

His mere attendance at such a meeting would have been an indorsement of this important and significant people's movement, but he went further and publicly lauded it. He spoke chiefly about the strong effort Communist imperialism has made here through the Huk organization, and how, of late, it has had to give up its masquerade as champions of the people and of democracy, but he credited the Namfrel as having played an important part in bringing this about. He said, in part:

"I believe that the communists realized their failure for the first time when several months ago there came into being a vast country-wide movement to insure free elections and to encourage widest possible use of the right to vote. At first they [the communists] chortled gleefully, thinking it a fractional matter which would further divide the force they sought to capture. But then there came to them the frightening truth, the realization that the movement embraced and had support in both your great political parties, as well as the Armed Forces of the Philippines and many civic organizations of the land.

"When it became clear that the movement for free elections meant not disillusionment with democracy, but rather a people more united than ever in its defense, the communists dropped their mask. First they screamed for a boycott of the elections. Then when it became evident that their exhortations were being ignored, they dropped all pretense of being champions of the people and ran amok in a desperate effort to achieve their ends by murder, kidnapping, and every form of intimidation known to gangsterism...

While not all of the attempted interference with free elections is of Huk or communist origin, the Ambassador was undoubtedly justified in stating, in closing his address:

"...I am even more grateful that I shall be able to report to my Government and to the American people that of all facts in this part of the world of which they may feel certain, the one fact that stands out firm and clear is that the people of the Philippines today have a firm grip upon freedom, and now show every evidence of their determination and ability to hold and strengthen that grip."

Thus the American Ambassador gave encouragement when encouragement is needed and praise to what deserves praise, and again gave strong evidence of the deep and watchful interest which American takes in the maintenance of the democratic system in the Philippines.

The fall of one of the greatest of capitalistic nations, Great Britain, to socialism, was always surprising as well as alarming, although it was ascribed to a "boring from within" carried on for many years by an increasing number of converts to socialism among

the intellectual classes as well as among the workers. It was at last and precipitately brought about at the close of World War II, through an ordinary election, by a people deeply weary of things as they were and determined to make a change.

Just prior to this 1945 election, which was described as the "most astonishing and significant in history", the Conservatives held 359 seats and the Laborites 165 seats in the House of Commons. In that election, the former minority won 387 seats and the Conservatives retained only 194. With supporting groups, the Labor Party held well over 400 seats.

The Labor Government which thus came into power interpreted the election as a mandate to carry out its program of limited socialism, which specified the nationalization of certain industries. One of the first steps was the nationalization of the Bank of England, and this was followed by the nationalization of the cable and wireless services and of civil aviation. Then came the socialization of various large industries,—coal, transportation, gas and electricity, and lastly steel. The Labor Government also established a nationalized system of insurance and the so-called socialized medicine. Practically all other economic activities were subjected to detailed government controls.

All of Britain's difficulties can not be laid to the socialist program which the Government thus put into execu-

tion, and there have been periods of improvement, though they have been followed again by periods of decline. But over the whole, it must be accepted that it has been under the socialistic regime that management has noticeably deteriorated, normal incentives have disappeared, production has either fallen off or failed to rise adequately, costs and prices have continued to mount, rationing has again had to be resorted to, standards of living have generally and seriously declined, "austerity" has become the Government watchword, strikes have been frequent, individual freedom has in many ways been sorely curtailed, and, despite ever heavier taxation and vast American aid, huge deficits have been incurred, the currency had to be devalued, foreign troubles have multiplied. And this was all under the Government's "planned economy" which it was announced would establish the "welfare state".

The Government slowly forfeited its support and a year and a half ago, hoping to better its position, it "went to the country". The results were disappointing for the Labor Party. It retained only the barest majority,—315 seats against the Conservative Party's 297 and the Liberal Party's 9.

Amid rising difficulties, approaching crisis, the Government last month again decided to appeal to the people, and this time was voted out of power entirely, the Labor Party retaining only 295 seats against the Conservatives winning of 321. The Liberals gained 6, other parties 2, with one seat still undecided.

In the issue over socialism, it is noteworthy that members of the Liberal Party generally favor the Conservative side. Churchill, himself, was formerly a member of the Liberal Party, which has now all but disappeared as sharper and sharper lines had to be drawn.

There is no one, who is human, who does not favor the general welfare; no one who would question that a government must look to the general welfare. There is only the question as to how an increased general welfare can be brought about. Conservatives generally would go slow in effecting fundamental changes; liberals generally favor more progressive action; but both conservatives and liberals are against radicalism and against class governments such as a labor government is bound to be.

The trouble with the so-called "planned economy" is that it is conceived as possible that a small group of bureaucrats can substitute their own and always largely theoretical planning for the continuous, practical, and highly experienced planning of the many thousands of a nation's ablest men engaged in finance, industry, and trade. It is an error to think that there is no planning under capitalistic democracy; there is planning, and it is done by those the most capable of it.

A more technical, but an even more fundamental objection to government economic planning is that it inevitably destroys the free market, and with it the cost and price system, rendering economic calculation impossible. As a noted economist has said: "What is called a planned economy is no economy at all. It is just a system of groping about in the dark."

That is what has been going on in Great Britain.

Perhaps socialism came to Britain in part because, for all its genuine political democracy, the traditional class system there militated against as great a diffusion among the masses of the benefits of capitalistic production as is so highly desirable and as is, indeed, inevitable in the long run.

It may well be that the experimenting which has been carried on in Britain,—for all the damage it has done, will in part be of some lasting benefit because some of the gains admittedly made by the very poorest classes will be preserved.

The task of the new Conservative Government will not be an easy one for it is always difficult to back-track and much that has been done will have to be put up with. As Mr. Churchill has pointed out, an island holding 50,000,000 people grows food enough for only 30,000,000 and must produce goods to buy the rest,—without most of the income once derived from empire investments. "To do this", in the words of the *Christian Science Monitor* (Boston), "involves immense problems of modernization of industries, resuscitation of incentive, and liberation of energies..."

One thing which should be recognized, in the Philippines as in the United States, is that socialism has more or less surreptitiously also made great inroads in both countries. The course of events in Britain holds a serious lesson for us.

"Flushing Meadow, N.Y., Oct. 18 (INS)—The United States warned Premier Mossadegh of Iran today that the Anglo-Iranian oil dispute threatens peace and that it is the United Nations Security Council's duty to intervene to safeguard peace..."

"Washington, Oct. 18 (AP)—... Secretary of State Acheson, urging Egypt to show 'restraint', said the United States considered invalid the Egyptian cancellation of the two treaties... The spirit of responsibility to others requires that no nation carelessly precipitate events which can have no constructive end but which by their nature create those elements of confusion and weakness which tempt aggression..."

Democracy stands for the right of self-government. It recognizes the sovereignty of the governments and peoples of other nations. It opposes aggression against and interference with other governments and peoples.

Democracy, and the Police Power

These are noble conceptions, but, on occasion, lead to confusion, especially when it is attempted to apply them to the problem of maintaining international law and order.

This is basically a police problem, and it is well understood that the police power is the inherent power of all governments to maintain the general security. In the democracies the police power is exercised within certain accepted constitutional and statutory limits, but within these limits the police arm of the government has clear right and authority to restrain the behavior of individuals and even to restrain them in the exercise of their individual rights when this behavior or this exercise becomes a danger to the community.

The police do not hesitate to "interfere" in such cases; they do not wait for "consent"; they "invade" private premises; they use "force" if necessary. And none of this is "un-democratic". It is as much a part of democratic government as of any other type of government.

Today we have at least the beginnings of a world government, of a world judiciary system, of a world police organization. This machinery should be put to the fullest possible use when it becomes advisable to restrain an international law-breaker, any nation, large or small, which defiantly makes a world nuisance of itself, even a world menace.

The noted political scientist, Charles E. Merriam, has said on this point:

"The person who does not consent to some established order becomes an outlaw. He can not claim a right without conceding a counter-right. A nation within a jural order of the world no more loses its personality than does an individual in a democratic society. The nation which will not participate in a world order becomes an outlaw. It can

not claim a right without admitting a rule of law. Neither outlaw individuals nor outlaw nations can complain if the treatment of outlaws is visited upon them."

We should clearly understand that while democracy may limit, it does not abrogate the inherent police powers of government, and that this should hold good internationally as well as nationally.

When wrong is being done by any nation, endangering the entire world community, it is not only the right, but the duty of the other nations to interfere, forcibly if necessary.

No apology is called for.

In commenting on the assassination last month of Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan of Pakistan, the *New York Times* pointed out that no fewer than thirteen important political leaders by Murder in Islam have been murdered since 1945,—five of them this year.

That is a fearful thing, and one may well wonder what hope the Mohammedan world can have for the future with their most outstanding leaders being wiped out at such a rate.

But assassination, under a legalistic guise, has become the practice on a far greater scale in all the totalitarian countries where it has assumed the proportion of a general massacre not only of all the old leaders but thousands of others among the better educated classes who are feared as potential leaders of opposition.

It was reported after the last World War that the Nazis in the Balkan countries had murdered a large proportion of the members of all the professional groups, including even physicians and teachers. And the communists are continuing this most terrible form of national destruction in the oppressed countries, in a deliberate effort to render them forever without leaders of their own and to reduce the people to nothing but mobs of slaves.

President Truman, in his opening address at the San Francisco peace conference a month or two ago, said, in an aside, that there are "thugs" among the nations, and surely there never were more dreadful regimes than those of the thugs and assassins of the 20th century. The word *thug* comes from the Hindu name of a secret fraternity among the worshippers of the goddess Kali in Northern India, which made a profession of murder, usually by strangling, and which was not suppressed until the 1830's. The word *assassin* has a similar derivation and comes from the Arabian designation of a secret order founded in Persia toward the end of the 11th century whose members committed widespread murders under the influence of *hashish*; it spread into both Syria and India and lasted for several hundred years.

These were criminal organizations one read about in works of history or in novels, perhaps with only a romantic shiver, for they existed long ago and far away. It is different today, when half the world lives under such evil officially enthroned and all mankind is menaced.

Despite its apparent strength, it would seem impossible for such rule to last, that it must collapse of its own rottenness or be overthrown either from within or without, or both. It is certain that such a rule is able to establish itself anywhere only by disguising its true nature. But the truth will out, and the truth shall make us free.

THE Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, when they were written, were revolutionary documents. But they were revolutionary in a very unusual sense.

"Many revolutions are simply a resort to force and violence to impose a new despotism upon the people. But these documents were for a very different purpose; their aim was to make despotism impossible. Both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution seek to make the rule of law and the concepts of justice the dominating factors in government. And to a large extent they have succeeded."—President Truman