

*This
is a time
for
understanding---*

Why a Republican Can't Be a Liberal

WILLIAM BRADFORD HUIE

WHAT THIS COUNTRY NEEDS is an intellectual revolt against Liberalism as it is now defined. We need more than a revolt; we need a national revulsion against the pretentiousness, the pomposity of the self-proclaimed Liberal.

For twenty years now Americans have cowered under "the craven fear of being thought illiberal." On college campuses not to be a Liberal has been more embarrassing than not knowing which spoon to use for your soup. On the hustings politicians have been more afraid of being called Conservative than of being called a bigamist. In books, magazines, on stage, and over radio, mentalities ranging from Einstein down to Frank Sinatra have preached that not to be Liberal was to risk offend-

ing like not using Mum or Listerine.

This country, truly, needs a freedom from fear: the fear of not being a Liberal.

There was a time in American history when to be a Liberal meant that one favored liberty — individual liberty and individual responsibility as against the restrictions of government and society. But today — for the past twenty years — to be an American Liberal has been to defend such positions as these:

1. *That there was and is something hopeful for mankind in Moscow.*

In 1933 one could be gay and hopeful and Liberal only by favoring recognition of the Soviet Union. In Washington an obscure lawyer named Dean Acheson worked diligently to bring this about. In his enthusiasm he almost literally ran errands for Maxim Litvinoff, the Russian emissary who was arranging the recognition. Acheson and his fellow Liberals, like Alger Hiss and Philip

This is the third in a series of excerpts from Mr. Huie's forthcoming book HOW TO BE A REPUBLICAN AND ENJOY IT. Additional excerpts will appear in subsequent issues. The book will be published April 1, 1952, by Duell, Sloan & Pearce.

Jessup, why were they so enthusiastic over Soviet recognition? Acheson and Jessup probably were not Communists; they were just Liberals — great Liberals — and they were convinced that Soviet recognition would be a boon to the Russian people and to the cause of mankind.

Let any American who wants to understand Liberalism — and how we have suffered from its follies — let him go back and read what the Liberals were writing about Stalin and about life in Russia in 1933.

In 1933 I was twenty-two years old, a Phi Beta Kappa, an intellectual, a student of Russian literature, and a supporter of the New Deal. Yet when I published an article opposing recognition of Soviet Russia I was accused by Liberals of being a reactionary at best, and probably a Fascist.

My article now reads like a 1951-model speech by Acheson or Jessup. It took them seventeen years to understand the nature of the Soviet regime; and during these seventeen years they and their fellow Liberals managed to lose, for free men, the opportunities of the Second World War, and they managed to deliver most of both Europe and Asia into the clutches of the Soviet regime which they so long regarded so hopefully.

In 1946, speaking in a large public auditorium in Brooklyn, I made this remark: "The great Liberals in our State Department tell us that there

is something hopeful in the movement of the Chinese Reds. During the war our own troops were furnished pamphlets describing the Reds as democrats, and likening the Red leader, Mao Tze-tung, to Thomas Jefferson. For myself I take a different view. I believe the Chinese Reds are tyrants, and if they are allowed to have their way in China they will set back Asia two hundred years, and they will cost us the lives of young men within the sound of my voice."

That remark almost precipitated a riot among the Liberals of Brooklyn.

Americans calling themselves Liberals have been the unwitting servants of tyranny in our time. It was American Liberals who expressed their friendship for the Russian people by helping the Soviet dictatorship establish itself more securely. It was American Liberals who were convinced that if only we'd make enough concessions to Stalin and quit irritating him, then he'd relax into a kindly and cooperative old democrat. And it was American Liberals who helped deliver the free men of Czechoslovakia and Poland and China to the torture chambers and work camps of Communism.

Does this recommend Liberalism to the thoughtful American of 1951?

In the pivotal elections of 1952 — the elections which will determine whether this country, too, is to become a one-party state — we should divide on this line: On the one side

should be the Liberals, of North and South — all those Americans who, like Dean Acheson and Philip Jessup and Alger Hiss, advocated the recognition of Soviet Russia, and who, even as late as 1949, were regarding the Chinese Reds as hopeful.

On the other side should be the Conservatives, of North and South — all those Americans who distrusted the Soviet regime in 1933 and who, even as early as 1946, recognized the Chinese Reds as tyrants.

If we Conservatives win, then we can return Mr. Acheson and Mr. Jessup to private life and replace them with Americans whose judgment has proved somewhat more trustworthy.

2. *The American Liberal sees no threat to freedom in burgeoning bureaucracy.*

To "secure the blessings of liberty" the founders of this Republic deemed it as necessary to *restrain* as to establish political authority. And it was the "Liberals" among the founding fathers who were most insistent on the restraints. Eighteenth century "Liberals," valuing individual liberty above all else, simply would not construct a national government without simultaneously making it part of the record that concentrated political power is, and continuously should be, suspect by those whom it subjects.

One of the great ironies of our history is that, in 1787, it was the Lib-

erals who most feared the Federal government, while in 1952 it is the Liberals who are insisting that free men have nothing to fear from a vast and unrestrained government.

In 1952 an American should ask himself these questions:

Do I have within me an innate distrust of government power?

Do I feel uneasy when I note that the Federal government is larger this year than it was last year?

Is there a voice within me which tells me that when free men no longer suspect government they soon lose their freedom?

If the answer to each of these questions is yes, then the voter should vote Conservative. If the answer is no, then the voter is a natural-born Liberal and he should vote for the Liberals.

3. *The American Liberal loves the social-worker mentality and despises the banker mentality.*

Among men today there are two extreme points of view which might be described as the social-worker mentality and the banker mentality.

The social-worker mentality thinks only of "helping people," of "doing good," of making every man more comfortable, more secure.

An example of the social-worker mentality was the Henry Wallace of 1942: he wanted to give every child in the world a bottle of milk. Another example is Justice William O. Douglas, of the Supreme Court.

In reviewing Mr. Douglas's new book in the *New York Times*, Louis Fischer declared: "He wants to feed, clothe, educate and cure the common folk of the world. In this manner he would entrench democracy, repel Communism, and prevent war."

The social worker is impatient at any question of cost; he wants only to hurry up the "improvements." He is so good and sincere and loving that he considers any obstacle a work of the devil.

The banker mentality, on the other hand, is concerned with costs. A bank is equipped with adding machines, and a banker is a trustee for the savings of thrifty men. A banker must ask where the money is coming from, and whether there is to be any return from the investment.

There is no denying that social workers are more pleasant people than bankers. They are more exciting; they are filled with enthusiasm over their plans; and their conversation is infectious. Bankers are often dull or unpleasant. They are killjoys; right in the middle of some exciting plan to bring electricity to Bechuanaland, a banker will want to know who is going to put up the money.

In the past a wholesome percentage of Americans have understood the necessity of using the banker to restrain the social worker—and then perhaps of using the

social worker to prod the banker. We have understood that if bankers were allowed to remain too long in control, then too little innovation would be attempted; and we have understood that if social workers were allowed to go too long unrestrained, then the costs would be too high.

The story of America's development is the story of compromise between social workers and bankers.

In 1932 perhaps the bankers had been too long in control and there had been too little social work; so perhaps quite properly the social workers were given control in 1933. Liberalism was enthroned.

For twenty years now the nation has been governed by the social-worker mentality. The bankers have been hooted at or cried down. The objective of our government was, for a time, to "feed, clothe, educate and cure" the common folk of America; now the objective is to "feed, clothe, educate and cure" the common folk of the world so that they can be saved from Communism.

In 1952 the American electorate should divide in this manner: voting Liberal should be all those persons who want to continue the social workers in power; and voting Conservative should be all those Americans who are beginning to wonder if we can "feed, clothe, educate and cure the common folk of the world" without breaking the bank.

4. *The American Liberal suspects thrift.*

Another of the ironies of our history is this: America was developed by thrift; thrift was once a virtue; and books were written about men who had the foresight to save their money so that they could provide capital for new ventures.

There was a time when Americans were concerned about government spending. Twenty years ago, working on a newspaper, I performed the regular weekly chore of writing an editorial on the national debt. There were a few people who read those editorials and wrote letters about them. There were a few Americans who still believed that debt was a threat to freedom.

But for twenty years now we have had a calculated campaign by the government — by Liberals within the government — to convince Americans that government debt is of no consequence. Mr. Harold Ickes devoted much of his energy to telling Americans that a large national debt is something to be desired — the more a nation owes, the more it has. And, as a result of this campaign, perhaps not more than one American out of five either knows or cares what the national debt is.

There are few newspapers today that bother to editorialize on the debt, and the reason for this is that there are too few readers who are interested. The Government debt

has become so astronomical that even most members of Congress have given up hope of being able to comprehend it.

In 1952 Liberals and Conservatives should divide in this manner: all those persons who do not know or care what the government debt is should vote Liberal — they have a true Liberal outlook. But those Americans who are beginning to feel uneasy over Government spending — who are beginning to fear that perhaps free men can spend themselves into slavery — those Americans should vote Conservative.

5. *The American Liberal believes in relaxing individual responsibility.*

To the Eighteenth-century Liberals who helped to found the American government, life, to an honorable man, was a serious business. Life was a charge; a man had an immortal soul for the development of which he was responsible. Life was, first of all, an individual process, and a restricted government was desirable so that men could enjoy the “blessings of liberty.”

But today Liberalism, as regards the individual, has acquired quite the opposite meaning. Liberals no longer want a restricted government so that they can enjoy the “blessings of liberty”; instead they prefer an unrestricted government from which they can derive the blessings of security.

It is Liberals today who would

relieve the individual of most of the responsibilities for his own existence. Life today is no longer a charge; it is something to be enjoyed. The purpose of living is to live easily, and the purpose of government is to secure the individual against risk.

The American voter in 1952 should ask himself this question: Should the government assume a greater degree of responsibility for my existence and demand, as the inevitable price, more of my liberty? Or should I insist on preserving my liberty by assuming more responsibility?

The American who wants more responsibility for himself should vote

Conservative. The American who wants to make further surrenders to the government should vote Liberal.

The Republican Party in 1952 should be the vehicle for revolt against Liberalism. No man who insists on calling himself a Liberal should seek or be given a Republican nomination. Republicans should proclaim their freedom from the fear of being thought illiberal; and the party should take pride in being called conservative.

Let all the Liberals be Democrats; then we can see where we really stand in America.

► It is, therefore, important to realize, and to confront, the disagreeable fact that many keen political thinkers have from the beginning been pessimistic about the permanence of the American form of government. Benjamin Franklin, in moving the signing of the Constitution, at the close of the historic Philadelphia Convention, asserted that "there is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered," and went on to predict that the federal union "is likely to be well administered for a course of years and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupt as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other." This ominous anticipation confirms the conclusion to which one is forced by theoretical reasoning. Either popular faith in the republican form of government must be recovered, or that form will continue to be changed until it no longer has any vital relationship with that laid down for posterity in 1787.

► The Constitution represents an unprecedented and unparalleled effort to integrate a system of government with an individualistic code of personal conduct. This explains the deep-rooted and continuing determination that

in the United States political action shall not be allowed to regiment the individual. Most Americans are confused rather than convinced when smartly told that "rugged individualism" produces "ragged individuals." The observation is clever. But it seeks to puncture more than commercial platitudes. To attack the principles underlying free enterprise is to impugn the traditional morality of the American people.

It is, however, a fundamental of American political theory that the clash of opinion between individuals and groups and parties should be vehement and continuous. As long as the American people differ with each other there is no danger to the Republic, for its philosophy assumes that they will so differ and its structure encourages them to altercation. Difference of opinion becomes discord and the security of the Republic is threatened, not when there is cleavage among the governed, but when it develops over the issue of personal liberty, between those who do the governing and any sizable or otherwise significant minority of those who are governed. It was to avert this ever present danger that the Constitution was drawn to balance and restrain the powers of government, giving political substance to the assertion, in the Declaration of Independence, that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed." And this means the acquiescence of the great body of the governed — not merely the consent of a bare majority.

The Power in the People, Felix Morley

A STORY

Graveyard in Brooklyn

Calder Willingham

WELL," said the doctor, "it's great. That stuff is great. God knows, it saves lives. But looking at it from one point of view — I mean, look at it this way, I haven't done a mastoid since I can't remember when. That is, no acute mastoids. A few radicals. But not even many of those."

"What's a radical?" asked Tom.

"A radical?"

"Yes."

From across the restaurant table, the doctor looked at him. Two mournful eyes, somber, dark, and philosophical, eyes filled with loneliness, isolation, resentment, many things. In a low, rather bored tone the doctor said, "You might have one some day."

"Me?"

"Yes. A radical mastoid could come from that ear of yours. But let's hope not, though. It means you obliterate the middle ear, and these days doctors are losing all their operative skill for work like that,

for the reason I told you." The doctor sighed. "Yes, siree," he added.

"But why?" asked the young man. "Why obliterate the middle ear?" The term *obliterate* jarred his sensibilities.

The doctor slowly cut up the pineapple that rested on his enormous slice of ham. Seconds passed as he did this, eyebrows raised and eyes looking down. He cut almost with the attentiveness he'd undoubtedly use in the operating room, and it was nothing but a slice of pineapple. As for the long silent pause, this was a way the doctor had. He liked to pause a long time before answering a question, while he reflected, and his audience sat there waiting to hear what he'd say.

"Sulfa's ruined most of it," he said. "Of course we're glad, but it hurts our income and doctors are human. I do plastic surgery now, but a lot of ear men, I'm telling you, they're on the spot." The doctor sighed. "You know, I haven't seen