



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series V: Writings, 1909-1963, undated.

Reel
176

Box
64

Folder
349a

The decline of the individual, 1934-1937.

THE DECLINE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

To the Oberlin Public Affairs Society
October 3, 1934

The problem of the one and the many, of the individual and society, is one of the most fundamental and continuing problems in human thought. How to insure the fullest expression of the individual without disrupting society, and how to co-ordinate personal freedom with group responsibility,---that has been the major problem of sociology. The pendulum has, throughout the ages, swung between the extremes of unlimited individualism and absolute social control, between the exaltation of the individual and his submergence.

Man begins historically as an indistinguishable member of a strongly co-ordinated community. He develops into greater freedom of thought and action as the life of the community moves into the higher ranges of civilization. In eras of decadence, individualism degenerates into anarchic subjectivism, turns anti-social and actually tends to destroy the individual.

There are epochs when the social gospel must be stressed, because individual privilege has been allowed to exploit the group. This has been true of our times when the masses which possess considerable formal political and economic freedom, do in actual practice enjoy very little of either. They are in large measure dependent upon political organizations and economic arrangements in the control of a minority which systematically exploits them. There are other times when the essential rights of the individual must be championed in the face of a dangerous encroachment of group tyranny.

Professor Eucken, in his essay "Society and the Individual" called attention forcibly to "the anti-individualistic influence of the tremendous accession of strength which has fallen to the part of the state in the course of the 19th century. This accession has been due for the most part to economic complications in the face of which every merely individual effort has seemed hopeless...The increasing complication, the technical development of civilization, demands a closer correlation of the separate forces and more organization of the whole, and therefore calls for a guiding centre. (Today we call it central planning)....Thus the visible power of the state and the invisible power of society are united against the independence of the individual"....

If that judgment of Professor Eucken held good when it was written in the days before the World War, how much more pertinent and re-enforced is it today, with state and class dictatorship riding in triumph through two thirds of the civilized world.

The post war era has been dominated by the idea of state corporateness to a far greater degree than the one which preceded it. The power and authority of the state have been augmented even in those countries where no dictatorship has been established. "The tremendous accession of strength which has fallen to the part of the state in the 19th century" is nothing in comparison to the accession of strength, control, and authority which has fallen to the part of the state since the beginning of the third decade of the 20th century.

The 19th century witnessed the triumph of bourgeois society which sought to delimit as far as possible the powers and functions of the State and to extend and establish the rights of the individual. The development of private capitalism in the 19th century necessitated and achieved a large measure of freedom for the individual and a sharply circumscribed corporate control. The 20th century is witnessing the final collapse of this system of unrestricted competitive individualism.

✓ Everywhere the state is stepping in to check the power and authority of the individual. The democratic apparatus which middle-class individualism created to safeguard its rights is being pushed aside or discarded. Bolshevism, Fascism, and Nazism have this one thing in common:---they are all champions of maximum state authority. The state, they claim, must have absolute dictatorial power over the whole life of man. The individual has no inalienable rights---no areas forever exempted from group control and interference. Mussolini declared: "Here, as in Russia, we are advocates of the collective significance of life, and we wish to develop this at the cost of individualism".

✓ There are spiritual advantages to a doctrine of collectivism as against the doctrine of private exploitation and careerism which characterized our passing civilization. Both Judaism and Christianity always doctrinally subordinated the private ambitions of the individual to the well-being of society as a whole. The highest good was the social good. Man was taught to discover the real significance of his own life in enterprises which contributed to the upbuilding of the perfect society. (Primitive Christianity was actually communistic in its social structure and so were the monastic brotherhoods which derived from it. The whole purpose of the Mosaic Jubilee legislation, touching land tenure and sale, as well as the whole tenor of the social message of the prophets of Israel, was to discourage the exploitation of the individual at the expense of the group.

Neither Judaism nor Christianity has therefore anything to fear from the spread of the doctrine of the socialized community and the collective life which is likely to dominate the New Era. All spiritual movements of mankind had this ideal at the core of their inspiration. The peaceful, neighborly, cooperative life has been the goal of all the weary marches of civilization. All religious education has been directed towards training men to think less in terms of personal career and success and more in terms of co-worker in a common social enterprise. Life is again vindicating classic religious ethics, in that the cooperative commonwealth is actually coming to be, and in the future it will go hard with the lone wolf, the predatory exploiter, the anti-social omniverous man.)

✓ The danger lies in the excessive zeal and over-reaching on the part of the state which may lead to the complete subjugation of the individual and which in time may prove fatal to his spiritual life. Our experience of the last decade and a half in different parts of the world with experiments in the corporate society, in Communism, in State Socialism, in State Capitalism, or in the corporative state, has given men ground for fear that the individual is being sacrificed in the process of economic and political coordination.

✓ Whether the suppression of the individual is only a necessary incident in the transition from one social order to another and freer social order or whether together with dictatorship it will become a permanent feature of the new social order is for the present a matter of conjecture. But for the time being at least it is alarming to behold in the lands where the corporate ideal of the state has made the greatest headway the total conscription of the individual in the service of the autocratic state. All thought is regimented. Education becomes propaganda. Every writer becomes a functionary of the state. Attempts are made, as in Germany, to make even the church an adjunct and a propaganda agency for the political state, a mouthpiece for its dogmas and pretensions. The right of the individual to quest for himself in the fields of the mind and the spirit are denied. A new orthodoxy has been enthroned. It is now proclaimed that absolute truth as regards social ethics, government and economics, even private morality, has already been revealed. It is in the safekeeping of a minority political group---a new priestly hierarchy. The individual must accept the dogma of the regime, unquestioningly and submissively or he is anathema. This new state absolutism, backed by its vast punitive power is far more dangerous than the old and now discredited absolutism of the church. The latter was frequently held in check by the secular arm of government. At least the secular and the ecclesiastical attenuated each other's powers. But with the decline in the political power of the church, and the ascendancy of the absolute authoritarian State, the individual is at the complete mercy of the latter, without recourse and without refuge.

It is quite possible that in the New Era organized religion will have to assume the role of the sole surviving champion of the rights of the individual. This necessity the Christian church in Germany has already been faced with, but for the time being, at least, the German Evangelical church has succumbed to the totalitarian state. It has been coordinated. The point of view of Dr. Krause, ganleiter of the Berlin section of the German Christians has won the day. "National Socialists must not be judged from a Biblical standpoint; it is the Bible and the Church which must be judged from a Nazi standpoint. The Nazi state embodies the totality of God".

In the face of the amazing pretensions of the state, it behooves all religious disciples to insist that man possesses certain rights over which the state, however noble its purposes and however exalted its program, has no power whatsoever. There are sovereign rights which are man's by virtue of his humanity and not by virtue of his citizenship in a given political group. Man has other relationships and other obligations than those to his country. There is the whole of mankind. There is the universe as a whole. There is his own inner spiritual microcosm. There is God.

The New Era is being ushered in by way of dictatorships. Whether they are passing or permanent it is impossible to say. It is well to remember, however, that dictatorships do not of themselves and as a matter of course pass over into democracies. They do not liquidate themselves. These dictatorships, wherever established, have so far been characterized by their utter ruthlessness. This is true both of capitalistic dictatorships, and of communistic. The latter in its revolutionary zeal to attain quickly the good life actually sacrifices all the values which men have always identified with the good life. We have entered an age of sanctified ruthlessness and exalted brutality. But even more dangerous than the terrible toll of victims of physical violence is the tragic toll of victims of the spiritual and intellectual violence. Men are driven into terrified silence. Conformity is prescribed. Men dare not dissent. All opposition, all parties, all dissenting opinion in press, pulpit, classroom, platform and book is stamped out. That this is fatal to man's spiritual life is easily apparent. It tends to dry up the well-springs of man's spiritual creativeness. It destroys the soil and roots of his moral growth. When man is not allowed to stand alone, to dissent from the majority, to proclaim the truth which has been born in him through his own soul's travail, his spiritual life is destroyed. Revelations never come to groups. At best, to quote Pestalozzi, the collective existence of our race can only civilize us; it cannot cultivate us. There were schools of prophets in ancient Israel, but they were merely monitors of ancient superstitions. It was only after the individual separated himself from the school and the group and pursued his own solitary quest of truth that prophecy discovered its authentic voice and mood.

The New Era may thus burden the church and synagogue with another task--- to save man from the dark heresy of sanctified ruthlessness and brutality at the behest of a new politico-economic Messianism and to safeguard man's spiritual and intellectual freedom in a world constricted by the encompassing wall of dictatorship.)

Side by side with the doctrine of the absolute, totalitarian state, runs the doctrine of competitive nationalism and intolerant racialism, both of which victimize the individual. There is a nationalism which is as instinctive as one's love of home and family and friends. It requires no artificial indoctrination and no propaganda. It is neither exclusive, intolerant nor militant. It is not a cunning tool in the hands of economic imperialism. But the western world is harassed and ridden today by a nationalism which makes a mockery of this simple, wholesome patriotism and employs it as a blind for shameless exploitation. The love of one's country is put under option by those who control the policies of government. A cabal of industrialists, financiers, bankers and munition makers prescribes what the government shall do,---and the individual, bound hand and foot before hand by the mandates of this newer nationalism, is delivered over to the drill sergeant. The youth of the world is being stampeded today into group intolerance and arrogant provincialism and into the shambles of another war by this disgraceful strategy. The individual seems helpless in the face of this cunningly stimulated mob-patriotism. The universal ideal which fired the imagin-

ation of the best minds of Europe in the 18th and early 19th centuries,---the idea of a federated world wherein a man at one and the same time could be a citizen of his country and a citizen of the world---the ideal which enlarged man's estate and set him free for a spiritual career beyond the narrow boundaries of his own land---this ideal, so thoroughly Christian and so thoroughly Jewish---has been pushed out of men's minds by the command of a restrictive, truculent and arrogant nationalism. Internationalism, today, in many lands is blackest heresy. The youth of the world is being taught to think not in terms of international human solidarity, but in terms of exclusive, aggressive and jealous national loyalties. One is first and foremost a German, a Frenchman, an Italian, a Pole, and only secondarily and not always necessarily a son of man, a child of God. Modern nationalism has unquestionably ghettoized the individual and confined him to a little corner in a fragmentized and disintegrated world.

In some parts of the world, nationalism is still further being narrowed by the concept of race. Nation has been made synonymous with race. Only those belonging to the racial stock of the dominant majority are recognized as citizens. All others are disfranchised and politically, economically and socially degraded. This has been particularly true in Nazi Germany where race idolatry has run riot to a point where all human virtues have been subordinated to it. (Hitler declared, in one of his recent outbursts, "I prefer a German deserter to a Jewish hero".)....

It is clear that in a state where race becomes the criterion and prerequisite for rights and preferment, the individual is sacrificed. It is no longer a matter of personal character or ability, but of hereditary fatalism. One's claim to equality can no longer be based upon a shared human destiny or upon worth or merit, but upon a factor which is beyond the individual's control,---ancestry.

Unfortunately, pseudo-scientific propaganda for racial imperialism is widespread in the world today. The doctrine of racial superiority was used as a cover for the vicious motives of the last war. It has always been a blind for economic imperialism. The people in the South used it as an excuse for exploiting the colored man and for denying him his elementary human rights and his legitimate opportunities. The white man's burden becomes the black man's curse, and the brown man's and the yellow man's.

It has again been invoked in present day Germany, as a camouflage for economic reaction, which is defending itself with such desperation, as inflammable propaganda material for the purposes of political incitement and stampede in order to achieve certain objectives which calm reason would fail to achieve, and as compensation for all the rights and liberties which a Fascist dictatorship takes away from the citizens.

Some peoples which have a large element of mysticism in their make-up are particularly addicted to race idolatry. Mysticism is at bottom religious romanticism and romanticism is essentially an historic throw-back, a hankering after older forms of social life and organization, a retroversion to herd mores, folkways and myths, to what is thought to be the protoplasmic racial soul. A hundred years ago Heinrich Heine called attention to this recurrent manifestation of mysticism among the German people. In Nazism, the German mass is again manifesting these strong mystic, primitivist and collectivist tendencies. Race has again surged to the forefront of popular obsession and the cosmopolitan spirit of Lessing, Herder, Schiller, Goethe and Kant is, for the time being, homeless in Germany.

It is not necessary for me at this time to point out the fallacies of this economically motivated race propaganda---this artificial division of mankind into "Herreuerasse" and "Untermenschen". There is, of course, no pure race in the world. The story of racial fusions which have gone on every where in historic and pre-historic times has been sufficiently attested by anthropology and archaeology, and is sufficiently convincing to everyone but the propagandist who has an axe to grind. And there are no superior races. There are no races endowed by nature

with superior qualities of mind and character. There are races more favored with circumstances, by environment, by geographical position, by the fertility of the soil, or by the treasures underneath the soil. There are advanced races and backward races. There are differences between races but no biologic gradations. And no race has a monopoly upon genius or creative capacity.

Dr. Paul Radin in his recent work, "The Racial Myth", wisely remarks: "In terms of a generation, we may, at times, get the impression that ability is confined to a specific corner of the earth and to specific peoples. When the time unit, however, is lengthened to two generations, doubt begins to arise; and when it is further lengthened to a century, our initial impression proves to be completely incorrect. Then it is born in upon us that Europe is an indivisible cultural unit; that race, nationality, language and religion, and social status are secondary. The Catholic agnostic Laplace is found side by side with the Protestant agnostic Kant, and the devout Protestant sectarian Faraday with the devout Catholic Pasteur; the history of the theory of relativity passes in continuous procession from the Russian Lobatchewsky to the Hungarian Bolyai, the German Riemann, the Russian Jew Minkowsky, the the South German Jew Einstein; wireless telegraphy begins experimentally with the Englishman Faraday, is given mathematical expression by the Scotchman Clerk Maxwell, proved experimentally by the German Jew Hertz, and obtains practical application by the Italian Marconi."

Racial conceits and pretensions are ripe in the world today and as long as these race mythologies and blood cults persist so long will the individual as such be disadvantaged and world unity will remain, as heretofore, an unrealized dream.

There is far more race idolatry in the world today than ever before in the history of mankind. There was no color line in antiquity. The Greeks were conscious of their cultural superiority but they did not attribute it to biology. They claimed excellency on the basis of their civilization, not their blood. The Romans were splendid racial cosmopolites. Roman citizenship was not restricted to any one racial group within the far-flung empire. Roman citizenship which at first was the privilege of only the few who lived in Rome was soon extended to the limits of the empire and under Caracalla it was universalized throughout the vast empire. The Jew was proud not of his race but of his religion, and the proselyte to the faith was welcomed into the life of the race. The Jews regarded themselves as the chosen people not because of their racial traits but because of having been selected to be the servants of Jahweh to carry His moral law to the world. They were a covenanted people, a kingdom not of supermen but of priests...Their prophets kept them from excessive pride by reminding them:

"Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto Me
"O children of Israel? saith the Lord.
"Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt
"And the Philistine from Caphtor
"And Aram from Kir?"

Yahweh was the God of all nations. Israel's prerogative lay only in arduous moral and religious pioneering. When that ceased, when Israel no longer wished to bear the burden of religious leadership, it knew itself to be rejected of God.

The Jew refused to inter-marry not on the ground that the resultant racial admixture would produce an inferior type, less gifted artists, scientists, or musicians. There was but one reason throughout the ages: "Lest he will turn away thy son from following Me, that they may serve other Gods". The Jew persisted in racial uniqueness in order to preserve the integrity of his faith. The heathen who was a scholar was held in far higher repute by the rabbis than an ignorant High Priest who could trace his descent from Aaron himself.

In its highest ethical ranges, the law of Israel drew no line of distinction between native and foreigner. "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you. And thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt".

Christianity, of course, took over the prophetic, universalistic concept from Judaism, emphasized it, enlarged upon it, and carried it to the far corners of the earth. "The God that made the world and all nations therein, he, being Lord of Heaven and earth....made of one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth". The organic racial oneness of the whole human family is nowhere in the Bible more clearly and forcibly enunciated. And again: For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him". The entire concept of race which is fatalistic and exclusive is subordinated to the concept of faith which is volitional and all-inclusive. "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise". (Gal. 3.29).

It is therefore no accident that Nazi racialists have been led to a repudiation of both the Old and the New Testaments and are invoking anew the dethroned tribal Gods of primitive, heathen Germany. And it is no accident either that the great Christian leaders of present day Germany have clearly seen the menace in atavistic Nazi racialism to the spirit and mission of their historic faith and are so strenuously resisting it.

The Middle Ages knew very little of that racial chauvinism which is so rampant in our day. There was no talk of race purity in the Middle Ages. It was with the rise of nationalism and of colonial imperialism among the Northwestern European peoples, particularly during the last century, and the consequent exploitation of the backward races that the necessity arose for some ideologic justification of such exploitation. It soon appeared in the form of pseudo-scientific theories of race superiority. These theories gained prestige and popularity as the European peoples proceeded to conquer, subject and despoil backward peoples. Some apologists even employed High Church terminology such as "Bearing the White Man's Burden" to savor the miserable mess of imperialistic pottage, by means of which European peoples robbed other races of their birthright of freedom. And, again, the "White Man's burden" became the black man's curse and the brown man's and the yellow man's.

Modern nationalism has fallen under the blight of this race idolatry, particularly among a people like the Germans who are not empire-builders and therefore politically provincial and among whom national unity is a quite recent achievement and hence still a matter of hallelujah. The novel doctrine is now being loudly proclaimed that a nation must be racially homogenous and every national within the state who can not trace his ancestry back to the racial stock of the majority is an alien and an intruder. Racial minorities are almost everywhere disadvantaged in the modern state and so are, of course, all the individual members of such racial minorities.

Racial imperialism like religious imperialism is a stumbling block in the way of man's freedom and progress. What is required in our day is not superheated race apologetics but a generous way of life which will give each race and to all men regardless of race, the opportunity to live their own life, to express their own soul and to contribute their unique values to the commonality of human life. Our age needs a form of good will which will not only tolerate racial and cultural differences but which will gladly use them for the enrichment of life.

There are people who would like to acquire good will through assimilation. They know that intolerance, in the last analysis, is due to the existence of differences---racial differences, cultural differences. They would therefore do away with intolerance by obliterating these differences. But that is paying too high a price! The thing gained is less than the thing surrendered.

I like to be on the best of terms with my neighbor. I invite his friendship even as I proffer mine---but only on one condition: that he respect my individuality even as I respect his. He must take me for what I am even as I take him for what he is, not for what each of us would like the other one to be. I am what I am. I am ready to acknowledge that my neighbor has the same right to retain his individuality and his racial and cultural distinctiveness. It is on the basis of such contrasts which are not conflicts that I would build a real comradeship of free men and good works.

There are some very high-minded men in our country who rightfully would resent any charge of racial intolerance, who nevertheless by their fond hankering after an American social and cultural unification, a sort of American "gleichschaltung" are unconsciously contributing to that very intolerance which they would repudiate. They are opposed to the existence of various social groups, based largely upon racial identity, in American society. They assume that there must be only one social group in America, and one thorough-going cultural totalitarianism. They regard all distinctive cultural groups in America as socially baneful. The Jewish community for example is sometimes criticised by these people, who clearly are not anti-Semitic, for its separatism, its solidarity and its refusal to assimilate.

To which the spokesmen of the Jewish group would reply that cultural uniformity is not a prerequisite of American democratic society or of any other democratic society, that such uniformity is not intrinsically preferable and that cooperation and good will in common national tasks are possible in spite of the existence of differences.

When it is claimed that if the Jew would surrender everything except his "personal religious views", the anti-Semitic disease would disappear and all would be well with him, these spokesmen reply that the German Jew for decades practised this very theory of assimilation. They tried in all ways not to be different. Their group consciousness had dwindled to a vanishing point. And yet, such is the patent bankruptcy of this whole thesis, the most virulent anti-Semitism developed in Germany, and in place of a self-willed "difference", a legal, prescriptive, and discriminating "difference" was forced upon them as a mark of shame. Even non-Aryan Christian clergymen who certainly never suffered from excessive Jewish group-consciousness have been "differentiated" and stigmatized in the land of classic Jewish assimilation.

"Social unity" or "cultural unity" is just as dangerous a slogan to raise in modern society as "racial unity". Too many noble ideals of mankind are being broken on the wheel of totalitarian obsessions in the world today for liberal churchmen, lay or cleric, who value individualism and exalt personality to permit themselves to become champions of "unification" crusades in American life.

What is needed in the world today is not race or religious imperialism, or mystic yearning after cultural or social reform and unification, after the monolithic society which crushes the individual, but the courageous reassertion of that liberal, generous, tolerant view of life which our present unhappy age has so tragically lost, but to which it will have to return if life is to be livable, and if men and minorities are to be saved from the tyranny of the mass and the curse of regimentation. If we men of faith are to remain faithful to the classic ideals of our religions we must set about rekindling the light of the ideal of one Humanity of free men within an economic system which will permit true freedom, and we must redirect the aspirations of men towards it. Then the questions of state and race and nationalism will assume their proper place of secondary importance in human life, and mutual adjustments will then be made far more simply and naturally than is possible today. The lost perspective will have been restored.

ABSTRACT OF THE ADDRESS

"THE DECLINE OF THE INDIVIDUAL"

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver
The Temple - Cleveland, Ohio

Everywhere the state is stepping in to check the power and authority of the individual. The democratic apparatus which middle-class individualism advanced to safeguard its rights is being pushed aside or discarded. Bolshevism, Fascism and Nazism have this one thing in common: they are all champions of maximum state authority. The state, they claim, must have absolute dictatorial power over the whole life of man. The individual has no inalienable rights - no areas forever exempted from group control and interference. Mussolini declared: "Here, as in Russia, we are advocates of the collective significance of life, and we wish to ~~develop~~ develop this at the cost of individualism."

There are spiritual advantages to a doctrine of collectivism as against the doctrine of private exploitation and careerism which characterized our passing civilization. Both Judaism and Christianity have always doctrinally subordinated the private ambitions of the individual to the well-being of society as a whole. The highest good was the social good. Man was taught to discover the real significance of his own life in enterprises which contributed to the upbuilding of the perfect society. Primitive Christianity was actually communistic in its social structure and so were the monastic brotherhoods which derived from it. The whole purpose of the Mosaic Jubilee legislation, touching land tenure and sale, as well as the whole tenor of the social message of the prophets of Israel, was to discourage the aggrandizement of the individual at the expense of the group.

Neither Judaism nor Christianity has therefore anything to fear from the spread of the doctrine of the socialized community and the collective life which is likely to dominate the New Era. All spiritual movements of mankind had this ideal

at the core of their inspiration. The peaceful, neighborly, cooperative life has been the goal of all the weary marches of civilization. All religious education has been directed towards training men to think less in terms of personal career and success and more in terms of co-worker in a common social enterprise. Life is again vindicating classic religious ethics, in that the cooperative commonwealth is actually coming to be; and in the future it will go hard with the lone wolf, the predatory exploiter, the anti-social omniverous man.

The danger lies in the excessive zeal and over-reaching on the part of the state which may lead to the complete subjugation of the individual and which, in time, may prove fatal to his spiritual life. Our experience of the last decade and a half in different parts of the world with experiments in the corporate society, in Communism, in State Socialism, in State Capitalism, or in the corporative state, has given men ground for fear that the individual is being sacrificed in the process of economic and political coordination.

Whether the suppression of the individual is only a necessary incident in the transition from one social order to another and freer social order, or whether together with dictatorship, it will become a permanent feature of the new social order, is for the present, a matter of conjecture. But for the time being at least it is alarming to behold in the lands where the corporate ideal of the state has made the greatest headway, the total conscription of the individual in the service of the autocratic state. All thought is regimented. Education becomes propaganda. Every writer becomes a functionary of the state. Attempts are made, as in Germany, to make even the church an adjunct and a propaganda agency for the political state, a mouthpiece for its dogmas and pretensions. The right of the individual to quest for himself in the fields of the mind and the spirit is denied. A new orthodoxy has been enthroned. It is now proclaimed that absolute truth as regards social ethics, government and economics, even private morality, has already been revealed. It is

in the safekeeping of a minority political group - a new priestly hierarchy. The individual must accept the dogma of the regime, unquestioningly and submissively, or he is anathema. This new state absolutism, backed by its vast punitive power is far more dangerous than the old and now discredited ~~absolutism~~ absolutism of the church. The latter was frequently held in check by the secular arm of government. At least the secular and the ecclesiastical attenuated each other's powers. But with the decline of the political power of the church, and the ascendancy of the absolute authoritarian state, the individual is at the complete mercy of the latter, without recourse and without refuge.

In the face of the amazing pretensions of the state, it behooves freedom-loving men to insist that man possesses certain rights over which the state, however noble its purposes and however exalted its program, has no power whatsoever. There are sovereign rights which are man's by virtue of his humanity and not by virtue of his citizenship in a given political group. Man has other relationships and other obligations than those to his country. There is the whole of mankind. There is the universe as a whole. There is his own inner spiritual microcosm. There is God.

Side by side with the doctrine of the absolute, totalitarian state, runs in Fascist lands, the doctrine of competitive nationalism and intolerant racialism, both of which victimize the individual. There is a nationalism which is as instinctive as one's ~~love~~ love of home and family and friends. It requires no artificial indoctrination and no propaganda. It is neither exclusive, intolerant nor militant. It is not a cunning tool in the hands of economic imperialism. But the western world is harassed and ridden today by a nationalism which makes a mockery of this simple, wholesome patriotism and employs it as a blind for shameless exploitation. The love of one's country is put under option by those who control the policies of government. A cabal of industrialists, financiers, bankers and munition makers prescribes what the government shall do - and the individual, bound hand and foot

beforehand by the mandates of this newer nationalism, is delivered over to the drill sergeant. By this disgraceful strategy, the youth of the world is being stampeded today into group intolerance and arrogant provincialism and into the shambles of another war. The individual seems helpless in the face of this cunningly stimulated mob patriotism. The universal ideal which fired the imagination of the best minds of Europe in the 18th and early 19th centuries - the idea of a federated world wherein a man at one and the same time could be a ~~man~~ citizen of his country and a citizen of the world - the ideal which enlarged man's estate and set him free for a spiritual career beyond the narrow boundaries of his own land - this idea, so thoroughly Christian and so thoroughly Jewish - has been pushed out of men's minds by the command of a restrictive, truculent and arrogant nationalism. Internationalism, today, in many lands is blackest heresy. The youth of the world is being taught to think not in terms of international human solidarity, but in terms of exclusive, aggressive and jealous national loyalties. One is first and foremost a German, a Frenchman, an Italian, a Pole, and only secondarily and not always necessarily, a son of man, a child of God. Modern nationalism has unquestionably ghettotized the individual and confined him to a little corner in a fragmentized and disintegrated world.

Racial imperialism, like religious imperialism, is a stumbling-block in the way of man's freedom and progress. What is required in our day is not superheated race apologetics but a generous way of life which will give each race and to all men, regardless of race, the opportunity to live their own life, to express their own soul and to contribute their unique values to the commonalty of human life. Our age needs a form of good will which will not only tolerate racial and cultural differences but which will gladly use them ~~for~~ for the enrichment of life.

THE DECLINE OF THE INDIVIDUAL
Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

The problem of the one and the many, of the individual and society, is one of the most fundamental and continuing problems in human thought. How to insure the fullest expression of the individual without disrupting society, and how to coordinate personal freedom with group responsibility-- that has been the major problem of sociology. The pendulum has, throughout the ages, swung between the extremes of unlimited individualism and absolute social control, between the exaltation of the individual and his submergence.

Man begins historically as an indistinguishable member of a strongly coordinated community. He develops into greater freedom of thought and action as the life of the community moves into the higher ranges of civilization. In eras of decadence, individualism degenerates into anarchic subjectivism, turns anti-social and actually tends to destroy the individual.

There are epochs when the social gospel must be stressed, because individual privilege has been allowed to exploit the group. This has been true of our times when the masses which possess considerable formal political and economic freedom, do in actual practice enjoy very little of either. They are in large measure dependent upon political organizations and economic arrangements in the control of a minority which systematically exploits them. There are other times when the essential rights of the individual must be championed in the face of a dangerous encroachment of group tyranny.

Professor Eucken, in his essay, "Society and the Individual," called attention forcibly to the "anti-individualistic influence of the tremendous accession of strength which has fallen to the part of the state in the course of the 19th century. This accession has been due for the most part to economic complications in the face of which every merely individual effort has seemed hope less...

The increasing complication, the technical development of civilization, demands a closer correlation of the separate forces and more organization of the whole, and therefore calls for a guiding centre. (Today we call it central planning.).... Thus the visible power of the state and the invisible power of society are united against the independence of the individual"....

If that judgment of Professor Eucken held good when it was written in the days before the World War, how much more pertinent and re-enforced is it today, with state and class dictatorships riding in triumph through two-thirds of the civilized world!

The post-war era has been dominated by the idea of state corporateness to a far greater degree than the one which preceded it. The power and authority of the state have been augmented even in those countries where no dictatorship has been established. "The tremendous accession of strength which has fallen to the part of the state in the 19th century" is nothing in comparison to the accession of strength, control and authority which has fallen to the part of the state since the beginning of the third decade of the 20th century.

The 19th century witnessed the triumph of bourgeois society which sought to delimit as far as possible the powers and functions of the state and to extend and establish the rights of the individual. The development of private capitalism in the 19th century necessitated and achieved a large measure of freedom for the individual and a sharply circumscribed corporate control. The 20th century is witnessing the final collapse of this system of unrestricted competitive individualism.

✓ Everywhere the state is stepping in to check the power and authority of the individual. The democratic apparatus which middle-class individualism advanced to safeguard its rights is being pushed aside or discarded. Bolshevism, Fascism, and Nazism have this one thing in common: they are all champions of maximum state authority. The state, they claim, must have absolute dictatorial power

over the whole life of man. The individual has no inalienable rights -- no areas forever exempted from group control and interference. Mussolini declared: "Here, as in Russia, we are advocates of the collective significance of life, and we wish to develop this at the cost of individualism."

I

✓ There are spiritual advantages to a doctrine of collectivism as against the doctrine of private exploitation and careerism which characterized our passing civilization. Both Judaism and Christianity have always doctrinally subordinated the private ambitions of the individual to the well-being of society as a whole. The highest good was the social good. Man was taught to discover the real significance of his own life in enterprises which contributed to the upbuilding of the perfect society. Primitive Christianity was actually communistic in its social structure and so were the monastic brotherhoods which derived from it. The whole purpose of the Mosaic Jubilee legislation, touching land tenure and sale, as well as the whole tenor of the social message of the prophets of Israel, was to discourage the aggrandizement of the individual at the expense of the group.

✓ Neither Judaism nor Christianity has therefore anything to fear from the spread of the doctrine of the socialized community and the collective life which is likely to dominate the New Era. All spiritual movements of mankind had this ideal at the core of their inspiration. The peaceful, neighborly, cooperative life has been the goal of all the weary marches of civilization. All religious education has been directed towards training men to think less in terms of personal career and success and more in terms of co-worker in a common social enterprise. Life is again vindicating classic religious

ethics, in that the cooperative commonwealth is actually coming to be; and in the future it will go hard with the lone wolf, the predatory exploiter, the anti-social omniverous man.

✓ The danger lies in the excessive zeal and over-reaching on the part of the state which may lead to the complete subjugation of the individual and which in time may prove fatal to his spiritual life. Our experience of the last decade and a half in different parts of the world with experiments in the corporate society, in Communism, in State Socialism, in State Capitalism, or in the corporative state, has given men ground for fear that the individual is being sacrificed in the process of economic and political coordination.

✓ Whether the suppression of the individual is only a necessary incident in the transition from one social order to another and freer social order, or whether together with dictatorship it will become a permanent feature of the new social order, is for the present a matter of conjecture. But for the time being at least it is alarming to behold in the lands where the corporate ideal of the state has made the greatest headway, the total conscription of the individual in the service of the autocratic state. All thought is regimented. Education becomes propaganda. Every writer becomes a functionary of the state. Attempts are made, as in Germany, to make even the church an adjunct and a propaganda agency for the political state, a mouthpiece for its dogmas and pretensions. The right of the individual to quest for himself in the fields of the mind and the spirit is denied. A new orthodoxy has been enthroned. It is now proclaimed that absolute truth as regards social ethics, government and economics, even private morality, has already been revealed. It is in the safekeeping of a minority political group -- a new priestly hierarchy. The individual must accept the dogma of the regime, unquestioningly and submissively, or he is anathema. This new state absolutism, backed by its

vast punitive power is far more dangerous than the old and now discredited absolutism of the church. The latter was frequently held in check by the secular arm of government. At least the secular and the ecclesiastical attenuated each other's powers. But with the decline of the political power of the church, and the ascendancy of the absolute authoritarian state, the individual is at the complete mercy of the latter, without recourse and without refuge.

It is quite possible that in the New Era organized religion will have to assume the role of the sole surviving champion of the rights of the individual. This necessity the Christian church in Germany has already been faced with, but for the time being, at least, the German Evangelical Church has succumbed to the totalitarian state. It has been coordinated. The point of view of Dr. Krause, Gamleiter of the Berlin section of the German Christians, has won the day. "National Socialists must not be judged from a Biblical standpoint; it is the Bible and the Church which must be judged from a Nazi standpoint. The Nazi state embodies the totality of God."

✓ In the face of the amazing pretensions of the state, it behooves freedom-loving men to insist that man possesses certain rights over which the state, however noble its purposes and however exalted its program has ~~not~~ no power whatsoever. There are sovereign rights which are man's by virtue of his humanity and not by virtue of his citizenship in a given political group. Man has other relationships and other obligations than those to his country. There is the whole of mankind. There is the universe as a whole. There is his own inner spiritual microcosm. There is God.

The New Era is being ushered in by way of dictatorships. Whether they are passing or permanent it is impossible to say. It is well to remember,

however, that dictatorships do not of themselves and as a matter of course pass over into democracies. They do not liquidate themselves. These dictatorships, wherever established, have so far been characterized by their utter ruthlessness. This is true both of the capitalistic dictatorship, and of the communistic. The latter in its revolutionary zeal to attain quickly the good life actually sacrifices all the values which men have always identified with the good life. We have entered an age of sanctified ruthlessness and exalted brutality. But even more dangerous than the terrible toll of victims of physical violence is the tragic toll of victims of spiritual and intellectual violence. Men are driven into terrified silence. Conformity is prescribed. All opposition, all parties, all dissenting opinion in press, pulpit, classroom, platform and book is stamped out. That this is fatal to man's spiritual life is easily apparent. It tends to dry up the well-springs of man's spiritual creativeness. It destroys the soil and roots of his moral growth. When man is not allowed to stand alone, to dissent from the majority, to proclaim the truth which has been born in him through his own soul's travail, his spiritual life is destroyed. Revelations never come to groups. At best, to quote Pestalozzi, the collective existence of our race can only civilize us; it cannot cultivate us. There were schools of prophets in ancient Israel, but they were merely monitors of ancient superstitions. It was only after the individual separated himself from the school and the group and pursued his own solitary quest of truth that prophecy discovered its authentic voice and mood.

The New Era may thus burden the church and synagogue with another task -- to save man from the dark heresy of sanctified ruthlessness and brutality at the behest of a new politico-economic Messianism and to safeguard man's

spiritual and intellectual freedom in a world constructed by the encompassing wall of dictatorship.

II

Side by side with the doctrine of the absolute, totalitarian state, runs in Fascist lands, the doctrine of competitive nationalism and intolerant racialism, both of which victimize the individual. There is a nationalism which is as instinctive as one's love of home and family and friends. It requires no artificial indoctrination and no propaganda. It is neither exclusive, intolerant nor militant. It is not a cunning tool in the hands of economic imperialism. But the western world is harassed and ridden today by a nationalism which makes a mockery of this simple, wholesome patriotism and employs it as a blind for shameless exploitation. The love of one's country is put under option by those who control the policies of government. A cabal of industrialists, financiers, bankers and munition makers prescribes what the government shall do -- and the individual, bound hand and foot beforehand by the mandates of this newer nationalism, is delivered over to the drill sergeant. By this disgraceful strategy, the youth of the world is being stampeded today into group intolerance and arrogant provincialism and into the shambles of another war. The individual seems helpless in the face of this cunningly stimulated mob patriotism. The universal ideal which fired the imagination of the best minds of Europe in the 18th and early 19th centuries -- the idea of a federated world wherein a man at one and the same time could be a citizen of his country and a citizen of the world -- the ideal which enlarged man's estate and set him free for a spiritual career beyond the narrow boundaries of his own land -- this ideal, so thoroughly Christian and so thoroughly Jewish -- has been pushed out of men's minds by the command of a restrictive, truculent and arrogant nationalism. Internationalism, today, in many lands is blackest

heresy. The youth of the world is being taught to think not in terms of international human solidarity, but in terms of exclusive, aggressive and jealous national loyalties. One is first and foremost a German, a Frenchman, an Italian, a Pole, and only secondarily and not always necessarily a son of man, a child of God. Modern nationalism has unquestionably ghettoized the individual and confined him to a little corner in a fragmented and disintegrated world.

In some parts of the world, nationalism is still further being narrowed by the concept of race. Nation has been made synonymous with race. Only those belonging to the racial stock of the dominant majority are recognized as citizens. All others are disfranchised and politically, economically and socially degraded. This has been particularly true in Nazi Germany where race idolatry has run riot to a point where all human virtues have been subordinated to it. Hitler declared, in one of his recent outbursts, "I prefer a German deserter to a Jewish hero"....

It is clear that in a state where race becomes the criterion and prerequisite for rights and preferment, the individual is sacrificed. It is no longer a matter of personal character or ability, but of hereditary fatalism. One's claim to equality can no longer be based upon a shared human destiny or upon worth or merit, but upon a factor which is beyond the individual's control -- ancestry.

Unfortunately, pseudo-scientific propaganda for racial imperialism is wide-spread in the world today. The doctrine of racial superiority was used as a cover for the vicious motives of the last war. It has always been a blind for economic imperialism. The people in the South used it as an excuse for exploiting the colored man and for denying him his elementary human rights and his legitimate opportunities. The white man's burden becomes the black man's curse, and the brown man's and the yellow man's.

It has again been invoked in present-day Germany, as a camouflage for economic reaction, which is defending itself with such desperation, at

infallible propaganda material for the purposes of political incitement and stampede in order to achieve certain objectives which calm reason would fail to achieve, and as compensation for all the rights and liberties which a Fascist dictatorship takes away from the citizens.

Some peoples which have a large element of mysticism in their make-up are particularly addicted to race idolatry. Mysticism is at bottom religious romanticism and romanticism is essentially an historic throw-back, a hankering after older forms of social life and organization, a retroversion to herd mores, folkways and myths, to what is thought to be the protoplasmic racial soul. A hundred years ago Heinrich Heine called attention to this recurrent manifestation of mysticism among the German people. In Nazism, the German mass is again manifesting these strong mystic, primitivist and collective tendencies. Race has again surged to the forefront of popular obsession and the cosmopolitan spirit of Lessing, Herder, Schiller, Goethe and Kant is, for the time being, homeless in Germany.

It is not necessary for me at this time to point out the fallacies of this economically motivated race propaganda -- this artificial division of mankind into "Herrenrasse" and "Untermenschen". There is, of course, no pure race in the world. The story of racial fusions which have gone on everywhere in historic and pre-historic times has been sufficiently attested by anthropology and archaeology, and is sufficiently convincing to everyone but the propagandist who has an axe to grind. And there are no superior races. There are no races endowed by nature with superior qualities of mind and character. There are races more favored with circumstances, by environment, by geographical position, by the fertility of the soil, or by the treasures underneath the soil. There are advanced races and backward races. There are differences between

racess but no biologic gradations. And no race has a monopoly upon genius or creative capacity.

III

There is far more race idolatry in the world today than ever before in the history of mankind. There was no color line in antiquity. The Greeks were conscious of their cultural superiority but they did not attribute it to biology. They claimed excellency on the basis of their civilization, not their blood. The Romans were splendid racial cosmopolites. Roman citizenship was not restricted to any one racial group within the far flung empire. Roman citizenship which at first was the privilege of only the few who lived in Rome was soon extended to the limits of the empire, and under C racally it was universalized throughout the vast empire. The Jew was proud not of his race but of his religion, and the proselyte to the faith was welcomed into the life of the race. The Jews regarded themselves as the chosen people not because of their racial traits but because of having been selected to be the servants of Jahweh to carry His moral law to the world. They were a covenanted people, a kingdom not of supermen but of priests. Their prophets kept them from excessive pride by reminding them:

"Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto Me

"O children of Israel? saith the Lord.

"Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt

"And the Philistine from Caphtor

"And Aran from Kir?"

Jahweh was the God of all nations. Israel's prerogative lay only in arduous moral and religious pioneering. When that ceased, when Israel no longer wished

to bear the burden of religious leadership, it knew itself to be rejected of God.

Christianity, of course, took over the prophetic, universalistic concept from Judaism, emphasized it, enlarged upon it, and carried it to the far corners of the earth. "The God that made the world and all nations therein, he, being Lord of Heaven and earth...made of one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." The organic racial oneness of the whole human family is nowhere in the Bible more clearly and forcibly enunciated. And again: "For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him." The entire concept of race ~~is~~ which is fatalistic and exclusive is subordinated to the concept of ^{which} faith ~~is~~ volitional and all-inclusive. "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." (Gal. 3:29.)

It is therefore no accident that Nazi racialists have been led to a repudiation of both the Old and the New Testaments and are invoking anew the dethroned tribal Gods of primitive, heathen Germany. And it is no accident either that the great Christian leaders of present-day Germany have clearly seen the menace in atavistic Nazi racialism to the spirit and mission of their historical faith and are so strenuously resisting it.

The Middle Ages knew very little of that racial chauvinism which is so rampant in our day. There ~~was~~ no talk of race purity in the Middle Ages. It was with the rise of nationalism and of colonial imperialism among the Northwestern European peoples, particularly during the last century, and the consequent exploitation of the backward races, that the necessity arose for some ideologic justification of such exploitation. It soon appeared in the form of pseudo-scientific theories of race superiority. These theories gained

prestige and popularity as the European peoples proceeded to conquer, subject and despoil backward peoples. Some apologists even employed High Church terminology such as "Bearing the White Man's Burden" to savor the miserable mess of imperialistic pottage, by means of which European peoples robbed other races of their birthright of freedom. And, again, the "white man's burden" became the black man's curse and the brown man's and the yellow man's.

Modern nationalism has fallen under the blight of this race idolatry, particularly among a people like the Germans who are not empire-builders and therefore politically provincial and among whom national unity is a quite recent achievement and hence still a matter of hallelujah. The novel doctrine is now being loudly proclaimed that a nation must be racially homogeneous and every national within the state who can not trace his ancestry back to the racial stock of the majority is an alien and an intruder. Racial minorities are almost everywhere disadvantaged in the modern state and so are, of course, all the individual members of such racial minorities.

✓ Racial imperialism, like religious imperialism, is a stumbling-block in the way of man's freedom and progress. What is required in our day is not superheated race apologetics but a generous way of life which will give each race and to all men regardless of race, the opportunity to live their own life, to express their own soul and to contribute their unique values to the commonalty of human life. Our age needs a form of good will which will not only tolerate racial and cultural differences but which will gladly use them for the enrichment of life.

There are some very high-minded men in our country who rightfully would resent any charge of racial intolerance, who nevertheless by their fond hankering after an American social and cultural unification, a sort of American Gleichschaltung,

are unconsciously contributing to that very intolerance which they would repudiate. They are opposed to the existence of various social groups, based largely upon racial identity, in American society. They assume that there must be only one social group in America, and one thorough-going cultural tradition. The Jewish community for example is sometimes criticized by these people, who clearly are not anti-Semitic, for its separatism, its solidarity and its refusal to assimilate.

To which the spokesmen of the Jewish group would reply that cultural uniformity is not a prerequisite of American democratic society or of any other democratic society, that such uniformity is not intrinsically preferable and that cooperation and good will in common national tasks are possible in spite of the existence of differences.

When it is claimed that if the Jew would surrender everything except his "personal religious views," the anti-Semitic disease would disappear and all would be well with him, these spokesmen reply that the German Jews for decades practiced this very theory of assimilation. They tried in all ways not to be different. Their group consciousness had dwindled to a vanishing point. And yet, such is the patent bankruptcy of this whole thesis, the most virulent anti-Semitism developed in Germany, and in place of a self-willed "difference," a legal, prescriptive and discriminating "difference" was forced upon them as a mark of shame. Even non-Aryan Christian clergymen who certainly never suffered from excessive Jewish group-consciousness have been "differentiated" and stigmatized in the land of classic Jewish assimilation.

"Social unity" or "cultural unity" is just as dangerous a slogan to raise in modern society as "racial unity." Too many noble ideals of mankind are being broken on the wheel of totalitarian obsessions in the world today for liberal churchmen, lay or cleric, who value individualism and

exalt personality, to permit themselves to become champions of "unification" crusades in American life.

What is needed in the world today is not race or religious imperialism, or mystic yearning after cultural or social unification, after a monolithic society which crushes the individual, but the courageous reassertion of that liberal, generous, tolerant view of life which our present unhappy age has so tragically lost, and to which it will have to return if life is to be livable, and if men and minorities are to be saved from the tyranny of the mass and the curse of regimentation. If we men of faith are to remain faithful to the classic ideals of our religions we must set about ~~rekindling~~ rekindling the light of the ideal of one Humanity of free men within an economic system which will permit true freedom, and we must redirect the aspirations of men towards it. Then the questions of state and race and nationalism will assume their proper place of secondary importance in human life, and mutual adjustments will then be made far more simply and naturally than is possible today. The lost perspective will have been restored.

ABSTRACT OF ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DR. A. H. SILVER, OF CLEVELAND, OHIO AT THE
CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERSEY STATE FEDERATION OF WORKER'S CLASSES
ON WEDNESDAY 6, 1935 -- ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.

THE DECLINE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Everywhere the state is stepping in to check the power and authority of the individual. The democratic apparatus which middle-class individualism created to safeguard its rights is being pushed aside or discarded. Bolshevism, Fascism, and Nazism have this one thing in common: -- they are all champions of maximum state authority. The state, they claim, must have absolute dictatorial power over the whole life of man. The individual has no inalienable rights -- no areas forever exempted from group control and interference. Mussolini declared: "Here, as in Russia, we are advocates of the collective significance of life, and we wish to develop this at the cost of the individualism."

There are spiritual advantages to a doctrine of collectivism as against the doctrine of private exploitation and careerism which characterized our present civilization. Both Judaism and Christianity always doctrinally subordinated the private ambitions of the individual to the well-being of society as a whole. The highest good was the social good. Man was taught to discover the real significance of his own life in enterprises which contributed to the upbuilding of the perfect society.

The danger lies in the excessive zeal and over-reaching on the part of the state which may lead to the complete subjugation of the individual and which in time may prove fatal to his spiritual life. Our experience of the last decade and a half in different parts of the world with experiments in the corporate society, in Communism, in State Socialism, in State Capitalism, or in the corpora-

tive state, has given men ground for fear that the individual is being sacrificed in the process of economic and political coordination.

Whether the suppression of the individual is only a necessary incident in the transition from one social order to another and freer social order or whether together with dictatorship it will become a permanent feature of the new social order is for the present a matter of conjecture. But for the time being at least it is alarming to behold in the lands where the corporate ideal of the state has made the greatest headway the total conscription of the individual in the service of the autocratic state. All thought is regimented. Education becomes propaganda. Every writer becomes a functionary of the state. Attempts are made, as in Germany, to make even the church an adjunct and a propaganda agency for the political state, a mouthpiece for its dogmas and pretensions. The right of the individual to quest for himself in the fields of the mind and the spirit are denied. A new orthodoxy has been enthroned. It is now proclaimed that absolute truth as regards social ethics, government and economics, even private morality, has already been revealed. It is in the safekeeping of a minority political group -- a new priestly hierarchy. The individual must accept the dogma of the regime, unquestioningly and submissively or he is anathema. This new state absolutism, backed by its vast punitive power is far more dangerous than the old and now discredited absolutism of the church. The latter was frequently held in check by the secular arm of government. At least the secular and the ecclesiastical attenuated each other's powers. But with the decline in the political power of the church, and the ascendancy of the absolute authoritarian state, the individual is at the complete mercy of the latter, without recourse and without refuge.

The New Era is being ushered in by way of dictatorships. Whether they are passing or permanent it is impossible to say. It is well to remember, however,

that dictatorships do not of themselves and as a matter of course pass over into democracies. They do not liquidate themselves. These dictatorships, wherever established, have so far been characterized by their utter ruthlessness. This is true both of capitalistic dictatorships and of communistic. The latter in its revolutionary zeal to attain quickly the good life actually sacrifices all the values which men have always identified with the good life. We have entered an age of sanctified ruthlessness and exalted brutality. But even more dangerous than the terrible toll of victims of physical violence is the tragic toll of victims of the spiritual and intellectual violence. Men are driven into terrified silence. Conformity is prescribed. Men dare not dissent. All opposition, all parties, all dissenting opinion in press, pulpit, classroom, platform and book is stamped out. That this is fatal to man's spiritual life is easily apparent. It tends to dry up the well-springs of man's spiritual creativeness. It destroys the soil and roots of his moral growth. When man is not allowed to stand alone, to dissent from the majority, to proclaim the truth which has been born in him through his own soul's travail, his spiritual life is destroyed.

Side by side with the doctrine of the absolute, totalitarian state, runs the doctrine of competitive nationalism and intolerant racialism, both of which victimize the individual. There is a nationalism which is as instinctive as one's love of home and family and friends. It requires no artificial indoctrination and no propaganda. It is neither exclusive, intolerant nor militant. It is not a cunning tool in the hands of economic imperialism. But the western world is harrassed and ridden today by a nationalism which makes a mockery of this simple, wholesome patriotism and employs it as a blind for shameless exploitation. The love of one's country is put under option by those who control the policies of government. A cabal of industrialists, financiers, bankers and munition makers prescribes what the government shall do, -- and the individual, bound hand and foot beforehand

by the mandates of this newer nationalism, is delivered over to the drill sergeant. The youth of the world is being stampeded today into group intolerance and arrogant provincialism and into the shambles of another war by this disgraceful strategy. The individual seems helpless in the face of this cunningly stimulated mob-patriotism. The universal ideal which fired the imagination of the best minds of Europe in the 18th and early 19th centuries, -- the idea of a federated world wherein a man at one and the same time could be a citizen of his country and a citizen of the world -- the ideal which enlarged man's estate and set him free for a spiritual career beyond the narrow boundaries of his own land -- this ideal, so thoroughly Christian and so thoroughly Jewish -- has been pushed out of men's minds by the command of a restrictive truculent and arrogant nationalism. Internationalism, today, in many lands is blackest heresy. The youth of the world is being taught to think not in terms of international human solidarity, but in terms of exclusive, aggressive and jealous national loyalties.

In some parts of the world, nationalism is still further being narrowed by the concept of race. Nationalism has been made synonymous with race. Only those belonging to the racial stock of the dominant majority are recognized as citizens. All others are disfranchised and politically, economically and socially degraded. This has been particularly true in Nazi Germany where race idolatry has run riot to a point where all human virtues have been subordinated to it.

It is clear that in a state where race becomes the criterion and prerequisite for rights and preferment, the individual is sacrificed. It is no longer a matter of personal character or ability, but of hereditary fatalism. One's claim to equality can no longer be based upon a shared human destiny or upon worth or merit, but upon a factor which is beyond the individual's control, -- ancestry.

THE DECLINE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

ABBA HILLEL SILVER*

THE problem of the one and the many, of the individual and society, is one of the most fundamental and continuing problems in human thought. How to insure the fullest expression of the individual without disrupting society, and how to coordinate personal freedom with group responsibility—that has been the major problem of sociology. The pendulum has, throughout the ages, swung between the extremes of unlimited individualism and absolute social control, between the exaltation of the individual and his submergence.

Man begins historically as an indistinguishable member of a strongly coordinated community. He develops into greater freedom of thought and action as the life of the community moves into the higher ranges of civilization. In eras of decadence, individualism degenerates into anarchic subjectivism, turns anti-social and actually tends to destroy the individual.

There are epochs when the social gospel must be stressed, because individual privilege has been allowed to exploit the group. This has been true of our times when the masses which possess considerable *formal* political and economic freedom, do in actual practice enjoy very little of either. They are in large measure dependent upon political organizations and economic arrangements in the control of a minority which systematically exploits them. There are other times when the essential rights of the individual must be championed in the face of a dangerous encroachment of group tyranny.

Professor Eucken, in his essay on "Society and the Individual," called attention forcibly to the "anti-individualistic influence of the tremendous accession of strength which has fallen to the part of the state in the course of the nineteenth

century. This accession has been due for the most part to economic complications in the face of which every merely individual effort has seemed hopeless. . . . The increasing complication, the technical development of civilization, demands a closer correlation of the separate forces and more organization of the whole, and therefore calls for a guiding centre. (To-day we call it central planning.) . . . Thus the visible power of the state and the invisible power of society are united against the independence of the individual" . . .

If that judgment of Professor Eucken held good when it was written in the days before the World War, how much more pertinent and re-enforced is it today, with state and class dictatorships riding in triumph through two-thirds of the civilized world!

The nineteenth century witnessed the triumph of bourgeois society which sought to delimit as far as possible the powers and functions of the state and to extend and establish the rights of the individual. The development of private capitalism in the nineteenth century necessitated and achieved a large measure of freedom for the individual and a sharply circumscribed corporate control. The twentieth century is witnessing the final collapse of this system of unrestricted competitive individualism.

Everywhere the state is stepping in to check the power and authority of the individual. The democratic apparatus which middle-class individualism created to safeguard its rights is being pushed aside or discarded. Bolshevism, Fascism, and Nazism have this one thing in common: They are all champions of maximum state authority. The state, they claim, must have absolute dictatorial power over the whole life of man. The individual has no inalienable rights—no areas forever exempted from group con-

* Rabbi, The Temple, Cleveland, Ohio.

trol and interference. Mussolini has declared of Italy: "Here, as in Russia, we are advocates of the collective significance of life, and we wish to develop this at the cost of individualism."

There are spiritual advantages to a doctrine of collectivism as against the doctrine of private exploitation and careerism which characterized our passing civilization. Both Judaism and Christianity have always doctrinally subordinated the private ambitions of the individual to the well-being of society as a whole. The highest good was the social good. Man was taught to discover the real significance of his own life in enterprises which contributed to the upbuilding of the perfect society. Primitive Christianity was actually communistic in its social structure and so were the monastic brotherhoods which derived from it. The whole purpose of the Mosaic Jubilee legislation, touching land tenure and sale, as well as the whole tenor of the social message of the prophets of Israel, was to discourage the aggrandizement of the individual at the expense of the group.

Neither Judaism nor Christianity has, therefore, anything to fear from the spread of the doctrine of the socialized community and the collective life which is likely to dominate the New Era. All spiritual movements of mankind had this ideal at the core of their inspiration. The peaceful, neighborly, cooperative life has been the goal of all the weary marches of civilization. All religious education has been directed towards training men to think less in terms of personal career and success, and more in terms of co-worker in a common social enterprise. Life is again vindicating classic religious ethics, in that the cooperative commonwealth is actually coming to be; and in the future it will go hard with the lone wolf, the predatory exploiter, the anti-social omnivorous individual.

The danger lies in the excessive zeal and over-reaching on the part of the state which may lead to the complete subjugation of the individual, and which in time

may prove fatal to his spiritual life. Experiences of the last decade and a half in different parts of the world with experiments in the corporate society, in Communism, in State Socialism, in State Capitalism, or in the corporative state, has given men ground for fear that the individual is being sacrificed in the process of economic and political coordination.

Whether the suppression of the individual is only a necessary incident in the transition from one social order to another and freer social order, or whether, together with dictatorship, it will become a permanent feature of the new social order, is for the present a matter of conjecture.

For the time being at least it is alarming to behold in the lands where the corporate ideal of the state has made the greatest headway, the total conscription of the individual in the service of the autocratic state. All thought is regimented. Education becomes propaganda. Every writer becomes a functionary of the state. Attempts are made, as in Germany, to make even the church an adjunct and a propaganda agency for the political state, a mouthpiece for its dogmas and pretensions. The right of the individual to quest for himself in the fields of the mind and the spirit is denied. A new orthodoxy has been enthroned. It is now proclaimed that absolute truth as regards social ethics, government and economics, even private morality, has already been revealed. It is in the safekeeping of a minority political group—a new priestly hierarchy. The individual must accept the dogma of the régime, unquestionably and submissively, or he is anathema.

This new state absolutism, backed by its vast punitive power, is far more dangerous than the old and now discredited absolutism of the church. The latter was frequently held in check by the secular arm of government. At least the secular and the ecclesiastical attenuated each other's powers. But with the decline of the political power of the church, and the ascendancy of the absolute authoritarian

state, the individual is at the complete mercy of the latter, without recourse and without refuge.

It is quite possible that in the New Era organized religion will have to assume the role of the sole surviving champion of the rights of the individual. This necessity the Christian church in Germany has already faced.

In the light of the amazing pretensions of the State, it behoves all religious disciples to insist that man possesses certain rights over which the state, however noble its purposes and however exalted its program, has no power whatsoever. There are sovereign rights which are man's by virtue of his humanity, not by virtue of his citizenship in a given political group. Man has other relationships and other obligations than those to his country. There is the whole of mankind. There is the universe as a whole. There is his own inner spiritual microcosm. There is God.

The New Era is being ushered in by way of dictatorships. Whether they are passing or permanent it is impossible to say. It is well to remember, however, that dictatorships do not of themselves, and as a matter of course, pass over into democracies. They do not liquidate themselves. These dictatorships, wherever established, have so far been characterized by their utter ruthlessness. This is true both of the capitalistic dictatorship, and of the communistic. The latter in its revolutionary zeal to attain quickly the good life actually sacrifices all the values which men have always identified with the good life. We have entered an age of sanctified ruthlessness and exalted brutality.

Even more dangerous than the terrible toll of victims of physical violence is the tragic toll of victims of spiritual and intellectual violence. Men are driven into terrified silence. Conformity is prescribed. All opposition, all parties, all dissenting opinion in press, pulpit, classroom, platform and book is stamped out. That this is fatal to man's spiritual life is

easily apparent. It tends to dry up the well-springs of man's creativeness. It destroys the soil and roots of his moral growth. When man is not allowed to stand alone, to dissent from the majority, to proclaim the truth which has been born in him through his own soul's travail, his spiritual life is destroyed. Revelations never come to groups. There were schools of prophets in ancient Israel, but they were merely monitors of ancient superstitions. It was only after the individual separated himself from the school and the group and pursued his own solitary quest of truth that prophecy discovered its authentic voice and mood.

The New Era may thus burden the church and synagogue with another task—to save man from the dark heresy of sanctified ruthlessness and brutality at the behest of a new politico-economic Messianism, and to safeguard man's spiritual and intellectual freedom in a world constricted by the encompassing wall of dictatorship.

Side by side with the doctrine of the absolute, totalitarian state, runs the doctrine of competitive nationalism and intolerant racialism, both of which victimize the individual. There is a nationalism which is as instinctive as one's love of home and family and friends. It requires no artificial indoctrination and no propaganda. It is neither exclusive, intolerant nor militant. It is not a cunning tool in the hands of economic imperialism. But the Western world is harassed and ridden today by a nationalism which makes a mockery of this simple, wholesome patriotism and employs it as a blind for shameless exploitation. The love of one's country is put under option by those who control the policies of government. A cabal of industrialists, financiers, bankers and munition makers prescribes what the government shall do—and the individual, bound hand and foot beforehand by the mandates of this newer nationalism, is delivered over to the drill sergeant.

By this disgraceful strategy, the youth of the world is being stampeded today into

group intolerance and arrogant provincialism—and into the shambles of another war. The individual seems helpless in the face of this cunningly stimulated mob-patriotism. The universal ideal which fired the imagination of the best minds of Europe in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—the idea of a federated world wherein a man at one and the same time could be a citizen of his country and a citizen of the world—the ideal which enlarged man's estate and set him free for a spiritual career beyond the narrow boundaries of his own land—this ideal, so thoroughly Christian and so thoroughly Jewish, has been pushed out of men's minds by the command of a restrictive, truculent and arrogant nationalism.

Internationalism, today, in many lands is blackest heresy. The youth of the world is being taught to think not in terms of international human solidarity, but in terms of exclusive, aggressive and jealous national loyalties. One is first and foremost a German, a Frenchman, an Italian, a Pole, and only secondarily and not always necessarily a son of man, a child of God. Modern nationalism has unquestionably ghettotized the individual and confined him to a little corner in a fragmented and disintegrated world.

In some parts of the world, nationalism is still further being narrowed by the concept of race. Nation has been made synonymous with race. Only those belonging to the racial stock of the dominant majority are recognized as citizens. All others are disfranchized and politically, economically and socially degraded. This has been particularly true in Nazi Germany where race idolatry has run riot to a point where all human virtues have been subordinated to it. Hitler declared, in one of his recent outbursts, "I prefer a German deserter to a Jewish hero" . . .

Unfortunately, pseudo-scientific propaganda for racial imperialism is widespread in the world today. The doctrine of racial superiority was used as a cover for the vicious motives of the last war.

It has always been a blind for economic imperialism. The people in the South used it as an excuse for exploiting the colored man and for denying him his elementary human rights and his legitimate opportunities. The white man's burden becomes the black man's curse, and the brown man's and the yellow man's.

Some peoples which have a large element of mysticism in their make-up are particularly addicted to race idolatry. Mysticism is at bottom religious romanticism, and romanticism is essentially an historic throwback, a hankering after older forms of social life and organization, a retroversion to herd mores, folkways and myths, to what is thought to be the protoplasmic racial soul. A hundred years ago, Heinrich Heine called attention to this recurrent manifestation of mysticism among the German people. In Nazism, the German mass is again manifesting these strong mystic, primitivist and collective tendencies. Race has again surged to the forefront of popular obsession and the cosmopolitan spirit of Lessing, Herder, Schiller, Goethe and Kant is, for the time being, homeless in Germany.

It is not necessary for me at this time to point out the fallacies of this economically motivated race propaganda—this artificial division of mankind into *Herrnrasse* and *Untermenschen*. There is, of course, no pure race in the world. The story of racial fusions which have gone on everywhere in historic and pre-historic times has been sufficiently attested by anthropology and archaeology, and is sufficiently convincing to everyone but the propagandist who has an axe to grind. And there are no superior races. There are no races endowed by nature with superior qualities of mind and character. There are races more favored by circumstances, by environment, by geographical position, by the fertility of the soil, or by the treasures underneath the soil. There are advanced races and backward races. There are differences between races, but no biologic gradations. And no

race has a monopoly upon genius or creative capacity.

There is far more race idolatry in the world today than ever before in the history of mankind. There was no color line in antiquity. The Greeks were conscious of their cultural superiority, but they did not attribute it to biology. They claimed excellency on the basis of their civilization, not their blood. The Romans were splendid racial cosmopolites. Roman citizenship was not restricted to any one racial group within the farflung empire. Roman citizenship which at first was the privilege of only the few who lived in Rome, was soon extended to the limits of the empire, and under Caracalla it was universalized throughout the vast empire. The Jew was proud not of his race but of his religion, and the proselyte to the faith was welcomed into the full life of the race. The Jews regarded themselves as the chosen people, not because of their racial traits, but because of having been selected to be the servants of Yahweh to carry His moral law to the world. They were a covenanted people, a kingdom not of supermen but of priests. Their prophets kept them from excessive pride by reminding them:

"Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto Me
O children of Israel? saith the Lord.
Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt
And the Philistine from Caphtor
And Aram from Kir?"

Yahweh was the God of all nations. Israel's prerogative lay only in arduous moral and religious pioneering. When that ceased, when Israel no longer wished to bear the burden of religious leadership, it knew itself to be rejected of God.

Christianity, of course, took over the prophetic, universalistic concept from Judaism, emphasized it, enlarged upon it, and carried it to the far corners of the earth. "The God that made the world and all nations therein, he, being Lord of heaven and earth. . . made of one blood

every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." The organic racial oneness of the whole human family is nowhere in the Bible more clearly and forcibly enunciated. And again: "For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him." The entire concept of race, which is fatalistic and exclusive, is subordinated to the concept of faith, which is volitional and all-inclusive. "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." (Gal. 3:25)

It is, therefore, no accident that Nazi racialists have been led to a repudiation of both the Old and the New Testaments, and are invoking anew the dethroned tribal gods of primitive, heathen Germany. And it is no accident, either, that the great Christian leaders of present-day Germany have clearly seen the menace in atavistic Nazi racialism to the spirit and mission of their historical faith, and are so strenuously resisting it.

The Middle Ages knew very little of that racial chauvinism which is so rampant in our day. There was no talk of race purity in the Middle Ages. It was with the rise of nationalism and of colonial imperialism among the Northwestern European peoples, particularly during the last century, and the consequent exploitation of the backward races, that the necessity arose for some ideologic justification of such exploitation. It soon appeared in the form of pseudo-scientific theories of race superiority. These theories gained prestige and popularity as the European peoples proceeded to conquer, subject and despoil backward peoples. Some apologists even employed High Church terminology such as "Bearing the White Man's Burden" to savor the miserable mess of imperialistic pottage, by means of which European peoples robbed other races of their birthright of freedom.

Modern nationalism has fallen under the blight of this race idolatry, particularly among a people like the Germans, who are not empire-builders and therefore po-

litically provincial, and among whom national unity is a quite recent achievement and hence still a matter of hallelujah. The novel doctrine is now being loudly proclaimed that a nation must be racially homogeneous, and that every national within the state who can not trace his ancestry back to the racial stock of the majority is an alien and an intruder. Racial minorities are almost everywhere at a disadvantage in the modern state. So are, of course, all the individual members of such racial minorities.

Racial imperialism, like religious imperialism, is a stumbling-block in the way of man's freedom and progress. What is required in our day is not superheated race apologetics, but a generous way of life which will give each race, and to all men regardless of race, the opportunity to live their own life, to express their own soul, and to contribute their unique values to the commonalty of human life. Our age needs a form of good will which will not only tolerate racial and cultural differences, but which will gladly use them for the enrichment of life.

There are some very high-minded men in our country who rightfully would resent any charge of racial intolerance, who nevertheless by their fond hankering after an American social and cultural unification, a sort of American *Gleichhaltung*, are unconsciously contributing to that very intolerance which they would repudiate. They are opposed to the existence of various social groups, based largely upon racial identity, in American society. They assume that there must be only one social group in America, and one thorough-going cultural tradition. The Jewish community, for example, is sometimes criticized by these people (who clearly are not anti-Semitic) for its separatism, its solidarity and its refusal to assimilate.

When it is claimed that if the Jew would surrender everything except his "personal religious views," the anti-Semitic disease would disappear and all would be well with him, these spokesmen

reply that the German Jews for decades practiced this very theory of assimilation. They tried in all ways *not* to be different. Their group consciousness had dwindled to a vanishing point. And yet, such is the patent bankruptcy of this whole thesis, the most virulent anti-Semitism developed in Germany, and in place of a self-willed "difference," a legal, prescriptive and discriminating "difference" was forced upon them as a mark of shame. Even non-Aryan Christian clergymen who certainly never suffered from excessive Jewish group-consciousness have been "differentiated" and stigmatized in the land of classic Jewish assimilation.

"Social unity" or "cultural unity" is just as dangerous a slogan to raise in modern society as "racial unity." Too many noble ideals of mankind are being broken on the wheel of totalitarian obsessions in the world today for liberal churchmen, lay or cleric, who value individualism and exalt personality, to permit themselves to become champions of "unification" crusades in American life.

What is needed in the world today is not race or religious imperialism, or mystic yearning after cultural or social unification, after a monolithic society which crushes the individual, but the courageous reassertion of that liberal, generous, tolerant view of life which our present unhappy age has so tragically lost, and to which it will have no return if life is to be livable, and if men and minorities are to be saved from the tyranny of the mass and the curse of regimentation. If we, men of faith, are to remain faithful to the classic ideals of our religions we must set about rekindling the light of the ideal of one humanity of free men within an economic system which will permit true freedom, and we must redirect the aspirations of men towards it. Then questions of state and race and nationalism will assume their proper place of secondary importance in human life, and mutual adjustments will be made far more simply and naturally than is possible today. The lost perspective will have been restored.

The problem, the one and the same, of the individual and society, is one of the most fundamental and continuing problems in human thought. How to insure the fullest expression of the individual without disrupting society, and ~~then~~ how to ^{coordinate} ~~conserve~~ personal freedom with group responsibility - that has been the major problem of sociology. The revolution has thrown out the ages swinging between the extremes of unlimited individualism and absolute social control, between the ^{exaltation} ~~apothosis~~, the individual ^{and} his submergence.

① Man begins his history as an individual, ^{member} ~~member~~ of a loosely coordinated community. He develops with greater freedom, they let and act as the life, the community moves into the higher ranges of civilization. In eras of decadence, ~~the~~ individualism degenerates into anarchic subjectivism, turns anti-social and actually ^{tends to} ~~destroys~~ the individualism.

① There are epochs when the social gospel must be ~~for~~ stressed, because individual privilege has been allowed to ~~violate~~ ^{exploit} the group. There are other times when the essential rights, the individual must be championed in the face of a dangerous encroachment of group tyranny.

① Prof. Eucken in his essay 'Society and the Individual' called attention probably to 'the anti-individualistic influence of the tremendous accession of strength which has fallen to the part, the State in the course, the 19th century. This accession has been due for the most part to economic

②

complications, in the face, which every merely individual effort has seemed helpless.... The increasing complication, the technical development & antithetical demands, a clear coordination of the separate forces and new organization, the whole, and therefore calls for a guiding center. (To-day we call it central planning)

"Thus the visible power, the state and the invisible power of society are united against the independence of the individual."

① If that judgment, Prof. Eucken held good when it was written in the days before the world war, how much more pertinent and re-enforced is it to-day, with state and class dictatorship riding in triumph in two-thirds of the civilized world.

5. The The post-war era has been dominated by the ^{state} idea of corporateness to a far greater degree than the one which preceded it. The power and authority of the state has been ~~largely~~ augmented even in those countries where no dictatorship has been established. "The tremendous accession of strength which has fallen to the part of the state in the 19th century" is nothing in comparison to the accession of strength, control and authority which has fallen to the part of the state since the beginning of the third decade of the 20th century.

World's Fair - Chicago - June 23rd

(3)

I have been asked to speak on Jew and Christian in the New Era. No one, of course, is able to foretell with any definiteness what this new era is going to be like. It is still on the anvil. It is even now being hammered into shape by vast new forces. A close observer, well versed in historical craftsmanship may detect the rough outlines of this new era which is emerging out of the titanic forging and fashioning going on. The completed design is still obscure.

(2) The New Era, for example, seems likely to be dominated by the idea of corporateness to a far greater degree than the one which preceded it. The power and authority of the State is certain to be augmented. The 19th century witnessed the triumph of bourgeois society which ^{sought to as far as possible} delimited the powers and functions of the State and ^{to} extended and established the rights of the individual. The development of private capitalism in the 19th century necessitated and achieved a large measure of freedom for the individual and a ^{sharply circumscribed} ~~minimum~~ of corporate control. The 20th century witnessed the final collapse of this system of unrestricted competitive individualism. ^{check} Everywhere the State is stepping in to ~~delimit~~ the power and authority of the individual. The democratic apparatus which middle-class individualism created to safeguard its rights, is being pushed aside or discarded. Bolshevism, Fascism and Nazism have this one thing in common: — they are all champions of maximum State authority. The State must have absolute dictatorial power over the whole life of man. The individual has no inalienable rights — no areas forever exempted from group control and interference. Mussolini declared: "Here, as in Russia, we are advocates of the collective significance of life, and we wish to develop this at the cost of individualism."

There are spiritual advantages to a doctrine of collectiv^{ism} as against the doctrine of private exploitation and careerism which characterized our

passing civilization. Both Judaism and Christianity always ^{doctrinally} subordinated the private ambitions of the individual to the well-being of society as a whole. The highest good was the social good. Man was taught to discover the real significance of his ^{own} life in enterprises which contributed to the upbuilding of the perfect society. Primitive Christianity was actually communistic in its social structure, and so were the monastic brotherhoods which derived from it. The whole purpose of the Mosaic Jubilee legislation, touching land tenure and sale, as well as the whole tenor of the social message of the prophets of Israel were to discourage the exploitation of the masses by the classes and to curb the exaltation of the individual at the expense of the group.

Neither Judaism nor Christianity have therefore anything to fear from the spread of the doctrine of the socialized community and the collective life which is likely to dominate the New Era. The danger lies in the excessive zeal and over-reaching on the part of the State which may lead to the complete subjugation of the individual and which in time may prove fatal to his spiritual life. Our experience of the last decade and a half in different parts of the world with experiments in the corporate society, in Communism, in State Socialism, ~~or~~ in ^{or in the corporative state} State Capitalism, has given men ground for fear that the individual is being sacrificed in the process of economic and political ^{coordination,} concentration. ³ Whether the suppression of the individual is only a necessary incident in the transition from one social order to another ^{and then social order} or whether together with dictatorship it will become a permanent feature of the new social order is for the present a matter of conjecture. But for the time being at least, it is alarming to behold in the lands where the corporate ideal of the state has made the greatest headway the total conscription of the individual in the service of the autocratic state. All

dictatorships, wherever established, have so far been characterized by their utter ruthlessness. This is true both of capitalistic dictatorships and of communism. ^{the} They are equally unscrupulous when they get into action. Both have no compunction whatsoever about trampling on the prostrate body of ^{-even of legal rights-} human rights, ^{of} ~~democracy~~ ^{elementary justice of} and liberalism. For both the end justifies the means. Both raise political violence to a principle and glory in their ruthlessness. ^{when the recent blood bath in Germany} In the ~~ferocious~~ ^{economic} class struggle the mandates of personal morality and basic human decencies and amenities are entirely lost sight of. We have entered an age of sanctified ruthlessness and exalted cruelty. The Dark Ages could offer no comparable records of mass brutality. But even more ^{the} dangerous than ~~the~~ terrible toll of victims of physical violence is the tragic toll of victims of ^{the} spiritual and intellectual violence. Men are driven into terrified silence. Conformity is prescribed. Men dare not dissent. All opposition, all parties, all dissenting opinion in press, pulpit, class-room, platform and book is stamped out. ~~That~~ ^{That} this is ^{fatal} ~~deadly~~ to man's spiritual life is easily apparent. It tends to dry up the mainsprings of man's spiritual creativeness. It destroys the soil and roots of his moral growth. When man is not allowed to stand alone, to dissent from the majority, to proclaim the truth which has been born in him through his own soul's travail, his ~~spirit~~ spiritual life is destroyed. Revelations never come to groups. There were schools of prophets in ancient Israel but they were merely the monitors of ancient superstitions. It was only after the individual separated himself from the School and the group and pursued his own solitary quest of truth that prophecy discovered its authentic voice and good. ^{at best (to quote Pestalozzi) "the collective existence of our race can only civilize us; it cannot cultivate us."}

The New Era may thus burden the church and synagogue with another task -- ^{at the behest of a new politico-economic} to save man from the dark heresy of sanctified ruthlessness and brutality, ~~which devastated life in previous epochs, to preach anew and with increased fervor the sanctity of reasonableness, and tolerance and charity, and to safe-guard~~ ^{missionary, and to safe-guard man's spiritual and intellectual freedom} ~~in a world constricted by the encompassing wall of~~ ^{dictatorship.}

Side by side with the doctrine, the absolute ~~state~~ totalitarian state, 7.
~~runs~~ the doctrine of competitive nationalism and unbridled racialism
- both of which victimize the individual. There is a nationalism
which is as instinctive as one's love of home and family and friends.
It requires no artificial indoctrination and ~~propaganda~~ ^{no} It is neither
exclusion, intolerance or militant. It is not a cunning ^{in the hands} tool of
economic imperialism. But the western world is harassed and
ridden to-day by a nationalism which makes a mockery of
this simple, wholesome patriotism of men, employing it as a
blind for shameful exploitation. The love of one's country is
put under ~~option~~ ^{by} those who control the policies of govern-
ment. A cabal of industrialists, financiers, bankers and
military matters prescribe what the government shall do - and
the individual, blind hand and foot before-hand by the mandates of these
^{newer nationalisms} ~~is delivered over~~ to the devil-servants. The youth of the world is being
stamped to-day by this into group intolerance ^{and} and provincialism
and into the shambles, ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~aftermath~~ ^{aftermath} was by this disgraceful
strategy. The individual seems helpless in the face of this
cunningly stimulated mob-patriotism. The universal
ideal which fired the imagination, the best minds of Europe in
the 18th and early 19th centuries - the ideal of a federated world -
wherein a man could be both a citizen of his country and
at the same time a citizen of the world - the ideal which en-
larged man's estate and set him free for a spiritual
career beyond the narrow boundaries of his own land -
this ideal - so thoroughly Christian and so thoroughly Jewish -
has been pushed out of men's minds by the command of
a restrictive, turbulent and arrogant nationalism.
Internationalism, to-day, in many lands is blackest heresy.
The youth of the world is being taught to think not in terms
of international human solidarity, in terms of humanity, but
in terms of exclusive and aggressive and jealous national
loyalties. One is first and foremost a German, a Frenchman,

an Italian, a Pole, and only secondarily and not always necessarily a son of man, a child of God!... Modern nationalism has unquestionably ghettoized the individual and ~~concentrated his world~~ consigned him to a little corner in a fragmented and disintegrated world.

In some parts, the world nationalism has still further been narrowed by the concept of race. Nation has been made synonymous with race. Only those belonging to the racial stock, the majority are recognized as citizens. All others are disenfranchised and politically, ~~and~~ economically and socially degraded. This has been particularly true in Nazi Germany where race idolatry has run riot to a point where all human virtues have been subordinated to it. Hitler declared: "I prefer a German deserter to a Jewish hero."

It is clear that in a state where race becomes the criterion and pre-requisite for rights and preferences, ~~that~~ the individual is sacrificed. It is no longer a matter of personal character or ability but of hereditary fate. One's claim to equality can no longer be based upon ~~merit~~ a shared human destiny or upon worth or merit, but upon a factor which ~~is beyond~~ the individual's ~~control~~ control - ancestry.

Unfortunately.

Pseudo-scientific propaganda for racial imperialism is widespread

in the world today. The doctrine of racial superiority was used as a cover for the vicious motives of the last war. It has always been a blind for economic imperialism. The people in the South used it as an excuse for exploiting the colored man and for denying him his elementary human rights and his legitimate opportunities.

It has again been invoked in present day Germany, as a camouflage *which is defending itself with desperation,* for economic reaction *as inflammable propaganda material* for the purposes of political incitement and stampede, to achieve certain objectives which calm reason would fail to achieve, and as compensation for all the rights and liberties which a Fascist Dictatorship takes away from the citizens of a country.

Some peoples which have a large element of mysticism in their make-up are particularly addicted to race idolatry. Mysticism is at bottom religious romanticism and romanticism is essentially an historic throw-back, a hankering after older forms of social life and organization, a retroversion to herd mores, folkways and myths, to what is thought to be the protoplasmic racial soul. A hundred years ago Heinrich Heine called attention to this recurrent manifestation of mysticism and romanticism among the German people. In the Nazism, the German mass is again manifesting these strong mystic, primitivist and collectivist tendencies. Race has again surged to the forefront of

popular *obsession* ~~interest~~, and the cosmopolitan spirit of Lessing, Herder, Schiller, Goethe and Kant is, for the time being, *harmless* in Germany.

In this economically-motivated race propaganda the possessor of blond hair, blue eyes and long head, the Nordic, is taught to look upon himself as the salt of the earth. His race is creative. His race is superior. The dark-haired, dark-eyed and round-headed man, the Mediterranean or Alpine, not to mention the Asiatic, is inferior. His race is mongrel. It can never rise to leadership. Therefore the Nordic race ought by right to be the *"Herrenrasse,"* the dominant race of leaders,

Stop rulers and masters, and all others should be content with the role of "Untermenschen"

There is, of course, no pure race in the world. *"It is curious,"* writes

← Anyone who has even a smattering of history knows that all through the dark centuries following the collapse of the Roman Empire, Europe was a veritable stamping ground of peoples, tribes and races, who moved to and fro across its face in vast migrations, mingled and co-mingled, and mixed their bloods with the indigenous populations, so that today there is not one people in Europe which can rightly claim racial homogeneity. And archaeology has established that in pre-historic times the processes of racial fusion were equally operative. The term "Aryan" as applied to race is a misnomer. Professor Max Müller, who invented the term "Aryan" as designating a linguistic group declared: "To me, an ethnologist who speaks of an Aryan race, Aryan blood, Aryan eyes and hair, is as great a sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dolichocephalic dictionary or a brachycephalic grammar. It is worse than a Babylonian confusion of tongues -- it is downright theft."

Again there are no superior races. There are no races endowed by nature with superior qualities of mind or character. There are races more favored than others by circumstance, by environment, by geographic position, by the fertility of the soil or by the treasures underneath the soil. There are advanced races and backward races but no superior races. There are differences between races but no biologic gradations.

The vaunted superiority of the peoples of Northwestern Europe is of very recent date and is due largely to the shifting of the lanes of commerce from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and to the rich deposits of coal and iron found in their mountains. If these races had possessed superior natural endowments, they would have evolved the first civilization of mankind instead of the last. They would have been civilized long before the Chinese were civilized or the Babylonians or the Egyptians or the Greeks or the Romans or the Arabs. Actually they were barbarians when these people were evolving great civilizations and carving highways for human progress.

-5-

Up the the fourteenth century the Prussians were heathens and barbarians. They were not even Christianized. Up the twelfth century England, as far as civilization was concerned, was practically unknown. England and Scandinavia and Northern France and the Netherlands and Germany were up to the last millennium, as far as human progress was concerned, negligible. They need not have existed at all. These "superior" peoples were utterly unknown when Greece -- a Mediterranean people of Oriental admixture -- was blessing mankind with a galaxy of poets, philosophers and artists whose gifts remain to this day unmatched for excellence by any Nordic people. They were unknown when a little Asiatic people, the Jews, was evolving a God-idea which is today the cherished faith of two-thirds of mankind. They were practically unknown to civilization when the Arabs were building universities in Cairo, Cordova and Bagdad. Nearly all that northern Europe has today of art, literature and religion, -- of the essential values of social life -- have come to it from Asiatic and Mediterranean peoples. It is therefore supreme arrogance for any one racial group to regard itself as the sole creator and monitor of civilization.

Furthermore, no race remains permanently dominant. No race retains a position of supremacy for more than four or five centuries. Races are like individuals. The individual has his period of infancy and of adolescence. Then comes his period of maturity when he is able to give expression to his powers and to make his substantial contributions to society. Finally and inevitably old age sets in and senility. No individual, however brilliant, can resist the weariness and the exhaustion which comes with age. Neither can any race. Races too have their periods of infancy and early development. Then comes their short golden age of maturity when they fashion out of the genius which is theirs those gifts which become their legacies to mankind. And then the reaction sets in, -- intellectual and spiritual exhaustion. The race

goes to seed. Five hundred or even a thousand years may elapse before the race will experience a new ferment and stir, before it will begin to forge its way anew to another cycle of creative life.

Again, as Professor Franz Boas has ^{pointed out} declared: "It is incorrect to assume that all the members of a racial group possess uniform characteristics because they are similar in some respects. All people who are blonde and have blue eyes have not the same characteristics and there is no reason to give inordinate weight to this single feature....The whole concept of race lacks in clarity, and a great error is committed in assuming that people who look alike in some respects must be alike in all respects.....A good many indications show that differences are determined more by environment than by racial descent."

it is a truism which need not be argued but
And finally, *genius* is the monopoly of no one race, and civilization is the achievement of no one people. Dr. Paul Radin in his recent work, "The Racial Myth," wisely remarks: "In terms of a generation, we may, at times, get the impression that ability is confined to a specific corner of the earth and to a specific people. When the time unit, however, is lengthened to two generations, doubt begins to arise; and when it is further lengthened to a century, our initial impression proves to be completely incorrect. Then it is borne in upon us that Europe is an indivisible cultural unit; that race, nationality, language and religion, and social status are secondary. The Catholic agnostic Laplace is found side by side with the Protestant agnostic Kant, and the devout Protestant sectarian Faraday with the devout Catholic Pasteur; the history of the theory of relativity passes in continuous procession from the Russian Lobatchewsky to the Hungarian Bolyai, the German Riemann, the Russian Jew Minkowski, and the South German Jew Einstein; wireless telegraphy begins experimentally with the Englishman Faraday, is given mathematical expression by the Scotchman Clerk

-8-

admixture would produce an inferior type, less gifted artists, scientists, or musicians. There was but one reason throughout the ages: "Lest he will turn away thy son from following Me, that they may serve other Gods." The Jew persisted in racial uniqueness in order to preserve the integrity of his faith. The heathen who was a scholar was held in far higher repute by the rabbis than an ignorant High Priest who could trace his descent from Aaron himself. "God created only one Adam," declared a Rabbi, "in order that in future times no man shall be warranted in saying: I came from better stock than you do." And another Rabbi declared, "I call heaven and earth to witness, be he man or woman, young or old, rich or poor, Jew or non-Jew, according to his deserts will the spirit of God descent upon him." In its highest ethical ranges, the law of Israel drew no line of distinction between native and foreigner. "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you. And thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."

Christianity, of course, took over the prophetic, universalistic from concept / Judaism, emphasized it, enlarged upon it, and carried it to the far corners of the earth. "The God that made the world and all nations therein, he being Lord of Heaven and earth.....made of one blood (εξ ἑνὸς αἵματος) every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." The organic racial oneness of the whole human family is nowhere in the Bible more clearly and forcibly enunciated. And again: "For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him." The entire concept of race which is fatalistic and exclusive is subordinated to the concept of faith which is volitional and all-inclusive. "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." (Gal. 3.29).

- 9 -

It is therefore no accident that Nazi racialists have been led to a repudiation of both the Old and the New Testaments and are invoking anew the dethroned tribal Gods of primitive, heathen Germany. And it is no accident either that the great Christian leaders of present-day Germany have clearly seen the menace in atavistic Nazi racialism to the spirit and mission of their historic faith.

The Middle Ages knew very little of that racial chauvinism which is so rampant in our day. There was no talk of race purity in the Middle Ages. It was with the rise of nationalism and of colonial imperialism among the Northwestern European peoples, particularly during the last century, and the consequent exploitation of the backward races that the necessity arose of finding some ideologic justification for such exploitation. It soon appeared in the form of pseudo-scientific theories of race superiority. These theories gained prestige and popularity as the European nations proceeded to conquer, subject and despoil backward peoples. Some apologists even employed High Church terminology such as "bearing the White Man's burden" to savor the miserable mess of imperialistic pottage by means of which European peoples robbed other races of their birthright of freedom. The "White Man's burden" became the black man's curse and the brown man's and the yellow man's.

Modern nationalism has fallen under the blight of this race idolatry, particularly among a people like the Germans who are not empire-builders and therefore politically provincial and among whom ~~national~~ national unity is a quite recent achievement and hence still a matter of hallelujah. The novel doctrine is now being loudly proclaimed that a nation must be racially homogeneous and every national within the state who can not trace his ancestry back to the racial stock of the majority is an alien and an intruder. Racial minorities are almost everywhere disadvantaged in the modern state ^{and} ^{no one} ^{of course} ^{can} ^{be} ^{all} ^{the} ^{individual members}, such racial minorities.

Stop

-10-

Racial imperialism like religious imperialism is a stumbling block in the way of human ^{freedom and} progress. What is required in our day is not super-heated race apologetics but a generous way of life which will give each race ^{and to all men regardless of race} the opportunity to live ^{their} ~~its~~ own life, to express ^{their} ~~its~~ own soul and to contribute ^{their} ~~its~~ unique values to the commonalty of human life. Our age needs a form of good will which will not only ^{racial and cultural} tolerate differences but which will gladly use them for the enrichment of life.

There are people who would like to acquire good will through assimilation. They know that intolerance, in the last analysis, is due to the existence of differences -- racial differences, cultural differences. They would therefore do away with intolerance by obliterating these differences.

But that is paying too high a price! The thing gained is less than the thing surrendered. To use Benjamin Franklin's phrase, "That is paying dear, very dear, for the whistle."

I like to be on the best of terms with my neighbor. I invite his friendship even as I proffer mine -- but only on one condition: that he respect my individuality even as I respect his. He must take me for what I am even as I take him for what he is, not for what each of us would like the other one to be. I am what I am. I have been molded by centuries of distinctive cultural experiences. I am a unique racial precipitate. I wish to remain what I am. I am ready to acknowledge that my neighbor has the same right to retain his individuality and his racial and cultural distinctiveness. It is on the basis of such contrasts which are not conflicts that I would build a real comradeship of free men and good works.

I am Hebrew and not Anglo-Saxon. I am Hebrew and not Teuton, Gaul or Slav. I never will be anything else. I do not wish to take on, as protective coloration, the manners, attitudes and points of view of the Anglo-Saxon, Teuton,

-11-

Gaul or Slav. I do not wish to take on the livery of any man in order to enjoy the privilege of being in his retinue. I wish to be myself. Any other basis for good will is spurious. Any movement for good will which demands of me self-abnegation, is a hostile attack. The man who would be my friend only if he can convert me to his way of living and thinking and believing, is not my friend. He is my enemy. He does not like me for what I am. He would like to see his own reflection in me.

The Jew who casts aside his distinctiveness for the sake of fellowship with other groups will bring nothing to that ultimate communion of minds which alone makes up human fellowship. He will bring to that hoped-for fraternity nothing but a masquerading self, a spurious and washed-out personality. He will have nothing to give. He has destroyed his uniqueness. It is only an integrated, vibrant and affirmative personality which has something to contribute to a community of personalities.

There are some very high-minded men in our country who rightfully would resent any charge of racial intolerance, who nevertheless by their fond hankering after an American social and cultural unification, a sort of American "gleichschaltung," are unconsciously contributing to that very intolerance which they would repudiate. They are opposed to the existence of various social groups, based largely upon racial identity, in American society. They assume that there must be only one social group in America, and one thoroughgoing cultural totalitarianism. They regard all distinctive cultural groups in America as socially baneful. The Jewish community is therefore sometimes criticized by these people, who are clearly not anti-Semitic, for its separatism, its solidarity and its refusal to assimilate.

To which the spokesmen of the Jewish group reply that cultural uniformity is not a prerequisite of American democratic society, that such uniformity is not intrinsically preferable and that cooperation and good-will in common national tasks are possible in spite of the existence of differences.

-13-

existed in Judaism) -- in what way are these (as some one charged) "focal centers of rebellion against common and wholesome social tendencies," and in what way do they interfere in "the common life of the community?" Why has not the Jew or any other individual or group of individuals in a free democracy the right to live his own life in his own way, so long as, to quote John Stuart Mill, "he does not attempt to deprive others of theirs, or impede their efforts to obtain it."

When it is claimed that if the Jew would surrender everything except his "personal religious views," the anti-Semitic disease would disappear and all would be well with him, these spokesmen reply that the German Jew for decades practised this very theory of assimilation. They tried in all ways not to be different. Their group consciousness had dwindled to a vanishing point. ~~Inter-marriage was widespread among them. There was very easy access from the group and no ingress to speak of.... Many joined the Christian church or became "konfessionlos."~~ And yet -- such is the patent bankruptcy of this whole thesis -- the most virulent anti-Semitism developed in Germany, and in place of a self-willed "difference" -- a legal, prescriptive and discriminating "difference" was forced upon them as a mark of shame. Even non-Aryan Christian clergymen who certainly never suffered from excessive Jewish group-consciousness: have been "differentiated" and stigmatized in the land of classic Jewish assimilation. Stop

"Social unity" or "cultural unity" is just as dangerous a slogan to raise in modern society as "racial unity." ~~In fact the one inevitably leads to the other. In Nazi Germany they have quite naturally been "coordinated" into one German-Nordic-Aryan dogma of infallibility.~~

Too many noble ideals of mankind are being broken on the wheel of totalitarian obsessions in the world today for liberal churchmen ^{lay a cleric} who value

-14-

individualism and exalt personality to permit themselves to become champions of "unification" crusades in American life.

What is needed in the world today is not race or religious imperialism, or mystic yearning after cultural or social unification, after the monolithic ^{which crushes the individual} society, but the courageous reassertion of that liberal, generous, tolerant view of life which our present unhappy age has so tragically lost, but to which it will have to return if life is to be livable, and if ^{men} ~~men~~ and minorities are to be

saved from the tyranny of the mass and incurse of regimentation. We must ^{the vision of man made in the image of God, a soul and unshakable personality} ~~rediscover in our day that vision which enkindled the imagination of the great minds of the Western World in the 18th and early 19th century -- the vision not of fragments of mankind -- nations, races, ^{classes} groups arranged hierarchically and competitively, but the vision of the whole ^{all} of mankind, of the encompassing brotherhood of all men. It is almost treason today or heresy to talk of mankind. One is in danger of concentration camps ^{in many parts of the world} if one speaks up of internationalism and world reconciliation. Such is the darkness and spiritual confusion of our~~

a reflection of
divinity --
as well as
the vision of
the voluntary
cooperative
consciousness
of such
individuals
-- rarely.

~~age~~ ^{religion} If we, men of faith are to remain faithful to the classic ideals of our ^{religion} profession, we must set about rekindling the light of the ideal of one Humanity of free men ^{of men} ~~in the souls of men~~ and we must redirect ^{Towards it} their aspirations ~~together~~. Then the questions of ^{state} race and nationalism will assume their ^{proper} place of secondary importance in human life, and mutual adjustments will then be made far more simply and naturally than is possible today. The lost perspective will have been restored.

Soviet Russia solved the problems of relationships among the numerous races and cultures which compose the Soviet Federation -- problem which had plagued and ^{fractured} ~~disrupted~~ the old Tsarist regime -- simply by transcending them. It set up ^{a different goal, another set of values} a social-economic ideal and program which ~~was~~ ^{was} in conflict with the cultural interests of no single ^{ethnic} group, and which for the actual business of living was far more significant and important ^{to them} than race or nation ^{has to} ~~is~~ ^{must} redirect the interests of our generation to ^{another goal - or} ~~the transcending ideal of one Humanity.~~ ^{to the transcending ideal of one Humanity.}

THE DECLINE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The post-war era has been dominated by the idea of state corporateness to a far greater degree than the one which preceded it. The power and authority of the state have been augmented even in those countries where no dictatorship has been established. "The tremendous accession of strength which has fallen to the part of the state in the 19th century" is nothing in comparison to the accession of strength, control and authority which has fallen to the part of the state since the beginning of the third decade of the 20th century.

Everywhere the state is stepping in to check the power and authority of the individual. The democratic apparatus which middle-class individualism created to safeguard its rights is being pushed aside or discarded. Bolshevism, Fascism, and Nazism have this one thing in common: they are all champions of maximum state authority. The state, they claim, must have absolute dictatorial power over the whole life of man. The individual has no inalienable rights - no areas forever exempted from group control and interference. Mussolini declared: "Here, as in Russia, we are advocates of the collective significance of life, and we wish to develop this at the cost of individualism."

Whether the suppression of the individual is only a necessary incident in the transition from one social order to another and freer social order, or whether together with dictatorship it will become a permanent feature of the new social order, is for the present a matter of conjecture. But for the time being at least it is alarming to behold in the lands where the corporate ideal of the state has made the greatest headway, the total conscription of the individual in the

in the service of the autocratic state. All thought is regimented. Education becomes propaganda. Every writer becomes a functionary of the state. Attempts are made, as in Germany, to make even the church an adjunct and a propaganda agency for the political state, a mouthpiece for its dogmas and pretensions. The right of the individual to quest for himself in the fields of the mind and the spirit is denied. A new orthodoxy has been enthroned. It is now proclaimed that absolute truth as regards social ethics, government and economics, even private morality, has already been revealed. It is in the safekeeping of a minority political group - a new priestly hierarchy. The individual must accept the dogma of the regime, unquestioningly and submissively, or he is anathema. This new state absolutism, backed by its vast punitive power, is far more dangerous than the old and now discredited absolutism of the church. The latter was frequently held in check by the secular arm of government. At least the secular and the ecclesiastical attenuated each other's powers. But with the decline of the political power of the church, and the ascendancy of the absolute authoritarian state, the individual is at the complete mercy of the latter, without recourse and without refuge.

In the face of the amazing pretensions of the state, it behooves all religious disciples to insist that man possesses certain rights over which the state, however noble its purposes and however exalted its program, has no power whatsoever. There are sovereign rights which are man's by virtue of his humanity and not by virtue of his citizenship in a given political group. Man has other relationships and other obligations than those to his country. There is the whole of mankind. There is the universe as a whole. There is his own inner spiritual microcosm. There is God.

✓ Side by side with the doctrine of the absolute, totalitarian state, runs the doctrine of competitive nationalism and intolerant racialism, both of which victimize the individual. There is a nationalism which is as instinctive as one's love of home and family and friends. It requires no artificial indoctrination and no propaganda. It is neither exclusive, intolerant nor militant. It is not a cunning tool in the hands of economic imperialism. But the western world is harassed and ridden today by a nationalism which makes a mockery of this simple, wholesome patriotism and employs it as a blind for shameless exploitation. The love of one's country is put under option by those who control the policies of government. A cabal of industrialists, financiers, bankers and munition makers prescribes what the government shall do - and the individual, bound hand and foot beforehand by the mandates of this newer nationalism, is delivered over to the drill sergeant. By this disgraceful strategy, the youth of the world is being stampeded today into group intolerance and arrogant provincialism and into the shambles of another war. The individual seems helpless in the face of this cunningly stimulated mob-patriotism. The universal ideal which fired the imagination of the best minds of Europe in the 18th and early 19th centuries - the idea of a federated world wherein a man at one and the same time could be a citizen of his country and a citizen of the world - the ideal which enlarged man's estate and set him free for a spiritual career beyond the narrow boundaries of his own land - this ideal, so thoroughly Christian and so thoroughly Jewish - has been pushed out of men's minds by the command of a restrictive, truculent and arrogant nationalism. Internationalism, today, in many lands is blackest

heresy. The youth of the world is being taught to think not in terms of international human solidarity, but in terms of exclusive, aggressive and jealous national loyalties. One is first and foremost a German, a Frenchman, an Italian, a Pole, and only secondarily and not always necessarily a son of man, a child of God. Modern nationalism has unquestionably ghettoized the individual and confined him to a little corner in a fragmented and disintegrated world.

In some parts of the world, nationalism is still further being narrowed by the concept of race. Nation has been made synonymous with race. Only those belonging to the racial stock of the dominant majority are recognized as citizens. All others are disfranchised and politically, economically and socially degraded. This has been particularly true in Nazi Germany where race idolatry has run riot to a point where all human virtues have been subordinated to it.

I point to another aberration. Nationalism. Now I draw a clear line of distinction, which men frequently overlook, between the principle of nationality and the principle of nationalism. Bertrand Russel deftly defines the two. "The advocates of nationality say: "Every country must be free to achieve its legitimate ambitions. The advocates of nationalism say: "My country must be free to achieve its ambitions, whether legitimate or not." Nationality is the principle of self-determination. Every people, conscious of being a distinctive people, has the right to control its own political destinies, free from foreign domination. That is as old as human groupings, conscious of their group solidarity, existed upon the earth. But nationalism is quite a recent development, a product, by and large, of the 19th century. In France it begins with the Revolution. In Germany with the Napoleonic Wars. In Italy with Mazzini and the struggle for Unification. This nationalism has always had in it a mystic, romantic element which has been frequently corrupted into imperialism and chauvenism, and dangerous belligerency. National destiny and national mission were pious phrases coined by this aggressive and militant nationalism to cloak expansionist ambitions and economic piracy. This nationalism and its ritual patriotism, has become man's other religion in the modern world.

*"World Unity
Conference held in Cleveland"* SA *The one + the
many*
IS ONE RELIGION FOR ALL MANKIND NECESSARY OR DESIRABLE?

OFFICE COPY

We have previously referred to the fundamental problem of the one and the many. It is one of the ever-recurrent themes in philosophic speculation: how to ground the many-foldness of the universe into some single unifying concept, how to harmonize the diversity of phenomena with the unity of a creative purpose.

In sociology the problem is one of insuring the fullest expression of the individual without disrupting society, of coordinating personal freedom with group responsibility.

In the realm of international relationships the problem takes the form of whether a way can be found which will permit nations to enjoy fullest self-determination without disorganizing the collocated life of mankind as a whole. Can national autonomy be reconciled with international accountability and can localized patriotism promote loyalty to a world federation of peoples and a world mind.

Racially the problem is coextensive with that of racial pretensions, rivalries and dark ancestral hatreds. How shall one human brotherhood ever arise out of a congeries of disjointed racial groups which are emotionally exclusive, inbred and fenced in by color and the dread memories of ancient unforgettable feuds? No antagonisms lead to such black murderous fury as that of race and yet it is only out of racial reconciliation and good-will that the happier society of tomorrow can be fashioned.

Religion, too, faces the problem of the one and the many. The principle of one uniform religion for all men is in conflict with the principle of religious freedom. After centuries of struggle, liberty of conscience and the right of non-conformity have been generally ^{afforded to} by the enlightened people of the earth. Still there remains in the minds of men the apparent incompatibility between their loyalty to their own religious group and beliefs and tolerance

for other forms of religious thought and organization. How can religions be of bigotry and hostility? How can a motley grudging and jealous sectarianism make possible the world-unifying mission of religion?

In the face of the wide ramifications of the problem of the one and the many and their vital and pressing importance, what is the task of civilization in our day? Clearly its task must not be to attempt to superimpose an artificial uniformity upon all races, peoples and creeds. Its aim must not be to force all into one common mold, so that they will all emerge looking alike and acting alike and thinking alike.

For it is only out of the conflict of opposing concepts, out of contrasted attitudes and outlooks, out of the clash and turmoil of warring ideas that the spark of the new insight is born and the new revelation is vouchsafed to mankind.

The task of civilization is not to constrict all men and groups into one Procrustean bed of uniformity, but to discover their common human needs, the common human denominator, and to organize them into voluntary cooperative efforts to meet these needs.

Civilization must cherish the inviolability of personality in individuals and groups, and must not desecrate them by some enforced and unnatural amalgamation. It must not attempt to destroy that uniqueness which time and ancient loyalties have builded. This would prove a distinct loss to civilization.

Men may meet without fusion. Men may unite without being first consigned to the melting pot. On the plane of common human aspirations all men may meet without sacrificing their characteristic cultures or modes of life.

Thus East and West may meet without conquest or assimilation, without the imposition of the cultural, political or religious hegemony of one over the other. The peoples of these two worlds, historically and geographically fashioned so differently, may discover in their common human needs a basis for cooperation and through the free exchange of their best thoughts they may discover ways of satisfying these needs.

When, for example, the man from India will realize that his greatest need is the stamping out of some dread disease and the man from Sweden or Mexico or Germany will realize that his is the self-same need, and when the best minds of these countries will meet to pool their intellectual resources and their experiences and together proceed to wrestle with this self-same problem, they will then have truly met and a strong bond of unity will have been forged between them. They may continue to retain each his historic integrity, his intrinsic self, his speech, his customs and his manners, but on at least one terrace of coparcenary interests they will have met and a spiritual covenant will have been established between them.

Or, for example, when the man from Russia will realize that his greatest need is the eradication of illiteracy and the man from South America or Africa will realize that he too, shares the same need and these peoples, separated by continents and so differently shaped by destiny, will get together upon this one common task in mutual stimulation and helpfulness, they will have met, truly, in the only true way in which free peoples can meet.

Similarly when Jew and Christian, Mohammedan and Buddhist, and men of all faiths, will realize that their source is one-God, and their destiny one- the service of man, and when they will join in a comradeship of labor to fulfill their destiny, they will have met, really. The walls of their churches will continue to separate them, but the spirit of their faiths will unite them. Their prayer books will continue to be many; their prayer will be one.

Frequently one hears the wish expressed that inasmuch as religious truth is one, there should be but one religion. The forms and institutions of religions are, after all, incidental and of secondary importance. Therefore for the sake of a universal religion, these incidental features of religion may well be human long and ugly.

But one religion for the whole of mankind is neither necessary nor desirable.

Only the religious monopolist who is convinced that there is but one true faith and one true church need insist upon one universal religion for the whole of mankind. All others who can find in no religion, however exalted, the final and absolute and exclusive revelation of God and man, but who find in all religions the identical passionate quest for truth and illumination, will look upon the yearning for universality and uniformity as something quite naive and of no importance. There is no true religion and there is no false religion. Some religions may have carried over a number of obsolete and discarded intellectual notions. To that extent they are out of alignment with contemporary thought. But every religion so far as it conceives of the universe as the manifestation of personality and beneficence and in so far as it impels human beings to the maximum of moral idealism is to that extent a true religion. And every church which looks upon itself as a corporate agency for the propagation of these beliefs and the inculcation of these ideals is a true church.

Religion is not a science. It is an art - the supreme art of the human spirit. In science truth is universal in the sense that a mathematical truth is cogent here and in China yesterday and for all time. Science is the observation of physical phenomena and processes. Therefore there can be an absolute identity in scientific truth. It is objective and not subjective.

Of course science, too, in a sense is relative. All human knowledge is relative. But it is relative not to this man or to this race but to mankind. There is a universal element in the concept of scientific relativity. But religion is an art. Religion has to do not with the observation of physical phenomena but with the interpretation of these phenomena, with judgments, values, spiritual appraisals, intuitive inferences. In this process of interpretation and race variations differences of temperament, culture, history, even of geography inevitably enter. They are the decisive factors in distinguishing one religion from another.

Art, too, is universal. All art is an effort to interpret life through the medium of line, color, rhythm and sound and to dramatize the beautiful. And yet how different and various are the ways by which artists arrive at their task - different not only as regards the media employed but also as regards technique and style. Very often artists will use the same theme, but they will be world apart in its treatment and the distinctiveness of a work of art is to be found not so much in the theme as in the treatment of the theme. Every fine artist reads into his work himself, his life, his philosophy, his environment and often his racial heritage.

It would therefore be altogether naive to say that inasmuch as art is universal, let us have one art, one style of music, one style of architecture, of sculpture or of painting.

So with religion. God is one but man's views of God are not one and cannot be one. "All the prophets", declared an ancient sage, "prophesied one thing but their styles were all different."

The Buddhist whose God-idea was evolved in the warm lands of the earth where physical effort and exertion are irksome will not conceive of his deity as ceaseless creative energy, eternal Becoming. He will think of his god as eternal Being, absolute existence at rest. He will crave for himself the boon of absorption in that everlasting calm, of losing himself in it as a drop of water loses itself in the ocean. He will not struggle and aspire for all aspiration is effort and effort is pain as well as vanity, for all existence is irrevocably evil. He will long for release from the sorrowful round of existence and for complete personal non-existence after death.

The Occidental, living in a world where climate and physical conditions compell and stimulate action and enterprize, will conceive of his deity as the Dynamic Creator, everlastingly renewing His universe and will crave for himself the privilege of being a co-worker with God in His marvelous cosmic laboratory.

What single religion will satisfy the spiritual needs of these men whose backgrounds, intellectual and emotional, are so different? And What single ritual?

The most potent arguments for religion come from the direct personal experiences of men. "Come and hearken, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what He hath done for my soul." Into its basic faith a people will read the experiences of its life. The religions of different peoples must therefore, to a degree at least, be destructive, autochthonous, reflecting their several histories and temperament. Every universal religion is sooner or later localized, transmuted by the alchemy of the racial psyche and absorbed into the life-pattern of each group.

Thus Judaism is certainly a universalistic religion and yet how markedly racial and national it is. It mirrors the unique history of a people. It oracles the ancestral voices of the races.

The Jew thinks of his God not alone in relation to the whole of humanity but quite specifically in relation to his own people. God has covenanted with Israel. The burden of a divine mandate has been placed upon him. He is to be the servant of God. His mission is to be "A light unto the nations, to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house" even if that mission makes him "despised, and forsaken of men, as one from whom men hide their face."

To ask the Jew to surrender this unique religious dogma for the sake of a compilation of rarified theologic abstractions which would be acceptable to all, is to rob him of that which is the most precious and magnificent quality of his faith.

So also with Christianity. Quite apart from the question of the divinity of Jesus, it is an indisputable fact that the personality of Jesus has been a glowing luminous fact in the life of Christianity. It has profoundly stirred the lives of hundreds of millions of people. It has moved myriads to emulation, to self-sacrifice and to martyrdom. This glorious personality which is radiantly central to the Christian means less, much less to the Buddhist, the Mohammedan, the Confucianist and the Jew.- To ask of Christianity to reduce this personality

so as to make it acceptable to Buddhist, Mohammedan, Confucianist and Jew alike, deprive it of that which is its sole distinction and its historic service to mankind.

I cannot think of a religious man in a vacuum. I cannot conceive of my religious life in a vacuum. If I think of my religion I think of it in terms of my people's religion. I like to pray as my fathers prayed. I like the ancient rhythms and the ancient psalm. I like my people's festivals. Their mood, their atmosphere, their associations are congenial to deep and joyous religious sentiments. I like the ceremonies of my faith, into which ages have poured their rich color. They bring beauty into my life and inspiration. They are the heritage of my people. They are mighty streams of religious idealism. Why should I surrender them? Why should the Christian or the adherent of any other historic faith be asked to surrender his intimate religious institutions and customs, which because of their venerable age and cherished associations have become powerful springs of action in his life?

In place of one religion for all mankind, civilization should foster one reverence for all religions. A man's faith is his innermost sanctuary and in its presence one should remove the sandals from off his feet for the place upon which he stands is holy ground. Mutual respect will lead to mutual cooperation in common tasks and opportunities.

We need not be concerned much about the presence of many religions in the world. That is not the serious problem. Religion is not playing its vital role in the world today not because there are too many religions but because there is too little religion in any of them. They have wandered far from the sources of their singular inspirations. They are repeating ancient battle cries from which the fervor of conviction has fled. They survive but do not revive. They have lost their visions but retain their dreams.

Similarly when Jew and Christian, Mohammedan and Buddhist, and men of all faiths, will realize that their source is one-God and their destiny one - the service of man, and when they will join in a comradeship of labor to fulfill their destiny, they will have met, really. The walls of their churches will continue to

separate them, but the spirit of their faiths will unite them. Their prayer books will continue to be many; their prayer will be one.

As long as the spirit of religious imperialism endures religions will not meet. As soon as religious groups realize that all faith is longing, all truth a groping and all dogma but temporary resting places for the advancing spirit of man, they will be prepared to meet in mutual helpfulness.

What is true of religious imperialism is true also of racial imperialism. Pseudo-scientific propaganda for racial imperialism is widespread in the world today. It was spread as a cover for the vicious motives of the war. It is a blind for economic imperialism. The possessor of blond hair and blue eyes, the Nordic, is taught to regard himself as the salt of the earth. His race is creative. His race is superior. The dark haired and brown eyed man, the Mediterranean or Asiatic, is inferior. His race is mongrel. It can never rise to leadership. Therefore the Nordic race should by right be the dominant race. The doctrine of racial superiority has always been used by the exploiters of mankind. The people in the South used it as an excuse for denying the colored man his elementary human rights and his legitimate opportunities.

There is, of course, no pure race in the world today. Anyone who has even a smattering of history knows that all through the dark centuries following the collapse of the Roman empire, Europe was a veritable stamping ground of peoples, tribes and races, who moved to and fro across its lands in vast migrations, mingled and co-mingled, and mixed their bloods with the indigenous populations, so that today there is not one people in Europe that can rightly claim racial homogeneity.

Again there are no superior races. There are no races endowed by nature with superior qualities of mind and soul. There are races more favored by circumstance, by environment, by geographic position, by the fertility of the soil or by the treasures underneath the soil.

The vaunted superiority of the peoples of northwestern Europe is of very recent date and is due largely to the shifting of the lanes of commerce from

the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and to the rich deposits of coal and iron found in their mountains. If these races had possessed superior natural endowments, they would have evolved the first civilization of mankind instead of the last. They would have been civilized long before the Chinese were civilized or the Babylonians or the Egyptians or the Greeks or the Romans or the Arabs. Actually they were barbarians when these people were evolving great civilizations and carving high-ways for human progress. "God created only one Adam" commented a sage of the Talmud, "in order that in the future no man shall have the right to say: I came from better stock than thou dost."

Furthermore, no race remains permanently superior. No race retains a position of supremacy for more than four or five hundred years. Races are like individual men. The individual has his period of infancy and of adolescence, and then his period of maturity when he is able to give expression to his innate capacities and make his substantial contributions to society. Then inevitably old age sets in and senility. No mind, however brilliant, can resist the weariness and the exhaustion which come with age.

So with the race. Races have their epochs of infancy and early development, and then their short golden age when they fashion out of the genius which is theirs those gifts which become their legacies to mankind. Then inevitably the reaction sets in, - intellectual and spiritual exhaustion. The race goes to seed. Five hundred or even a thousand years may elapse before it will experience a new birth, a new ferment and stir. Then the race will forge its way anew to a creative life.

As long as race mythologies and their blood cults persist in the world, - and they are very powerful today, so long will races not meet, and world unity will still remain an unrealizable dream. There is but one basis of goodwill between religions and races - mutual respect.

There are people who would like to acquire good will through assimilation. They know that intolerance, in the last analysis, is due to the existence of differences - religious differences, racial differences, cultural differences. They therefore to away with intolerance by obliterating these differences.

But that is paying too high a price! The thing gained is less than the thing surrendered. To use Benjamin Franklin's phrase, "That is paying dear, very dear for the whistle."

I like to be on the best of terms with my neighbor. I invite his friendship even as I proffer mine - but only on one condition: that he respect my individuality even as I respect his. He must take me for what I am even as I take him for what he is; not for what each of us would like the other one to be. I am what I am. I have been molded by centuries of distinctive cultural experiences. I am a unique racial precipitate. I wish to remain what I am. I am ready to acknowledge that my neighbor has the same right to retain his individuality and his racial and cultural distinctiveness. It is on the basis of such contrasts which are not conflicts that I would build a real comradeship of good works.

I am Hebrew and not Anglo-Saxon. I am Hebrew and not Teuton, Gaul, or Slav. I never will be anything else. I do not wish to take on, as protective coloration, the manners, attitudes and points of view of the Anglo-Saxon, Teuton, Gaul or Slav. I do not wish to take on the livery of any man in order to enjoy the privilege of being in his retinue. I wish to be myself. Any other basis for good will is spurious. Any movement for good will which demands of me self-abnegation, is a hostile attack. The man who would be my friend only if he can convert me to his way of living and thinking and believing, is not my friend. He is my enemy. He does not like me for what I am. He would like to see his own reflection in me.

The Jew who casts aside his distinctiveness for the sake of human fellowship will bring nothing to that ultimate communion of mind which alone makes up human

fellowship. He will bring to that hoped-for fraternity nothing but a masquerading self, a spurious and washed-out personality. He will have nothing to give. He has destroyed his uniqueness. It is only an integrated, vibrant and affirmative personality which has something to contribute to a community of personalities.

There is a type of good will which is based on indifference.

"I am a Jew but I do not care very much about my religion. You are a Christian and you do not care very much about yours. Why, then let us be broad-minded about it." This is not good will. It is unconcern. For an unbelieving Jew and an unbelieving non-Jew to be tolerant of each other's non-belief is no achievement. It is when a believing Jew, who is profoundly moved by his faith, and a believing Christian, who is profoundly moved by his, discover a common basis for good will, that a significant event is consummated.



THE ONE AND THE MANY

The problem of the one and the many is one of the most fundamental problems of human thought. It is the ever-recurrent theme in philosophic speculation: how to ground the many-foldness of the universe into a single unifying concept, how to harmonize the diversity of phenomena with the unity of a creative purpose.

In sociology the problem is one of insuring the fullest expression of the individual without disrupting society, of coordinating personal freedom with group responsibility.

In the realm of international relationships the problem is one of discovering the way which will permit nations to enjoy full self-determination without disorganizing the collocated life of mankind, of reconciling national autonomy with international accountability and localized patriotism with a world federation of peoples and the world mind.

Racially the problem is one of finding a common meeting ground for races sharply divided and beset with racial pretensions, rivalries and dark ancestral hatreds. How shall one human brotherhood ever arise out of a congeries of disjointed racial groups which are emotionally inbred, exclusive and hedged in by color and the dread memories of ancient and unforgettable feuds? No antagonisms are so fatalistic and lead to such black, murderous fury as that of race; and yet it is only out of racial reconciliation that the happier society of tomorrow can be fashioned.

Religion, too, faces the problem of the one and the many. The principle of one uniform religion for all men is in conflict with the principle of religious freedom. After centuries of struggle, liberty of conscience and the right of non-conformity have been generally agreed to by the enlightened people of the earth. Still there remains in the minds of men the apparent incompatibility between their loyalty to their own religious group and tolerance for other forms of religious thought and organization. How can religions be purged of bigotry and

hostility? How can a motley, grudging and jealous sectarianism make possible the world-unifying mission of religion?

In the face of the wide ramifications of the problem of the one and the many and its vital and pressing importance, what is the task of civilization in our day? Clearly its task must not be to superimpose an artificial uniformity upon all races, peoples and creeds. Its aim must not be to force all into one common mold, so that they will all emerge looking alike and acting alike and thinking alike. For it is only out of the conflict of opposing concepts, out of contrasted attitudes and outlooks, out of the clash and turmoil of warring ideas that the spark of the new insight is born and the new revelation is vouchsafed to mankind.

The task of civilization is not to constrict all men and groups into one Procrustean bed of uniformity, but to discover their common human needs, the common human denominator, and to organize them into voluntary cooperative efforts to meet these needs.

Civilization must cherish the inviolability of personality in individuals and groups, and must not desecrate them by some enforced and unnatural amalgamation. It must not attempt to destroy that uniqueness which time and ancient loyalties have builded. This would prove a distinct loss to civilization.

Men may meet without fusion. Men may unite without being first consigned to the melting pot. On the plane of common human aspirations all men may meet without sacrificing their characteristic cultures or modes of life.

Thus East and West may meet without conquest or assimilation, without the imposition of the cultural, political or religious hegemony of one over the other. The peoples of these two worlds, historically and geographically fashioned so differently, may discover in their common human needs a basis for cooperation and through the free exchange of their best thoughts they may discover ways of satisfying these needs.

When, for example, the man from India will realize that his greatest need is the

stamping out of dread disease and the man from Sweden or Mexico or Germany will realize that his is the self-same need, and when the best minds of these countries will meet to pool their intellectual resources and their experiences and together proceed to wrestle with this self-same problem, they will then have truly met and a strong bond of unity will have been forged between them. They may continue to retain each his historic integrity, his intrinsic self, his speech, his customs and his manners, but on at least one terrace of coparcenary interests they will have met and a spiritual covenant will have been established between them.

Or, for example, when the man from Russia will realize that his greatest need is the eradication of illiteracy and the man from South America or Africa will realize that he, too, shares the same need and these peoples, separated by continents and so differently shaped by destiny, will get together upon this one common task in mutual stimulation and helpfulness, they will have met, truly, in the only true way in which free peoples can meet.

Similarly when Jew and Christian, Mohammedan and Buddhist, and men of all faiths, will realize that their source is one-God, and their destiny one - the service of man, and when they will join in a comradeship of labor to fulfill their destiny, they will have met, really. The walls of their churches will continue to separate them, but the spirit of their faiths will unite them. Their prayer books will continue to be many, their prayer will be one.

Frequently one hears the wish expressed that inasmuch as religious truth is one, there should be but one religion. The forms and institutions of religions are, after all, incidental and of secondary importance. Therefore for the sake of a universal religion, these incidental features of religion may well be sacrificed.

But one religion for the whole of mankind is neither necessary nor desirable. Only the religious monopolist who is convinced that there is but one true faith and one true church need insist upon one universal religion for the whole of

mankind. All others who can find in no religion, however exalted, the final and exclusive revelation of God and man, but who find in all religions the identical passionate quest for truth and illumination, will look upon the yearning for universality and uniformity as something quite naive and of no importance. There is no true religion and there is no false religion. Some religions may have carried over a number of obsolete and discarded scientific notions. To that extent^t they are out of alignment with contemporary thought. But every religion so far as it conceives of the universe as the manifestation of personality and beneficence and in so far as it impels human beings to the maximum of moral idealism is a true religion. And every church which looks upon itself as a corporate agency for the propagation of these beliefs is a true church.

Religion is not a science. It is an art - the supreme art of the human spirit. In science truth is universal in the sense that a mathematical truth is cogent here and in China, yesterday and for all time. Science is the observation of physical phenomena and processes. Therefore there can be an absolute identity in scientific truth. It is objective and not subjective.

Of course science, too, in a sense, is relative. All human knowledge is relative. But it is relative not to this man or to this race but to mankind. There is a universal element in the concept of scientific relativity. But religion is an art. Religion has to do not with the observation of physical phenomena but with the interpretation of these phenomena, with judgments, values, spiritual appraisals, intuitive inferences. In this process of interpretation individual and race variations, differences of temperament, culture, history, even of geography inevitably enter. They are the decisive factors in distinguishing one religion from another.

Art, too, is universal. All art is an effort to interpret life through

the medium of line, color, rhythm or sound and to dramatize the beautiful. And yet how different and various are the ways by which artists arrive at their task - different not only as regards the media employed but also as regards technique and style. Very often artists will use the same theme, but they will be worlds apart in their treatment of it and the distinctiveness of a work of art is to be found not so much in the theme as in its treatment. Every original artist reads into his work himself, his life, his philosophy, his environment and his racial heritage.

It would therefore be altogether naive to say that inasmuch as art is universal, we should have one art, one style of music, one style of architecture, of sculpture or of painting.

So with religion. God is one, but man's view of God are not one and cannot be one. "All the prophets," declared an ancient sage, "prophesied one thing but their styles were all different."

The Buddhist whose God-idea was evolved in the warm lands of the earth where physical effort and exertion are irksome will not conceive of his deity as ceaseless creative energy, eternal Becoming. He will think of his god as eternal Being, absolute existence at rest. He will crave for himself the boon of absorption in that everlasting calm, of losing himself in it as a drop of water loses itself in the ocean. He will not struggle and aspire for all aspiration is effort and effort is pain as well as vanity, and all existence is irrevocably evil. He will long for release from the sorrowful round of existence and for complete personal non-existence after death.

The Occidental, living in a world where climate and physical conditions stimulate action and enterprise, will conceive of his deity as the Dynamic Creator, everlastingly renewing His universe, and will crave for himself the privilege of being a co-worker with God in His cosmic laboratory.

What single religion will satisfy the spiritual needs of these men whose intellectual and emotional backgrounds are so different? And what single ritual?

No one religion is sufficient for all mankind.

The most potent arguments for religion come from the direct personal experiences of men. "Come and hearken, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what He hath done for my soul." Into its basic faith a people will read the experiences of its life. The religions of different peoples must therefore, to a degree at least, be distinctive, autochthonous, reflecting their several histories and temperament. Every universal religion is sooner or later localized, transmuted by the alchemy of the racial psyche and absorbed into the life-pattern of the group.

Thus Judaism is certainly a universalistic religion and yet how markedly racial and national it is. It mirrors the unique history of a people. It oracles the ancestral voices of the race. The Jew thinks of his God not alone in relation to the whole of humanity but quite specifically in relation to his own people. God has covenanted with Israel. The burden of a divine mandate has been placed upon him. He is to be the servant of God. His mission is to be "a light unto the nations, to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house" even if that mission makes him "despised, and forsaken of men, as one from whom men hide their face."

To ask the Jew to surrender this unique religious dogma for the sake of a compilation of rarified theologic abstractions which would be acceptable to all, is to rob him of that which is the most precious and magnificent quality of his faith.

So also with Christianity. Quite apart from the question of the divinity of Jesus, it is an indisputable fact that the personality of Jesus has been a luminously radiant fact in the life of Christianity. It has profoundly stirred the lives of hundreds of millions of people. It has moved myriads to emulation, to self-sacrifice and to martyrdom. This unique personality which is so focal in the faith-life of the Christian means less, much less to the Buddhist, the

Mohammedan, the Confucianist and the Jew. To ask of Christianity to reduce this personality so as to make it acceptable to Buddhist, Mohammedan, Confucianist and Jew is to deprive it of that which is its prime distinction and its specific contribution to mankind.

I cannot think of a religious man in a vacuum. I cannot conceive of my religious life in a vacuum. I do not derive my life-determining ideas from my neuro-cerebral system exclusively but from the close social life about me as well. If I think of my religion I think of it in terms of my people's religion. I like to pray as my fathers prayed. I like the ancient [^]rhythm and the ancient psalm. I like my people's festivals. Their mood, their atmosphere, their associations are congenial to deep and joyous religious sentiments. I like the ceremonies of my faith, into which ages have poured their rich color. They bring beauty into my life and inspiration. They are mighty streams of religious idealism. Why should I surrender them? Why should the Christian or the adherent of any other historic faith be asked to surrender his intimate religious institutions and customs, which, because of their venerable age and cherished associations, have become powerful springs of action in his life?

✓ In place of one religion for all mankind, civilization should foster one reverence for all religions for all religions have a providential mission to perform in the world. A man's faith is his innermost sanctuary and one should approach it with unshed feet, reverentially, for the place upon which he stands is holy ground. Mutual respect will lead to mutual cooperation in common tasks and opportunities.

✓ We need not be concerned much about the presence of many religions in the world. That is not the most pressing problem. Religion is not playing its vital role in the world today not because there are too many religions but because there is too little religion in any of them. They have all wandered far from the sources of their original inspirations. They are repeating ancient battle cries from which the fervor of conviction has fled. They have lost their visions but retain their dreams.

What keeps races and religions from meeting? Imperialism! - the lust for domination.

We know political imperialism. It is predicated upon the assumption that the greatness of one nation depends upon the smallness of every other nation and that there is room on earth only for one masterful dominant people. There are other types of imperialism. There is religious imperialism and racial imperialism.

The religious imperialist looks upon religion not as the supreme adventure of the human soul, the pilgrimage of the questing child of man to the far-off shrine of divinity. He regards religion as a set of fixed concepts touching ultimate realities, revealed at a specific moment to a chosen individual or group and forever after entrusted into its charge and keeping. The final and absolute truth is already here, expressed in sacred texts and in the exclusive possession of his sect. He monopolizes not only all religious truth but also all their delectable rewards. He has an option on Heaven. All others will have to gnash their teeth in outer darkness. Far different was the generous faith of the ancient Rabbi who declared: "The righteous among the Gentiles will have ^{portion} a position in the world to come." The religious imperialists feel justified in imposing their truth upon all men, through kindly persuasiveness, to be sure, but if necessary also through force.

There are many scholarly theologians who are at heart nothing more than religious imperialists. Through skillful manipulations of texts and through fine-spun, subtle interpretations and homiletics accompanied by a great display of erudition and disputatious wisdom, they proceed to extoll the glories of their own faith and expose the shortcomings of other faiths. This is poor merchandising as well as bad religion.

As long as the spirit of religious imperialism endures religions will not meet. As soon as religious groups realize that all faith is longing, all truth a groping and all dogma but temporary resting places for the advancing spirit of man, as soon as they will consent to the doctrine: "Let each man walk in the name of his God" they will be prepared to meet in mutual helpfulness.

What is true of religious imperialism is true also of racial imperialism. Pseudo-scientific propaganda for racial imperialism is widespread in the world today. It was used as a cover for the vicious motives of the war. It has always been a blind for economic imperialism. The possessor of blond hair and blue eyes, the Nordic, is taught to regard himself as the salt of the earth. His race is creative. His race is superior. The dark haired and brown eyed man, the Mediterranean or Asiatic, is inferior. His race is mongrel. It can never rise to leadership. Therefore the Nordic race should by right be the dominant race. The doctrine of racial superiority has always been used by the exploiters of mankind. The people in the South used it as an excuse for denying the colored man his elementary human rights and his legitimate opportunities.

There is, of course, no pure race in the world today. Anyone who has even a smattering of history knows that all through the dark centuries following the collapse of the Roman Empire, Europe was a veritable stamping ground of peoples, tribes and races, who moved to and fro across its lands in vast migrations, mingled and co-mingled, and mixed their bloods with the indigenous populations, so that today there is not one people in Europe that can rightly claim racial homogeneity.

Again there are no superior races. There are no races endowed by nature with superior qualities of mind and soul. There are races more favored than others by circumstance, by environment, by geographic position, by the fertility of the soil or by the treasures underneath the soil. There are advanced races and backward races but no superior races. There are differences between races but no biologic gradations.

The vaunted superiority of the peoples of northwestern Europe is of very recent date and is due largely to the shifting of the lanes of commerce from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and to the rich deposits of coal and iron found in their mountains. If these races had possessed superior natural endowments, they would have evolved the first civilization of mankind instead of the last. They would have been civilized long before the Chinese were civilized or the Babylonians

or the Egyptians or the Greeks or the Romans or the Arabs. Actually they were barbarians when these people were evolving great civilizations and carving highways for human progress. Up to 1400 A. D. the Prussians, who have a large element of the Asiatic in them, were barbarians, heathens; they were not even Christianized. Up to the twelfth century England, as far as civilization was concerned, was unknown. England and Scandinavia and northern France and the Netherlands and Germany were, as far as human progress is concerned, up to the last millenium negligible. They need not have existed at all. These "superior" peoples were utterly unknown when Greece - a Mediterranean people of Oriental admixtures - was carving a highway for human thought, and was blessing mankind with the galaxy of poets, philosophers and artists whose gifts remain unmatched for excellence by any Nordic people. They were unknown when Rome organized the ancient world, and gave a law and a language to the peoples of Europe. They were unknown when that little Asiatic people, the Jews were evolving a God idea and a religion which are now the religion of two-thirds of mankind. They were unknown to civilization when the Arabs were building universities in Cairo, Cordova and Bagdad. All that northern Europe has today of art, of literature, of religion, of the essential values of social experience, has come to it from Asia and from Mediterranean peoples. Northwestern Europe has produced little that is indispensable to civilization. In modern times it was the Renaissance, born in Italy, that ushered in the modern era; it was southern Europe - Italy and Spain - that discovered the New World and largely explored it, that gave it its name. It was a Pole - Copernicus - who revolutionized the whole astronomic thinking of the world and prepared the way for our new ideas concerning the solar system. It is a supreme arrogance on the part of one group to think that it is the sole repository and safeguard of all civilization.

Furthermore, no race remains permanently superior. No race retains a position of supremacy for more than four or five hundred years. Races are like individual men. The individual has his period of infancy and of adolescence, and then his period of maturity when he is able to give expression to his innate capacities and make

his substantial contributions to society. Then inevitably, old age sets in and senility. No mind, however brilliant, can resist the weariness and the exhaustion which come with age.

So with the race. Races have their epochs of infancy and early development, and then their short golden age when they fashion out of the genius which is theirs those gifts which become their legacies to mankind. Then inevitably the reaction sets in, - intellectual and spiritual exhaustion. The race goes to seed. Five hundred or even a thousand years may elapse before it experiences a new birth, a new ferment and stir. Then the race will forge its way anew to a creative life.

As long as race mythologies and blood cults persist in the world, - and they are very powerful today, - so long will races not meet, and world unity will remain an unrealizable dream.

There is far more race idolatry in the world today than ever before in the history of mankind. There was no color line in antiquity. The Greeks were conscious of their cultural superiority to the rest of the world but they did not attribute it to biology. They claimed excellency on the basis of their civilization not their blood. The Romans were fine racial cosmopolites. The Jew was proud not of his race but of his religion, and the proselyte to the faith was welcomed into the life of the race. The heathen who was a scholar was held in far higher repute than the High Priest, who traced his descent from Aaron himself, if he was ignorant. "God created only one Adam", declared a Rabbi, "in order that in future times no man shall be warranted in saying: I came from better stock than thou dost." And another Rabbi declared, "I call heaven and earth to witness, be he man or woman, young or old, rich or poor, Jew or non-Jew, according to his deserts will the spirit of God descend upon him."

The Middle Ages knew very little of that racial chauvenism which had become so rampant in our day. The colonial imperialism of the Northwestern European peoples, particularly during the last century, and the consequent exploitation of the backward races of the earth necessitated some ideologic justification and it soon appeared in

the form of a pseudo-scientific theory of race superiority. This theory gained prestige and popularity as the European nations proceeded to conquer, subject and despoil backward peoples. They even employed such High Church terminology, such as "bearing the White Man's burden" to save the miserable mess of imperialistic pottage by means of which they robbed other races of their birthright of freedom. The "White Man's burden" became the black man's curse and the brown man's and the yellow man's.

Modern nationalism has also fallen under the blight of this race obsession. The novel doctrine is now being loudly proclaimed that a nation must be racially homogeneous and every national within the state who can not trace his ancestry back to the racial stock of the majority is an alien and an intruder. Racial minorities are almost everywhere disadvantaged in the modern state.

✓ There is but one basis of goodwill between races as between religions - mutual respect. What is required in our day is not super-heated race apologetics but the means by which each race shall be given the opportunity to live its own life, express its own soul and contribute its unique cultural values to the commonalty of human life.

✓ There are people who would like to acquire good will through assimilation. They know that intolerance, in the last analysis, is due to the existence of differences - religious differences, racial differences, cultural differences. They would therefore do away with intolerance by obliterating these differences.

✓ But that is paying too high a price! The thing gained is less than the thing surrendered. To use Benjamin Franklin's phrase, "That is paying dear, very dear for the whistle."

✓ I like to be on the best of terms with my neighbor. I invite his friendship even as I proffer mine - but only on one condition: that he respect my individuality even as I respect his. He must take me for what I am even as I take him for what he is; not for what each of us would like the other one to be. I am what I am. I have been molded by centuries of distinctive cultural experiences. I am a unique racial precipitate. I wish to remain what I am. I am ready to acknowledge that my

✓ neighbor has the same right to retain his individuality and his racial and cultural distinctiveness. It is on the basis of such contrasts which are not conflicts that I would build a real comradeship of good works.

I am Hebrew and not Anglo-Saxon. I am Hebrew and not Teuton, Gaul, or Slav. I never will be anything else. I do not wish to take on, as protective coloration, the manners, attitudes and points of view of the Anglo-Saxon, Teuton, Gaul or Slav. I do not wish to take on the livery of any man in order to enjoy the privilege of being in his retinue. I wish to be myself. Any other basis for good will is spurious. Any movement for good will which demands of me self-abnegation, is a hostile attack. The man who would be my friend only if he can convert me to his way of living and thinking and believing, is not my friend. He is my enemy. He does not like me for what I am. He would like to see his own reflection in me.

The Jew who casts aside his distinctiveness for the sake of fellowship with other groups will bring nothing to that ultimate communion of mind which alone makes up human fellowship. He will bring to that hoped-for fraternity nothing but a masquerading self, a spurious and washed-out personality. He will have nothing to give. He has destroyed his uniqueness. It is only an integrated, vibrant and affirmative personality which has something to contribute to a community of personalities.

There is a type of good will which is based on indifference.

✓ "I am a Jew but I do not care very much about my religion. You are a Christian and you do not care very much about yours. Why, then, let us be broad-minded about it." This is not good will. It is unconcern. For an unbelieving Jew and an unbelieving non-Jew to be tolerant of each other's non-belief is no achievement. It is when a believing Jew, who is profoundly moved by his faith, and a believing Christian, who is profoundly moved by his, discover a common basis for good will, that a significant event is consummated.

THE ONE AND THE MANY

The problem of the one and the many is one of the most fundamental problems in human thought. It is the ever-recurrent theme in philosophic speculation. Men have assiduously sought the way by which they could ground the manifoldness of the universe into a single unifying concept and harmonize the diversity of phenomena with the unity of a creative purpose.

In sociology the problem is one of insuring the fullest expression of the individual without disrupting society and of coordinating personal freedom with group responsibility.

In the realm of international relationships the problem is one of permitting nations to enjoy full self-determination without disorganizing the collocated life of mankind and of reconciling national autonomy with international cooperation.

Racially the problem is one of finding a common meeting ground for races which are sharply divided by color, rivalries and dark ancestral hatreds. How may one human brotherhood emerge out of a congeries of disjointed racial groups, emotionally inbred, exclusive and hedged in by dread memories of ancient and unforgettable feuds?

Religion, too, faces the problem of the one and the many. The doctrine of one universal, prescriptive religion has been in continuous conflict with the principle of religious freedom. After centuries of struggle, liberty of conscience and the right of non-conformity have been generally conceded by all the enlightened peoples of the world. Still there remains in the minds of people the apparent incompatibility between loyalty to their own faith and group and tolerance of other forms of religious thought and

organization. How can religions be purged of bigotry? How can a motley, grudging and jealous sectarianism ever make possible the world-unifying mission of religion?

In the face of this many-sided and all-important problem of the one and the many what is the task of civilization in our day? Clearly its task is not to superimpose an artificial uniformity upon all races, peoples and creeds. Its aim should not be to force all people into one common mold, so that they will all emerge looking and acting and thinking alike.

The task of civilization is not to constrict all groups into a Procrustean bed of uniformity, but to discover their common human needs, and to organize them into voluntary cooperative efforts to meet these needs.

Civilization should cherish the inviolability of personality in individuals and groups and should not desecrate it by some enforced and unnatural amalgamation. It should not attempt to destroy the uniqueness which time and ancient loyalties have builded. This would prove a distinct loss to civilization; for it is only out of the conflict of opposing concepts, out of contrasted attitudes and outlooks and out of the clash and turmoil of warring ideas that the spark of the new insight is born and the new revelation is vouchsafed to groping mankind.

Races and religions may meet without fusion. Men may unite without first being consigned to the melting pot. On the plane of common human aspirations all men may meet without sacrificing their characteristic cultures or modes of life.

Similarly when Jew and Christian, Mohammedan and Buddhist, and men of all faiths, will realize that their source is one--God,

and their destiny one--the service of man, and when they will join in the comradeship of labor to fulfill their common destiny, they will then have met. The walls of their churches may continue to separate them, but the spirit of their faiths will unite them. Their prayer books will continue to be many but their prayer will be one.

Frequently some enlightened and broad-minded men are heard expressing the wish that there should be but one religion. The forms and institutions of religions, they maintain, are, after all, incidental and of secondary importance. These incidental features of religion may well be sacrificed for the sake of one universal religion.

But one religion for the whole of mankind is neither necessary nor desirable. Only the religious monopolist who is convinced that there is but one true faith and one true church will insist upon one religion for the whole of mankind. All other men who do not find in any religion, however exalted, the final and exclusive revelation of God and man, but who see in all religions the self-same quest for spiritual truth and illumination, will look upon the yearning for universality and uniformity as something quite naive and primitive.

Religion is not a science. Scientific truth is universal in the sense that a chemical formula or a geometric proposition is the same here and in China, yesterday and for all time. Science is the observation and classification of physical phenomena. It therefore possesses a universal identity, for it is relative not to this man or to this race but to mankind. (There is a universal element even in the concept of scientific relativity).

But religion is not a science but an art--the supreme art of man. Religion has to do not with the observation of physical

phenomena but with their spiritual interpretation, with judgments, values, appraisals and intuitive inferences. In this process of interpretation individual and race variations inevitably enter and differences of temperament, culture, history, even of geography become decisive factors distinguishing one religion from another.

Art, too, of course, is universal. All art is the effort of man to interpret life through the medium of line, color or sound, to dramatize the love of the beautiful. But how different and various are the ways by which artists arrive at their interpretation --different not only as regards the media employed but also as regards technique and style. The distinctiveness of a work of art is to be found not so much in the theme as its treatment. Every original artist reads into his work himself, his life, his philosophy, his environment and his racial heritage.

It would therefore be quite naive and pointless to declare that inasmuch as art is universal, mankind should have but one art, one style of music or architecture, one school of painting or sculpture, one type of literature.

So with religion. There is but one text; but each religion has its own commentary. God is one, but men's views of God are not one and cannot be one. "All the prophets prophesied one truth," declared an ancient sage, "but their styles were altogether different."

The most potent arguments for religion frequently come from the direct personal experiences of men. "Come and hearken, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what He hath done for my soul." A man's life is reflected in his faith and so is a people's life. The religions of different peoples will therefore, to a marked degree,

always be distinctive, endemic, reflecting their several histories and temperaments. Every universal religion is sooner or later localized, transmuted by the alchemy of the racial psyche and absorbed into the life-pattern of the group. There is no great religion without its historic pattern.

Thus Judaism is certainly a universalistic religion and yet how markedly racial and national it is. It mirrors the unique history of a people. It oracles the ancestral voices of the race. The Jew thinks of his God not alone in relation to the whole of humanity but quite specifically in relation to his own people. God has covenanted with Israel. The burden of a divine mandate has been placed upon him. He is to be the servant of God. His mission is to be "a light unto the nations, to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house." He must follow his mission even if it makes him "despised, and forsaken of men, as one from whom men hide their face."

To ask of the Jew to surrender this unique religious dogma for the sake of a universally acceptable compilation of rarified theologic abstractions would be to rob him of that which is the most precious and magnificent quality of his faith.

So also with Christianity. Quite apart from the question of the divinity of Jesus, it is an indisputable fact that the personality of Jesus has been a luminously radiant fact in the life of Christianity. It has profoundly stirred the lives of many generations. It has moved myriads to emulation, to self-sacrifice and to martyrdom. This unique personality which is so focal in the faith-life of the Christian means less, much less, to the Buddhist, the Mohammedan, the Confucianist and the Jew. To ask of Christianity to reduce and attenuate this personality so as to make it acceptable to others

would be to deprive it of that which is its prime distinction and its specific contribution to mankind.

In place of one religion for all mankind, civilization should foster one reverence for all religions, for all religions have a providential mission to perform in the world. There is no true religion and there is no false religion. Some religions have carried over from their pasts a number of obsolete and discarded scientific notions. To that extent they are out of alignment with contemporary thought. But every religion in so far as it conceives of the universe as the manifestation of personality and beneficence and in so far as it impels human beings to a maximum of moral idealism is a true religion. And every church which looks upon itself as a corporate agency for the propagation of these beliefs is a true church. Therefore civilization should inculcate reverence and toleration for all religions. A man's faith is his innermost sanctuary and one should approach it with unshod feet, reverentially, for the place upon which he stands is holy ground. Such mutual reverence and toleration will ultimately lead to mutual cooperation in common tasks.

We need not be concerned about the presence of many religions in the world. Religion is failing to play its proper role in society today not because there are too many religions in the world but because there is too little religion in any of them. They have all wandered far from the wells of their original inspirations. They are repeating ancient battle cries from which the fervor of conviction has fled. They have lost their visions. They retain only their dreams.

But the presence of many religions makes necessary a *modus vivendi* among them. Some ways must be found which will enable them to meet in joint, cooperative enterprises without losing their individualities. This is altogether possible and feasible but the spirit of religious imperialism is constantly thwarting the effort.

We know something about political imperialism. It is predicated upon the assumption that the greatness of one nation depends upon the weakness of every other nation and that there is room on earth only for one masterful, dominant people. There are, however, other types of imperialism. There is religious imperialism and racial imperialism.

The religious imperialist looks upon religion not as the adventure of the human soul, the pilgrimage of the questing child of man to the far-off shrine of divinity. He regards religion as a set of fixed concepts touching ultimate realities, revealed at a specific moment to a chosen individual and forever after entrusted into the charge and keeping of his disciples. The final and absolute truth is already here, expressed in sacred texts and in the exclusive possession of one sect--his own. The religious imperialist monopolizes not only all religious truths but also all their delectable rewards. He has an option on Heaven. All others will gnash their teeth in outer darkness. He does not share the generous faith of the ancient Rabbi who declared: "The righteous among the Gentiles will have a portion in the world to come." The religious imperialist feels justified in imposing his faith upon all men, through kindly persuasiveness, if possible, but if necessary also through force.

There are many scholarly theologians engaged in the study of comparative or rather competitive religion, who are at heart nothing

more than religious imperialists. Through skillful manipulations of texts and through fine-spun, subtle, homiletic interpretations, accompanied by a great display of erudition and disputations wisdom, they succeed in extolling the glories of their own faith and in exposing the shortcomings of all other faiths. This is excellent propaganda but bad religion.

What is true of religious imperialism is true also of racial imperialism. Pseudo-scientific propaganda for racial imperialism is widespread in the world today. The doctrine of racial superiority was used as a cover for the vicious motives of the last war. It has always been a blind for economic imperialism. The people in the South used it as an excuse for exploiting the colored man and for denying him his elementary human rights and his legitimate opportunities.

The possessor of blond hair and blue eyes, the Nordic, is taught to look upon himself as the salt of the earth. His race is creative. His race is superior. The dark-haired and brown-eyed man, the Mediterranean or Asiatic, is inferior. His race is mongrel. It can never rise to leadership. Therefore the Nordic race ought by right to be the dominant race.

There is, of course, no pure race in the world. Anyone who has even a smattering of history knows that all through the dark centuries following the collapse of the Roman Empire, Europe was a veritable stamping ground of peoples, tribes and races, who moved to and fro across its face in vast migrations, mingled and co-mingled, and mixed their bloods with the indigenous populations, so that today there is not one people in Europe which can rightly claim racial homogeneity.

Again there are no superior races. There are no races endowed by nature with superior qualities of mind or character. There are races more favored than others by circumstance, by environment, by geographic position, by the fertility of the soil or by the treasures underneath the soil. There are advanced races and backward races but no superior races. There are differences between races but no biologic gradations.

The vaunted superiority of the peoples of Northwestern Europe is of very recent date and is due largely to the shifting of the lanes of commerce from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and to the rich deposits of coal and iron found in their mountains. If these races had possessed superior natural endowments, they would have evolved the first civilization of mankind instead of the last. They would have been civilized long before the Chinese were civilized or the Babylonians or the Egyptians or the Greeks or the Romans or the Arabs. Actually they were barbarians when these people were evolving great civilizations and carving highways for human progress.

Up to the fourteenth century the Prussians were heathens and barbarians. They were not even Christianized. Up to the twelfth century England, as far as civilization was concerned, was practically unknown. England and Scandinavia and northern France and the Netherlands and Germany were up to the last millennium, as far as human progress was concerned, negligible. They need not have existed at all. These "superior" peoples were utterly unknown when Greece--a Mediterranean people of Oriental admixture--was blessing mankind with a galaxy of poets, philosophers and artists whose gifts remain to this day unmatched for excellence by any Nordic people.

They were unknown when Rome organized the ancient world and gave a law and a language to the peoples of Europe. They were unknown when a little Asiatic people, the Jews, was evolving a God-idea which is today the cherished faith of two-thirds of mankind. They were practically unknown to civilization when the Arabs were building universities in Cairo, Cordova and Bagdad. All that northern Europe has today of art, literature and religion, --of the essential values of social life--have come to it from Asiatic and Mediterranean peoples. It is therefore supreme arrogance for any one racial group to regard itself as the sole creator and monitor of civilization.

Furthermore, no race remains permanently dominant. No race retains a position of supremacy for more than four or five centuries. Races are like individuals. The individual has his period of infancy and of adolescence. Then comes his period of maturity when he is able to give expression to his powers and to make his substantial contributions to society. Finally and inevitably old age sets in and senility. No individual, however brilliant, can resist the weariness and the exhaustion which come with age. Neither can any race. Races too have their periods of infancy and early development. Then comes their short golden age of maturity when they fashion out of the genius which is theirs those gifts which become their legacies to mankind. And then the reaction sets in,--intellectual and spiritual exhaustion. The race goes to seed. Five hundred or even a thousand years may elapse before the race will experience a new ferment and stir, before it will begin to forge its way anew to another cycle of creative life.

Racial conceits and pretensions are ripe in the world today and as long as these race mythologies and blood cults persist so long

will races not meet, and world unity will remain, as heretofore, an unrealized dream.

Racial and religious imperialism are stumbling blocks in the way of human progress. What is required in our day is not super-heated race or religious apologetics but a generous way of life which will give each race and religion the opportunity to live its own life, to express its own soul and to contribute its unique values to the commonalty of human life. Our age needs a form of good will which will not only tolerate differences but which will gladly use them for the enrichment of life.



1. Why is further life - How can ind. fulfil their duties without living in society? How can we best of all fulfil their duties without living in society. How can the one live in society by living without being subordinated and without thwarting the Many.

A. Tribe - ind. & little movement. honored his ideology - subject to it taboo - closest contacts - living - as St. Augustine albeit expressed a reluctance

B. Mashed pages into individualization - as an alternative to nationalist and racialist thought knowledge with ind. power & right to self-assert Renaissance. Rejection of Race and ecstasy, material as against sup. of that & Church. in spirit.

C. Conflict - the more necessary to reassert life as a corporate life. The reason that ideal life can be best only in community. - Human Interrelationships

2. as groups - Nations - Races have conflict on large scale - Imperialism vs. self-determination - On the Many -

1) Progres away from uniformity. the Roman Empire - the Roman with them

2. Conflict - the of Civilization

3. Indo-European etc.

3. Imperialism. Religion

4. Racial - I came Adam superior - many
 ① No pure race. Current - many, good
 ② No superior race Indo - pure, many
 ③ " fewer. Super. race. Asiatic - many, - ref
every -

5. Civil. must treat us to respect the One
 only as he respects the Many.

6. As for us Ref. Boshui - must to do - hold

① War.

② Crime.

③ Materialism - people - perspective

