

The Nature of International Understanding.

I am taking a gloomy view of ~~what~~ the outcome of my supposedly enlightening talk on the nature of international understanding. ~~with~~ ~~be~~. Having thought long and deeply upon the subject I have come to the conclusion that I am going to ~~present~~ <sup>deal out</sup> a sequence of ~~places~~ <sup>the most hackneyed common-</sup> ~~places~~ <sup>places</sup> to which an intelligent audience ~~was~~ <sup>has</sup> ever been treated by an unfortunate lecturer.

<sup>In effect,</sup> ~~indeed,~~ I will find myself trying to convince you that to achieve international understanding we must exert both idealism and common sense. We must ~~have regard~~ <sup>have regard</sup> both ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> our ~~own~~ <sup>own</sup> interest and that of the world, ~~then~~ we must satisfy the demands both of ~~expedience~~ <sup>expediency</sup> and principles. Now to hand out ~~maxims~~ <sup>maxims such as</sup> these to a people whose national ~~characteristics~~ <sup>inclinations</sup> include a ~~Lockian constitution~~ <sup>an innate constitution, an</sup> ~~habit~~ <sup>habit</sup> of Erastian Church ~~and~~ <sup>an</sup> inveterate ~~habit~~ <sup>habit</sup> of compromise, ~~amounts~~ <sup>amounts</sup> to ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> ~~exhortation~~ <sup>exhortation</sup> to resist all temptation and to remain Englishmen...

So I will have to limit myself to saying something about the kind of idealism which does ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> help towards international understanding, and the kind of ~~realism~~ <sup>realism</sup> which does ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> do so either.

~~They can be summed up in this way:~~ <sup>There is basically the</sup> ~~the~~ kind of idealism which preaches that, if we are only sufficiently idealistic, wars can be avoided altogether. ~~Secondly,~~ <sup>Now there is</sup> the kind of realism which says that ~~war~~ <sup>war</sup> cannot be avoided anyway.

Let us take the latter first:

That wars have always existed is not true. <sup>at some Australia aborigines</sup> (1) Very primitive society is ~~at~~ <sup>at</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~sub-war~~ <sup>sub-war</sup> stage, if for no other reason ~~because~~ <sup>than that it</sup> is unable to organise the discipline, the ~~co-ordination~~ <sup>co-ordination</sup>, and the other prerequisites

sites of a ~~planned and~~ sustained moral and material effort such

<sup>(the planned collective undertakings of)</sup> as is involved in war. (2) Some fairly developed societies like that

~~those~~ of the Eskimo know not war <sup>much or</sup> ~~Esquimaux~~ <sup>(the poor wretches)</sup> ~~know anything~~. They manage to get on without it

(3) The abolishment of war in vast areas is ~~the~~ <sup>experience</sup> common ~~history~~

~~history~~, usually described as the foundation of empires. This invariably meant the elimination of war over large territories and in respect to enormous populations, ~~and~~ <sup>thus</sup> restricting its <sup>occurrence</sup> both in time and space. There is nothing to support the pseudo-realistic prejudice that of all our institutions war is the only one which ~~is~~ ~~unavoidable~~ which is coterminous with mankind.

~~There~~ There have been times <sup>in the past</sup> without war, there may be ~~many~~ times ahead of us which will not know war.

But to <sup>turn from pseudo-realism to pseudo-idealism:</sup> ~~achieve this result~~ The increase of idealism alone ~~will~~ <sup>not</sup> achieve this result. Or rather the kind of idealism which implies such an expectation <sup>(most certainly)</sup> will not bring it about.

[Indeed, since this kind of idealism was more frequent, --very much more frequent--in the last <sup>thirty</sup> ~~thirty~~ years than ever before, it might be argued that it is precisely this kind of idealism which

has something to do with the unprecedented scale of <sup>world wars</sup> ~~war~~ (in our time). <sup>Conscientious objection are practically unknown in modern history before world war I</sup> ~~is not~~, This is not the idealism we need. The idealism which

(1) denies the institutional functions of war, which ~~regards~~ <sup>looks</sup> war as an aberration of the mind or temperament, which <sup>(a)</sup> believes it <sup>is</sup> business deal, ~~but~~ <sup>is</sup> ~~only~~ <sup>that</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>something is intended</sup> to be profitable ~~and~~ <sup>though it</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> profit is a great illusion; <sup>the philosophic source of</sup> this idealism which is idealistic in <sup>abstracting from all the basic facts,</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~greatest~~ danger to ~~us~~ today.

It has several variants =

notes

Political myth

1. The 'governments not the people' myth is one of the cheapest and most dangerous <sup>variants</sup> ~~forms of this idealism~~. This theory is essentially untrue.

*begin state*

- (a) The democratisation of the State -in the French Revolution introduces the ~~age of conscription and mass armies~~. The Convent initiated the levée en masse .. And the more democracy we have the ~~more wars we get~~. The USA produced the first large scale war of modern history, in the American Civil War.
- (b) In the USA Gallup polls prove that the masses urged on the government in this war to drastic steps. Even in this country, in 1940 and 1941 the pressure for conscription, for direction of labour, for rationing all along the line came from the people ...
- (c) But even if government and people are only two facets of the same crystal, for the Youth Leader the demagogic exoneration of the people is the thing to be avoided. That way 'mob rule' lies...

*admitted!*  
Psychological  
Reaction

2. Wars caused by ~~errors of judgment~~ <sup>men's passions;</sup> by outbursts of ~~judgement~~ <sup>emotions,</sup> ~~due to sentiment~~ <sup>overpowering</sup> and envy ~~due to sentiment~~ <sup>and envy</sup>, the result of hatred ~~due to sentiment~~ <sup>due to sentiment</sup>.

~~by the blind~~ <sup>cont</sup> ~~urge of~~ <sup>uncontrolled</sup> instincts, the beast in man, ~~primeval~~ <sup>not in the endearing sense</sup> (but not in the endearing sense) man, the cave man,, ~~use these terms to be taken~~ <sup>in these</sup> pejorative sense.

*Psychological argument false*

(a) Actually, under almost all systems of organised society we know, the Council of State which takes the decision on war or peace is surrounded by all the institutional safeguards of responsible statesmanship. This is true of the war Council of the Red Indians as much as that of Tudor England, ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> Prussian Council of State or the Machiavellian Council of Italian Renaissance States, in effect Greek and Persian, or for ~~that not for~~ <sup>that not for</sup> Arabs, Chinese and ~~Yankess~~ <sup>Yankess</sup>, equally ~~excel~~ <sup>excel</sup> in these institutional safeguards. And the mainpoint is universally the same: The elimination of emotion and ~~passion~~ <sup>passion</sup>, ~~smash~~ <sup>smash</sup> of all ~~transitory~~ <sup>transitory</sup> sentiment from a decision which is regarded as of utmost ~~importance~~ <sup>importance</sup>. The ~~dynastic~~ <sup>dynastic</sup> wars of the ~~16th~~ <sup>16th</sup> 17th centuries were decided by Cabinets and (perhaps) Cabala's which certainly did not act on emotions but on ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> so called reason of State.

*Arabs*  
*aphenical*

(b) The opposite is a purely modern phenomenon, and is actually a result of modern mass democracy, which makes the participation of the masses necessary in ~~the~~ ~~war~~ war. Its very doubtful whether the emotions roused by war, are the cause of war even today. But it is certain that they were not the causes of war in the past. Most wars in the past actually happened with an extremely small participation of the population (except in the case of/nomadic ~~societies~~ societies, where the position was somewhat ~~similar~~ similar to modern/ total war, except that the actual fighting was still/restricted to ~~the~~ ~~warriors~~ mostly the 'warriors').

some

somewhat

Moral Idealism

3. The theological explanation of war is an other form of the idealistic fallacy. Luther and Calvin taught that the State, its Laws and Prisons and Executioners were caused by 'original sin' which made man unruly and ~~disorderly~~ disorderly. In this sense all human institutions in the field of ~~crime~~ of law and order are due to original sin. In the same order of things, marriage is justified by man's propensity to ~~give way~~ give way to the temptation of promiscuity and lust. The good and the evil are equally explained by original sin. That 's why it does not 'explain' any one institution as distinct from another. ~~It~~ ~~only~~ ~~war~~ but also peace is due to 'original sin', not only the atomic bomb but Gravitation does not explain only the falling of the apple but also ~~the~~ ~~falling~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~apple~~ ~~but~~ ~~also~~ ~~the~~ ~~falling~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~apple~~ ~~but~~ ~~also~~ the swimming of the ship, the flying of the plane General a phenomenon to be adduced ~~as~~ ~~an~~ ~~explanation~~ for any one institution, ~~and~~ I am afraid, even when we will have succeeded in abolishing war, we will still have not ~~heard~~ ~~the~~ ~~last~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~war~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~original~~ ~~sin~~ ~~is~~ ~~not~~ ~~abolished~~ 'original sin. . . .'

psych  
phil  
psych

Neither the blaming of governments and idealisation of the people; nor the warning to keep our emotions under control; nor ~~the~~ reminders of man's fallen nature will help us to abolish war; every one of these idealistic fallacies tends to increase instead of diminishing the danger.

*(its problems and dangers)*

The basic realities of the institution of war, <sup>its problems and dangers</sup> should be as removed from ~~the range~~ <sup>the range</sup> ~~of an immature~~ <sup>of an immature</sup> ~~from~~ <sup>from</sup> ~~humanity~~ <sup>humanity</sup> / idealism and equally immature realism as the ~~human~~ <sup>human</sup> ~~problems and dangers~~ <sup>problems and dangers</sup> of sex. <sup>an</sup> These also have a vast negative and <sup>and</sup> positive import <sup>and</sup> for almost every realm of human existence. Yet remember the Victorian period and its supercharged idealism and just as supercharged anguish ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~in respect to sex.~~ <sup>in respect to sex.</sup> The romantic <sup>and</sup> sentimental idealisation of sex, and the unreasoning horror-mongering in respect to sex. One proved as unhelpful as the other. Its idealistic and realistic distortions did not help but hindered the solution of the problems of sex, as parents and educators <sup>have realised</sup> know. They made the unavoidable ~~problems~~ <sup>problems</sup> of sex even more tragic, while increasing the number of <sup>the</sup> avoidable ~~ones~~ <sup>ones</sup>, and decreasing greatly the number of sane, ~~undistorted~~ <sup>undistorted</sup> and self-respecting lives. Furtivity and dishonesty permeated life and undermined the ~~true~~ <sup>true</sup> ~~human~~ <sup>human</sup> forces of morality and personality. Neither ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> romantic idealisation nor unreasoning disgust ~~lessened~~ <sup>lessened</sup> the perils of the complications accompanying sex, while the ~~deep seated~~ <sup>deep seated</sup> forces of healthy personality remained underdeveloped, forces, which alone are ~~able~~ <sup>able</sup> capable of weaving the web of <sup>the</sup> ~~imperial~~ <sup>imperial</sup> ~~passion~~ <sup>passion</sup> into the web of a personal relationship of <sup>an</sup> ~~incomparable~~ <sup>incomparable</sup> ~~variety~~ <sup>variety</sup> of values.

Of course, the parallel is faulty, for sex is more basic than war: sex is actually <sup>intrinsic</sup> ~~coextensive~~ with man's biological life, while ~~when~~ <sup>when</sup> the institution of war, as we said, is not. ~~Humanity~~ <sup>Humanity</sup> ~~is not~~ <sup>is not</sup>. ~~At this~~ <sup>At this</sup> point the <sup>pseudo-</sup> idealist ~~stages~~ <sup>stages</sup> come back, of a rather dangerous character. He ~~points~~ <sup>points</sup> to the fact that war is an institution, a human institution, and consequently <sup>its existence</sup> ~~it depends only upon~~ <sup>it depends only upon</sup> ~~us whether we will have it or not.~~ <sup>us whether we will have it or not.</sup> ~~After all,~~ <sup>After all,</sup> ~~who else but~~ <sup>who else but</sup> ~~human beings~~ <sup>human beings</sup> fight in ~~a war?~~ <sup>a war?</sup> Who declares war, if not ~~human beings~~ <sup>human beings</sup> ~~but ourselves?~~ <sup>but ourselves?</sup> Consequently, it ~~depends only upon~~ <sup>depends only upon</sup> ~~ourselves to abolish it.~~ <sup>ourselves to abolish it.</sup>

Now this is a fallacy and a very dangerous one. It is not true that because something is a human institution it depends only upon us whether we will have it or not.

Can we abolish it? Only in a ~~non~~ <sup>narrow and</sup> superficial sense. Take the institution of marriage. ~~with~~ <sup>that is, we cannot abolish it without putting some other form of ordered relationships in its place.</sup> We can have this form of marriage or an other form of marriage,--they may vary greatly-- the one thing we cannot have is <sup>to go for</sup> some form of approved relationship between the sexes, which is precisely what marriage in the broad sense means.

This seems to contradict what I said about the lack of analogy between sex and war. Not at all. It is not sex and war we are putting here on the same footing, but sex and ~~group~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~conflicting~~ <sup>interests of</sup> ~~between~~ human groups. These latter are as universal a fact of ~~social existence~~ <sup>group life</sup> as sex is of human life. <sup>And</sup> (war (like marriage) is ~~only~~ <sup>an</sup> institution which solves the problems raised by the underlying facts <sup>(of group conflict</sup> ~~sex~~ in the one case, ~~group conflict~~ <sup>of sex</sup> in the other). Just as ~~group conflict~~ <sup>one form of marriage cannot be abolished without replacing it by an other,</sup>

the institution of war cannot be abolished without replacing it by some other institution which would serve the same purpose, <sup>wetting such</sup> ~~namely of~~ ~~group~~ ~~conflict~~ <sup>of group interests as</sup> ~~which~~ cannot ~~remain~~ <sup>permanently</sup> undecided if

the communities are to function normally. (Incidentally, this precisely is the reason why marriage, in one form or another, is an inevitable institution: <sup>for sex</sup> ~~sex~~ raises issues <sup>of public approval</sup> which cannot be ~~remain~~ <sup>permanently</sup> undecided if human beings are to function normally). So the idealists' last refuge has proved untenable

That war is an institution far from proving <sup>that</sup> its existence <sup>is</sup> a mere function of our volition <sup>rather</sup> (explains the fact why it is not possible to abolish war without replacing it by some other institution, which will perform the same vital function.

Example:

Take the most frequent reason for a conflict of group interests: it refers, in the case of territorial groups, to the frontiers. To the liberal idealist nothing ~~appears~~ seems to prove better the purely illusory character of war. Firstly, he says, it decides something that is entirely inessential. After all, unless the people study a map they would most likely not even realise what all the bother is about. Secondly, war unsettles nothing, and so the whole terrible process has not only fictitious reasons, but also fictitious results.

*Love:* This is like arguing as some anarchist free-love pseudo-idealist of the more immature type did, that ~~manages~~ the personal ~~and domestic~~ aspect of love is purely <sup>a conventional fact</sup> ~~imaginary~~, and that/marriage settles nothing since the same issues continue to exist unchanged..

Actually, the liberal idealist is mistaken about frontiers, and the simple people who cannot get over the issue of unsettled problems are right. For the <sup>good</sup> ~~simple~~ reason that no human community can develop any of its ~~main~~ vital functions without having settled for ~~something~~ like a generation <sup>at least</sup> who does and who does not belong to the community. For communities are organised in states and without some loyalty to ~~that~~ <sup>the community</sup> State, ~~it~~ cannot function satisfactorily. But how is it possible to ~~produce~~ <sup>expect</sup> loyal citizens (or even to ~~demand~~ <sup>expect</sup> them to be loyal) unless ~~one can point out who belongs and who does not belong to the~~ <sup>one can point out who belongs and who does not belong to the</sup> community? And this, in the case of territorial groups, is determined by frontiers. In other words no community of this character can produce ~~an~~ law and order, safety and security, education and morality, civilisation and culture unless its frontiers are settled and there is no reasonable danger of their becoming unsettled. Any threat to their frontiers, ever so distant, must inhibit the normal functioning of the community, and stop all higher forms of life.

Incidentally, this will usually be true of both communities involved. Since frontiers effect them both. Their must be decision, at all cost. And if no other institutions available, war must be evoked if higher forms of life would be allowed to continue.

An idealism which obscures this basic fact, makes it impossible to ~~evolve the tremendous energies needed to~~ ~~human create~~ conditions under which a substitute to war can be found a substitute for war. For no such substitute ~~can~~ is conceivable which does not involve new loyalties, and which would not demand the evoking of tremendous energies of a moral order to achieve. But how should such moral energies be ~~developed~~ <sup>generated</sup> unless mankind is faced with a real task, involving the solution of real problems; ~~issues of life and death, issues of our whole civilisation~~ <sup>is that</sup> ~~the idealist pacifists condensation~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>prejudice</sup>, ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> all we need is to rid ourselves ~~of our~~ <sup>of our</sup>, dispel some illusions and ~~join him in his enlightened~~ <sup>enthusiasms</sup> ~~enthusiasms~~? Is it surprising that nothing but failure lay ~~in~~ <sup>that</sup> way?

To clinch my argument I might have to show that wars do not necessarily depend upon human frailty, ~~upon~~ <sup>error</sup> ~~error~~ <sup>danger</sup> envy, hatreds, or other forms of ~~error~~ <sup>danger</sup> (for that in the philosophic sense these are) but there is such a thing

*Not a matter of persons*

*in war*

War is an institution and ~~not a matter of persons~~ <sup>is not a matter of persons</sup> ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> impersonal ~~affair~~ <sup>fact</sup>. Soldiers rarely hate their enemies personally, and the higher the rank of the soldier the less is this usually the case. The idea that personal hatred is the cause of war is utterly beside the point. But why ~~should~~ <sup>as</sup> ~~regarded~~ <sup>as</sup> ~~war~~ <sup>war</sup> a personal matter at all? ~~Personal~~ <sup>facts</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> personal only so long as we have not to think of them as <sup>institutions</sup> ~~institutions~~ (nat. Who would expect ~~as~~ <sup>as</sup> a judge to be anything <sup>in his dealings</sup>)

*in his dealings*



but impersonal? This would be true even of the postman, who would refuse to deliver to you an other man's letters, even though he might personally prefer to have dealings with you than with ~~whomever~~ your neighbor to whom they happen to be addressed.

All this should seem fairly obvious. But faced with the fact of war we tend to forget ~~it~~ it, and start arguing ~~about~~ about on an entirely different note. After all, <sup>of our</sup> is it not our doing? Is it not ~~something~~ something that happens between human beings? If we only knew the man personally, surely we would find that we had no grudge against him? International understanding is ~~an~~ an understanding between nations and nations consist of individuals, consequently if we ~~have~~ can only manage to have understanding between individuals, we would also have understanding between nations. This means to disregard completely the nature of an institution, and in war, which is an institution itself the reference is exclusively to institutions <sup>such</sup> as armies, States, governments and so on. It is a sad state of affairs, when man finds himself reduced to so utter helplessness that he disregards ~~the~~ obvious ~~facts~~ and ~~sets~~ sets his hopes superstitiously on a supposed common sense facts ~~bankrupt~~ ~~superstition~~ ~~man~~ personal element in international relations! Yet to misdirect our efforts in this way, wrecks our only chance of establishing institutions which would make war unnecessary.

To clinch my argument I might have to show that wars ~~do~~ do not necessarily come about through human frailty, through envy, mutual hatred or other forms of error or misunderstanding, <sup>though we have seen in several that way</sup> but that ~~there~~ there is such a thing as unwanted war, indeed, that this may be the true peril of our time.

~~unwanted war~~ For the sake of argument let us make a <sup>big</sup> ~~large~~ assumption. Let us

assume two Great Powers single mindedly determined to keep the peace, They have become convinced that that is what they need, and moreover are of the opinion that there is nothing they could reasonably fight about. ~~noncom...~~ Let us assume that these two countries ~~have~~ regard their duty to safeguard the security of their territory in the strict sense, in which it is not a cloak for aggression, but a sincere desire for safety, no more. Let us finally assume that these two Great Powers are not neighbours, ~~they have~~ <sup>possessing no</sup> ~~no common frontiers.~~

In this ~~noncom...~~ <sup>nan</sup> thoroughly anglic situation,

~~Let us~~ construct the following experiment. A great empire which hitherto separated the two Great Powers from one another, suddenly collapses. The vast populations of the <sup>(collapsing)</sup> empire and its vast territories ~~are~~ find themselves overnight masterless, without organized government, ~~an~~ orderly administration, a ~~large~~ black void in the middle of the map. This is what we ~~call~~ <sup>a, political vacuum.</sup> ~~of view of~~ From the point ~~of~~ <sup>of view of</sup> power the Great Powers have become <sup>m</sup> neighbours, since ~~nothing~~ <sup>no power</sup> separates them anymore from one another.

Now, ~~most~~ <sup>most</sup> students of politics ~~will~~ <sup>would</sup> agree, that there is ~~an~~ <sup>now of a</sup> danger of war between the Powers, of a war which might be avoided for some time, but is ultimately certain, unless they can agree, either to build up jointly the vast destroyed empire, or to prevent jointly its reconstruction. Both feats are extremely difficult to perform. Yet unless they succeed in this act of statesmanship an unwanted war between them is unavoidable. Why?

- (a) The population of the vacuum is active, <sup>Domestic</sup> its factions are <sup>fighting</sup> ~~struggling~~ ~~against~~ one another, and they may find an interest for reasons of their own to strengthen the one or the other power (land or maritime, racially akin or stranger)
- (b) Consequently, it is imperative to keep informed about things that is to keep in touch with internal forces, which

help to some

- (c) means some ~~probation~~ ~~people~~ and some control over them
- (d) assume this to be happening over a time, one ~~prob~~ penetration
- (e) if this happens from the North and South, the powers must meet somewhere in the empty space, on no boundary, in the dark, increasingly fearful and playing a blind man's buff which must end in a clash.

This is entirely independent of their intentions, apart from genuine concern for their safety. No envy greed or unreasonable suspicion enters. The unwanted war will emerge...

Example:

Such a situation is coming about in the Far East, but America and Russia are appearing to make great efforts to join ~~in~~ rebuilding a united China, in order to avoid unwanted war.

Policy:

The key to peace thus lies in policy. The means to international understanding is policy. It is the own laws of policy we must study.

1. The first aim of policy must be to avoid unwanted war. This, in a time like ours, may be a very great task. For almost 3/4 of the globe has turned into a vacuum.

2. The second aim of policy, must be to eliminate war altogether, for the atomic energy release has made war undoubtedly ~~is~~ a danger to this planet and all life upon it.

Policy is about means ~~to~~ ends. The decisive questions is the interests? of preserving interests in a given situation. What situation whose ends or in other words what ends? and in what situation?

This is the moral problem of policy. Who is the unit? What is his way of life? What does its survival imply? Bare survival is not a definition of survival in the case of a community; It's the way of life that defines its identity.

But the same is true of the situation. To judge of the world is to judge myself. The USA world outlook is different from the Russian and from the British. Policy implies the definition of some persons interests and involves a decision in some situation. At both ends moral problems are decisive. Not selfish or unselfish policy--this is a contradiction in terms--but

These decisions in national concern are again x

*What*  
Whose self? - is the question. And in what world?

The great problem of politics is the right appreciation of our interests as a country, and the right appreciation of the forces ~~at~~ <sup>at</sup> work in our ~~time~~ <sup>the world</sup>.

Then only will be able to formulate policies which do the necessary thing:

- a. Unite the nation at home
- b. Secure allies everywhere abroad.

No ~~selfish~~ selfish interest is ever supported by others, and only through the support of others can strength accrue to the community. That was the secret of 19th century British politics. The same ~~secret~~ <sup>problem</sup> is still there. *And the same answer is required.*

Same realism is realism which takes the moral and spiritual facts as realities. They are basic realities in politics. Sentimental idealisation mistakes the ~~human~~ facts. We do not love a personless for understanding his or her problems. We do not leave love our country less for understanding its problems. *I warned you that I would annoy you with the usual generalisations.* Still, it was perhaps worth while to think them over again.

*This also prompts an international ~~consideration~~*