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

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

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

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

Africa's Hidden Resources

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

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

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

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

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

Planning That Perished

By **BEN RAY REDMAN**

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

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

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

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

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

Clergymen and Socialism

By **STEWART M. ROBINSON**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Individualism *vs.* Statism

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

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

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

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

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

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