

which the organization extends. To put it another way, an organization tends to confine the acts of the individual within limits set by those at the top, and what gets done tends to be limited to the vision of a single man.

The Family and Government

All societies have had some form of organization. Indeed, two organizations are essential to human society: the family and government, the family as a means at least of nurturing the young and probably caring for the old, and government for keeping the peace and protecting from aggression. Family and government are probably the models for all other organizations. Complex societies have often had a considerable variety of organizations: armies, religious organizations, trade guilds, industrial enterprises, and so on. In looking back on them, we usually see readily how they limited, restrained, and confined the individuals within them. For example, it is easy for us moderns to perceive the confining character of the Medieval manor, the guild, the monastery, and other such organizations. Indeed, the authority of the Medieval Catholic Church seems to most of us to have entailed great restrictions on the liberty of the populace in general.

It is most unlikely, however, that the generality of men at that time

viewed the matter in that light. Ordinarily, the organizations within which they lived and labored were a part of the parameters of life; one might as well complain of floods or droughts as of the manor, the guild, or the church. Undoubtedly, man complained of the hardness of particular overlords or the limitations of some particular restriction—especially if it were new—as they are ever given to doing; but the general framework was accepted as a thing established of God and its doings hardly distinguishable from acts of God. It is only when arrangements have been unsettled as by some catastrophe, such as the Black Death which swept Europe in the fourteenth century, or the confrontation with other cultures, such as happened following the discovery of America, or the decay of some vital institution, such as that of the Catholic Church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, that men are apt to resent and resist the confinements generally.

Transforming Man

A specter has been haunting Western Civilization since the time of the French Revolution. It is the specter of the transformation of man. The catastrophe entailed was forestalled following the French Revolution, but the residue left from that and other efforts has been gaining ground since the late nineteenth

century and has now spread to the whole world. It is here referred to as the idea that has the world in its grip. The idea gains control in part by taking over organizations and using them to ends implicit in the idea.

The revolutionary ardor of those under the sway of the idea is usually expressed as an assault upon our received organizations generally. (For example, some nineteenth century socialists were so anti-government in their animus that they became anarchists.) This continually misleads us, and perhaps them, as to what they are about. Once those under the sway of the idea are in power we may learn, however, that their object was not to destroy organization, as such, but to use it to extend control over the individual, to sap his independence, and take from him the management of his affairs. True, revolutionaries sometimes crush particular organizations, but that is only as prelude to replacing them with others more effective for their purposes.

It is as appendages of organizations that contemporary man is most vulnerable to the thrust of gradualist socialism. It is by way of his dependence on organization—for his job, for his education, for his pension, for his sustenance—that the individual is drawn into the maw of the state. Economic independence underlies all indepen-

dence. "For economic independence," as C. S. Lewis said, "allows an education not controlled by Government; and in adult life it is the man who needs, and asks, nothing of Government who can criticise its acts and snap his fingers at its ideology. Read Montaigne; that's the voice of a man with his legs under his own table, eating the mutton and turnips raised on his own land. Who will talk like that when the State is everyone's schoolmaster and employer?"² Since the thrust of gradualist socialism may not be toward the state's becoming everyone's employer, it might be better to modify it to say when the state controls everyone's employer. Communism, of course, makes everyone under its power into an appendage of its organizations.

Platform for Collectivism

What I am getting at is this: It is the prevalence of organizations in modern life that set the stage for the triumph of collectivism. It is the modern dependence upon and veneration of organization that has paved the way for the fastening of the grip of the state upon us. It is the very control over the individual that is characteristic of organization that socialists use to build upon. This control is a disadvantage in all organization, even as it may be the means to strength of the organization, and it is the primary reason for