political to the economic sphere. Economic life should be put under the control of the political state. The emphasis was now more than ever on security and away from liberty. *So much so, in fact, that this fourth demand is nothing more nor less than a mandate for complete state socialism.* Thus the series of demands concludes with the masses at last extracting the true Fundamentals of Democracy from the grudging and reactionary privileged classes.

The lecture thus briefly summarized is easily the most impressive, as well as the most important, that Professor Driver delivers all term. The ideas which it embodies are reiterated in the concluding lecture of the year. Both of these are invariably received with a standing ovation and wild applause.

"The Sorehead"

Now, when Professor Driver informs his class that the demands of the people lead on to state socialism, just what is it that piques the emotions of his students, and brings them to shower him with applause? This question has a multiplicity of possible and probable answers. But, if the students may be presumed to be not completely mindless, they are primarily applauding the two main points so unmistakably implicit in the resumé—one apparently factual, the other moral:

a) that the process Professor Driver describes is a natural movement, a progression in history, leading to an inevitable outcome (i.e., socialism is inevitable);

b) that the process is not only inevitable, but it is also desirable. In the vernacular, it is a "good thing."

The Impact

These implications hit the student with an impact at least as great as that of the actual fact which appears in the lecture, if not greater. For it is these implications—that socialism is inevitable and desirable—*which make the fact contained in the lecture seem to add up to some great meaning.* The student does not applaud the "fact" of the Reform Bill of 1832; rather he applauds the emotional charge of the total scheme of which that piece of legislation was a part; he applauds the rectitude of economic levelling, and the sluggish but sure movement of the masses toward a final materialistic millennium.

Professor Driver accomplishes this by employing a kind of selective historical vision, which can see only certain facts, and which colors and shapes them so that they seem to point inexorably in one direction. All the "facts" which Professor Driver cites are there all right—all in the history books. But there are also a lot of other pertinent facts of history which he does not mention.

The desirability of socialism cannot, and need not, be debated here. As a coherent philosophy, it has long since been shattered. Empirically, its lofty promises have been discredited. It continues to advance, however, by piecemeal legislation, the direction of which the "masses" (so-called) do not understand. They do not desire the thing called "socialism"; but they do desire the flurries of government intervention which pander to their special interests; workers here, farmers there, manufacturers over here. What they cannot understand is that the socialism they hate and fear and the catnip rations that they wallow in are indistinguishable. They are led forward by the craft of their "leaders," who misrepresent to them every step that is taken.

Every so often the whole process pauses, and somebody remarks: "You know, we're in an awful mess." "So we are," the leaders reply. "All the more reason to do as we say." So the floundering machinery is set in motion again, and past blunders are made the *raison d'être* for future catastrophes. The actual fact of whether or not the people of a country *desire* socialism is completely irrelevant to whether or not it comes.

Does this mean, then, that socialism is inevitable, whether or not anybody wants it? Not at all. *Somebody* has to want it, although that "somebody" is not "the masses."

One fact which Professor Driver overlooked was that it is never the wishes of "the masses" that get embodied in reform legislation. It is always the wishes of someone who thinks he knows what is good for "the masses." After the Chartist movement had been effectively squelched, it took an "intellectual" who thought he could fix things a little bit to dream up the Reform Bill of 1832. Most of the "masses" of England didn't know what it was, or what it did. The point is that nothing is "inevitable" unless people of influence desire it and work for it.

What Professor Driver Omitted

For instance, Professor Driver omitted to give the curious circumstances in which socialism came to this country. He omitted to mention the fact that Mr. Roosevelt ran in 1932 on a balanced-budget, government-efficiency, free-enterprise ticket, or the fact that Mr. Roosevelt later explained that this was the only way that he could have been elected. Nor did Professor Driver inform his students that, after the election, some "experts" from political science departments in big universities came to Mr. Roosevelt with a plan; nor that since Mr. Roosevelt himself was innocent of such things as plans—excepting one to jettison the program on which the American people had been fooled into electing him—he accepted the advice of these experts. This advice blossomed into the rich, fruity growth of the National Recovery Act. This was not really socialism, but it was a good running start. It was fascism.

If Professor Driver had taken the trouble, he might have pointed out that this was done, not as a result of the wishes of the "masses," but in *direct violation* of those wishes. Like Wilson before him, Mr. Roosevelt always carried a mental picture of himself as the "leader"; he would go his way, and he would take those stupid masses with him! The inevitable course of history, evidently, had gotten itself all fouled up. Luckily, Mr. Roosevelt was there to give erring history a kick in the pants.

Let us suppose something. Let us suppose that Mr. Roosevelt had not lied to the American people in 1932. Or that, having lied, he abided by his lie. And that consequently he had rejected the filmy "planned economy" dreams that Stuart Chase, Lord Keynes, Professor George Warren, Rexford Tugwell, and Jerome Frank had concocted in their idle moments. Would history, thus unaided by professorial cunning, have vaulted us into socialism?

Naturally not. History is not the dreary go-round of an inevitable treadmill. It is the record of the influences of decisions by individuals in power, good and bad. The abandon of those making the decisions is modified only by the degree of responsibility felt toward the supposedly all-powerful "masses." The only real function left to this unfortunate horde is to vote on the basis of lies, and to hope that the lies are not very big ones. Beyond this, the "little people" can offer only a bewildered appraisal of each decision as a *fait accompli,* and —peering through the fog of governmental misrepresentation—wonder where their next traduction is coming from.

The implied lesson of Professor Driver's lecture is that we are caught in the grips of an impersonal deterministic force which directs history, independent of human choice. At best, this is Marxian hogwash. At worst, it is plagiarism of Marxian hogwash. If we are caught in the grips of anything, it is the dishonesty of our "leaders," and the craft of the "intellectuals" who aid and abet that dishonesty at every turn.

A goodly segment of our next generation of "leaders" and "intellectuals" will come from the happy four hundred that wildly applauded the certainty of socialism as Professor Driver propounded it. Was he thinking of that?

The Historian

The following is an excerpt from a letter:

"I am a student at Cornell University and at present am engaged in taking a course in American history. In this course I must write a term paper, and I am planning to do mine on 'Social Darwinism and the Horatio Alger Myth as a Justification for the Position of the Robber Barons.' . . ."