

There was nothing you could really put your finger on and say he stood for it in his campaigns. Well, that's the effective way to get office in a democracy. Maybe it's the best way when you have the great danger of a tyrant or of a Hitler getting in and getting control.

This way you have a chance ~~to~~ to keep decent people in control, but not necessarily a chance to keep able people in control, unless the man there is unusually able in selecting able people and willing to stand behind them. Even so the situation of the Post Office and bureaucracy in general pretty definitely shows that it is not an efficient way to run an organization.

In our system, you have corporations failing all the time. You can't always tell why. You can't say, This man is more able than this man. These people made a particular mistake; it just all goes together, and the most efficient ~~w~~ one ordinarily succeeds and the others fails. The result of that sort of a system has given us the economic advantages we have today.

When I hear silly arguments for changing to a government of tyranny I tend to get very angry and indignant at it, but there is not much any of us can do about it really. A theocracy, a dictatorship with Christ is the ideal. We can't bring that in. Any human dictatorship is bad. So I say, the less government the better. Let the government do its proper job which is enforcing law and order.

In that area we have a situation where in England 200 yrs. ago the party in power would kill off the leaders of the other power when they got in power. When the others got in power they would kill off their leaders on one excuse or other. It was much worse in many other countries than in England. There was so much of unfair dealing with individuals that we made our Bill of Rights and took a very proper stand against that sort of thing.

But now we're gone to the opposite extreme. I've heard it said, Better let 10 guilty men go free than have one innocent man punished! But it seems to me that the purpose of government is == a government should protect innocent men, but the purpose of government is not simply ~~to~~ to protect people wrongly accused but the the purpose of government is to protect all the people. There ought to be a way in which the 1/10th of 1% of the people who want to be violent and destructive can be eliminated. But our whole system is in the opposite direction.

Whether this is going to lead to anarchy or what I don't know. But there is not much we can do about it. I feel that personally we should support good sensible conservatives in every way I can. But when it comes to making it any great part of my activity, I don't see ~~it~~ enough to be accomplished to be worth it. I think it is a Christian's duty to vote; to find out who the people are, and to vote against those who ~~stand~~ stand