

JUNE - JULY 1977

THE GARGOYLE - Henry George School of New Jersey PO Box 637 Wdbg.N.J. 07095

AMERICA SPREADING STATISM ABROAD?

History is a peculiar business. No one knows exactly what has happened in the past for no one ever has all the facts. Even if one did, no one could possibly know the motivations of the peoples involved.

To try to reconstruct such a trivial incident as a fight in a nearby street or an automobile accident is very difficult, as is shown in the court cases on accident claims. If this is so, then it is patent that attempts to know what actually happened in such great historical events as a world war cannot be expected to succeed.

People we call historians do this, however. What arises is not so much history as their interpretation of what occurred. These views cannot help but be prejudiced by the historians' own beliefs, understanding and biases, no matter how objective they strive to be.

It is said that if one reads the history of the American Revolution as written by an Englishman and compares it with a history written by an American, one would think they were writing about two different events.

Already hundreds of books have been written about World War II, and this is probably only the beginning of the torrent which will keep flowing out as the years go by.

In studying periods of time, historians like to find great primordial forces at work. They attempt to generalize events and point out certain principles or purposes at work. Whether this is actually the case or not probably can never be proven definitely one way or the other. What we do know is that people who are living are attempting to get enough food,

clothing and shelter to stave off the inevitable death call as long as possible, and to get as much pleasure out of what they are doing as they can. To interpret such activities as part of some grand purpose or principle which is animating them seems to be a bit much.

But there is no question that the world is presently divided into what are known as states which are governed by a relatively small group of people. The group in control may have attained its power by force of arms, as when some group conquers another, or it may have come into control through such a process as elections by those deemed to be the citizens of the state.

In the United States, we like to believe that those in control were put there by the people through the elective process and that in general

they represent the wishes of the people. But, if that is so, why then is the United States constantly interfering in the affairs of other states? Whenever there appears to be an outbreak of violence as some group attempts to overthrow another, almost invariably the United States appears on the scene attempting to impose its will.

Just in mentioning the United States imposing its will constitutes a generalization of this writer. More properly, it may be said, that the group in control of the political and armed forces of the nation tries to impose its will on these other states. It is doubtful if the American people wish to. Often the countries involved most Americans never heard of, or if they did have only the vaguest idea where it even is located. How many Americans heard of Vietnam before those in control of the government involved the nation in its affairs?

It may well be said that while it is true that few Americans had the least interest in interfering in such countries as Vietnam, inevitably those in control of a nation as powerful as the United States always have and always will interfere, if only to divert attention from domestic problems which seemingly cannot be solved to foreign ones, which appear amenable to solution.

But why does the group controlling the United States seemingly always favor those in control of a state and rarely those wishing to overthrow it? With the example of the American Revolution, one would suppose it would favor revolutionary activity. Instead it appears to favor the status quo, not all the time, of course, as in the case of Rhodesia where it favors the overthrow of the white minority, but in most cases. Time and again, it has furnished the arms and supplies to dictatorships threatened by groups seeking their overthrow. The excuse is that the dictatorships are usually those fighting communists, who wish to install a group favorable to the Soviet Union.

How true this is, no one knows. Often, it appears that, as in the Philippines, those fighting the group in power merely wish to have free access to the land so they can make a decent living. Probably most of the revolutionary activities throughout the world really are motivated by a desire, conscious or unconscious, for access to the land, for land represents opportunity. One would think then, the powers that be in the United States would encourage such activity. Instead, they almost always throw their support to those in control. And those in control are usually imposing more and more statist control over their

We thus have the truly surprising sight of a nation presumably predicated on the principles of freedom and distrust of the state, actively aiding the spreading statism throughout the world. But people cannot help but yearn to be free to pursue their lives as they wish, so it seems inevitable that revolutionary activities will spring up all over the world time and again.

That being the case, would it not be wisest for those in control in America to let the chips fall where they may and stay out of such matters? Who knows which side is correct? Someday historians may tell us, but that will only represent their interpretations. We do know that common sense tells us not to interfere in our neighbor's family quarrels. Since that is true why is it not true where other nations are involved?

The sooner the United States starts to stop interfering in other nations' affairs, the sooner other people will once again respect Americans, and possibly the sooner will this trend toward world-wide statism reverse itself and move toward freedom.

OSCAR B. JOHANNSSEN