

EDGAR H. BROOKES

*Freedom, Faith
&
The Twenty-First
Century*

FREEDOM, FAITH
AND THE
TWENTY-FIRST
CENTURY

by

EDGAR H. BROOKES

Being the sixteenth Series of Lectures
under the Chancellor Dunning Trust,
Delivered at Queen's University,
Kingston, Ontario,
October, 1965

THE RYERSON PRESS — TORONTO

© The Ryerson Press, Toronto, 1966

PRINTED AND BOUND IN CANADA
BY THE RYERSON PRESS, TORONTO

FOREWORD

The lectures in this volume were given on October 12, 13 and 15, 1965, as the sixteenth series of Dunning Trust lectures at Queen's University by Edgar H. Brookes, Professor of History and Political Science at the University of Natal. This series, entitled *Freedom, Faith, and the Twenty-first Century*, contributed very directly to the purpose of the Trust, "to promote understanding and appreciation of the supreme importance of the dignity, freedom and responsibility of the individual person in human society."

The Trust was established in 1948 in honour of the late Honourable Charles A. Dunning, Chancellor of the University from 1940 to 1948. It is a condition of the Trust that the Trustees of the University shall every three years determine the means by which the purposes of the Trust shall be pursued. Until the academic session 1965/66, the method selected was an annual series of lectures given by a distinguished visitor during a brief stay on the campus of two or three weeks. For the current three-year period, the Trustees decided to appoint a Dunning Trust Visiting Professor who would give a series of three lectures as before, but who would also contribute to the academic program of the University for at least one full term. In this way, the purposes of the Trust would be served at the level of intensive scholarship as well as through the lectures directed to a more general audience of students and public.

Dr. Brookes was the first such Visiting Professor under the terms of the Dunning Trust. His public lectures, which speak eloquently for themselves in print, drew consistently large audiences. It was possible this year to have all three

lectures given within a single week. The combination of timing and the quality of the lectures themselves commanded the attention of students and staff early in the term. Dr. Brookes was then much in demand during the rest of his stay in Kingston for student organized meetings and less formal gatherings. In addition, he gave the first half of a course in Race Relations and Civil Liberties offered to senior students in Political Studies and related fields. In short, he fulfilled in every way the hopes and expectations of the Trustees in instituting the Visiting Professorship.

Although the lectures printed here represent a relatively small part of Dr. Brookes' contribution to the life of Queen's University in the autumn of 1965, they will amply demonstrate to the reader our good fortune in having with us for so long a man whose qualities of heart and mind are matched only by the courage with which he has devoted his life, against great odds, to the practical advocacy of his convictions.

J. A. CORRY

Principal and Vice-Chancellor

*Queen's University at Kingston,
December 1, 1965.*

CONTENTS

Foreword, by <i>J. A. Corry</i>	v
I. Towards the Twenty-first Century	1
II. Freedom	29
III. Faith	53

I

TOWARDS THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Standing at the foot of the funicular railway at Neuveville in the Bernese Jura thirty-eight years ago, I remember hearing two workmen talking to each other, and to my delight one of them, in his heavy Jurassian accent, said, "Vous savez, en général le monde mondial est bouleversé." If he could feel like that in 1927, how much more must we in 1965! We have lived through an era of rapid and radical change, and it seems probable that by the end of this century the world as we have known it will be very greatly altered. We may resist this as being lovers of the past, or lovers of quiet and tranquillity. Neither of these attitudes is *per se* unreasonable. Not all change is progress, nor is turmoil a desirable end in itself. It seems, however, a more mature and creative attitude to look at the probabilities of life with level eyes and see what we can do with them. Through tendencies which seem, at any rate superficially, inimical to freedom and a barren soil for faith, can we learn how what is ultimately true in faith and freedom can be reconciled with the twenty-first century?

A preliminary point which we ought to face is that there are limitations on prophecy. To prophesy with complete confidence on the nature of the twenty-first century is to commit one's self to two doubtful propositions—the first, that the course of history is predetermined; and the second, that we know the secrets of this predestination. That England, for example, would have been the same if there had been no John Wesley, or that France would be the same if there had been no Charles de Gaulle, and that the emergence of these and other great men could have been foreseen, are propositions which we can hardly accept without question. And if history is predetermined are we, to

use Thomas Hardy's phrase, so much "hand in glove with them above" as to know its secrets in advance? Karl Marx was apparently privy to the secrets of predestination, but was in the embarrassed position of not believing in a predestinator. We who are not Marxists must be more modest.

And yet though we cannot prophesy with complete assurance or without many reserves, we are called, so it would seem, to make from time to time that assessment of possibilities and probabilities which every practical statesman, like your own Chancellor Dunning whose memory is rightly honoured in these lectures, ought to make if his policies are to be responsible and coherent. He may make mistakes, but if he does not try to forecast the future his policies must either be static or opportunist. In thinking, therefore, of the twenty-first century and of our own last part of the twentieth century, we must take account of the political creeds of our own time and their likelihood of survival.

One of these creeds which has had a surprising new lease of life is nationalism. The creation of the succession states in Europe during and after the First World War, the attainment of complete self-government by Ireland, the fuller recognition by the Statute of Westminster of nationalities within the British Commonwealth, seemed as if they had met the major nationalist claims of the world. But even these achievements where, in the words of the hymn, "hope was emptied in delight," did not destroy nationalism. Free South Africa was more exposed to a sectional nationalism after the Statute of Westminster than before, and I believe that a similar phenomenon is not entirely unknown in Canada. To all this must be added the immense burst of nationalism in Africa in our own day. A teacher at one of the African Universities has rightly said that if a communist came to deliver a public lecture the students would throng to hear him, but if a communist and an African nationalist

advertised lectures at the same time, the former would be left with relatively few students while crowds would throng the lecture of the latter. If we are to take Bernard Shaw's down-to-earth view, from the preface to *John Bull's Other Island*, that nationalism is like a man with a stomach ache who can be interested in nothing else but his stomach ache until it is cured, we may feel that all the problems of nationalism will be over by the twenty-first century, the world's hundred stomach aches having been soothed to rest by that time; but in view of the immense capacity of nationalism for resurgence, we cannot be sure of this. What does seem likely is that by that time all 'colonialism' will have gone, and that the world will be composed of a large number of independent states. Nationalism may develop inside successful national states, such as Nigeria or Kenya, but sooner or later it would seem that the small self-conscious independent state will be the main unit of the future.

Still less can we predict the disappearance of Communism. There was a time when it seemed like a passing phase, but now it seems that our children and our children's children will have to live with it. It may well last as long as Islam; and as, after a century of religious wars, Catholics and Protestants settled down by the Peace of Westphalia to reluctant toleration, so it may well be with Liberals and Communists.

These religious comparisons have not been made unadvisedly, for Communism is a sort of religion. It puzzles us because it is the first great religion with no God, but a religion it is. In countries where Communism has been proscribed men have been willing to die for it, and many have served their cause with a passionate and dedicated loyalty which puts many of us Christians to shame. So far one may contest the claim that Communism is an enemy to faith. But since it is a purely materialistic creed with a somewhat dubious economics as its only theology, and since

it denies and ridicules all belief in the unseen, it does become an enemy to faith. Its historical determinism makes it an enemy to human freedom, and its form of government wherever it is in power is that of totalitarian absolutism. It opposes both the political freedom of the individual, and the freedom of association.

Many Liberals might conceivably be ready to accept Communism's economic policy, its redistribution of wealth, its nationalization of industry, and at the same time be ineradicably hostile to its denial of faith in God and freedom for man. Africa has tended to take an opposite view. In the nature of the case the leaders of liberation movements in Africa have been *bourgeois* intellectuals who are not willing lightly to surrender the freedom to live as they will and enrich themselves as they can, nor is there much attraction for emergent Africa to come out of the tyranny of the tribe and immediately substitute for it the tyranny of the Soviet. But the negative propaganda of Communism has been as extraordinarily successful as its positive teaching has proved markedly unfruitful. Missionaries have been denigrated and have had a most difficult time. The self-accusing attitude that they are "under judgment" has assuredly been pushed too far. The claim that they have ignored the tribal past comes oddly from Communists who believe neither in tribal politics nor in tribal religion. The missionaries have brought new faith, a new freedom for women and children, health services, education and a respect for the individual personality. In spite of their admitted faults, they have deserved well of Africa. No doubt African Christianity will survive the attack. "Sire," said Theodore Beza, four centuries ago, "it belongs to the Church of God to receive blows rather than to give them, but Your Majesty will remember that it is an anvil which has worn out many hammers." This is very true, but in the meantime African Christianity has had to suffer and is still suffering. So it is with truly liberal political theory.

This may seem surprising, since the first demand in African liberation movements is for universal suffrage. But universal suffrage, while an undoubted part of liberty, is not the whole of it, and many of the African heads of one-party states may well say in the words of Napoléon III: "Je veux bien être baptisé dans l'eau du suffrage universel, mais je ne veux pas vivre les pieds dans l'eau." Liberalism which consists only in the granting of votes to all is but a maimed creed. It needs civil liberty, the rule of law, individual freedom, freedom of association, to be worthy of the great name of "liberal." It is Liberalism based on Rousseau, but excluding Grotius, Hooker and Locke; Montesquieu, de Jouvenel and Maritain. It is Liberalism to which the Constitution of the United States is a stranger. In spite of universal suffrage, freedom as well as faith may be in danger throughout this newly liberated continent; though here again we must recognize the limitations of prophecy, and admit that parts of Africa may, before the end of the century, have revolted against one-party dictatorship.

There are factors other than political which may greatly influence our changing world. One of them is automation. We shall have to come to terms with it, as our predecessors in history had to come to terms with machinery, steam and electricity. No more than in the case of nuclear power can we go back and live as if the discovery had never been. We cannot, as one writer has said, pray God to take the questing ingenuity out of our minds or the skill out of our hands. We must accept the new discoveries with joy and learn how to put them to good use.

What seem to us today the great problems likely to be raised by automation may turn out to be not so bad in practice, or we may find solutions which are not clear to us at the present day. But we must state and try to face these problems as we see them—massive unemployment for a long period, and the extension of human leisure far beyond the

point where men are capable either of enjoying it or using it profitably.

The age of automation is likely to be the age of technological education. Even today, and even in liberal countries, voices are being raised against what we used to know as a "liberal education" and in favour of concentration on the education of scientists and technologists. In other words the plan is to train adequately the men who are to give humanity enforced leisure and not the men who might perhaps teach humanity how to use it.

Another great issue which seems likely to face the twenty-first century is that of over-population. It is claimed that with the elimination of war, the improvement of health services and the consequent reduction of the death rate, the time will come when the world will be uncomfortably over-populated or when, in the language of picturesque exaggeration, there will be "standing room only."

On no matter is there more confused thinking than this. Large numbers of people argue as if this over-crowding was urgent and immediate and as if the only remedy was compulsory birth control. They overlook the fact that birth control propaganda is always far more effective with the highly cultured, educated and advanced groups and is often extremely ineffective among those teeming masses of the poor and illiterate to whose numerous children they would consign the government of the future world, and they shrink from the only consistent means of making birth control universally effective, namely infanticide.

Over-population is not a mere question of numbers. You cannot have too many people, as people. You can only have too many people relative to the available food resources. And the agitated speakers who wish every healthy western family to limit the number of its children seem to ignore completely the more effective remedy of producing more food. There are still thousands of square miles of swamps to

be drained and deserts to be irrigated. What the State of Israel is doing with its limited physical resources should be an example to the whole world. The immense food resources of the oceans have hardly been touched. Certainly if mankind puts its energy fully into these tasks, over-population would not be a major problem of the twenty-first century, though it might possibly be of the twenty-second.

Moreover we are not sure that the major premise of this tremendous syllogism is sound. While we all most devoutly hope that war has come to an end, we must admit that the forces set up to maintain peace may break down, and if they do and if nuclear weapons are used, the twenty-first century may well have serious problems, but not the problem of over-population, to contend with. Moreover it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that nature may find her own unexpected solution to the problem of over-population and that new epidemics of disease may confound for a time even the World Health Organization.

For all these reasons we may claim that the much-discussed problem of over-population need not be so serious an issue for the twenty-first century as has been supposed and that the forces of humanity need not be marshalled for action with a banner featuring contraceptive pills going on before.

All this is not to say that the human race will never have to face the problem of over-population. If war can be eliminated and disease controlled, it will. But if in the meantime our energies are mainly directed to improving the food production of the globe, and raising and educating its illiterate millions, we shall be able to face the over-population issue when it comes with greater confidence and better prospects of success.

Even now, however, there are local or partial aspects of over-population which must concern us. One of these is the growth of urbanization and the depopulation of the

countryside. So strongly marked is this phenomenon that it is impossible to overlook it in any study of the probable future. North America is a classic example of it, but even in relatively new industrial countries such as Australia or South Africa, it is a marked feature of the economy. Urbanization has many great advantages, but the strongest upholders of it will admit that there are rural virtues the loss of which would impoverish any society. The old Roman qualities of *pietas*, *simplicitas* and *gravitas* are harder to come by in great urban centres. For good or bad the aspect of humanity in industrialized countries is changing. The chances of education are, perhaps, greater; so are the chances of degeneration and of revolution. The lights are higher but they cast deeper shadows. Urbanization, though it can perhaps be controlled, cannot be prevented. Planning for the twenty-first century must take account of it.

At this point allow me to put in a plea for the creation of a World Food Bank to ease the situation where in some countries millions are dying of hunger while in others surplus food is allowed to rot or dumped into the sea. The technical difficulties in the way of such a World Food Bank are formidable, but the technological know-how of North America could surely solve them at a cost less than the present annual subsidies to needy states.

If the globe is not yet over-populated, certain portions of it are. The single case of Japan is sufficient to prove the point. Since many countries close their doors to Japanese immigrants or permit only a few to enter, this is likely to be an increasingly difficult problem. In an ideal world the colour bar would be abolished, men would not be greatly aware of differences of race or appearance, and we should all accept Robbie Burns' dictum,

A man's a man for a' that.

A truly united world could hardly allow restrictions on immigration, except perhaps genuinely economic ones. But until this consummation is reached it would seem urgently desirable that the United Nations should set up an organization to assist in the movement of population by consent and to report to the General Assembly in cases of complete deadlock.

Purely on numbers, our world is an Afro-Asian world. One of the difficulties of international politics is that the wealth and "know-how" belong to one group of countries and the numerical strength to another. The Afro-Asian countries are already gaining power in the General Assembly of the United Nations to the manifest disquiet of the United States and the European countries. If there were a Parliament of Man with an elected House of Commons, the nations of Asia (including Communist China) would have the majority of seats in it. This is precisely the situation which the western world thinks that my own country, the Republic of South Africa, ought to accept. As an opponent of the colour bar I think so too, but are these Powers willing in all consistency to accept the same situation in the international sphere for themselves? There are dangers in doing so to what the west considers are freedom and faith. These dangers cannot be indefinitely postponed by denying to Asia and Africa the position to which their numbers entitle them. They can only be met by a deeper knowledge of what faith and freedom really mean and a wiser strategy in working for them. Whether mankind is to be white or black, brown or yellow, the human saga must still go on, and the world of men must still be provided for. Here is a major task of thought and action for ourselves and our children.

In these circumstances the importance of the British Commonwealth is very evident. In it we have white, Asian and African states working peacefully together, the Afro-Asians in a majority both of States and of total population, and the "white" States of the old Commonwealth quite

happy about it. This peaceful association of independent States may be contrasted with the ideal of a federal World State which we must discuss later.

It would be pertinent to ask at this stage what the Commonwealth really means. Is it a skilful way of covering up the withdrawal of Britain from a position of world power, of concealing the break-up of the Empire; or does it stand for something positive which may be permanent? There is much argument favouring the former view. After all, the Roman Empire in the west took a long time to die. The deposition of Romulus Augustulus took place in 476. It was not until 1806 that the last ruler of the Holy Roman Empire changed his title for that of Emperor of Austria. A kind of *mystique* lasted still later. The last ruling Hapsburg is buried in a lonely church on a hillside in Madeira, but the style and title on his tomb is "Charles VIII." As Emperor of Austria he would have been Charles I. As Charles VIII he is the successor of the seven Charleses of the Holy Roman Empire.

When the Visigoths ruled Spain and the Lombards Italy, when France was in the hands of the Merovingian Dynasty, Europe found it hard to think that the Roman Empire had disappeared. Perhaps Europe was right. Latin was the language of the Church and, when later they came to be established, of the Universities. A great prince, often of pure Roman blood, still reigned in the Vatican. If the men of the Dark Ages and the Middle Ages had been more politically agile they might have spoken of a "Roman Commonwealth of Nations."

Will the Commonwealth be as long-lived as the Roman Empire? If so, men may still be discussing it in the thirtieth century, let alone the twenty-first. We can perhaps at any rate assume that it will still be in existence when the twenty-first century begins its course. It may therefore be in order to discuss the key-positions of Canada and India

within it. Without Canada and India the Commonwealth would certainly be a weaker and more ramshackle institution if indeed it could hold together at all.

Canada, once a point of rivalry between Britain and the United States, is now the indispensable link between them. With Canada Britain becomes an Atlantic power, essentially committed with the United States to the defence of western culture. Yet with India she can never be committed merely to such a defence. India, the most moderate, the most constructive, the most powerful, the most heavily populated of the succession states, may well, like the Byzantine Empire of the twelfth century, represent the east to westerners and the west to easterners. So long as Canada and India remain in the Commonwealth and hold fast each to her vocation, so long will the Commonwealth be truly a world power.

But what are we to make of the succession States in Africa? Where does Ghana, for example, come in? Is it in the same category as Canada or India? It is not really "western" in its outlook. It has great dynamic virtues, but the moderation shown by India is not to be looked for there. How are we to reconcile the one-party Dictatorship of Africa, even if untouched by Communism, with the general ideals of the Commonwealth?

It is not an adequate answer to say that these dictatorships are simply a passing phase, the exuberant first-fruits of successful nationalism, that they are quite likely to disappear within a generation. This may be so, but it may not. Does the existence of these States within the Commonwealth render it a meaningless agglomeration of irreconcilable systems? This is not so. The older Commonwealth countries, with India, help to set the tone of the Commonwealth, but the peaceful and indeed friendly coexistence of Ghana, Canada and India furnish a proof that countries

with diverse ways of life and thought can co-operate in a perpetual alliance of peace.

That the Commonwealth is in full process of decolonization we accept. It has been the misfortune of the white ruling class of my own country, the Republic of South Africa, to come into sharp conflict with the spirit of the times on this point and thus to have been squeezed out of the Commonwealth. South Africa is a century behind the times. In the corresponding period of the nineteenth century, the United States was clearing the western Prairies of Red Indians and bison, and if South Africans are accused by Americans of being colonialists they might well reply in the words of Talleyrand to the Emperor Alexander I, "That, Sire, is only a question of dates." Nevertheless there is the highest authority for accusing a nation for "not knowing the time of its visitation," and that, as well as the manifold injustices of racial domination, must remain the condemnation of my country. There can no longer be a place in the Commonwealth for a system based on racial domination, and indeed it would seem that there can no longer be a place for such a system in the whole wide world. The twenty-first century will demand the equality of all races. It says much for the political genius of the British peoples that they have recognized the imperious call of history and succeeded as well as they have in replacing racial domination by racial co-operation.

Yet is it not possible that the nations of the west still covertly react against any Afro-Asian domination of the world? Even if they accept its inevitability they do not like it. What are the reasons for this attitude? The western nations are asked to do no more in the international sphere than they have urgently demanded in the name of justice that the Republic of South Africa should do in its national sphere. Is there not some hard thinking called for on this subject?

We should all agree that the ideal is not Afro-Asian domination but rather human co-operation, the co-operation of all men as men. Such is the ideal for South Africa. Such is the ideal for the comity of nations. Can we be sure that this will in fact be carried out, that we shall not simply substitute one domination for another?

The "western powers" resent the fact that the Afro-Asian millions, through their numerical superiority and the number of votes which they control in the United Nations, are able to exercise a political power out of all proportion to their economic position or their technological achievement. But is not the maldistribution of wealth and of education in the pure and applied sciences itself something that demands change? Can we advocate political equality and not feel a compulsion to change such marked economic inequality?

It is always hard for the possessors of great power to share it—whether the white man in the Republic of South Africa or the American in the commonwealth of mankind. There is a natural human reluctance to do this which we can understand—but can we justify it? Every great reform has had to face the inert strength of these great forces of natural conservatism. But the caravan of history must move on.

Another difficulty is the brashness of some of the new nations and the strident voice in which they make their demands. It would certainly ease the transition if the "have nots" were more courteous and considerate in the demands which they make on the "haves"; but surely we cannot make of the code of manners of the leaders of nationalist movements a serious test of future policy.

In short we have reached a stage in human history where the races who happen to be coloured must come into their own. We cannot measure liberty and equality in the scale of our personal likes and dislikes. Do we resist the full

recognition of Afro-Asian power because we think that such recognition is wrong or ultimately because we personally do not like the change? Let us try each of us to answer this question honestly.

The age of colonization and imperial rule is over. Historians of the future will, we hope, pay full and fair tribute to the many good things done by the colonizing powers. In Africa at any rate they brought peoples isolated by history and geography into the main currents of the world's life. Rising nationalism has resented alien control and in the heat of the liberation movement has not always been fair to the colonizers. When nationalism has done its work and the natural desire to put the white man in his place has lost its first impetus, may we not hope that the desire for human unity will prevail over the desire for racial vindication? Such would be a natural process.

But, it may be argued, the Afro-Asian powers are at least flirting, some of them much more than flirting, with Communism. If we liked Communism this would not matter. But, if as many people (by no means all of them westerners) hold, Communism is one of the greatest dangers that faith and freedom have to face, it is not unnatural that they should shrink with alarm and even anger from the thought of an alliance between some at least of the Afro-Asian powers and world Communism.

Perhaps the answer to our fears may lie in a re-appraisal of Communism. Perhaps our assessment of the international situation may be wrong. Perhaps the resources of faith and freedom are strong enough to preserve true values even in a Communist-dominated world. But it may well be that the first issue with which we have to grapple is the place of national sovereignty in world organization. Is the United Nations to follow the lines of the British Commonwealth, or ought it to develop into a World State? Is a World State possible? Is it desirable?

There is much to be said for a World State. It would have to be a Federation, with very limited powers, as far as possible excluding all ideological issues, given to the World Government. Is it possible to create a World State? Is it desirable? It is not technically impossible to bring a Federation of the World into being, but it would require immense drive and courage to overcome the natural defences of the sovereign State in the hearts of the peoples of the world. Perhaps, as the First World War had to be fought before the League of Nations could be born, and as the United Nations arose out of the ashes of the Second World War, the World State will need a World Nuclear War to bring it into being. "God forbid," we may well say, yet if we do say it how heavy a burden of responsibility lies on us to provide without war the dynamic which could lead to this great change in human life. How wonderful it would be if we could travel far and wide without passports or visas, if there were a world currency, uniform weights and measures. How wonderful if there were free migration—but here many will begin to hesitate. And if we go further how many will begin to see the dangers as well as the advantages of a World State. Will the twenty-first century really see it? Would it be a desirable thing that it should?

The United Nations is a great liberal institution. The Declaration of Human Rights is *par excellence* the liberal document of our day. Is it compatible with the Communist philosophy of life? Can its execution be entrusted to a Security Council which has one permanent Communist member on it possessing a veto? From every other point of view except this it seems monstrous to let the permanent Chinese vote be exercised by the Government-in-exile on Formosa.

Should the United Nations seek to ensure the carrying out of the Charter of Human Rights in the internal

administration of its member-States? The idea of the League of Nations Covenant was that the international organ should function only in international disputes. Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations is almost disastrously ambiguous on this point. The practice of the organization, however, has been to interfere in matters of domestic jurisdiction if these are in conflict with the Declaration of Human Rights, provided that the guilty nation is small and defenceless. Thus my own country, the Republic of South Africa, is attacked where a large and powerful country like the Soviet Union can transgress many fundamental human rights with impunity. Perhaps this is not the real explanation of this differential treatment. Free speech is looked on differently by Communists and Liberals: the abolition of the colour bar is one of the few principles of human rights on which Liberals and Communists agree.

The exercise of coercive or semi-coercive power is put by the Charter in the hands of the Security Council, of which those States which have large armed forces and large financial resources are permanent members. The object of these provisions of the Charter was to prevent the imposition of sanctions by a large numerical majority of poor and weak States. But the veto power given to the permanent members was so abused, especially at the time of the Korean War, that we sought and found means under the Charter to circumvent it by transferring some of the functions of the Security Council to the General Assembly. At the time we rejoiced over this well-intentioned constitutional subtlety. Now with the greatly increased number of member States, especially from Africa, we are hoist with our own petard. All of us are aware of the great financial difficulties of the United Nations, arising partly from the refusal of certain permanent members of the Security Council to face expenditure voted over their

heads by a prescribed majority of the General Assembly. The fact is that the Charter urgently needs revision yet nothing is harder than to get it revised.

The work of these humanitarian organizations which report to the Economic and Social Council has commanded on the whole the respect of the member-States, but our gratification at this must be tempered by the reflection that the similar organizations of the League of Nations were equally praised, yet the League fell to pieces. It seems that we must get the central political organs right. In this connection we have to consider the position of World Citizen No. 1, the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The post has grown in stature during the first two decades of the United Nations. Perhaps the existence of the veto power protects us against a violently partisan Secretary-General: it certainly removes many efficient and outstanding men from all hope of office.

The history of the United Nations is bound to be instructive to us who consider the possibility of a World State in the twenty-first century. It shows us how many difficulties beset international organization. It shows us that mankind will no longer be satisfied with the distinction between international and domestic issues drawn in the days of the old League of Nations. It shows us, further, that large powers like the United States and the Soviet Union will not take kindly to international coercion. There is much to distress and perplex us as we study the working of the United Nations.

And yet the Charter marks a step in human history from which mankind will not willingly go back. Standing in a dangerous position in a great cloud of darkness, would it not be better to go forward? Much in us responds to this call, but the appalling uncertainties of a World State make us recoil.

Tennyson, when he speaks of the "Federation of the

World," speaks also of the "Parliament of Man" and in many of us there will be a response to this. That man is to be a citizen of the world is an ennobling thought. Our minds go back to the old Stoics and their Universal Law of Nature. "The poet says 'dear City of Cecrops'," writes Marcus Aurelius, "and will not thou say 'dear City of God'?" Ah! there's the rub. We may be able to say "dear City of God" and shrink from saying "dear city of economic determinism" or "dear City of atheism" or "dear City of the co-existence of God and no-God."

To many men the conception of humanity as an ideal, even the worship of humanity, may be dear. It is important to realize that most people when they speak of the worship of humanity envisage a man, not indeed just like themselves, but that to which the best in themselves responds. But man, purely as man, is a dubious object of worship. Was not Hitler a man? We can call him all the names we like: the fact remains that he and Goering and Goebbels and Himmler were all human beings, however perverted. Could a Jew worship man without reservations in view of this? Could a Christian?

Tribal men, of whom there are still many millions in the world, illiterate men, men who refuse rights to women, cannibals, fear-ridden shrinkers from witchcraft—are these the humanity that we have to worship? Potentially, yes: actually, no.

Are we then to worship "civilized" man? Man who has mastered the technology of automation? But from his own milieu agnostic philosophers, fastidious psychologists, critics who are so honest that they cannot really enjoy anything, rise to depose him as an object of worship. Can we, then, worship *them*? It is said that in the later Roman Republic two augurs could not pass in the streets without winking: perhaps an academic audience might well respond to my question in the same way.

Who then or what are we to worship, for if it is not humanity *qua* humanity, we seem to have lost something from our argument for the World State. To believing Christians the answer is clear enough. We do worship Man, but he is the divine Man, in worshipping whom we worship God. We at least have some foundation, some morality, something of the numinous, in our thinking; but we shall have to join in building our World State with men to whom our conceptions are looked on as the rubbish of past centuries, cumbering the ground, men whose creed virtually is, "There is no God, and Lenin is his prophet." Can we build up a World State on such co-operation of opposites? This is a question to which the twenty-first century and indeed the latter half of the twentieth century has to try to find an answer.

Even Auguste Comte in his conception of the religion of humanity wished to see put up in his Positivist "Churches" a statue of the Virgin and Child. The Positivist congregations were never very numerous: indeed one sarcastic commentator summed them up as "three persons and no God." Another commentator has described Comte's theories as "Catholicism without Christianity," and no good Catholic would quarrel with this definition since Catholicism is unimaginable without faith in God. But for our present purposes it is sufficient to say that the most famous proponent of the worship of humanity found it necessary to indicate the type of human being whom he wanted to see worshipped. But if it is *humanity* that we are to worship have we the right to select one type? The Man whom Comte selects would have accepted and did accept no worship apart from God.

There is certainly something in this desire to canonize man, yet all history shows us that humanity in general is difficult to canonize. From Plato onwards we have had to face the phenomenon of degeneration among human

beings. Our own day has given us outstanding examples of deliberate perversion in which men have said, "Evil, be thou my good." Not one of us could worship himself if he had any sense of humour. Still less could he worship his neighbour: as a great preacher in England once said, "Saints! Saints! Just take a good look at the man sitting on your right." Gone is the Victorian political heresy of the inevitability of progress. Gone to some extent at any rate are the unscientific variations on the theme of the "survival of the fittest." And yet the ineradicable desire to find some place for the worship of man persists. Perhaps it is the desire to worship God, suppressed because religious pictures of what God is like have sometimes been too horrible for words, perhaps because the worship of man somehow seems more modern and more scientific. In orthodox Christianity the picture of God made Man in Christ Jesus is the perfect answer, and some of us are humbly grateful that we believe it, but ultimately this is the worship of God, though in human terms.

If we cannot accept the religion of humanity, is there any philosophical or emotional basis for the World State? There could be. Dante in his "De Monarchia" argues that since God is One the world should be one, that the one Roman Emperor is the mirror on earth of God's rule in the heavens. Since it was Henry of Luxemburg who was thus the mirror of divinity we may be permitted to smile with due decorum even in the presence of the Master Poet; but the argument that the world of men is essentially one is harder to refute than the argument that Henry of Luxemburg was divinely ordained to rule it.

More and more the world is one. The much-maligned capitalist-imperialist era certainly helped to make it so. Africa and Europe can never again live separate, self-contained lives. What is done in any part of the world affects other parts. Cholera in the Far East affects Europe.

Inflation in Europe affects America. War fever in America affects the Far East.

There was a time when, subconsciously at any rate, many white men thought of the ideal world of men as made up by white men ruling—more or less benevolently—the coloured races. Many people in my own country tend so to think today. We must not go to the other extreme. The cult of *négritude* has its limitations as well as its values. *Négritude* can never be a substitute for *humanité*.

The improvement of communications and of transport has made world unity already a real, if inchoate, thing. Bodies like the International Bank, UNESCO, the World Health Organization and the Food and Agricultural Organization have taken us already quite a way in the direction of world unity. The attempts of the Afro-Asian group of States to exclude South Africa and Portugal from bodies such as this on ideological grounds, however understandable, represent a regression in world history. Health, sanitation and food supplies affect sinners just as much as saints, political sinners just as much as political saints. In general the course of history moves towards world unity—a unity which cannot, as far as we can see into the future, be based on ideological uniformity. The World State might well come into being in the twenty-first century.

But to this there is an objection, and it must be faced. In homely phrase we are asked to put all our eggs into one basket and this looks to many like a basket with holes in it that will not bear the weight. If there were a World State and the Government of it were to oppose freedom, where could the man who loved freedom find refuge in exile? If there were a World State which persecuted religion, where could religion develop under peaceful conditions? To take an example, if Hitler had been ruling a World State instead of the Third Reich, there would have been no pillow in the whole wide world on which a Jew

could have laid his head in honour and safety. If the Parliament of Man had a Communist majority where would the freedoms which we Liberals consider so essential find a place? If the World State condemned any new discovery of philosophy or of science, where could new truth be taught. These questions assume certain things. They assume that the World State, though it could hardly be unitary, would be so close a federation as to leave very little freedom to its corporate States. They assume that it will be authoritarian, even in the religious and intellectual spheres, that no church and no university would be independent of the State. It is impossible merely to sweep away the fears caused by these assumptions as unreal: they are in many hearts.

It is true that if a World State were constituted, even in the twenty-first century, perhaps even after a nuclear war, efforts would probably be made to restrict the activities of the Parliament of Man to such non-ideological functions as currency, coinage, weights and measures, posts and telegraphs, migration and inter-State commerce. Every possible precaution would be taken to guarantee the distribution of powers by a rigid constitution, supervised by a World Supreme Court. But so long as the World State effectively controlled any armed forces that were permitted to remain, or even had its own superior force—and without this it is difficult to see how even a World State could prevent war—there would always be the danger of the Constitution being overridden by *force majeure* under some Stalin or Perón of the future. All the elaborate legal safeguarding of the American Constitution would be of little avail if the Americans were not fundamentally a law-abiding people. The more we examine the problems likely to face the human race in the next century, the more we realize that the ultimate remedies in the hands of humanity are the spiritual forces in the hearts and minds

of individual and perhaps collective man. There are of course those who feel freedom is not worth preserving, among them many who use the utmost freedom allowed by their present society to express their own dissenting views. Some of them would, I fear, stand before the firing squads of the new unfree society which their jeers at freedom would have helped to create. I am sure that they would face the firing-squad with courage, but courage is not enough. None of us is infallible, not even the youngest.

That the other organs of society should stand on an equal footing with the State is, as Jacques Maritain has taught us, tremendously important. We must do all we can within our own States to strengthen the independent position of the University and the Church. But Communist theory takes it almost as self-evident that all other social organs must be subjected to the omniscient Communist State, and Communists may well hold the majority in the Parliament of Man.

In these circumstances it would be well to consider the possibility of establishing a World University *before* the World State. This would strengthen its position *vis-à-vis* the State, help to build its traditions, and be (as it is suggested) good in itself. Today it would have to be built up, like UNESCO by the component States of the United Nations to which for this specific purpose non-members like Germany, Switzerland and China would have to be added. Perhaps a brief excursus into the idea of a World University might be permitted.

Such a University would presumably be a post-graduate University, and above all things a meeting place of research workers and thinkers. To ensure that some of the world's best scholars would be attracted to it without unduly depleting the national Universities, it would be as well to have, side by side with permanent appointments, a number

of one-, three- or five-year secondments from other universities. The World University would thus at any given time possess such a collection of scholars as to attract some post-graduate students even from the best of the national universities.

The World University should cover the whole field of human thought and activity. No one will question that it could do valuable work in Science, pure and applied, Medicine, Comparative Law and the like; but it is important that the Humanities should not be overlooked. The atmosphere needed for the writing of history from a world point of view could surely be supplied in such a meeting-place of historians. Philosophy, Economics, Ethics would be included. So should Theology—and obviously this means that place would have to be found for exponents of all the world's great religions, including the non-religion of Communism. No doubt there would be stimulating and at times dramatic differences of opinion between the teachers at this great centre, but they would influence one another, tolerance would grow among some, and all who had any openness of mind would get a wider and deeper vision of their own faith.

Religion (and in this phrase I include the dogmatic atheism of the Communist system) is not unimportant. Because of the differences of opinion and the deep emotions involved, we tend to exclude it from our discussions, and in the end build up University societies where well-bred agnosticism is the norm. But no one suggests that politics or economics should not be discussed freely. A fashionable neutrality about all economic theories would not be well taken in the Senior Common Room of a good University. To follow this course about religion may obviate some unpleasant arguments or awkward scenes, but it begs the whole question of the importance of religion by relegating

it to the side-lines of human thought. Such a course, widespread though it is, is neither intellectually honest nor intellectually satisfying.

A World University must open its doors to all schools of thought, Communist or anti-Communist, radical or conservative, if it is to be worthy of its name. Students must be free to attend any lectures without restriction from their home countries. He who would limit this freedom shows a lack of faith in the theories which he seeks to protect. Let them meet and clash and let truth prevail. Let each man be free to form his own judgment after hearing conflicting views.

What languages should be used must in some measure be left to the individual University teachers. But it would be desirable that there should be some recognized University languages and here, I would suggest, we can hardly do better than the traditional English and French. In their own interests teachers desirous of getting their ideas across will use one of these languages as well as, or in substitution for, their own.

But is this grandiose scheme practicable? In my own country, a National Convention called to discuss closer union between four States which only eight years earlier had been locked in fratricidal war, managed to agree on a unitary constitution, to provide equality for the languages of the two formerly hostile groups, even to patch up an agreement, temporary indeed and unsatisfactory, as to the place of the non-white majority in the new State. But, having done all this, the members, at the last minute, nearly broke off all discussions because of their inability to agree where the Capital of the new State was to be situated.

Where ought we to site our World University? It should preferably be in one of the smaller States—smaller in population and relative political importance. It should not be too remote from the great traditional centres of

learning with their large libraries. It should not be in a climate so difficult as to make it hard for scholars and their families to live there. Switzerland might be a possibility. So might some part of Latin America. So very specially might Canada—if it were not thought too cold! What of the City of Jerusalem, the meeting place of three great religions and almost of three continents, internationalized as part of a world settlement between Jews and Arabs? What of Constantinople, common certainly to Europe and Asia, Christianity and Islam, with a great tradition of learning in the past? Here we open up a debate which might last a long time. Doubtless the selection of an uninhabited island might soothe international rivalries, but what group of professors (and their wives, perhaps especially their wives) would agree to live on St. Kilda or in the remote Pacific?

Difficult though this question of bringing the World University down to earth and giving learning “a local habitation and a name” may be, it cannot be insoluble and if we can accept the main principle this very difficult point of detail should not be allowed to conquer us.

But in what society is this World University to work? In trying to answer this question we realize acutely the limitations of prophecy. There is the possibility that it may be an impoverished society of the survivors of a nuclear war trying to rebuild a ruined world. It would be done: the earth would be rebuilt. To take the most dramatic possibility, if only one man and one woman were left, freedom and faith would lead them to the only possible answer—life rather than death. In fact such a dilemma need not be forecast. No nuclear war would go on for ever, nor would it touch every remote corner of the earth. It would certainly give us a different set of problems: immediate over-population would not be among them.

We shall assume that mankind avoids the lunacy of nuclear war. What then? We may reasonably prophesy a literate world, more urbanized than at present, with automation, facing problems of the distribution of employment and the use of leisure. In many countries authoritarian government will exist behind a facade of democracy, life will be more regulated than the present free world would like, and that regulation might extend to the fields of learning and religion, to the University and the Church. If there were a World State it would certainly be one in which people of colour would be in a majority: it might be authoritarian, irrational, unbelieving. What position would such of our descendants as stand for freedom and faith take in such a society?

Those who uphold the liberal tradition might be strong enough to keep their countries out of the World State. Freedom and faith would then have, as it were, geographical boundaries. Or the World State might really—though this is doubtful—be willing to limit itself indefinitely to minimum federal functions. But some at least of those who love freedom may find themselves in a position of acute tragedy—a position in which all the institutions of their society are ranged against their deepest beliefs. What are they to do then?

I should be most reluctant to suggest that they should compromise on those fundamental beliefs. A Christian who truly believes will not, I suggest, find salvation in some anaemic and eclectic universal creed, nor in an effort to reconcile Christianity with economic determinism. A Liberal cannot easily conform to a totalitarian creed and give up human freedom. In a way the most rousing, and certainly the simplest, answer to these horrifying possibilities is that the faithful should fight the good fight and remain loyal to death. Such a call rouses our hearts and kindles the noblest of our emotions. In essence it is right:

the things that we hold dear we must defend with our very lives. But there is much that we must learn. The changing world demands of us deeper thought, some flexibility in non-essentials of methods or phraseology while we remain true to the deep underlying principles. We need, I would suggest, to examine the ultimate nature of freedom and faith while there is yet time, to see how far they have inherent power to live, to mould thoughts and to influence society, even when the institutions of men are hostile to their existence. Can man, will man really be satisfied in the society of our more sombre forecasts, or is there not something inherent in man which preserves those truths against the manifold attacks on them. It used to be said that if only the Pope and one old woman were left the Catholic Church would still exist. We might even venture to delete the Pope. Where a believing soul still exists faith is not dead, and where one man exercises his freedom in preferring the saltmines or the gallows to conformity, freedom is not dead either.

But both may sometimes have to express themselves in new forms in a new society, and here we need immense wisdom—perhaps only divine wisdom can do it—to discriminate between the essentials and the non-essentials. Thus a great challenge is present to our thinking, and there is a call to put our house in order to face the possible new conditions, and certainly to do all we can in the “western” world where the possibility still exists to guard the essentials of faith and freedom against encroachment and erosion no less than against direct attack. We need the firmness of a rock on the essentials and the flexibility of a running stream on the non-essentials of our situation. May we claim for this a wisdom which will surely not be denied to those who know they need it.