

British War Aims and the Peoples of Central Europe

In these notes we start on ^{three} ~~two~~ assumptions: (a) that ^{British} war aims ~~must~~ be such as to maintain national unity as far as possible in the persuasion of the war; (b) that they must be such as to induce other peoples to join the Allies in their effort to win the war; ~~and~~ ^{as well as} to secure the co-operation of these peoples in the solution of the problems of peace.

It is with this latter aspect alone that I am going to deal. ^{How} ~~then~~, then, ^{should} must British war aims ~~be like~~ ^{be formulated if they should gain} in order to evoke the support of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe?

This country ~~appears~~ ^{seems} to be united at present in the idea that ^{on the one hand} the aim of the war is the safeguarding ~~of~~ the democratic way of life and the establishment of a new world order which would eliminate the danger of recurrent wars. ^{Democracy & Peace are}

First of all ^{we} must face the fact that neither ^{the} ~~word~~ ^{the} democracy ~~nor~~ the word ~~peace~~ ^{is} able to evoke that kind of spontaneous response in the populations of Central Europe as might be expected by the average Englishman. Unless ~~with~~ ^{these} terms are supplied with a content which is able to meet ~~in a concrete way~~ the actual needs of these populations ~~they~~ ^{such} ~~abused~~ ~~terms~~ ~~democracy~~ ~~and~~ ~~peace~~ will fall flat.

A. Democracy. The peoples of Central Europe are acutely ~~conscious~~ ^{conscious} of their ~~real~~ ^{real} internal difficulties which do not allow them to proceed to a democratic way of life and which have frustrated ~~all~~ ^{their} post-war efforts to institute such a way of life ~~in these regions~~. ^{That} they must work out ~~is~~ the solution of their racial and social problems. ^{British} democracy ~~is~~ the result of three factors all of which ~~are~~ ^{are} absent under the conditions given in Central and Eastern Europe: ~~namely~~ (a) a long historical past, (b) unity of language, (c) economic prosperity. These countries are starting out on their national existence ~~new~~. They live in mixed settlements and are poor. They vaguely comprehend that democracy is ~~rather~~ ^{rather} a method by which an existing community may run its affairs than a method of establishing a community where ~~it~~ ^{it} had not been existing before. ^{This} is the element of truth in the slogan of 'dynamism' current in fascist circles to-day. ~~When~~ ^{When} ~~the~~ ~~community~~ ~~is~~ ~~established~~ ~~then~~ ~~laying~~ ~~down~~ ~~its~~ ~~final~~ ~~boundaries~~ ~~and~~ ~~assuming~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~community~~ ~~has~~ ~~settled~~ ~~down~~ ~~in~~ ~~its~~ ~~final~~ ~~boundaries~~, the problem of racial and social order within the community is still such as to be insoluble by the methods of democracy unless they allow for that measure of creative change which is implied in the ~~right~~ ^{right} meaning of the term dynamism.

In other words, ~~the~~ ^{the} question is this: can democracy be given a meaning which is broad enough to include the solution of the most

Struggling
of CE

burning racial and social problems of the European Middle region washed by the waters of the Baltic and the ~~the~~ Mediterranean. Unless ~~this can be done and that~~ swiftly and ~~and~~ convincingly ~~way~~, we cannot expect these peoples to join in a struggle for the victory of an abstraction for which they can see ~~a use only~~ in the transcendental condition of a future State which they may never live to see.

~~This~~ certainly cannot be ~~done~~ as long as the tacit assumption is maintained that democracy is synonymous with British democracy. The explicit assertion of the opposite is the ~~condition on which alone~~ democracy ~~can be expected to be~~ accepted as a war aim, by these nascent or renascent nations.

Thus we are thrown back on fundamental principles. What is democracy if it is to include its British embedment as a mere sample of a series just as genuine and valid as the Anglo-Saxon version?
~~Whanmanmanmanmanmanmanman~~

The answer is simple. In this country no racial and economic problem prevents the community from carrying on its political life on a democratic basis. Let these less fortunate countries which have still their racial, economic and social problems to settle do this with the same freedom of self-determination and equal individual participation as is done in this country in the political sphere. There is no conceivable reason why these peoples should not choose their economic and ~~manman~~ cultural institutions freely, and why they should not extend the institutional system of democracy to the whole of their economic and social life if they choose to do so.

Explicitly

B. Peace. Awareness of the urgency of unsolved racial and social problems makes the peoples of Central Europe unresponsive also to the abstract ideal of peace. Their interest and attention is fixed on the conditions of peace because they have learnt to think in concrete terms about these conditions. It appears frivolous to them to talk of peace where there is no peace, and to offer peace to a person who is unable to pay the price - a fact which is or at least ought to be known to him who makes the offer. They are too acutely conscious of the reasons for change to appreciate the offer of ~~manmanmanmanmanman~~ some imaginary condition of affairs which ~~manman~~ is promised to be everlasting. ~~Man~~ He is entirely conscious of the fact that war is a method of settling disputes which must be settled if ordered life should proceed and which ~~manman~~ ~~man~~ to settle which no other method is available. He is just as willing as the Western democrat to accept other, ~~manman~~, peaceful, methods of settlement, as long as they promise to bring about a settlement. Should they, however, fail to achieve this consummation he will definitely prefer to retain the method of war than re-

sign himself to the inevitable stagnation and ultimate chaos which must be the outcome of suspense, where the laws of life brook no suspense.

~~THE HISTORY OF THE POLICY~~
~~OF THE UNITED STATES TOWARDS~~
FOREIGN POLICY AND POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

- ① ~~History of power policy and its limitations.~~
 The hundred year peace. Attempts at an explanation.
- ② Balance of power as a ~~historical~~ law of history.
 Balance of power as a principle ⁱⁿ international law.
~~History~~
~~of the balance of power system with its history.~~
 The ^{modern} balance of power ~~system~~ ~~and its history.~~
~~and counter-balancing alliances.~~

The balance of power system also may be said to be a law of nature.

- ③ ~~The Versailles System~~
 The Versailles "System"
~~The 1919 Treaty failed to set up~~
~~a system of any kind. The League of Nations~~
~~was essentially a continuation of the~~
~~system, but that it had not provided~~
~~through its organization with a~~
~~basic weakness of having with the fatal~~
~~defects of which resulted however from the fatal~~
~~weakness of including permanently~~
 The main aim of Revision and Security.
 which the balance between has period in coming up, could not be
 broken.
 ④. ~~International~~ Secretary & repair system
 Free trade, & world-revolutionary socialism, as well as ^{of soviet}

The balance of power system also may be said to be a law of nature.

~~The hundred year year, 1815-1914~~

~~The~~ The nation-state ^{myth} ~~the~~ New summary (15-18/19)
of the like the regional state, ~~of~~ ~~these~~ ~~are~~ ~~primary~~ ~~local~~ ~~empire~~ &
Commonwealths of new ~~type~~ or ~~process~~
regional. The ~~internationalist~~ ~~postulate~~ of
internationalism is expressed in the
need for cooperation. The non-cooperating state
must be eliminated

The origin of the regional system.
Economic & politics in international affairs

What kind of world ~~peace~~ are we fighting for?

Answer: That such kind of thing as this should not be ~~repeated~~ ^{recur} every 25 years.

This looks like absolut unanimity.

Actually, it is not.

For ~~non~~people very much disagree what ~~you~~ ^{we} have to do to prevent it.

Why? Because this depends upon what one thinks has caused it.

Two completely conflicting views:

Who caused the depressions and business ~~sub~~ ^{the} cycle? The colonial scramble? The raw material rivalries? The national minority issues?

The collapse of the gold standard? The credit and currency collapse? The revolutions in Russia? ~~The~~

Not Italy, Germany and Japan. They were merely pushing that which was falling; fishing in troubled waters; hitch-hiking on the process

which was going on anyway.

The other group argues exactly the opposite. They ~~say~~ ^{argue} actually imagine that but for Germany Italy and Japan the problems of the last sixty years would have never arisen. This has the added advantage that it is extremely flattering to ourselves.

Consequently, there are two views on how to prevent it.

- A. Eliminate Germany, and everything will work perfectly.
- B. No. Unless we solve the problems raised by the last fifty years development, we will have the same thing ~~happening again~~ happening again. Some other country will give the lead.

THIS TIME IS IS THE PROBLEM OF THE WORLD WE HAVE TO SETTLE;
The moral effort implied is very great indeed. It will need all our intellectual and moral faculties.
Now that looks ominous. People hate to hear it. It is so much more simple to scuttle out of it again.

1. Now one way to scuttle out of it is to call for vengeance.

But vengeance- spontaneous vengeance- may be inevitable, but we should none the less oppose it. because it must make our task insoluble.

2. Another way out of it is to call for assurances that we will not cooperate with Russia.

Now that means excluding that state which by virtue of its economic ~~system~~ its non marketing mind- is most easily adjustable to a federative system.

3. Another way is to limit in any way or in any fashion ~~the~~ our commitment to the cause of mankind.

Some say, its ~~is~~ laright for a time.

Others say its ~~is~~ alright, on this hemisphere

Others say its ~~is~~ alright politically but not economically

Others say its ~~is~~ alright economically. but not politically

of
Now all this will not do.

For the commitment must be irrevocable, total and absolute.

Unless it is so, it is indeed most dangerous.

A world order in which there is peace and order and yet also freedom and change.

Handwritten: ~~And~~ what will the future challenge
Initially: (World domination, not to
End of freedom

Handwritten: A long long term of service at the end of which stands an achievement worthy of the greatest efforts & the circumstances of war from a manhood which has relaxed its freedom. It will cost us a high price. But the goal will be worth the price.

How?

Not by restoring the past; its political & economic

system

The independent sovereign states

let the dead bury its dead.

the old standards } liberal capitalism

have some for good

The new concerns are in fact more much more adjustable by cooperation and by the methods of freedom.

I. BALANCE OF POWER IN EUROPE AFTER THE WAR.

Europe?

Two questions involved: (1) Shall England pursue her b. of p. policy in ~~the~~ widely spread notions: (2) Shall a b. of p. system be restored in Europe?
1. That in the nineteenth century we had continuous wars,
2. that this was the result of the balance of power ~~system~~ "game"
3. that ~~the~~ ~~words~~ of this 'game', ~~was~~ England's balance of power policy
4. that the abandonment of the League ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~cause~~ of the present war

present war was caused by

The truth is ~~that~~ ^{since the League represented a different principle of action.}
1. that we have had a Hundred Years Peace, 1815-1914
2. that this was the outcome of the balance of power game under the given
3. that the First World War was caused conditions, by the abandon-
ment of the balance of power system in favor of counter-balancing
alliances, ~~since the turn of the century,~~
4. that England's balance of power policy, natural to an island off a
~~west~~ Continent, had nothing to do with it.
5. nor did the League represent anything else than an improved balance of
power system.

I. The Hundred Years Peace, 1815-1914.

18 war-moⁿths against 60⁷⁰ years in the two previous centuries.
No long and devastating wars between the Great Powers, and in effect,
no general wars whatsoever.

II. This was the result of the balance of power system under the given circumstances.

The balance of power is a basic law of politics. It is natural to
units of power to behave in such a way as to prevent the sudden increase
in the power of any one unit through a combination of the other units.

This has the very important consequence that the independence of small
units is safeguarded, since its absorption would increase the power of
the absorbing unit.

No state that was on the map in 1648 disappeared ~~from the~~ during the
following two centuries. (Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Denmark,
Norway etc...) We ~~do~~ ^{know} to-day that this is not in the nature of
things, but needs an explanation. It is given by the b. of p. system.

In other words the b. of p. system works in favor of the independence of
all units concerned, whether big or small.

This however does not mean peace. Quite on the contrary. The system
exists through continuous wars. Northern Italy, Southern Germany, ~~then~~
Confer Postovzeff: The ancient Greek cities, The balance of
power period of Hellenism was a period of incessant wars. (In this res-
pect, the tradition well founded.)

For this reason ~~the~~ ^{Wars} balance of power even more creative of ~~was~~ when
well organized than it is left to change.

In Europe since 1648 (peace of Muenster and Westphalen) and especially
since the Treaty of Utrecht (Ryswyck) in 1713, it was an accepted
principle and was increasingly organized. From this time onward
any sudden major change in the status quo was thought to give legitima-
te concern to all other ~~governments~~ ^{governments}, thus enormously increasing the faci-
lity with which coalitions could be formed.

I But how and why did this system since 1815 work for peace? I.e., avoiding avoidable wars and limiting the unavoidable ones, both in scope and in length?

capitalism This was, indeed, a startling development. Peace which had been an adornment of life, like art and crafts, now became a main interest. This was the result of the world economy, the gold standard, capital and currency and commodity markets, the investment habit, Peace became a primary general interest. A general war became almost inconceivable.

III. The system ceases to work as soon as there are not at least three independent powers in play.

Russia in 1893 and France 1904 and 1907 The formation of the Triple alliance by Bismarck, and ~~then~~ *first* Entente, ~~by~~ England, France and Russia made an end to the balance of power system. It was only a question of time when the structure of peace would come down.. Counter-balancing alliances are the very opposite of a balance of power-system which presupposes a number- preferably a large number- of independent power units... Indeed, the restoration of the sovereign states in Europe ~~could~~ *must* be supported on this score..

IV. England's balance of power policy antedates all this by much, and is a matter for England alone.

Continental This policy is an outcome of England's geographical position off a ~~Continental~~ litoral. Since Wolsey ~~as you know~~ it was ~~actually~~ practiced, even when unconsciously. Charles II connection with France ran counter to it and was disastrous. From Henry VIII time to our own times, it was instinctively practiced, since it was a common sense ~~abundance~~ (of security requirement)

assumed Fox ~~insisted~~ that England had a right to hold the balance in Europe and Burke actually spoke as if the balance of power was the Law of Europe and England was the guardian of this public law. (Public)

It is not difficult to see that it was easier to follow a balance of power policy if the ~~the~~ rs practiced a balance of power-system, since in that case the forming of coalitions was immensely facilitated.

But England would follow ~~such~~ *Such* a policy even in a League of Nations, and other countries would not follow such a policy even under the balance of power system. They would prefer alliances or hegemony or other more permanent forms of influence.

Of course England may not be in the position to follow such a policy after the war, simply because there may be second power in existence.

V. The League ~~was~~ merely ~~an~~ improved/organization of the balance of power system.

An alternative to the balance of power is a federation or a super state, ~~not~~ ~~the~~ League. A League does not (and cannot) outlaw war, it can only restrict it to cases not amenable to arbitration and conciliation. Accordingly, the League did not prohibit wars, merely provided machinery to avoid them 1. through regular consultation 2 through providing machinery for the forming of coalitions against the disturber of the peace.

The failure of the ~~League~~ *League* ~~was~~ ~~intended~~ to safeguard the independence of

I. (or weak)

small countries stands in need of explanation. (Lithuania, Greece, Germany, China, Abyssinia)

- (a) The permanent unilateral disarmament of the defeated countries.
- (b) the dissolution of the 19th century system of world economics.

(a). Germany and the other defeated countries had been unilaterally and permanently disarmed. This created a power-vacuum which prevented the League from functioning. Lithuania could not stand up to Poland, and Germany was not able to support Lithuania. Greece could get no support from other countries. The peace treaties were not carried out as scrupulously as they otherwise would have been (Silesian plebiscite; the handling of the reparations issue; Eupen and Malmédy; Austrian Anschluss prevented; Bulgaria kept in sub-revolutionary state by Macedonians; premium set on paramilitary and secret armaments e.g. Hungary gets Oedenburg contrary to peace treaties because Austria keeps to disarm while Hungary does not. etc.).

The knowledge that such a thing is impossible leads to uncertainty ~~in~~ the state itself. On the other hand it forces the victorious powers into the rank hypocrisy of pretending that they are going to disarm or even expecting ~~secretly~~ of their comrades to disarm while actually nothing of the kind is the case).

The alternatives were: occupation and partitioning or a time-limit ^{set to disarmament.} ~~to~~ ^(consequently) Nineteenth century world economics had dissolved and ~~also~~ ^{also} the 'peace interest'. The gold standard threatened one country after the other with anarchy, and attempts to restore it caused unanimous international social and political disaster.

If we had the League of Nations back again, it would not safeguard peace, but only the independence of the single states, which is a ~~very~~ doubtful asset.

- The true question is -1. Should England carry on a balance of power policy? ^{in Europe?}
2. Should the balance of power system be reestablished in Europe, whether in a League or otherwise?

- The answer is; 1. No b. of p. policy possible since there will not be any power besides Russia, ~~Germany~~ / in Europe and Gr. Britain
2. No b. of p. system possible for the same reason.
3. The balance of power must be one on a world scale.

concerning the basis of

I.

POST WAR BALANCE OF POWER OUTSIDE EUROPE.

1. Shall we have a balance of power system after the War, and if so, what kind of a system will it be?

A balance of power system ~~maintains~~ ^{consists in} a number of independent power units, which maintain the independence of all of their number, through the so-called balance of power game.

a }
b }

There must be more than two power groups: this excludes the counterbalancing alliances. They mean not only war but loss of independence maintains

It only ~~maintains~~ the independence, not the peace. It is not a peace system. It is a system of wars and threats of war.

No c

pre- It/supposes power. It excludes the ~~permanent~~ unilateral disarmament of ~~then~~ any ~~units~~, whether they are inside or outside the group. (e.g. a League of Nations).

Such a law of balance of power as old as human societies, indeed they need not even be human. As old as Adam and Eve, and the Serpent. Milton's Paradise Lost is full of it.

Political course then

But in political history, it does not always ~~play~~ the same role. Most periods society is coextensive with society. There is no political balance of power in existence.

No

It depends how extensive the society is, and how far it is organized in political units.

The medieval society was organized by Papacy and Empire ~~and~~ in not political groups.

The modern political power system is relatively new: not older than end of the 15th century in Europe.

It functioned fairly well since the middle of the 17th century: no state lost its independence, who was a signatory of the Treaty of Westphalen.

But during the nineteenth century it functioned without any general wars and even without any long or devastating war in Europe.

This unique occurrence was caused by liberal capitalism, a general interest of all countries of Western type in the absence of general wars. (NOT PEACE). The most specific institution of the age, the gold standard, is indeed incompatible with a general war. Increased trade & financial war but no general war.

nationality & racial issues...

One of the explanations of the terrific outcrop of wars is precisely that wars had to be avoided at almost all costs, even though it meant leaving innumerable questions unsolved which cannot be left unsolved without gravely affecting the lives of the communities. As long as there is no other method of solving these questions, wars must solve them, and if wars are excluded by the economic system, the countries fall into chaos and anarchy, until ultimately war ensues, which then may or may not solve the problems.

2. Toynbee's misprophecy. (not quite!)

T. wrote in 1924 that the Great Power system is 'out'. Of the 8 great powers of 1914 (4 in Europe and 4 outside). Germany and Russia were permanently weakened by defeat, revolutionary chaos.

Pushin' the divider
go to the space page

Before 1914 sixteen empires & states played an active part in international affairs.
(15 in Europe, 47 (22 in America) War

New international organizations coming into being at la postea union, telegraph etc.. The League of Nations was classes by him in this group.

He gave the following explanation:

Since 1875 the great Powers coming into being through Industrialism and Nationalism.

Nationalism had worked for bigger units in Germany and Italy 1870 and 1871

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Industrialism had worked everywhere for bigger units: markets Zollverein raw materials

Industrialism plus nationality had created the Great Powers.

Since 1914 both were working the other way: Nationalism was destroying the Persian, the Ottoman, the Russian empires Industrialism (capital) was outgrowing the boundaries of the Great Powers, they were less and less self-sufficient. as proven by the blockade effect

Toynbee was mistaken. These 20 years have disproved him thoroughly.

More than ever we live in a period of Great Powers, to the point of 23 out of 35 European so-called sovereigns disappearing from the map. Only 3 Great Powers and four neutrals are still there...

3. What kind of units are the new Great Powers ? What is their organization and what do they represent?

The answer is: they are not nation states but empires; their basis is not economic but social systems

The Great Powers (primarily USA, Russia, and British Commonwealth represent 'a way of life', the Aristotelian definition of a polis i.e. of a society.

Not even in name!

Nationality has long ceased to be the basis of these states: Russia explicitly repudiated it; Great Britain is not even at home one e.g. English nation; the USA motto is: Americans all- immigrants all.

Nationalism was the result of liberal credit and banking phase of capitalism all over the world. It has gone (unless we resuscitate it..)

Industrialism was from the beginning a universalist force (gold standard) and a regionalist one, It is not true that the states were more self-sufficient before. economic

The truth is the much closer politico-integration of the states. The decisive institution is currency under an independent Central Bank. What appeared at first as an economic phenomenon, turned out to be a social one i.e. all pervading and integrating. Only as long as the leading capitalist classes are all important does it make sense to call it economic. Later on the way of life of the whole community is involved. The defence of society against the effects of an unregulated market system. The defence is different everywhere. And that makes for social systems. A social system in our time is determined

13m.

II

by the re-~~action~~ of society to ~~the~~ Industrial ~~system~~.

In this respect USA, USSR and Gr. Br. different independent solutions. Such a one was given by Germany too... *This is about them...*

Two types of solutions:

- (a) Universalist type: Russia under Trozkyism and USA under liberal capitalism.
- 1. characteristics: uniformity and standardization constitutionalism, credit system etc.
- Great Britain, Russia, Germany, all other countries.
- 2. characteristics: control of external economics

b. Regionalist type

Russian foreign policy: Security. Intensely regionalistic, Relative isolationism.

managed currencies
controlled foreign trade
capital exports

Vassal states. Politico-economic methods etc.
Rudeness. Practical jokes.
Open diplomacy. / Two policies: openly presented as alternatives..
May be forced to revolutionary policy..

USA foreign policy Isolation and defensive imperialism.
New nation.
External economics pre.-1914.
Gold standard. Its dangers avoidable for the strongest.
Want us in. The rest disorganized.
Capitalist trozkyism...
Absolute ruthlessness of methods..

British Commonwealth of nations
Weaker than the other two.. But that makes balance of power system advisable.
Those who fear Russia want to force an American foreign policy. NOW. That is dangerous...
Freehand policy, the best.

Example:

Latin American problems: under universalist or regionalist

USA: make them insolvent large scale

USA in Latin America
Gr. Br. in Asia

racial minorities cooperation, even unrestricted

The political prerequisites of a stable & just world order.

The first requisite is Victory.
Second requisite is the absolute & irrevocable commitment of the victorious countries to the establishment of a new world order.

The third is ~~the~~ clarity about the nature of the ~~sacrifices~~ ^{tasks} involved.

(A) What is our position today?
The international ~~political~~ ^{political} system of the 19th century has broken down. It was a system of independent sovereign states which managed to avoid general wars. No long and devastating war occurred during the century ~~1815-1914~~ ¹⁸¹⁵⁻¹⁹¹⁴ ~~in Europe~~. The much abused balance of power system achieved this in conjunction with the mysterious gold standard. Both ~~have~~ ^{are} gone today. They are a matter of the past. They cannot be restored.

2
In the 1920s tremendous efforts were made to return to that system: (a) The countries starved themselves to restore the gold standard. In vain. ^{Only} ~~greater~~ ^{more} and ~~greater~~ ^{more} unemployment was the result.

(b) The countries tried to run a balance of power system, called, the League of Nations. But this proved impossible.

⊕ The institution which ~~made~~ ^{had} become a danger to all sovereign states was the independent state.

(B) Remember the Twenties! In Central and Eastern Europe the ind. sov. state proved its true nature: For 20 years Czechoslovakia & Yugoslavia could not agree on the post position of a frontier town. They perished separately. For 20 years Yugoslavia could not adjust the status of the



many people believe that if only the America had joined the League - ~~And~~ everything would have been different. But is that so? (1) America joining would not have changed anything. She would have left again, next year, perhaps next week month, if not the next week.

(2) She should have joined - for her own sake

(3) For the sake of the others; not for the sake of America itself which was unwise.

A system of independent sovereign states - voluntary association of them - could never function.

Crochans. Serbia & Croatia
perished separately
And so on - all along the
line.

Remember the views
of all enlightened ~~observers~~ ^{observers} students in the
twenties!

There were no two views in
this country about the state of Eastern
Europe; about the racial minority
issues; about the ~~dissemination~~
frontiers, boundaries in Europe;
the independent sovereign state
is an anachronism. ^{It} ~~excludes it~~ ^{excludes it}
economically
close interdependence

For 20 years Lumber was not
allowed to swim down the
Nyenien, from Polish to Lithuanian
territory. They perished separately.

- ① My argument is not that of
the cosmopolitan who deems
the essentiality of national culture
- ② Not the argument of the materialist
materialist who imagines that

7
economics is the key to all.

③ Not the argument of ~~the~~ a ~~vague~~
empty rationalism which puts
utilitarian considerations
first.

I agree that national
Culture - its diversity - is
essential, that the ~~the~~ immateral values
of freedom must be safeguarded.

But history is not a matter
of rationalism, but of flesh &
blood reality

And yet: the independent
sovereign state is doomed. (dedication)

(C) The prerequisite is the
~~abolition~~ abolition of those ~~states~~ states which
link their existence with this con-
ception of mankind.

America could not exist
half free, half slave - only when
the conviction became strong
enough.

9

The prerequisites of the United States of America was

~~(a) common war and the economic aftermath of a common war.~~

The United States of America were the result of two steps; not the federation of the present States - that never happened.

But (a) the close federation of the 13 founders forced upon them circumstances and the economic aftermath of the 35 year war under the conditions set by the founders.

(b) the joining up of the 35 states. Exactly the vacuum is the prerequisite of a new world order.

And the necessity of this system had to be realized in the most bloody fratricidal war of the century: the Civil War.

This is the way of history. This is the terrible lesson of history. This is the path that is set to man.

69 And yet, how glorious was the
outcome! In spite of all you
may criticize in it, here are
the United States of America
today — a vast country,
which has ~~been~~ ^{been} ~~and~~ ^{has} from
its internal life, free and safe,
wealthy and equal — to a large
extent; — who dares ~~lose~~
that history has not its prizes
other than the glimmering prizes
of imperialism — prizes
of peace, welfare, and the
quiet happiness of his
lives in the light of one's
best ideals.

The same situation faces
us again, this time on a world
scale. It seems ^{horrible} ~~unpleasant~~ ^{over} ~~over~~ ^{is it}
Re suffering is partly
behind us,

Think of the discommodities

of the thrifty who saw their savings
divided away; think of the
disillusionment of the ^{new} nation's
finding themselves imprisoned
in the new states. think of the
disill. of the unemployed; the
terrible instability of social
existence; think of the social
economic & national order
crashed; think of the sovereignty
destroyed; the tremendous
assets wanted in depression
the end was behind us.

~~But~~ this was the price we paid
for the realization that the system
was unworkable. Most of the
sovereignties have been either
destroyed or voluntarily relinquished.
Dozens of governments have given up
are in exile; others are surrendering their
resources as they have been never
pooled before.

Don't let us try and recapture
that which is gone.
Many people are asking

8/ already that but for Germany the old system would have worked, so let us get back to it, as soon as Germany is defeated. Don't let us listen to such dangerous illusions.

Unless we face the facts we cannot solve the problems. Nothing less than an irrevocable commitment to the source of mankind will do. We have come to the final stage. The preparation of a stable world order is this recognition.

It fell to this country to become the vast experimental field of the ideal of freedom and equality in social life. For 180 years you had the privilege of developing this experiment. Now the world calls upon you to return to the task. ~~It is not a matter of~~

This has been sent to you in order to fulfil his unfulfilled and meaningless; an existence

9) That seemed not in ~~realism~~ &
commercialism; a threatening
cynicism which is a form
of living death.

~~Behind the idol of the dollar
there was nothing for you~~

~~Not war is the life giver -~~

A coming which ~~shows war~~
is making the supreme sacrifice
as it never adored it in all its

history &
in shouldering ~~the~~ ^{its} commitment
to mankind.

Who knows how long the ~~way~~
road will be? Who can know when
the goal will be reached? Our children
will be perhaps still wandering
towards that distant goal. But
as ~~so~~ sure as I speak to you

~~now~~ now, that goal will be
achieved. Three hundred years
after ~~your~~ ^{the} beginnings you are making
a new start. Centuries hence
the world will be remembering
your decision. America's decision.