

## Appendix VII

---

### *The Emery Reves Parallels*

by Matthew Block, copyright © 2004

The following is an attempt to chart the parallels between Emery Reves's 1942 book, *A Democratic Manifesto*, and two of the midwayer messages that were first read to the Forum at the annual picnic on June 19, 1943.

The text of the communication used here was transcribed by a Forum member who has not been conclusively identified, although an oldtime Urantia Book reader in Chicago is reasonably certain it was Marian Rowley. The transcription was most likely made at the same two meetings Martha attended, where Forumites were invited to take notes as Bill Sadler read. A typed copy of this version surfaced in the mid 1980s, and copies were circulated among Urantia Book readers, including myself, in Chicago and elsewhere. Unlike Martha, the transcriber apparently tried to take down the message verbatim, which resulted in a fuller version than Martha's summarizations. However, at some points Martha's notes match Reves more closely or contain parallel passages not included in the larger version. I have inserted these passages into the communication, putting them in brackets and in italicized script.

Both versions show the imperfections that inevitably occur in taking down a lengthy and complicated dictation. Some parts of the message may have been misheard or, in the case of the unknown transcriber, shorthand notes may have been misinterpreted. For instance, in 7:2, what was probably read out as "men" and "nations" is rendered "trends" and "creations." Also open to question are the parenthetical statements in the fuller version: were they Bill Sadler's asides or part of the message?

Despite these ambiguities, the parallelisms between Reves and the transcription are generally clear, consecutive, and comprehensive. Occasionally, where the two texts contrast, I have underlined words in either or both sides of the parallel row to pinpoint where the difference lies. I have **bolded** certain words which signify similarities not readily apparent.

As will be seen, several passages in the communication are unparalleled. In Volume Four we will see how Dr. Sadler incorporated much of this unparalleled material into his 1944 book, *Prescription for Permanent Peace*. We will also trace his indebtedness—which he acknowledged in the preface to his book—to Reves and other internationalist authors.



A biographical note on Emery Reves (1904-1981). Born Imre Revesz in Hungary to middle-class Jewish parents, he received his doctorate in political economy from the University of Zurich. In 1930 he founded the Cooperation Press Service, which had exclusive syndication rights on articles by leading statesmen such as Clement Attlee, Winston Churchill, and Count Carlo Sforza. In 1940, forced to flee France during the Nazi occupation, he moved to London and became a naturalized British subject. Soon afterward he relocated to New York City.

*A Democratic Manifesto* was his first book. Writing for the general public, Reves stated: "These pages do not contain one single new idea. It is hardly possible to bring out any really new and original idea with regard to the political and social organization of the world. And certainly there is no need for any new idea to solve our present international problems" (121). The book was published in many countries and used as a textbook in U.S. high schools and universities. His second book, *The Anatomy of Peace* (1945), advocating world government, was widely acclaimed. In Volume Five we will trace its resemblances to certain sections of the Urantia Book's "The Urmia Lectures."

<i>A DEMOCRATIC MANIFESTO</i> (1942)	THE MIDWAYER MESSAGES (1943)
--------------------------------------	------------------------------

I. MEN OR PRINCIPLES (3)

1. RESPONSIBILITY

Twenty years after the greatest victory of democratic principles and of democratic nations, democracy is on the defensive all along the line. All the democratic nations of continental Europe have been vanquished and conquered. The two most powerful units of the world—the **British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America**—are forced to mobilize their entire resources in order to defend themselves and to escape defeat and conquest by those very same anti-democratic forces which were laid prostrate by them twenty years ago (3).

1.1 Full responsibility for peace rests upon the **English-speaking nations**. [*Responsibility for the present war lies squarely with the United States and Great Britain.*]

[contd] What has happened during those twenty years? After their victory in 1918, the democratic, freedom-loving nations had full control of and absolute power over this planet (3).

They had mastery after 1915.

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>Everybody yearned for peace. Everybody wanted disarmament. Everybody wanted a wider freedom of international trade. Everybody wanted a better organization of international economic life in order to secure for each nation and each individual more wealth and greater safety than ever before (4).</p>	<p>but didn't recognize and accept the call to duty. England and the United States turned their backs on the high privilege of planetary service.</p>
<p>In spite of the fact that the forces who supported those aspirations were ten to one—maybe fifty to one—against those who opposed them, from 1930 onwards, year by year, month by month, we were steadily marching towards greater armaments, sharper antagonisms, more poverty, diminution of trade, towards intolerance, persecutions, dictatorship, imperialism—towards the Second World War (4).</p>	<p>They wanted peace, prosperity, and national security; [<i>Everyone talked disarmament, wanted free trade, peace and security</i>]</p>
<p>The defense of our way of life, the defense of our nations and the destruction of the aggressive forces would have cost at that time [in the early 1930s] less than one thousandth in blood, sweat, toil and tears of what it will cost now (112).</p>	<p>they got depression, [<i>stagnation, armament,</i>] unemployment, insecurity, and in 20 years another war.</p>
<p>[contd from above] A young man, whose entire education was based on the hopes of the nineteen-twenties, and who followed closely step by step those events which led to the Second World War, can hardly understand this baffling development, unless he had been completely misled by the disintegrating</p>	<p>The United States increased its trials and tribulations a million-fold by trying to escape its responsibility.</p>
	<p>1.2 [<i>Youth was not prepared for his part in international evolution.</i>] Between the two wars nothing was done to prepare the children and the youth of the nation for their coming responsibility—their part to play in world progress—</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

propaganda of a movement of demagogic masses. Ponder as he will, there seems nothing for him to do but admit that he understands nothing in this world ... (4).

and many of them refused to grow up.

The simplest way to explain this rapid and almost catastrophic decline of the democracies during the short period between 1920 and 1940 is to accuse certain statesmen who have committed the greatest blunders.... We used to blame Lodge, Borah, Reed and the other isolationist Senators for the torpedoing of the League of Nations, even before it was launched. We used to condemn Clemenceau, Poincaré and the other French nationalists for having prevented the strengthening of democracy in Germany. We hold Sir Austin Chamberlain and the Tories in England responsible for the failure of the Geneva Protocol....

All these personal responsibilities are valid, but only to a certain degree.... They cannot offer explanations because obviously none of these statesmen was able to control events or to lead his country. They were controlled and led by greater forces.

Several examples prove that. When public opinion in England and France revolted against the policy of Hoare and Laval in the Ethiopian conflict [i.e. not to punish Italy for invading Ethiopia], their strongest opponents, Anthony Eden and Yvon Delbos replaced them. Shortly after the Ethiopian incident, another conflict of the same forces arose—the Spanish “Civil War.” And in this conflict, carrying the most powerfully felt international repercussions, Eden and

Why did Democracy decline so rapidly between the two wars? The leaders in England, France and America were shortsighted. Many couldn't see beyond their own personal interests.

These men sometimes performed against public sentiment; but even when replaced by others, the new ones behaved likewise.

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

Delbos committed exactly the same errors for which they so vehemently denounced their predecessors, and handled this new problem in exactly the same way as Hoare and Laval would have handled it. Innumerable citations of this kind could be made (5-6).

[contd] It is indisputable that the human quality of the leaders of democracy between the two wars was not on a par with those of their predecessors of the nineteenth century...

However ... the long series of defeats, the gradual sinking from world domination to subjugation certainly can not be adequately explained by the lack of statesmanship of our leaders, no matter to what extent they have been responsible (6-7).

[contd] Another school of thought ... says that Hitler and Mussolini are tyrants, megalomaniacs, militarists, ruthless demagogues, and they and their gangs are responsible for the ills and miseries of the world.

However obvious and simple such an explanation may appear to be, it cannot stand close examination. The democracies were overwhelmingly powerful when these movements were started a few years ago by a limited number of individuals. These movements could have been stopped and destroyed on innumerable occasions, with a minimum of effort, energy and force. No democracy was able or willing to do so, although these anti-democratic forces never made any attempt to conceal their character, their programs and their purpose (7).

There was paucity of leadership

and indifference to liberty.

They saw Mussolini, Hitler and Tojo arming, but didn't take it seriously. Democracy was not willing to fight.

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>It is certain that if the democratic powers had been willing to sacrifice 5,000 soldiers in Manchuria, 10,000 soldiers in order to save Ethiopia, 20,000 soldiers to prevent the Germans and Italians from establishing a puppet regime in Spain, if they had been prepared to risk 50,000 soldiers to prevent the occupation of Austria, it would not have been necessary two or three years later for the British Empire and the United States to mobilize their entire man power, from 18 to 65, and to spend a hundred billion dollars or more a year for armaments (9).</p> <p>In our anger and helpless fury we call Hitler and his associates "criminals," "outlaws," "gangsters." ...</p> <p>But where were the laws Hitler supposedly violated? Were we ever prepared to enact international legislation, so that its terms would be binding and its violation could have been called a crime? Such laws have never existed and the great democracies have refused to enact them when they had an opportunity to organize a new world (10).</p> <p>Every private individual, every businessman, the head of every family has to conduct his affairs in such a way that any event that might happen tomorrow or the following day will not catch him un-awares, unprepared and completely at a loss...</p> <p>In every field of life, the method of conducting affairs which looks beyond the events that might happen in later years, we call wise and far-sighted. In public affairs, we call it "unrealistic" and "Utopian" (11).</p>	<p>At various times an army of from 5,000 to 25,000 men could have prevented this war.</p> <p>The Democracies were unwilling and totally unorganized.</p> <p>They hated war and longed for peace—</p> <p>but could you run a business or even manage a home so shortsightedly?</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>After many thousands of years of religious, moral, social and political progress we find ourselves once again in a world as strange, as insecure, as unexplored as Adam must have found it after his expulsion from the Garden of Eden (12).</p>	<p>The cowardly leaders of Democracy have set the clock of civilization back 2000 years.</p>
<p>[contd] There is no other way out of this confusion, except to start again at the very beginning. We must undertake a thorough examination of all those elementary principles on which our social and political life is built (12).</p>	<p>But we have a chance to start afresh.</p>
<p>An examination of the real meaning of these basic principles of social and international life, will reveal that there is no democratic order to defend, but that there <i>is</i> a democratic world order <i>to create</i> (13).</p>	<p>Today there is little Democracy to defend, and we can build a new world order from the ground up;</p>
<p>In this world of reality, every system, every nation has to perish if it has nothing but pious sermons of non-violence with which to oppose cruel forces (27).</p>	<p>but we must reject the policy of non-resistance. [<i>The method of non-resistance used in the Lucifer rebellion must not be the model for us. That was a spiritual rebellion, this a worldly. (This point we were told not to make notes on.)</i>]</p> <p>You can't be as brotherly as you'd like to be with an unbrotherly brother.</p>
<p>II. FREEDOM (14)</p>	<p>2. FREEDOM</p>
<p>[contd] The great motor of human history is the struggle for freedom (14).</p>	<p>2.1 The real problem is: Man wants liberty,</p>
<p>Liberty without equality is an inconceivable state of affairs.</p>	<p>and liberty with equality;</p>
<p>As equality between men, nations or between any other human groupings is obviously against nature—it never existed and probably never will exist—</p>	<p>but equality never has existed [<i>and probably never will short of light and life</i>].</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>freedom in its pure and total conception would result in a state of affairs which would be the exact opposite of any kind of freedom.</p>	<p>Freedom is an ideal. It doesn't exist.</p>
<p>If we gave every man—strong and weak—and every nation—large and small—complete freedom of action without imposing any restriction whatsoever on their impulses, it would result in the greatest terror, oppression, violence—in total anarchy (15).</p>	
<p>[contd] It is obvious, therefore, that that kind of freedom which we regard as a human ideal is some kind of a synthesis between freedom and compulsion.</p>	<p>2.2 Evolution can have freedom only with compulsion.<sup>1</sup></p>
<p>The fact that some outside power forbids me to kill a man I dislike, or to take away the property of those who have more than I, considerably restrains my freedom. But this very same restraint protects me from being murdered by those who dislike me, and of being robbed by those who envy whatever I may possess (15-16).</p>	<p>We must restrain by compulsion.</p>
<p>In the public life of a nation the relationship between freedom and compulsion is exactly the same as in social life, and whether or not we shall enjoy political freedom will depend entirely on the right interpretation of these principles (19).</p>	<p>This is true of the individual, community, state, nation, and in family life.</p>
<p>It makes no sense that a free and democratic country should give to everybody unlimited freedom and every democratic means to combat freedom and democracy itself (18-19).</p>	<p>There is no sense to the doctrine of freedom that gives citizens the right to combat and destroy the freedoms that Democracy gives.</p>
<p>It is thanks to this conception of absolute freedom, which has created in the international field the same anarchic</p>	<p>There is no peace on earth with the license to destroy the liberty and sovereignty of other peoples.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

situation as absolute freedom would create in the social life of any community, that so many nations have been attacked, defeated and conquered, with brute force as the only arbiter among nations, and that hundreds of millions of people have become slaves again (19).

No nation can exist on a level above law.

### III. LIBERALISM (20)

[contd] The political thought that tried to put into reality in the social life the ideals of freedom was Liberalism (20).

Freedom is fostered by human liberalism and Christianity.

The democratic conception of the Nation is the only political corollary of Christian principles (36).

The program of our present-day conservative parties was revolutionary two hundred years ago, and the program of our present-day revolutionaries, if they achieve it, will be reactionary one hundred years hence (21-22).

What is liberalism in one generation is conservatism in the next.

[One] reason for the decline of the liberal parties is the ... paradoxical fact that they became automatically anti-liberal by developing into more and more doctrinaire parties with concrete and rigid programs which they defended with the most a-liberal fanaticism (21).

Liberalism has become dogmatic and Democracy has ceased to grow.

[A]s soon as it was realized that the liberal democratic systems as established could not solve the problem of distribution and could solve only partially the problem of production; as soon as it became evident that the rise in living standards following the establishment of the liberal democratic regime was not constant; ...

Democracy ceased to keep pace with industrial progress.

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

entire classes and nations saw no further chances of amelioration within the existing system.... More and more people, dissatisfied with the existing order, gathered together and began to organize and to hold meetings against the established principles of democracy (23-24).

A passionate controversy arose between the real believers in the democratic principles and those ruling circles who were constantly retreating and who had given up one democratic position after another before the ruthlessly attacking enemy. The argument was always the same: We are a democracy; our citizens have constitutionally guaranteed rights, and we cannot act against them in an anti-democratic way.

So they withdrew. And when they found themselves faced with the alternative, to capitulate or change their methods, their dogmatism was so deeply rooted, that they preferred to capitulate (25).

[W]e must secure democracy for those who are democratically minded and it is our primary democratic duty to oppose anti-democratic thoughts, movements and forces with anti-democratic methods (29).

If we try to analyze these democratic principles, it appears to be the most simple logic that in organized society liberty of speech cannot signify liberty of speech for those who want to abolish liberty of speech (26).

Self-government is slowly committing suicide.

2.3 Freedom must be ever militant and unhesitatingly destroy whatever assails freedom, and be intolerant concerning things undemocratic.

There should be no liberty of speech for those who would destroy liberty of speech.

The tools of freedom must not function in a suicidal capacity.

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>Freedom of vote cannot mean freedom of vote for those who want to abolish freedom of vote (26).</p>	<p>There must be no liberty to vote in the freedoms of Democracy to destroy the right to vote.</p>

### 3. DEMOCRACY

The democratic conception of the Nation must be clearly interpreted and such interpretation must be expressed through legislation which would assure a free and democratic way of life to all those who believe in a free and democratic life, but which would impose severe penalties on all those who *use* freedom and democracy as their tools with which to destroy the free and democratic way of life (36-37).

3.1 Democracy today is being destroyed by those who wish to *use* Democracy.

We thought it was sufficient to proclaim certain rules among liberally and democratically minded people in order to live in a democracy, something like an exclusive club where we may live among gentlemen, respecting the rules and regulations of the club (27).

Democracy is not a club to join and forever enjoy its protection.

[contd] But our exclusive social order was overthrown by a great number of newcomers whose only purpose in joining the club was to loot the kitchen and to cheat at the poker tables (27).

(Some club members are known to have looted the kitchen and cheated at the card games.)

As it is inconceivable that in our time all human beings will have the ... character and the moral capacity to act and react as democratic men have to act and react, we can only make democracy work if we are prepared to create the necessary defenses for a democratic regime, enacting and promulgating in an unmistakable form what we understand under each one of the freedoms granted

As long as Democracy's basic freedoms exist it is a Democracy.

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

by the regime, and if we establish simultaneously with the granting of these freedoms, the required institutions for their defense and for the prevention of their destruction (28).

#### IV. NATION (31)

According to the democratic thesis, accepted by all the Western countries and unchallenged during the past century, Nation is the totality of the population composed of all races, believing in all religions, speaking all languages, united by the same ideal in the same state (31).

3.2 The right view of Democracy is a geographic group of people having a common ideal.

[contd] National Socialism has replaced this theory by another one, according to which the "Nation" (*Volk*) is the totality of a people of the same race, of the same language, of the same origin— "*Volkstum*"—independently of the state or states in which they reside.... The democratic nations ... firmly believed that Germany and the other totalitarian powers with their conceptions of the "Nation" could well exist and live side by side with the democratic countries with their democratic-juridical conception of the "Nation."

In reality, this was identical with allowing wolves and sheep to live in the same fold. The acceptance of the Nazi conception of the Nation permitted the Nazi Government the untrammled organization of racially Germanic citizens in Denmark and Brazil, in Yugoslavia and Chile, in France and the United States, and in practically all countries in the world (31-34).

To allow Germans to live here and retain their German citizenship is like letting the wolves live with the sheep.

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

We must correct our present system of selecting representatives and government, and must require that whoever we send to a legislative assembly should possess not only a colorful personality, influential friends and rhetorical talents, but also a certain minimum knowledge of public affairs and of democratic principles (139).

Offices must be held by citizens trained in schools of statesmanship. These schools must be established.

#### V. NATIONALISM (38)

#### 4. NATIONALISM

[T]wo powerful currents, the integrating evolution of industrialism and the differentiating evolution of nationalism, dominating our epoch, while acting as fire and water, are now tumultuously clashing, and the explosion and conflagration through which we are passing are the consequences of this shock.

The crisis through which we are struggling is a crisis of nationalism and of industrialism (40).

4.1 The nations are suffering from intense industrialism and augmented nationalism.

At the end of the eighteenth century, nationalism, as it was conceived by the first founders of modern democracy, was a tremendous step forward.

In times past Nationalism was a good thing;

It meant the broadening of the fundamentals of the state from one man or a small group to the entire nation. It was the basis of individual freedom, of the rule of law, of free elections, of representative government (41).

it brought people together in common interest, within law and representative government.

[contd] But once established as a basic principle of policy, nationalism had the same fate as all other closed revolutionary ideals, once they ceased to be an ideal and became reality. "The sovereignty of the nation" ... began to hurt the realities of the economic life in the second part of

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>the nineteenth century. And since that time, like all social ideals which become dogmas, it has been the greatest obstacle to further progress (41).</p>	<p>But when a social ideal becomes a political dogma, it becomes an obstacle to world progress.</p>
<p>Nationalism ... possesses all the criteria of a rigorously dogmatic religion ... The ideals and symbols of nationalism, like the notion of "motherland," "flag," "national anthem," are typical taboos, which today in the highly civilized countries it is more dangerous to touch than the taboos of the savage cannibals of the South Seas. No man, no party dares to touch these relics; no one dares to criticize them (41-42).</p>	<p>Nationalism becomes a relic of patriotism which no forward-looking prophet would dare touch.</p>
<p>[Nationalism] became the popular fate of the uncultured masses, the expression of the lowest instincts of mass inferiority complex, and its defenders are the most intolerant priests of a dogmatic religion we have ever had on this earth (41).</p>	<p><i>[We compensate for inferiority by obvious superiority.]</i></p>
<p>If a man says loudly and publicly five times daily: "I am the greatest man in the world," everybody will laugh at him, and believe that he is mad.</p>	<p><i>If one man went down the street shouting, "I am a great man" we'd call him an egotist.</i></p>
<p>But if he expresses the same psychopathological impulse in the plural and says publicly five times daily: "We are the greatest nation in the world," then he is sure to be regarded as a great patriot and statesman, and will attract the admiration not only of his own nation, but of all mankind (42).</p>	<p><i>If a group say, "We are a great country" it is considered patriotism.]</i></p>
<p>[contd] During the past century three different organizations have tried to fight nationalism without any success: The Catholic Church, the liberal movements, and the international workers' organization (42).</p>	<p>4.2 Nationalism persists because it has not been attacked by modern and intelligent citizens who do not seek to disrupt, but to save it by intelligent control.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>The state of affairs that prevails at the present moment in the world would be justly characterized, from the religious point of view, by the term "polytheism." The modern religion of nationalism has driven the Christian faith from the soul of man, and ... the real god to whom he is above all devoted ... is not the one God of universal Christianity, but the goddess—"Nation" (42).</p>	<p>Present-day Nationalism is akin to polytheism.</p>
<p>[contd] These gods faithfully resemble the pagan gods of the pre-Christian era. They insist upon the recognition of their race and the hatred of other races (43).</p>	<p>Nation and race became the pagan god of many modern people.</p>
<p>It is undeniable that such a state of affairs must be intolerable to every real Christian, and it is also undeniable that the Church has the greatest interest in seeing its great universal ideal—monotheism—realized, not only in heaven but also on earth amongst peoples (43).</p>	<p>The time has come to give way before a monotheistic policy of Internationalism.</p>
<p>Though the policy of the Church is essentially conservative and anti-revolutionary, the leaders of the Christian faith will soon have to realize that they are going to destroy the very principles of Christianity, if they identify themselves for purely material reasons with the various nationalisms which are today fighting in the name of their own particular national gods (44).</p>	<p>The churches must divorce themselves from Nationalism.</p>

## 5. INTERNATIONALISM

The second force which tried to dam the disastrous consequences of dogmatic nationalism was the liberal elements

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

which at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century were rather influential among the bourgeoisie of all countries. These elements understood that the state of affairs engendered by nationalism could not be durable, and they strove to break national antagonisms and to bring the peoples together by agreements, treaties and mutual understanding (44).

Some people, above all the Anglo-American democracies, harbor even today this ideal which they consider as realizable: voluntary and pacific cooperation of the various sovereign states relying on the "good will" of the peoples. They have stubbornly refused to make any efforts towards a more unified international organization which would bring a weakening of national sovereignty, an international legislation, an international force, commitments, guarantees and sanctions (45).

In spite of this "good will" of men, which unquestionably exists, a social order cannot be imagined without laws of universal force and without compulsory submission of individuals to these laws (46).

5.1 Internationalism will not be created by pacts, treaties, appeasements, etc.

It will be created by force of arms. It is the only way for the next 1000 years of civilization's evolution.

International Legislatures must make the international laws, an International Court must interpret the laws, and an International Police must enforce the laws.

*[Good will does not take the place of our police force.]*

Lesser nations must be forced into the international union. (Rhode Island was forced into the United States by her neighboring states, New York and

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

Massachusetts. Soon she was proud to be one of us, and glad of the advantages and protection it gave her. The Civil War forced the Confederate States to stay in the Union; soon they became loyal members.)

One must choose: Either one holds the conception of the national sovereign state which necessarily leads to isolation, to autarchy and ultimately to conflicts and to war; or one wishes to realize an international or at least continental or **regional** organization which could assure peace and facilitate economic progress (47).

5.2 Not in centuries has the Christian world had the opportunity to establish **regional** internationalism.

Now, following total war, is the time to establish international government.

The third and perhaps the most important force which fought nationalism, was the "Internationale" of the Socialist workingmen parties....

Already before the First World War, the Socialist Parties were highly developed and making headway.... After many years of socialistic development and domination, these parties found themselves decadent in nearly all countries.... The reason why the Socialist Parties were unable to realize even partially their programs ... is that ... in all countries where they came to power, the Socialist Parties followed a nationalist policy (48-49).

Socialism, Communism, and other world movements have lost their influence.

Now there must be coercive law with sure penalties attached to its violation.

So we have witnessed during the past years the triumph of nationalism over Christianity, liberalism and socialism—over all those forces which were opposing it (50).

The god of Nationalism struck at the liberty of Democracy and at the Christian religion.

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>Nationalism actually reached the beginning of its end. It has destroyed and decomposed all that human mind, all that human work had conceived. The absurdity of nationalism is best characterized by the fact that we possess today the technical means of crossing the Atlantic Ocean in seven hours, but it takes seven months to obtain a visa (51).</p>	<p>5.3 Nationalism reached the beginning of the end when you could cross the ocean in six hours and it took six weeks to get a visa.</p>
<p>[Nationalism] is reactionary and makes impossible any progress towards welfare. It is born of terror and fear, of suspicion and mistrust and vanity (51).</p>	<p>Recalcitrant and selfish Nationalism must be made to accept Internationalism (just as the Confederacy was forced to stay in the Union). It won't regret it 25 years from now.</p>
<p>It must be understood that there exist only two realities—the <i>individual</i> and <i>humanity</i>.</p>	<p>5.4 There are only two realities in the world—the individual and the human race.</p>
<p>All other classifications into castes, tribes, classes, religions, races and nations are arbitrary, artificial and superficial (51).</p>	<p>The cosmos does not recognize caste, tribe, race, or nation.</p>
<p>Once we understand this problem and suppress the principle of <i>nationality</i> as the foundation of states, nationalist wars will stop</p>	<p>National wars will end when you recognize that nations [<i>nationalism</i>] is not the final goal of human evolution.</p>
<p>just as automatically as religious wars stopped at the moment when religion was separated from the state and ceased to be its foundation (52).</p>	<p>(Religious wars ended when church and state were separated.)</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
VI. SOVEREIGNTY (53)	6. SOVEREIGNTY
<p>[contd] The Golden Calf to which the most devoted and mystic adoration of the masses goes in our days is: Sovereignty. No symbol carrying the pretension of a deity, which ever got hold of mankind, caused so much misery, hatred, starvation and mass execution as the notion "Sovereignty of the Nation" (53).</p>	<p>6.1 No single idea has wrought so much misery as that delusive concept of sovereignty.</p>
<p>The revolutionary belief [of the eighteenth century] was that "sovereignty resides in the community," and that the notion of sovereignty must pass from the ruler to the nation (54).</p>	<p>Sovereignty passed from king to nation;</p>
<p>The sovereignty of the Nation became more and more a dogma, unchangeable, untouchable, indisputable, on which the whole international relationship had to be based (55).</p>	<p>a political dogma,</p>
<p>Through the political development of many of these nation-states, sovereignty, uncontrolled power, became an institution which did not at all provide for the peoples that freedom, security and happiness that it was meant to. On the contrary, it exerted sovereignty in a way not very different from that of the monarchs (55).</p>	<p>for soon the people wielded sovereignty much as kings did.</p>
<p>So millions will have to die again, hundreds of millions will have to starve again, and billions of dollars will have to be wasted again—because we do not want to recognize that the conception of the sovereignty of nations, which was a great progress in the eighteenth century, did not solve the problem of transferring these sovereign rights from kings to peoples (56).</p>	<p>Today millions are dying and millions more will starve to the national idea of sovereignty.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>At the moment when the French Revolution materialized the idea of the Sovereignty of Nation, France was the greatest power in Europe, and her population was half the population of the entire European Continent. She was, according to eighteenth-century conditions, an entirely self-sufficient political and economic entity. But under present-day economic conditions, what sense is there in the "Sovereignty of Latvia," or the "Sovereignty of Luxemburg"? (57)</p>	<p>Sovereignty reached its height in the French Revolution,</p>
<p>[contd] It will be very hard work to destroy the Golden Calf of Sovereignty for two reasons. First, the vested interests in the sovereignty of the nations are tremendous.</p>	<p>and its deathbed in this war. Military victors have a chance to resurrect it in a modified form. May it be a democratic modification.</p>
<p>On the small continent of Europe, as it was politically organized in 1919, there were at any time some six hundred members of governments with the title of minister, ... many times that number who were ex-ministers, ... seven to eight hundred active ambassadors, ... ten thousand counsellors, ... seven to eight thousand legislators, members of parliaments (57-58).</p>	<p>6.2 Enormous vested interests are involved in the worship of the Golden Calf of sovereignty</p>
<p>But there probably are even greater vested interests in the economic and financial fields.... There have been incalculable amounts invested in artificial industries created and maintained through tariff walls in every country in total disregard of any economic law,</p>	<p>(politicians, government employees, rulers, lobbyists, religions in some nations, etc.)</p> <p>which results in economic dislocation.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

purely for the purpose of eliminating commerce with other nations and making each unit called a "State" economically independent (58).

What will be the effect upon our returning soldiers?

Only through ... a *separation of sovereignty*, in establishing national sovereignties for all national matters, and international sovereignties for all international matters, can we create the basis of a world constitution which would really express the democratic thought that "sovereignty resides in the community" (60).

National matters should be handled by national sovereignty and international affairs be handled by international sovereignty.

#### VII. PEACE (61)

#### 7. PEACE

7.1 Peace will become the watch care of international government. When lawless minorities *learn that*, then peace will prevail.

Until now, peace was indeed nothing but the absence of war, and all the efforts of diplomacy were concentrated merely on adjournments and on compromise solutions of any conflicts arising among the nations. This primitive conception of peace has been prevalent throughout our entire history and particularly in the recent years of exaltation of nationalism and of sovereignty (62).

Appeasement and moral compromise are the habits of peace-loving and self-loving Nationalists.

[contd] During the twenty years preceding this war, ... we were prepared to accept any solution to the problems that arose if only such solutions kept us out of a shooting war.... We had no policy, no ideals, no purpose, save one—to prevent shooting. We wanted nothing but peace. So the war came (62-63).

The present conflict resulted when nations wanted peace at any price.

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>It will be less and less possible to keep nations from shooting at each other as education progresses and more and more nations will claim equality rights with the others (65).</p>	<p>The theory of Democracy validates the concept of equality— but the idea of equality produces conflicts</p>
<p>Equality is an ideal of the human mind and not something which exists naturally (67).</p>	<p>which only courts can settle, unless the victors establish international overcontrol for those less peoples who are hungry for freedom and self-government. (Victory is a continuous proposition.)</p>
<p>There will always be differentiation between nations, just as there will always be differentiation between individuals. And it is essential for cultural progress that such differentiation should persist (68).</p>	<p>7.2 The dream of equality is fiction.</p>
<p>Only the French Revolution and the revolutions in connection with it have been able successfully to enact legislation for equality, in guaranteeing equality <i>before the law</i>....</p>	<p>It is not nationally or individually true.</p>
<p>The reason for this success was that the Fathers of the Revolution followed the same practice as the Fathers of Christianity. They did not want to institute “general equality” among men, which does not exist and never will exist, but they wanted to establish equality in a limited and specified field, in the field of jurisdiction, and they made all men equal before the courts, before law, just as Christianity made men equal before the symbol of God (67-68).</p>	<p>Such a dream can only be realized before God or before a court (an altar and the law).</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>The only possibility of maintaining peace and of giving the nations equality is the establishment of law under which each nation has to be equal (69).</p>	<p>Man acquires citizenship equality <b>before the law</b>;</p> <p>before a super-court all nations are equal.</p>
<p><i>Equality without law has no sense and no moral justification whatsoever.</i> This is valid for both the social and the international life. It is only law that makes equality possible, and only before clearly specified laws can we make <u>nations</u>, just like <u>men</u>, equal (68-69).</p>	<p>You cannot have equality among <u>trends</u> or <u>creations</u> without law;</p>
<p>Equality without law means war (69).</p>	<p>and law, without the coercive power of enforcement is a tragic farce.</p> <p>Equality without law means war.</p>
<p>[contd] The only way to maintain peace for a certain period without law is the domination of one nation by another, the supremacy of one group of powers over the others (69).</p>	<p>Without super-law you can only have peace when the weaker submit to the stronger.</p>
<p>Any conception of peace without mandatory international law is a hopeless dream (69).</p>	<p>7.3 Any hope for world peace without coercive international law is a furtive [<i>futile</i>] dream.</p>
<p>We must limit the term "law" to measures with coercive power. And we shall only be able to talk about "international law" when we establish a system of norms in the relationship between nations with the same executorial force as in nation law (71).</p>	<p>Mandatory law is law enforced by unquestioned force.</p>
<p>Peace is law (72).</p>	<p>Peace <i>is</i> the reign of law.</p>
<p>[contd] Law is the justified use of force—a coercive order (72).</p>	<p>Law <i>is</i> the just use of force by unquestioned authority.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

[contd] Consequently, peace without the employment of force is inconceivable (72).

There can't be lasting peace without force.

*[At this point, Bill said the midwayer announced they would go no further until the additional points received the approval of some other authorities.—MBS, July 4, 1943]*

\* \* \* \* \*

[*Note:* These passages appear to be misplaced. Similar statements are made later in the message.]

To make peace we must wage legal war. There is a difference between the outlaw who kills a man and the sheriff who kills the outlaw for his crime. The sheriff is not a murderer—he is a peace officer.

7.4 Non-intervention and appeasements are like the old monarchs' "gentlemen's agreements." Each agrees to let the other carry out his nefarious schemes.

\* \* \* \* \*

*[Bill resumed his reading of the recent communications, which he said were received under dates of May 10 and 13.—MBS, July 11, 1943]*

VIII. WAR (73)

[contd] The central problem of all our controversies is, of course, the problem of war. This problem is as old as human history itself. In fact, the history of mankind is nothing but the history of wars (73).

7.5 War is the major factor in the nonspiritual history of the human race.

[contd] With the exception of convinced militarists and the adherents of a modern form of paganism represented by the Fascist-Nazi movements, the great majority of people of all races have a deep feeling that war is something evil, something wrong, a sort of catastrophe, and they all desire peace (73).

At the present time the most advanced peoples look upon it as an unnecessary evil.

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>If we disregard the older ages and look at the development of the last century, since the end of the Napoleonic wars, it appears clearer and clearer that the spreading of education, science, communications, makes more and more people believe that war is something that must be abolished.</p>	<p>It is the first time in history that world-wide peace has been talked of.</p>
<p>No government in any of the civilized countries was able to obtain the support of the majority of its people with a program of war.</p>	<p>Wars have become increasingly more terrible in the last 150 years, and for the last 100 years no government has been able to get the full support of its people to a war policy.</p>
<p>All governments promised peace. They all had to promise to fight against war and they all were able to bring their nations into war only by making them believe that they were attacked and were merely defending themselves. In spite of this growing feeling for international peace, mankind was driven into more devastating wars than ever before (73-74).</p>	<p>Leaders start wars on the theory that they are going to be, or have been, attacked.</p>
<p>[contd] Why can't we stop wars if people really want to abolish them? (74)</p>	<p>If the majority want to abolish war, why don't they do it?</p>
<p>War as a struggle between peoples, as the explosion of human passions, as the dynamic factor in human history, cannot and never will be abolished (75).</p>	<p>If war is an expression of human emotions like crime, it won't be abolished.</p>
<p>We have never been able to abolish individual crime, the use of brutal force between individuals ... But what we were able to accomplish as regards individual crimes in organized society was to make it clear through certain legislation what actions were</p>	<p>But civilized people have abolished [<i>outlawed</i>] individual crime.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>regarded as crimes and in setting up the necessary organization, legislation, jurisdiction and police execution to reduce such criminal actions to a minimum, and through retribution for crimes to create a feeling of individual security among citizens (75).</p>	
<p>We make a very clear differentiation between the man who kills someone in order to get a thousand dollars out of his victim's pocket and the man who executes someone on the basis of a legal document which we call a judgment.</p>	<p>Another view: in the case of a criminal committing murder, you quickly distinguish between the criminal and the sheriff who shoots him.</p>
<p>Though the two acts are from a biological point of view absolutely identical, we generally do not call them both murder (75).</p>	<p>Each from a biological viewpoint is guilty, but not from the social and moral viewpoints.</p>
<p>[contd] The same differentiation must be admitted and clearly stated with regard to the process of killing by groups of people we generally call wars (75).</p>	<p>There are two kinds of war: (1) social criminal aggression, (2) legal group military sanctions.</p>
	<p>(Churches should deal with principles, not expediencies.) [<i>Bill here pointed out that the Catholic Church had a war policy. It recognizes the right to resort to force.</i>]</p>
<p>[contd] We shall be unable to abolish war through any imaginable organization, just as we have been unable to abolish murder despite all the might of an organized police force. We might be in a position to reduce international wars to a minimum through an appropriate organization of the peoples, just as we have been able to reduce murder cases in a civilized state to an absolute minimum (75-76).</p>	<p>7.6 An International Government can (a) reduce war to a minimum just as courts function to minimize crime,</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

We must make a distinction between *legal* and *illegal* wars. Our only possibility of abolishing illegal wars seems to be the acceptance and the legalization of certain kinds of warlike actions which we shall have to resort to if we want to get rid of such devastating world wars as our generation has witnessed twice (76).

(b) render war a legal action on the part of authorized groups for the peace, safety, and security of all mankind.

War can be and must be legalized, minimized,

We might be able to prevent a certain type of international war through a definite policy, legislation and application of force, but we shall certainly never be able to "humanize" war once it has broken out (77).

and humanized.

[*This is **practical** advice not theoretical idealism.*]

All the rules ... which have been established by various conventions as to the use of certain weapons, as to the bombardment of the civilian population, as to submarine warfare, are nothing but wishful thinking in times of peace, to which no army pays any attention once engaged in a modern war (76).

The use of poison gas, submarines, and aerial bombing of civilian populations can be prevented.

The International Police will be known as Peace Armies.

As long as wars were decided upon and waged by monarchs, mostly with professional armies, it was possible to establish certain "rules" for such warfare, as though they were fencing-school rules. But since the modern wars of conscription involve the entire populations of the nations, all such rules are **impracticable** and without any value.

You cannot maintain rules of warfare when armies are conscripted and nations are fighting [*frantically for their lives*] for sovereignty.

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

It is obvious that in any such war every nation will apply all weapons which it believes might bring victory in the shortest possible time (76).

You can't have international law without international power to enforce the law. (Professional armies have strong customs. Things are done such and such a way because it is the custom; with conscription you dilute tradition to the vanishing point.)

The same naive idea of preventing wars is the idea of disarmament which has been so passionately advocated by pacifists from 1919 to 1935, until the complete breakdown of the Disarmament Conference (77).

7.7 Disarmament on the part of great nations such as the peace-loving people of the United States is a direct contribution to war.

Should the new democratic order have to be created by compulsion—and according to historical precedents it most probably will—then it is essential that the **Anglo-American nations** should undertake the task. They must undertake it not only because on the proper reorganization of the world will depend the survival of their own democratic institutions and the very existence of their peoples, but also because the past few centuries have proved that in the present phase of human history Anglo-American supremacy means general progress for all mankind, whereas all attempts at domination by any of the other potential world powers always meant reaction to the democratic evolution (134-35).

If the **English-speaking peoples** remain intelligent and fully armed, they will constitute the Peace Army until the regional and international courts can be established.

We can never get rid of wars through disarmament. Disarmament can only be the consequence of an international organization to prevent illegal wars. In

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>fact, if we regard armaments as causes of wars, the lesson history teaches is that only inequality of armaments was able to maintain peace for a certain time. Equality of armaments always meant and probably always will mean war (77).</p>	<p>Equal quality of arms [<i>sic</i>] is a delusion.</p>
<p>The most powerful argument of the dogmatic pacifists, of the adherents to the disarmament theory and of the non-interventionists, was that “you cannot prevent war by waging war” (78).</p>	<p>What mayor of a great city would allow criminals to carry guns? Arm well the police but prevent the criminal element from getting arms.</p> <p>Long have well-meaning but short-sighted pacifists proclaimed, “You can’t have peace by waging war.”</p>
<p>[contd] This is a most dangerous sophism. In fact, the only way to prevent illegal and anarchic wars is to wage a certain kind of <i>legal</i> war, just as the only way to fight and reduce crime is to commit the same “crimes” on a legal basis against the criminals (78).</p>	<p>That is exactly what you can do,</p>
<p>Legal wars which we have to institute if we want to abolish illegal wars presuppose the existence of an international legal order (79).</p>	<p>and will have to do for the next millennium.</p> <p>7.8 Legal war is the act of the legal authority of the International Government—action in response to law.</p>
<p>[contd] They mean forceful military actions undertaken in the name of the community, with the authority of the community, for the maintenance and safeguard of the established legal order (79).</p>	<p>Legal war is designed to maintain peace, not to take loot or seek revenge.</p> <p>It is waged by order of the legal authority of International Government for safeguarding the peace of nations.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

There are two kinds of fighting, and any nation that fights an illegal war will fight a hopeless one. The time has come for nations to be governed by law and not by political ambition, personal whims and directives, rampant nationalism, fanatical dictators, or the delusion of sovereignty.

The idea of neutrality stems from those ages when wars were recognized as legal acts of policy, when wars were fought among dynasties, among countries for **frontier** changes and for colonial expansion....

But since the technical developments and the industrial evolution have reduced the earth to a small unit ..., neutrality is not only political nonsense, but the greatest moral turpitude (89).

Modern science has ended the day of the international **frontiersman**. The forces of civilization have arrived on the international frontier.

(Being exposed to this doesn't mean a thing unless we have "the ear to hear.")

#### IX. NON-INTERVENTION (80)

[contd] The doctrine that perhaps wrought the most havoc in international relations is the principle of non-intervention. This principle, which is so deeply rooted in the minds of our statesmen and diplomats that it can be called a dogma, is in such complete contradiction to every manifestation of the modern life of nations that its consequences during the past twenty years have been disastrous..

7.9 The dogma of non-intervention is the most uncivilized and inconsistent ever held by modern nations.

What would you think of a policeman who would refuse to help a fellow officer who was engaged in a struggle with a thug?

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>This doctrine was one of the main reasons why a band of unscrupulous gangsters was able to achieve supreme power in Europe (80).</p>	<p>And it is just such strange and inhuman conduct on the part of America and other world powers which enables unscrupulous dictators to become rulers in other parts of the world.</p>
<p>[contd] The principle of “non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries” was established centuries ago by hereditary monarchies. It was a question of courtesy among gentlemen, expressing the same feeling as many related families have towards each other’s domestic affairs.... War and peace were decided upon by the monarchs, and it was the understanding among the great ruling houses that they were not to interfere with each other’s internal affairs (80).</p>	<p>Non-intervention is the remnant of the “gentlemen’s agreement” of the olden rulers which was just an agreement between monarchs not to interfere in each others’ wars.</p>
<p>During the period of transition from absolute monarchies to democratic nations, this idea was taken over, as it was to the interest of the newly established democracies that the remaining kings should not interfere in their internal constitutional life. But as time went on and the development of industry, commerce and communications made one single economic unit of the whole world, this principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries became a farce (80-81).</p>	<p>7.10 Today’s advances in science, industry, commerce, communication, etc. render the dogma of neutrality inconsistent.</p>
<p>It is not necessary to enumerate all the cases in which, under the hypocrisy of non-intervention, the totalitarian powers interfered in the internal affairs of other countries, established their own organizations, undermined the existing social order, bribed and corrupted men and institutions, instigated and fostered assassinations, revolutions and civil wars (81).</p>	<p>This neutrality makes possible (1) inconsistency of policies, (2) corrupt press, (3) fomenting of strikes, disorganization, disunity, divide and conquer. [<i>Herein was pictured how, through a farcical neutrality and non-intervention stand taken by our government and other powers, two or three headstrong and principle-less aggressors have now bribed traders, corrupted the press, directed assassinations and rebellions with one objective in mind—to divide and conquer.</i>]</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>The richest country in the world—the United States of America— ... was forced to stop motor-car production for private consumption, to ration sugar, to conscript its entire man power, to limit individual income, to tax all excess profits, thus changing most radically the American way of life. Why?</p> <p>These revolutionary changes in the mighty United States ... are the <i>direct consequences</i> of the fact that a few years before, the German Government stopped motor-car production for private use, conscripted its youth, rationed sugar, taxed excess profit and limited individual income.</p>	<p>7.11 Six or eight years ago the American nation began to watch a European nation stop making automobiles and turn to making airplanes, conscript its citizens, make over its schools, ration its food, tax and limit incomes. They were 2,000 [<i>4,000</i>] miles away so America refused to be concerned. Now we're doing those same things whether we like it or not.</p>
<p>Yet, there are people in the United States who, after having witnessed how the internal policy of a country <u>4,000</u> miles away has directly and profoundly affected the internal policy of the United States and the daily life of its citizens, are still talking seriously about non-intervention as a "policy"! (83-84).</p>	<p>The world can't go on half free and half slave; it must be either all free or all slave.</p> <p>There are still thousands of Americans who don't see things as they really are. They long for the day when it will be over and they can return to their old ways.</p>
<p>If one nation regards a treaty as a scrap of paper, treaties in general lose their value (84).</p>	<p>They are Isolationists at heart, ready to disarm and sink their navy again. They learned very little from the last world war (World War I) wherein the naval disaster (disarming) was <i>far more</i> costly than the loss at Pearl Harbor.<sup>2</sup></p> <p>7.12 If one great nation allows treaties to be counted as scraps of paper, then all great nations are invalidated.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>When as a result of the world economic crisis Britain gave up the gold standard and devaluated sterling, the United States shortly after was forced to devaluate the dollar proportionately (82).</p>	<p>Today if one goes off the gold standard, they all go off, because each is so interdependent.</p> <p>(All nations sneeze when one of the great powers takes snuff.)</p>
<p>The internal lives of the individual nations are so interwoven, their effect upon each other so apparent, that ... the price of a commodity is determined by the cost of production to the producer, working under the least favorable conditions among those able to compete (84).</p>	<p>The world is so economically interdependent that the price of commodities must be determined by the producer operating under the least favorable conditions.</p>
<p>[contd] It seems that in the modern inter-related lives of the nations the standard of living, of culture, labor conditions, individual freedom, taxation, export trade, defense policy—all depend to a great extent on the policies followed in the same fields by other nations.</p>	<p>Which means, in competition, the standard of living, depth of culture, extent of education, labor conditions, personal liberty, taxation tariff, exports and imports, defense policies, and moral standards.</p>
<p>And the nation living under the lowest moral and least favorable economic conditions is the determining factor (84-85).</p>	<p>The nation living under the least favorable condition and lowest cultural standard will become the determining influence over all other peoples.</p>
	<p>7.13 The only hope of the survival of the American standards of living is to share them as far as possible with other peoples. If one powerful nation is deficient in morality, it costs us much more to keep ours up. (Our tax money has to go into restraining N. Clark St., not into enlarging Northwestern University campus. We have to become Christians or pay the price. We're up against the buzz saw of circumstances.) The nation that would selfishly save its own high standards will be destined to lose them.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>[contd] It appears that in a given territory—certainly on the continent of Europe, but probably on the entire globe—there exists some law or at least some tendency according to which, among a certain number of interdependent nations, all the states are forced to adapt their form of government to the least civilized form of government existent in any state among them (85).</p>	<p>In any circumscribed area of the world it will be discovered, in the long run, that the existing government will be compelled to gravitate gradually down to the level of the lowest and most primitive that is allowed to exist.</p>

(You can enhance the possibilities of the lowest, and the highest can also be lowered.) One criminal and inferior abroad in a community can corrupt a score of well-meaning youths. In self-defense the Democracies must export life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

## X. NEUTRALITY (86)

### 7.14 Whoever heard of neutrality between right and wrong?

At the Pan-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro [in 1942], Mr. Sumner Welles, the representative of the United States of America, ... made the following declaration: ...

“The shibboleth of classic neutrality in its narrow sense can, in this tragic modern world, no longer be any real neutrality as between the powers of evil and the forces that are struggling to preserve the rights and independence of free peoples. It is far better for any people to ... die, if need be, in the battle to save its liberties than, by clinging to the tattered fiction of an illusory neutrality, succeed only by so doing in committing suicide” (87).

How can you be neutral in the struggle between good and evil?

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>Today, when the “policy of neutrality” is a dismal failure all over the globe, ... it is no more great statesmanship to admit that neutrality is suicide (87).</p>	<p>In any ideal struggle neutrality is suicidal.</p>
<p>The series of non-aggression pacts and neutrality guarantees signed and proclaimed by Hitler during the past years, thus permitting the conquest of all the countries which he never could have conquered if they had been united, but which he swallowed up one by one, was the greatest triumph of seduction since Casanova and Don Juan.</p>	<p>Neutrality means the enemy is free to pick you off one at a time. (Just what happened in Europe.)</p> <p>In local government a sheriff when hard-pressed by lawlessness can deputize any number of citizens, but such a plan won't work on a national scale. Such results can only be gotten by internationalism.</p> <p>7.15 Honest men cannot have confidential dealings with rascals. Honest nations keep their word and live up to their treaties. (The dishonest use a treaty to gain time for their further depredations.)</p>
<p>The victims were made all the more ridiculous, as each one of them from the tiny Luxemburg to the mighty United States believed profoundly that they would be treated differently and that the saccharine words of Hitler addressed to them were in their special cases really sincere (88).</p>	<p>The honest administration does not make treaties with a dishonest neighbor.</p>
<p>[S]ince the democratic nations are trying to organize this struggle for world power without bloodshed, and are trying to outlaw wars by calling them a crime, neutrality is not only political nonsense, but the greatest moral turpitude (89).</p>	<p>If war is to be outlawed, the farce of neutrality must end.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

It is immoral and **cowardly** for a group of law-abiding citizens to stand idly by and see a fellow citizen being held up, beaten and robbed; and such moral **indifference** is suicidal to a nation.

What is really revolting in the tragic events of the past ten years is not the repeated breach of faith, treachery, aggression, brutal conquest and the enslavement of hundreds of millions of people by the totalitarian governments, but the attitude of those people in the civilized, Christian countries who possess the moral capacity to recognize that we are faced with the most outrageous crimes ever committed on this earth under any form, and who in spite of the realization of the truth believe themselves to be entitled to say: This does not concern us; we want to stay out.

Whatever the excuse for such an attitude may be, whether it is fear, **cowardice**, **indifference** or blindness, from an ethical point of view it is beyond doubt that those who have the moral strength to recognize the crime, and yet tolerate it, are more guilty than those who commit the crime (90).

What can be said of Christian nations that stand by complacently while world gangsters strafe and plunder the civilized world, murdering and starving little children?

May it never happen again!

#### XI. INDEPENDENCE (91)

Just as the French Revolution was the greatest symbolic event in the liberation of the individual and in proclaiming the Rights of Man, the greatest symbolic event in the obtainment of national independence from foreign rule was the American Revolution and the Declaration of Independence (91).

7.16 The French Revolution reached the highest point in the struggle for personal liberty; the American Revolution in the struggle for national independence.

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>The drive for national independence has gained tremendous strides during the nineteenth century and reached its climax in the peace treaties of 1919, when—at least in Europe and America—each nation, even the smallest one, became independent. It was the basic principle of the order created in 1919 that each nation, regardless of its size, had the right to organize its independent national life, as the United States of America, Great Britain and the French Republic organized their national lives, ... and in 1920 more nations than in any other period in history achieved complete independence (91-92).</p>	<p>A grave mistake was made when the spirit of independence was concocted into a formula of self-determination;</p>
<p><b>Wilson</b>, Col. House, Masaryk, Lord Cecil, Leon Bourgeois, and the other encyclopedists of the 1919 treaties, thought that each nation would be happy to be independent and that through collaboration of these independent states, based on mutual good-will, we could maintain peace, organize international life and develop human progress (92).</p>	<p>and it was an American president who perpetrated this blunder</p>
	<p>when only fifty years previously a Civil War was fought to prevent the right of self-determination. (If the South had been allowed to secede, any misled group of states could secede and set up its own government, and the result would soon be fragmentation of the Federal Union. By giving up the strength they had in the Union they'd expose themselves to the intrigues and aggressiveness of some more powerful nation. Fragmentation is what happened to the Roman Empire.) Little nations can no more have self-determination than each State of the Union can have complete sovereignty.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>The independence of nations was a taboo, and no independent government was prepared to make international commitments, fearing that any such commitment might jeopardize the independence of their country.... Consequently, the governments of the independent nations distrusted each other and <b>intrigued</b> against each other, just as the absolute monarchs did when they ruled over subjugated peoples (93).</p>	<p>(When Texas separated from Mexico and sought to join with the U.S., England recognized her independence before we did—international intrigue at work!)</p> <p>7.17 Each state is sovereign in all matters of state, but in national affairs the Federal Government is sovereign, and you can only have peace predicated on law. The idea of every little nation having the right of self-determination only spells industrial paralysis and social hell.</p> <p>Internationalism is detrimental to national <b>intrigue</b>.</p>
<p>Today political independence has no sense without economic independence.</p> <p>And economic independence obviously cannot be obtained by <u>any</u> single nation (95).</p>	<p>7.18 You can't postulate independence without encountering interdependence [<i>economic independence</i>],</p> <p>and nine out of ten nations can't have economic independence without enormously lowering their standard of living.</p>
<p>[T]he present war has shown that not even the United States of America, not even Soviet Russia, is economically independent (95-96).</p>	<p>The United States and Russia—the two most powerful nations in the world—are not economically independent.</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

## XII. INTER-DEPENDENCE (97)

[contd] Every man is born into the greatest of all dependencies—into the dependency of the family. At the beginning of his life every child is totally helpless and he depends entirely upon the care of his mother (97).

Humans are born wholly dependent.

But as soon as the child grows up, he is seized by a tremendous desire to become independent of family ties (97).

Each child seeks independence

The new drive that overwhelms every individual as soon as he reaches maturity is the drive to become inter-dependent with his fellow citizens (98).

but he learns as he grows older, that he is interdependent.

We are now at the stage when complete independence brought the greatest disillusion to most nations, when it collapsed as an ideal, and when the nations have some kind of feeling of the insufficiency and futility of this ideal (98).

The concept of complete independence is fallacious.

This evolution—*dependence, independence, inter-dependence*—is the natural process of life through which every individual has to pass (98).

In life there is dependence, independence, and then intelligent interdependence.

The total independence of nations as it was established after the First World War created the same feelings in the collectivity as total freedom creates in the life of a man—the feeling of doubt, the feeling of insecurity and the feeling of fear, which are the origin of armaments, militarism and conquests (98).

7.19 The complete independence of self-determination which was accorded small nations after the first world war did not afford them security. They were uneasy, suspicious, and tormented by feelings of insecurity.

Both individuals and nations must learn the lessons of interdependence. (Liberty and license are in a confused state in this world.)

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>[D]uring the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth century, we understood freedom as “absolute freedom,” and regarded for a long time thoughts and movements tending to limit and organize economic freedom as “anti-democratic.” The result of it was a growing economic anarchy, and, in spite of ever-increasing production, a growing feeling of individual economic insecurity, poverty and unemployment (99).</p>	<p>The attempt at complete economic independence leads to over-production, disorderly distribution, unemployment, economic depression.</p>
<p>[contd] As a reaction to such absolute economic freedom which we wanted to maintain, there arose in the masses a drive for compulsion which is the origin of all the totalitarian movements.</p>	<p>Neither a nation nor a small group of nations can hope to enjoy complete and independent economic freedom.</p>
<p>It is no explanation to call the Fascist and Nazi movements “criminal” or “insane.” They are the natural reaction to a false interpretation of the conception of independence. However difficult it may be for freedom-loving people to understand, longing for compulsion is just as natural a drive in human nature as longing for freedom and can only be checked by a correct interpretation of this ideal (99).</p>	<p>7.20 In the spiritual world “no man liveth unto himself alone.” Neither can a nation continue to live to itself.</p> <p>A state that strives for economic freedom will gravitate certainly and swiftly to a totalitarian state.</p>
<p>Fascism and Nazism is the result of striving for economic freedom—freedom without restraint, liberty without compulsion.</p>	<p>(Gen. Chiang Kai Chek regards power as responsibility. He says that none of China’s strength after the war will be used to offset the strength of her</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

neighbors.) Honesty in business and altruism in government pays high dividends. If we fail England she will find an ally in Russia strong enough to maintain peace. If we *fail China*, how long will it be before the Communists in China will combine with the Communists in Russia? There's plenty of Communism in China and Russia if we default. If that happens where will we be? Always on the defensive pursuing isolation. (It would cost more than Internationalism.)

7.21 We must relinquish national sovereignty and enter into international sovereignty. Think how much states are free when they don't have to concern themselves with things Federal.

It is ... obvious that a much higher degree of independence of the nations would be attained if certain phases of such total independence were limited, regulated and properly controlled for all of them, and if these limitations and regulations were enforced on all of them by institutions *above* all of them (100).

So would nations be more free with an International Government to attend to global affairs.

The needless sufferings which mankind has to go through today will perhaps make it possible to organize international life on the basis of interdependence, which is the only form in which we can find a way out of the present convulsion. The opportunity is *now*, during this world-wide struggle, which involves every nation and when every nation realizes that its independence as it was interpreted until now did not give them national freedom and security (102).

It will be too late to undertake it after the war is over. [*It must be declared now.*]<sup>3</sup>

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>Such a change in the international life, the regulation of national independence, had been clearly foreseen by the signatories of the Declaration of Independence in 1777. It says: "That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends (Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness) it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness" (103).</p>	<p>Says the Declaration of Independence, "Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, it is the right of the people to alter, abolish, or institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."</p>
<p>[contd] This most unsafe and unhappy period in history, this catastrophe in which we find ourselves</p>	<p>7.22 Today the nations of the earth are most unsafe and most unhappy.</p>
<p>makes it imperative that we listen to the advice of the Fathers of Independence and tackle the problem at its root (103).</p>	<p>Nationalism is on its deathbed. Unlimited sovereignty is moribund. The time has come for the birth of Internationalism.</p> <p>Let the sick nations follow the wise counsel of the fathers of American independence.</p>
<p>XIII. FORCE (104)</p>	<p>Will you humble your nationalism enough to adopt a sane internationalism?</p>
<p>[contd] For two centuries the German peoples, whether under the leadership of Frederick the Great, Prince Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm II, or Adolf Hitler, have acted according to the Germanic conception of international law—"Might is right" (104).</p>	<p>7.23 Dictators proclaim "Might is Right."</p>

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

The opposition to the theory, "Might is right," led the democratic nations so far away from it that their conception of an international life was more or less exemplified by a principle which could be formulated as "Right is might" or "Right without might" (104).

Democracies believe Right is Might.

It is difficult to say which doctrine—the doctrine of "Might is right," or the strange doctrine of ignoring force—is more responsible for the present world situation (104).

The world is suffering from these errors or relative truths.

Spiritual causes cannot employ physical force in their interests,<sup>4</sup> but material [*national*] causes depend on physical force for their survival. It is perfectly proper to found a *church* on the ideas of the League of Nations of World War I. How could you run a family with each child having equal vote? You'd eat candy, ice cream, and strawberry shortcake most of the time.

When the League of Nations was founded after the First World War, the cardinal problem was whether force should be at the disposal of the League. All pacifists were against this and the League was instituted without any provision for the use of force to meet the demands of necessity. That meant that from the very beginning of its existence, the League was functioning in a vacuum of unreality, without any chance of settling such matters which could not have been equally well settled without its existence (105).

When the League of Nations didn't apply force it committed suicide.

Force is a reality (106).

War is a legal reality.

REVES	MIDWAYER
<p>[contd] If there is one law which can be deduced from the history of mankind, it is that whenever and wherever force was not used in the service of the law, it was used against the law (106).</p>	<p>When not used in the support of law, it will be used in the contravention of law and against economic justice.</p>
<p>We have seen gangsters organizing bank robberies, bootlegging, the kidnaping of children, the making and circulating of counterfeit money, but we have never before seen and could never imagine that a band of gangsters could take possession of the entire machinery of a state and could organize and run a great state entirely on gangster principles and methods (106-07).</p>	<p><i>[The democracies were accustomed to seeing gangsters but they were flabbergasted at seeing gangsters at the head of big nations.</i></p>
<p>We did not want law with force; just rules with good-will. So now we have to reckon with force without law (107).</p>	<p><i>Now we have worldwide force without law.]</i></p>
<p>Only if we put force in the service of justice can we hope that it will not be used against justice. Only if we use force to maintain peace can we hope that it will not be used against peace (108).</p>	<p>How silly to let international gangsters and criminals dominate the world!</p>
<p>Only if we put force in the service of justice can we hope that it will not be used against justice. Only if we use force to maintain peace can we hope that it will not be used against peace (108).</p>	<p>7.24 Divorce force from the service of aggression and attach it to the law of justice.</p>
<p>The only way to defeat the doctrine of "Might is right," is not "Right without might," but "Right <i>based</i> on might" (108).</p>	<p>Our slogan should be "Right predicated on Might."</p>
<p>That Christianity survived twenty centuries and exists today, we have to thank not only the Apostles and the Saints, but in equal measure the zeal of the crusaders. The time has come when the survival of democracy needs no more Apostles, but crusaders who are convinced that peace is unimaginable in any form, unless it is based on force (108).</p>	<p>Educate zealous crusaders to toil for the new order. Democracy has too many apostles and not enough crusaders.</p>

REVES

MIDWAYER

## XIV. AGGRESSION (109)

When two nations are in trouble with each other, neither one can judge their aggressions. That is the job of an International Court.

It is indefensible to call aggression any kind of forceful act independent of whether it is directed against an innocent people or against an injustice (110).

Aggression is good when directed against injustice.

This war started when Benito Mussolini proclaimed publicly and solemnly that Fascist Italy's aim is to destroy the principles of the French Revolution, and when Adolf Hitler's government proclaimed publicly and solemnly that for Nazi Germany "Right is what is in the interest of the German Volk" (111-12).

Hitler made his first aggression when he proclaimed, "Right is whatever is in the interest of the German folk."

[contd] It was in that moment, if our democracies were working according to present-day realities, and had we had a clear vision of the real possessions we must defend, that the aroused forces of the free peoples ought to have intervened to stop this aggression (112).

That's the time we should have struck.

Judgment is the function of a group.<sup>5</sup>

A conception of static peace is inconceivable,

7.25 Democracy cannot be static. Peace is dynamic.

and if we do not put the dynamic forces of life into the service of our cause, they will be used by others and directed against us (113).

When the law-abiding citizen is static then the outlaw is dynamic.

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

XV. PREVENTIVE WAR (116)

Even if we call the application of force “war,” it must be said that *only* such application of force can preserve peace (116).

As we exist today we can only exist by waging war—

[contd] What is the difference between such an application of force advocated here and wars as we have known them heretofore? The answer is very simple: The existence of law (116).

war that is waged in the interest of international law.

The only kind of peace conceivable on this globe and in the present century is the establishment of certain primary rules among peoples and the institution of armed forces to intervene automatically and unconditionally in any part of the world wherever these rules are violated (120).

War can only be prevented by the action of International Police ready to act instantly.

The fact that there is no coercive international law creates a situation in which criminals, determined to act, enjoy all the liberties and all the advantages of lawlessness (117).

Failure to provide for International Police provides for international banditry.

Peace will start on this earth on the day when for the first time a group of nations will wage war, based on previously accepted principles, against a violator of international law (120).

When the first international military force moves against the first one who dares to go against international law, then we’ll have peace.

\* \* \* \* \*

[*Note:* This passage appears to be misplaced. Similar statements are made above.]

7.26 Democracies were used to seeing local gangsters committing crime. But they were shocked to see them at the heads of governments. We dreaded law with force. Now we have a world with force without law.

\* \* \* \* \*

REVES

MIDWAYER

*[A second short recess was called before the reading of the final paper, purporting to have come through May 21. Notes were not permitted on this section, but it was stressed that this represented not a prophecy but the opinions and suggestions of the United Midwayers.—MBS]*

7.27 God is the same being under whatever name. But to have the same God does not insure sameness of worship. Emotional unity does not come about by agreement of beliefs about the good. Just as in aesthetic matters, understanding comes about by agreement on particular objects of art, so in moral matters it comes about by agreement on particular objects of esteem and reverence.

The first great institutions to spread the ideal of equality were the Judaic-Christian religions with their postulate that man has been created in the image of God and that all men are equal before God. This principle enunciated many thousand years ago shows the only form in which equality can find expression. This is equality before a certain specific authority, under a **concrete symbol** (67).

For the deeper stages of emotional understanding, men have need of a common and **concrete symbol** of regard and faith.

This need grows as the arrival of a world culture calls for increasing co-operation across racial and temperamental lines.

One ingenious author, Ely Culbertson, has [suggested] dividing the [proposed] world police force into a mobile corps recruited from the smaller nations and national contingents maintained within the larger ones.... But do we need this kind of separate police force, given a genuine international

REVES	MIDWAYER
-------	----------

system? Might it not create new difficulties, even new dangers? ... The danger might perhaps in part be avoided if the proposed mobile corps, stationed at ocean islands, were designed to **function as a kind of international Red Cross Brigade**, trained to bring swift aid wherever disaster befell—anywhere on the face of the earth—through hurricane, earthquake, flood, pestilence, or other cause. But the whole proposal lies outside our present perspective. [R. M. MacIver, *Towards an Abiding Peace* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943), pp. 124-25]

*[It spoke of the global government of the future as **functioning like the Red Cross** in fire, flood, earthquake and famine;*

*that a new language must be evolved and all nations must learn it—first a thousand words and expanded later to three thousand, etc. Newspapers must carry the language side by side with the original of each nation. Movies must devote five minutes before each show to its study. There must be a tithe on inheritances for upkeep of international government, also a tax on all airways. There must be an international flag always half the size of the national and displayed side by side.*

*There must be an international headquarters building—“most arresting on earth.” An international father must be chosen to head this international government. (Several possible names were suggested but it was advisable to choose an entirely new name out of the international language.) He would serve for a period of ten years during which time his photo and a reproduction of the international capitol must be hung in every home.*

[See 7:27.]

*A wish or hope for a united Urantia religion was also expressed.]*

## ENDNOTES

1. A further parallel from Reves: "We all know that, with the progress of civilization, our social life is becoming more and more complicated, and that this **evolution** demands more and more compulsion of human actions, and that only the total of these compulsions can give us freedom" (17).
2. In the transcribed message, this sentence came after the following one. I have switched the order for improved coherency.
3. Further parallels from Reves: "The proclamation of these [internationalist] principles cannot be postponed, to be discussed after victory. They are the wings, they are the only historical justification of our coming victory" (133). "The political organization which is required to solve the problems of war and peace, of freedom and slavery, is not a distant, remote aim, but an immediate necessity. We cannot waste much time. The foundation must be laid now, during this war" (143).
4. From the Urantia Book: "[S]piritual victories can be won only by spiritual power" (159:3.2).
5. From the Urantia Book: "Ganid, mercy may be lavish, but justice is precise. . . . Can you not see that on this world such responsibilities had better rest upon the group or be administered by chosen representatives of the group? (133:1.2) "Jesus invested legislative and judicial authority in the *group*, not in the *individual*. Even this investment of authority in the group must not be exercised as personal authority. There is always danger that the verdict of an individual may be warped by prejudice or distorted by passion. Group judgment is more likely to remove the dangers and eliminate the unfairness of personal bias" (159:1.6).