

The Christian and the World Economic Crisis.

I. The Crisis.

23 years ago the ~~stroke~~ ^{stroke} in the midst of which we stand at present.

The transformation of empires only a ~~small~~ part of the process. Ineed, the superficial aspect of it. Since the middle of the twenties much greater changes on.

World economic crisis 1929-1936.

The "world economic crisis" now practically over. The ~~trade~~ ^{production} figures back to 1929 ~~and over.~~ ^{and over. The trade figures are not.}

But the effects of the crisis very great indeed.

But are we justified to regard them as the effects of the ^{crisis?}

The right view: The world economic crisis only part of a ~~universal~~ ^{universal} process of a universal character.

Was it political or economic, or both?

II. The "effects" of the world economic crisis.

The international organisation of economic life ^{has gone!} destroyed.

- a/ International trade organised under free trade.
- b/ International currency organisation. (gold standard).
- c/ International capital markets (free capital exports).

Instead, a vast movement for autarchy i.e. separate politico-economic units set up all over the world.

- a/ National organisation of trade (quotas, tariffs, subsidies)
- b/ Managed currencies. (equalisation funds)
- c/ No international lending.

III. The political interpretation or the other way round?

a. Increasing imperialistic tension makes the international organisation of life impossible. (Gold standard, free trade, capital exports)

by political we mean: international affairs

WAR DANGER (nationalism) ^{capital exports}
War danger leads to autarchy. (grain supplies, gold hoarding, raw material substitute etc.)

by economic we mean: national affairs

b. Increasing ^{national integritia} economic isolation, lack of elasticity leading to ~~to~~ increasing political tension. AUTARCHY (of monopoly capitalism). Autarchy leads to war danger.

c. Obviously, the two kinds of effects would interact. If, for political reasons e.g. (war danger) ^{some measure of} autarchy was forced upon the nations, then economic internationalism would become unworkable, and they would be constrained to continue on the road to economic autarchy whether they wanted to (on political grounds) or not.

If, for economic reasons (of monopoly capitalism) ^{some measure of} economic isolationism was forced upon the ~~nations~~ ^{nations} separately

separately, this would tend to create a political tension in the international field which would have all the consequences described above.

III The political motives must strengthen the economic ones, and vice versa, necessarily.

Such an approach reveals that it is impossible to separate the economic from the political causes. We can distinguish them, but only to find that they mutually reinforce one another. It is always possible to find an economic reason behind a political one and so on. But the two series of causes are interdependent. They reinforce one another all the time. This proves that they are part of a deeper underlying reason which determines them both and of the which they are only two different effects in two different spheres.

We are faced with one total crisis of the system as a whole. *It is a religious crisis. It concerns the very life of human life*
 What is that system? What does the crisis consist in? And by what has it been tended? and its development determined?

IV. The Crisis of Capitalism in a Democratic society.

A/ Our economic system. (Capitalism: A system of free competition under the private ownership of the means of production).

- a. production governed by prices. b. These created by markets. Interest, rent, commodity prices, wages. Markets for everything.
- b. automatism, blind forces, play of natural laws ("quasi natural laws")
- c. experimental, transitional, extremely abnormal, special and ~~unnatural~~ artificial.
- d. quantitative limits to the "positive" effects of such a system.
 - aa. numbers of units involved;
 - bb. dimensions of units.

B/ Our economic system as a part of society.

- a. A separate, autonomous, detached sphere ~~with~~ within society.
- b. Non-commodities either artificially made into commodities (fictitiously) or dealt with as mere accessories of the commodity attached to them.

THE COMMODITY CHARACTER OF LABOUR.

- (land, natural resources, education etc depending on income).
- c. Human and social interests and values mere accessories. Their existence and survival cannot be safeguarded organically

- e.g. security of individual, *existence*,
 stability of human ~~existence~~, *social conditions*
 justice in the distribution of goods and ~~total~~,
 - family, craftsmanship, nationality, countryside
- d. moral development of mankind held up by fragmenta-
 tion of human life:
- a. the market makes human relationships imper-
 personal (we cannot serve one another)
 - b. the wholeness of individual life is destroyed
 by the fact that part of ourselves
 becomes "capital" and governs the rest
 of our creative life.
 - c. the fetish character of commodity value
 creates false objectifications like
 capital, demand, supply, that destroy
 the direct, immediate, human, personal
 character of life.
 - d. only one class responsible for the carry-
 on of production; the working class
 without insight and responsibility. The
 - e. denial of community involved in several
 respects:
 - aa. the solidarity of common huma-
 nity denied by such a system;
 - bb. the solidarity of mankind denied
 lack of unity in the nation;
 international tasks insoluble.

C/ Our political system as a representative of society.

Laissez faire was challenged in practice long before it
 it could have drawn the whole range of industrial organiza-
 tion into its orbit.

A contrary movement going on together with the expansio-
 sion of the sphere of economic competition: the
 protective reactions of society as a whole to the
 destructive effects of economic liberalism.

No ~~amount~~ amount of material goods produced could
 compensate for the loss of safety, sanity, se-
 curity, moral decency and ~~humanity~~ humanity common humani-
 ty involved in the new conditions.

The social history of the XIXth century became a blend
 of liberal capitalism and the protective measures
 forced upon society by the devastating effects
 of the capitalist experiment.

D./ The reaction of political democracy to economic liberalism.

D./ The reaction of political democracy to economic liberalism.

Under liberal capitalism the economic system tends to become separate and autonomous sphere in society.

Conversely, the political system gains an artificial independence.

Industrial and economic affairs cease to be also political. The political State is not supposed to interfere with economic life.

The further the original unity of society under feudalism is discarded in favour of the separation of politics and economics, the more completely economics tend to absorb all other spheres of social existence, restricting the political state proper to the role of the famous night watchman. (All actual activities being dependent upon material means, the economic sphere becomes the dominant sphere: the means begin to rule over the ends.)

But the absorption of society by liberal capitalism would amount to no less than the complete destruction of society by capitalism. Society reacts to this peril (as we said). The state starts out to regulate, limit, control, the economic sphere.

The outcome of this is that the state begins to reintegrate what the separation of politics and economics had disintegrated. While liberalism was dividing up society into distinct economic, political and other spheres, political intervention tends to integrate them again.

The State and industry mutually interpenetrate.

E./ Organised Capitalism.

It is this partial and incidental reintegration of society that has been often described as the transition from liberal to organised Capitalism. In the last quarter of the XIXth and the first decennium of the XXth century.

Undoubtedly, many of the dangers threatening society from the blind forces of an automatic system were lessened and many tensions and contradictions inherent in a competitive system were alleviated.

But the class structure of capitalist society proved an insurmountable barrier to organised Capitalism. The economic system implied the separation of society into two classes: the owners of the means of production and the actual producers whose economic existence depended upon the economic dispositions (actions) of the owners.

The owners have not freedom of action whatever. Bound to act according to the law of prices. Only justification of the hardship incurred (the stewardship principle). Not for them to consider the effects of their actions on society as a whole.

Economic power wielded by one class. Political power (of number) by another.

To a true reintegration of society

in virtue of

The economic system becoming the fortress of the one class, the political system of another.

The cleavage between economics and politics, the State and Industry was bridged by a system of complicated deals and compromises. An uneasy balance between the two main social classes achieved.

The interpenetration of State and Industry in "organised Capitalism" represented this state of affairs. A more complete reintegration of economic and politics was prevented by the class structure of society due to the capitalist system.

Beneath the superficial and incomplete reintegration the basic incompatibility of capitalism and political democracy continued. THE UNITY OF SOCIETY WAS NOT RESTORED.

RIGID, inelastic economic systems are the outcome. A diminishing capacity for adjustment is the price of the increased security, stability, sanity and safety, in society.

F/ The effects of the War.

This state of affairs was one of the causes of the great War. Free trade had disappeared. Tariffs, struggle for preferential markets, capital exports into monopolised fields and so on.

BUT MORE IMPORTANT STILL, the war reacted on this system and precipitated the greatest crisis of all.

Major adjustments were needed all over the world. These systems were unable to go onto major adjustments. Vast efforts were made to enforce them (the vast but necessarily unsuccessful effort of the post-War stabilisations or rather return to the Gold Standard was of this kind).

Under the pressure of these needs the imperfect integration broke down everywhere. A complete integration of politics and economics i.e. of society as a whole was inevitable.

A ghastly tragedy occurred. The means got the better of the ends. Interference proved unworkable. The compromises broke down. Politico economic units emerged on the FASCIST BASIS i.e. on the basis of capitalism sacrificing democracy.

G./ Fascist effort to organise society on this basis of Capitalism.

Of ~~reformed capitalism~~ capitalism anymore, but of a kind of reformed Capitalism reformed at the price of

- a. individual liberty and the idea of individual responsibility as the organising unit of society
- b. the organisation of international life as the common task of the nations.

The non adjustment accepted as final. International economic interdependence is not denied or ended but taken as a starting point for irreducible enmity.

The Christian and the World Economic Crisis.

I. The Crisis.

23 years ago the strombroke in the midst of which we stand at present.

The transformation of empires only a small part of the process. Ineed, the superficial aspect of it. Since the middle of the twenties much greater changes on World economic crisis 1929-1936.

The "world economic crisis" now practically over. The trade figures back to 1929.

But the effects of the crisis very great indeed.

But are we justified to regard them as the effects of the

The right view: The world economic crisis only part of a universal process of a universal character.

Was it political or economic, or both?

II. The "effects" of the world economic crisis.

The international organisation of economic life destroyed.

- a/ International trade organised under free trade.
- b/ International currency organisation. (gold standard).
- c/ International capital markets (free capital exports).

Instead a vast movement for autarchy i.e. separate politico-economic units set up all over the world.

- a/ National organisation of trade (quotas, tariffs, subsidies)
- b/ Managed currencies. (equalisation funds)
- c/ No international lending

III. The political interpretation or the other way round?

a. Increasing imperialistic tension makes the international organisation of life impossible. (gold standard,

WAR DANGER (nationalism) free trade, capital exports)
War danger leads to autarchy. (grain supplies, gold hoarding, raw material substitute etc.)

b. Increasing economic isolationism, lack of elasticity leading to increasing political tension.

AUTARCHY (of monopoly capitalism).
Autarchy leads to war danger.

c. Obviously, the two kinds of effects would interact.

If, for political reasons e.g. (war danger) autarchy was forced upon the nations, then economic internationalism would become unworkable, and they would be constrained to continue on the road to economic autarchy whether they wanted to (on political grounds) or not.

If, for economic reasons of monopoly capitalism economic isolationism was forced upon the ~~individual~~ nation separately

separately, this would tend to create a political tension in the international field which would have all the consequences described above.

EM The political motives must strengthen the economic ones, and vice versa, necessarily.

Such an approach reveals that it is impossible to separate the economic from the political causes. We can distinguish them, but only to find that they mutually reinforce one another. It is always possible to find an economic reason behind a political one and so on. But the two series of causes are interdependent. They reinforce one another all the time. This proves that they are part of a deeper underlying reason which determines them both and of the which they are only two different effects in two different spheres.

We are faced with one total crisis of the system as a whole.

What is that system? What does the crisis consist in? And by what has it been tamed? and its development determined?

our society.

IV. The Crisis of Capitalism in a Democratic society.

A/ Our economic system (Capitalism: A system of free competition under the private ownership of the means of production).

- a. production governed by prices. These created by markets. Interest, rent, commodity prices, wages. Markets for everything.
- b. automatism, blind forces, play of natural laws ("quasi natural laws")
- c. experimental, transitional, extremely abnormal, special and unnatural.
- d. quantitative limits to the "positive" effects of such a system.
 - aa. numbers of units involved;
 - bb. dimensions of units.

B/ Our economic system as a part of society.

- a. A separate, autonomous, detached sphere within society.
- b. Non-commodities either artificially made into commodities (fictitiously) or dealt with as mere accessories of the commodity attached to them.

THE COMMODITY CHARACTER OF LABOUR
(land, natural resources, education etc depending on income).

- c. Human and social interests and values mere accessories. Their existence and survival cannot be safeguarded organically.

- e.g. security of individual,
stability of human existence,
justice in the distribution of goods and total,
family, craftsmanship, nationality, countryside
- d. moral development of mankind held up by fragmenta-
tion of human life:
- a. the market makes human relationships imper-
personal (we cannot serve one another)
 - b. the wholeness of individual life is destroyed
by the fact that part of ourselves
becomes "capital" and governs the rest
of our creative life.
 - c. the fetish character of commodity value
creates false objectifications like
capital, demand, supply, that destroy
the direct, immediate, human, personal
character of life.
 - d. only one class responsible for the carryi-
on of production; the working class
without insight and responsibility. The
 - e. denial of community involved in several
respects:
 - aa. the solidarity of common human
mankind denied by such a system;
 - bb. the solidarity of mankind denied
lack of unity in the nation;
international tasks insoluble.

C/ Our political system as a representative of society.

Laissez faire was challenged in practice long before it
it could have drawn the whole range of industrial organiza-
tion into its orbit.

A contrary movement going on together with the expansion
of the sphere of economic competition: the
protective reactions of society as a whole to the
destructive effects of economic liberalism.

No ~~amount~~ amount of material goods produced could
compensate for the loss of safety, sanity, se-
curity, moral decency and ~~humanity~~ common humanity
involved in the new conditions.

The social history of the XIXth century became a blend
of liberal capitalism and the protective measures
forced upon society by the devastating effects
of the capitalist experiment.

D./ The reaction of political democracy to economic liberalism.

D./ The reaction of political democracy to economic liberalism.

Under liberal capitalism the economic system tends to become separate and autonomous sphere in society.

Conversely, the political system gains an artificial independence.

Industrial and economic affairs cease to be also political; the political State is not supposed to interfere with economic life.

The further the original unity of society under feudalism is discarded in favour of the separation of politics and economics, the more completely economics tend to absorb all other spheres of social existence, restricting the political state proper to the role of the famous night watchman. (All actual activities being dependent upon material means, the economic sphere becomes the dominant sphere: the means begin to rule over the ends.)

But the absorption of society by liberal capitalism would amount to no less than the complete destruction of society by capitalism. Society reacts to this peril (as we said) The state starts out to regulate, limit, control, the economic sphere.

The outcome of this is that the state begins to reintegrate what the separation of politics and economics had disintegrated. While liberalism was dividing up society into distinct economic, political and other spheres, political intervention tends to integrate them again.

The State and Industry mutually interpenetrate.

E./ Organised Capitalism.

It is this partial and incidental reintegration of society that has been often described as the transition from liberal to organised Capitalism, in the last quarter of the XIXth and the first decennium of the XXth century.

Undoubtedly, many of the dangers threatening society from the blind forces of an automatic system were lessened and many tensions and contradictions inherent in a competitive system were alleviated.

But the class structure of capitalist society proved an insurmountable barrier to organised Capitalism. The economic system implied the separation of society into two classes: the owners of the means of production and the actual producers whose economic existence depended upon the economic dispositions (actions) of the owners.

The owners have no freedom of action whatever. Bound to act according to the law of prices. Only justification of the hardship incurred (the stewardship principle). Not for them to consider the effects of their actions on society as a whole.

Economic power held by one class. Political power (of number

The destruction of democracy accepted as final in order to eliminate the influence of the actual producers who can have no say in the productive process under capitalism.

A new religion introduced in order to transform the nature of man, or at least the laws of his consciousness in accordance with the needs of this state affairs.

Christianity fought by consistent Fascists. A subhuman community needed. The higher type of community is the Christian community.

To-day it means internationalism and socialism.

The integration of society by socialism the task of Christianity today. If it is left to Fascism, the false integration comes about at the cost of the ~~the~~ elements in man which are the true life.

It is the way out at the cost of degeneration and destruction in war and famine. It is unacceptable to the Christian. It is the denial of all the values his civilisation is built upon.

Christianity must supply our generation with the force which looks beyond self interest. The time will come when the seed will grow and the birds of the ~~heavens~~ heaven will take cover of under it.

00000000 (0000000000000000) 00000000 (0000000000000000) 00000000

Engedjék meg hogy a külpolitikára szoritkozzam ,

A. A hatalmi egyensuly rendszere.

Bátran lehet allitani hogy napjainkban a külpolitika egy uj korszakaba leptunk. Sokan erzik hogy valami oriási fordulat küszöben allunk, de hogy milyen irányban rejlik a jövő, azt mély homály fedi. Pedig, és ez egyik fő mondani valonk, ~~ahapi politikát ma már nem lehet megérteni,~~ anélkül hogy a ~~hatalmi egyensuly~~ új külpolitikai rendszert megértsük. Itt rejlik a titka Amerika, Anglia es Oroszország jelenlegi viszonyanak

106 éves Béke. (dot)

A 19 század/külpolitikájáig egyetlen tény domináljjá : A Száz Éves Béke, amely 1815- 1914 terjedt. Ennek a megmagyarázása a történészek fő prob-maja máma. A tény maga nem vitathatosel:

A 19 században általános háboru nem volt (olyan amelyben a nagy hatalmak mind- vagy a többségük , részt vett volna). De még hosszú és pusztító háboru sem volt a hatalmak között. Bár szakatlanul valahol harcoltak, minden ilyen is koloniális betörést és kis ~~hatalom~~ állam meg-fegyverítést loaklizáltak. Számokban mérve: Az ~~európai~~ ^{európai} hatalmak között összesen 3 1/2 évig volt háboru. Az előző században, és a megelőzőben 60 -70 évig ennek a megfelelője. Ebből a 3 1/2 évből teljes kettő esik a krimi háborura (1854-1856) . Marad három háboru: 6 hónap a francia-osztrak -szardinaiai háboru 1859 ben; 6 hét az osztrak- porosz háboru 1866-ban és 9 hónap a francia- porosz háboru 1870/71 ben, összesen 17 1/2 hónap ~~ez~~ ^{ez} században!

Hatalmi egyensuly rendszere

Politikailag ez a század a hatalmi egyensuly rendszere alatt élt. De ez a rendszer nem volt új es azonfelül nem igen magyarázhatja meg ezt az eredményt.

T. higgatlan
29a. 13a
intha. P
Koalíciókat
amikor
Változó
háborúkkal.

Mi a hatalmi egyensuly rendszere es mi a normális eredménye? Több mint két állam mindig úgy viselkedik hogy az egyik erősödése ellen a többiek összeállnak. Ennek az eredménye, hogy az államok fennmaradása biztosítva van, mert bármely állam eltűnése - pléaul , feldarabolása- eltolná a hatalmi egyensulyt es így túl sok érdeket sértené. Ez ~~szintén~~ ^{szintén} eredmény a kis-államokat es megvédi, mert azoknak a felszívása ~~ugyanis~~ ^{ugyanis} ~~tulcsagan~~ ^{tulcsagan} eltolná a hatalmi egyensulyt. Bizonyitek: 1648 ban a Westfali békét aláíró hatalmak egymást garantáltak es tenyleg 200 évet egy kis állam sem tűnt el a térképről. (Hogy milyen hamar eltudnak tűnni azt mi 1938 óta lattuk, amikor a hatalmi egyensuly megszűnt!) Az államok függetlenségének a fenntartása-- kiesikie es nagyoke egyaránt- ez a rendszer eredménye.

Közvetlen

De nem a béke. A hatalmi egyensuly háboru es háborús fehéregetésen ~~sz~~ ^{sz} hat. Görögország az ókorban, ~~Észak~~ ^{Észak} Olaszország a 15. században, Európa a 17század közepétől a 19sz. elejéig szakadatlan háboruk szifere volt-- a hatalmi egyensuly jegyében.

Mi okozta hogy a hatalmi egyensuly a 19 sz. bantásképen hatott? A válasz gazdasági, ~~első~~ ^{első} sorban. A liberális kapitalizmus egy olynan új érdeket hozott felszínre, amely addig a politikában alig szerepelt, es soha főerdek nem volt, ugyanis , a beke-erdek. A beke addig csak dísz es ék volt , amilyen a művészetek viragzása , ~~de~~ ^{de} nem ~~szükséges~~ ^{szükséges} állam-erdek, amleyet meg a ~~függetlenség~~ ^{függetlenség} rovasára is meg kell örizni.

Szabadság es

A piac gazdasag ~~villag~~ ^{villag} elterjedése minden allmaot bele vont a ~~sz~~ ^{sz} ipari

(Uj külpolitikai A B C)

(hanem csak birodalmak...)

a sarat a jövőben (te tekintetben a Brit Commonwealthre az Amerikákra utalt).. ~~akkor birodalmi szema szent 17-él 19-re ugrott volt...~~

Milyen indokolást ~~adott~~ *adott* Toynbee a nagyhatalmi rendszer allitolagos bukasa/á számára?

1875 óta a nemzetiségi elv es a gazdasági autar káa a nagyhatalmi forma féle tendalt, mondja. Peldak: Nemteroszrag es Olaszország 1870 es 1871 ben. 1900 óta ez megofrditva volt: A nemzetiségi elv szetszedte a Szultan, a a Czar, a Csaszar birodalmiat. A gazdaság tulnött az államkerekten, világ gazdasag lett.

A nagyhatalmi rendszer nem tartó el.

nem előjár a kiterjedésben

Tenyleg egészen más törtent. De miért? Mert az államok maguk új alapra ~~széleskelték is új formát öltettek.~~ A nemzetiségi elv es az autarkia helyett, egy meg alapvetőbb tartalom nyertek: a szocialis rendszerét. *(A liberalis vagyis piac gazdasági rend bukásával renkívül különböző megoldásokra került a sor mindenütt.)* Roosevelt világforradalomból beszél es arról hogy itt tarsadalmi rendszerek versenyéről van szo- Ez közhelymama... De mit jelent a külpolitika szempontjából hogy az állam nem nemzeti, nem gazdasági, hanem tarsadalmi egységeket képviselnek *(előszörban)* *(autarkiai)*

es birodalmi formát öltözik!

C. Tarsadalmi típusok -- külpolitikai szempontból.

Ebből a szempontból két féle tarsadalmi szövet van: olyan amelyik univerzális, vagyis az egész civilizációra szükségkepek kiterjedő; es olyan amelyik nem ilyen, hanem csupan regionalis szövet.

A nyugati világban a középkor példája egy univerzalista szövetnek. Az az egyház rendje nemcsak elvben hanem gyakorlatban is univerzális volt. Szinte hihetetlen egyöntetűség jellemzte Iracsagtól legalább az orosz határig, es ~~azontul is~~ *ahonnan* a tarsadalmi ~~rendent~~ *rendent*, a városok szervezetet, az egyetemeket, a kereskedelmi jogot, stb.

Ennek teljesen véget vetett az 15ik századdal kezdődő modern államrendszer, a hatalmi állam, amelyet új monarchia indit el. Ezóta nem volt a tarsadalmi rend univerzális *(főbbé hanem)* *(szociális)* minden állam megállt önmagában. *(a feudalizmust elpusztító)*

1. Ennek a 19. század vetett végett, egy egész ~~ann~~ új univerzalista szövevvel, amelyet a szabadkereskedelmi iskola tüzzel-vassal terjesztett a glóbuson. Az arany-valuta volt ennek a ~~hangnóh~~ *hangnóh* megtestesitője. Mindehova egyöntetű intézmenyeket importáltak: alkotmányokat, jegybankokat legfőkép-

2. Ennek volt a párja a világforradalmi szocializmus, amelyet Troztky képviselt egészen a mi napjainkig. Ez a szocializmus egülmilag volt univerzalista, nem is volt elkepezhető más mint internacionális keretben.

3. Egy harmadik, a fasizmus felől ösvő formája is van ennek az univerzalis musnak, a faji világuralom német dogmájában. A Nazi hit szerint, csak az ő világuralomuk tudja megoldani az új tarsadalmi rend problémáját. (Mei Kampf-banket helyütt is ráter Hitler arra hogy a Naprendszer sem az egész világ... *(Jozsef Attila, parja?)*) *mif*

A jelen évtized világrendítő fordulata, mind e három univerzalizmus bukása. Stalin győzelme Troztky fölött, az arany valuta bukása, Hitlerek közedő romlása-- mind egy vágányban ~~minden~~ *minden* on vannak.

Az univerzalizmus örökösei ~~szocialisták~~ *szocialisták*, ~~kapitalisták~~ *kapitalisták*, ~~többé~~ *többé* kevesebbe tervezett gazdasagok ~~de~~ *de* mind regionalis,

es érvet világra kiterjedő

Osztály szempontból ennek a magyarázata egyszerű:

Az osztályok esélyeit a harcban, a társadalmi összefejlődés adja meg. Pelda: A burszoázia chance-ja abban volt, hogy a gép termelet csak a kapitalizmus tudta kifejleszteni az adott viszonyok között. Ma a munkásság chance-ja -- ma perspektivában -- abban van hogy a géptermelet kifejlesztését a piac-gazdasági rendszer nem biztosíthatja már.

Ma, a piac-világ gazdaság összeomlásának a jegyében mindenk fölött egy kérdés áll: mifele formában tudjuk biztosítani a társadalmi fennmaradását, amelyet ma a piaczdasági géptermelet létében fenyeget?

Innet mar láthatókka valnak a világpolitika választó vonalai es alternatívái:

világpolitikai

D. A nagyhatalmak/ jellemzői.

Elemet. (a) Az Egyesült Allamok a világ egyetlen allama amely törettel-
nül a piaczdasági rend alapján áll. Ezt sem az 1929-1936 os munkanélkül-
liség, sem a New Deal meg nem változtatta. A tulnyomó többség hite szerint
tűrhetetlen minden egyéb mint a vállalkozás szabadságában kifejeződő
versenygazdaság. Kitünően bevált a múltban, ma csak egy feladat van-
helyre kell állítani világmeretekben. Az USA külpolitikája: az 1914
előtti világrend helyre állítása.

Kifejgzője: Az aranyvaluta, ^{vagyis} tőkepiac, állami beavatkozástól mentes
külkereskedelem, tőke kivitel, valuta.

Practice: Ha Anglia velük tart, akkor a többi tőke rása mit sem
számít. Oroszország, per sze, bökkenő, de azzal majd csak elbannak.

modern állam típus:
(b) A világ összes többi allama, feladta az aranyvaluta, it külkereskedelmét
főleg tőke kivitel kontrollálása valutáját állami ellenrörzés alatt
tartja. Ez áll Nemterorszgra, Olaszorszagra, Japanra, de epen ugy meg vagy
ket tucat mas államra is. Ebből a szempontból alig van különbség fasista
na demokata vagy szocialista állam között.

Ezekközött első helyen áll ma Oroszország, az USSR, de lényegében
nem áll masutt mint Nemterország vagy Olaszország vagy Japan.

Ezek na államok között a különbség elsősorban nemzetközi
vagyis külpolitikai szempontból áll fenn; A fasista állam külpolitikailag
az uralom es alavates organuma; a socialista állam de minden nem-fasista
fasista állam kooperatív alakulat. Az uj külkereskedelmi szervek rettent-
etes eröt képvislenek. Mintaa a gép ereje vertte vált volna
amlyet, az állam kifele visel, olyan pancélba öltözött leviathan
minden állam ma, amiota a külkereskedelem, a tőke be- es kivitel es a valuta
kormány ellenrörzés alatt áll mindenütt.

A régi megoldhatatlan kérdéseket mag lehet oldani ezekkel az
eszközökkel, amint peldaul nyersanyag felosztás, a valuta állandósága
fabilitása, a munkanélküliség nemzetközi kiküszöbölése, a nemzetközi munka megosztás
razionalizálása stb., De ugyanezek az intézkemhyek rettentő erejű harci esz
közök is a fegyverkezés, a rabszolg sorba döntés, a kunszner munka szempont
jaból. Ezert fogja a világ kiküszöbölni a fasista típust, na itt nincs
kegyelem.

Atmeneti kétéltű:

(c) Anglia volt a 19t századi rendszernek a megteremtője.

Szabadkereskedelem és arany valuta angol intézmények, manna... azakar - csak azangani ipari forradalom (nemhoda hogy Marx itt írta a Kapitált, angol viszonyok alapján).

Anglia manh hagyta el az arany valutát és Anglia tért le a liberális kapitalizmus utjáról a világ válságban nünün... elsőnek. Ameriká ugyan követet az aranyvaluta tekintetében, de az USA nem külkereskedelmi állam, mint Anglia. *(itt az tehát igen keveset jelent)*

Anglia szakszervezeti rendszere a legátfogóbb, Anglia ippra teljességében kartellizálva van és Anglia külkereskedeleme és tőke piaca teljes állami felügyelet állanak, és állottak mar a haborn előtt. Viszont Anglia osztálytagozódása mélyen konzervatív. Ez inkább osztály társadalom mint bármely kapitalista államé.

Ez az Angol-amerikai ellentét gyökere. Ha csak osztoszkodásról volna szo, azon kartellen belül még soha sem veszték össze. *regly...*

Persze e tekintében is Anglia helyzete nehéz. mert Amerika jelenleg virulens imperialista phasis-ban van.

De a sokkal nagyobb érdek ellentét ^{ott van,} abban áll hogy Angliát az amerikai kapocs elüti a saját problémáinak legjobb megoldásaitól.

E. Regionális módszerek előrenyomulása:

(a) A Duna medencze problémái.

A nemzetiségi ~~problema~~, a korlátolt szuverenitású állam, és a gazdasági összeműködés kérdései mind megoldhatók.

A Népszövetség 20 évig hiába vacakolt. De az USSR nem fél ezeketől a kérdésektől.

boldogulni.

(b) Latin-Amerikában csak lend-lease alapján képes az USA *gagys*

(c) Az angol birodalom <sup>a saját szabad kereskedelméig "other" is eső...
csönnes óceáni problémái</sup> tisztá regionális felé mutatnak. *("kívül is, belül is.")*

(d) Az USSR legújabb alkotmány változtatása mutatja milyen fölényes a regionális elv, -- a "kívül is, belül is" elv. *Angorahia - Új-Zéland - Kanada.*

Nem szocializmus ^{versus} kapitalizmus áll előtérben, hanem universalis, liberalis Kapitalizmus, versus regionalis közületek. Az USA önzólatása vagy Angl- Amerikai ^{birodalmi} ellenfordulat.

+szóintélem nyomon kís állam.

(Handwritten signature)

THE RISE AND FALL OF MARKET - ECONOMY

Let me remind you briefly of the purport of my last talk on the Place of the economic system in society.

An economic system, we said, is the manner in which material goods are produced. ~~Economic means here simply 'concerning production'~~. No human society can exist, of course, without an economic system of somekind or other.

There are two ^{important aspects} ~~aspects~~ to such a system. First the technological side ^{capital counting} ~~side~~, the tools or methods used in production, ^{and} ~~and~~ secondly, the social side ^{Dependent upon} ~~side~~, the manner in which the economic or productive system is organized, ~~and~~ the motives and incentives of the ^{persons} ~~persons~~ engaged in production.

In our own time the position is this:

Technologically, we have ~~a factory system or~~ machine production ^{and control of} ~~and it will~~ socially, we must distinguish between the period ~~just behind us~~ out of which we are emerging, and the period into which we are moving.

We are in a period of transition from a system of private ownership ^{and control of} ~~of~~ the means of production ^{their} ~~into~~ a period of public ownership, or at least, ~~control~~.

^{Thus} ~~an important point is that~~ while the technological ^{aspect} ~~side~~ will remain roughly the same ~~partly~~, the ~~social~~ ^{aspect} side is undergoing a radical change.

It is with this change we will be concerned to day. Its ^{subject is the} ~~subject is the~~ rise and ~~fall~~ ^{Decline} of Market economy. ^(the social aspect) ~~(background)~~

I. Market - economy.

Under the system ^{called} ~~of~~ market - economy ^{exist} ~~we cannot exist~~ unless we buy ^{all} ~~commodities~~ ^{commodities} on the market, with the help of incomes ~~which we derive~~ from selling ^{of} ~~commodities~~ on the market. The names of the income varies according to ^{other} ~~what we are selling~~. If it is the use of labour-power, of land or of capital, respectively, the ~~names~~ ^{income is called} ~~income is called~~ wages or ~~rent and interest~~, ^{respectively}. Profit is income derived from selling commodities the production of which ~~has~~ cost less than the selling price. The margin forms the entrepreneurs income, ~~called profit~~. ^{Incidentally} ~~production is being taken care of~~; ^{and} ~~the consumers goods produced~~ during the period are distributed amongst the members of the community with the help of the incomes which they have earned. ^{of market - economy.} ~~the organization~~

The ~~most~~ ^{peculiarity} of such a system is that ^{all the} ~~the~~ motives which ^{induces} ~~induces~~ persons ^{to} ~~participate~~ in it ^{is given} ~~is given~~ by the fact that they ~~can~~ ^{earn} an income ~~which~~ ^{cannot} ~~cannot~~ get ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ any other way. The motive which ^{ultimately} ~~ultimately~~ makes them earn an income is (a) fear of hunger or generally fear of going without the necessities of life and (b) the hope of gain or profit. Roughly it can be said that the motive of ~~the~~ workers or salaried people is fear of ~~going~~ ^{hunger}, with the employing class, profit or gain. ^{We} ~~have~~ come to call fear of hunger and lure of gain ^{economic} ~~economic~~ motive. ^{It} ~~should~~ be said that there is nothing essentially economic about them. In effect, essentially economic motives do not exist, in the way there ~~are~~ ^{are} aesthetic or sexual or intellectual or religious motives, ~~these latter~~ ^{are} based on aesthetic experience, ~~sex~~ ^{sex} experience, ~~or~~ ^{intellectual} ~~intellectual~~ experience, ~~or~~ ^{religious} ~~religious~~ experience. ^{There is no} ~~such~~ ^{such} experience ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ regard ^{to} ~~to~~ these motives ^{for} ~~for~~ individual participation ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ production. ^{only} ~~only~~ under a market economy.

distinction between the motive to engage in productive activity. In any overlapping, they are only

There was of course some measure of truth in this. I doubt whether they are really sound. A sharp distinction between the economic motive of the employee and that of the employer of labour. to-day. (I am told) that the worker is also a capitalist, because he has a capital of skill and personality, which he tries to sell for a profit and so on. Obviously selling himself for more than he is worth. Hardly have I succeeded in refuting the fallacy, than the same person begins to argue that, no, it is the capitalist who is really a worker, and doesn't he also work, and doesn't he use his brain in stead of his hands, and that there is no difference after all between them. With your permission, I maintain the common sense attitude, that in spite of these arguments of desperation, the motive of the propertyless person is primarily to make sure that he earns enough not to go without the necessities of life, while with the owner of capital, or land worked not by himself as well as with the entrepreneur the motive is that of gain or profit. It really wont do to glorify the profit system as the most efficient and just, and when the argument becomes untenable to declare that the whole thing doesn't exist, workers and capitalists are the same - the worker is really a capitalist, and the capitalist is really a worker. In a word capitalism cannot be abolished because it doesn't exist. *One must admit that the motive is the* (abolished)

~~I have tried to show that~~ In other societies this was ~~not~~ not the motive of individual hunger or fear of it, as well as the motive of individual gain is not amongst the motives of production. The economic system is usually organised in such a manner as to be entirely bedded in the various social relationships of family, kinship, neighbourhood, profession, and so on, with a strong factor of emulation, team spirit and sheer joy of work. The man who works his garden, takes part in a hunting expedition, helps in building a cathedral, or plies his craft acts for such motives as make the citizen conform to the requirements of social order. *He does not act individually for fear of hunger or from love of gain. Such is the case exclusively under a market-economy.*

This leads us straight back to the subject of the Rise and Fall of Market Economy? *What is the reason why Market economy is passing away? What is taking its place? And what is the role of planning in this process? What about freedom?* *What was the reason for its fall?* The market-economy of the 19th century was based on an entirely impossible conception. No human society can be subordinated to the blind automaton of a mechanism like the market. The market mechanism is the supply and demand mechanism. To be more exact: the supply-demand-price mechanism. The interaction of Supply-demand and price makes the market-mechanism automatic, self-adjusting. But it is only self-adjusting if it includes markets for labor and land. *And*, this is the crucial point. Market-economy is a system of markets which include markets for labour and land.

Just an organization is inherently impossible - it is a utopia, *can we have* ~~But~~ Labour is only another name for man, and land for Nature. The system actually means no less than making man into a commodity, and making man implies the natural resources of man's environment into commodities. That is, dealing with them as if they had been produced for sale. *This is obviously a system.* Land has not been produced at all, and as for men, well they are being produced for a variety of motives, other than sale... *I need not say*

Such a system would have destroyed human society, both man and his environment in the shortest time. Men left to the tender mercy of the market-mechanism would have perished from the effects of social exposure, *men* they would die as the victims of social dislocation through vice, perversion, crime and starvation. Nature would be reduced to its elements: neighbourhoods and landscapes defiled, rivers polluted, military safety jeopardised, the power to produce food and raw material destroyed.

~~That is what an uncontrolled market-system achieves. It is a system of planning in its own right. What is going to take its place? and what are the reasons for the passing away of the Nineteenth Century system? Now let us proceed to the~~

Nothing of the kind was ^{actually} possible. What then happened?
 Markets spread ~~as~~ all over the globe for all kinds of commodities,
 but at the same time markets for labour and land were restricted, ~~by~~
~~all kinds of means.~~ Society protected itself against destruction
at the hands of a blind crazy mill. The forces of protection sprang
 from all quarters; from the Christian conscience, from ~~unscrupulous~~
 Tory democrats who feared the new manufacturing class, but most of all
 from the working class movement itself. Factory laws and trade unions
 sprang into being. The Owneite Movement and the Chartist Movement
 produced marvels of devotion and heroism- Until, later in the century,
 the market was tamed, and the danger from the market system was lessened...
It was the working class which saved society from destruction...

It is often argued by economic liberals that laissez-faire never
 had a chance, because all kinds of protection, national and social, pre-
vented the liberal market system from producing its fruit. ~~There is~~
 They complain of a kind of conspiracy of anti-liberals who defeated
 the enlightened methods of economic freedom ...

The truth is otherwise. There never ~~was~~ such a
 conspiracy against the market-system. ~~There was~~
~~nothing~~ In all countries of Europe the same thing ~~happened~~
 happened. People of very different parties and views, joined together
 on innumerable different issues to stop the destruction ~~of~~ the market.
 In England Conservative and Liberal cabinets laboured intermittently at
 the completion of factory legislation. In Germany Roman Catholics and
Social Democrats took part in its ~~quite~~ different forces,
 achievement; in Austria, the Church and its supporters, in France, the
 anti-Clericals, the enemies of the Church were responsible for almost
 identical laws. These were not actions of narrow group interests. On
 the contrary, everything supports the assumption that reasons of an
 imperative kind forced the hands of the legislators to protect society
against the Satanic Mill of the Market.

The liberals are true
 It is quite true that the market could not work if there was con-
 tinual intervention into the labour or the land market. But the basic
 fact remains that the market could not allow to work itself out at ~~its~~
will since that would have destroyed society outright.

The origins of fascism are to be sought here.

Market economy was introduced for technological reasons: the new
 tools could not have been used otherwise than in the hands of the owners
 of capital who took the risk and organised production. Such a system,
 if allowed to work itself out, would have led to the destruction of
 human society, since it made labour and land, man and nature/commodities
 in the market... dealt with as if they were

The self-protection of society set in. Labour was protected by
 factory laws and trade unions, nature too was protected by various means
 and the crazy system was not allowed to work itself out. From the
 beginning the means of achieving this was control, ~~at~~
 intervention and planning.

But many people argue there is a danger to freedom. Well, some freedoms are certainly endangered. Like the freedom to 'make a coal mine with a single shaft' or the freedom to send children ~~and~~ up narrow chimneys which was a torture to them... We do not want these freedoms, nor a number of other freedoms to exploit one man for the benefit of the other. Some people had too much freedom, others had ~~had~~ too little. In this respect, the cry that freedom is endangered should not cause a panic. For ask yourself ^{first} whose freedom ~~is~~ is meant..

But do not minimise the possibility that important and valued freedoms of all might conceivably be endangered in such a great transformation. That is possible and should be seriously acknowledged. We want to keep our freedoms even though many were the beneficial results of capitalist development. We have come to cherish them and will not part from them.

This is the argument which is made to scare many people who have sense and feeling of justice enough to realise that some people must have less freedom so as to let others have more. But they rightly feel that some freedoms like that of speech, conscience, assembly, press etc should be safeguarded to all. But are these freedoms in danger? Is it true that by planning ~~in~~ freedom for all, we are making freedom impossible? That planning ~~can~~ excludes freedom?

Under the market -economy the whole of society is only a by product of the ~~market~~ economic system. It is not the economic system which is shaped by society, but it is the economic system which shapes society.

This is not so under planning.

The truth is that we can have just as much freedom as we care to have. Freedom of speech, assembly, ~~even~~ the right to individual peculiarities our

May be we will have to have new safeguards, if necessary, so that a man's right to his job is absolutely safeguarded, against the possibility of victimisation on political or religious or other grounds. Maybe even ~~in~~ we will extend --cautiously the principle of Conscientious Objection, and say: You insist on taking on a line of profession which is definitely over crowded. If you insist--maybe you are that type of person, who must become mathematician or a gardener-- all right, but we cannot ensure you the same standards as you might have elsewhere. So if you are determined, ~~you~~ you will not be compelled... There is a niche even for the non-conformist in a free society. Do not let yourself be scared into the false idea that planning will turn against us, as long as we sincerely intend to retain and extend our freedoms... This last argument of those who want to save a dying market-economy, is no more than a bogey which must be fought through education and study.

The working classes saved society in the first instance, when they prevented ~~the~~ labour from being made into a commodity. They are taking up today their onward march in a planned and free society.

^{this type of}
Now political science is at its best when dealing with legitimate power
in sovereign States, as e.g., the ~~legitimate~~ powers of a legal government over
a population occupying a definite territory. ^{Yet} clearly, this is a ~~narrow~~
^{on natural} too narrow range from the point of view of ~~its~~ interest. We might be
interested in power which is not sovereign, or which is not ~~directly~~ related
to territory or to a definite population such as exists in functional ~~groups~~
groups or nomadic societies. ^{Yet in such cases} ~~the picture~~ the picture provided by
the science of ^{politics} government gets blurred. ^{of course} But this is a ~~necessary~~
~~result~~ ^{chosen} ~~effect~~ of the method. ~~out of the material of individual volitions and~~
~~abstract~~ ~~communal~~ ~~good~~ ~~the method of reason~~
~~has been shaped~~ It is based on the postulate that ^{communal} ~~abstract~~ good
sets 'a purpose' to individual ^{volitions} ~~interests~~. Whether this is really possible
or not, is indifferent, indeed, ^{the} ~~such a~~ question is meaningless, ~~in principle~~
^{in operating on} ~~the~~ the method consists precisely in assuming ^{this assumption} ~~that it is meaningful. Actually,~~
^{actually, important} ~~that it is meaningful. Actually,~~ ~~as a~~
~~matter of fact~~ interests find satisfaction in the resulting
pattern, although other equally significant ones draw blank. Herein lies
the justification, ~~as we will see,~~ of the ^{disciplines} existence of other ~~types~~ of
society ^(such as formal) besides political science, sociology or measuring sociology.
~~the~~ For the more strictly the method of reason is ^{used} applied, the fewer ^{are} the
interests to which the results respond, while at the same time ~~the~~

I will do not apply the "method of reason".

~~at the time~~ ^{more relevant} become more ~~vital~~ vital to the interests to which they do respond.

Take the various strands of interest ^{which are natural in the body politic} singly. We naturally would want to know, ^{for instance} why we should ^{we require} ~~fulfill~~ our political obligations, ^{unless we} are ~~not~~ ^{yet} compelled to do so? This question does not seem to find a very satisfactory answer in political science, strictly interpreted. ^{In order to produce results,} ~~Usually~~ some additional trait is ^{usually} ~~unconsciously~~ introduced into the ~~notion~~ idea of ~~the~~ communal good such as God's will, utility, nationalism, race or socialism; alternatively, the volition of the individual is purified (and rarified) until it yields ~~to~~ the ethical ^{quality} required. ~~But~~

^{often} both methods are ^{employed} used: the uncouth individual is being elevated into an enlightened citizen, and the communal good is reduced to the ^{thus etc} ~~rule~~ ^{To produce an answer, the method is artificially diluted} commonly useful. ~~Yet~~ as the tension between the poles diminishes, ~~the~~ the "rule of reason" is replaced by some religious, emotional or scientific ~~principle~~ ^{together, with the interest, tends to disappear.} argument, and the problem

^{Similar} ~~we are~~ ^{to be} interested in the uses ~~to be made~~ of legitimate power. What for instance, is the right sphere of action for the State? Should ~~it limit~~ ^{be limited} its activities in a definite way? The question is ^{most} ~~equally~~ relevant in regard to religion, eugenics, military safety ^{to} industry. But to produce an answer, it ^{is} ~~is~~ in each case necessary to ^{make some} ~~make~~ further assumptions ~~which are not~~ ^{forming} part of the method

of reason. ~~Instead of~~ ^{individual} ~~linking~~ human volition with abstract good, ^{capable of working} human emotions of a definite kind are linked with social objectives ~~which are~~ such emotions. A kind of religion, a kind of economic system, ^{concerning the limits of state action} ~~is assumed~~ is assumed, the answer fluctuating according to the ~~kind not assumed~~ ^{methods} ~~of~~ ^{assumptions} ~~of~~ a good life thus introduced ~~is not a political at all;~~ ^{they are} ~~is~~ metaphysical, religious, ^{legitimate} or otherwise extra-political. The theory of ~~just~~ power can tell us no-

real

nothing of interest about the limits of the jurisdiction of the State.

Or rather, it ~~can~~ ^{can} do so only by smuggling the answer into the question, ^{and then} it can easily shown the education is

Education is an instance. Thought ^{is} vital to the harmonising of ^{individual which} general will and the ~~will of all~~ ^{other} ~~will~~ ^{common good} still, as long as the ~~two~~ ^{harmonies} harmonise, ^{is} ~~agree~~ ^{achieved} education ~~is~~ ^{conforms to} political requirements. This holds true ~~even~~ though

the State and its citizens may harmonise precisely because they are both evil. ~~Again, nothing follows~~ ^o So Again ~~nothing~~ ^o follows ~~from the~~ ^o principle

rule of reason ^{in regards to} for the methods, subjects, institutional forms or financial conditions of education, ^{in order to get definite answers} unless further assumptions ^{are} made

either about individualism ^{or} or about the ~~good life~~ ^{common good}. These assumptions would necessarily be of a psychological, utilitarian, cultural, economic, national, racial, esthetic or otherwise non-political ~~character~~ ^{nature}

Only an adulterated political theory can produce principles of education that are not void of content.

But the nearer ~~to~~ we get to ~~the~~ ~~more~~ ~~often~~ ~~questions~~ ~~arise~~ concerning sovereign legitimate power and the more often questions arise concerning constitutions, the separation of powers, ~~the~~ ~~party~~ ~~system~~, the franchise, the courts ~~and~~ of law or the limits of taxation, and ~~suddenly~~ ~~the~~ ~~more~~ ~~obvious~~ ~~it~~ ~~suddenly~~ ~~becomes~~ ~~that~~ ~~suddenly~~ ~~the~~ ~~pattern~~ ~~of~~ ~~reason~~ ~~is~~ ~~the~~ ~~pattern~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~principles~~ they all ~~conform~~. Without regulative ~~principles~~ based on the postulate of reason, without general concepts which link ~~power~~ ~~and~~ ~~law~~ ~~and~~ ~~power~~ we ~~appear~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~unable~~ ~~to~~ ~~formulate~~ any of the numberless questions that arise in and out of the day, and even ~~find~~ ~~less~~ ~~to~~ ~~give~~ a satisfactory answer to them.

Thus in an entirely different way from ~~the~~ ~~science~~ ~~of~~ ~~physics~~, the science of politics also ~~is~~ ~~useful~~, with the difference that its use is ~~more~~ ~~immediately~~ ~~relevant~~ to the needs of ~~human~~ ~~living~~. While the accretional sciences produce a growing body of ascertained knowledge accompanied by ~~an~~ ~~only~~ ~~gradual~~ change of the organisation of that knowledge as well as the principles underlying that organisation, - the human sciences help to clarify our purposes in the light of changing conditions. But for their help we would be incapable of sustained effort or effective combination in the sphere of the State; also we would be unable to organise our personal life around the main efforts which it serves. For unless we know which of our aims are compatible ^{with one another} /and which are not, to what point and under what conditions we are in danger of ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~wishing~~ ~~for~~ but actually striving after conflicting ~~main~~ ~~ideals~~, we must frustrate our own endeavours and waste our sacrifices. We justly value many things, although some of them are only attainable at the price of the other. We want freedom and we want order; we want change and we want stability; we want effort and we want effortlessness; we want unity and diversity; we want

we want continuity and we want discontinuity; we want nationality and internationality; we want personality and impersonality; we want discipline and ~~man~~ spontaneity; we want local colour and singularity, we want cosmopolitanism and universality; we want morality and immorality, we want science and religion; man and super-man, we want to wait and not to wait, ~~man~~ to choose and not to choose, in other words we have very little notion of what we do want in terms of the simultaneous realisation of our mutually contradictory wants. In order to have a coherent existence concepts are needed. Only with their help is it possible to ~~develop~~ develop ideas rich enough to relate the various strands of our motives to ~~all~~ ^{every} aspects of our behavior, and thus to form principles of consistent ~~effort~~ effort and action. Without them chaos breaks in upon us as soon as we depart from routine ~~performed~~ performed under traditional conditions. ^{can afford to dispense} No progressive society ~~can~~ with political philosophy.

sider the forcible destruction of other States?

The fact is that whatever the motives
B. ~~Whatever motives, or combinations of motives,~~ ~~the main~~
the concern for independence
~~regards of external sovereignty~~ will induce ~~the same~~ identical attitudes.

~~towards other powers~~ If State ~~A~~ ^{A is} offer an alliance ^{ed} to State ~~B~~ ^B which
the importance of the aggressive
will increase their common security against (State C, State A ~~will~~)

may accept whether it is led by an ambitious young monarch ~~who is~~ ^{cautions} thirsting
for ~~political~~ ^{experienced} laurels or by a ~~unambitious~~ ^{ambitious} and ~~unambitious~~ ^{ambitious} Senate which
~~acts on so-called reasons of state.~~ ^{the dance of} If, however, (no such alliance
offers, ~~then~~ ^{neither} the dashing young monarch nor the circumstpect
Council of State will be able to form such an alliance. ~~It~~ ^{Nor} will ^{it} ~~make~~

much no difference whether ~~they~~ ^{the people} are enthralled by the way of life of their
country because ~~it~~ ^{embodies} ~~embodies~~ ^{it} ~~the~~ ^{on the contrary} barbarian virtues or ~~the~~
because it is ^{forms} highest ~~mann~~ ^{of} Christian morality. ~~Similarly, it is irrelevant~~

because it is
Key see in
it the
expression
of the

whether they believe in collective security or in ^{power politics} ~~isolationism~~,
since in either case they will have to seek to ~~form~~ ^{form} a ~~power~~ group
ing that can stem aggression. So far as power is concerned, the good
cause demands the same precautions and means of enforcement as the bad.

^{supreme} The same is true of ^(the) power within a State, that is, ^{to act} capacity ~~of those in possession~~
of those in possession ^{of the} power ~~to act~~
for ~~the~~ State by virtue of the fact that all ~~the~~ ^{others} who belong to
(and represent the) ^{circumstances} the State are ~~powerless~~ compared with the bearers of internal sovereignty.

The example
shows
that

in this regard as ^{before} ~~the~~ ^{again} ~~the~~ ^{a number of elements}
The political situation implies ~~in this case~~ ^{the} existence of persons
who ^{other who} seeking power; ~~of persons~~ follow ~~the~~ ^{the} their lead, or merely obeying
~~than~~ their orders, or, at least, passively consent ~~to~~ ^{to} their doings.

^{psychological} Here again a great variety of motives may be active. Yet it can
readily shown that what ever the motives, the persons will adjust them
selves to the ~~given~~ ^{given} situation and thereby submit to the
laws of politics. ^{for} Whether the individuals are power less because they
willingly consented to the acts of the sovereign, or because they feel
they owe blind obedience to the powers that be, or perhaps merely because

Before we turn to an analysis according to the three factors, we somewhat enlarge on the will ~~givanannhanbnnsfnndesentphtinnofnhan~~ terms used above:

Nothing is probably more natural to man than interest in ~~than~~ his position in the community, the rights and wrongs of it, the good and the evil which comes from government, the prospects of communal welfare and ~~thanpanihantanhinnpennnn~~ of his share in it. Nothing accordingly would be more welcome to him, than reliable knowledge ^{about} what to do and what to avoid in order to make both the community and himself safe and happy. ~~in modern terms~~ He would like to know how to vote? ~~What government should be in power? How long the government will be in? What foreign policy he should support?~~ ^{But in} Unfortunately, there is no science which ^{could} tell him ^{these things} what he really wants to know. ^{At a second or even third best.} Consequently, he must put up with ~~something at least vaguely relevant.~~ ^{some} ~~things~~. He will be content, if he can gain clarity on the nature ~~of his position in society etc.~~ ^{anything is of practical relevance}

The method ~~although it seems~~ natural to us ^{who} ~~since we~~ are accustomed to it, is of extreme peculiarity: It is postulated that the communal good sets ^{the} ~~an~~ ^{purpose} ~~purpose~~ to individual volition; the communal good is an idea ^{which} we ~~associate~~ associate with the community; it is that which is good for the community; ~~it is a postulate~~ ^{it is a postulate} of the survival of the community. It is thus not an individual motive ~~and if~~ in some sense, it ~~ought~~ be taken as entering into it, it certainly does not determine individual action. ~~To assume that the communal good is the 'purpose' of the individual action is thus~~ ~~an empirical postulate~~ ^{an} a formal postulate of ~~an~~ which cannot be put to ~~an~~ empirical test. ~~It is~~

The postulate is nevertheless of extreme significance for it expresses the idea that the manner in which the survival of the community is ensured should be referable to the volitions of the individuals.

Mind & Soul

This explains the nature of the elements of reality which are essential to political science. Mind and Soul.

Modern political science a caricature
that man does not
need science but he
needs political theory