The drift toward collectivization — decried as slavery when engineered by the Kremlin — is at an accelerating pace in the United States. And, astonishingly enough, this goes on without the aid of the customary socialistic rationalizations! Is socialism advancing under some new force? Probably not. It is more than likely that the socialistic excuses used in the past were nothing but catchy phrases, never reasons, and that most of us have been naïvely distracted by straw men while socialism has mushroomed unmolested.

The end of this road, be it municipal or federal, is omnipotent government which becomes harder to live with, more difficult to squelch, with each passing day. Effective squelching must rest on our knowing *how* to combat this rapidly spreading evil force. Our lack of know-how, I submit, stems from an unintelligent and impractical interpretation of self-interest and, also, a waning sense of common justice.

WERE we interpreting our self-interest intelligently, we would assist our neighbors in stamping out their socialistic fires as readily as we would our own. A conflagration destroys others than the one with whom it starts. But look at what happens: While the sugar folks are now crying "fire," all others shut out their annoying plea for help. Nor have the sugar refiners had ears for the M.D.'s warning, "Medicine is being socialized," or for the alarm sounded by the private utility people, "Power and light is being socialized." Those who lack concern except when their own ox is being gored are suspect; and, as a consequence, the populace merely yawns: they're getting what's coming to them.

If each of us could see clearly his self-interest, he would recognize that the socialization of the other fellow's business or industry is also an entering wedge or claim against his own life and liberty and property. The hunger after political power is insatiable, each gulp but an appetizer for the next. And the more government regulates and controls, the more it demands to cover costs and losses. The greater the federal deficits, the more urge to inflate the currency; and the sharper the inflation, the greater the temptation for individuals as well as governments at all levels to invest recklessly in all sorts of uneconomic ventures. Who knows the web of prior socialization that actually lies behind and leads up to this latest venture in socialized sugar at Mobile?

Permit the abrogation of any individual's God-given rights to life, liberty, and the fruits of his own labor, and the abrogation of one's own rights becomes an inextricable part of that policy. The proper defense was suggested by Milton Mayer:

> In the struggle for the rights of all men — which alone will save their skins and their souls — those who belong to minorities must fight first of all for the rights of other minorities than their own; next for the rights of all men; and last, if at all, for their own.[3]

ANY physician worth his salt does more than treat the manifestations of a disease; he approaches the problem systematically, that is, he goes to the root of the matter. This procedure, applied to the socialistic virus, suggests that we be as alert to its attack upon others as upon ourselves and that we help combat every outbreak, lest it reach epidemic proportions. This is not altruism; it is self-interest practically and intelligently at work.

Because it is easier to see faults other than our own, let me use a foreign example of a waning sense of common justice. A friend from Oslo reported that their opera could no longer be privately financed; that it had been turned over to government. I suggested that perhaps Oslo should have no opera unless it could be privately supported. "But what about our culture?" he asked, as though culture could be advanced by using police force to take the fruits of the labor of those who have no taste for opera in order to subsidize the few who are opera lovers. He had given no thought to common justice, to the uncultural means he had approved to achieve his own idea of a cultural end. Socialized opera by reason of a waning sense of common justice! And, it is this that contributes mightily to socialized sugar, medicine, power and light, housing, mail, education, cocktail bars, and whatever.

[3] Milton Mayer, *These Few* (Chicago: Human Events Associates, 1947), p. 11.

FINALLY, in viewing the problem systemically, we have not the ghost of a chance of reversing the present socialistic trend unless there is a revival of the revolutionary concept set forth in the Declaration of Independence that men's rights are endowments of the Creator. We either accept this or we must submit to the only possible alternative, namely, the absurd fallacy that men derive their rights from some man-concocted arrangement — a collective, in practical fact, the state!

If the sugar people would save their own industry, let them begin to help fight socialized medicine and socialized power and light. And let the Docs and the utility folks help fight socialized sugar. Not only will this procedure *be* good; it also will *look* good, with every man standing for a just treatment of all men. My freedom depends on yours; those who fail to help one another in this respect will lose their freedom, and deservedly. After all, the price of freedom is fair enough: intelligent interpretation of self-interest, a sense of common justice, and an appreciation that men's rights do not derive from government.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

THAT SUGAR REFINING is about to be socialized is simply an added confirmation that the American people are running away from their own revolution. Actually, we as a people are now returning to the very political omnipotence from which our forefathers escaped.

The real American Revolution was not the armed conflict with King George III. Instead, it was a revolutionary concept, a break with the whole political history of the world: *Men are endowed by their Creator, not by the state, with the rights to life and liberty.* According to the Declaration of Independence, government was instituted only to secure these rights. But how to limit government to such a worthy end? That was the question.

The Constitution was our answer. Its seven Articles with its first ten Amendments more severely limited government than had theretofore been the case. A re-reading of these will reveal 46 specific instances of limitation, not against the people but against the thing our forefathers, from their old-world experience, had come to fear — over-extended government. Inhibit and penalize fraud, violence, predation — the destructive actions of men — in short, invoke a common justice. That was the charge. Otherwise, leave men free to act productively and creatively as they please.

Benefits of unprecedented magnitude flowed from these severe limitations. First, there was no turning to the state for security, welfare, prosperity. It had nothing on hand to dispense nor did it have the power to take from some and give to others. To what, then, did our people turn? To themselves! The result? A self-reliant people! Second, with hardly any organized force standing against productive actions and free exchange, there followed the greatest outburst of creative human energy ever known. Thus, through the persons of self-reliant individuals flowed the American miracle!

If we would cease this headlong flight from our own Revolution, there are at least two requirements: (1) a new-born leadership for the idea that men's rights derive from the Creator, an implicit denial that they are subject to state dispensation, and (2) for those of our generation to relearn and to re-invoke the original limiting forces which were built-in features of THE CONSTITUTION. (See next page.)

Leonard E. Read

PRESIDENT