

M. L. Bloss
2304 Massachusetts Ave N.W.
Washington, D.C.

March 17, 1941

The peace business ^{has} to start from the ultimate place it is to go, and come back. Everybody knows that the universal brotherhood of man has been a concept since Christ. "Peace on earth, good will to men" is a Christmas ideal.

Inasmuch as most people trying to build a peace structure (and there will be tens of thousands of them) will start with two and two equal four, let us have the fun of starting with one divided by one equals one.

First, presume that a universe is One. Then drop down to what human beings know, or believe they know, and accept out of the universe concept-- in other words, what, practically speaking, the mass millions will agree upon concerning the universe and its function as a unit in unity. I said "practically." In practice human beings are concerned only with this earth. So we make that a unit. Practically they can be concerned about nothing off the earth) because the rain-makers are frauds, and no one has found a way to wink at the man in the moon without a sense of futility.

So, back to the earth, seeking and seeing one. At least we have gotten rid of the word "universal" and in the concept of universal brotherhood of man we may now write the "brotherhood of man." Obviously there must be a place where unity ceases in the business of living. As man, men are as many units as the living. So the unity we seek ends at the point where it becomes impossible for man to unify. So we shall hold on to One, and the idea of unity coming down from the universe, only so long as we may in intellectual honesty say that unity still exists there-in.

Already it becomes difficult to observe the earth in its unity of mankind. [One sees millions marching for and against. One hears noise, discordant conflicting. So these things ones must not see and hear at this moment. Were one so to do, one would stop the doing.]

Well, no one objects to the earth moving around the sun. There is no serious objection to the moon moving around the earth. So we shall accept

the earth's place in the solar system as a concept of unity. (Whatever we do from this point must make allowance for the insane, the excessively stupid, and the superstitious. We may have to admit here that our unity must be confined to the mass movement in health of the human race through time and space. Certainly we cannot reach any concept of unity on this earth if we allow the least common denominator of manhood--the lowest brain--to participate other than passively in the concepts of brotherhood of man--~~it is~~ unity.....

March 19, 1941

An individual dwelling in the finite may seek to serve the infinite as the business of life. One may lose all of the infinite in the dutiful awareness of the finite. Beauty dies--the noble line of proportion in the infinite perishes in the constant finite line.

One saw once a barefoot brother scrubbing the floor of the man of science --a Jesuit seeking God through the stars. One thought to speak with the brother of the scrub brush. Worn and aging hands told their story. The mind verified, and as one's eyes observed the delicacy and beauty of the hands of the man of science, suggesting a telescope, the hands told the story which the face finished.

To the man of science was put the question: "Where is the equality of God in this place?"

"In the service itself," he said.

An agnostic is a mind undecided about the existence of a knowing infinite. The one who saw the figure of the scrub brush and the figure of the telescope was groping. So the picture, with its question mark, lasted to be written here. But in the growth in time a larger range of finite questioning returned with two new questions unanswered:

"Does the finite melt in the finite one without perception into the infinite?"

"Is infinity merely the uncounted multitude of finites--a part of the whole? And the whole but the sum of the parts.

If these two questions are answered "yes"--that the whole is the sum of the parts, and all the parts make the whole, we have a finite answer to infinity in many of the mediums that puzzle--time finite being a fraction of the whole, space finite being a fraction of the whole. Finite dots making an infinite line, the infinite curve which closes the infinite circle at any

at ~~any~~ one of an infinity of finite dots.

In the word infinite itself there is acknowledgement of a concept quite positive and very useful in the stretching efforts of the finite one. True no one finite in substance, called a human one, ever in finite perception will perceive infinity. But the concept is in the precept, the concept, in the realm of emotion--yes, even in belief--may be quite real. Such is the power of emotion or feeling, or, as the formal religious one states, of faith, in contrast with imagination and perception. So, let us believe in the infinite, and gather within the fold all atheists, or agnostics, and all of the formally devout. It seems only an exercise in the particular for one to deny a God, to doubt a Godhead, or to believe in a savior of self. No one of these three in sincerity conflicts in the infinite concept. They merely differ in the precept.*

One is moving along, driving West under a sun, breathing in the beauty and the warmth. Comes the awareness of the speed of light, and what few moments ago the now perception of the sun was in the sun itself. The concept of the countless sun rays joining with imperceptible speed, but producing a perceptible warmth, is of and about the finite, having infinite texture and yet the speed of light is a finite formula so exact and accepted as a tool of science that it becomes almost as common in knowledge and use as the kitchen stove.

If the infinite and the finite so mix themselves, crossing and re-crossing at all angles of texture and thought, we may feel that the infinite pervades all three of the finite dimensions. So would we conceive that the three finite dimensions are but an infinitely small number of the infinite dimensions. Translating into quality and quantity in time and space one might

conceive that there can be no infinite without embracing the finite, and that the finite is an imperceptible part of the infinite.

So one drops one's eyes, sees the image of a truck driver who must be directing the tank of gasoline ahead. The driver, unseen, is one in motion toward the West; from East to West, from life to death, in time and space he drives. Who is he?

He is one alive in a world where all seek Oneness, condemned never to have it.

The one leading our Western multitudes moves South in this moment, seeking sunshine to refresh his sight for the insight that must come to him if he is to lead in health a finite people through a finite crisis. He as one detaches himself so that he may the better see and feel and hear from the infinite for the finite. And yet the truck driver and the leader are equal in mathematics. Together they are twice greater conceived as two in any infinity. There they would be seen in the brotherhood of man, did they know how.

(It is not conceivable that anyone wants the thing of another which he does not need in his pursuit of happiness.) So the trouble must be that the brotherhood of man, which is sought in the pursuit of happiness, may be harmed in the larger sense by the thing itself--merely [the belief that the other one has that which one wants more than one wants what one has.] It is certain that the truck driver, driving West, does not want the job of the leader, moving South. In fact the truck driver voted his consent recently to have the one in leadership maintain his leadership of his particular national unity. Change occurs, and the truck driver ordered the protection of the national unity by the gathering of force weapons.

Another picture of two.

A woman whom females, sex-conscious, had recently voted the most valuable woman in a nation was being driven North by a chauffeur at the moment the woman's money paid those who involved millions into the will to war to preserve the brotherhood of man ideal. The chauffeur in his youth was a soldier on horseback who had reached nearest toward Paris--a Bavarian peasant driven by the force of a Prussian will.

The woman said, "I so loved Bavaria."

The man said, "I believe you have the best newspaper in America."

Here is a weaving of unities and dis-unities in sex, in time, in method, but not in belief. Both in youth, unknown to the other, had been opponents at war. A half a life later in perfect harmony they discuss a repetition of the same war, of the same national opponents--the same group of opponents--and in general over the same conflict of thought. But in their perfect harmony they speak as one. [The thing that made the harmony was nearness and knowledge through sight and feeling.] Driving South, each one went another way, never again, perhaps, to meet.

Groping agnostic, seeking a near view of a peace which must follow every war of nations, has looked at three groups, three pairs of ones. The first pair, unequal, were equal in the service of a formal and man-formed God. These Jesuit brothers, one scrubbing floors, and one seeking God in infinite space, were joined in a brotherhood. It was a real and lasting peace between one and one. It was certain so to last in finite life. They sought to have it so infinitely with life. So the live and vital thing was in the concept itself. Certainly knowledge and nearness made the concept see-able to the agnostic, and brought him nearer in his knowledge--more than the distance from inquiring youth to inquiring upper age.

The second bit of concept in the now saw an unseen truck driver and an unseen leader, seeing the same, who had never seen each other, and who were not seen except in concept by the one rejecting the business of agnosticism as an adequate tool of sight.

The third, a man and a woman meeting in the harmony of the now of sight and sound, who had fought unseeing and unknowing half a life before.

(All ones in this world not in reverse against the social thing we call humanity are seeking a sameness under the pressure of a very great discomfort and a very great fear. They want peace.) They inquire as they fight or make ready to fight. They do not want the thing they are making ready for. They merely know that they must fight--they must struggle for the thing they seek, and that the struggle is a most awful thing. This struggle is to be so awful that they must not think of the serenity that must come out of the noise. They merely know that the noise is a horrible symphony of mass effort to save a future thing to be. They must not even pause to see the thing to be for fear that the thing will vanish if there is a pause to hear or see amid the noise. And they are right.

So why is one, driving West in the comfort of infinite rays of light and heat, making, or feeling, his way? Perhaps because there are places for all ones in the infinite. So this one inquires--this one who has seen the three pairs--both different and the same--such a one inquires what are the proportions and placements of an infinite concept of peace and harmony among men with the proportions of struggle, change, ebbs, and flows among men, and among the groups of men called nations. Of course, one sees an earth charted finitely on a sheet of paper in its movements in the universe. This earth has a surface which men have pierced and walked over to a point of relative

supremacy among living things. Two billion human ones live now here, fighting and loving and reproducing and killing in the mastery they have over the billions of other forms of life and of the infinite individual bits of life. These men seek to preserve their bits of life in increasing richness as they fight and love and kill and reproduce. But (all seek only for themselves the greater richness of life with a hope for richer and longer life after a finite death. So would they all tie themselves to an infinite harmony. They would reject conflict that kills. They would keep love that reproduces and so they fight to save and to obtain a peace.)

(Were one in insight to see an end to the fight, one must see what may in human bondage be the maximum of human freedom that is to be. One also must see a minimum of necessary requirements that must bind the freedom.)

Here is the formula:

The old, old formula of the most for the least, the greatest good to the greatest number with the greatest freedom in the search of richness by the one among the many within his own private truth of value. So, (the articles of a peace should be few so that all may understand. Each article should have a significance within the formula. Each article must withstand the microscope of change, and yet be flexible to progress as time lengthens and space diminishes. Each article must have a strength binding freedom as freedom of movement of the individual, without binding or fixing the individual in growth and change. For all parts--all persons--make up the whole of the human race. No world movement of humans into the future may be without change, insistent change, peaceful change, and change in richness. But all ones think of things that bind as enemies of change. Why must we say so? Why would the articles of a peace forbid change in richness of life by fixing the limits of the ones moving among the many?)

We do not say so about the steel that binds the part of an automobile joining the wheels, and he who conceived the first wheel thought so. There never would be, nor would there ever have been, a spoke to hold the wheel in circumference. So (the articles of the peace must be understandable and accepted as lasting without being the enemies of change. Such articles must not fix supremacies and inferiorities. [The articles of peace must fix a point where supremacy is equality and where equality is supremacy.] ~~And~~ the concept of the peace must be a unity in government which permits a growth toward the social unity of all human beings as the backward peoples move toward the light, and as those within the nations are led by leaders seeing well.

So (the articles of peace altogether must have a purpose clear, and so the overture and the statement of the whole must be in such simple words that the least common denominator called the average man may understand the peace without necessarily having to understand the bits of the peace, the parts of the peace, that make up the whole. This earth must come to him in words which he may see as clearly as he may see an apple put in his hand. [The discussion of the peace, with even the preparation of the articles of peace, may be as complex as the book which discusses the apple's progress from seed through flower to the fruit.] But be not mistaken. [There must be a peace of understanding for the average man,] and the understanding must be the simplicity of the overture which states with simple nobility the oneness of the thing which all seek, and which in simple articles must form this concept into the practical statement of the architecture of the peace.

((One knows that in this peace which is to be the government of harmony within equality and freedom there are almost one hundred national units. One knows also that there is but one concept worth the fighting, and one feels, riding now, that the thing--the peace to be conceived, the peace we want so passionately, is to be followed by more wars. But what of that, if a new

high peak of lasting peace in more richness of peaceful and world unity is made. [One must not say there shall be no peace simply because the peace will not last as long as the human race. What one wants within the practical life now within us, is that peace which will last as long as possible without compromise in quality.] If there is no compromise in the quality, is it not fair to assume that the quantity--the very time of lasting--will be better for the quality?

(And we all know now that no one within a nation who is in health, and no nation among the many nations which is composed of healthy citizens wants other than equality in the spirit and the freedom and in the fairness of a social world fabric.

(There are to be concerned in this peace these many nations. How shall we approach the unity? First by having all common men in the nobility of their very commonness see and understand the words of the intent, and so believe, and so will the thing to last, and so to teach their children, and that their childrens' children may be taught. There are words written from the past that have said this thing--words for both ones to believe and nations to believe. But these words have never to now been written as an overture to the fabric of a world to be. Perhaps this is because never before has there been a pressure of an entire world at war. These pressures of war always in the dead past have been over but a part of this earth, and so the peaces have been partial, and the articles of each peace have concerned but a part of this world. So there is hope now that this peace in its beginning, and in its parts, may conceive of a world with unity in peace. And so it must be written that way.)

Note:

Look up "precept" and "concept". Personally consider "con" is inclusive, and "pre" is projective and particular. If an exact meaning bears me out, the words are properly used for others to read. If they do not, still I would use the words as most clearly useful for myself, because to me a concept has a oneness and an aroundness and an inclusiveness, while a precept is a directed line, having a definite stop at a point of intelligence.

"Precept", n. A prescribed rule of conduct or action (L. *prae-cipio*, take beforehand, admonish).

"Concept", n. An abstract general notion or idea; also, any notion combining elements into the idea of one object. (L. *conceptus*, take together.)

Why all the quantity and quality and variety in a discussion of the
peace?

Want to see people around peace and framework.

One chapter on the maximums of peace and another chapter on the minimums
of peace, or a chapter on the maximums and minimums.

Has to have intent and statement.

March 19, 1941

One has to inquire into all the phases from man's character to infinity in the sense of lastingness in order to inquire where man himself is going-- what he wants. If anything is sure about that, it is that he is reaching toward infinity if he is growing at all. The thing has to be examined minutely. Then, as one eliminates the uselessly minute, and the useless discussions and factors of infinity or universality, one really gets down to earth considered as an earth, and human beings on it.

But, in any event, we cannot make the thing any bigger than the earth as a document, and we can't make it any less than the earth in the concept of the document. And, while there may be inequality in the sense that some people exceed others in grasp and force, and that some reaches exceed others in grasp and force, there can be no insulting lack of equality in fixing any lasting document of peace.

One can't have a Treaty of Vienna, and one must not have a Treaty of Versailles. But it is worth while to note that the Treaty of Versailles was a distinct improvement over the Treaty of Vienna, and that the light that failed in the Wilson concept of a World Court, and in the failure of the League of Nations, there was not a failure of vision, but merely a failure in practical architecture.

So, when we reach a point where we want to see the thing as a bit of architecture, we will reach a point of definite articles of peace. But there is a middle ground of elimination both in the minute and in the human --that is the thing that reaches beyond the practical of the average man who must accept it now. The idea must be brought down to the practical. The practical must not become the servant of the winner and the defeated.-- that is if it is to make for any unity of world peoples in peace.

So, the next step is not to write the overture, for that will write itself, but the process, just as definitely as a piece of sculpture, is the outcome of elimination. The creator sees his picture from the infinite

into the finite for the purpose of a lasting thing so that the many may see their own truths in the finished work, and the stone is cut, meeting, in the elimination of material, the dream.

Well, we cut both ways: cut the dream to the practical maximum that is of a the dream/world lasting peace in richness, and we cut out from the material of a hundred nations and two billion people the trivial, the useless, and the antagonistic.

March 19, 1941

What was written this morning was merely a suggestion for the gathering of material and men and ideas, and the pointing out of where it might be gathered and who should hold the basket. (Letter attached.) Out of all that shall be sorted the useless for the keeping of the useful. In much the same way a single person trying to produce a workable maximum peace in words must inquire minutely into the needs of almost a hundred nations in order to see the need minimums of the many. And he must exercise himself by tens of thousands of words, perhaps. And he should want to read what every other person has said as he stimulates himself into writing and seeing.

[By such a process of infinite pains and infinite number of bits of little things flowing through his mind will he come to the picture of a world average man's needs.] For [this is not to be a peace for an American, or an Englishman, or a German, but for a world man. And it must stand for a world man, and his needs in his movements over the earth.]

So the earth, pierced a few miles, and uneven on its surface by sea depth and mountain height less than ten miles, must be seen as a bit of the universal truth, and man's march over its surface as an equality. In this way we shall get the minimum in needs by keeping in the necessity of equality and free motion, for every must need is a binder. And for every need of the many that proves not to be a common need, we have another binder.

[The structure must be so simple that this world man and his sons may see it in its greatness and in its strength, but above all in the simplicity of its truth and the plainness of its statement,] at least as to the prologue.

And I wonder whether the articles themselves cannot be equally brief and simple, leaving the detail of the work-out to a few commissions indicated and designated. [a course which will break down into the multitude of petty branches covering the particular governmental needs of the diverse peoples.] But, if this structure has not world unity, what has it that is worth ~~anything~~?

And, if it does not have equality with its durability, how can it be durable?

It will, of course, have a supreme authority, and the authority undoubtedly will have to be of some force to bind two billion people and to keep these many nations in the line of growth, which is, of course, the growth into the unity of the concept of the peace, and not into the dis-unity of men and littler nations.

We have moved in this country from thirteen jealous colonies refusing unity to forty-eight states beautifully bound into unity. But yet, after one hundred fifty years, not having achieved either economic justice or the full growth of efficient national service for the individual. But it certainly has been a very great progress through evolution and elimination within the Preamble of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. So the American nation should produce the men who, as vetrans in blood and concept, ~~we~~ will be quickened by the world concept. And it is quite possible that it may produce the men who willnot be prideful, boastful, and forceful in becoming the center of the new order that is sought.

March 19, 1941

Dear H.:

Roosevelt will receive thousands of suggestions for the peace. He will not have time. He will place them somewhere--at least he should--for sorting.

Roosevelt has said: "We have a war to win, and a peace later," He is right. Churchill says the same. If these two men were to think of the peace, they would be robbing the effort to win the war.

But someone should sort and save and put into form an occasional summary, as the peoples' thoughts change from time to time.

I think this saving is almost as precious as the sorting and saving of inventions to win the war. I hope Churchill is having some sorting and saving until he has the time. If I were either one, I would not look at a peace idea.

(I think Wilson talked too soon, and out of place,) on his Fourteen Points.

.....Any work from these ideas can be done by others.....a sort of reporting which I think best can be done by persons neither executive nor ambitious, and only concerned with the excellence of the work itself.

.....definitely in the direct line of the next President.....to have a reservoir of the country's ideas on the war's end constantly brought up to date.....

March 19, 1941

Memorandum to H.:

This is a memo by itself for the practical facts. I believe you will find that the President already has set up an oldish, slow, day-dreaming bunch to take the pressure of all the peace people from his time schedule.

If you look into this and find it so, it should not discourage you. You should have W. made the liaison, and he should take over supervision of this particular agency so that you may have access; then you will put in the same a good executive secretary. And, of course, the financing probably already has been handked by making it an appendage of the State Department. If you find that all this stuff is being routed to Department Z of the State Department, you will find the matter in charge of some mangey derelict who could be given a secretary or be replaced and put under W.'s control with the consent of Hull. He could get the appropriation slowly raised if you needed high-class sorters.

.....The main thing is to start in where the thing now is without trying to supplant it with a new set-up. In that way you lose heat and make speed, as you are not ruffling feathers.

March 19, 1941

I can see a perambulating government, meeting in many places over this world. I can see a supreme government functioning in London for a year, and the next year functioning at Washington, and the next year at Moscow, and perhaps the next year at Tokyo. What is wrong with that? The men so functioning are but representatives of a world's people in unity, and the absence of a fixed place in establishment of the force of unity would be the very denial of a supreme placement.

I do not believe we need a Tribunal of The Hague, or the fixation at Geneva of a world business, or at Washington, any more than I am sure we need a fixed Pope at Rome, backed up by two-thirds Italian Prelates to maintain the fixation. *[This new peace must eliminate the supremacies of geography and permanent placement. This sentence should begin the paragraph.]*

On that sort of an article of the Peace, for instance, the world man would be told that he is supreme above the fixation of nationality--which is one thing he must know. And *(*the men seeking to be in the upper legislative or governing groups would be moved about the world, destroying by slow growth the conscious national differences and the babbel of supremacies of nations which has afflicted the world.*)*

*(*As far as the United States is concerned, we need not fear that the world as a whole may not think we are excellent; our fear should be that the world be jealous that we are too excellent. Already we reach toward South America in the concept of an equality with as many people below the Rio Grande as there are above it, knowing full well that no measuring stick would show the people below the Rio Grande the equal one to one of the people above it. But we never get any where unless we know that they are equal in that they must in the long time march become so, and that we must set up the machinery for the becoming. And the machinery must be impervious to jealousy and must be set up with the minimum of force, with permanency, and with safety.*)*

The biggest thing about the Roosevelt movement in foreign relations has been the substitution of the "Good Neighbor" policy for "Dollar Diplomacy." This Good Neighbor policy has taken an awful beating, but at least it has stood, and still stands, as the thing that must be if America is not to make herself boss state of the North and South Americas through the continuous use of her police power. And when we prove smart enough to have North and South America meeting at Lima, Peru, and Havana, Cuba, we are certainly moving far from the Pan American Building, at Washington, seeking to say that everybody come to us--at the big dog's table.

So, one article should provide for a perambulating capitol to be voted upon from time to time according to the march of time and events.

And, of course, another article must provide, much as did the Athenian states, for a not too big force, a trifle less snobbish than the mandate provisions of Versailles and the sanction and censure systems of Geneva.

March 19, 1941

I think the final effort at preamble or overture writing probably will be the last thing because it has to state so simply, briefly, and clearly the peace intent that I don't believe it should be attempted before the writing one has gone through every bit of observation and writing that he is capable of. [The book should be written for this world man and his needs in knowledge and growth in socialized government.] The preface must tell him what the book is about, so the book had better be written before the preface.

And so we shall try to write a few articles just as if the world war were over, and an American peace document was asked by Churchill of Roosevelt for study.

March 21, 1941

Who is the authority in a unity?

Isn't it, after all, just a matter of being honest to the thing itself that one is seeing? Certainly (in human beings there is a central thought that must rule if conflict is to be beaten and if harmony is the thing that is to win. This concept now is unity in the arrangement of mass affairs.)

(The enemy of such unity is the will growing among individuals throughout the ages to use power for self. It is doubtful if the highly successful users of power are ever conscious of selfishness. It is easy across an ocean to charge persons of self knowledge of evil. So West speaks to East, and East speaks to West, as the power people accuse and re-accuse and the millions of little ones echo and re-echo. Where is the monopoly of good motive?

Very definitely there is a difference of belief in what constitutes good action for humanity. Probably it is progress that under the pressure of this day the lesser shadings are vanishing. There seem now to be but two simple thoughts which may be stated as a question instead of as a conflict between one and one. If it may be stated so, progress has been made by the elimination of conflict and by reducing the concept to one. For unity may neither have conflict nor two. So (the question is: "Is it better that man direct those in power, or should man be directed by them?")

To examine this question, one starts with a unity of a single question. One begins without conflict. This question has been alive since history's dawn. It may never be settled. But the vitality of the question is what the firing is all about. Those of us who believe affirmatively that man must rule in the essence of his progress have the right first to examine the question from the affirmative. (To examine, one must examine the past to see if any progress has been made by man under this formula.)

Then one must state that the formula has not lost its vitality--that it is not old fashioned--that it is not out-worn. And finally, (one must make this formula work in the future.) And so one must consider such a working after the firing is over.

The idealist would state passionately the belief. He also will do what we of the affirmative are now doing--fight for this belief. And in the fighting, he will shed from the hosts that believe as he believes all those who refuse to fight for a unified peace. Here is where logic fails. We fight for peace; we fight in pieces for a unified whole.

But logic is merely a human exercise. And, strangely, logic may be two or three or four. So all those who logically believe that a peaceful unity of man cannot be promoted by fighting mankind must embrace logic and be left to die, or perhaps to join by negation the ranks which oppose their own logic.

So now, going backward, we have reached three logical conflicts.

But the progress made is that the controlling--that is, the significant--forces in this conflict seeking unity are in this today but two. And, if an Anti-God exists, must he not be laughing as he watches humans fighting in two world camps for a unified world. But perhaps also, if there is a God of Evolution, may not such a God be very happy as he surveys humanity approaching unity with only two fighting groups?

Surveying history, is this not the first time that this has been so? And, should you use figures, is two so very far removed from one?

In a world of progress one might see man in terms of two in a small image. Let us see the great director of a museum explaining to a little child the skull significance of a pre-historic man. The child might see progress. And the child might ask what is the basis of the progress. In simplicity the child might say, "Man has gone far." And the child might ask, "What was the road?" And the child might answer, "Man in courage kept going, winning and losing, but always with courage kept his faith that he would have sunshine and light to see thereby in health." So in words an older child might write, "Optimism and effort put man above and beyond the beasts."

The other words are "pessimism" and "unbelief". And the little child, tossing in restless sleep, might destroy his nightmare as he looks unseeing into the dark by knowing that he had but to await the light with courage.

Back to the picture of this today. The cave, the club, the daily battle for life itself when on in countless conflicts unorganized. Time passing organized the conflicts, conquered beasts, subdued the earth, arranged that food saved become the conqueror of hunger, that men of courage working as individuals bring ordered health and ordered law to man--out of the superstition and sudden force which ruled the man in the cave. And so, in the business of governing his organized might, man built the machinery which we call government itself. And, of course, man building thus did so that man might be served in his pursuit of happiness in this finite life.

Today the optimist, his eyes on a world at peace in richness of individual life, should be pleased with man's progress. For the question is looking toward settlement as opposing forces simplify the conflict.

It is not necessary to pass through history from the museum piece. One might pause for an illustration nearby in time and space. A nation, which is but a group of assorted humans, fought almost to extinction over the question of whether a race of men called black was essentially inferior in the human concept and must therefore be submerged under the race called white by the mere fact of color. From this pressure called war, which moved a nation divided into many different beliefs on this question to a nation of unity, came a progress which we believe to be permanent in a significant part of this earth. But it took conflict to do it--almost a destruction of the unity and freedom of a nation which may lead this world toward where the optimist would have it led--the world of a unified peace with equality and opportunity for the pursuit without conflict of happiness itself. But in order not to

delay an approach to the City of Now by roving over the fields, let us
confine the line of sight to the business of government, and the hope of
the optimist that [a world at peace with government functioning in peace for
man may be.]

March 21, 1941

[The peace to be is merely a way station. There will be those leading this divided world who shall say that a thousand years of darkness must come if either side is divided.] The optimist hears from across the sea the statement that the opponent plans to set up an enduring government to rule as a government over mankind for the next thousand years. Replying to this voice comes another voice saying that if this new rule force wins that the world must grovel in darkness without liberty for a thousand years. [Where is the truth?]

Perhaps it is that leaders in conflict must see the point of conflict that way in order to lead the forces themselves. But he who, looking at the moment when the conflict dies, may see not two opposing private truths of leaders in battle, but [one private truth which is not hampered by the noise and the fear of the now.] And what is this truth? Probably that two have become one. That the business has been settled. That his side won. And as the winning one he has the responsibility for the peace of the world.

And so his first sight is that the defeated ones were those who said that government must rule men from a central point. And if the winner were to set up a government to rule all men from a central point, where would be the victory? Would not the defeated have won? So the peace must not be that.

If humor is one's sense of lack of proportion in the normal, and if one is thinking of normal progress of man, the extremes may be smiled at as one attempts to approach the norm of a healthful world.

The side of force for unity would prevent a race called the Jews from reproducing. Today one of the Jewish race proposes that free doctors be mobilized on the peace day to perform the necessary operation on the German race, so that the German blood might perish from this earth. An optimist should smile if belief is his that world unity under peaceful government is

be as he observes the extremes of ideas in this conflict.

The Germans would call upon the rest of us to eliminate the Jew. The Jew would call upon the rest of us to eliminate the German. And by so doing, unity through destruction. Is this to laugh with the Anti-God? Or does God himself merely smile as he watches the progress, knowing that man will reject in the peace those things which he has found out to be the cause of pain and death and poverty for himself?

So, having rested, with humor may we procede.

March 21, 1941

All men die as ones, but man as mankind lives in the truth and by the truth as he sees it. His eye is imperfect, but the perfect thing is that he sees more as in mankind he moves through time.

So (mankind will not voluntarily suffer pain unless he knows that pain is a necessary overture to joy. So man wants a peace with joy which is worth the cost in pain. What is it that such a peace must leave behind?)

(The victors must consolidate the victory by the peace.)

If the victors by those who would make man supreme, they will seek to do so by this peace. (The peace will be the framework for the growth of man toward the unity of world peace. Such a peace will protect man with a sure framework. But the framework itself must have the elements of growth. The framework must not be made a fixed and final thing of boundaries and sanctions and protectorates, and permanent places where the mighty may sit in final judgement over the generations to come. If man meeting man in voluntary association conquered this earth, man himself must conquer man in voluntary fighting association/for his peace, not by destroying man, but by destroying the element which destroys. This framework of peace must be of the maximum spirit, because spirit is a thing eternal. It must be of a minimum of fixed rigidity because time changes all. So the business is to fix the quality of the spirit in the simplicity of unity itself.)

(All religions have perished which did not grow with knowledge and the growth of man. All governments shall perish which do not provide for growth. And what is this peace to be except man's effort to provide for growth in peace of man.) Both you and I are impatient right now at the generalizations and the failure to get down to cases, but it seems very clear to me that a very great knowledge must come to mankind now living before man's leaders will be able to function. (The end of every conflict throws to the top the scum of those who would immediately cash in on victory for the now, and a tired victor wants something in the immediate. The tired vanquished expects to be punished.

(These two forces meeting for a peace must face a problem involving detailed aspirations of over a hundred nations, and many groups within each nation-- blacks, whites, yellows among mankind; Labor and Capital; the have's and the have-not's; soldiers, politicians, would-be governors, demagogues, crackpots with ideas. (The best tool for a permanent peace will be the desire of mankind itself supporting the leadership which truly represents average man everywhere.) ~~So~~ this is why the general, tedious, and rather uninspiring, and vague work with one's self as he attempts to be the average man and not the maker of a peace. He is working with his own spirit in the clear realization that it is the average which must see or perish.

March 21, 1941

(How may average man be prepared for a peace unless he is prepared before the horrible emotions of the winner and the loser grab at the unity we are fighting for? Let us try a particular and definite peace framework, not because this particular framework shall look like the one to be, but because all average men must try in the spirit of all, if there it to be the peace.

(The document should: restate the case of man and government. Rousseau, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson from the past, Roosevelt and Chruchill in the present are sources. An opening speech to the Peace Congress is the place for this, so that the pitch of harmony may be reached for the listening world to hear. While this is going on, the hundreds of experts will be drawing up planks for the platform. But if the panks offered have to pass the analysis of the world peace concept, much time will be saved if a world approving the concept rejects the bad timber.

One group of bad planks will be those which seek permanently to imprison the defeated for all time. Another group of rejected planks will be those seeking to assess the indeminties of war under the cry of justice. For any world unity must provide against individual slavery, whether in groups of men or in individual cases, for man alone or together will fight to the death against a hopeless slavery. The last war and its peace proved that. All planks which would set up one nation or one race to rule all others will be refuted. There cannot be a supreme race, or a spreme spot of government for all races.

(The above are merely samples of what will be rejected by mankind striving for the permanent as against the temporary. Now what kind of planks are fitting? Probably the key planks will be those which provide for the maximum of voluntary association of different races of mankind with a minimum of control of his life--particularly control over his sense of truth and justice and right of self-expression. For without these, mankind may not grow. ~~No~~ the

planks which protect the individual man, and groups of men, in his right to strive for these individual values will be fought for.

(The wisdom of the leaders will come from those who may best express what mankind wants as mankind, and not what a particular variety or group of men may demand. But such leadership must have behind it almost a unified electorate. Wilson did not have this. So the work of unifying potential thought leaders must begin soon--just as soon, at least, as our side sees victory.

and but 4 P
✓

March 21, 1941

The actual respect of man for man as man should be going on even now. This is no time for purges and rejections of men potentially together in the business of making a national unity. There can be no "In's" and no "Out's" as a national leader forges ahead for victory. The great test of Roosevelt, for instance, may come when he sees victory. He will need at that time less and less help in the supremacy of victory itself. But if he makes the Wilson mistake, he may win the victory and lose the peace. And, if he fails to reach for actual unity now, he may have a great price to pay later, as the "Out's" and the rejects in the victory effort are left unoccupied and basically uninformed.

The strength of America at the peace table will be no greater than the unity of its people. Roosevelt must not only know what he wants, but must have the senior partner of the victory effort a solid force. So, were I engaged as leading in the business of victory, I would slowly add into the active victory business every consequential American, no matter what his present beliefs. We know of no honest Americans who do not want America to win. [If all such are put to work at winning, we need not worry about their beliefs concerning the peace, or even their beliefs as to the method of obtaining the victory.] The Roosevelt leadership of the war effort is itself substantial; it is the leadership following the Armistice that must be prepared for by having all potential objectors at work in forging the victory. Any man who truly works at or for something wants to get paid for it. The pay in this case is a permanent peace. [If a man does not work for this victory, he will spend his strength, his stored up energy, and his egotism in non-working criticism, building up in his sub-conscious a tremendous force to let loose as close as he can get to the peace table.]

He will not have had a chance to work for victory, so he certainly will insist on working at the peace. And as such will make a very great trouble.

✓
This explains the action of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate following the World War. Its little authority under the constitution is the power to pass upon the peace.

Ours is a two-party government. The nearer this becomes a "Will to Win" government, single purposed, the nearer we shall come in preparation for a unified peace effort. Were I seeking such a unity, I would not stop at anything in reaching for particular men and making them busy. I would take every opponent of Roosevelt and put him to work at something within his actual powers, and regardless of what he said. This would include the publishers such as McCormick; Strassburger, of Pennsylvania; Verne Marshall, of Iowa. It would include Lindbergh and Willkie. It would reach, if possible toward Wheeler, and even Lewis.

The principal is not to build up these men. It is merely that they be put to work so that their energies be properly used, and that they may become exhibits of the "all out" leader's effort to assemble all material for the victory. Many will argue that you can't work with half-workers, but if these men are half-workers, give them half jobs. The public will understand.

And then, as to the people in the next group--LaGuardia, and Moses, in New York; McNary and La Follette and Champ Clark. Make them so busy, and tie them so tight in the public service of victory that they will disappear and not be missed. (Wheeler and McCormick now are merely horrible examples of what we don't want.)

This is not unity. The leader now may force unity, since this very small fraction has not come into unity. The power behind the force is the majority concept of government which Roosevelt now is reaching toward in his last public speech. But he needs some dramatic examples as he brings Labor and Capital and the two parties together by hastening with his leadership their voluntary processes. ✓

✓ The voluntary process must be maintained in principal, but the ability of minute minorities to remain out of the effort must be discouraged by a positive action of leadership with majority approval. This is not the concentration camp idea. It is the idea of putting the positive ahead of the negative.

Those around the President will object, because each opponent brought to Washington will be called an example of appeasement, and each new man of color and size brought here will be opposed by men who don't want the competition. But the people know a leader, and they are perfectly aware when opposition is well-handled. ✓

✓ (The above has been written after an informal poll of a few hundred plain people on the question: "Should Willkie work in Washington for us, or should he work in New York for himself?" The answer was 90 per cent: "Yes, in Washington.")

Then, answering personally the query as to why LaGuardia was not more active and what was in Willkie's mind, a trip to New York was taken. The reply was that the President had not taken the initiative in the case of Willkie, and that his initiative in the case of LaGuardia was not satisfactory to LaGuardia.

I have not been to Chicago to look at McCormick, and haven't looked at Lindbergh, but I know McCormick, and I know that he is consumed with envy of Roosevelt, and he is very angry because Knox, his competitor, came to Washington and is now big stuff in Chicago and in the nation. If McCormick is called to Washington, and doesn't come, the President is absolved. If Lindbergh is called, that becomes Lindbergh's business. And the public will be very impatient if either were to say that the job wasn't big enough, and that they can do better work outside the government. For the true reason is that they are doing no work outside the government in winning anything.

Rough

(It is not good to leave Lewis, with a private line to Wheeler, plotting as he has the past few months.) He should be out in the open, or admit that he is sick and doesn't want to work directly and actively in any job assigned. Lewis should be put to work way down somewhere below Hillman, and made to like it. The same with McCormick under Knox, or better Knudsen.

The spirit of this is not vindictive. (It is merely carrying out the fact that substantial and active and all out aid must go on with people who now are at work and experienced in the business.) It is merely a statement that the public will understand that the President is using an an artist the inexperienced objectors in the business under the draft, and that he knows how to do it according to each man's ability and according to the need of the country. The passive method of permitting these men to say that they have not been asked to work dignifies them into a real opposition.

I say this out of the belief that in the long conflict for a place and differences over method that many egos have been hurt, but that no man exists who is a native American who should fail, upon call, to come without bargaining with the leader, and that once he makes that decision, he will become all "In" or all "Out." And, if all "Out", there is nothing left to hurt.)

March 21, 1941

the best answer to the accusation at the peace table that America wants to run the show would be to give first and take second. Give away supremacy of location first. Don't make any permanent place for world control, such as The Hague or Geneva, on the ground that permanent fixation of world government is not Democracy.

The practical people will say we have to have buildings and files and permanent locations of the working personnel, but that is all bunk compared with the big idea. The plank might read:

the plank will be included in the program

"The Association of Nations shall meet continuously at a place, or places, designated from time to time by members of a committee of representatives, named themselves as representatives of each nation, and a majority vote shall decide the meeting place. Each two years such a committee shall meet to select the place of meeting, to the end that all nations and all peoples may be drawn closer together in unity through knowledge by their representatives of the world and its problems."

"The Association of Nations may be called the Congress of Man. It shall consist of a single body. All nations shall be represented on the basis of population: one representative for each ten million persons, or major fraction thereof, with a minimum of one representative for each signatory."

(Because obviously this would put Asia, particularly India and China, in possession of more delegates than Europe and North and South America, it will not be adopted as a plant. But it is in the spirit of equality, and the representation at the highest point of the average man as a unit. So perhaps some sort of compromise would be adopted in the spirit of the American Federation of States, but not to the extent of providing a two chamber house.)

This plank might read:

"In determining representation in the Congress of Man, with due regard for economic life and geographical position, mankind shall be divided into representative zones of self government which shall send representatives to the Congress of Man. Eurasia shall constitute one; North and South America a second; the continent of Australia shall be permitted independent representation; the islands of the East Indies to determine whether Eurasia or Australia shall include them; with Africa to determine its independent status, or whether to join Eurasia. In any event, Eurasia shall have equal representation with North and South America, with fifty units each. Should Africa, with a minimum of ten representatives, elect to divide into North and South Africa, the representation shall be divided according to percentage of population at the line of demarkation. Australia shall have five representatives with one additional one for each ten million, or fraction thereof, of extra-territorial people in her unit of representation. In the Eurasian group, not more than twenty-five shall come from either Europe or Asia."

Another substitute might be:

"The Congress of Man shall meet continuously for periods of two years at a place or places to be designated by the majority vote of its members, but never twice in the same place, or the same continent during any ten years.

"The continents of Europe, Asia, North America, and South America shall be represented by twenty-five members; Africa by ten; Australia by five. All islands to be permitted to elect the continent of their representation, except Japan as a part of Asia, and the British Isles as a part of Europe.

"Existing governments in territory as constituted prior to January 1, 1935 in Eurasia shall be units of government in local affairs. Federations for district affairs shall be set up, including the United States of Europe,

a Union of Soviet Republics, a Union of Indian Peoples, and a Republic of China. The islands constituting Japan and Great Britain and Independent Ireland may elect to join the district autonomy or to have independent collaboration under the Congress of Man."

Functions of the Congress of Man

1. Control of world tariff.
2. Control of passports.
3. Control of world currency.
4. Control of transportation between governing units, including land, sea, and air.
5. Control of transmission of information, including postage, express, radio, telegraph, telephone, etc.

These are the minimum set-ups of the articles of federation from which the thirteen states made a nation. This is approximately the minimums found necessary in the Jeffersonian national concept that the country is governed best which is governed least. [Apply this to the world instead of the thirteen colonies, if you would have any harmonious peaceful government, with freedom of trade and peace to come for bariffs between parts and passports or movement control of their good or persons from one part of the world to another.] In freedom of thought one cannot have little parts of the world censoring newspapers, telephone, radio, nor may one have bits of the world subsidizing trade lines in competition against competing bits. So world transportation rates must be under central world control, as far as world control makes uniform rules and makes them for individual's initiative.)

The survey thus far indicates that we have had too much governing in too many parts with too little governing for the whole world. But the hope is that we have gone far from the Greek and Italian City States, and that Russia, Britain, and an expanding United States, and perhaps an expanding Germany, have, taken altogether, moved toward a world state where a world concentration has to move.

Enforcement Clause:

Any pooling of military force following the armistice must be determined by the victor. [How he determines will be the real essence of the permanency of any world system set-up.] The language here used is most important if the suspension bridge force and equality is to be spanned. The object is force as a servant of equality, rather than force to enforce a particular rigid concept of one man's idea of equality. This clause might read:

"An Enforcement Committee of the Congress of Man shall be set up composed of five members, not more than two from Eurasia, and not more than one from any other continent. This committee, under the sanction of the Congress, [shall request from each signatory the contribution to the enforcement control certain men and materials considered the minimum requirements in maintaining of authority ~~over~~ the Congress over the people of the world.] The amount of such enforcement material and men shall be changed from time to time according to conditions as determined by the Congress, and maintenance and replenishment shall be ordered and paid for out of the funds of the Congress. [In no event shall the personnel and officers and men be recruited from more than 30 per cent of any one of the five continental associates of the Congress.]

["Force used for the maintenance of order within sub-divisions existing prior to 1935 shall be determined by the authorities of the sub-divisions, and shall be certified to the Congress each year by annual statement."

"Seats of government shall be set up in the places existing prior to 1935. The regional governments shall follow the pattern of the Congress so that no seat of district government be maintained in any city more than two years to the end that national groups be recognized in equality, and so that government may not become fixed and rigid, and so that representatives of the government may become acquainted with the peoples they govern."

This thought is merely a bit of a general effort in moving management and government to the people, as against moving government and representation away from the people. [If government is not made mobile in framework, in location, and in representation, it is certain to become static force, and later a cesspool of hidden powers fighting change through special privilege.]

Having attempted to write a few sample planks in the concept of a Congress of Man to follow the peace, I have tried to remember something of The Hague and Geneva--both were efforts at voluntary association.

Geneva was more substantial than The Hague, but lacked much of the idealism of The Hague. They were a bunch of traders around Geneva, with entirely too much British and French victory attitude, and, of course, [the indemnity business, the mandates, and the sanctions, and the badly out up Europe with the poverty of the little countries did the rest,] But (the ideal of both is in the line of the effort. What is needed is:

1. More force for peace, honestly arrived at in the document itself.
2. A return of government to the people in every dramatic way, by making a world government an instrument of order and not a majesty of buildings and individual governments and individual statesmen. [As soon as we can quit calling world order and world peace and the Congress of Man by such spots as Geneva,) and as soon as we begin to realize that world equality means mobility and change as time and population through economics made by individuals

seeking the richer life means definitely man and his world, we will not have to deal so violently with such things as major powers and minor powers, dominant continents and backward continents, bosses and protectorates and the like. [This world needs the maximum of free movement of people and goods in order to insure any unity of this world worth the naming.]

Government fixed in dynastic and geographical placements has made the Berlin and Vienna and Paris and London the great sprawling things they are, preying upon the thinly populated countrysides. The money power of a capitalistic country has made New York a disproportion in America. National control of exchange currency, tariffs, and passports and citizenship exchanges have blocked out the world in uneven misery. The peace makers should know all this before they sit down. [They should know too that these miseries produce wars, and that only with a maximum freedom of movement over the world of man and men's work shall there be any lasting world peace.]

Government is proving the enemy of man, and not the servant of man. The units of government in local ~~events~~ ^{regions} should be very small, but not too small, so that the executive overhead be not too expensive or complicated. We shall evolve in this country. [More unnecessary units of state and county government shall merge, and, where unnecessary, taxation units shall cease.] Likewise in a world at peace unnecessary sovereignty over man which pervades his freedom or over-taxes his capacity by tariffs on exports and imports and unnecessary governing shall cease. [Man will be pleased if he comes out of this peace with:

1. The hope that war is over.
2. The hope that he may have freedom of thought and expression.
3. The hope that he may travel according to his conception of pleasure and opportunity to produce.
4. [The hope that in his own neighborhood where his own life is to be lived, that he may have protection in those things mentioned above with dignity and without too much expense of his time-hours.]

He will learn, if this peace embodies these ideas, to be proud of the structure of the peace and of the Congress of Man. [He will slowly, by evolution, reach directly from the dignity of himself and his family life to the dignity of God and the brotherhood of man, with the Congress of Man as his high point of brotherhood.] Men everywhere will dream and dream for their children of placing a representative upon this high point.

To this point everything said boils down to this:

America in less than two centuries, building upon Greece and Switzerland, which themselves were built upon the same formula that each fighting unit as one fought in government, has reached a place where the entire world may welcome the experience. [We started in America with little town meetings, moved to county units and state governments, and then into a unity embracing forty-eight states in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.]

We left the states to increase in local government. [We have changed a rigid constitution by judicial means so that unity in the national government might not be destroyed.] We withstood the test of sixty-one to sixty-five. We fought back the control by Capital in the last ten years. We have extended ourselves twice in this century beyond our shores to preserve what was founded here. [And now we should submit this work which is the United States as a suggested pattern for all to see. Nations thereby may become states in the world state.] But if we falter, or if we as a nation insist too strongly on the rights of this nation in a world nation, we shall have nothing except more fighting and less unity in the days to come.