

Friends of Democratic Hungary
AMERICA 1943

I have visited the States several times : I have seen them at their best during the Great Depression, when 9/10 th of the people I met had the tremendous moral reserves of that experiment in social org. ~~social~~. lost 9/10 of whatever they had possessed; I have known them at their worst during the Spanish crisis, when isolationism swept the country and neutrality developed into a craze together with a pmnphandianphobia raised by a foreign suspicion, not a phobia of propaganda which made every subject, ~~excluding~~ the wheather, ~~on~~. It was at that time that the intellectual paralysis developed which was partly responsible for Pearl Harbour.

The new American nation was born in Pearl Harbor.

~~and~~ The people of the States awoke that day from a fool's paradise, and never will they go back to that particular one again.

But Pearl Harbour ~~solved~~ them, — this must be well understood, not
Tojo - that was a ~~late development~~ —
to the danger of ~~Yugon~~ but to that of Hitler. With Japanese help, Hitler
~~might~~ ~~actually~~ dominate the Atlantic, since ~~USA~~ would not anymore ~~not~~ be
in the position to ~~her fleet there~~
~~concentrate~~ ~~part~~, in view of the new ~~danger~~ in the Pacific.
indirectly

But the ~~unseen~~^{indirect} effect was even more ~~unseen~~ profound: the USA suddenly realized the true nature of ~~her~~ situation. 1. ~~she~~ had no foreign policy; 3. ~~she~~ safeguarded her interests against any of them. While ~~most~~^{all} other countries came to appear as ~~her~~ opponents. This was quite natural: Foreign policy ~~is~~ determines which a priority list of one's interests; this has the advantage of being able to say which other country one regards as primarily dangerous, and which as primarily friendly. Though the positions on the ~~list~~ may shift, unless there is a list, all countries must be regarded as potential enemies. Such was the case with America.

Partly

As to the realization of America's powerlessness, this was the result of a new situation revealed by the war, namely the obsoleteness of financial power in the new set-up. To sum up, these were the three ingredients in the new mixture: 1. lack of foreign policy 2. a world of potential opponents and 3. no reliance on finance, the one factor of power on which America had relied in her foreign relations.

It was under these conditions that the people of the States took stock of the national position. They showed amazing intelligence in realizing the ~~weakness of the position~~. The rate at which Roosevelt unified the nation politically and switched over its industrial potential to war production achieved in as many months ~~which it took Hitler years to do.~~

- a. The efficiency of democracy showed at its marvellous best
- b. Even the anti-propaganda craze proved beneficial: the utter lack of enthusiasm for the war was accompanied by assurance that the nation was this time not the victim of propaganda.
- c. In the presidential elections, Wendell Willkie took foreign affairs out of politics, thus protecting the national interest against the vicissitudes of the world's most dangerous constitution.

The dominating change was the realization of the need for foreign policy; and that its natural aim must be the restoration of a world in which the United States had ~~been~~ ^{grown} wealthy and powerful. In the ~~old~~ world ~~she was such that she~~ ^{unaccountably & for no good reason} had changed, she herself had not changed and could not change. Consequently, the only possible war aim was the restoration of ~~the old~~ world. Democracy and the American way of life were now finally identified with liberal capitalism; ~~and in respect to the international economy~~ ^{at home and abroad,} the institutions of liberal capitalism were ~~in the~~ identified with the American way of life. The Gold Standard and Free Trade were established as the corollaries of democracy and ^{as} the esoteric meaning of the Atlantic Charter. The restoration of the pre-1914 world became the tacitly accepted ^{as} but nevertheless axiomatic war aim.

What a system! Under this system the movements of trade ^{are supposed to exchange} keep ~~uncontrollable~~ stable. This is called the Gold Standard. It has very little to do with gold but a great deal with the automation of trade, ^{here} which is synonymous with private trade.

Now, under such a

~~system~~ a country that is able to provide long term credits or loans, is also the master of ~~its~~ currencies. Such a country can, if it wishes, accumulate gold; it can ~~dominate~~ thereby the domestic conditions of other countries, and all this without ~~armies~~ or navies, merely by ~~means~~ of using its **capital** power to dispose of its investments and to withdraw ~~our~~ credits. ~~On~~ **S**uch a system cannot function, if the governments themselves are in business; if there is state-trading; if ~~there is control of our imports~~ capital exports; if there is acceptance of the responsibility of the State for employments and for standards of life. In other words, the American system demands ~~permanently~~ categorically, the restoration of the liberal state with its liberal competitive capitalism everywhere, the restoration of free trade and a system of stable currencies the stability is ensured ~~without government interference~~.

repeat: ~~is not good for capitalist states~~ ~~trade.~~ For this is the essence of free trade; not the absence of tariffs (which make hardly any difference at all-- their effect is merely that of a lengthened ~~distance, strengthened transportation~~) - ~~the jurisdiction of the in the external economy~~ but the ~~absence of government in~~ ~~in this respect there is~~ very little difference between socialist and capitalist countries. The difference is ~~rather~~ between old style and new style countries; between liberal capitalism and planned economies; between a regionalist conception of foreign trading and a universalist conception of foreign trading. The ~~American~~ ~~therefore~~ ~~conception~~ means: capitalism in all countries: world capitalism; the ~~modern~~ ~~idea~~ means: capitalism or socialism or any in-between economy in one country or a group of countries. In other words: the essence of the new organization of the world is that it is not universal but regional.

(at least as a political conception) Universals capitalism as much as universal socialism, ~~have~~ failed. The next period ~~belongs~~ belongs to regional organizations, such as, for instance, Europe. The difference is great. Take this example: Some people believe that capitalism is freedom and socialism, bondage; other others believe the contrary, viz., that socialism is freedom and capitalism is bondage. But which ever one believes, it remains true that the world ~~I am not discussing more here, but economic ones.~~ can be half slave, half free to-day. Indeed, this is the essence of the ~~from economic~~ ~~new feature~~ ~~that~~ the people are again able to live each according to ~~his~~ own fashion. This in the 19th was impossible. In its ~~own~~ ~~own~~ fashion.

4.

The real cleavage under the new form of life is between the cooperating and the non-cooperating state. ~~of the~~ ^{reliable} ~~independent~~ ^{economic} fascist state and the peaceloving ~~stable~~ state. Since ~~independent~~ cooperation within regional bounds, --will be more essential than ever. Peace cartels are the promotion of the new regional co-operation.

Let us return to America. This short excursion was necessary if we want to understand the American language. ~~Even~~ Private enterprise is popular in America. The Great Depression has not shattered its prestige. Big Business is still immensely popular. An American boy or even girl still thinks in terms of the great and resplendent masters whom they will serve, whose empire they will adorn and whose glory will be theirs : that is, in terms of General Motors, EastmanKodak, General Motors, Ford, and the few dozen other giants who are America. Their achievements in production and research, in organization and planning are tremendous. Fortune magazine is their organ. These are the modern feudal princes, the prinedoms of American Christianity. To imagine that the post-depression America had lost its faith in liberal capitalism would be to misread utterly the basic beliefs of the American people. The New Deal, as one can learn from Henry Wallace, is not meant to supersede private enterprise, but on the contrary to save it from monopoly and modernize its working.

It was this outlook which made the American people instinctively hostile to the USSR. Here was a great block of planned economy which would have to go or be isolated if the world should be safe for liberal capitalism. Today it is this outlook which makes America so impatient of every move in this country which points in the direction of new methods, of planned capitalism, or regionalist currency, of European cooperation with Russia.

This leads ~~us~~ to the need of defining more exactly the other basic negative feeling as you know is ~~existing~~ in the USA today which is towards Great Britain. What is the exact character and meaning of this attitude?

Firstly, it has nothing to do ~~with~~ with the traditional anti-British ~~sus~~. It is practically universal, it is even stronger in the West Coast than the Middle West, and is ~~entirely~~ definitely a popular attitude, uninfluenced by propaganda from above or in fact of any kind. The Administration is by far the most pro-British group in the country.

Secondly, it has not much to do with aversion towards the British aristocracy, snobbery and so on. It is not an expression of ~~hatred~~ ^{fear} but of contempt, and only where the facts make contempt appear as singularly inappropriate, does hatred make its appearance.

Thirdly, ^{This feeling} it is not argued but taken for granted. It expresses itself in a curious inability to understand why there is such a thing at all; why the ^{Colored} map should be ~~Britished~~ in the way it is; it is a feeling which feeds on Britain's weakness as much as on its strength; on its archaic characteristics as much as on its proclivity towards Bolshevism; on its smartness and as much as its old fashioned inefficiency. In other words, this is an expression of a fundamental national attitude ^{tale} which does not ~~not~~ trouble to rationalize.

WHY NOT?

The actual explanation seems to be geographical. Almost any plan that the USA may conceive of to organize its future is up against British positions. Whether the North American Continent, or the Western Hemisphere, whether the West Indies, the Pacific or the Northern Atlantic, whether ~~than~~ Western Africa or ~~any~~ ~~other~~ ~~country~~ is being considered, the position is everywhere the same. At the same time Great Britain cannot be shoved aside as Germany, Italy

France, Holland or Portugal might be.

^{But} ~~at~~ ~~the~~ ~~same~~ ~~time~~ the community ~~of~~ language and many essential institutions makes America and Great Britain natural allies. ~~that~~ ~~is~~ ~~to~~ say. The relationship is somewhat similar to that of the two German states in the middle of the 19th Century - 1840ies to 1870ies, when the rivalry of Austria and Prussia ~~who should have been~~ for the hegemony in the Germanies, ~~which~~ was eventually decided in the favor of Prussia, thus forcing Austria into an alliance with her, on her terms.

It was the beginning of the end of the Austrian Empire.

want
But what does the USA want BRITIAN PRIMARILY TO DO? The answer is given by the aforesaid: She wants Britain to cooperate in the maintenance of the liberal economy as the basis of world organization. On this basis the USA rightly feel much stronger than Britain. They demand that England should remain a free enterprise country, and should relinquish the element of planning which she has introduced since 1931.

To English people this will appear surprising. America regards England as advanced and is jealous of the advantages England might gain in this way.

They are very substantial indeed. Above all it would mean that Britain is able to link her economy externally with Soviet Russia, would be able to cooperate with the USSR in the post-War world especially in the reconstruction of Europe.

The American retrospective utopia of a restoration of the 1914 world, is not as phantasitic anymore once one puts one's self into the place of the Americans. If England can be won over or coerced over, the plan is feasible. Germany Italy, France do not exist anymore, and the USSR then might be forced to give in....

It is this double tendency in the USA policy towards Britain :
 the intent of compelling Britain to share in her plans on her terms, together with the Vatican undynastic (Hapsburgs and all) which explains the North African Intermezzo, the conversations on the Keynes plan, the policy towards Russia. Some of this was meant to ensure for the USA a pied a terre, independently from Britain, and on the other hand to bring her into the American gold stand plus free trade system after the war.

It might have been possible to put all this in concrete terms

territorial:	naval bases in the West Indies.
	empire policy: India,
	North American policy: Canada
	Pan American policy: British Honduras Guiana etc.
	Western Pacific: Australia, New Zealand
economic :	dollar or pound
	air lines
	shipping

7

It is doubtful whether that would be more illuminating. For the USA has no settled policy as yet. She has not yet limited her aims. That in fact is the trouble.

Domestically much trouble is foreseen. But that need not weaken her externally.

Nothing is more essential than that Great Britain should maintain her freedom of action within a balance of power by co-operation with the USA in the Pacific and with USSR in Europe.

In this respect the Moscow agreement as understood in Stalin's speech means a new offer to Britain to take an independent line. How much chance their ~~is~~ still is ~~in~~, I am not prepared to say.

Russian policy should, I believe be regarded in this light. It is a consciously regionalist conception. The discarding of Trotskyism was also the overcoming of capitalist universalism. From the point of view of the Daubian states the League of Nations solved none of the three problems of the region of mixed settlements: racial minority, restricted sovereignty and economic cooperation. On the regional basis much better chances offer. This is the great interest of these peoples to ~~wish~~ give the Russian ~~sphere~~ outlook on these questions a chance in Middle Eastern Europe.
