THE PENALTY OF SURRENDER

No discussion of human affairs -- social, political, or economic -- can properly exclude attention to principles. Most current discussions are tempered with concepts of expediency, compromise, and the middle way.

Can compromise be reconciled with principle?

Here follows Leonard Read's answer to that question. These remarks were first presented at the Sunday Evening Club of the First Congregational Church, Los Angeles, California, in January 1948. Editor's Note, May, 1948.

1. Give the working definition of compromise which author Read chose for this essay. See page 254.

2. Give his explanation of the possibility of physical compromise. See page 254.

3. On pages 255-256 he shows how compromise in the sphere of morals is impossible. Give this explanation, with particular reference to the Biblical injunction, "Thou shalt not steal."

4. "Principle does not lend itself to bending or to compromising." Give author Read's explanation of this statement with particular reference to the moral principle, "Thou shalt not steal" -- not even via majority vote.

5. Re-read Legalized Immorality, which begins on page 23.

6. "What may be a principle to one is not necessarily a principle to another." On pages 257-258 the author spells out the meaning of this statement. How does he differentiate between himself and "...those who would indulge in legal thievery..."?

7. On page 258 the author says: "...I am convinced that no person is capable of rising above his best judgment." How is judgment related to moral principle? How is judgment related to revelation?

8. "The sole way...to ultimate truth...lies through one's own person." See page 259 for the explanation of this statement.