THE CONSERVATIVE FELLOW TRAVELER*

MALCOLM P. SHARP†

IT is good of you to permit me to talk under this ambiguous title. Since the title is plainly an egotistical one, I may as well be a little personal about it for a moment. Since 1950, and particularly from 1950 until 1957, I have been in and identified with three so-called left-wing cases: George Anastaplo's bar admission case; the Rosenberg and Sobell case; and the proceeding by the Attorney General to list the National Lawyers Guild, in which, for a change, I was on the winning side. I am still concerned about George Anastaplo and in efforts to secure the parole of Morton Sobell. I may have occasion to refer to these cases in the course of our discussion, but in the mean time, I want to indicate that I am regarded by some as the last of the fellow travelers, in the sense of those who were so misguided as to use their energies in behalf of the interests of the Communist Party.

In a second sense, I am also a fellow traveler. My economic views, such as they are, are conservative. I have made it a point not to know whether my friends on the left were Communists or not, but I have been able to recognize them as central planners and I have had a fine time arguing with them about central planning. You will find my most reactionary statements about my economics in speeches made as President of the National Lawyers Guild, which were published in the *Lawyers Guild Review*. In spite of this devotion to what I took to be their general principles, my conservative liberal economist friends at the University of Chicago, though doubtless appreciating my good points, have quietly complained that I was somewhat muddle-headed in my economics. For this reason, I suppose I should be called at the most a fellow traveler of theirs.

In a third more fundamental sense, I am a perennial fellow traveler. You really need this warning in preparation for listening to my talk. The only vices I do not have are the gambling instinct and the instinct of the partisan. In hiking with Mr. Wilber Katz in the Rockies I made a famous observation, which you may have heard. Recognizing that we occasionally got lost and did not end up at our destination, I said that I rejoice in a flexible sense of objectives. I suppose this has something to do with my nonpartisan and fellow traveler instincts.

When your spokesman wrote me, I had been reading about the Vatican

* This is a talk given on February 19, 1963, under the auspices of the Conservative Club of the University of Wisconsin Law School. It may be considered a sort of valedictory, on becoming emeritus, to two law schools.

† Professor of Law, the University of Chicago.

Council, particularly the excellent articles signed by Xavier Rynne in the *New Yorker*. I indicated in my response that I could not certainly call myself a conservative when tested by what I understand to be Cardinal Ottaviani's standards. He is the one who views with alarm, for example, proposals to use the vernacular more extensively in the Mass. I indicated that I might hope to qualify according to the standards of Cardinal Bea, who welcomes extended use of the vernacular. He also apparently considers it possible for Catholics to organize a way of thinking about the universe which would be consistent not only with the views of Protestants, but with the views of adherents of other religions as well, and perhaps even with the views of those who have no religion.

Oddly enough, I shall want to return to this illustration for other reasons, but in the mean time I want to call attention simply to the difficulty about using the word "conservative." In 1933, enthusiastic New Dealers sometimes spoke of individualists, particularly businessmen, as "medieval" in their outlook. Nevertheless, it was plain to many of us then that the syndicalism and guild socialism which contributed to the vogue of central planning at the time were themselves, for better or worse, as a strictly historical matter, more medieval in their approach to society than the opposed views which were being vigorously expressed by many businessmen. In this respect, the New Deal was far more conservative than Wall Street, or at any rate LaSalle Street, but no one talked that way at the time.

Then there are those conservative Chinese Stalinists that we read about, who are resisting the deviationist ideas of Mr. Khrushchev. On the other hand, there are, or were, the French Radical Socialists, who are neither radical nor socialist, but conservative and liberal in the true or nineteenth-century sense of liberal. Their choice of a name which indicates the opposite is one of many indications of the ambivalence and paradox which govern human affairs, and particularly the affairs of politics. Everyone is conservative, and everyone is nonconservative, in the sense that he wants to get rid of some things in society which he does not like.

It is tempting to appropriate the word conservative for everything that one thinks of as good. What could be better than to save and what worse than to destroy? In a way the point is a good one, and needs to be remembered. In another way, it destroys controversy and inhibits growth, which is itself a factor in conservation. The question is what one wants to conserve and what one wants to change.

That brings us to another pair, liberty and authority, freedom and control. No one in his right mind would want to do without either, and yet here again some choice is necessary.

"Liberal," in the nineteenth century, came to mean a minimum of control by human groups, particularly the state. Yet in those same New Deal days of which we have spoken, liberal came to mean exactly the opposite. It came to

represent the position of people who thought that the powers of individuals, and so in a sense their liberties, could be enhanced by rather sweeping arrangements for help from the state.

There is another use of liberal, in a sense still unfamiliar to us, but familiar in Europe and not unrelated to some of the things that psychiatrists tell us. The free person is the well organized person, who is free among other things from unrecognized "compulsions."

I myself have come more and more to use "liberal" and "free" in the nineteenth-century sense, and to think of myself as "conservative" in the sense that I believe in conserving the kind of freedom which controls the ideas of "liberals" in the nineteenth-century sense of the word.

I have had the good fortune to be associated with two groups which seem to me to have adhered to, to have expressed and to have implemented this kind of liberalism. I refer you to the LaFollette Progressives in Wisconsin, whose sound ideas have survived the accidental circumstances which occasioned their political difficulties, and to the University of Chicago liberal economists. If you are dissatisfied, as I assume and hope you will be, with my own statement of position, you can read the University of Chicago economists and read about the Wisconsin Progressives.

With these warnings and observations, I turn to my own statement of position. The conservative liberal, like most other people, but to a particular extent, cherishes four institutions: Religion, the family, property and the state.

I have already indicated that, as you know, the church today has its problems. There is not only the tension between Cardinal Ottaviani and Cardinal Bea. There is the tension between Catholic and Protestant, Christian and non-Christian, Fundamentalist and Modernist, believer and atheist, with the campus parallel tension between the Humanities and the Sciences.

For anyone who has seen something of Catholic doctrine, and admired it without adhering to it, the problems of the Vatican Council have a singular interest. The conservative by the nature of his position has a considerable degree of confidence and pleasure in the universe, including his own society. The abstract God of the Greeks and the thirteenth-century Catholic philosophers may be, for the modern, the feature of the universe which is associated with confidence and pleasure.

But what do we do with the medieval "soul"? Magnificent as he is in his treatment of the unknown nature of God, St. Thomas fails dismally in his attempt to translate Plato's poetry into a rather cut and dried account of the human soul. If immortality is to be used at all in modern discourse, it must be in quite a different sense from that of the medieval church, though in a sense not wholly unrelated to its earlier one. There is the recognition that Remembrance of Things Past is not only timeless but related to super-personal phenomena, for example, pleasure. There is the super-personal interest in life which leads an elderly atheist like Bertrand Russell to conduct a

courageous campaign against what he conceives to be a threat of death to the species. There is the similar faith in life which appears in Dr. Zhivago's struggles with the inclement social circumstances of the Russian Revolution. There is Julian Huxley's faith in a tendency of the physical universe, with its countless worlds, to give rise to life. There is the confidence in the value of the human experience which may be independent of impending or ultimate destruction of all the living matter about which we know.

It is out of such materials that any church, however ancient, is likely to organize a scheme of things which is consistent with the cosmology which science, whether we approve—as I do—or disapprove, is showing us. It is perhaps not so much the world pictures of religion and science which require reconciliation, as their methods. Methods which are inconsistent with those of science are not likely to persist in either religion or science.

It is, of course, not only the cosmos, including the soul, with which the church is concerned. It is concerned also with society, and particularly with society's values. Cardinal Bea says the primary objective of Pope John is "pastoral": The manifestation in human relationships of the "love and kindness" which are the values of Christianity.

In the Sermon on the Mount, these values are expressed with startling paradox. Nonviolence consists not only in refraining from fighting back; it consists also in not litigating. "If a man sue thee at the law to take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." These are the words of a Greek text perhaps reporting an Aramaic oral tradition, but it is hard to gloss them over. We plainly do not believe them as they are spoken, or take them seriously, or we would be leaving law schools, both students and teachers, at once.

We know that the radical paradox in some passages of Christian teaching has been put into serviceable form by the development of medieval and modern ethics. There may be virtues in the monastic life, or something like it. In the world of daily life, human values are promoted and strife and hostility minimized, by the conservative institutions of the family and property, protected by the state.

We may stay a little with the next conservative institution, the family, before passing to the topics which are today more commonly subjects of controversy between those calling themselves conservatives and others. Your generation knows at least as well as mine that changes have been taking place in our attitudes toward the family. It is said that there has been for some generations an increasing freedom in sexual relationships. The various meanings of freedom may well be remembered in this connection. There is a kind of freedom which includes opportunity for the great range of sadistic phenomena, from rape to jealousy, which may be associated with sex. There is, on the other hand, the kind of freedom which today facilitates early marriage among students, or the creation of informal associations which apparently in your generation have often a certain stability, though they are not organized as

marriages. There is included here opportunity for a free expression of affection, which is said to be, in your generation, increasingly the test for relationships between the sexes.

The kinds of freedom suggested by such observations may still be inconsistent with another kind of freedom, which is appropriate for the great conservative life preserving functions of marriage. This is the freedom to form the kind of stable associations appropriate for the biological and economic functions of rearing and educating children. The conservative is bound to be confident in the ability of succeeding generations to carry on these functions.

One of the many new factors in the relationships between the sexes is the increasing availability of planned parenthood. The opportunities of planned parenthood produce problems about the family itself. They also produce new opportunities for dealing effectively with the most critical internal social and economic problems of the society. The family thus leads us to the theme of property, and to the controversial topics about which conservatives and others argue.

Here, however, I must remind you again of my fellow traveler propensities. If I am a conservative at all, and you must judge of that, I am one who considers both Republicans and Democrats quite often dangerous radicals.

The conservative concerned with the related topics of poverty and property should, I suggest, consider anyone who in authority contributes to the neglect of the Malthusian warning, the most dangerous of radicals, at least after the Russians and the Chinese. The Malthusian Revolution may prove in the long run a greater threat to the institutions cherished by the conservative, or anyone else for that matter, than the Communist Revolution. Moreover, if one is reluctant to think in such an apocalyptic fashion, it certainly remains true that for some sections of the world's populations, for example, Brazilian, Indian, Chinese, Mississippi or west side Chicago, Malthus affords a means of economic diagnosis and so of cure which is as important as anything the conservative can think about when he is concerned with internal problems.

One of the distinguished members of our Chicago group of liberal philosophers and economists is Professor Abram Harris, a philosopher and economist, and a Negro. Two or three years ago, we talked together as he was preparing a series of lectures on classical economic theory and its modern uses for delivery at a Negro institution, Morehouse College in Atlanta. As we talked, and discussed his observations of population problems on the neighboring west side, the form of his final lecture gradually evolved.

When he came back, he reported in such a way that I concluded his final lecture was a success. It was on Malthus with reference to the Negro. In the question hour afterwards, he reported that there had been a lively discussion of planned parenthood and population control. In response to a question from one young woman, he had said, "If you have fifteen children, you will have trouble improving your status." This was doubtless a rough appeal to

self-interest on the part of a group with special hungers for status, but it referred in context to the general trend of the discussion.

He went back a few months later, and talked with some of his sociologist friends at Morehouse. One of them, apparently representing the views of others, said, "You are expecting too much of people. They will have to be given money."

There are indications that the problem of poverty is for the first time about to become a center of attention in the United States. The books reviewed by Dwight MacDonald and his own generally excellent review in the January 19, 1963 *New Yorker*, seem to be an indication of a new kind of interest in the subject. In Illinois problems of relief are more and more the center of general attention as they occasion on the whole more and more public debate and controversy.

There are two principal themes in the discussion. One is that poor and rich alike are interested in the self-respect of the poor and their ability to take care of themselves. Large numbers of our Chicago poor, many of them Negroes and some fresh from the South, are learning to read and write as a first step in equipping themselves for work in an urban society. Encouragement, or at least opportunity, for planned parenthood is one element in the development of self-respect and self-reliance on the part of the poor, and encouragement to planned parenthood on the part of those on relief is currently one of our major local issues in Illinois.

The other theme is that our expenditures for all sorts of social welfare purposes might well be reconsidered in the light of the needs of the poor. Professor Milton Friedman, who is the most articulate spokesman for our liberal economists at Chicago, estimates that if about one-half of our expenditures for social welfare, local, state and national, were used annually in the form of negative income taxes, that is money payments, to those who are really poor, there would be a considerable improvement in their condition. His estimate is in fact that this sum would make it possible to raise the incomes of the members of the lowest one-fifth of income recipients to a point where they would all receive an equal minimum. This would apparently be something in the neighborhood of 4,000 dollars for a standard family of three.

His point is, of course, that our preoccupation with other classifications than that of the poor, for example farmers or laboring men, has led us to make contributions to their welfare which are not proportionate to the degree of their poverty. In some cases, for example that of the farmers, considerable resources are devoted to improving the income of large numbers who would in any case have more than the average per capita income of the community as a whole.

The two elements in what may be an emerging policy, self-reliance on the one hand and more money for the poor on the other, may be reconciled in all sorts of ways, which I will leave it to you to think about. Care for the in-

digent has been a familiar policy of all modern conservatives. It is not so much that the really poor threaten revolution, as at the present they surely do not. It is rather that a hard heart is not characteristic of the true conservative. On the contrary, I think it could be argued that the conservative liberal is by and large less hardhearted than the collectivist radical. In any case, the conservative is likely to have a strong distaste for misery and squalor and a strong impulse toward building a society which he can view with satisfaction.

Accordingly, I am a little surprised at what has happened in Illinois to at least one Republican leader, who might have been expected to support the hypothesis I have just suggested, but who seems to contradict it. At the last election, I voted for a number of Republicans, particularly three who were associated in some of the newspaper discussions with Mr. Charles Percy of Bell & Howell, who may prove the Illinois parallel to Mr. Romney and Mr. Scranton. Particularly, I voted for Mr. William Scott for State Treasurer.

Unless I learn something to correct my present impression, I shall not vote for him again. Though the issues are not quite that simple, my view is that he has shown himself a dangerous radical in declining to support a leading businessman, Mr. Arnold Maremont, this time a Democrat, in what promised to be an effective program for actively encouraging the exercise of family planning by women on relief. As I say, the issues are complicated, and the program at issue involves use of state funds in ways which might be objectionable, except that the whole effort is one to remove social and legal obstacles to family planning on the part of the poorest members of the community, and the ones whose children are likely to be born under the most miserable of circumstances and with the most ominous futures. You will see that I consider Mr. Scott a far more dangerous radical than Mr. Gus Hall of the Communist Party, since Mr. Scott is promoting an internal revolution which seriously threatens us, not now perhaps with disorder, but with growing neighborhoods of misery.

One may ask, if one is interested in Mr. Milton Friedman's proposal, what would happen if it should be carried further? An equal division of disposable income would give statistical families of three some 6,000 dollars a year at current levels of population and income. That would eliminate the two lower groups with which Mr. Dwight MacDonald particularly concerns himself, those with family incomes of 4,000 dollars or less and those with family incomes between 6,000 and 4,000 dollars. This would, of course, be communism in a familiar general sense.

Suppose for the moment that such a situation could be maintained without any effect on standards of living or employment, of course a questionable assumption. What would be the effect on the poor? It would, of course, be good in some obvious ways. But would it be good on balance? Social workers tell us that a sense of dependency is bad not only for the productivity, but for the happiness of the poor. We have learned that the over-protected child is

likely to experience frustration, defeat and unhappiness. There was a time when one heard of farmers receiving agricultural adjustment checks and angrily chasing the person who brought them off the farm. From the point of view of the softhearted conservative, this is the first answer, and I think an appropriate one, to all the appeals for egalitarian equality which can be made by a thoughtful Communist. The second answer is, of course, that our original assumption is an unrealistic one. What would be likely to happen to standards of living and employment can be imagined if one tries to imagine the kind of industrial depression which would be created by such a hypothetical division of income.

It is not the poor who have been the principal concern of Marx or Plato or indeed of most modern, more or less radical, collectivists. The simple poor were a subject of scorn by Marx, and it is the farmer and laborer, particularly the organized laborer, who are likely to be the favorites of contemporary political reform. There are many illustrations which result from these differences of approach. The Negro illustrates many things in our society, and we may return to him for an illustration.

The lowest per capita income in the country is in Mississippi, and our most miserable slums are our rural slums, not our urban ones. Just the other evening I had a vivid illustration of these observations in talking with a social worker friend, who is the wife of a leading corporation lawyer in our city. She spoke of an old Negro lady, fresh from a marginal farm somewhere in Missouri, who was having a miserable time adjusting in our west side urban slums near the University. In the midst of her troubles, this old lady was asked if she did not want to go back to the Missouri farm. With all the emphasis she could command she said, "No!" She had not had enough to eat there, or anything else, and she preferred to live in the most squalid part of our metropolis, with all its contrasts.

What happens when minimum wages are imposed in the South, or a union wage scale well above the minimum level, is seen in a community where there is a meat packing establishment, a textile mill or a steel mill. An obstacle is, of course, imposed on the movement which would otherwise take place from farm to city. I spent some time in 1933 working with a representative of the textile industry whose mills were in Rhode Island, developing the plans for narrowing differentials which were put into effect by the NRA. My mill owner friend was an honest and, as the saying went, statesmanlike leader who disliked poverty, and wanted to check its appearance in his Rhode Island community. Nevertheless his position required him to recognize that he was preventing the really poor in the South from exercising their choice to move from the farms where income was worse to the manufacturing centers where they would receive more, meager though it might be. My understanding is that the packing house workers in recent negotiations have been modest and conservative in making their inevitable demands for raising southern wages and

narrowing the differential in their industry, because of the considerations to which I have drawn attention. On the other hand, the steel workers have eliminated their differential, and thus made Birmingham less available as a haven for the poor farmers of the surrounding area.

I need hardly say that the effect of such restrictions will vary with conditions of employment and prosperity, but I think there can be no doubt that a significant obstacle to improvement in the condition of farmers is imposed by relatively high wage scales in cities. Historians of the New Deal speak with enthusiasm of the gains for labor made in the thirties. This was, I believe, the first time in our history when real wages stayed steady during a recovery from depression, when money wages, that is, kept pace with rising prices. The historians are too likely to forget the persistence of mass unemployment until 1939, when it may be that the improvement which took place was due to economic influences connected with the onset of the European war.

These are reminders of the extent to which, often at the expense of the seriously poor, farmer and laborer have been the favorites of reformers, radicals and collectivists. Lest the tone should sound too denunciatory, I hasten to say that those latter groups composed a large section of the population, perhaps even including me, during the thirties; and that the difference is perhaps more one of time and of experience than of individual wisdom.

However that may be, real wages both here and abroad are, of course, at the highest point in history, and at present the Marxist prophecy of increasing misery in capitalist society appears to have been answered negatively. Another Marxist prophecy, the prophecy of increasing monopolization, has been quite as clearly disposed of. When I was a boy, we used to lie awake worrying about the anthracite monopoly. Where is it now? When I first met the aviation industry in 1918, there was very little aluminum anywhere about. The aluminum industry, which not so long ago was our front page monopoly and which perhaps has benefited by steps to increase competition within the industry, has made its way by competing with other materials performing identical functions. We read today that Alcoa and the United States Steel Corporation are competing on products to make better cans, and neither Alcoa nor the Steel Corporation ("The Corporation") has now anything like the position which the public attributed to it a few short years ago. The one threatening case of industrial monopoly, the automobile industry, is no longer an exhibit for Marxists, since Mr. Romney and the Europeans have brought it back to normal.

Our critical controversial issues today are no longer issues of protecting farmer and labor monopolies or accepting what turns out to be a nonexistent trend toward enterprise monopoly. The principal contemporary internal economic problem for conservatives, after poverty, is the problem of subsidy and spending.

Transportation is the industry which has the longest history of subsidy. The

bankruptcy of publicly aided canals and toll roads was responsible for the appearance in many western constitutions, including the Wisconsin constitution, of prohibitions against or restrictions on state borrowing and so state spending. The western railroads were favored with land grants. The automobile industry was partly the creature of public roads.

I recall in this connection one incident in the course of some modest brain trusting I did for Governor Philip LaFollette in preparation for his first administration in 1931. Though I had no special connection with this project, I sat with a group of farmer legislators who were planning what was then an innovation, a gasoline tax by which the users of roads could pay for them. One of the legislators said with great feeling, "I voted for the first paved road in Wisconsin, and I wish my arm had been cut off."

This particular subsidy has been to a considerable extent corrected, but its effects linger. We are finding that we must now pay not only for roads but for competing forms of transportation which they have almost superseded, the transit systems and railroads which serve large cities.

The farmer's subsidies may be thought of as means to soften the consequences of the technological changes which are requiring and effecting an inevitable move from country to city. So far as unions are responsible for them, the union wage scales are, of course, a form of taxation and subsidy, and the costs occasioned by union proposals to alleviate the hardships resulting from technological change may be compared with agricultural adjustment payments.

The most interesting forms of public payment are now, however, of another sort. Urban development is still a small item in our national budget, but it is an instructive one, and its enthusiasts say that it will take 125 billion dollars to do the job which they envisage. This will be much more than our agricultural program has cost since the War,¹ and much more than the moon shot for which we are expecting to pay about 30 billion dollars. All these items are, however, still modest in comparison with our payments to the industries which supply us with weapons and the forces which use them.

¹ An observer of the argument from analogy knows that for every similarity between objects or abstractions there is always one difference, and quite often there are many more. One difference between our farm program and urban renewal is that it is not expected that any of the buildings built or improved by urban renewal will be put into bins. The most responsible proponents of urban renewal expect that the major part of its costs will be financed by private investment. Some apparently contemplate much higher costs than those mentioned here, and some apparently advocate various amounts of expenditure regardless of the availability of private investment. It will be observed that contemplated expenditures are in any event much lower than corresponding figures for military expenditures, especially if these include payments on account of past wars. Urban renewal might be used as one means of alleviating anxieties, whether reasonable or—as I think—unreasonable, about the possible economic effects of cuts in expenditures for military purposes. More important, it might be used to draw our attention to the pleasures of spending for means of life rather than for means of destruction.

Besides poverty, and not so clearly related to it as some think, these public expenditures produce the second of the two great internal social and economic problems for the modern conservative. Mr. Kennedy is no doubt a conservative individual. He is a Catholic and a man of wealth, and he does not appear to have the demagogic talents and impulses which have distinguished some of our reforming presidents. I would like to use demagogic in an almost colorless sense in this context, and I use it only because I cannot think of a better word. But by the test of his inclination to make public finance the means of vast economic change, Mr. Kennedy is this time the dangerous radical. Looking forward a little, I may say that I shall find him on balance, when foreign policy is taken into account, a less dangerous radical than either Mr. Rockefeller or Mr. Goldwater, so I urge you not to get ahead of me in putting me in one party or the other.

I live in an area which is a subject of urban redevelopment. I am to be for a week or two more in a solid apartment building about to be demolished to make a school playground addition which the Chicago Board of Education, comparing it with teachers and buildings, does not urgently want. For me the problems of urban development have thus a peculiar fascination.

Considered even abstractly, they would require a pretty extended treatment. Saving a great university like the University of Chicago may seem to anyone brought up in Madison a suitable use of public funds. But when one leaves a university neighborhood or a hospital or a public building neighborhood, and goes, for example, to our near north side, the problems become troublesome indeed. We are, among other things, zoning against slums, in fact as things stand today particularly Negro slums, while facilitating living for middle and upper income Negroes and whites alike. We are using public funds derived ultimately from those who pay sales and income taxes, including the lower income groups who pay twenty per cent of federal personal income taxes, to pay for expenses incurred in building middle and upper income housing. Those with incomes below the average belong in a group whose taxes as a whole are regressive when measured by income. In principle these taxes might be the first to be reduced by any decrease in public spending. We may be simply chasing the slums around the city, as one phrase has it, or pushing them back to Mississippi and Birmingham. We may also be stimulating house and apartment building beyond the limits which free private choices would set.

Particularly if one thinks of the 125 billion dollars, the problem becomes pretty big for our present discussion. We may take something a little simpler like the moon trip. Here the concise observations of Mr. Warren Weaver, an old University of Wisconsin mathematician and now a Rockefeller Foundation executive, may serve to jog our imaginations. Writing in the *Saturday Review* of last August 4th, Mr. Weaver summed the matter up in a few concise paragraphs, including the following:

It has been forecast that it may cost \$30 billion to "put a man on the moon." But how much is \$30 billion? It is sobering to think of an alternative set of projects that might be financed with this sum. We could: give a 10 per cent raise in salary, over a ten-year period, to every teacher in the United States, from kindergarten through universities, in both public and private institutions (about \$9.8 billion); give \$10 million each to 200 of the best smaller colleges (\$2 billion); finance seven-year fellowships (freshman through Ph.D.) at \$4,000 per person per year for 50,000 new scientists and engineers (\$1.4 billion); contribute \$200 million each toward the creation of ten new medical schools (\$2 billion); build and largely endow complete universities, with medical, engineering, and agricultural faculties for all fifty-three of the nations which have been added to the United Nations since its original founding (\$13.2 billion); create three more permanent Rockefeller Foundations (\$1.5 billion); and still have \$100 million left over to popularize science.

Whether you are primarily concerned with national welfare, international prestige, or science, weigh these alternatives against a man on the moon.

Urban development, the moon shot and the procurement and use of weapons are precursors and moderate intimations of the problems which we should face in what we vaguely think of as a socialized American economy. The prospect has a certain grandeur. It may be supposed that the integrity, ability, industry and care of the human being are sufficient to insure the operation of such a society. Even so, would it not be better to leave us more and more of the dollars we earn?

The word "better" reminds us that bit by bit, we have been developing materials for checking the evaluative judgment which has been implicit in much that has been said. It may now appear that the liberty of the nineteenth-century liberal, the maximum possible freedom from group control, is consistent with and conducive to the development of the other freedoms. It is likely to enhance the self-respect and self-reliance of poor and rich alike, and so increase the wealth which promotes freedom as power. The conservative liberal's freedom from group control is a necessary, if not indeed a sufficient, condition for the development of the organized person, who is free for example from compulsions, in the sense of the psychoanalyst and the Stoic alike. It may even appear that we have disposed of the supposed tensions between liberty and security, and between liberty and "equality" in its most useful sense.

Before we pass to the state, one observation—perhaps in the nature of a footnote—should be made about property and our economic problems. There are some economic problems with respect to which a judgment of feasibility, as amoral as a judgment about the operation of the Skybolt missile, is of considerable importance. People who seem to me to have the best credentials as conservative liberals differ about the consequences of the proposed tax cut

which is now so critical an economic issue in public discussion. Some of my friends with good qualifications both as conservative liberals and as specialists, think the tax cut cannot, except perhaps by means of incantation, produce either the good or the bad effects which are prophesied. If, as seems to be expected, our Government operations are financed in place of the taxes by an equivalent amount of borrowing from the general public, there is no reason, at least in economic circumstances like those of the present, why the change should add or subtract a nickel to or from the supply of money available for the nation's business. This is in the first instance a question of means rather than end.

Some of my conservative liberal friends who have this view about what may be called the mechanics of the problem, advocate the tax reduction on the ground that it is likely to encourage people to want more tax reduction and so eventually a reduction of Government spending. Others, and I confess in my amateur way I am inclined to agree with them, are opposed to the tax reduction, partly because its good effects can be produced only by a kind of deception, and partly because it is likely to take our minds off the objections to public spending.

One group of conservative liberals thinks our money should be frankly made by a well-controlled printing press and that we should cease to have what little regard we still show for gold. They think our society is capable of writing rules for the printing press, which will save us from the kind of inflation which we have seen, for example, in many Latin American countries. They think the printing press is generally in control now, but in concealed control, not subject to rules, and subject to irrational and accidental checks by our occasional concern for gold.

Other conservative liberals, and I am inclined to agree with them, have an old fashioned attachment to the slight regard which we do indeed pay to gold. Those of this opinion recognize that an excessive regard for gold could lead us into a deep depression, and that before that happens, we had better turn to the controlled printing press solution. We hope no such emergency will arise, and we are confident that here again a Marxist prophecy, of inevitable and constantly deepening depressions, is being answered. Here we may indeed not be so sure as we are about some of the other Marxist prophecies, and we may be prepared for critical new solutions in any impending serious decline in employment and production.

This brings us to the state. Besides the questions of social and economic liberty with which we have been concerned, there is the persistent tension between freedom of communication and order, to which our society has given a conservative liberal solution. It is true that our Constitution, properly read, seems to indicate that the solution is for voters and their representatives and not the courts. It is also true that from 1948 to 1957, and particularly from 1950 to 1954, both voters and their representatives committed striking and

instructive violations of our tradition. In doing so, they gave a rather moderate exhibition of what life in a Fascist state has been like and what life in a Communist state must also be like.

My friend, George Anastaplo, who refused to answer bar admission committee questions about his politics, is in fact the staunchest anti-Communist I know. He has never been any sort of a Collectivist in his economic thinking. He was a bomber navigator during World War II, and at the time of his first bar admission proceedings in 1951 he insisted that I conceal a remark of his to the effect that he would like to keep his reserve commission because he felt committed to fight, in case war came, against the Soviet Union.

By an amusing coincidence, he was put out of the Soviet Union in the course of a European trip in the summer of 1960. He had been photographing and talking with two other Americans and an English girl, who were themselves being arrested for taking pictures and distributing our State Department exchange magazine. The Russian police picked him up, took his film, and sent him out of the country. He has written amusingly about it. Among other things, he said, "My impression was that the police major conducting the investigation, which turned out to be a 'trial,' was not accustomed to forthrightness on the part of accused persons: the proceedings opened with my refusal to hand over my camera for removal of the film until I had received from them a statement of their legal justification for such a request; the major had the expression of one who was watching a strange creature from another world."

The similarity between the Russian police and the Character and Fitness Committee of the Chicago Bar must strike a detached observer. Nevertheless, Mr. Anastaplo has always been more impressed with the difference. In this same account of his arrest in Russia, he observes that the only literature he left behind was a copy of his closing argument to the Committee, printed in the *Lawyers Guild Review*, which he gave to a young man with whom he was talking. "I added a dedicatory inscription, 'To a Russian: On how free men contend.'"²

² It should be observed that Mr. Anastaplo remains convinced of the advantages of travel in Russia, and of communication between Russians and others. His views are expressed in the following letter published in *The London Observer*, August 14, 1960:

EXPELLED

Sir, I should like, as a recent visitor to the Soviet Union, to take issue with Mr. John Wain's suggestion that Western tourists provide that country with "unpaid propaganda work when they get home."

Almost invariably the fellow tourists with whom my wife, children and I exchanged impressions at the end of each day shared our serious reservations about the dreary, uncomfortable, restricted and monumentally tasteless life the Russian people seem to have had imposed upon them. The tourists with whom we came in contact most were young people using the camping facilities we lived in outside Minsk, Smolensk and Moscow.

Visits by tourists provide a valuable source of information for both the West

Not only in the Anastaplo case, but also in the tragic Sobell case, I think some who have criticized what they took to be the penalization of opinion in a time of stress, have been among the strongest of anti-Communists. The Anastaplo case and the Sobell case are remnants of the McCarthy period, the period surrounding the Korean War, when in my judgment the conservative liberal position required resistance to the spirit of the times, respectably represented though it was in such organizations as our bar associations.

For the moment, and it is to be hoped for some time ahead, this particular problem has receded considerably in public importance. Nevertheless, when we think of what the cold war is about, we may usefully remember it.

One thing that the cold war is about is the preservation of our social and economic organization against the threat of demoralization, depression or physical destruction at the hands of Russian and perhaps Chinese Communists. When we say that we would not like to be "red" and would perhaps even prefer to be dead, we have in mind such social and economic demoralization as is pictured by Pasternak in *Dr. Zhivago*, particularly in vivid descriptive passages dealing with life in Russia in the time of Lenin. We have in mind also a situation in which in the time of Khrushchev, Pasternak was able to publish his novel only by stealth, and was prevented from receiving his Nobel Prize. Faulkner, though he was attacked by citizens of his state, was not prevented even by Mississippi from receiving his prize; and though the Russian action has a kind of parallel, as an example of pure or ideal tyranny, in the Anastaplo case, we have seen also that, as George Anastaplo reminds us, his own circumstances here were vastly different from those of Mr. Pasternak in Russia.

Like the values involved in our economic liberties, the values involved here are worth reflection and analysis. We shall have to leave them as they stand with the reminder that, if I am right, such labels as conservative when used by an excited community may be misleading. The true conservative was in my opinion not an admirer of McCarthy in the United States, Franco in Spain, Mussolini in Italy, Hitler in Germany, any more than of Khrushchev in Russia or Mao in China.

The most critical problem of the state today is plainly the problem of the cold war. It is a problem not only for each individual country, but for that

and Russians. The eagerness of Soviet citizens to talk to and question visitors reflects their interest in the outside world.

I should like to urge increased contacts of the kind that only tourists can make. I say this despite the fact I was expelled from the Soviet Union last month, midpoint in a two-week visit, for having presumed first, to photograph and then to attempt to counsel three American and English students detained (and subsequently expelled) for allegedly distributing copies of the United States State Department exchange magazine, *Amerika*, on a Moscow street.

George Anastaplo,
Lecturer in the Liberal Arts
The University of Chicago

perhaps emerging consciousness of association which may contain materials for something like a world state.

What is the position of the conservative liberal here? I should say at the outset that since 1959 I have described my own position as that of a pacifist, and a believer in unilateral disarmament. I am not quite a systematic pacifist, for that would make me a philosophical anarchist. While I sometimes call myself an anarchist, particularly in left wing circles, I am perhaps more accurately described, at least so far as the present discussion has gone, as a Republican. So far as my pacifism goes, I have had the greatest difficulty in associating myself with other pacifists, a difficulty of a sort which I have never before experienced. Given our present policy, I find it impossible to criticize segments of it, like coolheaded vigilance over spies and saboteurs, coolheaded preparation of shelters, tests, plans for limited warfare, plans for controlled thermonuclear warfare, the satellite program so far as it may have military significance, and particular weapons programs. My belief in unilateral disarmament is in decisive but negotiated action, not the kind of piecemeal steps which in the best practical judgment available would tend to invite attack.

You will see that my position is a Utopian one, and so far as I know with virtually no agreement on the part of any practical person in the United States. I state it partly to enable you to discount the more down to earth judgment to which I am now proceeding. In my view, there are practically no leading western statesmen who take what I should call a sound conservative liberal position on these problems. I will suggest indeed that there are only two, Eisenhower and De Gaulle.

I invite your attention to President Eisenhower's foreign policy, which in my judgment was the only rational foreign policy which any American president has practiced since 1917. Until May of 1960, it seemed possible that it would be successful. I think that under the influences that were in control in the Eisenhower administration, it might eventually have recovered and succeeded even after the U-2 episode. I consider Mr. Khrushchev's reaction to the U-2 episode to be his worst failure, whatever his reasons, in his conduct of foreign policy. It was a critical example of the effect which overexcitement about routine espionage or reconnaissance may produce, in some circumstances, on international relations.

Today De Gaulle is the leading symbol of the view, which he is thought to entertain still, that Russia should be brought back into the western world. He has combined ingeniously his devotion to French glory and prestige with vigorous action to remove the liabilities of the French African empire, and with what appears to be quiet, though ambivalent acceptance of Russian power.

It seems to me that this is the appropriate practical conservative liberal position. Whatever may be said about financial support for the family farm or the redeveloped city, a conservative liberal should be ready to go to great ex-

tremes to prevent the demolition of farms and cities alike. If Mr. Herman Kahn is read carefully, that leading and very thoughtful student of thermonuclear war is not as confident as he at first sounds that our farms and country towns would survive a 1968 thermonuclear war any better than our cities. So good a conservative as Pope Pius XII, not by any means a pacifist, has unqualifiedly condemned a war of annihilation by modern weapons. It need hardly be said that the Sermon on the Mount can be read to the same effect.

Tested by these standards, we have no conservative liberal political leaders now in active political life in the United States. Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Rockefeller together with the New York Senators who are renewing the threat of war with Russia over Cuba, are by this test dangerous radicals. Conserving the life of the human species or the life of human inhabitants of the northern hemisphere, or the life of the United States, or even the achievements of civilization, seems an appropriate conservative objective. Compared with General Eisenhower or General De Gaulle, Mr. Kennedy and his advisors may seem to be radicals, but compared with Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Rockefeller, they seem to be conservative. While maintaining a deterrent, they appear determined to minimize the present chances of destruction of the human life on which the continued actual existence of human value depends.

You will see what I mean by the phrase "fellow traveler." I have exposed myself to your critical view in my attitude toward the various institutions which are inevitably cherished by anyone who may be called in any sense a conservative, that means by us all. The conservative attitude is an indispensable part of the human makeup, just as is the attitude which recognizes the need for superseding some old ways and replacing them by new. I have rashly touched on nearly all possible subjects. If the discussion is of any use to you, it must be not in affording you adequately supported proposals, but in indicating what in my opinion, at any rate, are the subjects deserving emphasis in the thought of conservatives, and in suggesting approaches to these subjects.