Mr. Read's pamphlet Outlook for Freedom[2] is written in the form of an allegory. It supports, by implication anyway, a philosophical theory of anarchy. A "thoughtful" man is introduced and the author presents his ideas to the reader. This American citizen begins with the idea, "Most Americans believe in socialism", then goes to "Socialism is state ownership or control", and finally arrives at a criticism of all government which is "belief in the use of organized police force ... as a means to attain social performance".

The views of the "thoughtful" citizen on public education follow:[3]

> "Possibly it would be best to begin a test of his new definition of communism -- previously defined as a belief in the use of organized force as a means to attain social performance -- against a reasonably familiar and generally accepted idea. So he took a critical look at perhaps the least challenged of all American institutions -- public education. How did government education stand up when squared with this new definition of the "isms"? There was force involved, all right -- compulsory attendance, compulsory curricula in many respects, and in all respects compulsory payment therefor. Even so, was this anything to worry about, since no institution had ever had more respectable and conservative support than public education? In fact in early times, most of the leading conservatives in America, including one of the most respected occupants of the White House, had much to do with popularizing the idea in the United States. But, he could not escape a deep concern by reason of his new definition; that regardless of the prestige of its forbears, and irrespective of the talents and high reputations of subsequent supporters, public education is still a denial of freedom of choice in vast areas. He could not logically deny that it is the communalization of the product of all, by force. He even recalled how, as a freshman in college, he had learned that public education was one of the primary objectives which Karl Marx set forth in his Communist Manifesto. However, maybe he ought to believe in some communism. But why, he asked, in this "great nation of freedom", had not his teachers in the several schools he had attended, raised questions about the use of force in "education"? Was it possible that they themselves had never thought of it?"

The following statement from a high school teacher was printed by the Foundation for Economic Education and widely circulated. It has also been sent out by the Committee for Constitutional Government. It was reprinted in The Educational Reviewer (CASBO) in the April 15, 1951, issue.

A LESSON IN SOCIALISM

As a teacher in the public schools, I find that the socialist-communist idea of taking "from each according to his ability", and giving "to each according to his need" is now generally accepted without question by most of our pupils. In an effort to explain the fallacy in this theory, I sometimes try this approach with my pupils:

When one of the brighter or harder-working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points and give them to a student who has made only 55 points on his test. Thus each would contribute according to his ability and -- since both would have a passing mark -- each would receive according to his need. After I have juggled the grades of all the other pupils in this fashion, the