



Max M. Kampelman Papers

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

WHY GOVERNMENT?

(Speech delivered to United World Federalists, Student Union, University of Minnesota, April 22, 1947.)

[Geologists tell us that there have occurred from time to time in the ages of the earth's history, gigantic and catastrophic cataclysms in which whole continents have been submerged and others have appeared.

In the sphere of human events, our era with its two World Wars may be in many respects analagous to such cataclysms. We live in an era in which the social, political, and economic equilibrium of all the peoples of the earth is upset.

Never before in all human history have political relations been so overwhelmingly important for the welfare of all mankind as they are today. Never has it been more essential for man to understand ; to determine what can be done about it.]

The most striking feature of modern politics is "rivalry between States". The result in our time has been 2 wars of gruesome proportion and now talk of a third. We have just witnessed another failure in the diplomacy of State Rivalry at the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers. We can expect more failiures, more rivalry.

Modern states are built on a concept of nationalism, which determines that each State is sovereign, is independent of every other, is supreme in its relations both within and without.

There was a time when that element of supremacy was vested in the patriarchal or matriarchal family community of primitive man; in the tribal group; in the village; in the City-State. Since political institutions, however, like all results of human association, are in the process of constant change, however, that element is now in the State.

As a result, the sphere and scope of Man's battles with himself have broadened and, with the modern state, have taken on the character of wars

between states rather than battles between families, tribes, villages, city-states.

As global wars recur and grow in intensity and extent, thinking people in every land are deeply perturbed. What does the future hold in store for our culture, for our civilization as a whole, they ask. They ask whether their governments, whether any governments are now sufficiently stable to provide safety; whether civilization itself may not be disintegrating, as other civilizations in man's past have disintegrated. They ask whether mankind may not have to face in the near future another more terrible conflict which will actually put an end to all ordered society and throw humanity back into a permanent condition of barbarism.

What can we do about it?

On this scene, more and more people are coming to insist that we need some sort of world organization, a government, to deter sovereign states from resorting to war in the future. Most such proposals suggest a League or a Federation; a very few envisage a unified world state. Most supporters of a federation point to the United States and argue that since the U.S. and other federal states succeeded in knitting together a group of states and people of diverse national origin into a unit, it should be possible to repeat the experience on a world scale.

Many of these, not all, also assume that since police power operating on individual citizens of nations preserves government, a similar police power operating on member nations of a world federation will have the same effect. All that is, therefore, needed is to establish a strong enough international military force to suppress any action by a state, in the interest of world government.

How valid are these proposals and assumptions?

The word "government" in everyday usage carries somewhat different meanings to different persons. Some people speak of "the government", a sort of autonomous body, the "authorities", an agency outside of and perhaps hostile

to the individual. Others speak of "this government" or "that government" having in mind particular philosophies, ways of life, national characteristics.

For our purposes, let us understand that government is to be viewed as a process, more or less continually undergoing change. We may define Government as the art of composing differences. In this context, it is clear that man has always had government; that the customs and laws which primitive man paid homage to, were the laws, the rules and regulations, the government of the primitive community.

Government, therefore, must be related to community. Basic to government is a feeling of cooperation, a recognition that there is a social order responsible to the needs of the community. There must be a security in that community relationship; and it is produced by intangible forces like geography, economic or cultural interdependence, increase of intercourse, elimination of causes of conflict, increased trade, education, transportation, common experiences.

A security based on fear, an agreement which comes about because the discontented fear to challenge the existing order, is no security at all, no agreement that can last.

A community in which there is a correct spirit, a determination to keep the system going and working, in which the order provides relative justice and whose functions meet the needs of members, will be effective. Where the correct spirit does not obtain, the order will fail with or without sanctions and force.

What lessons are there in this analysis for the international scene? More directly, is our world a community? Unless we face this question, there is little utility in discussing questions of world government.

The answer to that question, however, is not simple.

On the one hand, our logic tells us that the whole world is now 1 neighbor, a neighborhood. We all need to buy and sell in the far corners of the earth. Trade, the printed page, inventions, science, disease, radio, motion pictures, inflation and depressions, religion, now television, all surmount national and racial barriers, regardless of political boundary lines. In a real sense, therefore, it could be said that all our wars are civil wars.

On the other hand, however, a realistic appraisal of the world as it is indicates that the contrary spirit prevails. The world is in the grips of an intense spirit of nationalism; lack of understanding between the Anglo-Saxon mind and that of Asia; no common language; no common religious tradition; no common social organization; no common political philosophy; very little experience in cooperating toward a common enterprise.

Is the world a community? Is the world ready for world government? Would the United States, would you, be ready to give power to a Federation to control our tariff legislation; power to control immigration of foreigners; power to fix the value of money; power to send in policemen of foreign nationalities to enforce the laws of the world government; power to enforce judgments on us by courts manned by judges from Bulgaria, India, Chile, Russia.

It is unfortunate, but it is true that our loyalties to our respective countries are too stringent and our loyalties to ~~our~~ Mankind too weak to make world government a reality today.

The United States insists on reservations when it joins the World Court and its President proposes that we bypass the U.N. as too weak to solve the Greek crisis.

The Soviet Union hesitates to join the UN Health Organization because its sovereignty might be impaired.

What are we to do in the face of such a picture? What policy is there for the United States to follow; what policy can we ask our government to follow?

There are not many alternatives. The alternative of isolation can first easily be dismissed. It is impossible. It has never been possible. We are part of the world whether we like it or not. The real question is what kind of a part do we play in world politics. There are three alternatives:

Professor Nicholas John Spykman of Yale (STRATEGY IN WORLD POLITICS), proceeding I am sure from an analysis similar to one we have just observed and shared, proposes a deliberate, intelligent policy of power politics. In an honest and frankly intelligent framework, he suggests that there are no other workable alternatives. And he does not hide the implications of power politics. He admits that there can be no moral values in such a game.

"The statesman who conducts foreign policy can concern himself with values of justice, fairness and tolerance only to the extent that they contribute to or do not interfere with the power objective ... The search for power is not made for the achievement of moral values; moral values are used to facilitate the attainment of power".

Such a policy has followers in our midst today. We can urge those who are attracted to it, however, to face up further to its implications as Dr.

Spykman does : "He who plays the balance of power can have no permanent friends". Whether such a policy can help Man escape the fear of war and threat to his civilization, I leave you to answer.

A second alternative has been proposed by Walter Lipman (FOREIGN POLICY FOR AMERICA). Accepting our analysis and proving further that America has never been isolationist but just stupid in its decisions as to how it would be internationalist, he accepts half of Spykman and fears to accept the latter's implications. He calls for a "nuclear alliance" between Britain, Russia and the U.S., with China to be added later when it becomes stronger. But this too is a Balance of Power; less appealing than that of Spykman because it doesn't recognize the truth that there can be no friends in that game. The story of American-Russian relations which is very familiar to us all vividly portrays the weakness of Lipman's position.

Those of us who wish to climb out of the dilemma rather than dig ourselves in deeper, therefore, are back again to world government. We know now, however, that we cannot build a world government without building a world community.

Our call, therefore, is for a world community - not power politics of the strong; not a security based on fear of the atom bomb or else, which is no security. Fear is not the proper tool for community or government; we must explore the science of consent.

The function of a student organization such as this, therefore, cannot be a limited one if it is to accomplish its goals.

The great enemy of a decent world order is in the minds and hearts of men. There can be no world government while we as whites discriminate against Negroes and consider ourselves superior to the colored peoples of the world; not while we continue to enjoy our wealth and resources of plenty while the peoples of Europe and Asia go hungry; not while we ignore the calls for assistance from the democratic elements in Europe who, in their socialist parties, are attempting to resist the advances of the totalitarian Communist left and totalitarian right.

The great enemy of a decent world order is in our racial prejudices, our ethnocentric intolerance, our belated ideas of absolute national sovereignty, the proud complacency of our own virtues, our blindness to the world's interdependence; our failure to see that the welfare of any involves the welfare of all.

What then is our task?

Our task is to keep alive a positive loyalty and allegiance to mankind rather than to the nation-state.

To undersnatnd that in spite of all the machibery that is constructed, no international organization can function without the loyalty of the peoples of the world and that such loyalty does not now exist and must be created. A way of creating that oyalty is to learn about, encourage and understand the international agencies which now exist and which now serve the needs of man (ILO, Postal, Pan-American,)

Loyalty is created when men feel that international agencies are serving their needs.... International loyalties can develop as the peoples of all countries learn to work together and through participation in common enterprises, learn to understand one another.

Finally, those who are interested in world government must
and
help create a sense of justice and morality. Neighborhood ~~cannot~~ brotherhood.
are closely associated.

Only as we broaden our function to encompass such a broad scope,
can we achieve the spirit and reality of world government.

ETHICS AND GOVERNMENT

- 1) Richard Hall's heart dominates his brain ^{reflection of} - genuine heart accurate brain.
- 2) It was with much hesitation I considered Hall's invitation to speak. Speaking to ministers is an experience I never had. Recalled sermon I once heard commenting on speech he heard:
"In the OT it was considered a miracle for an ass to speak; now it's nothing short of a miracle if you can keep one quiet!"
- 3) Then came Frieda Nardenshauser's invitation to Thanksgiving Dinner taking note of R H's invitation - not, of course, condition one upon the other - but taking note also of L J W's desire to have me speak as well. - Pardon me if I look upon this as an after dinner speech, glorious American institution (not only American)
- 4) Nero, sports-loving Roman, turned Christians to lions in Coliseum - spend traitorous night - 11 stayed lions for weeks - 80,000 - calm, alert, unafraid - just like live crowd excited, amazing thing - whistles, shouted out, head lowered, tail between legs
"Remember you'll be expected to say a few words after dinner"

5) Accepted - prepared thoughts - not be like preacher who came to church, apologized, said they'd have to be sorry, next week better prepared.

6) Good Minister-League combination - Democracy facing crisis: people taking interest in their govt. - Need renewed stimulated activity. - Had one, but the issue: takes 40 days pair of pants

7) Issue of corruption most widely known. - More people know about mink coat than Point 4. - Yet corruption did, what people do doesn't always parallel their moral indignation. Slow to change

a) Philadelphia 65 yrs; Boston Curley

b) Like man who played the roulette wheel, knew it was fixed, but said it was only cro around.

8) Under Jackson-Van Buren: Collector of ny Port ran away with \$1,250,000.

Under Grant: Whiskey Ring scandal, tax fraud involving Pres's private secy.

" : Secy of War unanimously accused by H of R of arming Buckle's govt employees

Union Pacific RR, 1867: Land grants to western ms., bribes of Congressmen.

Under Harding: Secy of Interior Fall took \$100,000 from EL Oskern, lease of naval oil reserves.

9) Age should not make us complacent, however. What we do need is a constructive approach - There are 2 normal reactions:

- a) Politically motivated : turn rascals out
- b) large numbers : withdraw, plague on both your houses,
[bad officers - good people]

10) Yet, discussion of ethics in govt can't be separated from society. Here, in my judgment, is area where all of us is guilty. All of us aware of our own failings to live up to standards we feel are proper. That accounts for should give us some reluctance and humility.

11) Morals of official conduct can be distinguished but certainly not separated from public morals generally. - And we have a double moral standard!

12) We have a tolerance for unsympathetic methods if they bring immediate reward. Success becomes an ethical standard

- a) The clever man who makes a "fast buck" rewarded if he makes any of them.
- b) traditional : "business is business"; "politics is politics".
- c) teach children : material success is real goal.

- 21) Let us take taxes - Int. Rev. scandal had
- 22) Ant 7 plucking the goose so as to obtain largest
ant. } feathers with the least possible
ant. } heaving - ignored by people's
good will.
- 23) Scapshots: \$4 billion years - legal
- 24) a) Corp Inc. Tax - July 1 - Jan. 1 - loss \$800 million,
Wall St. Jnl - US Sted \$23 million
- b) Depreciation Allowance - \$750 million a year (\$54 \$1.00
to oil) Oil profits will exceed \$2 billion this
year. — Wealthy individual with annual
incomes averaging over million dollars a year paid
tax of only 22 1/2%. — One oil operator
developing projects yielding \$5 million in 1 yr.
did not have to pay income tax on that.
- c) Oyster Shells
- d) Capital gains for coal royalties

25) Lesson is to distinguish vital issues.

26) areas: govt gives rights, public works, loans, taxes, regulation

b) standards high (p. 11)

c) WOC - bear

d) accessibility lobbying

~~27)~~ e) gifts

f) good job

g) constituents

27) Campaign expenses - expenses during office
(Tax - \$ 2 million)

~~28) Holts:~~

~~29)~~

28) Attacks reduce competition

29) Issues: citizenry vs p2.

We get govt we desire - hydrocarbon down right,
but we can keep it at low demand.

- 14) Reflects truly in business story: "What are ethics?", Pop"
"Should I keep the extra dollar, or tell my partner about it?"
- 15) Business added new commandment to Decalogue:
"Thou shalt not be found out."
- 16) Overlaid relation bet business ethics, good ethics. - No public official
ever corrupted himself - yet gives slips away. Spotlight on
recesses. [Hester \$50,000; HH - posted outside]
- 17) Extension of influence: Accepted part of American scene in effort to
present product in best possible way. - Advertising, sales promotion.
- Implicates in right to hire ablest lawyer.
- 18) Associated with this is reverence for principle, good by law.
What is lawful may not be right.
- 19) Quote p. 10 quatrain. - Common lands
enclosed and taken over by English nobility.
- 20) Friend: Big steel - little steel