

***This is***

***The Pivotal Year***



***In the  
Mercury's  
Opinion***

**I**N 1926, in this magazine, a wise man, Henry L. Mencken, wrote:

The American State has taken on a vast mass of new duties and responsibilities; it has spread out its powers until they penetrate to every act of the citizen, however secret; it has begun to throw around its operations the high dignity and impeccability of a state religion; its agents become a separate and superior caste, with authority to bind and loose, and their thumbs in every pot. But the state still remains, as it was in the beginning, the common enemy of all well-disposed, industrious and decent men.

That was in 1926. But as early as 1776 the patriots began warning Americans to watch out for the one old and certain enemy which could destroy their dream: the burgeoning state. Tom Paine warned: "Government, even in its most restrained form, is but a necessary evil." Thomas Jefferson warned: "The best governed people are the least governed people." James Madison, in 1794, warned: "Free men must guard against the old trick of turning every contingency into a re-

source for accumulating force in government." And on down to Woodrow Wilson who, speaking in New York on September 9, 1912, warned: "The history of liberty is the history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

Here is a fact: of all the liberal minds, between 1776 and 1933, which contemplated the American experiment and wished it well—every one of those minds foresaw that the one enemy most likely to destroy America was burgeoning bureaucracy. The chief concern of the men who created the American union was how to restrain the government; and, until 1933, this concern was the mark of an American liberal.

But around 1930 there appeared in this country a group of people calling themselves "Liberals" who wanted to extend, not restrain, government power. These were men like Felix Frankfurter and Dean Acheson and Alger Hiss and Harry Hopkins. They described themselves as Fabian Socialists or Democrats or just plain "Liberals." They equated their "Liberalism" with state socialism; they gazed hopefully toward Moscow; and what they wanted, under whatever name, was more and more state power. On every campus and farm and in every factory they spread confusion by insisting that, in the name of "Liberalism," the government of the United States

should be "big enough" to guarantee "social security" to every citizen.

Would not this big government mean big taxes and big debt? Perhaps, said the new "Liberals," but the taxes would be collected from the "economic royalists" and government debt didn't matter.

Where can this trend toward bigger and bigger government be halted? the true liberals inquired. "It won't be halted," replied Mr. Hopkins. "We'll spend and spend, tax and tax, and elect and elect."

This new "Liberalism" became so fashionable that any youth, professor, actor, or writer who dared to question it had to risk not being invited to hot dog parties at Hyde Park as well as being called a reactionary, a Fascist, or a "tool of the selfish interests."

The new "Liberals" rushed to embrace Communism as an ally. Mr. Acheson risked his tailoring by working himself into a sweat for the recognition of the Soviet regime, and his friend, Mr. Hiss, fed it all the secret documents he could lay hands on. Mr. Acheson walks to work each morning with his dearest friend and mentor, Mr. Frankfurter, and during the Second War it was Hopkins, Acheson, and Hiss who strove, first to deliver American goods and American patents to Russia, and then, at Yalta, to deliver half of Europe and the keys of Asia into Russian hands.

In 1945 it was Acheson's State

Department which was distributing printed propaganda among American soldiers telling them that the Chinese Red leader, Mao Tse-Tung, could be compared with "our own Thomas Jefferson."

Here is one of the supreme ironies of human history: the United States of America, once a carefully restrained republic, is now far along toward being converted into a "modern collectivist state" — a state which would have appalled both Jefferson and Wilson. Yet the men who have promoted this conversion have called themselves "Liberals" and have used as their political vehicle the party of Jefferson and Wilson.

**N**OW, IN 1952, where do we stand?

The government which was our fathers' servant has become our master. It is so big that it defies analysis, description, or understanding. It confiscates a third of our national income, yet it plans only to become larger, never smaller. It claims that it is guaranteeing security to many citizens, but, by its own actions, it is destroying the value of our money and is, therefore, rendering every citizen less secure.

How reliable is government as a security agency when it is systematically destroying the value of every government bond, every life insurance policy, and every dollar bill?

At the top of this vast heap of

confusion sits a frightened, foolish little man who was chosen by Franklin Roosevelt only because he was a human cipher, incapable of exciting opposition, and whose principal political experience had been as a front for corruption. Truman, confronted by more war, corruption, and inflation, can only be expected to grow daily more neurotic, and his "program" will be to try to expand the government even more with "social gains."

Truman's right arm is Acheson, a man who truly deserves the contempt of every "well-disposed and industrious" American — particularly the young. Acheson is a diplomat *in reverse*. A diplomat is hired by a country to endeavor to make that country more secure in relation to its enemies. One of the self-announced enemies of the United States, since 1923, has been Soviet Russia. Yet Acheson, on his record, worked from 1933 to 1948 to *increase* the power of Soviet Russia. All his contrived and televised grimacing at Gromyko in 1951 can hardly win him the respect of intelligent men who know his record.

Supporting Truman and Acheson is an enormous mass of subsidized voting power. Some of this voting power is in the highest economic bracket — manufacturers like Henry Kaiser who get both their capital and profits from government; the Wall Street Democrats who have a vested interest in continued government

spending abroad; the wheat millionaires whose principal customer is government; and the twenty-five multi-millionaires in Washington who had nothing in 1934 but who have gotten fat manipulating government money and government influence.

Other millions of Americans, some with misgivings, will follow in the subsidized, big government train — farmers who have “deserted to the government”; minorities in search of “recognition” and preferment; Common Men who have been invited by big government to relax and take pride in their commonness. All these groups will be pushing, shoving, trying to find in bigger government the security which they prefer to liberty.

**C**AN THESE FORCES be beaten in 1952?

Those of us with a sense of history must retain our doubts. With universal suffrage, liberty has seldom won at a counting of noses. Hope for victory can spring only if the issues are drawn clear, and only if there is a national realization that this is the last chance for those of us who be-

lieve in checks and balances and in the restraint of government.

This is the pivotal year. If the Democratic Party, now irretrievably committed to bigger government, can be beaten and thrown into retreat, then perhaps there is hope that Americans can once again discipline their government. There is hope for a return to liberalism — the liberalism which holds all power suspect, and which knows that when men seek security at the price of liberty they always lose both.

But if there is another Democratic victory, or, worse, if there is an inconclusive or irresolute Republican victory, then all hope for liberalism can be abandoned in our time. Those of us who oppose the government will become a permanent minority, or, at least, we will be “permanent” as long as we are tolerated. But we will have lost all reason for striving.

This is not written in despair but with some hope. Now is the time for all “well-disposed, industrious, and decent” Americans to unite for the restraint of government. The government is the enemy, and after November, 1952, we will either be its masters or its slaves.

# What EISENHOWER Has Learned In EUROPE

A political analyst  
appraises the man  
who may be President

ROBERT INGRIM

IN WESTERN EUROPE, more than in America, it is assumed that General Dwight D. Eisenhower will campaign for the Presidency of the United States. Therefore, there is in Europe even more speculation as to the General's political views. Is he a "Liberal" or a "Conservative"? Will he lend America's aid to the conservative forces in Europe or to the European Socialists? And, because of his experience, will he drive harder bargains with America's allies?

Eisenhower has had the oppor-

tunity for profound political education since 1943. He has been a party to grave political errors and those of us who have observed him closely believe that he has profited from the experience.

For Americans who wish to understand what Eisenhower may have learned in Europe, it is necessary to realize that America — and to some extent, Eisenhower — has passed through three easily identifiable stages in dealing with postwar Europe.

1. The 1945-46 — the "Cooperate-with-Russia" — stage.

2. The 1947-50 — the "Protect-Europe-with-Economic-Aid" — stage, and

3. The 1951-52 — the "Protect-Europe-with-Arms" — stage.

---

*Robert Ingrim is currently back in America after three years in Europe as a special columnist on international politics for a number of newspapers. He is the author of After Hitler Stalin (1946) and, most recently, a scholarly work on Bismarck.*