

Ad: Book-Plan

You sent me a note on one of the most interesting pieces of information of recent times - the Ernest Fisher broadcast to Germany from "Freies ^{Switzerland} Switzerland." (I happened to know of it; actually we subscribe to that weekly.) I had already passed it on myself, to others. Of course you will have noticed that it fits in exactly with some other news items that have percolated from Russia in recent weeks.

On the face of it, it is of course to be read diplomatically - i.e. it leaves all avenues open. The "generals and professors" may be just another "Vichy" (i.e. semi-fascist government) or another Kerensky government; it would depend. This, as to ambiguity of all policies ~~and~~ ^{which are} not definitely determined ^y my simultaneously created unalterable facts.

But the question remains: What is the intention? What is the line the Russians themselves would prefer to follow if they had to choose? ~~More~~ revolution or self-sufficiency (both qualified, slightly, by elements of the opposite)? And what does the Fisher broadcast-line mean in this context? The answer is plain to me: Russia is following an independent policy. She is not expecting to cooperate permanently with any one power and she is not inclined to go out for a new world organization which might solve the problem of security in the future.

As to her own immediate interests: she feels not in ~~view~~ ^{need} of territorial expansion, and is not interested in her neighbors beyond the western frontiers of Poland and Hungary, ~~the~~ Baltic, the Balkans, the Vistula, the Danubian plain - but not beyond that. Conditions in Germany, etc., affect her only to a lesser degree, but of course to a still very essential one, i.e. exclusion of a military power of possibly hostile tendencies.

Russia will attempt to achieve her aims by ~~having~~ close military alliances with her neighbors; she is inclined to leave them to run their

internal affairs since she is definitely averse to an expansion^{ist} policy. (i.e. that "every power expands," that "l'appetit vient en mangeant" is tosh: look at the British empire between 1786-1880: -- a long story of absolute disinterestedness of the English government in colonial expansion; opposing it (India) where she could.)

Here we come to the main point. The "Laws" of international politics (imperialism, etc.) which are current today are merely the reflexion of the fashions of the last 50 or 60 years, at the best. The very idea that either republican or socialist or capitalist or whateverist governments "must" ^{come} ~~come~~ everywhere is utterly untrue: during the greater part of recorded history no such "law" was in operation. Its origin lies in the curiously diffuse organization of a capitalist world economy: it definitely demands two things everywhere: (a) constitutional governments who check budgets and offer safeguards to foreign bondholders; (b) a market-economy organized in an independent monetary system. Consequently the 19th century established an unheard of uniformity of internal institutions all over the world. That's why we imagine that the world 'must' be either fascist or socialist or capitalist or whateveritist.

In the next period of history this will not be so. This - and this above all - is the advantage of planned economies - that they allow countries to be truly independent in their internal arrangements again. Russia's policy is a (perhaps unconscious) recognition of this basic new fact. This doesn't mean in the least that the interventionist problem is not the pivotal one: quite the opposite. We are witnessing a new solution of that problem, and it is the superior ^{ing} of planned economies over marketing ^{ones} ~~ones~~ that ensures the victory of democratic socialism. For the difference between the various planned economies of the future consists precisely in their willingness or unwillingness to cooperate internationally. That's what this war is about.

I agree that this qualifies the 'quod-libet'-ness of internal systems - for not all kinds of internal systems are externally cooperative. Fascism will thus die of its foreign policy: its denial of the international commitment.. This only bears out my view that basic social change is always induced by external factors - Russia's policy may represent this new internationalism.

the beginnings of