"TO PROMOTE THE GENERAL WELFARE"

An essay on the powers and duties of government and the rights, obligations and responsibilities of citizens

By SCOTT NEARING

Scott Nearing

Social Science Pamphlets No. 1

Harborside, Maine Social Science Institute

Price per copy 25 cents; Five copies one dollar
Ten or more copies 17 cents each

1956

"TO PROMOTE THE GENERAL WELFARE"

"We the people of the United States, in order to . . . promote the general welfare, . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of North America." This statement is embedded in the Preamble to the United States Constitution. It is known as The General Welfare Clause.

Six purposes are set forth in the Preamble as the underlying objectives which led to the writing of the Constitution. "To promote the general welfare" is one of the six. The authors of the Constitution laid down a proposition which was widely accepted among the political scientists and popular leaders of the day: Human beings must work together to promote the general welfare.

The Importance of Right Thinking

Packed into the brief General Welfare Clause are three interrelated concepts: "welfare," "general" and "promote." We should be clear in our minds as to the nature of these ideas before considering how political scientists and popular leaders of our day are dealing with the general welfare issue.

During the years since the Constitution was written, the General Welfare Clause has been given less attention than those parts of the Constitution concerned with special interests, such as the provision that private property may not be taken for public uses without just compensation. There has been a tendency, particularly since the rise of the big corporations, to pass up the general welfare with a cursory glance, while treating the special interests of property owners with a consideration bordering on tenderness. As the country has grown in size, wealth and complexity, there have been more special groups demanding priorities, protection and assistance. Consequently, the general welfare has been pushed further and further into the background of public attention. The result of this emphasis on the particular, and neglect of the general welfare, has been a growing babel and confusion as particular claimants have advanced their interests at the expense of the general public, of which the individual contenders are integral parts.

Definitions are at best annoying and at worst frustrating and exasperating. However, until our ideas are clear and our thinking is straight we will blunder into one dead-end policy after another. If we are sincere in our desire to promote the general welfare, we must begin by defining our terms and then lay out a program of action which promises to crown our efforts with success.

Eastern thinkers lay emphasis on the relative four dimensional nature of ideas—length, breadth, height and movement. Westerners have been inclined to regard ideas as having length, breadth and height, but no fourth dimension of change or variation. For the purposes of this discussion, we propose to follow the Eastern thought pattern, based on the premise that all human experience reports not merely dimensions but relationships. One of the most important of these relations is the range of opposites or the clash of opposing forces, such as positive and negative charges of electricity; the expansion and contraction of materials; the growth and decay of living forms; the production and destruction (or consumption) of goods and services. On all sides, in nature as in society, we observe the unceasing process of building up and tearing down. Economics and politics are in a peculiar sense subject to this principle of relativity because of the far-reaching consequences of discovery and invention in the fields of science, technology and social engineering.

The Idea of "Welfare"

We propose to use this approach in dealing with the three concepts contained in The General Welfare Clause, beginning with "welfare."

We assume that "welfare" is an affirmative idea. Therefore we set it down as a positive concept. Opposite to it, on the negative side, we place "illfare." All matters of public concern, such as soil fertility, means of transportation and communication, educational opportunities, and the use of government to serve public needs and advance public enterprises, are to be judged in terms of their contribution to welfare or illfare. The soil may be conserved or depleted; the means of transportation may be adequate or inadequate; educational facilities may be equal and ample or unequal and niggardly; government may be adding to the security and stability of the community or providing more effective means for its destruction and annihilation.

In each of these situations—soil fertility, transportation, educational opportunity, the contributions of government—positive and negative forces are at work. Soil is being built and at the same time is being eroded; transportation facilities are sufficient for today, but

by tomorrow an increase in the number of cars on the highways or the number of people wishing to ride in busses may make the facilities quite inadequate; educational opportunities, satisfactory at one stage in the development of a community, may become obsolete at another stage; government may serve the people or it may become an instrument for their enslavement. The omni-presence of change—of expansion and contraction, of growth and decay, of production and destruction, gives relativity an important place in any discussion of society, its requirements and opportunities.

Perhaps we can meet the needs of our thinking by stating that welfare is present where the plus forces predominate and illfare where negative forces are in the ascendant. At the same time we must realize that the relative strength and position of the positive and the negative, of the constructive and destructive forces, is being constantly altered, so that a situation dominated by the constructive forces today may be in the grip of the destructive forces tomorrow. If we propose to establish, maintain and enhance welfare, we must strengthen the positive forces and hold them dominant in relation to their negative opposites.

Put the thought in concrete terms—the construction of a house. The homemaker, in order to protect the members of his family against wind, sun, rain, snow, decides to put up a building. Before he even finishes laying the roof, it begins to wear—the wood rots, the metal corrodes. In order to safeguard his family against the elements, he must repaint, repair and eventually replace the roof. Destruction accompanies production and can be offset in part by eternal vigilance and in part by ceaseless replacement and re-production. This principle applies to the general welfare as it does to every effort of men to preserve and increase life, freedom and well-being.

What is "General" Welfare?

Second among the terms in The General Welfare Clause is "general." The authors of the Preamble had in mind not merely welfare but a particular kind of welfare, the general welfare.

Again we are compelled to deal with a relative concept. Opposite "general" we place "particular," or, in a parallel opposition, "whole" and "part." The word "general," used in this sense means all-inclusive. We may speak of the general health of the human body, referring not to a particular cell or tissue or organ, but to the entire body. Or we may speak of the general welfare of a community of human beings, such as the passengers and crew of a ship at sea, or the citizens of a nation or a state—having in mind not the welfare of a particular individual in the group, but of the collectivity. Victor

Hugo summed up this thinking aptly: "There can be no accident to the vessel that is not the concern of every passenger." In terms of the general welfare of a city, state or nation, this thought could be translated into: "An injury to one is an injury to all; a benefit to one is a benefit to all."

Welfare may be particular or general. The authors of the Preamble had in mind the welfare of all inhabitants of the territory for which they were responsible.

"Promoting" the General Welfare

"Promote" is a positive, affirmative word meaning to further, advance, augment. In opposition to "promote" one may put a tepid "permit," "allow" or a staunch "oppose," "retard," "restrict." If we allow something to happen we are passive or indifferent. If we oppose an idea or a policy we take an active contrary position.

"Promote" and "laissez-faire" are in opposition to one another. Promotion is affirmative, active, insistent; while laissez-faire or hands-off, is negative, passive. The men who wrote "to promote the general welfare" evidently had in mind definite affirmations designed to enhance the well-being of the whole body of the citizenry.

Checks and Balances in Human Society

Society, like nature, taken at a particular place and time, is a resultant of opposing forces. Until some change occurs, we say that the natural object or the community is "in balance." If we wish to build a bridge we must assemble the required materials and place them in such relation with one another that the resulting structure will carry traffic. If we are interested to promote the general welfare, we must establish an equilibrium or balance of social forces which will improve conditions for the inhabitants of all parts of the community.

General welfare presupposes the particular welfare. You cannot hope for health in a body where tissues and organs are diseased and whose functions are deranged. The welfare of the whole is dependent upon the welfare of the parts composing the whole. Interdependence works both ways. General welfare is essential to particular welfare, and particular welfare enhances general welfare up to the point at which particular welfare upsets the balance of the whole.

We have now thought our way through to the problem of checks and balances in society and in government. Society and government are wholes or aggregates composed of interdependent parts, held in balance by the forces which they contain and express. If the forces are properly adjusted to one another, the community and the gov-

ernment enjoy order and peace. If the adjustment is faulty, the result will be disorder and conflict.

Those who wrote the United States Constitution were colonists, striving to make a home for themselves on an undeveloped continent. They or their fathers had migrated from a Europe torn by class conflict, disrupted by national ambitions and rivalries and devastated by war. The North American colonies were likewise feuding—over land grants, boundaries and trade restrictions. Both Europe and North America were passing through a profound social transition, from agriculture to commerce and industry, from a community dominated by landlords to one dominated by businessmen, from monarchical to republican forms of government.

Students of government and practical politicians among the American colonists were concerned to promote the general welfare by bringing order out of chaos, replacing war by peace, and dedicating government to the public interest rather than to the interests of special privileged minorities. The United States Constitution was designed to achieve these results. The central principle used in its formulation was that of checks and balances.

European nations had been taken over by hereditary rulers who owned the land, collected the taxes, made and enforced the laws, raised armies, and fought wars as fancy or class interest might dictate. Barons, princes, kings and emperors thought little of the general welfare. They inherited or seized power and exercised it in pursuit of their ambitions or of their pleasures. Their subjects suffered the consequences and footed the bills.

Despotism and tyranny resulted from concentration of authority in the hands of unrepresentative irresponsible minorities. The authors of the United States Constitution faced the problem of establishing a pattern of society and a form of government that was representative and responsible, and that would devote itself to the general welfare rather than to the promotion of special interests.

Checks and Balances in the Constitution

The checks and balances provided for in the United States Constitution are of several sorts. First there are the three parallel departments of the government—legislative, executive, judiciary, each with its specified powers, functions, and designated sphere of action. Each was to be semi-independent of the other two. Yet all three are coordinated to carry out the tasks outlined in the Preamble.

Second is the parallel organization of the federal and the state governments. The Federal Government has specific powers, duties and responsibilities. Each state government also has powers, duties

and responsibilities within its own boundaries. Matters of concern to a particular state are left to the state government, while matters of concern to two or more states—inter-state relations—are placed in the hands of the federal authorities. The Federal Government is the whole. The states are semi-independent parts within that whole. The whole and the parts are coordinated under the Constitution.

Public Authority and Private Citizenry

The third sort of check and balance is that between the government or public authority and the people or private citizenry. The government—federal and state—occupies its allotted place in the life of the community. There are other, non-governmental, institutional and personal aspects of community life.

Institutional aspects are referred to in the First Amendment to the Constitution. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." When this article was written, various non-governmental institutions were functioning in the several states—churches, newspapers, political committees and associations. These institutions, and their place in the social scheme, are recognized in the First Amendment.

Since the First Amendment was written, additional private associations have come into being. Among businessmen there are corporations, chambers of commerce, boards of trade and social service clubs. Among farmers, wage-workers and professionals, there are granges, unions, producers and consumers co-operatives, insurance, mutual benefit and educational organizations, and professional associations. In the general population there are parent-teachers associations, mens' clubs, womens' clubs, clubs concerned with sport, social gatherings, amusement and entertainment. Government has entered this field, particularly in connection with education, public health and recreation, but the bulk of its activities are still in the hands of private associations.

Government in its different branches, and the numerous and varied private associations, occupy two semi-independent compartments in the community. To continue our analysis in relativist terms, social relationships in the United States are ranged along a band or scale. At one end of this scale is government or public authority. At the other end are the citizens, with their private (non-public) affairs and associations. So long as these opposite forces are kept in balance, the community enjoys order and peace. The public or governmental

sphere of life and the sphere occupied by private activities and associations are connected by many ties such as communication, taxation, legal regulation. Each sphere enjoys a degree of independence or sovereignty, as expressed in the First Amendment. Government does not include private associations, nor do private associations owe their existence to government. Like two peas side by side in a pod, each has its separate connection with the mother plant—the community.

Public institutions and private activities and associations are balanced against one another in the same sense that the legislative and executive departments of the government are balanced. The spheres of the two are prescribed in part by the Constitution, by law and judicial rulings. In part they are fixed by custom and by accepted current usage.

The juxtaposition of public institutions and activities and private associations is one aspect of check and balance in the American community. Three others merit comment.

Crafts, Arts, Trades and Professions

Crafts, arts, trades and professions are results of the principle of specialization. Long before there was a constitution, or a civilization, for that matter, human beings were specializing—the hunter, the shepherd, the wood cutter, the soil tiller, the metal worker, weaver, tailor, mason, carpenter, trader. Crafts and trades were organized, in the course of time, with their rules, regulations, disciplines.

Historically, there were three "learned professions," theology, the law and medicine. Western civilization had added four other categories to the professions before the Constitution was adopted in 1789. One was the professional soldier; another, that of political leader and office holder; the third was the writer-journalist-publisher, and the fourth was the educator-school teacher. Since the Constitution was written, important additions have been made to the list of professions: scientists, engineers, economists, sociologists, psychologists, public relations counsel. Professions have certain common features. They require special knowledge, for which considerable periods of training are necessary. Much professional education is provided gratis, putting the recipient in debt to the community. The community on the other hand, is indebted to the professional for the specialized, expert services which he is able to render.

Time was when craft and trade guilds and professional schools (universities) and associations enjoyed somewhat the same independent status as the church, and like the church were represented in legislative bodies. As Western society is stabilized and the social bal-

ance is restored, occupational associations will again be recognized by the community and will speak and act for their respective occupational groups, establish and maintain standards of occupational excellence, preserve order, maintain discipline within the group and thus play an essential and semi-autonomous part in advancing the general welfare.

Prerogatives enjoyed and responsibilities assumed by members of the crafts, arts, trades, and professions do not derive from government and are not based on law. They are inherent in the services rendered to the community by members of these specialized groups. If there were no government and no law, craftsmen, artists, tradesmen and professionals still would enjoy a status based upon their contributions to community well-being.

Personal Privacy

Personal privacy is another aspect of community life, referred to in the Constitution and respected and followed by common usage and consent. The best-known popular description of this semi-independent phase of community life is found in the saying: "A man's home is his castle." The Constitution-makers laid great emphasis on personal privacy. The citizen enjoys, under the Constitution, certain carefully specified rights and privileges. Thus, in Amendment IV:—"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated." Amendment III reads:—"No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

Each citizen, under Constitutional provisions, is entitled to a life of his own. He and his family circle occupy a position which is semi-autonomous and semi-sovereign. As a citizen he is part of the neighborhood, the town and the state. In the field of his occupation he is a member of an interdependent team or group. He may have his responsibilities to various private associations, but at home he is entitled to live his own life. The citizen, "his house, his papers and his effects," constitute a preserve or sanctuary which may not be invaded by the most powerful government.

Popular Sovereignty

Beside and beyond the areas occupied by non-governmental, private associations, by occupational groups, and by the citizen and his homestead, the Constitution recognizes the area of popular sovereignty, described specifically in Amendments IX and X. "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed

to deny or disparage others retained by the people." "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Amendments V and VI safeguard the people against excesses by law-enforcing agencies. Amendment VII provides for jury trials in civil suits. Amendment VIII forbids excessive bail, excessive fines and "cruel and unusual punishments."

The Constitution recognizes and describes the area of popular sovereignty in some detail. It is a definite area, occupied by the sovereign people in the same sense that other areas of autonomy and authority are occupied by Congress or the courts.

One additional distinction of the greatest importance is made in the Constitution. Certain powers are granted to the Federal Government. Certain other powers, such as passing *ex post facto* laws or bills of attainder, or imposing export taxes, are prohibited to the Federal authority and to the states. All other powers not specifically listed "are reserved to the states respectively or to the people." Thus, the people are the residual claimants of power.

Parallel Interdependent Sovereign Areas

Here are six parallel autonomous or sovereign areas occupying, with respect to each other, the relation of opposing forces and thus following the principle of social checks and balances—(1) The departments within the Federal Government. (2) The federal, state and local public authorities. (3) Non-governmental voluntary associations. (4) The crafts, arts, trades and professions. (5) Personal privacy. And (6) the final claimant to residual power and authority, the people. Each of these areas is semi-autonomous or semi-independent. Each enjoys privileges and assumes responsibilities. All are coordinated into a totality which we call the community.

The pattern was designed to protect the community against disorder and chaos on the one hand and against despotism and tyranny at the other extreme. Each of these semi-autonomous areas enjoys a degree of sovereignty. Hence, its borders may not be crossed by representatives of other areas, nor may its rights and privileges be infringed. Each area must be eternally vigilant to protect its borders against violation, and must be prompt to take appropriate action in case of infringement. Only thus can justice be done and balance, order and peace be preserved in the community. The community out of which the Constitution grew, and in which the Constitution has been operating, is an example of planned multiplicity within unity. It was designed to promote the general welfare and at the same time to recognize, describe and safeguard the interests of the various groups and areas of which the community is composed.

This analysis of the universal principle of polarity, expressed in the balance of opposing forces, and of its corresponding principle of checks and balances in an interdependent, pluralistic or federalistic society, has been written mainly in terms of American experience. It might have been written with equal validity in terms of Swiss, Scandinavian, French or British experience. The principle has a wide application. We have illustrated it with American examples because this pamphlet will be read chiefly by an American audience.

From the twelfth century A.D. onward, Europeans were thinking, discussing, planning, organizing and administering life in terms of the division of rights, duties, responsibilities and powers in a complex, interdependent community. The governments of the various North American colonies reflected the developing science and art of social engineering, which played so significant a role in the drafting of the United States Constitution.

A Social Hurricane

During the past half century a social hurricane has swept the western world. Economic depression, war, revolution and counter-revolution have twisted, torn and uprooted the accepted institutions in one country after another. The social uprooting has been particularly destructive in Europe and Asia.

Disturbance and disruption, from whatever cause they may arise, upset the social balance, and dislodge some among the powerful and the privileged. In the course of re-establishing the social balance, power and privilege are re-distributed among individuals, classes and power-wielding cliques and groups. For considerable periods authority may go begging, as it has in France since the war of 1914-18, or it may be seized by adventurers as it was in Italy and Germany in 1922 and 1933.

"Easy power," like "easy money," is a temptation to the greedy and the ambitious. A clever demagogue, preying on the ignorance, credulity and anxiety of the populace, and using the publicity techniques now available, may build himself a following over night, seize power, place himself and his backers in the seats of the mighty, fatten on the spoils of office, and bathe in the spotlight of fame and fortune.

It is at this stage in the process that we find ourselves today in the United States. The depression of 1929-39 bit deep. Pearl Harbor and the war of 1941-45 proved to be a rough awakener to the realities of the world power struggle. Since 1946 the Oligarchy has deluged the country with fear and hate propaganda. In 1945 the first atom bomb, manufactured under the direction of President Roosevelt and dropped at the behest of President Truman, vaporized an en-

tire city on the instant. The Korean police action, begun by President Truman in 1950, developed into a major and tragic war of position and attrition. Meanwhile, East Europe and large parts of Asia "went Communist," India won its independence, and Africa rose in revolt against its imperial overlords. The world seems to be shifting on its foundations. Men and women in the United States are unclear concerning these events, and disturbed and anxious regarding the outcome. Such a situation is easy meat for the demagogue.

Inquisitors on the Rampage

Demagogues in many parts of the world have risen to power because of instability and insecurity engendered by a major change in the culture pattern. American demagogues are taking advantage of the confusion, disorder and uncertainty that the social hurricane has left in its wake—particularly during the anxious cold war years and the wracking epoch of the Korean War.

Locally, United States demagogues are harrying dissidents, denouncing heretics, closing public forums, banning meetings, boycotting magazines, burning books, terrorizing the wives and children of the unorthodox, hounding teachers, preachers and editors who have the temerity to speak or write in opposition to the official line on matters of public policy. At the state level, the demagogues are prescribing loyalty oaths, purging the schools, enforcing state sedition laws, and in a few instances, sending their most stubborn opponents to serve long terms in the penitentiary. At the federal level, the demagogues are working out from the office of the Attorney General, the secret police (F.B.I.), the White House, the House of Representatives and the Senate—encouraging denunciations of private citizens, cataloging neighborhood gossip, listing and attacking organizations which express minority opinion, putting millions of office holders through humiliating loyalty tests, indicting and convicting men and women for the crime of "conspiracy to teach." The most spectacular performances have been the inquisitions directed by Congressional committees into the beliefs, ideas, associations, political leanings and activities of trade unionists, movie producers, writers and actors, educators, scientists, publicists, and the determined efforts, backed by threats of public smearing, fines and jail sentences, to extort from witnesses the names of others, who in their turn may be put on the grill for the delectation of the committee members and to satisfy the cravings of a sensation-sated press, radio and television audience.

Legislative committees are raiding parallel government agencies, private associations, the prerogatives of professionals and the privacy of individuals, asking questions, making demands and uttering threats

which contravene both constitutional guarantees and the fundamental principles underlying the pluralistic make-up of the United States community. Interrogations center around the question: "Are you or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" Demands center around the citing of names and the furnishing of lists of individuals—a demand that compels the witness to become an informer against his neighbors, associates, fellow workers and fellow citizens. The witnesses are under oath. If they make an inaccurate or incorrect statement, they are indicted for perjury; if they refuse to answer, they are charged with contempt of Congress and, if convicted, are fined and/or imprisoned. If witnesses invoke the Fifth Amendment, written to prevent self-incrimination as the result of torture, they are *ipso facto* considered to be guilty, dismissed from their jobs and denounced as subversives. When one of the inquisitorial committees goes to a community like Los Angeles or Detroit, staff members summon educators, doctors, lawyers, trade union leaders, ministers, workers, editors. Anyone, man or woman, who is known as an upstanding, energetic advocate of minority causes and a supporter of unpopular ideas is called before the inquisitors, grilled, badgered, insulted, bullied and threatened. The unhappy victims of this procedure are not charged with any overt or illegal act. They are accused of holding ideas and of associating with groups which are out of favor with the American Oligarchy.

As the heresy hunt gains momentum, to be subpoenaed before one of the inquisitors is considered the equivalent of a charge of disloyalty. Since the inquisitors are by-passing due process of law, a subpoena is accepted by the public as a conviction. Those who are summoned are discredited in their work places, among their associates, in their neighborhoods. Inquisitions, elaborately staged and publicised, spread terror across the country. Anonymous denunciation, channeled through the secret police, can result in unfavorable publicity, unemployment and a reputation ruined by the mere fact of accusation. The terror is particularly great among public employees; however, it reaches into all of the major professions and even into the offices of the United Nations.

Conducted in any form, public grillings such as those of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Permanent Committee on Investigation would be annoying and aggravating, even to the most experienced public figure. To the uninitiated, they are as terrifying as a child's first appearance on a public platform.

As an example of such procedure, take the hearings which the Senate Subcommittee on Permanent Investigation staged in Boston,

Massachusetts, on November 19, 1953. Private hearings, held previously, had convinced the Committee that it had savory morsels for the avid press, radio and television audiences. The press and camera men were alerted, the public was informed of the approaching spectacle and at 9 o'clock on Wednesday morning the Committee turned on the Kleig lights and produced a hero and several villains. The hero, William Teto, was a former worker at the General Electric Plant in Lynn, Mass., who, in 1941 had decided that it was his patriotic duty to join the Communist Party and report his findings to the secret police (F.B.I.). Before a packed hearing room and a breathless radio and television audience he went through the act which had been rehearsed the previous day in the private committee session.

The secret police spy told his local, his radio and television and his newspaper audience that he was a Communist. Senator McCarthy: "Mr. Teto, as of this moment are you a member of the Communist Party?" Answer: "Yes sir."

Teto then told how in 1941, he had decided to provide the secret police with what information he could gather by joining the Party, and of the thirteen terrible years from 1941 to 1953 during which his reputation as a Communist had alienated his father, wrung the heart of his mother, separated him from his brother and kept him from going to church. The under-cover man had been elected secretary of his Communist Party branch and was thus in possession of the membership list and of branch records. He knew who worked in the factory, the reports they made at meetings and the private conversations which he was able to over-hear. Thus he could inform the Committee: (1) that Communist Party members were employed in the General Electric plant; (2) that some of them worked on government contracts; (3) and were in a position to sabotage defense production, and (4) that they could bring secret information concerning government contracts to the Communist Party branch. He did not report a single example of sabotage nor an instance in which secret information had been brought to the branch.

The spy was then asked to identify his fellow Communist Party members. Since they were waiting, conveniently, with their attorney, in the hearing room, and stood up when requested, the Committee was able to confront the police-spy hero with the Communist villains. Whereupon the following interrogation took place: Question—(To Teto): "Did you know a man named Robert Goodwin?" Answer—"Yes sir."

Q.—"Does he work for the General Electric?" A.—"Yes sir."

Q.—"Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?"

A.—"Yes sir."

Q.—"I think Mr. Goodwin is here. Would he stand up?"

The marshall called Goodwin.

Q.—"Will you take a look at this man. Is this Mr. Goodwin a member of the Communist Party as far as you know?"

Goodwin started to talk before Teto could answer but McCarthy interrupted: "No Communist will cross examine our witness."

Goodwin: "You are making a political speech here."

McCarthy: "Marshal, will you remove the witness?"

(The witness was removed.)

Q.—(To Teto): "As far as you know is he a member of the Communist Party at this moment?" A.—"Yes sir."

Q.—"In his work at the General Electric plant in Lynn would he be in the position to sabotage facilities there in case of war with Communist Russia?" A.—"Yes sir."

Q.—"Do you consider it an extremely dangerous situation to have men who are Communists at this moment working in the GE plant?" A.—"Yes sir."

Another witness was then called to the stand and the act was repeated.

Supposedly, the Senate Committee was aiming to show that the Communist villains had reported secret information to their Party branch or sabotaged work on government contracts. Actually, the Committee got only second-hand information that the villains were Communist Party members. When questioned on the subject, the villains invoked the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. This "hiding behind the Fifth Amendment" was treated by the Committee as an admission of guilt.

At 10 A.M. the hearing adjourned in order that the Committee Chairman might fly out to his home state to make a speech. Whereupon the spy-hero, under police escort to heighten the dramatic effect, went home and was received into the bosom of his family amid the flashing of bulbs and the clicking of cameras. The General Electric Company played its part in the drama by sending telegrams suspending from work two villains who had refused to say whether they were or were not Communists. Verbatim reports of this affair were carried in the Boston papers on Nov. 20, and detailed stories were telephoned, telegraphed and radioed across the United States.

There was an anti-climax next day when newspapers reported that the spy-hero had a record as an army deserter, that he had pleaded guilty to passing bad checks, that in his garage were two expensive autos and that he had been living a life of comfort not as

a GE worker but as an upholsterer. A spokesman for the Communist Party threw more cold water by announcing that the spy-hero had been expelled from the Party in 1949 on charges of being a government agent. He was therefore guilty of perjury when he had said, under oath, that he was a Party member in 1953. This information, however, appeared in an inconspicuous place and in small type, while the name and fame of the Committee Chairman had been headlined and broadcast across the nation. Millions had heard and seen evidence that the General Electric plant at Lynn, Massachusetts had been the scene of a horrendous Communist plot.

Now comes the most devastating aspect of this squalid episode. In the course of a controversy over espionage in government, Senator McCarthy had secured time on a nation-wide radio and television hook-up (on Nov. 24th) to answer charges made against him by Ex-President Harry Truman. In the course of his radio address, the Senator attacked the Eisenhower Administration, of which, in theory at least, he is a part. At his next press conference, on December 2, President Eisenhower, without mentioning McCarthy by name, read this statement: "In all that we do to combat subversion, it is imperative that we protect the basic rights of loyal American citizens. I am determined to protect those rights to the limit of the powers of the office with which I have been entrusted by the American people."

The President read the words slowly, emphatically, dramatically, to a hushed press audience. Presumably he was silencing Senator McCarthy. In fact, he was endorsing the entire McCarthy program of insult, slander, purge and terror by referring to "the basic rights of loyal American citizens."

What is a "loyal" citizen? Has the President the authority to define it? The word does not appear in the Constitution. The Bill of Rights refers to "the right of every citizen." This would include those critical of the government as well as McCarthy men. Senator McCarthy would agree with the President's statement one hundred percent—if McCarthy were permitted to decide who are loyal and who disloyal.

American citizens have a right to disapprove and oppose everything for which the Senator or the President stands. The term "loyal" as used by the President contravenes the Constitution and violates the fundamental concepts of the part played by the citizenry in a society of checks and balances.

The Romans threw subversives to the lions. In the United States they are subpoenaed before legislative committees. The Committee members emerge from the hearings as high priests of patriotism and defenders of freedom and justice. The victims of the public circus lose their jobs and are smeared as disloyal.

At the time the Senate Committee staged its rehearsed television show in Boston, there was no United States law which made Communist Party membership a crime. If there were such a law, it would contravene the constitutionally guaranteed rights of private association and personal privacy. If these constitutional guarantees are swept aside, the social balance will be upset and the life, liberty and happiness of the population will be endangered by the demagogues and the tyrannical actions of despots. The Constitution also provides that a citizen must be presumed innocent until guilt is proved. The Senate Committee began the hearing with the presumption that a Communist is guilty of anything and everything until proved innocent.

While the Senate Committee in Boston exceeded its authority as defined in the law which called it into being, flouted the Constitution and violated the most elementary principles of justice and social decency, there are urgent reasons behind such exhibitions.

The first reason is that the Republican Party, during its first year of office since 1932, has failed dismally to fulfill its budget-balancing, deficit-liquidating, tax-reducing, peace-making promises, and has fallen heir to a full-scale slump in farm prices at the same time that the prices of manufacturers and the dividends on industrial stocks are rising. To divert public attention from these unpleasant facts, the most effective scheme is a red herring in the form of an anti-Communist drive.

The second reason is that the Republican Party is anxious to win the Congressional elections in 1954 and the Presidency in 1956. Party leaders have evidently decided that their surest road to success is to prove to the voters that the previous Democratic Administration, from the President down, was pro-Communist, and that national defense was being undermined by a monstrous Communist plot to corrupt the schools, subvert the trade unions and sabotage the industries.

The third reason is that the United States Oligarchy must have a menacing devil abroad to attract public attention while it grabs more power and consolidates its position at home. International Communism fills the bill.

Last, but perhaps not least, the Chairman of the Senate Sub-Committee is building a platform of public confidence and support from which he proposes to leap into the White House. After testing out the vote-getting possibilities of several other issues, he has come to the conclusion that red-baiting and witch-hunting are the best devices for keeping him in the spotlight. He made this clear in his broadcast on Nov. 24, 1953.

Another excuse for the Congressional inquisitors, and perhaps the most convincing to the general public, is the allegation that there existed in the United States, and in government service during the 1941-45 war, groups of individuals who were securing and transmitting information to the Soviet Government. This charge merely asserts a truism. All rich and powerful nations, including the United States, organize and subsidize groups of individuals whose business it is to gain access to confidential information and report it to their home governments. Such efforts are stepped up in wartime. Foreign offices, defense departments, treasuries and other government agencies all maintain undercover sources of information. Important news agencies and business firms do the same thing. International espionage networks were operating on a planetary scale before the Russian Revolution of 1917. Perhaps the two most effective were directed from London and the Vatican. They are the rule of the road in power politics. But their existence provides no justification for extra-legal, unconstitutional, anti-social actions of public servants, whether they be legislators or police agents.

Whatever justifications legislators may advance for the inquisitions they have staged since 1946, the fact remains that they are members of legislative bodies with clearly defined powers, duties, obligations and limitations, who over-step their authority by trespassing on the fields of the judiciary and the executive branches of government and by violating the Constitutional guarantees protecting individuals and private associations against the intrigues and adventures of ambitious power seekers.

Invaders and Usurpers

Forays such as the Senate Sub-Committee drive against Communists in the General Electric plants are examples of the procedures that have been followed and expanded by legislative investigators during the past decade. The raids have been staged by committees of the United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate and of several state legislatures.

During the early phases of this development, the drive was spearheaded by the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities. After this House Committee had demonstrated the feasibility of attacking, bullying, insulting and smearing subpoenaed witnesses, depriving them of their jobs and ruining their reputations at the hands of a legislative committee which was without legal or constitutional authority to perform any one of these functions, the practice was adopted by committees of other legislative bodies.

Guarantees of civil rights refer specifically to the functioning of

legally constituted legislative, judicial and executive authorities. Due process of law, the right of trial by jury, the right to have charges specified and to be confronted in open court by those who had made the charges, are associated in the Constitution with criminal procedure. Evidently it never occurred to those who drafted the document that a time would come when one or more departments of government would gang up on the citizenry, establish extra-constitutional bodies, which would be able to by-pass constitutional guarantees, deprive citizens of their jobs, slander them and destroy their reputations on the plea that such anti-social and unjust acts did not come under the heading of criminal procedure.

One of the most curious kinks in this entire extra-constitutional development involves the acceptance of information from the files of the secret police (F.B.I.) on the mere assurance of the Director, J. Edgar Hoover, that the information came from "reliable sources." When asked to name the collector of the evidence and to produce him in open hearing or open court for cross-questioning by the accused, the director of the secret police replies that to produce the individual spy in public would unmask his activities and thus interfere with his future spying. On this plea, the secret police, for whose existence there is no specific constitutional provision, are protected and encouraged to go on with their spying, while the specific guarantees of due process of law contained in the Constitution are thrown overboard. The VI Amendment specifically states the right of an accused person "to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation," and "to be confronted with the witnesses against him."

We have emphasized the raiding, usurpation and political adventurism of legislative committees because, at the moment, this is the most glaring example of social unbalance threatening the general welfare of the American community. There are other examples, more dangerous because more fundamental and more pervasive, such as the effort of the military to trespass on other departments of government and of society; the attempts of business to take over government and dictate to non-business areas of the community; the arrogant demands of government to lord it over the entire community, and the pretensions of at least one group of ecclesiastics to establish itself in a position of omnipotence. Each and all of these efforts tend to upset the social balance and thus threaten the general welfare.

In all cases of raiding and freebooting, the principle is the same: —one part, aggressing against other parts in a drive to extend its own area of function, upsets the social equilibrium and threatens the general welfare by demanding that the interests of one component group in the community be recognized and empowered at the expense

of parallel groups. This is another example of the insistence that the interests of a part be given precedence over the interests of the whole. The acceptance of such a policy in any field—biological, sociological or cosmic, delivers the whole and all of its parts to unbalance, disorder, and eventually to disintegration and chaos.

This is Civil War

We have referred to the social upheaval which has destroyed the old power balance in society and opened the way for power redistribution. The resulting insecurity and uncertainty have given power-hungry individuals and groups an opportunity to cross social frontiers, invade the preserves of their neighbors, trample on rights, usurp prerogatives. Domestic aggressions may be conducted with the weapons of publicity and propaganda or with gun-fire. Whether the technique employed be "cold" or "hot," such activities constitute civil war.

Civil war has several characteristic aspects: (1) It takes place within the boundaries of a community. (2) Its object is a redistribution of power between community sub-groups. (3) It involves the use of practices which violate traditional and customary procedures and, in a modern community, usually run counter to legal and constitutional limitations, restrictions and prohibitions. (4) Aggressors in a civil war attempt to weaken those whose position they are attacking by concentrating power and privilege in their own hands. (5) Civil aggressors declare an emergency, using the fear and prejudice engendered by war, and the uncertainties and anxieties associated with war, to bring about a situation in which their seizure of power will be tolerated on the plea of the emergency which they have helped to bring about. (6) Opponents, who demand the re-establishment of the social equilibrium, are classed as subversives and they and the associations to which they belong are pilloried and proscribed. (7) The aggressors then proceed to consolidate power in their own hands and to establish a social equilibrium favorable to the interests which they represent. All of these characteristics of civil war are present in the United States. At the moment, elected and appointed public servants and the government agencies in which they function, are the leading invaders and usurpers, the most flagrant violators of legal and constitutional guarantees and restrictions, the most militant fomenters of cold civil war in the United States. Behind these unfaithful public servants are the three most powerful social groupings in present day United States: the military (Eisenhower), business (Dulles), the Roman Catholic hierarchy (McCarthy), who are attacking the Communists, the liberals and the Truman-Stevenson Democrats.

Resistance to the aggressors has developed at several points. Inside the United States, it has come chiefly from four quarters. *First*: representatives of parallel governmental establishments, chiefly the executive, have protested the invasion of their own preserves. This protest has been voiced at various levels, and includes Ex-President Truman and President Eisenhower. *Second*: certain private associations as trade unions, educational bodies (of teachers and librarians), minority groups of scientists and some religious groups have raised their voices against the aggressors. *Third*: many individuals when called before the inquisitors have stood their ground and refused to be intimidated or coerced. This has been true of professional people, of trade unionists and of government employees charged with subversion. Albert Einstein as a scientist and Barrows Dunham as an educator have taken the position that the legislative inquisitors have no authority and no right to subpoena scientists and educators and question them under threat of prosecution and imprisonment. Barrows Dunham, when summoned, gave his name and address, but remained silent when asked about his beliefs and his associations.

Similar action was taken by Leo Huberman and Harvey O'Connor as editors and by Corliss Lamont as a writer and teacher. The Huberman and O'Connor inquisitions are printed in *Monthly Review* for August and September, 1953. The text of the Lamont testimony is not yet in print, but the November, 1953 issue of *Monthly Review* carried a statement by Corliss Lamont, in which this educator gave his reasons for refusing to answer committee questions regarding (a) his "political beliefs," (b) "other personal and private affairs," (c) his "religious beliefs," and (d) his "associational activities."

Resistance has come, in the *fourth* instance, from some of the organizations which, under Congressional authority, have been listed as subversive by the Federal Attorney General. Backed by the Federal Justice Department, assisted by the secret police (F.B.I.) and supported by the propaganda and vigilante apparatus controlled by the United States post-war Oligarchy, the organizations listed as subversive have been publicly named, their officers have been subpoenaed and questioned, their members have been smeared and in some cases legal proceedings have been instituted for the dissolution of the accused organizations. Organizations listed as subversive included more than 250 groups, covering a wide area from defense committees, through benefit and friendly societies, to political parties.

Listed organizations were appraised of their subversiveness when the lists appeared in the newspapers. They were pilloried in the public press without a hearing, without the presentation of charges, without

an opportunity to be confronted by the witnesses against them. Officers of the organizations were asked for lists of their members, were called before the inquisitors, smeared, bullied, threatened, and in extreme cases, jailed for refusal to become public informers.

One spectacular battle is being fought between the Communist Party and the Oligarchy. The Department of Justice, using the powers conferred upon it by the Smith Act, charges Communist leaders with "conspiring to teach" the overthrow of the government by force and violence. They support the charge by reading from the Communist Manifesto, published in 1848, and from the writings of Lenin and Stalin. Convictions have been secured and upheld by the United States Supreme Court, with two of the nine justices strongly dissenting, on the ground that the Smith Act was clearly unconstitutional.

Finally, among the sources of opposition to the present tactics of the American aggressors, are public opinion and semi-official and official protests from abroad. Foreign pressure has taken the form of resolutions and mass meetings, newspaper and radio comment, questions and speeches in legislative chambers, and direct representations from foreign governments. The chief occasion for the exertion of this foreign pressure was the conviction and execution of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg in 1953, on a charge of transmitting atomic secrets to agents of the Soviet Union. Europeans who had witnessed the rise of fascism, nazism and phalangism, and had suffered the consequences, were quick to conclude that they were confronted in the United States with a similar situation, rendered doubly dangerous by the pivotal position occupied by United States economy, and the extensive and elaborate military apparatus which the Washington Government has flung across the world since 1940.

As the American aggressors proceed with their violations of legal and constitutional limitations and guarantees, and continue their drive for power, it becomes increasingly evident that the new circumstances arising out of the social transformation through which the modern world is passing, necessitate a new evaluation of social forces and the adoption of new measures to re-establish and preserve the social equilibrium. The United States and the world must take positive steps and adopt drastic measures if the elementary requirements of justice are to be safeguarded and order and peace are to be established and maintained.

The Tasks Before Us

General welfare depends upon the establishment and maintenance of an orderly, peaceful community—made up of an effective coordination of healthy parts. We mention the whole first because

unless the whole is functioning normally, the parts are bound to suffer.

Healthy parts alone will make possible the health of the aggregation or the organism within which the parts function. The community depends upon its parts as the human organism depends upon its hands, eyes, its nervous, circulatory and digestive systems. Unless the parts are in good order, the whole to which they belong will suffer correspondingly.

We have been discussing the parts of a modern interdependent community—the public official segments, the professional segments, the private associations, the body of citizens, and finally the individual human beings who compose these social groupings. These segments are specialized and interdependent. An injury to one is an injury to all; a benefit to one is a benefit to all.

The crisis through which the United States is passing requires every individual and every component social group to ascertain its duty and perform it. Where there is duplication or conflict, adjustments will be necessary. The essence of acting is action. To the man or woman who asks: "What can I do?" The general and obvious answer is: "Review your opportunities, find out what your duty is and do it." More specifically, we have been pointing to the crying need to meet the presumptions and excesses of heresy hunters by group and individual resistance.

Resistance is urgently necessary in view of the existing emergency, but it is no effective answer to the confusion and uncertainty associated with heresy hunts and attempted seizures of power by ambitious individuals or minority interest groups. Whether such attempts at power seizure succeed or fail, they reveal serious deficiencies in the provisions for orderly social procedure in the face of extraordinary or crisis situations.

Mankind, interdependent for the first time during the period of written history, has come face to face with unnecessary physical hardship, insecurity and the threat of annihilation. This situation has arisen as a consequence of scientific and technical developments, of the ruthless struggle for wealth and power between individuals and social groups, and the failure to foresee the consequent danger to the general welfare of such developments, and to make plans and provisions for meeting them.

The people of the United States are in no wise exempt from impending disaster. They are in and of the imperilled world—a part of the ignorance, confusion, uncertainty, irresponsibility, turmoil and conflict which have led mankind into the present predicament.

Whatever is done by the human family to extricate itself from

its perilous situation will depend, to a considerable degree, on the people of the United States. Theirs is the richest and the most fully armed among the nations. And it is greed for wealth and power coupled with the desire to get ahead of the neighbors, and the pride and arrogance arising from victory, which are chiefly responsible for the current threat of general devastation.

Until the people of the United States put their own house in order, the entire human family faces the unceasing threat of untimely and violent death. The cold civil war now raging in the United States is a matter of grave concern to men and women everywhere. The ending of that civil war and the redirection of United States competence and experience towards the solution of world stability and security problems may be approached from many angles and at several levels. It is not enough for government to act wisely and courageously in the interest of the general welfare, desirable and necessary as such a course would be. The people must also act, individually and through their non-governmental associations, first because as sovereign people, they are the final authority in determining the direction of public affairs, and second, because the existing government is so frankly the spokesman of private, special interests and so patently unconcerned with the general welfare. Therefore, the sovereign people must act individually and collectively, through existing associations and organizations or through such organizations and associations as may be developed to meet the present threat to the general welfare.

Getting Our Bearings

Emergency demands action, but action should be based upon comprehension and understanding. We have tried, in these pages, to describe the emergency confronting us in the United States, to explain its origins and to relate the United States civil cold war to the worldwide cold war. That analysis was designed to provide a foundation for understanding and reasoned action.

Reasoned action is hampered by the flood of emotion which has been unloosed in the United States during and since the War of 1941-45. Increasingly this tidal wave of emotionalism has submerged reason, until even the phrase "I think" has become suspect.

The chief ingredients of the emotional upsurge which has gripped the people of the United States is fear, based on ignorance, uncertainty, rumor, gossip and artfully designed propaganda. The Oligarchy has felt the necessity of keeping the American people stirred up and emotionally unbalanced because emotional disturbance is the best medium in which to engineer a quick and painless transfer of power.

If the people of the United States are to act rationally and intel-

ligently in the present emergency, they must stop being afraid. Fear inhibits or blacks out reason. Fear is negative, frustrating, paralyzing. Its primary effect is to corrode and finally to destroy the fearful. This statement remains true whether the object of fear is the neighbor's dog, the most recently designated military enemy or the possibility of vaporization by atom or by hydrogen bomb. In an emergency, fear is the last counsellor to whom men should turn.

Individually we should cease to fear. Collectively we should end the fear propaganda campaign which has been a disgrace to the government and people of the United States since its inauguration in 1946.

The people of the United States must take another important step if they are to act intelligently in the present emergency. They must turn their eyes from abroad and focus them on the home front. This is not easy and perhaps not too pleasant.

The last time the American people put their minds on the home situation they were confronted by depression and were asked to deal with problems for which they were wholly unprepared. The business cycle had followed its course through prosperity, recession, depression, revival and back to prosperity for more than a century, but it had not been understood, or for that matter, seriously studied. So the people found themselves in the years following 1929, face to face with a challenge that was beyond their comprehension. Through seven bitter years, from 1929 to 1936, they floundered from one makeshift to another. Then relief came, from abroad, in the guise of war.

War had been going on in China since the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931. Four years later the Italians invaded Abyssinia. In 1936 a Little War began in Spain. Another three years, and the general war of 1939-45 was raging in Europe. War dragged the United States economy out of the depression, and war has kept it at a high productivity level for fourteen years.

War has other advantages. It is dramatic. It makes good headlines and provides exciting stories. It substitutes new tensions for old ones and takes peoples' attention from their troubles. It provides action—common action for a common purpose.

Oligarchs, time out of mind, have embarked upon foreign military adventures as the readiest means of diverting the public mind from domestic difficulties. Since the wars began in the 1930s, the American people have not concentrated their attention on home problems. It is time, and past time, for the citizens of the United States to make a careful inventory of the home situation.

Americans will find the home front easy to understand if they will read history, including United States history, and master the

principles of social engineering. Until they have a sense of historical perspective and an understanding of social science, the home scene will be confusing and baffling because it is so extensive, so elaborate and so complex.

Until they learn some history and social science, Americans will do well to pay heed to what the social scientists and engineers have to say, because our predicament cannot be rationally dealt with on any other basis than analysis, reasoned judgment, careful planning and courageous constructive action. If Americans escape, unharmed, from the perilous situation in which they now find themselves, they must rely, not upon fear but upon the reasoned, planned procedures of social engineering.

Reasoned concentration on home problems will help the people of the United States to get their bearings. They must take another important step. They must face the future. There is no way to escape the dilemma. Americans have made their bed. They must lie in it until they are prepared to make another bed.

American demagogues have other ideas. They want to divert the people by foreign adventures or by raking over the ashes of the dead past. Europeans gasped with amazement, in November, 1953, to see the Republican political strategists prepare for the election campaign of 1954 by exhuming the story of a dead man and charging Ex-President Truman with knowingly employing a foreign spy in the Federal service. By this strategy, the campaign in 1954 would be fought on issues of 1946.

Americans must face the future. They should learn from the past, but the grave issues which they confront are domestic issues and issues not of yesterday, but of today and tomorrow.

There is another issue of the gravest concern. If the United States is to extricate itself from the present dilemma, it must know the truth and teach it to the oncoming generations.

The American Oligarchy control practically all of the channels of communication—press, films, radio, television, schools, churches, libraries. Their heresy hunters have been purging these agencies, devoting particular attention to the schools and the films. If the campaign of the Oligarchs is successful they will be in a position to provide the people with their only food for thought.

If we are to deal intelligently and successfully with the present emergency, we must study the revolution of our time inside and out. We must understand the origin, the nature and the purposes behind the fomenters of civil war in the United States. This study and the information which it makes available must be passed on to youngsters in the elementary schools, to high school and college students,

to adults. We must toss out the lying text books, clear the radio of drivel and the television networks of trash. We must use the press and every other channel of communication to teach the elementary facts of social change and to explain the possible alternatives to the reactionary, self-defeating policies now being followed by the United States Oligarchy. We must suspend the licenses of the witch hunters, convict the book burners of pernicious mischief, turn the floodlights of publicity into every corner of public business. In the name of the general welfare, the American people must know.

Avoiding the Rocks and Breakers

Having got our bearings and decided upon our course of action, our next concern must be to avoid the shoals, reefs and rocks which are an immediate threat to the general welfare. Among these dangers, five of the most menacing are distrust and disunity, political adventures, nationalism, depression and war.

Distrust and disunity are not dangers peculiar to a particular time, place or set of social conditions. They threaten to unbalance and disrupt every social grouping. They are particularly dangerous in a community like present-day United States which emphasises individualism, separatism and the elevation of special interests to a position above the general welfare. The number one priority, so far as we are concerned, is the promotion of the general welfare.

Political adventurism is a second immediate danger which, like disharmony and disunity is met in varying types of social groups. Every frustrated, neurotic, egocentric, with capacity for single-minded dedication, may develop into a political adventurer, seeking to advance his fortunes at the expense of the general welfare. Such individuals are attracted to a scene of power unbalance as hungry sharks swarm about a carcass at sea.

Nationalism which has become an object of loyalty and worship among modern humans, is another special interest, distracting attention and energy from the general welfare. The nation represents a general interest of sorts, as does the family, the neighborhood, or the city. It is general in the sense that it is made up of individuals and sub-groups. But the nation, in its turn, is a part of the modern world, since there are fourscore nations on the earth today, each one a part of the world community.

Nationalist propaganda tends to elevate national welfare and national security above general welfare and general security. In this sense nationalism is divisive and correspondingly dangerous. There are legitimate national interests as there are legitimate municipal interests. At the other end of the scale, however, is the international

or world interest. Viewed from the standpoint of mankind, national interests must be subordinated to general world welfare.

Local, provincial loyalties have their places and their uses. Nationalism is such a local loyalty. Like pride in the home town and devotion to alma mater, it plays a constructive role up to the level at which more general interests are paramount. Beyond that point, promotion of a single nation becomes a detriment to the world whole.

Another formidable danger which the American people must face is the economic insecurity resulting from variations in the production level. This obstacle is particularly dangerous because the advocates of the profit system hold out the promise of prosperity, even during a period of depression. "After each previous depression," they argue, "there was a period of prosperity. Wait. Prosperity will come again."

Four important considerations bear on this argument. (1) Private enterprise economy has depended on selling goods in a scarcity market, where demand exceeds supply. (2) The market is competitive, and in the large sense, planless. (3) A point comes in the history of a private enterprise economy at which the depression ceases to be periodic and becomes chronic. (4) Because of the reinvestment of accumulating profits, private enterprise is expansive, aggressive and in the end combative.

Economic breakdown following 1929 showed the depth and extent to which depression might go. Large groups of human beings concentrated in cities and dependent, as employees and as consumers, on a vast network of interdependent economic activities, cannot afford to leave their physical well-being to the tender mercies of a planless, competitive struggle for wealth and power. Nor can they and their dependents risk the depression losses and war devastations which accompany the efforts of the rich and greedy to get richer. Until the provision of livelihood, in its larger aspects, is taken out of the hands of privileged minorities and classed, with the provision of education, health and security, as a phase of public business, periodic economic depressions and ultimate economic disaster must be taken for granted.

Finally, as an obstacle in the path of the American people, we list war. This may be bitter medicine for Americans to swallow, after winning an unconditional surrender war in the Atlantic and the Pacific, and after having lived through fourteen years of high productivity and employment based on war demand and absence of physical war damage. The fact remains, however, that war employs the destruction of life and property as its chief means of winning victory. With recent advances in the technique of destructiveness, to make war is to court annihilation.

War is the highest form of competition. Competition has its uses in every community. Like fire, it is a good servant but a bad master. At the center of each balanced stable community, there must be the principle of mutual aid. Competition, in all its forms, must be subordinate to cooperation.

Not only must we, as the price of survival, renounce war and war-making as instruments of national policy, but we must make the social rearrangements necessary to establish and guarantee peace. This means, of course, duly constituted authority at the world level.

Keeping Our Course in the Whirlwind of Social Change

Avoiding the rocks and breakers is a negative task. Holding to our course in the whirlwind of social change is a positive one. Mariners face two uncertainties—the sea and the wind. Statesmen and citizens face several. The responsibilities of social seamanship are particularly arduous for a government and people who have left the comfortable harbor of isolation and launched their Ship of State on the stormy deeps of power politics.

Our first task is to re-examine and re-check our course. Early in this essay we noted that the principle of checks and balances is an axiom of our community life. Having reasserted the need for checks and balances, our next task is to discover whether the original form of the check-and-balance principle, as conceived and applied to the American community, is still workable. On this issue, we have reached a negative conclusion.

The present emergency has showed the absence in the United States of checks and balances sufficient to prevent the kind of disruption and disorganization from which 20th century man has suffered and is suffering. Following out the argument which we have advanced in this essay, we propose to meet the deficiency by the establishment of two new check-and-balance institutions at all five levels—local, state, national, regional and world.

The first of these new institutions would be a General Welfare Authority composed of an equal number of representatives from each of four groups: (1) government, (2) professional and occupational associations, (3) other private, voluntary associations and (4) from the public at large. These General Welfare Authorities would include scientists, technicians, and representatives of the grass roots of everyday life, and would be staffed with adequate personnel. The Authorities would have four inter-related tasks: (1) To inquire into existing matters or situations which concern the general welfare—locally, in states, nations, regions or on the planet. (2) At their own discretion, to publicize their findings. (3) To make plans and suggestions for

replacements, improvements and betterments of the general welfare, and to publicize their findings. (4) To make surveys in particular fields, such as transportation or education, or in more general fields, to draw comparisons between theories and practices, and to grade and compare similar or like communities in their handling of matters related to the general welfare. In this way people in one locality would be made aware of parallel problems and solutions in neighboring communities. Thus the General Welfare Authorities would act through inquiry, analysis, comparison, publicity and emulation, utilizing the feeling of local pride in serving the general welfare as the primary motive force for raising the levels of general well-being. Where particularly difficult geographical or other conditions made it harder to maintain or advance the general welfare, it would be the duty of the proper authority or authorities to recommend and to secure, from the proper sources, loans or appropriations of goods and services adequate to preserve and enhance the level of well-being in the community or communities under consideration.

The second of these suggested new institutions would be a Court of Appeal and Final Resort, authorized and competent to hear, adjudicate and make recommendations on any issue involving the general welfare at the level on which the particular Court of Appeal and Final Resort was organized. Courts of Appeal and Final Resort would be organized at five levels—local, state, national, regional and world. They would be composed of representatives elected by the people at large. Thus they would serve the general interests of that popular sovereign body—the entire citizenry—to which, under many existing constitutions, including that of the United States of North America, residual power belongs.

This new range of checks and balances would be constituted in an attempt to meet the dangerous situations brought about by scientific and technological development, by the recent redistribution of power as between classes and economic and political groups and to take action concerning the grave emergency arising in a world coordinated technically and split politically and socially into hostile competing groups and factions. The General Welfare Authorities and the Courts of Appeal and Final Resort would concentrate their efforts on attempts to preserve and improve the general welfare and to maintain the social balance by defining and maintaining the rights, duties, obligations and other relations between government, professional and occupational groups, other private associations and the people at large.

Increased contacts and complexities have made modern life confusing and difficult for the individual. Men who saw and heard little beyond the household and the village could be simple, quiet, relaxed.

Today men see and hear and feel the entire planet, and even interplanetary forces, clamoring for attention and recognition. It is all too big and too much! Yet it is in such a world community that our children will live.

Growing magnitude and complexity have depersonalized and dehumanized life. Particularly at the centers of action the individual human tends to become a number, almost an abstraction. Human beings cannot live at their best under such conditions. The entire community must be so organized and related that human, personal relations are as easy and as natural as they were in the household, the village, the neighborhood.

Men are social beings, and they must live socially. At the same time they are individuals and must live their own lives. Social activity is at one pole; individual activity is at the other. The complete human being lives most satisfactorily somewhere between the two extremes. It is good to come together. It is good to be alone. Complete living makes both possible and easy.

General welfare and local welfare must co-exist. Each is a necessary aspect of human life. The two are complementary and supplementary. Even when they are at odds, both are indispensable. Therefore men must make the adjustments which the co-existence of general and local welfare involves.

From another point of view, we might say that authority and freedom exist at every level, from the individual and the household to the nation and the world community. They constitute a pair of opposites between which a working balance must be maintained.

The United States and its people are a segment of the human world community. They can no more isolate themselves from the world than a finger can isolate itself from the hand of which it is a part. Under the impetus provided by science and technology the world community has been expanded and integrated, during recent years, at an accelerated pace. The United States and its people must advance with the world, and as a part of it.

Finally, among the tasks that face us if we are to keep abreast of the fast changing times, is that of understanding the individual and collective duties, responsibilities and rights, which exist at three levels: (1) The universal level—at which we contemplate the purpose and order with which the human race is surrounded and with which it is in ceaseless contact. (2) The ethical level, or the level of right thought, speech and action. ("Right" in this instance means the highest of which one is capable under existing conditions.) (3) The social or legal level provided by the pluralistic pattern of delegated power, shared responsibilities and equal rights embodied in tradition,

custom, and in constitutional and legal forms. Unless these powers are utilized, these responsibilities assumed and carried and the rights exercised, they are as useless for the promotion of the general welfare as uneaten food is for nourishing the human body.

Conflicts, apparent or real, will arise between the universal, ethical and social or legal duties, responsibilities and rights. In such cases, the universal holds first priority, the ethical second, and the social or legal takes third place.

Carry On!

We are now in a position to say a final word concerning the powers and duties of governments and the rights, obligations and responsibilities of citizens. Public servants must carry on with the tasks to which they have been elected or appointed. Representatives of non-governmental associations must meet their obligations. Artists, craftsmen and professionals must perform the work and uphold the honor incident to their callings. Citizens must live their private lives and exercise that eternal vigilance without which the social balance cannot be long preserved.

Our first task is to resist the invaders and usurpers who are waging cold civil war in the United States.

Our second task is to liberate North America from the plutocratic Oligarchy which is violating the Constitution and threatening the life, liberty and happiness of the American people.

Our third task is to set up institutions and practices which will use science and technology to provide peace and plenty for the entire human family.

Here is our program. To our posts. No defections or desertions. When the Oligarchs threaten; preserve discipline and move ahead. If some are jailed or shot, close ranks and keep contact. Let us play our parts well today—the best we know how. And on each tomorrow, carry on as before—to promote the general welfare.