

Wells Wulsin  
SASS  
2010 March 3

## Einstein's Politics

### **Advert**

“That is simple my friend: because politics is more difficult than physics.” So answered Albert Einstein when asked why people could discover atomic power but not the means to control it. Even if more challenging, politics was a subject that Einstein wrote about throughout his life, taking bold and often unpopular positions. In this talk I will discuss Einstein's political views on issues including intellectual freedom, racism, and prospects for world peace.

### **Introduction**

I am not an expert on Albert Einstein, nor am I a historian at all. However, I enjoyed reading Walter Isaacson's biography of Einstein so much last summer that I thought maybe by giving a talk on Einstein's life I could persuade some of you to pick it up on your own. Much of the content of this talk comes from that biography, as well as from two other collections of Einstein's works, “Ideas and Opinions”—which includes lots of his writing on other matters besides politics—and “Einstein on Politics,” edited by David Rowe and Robert Schulmann. I've read bits of these latter two works to find Einstein's original words as well as the context in which he wrote them. I recommend all three texts, but if you have time for just one, I'd suggest starting with Isaacson, because it gives the most holistic picture of Einstein's life and science. I should also say at the outset that I take responsibility for any factual errors I may have introduced in my own retelling of the story, and plead forgiveness by reiterating that I am a student of science, not history.

Einstein's scientific accomplishments earned him widespread fame, not only within academic circles, but among the general public as well. When Arthur Eddington measured the deflection of starlight around the sun during a solar eclipse in 1919, confirming the predictions of general relativity, Einstein was launched into celebrity status possibly unequaled by any scientist in history.

His name made headlines in newspapers around the world. He drew huge crowds when he spoke, he met with statesmen, he became a household cultural icon. Everywhere he went, he was bombarded by the paparazzi. His second wife Elsa decided not to let all this attention go to waste and began charging a fee to have a photograph taken with Einstein, and then donated the proceeds to charity. It's quite a thrilling thought—that reporters and photographers would mob a theoretical physicist the way they stalk Britney Spears or Tiger Woods today.

The attention Einstein attracted from the general public gave him the opportunity to speak not only about science but also about a wide range of other topics, including philosophy, religion, and education. Today I'll focus on just one arena in which he leant his voice, that of politics.

I'll read a few selections of Einstein's writings, because I think that Einstein's own words speak more powerfully than any summarized version I could have written myself.

To give some context to these readings, let me quote a passage from the preface of Rowe and Schulman, in which they highlight two broad themes that dominate Einstein's worldview: his commitment to internationalism and to the Zionist movement.

“In his writings and correspondence...Einstein stressed above all the importance of human dignity and the need for creative freedom. His sense of social justice was defined by a fierce empathy with the underdog that served as the moral catalyst of his political engagement. And yet, his sense of responsibility for the defenseless and the underprivileged was offset by a jealously guarded independence that made him indifferent to the temptations of political influence.

“Alongside this steadfast commitment to human freedom, two central themes define his lifelong search for means to advance his moral purpose, and to our mind, these constitute the heart of his political legacy. The first was his heartfelt belief that intellectuals had a moral obligation, clearly and truthfully, to strive for international solidarity and to address the fundamental causes of national hostility. Only thus could political leaders be forced to deal with the scourge of war, the single greatest challenge facing humanity in the twentieth century. The second and no less important theme for Einstein was his personal embrace of the cultural Zionist movement as a model for restoring dignity to the powerless. He deeply hoped that this movement would not only provide a spiritual homeland for the oppressed Jews of Eastern Europe but would also serve as a symbol of humanity's search for a world community based on mutual solidarity and as an ‘ideal form of human interdependence.’

“Taken together, these two themes go a long way toward defining Einstein's political persona... As a pragmatic idealist, however, he recognized that politics was the art of achieving what is possible in a given situation. Indeed, this facet of his political persona—along with the powerful moral messages he sought to convey—make his legacy truly worthy of closer examination, especially at a time when political idealism has lost nearly all credibility. By studying the ways in which Einstein chose to advance his clearly articulated agenda we can see how far removed he really was from the mythic image of a bumbling, naïve idealist.” (Rowe xxiv-xxv)

Einstein wrote many letters, articles, and speeches related to politics, so by necessity I have chosen just a few to read here, and in many of these I have had to read just excerpts of the full version.

### **On intellectual freedom**

After the Soviet Union detonated an atomic bomb, a fear of communism spread across America. Suspected Communists were called before the House Un-American Activities Committee and other government bodies. Some refused to testify under the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment, while others argued these trials were a violation of their First Amendment rights. William Frauenglass was a school teacher from Brooklyn subpoenaed to testify before Congress, and

asked Einstein for support after reading a remark by Einstein in which he described himself as “an incorrigible nonconformist whose nonconformism in a remote field of endeavor [physics] no senatorial committee has as yet felt impelled to tackle.” Einstein's open letter to Frauenglass was published in the New York Times in 1953.

*Reading: “Open letter to William Frauenglass,” NY Times 1953, Rowe 494-495.*

The problem with which the intellectuals of this country are confronted is very serious. The reactionary politicians have managed to instill suspicion of all intellectual efforts into the public by dangling before their eyes a danger from without. Having succeeded so far, they are now proceeding to suppress the freedom of teaching and to deprive of their positions all those who do not prove submissive, i.e., to starve them.

What ought the minority of intellectuals to do against this evil? Frankly, I can see only the revolutionary way of non-cooperation in the sense of Gandhi's. Every intellectual who is called before one of the committees ought to refuse to testify, i.e., he must be prepared for jail and economic ruin, in short, for the sacrifice of his personal welfare in the interest of the cultural welfare of this country.

This refusal to testify must be based on the assertion that it is shameful for a blameless citizen to submit to such an inquisition and that this kind of inquisition violates the spirit of the Constitution.

If enough people are ready to take this grave step they will be successful. If not, then the intellectuals of this country deserve nothing better than the slavery which is intended for them.

P.S. This letter need not be considered “confidential.”

Although Einstein received a flood of mail, mostly positive, after this statement, many of the newspapers commented disapprovingly. The New York Times editorial board sharply criticized Einstein, calling the use of “the unnatural and illegal forces of civil disobedience” merely an attempt “to attack one evil with another”.

### **On a Jewish homeland**

Being Jewish, Einstein himself had experienced the pain of discrimination in Germany. To cite just one example of that, in 1909 a report by the faculty at the University of Zurich in consideration of a professorship for Einstein cites his Jewishness as a potential problem: “...Herr Dr. Einstein is an Israelite and since precisely to the Israelites among scholars are inscribed (in numerous cases not entirely without cause) all kinds of unpleasant peculiarities of character, such as intrusiveness, impudence, and a shopkeeper's mentality in the perception of their academic position.” (Isaacson 152) But thanks to the support of a colleague, Einstein was offered his first professorship, four years after he had revolutionized physics.

Einstein became a leader of the Zionist movement, speaking publicly in support of a Jewish homeland and raising money to open Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He was such a prominent figure in the Jewish community that in 1952, on the death of Chaim Weizmann, the first President of Israel, Einstein himself was offered the presidency. Though the position was only ceremonial, Einstein declined, citing his advanced age. But he also feared that his views on Jewish Arab relations might clash with the mainstream opinion in Israel, thus putting him in the uncomfortable position of having to authorize laws and policies with which he disagreed. Privately, Prime Minister David Ben Gurion did not think it was a good idea, confiding to his

secretary, “Tell me what to do if he says Yes!...If he accepts we are in for trouble.” (Rowe 355) Ben-Gurion was relieved with Einstein’s refusal of the post when they met at a black tie reception two days later, and Ben-Gurion noticed that Einstein was not wearing any socks! (Isaacson 523)

The persecution of Jews throughout Europe, culminating with the Holocaust, convinced Einstein of the need for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. And yet he was not committed to a single Jewish-majority state in the Middle East. He considered that Palestine become a binational state in which Jews and Arabs would live harmoniously side by side (Rowe 2). He proposed the creation of a council of four Jews and four Arabs to resolve any disputes. “The two great Semitic peoples have a great common future,” he said. (Isaacson 381)

However, after the founding of Israel in 1948, tensions between Jews and Arabs grew rapidly. For a conference of the United Jewish Appeal in Atlantic City, NJ, Einstein delivered a radio address on NBC, in which he blamed the British, which had occupied Palestine since the First World War, for sowing the seeds of conflict between Jews and Arabs.

*Reading: “The Jews of Israel,” NBC radio address, Rowe 352-4.*

There is no problem of such overwhelming importance to us as Jews as consolidating that which has been accomplished in Israel with amazing energy and an unequalled willingness for sacrifice. May the joy and admiration that fill us when we think of all that this small group of energetic and thoughtful people has achieved give us the strength to accept the great responsibility which the present situation has placed upon us.

When appraising the achievement, however, let us not lose sight of the cause to be served by this achievement: rescue of our endangered brethren, dispersed in many lands, by uniting them in Israel; creation of a community which conforms as closely as possible to the ethical ideals of our people as they have been formed in the course of a long history.

One of these ideals is peace, based on understanding and self-restraint, and not on violence. If we are imbued with this ideal, our joy becomes somewhat mingled with sadness, because our relations with the Arabs are far from this ideal at the present time. It may well be that we would have reached this ideal, had we been permitted to work out, undisturbed by others, our relations with our neighbors, for we *want* peace and we realize that our future development depends on peace.

It was much less our own fault or that of our neighbors than of the Mandatory Power that we did not achieve an undivided Palestine in which Jews and Arabs would live as equals, free, in peace. If one nation dominates other nations, as was the case in the British Mandate over Palestine, she can hardly avoid following the notorious device of *Divide et Impera*. In plain language this means: create discord among the governed people so they will not unite in order to shake off the yoke imposed upon them. Well, the yoke has been removed, but the seed of dissension has borne fruit and may still do harm for some time to come—let us hope not for too long.

...

It must not happen that this magnificent work breaks down because the Jews of this country do not help sufficiently or quickly enough. Here, to my mind, is a precious gift with which all Jews have been presented: the opportunity to take an active part in this wonderful task.

## **On racism**

As with discrimination against Jews, Einstein was disturbed by the racial discrimination he saw in America. He wrote the following article in 1946. Though many of these observations

may seem obvious today, remember that he was writing 8 years before the Brown v. Board of Education, 9 years before Rosa Parks took a stand, 17 years before Martin Luther King's I have a Dream speech.

Although in the original version, Einstein used the word "Negro," I'll use "African-American" instead, since he would surely have used this accepted term were he alive today.

*Reading: "A Message to my adopted country" Pageant 1, 1946, Rowe 474-476.*

...  
In the United States everyone feels assured of his worth as an individual. No one humbles himself before another person or class. Even the great difference in wealth, the superior power of a few, cannot undermine this healthy self-confidence and natural respect for the dignity of one's fellow-man.

There is, however, a somber point in the social outlook of Americans. Their sense of equality and human dignity is mainly limited to men of white skins. Even among these there are prejudices of which I as a Jew am clearly conscious; but they are unimportant in comparison with the attitude of the "Whites" toward their fellow-citizens of darker complexion, particularly toward Negroes. The more I feel an American, the more this situation pains me. I can escape the feeling of complicity in it only by speaking out.

Many a sincere person will answer me: "Our attitude toward Negroes is the result of unfavorable experiences which we have had by living side by side with Negroes in this country. They are not our equals in intelligence, sense of responsibility, reliability."

I am firmly convinced that whoever believes this suffers from a fatal misconception. Your ancestors dragged these black people from their homes by force; and in the white man's quest for wealth and an easy life they have been ruthlessly suppressed and exploited, degraded into slavery. The modern prejudice against Negroes is the result of the desire to maintain this unworthy condition.

...  
I believe that whoever tries to think things through honestly will soon recognize how unworthy and even fatal is the traditional bias against Negroes.

What, however, can the man of good will do to combat this deeply rooted prejudice? He must have the courage to set an example by word and deed, and must watch lest his children become influenced by this racial bias.

I do not believe there is a way in which this deeply entrenched evil can be quickly healed. But until this goal is reached there is no greater satisfaction for a just and well-meaning person than the knowledge that he has devoted his best energies to the service of the good cause.

That is precisely what I have tried to do in writing this.

There are other examples of Einstein taking a stand against racism. In 1937 the renowned concert singer Marian Anderson visited Princeton to perform but was denied accommodation at the whites-only Nassau Inn. So Einstein invited her to stay at his home, which she did repeatedly over the years. (Jerome 4)

In 1946, after the lynching of two African-Americans in Georgia, Einstein co-founded the American Crusade to End Lynching with Paul Robeson. They demanded that Congress make lynching a federal crime, but President Truman responded, "The time is not right." (Jerome 2)

And in 1951, the African-American scholar and founder of the NAACP WEB DuBois was arrested and charged with being a "foreign agent." He was taken to court, where the prosecution presented its case. The defense attorney told the judge that Albert Einstein was

prepared to appear as the first character witness, and after a recess, the judge dismissed the case. (Jerome 3)

### **On conscientious objection**

The second dominant theme of Einstein's politics was his commitment to international cooperation. Part of this was his opposition to war. He gave the following speech extemporaneously at a meeting at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in New York of the New History Society, which was an offshoot of the pacifist Baha'i religious movement. It was later published by the New York Times and became a manifesto for war resisters.

*Reading: "Two Percent Speech", New History Society, Carlton Hotel, New York, 1930, Rowe 240-1.*

When those who are bound together by pacifist ideals hold a meeting they are always consorting with their own kind only. They are like sheep huddled together while the wolves wait outside. I think pacifist speakers have this difficulty: they usually reach their own crowd, who are pacifists already. The sheep's voice does not get beyond this circle and therefore is ineffective. That is the trouble with the pacifist movement.

Real pacifists, those who are not up in the clouds but who think and count realities, must fearlessly try to do things of practical value to the cause and not merely speak about pacifism. Deeds are needed. Mere words do not get pacifists anywhere. They must initiate action and begin with what can be done at once.

As to what our next step should be, I should like you to realize that under our present system of military duty everyone is compelled to commit a crime—the crime of killing people for his country. The aim of all pacifists must be to convince others of the immorality of war and rid the world of the shameful slavery of military service. I wish to suggest two ways to achieve that aim.

The first has already been put into practice. It is uncompromising war resistance, refusal to do military service under any circumstances. In countries where conscription is established, the real pacifist must refuse military duty. A large number of pacifists in many countries are refusing at great personal sacrifice to serve their military term in peace-time. By doing so, they indicate that they will not fight if there should be war.

In countries where compulsory service does not obtain, real pacifists must in time of peace publicly declare that they will not take up arms under any circumstances. This, too, is an effective way of announcing one's war resistance. I earnestly advise recruiting people with this idea all over the world. For the timid who say, "What is the use? We might be shut up in prison," I add: even if only two percent of those supposed to perform military service should declare themselves war resisters and assert, "We are not going to fight. We need other methods of settling international disputes," the governments would be powerless—they could not put such masses into jail.

As a second line of action for war resisters I suggest something which appears to be less illegal. That is, to try to establish through international legislation the right to refuse military service in peace-time. Those who are unwilling to accept the obligation might advocate legislation which would permit them to do some strenuous or even dangerous work, each for his country or for mankind, in place of military service, to prove that their war resistance is unselfish—a consequence of their belief that international differences can be settled other than by fighting; to prove that they do not oppose war for their personal comfort or because of cowardice or because they do not want to serve their country or humanity. If we take upon ourselves such

dangerous occupations we shall be advancing far on the road to the pacification of the world.

After this speech, buttons labeled with nothing but “2%” began popping up on students and pacifists, sometimes causing confusion when they were taken to refer to 2% beer.

### **On international peace**

Einstein was a pacifist—even a “militant pacifist” he once declared—but he was also a realist. He believed that the only way to ultimately curb the use of military force would be the threat of greater force in retaliation. He saw a single path to the abolition of war: the creation of an international governing body with the authority to use military power to resolve disputes between nations. For Einstein, world government was the only solution that would bring lasting peace. He expected a supranational body would lead to some problems, but thought them vastly preferable to the inter-state violence that would continue without one.

Einstein held few sentiments of nationalism. He once summed up his internationalist position simply: “By heritage I am a Jew, by nationality Swiss, by conviction a human being and *only* a human being with no particular penchant for a state or national entity.” (Rowe 1) He saw loyalty to one country over others as a major obstacle to ending global conflict. Peace could only come when people developed an understanding and respect for societies different from their own. This commitment to internationalism is one of the dominant themes that Einstein wrote about throughout his life.

In this passage he discusses how these ideas can help lay the foundation for lasting peace.

*Reading: “Atomic War or Peace”, interview with Raymond Swing, Atlantic Monthly 1945, Rowe 373-6.*

The release of atomic energy has not created a new problem. It has merely made more urgent the necessity of solving an existing one. One could say that it has affected us quantitatively, not qualitatively. As long as there are sovereign nations possessing great power, war is inevitable. This does not mean that one can know when war will come but only that one is sure that it will come. This was true even before the atomic bomb was made. What has changed is the destructiveness of war.

I do not believe that the secret of the bomb should be given to the United Nations Organization. I do not believe it should be given to the Soviet Union. Either course would be analogous to a man with capital who, wishing another individual to collaborate with him on an enterprise, starts by giving him half his money. The other man might choose to start a rival enterprise, when what is wanted is his cooperation. The secret of the bomb should be committed to a world government, and the United States should immediately announce its readiness to do so. Such a world government should be established by the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain, the only three powers which possess great military strength. The three of them should commit to this world government all of their military resources. The fact that there are only three nations with great military power should make it easier, rather than harder, to establish a world government.

Since the United States and Great Britain have the secret of the atomic bomb and the Soviet Union does not, they should invite the Soviet Union to prepare and present the first draft of a Constitution for the proposed world government. This would help to dispel the distrust of the Russians, which they feel because they know the bomb is being kept a secret chiefly to prevent their having it. Obviously the first draft would not be the final one, but the Russians should be

able to feel that the world government will guarantee their security.

It would be wise if this Constitution were to be negotiated by one American, one Briton and one Russian. They would, of course, need advisers, but these advisers should serve only when asked. I believe three men can succeed in preparing a workable Constitution acceptable to all the powers. Were six or seven men, or more, to attempt to do so, they would probably fail. After the three great powers have drafted a Constitution and adopted it, the smaller nations should be invited to join the world government. They should also be free not to join and, though they should feel perfectly secure outside the world government, I am sure they will eventually wish to join. Naturally, they should be entitled to propose changes in the Constitution as drafted by the Big Three. But the Big Three should go ahead and organize the world government, whether or not the smaller nations decide to join.

Such a world government should have jurisdiction over all military matters, and it need have only one other power. That is the power to interfere in countries where a minority is oppressing the majority and, therefore, is creating the kind of instability that leads to war. For example, conditions as they exist today in Argentina and Spain should be dealt with. There must be an end to the concept of non-intervention, for to abandon non-intervention in certain circumstances is part of keeping the peace.

...

Do I fear the tyranny of world government? Of course I do. But I fear still more the coming of another war. Any government is certain to be evil to some extent. But a world government is preferable to the far greater evil of wars, particularly when viewed in the context of the intensified destructiveness of war. If such a world government is not established by a process of agreement among nations, I believe it will come anyway, and in a much more dangerous form; for war or wars can only result in one power being supreme and dominating the rest of the world by its overwhelming military supremacy.

Now that we have the atomic secret, we must not lose it, and that is what we would risk doing if we gave it to the United Nations Organization or to the Soviet Union. But, as soon as possible, we must make it clear that we are not keeping the bomb a secret for the sake of maintaining our power but in the hope of establishing peace through world government, and that we will do our utmost to bring this world government into being.

I appreciate that there are persons who approve of world government as the ultimate objective but favor a gradual approach to its establishment. The trouble with taking little steps, one at a time, in the hope of eventually reaching the ultimate goal, is that while such steps are being taken, we continue to keep the bomb without convincing those who do not have the bomb of our ultimate intentions. That of itself creates fear and suspicion, with the consequence that the relations between rival countries deteriorate to a dangerous extent. That is why people who advocate taking a step at a time may think they are approaching world peace, but they actually are contributing by their slow pace to the possibility of war. We have no time to waste in this way. If war is to be averted, it must be done quickly.

## **On the atomic bomb**

One of Einstein's most famous public policy actions was the 1939 letter that he wrote to President Franklin Roosevelt, promoting research into nuclear fission with the possibility of building an atomic weapon. This letter prompted government action which eventually led to the creation of the Manhattan Project.

After the bomb was used twice in the war, an editor of a Japanese newspaper, *Kaizo*, asked Einstein to respond to the use of the atomic bomb. This is what he wrote back to the

editor.

*Reading: "Reply to the Editor of Kaizo", 1952, Rowe 488-489.*

My participation in the production of the atomic bomb consisted of one single act: I signed a letter to President Roosevelt, in which I emphasized the necessity of conducting large-scale experimentation with regard to the feasibility of producing an atom bomb.

I was well aware of the dreadful danger for all of mankind were the experiments to prove successful. Yet I felt compelled to take the step because it seemed probable that the Germans might be working on the same problem with every prospect of success. I saw no alternative but to act as I did, *although I have always been a convinced pacifist.*

I believe that the killing of human beings in a war is no better than common murder; but so long as nations lack the determination to abolish war through common action and find means of solving their disputes and safeguarding their interests by peaceful arrangements according to existing laws, they will continue to consider it necessary to prepare for war. They will feel compelled to engage in the manufacture of even the most detestable weapons in their fear that they may lag behind in the general arms race. Such an approach can only lead to war, and warfare today would mean universal annihilation of human beings.

There is little point, therefore, in opposing the manufacture of specific weapons; the only solution is to abolish both war and the threat of war. That is the goal toward which we should strive. We must be determined to reject all activities which in any way contradict this goal. This is a harsh demand for any individual who is conscious of his dependence upon society; but it is not an impossible demand.

Gandhi, the greatest political genius of our time, indicated the path to be taken. He gave proof of what sacrifice man is capable once he has discovered the right path. His work in behalf of India's liberation is living testimony to the fact that man's will, sustained by an indomitable conviction, is more powerful than material forces that seem insurmountable.

### **On global divisions**

In April 1955 the Israeli Ambassador to the United States asked Einstein to give a radio address to commemorate the seventh anniversary of the founding of Israel. It would be heard by as many as 60 million listeners. Einstein saw the birth of Israel as one of those rare political acts which had a moral quality, but he was worried about the tensions between Jews and Arabs. "The attitude we adopt toward the Arab minority will provide the real test of our moral standards as a people," he had said to a friend just weeks before. Rather than just celebrate independence, Einstein wanted to expand the speech to discuss the persistent divisions of peoples around the globe. (Isaacson 541) He began to draft the speech, but became sick and died before he could deliver it. This is what he had written.

*Reading: "Final undelivered message to the world," prepared remarks for a speech to Israeli consul in New York, 1955, Israel/Arab conflict, Rowe 506-7.*

I speak to you today not as an American citizen and not as a Jew, but as a human being who seeks with the greatest seriousness to look at things objectively. What I seek to accomplish is simply to serve with my feeble capacity truth and justice at the risk of pleasing no one.

At issue is the conflict between Israel and Egypt. You may consider this a small and insignificant problem and may feel that there are more serious things to worry about. But this is not true. In matters concerning truth and justice there can be no distinction between big problems

and small; for the general principles which determine the conduct of men are indivisible. Whoever is careless with the truth in small matters cannot be trusted in important affairs.

This indivisibility applies not only to moral but also to political problems; for little problems cannot be properly appreciated unless they are understood in their interdependence with big problems. And the big problem in our time is the division of mankind into two hostile camps: the Communist World and the so-called Free World. Since the significance of the terms *Free* and *Communist* is in this context hardly clear to me, I prefer to speak of a power conflict between East and West, although, the world being round, it is not even clear what precisely is meant by the terms *East* and *West*.

In essence, the conflict that exists today is no more than an old-style struggle for power, once again presented to mankind in semireligious trappings. The difference is that, this time, the development of atomic power has imbued the struggle with a ghostly character; for both parties know and admit that, should the quarrel deteriorate into actual war, mankind is doomed. Despite this knowledge, statesmen in responsible positions on both sides continue to employ the well-known technique of seeking to intimidate and demoralize the opponent by marshaling superior military strength. They do so even though such a policy entails the risk of war and doom. Not one statesman in a position of responsibility has dared to pursue the only course that holds out any promise of peace, the course of supranational security, since for a statesman to follow such a course would be tantamount to political suicide. Political passions, once they have been fanned into flames, exact their victims.

## Conclusion

I'd like to close with a summary of Einstein's political views from Walter Isaacson. He writes, "Einstein's instinct for unification was ingrained in his personality and reflected in his politics. Just as he sought a unified theory in science that could govern the cosmos, so he sought one in politics that could govern the planet, one that would overcome the anarchy of unfettered nationalism through a world federalism based on universal principles." (Isaacson 550) In one of the final lines of the book Isaacson sums up Einstein's character in a single sentence: "He was a loner with an intimate bond to humanity, a rebel who was suffused with reverence." (Isaacson 551)

## References

Isaacson, Walter, *Einstein: His life and universe*, Simon & Schuster, 2007.

Rowe, David and Robert Schulman, *Einstein on Politics: His private thoughts and public stands on nationalism, Zionism, war, peace, and the bomb*, Princeton University Press, 2007.

Einstein, Albert, *Ideas and Opinions*, Three Rivers Press, 1954.

Jerome, Fred and Rodger Taylor, "Einstein as Citizen: Addressing race and racism," *SPS Observer*, Spring/summer 2009.