

May 24, 1946
Leo Szilard

ON RACIAL SECURITY

If we really grasp the fact that world government, within the next fifty years, will be a reality, that it will come either as a result of a merger, or as a result of the next world war, it is a cause for concern that so little thought has been given to the problems with which such a world government will be faced. For a few decades that world government may very well be a limited world government and the regulation of immigration as well as the regulation of birth might well fall outside its scope. But in the long run it is unlikely that a system of world government can persist unless ~~the~~ world authority can command the loyalty of the people ^{through} showing a genuine concern in the welfare of all people. The stabilizing of the status quo by immigration barriers can hardly fit into the concept of such a world government, ^{and} ~~On the other hand,~~ population changes by migration, even if controlled by a world authority, will lead ~~to little countries~~ ^{in many areas of the world. TP} ~~with~~ large racial minorities ^{These} and the question ^{will arise} of how to deal with the ^{immigrants} problem arising out of the existence of large racial minorities in the next few hundred years. The first requirement to be met is to establish social equality between markedly different races which live in the same area. This problem of course has a trivial solution, ^{but} it is not at all sure that the trivial solution is the one which is desirable. The trivial solution consists in simply mixing all the races so completely ^{together} through intermarriage that the problems ^{disappears} ~~disperse~~ because the races have ^{disappeared} ~~dispersed~~. This solution is not so difficult to attain as people might think. As a matter of fact, it ^{will} ~~will~~ come about in time as ^{surely and automatically} a result of the present anarchic conditions. For instance, the social inequality

between the whites and the negroes in the United States for which some people apologize by saying, "after all, you would not want your sister to marry a negro," does not prevent the ^{that} ~~mixture~~ ^{crossbreeding} of these races. Although the forces which maintain this social inequality may be interpreted in terms of an effort to prevent inter-marriage, the mixing goes on and will in time lead to a completely homogeneous population. No doubt, this trivial solution could be greatly accelerated by some enlightened autocrat. For whatever the causes for the so-called racial prejudices are and even if they would represent as natural, a reaction as the proverbial antipathy between cats and dogs, if the children were taken away from their families and if black and whites were brought up together, there would be as little racial prejudice left among them, as there is antipathy left between cats and dogs who as puppies and kittens are brought up together. The civilization of cats and dogs may represent an artificial inhibition of their natural antipathies, but even if it were so, we must be reminded that all civilization is an artificial inhibition of a number of natural tendencies. I believe we must conclude that the trivial ^{the} solution of/racial problem is feasible but we may have serious doubts whether it is desirable. A scholar, looking back a few thousand years hence on to the past history of mankind, might interpret the tragedy which has befallen mankind, by saying that communications were invented and developed a few thousand years too early, that is, before the local communities had time to develop the wisdom which arises out of the knowledge of the true nature of man. A few thousand years ago there were a number of social experiments in process in various parts of the earth each of them proceeding independently of the other---some failing and some succeeding

---at least for a period of time. With the advent of modern transportation there will be soon one single social experiment in process on the surface of the earth and if that fails, everything may be lost.

in
It might be that/a few centuries hence, some enlightened world government will artificially create conditions in which various civilizations can develop, so to speak, in water tight compartments in different areas of the globe. Fortunately, the unification which is going on at present is not an irreversable process and it takes nothing but the decision of some future world government to reproduce the original state of multiple experiments and create artificially the diversity which is at the present time in the process of being extinguished. On the other hand, once we adopt the trivial solution and mix our races together in a homogenous mixture of Chinese, Irish, and Negro, to pick out a few extremes at random, we have taken an irrevocable step and it would take countless thousands of years of painstaking breeding policies to regain the diversity which is in the process of being lost. One may of course take the view that these racial differences do not correspond to anything essential. They are merely due to supervicial characteristics such as color of the skin or the shape of the eye. The simple truth of the fact is that we do not know whether this is so, or whether it isn't. It is quite true that apart from a very few exceptions, such as certain Aborigines of Tasmania or the midgets of the African Congo, there is no evidence whatsoever to show that there are any essential differences between any of the races which are usually distinguished from each other by some superficial characteristic. But this lack of knowledge cannot be served as an excuse for basing our future policy on ignorance.

Our methods of psychological examination are far too crude to distinguish differences even where it is obvious that there must be far-reaching differences present. Take for instance, a man who has been subjected to labotomy. That is, who had the nerve fibers, the so-called association pathways connecting the front lobe with other areas of the brain, severed on both sides of his skull. Many neurologists assert that there is no detectable difference in intellect or personality, apart from a trivial change in emotional stability. (The patient does not worry about the future). If the psychological effects of such a gross injury cannot be detected by our psychologists, how can they hope to detect undoubtedly less far-reaching, but still possibly very far-reaching, differences between races? Certainly there is no hope that any intelligence test, and none of them that I have seen deserved this name, (at best they could have been called, stupidity tests), could distinguish between those races with which we are concerned. But even if we had very much better tests and could perform experiments under controlled conditions where the influence on the early childhood environment was completely eliminated and if these tests showed no individual differences between individuals belonging to different races, we still would have to go one step further. For instance, it may very well be that the differences between races would not manifest themselves in any reaction which an individual would show and that yet a large community, composed of individuals of one race would tend to develop an entirely different civilization or culture from a community composed of individuals of another race. It seems to me that if we take such an irrevocable step as advocating the elimination of different races by either letting the present anarchical condition continue or by other methods

which will accelerate the present process of inter-mixture, it would be inexcusable to do so on the basis of our present ignorance. We might be wasting the most precious heritage of mankind and one that will be almost impossible ever to recover. Thus the question arises, is there any other solution to the racial problem than intermixture? There is of course another trivial solution--segregation, but it is not one which we wish to contemplate in the present paper.

The solution in which we are interested in is rather one in which at least two races, say black and white, live in a country on terms of social equality and we are interested in two questions--what are the necessary conditions of obtaining and maintaining social equality and the other--which I believe is closely inter-related, can we maintain the black and white sector numerically consistent in a stationery state indefinitely, or will, through intermarriage, the mixed sector gradually encroach on the white and black sectors, threatening them as time goes on more and more with extinction.

The answer which is proposed to give to this question is an emphatic yes. There is no thought of course of budgeting intermarriage and even if intermarriage did not occur, that would not prevent cross-breeding. The answer lies rather in a simple expedient consisting in statistically determining the amount of intermarriage or cross-breeding which actually takes place. If this amount is known and is found say to be ten per cent, then all it takes is to keep the birth rate (Change) of the black sector and of the white sector slightly above the birth rate of the mixed sector to have a stationery situation in which neither sector encroaches on the other. It is my contention that if such a stationery situation

is created, one of the most powerful causes for social inequality has been removed because racial security has been established.

Before going further it is necessary to take issue with the prejudices with which racial prejudice is usually regarded. One cannot do justice to any characteristic of human behavior without being aware of the role that the kind of human behavior played in the historical development of our race. One of the most elementary reactions of any tribe or any other sort of group, is its reaction to persons who differ by habit, clothing, or color of the skin. The color of the skin being the most serious of the three because of the fact that it cannot be changed and that is hereditary. These primitive reactions performed a very important function in the past that preserved the individuality of the tribe or of various ethnic groups. They probably led to a certain amount of Darwinian selection leading to the survival of the fittest tribes and in any case have permitted the evolution of a number of distinct and separate races by reducing inter-breeding and thereby keeping the different races in existence. In every country where there are different racial minorities, these natural tribal reactions come into conflict with our sense of justice. Civilization demands that there shall be racial equality. Our primitive instincts try to assert themselves by rationalizing our feelings in various ways, but in the long run, obviously, civilization will win out and early childhood education in mixed groups will overcome racial feeling. It must not be overlooked however that there is a powerful force acting against the possibility of bringing about racial social equality between races. It is a natural tendency for every person, family, tribe, or racial group, to wish for the survival of its own

kind. Yet in a country where there is a white-black and a mixed sector of the population, the white and black sectors are threatened with extinction through cross-breeding. Just how important a role this subconscious fear of having your own kind vanish contributes in maintaining social inequality as an irrational and inadequate attempt to prevent cross-breeding, I am not able to say. But it is obvious that nations are fighting wars in order to preserve such superficial things as their national institutions and it is possible that after wars have been eliminated, we still will not have peace until we can guarantee to those racial groups which feel threatened in their existence that they will not be annihilated by migration and cross-breeding in place of conquest by war. Viewed in this light, racial security may be for all practical purposes, a pre-requisite for peace and social equality among the different races. Moreover, the slight differential birth rate advocated here will preserve all those races which wish to be preserved until such time as we shall be in a better position to know what we should be losing by homogenization, than we are at the present time.

According to the Denver Poll, the fraction of the population in the United States which believes that we shall have still another war within 25 years has increased since September of last year from 44% to 68%. One cannot see from the text of the poll how many of these people believe that war may come much earlier and how many think of Russia when they think of the next war. If more and more people are convinced that war is inevitable, it will be logical that the United States should go to war before other nations have atomic bombs, to which its cities are exceedingly vulnerable. In order to be on the safe side, you might think that the United States had best go to war within the next two years and get it over with. Undoubtedly there are people who believe that this ought to be done. And it is only to be regretted that this proposition is not discussed in greater detail in the open so that those who play with this idea in the dark can recognize its details in the full daylight. The more clearly you realize just what such a war would mean, the less likely it is that you will go on playing with this idea. Clearly, the war could not be won without an invasion of Russia. And clearly, it would not be safe to withdraw our occupation forces from Russia for another ten or fifteen years. ^P The possession of atomic bombs might give us within the next two or three years a decided advantage, but while it is perfectly logical that the country who has atomic bombs would drop it on the city which has not, rather than the other way around. It could not be considered a very chivalrous procedure. It is difficult to say just how great the contribution of moral considerations of this sort may be. But they are not entirely non-existent and shift the balance even further against the probability that the United States will go to war against Russia in the next three years. What is there actually happening? And what is the forecast about things to come? Let us first

deal with the psychological factor which is of comparatively minor importance but which we have to drag out into the open so as to reduce its importance to its proper level.

Whenever a nation wins a war and defeats its enemy, there is an empty place in its heart which has to be filled. We can no longer hate the Germans and the Japanese, having defeated them. The Russians seem to be admirably suitable to fill their place in our hearts.

Similar phenomena could be observed in England after the first World War. For a number of years/the place of the Germans was filled by the United States. After that it was the French, and so it remained until the Germans came back into their own. I have no doubt that obviously after this war similar results would be shown in France. The war ended and the Germans were gone but the hatred remained. This phenomenon, taken alone, is harmless enough. And we need not be particularly concerned with anti-Russian utterances in the newspapers, if atomic bombs did not exist.

Much more dangerous is the vicious circle in which both the United States and Russia find themselves caught. And caught in that circle, war appears to be inescapable. If there is a way out, we better find it fast. The purpose of this article is to discuss one possible solution. Before going into it however, let us first try to understand just what the military position of the United States is, or will be, in the next ten or fifteen years. In the past we could be confident to win every war simply because we could out-produce every country in tanks, airplanes, or guns. When it comes to atomic bombs, we may still out-produce every other country, except this no longer will do us much good. At first every atomic bomb is ^a ~~an~~ considerable asset. It means that we can destroy another city of the enemy. But once we have enough bombs to destroy all of the cities of the enemy, additional bombs are of much lesser value. Atomic bombs will be

cheap. And at cost of a bomb it will certainly be possible to produce one. It will not take long before we will be weaker than Russia even if we have many more bombs than Russia. Simply because we have a larger population concentrated in the cities who can be killed over night. If this were all, we might still consider dispersal of our cities. At an expenditure of twenty billion dollars a year, spent for ten years, we could relocate sixty million people and make the country considerably less vulnerable to atomic bombs. Twenty billion dollars a year we can well afford to spend. It might be just enough to provide full employment and we have spent almost that amount in 1942 for construction alone--that is, we would not increase the volume of the construction industry appreciably above its peak volume during the war. We would have to start dispersing at the latest in two years and ought to complete dispersal then within ten years. Crazy as this may sound in a crazy world, a crazy solution might be the most reasonable one. Unfortunately there is a catch. Twelve years is a long time. Soon after Hiroshima you probably saw newspaper reports on speeches made by Dr. Oliphant, who talked about atomic bombs which were a thousand times more powerful than the bomb used over Hiroshima. Obviously, such bombs cannot be made just by increasing the amount of plutonium or U235 which you put into the bomb. Some new principle must be involved which will have to be explored and tested before it can be applied. But twelve years is a long time---for making just one step going beyond the present state of the art. Once you make that step you are no longer limited to the blast action of the bombs. You can produce radioactive materials in practically unlimited quantity. You need not bring in the bomb and explode it over Chicago. You can explode it out somewhere at sea and let the wind carry the

radioactive materials across the continent. How much good will the dispersed cities do us? Our population will then die dispersed rather than concentrated. With such potentialities ahead of us, I believe not many scientists will advocate dispersal of cities with any degree of zest. Surely, war under these circumstances, is something entirely different from what it was during historical times. Fighting to the last man used to mean, fighting to the last soldier. If its meaning is to mean fighting to the last civilian, fighting to the last man becomes a nonsensical policy.

Let us now try to understand the present play of forces which pushes us towards such a precipice. It seems to be the policy of the United States to make an attempt to bring atomic energy under international control. Since however, we cannot be sure that we will succeed, we must strive, if we should get the world in a war with Russia, to win that war. The Russians are in precisely in the same position with respect to us. Unfortunately, if there is a war between Russia and the United States, it is not possible for both countries to win it---although it is quite possible for both countries to lose it. Since both the United States and Russia must consider the possibility of such a war and since the solution of almost every issue either strengthen us potentially or it strengthens Russia potentially, it is difficult to agree on any issue. The more terrible the aspect of the war will be, the more difficult we will find it to settle issues which arise and the greater the actual outbreak of the war will seem to bring us relief of the tension. In this situation we can take it for granted that the world will be under a single government within fifty years. Since without a world authority, we would surely get into a war and the victor will not be able to do anything afterward but extend its own government to the surface of the world. World government however is an ambiguous

word which can mean very many different things. If it means government of the victor of the next war over the world it probably will be a government in the full sense of the word. For instance, something like the Federal Government of the United States.

On the other hand, if a world authority were established in the not too distant future and a world war could be prevented, that world authority could at least in the next fifty years be in many respects this form which is commonly understood as world government. What are the conditions under which we can hope that such a world authority could be established and could have enough stability to serve the purpose which we have in mind? Turnign to the past, we find no precedent for a successful merger. The nearest example, the United States, can hardly be considered an example for success, since it had to go through a civil war before a stable government could be established. Since the only issue involved is whether or not a world government can be obtained without another world war, the example of the United States can surely not be recommended.

There is no consolation in the fact that the war between the South and the North was a civil war. It was a civil war only in ~~xxx~~ name since it was a war between two geographically separated regions and, had atomic bombs been available at that time, the cities would have been just as ruthlessly destroyed as in a war between any two enemy nations.

There will be no point in establishing a world authority unless it could be planned in such a manner as to rule out the possibility of a civil war between people who live in different parts of the world, within an appreciable period of time. A civil war of this sort becomes ~~important~~ impossible if the world authority gradually becomes the only executive force--that is, if a world police and area police, in contradiction to the army, is essentially the only executive police everywhere in the world. Civil war

then becomes impossible because the local leaders can be arrested and would be arrested before they can organize their region for war. Can this stage be reached within an appreciable period of time and can we have a limited world government in the sense of a world government which is limited to military police functions and which considers as its sole responsibility the maintenance of peace and order? I believe the answer is no, because a world authority which is not responsible for the welfare of the people but only for keeping order cannot command the loyalty of the people. And such a world police force could therefore not be established with the consent of the people. Of course, it could be created by the victorious power after the war, but that is not the alternative which is at present being discussed. Progress in this respect can in my opinion only be made if the concern of the world authority for the welfare of the people everywhere grows hand-in-hand with its concern for maintaining peace and order. Just in what manner can we then proceed towards that goal and can we proceed as fast as we have to in order to avert the next war? Just what limits the speed with which we can move? And is the speed high enough? Those who speak of world government usually put in the forefront something like the constitution--speaking of judicial, legislative, and executive branches of the government. And if they speak of a limited world government, I mean limited to the area of security, it seems to me that the problem might be approached from a different angle. The world government which we have to set up might very well be limited. But the limitation would have to be quantitative rather than qualitative. If you create a new corporation to draw up a charter which defines the limitations of the corporation and then you may write the by-laws which define the modes of operation, then it would correspond to the constitution of a world government.

I do not propose to discuss the constitution, but rather the charter, since if we can agree on the charter, it will be much easier to agree on the by-laws of the constitution. It seems to me that what needs to be done in the next three years is to adopt a charter by mutual consent of the great powers which are primarily involved and of other nations who can be persuaded to join. This charter could establish a number of international authorities which may increase in number and in the scope of their activities, according to a fixed schedule over a period of twenty-five years. At the end of the twenty-five years, or possibly even earlier, we might have a full-fledged government in the area of security and may have gone a long way towards a full-fledged world government in many other respects. One of the first authorities to establish would be an international authority for the control of atomic energy and little need be said about that here, since we have mentioned this subject above.

Another international authority/^{which}would have to be set up at once would be one in charge of distribution of commodities. Its authority would be limited to levy and income tax up to ten per cent of the national income and to purchase commodities in any country up to ten per cent of any given commodity produced in that country. The contribution of the United States might be fixed for a transition period of five years as rising from five billion dollars in the first year to twenty billion dollars five years from now and thereafter remain ten per cent of the national income. Clearly, in the next twenty-five years a large fraction of the burden for raising the standard of living elsewhere in the world, but clearly, there will be no permanent security for the United States in this world unless the standard of living elsewhere rises rapidly

to approximately the same level as ours. Twenty billion dollars appears to be a large sum of money but it may be just about enough to provide full employment and would not ~~ix~~ depress the standard of living below its present level.

Another authority which ought to be created at once would be one in charge of transportation with the right to purchase ten per cent of the shipping tonnage and in control of railways necessary for the transit of goods. The third authority in charge of inter-state commerce will have the right to decree or abolish tariffs but again its authority is limited inasmuch as its decree would fix or abolish the tariffs at the end of a ten year period, rather than at once and the tariffs levied by nations would be adjusted according to a gliding scale in such a manner that they would gradually, over a period of six months, be lowered to the tariffs decreed by the international authority. No manufacturer would have a legitimate claim against such an adjustment since the change is so slow that he can expand or restrict his business having sufficient advanced notice to be able to adjust. It seems that what is important is not so much the rapidity of the rate at which world government gets in fact established as is the certainty of conviction that world government is being established according to an inexorable schedule. If we are convinced that we are on our way to a world government and need not make provisions for the possibility of another war, the most dangerous sort of issues will disappear, leaving as perhaps the most serious issue, the question of migration. This too will have to be regulated by a world authority which would again be subject to a quantitative rather than qualitative limitation. There is little doubt in my mind that immigration is resisted by almost every country and the

economic arguments usually put forward against immigrations are rationalizations rather than the causes of the resistance. The problem would be a much more serious one if it were not for the fact that emigration is just as distasteful as immigration and that few people will leave their native country after the economic pressure to do so is relieved. This of course raises the problem of birth control, since in the long run the problem is not capable of a solution without birth control.