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951, p. 5.
3. Anne Fremantle, **This Little Band of Prophets: The British Fabians**, New York: The New American Library, 1959, p. 263. See page 10 for some definitions of socialism. The Fabian coat-of-arms is a wolf in sheep's clothing. See the picture in Margaret Cole, **The Story of Fabian Socialism**, Toronto: Heinemann, 1961.
4. Oscar Jaszi, "Socialism," **Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences**, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942, Editor-in-Chief, Edwin R. A. Seligman.
5. Norman Thomas, **America's Way Out: A Program For Democracy**, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931, p. 55.
6. Fabian Tract No. 116, **Fabianism and the Fiscal Question**, London: 1904, p. 3.
7. See Irwin Sull, **The American Ultras**, New York: New America, 1962.
8. Norman Thomas in **Eugene Victor Debs**, Published by Debs Centennial Committee, Socialist Society, USA, 1956, p. 9.
9. Norman Thomas, **America's Way Out: A Program for Democracy**, p. 84. See also Thomas' chapter on "Socialism and Internationalism," pp. 231-250.
10. Erich Fromm, **Let Man Prevail**, New York: The Call Association, 1960, p. 26.
11. See the Labour Party's Centennial edition of **The Communist Manifesto** in 1948. "Socialist Reading List" circulated by the Socialist Party in 1961. Norman Thomas wrote an introduction in the 1930's to an edition of the **Manifesto**. Perhaps this accounts for the Fabian G. D. H. Cole's endorsement of violent revolution in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, **World Socialism Restated**, London: New Statesman, 1956, p. 12.
12. Reinhold Niebuhr, "Walter Rauschenbusch in Historical Perspective," **Religion In Life**, Autumn 1958, p. 33.
13. *New Politics*, Vol. I, No. 4, p. 118.
14. *U. S. News & World Report*, February 7, 1966, p. 60.

15. Ivor Thomas, **The Socialist Tragedy**, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951, p. 155.
16. **World Marxist Review**, February 1966, p. 80.
17. **World Marxist Review**, March 1966, p. 8.
18. **Information Bulletin**, No. 54, Toronto, Canada: Progress Books, September 22, 1965, pp. 26-27.
19. **The Good Society**, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1950, pp. 19-21.
20. **U. S. News & World Report**, November 18, 1963, p. 50. On Burma see **U. S. News & World Report**, May 16, 1966, pp. 116-118.
21. Stanford University Speech, July 28, 1961. Contrast the **Congressional Record**, March 4, 1949, p. 1876.
22. **The Good Society**, p. 29.
23. **Ibid.**, p. 30.
24. **Ibid.**, p. 24.
25. **Ibid.**, p. 30.
26. **The World As I See It**, New York: Covici-Griede Publishers, 1934, pp. 275-276.
27. **Ibid.**, p. 257.
28. **Ibid.**, p. 245.
29. Compare F. A. Harper, **Morals and Liberty**, Stanford, California: Institute for Humane Studies, Inc.
30. Hazard Adams, **Blake and Yeats: The Contrary Vision**, Ithica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1955, p. 127.
31. **Features and News From Behind the Iron Curtain**, March 25, 1964.
32. **The Good Society**, p. 4.
33. **The New Leader**, June 10, 1963.
34. **The Good Society**, p. 329.
35. **Ibid.**, p. 332.
36. **Ibid.**, p. 37.
37. Ivor Thomas, **The Socialist Tragedy**, pp. 130-131.
38. **Ibid.**, pp. 132-133, 138.
39. **Congressional Record**, September 26, 1961, reprint, p. 3. Compare Ivor Thomas, **op. cit.**, p. 217.

40. **Parade**, February 20, 1966, pp. 4-5.
41. **Time**, February 18, 1966, p. 92.
42. **The Socialist Tragedy**, pp. 39-77.
43. **Great Contemporaries**, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1937, p. 169.
44. Khrushchev in **Time**, February 9, 1959, p. 19; William Z. Foster, **Toward Soviet America**, New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1932, p. 269.
45. **World Marxist Review**, April 1963; June 1964, pp. 4, 10.
46. "Is There Common Ground?" **Masses and Mainstream**, July 1956, pp. 1-6.
47. See a survey of such cooperation in James D. Bales, **Americanism Under Fire**, Searcy, Arkansas: Bales Bookstore, 1965, pp. 48-60.
48. **The Good Society**, p. 4.
49. Paper No. 1, p. 129. The author seems to be using "popular" in the sense of widespread.

The **NATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM**

● **WEEKLY EDITORIAL COLUMNS**, "Looking Ahead" and "Listen Americans!" being syndicated to 3,900 publications.

● **NATIONAL PROGRAM MONTHLY LETTER** being mailed to 37,000 persons coast to coast.

● **TELEVISION PROGRAMS** "The American Adventure" and other films reach people throughout the nation.

● **MOTION PICTURES** 16mm, and **FILM-STRIPS** 35mm, reach audiences of 50,000,000. Ten full technicolor economic cartoon shorts; 13 newly revised educational films, and others.

● **LECTURE TOURS**, six speakers address approximately 350 audiences totaling at least 250,000 people per year throughout the United States and foreign countries.

● **FREEDOM FORUMS** each April develop "tools" in economics and citizenship education and attract thousands of patriotic, civic minded citizens.

F O R I N F O R M A T I O N

on any of these services or
activities write National Education
Program, Searcy, Arkansas

Copies of this timely reprint may be obtained at \$17.50 per 100, or \$150 per 1000.