

The Age of Permanent Revolution

SCARCELY less than a quarter of a century has gone by since the successful testing of the atom bomb ushered in the technological revolution, and yet there is every indication that this revolution is still in its infancy. In contrast to the technological breakthrough in steam, steel, and electricity, the atomic, computer, and aerospace technologies are characterized by an infrastructure and inner dynamic that breeds permanent revolution. The post World War II technologies function as tools for the solution of ever more complex problems that emerge out of each successive solution. Whereas earlier technological breakthroughs were followed by many decades, if not centuries, of consolidation, the technology of our day is geared to endless innovation by the prodding of functional obsolescence. Each technological success by opening up new possibilities dooms it-self to inadequacy. The functional lifespan of a jet, a missile, a computer is measured in months, not in decades or centuries. Functional obsolescence in contrast to built-in obsolescence is the obsolescence of problem-solving efficacy brought on by the novel demands of the problem, not by the breakdown of the component parts. Each new generation of computers leaves in its wake any number of computers that have barely been broken in.

The new technology has thus opened a new era of man: the era of permanent revolution. Innovation and novelty is the norm; persistence and endurance the exception. The dialectic of problem solving, once unleashed, need not come to an end short of infinity. Every solution creates a problem; every problem a spur to resolution; every resolution the conjuring of a new problem. This dialectic is as operative in the limitless realms of space as in the limitless realms of the nucleus of the atoms. It is as operative in the exploration of the inner earth and the inner seas as in the exploration of the molecular universe of the cell.

The age of permanent revolution creates a new kind of decision maker. Since functional obsolescence is the dynamic of the new technology, the decision maker is not primarily concerned with how to attain equilibrium, but how to manage innovation. He becomes a student of process, of growth, of systems in flux. He is future oriented; the connection to the not yet; the past a painful reminder of the reality of functional obsolescence. Innovation becomes the teacher; tradition a stumbling block. The mind is sharpened as a problem solving tool; it ceases to be a storage bin. The processing of information demands a resilient, innovating mind, not a prodigious memory. The skillful evaluation and weighing of data proves far more efficacious than their quantity. The mind is tuned to evaluate, not to accumulate.

The basic challenge of the new technology to religion in general and to Judaism in particular lies in the prospect that it has ushered in an age of permanent revolution, an age with no foreseeable limits to its duration. If reality is to reveal itself as process, then all

religious systems committed to reality as unchanging, repetitive, and circular are doomed to irrelevance. All religions that are more traditionally oriented than future-oriented, that are more rooted in the past than in the future — these religions will tend to become functionally obsolescent. If religion is to survive at all it must respond to the reality of process as a revelation, as sure and as certain a revelation of what God is as any revelation on Sinai. If man does indeed experience process as so powerful a reality that it shapes his existence and his mode of life, how can religion deny that God is the source of process, the sustainer of process, the power that makes our experience possible. If reality makes the past obsolescent, how can God's power be sur-rendered to distinction?

All then hinges on whether an age of permanent revolution is indeed upon us. Does the technological revolution represent just another interlude pregnant with illusions of permanent, never-ending innovation and progress, to be followed by a new age of destructive violence, much as totalitarianism made mock of an earlier premature illusion of the inexorable march of civilization and progress? Or are we indeed witnessing a decisive mutation, the transition of man to a new evolutionary stage, a stage where aggression and violence against his fellow man becomes functionally obsolescent, and where his DNA programs his life for growth and development?

It will be the burden of this paper to call attention to certain powerful, though subterranean forces that have been at work not only setting the stage for a mutation, but preparing the scenario as well. The technological revolution is but the external sign that the era of permanent revolution has indeed been ushered in; and this sign is no illusion, but a reliable bellwether of the shape of the future.

THE technological revolution is itself a manifestation of a developmental process that is far more encompassing in scope than technology itself. This developmental process is no recent phenomenon, but reaches back many centuries, to the birth of the modern world in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is a process that charted a vicissitudinal history of remarkable complexity and that seemed to be doomed to extinction in the collapse midst violence and unfreedom of Western civilization. I am referring to the pattern of capitalist development.

Capitalism has been the most revolutionary economic form that has emerged in the history of mankind, for its essential dynamic is innovation and change. To be itself, it must persistently become other than it was. And for good reason. So long as the lure of profit galvanizes entrepreneurs and so long as competition spurs them to lower the costs of production, seek out new markets, or more fully utilize markets already available, innovation and change is inexorable. Developing capitalism not only destroys pre-capitalist forms by its greater efficiency, but it persistently undermines and dis-integrates outmoded and obsolescent forms of capitalism itself. Mercantilism was vanquished by industrialism; small scale industrialism by large scale; individual, laissez faire entrepreneurship by the corporate form; the simple corporate form by the diversified; the diversified by the con-glomerate. The collapse of Krupp's efforts to sustain a vast

industrial complex with an outmoded form of personal ownership and direction, following as it did a somewhat earlier succumbing of the Ford family to the corporate form, is to be attributed to the essential dynamic of capitalism, not to a failure of the system itself. Just as the Krupps, the Carnegies, the Rockefellers, and the Fords ran roughshod over smaller scale laissez faire industrialism because of their co-petitive prowess and innovating concepts, so their mode proved no match for the newer forms of capitalism.

It is therefore pointless to attempt a definition of capitalism that would limit it to a single one of its forms or phases. The only definition that can pass muster is one that is open, i.e., an historical definition. Capitalism is whatever its history shows it to have been and whatever it may in the future become. It is a definition in process, much as we as individuals are definitions in process: we continuously undergo redefinition as our life cycle moves through various phases. Our ultimate definition awaits our death. Until then the ongoing process of our lives makes any definition along the way contingent. And so it is with capitalism. Mercantilism, industrialism, corporatism are forms of capitalism historically interlinked in a series. Capitalism itself is not any single one of these, but the process of profit seek-ing, capital accumulation, competition—a process which simultaneously breaks down obsolescent forms even as it creates forms more adequate.

A static definition of capitalism may elude us, but a major distinction between two basic kinds of capitalism need not. The first may be called developing capitalism; the second, stagnant capitalism. Developing capitalism is a process characterized by growth, a steady augmentation of capital, a widening and deepening of markets, and a generation of ever more efficient forms for accomplishing these goals. Stagnant capitalism reveals a reverse process: an effort to sustain profitability in the face of shrinking markets, an attempt to brake the degree and extent of capital accumulation, and a resort to totalitarian mechanism to create markets and to reduce labor costs. Developing capitalism tends to raise the standard of living; stagnant capitalism to depress it. Developing capitalism thrives on innovation and individual freedom; stagnant capitalism is sustained by tradition and coercion.

Developing capitalism and stagnant capitalism, however, are not two separate entities. They are umbilically related to each other. They are interconnected on the historical continuum even as the various forms of capitalism are historically interlinked in a series. Stagnant capitalism followed on developing capitalism; it did not emerge as an independent phenomenon. From its emergence in the sixteenth century, until World War I, capitalism was developmental. Wherever it had penetrated and consolidated itself, it had undercut, undermined, and transformed the old order. It had unleashed revolutionary upheavals in the Netherlands (sixteenth century), England (seventeenth century), United States and France (eighteenth century), Germany (nineteenth century), and it laid the groundwork for revolution in Eastern Europe. Each of these revolutions had been preceded by radical intellectual ferment that subjected the ideational presuppositions of

the old order to annihilating criticism: the Puritan and sectarian critique of the Established Church in England, the rational critique of the American and French intellectuals, the historical, materialist, and romantic critique of the Germans. Each of these revolutions was followed by parliamentary-type institutions and by principles of sovereignty which committed the state to underwrite certain rights of the individual as inalienable. Each of these revolutions was followed by an expansion of the freedom for the mind to explore the universe without coercion. Each of these revolutions was followed by either a full or partial emancipation of the Jews. And each of these revolutions was followed by some wider extension of freedom to religion and irreligion to compete for the souls of men without the coercive interference of the state.

Despite the erratic line traversed through these centuries, the predominant pattern reveals, first, that developing capitalism was a revolutionary force that dismantled the pre-capitalist economic mode and its concomitant social, political, religious, and ideational systems, and that, second, it generated and underpinned social, political, religious, and intellectual systems that accorded the individual a wide area of personal freedom and that unleashed the mind from coercive authority and set it loose to roam in the search of truth and knowledge. Developing capitalism generated freedom because the pursuit of profit and the goad of competition placed a premium on economic innovation, technological innovation, intellectual innovation. For the first time, technology could have explosive consequences because it held within it the potential for new markets, higher profits, greater efficiency. Hitherto, technological advance had been sluggish and meandering; now it could surge with vigor. And for the first time, too, science could come into its own. The mind freed of restraints could explore the universe; and the mind stimulated by the profit lodging in technological discovery became inventive. Thus, modern technology and science were created by the dynamism of capitalism, and their fate, as we shall subsequently see, is largely dependent on the fate of capitalism.

Developing capitalism thus created ideational, intellectual, and spiritual concomitants that were not only revolutionary in character, but universal in principle. Capitalism itself as an economic form is limited and constrained only by the extent of the widening market. It is not a form that derives from some national, racial, or religious quality, but rather from entrepreneurial talents and drives which, in the course of the history of capitalism, have emerged wherever this economic form has penetrated. Gifted entrepreneurs have been Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Japanese; they have been Protestants, Jews, Catholics, and pagans. The lure of profits and the spur of competition have proved irresistible wherever the capitalist mode has made inroads. The basic principles which drive capitalism to innovation, renovation, and revolutionary transformation are as universally operative as any law of nature. They know no boundaries or limits except those that have been erected by pre-capitalist societies, previous but outmoded capitalist forms, and anti-capitalist systems. These are man-made, historically conditioned structures, highly vulnerable to developing capitalism's cutting

edge; they are not the consequences of some operative law of nature that renders them immune to capitalist penetration. Until the First World War, the steady expansion of capitalism eastward and its revolutionary transformation of traditional societies proved conclusively that, in principle, all barriers were man-made, temporal, and susceptible to radical renovation.

Little wonder then that developing capitalism carried along with it ideational concomitants that were themselves grounded in universal principles. The onslaught against the old regime was legitimized by positing universal claims of the individual against the particularistic and parochial claims of divine right of monarchy and an established Church.

John Locke grounded the sovereignty of the parliamentary state in a contractual relationship that sought to preserve the inalienable rights that the individual had enjoyed in a pristine state of nature — a state antedating particular, historical polities, and a state antedating the revelation on Sinai. The individual has enjoyed inalienable rights prior to the historical differentiation into peoples, nations, and religions. The underpinning, therefore, of a particular state, according to Locke, was a right that inhered within man as man.

The founding fathers of this country echoed Locke. They justified their break with England by appealing to the universal rights of man stemming from an original state of nature; England had violated a contract that was binding, for no state had the right to sovereignty unless it protected more effectively the inalienable rights of the individual than his own individual power. Neither the Declaration of Independence nor the Constitution legitimizes independence by an appeal to a national right or quality. It was not an American identity breaking away from an English identity, but a grouping of individuals — a people, not a nation — who were enraged at a breach of contract and took the necessary steps to protect their interests by negotiating a more durable contractual relation. It is by no means accidental that though the term “people” may be found in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, one looks in vain for the word “nation.”

The great French Revolution was likewise seeded by an appeal to universals. The *philosophes* in the eighteenth century forged their devastating critique of the old regime out of the stuff of Reason. Absolutism was evil because it was unreasonable. Not just the absolutism of Louis XV, but any absolutism that was not enlightened, i.e., guided by Reason’s blueprint. Voltaire, Diderot, Condorcet were heralding a new age for all enlightened individuals, wherever they might be; they were not motivated by a special feeling of ethnic kinship for their fellow Frenchmen. For them an enlightened sage from Cathay was more their brother than a superstitious practitioner of priestcraft who happened to be both French and Christian. The Declaration of the Rights of Man, not the Declaration of the Rights of Frenchmen, was the theme of the French Revolution. And

even in Germany, the ultimate triumph of unification was marked by a constitution that incorporated these same basic universal principles.

The basic ideational concomitant of capitalism was thus the revolutionary notion that the state should exist to protect the inalienable rights of the individual, rights whose origins were in contract, not in ethnic or religious claims. The grand vision was that once the old regimes were toppled, the new type states founded on identical universal principles would enter into mutually beneficial contractual relations among themselves — relations that could not but eventuate in wider individual freedom and a harmonious world order. That no such development occurred was as tragic as it is intelligible. But this motif can best be explored at a more advanced stage of this analysis.

That this assumption was no idle dream is evident from the history of the United States, the one country that was created by expanding developing capitalism and the one country where developing capitalism had only its own previous outmoded forms to contend with and was free of the resistant barriers of pre-capitalist systems. Whereas developing capitalism in Europe was always compelled to compromise with pre-capitalist economic forms and institutions and was periodically threatened by powerful reactionary and conservative onslaughts, it was spared such resistant barriers in the United States. Once and once only did an anomalous form of capitalism — the slave labor profit and market-oriented economy of the South — attempt to preserve itself by coercive means, only to be stripped of its servile source of profits and be doomed to a century of underdevelopment. Except then for the Civil War, developing capitalism in the United States did extend the contractual principle the length and breadth of a continent and even beyond. Each new territory ultimately became a state, each state in turn wielded autonomy within a range, even as it was integrated into a system that precluded impediments to the free movement of capital, labor, and commodities. What is of transcending significance is that developing capitalism, when unimpeded by pre-capitalist systems, does not generate nation states, but binds semi-autonomous units into a single system that wields a monopoly of effective coercive power.

Of hardly less significance is the fact that developing capitalism, when unimpeded by pre-capitalist systems — as the American experience reveals — has the capacity for the absorption, the utilization, and the integration of multiethnic, multiracial, multi-religious, and multi-class elements. The import of this fact should not be lost. So long as capitalism is developing it dissolves the hostile and negative potential inherent in historically conditioned differences even as it remains neutral with respect to the individual's choice of as many private identities, including the ethnic, that he wishes to perpetuate. Thus Jews were free to have the Judaism of their choice or no Judaism at all. They were free to cultivate ethnic ties or to dissolve them completely. What they were not permitted to do was organize a form of Judaism that challenged the constitution, or to band together as an ethnic body, form an independent state, arm it with coercive power, and erect tariff or other barriers impeding the free flow of trade between the states. The example may seem

incongruous, but was this not after all what literally did happen in Europe, especially in the multinational empires of Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Russia in the latter part of the nineteenth century? Yet every ethnic, national, racial, and religious strain of Europe was not only accommodated in the United States, but each was given the freedom to perpetuate its differences so long as it did not resort to armed coercion.

Not that this was accomplished without a good deal of friction, tension, and even on occasion, bloody violence. Especially was the process painful for the working classes, for here the very dynamics of capitalist development and accumulation were involved. The notion that cheap labor was more profitable than well-paid productive labor was a dogma that capitalists were loath to question. During the primitive industrial phase of accumulation, the prospect that there would emerge a phase of capitalism that would find cheap labor an annoying and irritating limitation on productive growth was probably glimpsed by no one, least of all by Karl Marx. Nevertheless, despite the bitter and often bloody struggles between capital and labor, the real wages of workers began to rise and with it the potential for compromise and conciliation. To put it another way, so long as capitalism developed and increased productivity, the creation of an ever growing economic surplus, i.e., gross national product, could raise living standards without a fall in the rate of profit. Capitalism might indeed, once the primitive stage of industrialism had been worked through, be profitable without being exploitative. It might even have to subsidize rising living standards to ensure profitability. Though prior to World War II only a glimmer of these possibilities was grasped intellectually, the real life experience of the workers in the United States was already giving intimations of a new developmental phase.

A word is likewise in order for the farmer. Agriculture under capitalism proved to be a highly vulnerable sector. The operation of the market, especially in its tendency to favor the industrial sector over the farming sector, had disruptive effects, but they were overcome in the United States without recourse to violence. A two-fold development took place: first, the increase of agricultural efficiency by the utilization of machinery and, second, a steady movement from farm to city as the less efficient producers abandoned agriculture and as surplus farm labor sought a livelihood in mine and factory. Although prior to World War I the miracle of American agriculture was still years ahead, the process of transferring the majority of farmers from country to city, even as agricultural productivity grew, without violence, without starvation, without emigration, and without any major challenge to the constitutional system did bespeak developing capitalism's resilience.

Now for the point that this interlude is intended to make: Developing capitalism is rooted in universal principles and when it is unimpeded by pre-capitalist forms it expands via a contractual network that dissolves all artificial barriers to the freedom of the individual.

The other ideational concomitants of developing capitalism likewise reveal this grounding in universals. Capitalism generated the scientific and intellectual revolutions. At the heart of these revolutions is the principle that true knowledge is possible only if the mind is freed to wrestle with the phenomenal world without any coercive intrusion by systems grounded in authority. Along with the freedom of the mind to explore reality uncoerced went the potential for error. The pursuit of knowledge was precarious, for there was no certainty that it could ever be found. The intellectual became an entrepreneur lured by the unknown to risk his mind in an enterprise that could as easily fail as succeed. His ideas competed with those of his co-adventurers for acceptance or rejection by other minds. Intellectual entrepreneurship was open to all minds. Racial, ethnic, religious, and class origins were irrelevant. The adjudicating bar of uncoerced reason was swayed only by logic and evidence. An appeal to anything extraneous was contempt of court.

Nowhere is the universal grounding of a claim more fundamental than in the realm of scientific thought. Here, intellectual pursuit is wedded to a testing process that appeals ultimately to the totality of nature for confirmation. The law of gravity is not English law, the law of relativity not German or Jewish, the law of DNA programming is not American. If true, they are universal. If false, their status cannot be altered by massive nuclear retaliation against the scientific community. But it was developing capitalism that created and nurtured the scientific revolution and that gave it the freedom to proclaim its non-authoritative metaphysics, for entrepreneurialism can flourish only when the nature of reality is open to continuous exploration. Innovation challenges previous assumptions about what will or will not work. To create a conducive to pragmatic analysis and decision making in the pursuit of profit, it was essential that no limits be placed on mental activity however far removed from economic and entrepreneurial concerns.

And now for religion in general and Judaism in particular. Developing capitalism seeded religion with its own revolutionary drive. It could not be otherwise. Capitalism was born in Christian Europe. The first grand entrepreneurs were all Christians or Jews. But the Christianity and Judaism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were ideational, symbolic, and religious systems that were so intermeshed with the economic, political, and social institutions of pre-capitalism that an onslaught against the latter inevitably carried with it an onslaught against its spiritual counterparts. Traditional Christianity and Judaism were especially obstructive because in proclaiming a single God who had made known His immutable will through revelation, the underpinning of society rested upon an *external* authority. The individual was not free to grapple with reality with mind uncoerced. Furthermore, so long as state sovereignty was grounded in revelation and so long as revelation was susceptible to multiple interpretations, the state could not claim equal allegiance from all its citizens. Developing capitalism, therefore, sought the foundations of sovereignty in a state of nature *prior* to revelation; and, having secured such a foundation, it could proclaim that all religions were free to make absolute claims

for the truth of their revelations so long as these claims did not challenge the ground-ings of the state in a pre-revelation setting.

It is true that compromises had to be made with the pre-capitalist systems in Europe because they proved too powerful to destroy completely. Hence, established churches were recognized by the refashioned and restructured nation states. But in the United States where there were no pre-capitalist obstructions to developing capitalism, individuals were free to have any religion or no religion.

Little wonder then that it was in the United States, and only in the United States, that religions spawned not only freely but prolifically. And it is also little wonder that it was in the United States, and only in the United States, that there were no wars of religion. Economic, social, and political interests which in Europe were frequently masked by religious ideology could struggle openly in this country because the issue of sovereignty had been resolved at the outset by a non-religious metaphysic.

Developing capitalism thus represented a challenge to religion, even though it was basically indifferent to it. The challenge resided in its inherent critique of pre-capitalism and the ideational and symbolic concomitants that were associated with it. To the extent that individuals were drawn into the matrix of developing capitalism, to that extent did traditional religion tend to become outmoded and obsolescent.

The record insofar as Judaism is concerned is clear: wherever capitalism penetrated into Europe, traditional Judaism was thrown on the defensive. Moses Mendelssohn proclaimed Judaism to be congruent with Reason and made a sharp differentiation between the metaphysical principles of Judaism which were universal and the legal system which was particularistic. Mendelssohn had been drawn to one of the great centers of nascent capitalism and had been attracted to its ideational concomitant, the sovereignty of universal reason. His teachings gained a sympathetic hearing among the new class of en-trepreneurs even as they were denounced as heretical by the rabbinic spokesmen of the old regime, i.e., the traditional Judaism that had gone hand in hand with the pre-capitalistic structure of medieval society.

Abraham Geiger and Samuel Holdheim were champions of religious radicalism in nineteenth-century Germany, as their non-Jewish counter-parts were subjecting the old economic, political, and religious order in Germany to a devastating critique. Reform Judaism challenged traditional Judaism not only on the ideational level, but dared to deprive the *halachah*, the traditional law, of its claim to program the life of the individual. Judaism was proclaimed an historical, developmental religion that recognized the spiritual grandeur and challenge that resided in process and change. These Reformers championed the need for a religious breakthrough to set the individual Jew free from an external immutable revelation. They saw God's power enhanced, not di-minished, by the evidence that man could create an exciting new world of prosperity and individual dignity. For them, the Jew was experiencing a new and more durable exodus — an

exodus from the old regime of unfreedom pre-capitalism to the new order of limitless opportunity, developing capitalism.

What was true of Germany proved to be true of Galicia and of Eastern Europe. Simply trace the movement of capitalism eastward and you will find that it stirs Jews to question, criticize, and ultimately to break with traditional Judaism. The so-called *maskilim* or enlighteners, whether in Galicia or in Poland, dissolved the intellectual structure of medieval Judaism with tools that had been fashioned by the freeing of the mind from external authority. What needs to be stressed, however, is that the intellectual revolution was unleashed by developing capitalism. No significant challenge to traditional Judaism occurred in any part of Europe prior to the penetration into the area of capitalistic forms. In the eighteenth century, Galicia and Eastern Europe — and for that matter provincial, rural Germany, too — were hardly touched by Mendelssohn. In the first decades of the nineteenth century, the *Has-kalah* was making headway in the great commercial centers of Galicia, but only an echo could be heard from Poland. Yet from the sixties on Eastern Europe was the hotbed of Jewish radical thinking.

Once again the history of Judaism in the United States underscores the umbilical relationship between developing capitalism and religious radicalism. Here Reform Judaism in the post Civil War period charted a course more radical even than that of Germany. Not only was the tie to the law severed more absolutely, but by the turn of the century the most radical school of biblical criticism found a welcome home in the Hebrew Union College. Reform Judaism in the United States was the Judaism of the capitalist entrepreneurs while Orthodoxy and Conservatism represented the Judaism of the immigrants from pre-capitalist society. But as the East-European Jews were drawn into the capitalist orbit they either drifted towards Reform Judaism or lent support to the modernizing of Conservatism and Orthodoxy.

Developing capitalism thus served as a catalyst for religion. Though it does not interfere with religious freedom and though it passes no judgment on religious claims, it does render traditional religions highly vulnerable for it continuously refashions experience by placing a premium on the scientific, technological, and secular mentality. So long as capitalism itself undergoes changes, it must generate critical thinking to corrode the mental, intellectual, and spiritual concomitants of previous forms. Whereas a static, repetitive capitalism might not only settle for, but even encourage a conservative mentality, changing and developing capitalism has no alternative but to engender radical criticism, even of capitalism itself.

This generalization is by no means altered by the fact that in the nine-teenth century capitalist growth was accompanied by a proliferation of fundamentalist and evangelical forms of Christianity. This was largely the consequence of the expansion and proliferation of a free farming class. It was also abetted by a large influx of immigrants from rural and pre-capitalist backgrounds. The roots of fundamentalist creed thus struck deep into the soil of agricultural and pre-capitalist modes of experience. The steady

process, however, of developing capitalism tends to weaken the fundamentalist hold, not because of any intrusion on the realm of religious freedom, but because of the inadequacy of traditional type religions to deal with the novel configurations of experience shaped by capitalistic development.

Thus far I have confined my remarks to a description of the historical vicissitudes of developing capitalism. I have said next to nothing about stagnant capitalism, for stagnation did not make its appearance before the First World War. This, of course, does not mean that capitalism did not experience periodic crises which at the time were prematurely interpreted as evidence that stagnation had already set in. Nor does it mean that the course of capitalist development was unmarked by temporary setbacks that may have been prematurely taken as evidence that permanent decline had begun. The renovating of pre-capitalism in Europe took many centuries, and, as already pointed out, involved, even in the case of England and France, all sorts of compromises with the old regimes. Even in the United States the going was far from smooth, and for four bloody years there was considerable uncertainty as to whether the country would be split into two nation states. Be that as it may, in retrospect it is clear that before World War I all major blocks to capitalist development had been overcome; crises and depressions were successfully liquidated; new areas were penetrated; total capital in 1914 was far greater than it had been in 1870 and could not even be meaningfully compared with the negligible capital that had existed in 1800; even the last bastion of the old regime in Russia was being undermined daily by capitalist growth and the intellectual forces of Czarism were in disarray before the onslaught of Western modes of thought.

Developing capitalism, however, met what seemed to be its Waterloo on the blood drenched battlefields of Europe. For four years, 1914-1918, the mightiest *capitalist* nation states sought to resolve their rivalries by destroying each other. And when the war came to an end, capitalism ceased to develop; it stagnated and lurched through two decades of economic instability into a new holocaust of destructiveness.

The shambles left by the path of stagnation is there for all to see. Individual freedom, the uncoerced mind, the parliamentary institutions, the rising standard of living — all succumbed to stagnation. Italy embraced Fascism; Germany Nazism; France flirted with a fascist solution; Spain went totalitarian; England gave sanction to appeasement. And the Soviet Union, the first non-capitalist state to emerge out of the economic changes unleashed by capitalism, proved to be thoroughly totalitarian. The all new totalitarian-type regimes were grounded in principles that were the very opposite of those that had accompanied the revolutions engendered by developing capitalism. The appeal was not to universals but to authority. The state did not exist to protect the individual's inalienable rights, but to demand his total obedience. Who was or was not a German or an Aryan was decided by arbitrary authority. Truth and falsehood were a function of the state, not of the mind. In the Soviet Union, the Communist party alone could determine whether or not a scientific proposition was an exemplification of dialectical materialism. One's class or

racial status was more pertinent than one's competence. The novelist, the artist, the poet, the philosopher, the journalist — all were de-prived of a free market for their ideas and were either harassed or coerced into conformity or simply disposed of as mental wreckage and debris. The life of the individual was deemed worthless as were any independent thoughts or ideas that he might have. What these systems did — and in the case of the Soviet Union still do — to the Jews needs no retelling. Nor is any reminder necessary that in these totalitarian systems Judaism was as unpalatable as the Jews.

The age of totalitarianism was ushered in by the disintegration of capitalism. The triumph of Bolshevism and Nazism was rooted in the withering away of the developmental and revolutionary elan of an economic system that for more than three centuries had been able to batten down the most formidable bastions of pre-capitalism. It could not break through the barriers erected by Bolshevik totalitarianism in the East and it was unable to renew its power to generate freedom in the West. And when the Great Depression sent capitalism reeling even in the United States, one did not have to be a Marxist to raise the ominous question: Was capitalism doomed?

The period of capitalist decline between World War I and World War II yields precious insights for the analytical historian. It underwrites the crucial connection linking economic growth and individual freedom and economic growth and spiritual, ethical, and religious development. So long as capitalism was developing, its negative features — and there were many — were offset, to some extent, by its liberating effects. It placed virtually no restraints on the intellect and the spirit. It allowed the individual any number of options as to the kind of life he wished to lead. It did not, it is true, guarantee him a livelihood, but it did little to restrict a gifted and talented artist or writer or thinker or religious teacher from expressing his talents and his insights freely. And what is more, it tolerated even the most radical criticism of capitalism itself. One too easily forgets that Karl Marx not only found refuge in capitalist England, but that his research for *Das Kapital* was in a sense subsidized by British capitalism — the riches of the British Museum were never denied him.

The nub of the matter is that the concomitants of developing capitalism operated irrespective of contrasting ethnic, racial, religious, or intellectual backgrounds; individuals demonstrated their capacity to undergo radical change. They could alter radically their value systems, despite the intensity of exposure in infancy and childhood to traditional nurture. Peoples again and again rejected the old order as they opted for a broader range of options.

That the human equation was all too variable was tragically illustrated when capitalist stagnation and decline set in. Though nurtured on freedom, millions of Germans were lured to Nazism because of economic break-down and collapse. They were not congenitally evil. They had reacted quite otherwise during the phase of capitalist growth. Nowhere, indeed, had the commitment to free scientific inquiry and free literary and artistic expression found more devoted exemplars. And should the German example be

insufficient, what is one to say of France during the interwar years — a France that had been one of the great fountainheads of freedom and yet in the 1930's, skirted on the edge of fascism. And what of England? Was appeasement the fruit of the English spirit, or was it an accommodation to the facts of capitalist decline and its incompatibility with freedom?

Or consider the Russians. Can there be any doubt that the Russian people would have responded to capitalist growth with an outburst of freedom, even as they acquiesced to the totalitarianism that went hand in hand with economic underdevelopment? The patterns of Russian response in the latter part of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century to the quickening of capitalistic development certainly ought to quickly remove such doubts.

And this indeed is the tragedy: religious, ethical, and spiritual idealism proved to be impotent to offset the ravages of economic breakdown. And not only did it fail to stop Hitler's rise to power, but it could do next to nothing to ward off the physical annihilation of millions of Jews. This heinous crime was not a German crime, but a consequence of the economic collapse of Germany after World War I. Had there been no economic breakdown, one can be certain that there could have been no Hitler and no extermination of the Jews. The Germans had given Jews emancipation in the era of developing capitalism; they destroyed Jews when stagnation and collapse altered their ideational loyalties.

The same truth holds good for the Soviet Union. Millions of peasants were brutally condemned to death by Stalin in the 1930's as he obstinately sought to squeeze the capital for industrialization from a recalcitrant peasantry. He broke the minds and spirits of any number of sensitive souls in his purge trials. This would scarcely have been the history of Russia had developing capitalism made sufficient inroads before 1918.

BUT why the grand reversal? Why did capitalism cease to develop? The answer, I would suggest, is to be found in the limitations placed on capitalist expansion by the nation state and by the loss of the Marxists of control over the ideology of revolution. The two causes are interconnected.

Capitalism, as pointed out above, is an economic form that has the capacity to function anywhere. Its inner dynamic is the lure of profit and competition. Its boundaries are wherever markets are to be found. This universal economic form, however, was born in an historical matrix that was pre-capitalist. Its growth and development, therefore, had to take place within the contours of powerful and traditional societies. The new economic form was not simply embraced by all of Europe; it had to carve out for itself enclaves; and these enclaves were largely limited by the preexistent state system, i.e., the basic territorial state of Europe had been developed with no regard to the rational integration of economic resources or the optimal exploitation of markets. Entrepreneurs thus had little alternative but to take advantage of the potential lying within the unification of the nation state. The result was English capitalism, Dutch capitalism,

American capitalism, German capitalism, even though the dynamic of capitalist enterprise was identical in each of these nation state enclaves. That the enclave was fortuitous, i.e., did not stem from the nature of capitalism, is proved by the fact that the unification of Germany under Bismark had to forego integrating Austria, and by the fact that in the United States capitalist expansion did not generate the formation of nation states. There is every reason to believe that if Europe had been occupied only by primitive tribes, it could have been organized into a continental system by unhampered entrepreneurs. Indeed, this was almost achieved by Napoleon in his bid for continental hegemony.

The first capitalist states nonetheless were grounded on universal principles. However, as these states became more numerous and as the productivity of capitalism surged, the nation state market was quickly saturated and there was no way of extending the market without collision with other capitalist states. The attempt to extend the market and to assure profitability by imperialism may have succeeded in its aims, but it only intensified the rivalry between the great imperial states and tempted such newcomers as Germany to demand their share.

Imperialism likewise was a paradox-ical phenomenon. On the one hand, it was an extension of capitalism; on the other, it was an effort to sustain capitalism at home, by retarding the developing of capitalism in the colonial and semi-colonial areas. Cheap primary commodities could be extracted only by the exploitation of cheap labor. This labor force could be sustained only so long as pre-capitalist systems were preserved in the colonies; otherwise it would be lured to developing capitalist enterprise. Capitalism, which was a revolutionary force in Europe, was not exported to the underdeveloped areas, since it would have revolutionary consequences; its dynamic would begin working to break down the old order, the very order needed to preserve a cheap labor force. Nation state imperialism was geared to shoring up domestic capitalism; it was not geared to the expansion of a global market by encouraging the development of capitalism in colonial areas.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the state system of Europe was split into rival camps. As a consequence nationalism had become the dominant ideology. Each nation had to be certain that its population would rally behind its leaders should the rivalries between the nation states lead to war. Only intense national feelings, patriotism, and *not* rationalism, could stir the kind of patriotic fervor that could lead a westernized Frenchman to kill a westernized German. In order to protect its national enclave from encroachment, the capitalists were compelled to make alliances with reactionary and conservative forces, often the most outspoken leaders of the institutions of an earlier age, for these were the most fervid votaries of nationalism, patriotism, and irrationalism. The fact that the officer class of the armed forces was largely recruited from the old aristocracy made it all the more necessary to respect their conservative ideology. Although nation state capitalism did not totally abandon its commitment to change and

progress, it was caught in a bind that derived from the enclosure of a universal economic mode within the narrow limits of the nation state, and from its dependence on the nation state's coercive power to *retain* what it had and to *attain* what was so desperately needed — new sources of profit.

The dilemma of nation state capitalism was the opportunity for Marx-ism. Karl Marx had already discerned when he wrote the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848 that capitalism was a dynamic system that continuously transformed itself. He likewise recognized that it had unleashed the revolutions that had toppled the old regime and had created the modern nation state. His lifetime was devoted to snatching away from capitalism its revolutionary dynamic and leadership. Extrapolating from the primitive phase of accumulation that had accompanied industrialism in England the operation of a universal law of capitalist development, he sought to convince the worker and the intellectual that the inner dynamic of capitalism would be self-destructive and that a novel, non-capitalist form, first Socialism then Communism, would emerge. Extrapolating from the fact that capitalism had become congealed within the nation state, he identified capitalism with nationalism and conservatism, and socialism with internationalism and progress. But in proclaiming the internationalism of socialism, he grounded the internationalism in class and not in the inalienable rights of the individual. Furthermore, by affirming that the dialectic was the law of history and that the trustees of this law were the Communist elite, the freedom of the mind to explore reality uncoerced was denied. The pursuit of truth with the hazards and risks of error was denied as effectively as the pursuit of profit. As for religion, Marx saw it as a conservative and reactionary force that was a fundamental support of both the old regime and of capitalism. He did not see religion as a realm of the spirit that might be conservative, but need not be.

Marxism, which was itself generated out of the radical economic and ideational changes that developing capitalism in Germany was bringing about, became henceforth the voice of revolution and, since it was anti-capitalist, deprived developing capitalism of its ideational cutting edge. This in turn not only encouraged the notion that capitalism was antirevolutionary and conservative, but induced the capitalists to keep the bridges to the conservative classes unburnt. Nevertheless, the steady rise of the real wages of workers from the last decade of the nineteenth century till the outbreak of the First World War was effecting a coalition between capitalism and Marxism. This was revealed with startling clarity when the Social Democratic parliamentarians voted war credits in 1914 for their capitalist nation states.

World War I, however, was decisive. A coalition of capitalist nation states had triumphed over another coalition of nation states. When the bloodbath was over, the nation state enclaves continued to remain enclaves. The beating down of Germany did not prevent an outbreak of rivalry between England and France. No way was found to restore the dynamics of capitalist development. A host of non-viable nation states emerged in central, and eastern Europe and in the Balkans. The Bolsheviks, catapulted to

power by the ravages of the war and by the appeal of its anti-capitalist ideology — capitalism had let loose the war and capitalism could bring neither bread nor peace nor freedom—blocked off from capitalistic penetration a vast territory rich in resources and potential wealth. Marxism vied with fanatical nationalism and racism to plunder liberal capitalism. The tragedy of the collapse of nation state capitalism is perhaps nowhere more starkly revealed than in the gruesome decision that Germans were called upon to make in 1932: Which of the two competing systems of unfreedom would enslave the least?

WORLD WAR II began as another round of nation state rivalry with all of the ominous forebodings of the tragedy that would come with the peace: a pulverized victim and quarreling victors; crisis stricken capitalism; tyrannical socialism; resurrected fascisms — all squaring off for a new round of annihilating warfare. But it did not happen quite this way. And the reason that it did not happen was that the United States emerged out of World War II with the atom bomb, with a resurrected capitalism, and with the determination that the nation state form would no longer be permitted to strangle economic growth. In a word, the United States embarked upon a policy of liquidating nation state capitalism and imperialism and of ushering in the phase of global capitalism. Capitalism would be treated as a universal economic form and be freed of man-made impediments to its inner dynamic of perpetual growth *and* radical change. What had led to stagnation and decay had been the limitations set to expansion by the restricted markets of the nation state, not an inherent principle. Far from being a counterrevolutionary force, capitalism either generates revolutionary change or it withers away. It does not thrive on static, conservative thinking, but on a critical exposure of the inadequacy and the inefficiency of outmoded kinds of thought. Laissez faire may have been a spur to economic growth for a more primitive phase of capitalism, but it becomes a millstone in more advanced stages.

A global economy, a global community, and global freedom — these goals have fashioned the complex, often obscure, and seemingly contradictory policies of United States decision makers. Although the surface of events often seems to belie the operation of powerful, long-range, and highly enlightened subterranean forces, the record in retrospect reveals the emergence of structural configurations that testify to careful thought and planning, and that bear the imprimatur of global direction. Regrettably, the limits of this paper permit only a brief listing of the major accomplishments to date:

1. The Marshall Plan, the creation of the European Common Market, and the reconstruction of Germany and Japan. The basic assumption underlying these decisions was that European economic integration would dissolve nation state hostility and tend to develop a feeling of community that transcended national barriers, and that the basic cause of Nazism and World War II was the collapse of capitalism, not a German state of mind. The most effective antidote to war is economic well-being and its psychological

concomitants. Instead of lecturing the Germans and the Japanese on the virtues of democracy, the United States created the economic base for a functional democracy.

2. The successful containment of the Soviet Union and the steady dismantling of the Cold War with Russia without recourse to nuclear warfare. Someday perhaps the skilled and responsible use of American nuclear might to prod the Soviet Union into a global community will be made a matter of record. Until then the operation of such a far-sighted policy can only be inferred from the facts themselves: (a) the steady liquidation of the Cold War mentality since the Summit Conference of 1955, accompanied as it was by a relaxation in both cultural and economic controls; (b) the signing of a series of nuclear ban treaties (Ant-arctica, 1959, atmospheric testing, 1963, space, 1967, and now the agreement to support an anti-proliferation treaty).

3. The American encouragement of a peaceful disintegration of the Soviet satellite system by effective economic support of Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, and of a slow but steady process of introducing a profit and market economy as productively more efficient than a totalitarian managed economy. The “building of bridges” slogan of President Johnson is to be read in this light: a peaceful transition from an anti-capitalist to a capitalist economy.

4. The remarkable liquidation of the colonial and semi-colonial systems of the great imperial nation states, and the opening up for the first time, to the underdeveloped areas of the world, the road to modernization with freedom and dignity. The task that decolonialization posed for American policy makers was staggering. On the one hand, the United States had to maintain an effective alliance with its European allies — France, Holland, Belgium, and England—to regenerate and integrate Europe and to mount a common defense against the Soviet Union, and on the other hand, it had to encourage and lend support to the aspirations of the underdeveloped areas for freedom from nation state imperialism. Exactly how this was accomplished may never be known, but as of this writing, only England has not been completely severed from its imperial past, though the remaining links are snapping away with each passing day.

WHEN one looks at this record in retrospect and is willing to entertain the notion that the decision makers of our country are and have been men of intelligence and dedicated purpose—a notion I realize not readily shared by intellectuals, journalists, and the cultured public at large—then it seems to reflect a realization that war will disappear only when the world is integrated as a global system functioning in response to permanent economic growth. Capitalism, in a word, must be freed from all man-made impediments to growth and development. This means that the growing and developing sector of American capitalism is in principle opposed to colonialism and imperialism as a major limitation on capital accumulation. Profitability, it is now realized, is enhanced by highly productive labor joined to expensive capital equipment. Cheap, illiterate, malnourished labor is high cost, low yield labor. Underdevelopment is thus not an asset but a liability: wasted labor, wasted resources, and wasted potential markets. The global stage of

capitalism is thus driven in its own self interest to liquidate poverty, malnutrition, illiteracy, and all those pre-capitalist traditional systems of economic, social, political, and intellectual controls that are still a living heritage from the era of nation state capitalism and imperialism. Global capitalism thus opens the sluice gates for revolutionary transformation of the underdeveloped lands, even as developing capitalism in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries unleashed the revolutions that overthrew the old regimes of Europe.

The new regenerated capitalism, however, does not simply challenge the traditional pre-capitalist and underdeveloped societies in South America, Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, but it challenges the outmoded, obsolescent forms of nation state capitalism in this country as well. The new capitalism is growth oriented and geared to raising productivity by hitching intelligence to ever more efficient capital. In effect it humanizes man by making his *brawn* power obsolescent and his *brain* power a precious source of profit. Furthermore the never ending threat of functional obsolescence places a high premium on innovation, hence on intellectual and individual freedom.

The new capitalism thus confronts the capitalism of an earlier age; a capitalism that had identified maximization of profits with cheapness of labor, that had acquiesced to the dogma that periodic depressions were a law of nature, that had simply taken for granted that the world would be forever divided into rival capitalist states, each protecting its domestic markets with higher and higher tariff walls and abandoning the notion of a global economic system as an illusion. But since World War II, the older forms of capitalism and their presuppositions have been fighting a losing battle against the global sector. The remarkable augmentation of the gross national product since 1946, and especially the even more remarkable pattern of steady growth since 1961, coupled as it has been with the expansion of world trade and the transplantation of American corporations abroad, gives assurance that the new capitalism with its global goals will effectively dissolve the capitalist forms resistant to development and sustained economic growth.

Indeed, it is to this new capitalism that we must attribute the assault against the underdeveloped sectors of American society. For these new economic forces, the backward agrarian economy of the south is a wastage of labor and resources; poverty, the strangulation of potential markets; illiteracy and undernourishment a drag on desperately needed qualified man-power; laissez faire and social irresponsibility, a bastion of inefficiency. The significance of the Warren Court lies in its utilization of the judiciary to break down the institutional obstacles to economic expansion and growth. The fact is all too frequently overlooked that the initiative for integration and advanced social reform have come from the ruling global elite and not from the masses. And with good reason. The new capitalism needs a radically new society if it is to be profitable.

In essence, then, what we have been witnessing during the past two decades and what we are witnessing now is a revolutionary struggle between the new economic forces and

their ideational concomitants and the outmoded and obsolescent forces. The seeming chaos all about us is the inevitable consequence of major structural changes. A revolutionary transformation is taking place, but with much less violence than would normally be the case.

If this analysis is correct, then what we are witnessing is the struggle attendant on the birth of global capitalism and its ideational and spiritual concomitants. These concomitants are once again universals, for the ground of the new global order is the inalienable right of every individual in the world to nurture, self-esteem, and freedom, i.e., life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Global capitalism underwrites these rights because it cannot develop and grow otherwise; exploitation becomes less and less profitable as the advancing technologies render brawn power obsolescent and demand for their expanding productivity infinite and sophisticated markets predicated on ever-rising living standards. Furthermore, global capitalism cannot afford the loss attendant upon narrow nationalism, provincialism, racism, cultural snobbism. In its own interest it must more and more demand that the educational system prepare the individual as a citizen of the world with the capacity to appreciate all the varieties of humankind along with the contrasting cultural configurations that are their consequence. The triumph of global capitalism will ensure both the freedom of the mind and the freedom of religion because growth and innovation are functions of freedom, not of slavery.

Indeed its triumph may very well usher in a mutation for the human species. And for the following reasons: hitherto, man has never known the absolute security of nurture, self-esteem, and freedom. The struggle for survival has led man to kill and destroy. The well-being of one society has almost always been at the expense of other societies. When men fear hunger, deprivation, and humiliation, they kill and maim, irrespective of the ethical, moral, and religious teachings that admonish them that it is wrong. History is only too replete with the truth of this generalization. But there has been another side to man. Whenever he has created a society that nurtures him, fills him with pride of accomplishment, and gives him some sense of freedom, he has found a capacity for love, for sublime ideals, for artistic and poetic creativity. Such societies are still looked back upon with wistful longing. But somehow they just did not endure.

SCHOLARS have searched long and hard to fathom the reasons for the tragedy of man, but their findings have been inconclusive. I would submit the following hypothesis: No society in the past solved the problem of economic growth. The wealth of society expanded up to a point, and then ceased to grow. Capitalism was the first economic system whose inner dynamic is growth and the augmentation of capital. Unlike previous economic systems, it kept creating more and more capital as it expanded from its beachheads in the west. But it, too, stagnated and threatened to make of Western civilization a shambles, because its dynamic for growth was curbed by the limits of the nation state. Now a new global form has emerged with the inherent potential of infinite development and growth. Should this form build a global community, then each

individual at birth will be assured of nurture, self-esteem, and freedom. The competitive principle will continue to operate; but it will no longer condemn to hunger, poverty, or humiliation an individual who, for one reason or another, is not equal to a specific task.

Should this stage of economic growth be attained, then the child rearing patterns will be radically altered. The child's superego, the guardian within the conscience of society's demands, will continuously reassure him that society will nurture him, respect him, and look with favor on his pursuit of happiness. His superego will no longer be split between the commands. Thou shalt not kill and Thou shalt kill. The child in his most vulnerable stages of development will not be exploited in the interests of a society that needs a machine, a con-forming automaton — far better machines and automatons will by then be doing servile work. Instead, his most impressionable years will have imprinted upon his unconscious a sense of personal worth and of pride in doing what he can do best. Reared to be a citizen of the world, he will look back on man's tragedy and travail as the prelude to the age of humanity.

I am fully aware that such a global society will not emerge in my time. I need no reminder of the war in Viet-nam, of the precarious situation in the Middle East, of the galloping starvation, the degrading poverty, the specter of an age of malnutrition and premature death. Nor are my eyes closed to the gutting of the cities, the poisoning of the atmosphere, the crisis of morals. I, too, read the papers, listen to the commentators, think and ponder. The tragedy of waste, despair, and destruction is no source of joy.

But the crucial question is whether we are going through the travail of birth or death. Is a new world being born with all the pain, suffering, and anguish that inevitably attend it, or is the world dying?

I, for one, read the agony of our times as the sign of new life. We are living through an age of transit. Global capitalism, in its own self-interest, is creating a global free community. It is engaged in a titanic struggle against the outmoded forms of nation state capitalism and imperialism and the stagnant traditional structures of the underdeveloped worlds. The gi-gantic nature of the task requires tactics that often obscure the directional thrust. Nothing could be either simpler or more irresponsible than annihilating the enemy and bludgeoning the peoples of the world into submission. It is far more difficult to carry through a policy that seeks to enrich and ennoble an enemy rather than have him humiliated and enslaved. If the United States has done just that with Germany and Japan, we cannot be so certain that this is not its goal everywhere. Global capitalism is unleashing world revolution not containing it.

If this analysis is correct, then a new stage of mankind is a real possibility. If it is in error, then I find little cause for optimism. Unless economic growth is sustained at ever higher levels of magnitude, and unless economic growth is spun off in the underdeveloped parts of the world, then billions are doomed to starvation. But thus far only developing capitalism has shown the capacity both to grow economically and to sustain the freedom of the individual and the freedom of the mind. Both the Soviet and

Chinese systems have failed to sustain economic growth even as they deprived the individual of freedom. They have failed to feed their people. Without the grain produced by capitalistic agriculture, the Russians and Chinese would starve to death. Should global capitalism fail to create a global community of freedom, then most, perhaps all the world is headed for disaster and no technology will save it.

Technological innovation and change will be permanent so long as capitalism develops and grows. This means that the critical, questioning, and innovating mind will be more highly prized than the conservative and the traditional. Hence there will be more freedom for the individual rather than less. The right to explore reality with uncoerced mind will be affirmed ever more strongly.

Technological innovation will likewise steadily reduce the value of brawn power even as it enhances the value of brain power. It will also increase leisure time, even as it increases profits. The exploitation of labor power or the Marxist theory of surplus value thus becomes meaningless because the upgrading of the quality of labor supply will rise together with profits and the ultimate withering away of a proletariat.

Technological advance in a global capitalist system will likewise go hand in hand with the buildup of a cosmo-politan class of corporate decision makers, scientists, and engineers whose outlook will be global and whose ideology will be humanistic.

Individual, national, and racial differences will lose the power to evoke strong hostile feelings even as they serve as a source of enrichment.

And now for Jews and Judaism. So long as capitalism was developmental, Jews everywhere benefited from emancipation and Judaism benefited from freedom. In the period of stagnation and decline Jews were the major victims and Judaism highly vulnerable. In anti-capitalist totalitarian systems, as in the Soviet Union, Jews have been discriminated against ethnically and Judaism has been all but extinguished. Since this destructive process is still going on, it is unlikely that the Soviet type system will attract many Jews as the society of the future.

It is also true that developing capitalism undercuts and undermines traditional systems and thought patterns. It frees the individual to have the religion or the irreligion of his choice. It frees the religionist to propagate the faith in a free market, but it accords an equivalent freedom to the atheist to hawk his wares. In the context of development, traditional religions tend to lose their hold on those who are linked to the developing sector of the economy. By contrast, in the context of stagnation, decline, and crisis, traditional religions have shown great recuperative powers. This was particularly manifest during the period of age-old symbols and rituals when even the intellectual and scientific elite were attracted to the Cold War.

But if, as this analysis suggests, we have entered an age of permanent economic growth and development, then traditional systems and traditional values will undergo mortal challenge. They will tend to become more and more out of joint with experience. Meaningful survival will become more and more dependent on flexibility, resiliency, and

a resonance with the novel and the untried. Traditional religious teachings will tend to have less and less applicability.

And what is more, to the extent that nurture and self-esteem are assured, and to the extent that pain and illness are controlled, the basic anxieties that have always been a fundamental source of religious feelings will cease to nourish religious institutions. "Our Father and King, spare us from famine and pestilence" will be a memento of man's experience, not an echo.

THIS is challenge indeed; a challenge that Reform Judaism should welcome. Our form of Judaism was born as a response to developing capitalism and its concomitant universals of individual freedom and the uncoerced mind. Our forefathers dared affirm that Sinai was a beginning, not the end. They said yes to development, to freedom, to risk. They did not doubt that the spirit was nurtured on freedom, not authority. They saw in the new thinking, the new science, and the new technology the dawn of a golden age for mankind. They saw in them freedom for the Jew to walk with head held high. They were willing to break with the traditional Judaism of their day because they believed that God had created man to fulfill himself as an individual. They refused to accept the ritual law as binding, for they had faith in the self-determination of the individual. They proclaimed God as the eternal ground for the realization of man's hopes and aspirations; they did not confine Him to heaven. But this faith was harshly tried in two world wars and in the seeming triumph of totalitarianism.

The time has now come when this faith can be revived. Judaism lives today because it has built within its concept of the one God the dynamic for change and development. Judaism was a developing religion long before there was capitalism. It is still a developing religion. It looks to growth and development as the path of fulfillment of man's yearning for natures, for self-esteem, for individual freedom. It is not a religion that is rooted in man's helplessness and incapacity, but in his creative potency. Its strength is not built on man's weakness. Very long ago Judaism affirmed that there was but one God and that He created one world and He fashioned one man in His image. The faith that God was one and that someday the world and man would be one was never abandoned. We are now in transit to that age. During the years of agony ahead we must not allow our faith to diminish. We know that a new kind of man is possible and that he will respond to the Judaism that has faith in him.