

Indian agricultural workers, the job to build a democracy could not be hurried. Arévalo should have chosen a long but more gradual route.

Most of the freedoms which Arévalo has granted have been turned against him. Within four years of his regime there were about twenty-two attempts at revolution. Opposed and antagonized by the middle and upper classes, Arévalo was forced to rely heavily for support upon the labor organizations. In July 1949, the big military *coup* against Arévalo was subdued mostly with the help of armed labor forces. In this way the labor organizations in Guatemala were able to gain an important position in the political scene.

No doubt many of the labor leaders in Guatemala were Communists and they found it advantageous to exploit the turmoil and unrest in the country and to strengthen their personal power. The *Federation of Guatemalan Workers* became affiliated with the *Latin American Labor Confederation* led by Vicente Lombardo Toledano, a well known Communist fellow-traveler tempered by Mexican nationalism. When Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán took over the presidency in 1951, the situation in Guatemala was grave and in some areas the split between the laborers and peasants on one side and the landowners, Church, and wealthy merchants on the other, was complete. The new government was known to be openly sympathetic with Communism and the population had begun to take sides as "Communist" or "Anti-Communist."

However, the association of the President and leaders of the labor organizations with Communists brought about their downfall. Great power lies in a word, and the word Communism carried a stench. The masses of Indian and Ladino peasants had no idea what it was to be "Communist" or "Anti-Communist" in any true definition of the term; but they were taught by the Church, their employers, many of the teachers in their schools that to be a Communist was an evil and irreligious thing. Even though many were eager for the reforms offered by the labor organizations, they shrank from the association with Communists, and when General Castillo Armas and a group of the military organized an "Anti-Communist" *coup* against the Arbenz government in June of 1954, he found many supporters from among the rural population. After considerable bloodshed his troops marched against Guatemala City and were greeted with great ovations. Arbenz fled the country, followed by the labor leaders, and Guatemala reverted to its pre-revolutionary standards.

After his election as president of the country, Castillo Armas lost no time in clarifying his position regarding the social reforms inaugurated by his predecessors. He announced that many would be continued as before, others would be revised so as to be fair to all elements of the population, and all would be cleansed of Communist elements in favor of a healthy democratic nationalism. His program, although essentially sound, was soon opposed by the wealthy, landed interests. The national treasury was empty and without financial resources he found, as had Arévalo and Arbenz, that he would have to rely for strength and backing on the labor organizations and the organized campesinos or abandon his liberal ideas for the co-operation of the upper classes. How he will solve this problem and what will be the future of Guatemala is still to be seen.

It is obvious, however, from all this that Central America has the political ideas necessary for democracy but that the democracies cannot function as such without a sound economic and social basis. Furthermore, the creation of a democracy in a sixteenth century semi-feudal environment cannot be accomplished solely through a rapid technological or industrial development. The United States, in providing the Latin American countries with the marvels of twentieth century technology, has often neglected to send along "instruction sheets" explaining the ways in which they can be made available for the best use of most citizens of the country. Since the Soviets have a ready-made formula, "take by force what belongs to you by right," it is no wonder that Communist propaganda has been successful among the lower and illiterate classes in Guatemala and elsewhere. Recent examples from other parts of the world have shown that the Communist and Fascist leaders are exploiting these labor organizations in order to achieve power for themselves. This, however, is not generally known by the politically unsophisticated members of the Central American labor organizations. They are victims of ruthless agitators who seek personal power under nationalistic pretenses. It is our duty to enlighten them to this effect, but how can it be done?

Negative anti-Communism is, I think, insufficient. To become emotional or panicky about Communism is equally unsatisfactory. The effort of amateur politicians, guided by personal hatred against Communism, only serves to widen the gap and makes the situation worse. In order to fight Communism successfully in Central America, we should have an outlook uncolored by emotion and a constructive program for

Continued page 32

An Affirmation of Man's Freedom

By J. CLAYTON FEAVER

A GOOD DEAL of confusion prevails as to whether man may make any positive affirmations. Human knowledge is limited. Are we thus left solely with relativism? Or can we formulate valid propositions and principles? What is truth, and can we know truth?

Let us admit our finitude, admit that nothing as *we* know it is precisely this or that. And yet, observe that without knowledge we do little; without it altogether we do nothing. As practical men and women (which we all are though we sometimes deny it) then, we *act* in the light of our knowledge; we *verify* what we know in action; and our knowledge verified and accrued stands as the basis for further *action*. May we know with certainty? No. May we know with sufficient certitude for confident action? Yes.

And what are the tests—aside perhaps from Divine authority? *Plausibility* and *significance for living*. Does a proposition or principle or plan of action make sense? Is it amenable to reason? After all, man is a rational creature. As the Greeks saw, this is a definitive characteristic. And, is the proposition or principle or plan of action practically significant? Can man *do* more things and do them *better* and for a longer period of time and for *more people*? One never quite gets around the test of living, even so for the "pure" theorist, so-called. No, living shows up the kinks in theory; and theory, and vision too, suggest further plans of action. Theory and action belong together; they complement each other. As such they are reliable tests of truth.

We assume, then, limited knowledge. This is the lesson of skepticism. Human knowledge is relative, tentative. But we also stress the legitimacy of positive affirmation. Indeed, we live and develop in the light of our questions on the one hand and of our affirmations and faith on the other.

What, then, may we affirm as plausible

and significant to life? We begin with two propositions: The first pertains chiefly to human nature, the second to nature other than human.

Each individual and humanity as a whole is of sacred and inviolable worth. How came it about that this is the case is another matter. The claim is simply that this affirmation about human nature is plausible—it makes sense when man puts his best mind to it; and it is highly significant to living. And notice: the emphasis is upon the discrete person and mankind collectively. The individual and society in fruitful tension can do more things and do them better. This is the truth of both individualism and socialism. Each acts as a check on the other; and each fulfills the other. Without such tension, individualism becomes anarchism, irresponsible endeavor at power *over* people; and socialism becomes totalitarianism, irresponsible reduction of persons to servitude.

The other proposition: *the world* (nature other than human, chiefly) *is "given" for man's use.* Again, the question is not, how did this come about, whether so created or evolved. Rather, it is here, available and dependable for man's use. It may have some other meaning, an additional meaning. Stars, trees, earthworms may exist for some other end—perhaps even for themselves. No doubt the generation of the modern sciences is to be understood largely in terms of man's concentration upon, indeed devoted interest in the things of this world for their own sake. Nevertheless, man lives and moves and sustains his being largely because of an available, dependable world, used and to be used.

These two propositions—metaphysical propositions we all call them—then, are plausible affirmations on which man may act with confidence: each individual and humanity as a whole is of sacred and inviolable worth; and, the world is "given" for man's use.

In turn, upon these we base two ethical principles. First—for emphasis let us use almost identical wording—*each individual and humanity as a whole ought to be treated* (there's the imperative) *as of sacred and inviolable worth.* No individual may be exploited. The welfare of the community may not be vitiated. Why an imperative? Because to exploit the individual is to destroy his fruitful activity; and to vitiate humanity is to jeopardize the stable structure within which the individual may function. Human growth and achievement demands sacred regard for individual rights and social well-being. Thus rights and responsibility belong together. This

is the dictate of reason and the confirmation of experience.

The second ethical principle: *The world ought to be used for man's "good."* Nothing may be misused, wasted, squandered, whether natural resources or the beauty of the flower or food for the body or made things. Why a command? We answer in the same vein, because this makes sense to the rational creature and is significant for living; man can do more things, demonstrate more effectively and extensively his own power of being, thus using the things of the world.

A further note: we suggest that these two ethical principles define pretty well the order of the *right*. It is always right to treat individuals and groups as of worth; and it is always right to use the things of the world for man's "good."

And what is man's good? *His good is inclusive of that which* (a) *satisfies human appetite, desire, aspiration and* (b) *fulfills human possibility for growth.* We use the word "inclusive" advisedly. Perhaps man's good has a greater wealth of meaning. But it may not be less than that which satisfies his bodily needs, his longing of mind, his furthest reaches of vision—even aspiration unto the "throne of God." And it may not include less than that which fulfills his potential for growth, in strength of body, in wealth of knowledge, in fineness of spirit. And see how these minimal aspects of the good go together: desire and aspiration, the springs or dynamics; increased perfection, the end sought luring forever onward.

See, too, how the good and the right go together: we must do the right to achieve the good; and in seeking the good we give meaning to the right. The order of the right is the structure or form for the good. Violate persons, exploit the bounties of the earth, and human satisfaction and achievement are thus far precluded. In turn, the order of the good gives meaning to the structure. Eliminate the search—indeed the strenuous endeavor and risk in search—and the structure is barren of meaning.

Observe now how intricately and meaningfully man is involved in shaping his destiny. Quite clearly he is not wholly sufficient. He is dependent for his physical being, its appearance and maintenance, dependent in his thinking upon the fund of knowledge accumulated throughout the ages by his fellows; dependent in his soul's longings on the vision and insight of all who in any way glimpse the ideal—even from afar. Nevertheless, he may make choices. He may accept or reject—his body perhaps, accrued knowledge, the wishes and longings and insights and dreams of men, even his own. The choice is always his, more or less. And, in making the choice he determines his destiny, more or less.

Thus, we suggest: *Man's moral freedom consists in his ability to do the right and to achieve the good.* Right conduct and the good life depend on individual *decision and commitment.* We decide to *do* and to *search*—will's task chiefly. We must also have a strong *affection* for and commitment to—feeling's task, or roughly so. Decision and commitment, in turn, depend on (or are closely tied to) understanding. We will or feel *something*, and something involves some awareness, some cognition. Yes, man's moral freedom is addressed to the whole person: it is the complete self as chemical and biological, psychological and social, moral and spiritual functioning in reference to the right and the good. Only, we repeat, man may choose *not* so to function. And he may thus violate his freedom, narrow the range of his significant activity, even destroy himself. The choice is his; his freedom may be vindicated; he may do the right and achieve, commensurable to human limitation, the good.

One further suggestion: *The Goal* (Ideal) *is a community of persons, of free, responsible, participating members.* It is one in which full reciprocal relations obtain among persons of stature and maturity—a reciprocity of persons each of whom acts in his own right (independently) and in relation (interdependently). In a word,



About the Author

Dr. J. Clayton Feaver, Kingfisher College Professor of the Philosophy of Religion and Ethics, joined the University faculty in 1951. He was pastor of the Bridgeport Memorial Church, Connecticut, in 1933-38, and taught philosophy and religion at Berea College, Kentucky, from 1941 to 1951. His doctoral dissertation on "Edwards' Concept of God" was written at Yale under the direction of Albert C. Outler.

we speak of a community of love, of giving and acceptance, wherein each person freely renders responsible service and receives deserved benefits.

A word about goals or ideals: *we live by them*. Put this way, it becomes a bit silly to speak of them as "impractical," as we sometimes do. If we live by them, they are surely practical. Of course, our ideals differ, especially with respect to loftiness; some shoot for bigger stakes, so to speak. Some live in larger worlds than others; thus their ideals are more comprehensive. Some have more mature imaginations than others; and their ideals are more sublime—for some the heavens declare the "glory of God," for others the heavens are at best the source of sunshine and rain, and, where the imagination is quite limited, the heavens may rarely be seen. Some live in the bright light of a great *faith* and envisage the "kingdom of God"; others live in the dimmer light of a more circumscribed faith, and vision is shortened. Yet, probably none is quite *without* goals: they serve as frames of reference, prompting, prodding, giving direction to present activity, making it possible to "Remould life nearer to the Heart's Desire."

And here we speak of *the Goal* as a community of persons. Why the capital-letter "goal"? To suggest that man's highest vision is always transcendent, always beyond, the unrealized ideal pointing onward, the inexhaustible cause of advance. But it is also within, realized thus far in human experience, as in close friendship or between man and wife; otherwise we would have no vision. And see how the circle completes (perfects) itself: our knowledge gives the hint; imagination or insight takes us beyond to grasp the Goal; the Goal serves as directive for further knowledge, larger experience.

A closing note: *In giving himself to the Goal man gains greater power to act, and opens the way to "endless advance."* So far as we can judge, man gains strength—power to act—from goals envisioned; and this activity may go on indefinitely long. Is this common experience in the loving devotion of husband and wife in planning the ideal home, in the commitment of the scholar to his work in his search for truth, and so on? Is this "religious voice" at its finest, everlasting life in unreserved devotion to God and neighbor?

The Roots of Communism . . .

Continued from page 30

labor organizations in under-developed areas. If the leaders and members of labor organizations cannot receive guidance and

assistance from the United States in practical democratic techniques, if they are ignored by us or just simply hated, they will turn for help to the ever-eager radicals and Communist agitators. The "instruction sheets" to our "gift parcels" and technological marvels should be filled out with suggestions of ways and means for a peaceful integration of workers, merchants, peasants, and landowners into a sound national economy. The workers and peasants in Central America need social reforms badly and most of all they need "bread and land." We can help them. If we do not, they will fall prey to the Soviets. The Soviet remedy calls for violence and destruction and will ultimately bring along the loss of freedom and the enslavement of the mind. Our approach, therefore, should be a peaceful and constructive one. We should offer techniques and ideas to the labor organizations and a working program for democracy rather than arms for small military cliques. I am convinced that we can go after the Communist workers in the labor organizations in Central America with an unemotional, but aggressive and constructive program, to show that the laborers and peasants "can have their bread, their land, and maintain their freedom, too." Without nourishment the roots of Communism will soon shrivel and die.

The 1954 Election . . .

Continued from page 21

Carthy debacle. And there is no doubt that he can get the nomination again if he will take it. The Democrats will presumably nominate Mr. Stevenson. But how could he hope to win, even though he richly deserves the office? He could only conduct a "me-too" type of campaign or throw overboard the Democratic program which has been painfully hammered out since 1932. The Brackin Lees, the Malones, and those reflecting the *Chicago Tribune* mentality may find the 1956 fare extremely putrescent, but they could hardly be expected to join the Stevenson dinner party. They are tied to Mr. Eisenhower with strands of steel. All of their talk of a third-party, composed of the intelligent Republicans and the intelligent Southern Democrats—and there are no others—appears only as a feeble effort to pull the President a bit toward the right. If they are serious, they need no more adding machines than they already have in their counting houses to tally the intelligent vote, for the American electorate will not forego the opportunity of choosing again between two of the most popular candidates who ever battled one another in our presidential sweepstakes.

From the present vantage point, I would think that the Democrats should hope, and pray, that the President would make a serious mistake within the next fifteen months or that the national economy would suffer a noticeable decline. Under such circumstances, if war did not come, they might win in 1956. Could we be about to witness the emergence of an entirely new phenomenon in our national politics—the election of a Republican President and Democratic majorities in both houses of Congress?

America's Defense Frontier . . .

Continued from page 27

ever, never be 100 per cent air defense possible.

Especially acute is the present security posture of the United States in the Arctic, both with reference to defensive and offensive operations, which would be launched in event of Soviet attack.

However, improvement of United States Arctic air capabilities along the lines recommended by Colonel Fletcher should do much to rectify this situation and enhance our ability, in the event of war, to seek out enemy air forces and their supporting installations. Much of it may have to be done by tactical fighter-bombers rather than long-range strategic aircraft. A tremendous geographical advantage will lie with such tactical forces, owing to the relative proximity of many military as well as economic and political targets to the Polar regions. The extent to which this advantage could be exploited will be dependent upon the rapidity and effectiveness with which such forces are developed, trained, and equipped for Arctic-type operations. In this connection, the most pressing military-technical problems are the development of Arctic-adapted aircraft and means of supplying them with fuel and lubricants.

Improvement of our Arctic offensive capabilities will serve to make the oft-repeated threat of our devastating retaliatory attack more real, and thereby serve as a more effective deterrent to Soviet aggression. Improvement in Arctic operational capabilities will also vastly increase the effectiveness of Air Defense over the North American Continent. Considering our relative weakness in the Arctic at present, there is a pressing need to become Arctic-minded, especially among both military and scientific-technological people.

In view of the critical nature of the present situation, with the danger of substantial and sizeable Soviet nuclear and thermonuclear attacks in the near future a real