



STRINGFELLOW BARR, who was born in Suffolk, Virginia, on January 15, 1897, wrote *LET'S JOIN THE HUMAN RACE* when he returned last spring from a tour of South and Central America—a tour that took him into the out-of-the-way places most travelers never see. “What I saw was heartbreaking,” he writes. “The poverty, the disease, the misery have to be seen to be believed. Heroic efforts are being made to help, but the scale is too small. Neither the U.S. government nor American private business can do

this job. And the most competent students of Asia and Africa say the same thing. Our generation will not find peace till this job is tackled, and the job is not America's problem—it is the problem of all nations.”

During most of his life, Stringfellow Barr has worked in education. In 1919 he went as a Rhodes Scholar to Oxford. After four years in Europe, he taught history for twelve years at the University of Virginia, and he was for ten years president of St. John's College in Annapolis. In 1948 he became president of the Foundation for World Government, which has sponsored research in the political and economic problems of establishing a common government. His most recent book is a history of modern Europe, *The Pilgrimage of Western Man*. He has lectured and traveled widely and has often spoken on the radio, especially on the program he originated—“Invitation to Learning.”

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

62725
Stringfellow Barr

LET'S JOIN The HUMAN RACE

25 cents

25 cents

Copies of LET'S JOIN THE HUMAN RACE may be secured through bookstores or from The University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois. Mail orders for single copies must be accompanied by 25 cents in cash.

The following prices apply to quantity orders:

10 copies	\$ 2.25
25 copies	 5.00
100 copies	 15.00
500 copies	 60.00
1,000 copies	 75.00

Quantity orders should be addressed to the publisher and accompanied by payment in check or money order.

BY STRINGFELLOW BARR

LET'S JOIN THE HUMAN RACE



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS • CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO 37

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, London, N.W. 1, England

Copyright 1950 by The University of Chicago

All rights reserved. Composed and printed by

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

Published November 1950

Second Impression December 1950

Third Impression January 1951

Fourth Impression January 1951

Fifth Impression March 1951

Sixth Impression March 1951

Seventh Impression July 1951

Eighth Impression November 1951

Ninth Impression May 1952

Tenth Impression March 1953

Eleventh Impression October 1953

LET'S JOIN THE HUMAN RACE

1

OUR basic foreign policy since World War II has been to oppose Russia. But that is a negative policy, and, deep down underneath, most Americans know it. Now we are slowly discovering that we need a positive policy. We are discovering we need a positive policy because we are slowly discovering what the world's basic problem is.

The world's basic problem was recognized by Secretary of State Acheson in his speech to the United Nations on September 20, 1950, and by President Truman, speaking to the same body on October 23, 1950. But unless American public opinion also recognizes that problem, these two speeches will of course remain just speeches.

We have been sadly agreeing that this is no longer what Wendell Willkie called "one world" but that we are living in two worlds—the Communist world and the non-Communist. And now we are beginning to learn that Willkie was right. It is still one world, a world torn by tension between its two most powerful states, a world rising against inequality whether of race or of economic opportunity, but still one world inhabited by one human race. What will happen to this world will depend, not just on us, or on Russia, but on what the human race does. What should they do? If the American government is to find a foreign policy, a policy that is constructive and realistic, we American citizens had better have a good realistic look at the human race.

2

But this is hard for us to do. In terms of food to eat and clothes to wear and houses to live in, the United States is a rich suburb, surrounded by slums. Some of the slums, like western Europe, were once elegant suburbs themselves, controlling every other continent on our planet. Some, like India, have not been powerful or elegant for hundreds of years. For a long time their citizens have been hungry, naked, and without decent shelter.

It is not easy for people who live in rich suburbs to understand the needs of people who live in slums. No bread? Why don't they eat cake? No money to buy clothes? Why don't they charge them? No

roof on the house? They ought to phone a reliable contractor! Sick? They ought to call a doctor. Out of work? No real hustler stays out of work very long.

But a few of our economists and engineers, and a lot of our G.I.'s, have seen the staggering human misery of Asia, of Africa, of Latin America. The rest of us must just try to imagine it. Otherwise we won't understand the actual problems of the human race. And until we begin to understand those problems, our foreign policy will go on being unrealistic, and we Americans will ourselves seem less and less real to the two billion human beings who are not Americans. They may learn to fear us, but they won't understand us.

3

I believe there is a trick by which we Americans can understand these two billion men, women, and children scattered all over the globe. Will the reader play "Let's pretend" with me, the way children do? Let's pretend that you have not yet been born but will be born this year, somewhere on the planet, somewhere in this Mighty Neighborhood. And let's try to estimate your chances of living a happy, healthy, decent, and useful life.

If you are born this year, then on the same day more than 200,000 other babies will be born, all over the world.

You will have less than one chance in twenty of being born in the United States. Your chance of being born in the Soviet Union will be not much better. These countries may be heavily armed, but most people just don't live in them.

You will probably be colored. Remember that you and the 200,000 other squawking brats who will be the day's baby crop are going to be born all over the planet and that there are just not many openings in the places where the white race lives. You must take your chances with the other babies. And the chances are, you will be colored—colored black, or colored brown, or colored yellow.

Your chances of being born white this year are not more than one in three. Your chances of being Chinese are one in four; of being born in India, better than one in nine.

If you are born colored, you will probably be born either among people who have recently revolted and thrown out the white folks who used to govern them or else in a country that is still trying to

throw the white folks out. If you are born in Africa, you are likely to learn the maxim: "Never trust a white man."

You have only about one chance in four of being born a Christian. It is far more likely that you will be born a Confucian or a Buddhist, a Mohammedan or a Taoist.

4

If you are born in the United States—and, remember, that's quite an *if*—you will probably live longer than a year. But if you are born in India, which is more likely, you have only a little better than a one-to-four chance of living more than a year. But cheer up! your chances in some places would be worse; and, besides, even if you survive babyhood in India, you have only a fifty-fifty chance of growing to maturity.

If you are born colored, the chances are overwhelming that you will be chronically sick all your life—from malaria, or intestinal parasites, or tuberculosis, or maybe even leprosy. And even if you are not chronically sick, you are likely to be weak from hunger. You have about a two-to-one chance of suffering from malnutrition, either from too little food or from food that is not a balanced or nourishing diet. You have a reasonably good chance of experiencing real famine—to the point where you will be glad to eat the bark off a tree. But this chance is extremely hard to calculate.

Again, if you are born colored, you have only a one-to-four chance of learning to read. And since you almost certainly will not own a radio, you will be pretty well cut off from that part of the human family that has enough to eat and that is reasonably healthy. You will most likely live in a mud hut, with a dirt floor and no chimney, its roof thatched with straw. You will almost certainly work on the land, and most of what you raise will go to the landlord. In addition, you are likely to be deeply in debt to the local moneylender, and you may have to pay him annual interest of anywhere from 30 to 100 per cent.

5

But enough of this "Let's pretend." No need to be quaint about it. What I am describing is the actual condition of mankind in the middle of the twentieth century. To explain how it got there would involve a good deal of history for which we have no time here. The

point is, that is where it got. Many millions of these sick, hungry, illiterate, and oppressed people belong to "the free nations" we propose to lead in a crusade against communism. We had better take a good look at the real world we live in before we lead much further. We had better base American foreign policy on real facts.

When we Americans look at Russia, all that we see is tyranny. When millions of these wretched outcasts look at her, what they see is liberation from the landlord and the moneylender and the planned reconstruction of their country on the basis of modern machinery. They see a possible end to a kind of misery and despair which most Americans have never seen. Tyranny does not frighten them: they have never known anything else. We had better stop shouting slogans at them long enough to try with all our might to imagine their misery.

This misery, and not communism, is the basic problem of our one world—the one world which modern science and modern techniques have built. Communism is what the Russians propose as a solution to that basic problem—they say, the only solution. The world community is listening attentively for other proposals. The nearest to another proposal that it has heard was made by President Truman and presented as "Point Four" in his Inaugural Address of January 20, 1949. The President proposed a "bold, new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas." Eighteen months later, the U.S. House of Representatives voted \$35,000,000 for Mr. Truman's "Point Four," and a Senate Committee promptly whittled it down to \$10,000,000. That is less than New York City spent in 1949 to sweep its streets and dispose of its garbage. In terms of the problem of a sick world economy it is peanuts, and it is highly debatable whether it would not be better policy to do nothing. The best estimate I know of what World War II cost the United States is \$330,000,000,000.00—*three hundred and thirty billion dollars*. Until the men and women and children now in the world have some hope of escaping from the hideous misery in which two-thirds of them are trying to live, can we hope to build a stable peace? Russia has offered them world revolution and a planned, productive, expanding economy. Our Senate Committee offered \$10,000,000. (Later, that ten got painfully hoisted up to thirty-four and a half.)

Yet on February 2, 1950, Senator Brien McMahon had proposed ten *billion* dollars a year for five years as the American share toward

rebuilding the world's economy. That is one thousand times as much as the Senate Committee seemed to think adequate. Only one thousand times.

On July 15, a few days after the Senate Committee bid peanuts, Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, proposed thirteen billions a year for a hundred years, totaling over one trillion dollars.

Either Senator McMahon and Mr. Reuther have both gone mad, or else the Senate Committee is quite unaware of the problem these two men think we must tackle if we are to have peace. Senator McMahon's proposal last February was widely applauded both on the floor of the Senate and by the public. It must be that the committee that proposed \$10,000,000 for "Point Four" was not really looking at the problem we are talking about.

Why not? The main item in our foreign policy is "Stop Communism." How? With guns? You cannot shoot communism with a gun. Communism is an idea and a program, which the Communists claim is the way—the *only* way—to rescue mankind from the ghastly misery in which most of it now lives. There is plenty of evidence that mankind is determined to be rescued. True, this is not the first time it has experienced misery. But it is the first time that hundreds of millions of human beings have become convinced that, because of new scientific knowledge and new technical skills, their misery is not necessary. In Asia, in Africa, in Latin America, that conviction is growing. And the people in these lands are determined to solve their economic problem.

The only way to stop communism is to offer the one world that we all live in a better solution of the real problem than communism offers, and certainly a better solution than peanuts. This fact is apparently what Senator McMahon and Mr. Reuther both know. A good many economists, engineers, and technicians all over the world know it too. Why have we Americans on the whole missed the point? Why have we tolerated a foreign policy which has so little to do with the real world mankind is living in? Why has our discussion of "Point Four" had so little to do with facts?

6

I think our discussion of "Point Four" has been based, like our present foreign policy, on false premises. I think we shall make no

real headway with the problem until we base it on facts. Of course, Washington's accusations against Moscow and Moscow's accusations against Washington are facts too, but they are not facts of the same order as a hungry peasant or a piece of bread or a flooded river valley or a ruined irrigation system or a malarial swamp or a dying work animal or a broken wooden plow. It is facts like these that our foreign policy must mesh with—"facts of life"—of life and death. A foreign policy deals with foreigners, and these are the facts which most of the foreigners now alive are worried about.

Some two and two-tenths billions of human beings are alive today, and only a small fraction of them are either Russians or Americans. For most of them, there are far more urgent matters to think about than the cold war or communism or political freedom. They want to solve Problem Number One. We Americans have not been thinking clearly about Problem Number One—what we call "Point Four"—because, I believe, of the following false assumptions:

False Assumption Number One: That Russia is all that stands between mankind and a stable peace.

False Assumption Number Two: That American "know-how" and American money can rebuild the world economy, or enough of it to stop Russia.

False Assumption Number Three: That "free enterprise" (what the non-American world still calls "private enterprise") can do the job better than government.

False Assumption Number Four: That the job can be done on the basis of small yearly appropriations.

Let's examine these four assumptions carefully. In congressional hearings, in the literature on "Point Four," in public pronouncements on the subject, these four assumptions keep bobbing up. I believe it is these four false assumptions that have reduced the American discussion of "Point Four" to small talk. That leaves Russia's proposal of communism as the only proposal effectively on the table. Communism offers to rescue mankind from acute poverty, chronic starvation, constant plague, and bewildering ignorance. Communism is expanding because it has no competition.

7

"That Russia is all that stands between mankind and a stable peace." Our glance at the actual condition of mankind today should convince us that, if all the Russians in the world obligingly died this evening, and if all the Communists of whatever race were so kind as to commit suicide tomorrow at noon sharp, the world revolution for equality would not stop. We should remember that the "backward" peoples are not only hungry and sick and desperate; they now know that modern science and modern techniques make their hunger and sickness unnecessary. If they find that all the Communists have suddenly and unaccountably died, they will follow whoever else will promise to do something about it. The Asians and Africans will go on fighting or planning to throw the white folks out. The hungry will go on fighting or planning to eat. These peoples are in motion. You and I want peace and quiet, so we can enjoy our unbelievable standard of living. They have nothing to enjoy; so they want change.

In these circumstances, to suppose that these people would obligingly settle down, if we could just make Russia behave, is to live in an unreal world, not in the world that exists today. To think, therefore, that we can get a stable world by frightening or defeating Russia is absurd.

On the other hand, to hope that by being nice to Russia—and doing nothing else—we can have peace in which to enjoy life in America is equally absurd. Neither "containment" nor "appeasement" will bring us peace. Our only chance is to do something about the real problem. To do that, we must look, not only at the Russians, but at the two billion other people whom she offers to rescue. What do they want? What do they think has to be done to make the world tolerable? For they might be right. Why allow the Communists to be the only people they can turn to for understanding and action?

Once we give up the childish belief that the Russians are all that stand between mankind and a stable peace, we can begin to think again. And if we think, we shall find a sensible foreign policy based on facts instead of fancies.

8

Our second false assumption is that American money and American "know-how" can do the job, or anyhow enough of it to stop Russia.

First, let's rule out this "anyhow" kind of thinking. What we want is a peaceful world, not just a world barely peaceful enough to stop Russia. Communism is indeed a very great evil; surely, we have not become so addled as to believe it is the only evil in the world. If we have, we shall fight it alone, because other peoples can name lots of evil things besides communism—things like hunger and disease, for example. The question is not whether American money and American know-how can do the job enough to stop Russia, but simply whether they can do the job.

I suggest that they cannot.

If you can imagine the American government abolishing its army, its navy, its air force, and canceling all its war contracts, then the billions of dollars it would save might go a long way toward putting the productive powers of the rest of the world into action. Unfortunately, such drastic disarmament would throw this country into an economic depression and cause widespread unemployment—with serious consequences for the world economy! But there is nothing to worry about, because clearly our government is going to do no such thing.

If, on the other hand, we are going to add a "Point Four" program for world economic development to our vast military program, then we will probably add what we have been adding—peanuts. So, in either case, we just haven't got the money the job will take.

As to our famous know-how, I think that word (which is pompous gobbledegook for "skill") has already done our thinking enough harm. It always implies that scientific knowledge and industrial technique can be found only in America. And this is simply not the case. In the field of science and technique American industry has always leaned heavily on Europe. Even the "backward" continents of Asia, Africa, and South America boast some excellent scientists and engineers, although they have fewer than they need and although those they have got lack the laboratory and factory facilities of Europe and America. The gobbledegook word "know-how" was popularized by those who wrote advertising copy for our industrial corporations, to flatter our national vanity. Besides, it filled us customers with proper awe for the mysterious and beneficent power of these corporations to supply us with gadgets which we ought to consider cheap at almost any price.

In two specific fields we do indeed excel. It was we Americans who,

because of our huge free-trade home market, developed mass production and the low unit cost which mass production makes possible. The other way we excel is a psychological matter. Because we have lived for centuries amidst bountiful natural resources and in an expanding economy, we are perhaps the world's most hopeful people. We display, therefore, an initiative and a daring that the world really needs. Or, at least, we display them at home. We have not been displaying them lately in our foreign policy. If the economy of the world began to expand sharply, our hopefulness and initiative could prove extremely catching.

I suspect that the reason we like to think that only Americans have know-how is that we feel self-conscious about our riches in a poor world. Like most rich people, we would rather our neighbors thought of us as unusually skilful than as unusually lucky. Human beings envy good luck but they respect skill, and we Americans, quite naturally, would rather be respected than envied. But we will not decrease the envy by talking loudly about our know-how. And we should remember that any talk these days is loud—thanks to the world press and radio. We had better be careful not to sound to other nations the way the Russians sound to us when they claim that practically all important inventions and discoveries have been Russian.

The job that we have been talking about here needs technical men not only from America but from the whole world. It particularly needs those familiar with the local conditions, languages, and customs in the spots where the work has to be done.

9

But aside from the fact that the United States has neither enough dollars nor enough experts available to do the job, there are other compelling reasons why we Americans should call in our neighbors, not to help us complete the job but to plan it with us and get it started with us. American help on this job depends on congressional approval. Anybody who followed the hearings and debates of Congress, on Mr. Truman's "Point Four" proposal for "a bold, new program," will quickly see why it is fatal for America to go on playing Santa Claus—fatal, regardless of how big a sack of gifts America may carry on her broad shoulders.

Santa Claus always distinguishes sharply between good little boys

and bad little boys. And Congress tries to do the same. It simply will not give presents to bad little boys—that is, to those not clearly playing on our team against Russia. But the Bible says it rains alike on the just and the unjust. Most of the rainfall runs in rivers to the sea. These rivers have an annoying habit of ignoring the morals of the nations that live in their watersheds. If Congress had stipulated that TVA must help the people of Tennessee while injuring the people of Alabama and Kentucky, Mr. Lilienthal would have had an even tougher problem than he did have. Yet Congress has a foreign policy—"Stop Russia"—aimed at protecting America, and it is not going to "develop" foreign countries unless it knows how such development will affect its own foreign policy. So Congress sticks to peanuts, the world economy continues to stumble along, the Communist proposal remains the only available proposal, and we are back where we started.

Congress sees this problem, and all problems, through cold-war spectacles, and this problem cannot be examined well through those particular spectacles. But quite aside from the spectacles, why should Congress play Santa Claus at all? Why should the Senator from Ohio, let us say, vote large sums to help Indonesia rebuild its economy? When he campaigned back home, he certainly promised a lot of things—to the people of Ohio; and maybe, even, he promised something or other to the people of the other forty-seven states. But he never promised anything to Indonesia. For one thing, there are no votes in Indonesia—not at least for Ohioans who happen to be running for the Senate. Frankly I sympathize with the Senator from Ohio.

The Senator is under heavy pressure. When the Marshall Plan was before Congress, somebody remembered that the Navajo Indians were having an awful time. Why vote money for Europeans when our own Americans—indeed, the original Americans—were in such a desperate fix? And you don't have to use the Navajos to make the same point. A lot of Americans are dirt poor without being Navajos. What about Santa Claus coming down their chimney for a change?

10

Or look at it through European eyes. When the Marshall Plan was voted, Congress argued that the money must be spent for Ameri-

can goods. Economists quickly pointed out that, since the dollar shortage was world-wide, a dollar let loose in Europe would find its way home to the American market anyhow, as surely as a carrier pigeon finds its loft. If Europe used it to buy South American goods because they were cheaper than ours, then South America would buy more from us and would have to send us the dollar. But the argument did not persuade our business interests.

The European, listening to that debate, wondered if the real purpose of the Marshall Plan—aside from hurting Russia by buying allies—might not be the purpose of paying Europe to haul away our surplus goods. Under our "free-enterprise" system, he reasoned, that surplus would choke our economy, cause unemployment, and bring on the depression which everybody, including the Americans, was predicting. The European took the needed aid but he wondered. If he had not, the Communists in his own country were there to remind him to wonder. They were shrieking that the real purpose of the Marshall Plan was to dump our goods on Europe, and make her a sort of economic colony of ours, like Latin America. But intelligent Europeans needed no Communists to tell them. Unlike most Americans, European non-Communists are accustomed to think freely in Marxist terms, whenever those terms seem useful.

Yet what would you have done had you been a Senator from Ohio, with a business lobby urging you to insist that Marshall dollars be spent at home where they came from? Remember, it really is true that the Marshall Plan is one of the supports of our prosperity. It acts like a huge WPA project—or, for that matter, like the arms program. It cuts down unemployment. And it boosts profits.

It probably did us less harm with European opinion to insist on having Marshall aid spent here than it did to interfere constantly with the normal trade relations between western Europe and eastern Europe—between the "free nations" and the "Soviet satellites." We interfered, of course, on the grounds that strategic war materials must be kept from flowing into the "Soviet orbit" beyond the Iron Curtain. But modern warfare is such that almost any goods can be considered strategic. Many non-Communist Europeans were eager to exchange their machine-made goods and machine tools for food from eastern Europe, and were not allowed to do so, or at least to do so enough. Yet our tariffs would not allow them to exchange their goods for food from here—wheat which was spoiling in the bins or potatoes into

which we pumped blue dye to keep them from depressing the market. The West European wondered if our object was really to rebuild a strong economy in Europe or to make Europe our economic and military colony. The Communist said it was the latter. But the Communist was not alone in charging that Marshall aid was American imperialism, thinly disguised.

To the congressman who felt America had been pretty darned generous—but who insisted that naturally America's interests, both economic and military, had to come first—the charge of imperialism from those we were helping sounded extremely ungrateful. So everybody distrusted and blamed everybody else.

11

The basic trouble was that Congress was trying to rebuild the economy of Europe (which in any case could not be done until Europe's world markets were rebuilt too) as an American project, subject quite naturally to considerations of America's general policy. Meanwhile, Europeans were attacking our motives, and they were attacking them far more vigorously than the American press led us to believe.

Asians were attacking us even more. Our financial aid to Europe was allowing the Dutch to shoot down the Indonesians who were fighting a war of independence. It allowed the French to shoot down the Indo-Chinese, and the British to shoot down Malaysians. Indeed, over a considerable period, the Marshall aid we sent France just about equaled what France spent suppressing the Indo-Chinese. To the Asian, Marshall aid was, even in theory, rebuilding a European standard of living already beyond Asia's wildest dreams. Practically, it was blocking Asia's efforts to throw out the white folks. No wonder America's popularity among the "free nations" of Asia sank rapidly.

I do not think our motives were as bad as they looked. The real trouble was that our foreign policy was based on a false assumption that did not take account of the facts. It was based on what I above called *False Assumption Number Two: that American "know-how" and American money can do the job.*

They cannot. The problem is not basically an American problem, for the people of America to settle. It is a world problem, for the people of the world—including us in America—to settle jointly. Con-

gress is playing Santa Claus and handing out peanuts to good little boys, who become ungrateful and critical; and skipping bad little boys, who hope to get even with Santa some day. For Congress to do the job without getting in this jam, Congress would have to include members elected from all over the world.

That is what lies behind the witty remark of a Paris journalist that he planned to take out American citizenship so he could have some influence on French affairs. Only a truly representative, truly international agency can handle this generation's problem, a sick world economy. All Congress can do that makes any sense is to resolve to call in the neighbors. If Congress insists on supporting the neighbors financially, on no matter how small a scale, Congress will eventually insist on governing them. Europeans know enough history to sense this fact. They know our policy must lead to imperialism, no matter how honest our intentions are now. So their charge of imperialism is quite justified.

If we insist on doing this job alone, it will prove beyond our powers; we will continue to vote peanuts for the world's hugest problem; the world will get sick of peanuts; there will be rebellions; we will call the rebels "Communists"; and then we will call out the Marines. But the world's accepted name for this procedure is "imperialism." The other thing we can do is to recognize that the world economy is a world problem, not one facet of an American foreign policy, not the fourth point of anything, but the first point on the world's agenda. The most we can do is to call in the neighbors, get the problem thoroughly discussed and understood, and offer to do our share to solve it—no more than our share, no less than our share.

12

That "free enterprise" can do the job better than government. This, I have already suggested, is False Assumption Number Three in our American discussion of the main problem. Even more than our assumption that the problem is merely an American problem, this free-enterprise assumption cannot possibly produce anything bigger than peanuts for what is the biggest constructive job of modern times.

The assumption that private capital can do the job runs head-on against a hard fact: there is not enough private capital available. Pri-

vate capital has other jobs to do. If we could solve the problem by leaving it to "business leadership," that would be fine. But we cannot. Private capital goes only where those who manage it think it can make the most money. That is one reason businessmen proudly call private enterprise "free enterprise." It is free to hunt maximum profit. It is free to enter underdeveloped areas if it likes. Does it? The hard fact is that it does not—not in anything like the quantities needed. From 1945 to 1948, outside of the Export-Import Bank, American business invested only two and one-tenth billion dollars in all foreign countries, including the foreign countries that least need developing.

Some businessmen, confronted with this hard fact, try to get around it by claiming that they would gladly invest in underdeveloped countries if they could trust the governments of those countries. They are afraid of "socialist" controls, of currency restrictions that would keep them from converting their profits into dollars, of labor restrictions that would prevent them from getting "cheap labor," even of having their business nationalized without adequate compensation. So they want "treaty concessions"—dangerous words in most parts of the world. Most dangerous precisely in those parts that most need economic development, for those are the parts that have been colonies of Europe. Those are the parts that have been forced for centuries to make "concessions." So again they smell imperialism.

American businessmen propose that Washington guarantee them against losses from local political "interference." If Washington does, it will have strong reason to put pressure on local governments not to interfere. "Imperialism again," says the colonial world. This is the kind of policy we simply cannot follow except through puppet governments, well armed against "socialist discontent"—a term we could quickly shorten to "communism."

But even if Washington could be persuaded to create by these measures what some of our businessmen call "a favorable climate for investment," it would not work. The job is too vast for American business, and it is the wrong job. All those who know the problem are agreed that the things these countries need are road systems, school systems, public sanitation, hospitals, agricultural experiment stations, electric power, irrigation, before the "free enterpriser" can do his stuff.

Roads? No use boosting crops if you cannot get them to market. Schools? An illiterate population cannot compete in the modern world of technology. Public sanitation? With millions of people

weakened by malaria, how can a country produce? Irrigation? Rich lands, without water, remain a desert, a desert that leaves the free-enterprise go-getter exactly where it leaves the Arab—helpless. What can he go and get? Sand?

In America the businessman *assumes* there are highways, that people can read his advertisements, that the population is reasonably healthy and productive, that government irrigation works are available where water is short. He had better stop assuming such things about the countries we are discussing here. If he knew the facts, he would have stopped assuming before the congressional hearings ever started.

13

"But," says the businessman, "private enterprise built *this* country!" No. It helped build it. At every stage government intervened. It drove out the Indians, the Dutch, the French, the Spaniards. It made gigantic grants of land to the men who built our railways. Through a high tariff it gave American business a near-monopoly of the home market. It constructed vast irrigation works. It supplied a public health service. Government, local or national, built our roads—almost three and a half million miles of them. It built schools and paid teachers. It provides constant services to businessmen today. It put a floor of cheap power, navigation, and soil conservation under the Tennessee Valley. For these are things which private individuals cannot do, or cannot do well, except through the one agency that represents the entire community—government.

Even so, we Americans were able to do a bigger share as individuals than many peoples could hope to do today. Compare, for example, the Mississippi Valley in our country with the Orinoco Valley in Venezuela. I happen to choose these because I have been in both, but there are many other examples. Not only is the Mississippi Valley one of the two richest agricultural areas on this planet—because God, not "the American way of life," made them that way—but it never offered the vast sanitation problems that the Orinoco does, not even in its southernmost reaches.

Or take Asia and Africa. They are in many portions already supporting dense populations. North America was almost empty when we took over. Endless stretches of rich land, unclaimed except by

sparse and primitive tribes, awaited our exploitation. In short, the parallel of our own national history cannot help us if we want to think about the real problem, instead of merely making patriotic speeches before congressional committees. And we should never forget that American history is quite well known in other countries, so that our speeches are likely to fall flat with the neighbors.

I may have sounded in these pages as if I were opposed to the American businessman. Far from it. He, too, can contribute, and contribute heavily, to the solution of our problem. But he cannot do it by exhibiting ignorance of American history, or ignorance of world geography, or ignorance of the history of European colonial management. You may be quite sure that those American businessmen who know these subjects are under no illusion that private business can solve this problem.

14

But there is one all-compelling reason that gives a silly sound to some of the recent testimony by business representatives. They have been urging that we turn over the world's most pressing problem to American private enterprise to solve for us. Let me invite the reader once more to play the game of "Let's pretend"—children's games are often wise. I promise that this time the game will be more cheerful to play. Let's pretend that you are a stockholder in a big American oil company. And let's pretend that the management thinks private enterprise should develop the underdeveloped countries. Since your company does a big business in Iraq, that will be a good place for them to begin.

Now Iraq, of course, is the ancient Mesopotamia, where the Babylonian and Assyrian and Chaldean civilizations flourished for centuries and passed away. It is a country of rich, deep, alluvial soil, brought down from the highlands by the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. Its crop yields astonished the ancient world as did the crop yields of ancient Egypt, which also came from alluvial river soil. To get those yields, successive governments built and regulated for many hundreds of years a complicated system of irrigation canals. After thousands of years that system was allowed to collapse, and Mesopotamia became a land of flood and drought, of endless marsh and burning desert.

Today, except for its oil, which foreigners are extracting from the

soil and extracting from the country, Mesopotamia—or Iraq—is a desperately poor land. The country where cuneiform writing was invented and where an exact astronomical science once flourished is largely illiterate. With the marshes came the mosquito, and with the mosquito came malaria. So now the people of Iraq are mostly sick. The canals, the ancient highways, are gone.

What can your oil company do about it? Rebuild the system of canals? If they try it, you had better forget about dividends for many years to come. Are you willing? You probably invested your savings in their stock because you thought the stock would pay dividends to you out of the profits the company would make from oil. In fact, I suspect their corporation charter strongly suggested that this would happen. I doubt if it says a word about rebuilding the economy of Iraq. Well, then, wouldn't you be morally justified in bringing a stockholder's suit? If you want to help the people in Iraq build their economy, you still might prefer to do it with other funds and perhaps funds of a different amount than the ones you invested in oil stock.

I think you would be justified. And I think the courts would agree with you. That is one reason there is very little danger that your investment in oil will be used to rebuild Iraq's canal system. Of course, the management may already have built a model village with some of your money, where they are pumping out Iraq oil. But they could argue reasonably in court that well-housed labor is more efficient and hence more profitable than people in hovels. I think the court would again agree. They might even argue that a lot of Iraqis were objecting that Iraq's chief natural resource was being piped out of Iraq without visibly improving the lot of the people of Iraq, and they might argue that an attractive workers' village would be good public relations. I think the court would agree. But it will be a long time before the share of your company's profits that stays in Iraq will build those canals. Or even Iraq's share of all the profits of all the foreign corporations likely to operate in Iraq.

15

The Iraqi Communists will suggest that a quicker way to accumulate the capital Iraq needs for basic public works would be to overthrow the present Iraqi government, confiscate your company's holdings, including the village your investment helped build, and use the oil profits to build the needed canals. To a wretched, sick, illiterate

population this program might make a good deal of sense—unless there is some other capital ready to build the canals.

If your oil company extracts oil in Venezuela, the details of this problem will differ, but not the basic problem. Thanks to royalties on oil, the Venezuelan government is one of the only two governments in the world that operate on the gold standard—which cannot be said of either Iraq or the United States; but the basic economy of Venezuela is in a very sorry state. One of the penalties a people pays for being poor, sick, and illiterate is that it is unlikely to have a government that can and will develop its basic economy, even if it gets money—either from royalties on oil or as a Washington hand-out.

The main point is that American corporations, organized and chartered for private profit, are quite unable to get the world economy in motion. Why have their spokesmen been loudly claiming they could and would? Maybe it has been ordinary ignorance of the problem. Maybe it has been a superstition that government should leave all problems of the public interest to private interests to attend to, and that this has been “the American way”—which it has not. Maybe they knew they could not do it but feared that, if public funds did do it, then Americans at home would demand more use of public funds for the same kind of things here. Maybe it was all these things. I simply do not know and I do not believe anybody else knows. In any case some or all of these factors caused us Americans to waste time discussing the problem on the basis of a fundamentally false assumption: that American private enterprise could do the job. The result of that kind of discussion could, and did, lead only to trivial sums of money. Meanwhile we will think more clearly about our problem and therefore discuss it better if we keep two hard facts in mind.

First, the American taxpayer will not let Washington take on this job alone, and he is right.

Second, the American investor will not let American business take it on, and he is right too.

16

The people of the world are alone able to take on what is the main economic problem of every single national group: the problem of rebuilding their common world economy. They can hope to do it only

by the massive use of public funds. America cannot do it for them. It might, of course, be done under Communist leadership, but that could come only through a Communist revolution. And it would be twisted to meet Russian needs in Russia's power struggle with America. The nearest thing to a suitable agency that already exists is the United Nations. And the United Nations is the nearest thing that exists only because the people of the world lack a common government.

A common government would be the proper agency, just as the common government of the forty-eight American states is the proper agency for the American people when they have to construct irrigation systems or take flood control measures that cross state boundaries or cost too much for single states to tackle. There are Americans who get angry whenever government is used that way, but most Americans agree with that well-known Republican, Abraham Lincoln, who said:

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do for themselves.

But the new world community has no common government. And while leading statesmen have declared that we must build one or destroy ourselves through further world wars with ever more murderous weapons, we are finding it hard to build in the midst of a world revolution. Without common government, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are condemned to threaten each other and to seek allies for the next war. The whole of human history bears witness that the world's two major powers would be doing this quite aside from the question of communism or capitalism.

The reason for this is terrifyingly simple: each is afraid of the other. Each claims it is arming only for defense. But the nature of arms is such that the U.S. cannot defend itself without becoming a threat to the U.S.S.R., and the U.S.S.R. cannot defend itself without becoming a threat to the U.S. This vicious circle has become clearer to Europeans than to Americans. Meanwhile, we fumble the problem if we suppose that, except for communism, we and the Russians would not be a threat to each other. What threatens all of us is the fact that the world's present political system—the system of sovereign nation states—is incapable of keeping peace in the world community

for more than brief periods. Meanwhile, the better our weapons get, the worse our wars get.

No human community has ever lived in peace for long without a government. The new world community will prove no exception to this rule. It is unrealistic to expect it to. Those who have discovered why a "world government" is necessary are accused of being "idealistic"; but only the most starry-eyed "idealist" can expect the new world-wide community which science and invention have created to be unlike all previous human communities and to get along without common government. In any case, the chances are overwhelming that it will get a common government, either by mutual agreement or by conquest. That is why so many human beings in the world fear and distrust both Russia and America. Both of them look like strong candidates for world empire. On the one hand, they seem to believe more and more in the use of force—in "getting tough," as we Americans love to say. The rest of the world is not surprised that each claims to be a peace-loving nation. The ancient Romans loved peace too—and imposed it by force on others.

17

But there is a frightful obstacle to getting a common government by mutual consent. I am not speaking of the world community's many races or its many languages or its national jealousies or its different religions. Racism seems either silly or vicious to more and more men today—even white men, who have had a vested economic interest in racism. Language barriers are awkward, but they can be surmounted. Nationalism is violent today in countries that are fighting for national independence, particularly in Asia and Africa. But in the independent countries, nationalist feeling is beginning to look to more and more people like comic opera, and this for two simple reasons. First, economic nationalism squeezes hard on a great many people. Second, national governments can no longer offer their peoples even reasonable military security, not even by taxing them half to death and conscripting their strongest young men to boot. As to religion, there are not many parts of the planet where people are determined to force their religion on their neighbors or to refuse to live under a common government with neighbors of a different creed.

None of these obstacles to a common government is decisive. There

is a much more serious obstacle. It is an obstacle that the philosopher Plato was speaking of when he said that most cities were not really one city but two—the city of the rich and the city of the poor. In the last century a Conservative prime minister of Britain wrote a novel under the subtitle, "The Two Nations"—the rich and the poor. History suggests that wherever a community is too sharply divided between rich and poor, one of two things happens: either the "city of the poor" rises and overthrows the other "city" or this other city imposes order by force on the city of the poor. If our generation were to set up a common government for the world community, before it moved aggressively to revive the world's economy, one of these two fates would sorely threaten it. In contemporary terms, the world government would be under heavy pressure to go Communist or to go Fascist.

The City of the Rich, based largely on the economy of the United States, sees this problem less clearly than does the City of the Poor—the hungry, half-naked, diseased, and mostly colored millions. If Americans propose to them a common government "to keep law and order" in the world-wide City of Man, to control "the bomb," and let us all enjoy life in peace, then those who are not enjoying life and who fear the bomb much less than they fear famine may well be unmoved. There is a lot of ease and abundance in America for a bomb to destroy, so we go to bed at night asking, "How can we sleep?" But they ask, "When do we eat?" Those questions measure a yawning gulf between the Two Cities—cities that really do need one government. It is true that man shall not live by bread alone, but should this particular statement by Jesus Christ be quoted between meals to those who have had no meal at all?

Another way to state the problem of the Two Cities is to say that though law and order have to be *enforced* in human communities by means of government, no government enforces them for long that does not bother about justice. Today the City of the Poor might well wish to know whether the City of the Rich really cares, before setting up political housekeeping with it. Nothing would reassure it more quickly or surely than a frontal assault by the whole City on the unspeakable misery of most of its inhabitants. That is why President Truman's "Point Four" remarks, even though timid and vague, briefly stirred not only the consciences of Americans but the hopes of men throughout the planet. The discussion which followed those re-

marks has now bogged down, because the false assumptions on which it was based could not sustain its weight. So "Point Four" has become a gimmick in the cold war against Russia; and the problem back of the cold war, back of the Korean catastrophe, and even back of World War III, if that should break out before these words are in print—that problem has not been tackled.

How can it be tackled? Not by the American government, for reasons we have seen. Not by American business, for reasons even easier to see. Not by the common government of mankind, for mankind has no common government. The nearest thing to a common government that mankind has is the United Nations. Can the United Nations tackle the job?

18

It might. It would stand a better chance if its delegates were elected directly by the people of the world and not appointed by national governments with national policies. It would stand a better chance if it had some way of getting the money it needs, directly from the people and not by begging it from the national governments. This way, appropriations remain laughably small, and many governments stay in arrears even on these small appropriations. **And False Assumption Number Four is that the job can be done on the basis of small yearly appropriations.**

World War II cost mankind, in money spent and property destroyed, about two trillion dollars—plus blood and tears. Mankind gives the United Nations each year about one fifty-thousandth part of that sum. Still, it is a straw in the wind that the job we are talking about is one of the few things America, Russia, and every other member government in the United Nations have agreed on, even though their appropriations for that job have been absurdly small. The chief trouble with the United Nations has been that, on the one hand, too many people thought it could prevent war by police action, which its organization almost guaranteed it could not do; and too few people realized that it could, in economic and social matters, do a very great deal. As a result, we fastened our eyes on the Security Council, where the name-calling goes on; we starved the Economic and Social Council; and we starved its specialized agencies. But even if we took "Ecosoc" and the agencies off their diet of peanuts and gave them money to work with, there would still remain a tough problem.

"Ecosoc," like the rest of the United Nations, is a creature of national governments, responsible to national governments, and therefore subject to the whims of national governments. It must live from hand to mouth; as national governments let it. But the job of getting the world's economy in motion must be done by a stronger, more stable agency than that. I believe that this country's experience with the Tennessee Valley Authority is the key to our problem.

Americans who happen not to travel in foreign countries cannot, I believe, imagine the prestige that TVA enjoys on our planet. Foreigners were not so impressed by Hiroshima and Nagasaki as we Americans were. They were shocked, but they did not admire. The destruction of those two cities by atomic bombs appears to many foreigners still as a moral stain on our fair name. This judgment is not restricted to pro-Communists. Foreigners are shocked, but often quite unimpressed, by our perpetual talk of the frightful new weapons we are preparing. They cannot see how an atomic war could possibly solve any of the world's basic problems. The overwhelming majority do not go into ecstasies over the capitalist system or the American way of life or free enterprise or the profit incentive.

But what they do profoundly admire is the way we strengthened the economy of the Tennessee Valley. In their minds the initials TVA go with the initials USA. For TVA, though limited to a single river system, indeed to only one tributary river system of the vast Mississippi Valley, nevertheless laid down the basic pattern for the frontal assault on poverty. The capital that was needed for the job did not come out of forced labor in the Tennessee Valley under the discipline of a dictatorship. It came out of public funds advanced from the capital accumulation of the entire American community of which Tennessee was one "underdeveloped" part. Finally, the prosperity it brought about in the Valley stepped up the economy of the entire American community.

19

Now it is worth noting that "the Authority" that did this job was not a regular government department, subject to political patronage and battling every year for government appropriations. True, it was a creature of Congress; it had to report annually to Congress; it could even be abolished at any time by Congress. But as long as it was not

abolished, it could be decisive and flexible and responsible like a good private corporation. It could buy, sell, negotiate contracts, and sign on the dotted line. Also, it was a *public* corporation, and, although it might make "profits" on a given deal, it could not distribute those profits to private stockholders. The stockholders were the American people, who had put up the initial capital. The "board of directors" were the Congress, elected by the stockholders. And the policy the directors had laid down for management was to make the Valley prosper, in a way that no private corporation could.

Truly, this Authority was an extraordinary invention. It was something of a hybrid. It was "political" in the best sense: it was ultimately responsible to the people. But it followed many of the practices for which we praise sound business and for the lack of which we denounce government bureaucracies. To countless foreigners, it is the American answer to the challenge of communism and the only genuine alternative to the social revolution the Communists claim is necessary. As an American answer, it is much more impressive to foreigners than the atomic bomb is. The atomic bomb looks to them like an effort to get out of answering at all, like an attempt to dodge the world problem which the Russians claim they are solving. Let us never forget that the rest of the world is determined that their most urgent problem shall be solved, not dodged.

20

A "TVA of the World" may sound to the reader like big-time talk—too big-time. Anyhow, a World Development Authority may not be the precise gadget to do the job. I did not write this book to persuade people it was. All I hope for is to have us look squarely at mankind's most urgent problem and to talk about it realistically, not on the false assumptions that communism is the problem, or that "Point Four" should be run from Washington with money put up by the American taxpayer, or that the whole program should be left to American private business, or that it can be done by small, uncertain, yearly appropriations to the UN. If we drop these false assumptions, if we start looking at the real facts about the human race, if we talk about them as members of the human race, if we stop planning *for* the rest of the race and start planning *with* them, we will find a way to handle this business. It is a vaster problem than any our grandfathers

faced, but we have vaster means of solving it. There are people who dread hard jobs and who want to solve their problems with grandfather's means. But life is not like that. The same revolution in science and industrial techniques that put the One World problem in our laps put the means of handling it at our feet. We ought either to imitate the courage of our forefathers, who tackled big problems for their day, or else stop praising them. Praise by cowards or sluggards is an insult to heroes.

Besides, is it so much vaster than the problem of defeating Hitler in World War II? It should certainly be a lot cheaper. Walter Reuther estimates that our annual share of financing this peace offensive ought to be approximately one-hundredth of what World War II cost us. Senator McMahon proposed in February that our share ought to be ten billions a year. Senator McMahon shrinks from adding that much to our budget unless we first get international agreements that would let us cut our arms program by that much. Yet, a few months later, he and his fellow-senators voted that extra ten billions quickly to finance our intervention in Korea and permit other military interventions. The costs of World War III, toward which we are now heading, would make ten billion dollars look like chicken-feed.

No, we are still arguing about "Point Four," which is today a gimmick in the cold war like "The Voice of America" or civilian defense. Gimmicks with a ten-billion-dollar price tag are too high, even for the U.S. What we should be arguing about is not a gimmick for our present foreign policy, but a new and quite different policy. We should be shifting from the policy of "containing Russia" to the policy of joining the human race and doing our share to see that the human race dwells on this planet with decency and dignity. Once we make up our minds that that is our policy, we will call in the neighbors and with them find a way.

Nevertheless, although the facts which make it necessary to call in the neighbors do not depend on any single proposal of how we and the neighbors might do the job, it is not too early for each man among us to use whatever imagination he has and to talk out loud about what he is able to imagine. If you now agree that the neighbors must be called in, that the job must be done, it matters very little indeed whether you agree with the rest of this pamphlet. Because from now on I shall be imagining; and I hope that you can imagine something better. I wish that every man or woman who reads these

words would think of something better, and talk about it with his neighbors. Then we would get some action. And the world would begin to hope again.

21

Anyhow, here goes. The modern world is largely governed by corporations. For example, even before Pearl Harbor, over two-thirds of the manufacturing facilities in the United States were owned and operated by only two hundred and fifty giant corporations. Between the two world wars, many big corporations made trade agreements, called "cartels," to control world markets. Now, because these giant corporations are run for private profit and often act against the public interest, the American government sometimes hales them into court. Moreover, our policy in Occupied Germany—or perhaps our publicly declared policy—was to break up the international cartels. The fact remains that, though the modern corporation often acts irresponsibly, dangerously, and oppressively, it is the chief modern device for getting big jobs done.

Congress recognized this when it set up TVA as a *public* corporation, responsible to Congress. This pamphlet suggests that the UN set up a public corporation to do a job for the people of the world and that they give it so much money that men and women in every country will know that they mean business and can deliver. On the day that money was set aside, and long before the WORLD DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY could plan its wise investment, hope would sweep the world where now fear holds it paralyzed. That day would be one of the great historic dates of the present century.

I would like to add a second suggestion. Voting for representatives in the "Peoples' World Assembly," which Mr. Reuther has proposed, would be one way of participating. But going down in your jeans to support their recommendations is another. I would like to see the Assembly issue long-term World Peace Bonds, including low-priced "baby bonds," that men and women everywhere could buy. I should like to see the face of the bond declare that the only "interest" the bond paid was the interest of all of us—world peace. I believe the human race would invest. I believe you and I would invest. Millions of men and women have agonized as they watched the third World War approach. Millions of men and women have cried in their hearts,

or out loud to their neighbors: "This is madness, but what can *I* do?" I would have us answer that question. The funds thus raised would allow the Peoples' World Assembly to make loans to the Development Authority without waiting for the UN and the national governments it now depends on—even for the salaries of its own personnel. I think men and women everywhere would heave a sigh of relief that they had an agency of their own choosing, able to use their own money, to tackle the human problem which national governments are so slow to tackle.

If we did these things, I think the national governments would find out which way the wind is really blowing; they would quickly fall in line.

22

National governments need an example. The human race is engaged in a shoot-the-chute toward world-wide catastrophe. The brutal fact is that, as the world's economy has knit mankind closer and closer together, national governments begin to look like local governments—with each local government running an armed camp. That is why so much military policy today affects us as if Delaware should suddenly arm to the teeth, arrest spies, shriek that it was being encircled by New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, and start playing footsie with Connecticut and Ohio. It is like one of those musical comedies in the movies, with the scene laid in some unknown, Balkan Ruritania, a comedy in which the Grand Duke (who loves the chambermaid) has an army of extras that march across the stage and then dash back again behind scenes so as to look like an army without unduly burdening the company's payroll. And international politics since V-J Day really would be comedy if they would quit using live ammunition. It is the slaughter that keeps us from laughing and makes us weep.

But the Peoples' World Assembly, which Mr. Reuther has wisely imagined, would win the respect which national governments are so rapidly losing. It could substitute statesmanship for "politics," because its assignment would be real. Its "bold, new program" could be really bold, where Mr. Truman's was condemned by nationalism to be timid. True, it could not be "new," any more than Mr. Truman's could be, because economic development programs have been carried

on for some years now and have created a rich pool of technical experience. They have merely been too small to meet our enormous need.

The Reuther program could appeal to the common sense and human decency in the American people and silence our prattle, at congressional hearings on ECA or "Point Four," about "enlightened self-interest."

I may be blinded by the love I bear my own country, but I have seen no people in my travels more willing to do their share. And when a barn in the neighborhood catches fire, we do not stand around thinking about our enlightened self-interest before we pitch in with the neighbors. If lately we have seemed to, that is because we did not grasp the problem—a problem that was equally theirs and ours.

23

But the UN is dominated by local national governments that own it, pay for it, and want to use it for their local purposes. Suppose it is not allowed to set up a World Development Authority. What shall we do? Will anybody act?

Well, I have wondered why the churches have not acted. Intermittently, for nearly two thousand years, they have cleared land, taught farming and medicine, as well as just plain reading and writing. If asked whether they were helping Russia or hurting her, they could answer—I trust without embarrassment—that they were acting under orders from Jesus Christ and were prepared to take whatever consequences might follow. But, unless they were prepared to make the Great Proposal in such a form that a self-respecting Moslem, or Buddhist, or indeed atheist, could accept it, I doubt if they would get much help. Are they prepared to do that?

I have wondered, too, why a small group of men, from many different countries but internationally known and trusted, did not meet somewhere in the world and issue the call to action. They could then set up the public corporation that could get things going.

Finally, I have wondered whether my generation has enough moral energy to set up the needed Authority by whatever method. It is so much easier to compete than to co-operate, so much easier to fight than to build. Our generation has been partially barbarized by two world wars and by planning for a third. If our statesmen are pygmies,

I suppose we have ourselves to thank: we chose them—more or less.

In any case, it is not certain that our America is the place to launch such an idea. In 1776 we were a new and daring—and, in the eyes of others, dangerous and revolutionary—country, defying Europe's feudal traditions and declaring to the whole of mankind that all men are born free and equal. When we use words like that today, they do not carry conviction to the rest of mankind. Of all the industrially advanced countries, we are easily the most conservative, the most fearful of change, certainly the least interested in the idea of equality. Perhaps it is merely that we are the richest. Perhaps we must suffer dreadful catastrophe before we can share again the hopes of the less fortunate—that is, of the rest of the human race. Our sense of moral superiority and of our own benevolence cuts us off from the others. Maybe somebody else must make the Great Proposal, must call in the neighbors from all the Mighty Neighborhood.

24

And yet—and yet, we ought to be able to make it somehow. It was we who said that all are free and equal. It was our separate sovereign states that first showed the world how to build common political and economic institutions to handle the problems of all the men and women in them, regardless of what nation they live in. It was we who developed mass production to put goods in the hands of millions. It was our economy that men from every continent on earth built with their brain and brawn. It was when speaking of us that a great German immigrant, Carl Schurz, declared that America was a colony of mankind. The wealth of the world is concentrated in our land. Two world wars that very nearly shattered the rest of the world's economies put only a forced draft under ours, here beyond broad oceans which the weapons of neither war could pass. Must this incredible good luck leave us blind, self-righteous, belligerent, threatening to "get tough"? Or shall it wake us up from the dream-world of nationalism and conservatism in which we live, give us the will to open our eyes to the world of fact, to the world we really live in, a world which—despite the fear and frustration of these wasted years—is still one world?

If we do open our eyes, we shall quickly see what needs doing, and we shall ourselves call in the neighbors. We shall say to them: "We

have all been wasting time and wasting words. We have been wasting lives. We have been wasting the chance to act like men. Let us take common counsel for our common cause."

25

But let's be frank with ourselves. We have of late been forming habits of fear, not hope. We may go on as we have gone: arming, taxing ourselves, crying that the godless are at our gates. If we do, I think that all mankind will be heavily punished, the guiltless with the guilty. Part of our punishment will be that, refusing to see the world's oneness or our common destiny, we shall suffer each in his separate nation. A further collapse in the world economy would bring famine to India but not to us. It would bring us unemployment instead, and on a vast scale—poverty in the midst of plenty. We would have sent our sons all over the globe to put down revolution, and we would probably be rewarded in the long run by revolution at home. I have not urged this as the reason for acting, because I do not believe that the best reason for health is to escape the painful symptoms of disease. The best reason for health is this: a healthy man is a complete and proper man.

But if we insist on treating symptoms, I think that mankind—and particularly that little portion of it called American—is in for very rough weather. Perhaps a third World War may be needed to teach us. If so, when it is over, we may still arise and act. The tools to work with may by then have been nearly destroyed and the work may by that time be much harder to do. But there is a chance that we may have more wisdom too. And wisdom, armed with simple tools, might succeed where rich folly had failed.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

If the reader wants the judgment of experts on the things that I have said in this pamphlet, a lot has been written on the subject. I advise him to begin with eight pamphlets ("Bold New Program Series"), published by The Public Affairs Institute, 312 Pennsylvania Avenue S.E., Washington, D.C. Price of set: \$2.50. These pamphlets give facts and figures and also many references to additional works.