



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel
151

Box
53

Folder
320

The faith of an untired liberal, 1928.

"THE FAITH OF AN UNTIRED LIBERAL."

RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER.

THE TEMPLE, SUNDAY MORNING,

OCTOBER 21, 1923, CLEVELAND, O.



U.S. BOND

You have heard it said that the liberals in the United States are tired. There is a great deal of truth to that statement. Some liberals seem to have gone into cautious retirement; others have become disillusioned because of the frustration of their high hopes in the last decade and a half; still others have sampled the rich savour of the fleshpots of Egypt and have succumbed to their enticements; and, again, other liberals seem to have been captivated by what appears to them to be the triumph of their liberal ideas through revolution, in countries like Russia, and they have accordingly seceded from the ranks of the slow moving, and, to them, rather ineffective liberals, and they have joined themselves with the ranks of the red fraternity.

So that the hosts of liberals in the United States/^{that} have suffered desertion, discomfiture, discouragement, may be said to be not so much retired as demoralized and scattered. That condition obtains, of course, also among the liberals of England and in the countries on the continent. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that there are no liberal sentiments in the United States today. There is a substantial amount of it in every department of our national life,--in politics, in economics, in religion, in our art, in our literature. But it is unorganized and undirected. It lacks program and leadership, and it is certainly not affirmative or aggressive.

At best the liberals in the United States today seem to rally around a few liberal magazines, around a few schools of social work, or around a few outstanding personalities noted for their liberal tendencies. Strangely enough liberalism today is most in evidence in the realm of religion, in spite of the notorious instances of fundamentalist reaction here and there. There is going on today in the realm of religion in the United States a real ferment and a real heart-searching which bode well for the liberalization of religious thought in our country.

It is next in evidence in our literature, more particularly in our novel of social criticism and protest, and in the saving remnant of our American drama. In the economic world liberalism today is static, content to maintain the status quo; content to rest upon the truly remarkable gains which were made in the twenty or twenty-five years preceding the war and during the years of the war. And in the realm of politics liberalism is today purely negative. It has not even attained to the dignity of a party of protest, and it is a very illuminating commentary upon the negative status of liberalism in the political life of the American people that the so-called "big business"--and all that is assumed under that term--can afford to smile contentedly upon the platforms and the programs and the candidates of both of the major political parties, and to ignore with complete indifference the platform of the candidates of the third minor political party.

But lest we despair let us always remember that liberalism in the United States is rooted in the very life and traditions of the American people, and that its present decline is indicative not of a change of heart but of a change of circumstances. The world outside has changed, not the spirit within; but the spirit, whether it be the spirit of a man or of a people, is always sorely tried and harassed, and oftentimes driven out of its legitimate and essential channel by any radical change in the circumstances of the world outside until the proper adjustments have been made.

Lest we despair let us remember that liberalism in the United States is not a recent manifestation, nor is it a tender and foreign shoot. Already in our Colonial days traces of it were present; and during our remarkable revolutionary era American liberalism burst forth in splendor and succeeded in emblazoning itself upon the two immortal documents of our country, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It received a setback in liberalism in the period of reconstruction which followed the revolutionary era; it gathered momentum again in the decades preceding the Civil War; it was hallowed and sanctified by the national martyrdom during the Civil War; it slumped seriously in the years following the war--the Civil War, during the epoch of the continental expansion and exploitation, but it bestirred itself again in the 90s and for some two or three

decades liberalism was a potent, driving motif in American political life. It gave us great liberal leaders, and it placed many an important item of legislation of a liberal character upon our state and federal statute books. And, strange to say, it was this self-same liberalism which led the United States into the last great war, in the hope of extending the boundaries of the empire of freedom to other peoples and to nations less favored than ours. And liberalism came out of the war broken and depraved.

But don't you see that war is the enemy of all freedom? War makes impossible all the things for which liberalism is struggling. There can be no war today without the conscription of thought and opinion; there can be no war today without the conscription of man power and the complete militarization of a people. I say this not in criticism of war but simply as a statement of cold, sober facts. War means the denial of all the aspirations of liberalism. When this last war ended the war psychology did not end; it remained. And now for almost ten years the individual has been struggling to get from under the heel of the state; now for ten years the individual has been struggling to regain his own essential, decent human instincts, his spiritual autonomy, his intellectual freedom, his soul. Liberalism in the United States and in other parts of the world suffered a great eclipse in the last years, but I believe that it is emerging again in the light of a new day.

MADE IN U.S.A.

There are, to my mind, friends, three enemies which the liberal will have to encounter in the days to come, and I call them the three usurpations: the usurping state, the usurping class, and the usurping machine. From the very beginning of time one of the great social problems has been how to adjust the one to the many; how to save the individual from the tyranny of the group while preserving the historical continuity and heritage of the group; in other words, how to permit the fullest expansion of the capacities of an individual without destroying the essential political organism, the state,---how to adjust the one to the many.

cont
P 4

Now, in primitive society the one, the individual, counted for very little. The tribe was monolithic; its solidarity was paramount. The individual was absorbed; the conduct of the individual was regulated rigidly by the tribal codes and customs and taboos. The customs, the habits, the ideas of the one, of the individual, were the habits and the ideas of the tribe; even the god of the individual was the tribal deity.

Now there are certain great advantages to such an arrangement. The one, the individual, felt sheltered and secure in a society which arranged for his care, his protection, his ideas; the individual felt secure in a social organization where the spirit of mutual responsibility was so dominant and so intense; the individual felt that he would be avenged by his group if wrong came

to him. But the life of the individual, the intellectual growth of the individual were stunted. There could be little room in such a compact organization of mass structure and corporate activity for the individualist, for the rebel, for the non-conformist. He had to conform or the tribe destroyed him. He could not go beyond the boundaries of his tribe physically or mentally. Beyond the boundaries of his tribe even his gods dared not venture.

But life moved on. In the course of time the despotism of the group was attenuated. The individual began to discover his own private life; he began to be conscious of a world within himself quite distinct from the world outside of himself, and against his heritage of mass judgments and mass opinions, he began to become conscious of personal and private sources of sanction and judgment and opinion.

During the last five hundred years three great movements, three revolutionary movements, occurred in Europe, which still further accentuated the rights of the individual as over against the mass, the group, the class, the state. I am referring, of course, to the Renaissance, to the Protestant Reformation, to the French Revolution. Man's claim emerged triumphant, whether it was the intellectual claim of man to intellectual freedom, or the religious claim of man to religious autonomy, or the political claim of man to political sovereignty. The one triumphed as over against the many.

But this is the point I wish to make: these hard won victories of the individual against the tyranny of the state are not permanently secure, and oftentimes they are challenged, and oftentimes they are in danger, and oftentimes they are completely wiped out. The state is always there, greedy, ready to encroach upon man's domain, eager to overgovern him, to enmesh him in laws and legislations, and coerce him to do that which the state claims is for his good; and in periods of emergency, such as war, the state as blithely steps in and takes complete charge over a man's life, over a man's property, over a man's opinion. And the sad thing about it all is that the state is in the ascendancy today in all parts of the world. There is a recrudescence of state tyranny everywhere.

Now, my friends, there is nothing sacrosanct about the state; there is nothing holy about it. It should not be confused with society or with humanity. There have been political philosophers in the past, especially in those times and places when and where state consolidation was going on,--I say, there have been political philosophers who have tried to cast a mantle of mystic sanctity over the concepts of these states. But that is all political twaddle. There is nothing holy about the concept of the state. The state is just the political machinery which a people sets up in order to be able to carry on its life in an orderly and a secure fashion, and that machinery is administered by human beings quite as fallible as all other

human beings, and these human beings possess authority, sometimes delegated, sometimes inherited, oftentimes usurped, and they exercise that authority sometimes wisely, and most often foolishly and never faultlessly, and it is folly to idolize the state; the ideal state, as has been truly said, is the one which rules with moderation and serves without meddling. I repeat--and it is not my definition--the ideal state is the one which rules with moderation and serves without meddling. And that is the liberal's position.

And by this definition communism or Marxian socialism, which is proletarian state idolatry, and Fascism, which is bourgeois state idolatry, both of these are by this definition irliberal and reactionary, and it is quite consistent with their philosophy and not at all a matter of accident, my friends, that men like Karl Marx, the theorist of socialism, and Lenin, the pragmatist of socialism, hated liberalism and the liberal quite as viridictively as the czars did; and it is quite consistent with their philosophy and not at all an accident that a man like Mussolini could pass without any mental wrench from the role of a socialist agitator to that of spokesman and prophet of fascismo. He has underlined both of these theories as this idolatry of the state against which the liberal must wage relentless war.

The second foe of the liberal I call class usurpation--the usurping class. In the olden days it was the dynasties, the feudal lords, the ecclesiastic hierarchies,

the military cliques, who usurped power over the lives and fortunes of men. More recently it has been the capitalist class. Today in Russia it is the proletarian class which is playing the same old game of class usurpation. They all do it, of course, in the name of humanity and for the benefit of mankind,--all of them, only mankind is so stupid that it does not realize the fact, and so bloody arguments of force and terror and intimidation have to be employed in order to convince mankind that it is all done for its own good.

Now, the great conflicts of tomorrow, my friends, the bitter struggles ahead of us, are going to be economic conflicts, and they are likely to lead to war, not only international war, but what is even more ghastly, civil war, class against class. Someone has said that the outstanding feature of the world today is the political movement has passed from the political phase in which liberalism dominated, and has entered into the economic phase in which socialism dominates. I am not so sure that that is a correct description of conditions as they are, but if correct, if it is true that we are now entering the phase of social living, which will be dominated by intense and bitter economic strife, class against class, man against man, then the prospect is dark indeed, unless the nations of the earth pit a full measure of economic liberalism against the menace of class struggle and class usurpation.

The peace and well-being of humanity, my friends, depends not upon the triumph of predatory capitalism,

nor upon the triumph of predatory communism, but upon the triumph of a broad economic liberalism which, while safeguarding the essentials of social existence and all economic progress, individual enterprise and initiative, and the zest and tang of competition, and the right of private property,--while safeguarding these will at the same time wipe out the glaring, tragic extremes which exist in society today,--the extreme of wealth and the extreme of poverty; will at the same time lift the burden of our industry from the shoulders of our childhood and our womanhood; will at the same time enable a man who toils to share more generously in the good things of life; will keep the avenues of opportunity free and open for all the strong and ambitious who toil, and will protect him who labors against the disabilities of sickness and accident and old age and unemployment. And it is only this policy of broad economic liberalism which is the antidote and the true social strategy against any revolutionary theory of economic reconstruction.

Now I know--I am not naive--I know that the road of the economic liberal is going to be a very hard road, for his way is always the way of groping and experimentation and compromise and moderation. In other words, the way of progress. The philosophy of the liberal must always be the rather unheroic philosophy of the half loaf instead of the heroic, and therefore the impossible philosophy of all or nothing. I know that the liberal, for example, will never have that glow of self-righteousness which the

doctrinaire has; he will never feel the glamour which comes from knowing that he is in possession of the absolute truth and the perfect program. The liberal will never be able to indulge in the contempt of his adversary, as the doctrinaire does; nor will he ever be able to relish the unholy gleam of exterminating, either in prospect or in actuality, his adversary, that is the delight of the fanatic, the extremist.

The way of the liberal is a halting and a groping way; he will be damned alike by the radical on the one hand and by the conservative and the reactionary on the other hand, but his way is nevertheless the way of social salvation.

Now the third foe of which I speak is the usurping machine. The swift industrialization of life today has not only surrounded man with many mechanical devices, but has also given the machine, and when I speak of the machine I mean not merely the machine but the human organization about it which the machine has called into existence. The machine has obtained a terrible hold over the intellectual and the cultural and the social life of human beings.

Now it is folly to rail against the machine. It is absolute folly to say that the machine has brought no good to mankind. I have heard it said. It is just irresponsible romanticism. The machine has brought great blessing to mankind; the machine has given to the workman a standard of living higher than that possessed by any workman in any period of time in any place in the world

since the beginning of time. The machine has removed from labor the curse of drudgery, the curse of serfdom. I read the other day where a New York electrical concern is building for a California power company a turbine generator which will develop twice the muscle power possessed by all the slaves who lived in the United States before the Civil War! And the fear that the machine is robbing the workingman of his job is also an ungrounded fear. Temporarily it might dislocate jobs, but in the long run it creates a hundred-fold more jobs, for it produces things more cheaply and creates a greater demand for these jobs, and creates greater and more numerous jobs for men.

The machine has given to all of us greater comfort, greater security, more contacts, and, above all, the machine is destined to knit mankind more closely together. When you think of the coming of the Graf Zeppelin, is not that a significant event? Anyone who reads the signs of the times can see that that Zeppelin is but one of many bands of unity which are being fashioned today by the machine age, if you will, by the scientific age. It is drawing mankind more closely together.

But--and this is the point I want to make about the usurping machine--while it is standardizing production, it is also in danger of standardizing the producer; it is in danger of mechanizing the man, of absorbing him into the process. You see, the machine makes necessary a rigid, machine-like organization about it of human servitors,

and these human servitors of the machine must conform to a certain pattern or the machine can't function smoothly; so that after a while the men who serve the machine come to think in terms of a rigid discipline, a uniformity. Their thoughts sink into grooves; they begin to work with the line and precision of a machine. Now as far as the machine is concerned that is proper, but the sad part of it is these human servitors carry with them from their machine world into the intellectual world, into the political world, into the religious world, if you will, that same habit of rigid organization and conformity, that same passion for uniformity, and that same distrust of everything and anything which is different, with the result that our human values are in danger of becoming machine values, and our judgments are in danger of becoming mass judgments, and our reactions are in danger of becoming automatic and mechanical, our ideas are becoming stereotyped, our tastes, our conversation, our entertainments, our amusements, our religion, everything about us is coming to take on a drabness and a monotonous of color, a sameness.

Now as far as efficient production is concerned, as far as the machine is concerned, that is highly desirable, but as far as human life is concerned, that is a bane, that is a curse. Standardization is the worst enemy of liberalization, for if there is anything to liberalism, it is this: that the liberal demands the fullest and freest expression of the uniqueness and the distinctiveness

which is in the soul of every human being. The liberal does not want to cast state men, to dragoon them, to force them all into one mould so that they will all emerge alike, acting alike, thinking alike and speaking alike, as the machine does. The liberal is concerned with human souls distinctive, unique, colorful.

And so the usurping machine today is threatening to reduce this variagated life of free men into a rigid pattern of conformity. It is doing even more than that; it is not only standardizing them but it is even exploiting them, bitterly exploiting them. I read from time to time--and my heart bleeds when I read it--that some great industries in this country refuse to accept men who are more than thirty-five or forty years old. From the point of view of the speed and tension of their efficient industry, such men are already too old, and they have to be scrapped, thrown on the human waste heap. Think of it! Men who have not even reached the noontide of their life. The machine uses them up swiftly and then discards them.

The machine is exploiting men in yet another way; the machine is making demands for a machine type of education. The machine--and again remember when I speak of machine I mean that vast human organization that has developed around it--the machine is now demanding that our young people be trained to be efficient producers instead of efficient human beings; and men are coming to think, first and foremost, of their jobs, of their professions, of their

success, and losing sight of all of this marvelous adventure of living. So that the machine is draining the rich sap of human life in order to oil the wheels of industry.

Now, my friends, to the liberal man comes first and the machine last. The distribution and the production of job commodities is a necessary part of social life, but only a part and not the most important part. The greatness of a nation, my friends, depends not upon its wealth but upon the quality of its cultural and moral life, and its treasures are those which serve as nutriment to the soul of man.

A man is more than his job, whether the job pay him three dollars a day or three hundred dollars a day; a man was meant to live a full and abundant life, to enjoy all the blessings of life, to enrich and sensitize his mind, to sensitize his soul to beauty, to enjoy that immemorial pilgrimage of the spirit of man to the far off shrines of blessedness; and industry must not so use up man, so exploit him, so cripple him as to render him unfit for this great adventure of living. Industry must not standardize a man nor consume him. The machine must not usurp the life of the man.

Now these three usurpations, my friends, the state, the class, the machine, are the three dark angels which the free spirit of the earth, the pilgrim to the city of God, will have to encounter in the years to come. They have always been here in a way,--sensed; they may have just

assumed new forms today; and the untired and undaunted liberal will join battle with these three usurpations armored in his faith,--faith in the rationality of life, faith in the reasonableness of life, faith in the righteousness of life, faith in human progress.

Now the untired liberal is going to suffer many a sharp defeat, and none of his victories in the years to come will be final or decisive, but every small victory will bring his peak just a step nearer to the ways of blessedness and to the paths of peace.

There is a creed, my friends--and this is my last word to you--there is a creed to which the liberals of all ages subscribe, and I submit it to you as a guide to the city of God.

We believe in man, in his slow ascendent progress; in the autonomy of his spirit and in the primacy of his claims over all other claims of social organization or interests. We believe in the fullest measure of freedom comparable with the fullest measure of responsibility.

We believe in authority, but only the authority sanctioned by consent and reason.

We believe in social progress, but progress achieved through education, through experimentation, through toil.

We believe that good government is not as important as self-government, and that values bestowed are not as desirable as values achieved, and therefore we reject

any millenniums proffered to us on the spear point of hate.

We believe that all truth is made manifest through the clash and the conflict of diverse and opposing opinion, and that at the very heart of liberalism, at the very heart of human progress, is the free exchange of ideas and the exercised privilege of non-conformity.

We believe in tolerance but not in indifference; in enthusiasm but not in fanaticism; in convictions but not in oppositions; in independence of thought but not in isolation; in conflict for great ideas, but never in hate.

WRITIS

--O--

ENCLOSURE

MADE IN U.S.A.

"THE FAITH OF AN UNTIRED LIBERAL "

BY

ABBA HILLEL SILVER

You have heard it said that the liberals of America are tired. There is much truth to that statement. Many of them have gone into cautious retirement. Many others have been disillusioned by the manner in which their high hopes were frustrated during the last decade and a half. Still others have sniffed the rich savor of the flesh-pots of Egypt and have succumbed to their enticements. Others again have been fascinated by what appears to them to be the swift consummation of their ideals through revolution in countries like Russia, and they have accordingly seceded from the ranks of the slow-moving ineffectual liberals and have joined the ranks of the red fraternity. Thus the liberal forces of America, having suffered desertion and discouragement, are not so much tired as demoralized and scattered. This condition also obtains among the liberals in England and in other countries on the Continent.

It would be inaccurate however to say that there is no liberal sentiment in the United States today. There is a very considerable amount of it in all departments of our national life, in politics and economics, in religion, in art, and in literature. But it is unorganized and undirected. It lacks program and leadership. It is certainly not aggressive. At best it rallies around a few liberal magazines, or a few schools of social work, or a few outstanding men noted for their liberal tendencies. Strangely enough, American liberalism today is most in evidence in the realm of religious thought. There is

real ferment here and a real heart-searching. It is next in evidence in our literature, particularly in our novels of social criticism and in the saving remnant of our drama. In our economic life it is marking time, content to rest upon the truly remarkable gains which were achieved in the quarter of a century preceeding the World War, and in the period of the war. In our political life, liberalism is purely negative. It has not even attained to the dignity of a party of protest. It is a sad commentary on the negligible status of political liberalism in America today, that Wall Street felt free to smile contentedly upon the platforms and candidates of both major political parties, and to ignore in complete indifference the very existence of the third minor political party.

Liberalism Deeply Rooted
But lest we despair, let us bear in mind always that liberalism is rooted in the very life and traditions of our people, and that its present decline is a temporary phase, indicative of a change not of heart but of circumstances. The world without has changed, and not the spirit within; but the spirit whether of men or of nations, is always harassed and sorely troubled, and at times diverted from its essential channel by any radical changes in the world without. It should be borne in mind that liberalism in America is not a recent growth nor a tender and alien shoot. Phases of it were important factors in our early colonial days. Liberalism burst forth in astounding glory in the Revolutionary era when it emblazoned itself in imperishable splendor upon two of the great documents of mankind, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It suffered a set-back in the stormy period of reconstruction which followed. It gathered momentum during the decades preceding the

Civil War. It was hallowed in the nation's martyrdom during the Civil War. It slumped sadly in the era of continental expansion and exploitation which followed the war. It bestirred itself anew in the nineties, and thereafter for almost three decades it was a motive power in American political life. It gave us leaders of the type of Bryan, Roosevelt and Wilson and LaFollette. It wrote many an advanced measure of legislation upon our state and federal statute books. It bravely led America into the World War, in the hope of extending the empire of freedom to other parts of the world and to peoples less favored. It emerged from the war beaten and betrayed.

For war is the enemy of all real freedom. It is the negation of all that liberalism stands for. There can be no war without the conscription of thought and opinion. There can be no modern war without the conscription of men and the complete militarization of a people's life. This is said not in criticism of war but simply as a matter of cold incontestable fact.

When the World War ended, the war psychology did not end. And now for ten years the individual has been struggling to get from under the heel of the State, to regain his self-respect, his intellectual autonomy, his decent human attitudes. Liberalism suffered a grave eclipse during these last years. We believe however, that it is now emerging again into the light of a new day.

There are three enemies in modern society against which the untired liberal must be prepared to wage incessant warfare:

1. ~~The~~ Usurping State. 2. The Usurping Class. 3.. The Usurping Machine.

One of the major social problems of all time has been how to adjust the one to the many, how to save man from group tyranny whilst preserving the heritage and the continuity of the group. In other words, how to insure the fullest expression of the individual without destroying the necessary political organism - the State.

In primitive society the individual counted for very little. The tribe was monolithic. Its solidarity was paramount. The individual was absorbed. He borrowed his ideology from his tribe. His actions were rigidly regulated by the tribal code and habits. His personal habits and customs were the habits and customs of his tribe. The deity whom he worshipped was the tribal deity. There were decided advantages to this arrangement. The individual was sheltered and protected, and if need be, avenged by his group. He felt secure in belonging to a group which was dominated by a sense of mutual responsibility. The growth of the individual, however, was stunted. There was little room in this compact world of mass structure and corporate action for the individualist, the rebel, the non-conformist. Beyond the boundaries of his tribal home, even his Gods dared not venture.

Life moved on. The despotism of the organized group was slowly attenuated. The individual began to discover his own private life. Within himself he had come upon a world distinct in many ways from the world about him. As against his heritage of mass tradition, he became aware of personal sources of judgment and sanction.

Within the last five hundred years three great movements in European civilization accentuated the primacy of the individual over the group. The first movement was the Renaissance. The second was the Protestant Reformation. The third was the French Revolution. In each ~~one~~ of these three movements of thought, man's

claims emerged triumphant, whether it was the intellectual claim of man to freedom, or the religious claim of man to spiritual autonomy, or the political claim of man to political sovereignty.

But man's hard-won victories against the usurping State are not permanently secure. His gains are frequently challenged and endangered. At times they are totally wiped out. The State is always there greedy to encroach upon man's domain, to over-govern him, to enmesh him in laws and regulations, to coerce him into doing things which it thinks is for his good. In periods of emergency, such as war, the State ruthlessly proceeds to take complete charge of a man's life, his possessions and his opinions. All over the world today the State is in the ascendancy.

Now there is nothing sacrosanct about the State. The State should not be confused with society or with humanity. Some political philosophers, especially those who happened to live in times and in places where State consolidation was going on, have sought to cast a halo of mystic sanctity around the concept of the State. It is all metaphysical twaddle. The State is nothing more than the political machinery set up by a people in order that it might live securely and in an orderly fashion. It is administered by human beings, as fallible as all human beings are, who possess either delegated, inherited or usurped power, and who exercise that power, sometimes wisely, oftentimes foolishly - never faultlessly. It is folly to idolize the State. The ideal State, it has been truly said, is one "that rules with moderation and serves without meddling." This is the liberal's position. Both socialism, which is proletarian State idolatry and Fascism which is bourgeois State idolatry are, by this definition, reactionary and illiberal. And it is quite con-

sistent with their philosophies that Marx, the theorist of Socialism, and Lenin the pragmatist, hated liberals quite as vindictively as the Czars, and that a Mussolini could pass without any mental wrench from the role of a Socialist agitator to that of spokesman and prophet of Fascismo.

Liberalism today must again wage war upon this formidable foe - the Usurping State.

The second foe of liberalism is the Usurping Class. In olden days it was the dynasties, the feudal lords, the military cliques, the priestly hierarchies which usurped power over the lives and fortunes of other men. More recently it has been the capitalist class. In Bolsheviki Russia it is now the proletarian class which is playing the old game of usurpation. They all do it, of course, for the benefit of mankind. But mankind is seemingly too stupid to realize it; so that they must all resort to the bloody arguments of force, terror and intimidation to persuade mankind that it is all meant for its own good.

The bitter struggles of tomorrow will be economic ones, and they are likely to lead not only to international wars but to civil wars as well, - class against class - the ghastliest of all wars. Some one has said that "the main feature of our time is that the political movement of the world has passed through a political phase where liberalism led, and has passed into an economic phase where socialism leads." I am not sure that this is altogether true; but if true, the prospect is black indeed unless nations pit a full measure of economic liberalism against the rising menace of class struggle and class usurpation. The peace and well-being of society will be secured by the triumph neither of predatory capitalism, nor of predatory communism, but by the triumph of a broad economic

liberalism which, while safe-guarding the indispensable requirements of social progress, such as individual enterprise, the stimulus of competition and private property, will yet wipe out those tragic extremes of excessive wealth and excessive poverty which obtain in our midst, will keep the avenues of opportunity open, will lift the burdens of industry from childhood and womanhood, will enable all men who labor to share more generously in the good things of life, and will protect them against the disabilities of sickness, accident, old age and unemployment.

The liberal here will have a hard road to travel. His way must always be the way of groping, experimentation, compromise and moderation - the way of progress. He has no simple and appealing formula - no panacea for all economic ills. His philosophy must always be the unheroic philosophy of the half loaf, as against the extremist's philosophy of the whole or nothing. He will be damned alike by radical and reactionary. Because he dare never be a doctrinaire, he will miss in his life the glow of self-righteousness, and the glamour which surrounds those who believe themselves to be in possession of the absolute truth and the perfect program. He can never relish the sly satisfaction of being contemptuous of his opponents - a favorite pastime for the doctrinaire, and he may never know, in prospect or in actuality, the unholy joy of crushing and exterminating his adversary - the fanatic's ecstatic reward. But the liberal's way is nevertheless the only way of social salvation.

The third foe of modern liberalism is the Usurping Machine. The rapid industrialization of society has not only surrounded man with machines but has given the machine terrible power over his physical, intellectual and social life. It is folly to rail at the machine-age and to think that the machine has not brought great blessings to

mankind. The machine has given to the working-men of our age a standard of living higher than that possessed by his brothers in toil at any time in human history - shorter hours, higher wages and better conditions of employment. It has removed the curse of serfdom from industry. It is removing the back-breaking drudgery from it. I read where a New York electric company is building for a California power company a turbine generator which will develop twice the muscle power of all the slaves who lived in the United States before the Civil War. In the long run, too, the machine not only does not rob men of their jobs, but multiplies their job tenfold. The machine has given to all men greater security, greater comfort, greater contacts. It is slowly but surely knitting the world more closely together.

But the machine which standardizes production also comes to standardize the producer. It tends to mechanize man, to absorb him into the process. The machine demands a rigid, machine-like organization of human servitors around it. They must conform to a given pattern, else the machine cannot work smoothly. As a result the thought of men who serve the machine are frequently driven into grooves. They move with the alignment of pistons... Men carry over into their social and cultural life this machine discipline - the passion for uniformity and organization. They grow to dislike and to distrust any manifestation of individualism. Thus our human values are becoming machine values, our judgments - mass judgments, and our reactions - mechanical. The ideas of men are becoming stereotyped. Their religion, their politics, their amusements, their tastes are becoming all of a kind - drab and monotonous.

Standardization and regimentation so indispensable to modern industry and commerce are nevertheless fatal to liberalism, for

The very essence of liberalism is the free and full development of men, each according to his native gifts and capacities, each according to his distinctiveness and uniqueness.

The machine not only standardizes man but frequently exploits him. Man's interests are subordinated to that of production. Oft-times man is brutally used up by the machine. I read where many industries today refuse to employ men who are over thirty-five or forty years of age. Such men are regarded as too old to keep pace with the high speed and tension of modern industrialism. They are accordingly scrapped, thrown on the human waste-heap.

The machine also calls for a machine-type of education which trains men to become efficient producers but not well-rounded, full-orbed human beings. Men are coming to think primarily of jobs, careers, professions, success, and not of the great adventure of living. The rich sap of human life is being drained to oil the wheels of industry.

But in the eyes of the liberal, man comes first, - the machine last. The profitable production and distribution of commodities is a necessary part of social existence - but only a part. Social life has other requirements. A nation's greatness is not its material wealth. It is the high tone and quality of its moral and cultural life. A nation's real treasures are those which serve as nutriment to the souls of men. Man was meant for more than a job - whether that job pay three or three hundred dollars a day. Man is born to enjoy the fullness of life, to enrich and cultivate his mind, to sensitize his being to beauty, to adventure in the realms of the spirit. Industry must not so completely monopolize his energies and cripple him as to leave him unfit for this fuller life. It must neither standardize him nor consume him. It must not usurp his life.

These three usurpations, State, Class, and Machine, are the dark angels which the pilgrims to the city of God, the liberal spirits of the earth, will have to encounter in the days to come. In a sense they have always been with us. They are immemorial enemies of humankind. They have only assumed new forms. The untired pilgrim will join battle with this three-headed Apollyon, armored in his strong faith in the all-conquering power of reason and righteousness. He will suffer many a sharp defeat and his victories will never be final or complete, but each victory will bring him nearer to the ways of pleasantness and to the paths of peace.

There is a creed which the untired and undaunted liberals of all time have lived by. It is this:

We believe in Man, in his slow, ascendent progress, in the autonomy of his spirit and in the primacy of his claims over the claims of all forms of human organization.

We believe in freedom - the fullest measure of freedom compatible with the fullest measure of responsibility.

We believe in authority - but only in authority sanctioned by reason and consent.

We believe that the only tools of social progress are education, experimentation and cooperation.

We believe that to be well-governed is not as important as to be self-governed; that values bestowed are not as desirable as values achieved. Hence, we reject all manner of milleniums proffered to us at the spear-point of dictatorship.

We believe that all truth is made manifest through the contact and clash of diverse opinions and that the very motive power of progress is the free exchange of ideas and the exercised privilege of non-conformity.

We believe in tolerance but not in indifference, in enthusiasm

but not in fanaticism, in convictions but not in obsessions, in independence but not in isolation, in conflict but not in hate.



279

AN ABSTRACT FROM
THE FAITH OF AN UNTIRED LIBERAL
By
RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER

OFFICE COPY

You have heard it said that the liberals of America are tired, and there is much truth to that statement. Many of them have gone into cautious retirement; many others have been disillusioned by the manner in which their high hopes were frustrated during the last decade and a half; still others have sniffed the rich savor of the flesh-pots of Egypt and have succumbed to their enticements. Others again have been fascinated by what appears to them to be the swift consummation of their ideals through revolution in countries like Russia, and they have accordingly seceded from the ranks of the slow-moving, ineffectual liberals and have joined the ranks of the red fraternity. Thus the liberal forces of America, having suffered desertion and discouragement, are not so much tired as demoralized and scattered. That condition obtains also among the liberals in England and in other countries on the Continent.

It would be inaccurate to say however that there is no liberal sentiment in the United States today. There is a very considerable amount of it in all departments of our national life, in politics and economics, in religion, in art, and in literature. But it is unorganized and undirected. It lacks program and leadership. It is certainly not aggressive. At best it rallies around a few liberal magazines, or a few schools of social work, or a few outstanding men noted for their liberal tendencies. American liberalism today is strangely enough, most in evidence in the realm of religious thought. There is real ferment there and a real heart-searching. It

is next in evidence in our literature, particularly in our novels of social criticism and in the saving remnant of our drama. In our economic life it is marking time, content to rest upon the truly remarkable gains which were achieved in the quarter of a century preceeding the world war, and in the period of the war. In our political life, liberalism is purely negative. It has not even attained to the dignity of a party of protest. It is a sad commentary on the negligible status of political liberalism in America today, that Wall Street feels free to smile contentedly upon the platforms and candidates of both major political parties, and to ignore in complete indifference the very existence of the third minor political party.

But lest we despair, let us bear in mind always that liberalism is rooted in the very life and traditions of our people, and that it's present decline is a temporary phase, indicative of a change not of heart but of circumstances. The world without has changed, and not the spirit within; but the spirit whether of men or of nations, is always harassed and sorely troubled, and at times diverted from its essential channel by any radical changes in the world without, until the new adjustments are made. It should be borne in mind that Liberalism in America is not a recent growth nor a tender and alien shoot. Phases of it, especially political and religious phases, were dominant factors in our early colonial days. It burst forth in astounding glory in our Revolutionary era when it emblazoned itself in imperishable splendor upon two of the greatest documents of mankind, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It suffered a set-back in the stormy period of reconstruction which followed. It gathered momentum during the decades preceeding the Civil War. It was hallowed in the nation's martyrdom during the Civil War. It slumped sadly in the

era of continental expansion and exploitation which followed the Civil War. It bestirred itself anew in the nineties and thereafter for almost three decades it was a motive power in American political life. It gave us leaders of the type of Bryan and Roosevelt and Wilson and LaFollette. It wrote many an advanced measure of legislation upon our State and Federal statute books. It bravely led America into the Great War, in the hope of extending the empire of freedom to other parts of the world and to peoples less favored, but it emerged from the war beaten and betrayed.

For war is the enemy of all real freedom. It is the negation of all that liberalism stands for. There can be no war without the conscription of thought and opinion. There can be no modern war without the conscription of men and the complete militarization of a people's life. This is said not in criticism of war but simply as a matter of cold, uncontested facts.

When the World War ended, the war psychology did not end. And now for ten years the individual has been struggling to get from under the heel of the State, to regain his self-respect, his intellectual autonomy, his decent human instincts. Liberalism suffered a great eclipse during these last years. We believe that it is now beginning to emerge again into the light of a new day.

There is a creed which the untired and undaunted liberals of all time have lived by. It is this:

We believe in Man, in his slow ascendent progress, in the autonomy of his spirit and in the primacy of his claims over the claims of all forms of human organizations and activities.

We believe in freedom - the fullest measure of freedom compatible with the fullest measure of responsibility.

We believe in authority - but only in authority sanctioned by reason and consent.

We believe that the tools of social progress are education, experimentation and cooperation.

We believe that to be well-governed is not as important as to be self-governed; that values bestowed are not as desirable as values achieved. Hence, we reject all manner of milleniums proffered to us at the spear-point of dictatorship.

We believe that all truth is made manifest through the contact and clash of manifold and diverse opinion and that the very motive power of progress is the free exchange of ideas and the exercised privilege of non-conformity.

We believe in tolerance but not in indifference, in enthusiasm but not in fanaticism, in convictions but not in obsessions, in independence but not in isolation, in conflict but not in hate.

Rabbi Silver

8741

Sermon
279

LIBERALISM AT THE CROSSROADS

ABBA HILLEL SILVER, CLEVELAND.

10 pt O.S. #1

Letter #1

24 lines

10 on 10.

2 line
Easton

[You have heard it said that the liberals of America are tired. There is much truth to that statement. Many of them have gone into cautious retirement. Many others have been disillusioned by the manner in which their high hopes were frustrated during the last decade and a half. Still others have sniffed the rich savor of the flesh-pots of Egypt and have succumbed to their enticements. Others again have been fascinated by what appears to them to be the swift consummation of their ideals through revolution in countries like Russia, and they have accordingly seceded from the ranks of the slow-moving, ineffectual liberals and have joined the ranks of the red fraternity. Thus the liberal forces of America, having suffered desertion and discouragement, are not so much tired as demoralized and scattered. That condition also obtains among the liberals in England and in other countries on the Continent.

It would be inaccurate however, to say that there is no liberal sentiment in the United States today. There is a very considerable amount of it in all departments of our national life, in politics and economics, in religion, in art, and in literature. But it is unorganized and undirected. It lacks program and leadership. It is certainly not aggressive. At best it rallies around a few liberal magazines, or a few schools of social work, or a few outstanding men noted for their liberal tendencies. Strangely enough, American liberalism today is most in evidence in the realm of religious thought. There is real ferment here and a real heart-searching. It is next in evidence in our literature, particularly in our novels of social criticism and in the saving remnant of our drama. In our economic life

[last folios 2 to 8
centered]

①

it is marking time, content to rest upon the truly remarkable gains which were achieved in the quarter of a century preceeding the World War, and in the period of the war. In our political life, liberalism is purely negative. It has not even attained to the dignity of a party of protest. It is a sad commentary on the negligible status of political liberalism in America today, that Wall Street feels free to smile contentedly upon the platforms and candidates of both major political parties, and to ignore in complete indifference the very existence of the third minor political party.

But lest we despair, let us bear in mind always that liberalism is rooted in the very life and traditions of our people, and that its present decline is a temporary phase, indicative of a change not of heart but of circumstances. The world without has changed, and not the spirit within; but the spirit whether of men or of nations, is always harassed and sorely troubled, and at times diverted from its essential channel by any radical changes in the world without. It should be borne in mind that liberalism in America is not a recent growth nor a tender and alien shoot. Phases of it were important factors in our early colonial days. Liberalism burst forth in astounding glory in the Revolutionary era when it emblazoned itself in imperishable splendor upon two of the great documents of mankind, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It suffered a set-back in the stormy period of reconstruction which followed. It gathered momentum during the decades preceeding the Civil War. It was hallowed in the nation's martyrdom during the Civil War. It slumped sadly in the era of continental expansion and exploitation which followed the War. It bestirred itself anew in the nineties, and thereafter for almost three decades it was a motive power in American political life. It gave us leaders of the type of Bryan and Roosevelt and Wilson and LaFollete. It wrote many an

advanced measure of legislation upon our state and federal statute books. It bravely led America into the ^{World} Great War, in the hope of extending the empire of freedom to other parts of the world and to peoples less favored. It emerged from the war beaten and betrayed.

For war is the enemy of all real freedom. It is the negation of all the ^{at} liberalism stands for. There can be no war without the conscription of thought and opinion. There can be no modern war without the conscription of men and the complete militarization of a people's life. This is said not in criticism of war but simply as a matter of cold incontestable fact.

When the World War ended, the war psychology did not end. And now for ten years the individual has been struggling to get from under the heel of the State, to regain his self-respect, his intellectual autonomy, his decent human attitudes. Liberalism suffered a grave eclipse during these last years. We believe however, that it is now emerging again into the light of a new day.

There are three enemies in modern society against which the untired liberal must be prepared to wage incessant warfare:

1. The Usurping State. 2. The Usurping Class. 3. The Usurping Machine.

One of the major social problems of all time has been how to adjust the one to the many, how to save man from group tyranny whilst preserving the heritage and the continuity of the group. In other words, how to insure the fullest expression of the individual without destroying the necessary political organism - the State.

In primitive society the individual counted for very little. The tribe was monolithic. Its solidarity was paramount. The individual was absorbed. He borrowed his ideology from his tribe.

His actions were rigidly regulated by the tribal code and habits. His personal habits and customs were the habits and customs of his tribe. The deity whom he worshipped was the tribal deity. There were decided advantages to this arrangement. The individual was sheltered and protected, and if need be, avenged by his group. He felt secure in belonging to a group which was dominated by a sense of mutual responsibility. The growth of the individual, however, was stunted. There was little room in this compact world of mass structure and corporate action for the individualist, the rebel, the non-conformist. Beyond the boundaries of his tribal home, even his Gods dared not venture.

Life moved on. The despotism of the organized group was slowly attenuated. The individual began to discover his own private life. Within himself he had come upon a world distinct in many ways from the world about him. As against his heritage of mass tradition, he became aware of personal sources of judgment and sanction.

Within the last five hundred years three great movements in European civilization accentuated the primacy of the individual over the group. The first movement was the Renaissance. The second was the Protestant Reformation. The third was the French Revolution. In each of these three movements of thought, man's claims emerged triumphant, whether it was the intellectual claim of man to freedom, or the religious claim of man to spiritual autonomy, or the political claim of man to political sovereignty.

But man's hard-won victories against the usurping State are not permanently secure. His gains are frequently challenged and endangered. At times they are totally wiped out. The State is always there greedy to encroach upon man's domain, to over-govern him, to enmesh him in laws and regulations, to coerce him into doing things which it thinks

4

is for his good. In periods of emergency such as war, the State ruthlessly proceeds to take complete charge of a man's life, his possessions and his opinions. All over the world today the State is in the ascendancy.

Now there is nothing sacrosanct about the State. The State should not be confused with society or with humanity. Some political philosophers, especially those who happened to live in times and in places where State consolidation was going on, have sought to cast a halo of mystic sanctity around the concept of the State. It is all metaphysical twaddle. The State is nothing more than the political machinery set up by a people in order that it might live securely and in an orderly fashion. It is administered by human beings, as fallible as all human beings are, who possess either delegated, inherited or usurped power, and who exercise that power, sometimes wisely, oftentimes foolishly - never faultlessly. It is folly to idolize the State. The ideal State, it has been truly said, is one "that rules with moderation and serves without meddling." This is the liberal's position. Both socialism, which is proletarian State idolatry and Fascism which is bourgeois State idolatry are, by this definition, reactionary and illiberal. And it is quite consistent with their philosophies that Marx, the theorist of Socialism, and Lenin the pragmatist, hated liberals quite as vindictively as the Czars, and that a Mussolini could pass without any mental wrench from the role of a Socialist agitator to that of spokesman and prophet of Fascismo.

Liberalism today must again wage war upon this formidable foe - the Usurping State.

The second foe of liberalism is the Usurping Class. In olden days it was the dynasties, the feudal lords, the military cliques, the priestly hierarchies which usurped power over the lives and

5

fortunes of other men. More recently it has been the capitalist class. In Bolsheviki Russia it is now the proletarian class which is playing the old game of usurpation. They all do it, of course, for the benefit of mankind. But mankind is seemingly too stupid to realize it; so that they must all resort to the bloody arguments of force, terror and intimidation to persuade mankind that it is all meant for its own good.

The bitter struggles of tomorrow will be economic ones, and they are likely to lead not only to international wars but to civil wars as well, - class against class - the ghastliest of all wars. Some one has said that "the main feature of our time is that the political movement of the world has passed through a political phase where liberalism led, and has passed into an economic phase where socialism leads." I am not sure that this is altogether true; but if true, the prospect is black indeed unless nations pit a full measure of economic liberalism against the rising menace of class struggle and class usurpation. The peace and well-being of society will be secured by the triumph neither of predatory capitalism, nor of predatory communism, but by the triumph of a broad economic liberalism which, while safe-guarding the indispensable requirements of social progress, such as individual enterprize, the stimulus of competition and private property, will yet wipe out those tragic extremes of excessive wealth and ~~expressive~~^{extensive} poverty which obtain in our midst, will keep the avenues of opportunity open, will lift the burdens of industry from childhood and womanhood, will enable all men who labor to share more generously in the good things of life, and will protect them against the disabilities of sickness, accident, old age and unemployment.

The liberal here will have a hard road to travel. His way must always be the way of groping, experimentation, compromise and moderation - the way of progress. He has no simple and appealing formula - no

panacea for all economic ills. His philosophy must always be the unheroic philosophy of the half loaf, as against the extremist's philosophy of the whole or nothing. He will be damned alike by radical and reactionary. Because he dare never be a doctrinaire, he will miss in his life the glow of self-righteousness, and the glamour which surrounds those who believe themselves to be in possession of the absolute truth and the perfect program. He can never relish the sly satisfaction of being contemptuous of his opponents - a favorite pastime for the doctrinaire, and he may never know, in prospect or in actuality, the unholy joy of crushing and exterminating his adversary - the fanatic's ecstatic reward. But the liberal's way is nevertheless the only way of social salvation.

The third foe of modern liberalism is the Usurping Machine. The rapid industrialization of society has not only surrounded man with machines but has given the machine terrible power over his physical, intellectual and social life. It is folly to rail at the machine-age and to think that the machine has not brought great blessings to mankind. The machine has given to the working-men of our age a standard of living higher than that possessed by his brothers in toil at any time in human history - shorter hours, higher wages and better conditions of employment. It has removed the curse of serfdom from industry. It is removing the back-breaking drudgery from it. I read where a New York electric company is building for a California power company a turbine generator which will develop twice the muscle power of all the slaves who lived in the United States before the Civil War. In the long run too, the machine not only does not rob men of their jobs, but multiplies their job tenfold. The machine has given to all men greater security, greater comfort, greater contacts. It is slowly but surely knitting the world more closely together.

But the machine which standardizes production also comes to standardize the producer. It tends to mechanize man, to absorb him into the process. The machine demands a rigid, machine-like organization of human servitors around it. They must conform to a given pattern, else the machine cannot work smoothly. As a result the thought of men who serve the machine are frequently driven into grooves. They move with the alignment of pistons.... Men carry over into their social and cultural life this machine discipline - the passion for uniformity and organization. They grow to dislike and to distrust any manifestation of individualism. Thus our human values are becoming machine values, our judgments - mass judgments, and our reactions - mechanical. The ideas of men are becoming stereotyped. Their religion, their politics, their amusements, their tastes are becoming all of a kind - drab and monotonous.

Standardization and regimentation so indispensable to modern industry and commerce are nevertheless fatal to liberalism, for the very essence of liberalism is the free and full development of men, each according to his native gifts and capacities, each according to his distinctiveness and uniqueness.

The machine not only standardizes man but frequently exploits him. Man's interests are subordinated to that of production. Oft-times man is brutally used up by the machine. I read where many industries today refuse to employ men who are over thirty-five or forty years of age. Such men are regarded as too old to keep pace with the high speed and tension of modern industrialism. They are accordingly scrapped, thrown on the human waste-heap.

The machine also calls for a machine-type of education which trains men to become efficient producers but not well-rounded, full-orted human beings. Men are coming to think primarily of jobs, careers, professions,

success, and not of the great adventure of living. The rich sap of human life is being drained to oil the wheels of industry.

But in the eyes of the liberal, man comes first, - the machine last. The profitable production and distribution of commodities is a necessary part of social existence - but only a part. Social life has other requirements. A nation's greatness is not its material wealth. It is the high tone and quality of its moral and cultural life. A nation's real treasures are those which serve as nutriment to the souls of men. Man was meant for more than a job - whether that job pay three or three hundred dollars a day. Man is born to enjoy the fullness of life, to enrich and cultivate his mind, to sensitize his being to beauty, to adventure in the realms of the spirit. Industry must not so completely monopolize his energies and cripple him as to leave him unfit for this fuller life. It must neither standardize him nor consume him. It must not usurp his life.

These three usurpations, State, Class, and Machine, are the dark angels which the pilgrims to the city of God, the liberal spirits of the earth, will have to encounter in the days to come. In a sense they have always been with us. They are the immemorial enemies of humankind. They have only assumed new forms. The untired pilgrim will join battle with this three-headed Apollyon, armored in his strong faith in the all-conquering power of reason and righteousness. He will suffer many a sharp defeat and his victories will never be final or complete, but each victory will bring him nearer to the ways of pleasantness and to the paths of peace.

There is a creed which the untired and undaunted liberals of all time have lived by. It is this:

We believe in Man, in his slow, ascendent progress, in the autonomy of his spirit and in the primacy of his claims over the claims of all forms of human organization.

We believe in freedom - the fullest measure of freedom compatible with the fullest measure of responsibility.

We believe in authority - but only in authority sanctioned by reason and consent.

We believe that the only tools of social progress are education, experimentation and cooperation.

We believe that to be well-governed is not as important as to be self-governed; that values bestowed are not as desirable as values achieved. Hence, we reject all manner of milleniums proffered to us at the spear-point of dictatorship.

We believe that all truth is made manifest through the contact and clash of diverse opinions and that the very motive power of progress is the free exchange of ideas and the exercised privilege of non-conformity.

We believe in tolerance but not in indifference, in enthusiasm but not in fanaticism, in convictions but not in obsessions, in independence but not in isolation, in conflict but not in hate.

THE FAITH OF AN UNTIRED LIBERAL

Abba Hillel Silver

You have heard it said that the liberals of America are tired, ~~and~~ There is much truth to that statement. Many of them have gone into cautious retirement. Many others have been disillusioned by the manner in which their high hopes were frustrated during the last decade and a half. Still others have sniffed the rich savor of the flesh-pots of Egypt and have succumbed to their enticements. Others again have been fascinated by what appears to them to be the swift consummation of their ideals through revolution in countries like Russia, and they have accordingly seceded from the ranks of the slow-moving, ineffectual liberals and have joined the ranks of the red fraternity. Thus the liberal forces of America, having suffered desertion and discouragement, are not so much tired as demoralized and scattered. That condition obtains also among the liberals in England and in other countries on the Continent.

It would be inaccurate to say however, that there is no liberal sentiment in the United States today. There is a very considerable amount of it in all departments of our national life, in politics and economics, in religion, in art, and in literature. But it is unorganized and undirected. It lacks program and leadership. It is certainly not aggressive. At best it rallies around a few liberal magazines, or a few schools of social work, or a few outstanding men noted for their liberal tendencies. ^{strangely enough} American liberalism today is ~~strangely enough~~, most in evidence in the realm of religious thought. There is real ferment there and a real heart-searching. It is next in evidence in our literature, particularly in our novels of social criticism and in the saving remnant of our drama. In our

economic life it is marking time, content to rest upon the truly remarkable gains which were achieved in the quarter of a century preceeding the World War, and in the period of the war. In our political life, liberalism is purely negative. It has not even attained to the dignity of a party of protest. It is a sad commentary on the negligible status of political liberalism in America today, that Wall Street feels free to smile contentedly upon the platforms and candidates of both major political parties, and to ignore in complete indifference the very existence of the third minor political party.

But lest we despair, let us bear in mind always that liberalism is rooted in the very life and traditions of our people, and that its present decline is a temporary phase, indicative of a change not of heart but of circumstances. The world without has changed, and not the spirit within; but the spirit whether of men or of nations, is always harassed and sorely troubled, and at times diverted from its essential channel by any radical changes in the world without. ~~until the new adjustments are made.~~ It should be borne in mind that liberalism in America is not a recent growth nor a tender and alien shoot. Phases of it, ~~especially political and religious phases,~~ ^{important} ~~social~~ factors in our early colonial days. ^{Liberalism} ~~It~~ burst forth in astounding glory in ^{the} ~~our~~ Revolutionary era when it emblazoned itself in imperishable splendor upon two of the greatest documents of mankind, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It suffered a set-back in the stormy period of reconstruction which followed. It gathered momentum during the decades preceeding the Civil War. It was hallowed in the nation's martyrdom during the Civil War. It slumped sadly in the era of continental expansion and exploitation which followed the ~~Civil~~ War.

It bestirred itself anew in the nineties, and thereafter for almost three decades it was a motive power in American political life. It gave us leaders of the type of Bryan and Roosevelt and Wilson and LaFollette. It wrote many an advanced measure of legislation upon our State and Federal statute books. It bravely led America into the Great War, in the hope of extending the empire of freedom to other parts of the world and to peoples less favored, ~~but~~ It emerged from the war beaten and betrayed.

For war is the enemy of all real freedom. It is the negation of all that liberalism stands for. There can be no war without the conscription of thought and opinion. There can be no modern war without the conscription of men and the complete militarization of a people's life. This is said not in criticism of war but simply as a matter of cold, ~~uncontested~~ ^{incontrovertible} fact.

When the World War ended, the war psychology did not end. And now for ten years the individual has been struggling to get from under the heel of the State, to regain his self-respect, his intellectual autonomy, his decent human ~~habitudes~~ ^{attitudes}. Liberalism suffered a ~~grave~~ ^{grave} eclipse during these last years. We believe ~~however~~ ^{however} that it is now ~~beginning to~~ ^{beginning to} emerge ^{ing} again into the light of a new day.

There are three enemies in modern society against which the untired liberal must be prepared to wage incessant warfare:

1. The Usurping State. 2. The Usurping Class. 3. The Usurping Machine.

One of the major social problems of all time has been how to adjust the one to the many, how to save man from group tyranny whilst preserving the heritage and the continuity of the ~~group~~ ^{in other words,} how to insure the fullest expression of the individual ~~as a person~~ without destroying the necessary political organism - the State.

In primitive society the individual counted for very little. The tribe was monolithic. Its solidarity was paramount. The individual was absorbed. He borrowed his ideology from his tribe. His actions were rigidly regulated by the tribal code and habits. His personal habits and customs were the habits and customs of his tribe. The deity whom he worshipped was the tribal deity. There were decided advantages to this arrangement. The individual was sheltered and protected, and if need be, avenged by his group. He felt secure in belonging to a group ^{which was} dominated by a sense of mutual responsibility. The growth of the individual, however, was stunted. There was little room in this compact world of mass structure and corporate action for the individualist, the rebel, the non-conformist. Beyond the boundaries of his tribal home, even his Gods dared not venture.

Life moved on. The despotism of the organized group was slowly attenuated. The individual began to discover his own private life. Within himself he had come upon a world distinct in many ways from the world about him. As against his heritage of mass tradition, he became aware of personal sources of judgment and sanction.

Within the last five hundred years three great movements in European civilization accentuated the primacy of the individual over the group. The first movement was the Renaissance. The second was the Protestant Reformation. The third was the French Revolution. In ~~the~~ ^{each of} these three movements of thought, man's claims emerged triumphant, whether it was the intellectual claim of man to freedom, or the religious claim of man to spiritual autonomy, or the political claim of man to political sovereignty.

But man's hard-won victories against the usurping State are not permanently secure. His gains are frequently challenged and endangered.

At times they are totally wiped out. The State is always there greedy to encroach upon man's domain, to over-govern him, to enmesh him in laws and regulations, to coerce him into doing things which it thinks is for his good. In periods of emergency such as war, the State ruthlessly proceeds to take complete charge of a man's life, his possessions and his opinions. All over the world today the State is in the ascendancy. ^{TP} Now there is nothing sacrosanct about the State. The State should not be confused with society or with humanity. Some political philosophers, especially those who happened to live in times and in places where State consolidation was going on, have sought to cast a halo of mystic sanctity ^{around} ~~found~~ the concept of the State. It is all metaphysical twaddle. The State ^{is nothing more than} ~~represents~~ the political machinery set up by a people in order that it might live securely and in an orderly fashion. It is administered by human beings, as fallible as all human beings are, who possess either delegated, inherited or usurped power, and who exercise ^{that} ~~at~~ power, sometimes wisely, oftentimes foolishly - never faultlessly. It is folly to idolize the State. The ideal State, it has been truly said, is one "that rules with moderation and serves without meddling." This is the liberal's position. Both socialism, which is proletarian State idolatry and ^SFascism which is bourgeois State idolatry are, by this definition, reactionary and illiberal. And it is quite consistent with their philosophies that Marx, the theorist of Socialism, and Lenin the pragmatist hated liberals quite as vindictively as the Czars ~~and~~, and that a Mussolini could pass without any mental wrench from the role of a Socialist agitator to that of spokesman and prophet of ^SFascism.

Liberalism today must again wage war upon this formidable foe - the Usurping State.

The second foe of liberalism is the Usurping Class. In olden

days it was the dynasties, the feudal lords, the military cliques, the priestly hierarchies which usurped power over the lives and fortunes of other men. More recently it has been the capitalist class. In Bolsheviki Russia it is now the proletarian class which is playing the old game of usurpation. They all do it, of course, for the benefit of mankind. But mankind is seemingly too stupid to realize it; so that they ~~must~~ ^{must} all ~~have~~ resort to the bloody arguments of force, terror and intimidation to persuade mankind that it is all meant for its ^{own} good.

The bitter struggles of tomorrow will be economic ones, and they are likely to lead not only to international wars but to civil wars as well, - ^{- the ghastliest of all wars.} class against class. Some one has said ~~that~~ that "the main feature of our time is that the political movement of the world has passed through a political phase where liberalism led, and has passed into an economic phase where socialism leads." I am not sure that this is altogether true; but if true, the prospect is black indeed unless nations pit a full measure of economic liberalism against the ^{rising} ~~menace~~ of class struggle and class usurpation. The peace and well-being of society will be secured by the triumph neither of predatory capitalism, nor of predatory ~~communism~~ ^{economic}, but by the triumph of a broad ^{economic} liberalism ~~in economic life~~ which, while safe-guarding the indispensable requirements of social progress, such as individual enterprise, the stimulus of competition and private property, will yet wipe out those tragic extremes of excessive wealth ^{which obtain in our midst} and expressive poverty, will keep the avenues of opportunity open, will lift the burdens of industry from childhood and womanhood, will enable all men who labor to share ~~more~~ generously in the good things of life, and will protect them against the disabilities of sickness, accident, old age and unemployment.

The liberal here, will have a hard road to travel. His way must always be the way of groping, experimentation, compromise and moderation - the way of progress. He has no simple and appealing formula - no panacea for ^{all} economic ills. His philosophy must always be the unheroic philosophy of the half loaf, as against the extremists philosophy of the whole or nothing. He will be damned alike by radical and reactionary. Because he dare never be a doctrinaire, he will miss in his life the glow of self-righteousness, and the glamour which surrounds those who believe themselves to be in possession of the absolute truth and the perfect program. He can never relish the sly satisfaction of being contemptuous of his opponents - a favorite pastime for the doctrinaire, and he may never know, in prospect or in actuality, the unholy joy of crushing and exterminating his adversary - ~~which is~~ the fanatic's ecstatic reward. But the liberal's way is never ~~the less~~ the only way, ~~the way~~ of social salvation.

The third foe of modern liberalism is the Usurping Machine. The rapid industrialization of society has not only surrounded man with machines but has given the machine terrible power over his physical, intellectual and social life. It is folly to rail at the machine-age ^{and} to think that the machine has not brought great blessings to mankind. The machine has given to the working-men of our age a standard of living higher than that possessed by his brothers in toil at any time in human history - shorter hours, higher wages and better conditions of employment. It has removed the curse of serfdom from industry. It is removing the back-breaking drudgery from it. I read where a New York Electric company is building for a California Power company a turbine generator which will develop twice the muscle power of all the slaves who lived in the United States before the Civil War. ~~was~~ In the long run, ^{too, the machine} not only does not rob men of their

jobs, but multiplies their job ^{ten-} ~~a hundred~~ fold. The machine has given to all men greater security, greater comfort, ^{greater} ~~and more~~ contacts. It is slowly but surely knitting the world more closely together.

But the machine which standardizes production also comes to standardize the producer. It tends to mechanize man, to absorb him into the process. The machine demands a rigid, machine-like organization of human servitors around it. They must conform to a given pattern, else the machine cannot work smoothly. ^{As a result} ~~as a result~~ the thoughts of men who serve the machine are ^{frequently} ~~driven~~ into grooves. They ~~must~~ ^{move} with the alignment of pistons.... ~~Men~~ ^{Men} carry ^{over} ~~over~~ into their social and cultural ^{life} ~~where~~ the ~~same~~ machine discipline - the ~~same~~ passion for uniformity and organization. They ^{grow} ~~begin~~ to dislike and to distrust any manifestation of individualism. Thus our human values are becoming machine values, our judgments - mass judgments, and our reactions - mechanical. The ideas of men are becoming stereotyped. Their religion, their politics, their amusements, their tastes ^{are becoming} ~~are~~ all of a kind - drab and monotonous.

^{so indispensable to modern industry and commerce}
~~Now~~ Standardization and regimentation ~~are the deadly foes of~~ ^{are} ~~humanism~~ ^{liberalism}, for the very ^{essence} ~~nature~~ of liberalism is the free and full development of ^{the} ~~man~~, each according to his native gifts and capacities, each according to his distinctiveness and uniqueness.

~~again~~ The machine not only standardizes man but frequently exploits him. Man's interests are subordinated to that of production. Oft-times man is brutally used up by the machine. I read where many industries today refuse to employ men who are over thirty-five or forty years of age. ^{Such men} ~~They~~ are regarded as too old ^{to keep pace with the} ~~for the~~ high speed and ^{is} ~~the~~ tension of modern industrial ~~activity~~. They are accordingly scrapped,

^{TP} The machine ^{also} calls for a machine-type of education which trains men to

(thrown on the human waste-heap.)

become efficient producers but not well-rounded, full-orbed human beings. Men ~~have~~ ^{are} come ^{ing} to think primarily of jobs, careers, professions, success ^{and} not of the great adventure of living. ~~The~~ The rich sap of human life is ^{being} drained to oil the wheels of industry.

But in the eyes of the liberal, man comes first, - the machine last. The profitable production and distribution of commodities is a necessary part of social existence - but only a part. Social life has other requirements. A nation's greatness is not its material wealth. ^{It is} ~~that~~ the high ^{time and} quality of its moral and cultural life. ^{A nation's} ~~Its~~ real treasures are those which serve as nutriment to the souls of men. Man was meant for more than a job - whether that job pay ^{three} ~~five~~ or ^{three} ~~five~~ hundred dollars a day. Man is born to enjoy the fullness of life, to enrich and cultivate his mind, to sensitize his being to beauty, to adventure in the realms of the spirit. Industry must not so completely monopolize his energies ^{and} ~~or~~ cripple him as to leave him unfit for this fuller life. It must neither standardize him nor consume him. It must not usurp his life.

These three usurpations, State, Class, and Machine, are the dark angels which the pilgrims to the city of God, the ^{liberal} ~~free~~ spirits of the earth, will have to encounter in the days to come. In a sense they have ^{always been with us. They are} ~~been~~ the immemorial enemies of humankind, ~~since the~~ ~~beginning of time~~. They have only assumed new forms. The untired ~~liberal, the unshaken~~ pilgrim will join battle with this three-headed Apollyon, armored in his strong faith in the all-conquering power of reason and righteousness. He will suffer many a sharp defeat and his victories will never be final or complete, but each victory will bring him nearer to the ways of pleasantness and to the paths of peace.

~~THE LIBERAL~~

There is a creed which the untired and undaunted liberals of all time have lived by. It is this:

We believe in Man, in his slow, ascendent progress, in the autonomy of his spirit and in the primacy of his claims over the claims of all forms of human organization.

We believe in freedom - the fullest measure of freedom compatible with the fullest measure of responsibility.

We believe in authority - but only in authority sanctioned by reason and consent.

We believe that the only tools of social progress are education, experimentation and cooperation.

We believe that to be well-governed is not as important as to be self-governed; that values bestowed are not as desirable as values achieved. Hence, we reject all manner of milleniums proffered to us at the spear-point of dictatorship.

We believe that all truth is made manifest through the contact and clash of diverse opinions and that the very motive power of progress is the free exchange of ideas and the exercised privilege of non-conformity.

We believe in tolerance but not in indifference, in enthusiasm but not in fanaticism, in convictions but not in obsessions, in independence but not in isolation, in conflict but not in hate.

~~ALAN LAMONT OLIVER~~

Liberalism at the Crossroads

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver



**THE TEMPLE
CLEVELAND, OHIO**

Price 25 Cents

Liberalism at the Crossroads

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

YOU have heard it said that the liberals of America are tired. There is much truth to that statement. Many of them have gone into cautious retirement. Many others have been disillusioned by the manner in which their high hopes were frustrated during the last decade and a half. Still others have sniffed the rich savor of the flesh-pots of Egypt and have succumbed to their enticements. Others again have been fascinated by what appears to them to be the swift consummation of their ideals through revolution in countries like Russia, and they have accordingly seceded from the ranks of the slow-moving, ineffectual liberals and have joined the ranks of the red fraternity. Thus the liberal forces of America, having suffered desertion and discouragement, are not so much tired as demoralized and scattered. This condition also obtains among the liberals in England and in other countries on the Continent.

It would be inaccurate however, to say that there is no liberal sentiment in the United States today. There is a very considerable amount of it in all departments of our national life, in politics and economics, in religion, in art, and in literature. But it is unorganized and undirected. It lacks program and leadership. It is certainly not aggressive. At best it rallies around a few liberal magazines, or a few schools of social work, or a few outstanding men noted for their liberal tendencies. Strangely enough, American liberalism today is most in evidence in the realm of religious thought. There is real ferment here and a real heart-searching. It is next in evidence in our literature, particularly in our novels of social criticism and in the saving remnant of our drama. In our economic life it is marking time, content to rest upon the truly remarkable gains which were achieved in the quarter of a century preceeding the World War, and in the period of the war. In our political life, liberalism is purely negative. It has not even attained to the dignity of a party of protest. It is a sad commentary on the negligible status of political liber-

alism in America to-day, that Wall Street felt free to smile contentedly upon the platforms and candidates of both major political parties, and to ignore in complete indifference the very existence of the third minor political party.

But lest we despair, let us bear in mind always that liberalism is rooted in the very life and traditions of our people, and that its present decline is a temporary phase, indicative of a change not of heart but of circumstances. The world without has changed, and not the spirit within; but the spirit whether of men or of nations, is always harassed and sorely troubled, and at times diverted from its essential channel by any radical changes in the world without. It should be borne in mind that liberalism in America is not a recent growth nor a tender and alien shoot. Phases of it were important factors in our early colonial days. Liberalism burst forth in astounding glory in the Revolutionary era when it emblazoned itself in imperishable splendor upon two of the great documents of mankind, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It suffered a set-back in the stormy period of reconstruction which followed. It gathered momentum during the decades preceding the Civil War. It was hallowed in the nation's martyrdom during the Civil War. It slumped sadly in the era of continental expansion and exploitation which followed the war. It bestirred itself anew in the nineties, and thereafter for almost three decades it was a motive power in American political life. It gave us leaders of the type of Bryan and Roosevelt and Wilson and LaFollette. It wrote many an advanced measure of legislation upon our state and federal statute books. It bravely led America into the World War, in the hope of extending the empire of freedom to other parts of the world and to peoples less favored. It emerged from the war beaten and betrayed.

For war is the enemy of all real freedom. It is the negation of all that liberalism stands for. There can be no war without the conscription of thought and opinion. There can be no modern war without the conscription of men and the complete militarization of a people's life. This is said not in criticism of war but simply as a matter of cold incontestable fact.

When the World War ended, the war psychology did not end. And now for ten years the individual has been struggling to get from under the heel of the State, to regain his self-respect, his intellectual autonomy, his decent human attitudes. Liberalism suffered a grave eclipse during these last years. We believe however, that it is now emerging again into the light of a new day.

There are three enemies in modern society against which

the untired liberal must be prepared to wage incessant warfare: 1. The Usurping State. 2. The Usurping Class. 3. The Usurping Machine.

One of the major social problems of all time has been how to adjust the one to the many, how to save man from group tyranny whilst preserving the heritage and the continuity of the group. In other words, how to insure the fullest expression of the individual without destroying the necessary political organism—the State.

In primitive society the individual counted for very little. The tribe was monolithic. Its solidarity was paramount. The individual was absorbed. He borrowed his ideology from his tribe. His actions were rigidly regulated by the tribal code and habits. His personal habits and customs were the habits and customs of his tribe. The deity whom he worshipped was the tribal deity. There were decided advantages to this arrangement. The individual was sheltered and protected, and if need be, avenged by his group. He felt secure in belonging to a group which was dominated by a sense of mutual responsibility. The growth of the individual, however, was stunted. There was little room in this compact world of mass structure and corporate action for the individualist, the rebel, the non-conformist. Beyond the boundaries of his tribal home, even his Gods dared not venture.

Life moved on. The despotism of the organized group was slowly attenuated. The individual began to discover his own private life. Within himself he had come upon a world distinct in many ways from the world about him. As against his heritage of mass tradition, he became aware of personal sources of judgment and sanction.

Within the last five hundred years three great movements in European civilization accentuated the primacy of the individual over the group. The first movement was the Renaissance. The second was the Protestant Reformation. The third was the French Revolution. In each of these three movements of thought, man's claims emerged triumphant, whether it was the intellectual claim of man to freedom, or the religious claim of man to spiritual autonomy, or the political claim of man to political sovereignty.

But man's hard-won victories against the usurping State are not permanently secure. His gains are frequently challenged and endangered. At times they are totally wiped out. The State is always there greedy to encroach upon man's domain, to over-govern him, to enmesh him in laws and regulation, to coerce him into doing things which it thinks is for his good. In periods of emergency, such as war, the State ruthlessly proceeds to take complete charge of a man's life,

his possessions and his opinions. All over the world today the State is in the ascendancy.

Now there is nothing sacrosanct about the State. The State should not be confused with society or with humanity. Some political philosophers, especially those who happened to live in times and in places where State consolidation was going on, have sought to cast a halo of mystic sanctity around the concept of the State. It is all metaphysical twaddle. The State is nothing more than the political machinery set up by a people in order that it might live securely and in an orderly fashion. It is administered by human beings, as fallible as all human beings are, who possess either delegated, inherited or usurped power, and who exercise that power, sometimes wisely, oftentimes foolishly—never faultlessly. It is folly to idolize the State. The ideal State, it has been truly said, is one "that rules with moderation and serves without meddling." This is the liberal's position. Both socialism, which is proletarian State idolatry and Fascism which is bourgeois State idolatry are, by this definition, reactionary and illiberal. And it is quite consistent with their philosophies that Marx, the theorist of Socialism, and Lenin the pragmatist, hated liberals quite as vindictively as the Czars, and that a Mussolini could pass without any mental wrench from the role of a Socialist agitator to that of spokesman and prophet of Fascismo.

Liberalism today must again wage war upon this formidable foe—the Usurping State.

The second foe of liberalism is the Usurping Class. In olden days it was the dynasties, the feudal lords, the military cliques, the priestly hierarchies which usurped power over the lives and fortunes of other men. More recently it has been the capitalist class. In Bolsheviki Russia it is now the proletarian class which is playing the old game of usurpation. They all do it, of course, for the benefit of mankind. But mankind is seemingly too stupid to realize it; so that they must all resort to the bloody arguments of force, terror and intimidation to persuade mankind that it is all meant for its own good.

The bitter struggles of tomorrow will be economic ones, and they are likely to lead not only to international wars but to civil wars as well,—class against class—the ghastliest of all wars. Some one has said that "the main feature of our time is that the political movement of the world has passed through a political phase where liberalism led, and has passed into an economic phase where socialism leads" I am not sure that this is altogether true; but if true, the prospect is black indeed unless nations pit a full measure of economic liber-

alism against the rising menace of class struggle and class usurpation. The peace and well-being of society will be secured by the triumph neither of predatory capitalism, nor of predatory communism, but by the triumph of a broad economic liberalism which, while safe-guarding the indispensable requirements of social progress, such as individual enterprise, the stimulus of competition and private property, will yet wipe out those tragic extremes of excessive wealth and excessive poverty which obtain in our midst, will keep the avenues of opportunity open, will lift the burdens of industry from childhood and womanhood, will enable all men who labor to share more generously in the good things of life, and will protect them against the disabilities of sickness, accident, old age and unemployment.

The liberal here will have a hard road to travel. His way must always be the way of groping, experimentation, compromise and moderation—the way of progress. He has no simple and appealing formula—no panacea for all economic ills. His philosophy must always be the unheroic philosophy of the half loaf, as against the extremist's philosophy of the whole or nothing. He will be damned alike by radical and reactionary. Because he dare never be a doctrinaire, he will miss in his life the glow of self-righteousness, and the glamour which surrounds those who believe themselves to be in possession of the absolute truth and the perfect program. He can never relish the sly satisfaction of being contemptuous of his opponents—a favorite pastime for the doctrinaire, and he may never know, in prospect or in actuality, the unholy joy of crushing and exterminating his adversary—the fanatic's ecstatic reward. But the liberal's way is nevertheless the only way of social salvation.

The third foe of modern liberalism is the Usurping Machine. The rapid industrialization of society has not only surrounded man with machines but has given the machine terrible power over his physical, intellectual and social life. It is folly to rail at the machine-age and to think that the machine has not brought great blessings to mankind. The machine has given to the working-men of our age a standard of living higher than that possessed by his brothers in toil at any time in human history—shorter hours, higher wages and better conditions of employment. It has removed the curse of serfdom from industry. It is removing the back-breaking drudgery from it. I read where a New York electric company is building for a California power company a turbine generator which will develop twice the muscle power of all the slaves who lived in the United States before the Civil War. In the long run, too, the machine not only does not rob men of

their jobs, but multiplies their job tenfold. The machine has given to all men greater security, greater comfort, greater contacts. It is slowly but surely knitting the world more closely together.

But the machine which standardizes production also comes to standardize the producer. It tends to mechanize man, to absorb him into the process. The machine demands a rigid, machine-like organization of human servitors around it. They must conform to a given pattern, else the machine cannot work smoothly. As a result the thought of men who serve the machine are frequently driven into grooves. They move with the alignment of pistons. . . . Men carry over into their social and cultural life this machine discipline—the passion for uniformity and organization. They grow to dislike and to distrust any manifestation of individualism. Thus our human values are becoming machine values, our judgments—mass judgments, and our reactions—mechanical. The ideas of men are becoming stereotyped. Their religion, their politics, their amusements, their tastes are becoming all of a kind—drab and monotonous.

Standardization and regimentation so indispensable to modern industry and commerce are nevertheless fatal to liberalism, for the very essence of liberalism is the free and full development of men, each according to his native gifts and capacities, each according to his distinctiveness and uniqueness.

The machine not only standardizes man but frequently exploits him. Man's interests are subordinated to that of production. Oft-times man is brutally used up by the machine. I read where many industries today refuse to employ men who are over thirty-five or forty years of age. Such men are regarded as too old to keep pace with the high speed and tension of modern industrialism. They are accordingly scrapped, thrown on the human waste-heap.

The machine also calls for a machine-type of education which trains men to become efficient producers but not well-rounded, full-orbed human beings. Men are coming to think primarily of jobs, careers, professions, success, and not of the great adventure of living. The rich sap of human life is being drained to oil the wheels of industry.

But in the eyes of the liberal, man comes first,—the machine last. The profitable production and distribution of commodities is a necessary part of social existence—but only a part. Social life has other requirements. A nation's greatness is not its material wealth. It is the high tone and quality of its moral and cultural life. A nation's real treasures are

those which serve as nutriment to the souls of men. Man was meant for more than a job—whether that job pay three or three hundred dollars a day. Man is born to enjoy the fullness of life, to enrich and cultivate his mind, to sensitize his being to beauty, to adventure in the realms of the spirit. Industry must not so completely monopolize his energies and cripple him as to leave him unfit for this fuller life. It must neither standarize him nor consume him. It must not usurp his life.

These three usurpations, State, Class, and Machine, are the dark angels which the pilgrims to the city of God, the liberal spirits of the earth, will have to encounter in the days to come. In a sense they have always been with us. They are the immemorial enemies of humankind. They have only assumed new forms. The untired pilgrim will join battle with this three-headed Apollyon, armored in his strong faith in the all-conquering power of reason and righteousness. He will suffer many a sharp defeat and his victories will never be final or complete, but each victory will bring him nearer to the ways of pleasantness and to the paths of peace.

There is a creed which the untired and undaunted liberals of all time have lived by. It is this:

We believe in Man, in his slow, ascendent progress, in the autonomy of his spirit and in the primacy of his claims over the claims of all forms of human organization.

We believe in freedom—the fullest measure of freedom compatible with the fullest measure of responsibility.

We believe in authority—but only in authority sanctioned by reason and consent.

We believe that the only tools of social progress are education, experimentation and cooperation.

We believe that to be well-governed is not as important as to be self-governed; that values bestowed are not as desirable as values achieved. Hence, we reject all manner of milleniums proffered to us at the spear-point of dictatorship.

We believe that all truth is made manifest through the contact and clash of diverse opinions and that the very motive power of progress is the free exchange of ideas and the exercised privilege of non-conformity.

We believe in tolerance but not in indifference, in enthusiasm but not in fanaticism, in convictions but not in obsessions, in independence but not in isolation, in conflict but not in hate.

FORD HALL FORUM

Founded February 23, 1908

Incorporated October 1, 1928

GEORGE W. COLEMAN
Director and Chairman



DAVID K. NILES
Associate Director

RUSSELL COOK, Director of Music
CLARA BELLE COOK, Accompanist

LOUIS P. SMITH, Director of Workers
EDNAH BLANCHARD, Sec'y, Ford Hall Folks

OPENING MEETING

October 20

1929

ABBA HILLEL SILVER, D.D.—An Untired Liberal

"The Faith of an Untired Liberal"

CONCERT—THE UNIVERSITY DOUBLE QUARTETTE

Douglas H. MacKinnon, *Director*

Ralph Kirkpatrick, *Accompanist*

OUR SPEAKER for this evening has been Rabbi of The Temple, Cleveland, the largest liberal Synagogue in America, since 1917. Born in Lithuania in 1893, he received his A.B. degree at the University of Cincinnati in 1915, his D.D. at the Hebrew Union College, 1925, and Litt.D. at the Western Reserve University in 1928. Dr. Silver, each year, receives many more invitations to speak away from Cleveland than he can possibly accept but his interest in the Ford Hall Forum makes him willing to take the time to come to us. *"The Faith of an Untired Liberal"* as Dr. Silver interprets it will give us the best possible preparation for the varied program that has been arranged for this season.

October 27

DAVID SEABURY—Consulting Psychologist

"The Enigma of Marriage"

CONCERT—Blanche Haskell, *Soprano*

Walter Arno, *Accompanist*

DAVID SEABURY, who talked to us last year on "What Makes Us All So Queer", will lead us upon another exploration into the human mind. As the author of "Unmasking Our Minds" and "Growing Into Life", he has proved his ability to bring some light to those seeking answers to present-day difficulties. He himself has chosen *"The Enigma of Marriage"* for this evening's discussion because, as he writes us: "When one marriage in seven leads to divorce, and so few are really happy, there can be no debate that the psychology of love and the facts of our mental and emotional traits in marriage-experience lie at the very foundation of the future of home and state. If love and marriage fail, what is left for society to build upon?"

Every speaker who accepts our invitation agrees to submit to a cross-examination by members of the audience on the subject matter of his address for as long a period, at least, as is taken in its presentation. Each speaker has from fifty to sixty minutes for the address and we always plan to close our meetings promptly at ten o'clock.

DOORS OPEN AT 7.00 O'CLOCK

MEETING BEGINS AT 7.30

TO HELP MEET EXPENSES A COLLECTION IS TAKEN AT THE DOOR.

Ford Hall Folks

Meet in Kingsley Hall, Ford Building,

The First Sunday of the Month at 4.00 P. M.

THE FORD HALL FOLKS' membership is the "pulse of the Forum." It helps determine policy and program. It discusses and analyzes speakers and their subjects. Its membership is a cross-section of our larger constituency and thus furnishes, by its criticisms and approval, the information necessary to enable the management to serve intelligently. Our Hospitality Committee, with Miss Rachel A. Peaslee as Chairman, helps members to get acquainted. Most members bring a box supper to the meetings and the Supper Committee, with Mrs. J. J. Sullivan as Chairman, furnishes coffee and cocoa. This enables members more conveniently to stay for the evening meeting in the upstairs hall. After the business of the meetings is disposed of, we generally listen to an inspirational talk of a more informal and intimate nature than in the regular Forum meeting. This season we shall devote these Sunday afternoon talks to an understanding of the aims and purposes of the civic organizations serving our community.

At the November 3 Meeting—"What the Ford Hall Folks Should Know About the Boston Legal Aid Society" will be presented by MR. VERNON L. MARR.

At the December 1 Meeting—"What the Ford Hall Folks Should Know About the Massachusetts Civic League" will be presented by MRS. WENONA O. PINKHAM.

At the January 5 Meeting—"What the Ford Hall Folks Should Know About the Family Welfare Society" will be presented by MR. STOCKTON RAYMOND.

Membership dues, \$2.00 per year.

Discussion Group

ALFRIEDA M. MOSHER, *Leader*

ARRANGED IN GROUPS to suit your convenience: the evenings are determined by the group itself. In all the searchings for new and more effective educational methods that are occupying the specialists in education throughout the world, one of the most promising experiments in adult education is that called group discussion.

This method abandons the lecture and formal teachings and concentrates on group thinking.

It is most effective with small groups, with twenty to twenty-five as the normal number.

The chief aim in group discussion is to lead the members of the group to pool their previous experiences, information, and viewpoints in exploring the subject or question under discussion.

A definitely trained leader guides the discussion process.

Argument is put aside and stress is placed on searching for the complete facts and all the aspects of the problem.

For the past two years, groups have spent one evening a week discussing, under trained leadership, the subject of the previous Sunday evening Forum meeting. This year these Discussion Groups will be extended to our suburban districts so that the members living in a suburb will meet in their own district.

The Forum is conducting a training course for group discussion leaders and intends to develop a large corps of such leaders.

Reading Circle

FLORENCE H. LUSCOMB, *Leader*

At the Town Room, 3 Joy Street, Boston

AN OPPORTUNITY IS NOW OFFERED you to join a Reading Circle on Economics, Sociology, International Relations, or allied subjects. One or more groups will be formed to meet weekly, for the reading and discussion of some book such as Beard's "Whither Mankind," Moon's "Imperialism and World Politics," Shaw's "Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism," Beard's "Rise of American Civilization," or Lippman's "A Preface to Morals." This is your opportunity to combine some serious reading with the stimulating contact of minds. We shall try to arrange evening and subject to accommodate as many as possible.

Ford Hall Forum Fellowship for Understanding

Meets in Kingsley Hall, Ford Building,

The Second Tuesday of Every Month at 8.00 P. M.

"QUESTIONING OUR PREJUDICES"

THESE MEETINGS are being organized as a "social relations laboratory or dissecting room" where members of the Ford Hall Folks will meet once a month to examine and discuss scientifically, under expert leadership, problems of mutual concern. These meetings will be in no sense like good-will or appreciation meetings but will be a frank discussion of the prejudices that divide us, how they originated and what we can do to eliminate them. The procedure of these meetings will be as follows:—syllabi will be prepared on the subject matter of the evening and distributed in advance of the meeting, specialists in the field to be covered will open the discussion, and after examining the viewpoints of the Folks will attempt to clarify them.

Our first laboratory meeting will be November 19 (the third Tuesday instead of the second) on "*Questioning Our Religious Prejudices.*"

LEADERS

REV. MICHAEL J. AHERN, S.J., *representing the Catholic group.*

REV. HARRY LEVI, *representing the Jewish group.*

REV. RUSSELL H. STAFFORD, *representing the Protestant group.*

December Meeting—Tuesday, December 10—"Questioning Our Economic Prejudices."

January Meeting—Tuesday, January 14—"Questioning Our Political Prejudices."

Other Meetings Being Arranged.

Ford Hall Forum Dramatic Society

VERY ACTIVE DRAMA SOCIETY was organized last winter, because we believe that we can use the drama as still another form of Forum expression. The Constitution of the Ford Hall Forum Dramatic Society reads:

"The purpose of the organization shall be to study and produce significant plays, promote and stimulate interest in dramatic art in all its phases; to encourage plays, amateur and professional, stimulate and foster a more intelligent interest in drama through direct contact with workers in the field of drama."

Membership in the Dramatic Society is limited to members of the Ford Hall Folks who pay an additional membership fee of \$3.00 per year (payable 25 cents monthly).

A course on the technique of the drama, with E. E. Clive of the Copley Theatre as the leader, is being arranged. Other courses on the drama will be announced later.

Singing Society

RUSSELL A. COOK, *Director*

Meets at Huntington Chambers

IF YOU ARE INTERESTED in Choral Singing or would like to sing with others just for the joy of it, this is your opportunity. Trained voices are acceptable, of course, but are not the essential qualification. We believe that singing together is one of the best means of getting to know and understand one another. As Mr. Cook so well put it, "we can't all talk at the same time, but we can all sing together."

Saturday Evening Socials

At the Twentieth Century Club, 3 Joy Street, Boston

ONCE A MONTH, commencing Saturday evening, December 14, our Entertainment Committee has arranged a dancing party at the halls of the Twentieth Century Club. Meet your Forum friends and their guests socially. Subscription to these dances, 50 cents per person. Dancing from 8 to 12 o'clock. Other socials—January 11, February 8 and March 8. Save these nights in your social calendar.

Ford Hall Forum Dramatic Society

and the

University of North Carolina

Present for the First Time in Boston

The Carolina Playmakers

In a Series of Three One-act Folk Plays of the North Carolina Mountains

At the FINE ARTS THEATRE on the Evenings of

NOVEMBER 25 AND 26

THIS IS a dramatic event for Boston equalled only by the first appearance (of course we do not mean this season) in our city of the Theatre Guild.

In presenting the Carolina Playmakers the Ford Hall Forum Dramatic Society demonstrates in a startling manner how effective the drama can be as an aid to understanding. North Carolina with its industrial problems is very much in the public eye. Yet how little do we know about North Carolina Folk. How little do we know about their mill-workers, their mountaineers, their colored people. Through these dramatic presentations you will see for yourself who they are and how they live.

The Carolina Playmakers will present for you three one-act Carolina Folk Plays—

"THE NO 'COUNT BOY" by Paul Green

(The Belasco Prize Play)

"GAIUS AND GAIUS, JR." by Lucy Cobb

(A Comedy of Old Southern Plantation Days)

"JOE'S KINFOLKS" by Loretto Carroll Bailey

(A Tragedy of Mill People in North Carolina Today)

The Editor of Theatre Arts Monthly, in reviewing the performances of The Carolina Playmakers in New York last fall, wrote: "There is nothing that can represent Carolina better to the people of other states, near and far, than the record of her own people in the comic and the tragic moments of their living and their history. There is nothing that *does* represent them better—no product of the soil or of the machine—than the contribution The Carolina Playmakers are making."

Walter Pritchard Eaton says of Professor Frederick H. Koch, Director of The Carolina Playmakers, "He is far more important to the future of the American stage than Belasco or Arthur Hopkins."

The New York Herald Tribune says of The Carolina Playmakers, "They have a quality of verity and a poignant poetic beauty that can be found only in bona fide folk drama."

Professor Frederick H. Koch, Director of The Carolina Playmakers, writes,

"I was delighted to learn from your letter that your Forum will sponsor the performances of The Carolina Playmakers on November 25 and 26. It gives us great pleasure indeed to make our first appearance in Boston under your auspices. We carry our own electrician and our own stage crew. We carry complete lighting and scenery equipment and all the properties that are necessary for our production. Our entire company will include at least sixteen people."

We will tell you more about these plays later. In the meantime send in your order for seats to the office in the Little Building. All seats reserved at from 50 cents to \$2.00. All money made above expenses goes to furthering the work of the Dramatic Society.

Ford Hall Forum, Inc.

THE FORD HALL FORUM is a popular adventure in Adult Education. It enables one to "keep on learning". Thousands of people from all walks in life—manual workers, clerks, and business executives; high school and university students; teachers and professors; laymen and clergymen; Agnostic, Atheist, Catholic, Protestant and Jew; blacks, orientals and whites; the prosperous and the struggling; the young and the mature; as many men as women—are already devoted to the forum idea and are getting from it a mental and spiritual challenge to be worked out in their citizenship.

The Forum's only support comes from voluntary subscriptions and contributions. Friends of this democratic adventure will translate their interest and approval in the form of a subscription each according to his ability and understanding.

Please remember that we no longer get any subsidy from the Boston Baptist Social Union. We no longer get the free use of the halls. Our ability to serve and extend our usefulness is dependent on the amount of financial aid we receive from the alert-minded men and women who believe, with Justice Brandeis, that "*The Path of Safety Lies in the Opportunity to Discuss Freely Supposed Grievances and Proposed Remedies.*"

FROM THE BY-LAWS OF THE FORD HALL FORUM, INC.

ARTICLE IV—GENERAL COUNCIL

The General Council shall have the general direction, control and management of the affairs and property of the corporation, with full power to deal with such property in any way, and to appoint such agents and committees as they deem proper. The members of the General Council are as follows:

MR. GEORGE W. COLEMAN, *President*

DR. HARRY LEVI, *Vice-President*

MR. J. ARTHUR SPARROW, *Vice-President*

MR. DAVID K. NILES, *Treasurer*

MR. LAWRENCE G. BROOKS, *Clerk*

Mr. Roger W. Babson
Mrs. Grace E. Blanchard
Mr. F. Lauriston Bullard
Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr.
Mr. Rolfe Cobleigh
Mrs. Alice B. Coleman
Mr. Waldo L. Cook
Mr. Courtenay Crocker
Mr. Henry S. Dennison
Mr. Herbert B. Ehrmann
Mrs. E. Glendower Evans
Mr. Robert Fechner
Mr. Edward A. Filene
Mr. Samuel B. Finkel
Prof. Felix Frankfurter
Mr. Richard W. Hale
Dr. Lewis O. Hartman

Mr. Hiram N. Lathrop
Mr. Alfred Baker Lewis
Mr. Reuben L. Lurie
Miss Florence H. Lascomb
Pres. Daniel L. Marsh
Rev. Harold D. Marshall
Dr. Denis A. McCarthy
Mr. Alton L. Miller
Mrs. Ethel Paine Moors
Mr. John F. Moors
Prof. Samuel Eliot Morison
Mr. Henry Penn
Hon. Andrew J. Peters
Mr. Anthony J. Philpott
Dean Roscoe Pound
Mrs. William Z. Ripley
Mr. James P. Roberts

Mr. George E. Roewer
Mr. Bernard J. Rothwell
Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger
Prof. Clarence R. Skinner
Miss Margaret Slattery
Mr. Louis P. Smith
Rev. Russell Henry Stafford
Mrs. John J. Sullivan
Prof. Richard G. Tyler
Prof. David D. Vaughan
Mr. Felix Vorenberg
Mrs. Winslow L. Webber
Dr. DeWitt C. Wilcox
Mr. Butler R. Wilson
Mrs. Gertrude L. Winslow
Pres. Marc E. Woolley
Mrs. Louise M. Young

In addition to the above, the following have been elected to the General Council as especially representing the Ford Hall Folks:

Mr. Alexander Abrahams
Miss Carolyn E. Alling
Miss Ednah Blanchard
Mr. Russell Cook
Dr. Annie G. Copeland
Mr. D. W. Cotter
Mr. O. D. Field

Mr. Andrew Fisher
Mr. Joseph B. Greenfield
Mr. Joseph Hallwood
Mr. Herbert H. Hammond
Mrs. Nettie F. Lewis
Mr. Leo Meltzer
Miss Alfrieda M. Mosher

Miss Gertrude O. Oppenheim
Mrs. Alice M. Parnell
Miss Rachel A. Peaslee
Mr. Arthur E. Perkins
Mr. Maurice Rosen
Mrs. Sara VanB. Schenck
Mr. Clifford H. Taylor

Ford Hall, Boston
October, 1929

THE FORD HALL FORUM, INC.
ANNOUNCES THE OPENING OF
ITS TWENTY - SECOND YEAR
SUNDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 20

*This is our only answer to those cheerful souls who
said we could not survive as an
independent body*

1929 - 1930

Abba Hillel Silver, D.D.
David Seabury
Horace M. Kallen
Mayor Daniel W. Hoan
Dr. Clarence C. Little
Vachel Lindsay
Bertrand Russell
Liam O'Flaherty
Lewis Browne
Abbè Ernest Dimnet
John Haynes Holmes
Rabbi William H. Fines
Robert Lincoln O'Brien
Fres. Henry Sloane Coffin
Rev. J. Elliot Ross, C.S.P.
Nan Burroughs
Alain Locke
Harry A. Overstreet
Margaret Slattery
Norman Angell
John Cowper Powys
Max Eastman
And Others

Office: 124½ LITTLE BUILDING, BOSTON, Mass.
Telephone HANcock 2657



Jewish Advocate

"The Faith of An Untired Liberal"

By RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER

(This nationally known spiritual leader and orator addressed a capacity audience at Ford Hall last Sunday evening on the subject of the untired liberal.)

You have heard it said that the liberals of America are tired. There is much truth to that statement. Many of them have gone into cautious retirement. Many others have been disillusioned by the manner in which their high hopes were frustrated during the last decade and a half. Still others have sniffed the rich savor of the flesh-pots of Egypt and have succumbed to their enticements. Others again have been fascinated by what appears to them to be the swift consummation of their ideals through revolution in countries like Russia, and they have accordingly seceded from the ranks of the slow-moving ineffectual liberals and joined the ranks of the red fraternity. Thus the liberal forces of America, having suffered desertion and discouragement, are not so much tired as demoralized and scattered. This condition also obtains among the liberals in England and in other countries on the Continent.

It would be inaccurate however to say that there is no liberal sentiment in the United States today. There is a very considerable amount of it in all departments of our national life, in politics and economics, in religion, in art, and in literature. But it is unorganized and undirected. It lacks program and leadership. It is certainly not aggressive. At best it rallies around a few liberal magazines, or a few schools of social work, or a few outstanding men noted for their liberal tendencies. Strangely enough, American liberalism today is most in evidence in the realm of religious thought. There is real ferment here and a real heart-searching. It is next in evidence in our literature, particularly in our novels of social criticism and in the saving remnant of our drama. In our economic life it is marking time, content to rest upon the truly remarkable gains which were achieved in the quarter of a century preceding the World War, and in the period of the war. In our political life, liberalism is purely negative. It has not even attained to the dignity of a party of protest. It is a sad commentary on the negligible status of political liberalism in America today, that Wall Street felt free to smile contentedly upon the platforms and candidates of both major political parties, and to ignore in complete indifference the very existence of the third minor political party.

Liberalism Deeply Rooted

But lest we despair, let us bear in mind always that liberalism is rooted in the very life and traditions of our people, and that its present decline is a temporary phase, indicative of a change not of heart but of circumstances. The world without has changed, and not the spirit within; but the spirit whether of men or of nations, is always harassed and sorely troubled, and at times diverted from its essential channel by any radical changes in the world without. It should be borne in mind that liberalism in America is not a recent growth nor a tender and alien shoot. Phases of it were important factors in our early colonial days. Liberalism burst forth in astounding glory in the Revolutionary era when it emblazoned itself in imperishable splendor upon two of the great documents of mankind, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It suffered a setback in the storm period of reconstruction which followed. It gathered momentum during the decades preceding the Civil War. It was hallowed in the nation's martyrdom during the Civil War. It slumped sadly in the era of continental expansion and exploitation which followed the war. It bestirred itself anew in the nineties, and thereafter for almost three decades it was a motive power in American political life. It gave us leaders of the type of Bryan, Roosevelt and Wilson and LaFollette. It wrote many an advanced measure of legislation upon our state and federal statute books. It bravely led America into the World War, in the hope of extending the empire of freedom to other parts of the world and to peoples less favored. It emerged from the war beaten and betrayed.

For war is the enemy of all real freedom. It is the negation of all that liberalism stands for. There can be no war without the conscription of thought and opinion. There can be no modern war without the conscription of men and the complete militarization of a people's life. This is said not in criticism of war but simply as a matter of cold incontestable fact.

When the World War ended, the war psychology did not end. And now for ten years the individual has been struggling to get from under the heel of the State, to regain his self-respect, his intellectual autonomy, his decent human attitudes. Liberalism suffered a grave eclipse during these last years. We believe, however, that it is now emerging again into the light of a new day.

Three Enemies Today

There are three enemies in modern society against which the untired liberal must be prepared to wage incessant warfare: (1) The Usurping State; (2) The Usurping Class; (3) The Usurping Machine.

One of the major social problems



RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER

of all time has been how to adjust the one to the many, how to save man from group tyranny whilst preserving the heritage and the continuity of the group. In other words, how to insure the fullest expression of the individual without destroying the necessary political organism—the State.

In primitive society the individual counted for very little. The tribe was monolithic. Its solidarity was paramount. The individual was absorbed. He borrowed his ideology from his tribe. His actions were rigidly regulated by the tribal code and habits. His personal habits and customs were the habits and customs of his tribe. The deity whom he worshipped was the tribal deity. There were decided advantages to this arrangement. The individual was sheltered and protected, and if need be, avenged by his group. He felt secure in belonging to a group which was dominated by a sense of mutual responsibility. The growth of the individual, however, was stunted. There was little room in this compact world of mass structure and corporate action for the individualist, the rebel, the non-conformist. Beyond the boundaries of his tribal home, even his Gods dared not venture.

Life moved on. The despotism of the organized group was slowly attenuated. The individual began to discover his own private life. Within himself he had come upon a world distinct in many ways from the world about him. As against his heritage of mass tradition, he became aware of personal sources of judgment and sanction.

Within the last five hundred years three great movements in European civilization accentuated the primacy of the individual over the group. The first movement was the Renaissance. The second was the Protestant Reformation. The third was the French Revolution. In each of these three movements of thought, man's claims emerged triumphant, whether it was the intellectual claim of man to freedom, or the religious claim of man to spiritual autonomy, or the political claim of man to political sovereignty.

Gains Not Secure

But man's hard-won victories against the usurping State are not permanently secure. His gains are frequently challenged and endangered. At times they are totally wiped out. The State is always there greedy to encroach upon man's domain, to over-govern him, to enmesh him in laws and regulations, to coerce him into doing things which it thinks is for his good. In periods of emergency, such as war, the State ruthlessly proceeds to take complete charge of a man's life, his possessions and his opinions. All over the world today the State is in the ascendancy.

Now there is nothing sacrosanct about the State. The State should not be confused with society or with humanity. Some political philosophers, especially those who happened to live in times and in places where State consolidation was going on, have sought to cast a halo of mystic sanctity around the concept of the State. It is all metaphysical twaddle. The State is nothing more than the political machinery set up by a people in order that it might live securely and in an orderly fashion. It is administered by human beings, as fallible as all human beings are, who possess either delegated, inherited or usurped power, and who exercise that power, sometimes wisely, oftentimes foolishly—never faultlessly. It is folly to idolize the State. The ideal State, it has been truly said, is one "that rules with moderation and serves without meddling." This is the liberal's position. Both Socialism, which is proletarian State idolatry, and Fascism, which is bourgeois State idolatry, are, by this definition, reactionary and illiberal. And it is

quite a
philosophical
Socialist
ist, his
ively
Mussolini
mental
Socialist
man and
Liberal
vage was
the U

The
the U.S.
it was
lords.
priestly
power
of other
been the
sheviki
varian
old gar

(Con

"The Faith of an United Liberal"

(Continued from Page 1)

do it, of course, for the benefit of mankind. But mankind is seemingly too stupid to realize it; so that they must all resort to the bloody arguments of force, terror and intimidation to persuade mankind that it is all meant for its own good.

The bitter struggles of tomorrow will be economic ones, and they are likely to lead not only to international wars but to civil wars as well—class against class—the ghastliest of all wars. Some one has said that "the main feature of our time is that the political movement of the world has passed

through a political phase where liberalism led, and has passed into an economic phase where Socialism leads." I am not sure that this is altogether true; but if true, the prospect is black indeed unless nations pit a full measure of economic liberalism against the rising menace of class struggle and class usurpation. The peace and well-being of society will be secured by the triumph neither of predatory capitalism, nor of predatory communism, but by the triumph of a broad economic liberalism which, while safeguarding the indispensable requirements of social progress, such as individual enterprise, the stimulus of competition and private property, will yet wipe out these tragic extremes of excessive wealth and excessive poverty which obtain in our midst, will keep the avenues of opportunity open, will lift the burdens of industry from childhood and womanhood, will enable all men who labor to share more generously in the good things of life, and will protect them against the disabilities of sickness, accident, old age and unemployment.

The liberal here will have a hard road to travel. His way must always be the way of groping, experimentation, compromise and moderation—the way of progress. He has no simple and appealing formula—no panacea for all economic ills. His philosophy must always be the unheroic philosophy of the half loaf, as against the extremist's philosophy of the whole or nothing. He will be damned alike by radical and reactionary. Because he dare never be a doctrinaire, he will miss in his life the glow of self-righteousness, and the glamor which surrounds those who believe themselves to be in possession of the absolute truth and the

perfect program. He can never relish the sly satisfaction of being contemptuous of his opponents—a favorite pastime for the doctrinaire, and he may never know, in prospect or in actuality, the unholy joy of crushing and exterminating his adversary—the fanatic's ecstatic reward. But the liberal's way is nevertheless the only way of social salvation.

The Usurping Machine

The third foe of modern liberalism is the Usurping Machine. The rapid industrialization of society has not only surrounded man with machines but has given the machine terrible power over his physical, intellectual and social life. It is folly to rail at the machine-age and to think that the machine has not brought great blessings to mankind. The machine has given to the working-men of our age a standard of living higher than that possessed by his brothers in toil at any time in human history—shorter hours, higher wages and better conditions of employment. It has removed the curse of serfdom from industry. It is removing the back-breaking drudgery from it. I read where a New York electric company is building for a California power company a turbine generator which will develop twice the muscle power of all the slaves who lived in the United States before the Civil War. In the long run, too, the machine not only does not rob men of their jobs, but multiplies their job tenfold. The machine has given to all men greater security, greater comfort, greater contacts. It is slowly but surely knitting the world more closely together.

But the machine which stand-

ardizes production also comes to standardize the producer. It tends to mechanize man, to absorb him into the process. The machine demands a rigid, machine-like organization of human servitors around it. They must conform to a given pattern, else the machine cannot work smoothly. As a result the thought of men who serve the machine are frequently driven into grooves. They move with the alignment of pistons Men carry over into their social and cultural life this machine discipline—the passion for uniformity and organization. They grow to dislike and to distrust any manifestation of individualism. Thus our human values are becoming machine values, our judgments—mass judgments, and our reactions—mechanical. The ideas of men are becoming stereotyped. Their religion, their politics, their amusements, their tastes are being all of a kind—drab and monotonous.

Standardization and regimentation so indispensable to modern industry and commerce are nevertheless fatal to liberalism, for the very essence of liberalism is the free and full development of men, each according to his native gifts and capacities, each according to his distinctiveness and uniqueness.

The machine not only standardizes man but frequently exploits him. Man's interests are subordinated to that of production. Oftentimes man is brutally used up by the machine. I read where many industries today refuse to employ men who are over thirty-five or forty years of age. Such men are regarded as too old to keep pace with the high speed and tension of modern industrialism. They are accordingly scrapped, thrown on the human waste-heap.

The machine also calls for a machine-type of education which trains men to become efficient producers but not well-rounded, full-orbed human beings. Men are coming to think primarily of jobs, careers, professions, success, and not of the great adventure of living. The rich sap of human life is being drained to oil the wheels of industry.

Man Should Come First

But in the eyes of the liberal, man comes first—the machine last. The profitable production and distribution of commodities is a necessary part of social existence—but only a part. Social life has other requirements. A nation's greatness is not its material wealth. It is the high tone and quality of its moral and cultural life. A nation's real treasures are those which serve as nutriment to the souls of men. Man was meant for more than a job—whether that job pays three or three hundred dollars a day. Man is born to enjoy the fullness of life, to enrich and cultivate his mind, to sensitize his being to beauty, to adventure in the realms of the spirit. Industry must not so completely monopolize his energies and cripple him as to leave him unfit for this fuller life. It must neither standardize him nor consume him. It must not usurp his life.

These three usurpations, State, Class and Machine, are the dark angels which the pilgrims to the city of God, the liberal spirits of the earth, will have to encounter in the days to come. In a sense they have always been with us. They are immemorial enemies of humankind. They have only assumed new forms. The untired pilgrim

will join battle with this three-headed Apollyon, armored in strong faith in the all-conquering power of reason and righteousness. He will suffer many a sharp defeat and his victories will never be final or complete, but each victory bring him nearer to the ways of pleasantness and to the paths of peace.

There is a creed which the untired and undaunted liberals of all time have lived by. It is this:

We believe in Man in his slow ascendant progress, in the autonomy of his spirit and in the primacy of his claims over the claims of all forms of human organization.

We believe in freedom—the fullest measure of freedom compatible with the fullest measure of responsibility.

We believe in authority—only in authority sanctioned by reason and consent.

We believe that the only tools of social progress are education, experimentation and co-operation.

We believe that to be well-governed is not as important as to be self-governed; that values bestowed are not as desirable as values achieved. Hence, we reject all manner of milleniums proffered to us at the spear-point of dictatorship.

We believe that all truth is made manifest through the contact and clash of diverse opinions and that the very motive power of progress is the free exchange of ideas and the exercised privilege of non-conformity.

We believe in tolerance but not in indifference, in enthusiasm but not in fanaticism, in convictions but not in obsessions, in independence but not in isolation, in conflict but not in hate.