

COMMENTARIES ON GOVERNMENT AND FREEDOM

by
Admiral Ben Moreell, CEC, USN (Retired)

Lecture Series to the
Staff and Students
of the Naval School, Civil Engineer Corps Officers
Port Hueneme, California

Introduction

If officially approved, I plan to deliver a series of five lectures under the auspices of CECOS.

The overall theme is that we are citizens first, then Naval officers, and lastly engineers; that we must know the character and extent of our rights and responsibilities in each of these roles if we are to preserve the structure of our free social order on which we depend for protection of our right to maximum freedom of thought and action in our legitimate pursuits.

The essence of this theme was summarized by the great modern Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset as follows:

“I wish it would dawn upon engineers that, in order to be an engineer, it is not enough to be an engineer. While they are minding their own business, history may be pulling the ground from under their feet.

“People believe modern technology more firmly established in history than all previous technologies because of its scientific foundations. But this alleged security is illusory.

“Indeed, it is just this feeling of security which is endangering Western civilization. The belief in progress, the conviction that on this level of history a major setback can no longer happen and the world will go the full length of prosperity, has loosened the rivets of human caution and flung open the gates for a new invasion of barbarism.” (*Toward a Philosophy of History*, pages 103-105.)

Ortega has thus described the issue dramatically. We are too sure of ourselves, too complacent in a time of great danger. We place too much reliance on our technical skill, our command of natural physical forces and energy, and our matchless ability to produce. Intoxicated with pride in our achievements, immersed in the interesting problems still unsolved, we have left unguarded the gates through which are pouring the destructive hordes and forces of that “new invasion of barbarism” to which Ortega referred.

The basic principles which govern the development and growth of the individual and his free institutions, are as old as civilization. Indeed, at least some of those principles had to be discovered and practiced before man could start on his long progression from a predatory animal toward the still far distant goal of human perfection. Those unchanging moral and spiritual laws, enunciated by the Creator, discovered by inspired and devout leaders of mankind, stated and restated for man's guidance through the ages, include the fixed moral absolutes of the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule.

Former President Hoover presented important commentary on this subject in his masterful address to the Centennial Convention of the Republican Party in 1956. He said:

“Human history, with its forms of governments, its revolutions, its wars, and in fact the rise and fall of nations, could be written in terms of the rise and fall of ideas implanted in the minds of men.

"In the whole world of ideas the most beneficent and dynamic force since the dawn of history has been man's quest and vigil for freedom. The ancient Greeks and Romans did much to establish this concept. But it flickered out. A spark again arose in England beginning with Runnymede and its Magna Charta.

"But the real dawn of freedom came when, after the Middle-ages, our Founding Fathers recovered the tablets of the rights of free men. They added to the text of those ancient tablets. Their genius provided safeguards for their preservation. Our forefathers established the principles of freedom so firmly that despite occasional stumblings, this Republic has had a longer life, and a prosperity for its people unmatched by any other nation in history.

"That turning of the pages of history was the fulfillment of God's purpose that the mind, spirit and enterprise of men should be free. It gave courage and hope not alone to our people. It lighted an illuminating flame to guide all the waiting and anxious men and women of the earth."

* * *

"Today the greatest issue in America and of all mankind is the encroachment of government in the mastery of their lives."

* * *

Mr. Hoover continued:

"If you face the truth that we are in a critical battle to safeguard our nation and civilization which, under God, have brought to us a life of liberty, then you will be guided step by step to restore the foundations of right thinking, of morals and faith throughout the world. Then you will issue that call to arms given by our political ancestors at your Convention of 100 years ago --- that America shall safeguard the freedom of men."

From close association with Mr. Hoover over a period of years I learned that his great fear for the safety of our Republic stemmed from the ever-accelerating growth of central government, the rapid evolution of a power-hungry colossus which, if unchecked, will eventually devour its own children!

The first step on the road to victory is to define the objective, i.e., what one ~~aims~~ **aims** to accomplish. Then a strategy is devised to achieve that purpose. Following this procedure, I have chosen as the subject of this first lecture "The Principles of the Free Society". The four lectures which follow will be delivered under these titles:

The Nature of the Crisis

The Safety of the People

Management, Automation, Freedom and Productivity

Reflections From a Rolling Stone

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE FREE SOCIETY

(9 December 1971)

A discussion of the Principles of the Free Society should include consideration of two vitally important questions: First, What are the basic Principles of our Free Republic and second, What can I, as an individual, do to assure its survival?

The over-riding issue of our day is self-disciplined individualism versus coercive collectivism. The question is whether the individual, divinely endowed with certain inalienable rights, will be permitted to exercise them freely; or, whether his life is to be ordered by the will of the majority, a majority not guided by eternal and immutable laws of right and wrong, but by currently popular political and social practices, a majority whose power is always controlled by a small group adept at political, economic and social manipulation.

The antithesis of "majority rule" is not "minority rule". Rather, it is the principle of freedom of the individual. Lincoln spoke of our Republic as "a majority held in restraint by Constitutional checks and limitations". At the center of our system is the conviction that each man has certain inherent rights which it is the duty of government to protect, so that even as a minority of one in a nation of 205 million people, he has immunities which no numerical majority may invade. Under our system, no majority has the right to impose its religion on any minority, or to impair its freedom of utterance, or to deprive it of property for private use or, if for public use, without due process of law and just compensation.

Unfortunately, in recent years, political campaigners and party platforms reveal an alarming disposition on the part of many office-seekers to sacrifice basic principles in pursuit of votes. While professing devotion to generalized concepts of God-given rights, limited government, the free market economy, and individual moral responsibility, many candidates advocate specific measures which could ultimately destroy the very freedoms they vow to defend.

Many of our time-honored concepts of government are being eroded and even discarded. We are destroying our heritage of freedom, and unless we change our ways our children will live in a society and under a government far different from that which we inherited. What can we do to stem this apparently inevitable wave of destruction? The answer may well lie in the power of public opinion!

Freedom and Public Opinion

The stability of any society depends upon the stability of its public opinion, whether for good or for evil. This is more evident in a free society where little or no attempt is made to impose opinions on the people. It is nonetheless true in a coerced society where government tries to mold public opinion by force or intimidation. So, ultimately, even under despotic governments, and in spite of the fear or apathy of the people, changes in public

opinion always precede changes in the policies and practices of government.

President Lincoln said, "Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment nothing can fail; without it nothing can succeed; consequently, he who molds public sentiment goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions."

Seventy-seven years ago the Russian philosopher, Count Tolstoy, in his essay on "Patriotism and Christianity", wrote: "The power of the government is maintained by public opinion. -- No feats of heroism are needed to achieve the greatest and most important changes in the existence of humanity -- (only) -- a change in public opinion. -- And to accomplish this change no exertions of the mind are needed. It is only needful that we should not succumb to the erroneous, already defunct, public opinion of the past which governments have induced artificially; it is only needful that each individual should say what he really feels or thinks, or at least, that he should not say what he does not think."

That statement was addressed to Czarist Russia of 1894. It applies with even more pertinence to the totalitarian state of contemporary Russia; and it is especially relevant to our own comparatively free society which currently seems irresistibly drawn into the orbit of communist ideology, even while nominally opposing Russian expansionism.

We are confronted by some crucial questions. What is the nature of that "government induced artificial public opinion" mentioned by Tolstoy which, in recent years, has been imposed on our own society? Does it conform to the concepts of the Founders of our Republic? Should we try to change it by the comparatively simple formula advanced by Tolstoy, i.e. by inducing a voluntary change in public opinion by education, indoctrination, persuasion and evangelization, or must we resort to more drastic action? Few will deny that, under the guidance of principles enunciated by our Founders, our people achieved the highest pinnacle of spiritual and material well-being of any nation in history. What were those principles and what has happened to them?

Basic Principles Of Our Constitution

Perhaps a brief examination of the history of our Republic and its institutions will provide the answers.

Before the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution with its Bill of Rights could be written, it was necessary to resolve certain basic issues, which may be summarized as follow:

Do men have inherent and inalienable rights bestowed by God, or merely privileges granted by government?

Are there universally valid and eternal moral laws, Divinely authored, or must man make shift with whatever customs or statutes happen to prevail at any given moment in history?

Are political and economic policies validated merely because they promise the achievement of a higher level of material well-being for some, at the

expense of others, without regard to the moral content of those policies or their effects on the spiritual well-being of all of us?

What is the role of government in human affairs and how do we apply ethical standards to political actions?

Does government control of the means of production create greater abundance than capital privately formed and administered and subjected to the competitive forces of the free market place?

A consideration of these issues led our political forebears to adopt certain basic principles, enunciated in the Declaration and intended to be made operative by the Constitution. They are as follow:

(1) Man derives, directly from the Creator, his rights to life, to liberty and to the means of acquiring, possessing and disposing of his property. These rights are inherent and inalienable. They are not mere privileges granted by government, subject to withdrawal at the whim of government.

(2) To deprive a man of his God-given rights is to violate the moral law. This will call forth its own penalties as does violation of any natural law.

(3) No man has a right to deprive his posterity of their God-given rights by voting away their freedom and thus condemning them to bondage.

(4) The powers of government are acquired by delegation from the individual citizens. Therefore, government can exercise with propriety only those powers which individuals first possess. Thus, neither kings nor majorities can morally lay claim to the "Divine Right to rule".

(5) Because the essence of government is power, which is exercised by fallible human beings, like you and me, governmental authority must be strictly circumscribed to make sure that the instrument forged to protect the rights of the people will not be turned against them and used to destroy those rights.

(6) To secure the blessings of liberty, we must preserve a free market for goods, services and ideas, with government acting only when necessary to protect individual rights and to prevent predatory action in the market place.

(7) Onerous and punitive taxation can lead only to destruction of economic freedom and this leads eventually to the destruction of all freedoms.

To make those concepts workable our forefathers realized that one more ingredient is essential. This was set forth by James Madison in 1787 as follows: "We rest all of our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government."

While the emphasis was on the sovereign individual, the great thinkers who shaped our institutions condemned undisciplined individualism. They emphasized freedom, because freedom accords with the laws of human nature. But they held that freedom must be exercised within the framework of the moral law, as this finds expression in such stern admonitions as the Ten Commandments, the Sermon

on the Mount and the Golden Rule. They knew that individual moral responsibility must be an integral part of individual personal privilege.

This concept was advanced by the great English statesman, Edmund Burke, as follows:

"Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put chains upon their own appetites. -- Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon the will and appetite is placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be of it without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate habits cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

In summary, the fundamental of fundamentals of the plan for living in these United States, which has become known as the "American Way of Life", was an economically independent citizenry, supporting and controlling a government so limited and confined by a written constitution that the age-old revolutionary trick of reversing this situation and enslaving the people by having the government support them, could never be pulled off in America! Thus our forebears rejected the familiar seductive scheme for a socialist "utopia" which impelled many of our people to leave their old world homes and seek freedom and opportunity in America.

The American Constitution

But this careful planning failed to take account of certain loop-holes in the Constitution which could be and, in fact, have been used by power-hungry demagogues to lead us into bondage to the State.

Our Constitution was designed to provide a government of laws, not of men. But it was not a perfect instrument. It contained flaws, some of which were noted at the time; others were discerned later. George Mason, delegate from Virginia, and author of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, which served Jefferson as a model for our own Declaration, refused to sign the Constitution because it did not abolish human slavery. Also, he believed it failed to protect individual rights adequately. The latter defect was remedied, in part at least, by the Bill of Rights, the first ten amendments to the Constitution. But the former was not remedied until we had paid for our sin by a bloody fratricidal war. The Nation still suffers grievously from that transgression.

There were other flaws in the Constitution. It left unresolved the matter of equal rights for women; a defect corrected by the 19th Amendment, in 1920. Furthermore, while the Virginia Declaration was specific in asserting the citizen's right to own, use and dispose of his honestly acquired property, our Declaration substituted an ambiguous paraphrase which proclaimed the individual's right to the "pursuit of happiness". With the passage of years, zealous humanists and political opportunists distorted this to mean "the right to happiness -- at the expense of someone else. They appear to overlook the fact that our political forebears merely asserted the right to freely pursue happiness, the responsibility for catching up with it remaining with the pursuer!

Later, real or imaginary ambiguities were detected in the wording of the general welfare clauses, the interstate commerce clause and most recently, the provision in the first amendment which prohibits Congress from making any law "respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." These alleged deficiencies have been seized upon by the Central Government in Washington as instruments for increasing its own power.

The Founding Fathers knew that political, economic, technologic and social changes are inevitable and, if the Constitution is to serve as a living code for the conduct of government, it, too, must be susceptible of orderly change. For this reason, they incorporated in the Constitution itself clearly defined procedures for amending it. But these do not include provision for "de facto" amendments by judicial or executive decisions or by judicial, legislative or executive disregard of its clearly stated provisions. The danger of these procedures was brought to our attention by Washington in his farewell address.

Nevertheless, in spite of its real and imaginary defects, which are, to a large degree, but reflections of human frailty, our Constitution stands as a bulwark of individual freedom in these United States, this "last best hope of earth". In 1878, the great British Statesman, Gladstone, stated: "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

The question arises: Does our current political behavior conform to the spirit and principles of the Constitution, or is it more closely related to the ideology of Karl Marx?

Americans are now alerted against communism, but many of our people are not alerted against, and are not condemning, the heart of the communist doctrine, which is socialism, i.e., the enhancement of political power at the expense of individual rights.

Most of us are against communist methods; we don't like communist manners, violence or threats of violence. But for many years our people have been very hospitable to the communist economic program. Politically, their elected representatives have voted more than once for collectivism. And in their attitude toward the expanding powers of government they have indicated their approval of ever larger doses of socialism by way of the doctrines laid down in the "Communist Manifesto".

Many of us who have challenged the morality and effectiveness of mis-named government "welfare measures", i.e., "political charity", have been intimidated into silence by the blatant charge that those who believe in "voluntary biblical charity" are indifferent to human suffering; that they place "property rights" above "human rights"; that they cannot be trusted to come to the aid of a brother in need!

These are unfounded accusations. Everyone of good will wants to see the needy better housed, better clothed, better fed, better educated. But he has grave doubts about the moral propriety and the effectiveness of the means to those ends which are advocated by the Welfare Staters. Santayana has said, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."* History

*From The Life of Reason

teaches that the road to collectivism and ultimate serfdom leads through the Welfare State! We have learned that governments which undertake to play the role of Robin Hood achieve power and prestige by promising to rob the rich to pay the poor. The plan is thoroughly immoral, but the practice is even worse. The promise is soon forgotten, and Robin Hood robs rich and poor alike--to pay Robin Hood!

We appear to have forgotten the old adage "whoso controls our subsistence controls us". The eminent economist and architect of West Germany's post-war economic renaissance, Wilhelm Röpke, stated: "It is hardly forgivable naiveté to believe that a State can be all-powerful in the economic sphere without being autocratic in the political and intellectual domain --. It, therefore, makes no sense to reject collectivism politically if one does not, at the same time, propose a decidedly non-socialist solution to the problems of economic and social reform."

And Professor F. A. Hayek, formerly of the University of Chicago, has cautioned, "Economic control is not merely control of a sector of human life which can be separated from the rest; it is control of the means for all our ends."

Freedom of worship is an empty thing if we are denied the financial means to erect churches, pay our clergy, print religious literature, and propagate our faith. Freedom of the press means nothing if we are deprived of the money needed to pay the personnel and to buy presses, type and newsprint. And what meaning can be attached to free speech if we know that we must speak in a certain way or else lose favor with those who control the food, clothing and shelter we need to survive?

Unless we have full freedom in the economic realm we cannot have full freedom in any other. Unless we have a society in which the producer enjoys the fruits of his labor, our freedom is impaired precisely to the degree that political exactions deprive the man who works, whether with mind or muscle, of his production.

Government and Economic Power

Where are we today? How much power over the products of our labor have we conferred upon government? The latest statistics indicate that the total tax "take" by all levels of government is in excess of 43% of the National earned income. This is a valid measure of the erosion of our freedom. Government has curtailed our liberty by almost one-half! But this takes into account only direct taxes; it does not include the hidden capital levy which results from inflation, which has been called "the cruelest tax of all" and which has had tremendous impact on our social structure.

The progressive loss of liberty in America is clearly shown by the statistics compiled by the Second Hoover Commission in 1955. In 1910 the National Government cost the average American family \$38.00 per year; in 1955 it was \$1600.00! During this same period, while the increase in population was less than double, the debt of the National Government grew from slightly over \$1 billion to \$275 billion, the number of government employees (civilians only) increased from 384,000 to 2,362,000 and the National budget grew from \$639

million to \$65 billion, or 100 times. The budget proposed for 1973 is \$249.5 billion! In the meantime, the public debt of the United States, as of December 31, 1970, was \$392 billion, or \$87 billion more than all other nations of the world combined! And the accumulation of debt by the Federal Government is accelerating, the deficit for the fiscal year 1972 being estimated at \$40 billion, the largest peacetime deficit in our history, the largest since the World War II year 1945. For fiscal 1973, the deficit is estimated at \$32 billion! During the four years of the present Administration the deficit figures, actual and estimated, are as follow:

FY 1970	\$2.8 billion
FY 1971	23.0 billion
FY 1972	40.0 billion (estimated)*
FY 1973	32.0 billion (estimated)

Practically all economists agree that imbalanced budgets are the principal cause of inflation. During the past 41 years the Federal budget has been balanced in only 9 years! During the 30 years from 1939 through 1969, the inflation due to imbalanced budgets caused the value of the dollar to shrink from 100 cents to 41 cents.

In 1955, Virgil Jordan, Chancellor of the National Industrial Conference Board and one of the Nation's outstanding economists, speaking of the effect of inflation caused by imbalanced budgets, said:

"The U.S.A. is a victim of government by subsidy, bribery, and robbery; a government willing to steal, and convert to fake money the savings of its citizens to satisfy its lust for ever increasing power. The welfare and protection promised for the future in return for votes can only be called the cruelest and most colossal fraud that has ever been practiced on a credulous people."

In 1916, the tax collections of the National Government amounted to only 23% of the total tax take, State taxes being 12% and Local taxes 65%. By 1954, the process of centralization of power in Washington had progressed so far that the tax figures were National 74%, State 13% and Local 13%.

Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and now Secretary of Commerce, in 1961 estimated our total National Government Debt, direct and in the form of Federal guarantees, at \$750 billion, which at that time was \$4200 for every man, woman and child in the country! In addition, there were the debts of State and Local governments and the private debts, amounting in all to \$547 billion. And these debts are steadily increasing. There is no attempt to reduce them.

The massive weight of these obligations should be appraised in light of the fact, previously demonstrated, that without economic freedom, all other freedoms are eroded or destroyed. Our forefathers held that no man has a right to vote away the freedom of his posterity. What have these debts done to our children's freedoms?

*Originally estimated at \$11.6 billion in January 1971.

Thomas Jefferson considered the act of deferring payment on the public debt the same as enslaving future generations. He wrote to a friend, "There have existed nations, and civilized and learned nations, who thought that a father had a right to sell his child as a slave in perpetuity. -- We believe, or act as if we believed, that although an individual father cannot alienate the labor of his son, the aggregate body of fathers may alienate the labor of all of their sons, of their posterity, in the aggregate, and oblige them to pay for all the enterprises, just or unjust, profitable or ruinous, into which our vices, our passions, or our personal interests may lead us. But I trust that this proposition needs only to be looked at by an American to be seen in its true point of view and that we shall consider ourselves unauthorized to saddle posterity with our debts, and morally bound to pay them ourselves." It appears that we have completely abandoned that honorable standard!

The National Government now owns 34% of the land acreage within the boundaries of the 50 States. It has real property with a total acquisition cost of some \$50 billion. It owns and operates some 3000 business facilities and its functions are carried on by almost 2000 major operating units.

It is clear that, knowingly or not, we have supported the communist objective, enunciated by Lenin, that the success of communism depends on concentration of control of all production and all social functions in the central government!

It is distressing to note that in spite of the frightening implications of this expanding power of government, the legislative programs advocated by recent administrations would require more centralization of power in Washington, more dependence of the citizens on government, more controls, more spending, more taxes and more debt!

Crisis In Government

In light of the current vast undertakings of our government in practically all areas of human activity at home and abroad, which demand gigantic expenditures in terms of human energy, tools of production and natural resources, one wonders whether, in the event of grave National crisis, anything will be left with which government can discharge its basic responsibility to protect the lives, the limbs, the liberty and the property of its citizens against internal or external aggression!

What course should be pursued by those of us who see this clear and present danger?

In the Virginia Declaration of Rights, adopted on June 12, 1776, George Mason included this statement: "No free government or the blessings of liberty can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

A few years later, Thomas Jefferson proposed this resolution: "(Resolved that) it would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights -; that confidence is

everywhere the parent of despotism; free government is founded in jealousy and not in confidence; it is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power; that our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence may go --; -- In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

What were the "fundamental principles" referred to by Mason? I believe they were, broadly speaking, religious principles; not the doctrines and creeds which distinguish one sect or denomination from another, but rather the fundamental belief in God which they shared. This conclusion is supported by the many statements contained in the sermons of the Colonial clergy and by the following excerpt from George Washington's Farewell Address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. -- And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. -- Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

In closing, let me return briefly to the discourse of Count Tolstoy and this statement: "The most powerful and untrammelled force of freedom is that which asserts itself in the soul of man when he is alone, and in the sole presence of himself reflects on the facts of the Universe, and then naturally communicates his thoughts to wife, brother, friends, to all those with whom he comes in contact and from whom he would regard it as sinful to conceal the truth--

"Let government keep the schools, church, press, its milliards of money and millions of armed men; all this apparently terrible organization of force is as nothing compared to the consciousness of truth which surges in the soul of one man who knows the power of truth, which is communicated from him to a second and a third, as one candle lights an innumerable quantity of others. The light needs only to be kindled and, like wax in the face of fire, this organization which seems so powerful will melt and be consumed."

Here, then, is our cue in this trial of freedom we now face. Let each one of us go forth with determination, moral courage and understanding, without expectation of reward or fear of reprisal, and, in humble devotion to the principles of our forefathers, speak the truth as he sees it! This task should always be in the forefront of our consciousness; we should be untiring in our efforts to preach the gospel of freedom. In this way, each of us will light a candle instead of cursing the darkness!

Some 2000 years ago the Master Teacher told those who would listen: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

That promise is eternal and universal; it must be our beacon if we are to preserve this land of freedom, this "last best hope of earth".

THE NATURE OF THE CRISIS

(27 January 1972)

This is the second of five lectures which comprise a review of current trends in government and their resultant effects on the freedoms of our citizens.

The first lecture covered "The Principles of the Free Society". In this second lecture I shall discuss "The Nature of the Crisis".

My views are presented from the vantage point of one whose experiences cover more than half a century of personal participation in some of the crucial events of the most turbulent period of our history, a period which saw major changes in governmental organization and procedures, social practices, industrial developments, military power, educational methods, church activities, international relationships and national priorities.

A consideration of these changes, some of which are truly revolutionary, leads to the conclusion that it would be well to examine our current situation closely, to determine, if we can, whether in the name of "progress" we are discarding some fundamental values which mankind has acquired only after centuries of costly trial and error and with the expenditure of much blood, sweat and tears. We need satisfying answers to questions such as these: What is happening to the individual and his freedom as the result of these recent changes? Are we paying too high a price for the material progress, comforts and conveniences we have attained? In a period of the world's greatest material prosperity why do we have so many "wars and rumors of wars" and such great chaos in human affairs, at home and abroad? Are we in danger of overlooking the poet's admonition:

"Ill fares the land,

To hastening ills a prey,

Where wealth accumulates

And men decay?"

Perhaps some answers will be obtained from our discussion of "The Nature of the Crisis".

Man's Place in the Universe

The great Cardinal Manning of England stated, "All human differences are ultimately religious ones." I interpret this to mean that such differences arise from divergent views of the nature of the universe and how it is ordered, and the nature of man and his proper place in that universe. Those views, in turn, define the character and extent of man's natural rights and his collateral responsibilities to God and to his fellow man. Since the conduct

of every social order is determined by the prevailing concepts of man's rights and responsibilities, human conflicts result when there are significant differences in those concepts.

There is a concept of man's proper place in the universe which is conducive to spiritual, cultural and material growth. The essence of this belief is that there is a Supreme Being, Whom we call God, Who rules the universe and from Whom all power and all authority flow. All men are children of God and each of us is endowed by Him with certain inherent rights which no one, not even government, can take from us without violating the moral law. These are the right to life, the right to liberty and the right to own, utilize and dispose of our honestly acquired property.

Our Founding Fathers believed devoutly in this concept. To make man's rights secure, they established a government of strictly limited powers which, they intended, would be clearly defined in a written Constitution. The basic functions of government were to be: first, to safeguard the freedoms which flow from man's inherent rights, such as freedom of worship, of speech, of the press, of assembly and others, including freedom of economic enterprise; second, to dispense justice; and third, to keep the records incident thereto. Other than these, the people were to be free to pursue their own interests, provided this would not cause them to trespass on the rights of others.

An essential part of this doctrine is that each man, in the exercise of his natural rights, will be held personally responsible, the definition of his responsibilities being derived from such stern admonitions as The Ten Commandments, The Sermon on the Mount and The Golden Rule.

Freedoms "From" versus Freedoms "To"

The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and other contemporary documents reveal that our political forebears knew that efforts by government to establish collective "freedoms from" one's personal responsibilities would restrict individual "freedoms to" enjoy one's natural rights. Today, we see this process operating on us, as individuals, through the device of taxes. We pay huge sums to government to provide what President Roosevelt called "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear". By doing so, we drastically curtail our economic capacity to exercise our individual freedoms to worship, to speak, to publicize, to choose our own benefactions, and to venture economically. Thus, individual "freedoms to" are sharply restricted by collective attempts to achieve "freedoms from".

The currently widespread belief that this is as it should be marks a pronounced change in American political thought. But the propriety of this belief is now being questioned. There are signs that many of our people are affected by a "vague moral uneasiness". The growth of giant government and its penetration into every nook and cranny of our private lives cause us to wonder what is happening to our freedom to pursue our legitimate private interests.

There are some who insist that "we never had it so good". They say all we need do to achieve the kingdom of heaven on earth is to continue the economic and political nostrums of the New and Fair Deals, the New Frontier and the Great Society in ever-increasing doses.

But current events do not support these disciples of Pollyanna. There is a growing conviction that something is wrong and that, ultimately, each of us will be held accountable! There is general agreement that there is a national crisis - but widespread disagreement as to its nature and extent.

Some years ago I was told by a very wise friend who has spent his mature life as an employee of the National House of Representatives that, with some few exceptions, the voting performance of a Member of Congress is a valid reflection of the prevailing concepts of political, economic, cultural and moral values of his constituency. If this be true, it is significant that in recent talks with Senators and Representatives, I have noted a marked anxiety for the future of our Republic and its free institutions. I believe their concern reflects that of their constituents.

In light of this National unrest, and the seemingly endless succession of "emergencies", foreign and domestic, which have plagued our Nation during the past five decades, it is important that we attempt to define the nature of the crisis we face, and to resolve it, if possible, to our advantage.

The Crucial Conflict

The crucial conflict of our times is between self-disciplined, responsible individualism and coercive collectivism functioning under disciplines imposed by the State. Important economic, political, cultural and social issues are involved, but, essentially, the struggle is between two opposing sets of moral values. Perhaps it would be more accurate to state it is a struggle between a code of moral values based on religious principle on the one hand and, on the other, a set of materialistic policies and practices which make no claims to moral content, which are improvised to meet the expediencies of the moment, and which, history teaches us, inevitably lead to despotic control of all human affairs by government.

The two principal adversaries are the United States and Soviet Russia. Russia is firm in her openly stated positions while we give wavering allegiance to our values. In recent decades, we have discarded many of the time-honored traditions of responsible individualism bequeathed to us by our political forebears. Russia does not conceal its purpose to enslave the world. Communism gives an affirmative, unequivocal answer to that eternal question posed by Patrick Henry to his fellow Virginians: "Is life so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" Unfortunately, and to our shame, some of our most vocal proponents of appeasement and accommodation are in agreement with the Russian position.

The key ideas of the American system are found in the Declaration of Independence which asserts that men have inherent rights which accord with the "laws of Nature and of Nature's God". Governments are established to secure men in these antecedent rights. Constitutions and political structures merely formalize the condition of outer and social freedom which men's inner and spiritual liberty demands. If government fails in its primary task of defending men's birthright of freedom, they are duty-bound to alter or abolish it and to "provide new guards for their future security". So the Declaration admonishes us.

Natural Rights versus Communism

The natural rights idea, which was so prominent in the thinking of the Founding Fathers, is but the immediate application to political philosophy of the Judeo-Christian idea of man as a creature of God, accountable to Him for the proper ordering of the soul for which each of us is responsible.

On the other hand, Marxism, denying God, logically denies the idea of individual rights and thus reduces individuals from persons in their own right to mere wards of the State. Communism is an idea. It is a belief that individual freedom as a way of life will not work. It is a conviction that certain ordinary mortals, like you and me, who happen to occupy the seats of government, are far more capable of ordering our lives than we are. It is a fear that if we, the people, are left free to manage our own affairs, most of us will go hungry and be cold. It repudiates the free market, where willing buyers and willing sellers voluntarily arrive at a figure agreeable to both. It embraces the false thesis that employers and employees in a free society belong to different classes and are natural enemies. It is a coercive process whereby some people use the power of government to make others conform to their views and their desires. It debases the intelligence, integrity and dignity of the individual, who must bow his head in deference to political overlords.

It is clear that there can be no reconciliation between such beliefs and the high-minded principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Why, then, are we so surprised, and so disappointed, when we fail to reach agreement with the Communists, and when they flagrantly violate the agreements to which they have willingly subscribed? If we are faithful to our traditional moral values, and they to their own standards of behavior, it would be a miracle, indeed, if we reached any lasting agreements with them! "All human differences," said Cardinal Manning, "are ultimately religious ones."

Outright Communism, with a "made in Moscow" label, is not popular in America. It doesn't need to be, if only we can be induced to accept Marxism under some other label. This we are now doing, as has often been demonstrated. Similar things have happened before, as the last Dean Inge cautioned us in these words: "History seems to show that the powers of evil have won their greatest triumphs by capturing the organizations which were formed to defeat them, and that, when the devil has thus changed the contents of the bottles, he never alters the labels. The fort may have been captured by the enemy but it still flies the flag of its defenders."

We Americans have been running away from the spirit and principles of our own revolution in order to embrace an alien program saturated with Marxist ideology. We do this under the delusion that there is some safe middle ground between the idea of freedom, on the one side, and communism on the other. But the danger of the "middle-of-the-road" position, as former President Hoover once remarked to me, is that "you may be hit by the traffic going in either direction". If we are really opposed to Marxism there is only one place to take a stand, and that is with the philosophy of Freedom, which makes no compromise with Communism, however it may be disguised!

The late Wilhelm Röpke, architect of the economic renaissance of post-war West Germany, stated, "We should stand for a free economic order even if it implied material sacrifice and even if Socialism gave the certain prospect of material increase. It is our undeserved luck that the exact opposite is true. More important, the free economic order is indispensable as the prerequisite of liberty, human dignity, free choice and justice. That is why we want it, and no price would be too high for it, even if the Communists would make bigger and better washing machines."

Economic Controls and Freedom

It is unfortunate that we Americans are so divided on this issue. Many of us have failed to weigh the philosopher's question, "If men use their liberty in such a way as to surrender their liberty, are they thereafter any the less slaves?" Americans have apathetically surrendered liberty in the economic sphere, forgetting the old adage, "Whose controls our subsistence controls us." "Economic control," said Professor Hayek, formerly of the University of Chicago, "is not merely control of a sector of human life which can be separated from the rest; it is control of the means for all our ends."

Slavery is commonly thought of as ownership of one man by another. But no slave-holder would quibble about owning the man if he can own the products of the man's labor. A slave is a person to whom economic freedom is denied. From this premise, the denial of all other freedoms follows.

How much power over the products of our labor and hence our economic freedom have we conferred upon our own government? The total tax "take" by all levels of government is now 43% of the National earned income! This is a valid measure of the erosion of our freedom. But this takes account only of direct taxes. In addition, there is a large capital levy which results from inflation, the reduction of the value of our accumulated savings!

Several years ago I undertook a study to determine the approximate percentage of his total income which is left to the individual, and over which he can exercise freedom of choice, after he has provided for the necessities of living.

The averages of the expenditures by all Americans, expressed as percentages of the average of the incomes of all Americans, are as follows:

Food.	19.5%
Clothing.	6.3%
Housing	13.0%
Taxes (all levels of government)	<u>43.0%</u>
Sub-Total.	81.8%

The next set of figures represents items which are nearly as essential as the first set. They are:

Medical & Burial expense.	2.5%
Transportation of all kinds	6.0%
Recreation.	<u>3.0%</u>
Sub-Total.	11.5%
Grand Total of above.	93.3%

The 6.7% of income remaining is available for support of the church, charities, schools, cultural activities, tobacco, alcohol, insurance and, last but far from least, savings.

To provide adequately for their spiritual, charitable, educational, and cultural needs and for insurance and savings, Americans must either make drastic reductions in their expenditures for necessities or call on government to relieve them of the responsibility for financing some of those needs. Unfortunately, many of us have succumbed to the seduction of getting "something for nothing", and we follow the latter course. Thus, we are contributing to the achievement of the Communist objective, enunciated by Lenin, that is, concentration of control of all instruments of production and all social functions in the hands of centralized government.

Parenthetically, the foregoing figures explain why it now seems necessary to call on government to relieve human distress through the medium of "political charity" thus superceding the practice of "biblical charity", i.e., voluntary giving by individual citizens.

A Crisis of Morals and Moral Courage

We Americans take pride in our material prosperity, our high standard of living, the expansion of education "for the masses", and the growth of church attendance. But in light of the increasing willingness of the individual to abdicate his personal responsibilities in favor of impersonal, all-powerful government, one wonders whether our currently popular "back-to-church movement provides, also, that the individual communicant should go "forward to God".

The First Commandment states, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." But we have erected a gold-plated Colossus, the Giant State, at whose feet we worship because it promises us food, clothing, housing, medical care, education, comforts, luxuries, entertainment, "bread and circuses". In return, the State demands blind submission to the dictates of "Big Brother", and rejection of the commandments of the God who gave us life and liberty.

The Eighth Commandment states, "Thou shalt not steal." But by the 16th Amendment, the progressive income tax, we have unwittingly conferred upon government unlimited power to take the products of all property and all labor. Under pretext of "promoting the general welfare", government has now usurped authority to use vast quantities of these products in ways which are repugnant to many of us, and for purposes which seriously impair our natural right to

own and enjoy our honestly acquired property.

The Tenth Commandment states, "Thou shalt not covet." But those who come to Washington with hat in hand, begging for government largesse, do so because they covet their neighbor's property. They have neither the courage nor the energy to take it themselves, so they beg government to legalize the taking and expropriate it for them, thus impoverishing the citizenry and aggrandizing the State.

It is clear that our Nation is in a crisis of morals and moral courage. "It is the sort of moral crisis from which one merits the victory only when there is no longer a wide and embarrassing gap between one's stated aims and one's personal example."

The Gospel of Freedom

This means that when we preach the gospel of freedom to the oppressed peoples of the world, we must first make sure that we believe in it and practice it at home. Otherwise, our words carry no conviction.

We cannot sell goods we do not have in stock. A former President said, "We stand for Freedom." But he did not define "Freedom". What freedom? Whose freedom? Is it individual "freedom to" or collective "freedom from"? He told us we must help "the lands of the rising peoples - regardless of which political or economic route they take towards freedom." But there is no acknowledgment that, in the American idiom, "Socialist Freedom" is a contradiction in terms. He warned us that this will require "sacrifices". What sacrifices? Sacrifices by whom? As it turned out, the so-called "sacrifices" include every "Welfare-State" spending scheme dreamed up by the planners since the beginning of the Roosevelt New Deal. While those "give-aways" will ultimately weigh heavily on all our people, they are, for the time being, camouflaged as measures designed to help the alleged needy sectors of our society, which, fortuitously, are those with the heaviest concentrations of voting strengths! "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need," the "abilities" and "needs" being as decreed by omnipotent government. Thus are "freedom" and "sacrifice" defined in the gospel according to "Saint" (?) Marx!

The President told us, "America must start moving again." We are moving. But, unfortunately, it is in the direction of a police state! Many of our people believe that individual freedom, as a way of life, has been tried and found wanting. They subscribe to the doctrine of the New and Fair Deals, the New Frontier and the Great Society, that by substituting man's law of force for God's law of love, people can be compelled to "do good" for their neighbors. The self-anointed humanitarians who advocate this procedure are convinced that the second of the Two Great Commandments "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" can be imposed on mankind by the police power of the State, and, when this occurs, the first, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," ceases to have significance.

The By-Products of Centralization

If this rapidly increasing power of the State does not frighten us, then we get our ulcers from some of its by-products: corruption in high places,

the growing crime rate, drug addiction, pornography, juvenile delinquency, expanding indifference to our traditional spiritual and cultural values, oppressive and punitive taxation, and a rapid succession of international crisis from each of which America emerges bearing the onus of yet another "defeat by appeasement" of God-less Communism!

Here one should recall the prophecy of the great English scholar and statesman, Macaulay, in 1857. Addressing himself to America, he said:

"Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth - with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, while your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

Have we, in fact, embarked on this voyage to destruction? In 1835, after an extended tour in America, the gifted French scholar, de Tocqueville, wrote: "In examining the Constitution of the United States, which is the most perfect federal constitution that ever existed, one is startled at the variety of information and the amount of discernment that it presupposes in the people whom it is meant to govern." And, he predicted that if this discernment should fail, Americans would "fall beneath the yoke of a centralized administration".

It appears that Americans are, in fact, surrendering their power of discernment in exchange for the materialistic pleasures of "bread and circuses". Current events have emphasized this fact. A prominent Journal of Political Opinion (The National Review) recently commented as follows on the President's New Economic Policy:

"Article I, Section 8 - Powers of Congress.

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, . . .

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, . . .

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, . . .

"How charmingly old-fashioned it sounds! The whole document ought to be handwritten on antiques vellum and distributed by the Nostalgia Society.

"Luckily we moderns don't let ourselves get tangled in all that outworn verbiage.

"Said the President, 'I have ordered a 10% cut in foreign economic aid. . .I am reordering our budget priorities. . .I am today ordering a freeze on all prices and wages. . .I have today appointed a Cost of Living Council. . .I directed Secretary Conally to suspend temporarily the convertibility of the dollar. . .I am today imposing an additional

tax of 10% on goods imported into the United States. . . ' The citizen asked, 'But Mr. President, what about all those laws and contracts and treaties that your orders make hash of?' The President replied: 'I hereby declare a national emergency.'

"The most remarkable fact about the President's New Economic Policy is the silence and passivity with which the citizens of a national fancying itself a republic conceived in liberty have submitted to so rude a violation of constitutional process and the norms of a free society."

* * * *

"Let us neither exaggerate nor whitewash. The United States at New Year's 1972 is not a totalitarian state, but in these past months since August 15 it has become a markedly less free society. In both procedure and substance the New Economic Policy is authoritarian, regimenting, autarchic."

It seems that we Americans are losing sight of the importance of our Constitution as the protector of our rights as free men. Or, are we losing interest in individual freedom?

The Way Ahead

Is there a way ahead which will take us out of this morass? Is there a way to recover the sanity and balance which once marked our life? I believe there is. But it is not by means of political legerdemain. It is through the rehabilitation of those moral values and the moral courage which once guided our conduct.

The way has been well marked in an inspiring address entitled, "Those Who Would Have Freedom From Tyranny", by Dr. Ralph Hutchison, former President of Lafayette College. He said, "Our common ideal is that these laws of God, these rights of man, these responsibilities of the individual to the social order should be preached and taught, but not otherwise forced upon the minds and consciences of the human race. 'Go ye into all the world and teach all nations,' was the last command of the Master. To force men into ways of righteousness by police powers, to legislate them into social progress by laws, to brain-wash them from their evil ways, to torture men to the confessional, to hypnotize the social order with mass psychiatry, to terrorize them into discipline, was never the Creed of Spiritual America. Education by conviction has been our ideal. The teaching, persuading mission, we believe, is the way of Social reform."

In the foregoing I have not meant to imply that there are not problems peculiar to the economic and political levels. But if men are not right at the deeper level, in their understanding of the nature of the Universe and man's position therein, they can tinker with economic and political problems from now until doomsday and still come up with the wrong answers, which is precisely what we have been doing in recent years. It is a case of putting first things first, and the very first thing is a rehabilitation of those moral and spiritual values which are basic to the American dream. Such effort

on our part will call forth the supporting power of cosmic sanction, for God intended men to be free. "The God who gave us life," Jefferson observed, "gave us liberty at the same time."

One thing is certain: we cannot defeat the forces of evil if we feel compelled to adopt their policies and practices even though this be done gradually, in increments so small that they do not arouse the suspicions of our people. "To close the missile gap," said Dr. Felix Morley, "is of far less consequence for freedom than to make sure the spiritual gap between our faith and that of Communism is kept "wide open."

We can recapture the ground already lost only if we understand the nature of the crisis we face and take proper corrective measures. The communists are aware of this. While we sleep they concentrate their fire on the one weapon with which we can surely defeat them, the strength inspired by our religious faith! This they do, not by persecution, which defeats its own ends, but by a careful promotion of the same sort of apathetic indifference to our religion and our morals that has become a pronounced characteristic of American life.

Communism is a species of blasphemous religion, an evil thing which wars against the best in human nature. Its followers have invented a new code of anti-morality which elevates lying, theft, murder, and treason into primary virtues whenever these are thought to further the goal of Communist world domination. But the Communists are no fools. They are aware of the rich harvest of productivity which can be reaped from economic freedom, incentives and the collateral rewards for achievement of the capitalist system. So, when their needs are imperative, they move in our direction, as they did during the period of Lenin's New Economic Policy and as they are doing today with their scientific progress, their production of war material and their space explorations.

Would it not be tragic if the Communists, in their eagerness to achieve maximum productivity, should adopt our former devotion to spiritual ideals, individual freedom and the free market, while we Americans are moving so far into the orbit of secular, coercive collectivism that we cannot retrace our steps? It is our great good fortune that such a development cannot occur as a permanent change since it would require surrender by the Communist masters of absolute powers over the lives of their citizens, a condition they would never accept! This was demonstrated by the recent events in Czechoslovakia!

The final battle of this ideological war will be fought in the arena of moral values. The antagonists will be the forces of self-disciplined, responsible individualism on the one side, arrayed against those of atheistic coercive collectivism on the other. Let us pray that, in this Armageddon, Americans will be found fighting on the side of God!

THE SAFETY OF THE PEOPLE
(15 February 1972)

Introduction

In the opening lecture of this series, "The Principles of the Free Society", and in Lecture No. II, "The Nature of the Crisis", it was my purpose first, to define the ideology which motivated the Founders of Our Free Republic and second, to explain why it is vitally important for us, as citizens, naval officers and engineers to have a working knowledge of that ideology and of the government mechanisms which flow from it.

It is pertinent to recall that the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence included some of the most cultured, knowledgeable and affluent men of America. They were so committed to the ideals set forth in the Declaration that they willingly pledged to each other their Lives, their Fortunes and their Sacred Honor for the support of those ideals.

They were thoroughly aware of the great risks they were assuming in rebelling against the Crown of England. That their concerns were well founded is attested by the fact that of the 56 who signed, 42 actually paid the price of their dedication to freedom by sacrificing their lives and/or their fortunes in the years that followed.

Let us now proceed with a consideration of the subject matter of the third lecture, "The Safety of the People."

The Higher Law

In his classic work, "De Legibus", Cicero, greatest of Rome's jurists and philosophers in the law, set forth this proposition:

"The safety of the people shall be the Highest Law."

That dictum stemmed from the concept that there is a Higher or Natural Law which transcends all man-made law. The idea originated with the ancient Greeks, was elaborated by Aristotle, and later adopted by the Stoics from whom it was taken by Cicero and incorporated into the Roman law.

It was accepted by our Founding Fathers for inclusion in the Declaration of Independence, as evidenced by their avowed reliance on "the laws of Nature and of Nature's God" as sanction for their claim to that "separate and equal station -- among the powers of the earth" to which a people is entitled when it becomes necessary --- "to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another."

Professor Edward S. Corwin, noted scholar and teacher of jurisprudence, in his essay, "The 'Higher Law' Background of American Constitutional Law", wrote:

"There are ... certain principles of right and justice which are entitled to prevail of their own intrinsic excellence, altogether regardless of the attitude of those who wield the physical resources of the community. Such principles were made by no human hands ... They are external to all will as such and interpenetrate all reason as such. They are eternal and immutable. In relation to such principles, human laws are ... merely a record or transcript, and their enactment an act of will or power but one of discovery and declaration."

Later, with respect to the 9th Amendment of the Constitution, which validates those rights of the people which are not specifically enumerated, he wrote:

"Such rights ... owe nothing to their recognition in the Constitution. Such recognition was necessary if the Constitution was to be regarded as complete.

"Thus the legality of the Constitution, its supremacy, and its claim to be worshipped, alike find common standing ground on the belief in a law superior to human governors."

That concept was endorsed by the late President Hoover in his address to the 1956 Republican National Convention. He said:

"Those great documents of 180 years ago from our Founding Fathers must still be the foundation of our American way of life...

"I have faith that there are principles which neither Communism, nor Socialism, nor neutralism, nor other evil ideas, nor even the march of time, can defeat. Those truths came into the world along with the shooting stars of which worlds are made. They are as inevitable as the existence of the Supreme Being, the forces of gravity, and the ceaseless struggle of mankind to be free."

Limits for Man-Made Law

Those "principles of right and justice" referred to by Professor Corwin fix the limits within which man-made law must function if we are to avoid doing violence to the higher law of nature.

Our Declaration defined those limits as follows:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure those rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government ..."

The preliminary drafts of the Declaration and contemporary documents make clear that the phrase "all men are created equal" was intended to denote

equality before God and before the law, not an impossible equality of natural talents and consequent equality of material possessions.

With those Principles of Right and Justice to guide us, starting practically "from scratch," we became, in little over a century, the greatest nation in history in terms of spiritual stature, individual freedom, material productivity, cultural progress, biblical charity and the security of our citizens and their property.

How well have we managed our heritage? I believe my generation has squandered its legacy. We have permitted the superstructure of this citadel of freedom to be ravaged and its foundations eroded to the point where there is danger of total collapse.

Our pursuit of profit and pleasure left little time or inclination to reflect on the dismal records of some great civilizations of the past, best exemplified by the tragic decline and fall of the Roman Empire. This debacle resulted when "the safety of the people" was no longer revered as "the highest law" but had given way to ruthless competition for political and/or economic power, an essential feature of which was corruption of the people by ever-increasing government largesse in the form of food, clothing, shelter, entertainment, "bread and circuses." These were the prototypes of our present-day multi-faceted "war on poverty", publicly-financed stadiums, playgrounds, recreation areas, theatres, cultural centers, and a myriad of other "Great Society" subventions.

All of us must share the blame for this betrayal of our trust.

Over the past fifty years we have propagated a child-like faith in the competence of government to achieve any kind of material, economic, social or moral purpose. Implementing this faith we have stood by, meekly, while government seized power at an ever-increasing pace, centralizing it in Washington, where it would be shielded from the scrutiny of those from whom it had been taken. And this was done under the pretext that it was solely for the good of the people!

But even more harmful is the fact that, as government functions today, decisions on matters of vital import to the security and well-being of our nation are most frequently taken in light of their probable political effects, rather than on purely economic, social or national security considerations.

It has been said that the people never give up their liberties except under some delusion. In this case the delusion is that government which, after all, is operated by ordinary mortals like you and me, not by gods or supermen, has some superior competence in the realm of economics, some magic multiplier of wealth, some power to open the doors to a vast store of economic goods which can be had without working for them, merely by voting for them!

Few of us are completely immune to such delusions, or to the human passions which they arouse, apathy, fear, greed and violence. But those who see the terminus of this road to ruin are duty-bound to sound the alarm.

Let us look briefly at some areas where we have departed from the time-tested principles, and thus jeopardized "the Safety of the People."

The Evils of Inflation

Perhaps most obvious is the debauchery of our currency. Largely as the result of profligate spending and unwise fiscal and monetary policies, at home and abroad, our gold reserve, intended to insure national solvency and to promote dynamic economic equilibrium, has been depleted to the point where our government resorts to frantic maneuvers in the international money markets to maintain the value of the dollar.

Our foreign aid programs have served principally to buttress unstable authoritarian socialist governments, to subsidize dictators and to encourage cutthroat foreign competition with our own industries.

Our public debt is at an all-time high and increases each year. In addition, there are hidden obligations accumulated under the social security and government retirement systems, and as guarantees of mortgages and other indebtedness, which amount to hundreds of billions, the total of Central Government liabilities alone having been estimated recently at more than 1½ trillion dollars, that is, \$7500.00 for every man, woman and child in the Nation!

The debts of States, subordinate units of government, and public "authorities", as well as private indebtedness have kept pace with that of the Central Government. Our Nation is mortgaged to the hilt! And the process continues.

Several years ago the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy published an analysis which showed that losses in purchasing power of the people's savings arising from the depreciation of our dollar during the period 1939 to 1959 were 122 times the loss of \$1,901,000,000 of deposits in banks for the years 1921-1933, which includes the period of the New Deal's mis-named "Hoover Depression!" The culprit principally responsible for these huge inflationary losses is the agency that creates dollars out of thin air and pumps them into our economic blood-stream, with no off-setting increases in goods and services available for purchase. This agency is our own out-of-bounds government.

But the harsh realities of politics will not permit government to admit its guilt. So they look for a scape-goat, preferably one who will be a politically profitable whipping boy. In this case it is private industry, whose managers have tried to protect their owners' properties against inflationary erosions by modest increases in the prices of their products.

The government propaganda machine then goes into action full-force, in an effort to delude our people into believing that private industry is not the unfortunate victim of inflation but is the greedy villain who caused it!

Initially inflation weighs most heavily on the thrifty citizens who, largely through fixed income investments, have tried to provide for their old age and their loved ones. But eventually, it involves the entire Nation. The resultant chaos can be ended only by dictatorship and ruthless suppression of

the rights of the people. A dictator has been defined as the receiver for a nation gone bankrupt!

I have dwelt at some length on this subject because debauchery of the currency is so pervasive that, ultimately, no one can escape its destructive effects. Our government, whose fiscal and monetary policies and practices induce inflation, stands guilty of flagrant violation of that highest law --- the safety of the people!

Not unrelated to the debauchery of our currency is the national crisis of morals and moral courage.

Our national crime rates, notably crimes of violence, are skyrocketing, as are the rates of divorce, juvenile delinquency, illegitimate births, family desertions and drug addiction. We are demoralized by an apathetic acceptance of low standards of conduct of prominent persons and of the general public; an increasing tolerance of openly flaunted pornography in the theatre, books, periodicals, recordings, movies and television; the deterioration of family life; derision of religion and spiritual values; and downgrading of the individual as a responsible creature of God, sovereign in his natural rights, having personal worth and dignity, deserving of respect because he is self-respecting and respectable.

I believe that personal example is the most powerful element of effective leadership, for good or for evil. A fair reading of the record leads to the conclusion that, in its role of Robin Hood, our giant government has provided the worst kind of moral leadership for our people. Robin Hood may have been impelled by the most altruistic of motives -- but he was still a thief! Today the "powers that be" neatly gloss over the fact that when people vote for legislators who promise them "goodies" at the expense of those who worked to produce them, they become partners with government in thievery! More's the pity that such legalized larceny has the sanction of many high government officials who urge the voters to "come and get it!"

Many politicians now run for office on the platform, "I can get more from the government for you." But they do not mention what government must first take from you and others who produced the wealth.

In a recent study of socialist Sweden, commenting on public housing, the author wrote: "Here, as well as in other spheres, personal corruption and indifference to laws are the results of State intervention in the functioning of the free market economy."

Civil Rights and Moral Wrongs

Our social order is subjected to massive stress as government seeks to impose legal curbs on freedom to use or dispose of one's property. Justifying the means they propose by the ends they seek, public officials and prominent private citizens encourage violation of those laws which one does not like, as well as civil disobedience merely for its nuisance value, and illegal seizures of private and public property. All such acts constitute trespass on the rights of others and are "civil wrongs"! They point the way to anarchy and, ultimately, to dictatorship!

Our judiciary frequently shows excessive concern for the civil liberties of hardened criminals at the expense of the moral and legal rights of their innocent victims. Similar tolerance is displayed toward union officials who order or condone acts of violence on persons and property by their subordinates.

We appear to be suffering a paralysis of will which saps our courage, moral and physical. We are being transmitted from a God-fearing, energetic, self-reliant, confident and venturesome people, free and independent, into a nation of timid dependents, insecure, apprehensive, fearful of incurring the displeasure and reprisals of our political masters to whom we are told to look for food, clothing, shelter, medical care, education, entertainment and security from the cradle to the grave.

Our Foreign Policy

The emotions which paralyze our wills in domestic affairs appear to have infected our courage and integrity when dealing with other nations. On the international scene, compromise of principle, appeasement of blustering bullies, support of cruel oppressors, intervention in the internal affairs of friendly nations and surrender to blackmail, mark our conduct. Moral principle is sacrificed on the altar of expediency to achieve the promise of a dubious security. Any dictator who wishes to rub our nose in the dirt for political profit or personal pleasure does so with impunity, secure in the knowledge that when he is ready to trade we will buy him off with generous allocations of foreign aid.

Little wonder, then, that Khrushchev was quoted as having remarked on returning from his trip to America, "You spit in their faces and they smilingly wipe it away and say 'The dew is very heavy today.'"

We are not respected by our enemies, by the so-called neutrals, nor by our professed friends. In spite of generous concessions in all areas, "Yankee Go Home" has become an international slogan. Unruly mobs, unrestricted by police or other public authorities, attack our embassies, legations, consulates, libraries and other installations and menace the safety of our representatives.

To show our complete confidence in the honor of dictators who have repeatedly repudiated their treaty obligations, our government has proposed a long-range program for total disarmament of all nations, in which we are now taking the lead, unilaterally. We seem to have adopted the tragic Carthaginian policy of disarmament by example.

I am under no illusion. I know that a Jeremiah is without honor, expecially in his own country, when the people become servile and insensitive to moral wrongs under the narcotic effects of a false prosperity, buttressed by massive government seductions and propoganda. But those who feel, as I do, that the safety of the people is in jeopardy are morally bound to say so.

You will note that in the foregoing I have not mentioned the danger to "The Safety of the People" which results from our failure to maintain our military position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Much has been said and written on this subject in recent years and months. Current statements by Secretary

of Defense Laird and by high ranking military leaders, in particular, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Zumwalt, serve to emphasize the dangers we face because of our surrender of leadership in nuclear weapons, and the prospective loss of Naval supremacy to Soviet Russia. Given the kind of adversary we face, we can be sure that, if we are defeated militarily, all of the great progress we have made in science, agriculture, industry, religion, education, the arts and professions, in fact, all of our highly advanced standards of living will go down the drain! We will have traded the Safety of the People for a mess of potage! It is clear that the paramount issue of our day is the survival of our free Republic!

But we need not despair! History, tradition and what Mr. Hoover called "the ceaseless struggle of man-kind to be free" are on our side! But we will need conviction, courage, tenacity, understanding, humility, compassion and, above all, faith, to set in motion what William James called "...those tiny invisible, molecular moral forces which work from individual to individual, creeping in through the crannies of the world like so many soft rootlets, or like the capillary oozing of water, but which, if you given them time, will rend the hardest monuments of man's pride."

That is the way! May we be endowed with wisdom, strength and courage to follow it! Our forebears did so under more oppressive conditions than those we face. We can do it too, provided only that we have the will! That is your challenge and your opportunity! I hope you will make this your post-graduate mission and, if this be your resolve, that you will translate it into actions that count. St. James said: "...Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed."

MANAGEMENT, AUTOMATION, FREEDOM AND PRODUCTIVITY
(17 February 1972)

In this fourth lecture I propose to discuss the interrelationships of management, automation and individual freedom, and the resultant effects on national productivity.

While the discourse appears to be directed, primarily, to a consideration of industrial organization, I hold that the basic principles discussed herein are just as applicable to any activity, military or civil, which requires coordination of the efforts of many people.

During the past century the predominant pattern of American life has changed from agrarian to industrial. Even agriculture and animal husbandry have acquired many of the features of large-scale industry. Concurrently, there have been great increases in national productivity.

There are hazards as well as benefits in this evolution. High productivity makes possible a better standard of living for all. But it can do more. To the extent that it enables people to obtain the economic necessities of life with minimum expenditures of time and energy, it puts at their disposal increasing amounts of both, to be used in whatever ways they may choose.

Not everyone will use them wisely. But if surplus time and energy do not exist, if people are bound down by toil to earn a bare livelihood, there can be no flowering of those faculties which enable men to attain the higher ends of life; scholarship, art, music, charity and worship. Thus, in addition to larger material benefits, high productivity can provide a greater value, the means by which a people can achieve spiritual, cultural and intellectual growth. It follows that progress in all areas of our social structure is dependent on the efficiency of our production procedures.

But we should be aware of the hazards to which I referred. Most increases in productivity result from mechanization or assembly-line automation. What is happening to the people engaged in this work? Industrial managers, striving for maximum production, may overlook the fact that only machines can be "automated". Any attempt to "automate" a man tends to deprive him of his individuality as a unique human being who is most creative when he has maximum freedom of choice. Thus, in trying to achieve short-range benefits, we may sacrifice a larger gain, improvement of the whole man.

The eminent French scholar, de Tocqueville, visited our country over a century ago and wrote a book called "Democracy in America". It is more cogent today than when written. He held that America, although a nation of vigorous free people, is vulnerable to a new kind of political tyranny which he called "democratic despotism".

This would not be an alien dictatorship imposed by conquerors on a rebellious people. Democratic despotism, he said, would manifest itself as a

spreading paralysis of will, a failure of nerve, a gradual erosion of individual responsibility.

He wrote: "A democratic state of society, similar to that of the Americans, might offer singular facilities for the establishment of despotism; it would be a despotism more extensive and more mild than any previous; it would degrade men without tormenting them... The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting. Such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd."

Are we witnessing the fulfillment of what prophecy? Is the steady encroachment of our government on the people's rights leading us to democratic despotism? Is government attempting to "automate" our people by depriving them of responsibility for earning their own livelihoods by the unhampered use of their own God-given talents coupled with freedom of choice?

Government, at all levels, confiscates an even larger portion of the fruits of our labors, now 43% of the National earned income. Will this eventually reduce us to virtual serfdom so that, after providing for bare essentials, little will remain with which to exercise freedom of choice; no surplus for pursuing those higher ends of life I have mentioned? Is the shrinking importance of individuals (as contrasted with that of organized groups) in our political, economic and social affairs jeopardizing freedom? If so, what steps can be taken to halt this progression? Can the power of private industry be mobilized to stem the tide now running so strongly against us?

I will offer some observations on these questions from the vantage point of 12 years experience as head of a nation-wide, non-partisan, non-profit, political action organization; preceded by 12 years in positions of major responsibility in private industry; and, before that, 29 years and 3 months in the United States Navy, where I was concerned with productivity in engineering design and construction on a world-wide scale.

To correctly appraise our current problems and to formulate adequate solutions, we must be aware of the beliefs which guided our Founding Fathers. I have outlined these in the first two lectures and I shall not repeat them here.

Our political forebears were trying to set up a secular order based on their idea of the pattern laid down by God for man's conduct in society. There is much historical evidence to support this view. De Tocqueville wrote in 1835:

"...whilst the law permits the Americans to do what they please, religion prevents them from conceiving, and forbids them to commit, what is rash or unjust..."

"Religion in America takes no direct part in the government of society, but it must be regarded as the first of their political institutions;..."

Material conditions improved rapidly in our country. To account for this, as well as our substantial spiritual and cultural advances, we must credit those basic concepts upon which our social order was founded.

Here is a nation with less than six percent of the world's people, which produces 40 percent of the world's goods! Our people have no more innate intelligence than the peoples of the countries whence they came. Our natural resources are less abundant than those of many less prosperous nations. Furthermore, they lay for centuries relatively unused, supporting fewer than a million inhabitants. Now they support 205 million people who, in turn, contribute largely to the support of the rest of the world.

If the beliefs which guided our Founders account for this progress, it follows that devotion to their ideals is of utmost importance for the future of our Nation. Therefore, it should be the duty of all to foster an understanding of those beliefs.

This means that all who are in positions of responsibility should participate vigorously in the pursuit of wisdom and understanding and in the formation of public opinion in all sectors of social activity. It is not enough that we concern ourselves only with the problems of our own specialty. Unless those who wish to preserve American ideals move forthrightly into these fields, they will be pre-empted by others who expound doctrines which will ultimately destroy us.

What are the specific duties of industrial management in this context? Management attains its objectives through the medium of human beings. Even the most automatic of machines must be designed, built, operated, serviced and repaired by human minds and hands. It follows that the most valuable asset to an organization is its people. So what management does with and to people is of supreme importance to our well-being, even to our very survival!

Every industrial enterprise consists of three basic elements: men, money, and machines. But if we have the right kind of men, we can borrow the money and build the machines. The ingredient essential for success is people with talents suited to the needs of the enterprise. But competent personnel alone is not enough. There must be motivation, compelling reasons for wanting to be productive. To induce such motivation is one of the most important functions of management.

Some years ago I undertook a study to find a satisfying answer to the question: What makes men productive?

Obviously, the conditions which promote optimum production are not the same for all peoples and at all times. There are, at the very least, differences in emphasis, and these reflect differences in personal characteristics and abilities.

Generally speaking, people are most productive when they are doing what they want to do, i.e., what they have chosen to do without being coerced. Such freedom of choice is conducive to the development of individuality, initiative and self-activated incentive. It permits a voluntary division of labor which results in greater productivity for the entire community.

It is important that industrial managers be aware of a law of nature that should affect their daily decisions. This is the law of human variation. It says that no person is physically or mentally or morally identical with any other person. For example, no person's fingerprints match the prints of any other. Such differences, such individualities, such inequalities, carry through all of the characteristics of mankind.

We should realize that God had a purpose in designing us so that no person is like any other person; so that each person is a unique individual.

The law of human variation permits children to be different from their parents. It permits brothers to think differently and to act differently. It permits the coexistence of misers and philanthropists; saints and sinners; rich and poor. It permits scholars to study, inventors to invent, preachers to preach, managers to manage, and laborers to labor. In short, it permits each person to seek the vocation and avocations which best suit his inherent talents, his education, his training, and his ambitions.

Without this variation, this unequalness, our social structure would be similar to that of an ant-hill or a bee-hive, where each member is born to fill a pre-determined niche, which he does with blind allegiance to his society and with no thought of personal interests or preferences.

I quote here from an authority on this subject, Dr. Roger J. Williams, co-founder and Director of the world-famous Clayton Biochemical Institute of the University of Texas. He said:

"It is my confirmed opinion, based upon diverse considerations and upon prolonged thought, that one of the most constructive and harmony-producing moves that we as inquiring human beings can make, is to get acquainted with, in the most scientific manner possible, the inherent differences that exist among members of the human family.

"Why choose our own schools, our own amusements, our own books, our own church? Why not have someone tell us what to eat, what to drink, whom to marry, and when we can have children? The fundamental reason is that each of us is a different individual, with profound differences, and each of us wants to live his own life..."

Given freedom of choice, some men may choose their vocations unwisely and will suffer thereby, as will the entire community because of reduced over-all productivity. But the risk of making the wrong choice is the price we pay for freedom. It is well worth it. For ultimately, our only options are individual freedom, or blind submission to the dictates of those who happen to occupy the seats of power.

Others may choose to do things which cause great harm. They may try to defraud or defame or steal from or murder their fellows. Forceful restraints are needed for such men. To apply such restraints is a proper function of government.

This arrangement for the protection of men's rights is not always successful. There are two hazards. First: given a monopoly of legalized force, government may become so powerful and so corrupt that it indulges in the very oppression of the people it was set up to prevent. Second: Should a preponderance

of the people abandon the disciplines of self-restraint they may require massive external force to control their behavior. Should this occur, the task of responsible representative government becomes impossible. The financial burden of maintaining order is intolerable. Furthermore, when an entire community becomes corrupt, whom can we then call upon to police the policemen? The processes of the free society break down, and despotism moves in to replace them.

These dangers were recognized early in our history when, at the close of the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin predicted that the Federal Union "... can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupt as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

It is clear that to have a free society it is essential that by far the greater part of the disciplines needed to preserve order must be generated within the individual citizens themselves. The only source of such internal restraints is the morality which flows from our religious precepts.

With such internal controls we can achieve a desirable balance between individual freedom and public order. We can avoid the dangers of having so much liberty that it becomes license, or alternatively, so much restrictive order that it becomes regimentation.

The early Americans were cognizant of this problem. William Penn said, "Men ultimately will be governed by God or ruled by tyrants." And George Washington, in his Farewell Address, warned us: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

What is the relevance of this to my subject, "Management, Automation, Freedom and Productivity"? I have indicated that maximum productivity, the basis of social progress, flows from a voluntary division of labor and that this freedom of choice must be subjected to the disciplines generated within the individual by his devotion to the moral code.

I have noted, also, the hazards which lurk in the automatic processes of mass production. Those processes require large accumulations of men, money and machines. This results in large concentrations of social, economic, and political powers that have not always been used by industrial managers equitably and with discretion. This facilitated the formation of huge labor unions which have great political potential. The unions acted to impose major restraints on management.

But the power of the unions was not always used in the public interest, nor even solely in the interest of their members. So "big government" glibly promised the people to act as arbitrator between "big industry" and "big labor", and to prevent excesses by either. In actual practice, the major effect of big government on the industry-union relationship has been to impose further restraints on management and to increase the power of government and unions.

Such restraints by unions or by government on the freedom of choice of management act, generally, to impede productivity, even though, in some instances, they may be needed to prevent injustices.

Until now, political expediency has exempted big unions from most of the restraining power of government. So, generally speaking, the major union effort has been diverted from improvement of the economic and working conditions of their members to the accumulation of political power to be wielded by their leaders.

We have here a powerful triumvirate, management, unions, and government, which should act together to achieve maximum productivity. How can such cooperation be obtained?

Edmund Burke said, "Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon the will and appetite is placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be of it without." I have explained the relevance of this thesis to the individual. It is equally applicable to the management of an industrial organization, or of a voluntary union, or of any other voluntary association of men. The standards of individual moral conduct essential to the preservation of a free society are precisely those which are essential to the preservation of free enterprise, or free unions, or free, that is, non-despotic government. In a free society when any of these indulges in corrupt or anti-social practices, it will eventually be subjected to such external restraints as are needed to preserve the structure of the social order.

What has been the net effect of assembly-line automation on the individual? When management divides tasks into minute repetitive actions the employee's freedom of choice and his creativity are restricted. But, at the same time, the resultant increase in productivity makes more time, energy and money available to him. These increased resources afford opportunities to exercise his creative energies in any way he may choose, or not to exercise them if he so chooses.

The question arises whether such expansion of freedom outweighs the contraction that the disciplines of automation demand.

I know of no device for measuring these factors precisely or even approximately. We must resort to generalities.

Perhaps our best indicator is the progress we have made as national productivity increased. Never before has any nation recorded advances in spiritual awareness, cultural attainments and material possessions comparable with those of America. Not only have the national totals of these blessings reached new heights, but their penetration into the less privileged areas of our society has been phenomenal. Today the standard of living of many semi-skilled or even unskilled American workers compares favorably with that of the wealthy of several generations ago.

Thus, while assembly line automation does restrict the freedom of choice of the individual who is directly engaged in that work, the resultant greater productivity acts to enhance his freedom and that of the entire community, in which he shares, also. On balance, there is no doubt that the pluses of automation outweigh the minuses.

It has been said that work on the assembly line is akin to drudgery. This need not be so. My experience in directing the productive activities of men leads me to conclude that much depends upon the spirit that prevails

in the organization. Most of us have seen instances where the cheer-leader, or the water boy, or the enthusiastic fan in the bleachers is convinced that he played a significant part in the success of his team; and thus he had a right to share in the psychological fruits of victory!

It is the spirit that should be fostered in mass-production industry. For precisely because the process is minutely divided, the correlation of the parts is the more significant. The machine operator should be aware of the importance of his role in the success of the whole enterprise.

Where there are industry-wide unions it is difficult to do this. The employee has a divided allegiance. His natural loyalty is to the man who gave him a job, a chance to earn a living. He sees that the stability and profitability of the company make his job more secure and improve his chances for advancement. He is a member of a "team"; he wants his team to win; and he wants to play a part in the victory.

But his union officials have no special interest in, nor do they feel any responsibility for, the success of his particular company. Their interest is in obtaining industry-wide concessions. Therefore, they reject any considerations which might be cited to justify preferred treatment for his company. Drawn, on the one hand toward the enterprise that gives him employment and, on the other, frequently told by his union officials that his personal interests and those of his company are antagonistic, the employee is subjected to the tension of divided loyalty. A specialist in industrial medicine has attributed many of the mental and emotional problems of workers to this tension.

Nevertheless, even under such conditions, management can do much to promote the spirit of responsible individuality and so achieve increased productivity. Most men are gratified when they work efficiently. It is this trait that should be nurtured by management. This can be done by following procedures which have proved to be effective. I will mention some of them briefly:

1. Leadership - Perhaps the most important factor in promoting efficiency in any organization, civil or military, is that nebulous thing called "leadership".

There have been many definitions of the term. The picture of a leader as a man of great personal power who, through the use of pressure, mental or physical, imposes his will upon others, has no place in our kind of society. With us, the true leader is one who achieves his objectives through the power of personal example, so that his followers will try to emulate him. This man is a leader, not a driver; he uses reason and persuasion, not a whiplash. A voluntary and enthusiastic following has this advantage: when the leader's back is turned, his followers serve his cause with even greater devotion than when he has his eye upon them.

Such a following can be developed and retained only if the leader has understanding and an open mind, manifested by a willingness to learn from anyone, no matter how lowly his job.

This is the highest type of leadership. It motivates men to be self-motivating.

Perhaps the greatest example of the power of leadership by personal example is recorded in the gospel of St. John, wherein it is related how, at the Last Supper, Jesus washed the feet of His disciples and said, "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you."

Thus did the Master, by His deed, lead His followers into the practice of humility and service to mankind!

2. Stature and Significance - Everyone wants to feel that he has worth and dignity. He thinks of himself as a person, not a number. Since God has endowed him with certain talents, he has stature and significance. Unless this is recognized by others, his efforts fall short of maximum productivity.

3. Utility - There is probably no more effective disincentive than for an employee to feel that his work is of little value. Everyone likes to know that what he is doing is important, for that means that he is important! All employees should be made aware that their contributions are of real value to the success of the whole enterprise.

4. Compensation - Perhaps it is trite to say that compensation, including fringe benefits, should reflect the going market rate for the kind and quality of services rendered. Most American enterprises are in competition with others. It is no less important for them to be competitive in the personnel market than with respect to the price and quality of their product.

5. Incentives - Properly designed incentive systems can provide large benefits for all. Care must be taken to avoid inequities and imbalances. American industry has sufficient competence and experience to devise effective incentive systems.

6. Tenure - In this age of rapidly changing technology and technological obsolescence, it is important that imaginative planning by management provide assurance of reasonable job security for the competent. Uncertainty as to whether he will soon be without a job can effectively destroy and employee's morale.

7. Duties - Responsibilities and Authority - Every employee should know what is expected of him. A precise definition of his duties, his responsibilities, and the extent of his authority are essential. This applies to the president of the corporation as it does to the lowest rating on the assembly line.

8. Team Play - Maximum productivity demands that every employee realize he is on the team, and he must sacrifice personal advantage when essential to team success. Industrial organizations are like athletic teams. It is possible for an all-star team to lose many games if each member is striving solely to establish records for himself, without regard to how the team is faring.

9. Competition - Americans thrive on competition. Employees should know that they are in competition with each other for the higher places in the organization. And they should be indoctrinated with the principle of fair competition, i.e., the golden rule.

10. Decentralization - One of the great hazards of management is the tendency to centralize operations in the hands of one individual. No matter how

efficient he may be, if he is directing a large scale operation he may easily become a bottleneck. There is a natural tendency for most subordinates to come to the "chief" for decisions, not only to relieve themselves of responsibility but also because it gives them a more intimate contact with the "boss".

Decentralization of authority induces growth in stature and capacity of subordinates and encourages them to reach out for responsibility. Furthermore, it permits a more effective budgeting of the boss' time, so that he has more opportunity for constructive thinking and for attention to "trouble spots".

11. Budgeting People and Time - As I have stated hereinbefore, the most important asset of an industrial organization is "people". A corollary to this statement is that the most scarce commodity is "time". It is very important that both "people" and "time" be carefully budgeted so that there will be no waste of either. It is gross inefficiency on the part of management to burden their subordinates with so many details of minor importance that they are overworked and so rapidly lose efficiency. There is an optimum work-load for each individual and it is management's job to find out what it is and then to avoid exceeding it except in cases of emergency.

In budgeting time, work sequences should be carefully studied out in advance in order to avoid costly delays.

12. Committees - I trust I will not be thought irreverent if I paraphrase a famous biblical statement by saying, "And God so loved the world that he did not send a committee, etc." Committees have their place in an industrial organization but they are not omniscient, as is evidently thought by some industrial managers. Committees are useful in determining policy matters. But when a committee tries to perform administrative or executive functions, it becomes ponderous, time-consuming, and ineffectual.

13. Perfection - One of the greatest burdens inflicted on business managers is the tendency on the part of some subordinates to strive for an impossible perfection in the performance of their duties. By doing so they frequently waste time, energy and money. This tendency is usually more prevalent in technically or professionally trained people.

In many instances where perfection would require x-days of effort on a specific item, an entirely satisfactory result can be obtained by the expenditure of something less than x-days. Frequently, by expending 75 percent of the time necessary to achieve perfection, we can achieve a result which is 95 percent of perfection and entirely satisfactory for the intended purpose.

14. Executive Functions - The basic functions of an executive heading a large organization are to (a) organize, (b) deputize, (c) synchronize, and (d) energize the efforts of his subordinates, who should then be turned to loose to "sink or swim". Only in this manner can he find out who are the best men.

An important collateral function is to provide for succession. Sometimes one finds a great reluctance on the part of some managers to formalize a plan for succession. Then, when misfortune strikes, hasty and ill-considered action is frequently taken, with disastrous results. Speaking on this subject, a business colleague of mine once remarked, "It frequently happens that

when a great president dies suddenly, the nearest guy who hasn't had a coronary is swept into the office."

15. Organization Charts and Organization Manuals - Organization charts and organization manuals are important tools of management. From my experience in many localities and in different types of organizations, both military and civil, I have concluded that any organizational structure will work with acceptable efficiency provided the people who compose the organization are imbued with the right spirit. A good organizational structure, accurately defined by charts and manuals will, however, make everyone's task easier and will produce greater productivity with far less effort. Conversely, no organization, no matter how well conceived and designed, can be efficient, ultimately, unless the personnel has those essential attributes which I have mentioned, namely, loyalty, devotion to duty, a dedication to "team-play", and adherence to fundamental principles.

16. Morale - All of the factors I have discussed above, taken together, add up to the stimulation of that indefinite thing called "morale". I have never seen an entirely satisfactory definition of this term. Perhaps the closest to my concept of a proper definition was given me during World War II on the occasion of a trip to the forward areas in the Pacific Ocean. I was chatting with a Seabee who had been under intensive enemy fire. I asked him, "Is there good morale in this outfit?" He said he thought so. I then asked him to define morale as he understood it. He hesitated, then said, "Morale is when your hands and feet keep working when your head says it can't be done."

How does one inspire morale in an organization? The formula varies with time, place and other circumstances, including the personal characteristics of the individuals concerned. But, we can be sure of this: Morale is "made at the top". Loyalty, esprit de corps, devotion to duty, and all other desirable traits permeate downward. They do not rise from the bottom. If fair dealing, genuine concern for the individual, devotion to moral principle, and willingness to sacrifice for the other fellow are to prevail in an organization, the standard must be set at the top.

This places a great responsibility on management. Figuratively speaking, every eye is on the boss watching to see what he will do in an emergency or when a crucial decision is to be made. If the action he takes conforms with the prevailing concept of honorable conduct, fair dealing and sympathetic understanding, rather than cold-blooded expediency or indifference, it sets a moral standard which is reflected throughout the organization.

The concepts I have described in brief outline are not mere theories. They represent the distilled essence of experiences in civil, military and industrial administration over many years. The results obtained support the thesis that management must achieve its objectives through the medium of human beings, and that employees respond most effectively when each one is treated as a responsible individual of worth and dignity, entitled to respect because he is self-respecting and respectable, and to whom is accorded maximum freedom of choice consistent with the nature of the operation.

The problem, we are told, is to fit little men into big societies. The ballot box operates in all modern States, and, therefore, most countries, even

the Communist despotisms, call themselves "democracies", merely because men are counted. But to be counted is not the same as to count. In mass societies the individual does not count. He feels himself submerged in the mass, dwarfed into insignificance except as he joins some crowd or pressure group. So long as he runs with the pack he feels secure. But a man's legs were given him not only to run with but also to stand on. If we do not take a stand for something, we are in danger of falling for anything. Where shall we take our stand and for what principles?

Our political forebears believed that each man counted -- because each man was accountable. In the religious faith they professed, the individual, not the group or the State, had to render an account of his life before God and, therefore, he was, in his own and his fellows' eyes, a responsible being. These are the convictions we must recover: that, whether one's contribution be made in the higher echelons of management or on the assembly line, each of us does count, each of us is responsible, and what each one does with his life can mean victory for the things that matter most!

The Communist despots, call themselves "democrats", merely because man
and counted, but to be counted is not the same as to count. In mass societies
the individual does not count. He feels himself submerged in the mass, dwarfed
and insignificant except as he joins some crowd or pressure group. So long
as he goes with the pack he feels secure. But a man's legs were given him not
only to run with but also to stand on. If we do not take a stand for something,
we are in danger of falling for anything. Where shall we take our stand and
for what principle?

The political forebears believed that each man counted -- because each man
was accountable. In the religious faith they professed, the individual, not
the group or the State, had to render an account of his life before God and,
therefore, he was, in his own and his fellow's eyes, a responsible being.
These were the convictions we must recover. That, whether one's contribution
be made in the highest echelons of management or on the assembly line, each of
us does count, each of us is responsible, and what each one does with his life
can mean victory for the things that matter most.

REFLECTIONS FROM A ROLLING STONE
(25 February 1972)

In this final lecture, I shall summarize the salient points of the first four lectures. While some repetitions may be desirable for emphasis, they will be kept to a minimum.

There is an old adage that "a rolling stone gathers no moss," meaning that it comes to final rest with little of value adhering to it. But, if it is tough enough, it will acquire many abrasions and, hopefully, here and there, small areas of polish. Usually there are useful lessons to be learned from the abrasions and satisfactions to be derived from whatever polish has been accumulated. In this light, my career may be likened, in some respects, to that of the proverbial rolling stone, and the commentaries which follow to the reflections from whatever polished areas there may be.

I present my views with humility. From experiences over many years I have learned that in light of the infinite variability of human beings, conclusions drawn from any set of circumstances may vary widely, depending upon the predilections of the observer. Each person will select, from a specific event, those values which he deems most appropriate for him.

I was educated as a Civil Engineer at Washington University, in St. Louis, graduating in 1913. I then served four years in the Engineering Department of the City. I was commissioned in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in 1917 as a lieutenant, junior grade, as the result of a competitive examination. During my service with the City I taught a night course in structural engineering at the University.

I retired from the Navy in 1946, after twenty-nine years and three months active duty. Thereafter I first served as President of a large construction company. In 1947 I became Chairman of the Board, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation, at that time the fourth largest steel producer in the United States. I retired from all executive functions of Jones & Laughlin in 1958, after 11½ years of service. I remained as a Director until 1965.

On leaving executive service with J&L I collaborated with the Honorable Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey, former Secretary of the Navy and then Chairman of the Board of McGraw-Edison Co.; and Mr. Henning W. Prentis, then Chairman of the Board of Armstrong Cork Co., to establish Americans for Constitutional Action, a nation-wide, non-partisan, non-profit political action organization. The primary purpose of ACA was, and is, to help elect to the Congress of the United States men and women of either Party, or of no Party, who have shown by their deeds their devotion to the spirit and principles which guided our Founding Fathers in formulating the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, with its Bill of Rights.

A secondary purpose is to keep the American electorate informed on the voting performances of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives on those issues which have a significant bearing on preserving the integrity of the Constitution.

An important collateral activity is to educate our people, insofar as our resources permit, in the basic principles of the Declaration and Constitution and to show them how the latter can be used as an instrument for preserving the rights of the people, as these are defined in the Declaration.

I served as Chairman of the Board of Trustees and Chief Executive Officer of ACA for 12 years, until I retired in 1970 and became Chairman Emeritus, a title I still retain.

My active service in the Navy covered the periods of World Wars I and II. It also included post-graduate study in concrete design and construction in the French Government Engineering School in Paris in 1932 and 1933.

During the eight years from 1937 to 1945, the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy, which I then headed, directed a world-wide construction program. This included the World War II operations of the Seabees in all theatres of war. At the peak, the total force numbered about 260,000 military personnel and 480,000 civilians. The total of the expenditures under the cognizance of the Bureau during this period was about \$11½ billion, including the pay and allowances of military personnel engaged on our work.

Shortly after VJ day in August 1945, I was given additional duty as Chief of the Material Division of the Assistant Secretary's Office. In October 1945, I was designated by President Truman to be Administrator of a major part of the American Petroleum Industry which had been seized by the Federal Government as the result of a nation-wide strike.

Later, in May 1946, the nation's strike-bound Bituminous Coal Industry was seized by the Government and placed in my charge. I had relinquished my duties as Chief of Bureau and Chief of Civil Engineers of the Navy when my second term expired on November 30, 1945.

I retained my assignment as Chief of the Material Division, Administrator of the seized Petroleum Industry and Coal Mines Administrator until I retired from active duty in the Navy on September 30, 1946.

Other major assignments during and after my Naval Service included duty as a member of the Board of Consulting Engineers of the Panama Canal, Chairman of the Task Force on Water Resources and Power of the Second Hoover Commission, member and later Chairman of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy and, more recently, Chairman of a Special Advisory Commission for the Future Development of the Naval Academy.

These varied activities afforded me opportunities to observe "all sorts and conditions of men" at home and abroad, people of different races, creeds, superstitions, prejudices, cultures, political systems and moral standards. Their governmental and social institutions ranged from those which permitted a considerable measure of individual freedom and few class distinctions to those under despotic rule and with sharply defined class stratifications.

I travelled in Italy during the Mussolini regime, in Germany as Hitler was coming into power, in England, and in France and other European nations during the same period.

I served in the Republic of Haiti from 1920 to 1924 as Executive Officer to the Engineer-in-Chief, Department of Public Works. The country was then controlled by an American military occupation administered by the U. S. Marine Corps. This was brought on in 1915 by a complete breakdown of law and order which threatened the security of all foreign nationals. The Civil Engineer Corps of our Navy was responsible for the operation of all public works and public utilities under the occupation.

In Haiti I was able to observe, at close range, a tax-burdened, regimented and impoverished people who has been exploited for more than a century by despotic unstable governments, controlled by venal political adventurers. Under their regimes, a once luxurious, highly productive island, which had been known as the Pearl of the Antilles, had been transformed into an almost barren wasteland, unable to feed its own people.

The France of 1932-33 showed the long-term effects of constant yielding to the demands of political pressure groups, urged on by ambitious politicians, for more and more special priveleges from government at the expense of their fellow citizens. There was clear evidence of the weakening of public and private marals. Later, in World War II, this culminated in the collapse of the famed Maginot Defense Line, surrender to the German Armies, and establishment of the collaborationist Vichy Government. The disintegration of the French defense establishment demonstrated the futility of reliance on physical instruments of defense when the spirit of the people had become perverted.

In Hitler's Germany, a cultured and industrious people had slipped their moral moorings and were being terrorized into obedience to a cruel and ruthless dictator.

In England the people were being subjected to the insidious seduction of the Fabians who held forth the promise of a Socialist Utopia in exchange for surrender of individual freedom and control of all human action by the master planners of the State.

In Italy a military dictatorship under Mussolini had led a peaceful, pleasure-loving people into ruthless suppression of opposition at home and war-like adventures abroad.

In the far East the militarists of Japan were making belligerent noises and indulging in threats and aggressive actions vis-a-vis China.

Soviet Russia, enthusiastic promoter of political and economic chaos in all non-communist nations, was still too weak relative to the highly industrialized nations of Europe to initiate war-like actions. But her ultimate objective of world conquest was made quite clear after she had been granted recognition by the United States in 1933. Her political leaders then boasted openly of their ambitions.

Here, at home, the Nation was in the throes of a severe economic depression which was world-wide in scope. Industry was stagnant, unemployment was nationwide and discontent was wide-spread. In 1933 a new National Administration had come into office under President Roosevelt with the promise of justice, moderation, frugality and virtue, and a return to conservative fiscal and monetary practices. But these noble objectives were soon forgotten and the Nation embarked on a profligate policy of Welfare Statism.

Such chaotic world conditions invited exploitation by despotic political adventurers!

In retrospect, one may well ask what lessons can be learned from these tragic events and their aftermath?

Foremost in my consciousness is the firm conviction that the most dread enemy of human well-being and progress is coercive force which is used to restrict man's freely chosen, morally proper, creative activities of mind or muscle. It makes little difference whether such coercive force be directed by benevolent or tyrannical masters, whether it be imperialism, fascism, nazism, communism, socialism or welfare-statism. In all cases the ultimate effect is the same; to restrict persons in their legitimate freedoms to worship, to speak, to study, to save, to venture economically, to help a neighbor in need and to be responsible for the results of their free choices.

It is not generally recognized that, in a large sense, my freedom depends on yours. If I should throw you to the ground and hold you there, your freedom of movement would be destroyed. But what has happened to my freedom? As long as I hold you in place my own freedom is impaired to the extent that I am bound to expend time and energy to restrain you and I, too, am immobilized!

The same process is at work on a larger scale when cities, states and nations take measures to restrict the freedoms of their citizens because such restrictions must be enforced by the agents of the government. The human energies thus diverted from productive activities might well spell the difference between poverty and affluence for the entire community.

It is of utmost importance that those of us who share the responsibilities of citizenship should know the principles of right and justice upon which the structure of our Free Republic was erected. Such knowledge would enable us to avoid the hardships which are inflicted on us when we violate those principles. They have served over the years to make our Nation a beacon of hope for the downtrodden and oppressed of the world until recently when we have seen fit to abandon them in pursuit of material comforts, luxuries, entertainment and economic security, all without demands on individual responsibility.

Perhaps changes in emphasis in the educational processes of some of our institutions of higher learning would be helpful in this area. In my own case, as I look back upon my formal education, I am sure I would do some things differently were I given the opportunity. I would concentrate on learning more about people, individual human beings, their hopes, their fears, their frustrations and how they can be motivated to help themselves, that is, to be self-motivating. I would try to learn the meaning and significance of that intangible thing called morale, and how it can be stimulated by effective leadership.

In retrospect, I am sure that I placed far too little emphasis on learning how to "think", and far too much on learning about "things". The world changes rapidly. New situations arise daily. The person who has the knowledge and the courage to break with tradition and, building on the accumulated wisdom of the past, open new trails into unexplored areas can make great contributions to human progress.

I am sure I devoted too much time and energy to learning "how to make a living" with corresponding neglect of learning "how to live". I see now the importance of learning about the nature of the universe, and the nature of man and his rightful place in that universe; about the meaning of freedom and its essential bond with religious faith. We engineers were taught to adapt the forces of nature to the uses of man, but we received no instruction in that vital force which is essential for all human progress, the spiritual strength of the individual.

As stated in prior lectures, the crucial conflict of our day is between self-disciplined responsible individualism and coercive collectivism, functioning under disciplines imposed and enforced by the State.

Self-discipline stems from dedication to a system of moral values derived from religious conviction. Coercive collectivism functions as a grouping of pliable, materialistic policies and practices, which make no claim to moral content, which are formulated to meet the needs of the moment, which promise a "heaven on earth" to its followers, and which always end in despotic control of all human action by a small clique who are masters at manipulating "the will of the majority" to suit the vagaries of currently popular political and social expediencies.

What was the nature of the fundamental principles professed by our political forbears? They were, broadly speaking, religious principles; not so much the doctrines and creeds which distinguish one sect or denomination from another but rather the fundamental belief in God which they share. It was a basic American principle to maintain a strict separation between Church and State, not because of any hostility to religion; quite the contrary. The State was to be secular in order that the society might be self-disciplined by religion, and thus free from the intrusions on privacy which almost always accompany efforts by government to preserve public order.

These convictions are visible in both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The framers of those documents believed they were transcribing "the laws of Nature and of Nature's God." The supremacy of the Constitution was believed to stem from its correspondence to a law superior to the will of human rulers.

The Founding Fathers were trying to set up a secular order based on their idea of the pattern laid down by God for man's conduct in society. And as evidence of their faith in the sanction of "Divine Providence" for their actions, they pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

In a free society it is vitally important that each of us should formulate his personal standards of values and principles by which he can set the course

of his own conduct. By doing so he can avoid the hazards which result from accepting ready-made standards presented to him by persuasive demagogues.

Each of us begins life with certain inherited physical, mental and moral characteristics, which are as unique as one's fingerprints. As we grow older, the differences at birth are enlarged by differences in environment, education, training, associations and personal experiences and by the influences of our studies, meditations, and such Divine guidance as we are able to invoke.

In light of the resulting wide variations in human beings, it follows that the conclusions they may draw from any given set of circumstances will vary widely, with corresponding differences in the values they are willing to accept. With increased knowledge, we will refine, amplify or correct our earlier views. As we develop keener perception, we will be able to distinguish more precisely between true and false values, between sound principles and expediencies.

If we accept, without question, alleged principles of right and wrong offered to us by others, we may become victims of gross deception. Each of us should decide for himself! And this applies with full force to the views I have presented in these lectures.

In my own case, I have learned that there are two significant questions one might ask in appraising the worth of proposed values and principles. They are, first, have they in the past worked productively? And, second, have they endured, under fire, over the ages? It is clear that the great moral precepts of the Judeo-Christian code pass these tests with flying colors, while the doctrines of dictators, although sometimes temporarily successful, have ultimately failed miserably, at tragic cost to the human race.

There are currently large gaps in all fields of human knowledge. In spite of great progress in recent decades, we are continually discovering new and unexplored areas more rapidly than we eliminate the gaps. Frequently we find that some of the physical laws which had already achieved the status of eternal truths are really not true. I am reminded of the story told of Larry Bell, noted airplane designer. To inspire his engineers he kept a large painting of a bumble bee over his desk with a legend which read something like this: "According to all the laws of aerodynamics, as expounded by our most learned scientists, this bee cannot possibly fly. But the bee cannot read the laws! So he flies! Go thou and do likewise."

The embryonic state of our knowledge and our vast potential for discovering new truths is clearly evident in the field of human actions and human relations. We still know relatively little about man. It is said that man has changed very little, if at all, over the past 4000 years. I feel sure that he has infinite capacity for good, just as he has infinite capacity for evil. Whether his talents will be devoted to the one or to the other depends upon his freedom to choose and, ultimately, will be determined by the strength of his devotion to the moral code of his religious faith.

Any effort to equalize the social and economic status of individuals by imposing on them the coercive force of government, thus restricting their free choice and their creative energies, is a contradiction of Nature's laws and can

only end in destruction of individual freedom without attaining the avowed objective. The task is too large and too complicated; it is even beyond human capacity to define with any degree of accuracy. Surely, we must join with the psalmist and sing ...

"O Lord, Thou has searched me and known me ...

Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; ...

It is high, I cannot attain unto it. ...

I will praise Thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made."

Because these lectures have been presented in an institution of learning which is an important part of our military establishment and to an audience of knowledge and perception, I believe it is fitting that they be ended with a few words on that formerly highly regarded but now much maligned attribute, patriotism.

My dictionary defines patriotism as "love of Country; devotion to the welfare of one's Country." It is a profoundly disturbing sign of our times that such a virtue is frequently challenged, as are others which formerly were highly regarded, such as honesty, piety, love of family and of neighbor, charity, duty and individual responsibility for honorable conduct!

Our materialistic age has spawned a rapidly expanding belief that only matter and motion are real; that there is significance only in events observable by the senses or measurable by physical instruments; that unless one can see, hear, smell, feel or taste a substance, it has no reality.

Based on my experiences, in many lands, with peoples of widely varying characteristics and customs, I reject this secular concept of the nature of the universe, and how it is ordered, and the nature of man and his place in that universe. I hold that those basically spiritual values, patriotism, piety, honor, love, duty, charity and personal responsibility, which can neither be observed by the senses nor measured by instruments, constitute the most powerful of those forces which, in the years to come, will shape the character of our world and of its peoples!

The materialistic concept was formerly supported by the most eminent scientists of the time. But early in the present century new concepts were advanced by a new generation of scientists. I will quote two which are typical of many.

In 1930, Sir James Jeans, eminent British physicist, said:

"Thirty years ago we thought, or assumed, that we were heading toward an ultimate reality of a mechanical kind. It seemed to consist of a fortuitous jumble of atoms which was destined to perform meaningless dances for a time under the action of blind, purposeless forces and then fall back to form a dead world. Into this wholly mechanical world, through the play of the same blind forces, life had stumbled, by accident.

"Today there is a wide measure of agreement which, on the physical side of science approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge

is heading toward a non-mechanical reality. The universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine....

"We discover that the universe shows evidence of a designing or controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds...."

In 1946, Dr. Arthur H. Compton, noted atomic physicist and Nobel Prize winner stated:

"...In their essence there can be no conflict between science and religion. Science is a reliable method of finding truth. Religion is the search for a satisfying basis for life....Science is growing. Yet a world that has science needs, as never before, the inspiration that religion has to offer.... Beyond the nature taught by science is the spirit that gives meaning to life."

Patriotism is a manifestation of love, a non-mechanical spiritual force of great purity and power. Over the ages man has revered it as the epitome of sacrifice, of selflessness, of devotion to high ideals.

During my military career I have seen this force at work under the most oppressive and hazardous conditions and I have observed its tremendous power.

I suspect that, in their zeal to promote internationalism and global interdependence, the advocates of "One World" are attempting to destroy nationalism by attacking patriotism. They never tire of quoting Samuel Johnson's famous aphorism, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." But Dr. Johnson was not attacking patriotism, he was attacking the scoundrel who sought refuge in patriotism because most people believe in it devoutly and thus it has become a privileged sanctuary! Dr. Johnson himself believed in patriotism, for he wrote, "That man is little to be envied whose patriotism would not gain force upon the plain of Marathon."

Religion, too, has been attacked as a refuge of scoundrels, as have other ethical and spiritual forces. Madame Roland, ardent activist of the French Revolution, on her way to the guillotine exclaimed, "O Liberty! Liberty! What crimes are committed in thy name!" Should we then condemn liberty because it was so abused?

I have long believed that a peaceful, morally motivated world society can evolve only if individuals first establish moral disciplines within themselves, then in the family, the local community, the State and finally in the Nation, after which they could join with other nations of like disciplines to form larger communities.

A fair appraisal of the current scene indicates that we have a long hard road to travel before we will have established moral standards of such integrity in our own communities as to justify any attempt to reform the world.

It is characteristic of visionary political planners, who often have great difficulty managing the affairs of their own small households, to demonstrate

complete confidence in their competence to plan and direct the orderly functioning of a united world!

Patriotism -- love of one's own Country -- is no more outmoded than is belief in a just and merciful God. The late General MacArthur, the very acme of patriotism, said:

"Our great strength rests in those high-minded and patriotic Americans whose faith in God and love of country transcends all selfish and self-serving instincts. We must command their maximum effort toward a restoration to public and private relationships of our age-old standards of morality and ethics -- a return to the religious fervor which animated our leadership of former years to chart a course of humility and integrity as best to serve the public interest."

At the close of the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin predicted that the Federal Union "...can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupt as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

And the late David Starr Jordan, former President of Stanford University, reminded us of our duty in these words: "Does history ever repeat itself? It always does if it is true history. If it does not, we are dealing not with history but with a mere succession of incidents. Like causes produce like effects just as often as man may choose to test them.... How long will the Republic endure? So long as the ideas of its founders remain dominant."