

# THE DESCENT TO A DICTATORSHIP\*

By GEORGE W. MAXEY

[FROM VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY,  
Vol. IV, No. 24]

IT is a happy coincidence that the meeting that directly led to the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention was a meeting of the representatives of five states held on September 11, 1786, in Maryland, and 152 years later almost to the exact date, news from Maryland demonstrated that the majority of American voters are still free men and that the United States is not yet ready to descend to a dictatorship. On September 11, 1786, the Maryland meeting was good news and on September 12, 1938, the report of the Maryland vote was in a double sense "glad Tydings." The defense of constitutional government rises above politics or partisanship and because of that fact I feel justified in speaking here.

"Easy is the descent into hell." That a dictatorship is hell is self-evident. Refugees who recently escaped from the German dictatorship to the Swiss Republic knelt with a prayer of thanks and kissed the free soil. Not long ago the Russian dictator executed the Admiral of the Russian Navy, the Superintendent of the Russian Naval Academy and many others, and a little before that he did corresponding jobs on the army High Command. Stalin possesses the all-time Russian record for assassinations. He "has slain his tens of thousands." Germany is a cruel despotism. In both countries people are regimented by brutal bureaucracies, lied to by a controlled radio and press, and convinced by bullets. Ship captains find it unnecessary when their ships touch Russian or German ports to take precautions against desertions. Desertions are numerous only in the ports of free countries. Sailors have an unerring instinct for a good land.

In Russia and Germany there are 240,000,000 human beings living under terrorism. Hundreds of thousands of them are in prison camps. Fifty thousand Austrians have been imprisoned or exiled because of their race. Chancellor Schuschnigg is to be tried for treason because he was loyal to his own country. Many have found in suicide the only escape from intolerable tyranny.

In Germany there is a secret tribunal with spies everywhere. When a German finds that this tribunal is making inquiries about him, it is said that "he puts a pistol to his head," no matter how blameless he may be. Defense is useless, for Hitler proclaims his belief in periodic purges. Hitler's right-hand man is "Iron

Hermann" Goering. He expressed his idea of his official duty when he said: "I am in the habit of shooting from time to time and if I sometimes make mistakes, at least I have shot." This savage dictatorship has destroyed German freedom, made Germany medieval in its barbarism and today world peace is subject to the whim of a man who but fifteen years ago was a paper-hanger. It's too bad he didn't remain one. The descent from the Germany of Bismarck and Von Bulow, of Rathenau and Stresemann to the Germany of Hitler and Goering has been a descent into barbarism.

If the assaults being made on our Constitution are not emphatically repelled, this Republic will make the same descent. The German people were warned against Hitler. They were told that this "cheap Austrian demagogue," as he was then characterized, would take away their liberties if he were entrusted with power. The warnings were ignored. Germans thought "it could not happen" there. Von Hindenburg took Hitler so lightly six years ago that he said he would get rid of him by putting him to work licking the backs of Hindenburg postage stamps. Today the once despised demagogue holds in his hands the lives of 75,000,000 people and menaces the welfare of the world. Edmund Burke was right when he said that "early and provident fear is the mother of safety." If the Germans had feared Hitler a little more when they had a chance to vote him out, they wouldn't have to fear him so much now when they have no chance to vote at all.

The road descending to a dictatorship is an old one. Plato and Aristotle described it twenty-three centuries ago. There is no mystery about the science of government. The greatest intellects have illumined that subject and all history confirms their conclusions. Aristotle said that a democracy unrestrained by constitutional limitations was "a state in which everything, even the law, depended on the multitude set up as a tyrant and governed by a few declamatory speakers." James Madison had the same thought in 1787 when he described *unrestrained* democracies as "spectacles of turbulence, short in their lives and violent in their deaths."

Human character is the stuff states are made of and it has never changed. The ambitions and vanities of men of today are all described in ancient literature. In Homer's story of the Trojan Horse, he told how the hostile Greeks got into Troy by being concealed in a device that appeared to be something other than what

it was. If he were living today and saw the devices used to introduce deadly evils into this Republic, he would say the deceptiveness of the few and the gullibility of the many had not changed in 3,000 years.

Fortunately for us Americans those statesmen who met in Philadelphia 151 years ago knew human history, human nature and the conclusions of all the political philosophers. John Locke's "Treatise on Government," and Montesquieu's "Spirit of the Laws," declaring that the separation of governmental powers is the only safeguard against tyranny, were well known to these men. Madison and Hamilton and Wilson had studied the records of all republics. Franklin was there and he was one of the wisest men of the ages. The convention's presiding officer was George Washington, whom Gladstone pronounced, "the purest figure in history." Washington's life and character personify just resistance to the abuse of power. He often declared: "Arbitrary, irresponsible power cannot be entrusted to human minds."

These nation builders were practical men. None of them had ever learned to walk by being carried or sought remuneration through indolence. Whatever they possessed they had struggled for. They had liberty only because they had fought for it.

After the Revolution the need of the hour was government. There are two kinds: autocratic and democratic. Americans had fought off one autocratic government and did not want another. They wanted "a government of the people," and such a government means the rule of neither a man nor a mob. A free spirit abhors both anarchy and chains. Mindful of the lessons of the past, these men were eager to protect human liberty by constitutional safeguards. Republics descend to dictatorships only when people forget the past and are blind to the present and indifferent to the future.

Napoleon said that it was easier to make a plan of campaign than to execute it. Our Constitution was a plan of campaign against autocracy. The plan was executed successfully for nearly 150 years. If the plan is failing now, it is because the American people have lost their capacity for self-government. Our constitutional guarantees become "poor, poor dumb mouths" only when character no longer stands behind them. The plans of Napoleon succeeded only when he had men with character to execute them. His perfect plan for the Battle of Waterloo was wrecked by a single subordinate.

\*Speech delivered in Chicago, Ill., on September 23, 1938, under the auspices of The Union League Club of Chicago.

Nations have been ruined by one man alone. Place the government in the hands of a single individual and you endow him with unlimited capacity for evil, which he is likely to exercise. Proof of this is found in the European dictatorships of today.

"A thousand years scarce serve to form a state,

An hour may lay it in the dust; and when

Can man its shatter'd splendor renovate?"

Our Constitution has been declared to be "the greatest document ever struck off at one time by the mind of man." Like all works of superior minds, it is not complex but simple. It has four basic principles, which until recent years had the whole-hearted allegiance of every American statesman. No man ever takes official authority here without first making a solemn covenant with God and his country to be faithful to the fundamental law. To take that oath and then attempt to undermine the fundamental law is not only perjury, it is treason—treason to the most sacred trust human hands can hold. Infidelity to the Constitution is infidelity to freedom. Heretofore, however much political rivals in America might have differed on policies, they did not differ in their devotion to the fundamental law. In June, 1861, Stephen A. Douglas lay dying in this city. He and Abraham Lincoln had been long-time rivals in the politics of Illinois and recent rivals for the presidency. The defeated and dying Douglas, when asked by his wife if he had a farewell message for his sons, said: "Yes, tell them to support the Constitution of the United States."

What are these four basic principles of the Constitution? They are: (1) The federal government shall keep to its sphere and the states to their proper spheres of government. (2) No official shall be entrusted with autocratic power. (3) Unrestrained power shall never be lodged anywhere, not in the President, not in the Congress, not even in a majority of the American people. (4) There shall be maintained an absolutely independent judiciary. In our constitutional system the United States Supreme Court is the "power of gravity" which holds to its assigned "orbit" every "planet" of government. As long as these basic principles of the Constitution are unviolated, there can be no dictatorship. A certain siren of a dictatorship-complex in any public official is his scorn of these principles. Within the past few years these principles of sound, democratic government have been flouted in the "New Russia," the "New Germany," and the "New Deal."

The first act of the German dictator was to abolish home rule and to concentrate all power in Berlin. In his first speech as Chancellor in February, 1933, Hitler said the German provinces were "the historical cor-

ner-stones of the German Empire," and he would respect them. Within a year he broke that pledge and appointed commissioners to rule the provinces. Thereafter local rights and then individual rights quickly disappeared. The federal republic of Germany had become a centralized autocracy. Insisting that he had done all this by legal means, Hitler called himself "Legality Adolf." Exactly five months after he had centralized all authority in himself he carried out his blood purge, murdering several hundred men and one woman. These people were murdered because they were critical of Hitler's policies. Willi Schmidt, the Munich press chief, was one of the victims. He had criticized Hitler. The gang of executioners first shot the wrong Will Schmidt, a musician, and then discovering their mistake, went back and shot the other. Thus two men were killed to get rid of one critic. Another victim of the blood purge of June 30th was Dr. Klausener, Under-Secretary of the Ministry of Transport and Chief of the Rhenish Catholic Party. He was shot at his desk. Two of Von Papen's secretaries were killed at their desks. The story of the murders of July 30, 1934, is one of the most grisly stories in history.

How fares federalism in the U. S. A.? On June 7th last, Senator King of Utah declared on the floor of the Senate that "local self-government lies at the very foundation of a free country" but that "if present policies continue, the states will become mere shells out of which all life has departed." The handmaiden of liberty is home rule. It is what Ireland fought for and at last secured after 700 tragic years. Home rule is what the despotism of Russia and the imperialism of old Germany denied the Polish people after Poland's cruel dismemberment. Our states as autonomous commonwealths are being rapidly destroyed. In the domain of taxation, Governor Lehman of New York pointed out that the Federal Government is exhausting the sources of the state's financial support and reducing the states to "vassals." This practice has made it necessary for governors to go to the President seeking donations from the federal treasury—a treasury whose only source of supply is the savings of the American people. A state that has to solicit alms from a central government is no longer sovereign. It has lost even its self-respect.

The second basic command of the Constitution: Entrust no official with autocratic power, has been scorned during recent years. No such concentration of power in the hands of the Executive as now exists has ever before been seen in this Republic. Never before has this been a one-man country. Washington's refusal of a third term, Jefferson's refusal of a third term, Coolidge's refusal of a third term, were all based on the principle that it must always be demonstrated that this is not a

one-man country. Jefferson declared that the two-term-only precedent set by Washington was "sound and salutary," that it is as much a president's "duty to lay down his charge at a proper time as to have borne it faithfully." He added: "If some termination to the service of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution or supplied by practice, his office nominally for years, will in fact become for life; and history shows how easy that degenerates into an inheritance." A one-man country soon becomes a dictatorship no matter what its governmental form.

The placing in the hands of the President, of billions of dollars to be spent as he sees fit and where he sees fit, clothes him with dictatorial power. Millions of individuals are on the federal pay roll and it is conceded that 90 per cent of them vote as the President wills. As these voters have other voters in their families, it follows that the President has, through his control of jobs, a control over the electorate which is utterly repugnant to a free expression of the public will. "Priming the pump" has become a mere euphemism for pulling the primaries. The greatest work-master in American history is now attempting to become the greatest vote-master in American history.

Senator Byrd has recently declared that there are today 7,000,000 direct and 32,000,000 indirect recipients of federal funds. The gratitude of the recipients of such funds is translated into votes for the man from whom they seem to think the funds come. We have seen recently the spectacle of the President going into a state to solicit votes for his candidate for the United States Senate and his first utterance upon reaching that state was to promise the voters that he would spend \$14,000,000 of public money on bridge-building in that state. If he had succeeded in his purpose to fill the Senate with marionettes, this nation in its descent to a dictatorship would have "touched bottom." President Washington rebuked a man who asked him merely to express his wishes in the selection of a certain congressman.

Washington, "thou shouldst be living at this hour,

America hath need of thee: she hath become a fen.

Of stagnant waters...

Oh! raise us up, return to us again; And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power!"

President James Buchanan and Senator Stephen A. Douglas were political enemies, though members of the same party, but there is no record of Buchanan asking the people of Illinois to defeat Douglas when he ran for the United States Senate in 1858. President Jackson and John C. Calhoun were political enemies, though members of the same party; but there is no record of Jackson attempting to bring



about the termination of Calhoun's senatorial career. The respective independence of the Executive, the Legislature and the Judiciary is the corner-stone of American constitutional government, and that the voters of Maryland, South Carolina and Georgia and other states have recently reasserted their independence in defiance of presidential interference is the most hopeful thing that has happened in this country since the court-packing plan and the reorganization plan were killed by courageous Senators and Congressmen. This defiance of the President transcended all party considerations; it was a manifestation of old-fashioned Americanism. It would have delighted equally Hamilton and Jefferson, Lincoln and Douglas, Grover Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt. At the last session of Congress a senator known as a presidential "yes man" introduced a bill to penalize any newspaper for publishing a falsehood. As some governmental bureaucrat would be the judge of the fairness of an article challenged, that law would have destroyed the liberty of the press. The original N. R. A. had a press licensing measure attached to it. It required a fight to kill it.

Napoleon III was elected President of France and in a few years he had subverted the Constitution he had sworn to support and became an hereditary Emperor. Read what the historian Lecky says about the methods Napoleon III employed to acquire arbitrary power. Possibly you will notice a present-day parallelism. This is what Lecky says in his "Democracy and Liberty" of Napoleon III and his political "technique": "Every official from the highest to the lowest was turned into an electioneering agent. All the powers of administration were systematically employed in directing votes. Each constituency was taught that its prospect of obtaining roads or bridges or harbors or other local advantages depended on its support of the government and if the official candidate succeeded he would have the power of distributing among his supporters innumerable small government places, privileges and homes. . . . The legislators were elected by universal suffrage yet the government (because of its control of the voters) became an almost absolute despotism." He describes the government of Napoleon III as "a government with no real constitutional freedom, no liberty of the press and no liberty of public meeting." The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed., says of Napoleon III: "His was the government of cheap bread, great public works and holidays." History records that Napoleon III's grandiose schemes brought ruin to his country. The disastrous Franco-Prussian War, followed by the Paris Commune, in which there were 20,000 executions, and colossal destruction of property, was the fruit of his lust for power. The Franco-Prussian War, which this dictator caused,

led, with Alsace-Lorraine aftermath, to the World War of 1914. Such are the fruits of dictatorship.

We have in this country now an executive whose personal power is greater than the head of any constitutional state ever possessed. This power is based almost exclusively on the fact that Congress has given him a blank check on virtually unlimited public funds. These funds are used to increase and perpetuate executive power. This power generated by public funds was almost sufficient to enable the President to pack the Supreme Court so that it would be but the echo of his will, and thereby destroy our constitutional government.

How about the third command: Never permit unrestrained power to be lodged anywhere, not even in a majority? This principle has not yet been destroyed but it has been disdained. Men now in power have declared that there should be no curb on the popular will as expressed by a majority. This means that neither an individual nor a minority has any rights which the majority are bound to respect. It means the yielding of principle to what seems like temporary expediency. It means abject surrender to the pressure of prejudice or emotion. No nation is worthy to be called a republic where majority rule is not restricted by constitutional minority protection. Otherwise the passion or the caprice of the majority at any time is the supreme law of the land, and no man's life, liberty or property is secure. In a genuine constitutional government the law and not the mob, rules, and whatever the majority may in a moment of madness or excitement demand must yield to the intelligent and sober judgment the organic law embodies. Freedom does not long survive where the law of force supplants the force of law. A ship that is steered by the hurricane soon becomes a ship-wreck. A great navigator consults his charts and adheres to the established principles of navigation. Real statesmen and fearless judges oftentimes have to stem the torrent. They go with the tide only when the tide sets in the right direction. Every great American President at times breasted the popular tide. This was particularly true of Washington and Lincoln and Cleveland. Their quest was for the path not of popularity but of right, and when they found that path they travelled it without fear. They never counted voices of approval, they weighted them, and to them the most weighty voices were those of intelligence and conscience. The insatiable appetite that certain men in power have for popular applause is the chief cause of the evils that now beset the world. Anyone who eleven days ago heard on the radio, the German dictator's speech to a howling mob of fanatical supporters can understand what the intoxication of applause does to petty men clothed with great

power. They care not what happens to their country tomorrow so long as they are cheered today. An excited state of the public mind has no more relation to the public's reflective judgment than a cloud-burst has to the beneficence of rain. Where a Constitution like ours is maintained and laws respected there is always "an appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober."

The fourth basic principle of the Constitution is: Maintain an independent judiciary. Everywhere cowed courts have meant an enslaved people. In his march to absolutism every dictator has destroyed the independence of the judiciary. Before Hitler had been in Austria 72 hours, he revoked the commissions of independent judges and put puppets in their places, exactly as he had done in Germany. Napoleon III did the same thing in his march to absolutism in France. Victor Hugo graphically tells that story.

The proposal last year to pack the Supreme Court was avowedly to make that court validate any law the President wanted. The success of that scheme would have ended this constitutional Republic. Josiah W. Bailey, North Carolina's able and courageous Senator, said in an address on June 20th last, that the President's court-packing plan was "a direct attack upon the independence of the judiciary, for the express purpose of having the court uphold as within the power of Congress, acts passed at the instance of the President, which according to every decision of the court in similar cases have been uniformly held to be beyond the power of Congress." Senator Bailey added: "No president takes an oath to support the Constitution as he understands it. He must accept the court's interpretation or be over the Constitution and not under it." Senator Bailey characterized the court-packing proposal "as a blow against the process of democracy most essential to its existence—the constitutional check on Executive and Legislative power," and said: "I am appalled when I consider that labor and struggle was required to repel an attack that in any other period would have at once disgraced those who made it."

Senator Wheeler of Montana on March 10, 1937, stated that the President's purpose in adding six new justices to the Supreme Court was to make that court "subservient to his will." Carter Glass said on March 29, 1937: "No threat to representative democracy since the foundation of this Republic has exceeded in its evil portents this attempt to pack the Supreme Court of the United States and thus destroy the purity and independence of this tribunal of last resort." The Senators who saved the Supreme Court should be honored alongside the signers of the Declaration of Independence. When the Chief Executive of any country can dictate to its Congress and to its courts, he is in fact a dictator no matter what may be his title.

If he claims that his dictatorship is "benevolent," he is claiming an impossibility, for a "benevolent dictatorship" is as much a contradiction in terms as "patriotic treason." Absolute power transforms its possessor into a tyrant no matter how benevolent his original nature. "Power breeds arrogance and arrogance corrupts the understanding heart." Any American who consents to giving the Chief Executive dictatorial powers either doesn't know or care what he is doing or is a slave in his soul. If Americans are to continue to enjoy the protection of the Constitution, they must be vigilant and resolute to defend it.

But violation of the Constitution is not the only route to a dictatorship. A nation can squander itself into a collapse which leads to chaos and then to a dictatorship. No limit on governmental spending was imposed by the Constitution, for it was assumed that the people would not permit themselves to be reduced to insolvency by spendthrifts in public office. Since the British Parliament won the right to control the British purse, it has more than once refused to open it at the behest of the king. Whenever a British king has gone to Parliament for money he has gone humbly, with his hat and not his sceptre in his hand. Governmental extravagance and the excessive taxation it entails have always been the heralds of social disorder and economic anarchy. Taine in his "Ancient Regime" said: "During the decline of the Roman Empire so enormous was the weight of taxation, that the laborer broke down, plains became deserts and woods grew where the plow had been." Herbert Spencer said: "When the French Revolution was approaching, public burdens were so heavy that many farms remained uncultivated and deserted, one quarter of the soil was lying waste and in some provinces one-half was in heath." When a nation's annual tax bill reaches more than 20 per cent of the national income, it is time to put up danger signals. Benjamin Franklin declared that for a government to take from its people one-tenth of its income in taxes would be "hard and oppressive." A government that costs a country more than 20 per cent of its national income is leading it to debt repudiation in the form of inflation or depreciation of currency, to be followed by social disorder and economic chaos. Today the annual cost of federal, state and local government is eighteen billions of dollars or about 30 per cent of our national income. The public debt of no other people in history ever equalled the present public debt of the United States, including the debts of states, countries and municipalities. The total is in round numbers \$60,000,000,000.

The federal deficit during the current fiscal year is now running at the rate of four billions of dollars. This equals the cost of the Civil War. As we cannot endure a 30 per cent tax collection, we have

resorted to borrowing which means taxes deferred and with interest. The increase in the national debt by the present administration is a sum equalling nearly fifteen dollars a minute from the birth of Christ to the present day. In one of his last public utterances Senator Robinson said in the Senate on June 18, 1937: "Gentlemen may laugh about a \$36,000,000,000 debt but with all my refined and expansive sense of humor, I find it impossible to laugh about it." That debt has increased 11 per cent since Senator Robinson uttered those words and by June 1, 1939, it will be forty billions of dollars. Carter Glass said last June: "This country is in a state of irremediable bankruptcy." The present leader of the majority in the United States Senate was interviewed a few weeks ago about the federal deficit. He said (as reported): "I don't agree that there is no alternative other than heavy taxation. If money is needed, it will have to be found." As to where he expects to "find" the money he gives no clue. Possibly he expects to find it "at the foot of the rainbow." A crew which glides down the Niagara River in a canoe, attentive only to the alluring prospect on the shore and hoping to "find" land, is headed for catastrophe. When Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate for President in 1932, he said: "If the nation, like a spendthrift throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy." This nation is now nearer by fifteen billions of dollars to bankruptcy than it was when that admonition was uttered. The expenditures for the national government during the year before he spoke those words were \$4,091,000,000. This year they are over \$9,000,000,000. Great Britain was in the World War fifty-one months, she has a population only one-third as large as ours and she has 740 inhabitants to every square mile of land while we have only 41, yet on June 8, 1935, her Prime Minister was able to announce that her budget was balanced, her taxes were cut by \$60,000,000, that public confidence had been restored, trade revived and that the number of people in employment there was the highest ever recorded in the history of that country. That is another example of the fact that statesmanship cooperates with natural forces and cures the ills of the body-economic while quackery meddles with nature and either kills the patient or cause a devastating relapse.

The Thirteen Colonies went to war on the proposition: "Taxation without representation is tyranny." We now have a taxation far worse than that which drove the Colonists to revolt. Montesquieu said, and all history proves it, that "the effect of excessive taxation is slavery." It makes

thrift useless and paralyzes the initiative of a people. Today Americans are in the name of taxation having their accumulations confiscated and their daily earnings devoured. Public officials who would impoverish and strangle the industrial life of the nation were never dreamed of by the men who established this Republic.

The Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. The colossal and corroding waste of public funds on every hand is proof that the present-day taxpayer is not getting "just compensation" for the property taken from him: The Constitution specifically mentions life, liberty and property as being the subjects of its protection. Today the government is not conserving property, it is consuming it. It's only a short step from taking property to taking liberty. Andrew Jackson said in his Farewell Address, March 4, 1837: "There is no power conferred on the Federal Government so liable to abuse as the taxing power. Congress has no right to take money from the people unless money is required to execute some of the specific powers entrusted to the government."

Another cause of the collapse of republics is their overloading. When a government takes on more responsibilities than any government can discharge successfully, it is courting chaos. The German republic collapsed because it undertook to satisfy too many human wants. This collapse made "Hitlerism" possible. Society and government are two different things and from the confusion of them comes the folly of fanatics. Society involves all human relationships, and only limited areas are a legitimate field for government. No government possesses the wisdom or power of Providence. Putting a man into office does not make him a Superman. Even Superman are "super" only in special lines, and, in government, they have been few. The men who aspire to the role of Providence in controlling society have usually been failures in their private lives. They seem to think that mating mediocrity with public office begets genius. It is not so. The association is more likely to beget these "twins": *delusions of grandeur and an ambition to administer civilization.* The geniuses in government have been men who understood government's natural limitations—understood that while government's capacity for good is limited, its capacity for evil is unlimited—understood that while any "quack" can kill, the greatest physician can cure only when he cooperates with Nature's healing processes. Jefferson's best known dictum is "that government governs best which governs least." Spengler said that Bismarck was a statesman of the first rank, for in his statesmanship "his high policy was the art of the possible."



That most profound analyst, Gustave Le Bon, says that "the basic philosophy of the French Revolution was that a society may be remade in all its parts by means of institutions. The lawmakers of that day resolved to break with the past, found a new era, fix prices and legislate for the human race. They wanted to annihilate the past but in the end they were annihilated. Their faith in the power of laws and institutions was absolute. After ten years of violence and destruction and burning and pillage and massacre their impotence was revealed so startlingly that they fell into universal reprobation. The possibility of remaking society by means of laws has been given the lie by observation and experience." Woodrow Wilson must have had such remakers of society in mind when he said here in Chicago in 1909: "The men who are dangerous are the men who propound theories which will make a new pattern for society and a new model for the universe. These are the men who are not to be trusted."

The decisive test of any law is not its objective but its workability. The doctors who bled George Washington "meant well" but they killed their patient. The League of Nations had a noble objective but it hasn't worked. It did harm. England depended too much upon it and neglected rearmament. No pilot of a ship of State dare ignore the rocks and reefs of reality. Marshal Foch was a realist and said that world peace would come only when the ambitions of nations no longer clashed and peace lodged in all human hearts. Treaties cannot guarantee peace and laws cannot create prosperity. No law can kill the profit motive or the instinct to possess property and no law can restore business confidence and enterprise in a country whose public officials are constantly attacking capital. In all countries and in all ages sacred capital means idle capital and idle capital means idle men. To have employees there must be employers. It has been recently said that "every man in the United States who possesses property of any kind is afraid of being robbed and almost certain of being ruined. The only uncertainty is whether the robbing will be accomplished through taxation, inflation, confiscation or all three." An attack on capital is an attack on something produced by liberty. Only free men have capital. A slave has no property, he is property. We have men in high station who denounce communism and yet foster practices that are leading directly to it. Every attack on capital, every policy that squeezes value out of property and interferes with its use, are steps toward communism. He who rails against success and excellence has in himself the making of a communist. He is certainly giving communism "aid and comfort."

If multiplicity of laws made for prosperity, American prosperity would be unpar-

leled. No other nation can rival us in multiplicity of laws. There is a law prohibiting even the interstate shipping of a potato if it's less than 1-1/2 inches in diameter. Our bureaucracy is the world's bulkiest. There are 1,000,000 employees on the federal government's civil pay roll. Since July 1, 1933, the government built 664 new office buildings outside of Washington at a cost of \$239,000,000 and three years later it was leasing 11,842 other buildings, all as office space for its employees. The floor space of buildings owned and leased by the government outside of Washington is the equivalent of fifty-two Empire State buildings. Government agencies became so numerous in the District of Columbia that some had to go to Baltimore for office space. This huge bureaucracy has functioned so wastefully that, according to Senator Byrd of Virginia, it built dwellings in Virginia at a cost of \$8,000 which local builders agreed to reproduce for \$900. The government built elsewhere 15,000 homes at a cost of \$16,000 each, which puts them beyond the reach of the tenants they were built for. The multitude of laws and our colossal taxes have mired American business into stagnation. Enterprise thrives only in freedom. The expensive "New Deal" remedies have had no more curative effects on the depression than cosmetics have on character. The United States had periodic depressions before 1929 and so did every other country in the world. The records prove that depressions here and elsewhere lasted on an average of five and six-tenths years and then prosperity returned. In 1838 at about the bottom of the four-year depression of that period the national debt was less than half of what it had been five years before. When President Van Buren was urged to take measures of relief which he deemed unsound, he said in a message to Congress on September 4, 1837: "All communities are apt to look to government for too much . . . especially at periods of distress. The framers of our Constitution acted on a sounder principle. They wisely judged that the less government interferes with private pursuits the better. It is not its object to repair by grants of money or legislation in favor of particular pursuits, losses not incurred in the public service. This would be to use the property of some for the benefit of others. It never assuming even for a well-meant object, such powers as were not designated to be conferred upon it, we shall in reality do most for the general welfare." The depression of 1873 lasted six years. When President Hayes took office in 1877, he described the country's industrial condition as one of "prostration." But he adhered to sound principles during his four-year term and when he turned the country over to his successor in 1881, the latter was able to announce that "the prosperity which now prevails is without parallel in any history." During President Hayes'

term the national debt had been reduced by \$64,000,000. The depression of 1893 both here and abroad, which lasted five years, was characterized by the then Governor of the Bank of England as "the most severe financial disturbance of the century." Yet President Cleveland declared that the American people "can be assured of safety only as long as the nation's solvency is unsuspected," and with dauntless courage he held the country to sound financial policies, and the country moved forward under President McKinley to another era of unparalleled prosperity, and during that entire five-year depression period the national debt was not increased as much as it is now increased in two weeks.

Why has the 1929 depression been extended to nearly ten years and the national indebtedness increased nearly twenty billion dollars while other depressions ended in about five years without any substantial increase in the national debt? The difference is the difference between sound statesmanship and reckless experimentation in the treatment of the ills of the body-economic. There is no other explanation. It is asserted that we recovered from former depressions because we had an "open frontier." It is assumed that as soon as men became idle they took up free Western lands and became prosperous. Those who remember earlier depressions do not recall any such exodus from Eastern homes to Western homesteads. Two-thirds of the 1891 decade were depression years. Our population then increased by 13,046,861. The trans-Mississippi area increased in population by only 3,936,561 men, women and children. Our population increase by immigration during that decade was 3,687,564, mostly adult male laborers. The millions then out of work were obviously not absorbed by the free lands of the West.

Political and economic delusions are as old as those of alchemy and witchcraft and youth-restoring potions. Ponce de Leon led his men on a well-financed quest for "the fountain of eternal youth" but it ended in disaster for him and his followers. In 1880, David A. Wells, a profound economist, said of schemes to end financial ills and create prosperity by legislation: "Their authors think they have discovered something new in the domain of economic truth but the record of the past shows that all such schemes are but repetitions of old infelicities. Those who war on natural laws meet failure and disaster."

The American billions entrusted to empires for investment have yielded no dividends but disappointment. The Statistical Year Book of 1937-38 just issued by the League of Nations shows that during the world-wide depression starting late in 1929 the United States has made the poorest record for recovery of all the nations on the globe. Taking the industrial production 1929 as the basis and representing it by the figure 100, Great Britain's industrial

production is now 124, Sweden's 146, and the United States is 64, which is far the lowest of the seventeen nations reporting.

Occasionally some American who goes to Russia or Germany on a visit professes to like what he finds there, though I observe that he doesn't stay there. If he wants to understand a dictatorship in all its phases, let him seek out the families of those whom dictators have murdered and imprisoned; let him think of the 800,000 Jews of Germany and Austria who have been despoiled of their possessions and denied the right to practice their professions or otherwise earn their daily bread simply because of their race; let him consult the clerics and nuns who have been cast into prison for exercising freedom of religion. Let him interview the editors who have been imprisoned or exiled for exercising freedom of speech. If any one contemplates the peace and order found in dictatorships, he should recall the words of the Czar who, after confiscating the property of Poles and jailing and executing them by the thousands, proclaimed: "Peace reigns in Warsaw."

The dictator type is well known. Washington and Lincoln were not of the type, for they possessed no vanity. Napoleon said that the leaders of the French Revolution were all animated by vanity. A dictator craves adulation, is always sure that his talents and virtues surpass those of others, and he feels that to question his judgment is treason. Dictators are self-righteous, self-confident and arrogant. Their test of political ethics is political consort with them. The dictator Robespierre is described by historians as a "a man of mediocre intelligence, incapable of grasping realities, crafty and dissimulating, his prevailing note being pride and vanity." His method was to kill those who did not conform to his views.

Dictators are also jealous men. They brook no rivals and are intolerant of intellectual equals or superiors. Stalin killed off his equals and superiors and Hitler has done the same. Robespierre and Danton were friends and allies in the early stages of the French Revolution, but when Robespierre became powerful enough to do so, he guillotined Danton. Both Le Bon and Michelet say that Robespierre "put his associates to death because he was jealous of their talents, which eclipsed his." The typical demagogue-dictator is

"In friendship false, implacable in hate  
Resolved to ruin or rule the state."

Demagogues succeed only in an atmosphere of emotion. Since hate is the most powerful of all emotions, they engender it. The easiest hate to engender is class hatred. It is also the most fatal to the welfare of nations. James Bryce said that "class war is a menace to mankind and the heaviest

blow ever directed against democracy." In stirring up class warfare the demagogue always selects some minority group as the object of hate. In France of the 1790's it was the nobility, in Russia the aristocracy and in Germany the Jews. In America it is the "economic royalists." An "economic royalist" appears to be something evil to have in the country but nice to have in the family. The demagogue first deludes the people with an exaggerated belief in the power of government to promote human welfare and happiness and he then foments revolutions to achieve impossibilities, hoping that in the social upheaval he will be cast up in the role of dictator. The world today is a witness to a dictator's power for evil.

It is characteristic of would-be dictators that they always disclaim any intention of being dictators. Even Julius Caesar put "the proffered crown aside" while at the same time he was looting the Roman treasury to increase and perpetuate his power. No dictator today even wears that title. We had a dictator in an American state a few years ago who rejoiced in the title of "Kingfish." His sense of humor which led him to exploit that title did not prevent him from attempting to suppress in his state, along with individual liberties, the liberty of the press, which attempt was frustrated by the Supreme Court of the United States.

When demagogues with their "catch words" and seductive illusions and false promises acquire the dictatorial power their vanity covets, they proceed by force to convert majority into totality, to war on liberty, and to make all non-conformity a crime. This has happened in Russia, in

Germany and in Spain. In Madrid thirty thousand executions have taken place, yet three years ago our Minister there wrote that no serious disorder was threatened. But the seeds of class hatred had been sown and the harvest of blood was reaped when the smoldering passions were released and legal and social restraints cast off. In the late 1780's France was acclaimed the most civilized nation in the world. A few years later in the fury of class warfare, the heads of kings, nobles and laboring men were cut off with perfect "equality" and French rivers ran incarnadine to the sea. The demagogues who started all this perished too. One of history's most dramatic moments was when Danton, on the scaffold, asked pardon of God and man for the part he had taken in fomenting the French Revolution.

Aristotle said: "All dictators begin as demagogues." Demosthenes said: "To guard against tyrants is the first duty of a people who desire to remain free." All history teaches that if the social stream is permitted, when lashed into torrential rage, to forsake its channel and leap its barriers, it will spread devastation far and wide before its force is spent.

"Laws are vain by which we right enjoy,

If power unquestioned can those laws destroy."

Such are the lessons of the past. "Shall all these things be washed in the waters of Lethe and forgotten?" Or shall Americans "wake up" before it is too late, and standing shoulder to shoulder regardless of party, maintain the restraints of law and order and repel every attempted breach of the Constitution?

## DRESS ELEGANTLY

*With Smart Suits Made Just The Style You Desire*



J. C. de los Reyes

*We guarantee all of our work*

**We Wish To Announce The Opening  
Of Our Modern Haberdashery**

*just next door to us*

**JULIAN C. DE LOS REYES**  
*Manager and Master Cutter*

*Our Motto: "To Serve With Satisfaction."*

**THE SMART BROS. TAILORING**

840 O'Donnell, Sta. Cruz, Manila

Res. Tel. 2-70-55