

Washington Law Review

Volume 29

Issue 4 *Annual Meeting of the Washington State Bar Association*

11-1-1954

Our Forgotten Findings of Fact

Clarence E. Manion

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr>

Recommended Citation

Clarence E. Manion, Address, *Our Forgotten Findings of Fact*, 29 Wash. L. Rev. & St. B.J. 330 (1954).
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol29/iss4/4>

This Address is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington Law Review by an authorized editor of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact cnyberg@uw.edu.

in the administration of law, and it seems logical, therefore, that it should be we who have most to do with the drafting and consideration of the laws, either directly or through articulate influence in our respective communities. The scope of our opportunities are beyond comprehension, and the depth of our responsibilities is overwhelming. We must cease trying to get so much out of government and think more of our responsibilities to government. I think Chief Justice Hughes clearly and concisely set forth the situation when he said, "Whether our system shall continue does not rest with this court but with the people who have created the system." Or as was said by Charles Fairman, "To think of freedom of speech and of the press as some eighteenth-century heirloom, enshrined in the Constitution and guarded for us by the Supreme Court so that we have nothing to do about it but to enjoy it, is bad history and mischievous thinking."

We do not need to always ask the judges whether we are acting like good Americans. Proper use of the ballot box by an informed citizenry is the only true insurance that America has against the loss of its priceless heritage of individual liberty. My plea is that during the coming year you and I will re-dedicate ourselves to the principles on which our nation is founded and because of which our profession has prospered—unselfish service to the citizens in all fields of political activity, participation at all levels of government, and a realization that as a privileged class we must fulfill our trust to the public over and beyond the selfish duty premised upon self preservation.

OUR FORGOTTEN FINDING OF FACT

An address by the Honorable Clarence E. Manion

First of all it will be a reassurance to you to know that—at least according to my doctor, in a spirit of self defense my vocal cords will cease to function after a certain amount of exercise. This puts a time limitation upon this address which you will all enjoy anticipating. I expect eventually to get out of this vocal straightjacket. It came about because of an honest mistake that I made. A couple of years ago after falling into an evil association with the great Frank Holman, I thought that I could talk as loud and as long, if not as effectively, as he did.

I will say, however, at the outset that any journey for any distance finds its justification here in this room.

It has been my happy experience during the past half dozen years to

be closely and professionally associated with three members of this association, Mr. Tracy Griffin, Mr. Holman and Mr. A. Schweppe. In my judgment these are three of the most representative, the most erudite and most patriotic members of the Bar to be found anywhere.

If they are representative of the Washington State Bar Association, then indeed it is a great honor for me or anybody else to have the privilege of addressing you, and I so regarded it and so accepted the invitation.

I have studied your excellent program. I have observed that you have been here in Spokane for a relatively long time in terms of associative deliberation. You have had your fill of inspiration and instruction and now you are nearing the end of a meeting.

I am reminded of something my old friend Knute Rockne told me many years ago. It was at a football banquet at Notre Dame at quarter to two in the morning and the distinguished speaker was just warming into his address,—no sign of the finish at all, Knute leaned over to me. "Pat," he says, "you know I can forgive the public speaker who doesn't consult his watch. The fellow I want to shoot is the guy who doesn't keep his eye on the calendar."

I know what day it is, and knowing the ardor of your study and deliberation here, I am painfully conscious of the fact that I shall be able to add little or nothing to it, except perhaps a few cautionary notes of warning. I might say also of disconsolation.

Mr. Kern has mentioned the fact that I left Notre Dame in 1952, after a long tenure as teacher and dean. I didn't then expect to launch forth into excursions like this. My ambition was to practice law and stay at home, but since that day I have been teased into one assignment after another. I have been in every state of the Union and in some of them, like Washington, many times. I have talked I think to every kind of an association that exists,—beer associations, plasterers, painters, bakers, butchers—I mean this literally, not in the spirit of literature. I am coming to you lawyers here this afternoon, as I say, in a spirit of disconsolation, as a sort of a witness to the fact that we are the most highly and proficiently organized country of special interests in the world.

Frank Holman will recall when I was in Seattle a couple of years ago at the Farm Bureau convention. Those farmers knew what they wanted. They resolved upon it. There was very little of general interest discussed at that convention. It was the same way with the brewers in

New Orleans, the merchants in Massachusetts, the doctors in Chicago. It's the same everywhere. The general interest is nobody's interest, and that is unfortunate.

If this great complex of American organization could somehow coordinate a tithe of their mind, of their proficiency of their drive in the direction of the general interests of this country I wouldn't come to you in a spirit of disconsolation. I do know what day it is. I do have my eye on the calendar, and I tell you that the time of our American history, gentlemen, is extremely far advanced. This advanced time and its attendant circumstances are forming a judgment upon our generation and upon those which will follow it.

I use the term judgment advisedly, because this judgment will be enforced against us and against our children. You know what a judgment is. If the facts are carefully and accurately found, if the law is reasonably well established, then a judgment is generally predictable, in its terms and its applications. Well, what is the judgment of our time upon our generation? Out of all this confused notion of Americanism, what will be finally and ultimately written upon which execution will be levied?

I had an interesting conversation at The American Bar Association convention in Chicago with a very distinguished man, not a lawyer, who had just returned from the International Labor Organization at Geneva. This was his fifth trip over there. If you gentlemen don't know what the International Labor Organization is I advise you to find out. But after this 5th visit as a business delegate to this extraordinary body, composed of sixty nations of which we are one, this man told me something that I had never thought of before. He related it in connection with Russia's emergence into the organization. Soviet Russia admitted this year for the first time, and there was a close, warmly contested vote about it. The vote actually wasn't close, but the discussion was warm. Russia was voted in, almost unanimously, in spite of the protestations of the United States. I asked, "What was the trouble?" "Why don't you know?" he said, "the world is divided today between the Communists, the Socialists, and us, the U.S." Here is a sharp determination. Brought back from Europe last month by a man who knows what he sees going on.

Gentlemen, there isn't any free world left outside the geographical limitations of this country. When the term "free world" is used, euphemistically, with reference to countries other than ours, it is done

largely as a figure of speech, in a spirit of naivete, or outright ignorance or perhaps fraud.

Let's face the facts. These are not consoling considerations, but certainly lawyers shouldn't duck or dodge the issue at such a critical time as this.

I spoke to you about a finding of fact. What are the facts about freedom? What are the facts that go into this pending judgment upon our generation?

We have all picked our position. Some of us are to the left and others are to the right. In my opinion this is one of the mistakes that we make at the outset, this differentiation of our population between left and right.

The time has come, gentlemen, not to distinguish between right and left. The time has come to distinguish between right and wrong. The principles of morality have to be revived, and who is going to revive them if the lawyers do not?

For many years I used to be introduced as a law teacher. Well if there is any lawyer who is not at one and at the same time a teacher, he belies his profession. We are a teaching profession in school and out. You know that from your own experience. The lawyer teaches his clients to believe they have a case. He goes into court and tries to teach the judge to believe what he has already taught his client to believe. The judge goes into recess and comes forward with an opinion,—a decision, which is immediately bound up into a casebook and sent to the law school as teaching material for the next generation of lawyers. That completes the cycle of instruction. Have you ever thought of it?

The thing that began in your law office as an attempt upon your part to teach your client a principle of law, finds its way into a textbook, which finds its way into the mind of the student, who eventually shows up as a member of your association; and so you are teaching from the very beginning of your professional life to its end.

Our only question is, do we teach to proper effect? Do you satisfy yourself merely by teaching your client so that the bread and butter business of feeding and clothing your family may be complied with, or do you carry out your responsibility as a teacher of the public with reference to the vitality of our constitutional system? Because who knows it if you do not? I've talked to the bakers and the butchers and the bartenders and they know nothing about it. Do you expect them to proclaim it, and to carry it on if the lawyers are remiss or apathetic or neglectful?

Well, the time has come for us to live up to our pedagogical responsibilities. If this judgment which is to be rendered upon our time is to be an accurate judgment founded in fact and law, then we had better see to it that we are straight in our own minds, first of all, about the facts.

Now, what are the facts of American life? What are the facts which underlie the judgment which the world must make about the vitality of the American constitutional system; because that is what it is, my friends.

America is not the glorious chunk of geography that I saw out of the plane window as I flew into this magnificent Washington-Idaho country. That isn't my country. Our country is not the lakes and the valleys and the mountain peaks and the depressions, economically geographically. My country represents something else than geography, or business profits. It is represented in constitutional government which doesn't obtain anywhere else in the world. Here is the only place on earth where an individual citizen can stand up and enforce his rights against his government, not merely against his fellow man, but against the state. That is the beautiful, the sublime concept of the American Constitutional ideal. Look on the back of a dollar bill if you have one. There on the great seal of the United States you will see in Latin "A new order is born in the world."

This American system is new, and nobody has deemed to copy it anywhere on earth, yet we are in the process of losing it because we have failed to understand it.

The judgment which is the American constitutional system was made deliberately in lawyer-like fashion by the founding fathers of this republic. Before rendering a judgment in favor of constitutional government, they first made a finding of fact. The finding of fact came first. It is precisely that finding of fact that lawyers need to revive and to proclaim. They made it in a document called the American Declaration of Independence. It was the first breath of new life of this republic. It is what the supreme court used to call the spirit of our whole system, and in this remarkable declaration which was not a declaration of independence at all, but as they called it officially, a declaration merely, of many things. It was first a declaration of fact. Self evident truths, they called these facts. There were just four of them. Four findings of fact, not of opinion, but of fact. Do you remember what they were? "We hold these truths to be self evident." No metaphysician, no logi-

cian can find anything more certain than a self evident truth. There aren't very many of them. The words were used deliberately in this document. These are the facts.

First of all, number one; that "all men are *created*." There is a God, in other words. God is a fact, the first fact of American life. God exists not as a matter of faith but as a matter of fact. How often do we remember that? How often do we proclaim it? This fact is the number one cornerstone of this republic. Nothing makes sense in the absence of that fundamental finding of the fact of God.

We are a confused people. We are surrounded with fog, misunderstanding, and I find myself unconsciously repeating the words of Daniel Webster that I once memorized, I think, in the eighth grade. They began his famous reply to Senator Hayne in the Senate fore than a hundred years ago. I think it would do well for lawyers to commit these words when they begin to study and ponder over a difficult question. Daniel Webster said this—it will only take a minute. He said: "Mr. President," addressing the chair, "when a mariner has been tossed for many days in strange waters on a tempestuous sea he avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the first glance of the sun to take his bearings to see how far the winds have driven him from his true course. Mr. President," he said, "let us emulate his prudence and before we drift further on the waves of this debate, let us refer to the point of our departure so that we may then know where we now are." There was never a more propitious time for Daniel Webster's summary than now! Let us refer to the point of our departure: the point where the new world left the old was the American Declaration of Independence, and the first fact found was the fact of God.

Secondly, "We hold this truth to be self evident," they said; "that all men are created equal." Here is this tortured concept of human equality. Human equality in law is the most bedeviled phrase in any language today.

The Soviets are selling a brand of human equality around the world and people are buying it. They like the idea of being lifted up and made equal to everybody else. We have to face up to this proposition of human equality.

What are the facts about human equality? Has there been a finding of fact on the subject? Here in this documentation we find that all men are created equal. All men, in other words, are equal in God's sight, and for that reason they are equal before the law of the land, because if I

know anything about the law of this land I know that it is merely a projection of God's law; equal before God, equal before the law, and unequal in every other conceivable way. All men, aside from the sight of God and the law are unequal. Do you realize that? Have we got the courage to proclaim the facts on the matter of equality?

Take a look at that fingerprint of yours. That fingerprint distinguishes you from every person who now lives, or who has ever lived on the face of the earth. God Almighty has given you a little trademark which distinguishes you from every other man or woman ever created. That is the beginning point of your differentiation, your individuality. Then from that point forward the differences are multiplied.

There are no two lawyers in this room who are identical, or who can ever be made equal by any power on earth, in their professional capacity, to say nothing of other things. That differentiation of course is Providential.

Human inequality is what feeds and clothes the world. Some people want to be lawyers, some want to be policemen, politicians, plasterers, bartenders, butchers, bakers, farmers. And isn't that fine, because out of that complex of differences we manage to eat and to be sheltered and to make the progress that we call civilization.

Have you ever thought about what a stale and unprofitable world this would be if everybody in it, for instance, wanted to hang paper? Can you imagine two and a half billion frustrated people running around looking for a wall to hang the paper on? You have to have builders, too, and you have to have fabricators, and a hundred thousand different kinds of people doing a hundred thousand different things each in his capacity, each according to the individualistic design, which grows out of his God-given fingerprint.

Let us have the courage to tell the truth about human inequality as well as human equality, which is before God and the law, and that's all. This is a basic finding of fact which was the preliminary to the great judgment concerning our constitutional system. And human rights? "I have a right to this, I have a right to that"—human rights are in the air today.

What are the facts about human rights? Where do they come from and what are their limitations? Here again the great document: We hold this to be a fact. This is "self evident," they said, "that all men are endowed"—not by the Bill of Rights, not by the state, not by the Constitution, but by God, Himself, "with certain unalienable rights," and they spelled out two of them—life and liberty.

Life is a gift of God. Murder is therefore a heinous crime. But what about liberty? The Founding Fathers put life and liberty together. It's just as much a violation of God's natural law to take a man's liberty as it is to take his life. Liberty is an essential prerequisite to full complete human life, and to deprive a man of liberty is a kind of murder, too. This is a logical deduction from the finding of fact about life. Liberty is important too. Nobody has short circuited the importance of life yet except in the countries where liberty has been cashiered. As soon as liberty is disregarded, life becomes unimportant, too, because they are inseparably connected one with the other. We have to revive respect for human liberty because its unalienable God-given nature is a fact; not opinion, or theory, but a fact.

Finally, fact number four. The last cornerstone which underpins the republic, the fact about government. Here is where the lawyers come in *en masse*, because the lawyers have a special functional duty with reference to government, not merely to teach about it but to work with it. What is government for? What are its limitations, and potentialities? Why does it exist? Can you think of a more ponderous question than that one, in addition to those that have preceded it?

Now for the finding of fact. We hold this to be a fact. This is a "self evident truth," they said, "that to secure these rights," to protect these gifts of God, "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Now there it is, measured and clarified and most deliberately in language that everybody can understand. Government is a protective agency made by man to secure God's gifts. This is the point from which we departed. This is the purpose of government in a free country, and this is what the Founding Fathers said as they proceeded to the establishment of a constitutional system. Now get the sequence: The fact of God, subordinates this government to service, rather than mastery of men. If God does not exist, then government is God, don't you see? And where God does not exist officially, government *is* God as in Russia today and in any other complete, absolute dictatorship.

It's the fact of God, my friends, that puts government down into its constitutional role of service. You can't take these things out of their contexts. You have to take them in sequence. You can't make the judgment without the finding of fact.

These differences in human nature, what is it that sparks them into a great civilization? It's freedom! If men are free to follow their

bends and their enterprises and their ambitions, civilization blossoms automatically. But how to keep men free, that's the \$64 question. "Men are kept free," the founding fathers said, "by keeping government limited." How to keep government limited? It had never been kept limited before in the 6,000 years of human history. The new order chained it down by constitutional limitations. Government never goes about in America except in chains. That is the hallmark of our system, remember it. There is no stem or branch of American government that hasn't its limitation shackled to its ankle, because the very definition of liberty, lawyers, is limited government, and the very definition of tyranny is unlimited government. Where government is unlimited, no citizen is free, and what is the communism that we are frantically fighting today?

Communism is merely a concentration of absolute governmental power in the hands of Godless gangsters! What we need is a new genius for simplification. We need to put these things in single declarative sentences and teach them ourselves to the people in the kind of language used to sell the people soft drinks, and deodorants. Don't hand somebody a 5-volume treatise on liberty. Tell them what liberty is, and what facts have been officially found with reference to liberty.

Liberty is limited government. Communism is the concentration of unlimited governmental power in the hands of Godless gangsters. It might be in the hands of an angel, in which case according to Plato and others it would be administered beautifully, but in the hands of the Communists it is in the hands of Godless materialistic gangsters. First it is unfortunately concentrated in one place. Once that is done it can be grabbed easily when the occasion arises.

The Founding Fathers anticipated all this tendency to Dictatorship. They approached government with a determination, first of all that its power would not be concentrated. They had seen the evil of concentrated governmental power. George Washington had a phrase for it. Washington said, "Government is like fire, a dangerous servant, a fearful master." You couldn't express it any better than that in ten volumes. That in a single sentence is a whole lesson in political science. Government *is* like fire. Government is precisely like fire. Useful, of course, and necessary, but dangerous in the extreme. When fire is held in a cook stove or a blast furnace behind iron walls it is serviceable and useful, but when fire roars out of control it becomes a destructive conflagration. Fire is the great cleanup man in all the great catastro-

phies of the world, whether it's in Hiroshima or San Francisco. It was not the quake or the bomb that destroyed these cities. It was the fire that followed. Fire is a dangerous thing, and Washington said, "Government is like fire."

Government is what destroys liberty, not the corporations, or the reactionaries, or the liberals. Wherever liberty is destroyed, government destroys it. Government, the fire—the great destroyer, constructive and serviceable only when held in constitutional iron walls built for it by the wise founding fathers. They handled this fire of government very precisely and according to a scientific pattern. They put a little of it in the State of Washington, and they put a very little bit of it in a place called Washington, D. C., and they kept those parts here and in Washington, D. C., separated from the legislative and the judiciary and the executive segments. Wherever they put the fire of government they walled it away segment from segment lest it come together and congeal into a great conflagration.

The genius of our constitutional system is that in it we found a way in which to separate the fires of government so as to make them serviceable without risking tyranny and destruction.

Well gentlemen, one of the judgments about to be rendered upon our generation and our time and upon our new order is the judgment for the further and further concentration of this fire of government. Your chairman casually and considerately, let me say, mentioned my recent service with the government as chairman of the Commission on Inter-governmental Relations. During my short time in that position I had the opportunity to see the concentration of government taking place before my very eyes. The constitution is being misconstrued, bypassed and officially disregarded by the greater and greater concentration of governmental power every minute.

More than 40 years ago Woodrow Wilson, a great constitutional lawyer, said, "A concentration of governmental power is what always precedes the death of human freedom." Lawyers, if we could amplify that, over and over, we might stick it into the subconscious of our citizens. "A concentration of governmental power," he said, "is what always precedes the death of human freedom." Today, 40 odd years later, the communists paraphrase Woodrow Wilson. They say, "A concentration of governmental power is what must precede the death of human freedom," and so they proceed to concentrate the powers of government first and make them ready for the hands of the Godless gangsters who will seize them inevitably and eventually.

I told Tracy Griffin last night about my trip past the Gary Steel mills with a notorious and I am sure a thoroughly repentant ex-communist who was then teaching at Notre Dame. As we drove past that industrial establishment at dusk and saw the flame and the smoke billowing up against the evening sky making an incomparable picture of American industry at its best, I observed that this would be the first target of the Russian Communist bombers. He said, "No, you are wrong. The Communists want that establishment. They intend and hope to get it, but they want it in action. They don't want it in ashes." Everytime I see a smokestack in America I think of what he said. "In action, not in ashes," not bombed to rubble and uselessness, but as a going concern as they took the Skoda Works in Czechoslovakia from the inside. Fifteen separate formerly independent nations swept behind the iron curtain by soldiers, by bayonets, by submarines and ships and bombs? No, my friends, by the insidious infiltration process, by the concentration of governmental power first, and then the grabbing of it later by the communists.

This man told me more. "Do you know the greatest frustration that the communist conspirator experiences when he comes to the United States?" He said, "It is the dispersion of important powers throughout the states of the union. You don't know it," he said, "but states' rights is your best defense against the communist conspiracy."

What are the three basic most essential powers that the communists need to have in one place before they take over? Number 1, the police—the police. That's what they had in Czechoslovakia, and through the police they controlled the ballot boxes, number 2; and then the first act of the newly "elected" Communist government is to redistribute the land. Step number 3; and they were in—irretrievably in. But when the conspirator comes to the United States of America he looks for the police, the central control of police, so he can give it to Alger Hiss, to Dexter White or one of their counterparts and make them chief. Where does he find the police, in Washington? No, thank God and the founding fathers. He finds the police separated into 48 separate and independent constitutional jurisdictions called states, and at that point further decentralized to the control of counties and cities. The policeman, the police force, is the most disintegrated branch of all American government. That is a fortuitous thing, lawyers. Keep it that way. Keep the land there too, in 48 states, rather than in one place as it was in Czechoslovakia. Keep the ballot boxes under state

control. The same goes for education, agriculture, welfare, and such like.

I have it on the authority of an ex-communist that states' rights is our best defense against the success of the communist conspiracy. I said that once too often in Washington. Some bureaucrat overheard me.

Let me tell you that bureaucracy is like any other organism. It fights to maintain itself and to expand itself in spite of a President, in spite of a Congress and in spite of the opinion of the people, or the Constitution of the United States.

When President Eisenhower was president of Columbia University 40 years after Woodrow Wilson, he said, "If this drift toward central government continues, then private property will drift into that central government, then we'll have to have dictatorship in order to manage such a huge establishment." That's a basic truth. Private property will follow the power, and then of course dictatorship is the only alternative. Along will come some sort of an emergency in the execution of some frantic futile foreign policy, then suddenly we established the central authority which has been ready made.

Liberty is limited government, and despotism is concentrated power. Right now power is being concentrated under various guises. One of these is Federal Aid. What the federal government cannot regulate by law they proceed to subsidize by a handout.

Federal Aid is a fraud. It aids nothing except the concentration of governmental power through indirection. Federal Aid to education is not aid to education. It is aid to the centralized bureaucracy, because what they aid they will control. When the control is completely centralized the communists will take it over, you'll never get it back. Ours is the only time in human history, ladies and gentlemen, when men ever mastered their government, ever tamed and domesticated this dangerous beast and threw around it a net of shackles called constitutional limitations.

Thank God for Frank Holman and Al Schweppe who fought so valiantly to put an effective limitation upon the dangerous power of Government which is now unlimited, namely, the treaty power. I hope that all lawyers will follow their courageous example.

Not merely the treaty power, however, but every power wherever it is, must have an effective limitation placed upon it. That's the American system. That's the definition of Liberty, and the shorter you can make these sentences, the more declarative, the more illustra-

tive of this simple finding of fact, the more certain and secure will the judgment of this generation be.

Let me tell you a story in conclusion. The chairman mentioned that I was a practicing lawyer. I appreciate the plug. Occasionally I do have a client. We had one some months ago—a paying client, too, which is even more extraordinary. This gentleman like so many others at his time of life was trying to insulate himself against the post mortem impacts of the federal tax collector. He had made some money. He was very happy about it—pretty smug, too. He had reason to feel proud of himself, and he was coming in day after day to be counselled. Finally the signing stage had been arrived at. We had all the mine run documents in front of him. You know them all. We had his Will, and a trust agreement, and there were inter vivos gifts, none of them *causa mortis* of course. There were transfers of land and all sorts of accompanying letters to his children and so on to make this thing bombproof when death sealed up his eyes. I was sick and tired of the whole business but I had to be pleasant because this was a critical time in the whole stage of our intercourse.

Well, in came my client, a big blustering fellow and smoking a horrible pipe. He sat down at the table and rolled up his sleeves and began to sign the documents with a big smile on his face, even when he signed our check which by chance was prepared along with everything else. Well, at this point I had to interrupt him. I said, "John, you seem to get a kick out of all this." He pulled out the pipe and laid down the pen. "Pat," he says, "you bet I get a kick out of this. Let me tell you something." He continued, "I'm an old man. I don't mind admitting it to you in this office, and I've made what is for me a lot of money. I've done pretty well. I've had some bad luck, too, as you know. I lost my good wife a couple of years ago and my boy didn't come back from the war, but," he said, "I've got a daughter and some wonderful grandchildren and I've got a lot of property. I never ever had a Will, as you know. I always knew that unless I did this everything I have would go to the four winds, to the government or some place I didn't want it to go to. I know this has been quite a chore here and maybe I have been unreasonable at time, but," he concluded, "I'm really going to sleep tonight." He put his pipe back into his mouth and picked up his pen and he started to sign again, still smiling.

Then I interrupted him a second time. I said, "John, now that you have left this property of yours to your children, what are you going

to do about their liberty?" Well, he didn't stop signing and he didn't stop smoking, he just burst out laughing. "Liberty," he says, "My God, I don't know anything about liberty. I'm a merchant, I can make a little money, but I'm going to have to leave that liberty business to the politicians and the professors." He kept on laughing kept on signing. Then I made what was probably a faux pas. I told him something, gentlemen, which I am going to tell you. "Tear up that Will. Throw away the insurance policies, forget that bank account, forget all that we have done here, because unless you leave those children liberty, John, you leave them nothing at all." Ask the Jews in Germany, ask the well-heeled Jews in Germany what good, in God's name, did wealth and property do them, when they were faced up against concentrated, unlimited, tyrannical governmental power in the hands of Adolph Hitler. Ask the Kulaks in Russia, ask the ghost of 10 million Kulaks, murdered by Joe Stalin—"Say fellas, what good did your land do you when you were faced up against this concentrated unlimited power called communism," and ask the landlords in China, the dispossessed merchants and property owners of China what good their property did them when they ran into Mao Tse Tung and his concentrated unlimited communistic power?"

My friends, it doesn't make any difference whom you ask at whatever point of history, the answer comes back always the same. In time of tyranny, in time of unlimited concentrated governmental power your property is going to buy your children just one thing: a ticket to the concentration camp, here or anywhere else. Remember it, a one-way ticket to the point of no return. Will you think about that the next time you draw a Will for anybody, or for yourself? Or when you stasch away a few dollars for that new grandchild? Just one thing—in time of concentrated unlimited governmental power. But think of it please when you gather those children and grandchildren around you and then look them in the eye as I have looked at mine. When you do that, ask yourself one question, "How much unlimited concentrated power is my government going to have when these youngsters are as old as I am?" Ask that question, ladies and gentlemen, and that will do it. Then and there, God helping you a little, you will be resolved that your legacy, not of property if you please, but of liberty of these children, is going to compare to the big fortune of freedom that the founding fathers left to us.