

Mo 2-5743

①

COMMON MAN'S MASTERPLAN

Governing view points:

PART ONE: ORIGINS OF THE CRISIS.

1. The collapse of the institutional system of the nineteenth century was not caused by the conflict of ambitious empires, warring ideologies or even a single massive event like World War I, but by an underlying process of vast scope the origins of which reach far back into the social and industrial history of the period.

393 - W - 1

This view point allows us to dissociate the world crisis from the accompanying wars and the problems of the Peace Conference. Unless this is done, it is impossible to show that Post-War reconstruction is not a question of 'What to do with Germany?' the

process

The story of the origins of the crisis will clearly show that the great transformation was on long before the single nations decided to hitch-hike on that movement towards their own ends.

These problems partly <sup>caused</sup> ~~caused~~ World War I, and certainly <sup>filled</sup> ~~filled~~ the period 1919-1933. This proves beyond shadow of a doubt that the unsolved problems of the <sup>a</sup> period are the ~~main~~ <sup>background</sup> and root cause of all present troubles.

Dignitaries  
the conceiving  
and the standard  
self-regulating  
markets  
led to:  
found catastrophe  
break down of  
internal system

PART TWO: THE STATE OF THE WORLD.

2. The unsolved problems which forced the great transformation upon us imperatively demand their solution in and after this war.

This view point will allow us to show in what manner the ambitious nations made use of the hitch-hiking process; how they gained even a kind of intellectual superiority over the complacent powers which failed to see the hidden weaknesses of the system.

That it will allow us to show why the conservative countries, like Great Britain were handicapped by their adherence to gold in their armaments and strategy. ~~Not~~ the Bolshevik bogey was mobilized by the ambitious states to paralyze the conservative Powers.

The story of ~~the~~ appeasement policy, of the Four Pact policy; of the Manchurian, the Abyssinian, the Spanish episode.

The unsolved internal problem: How to reform the economic system?

The unsolved international problem: How to replace the international economic system?

Consequences:

The Fall of France

The British Appeasement policy. etc.

modern

PART THREE: FREEDOM ON TRIAL

3. As in every previous phase in the history of Western civilization, external influences form the decisive factor in the development of national life. The survival of democracy depends ~~on the measure of its success in tackling the global tasks of the time.~~ upon the measure of its success in tackling the global tasks of the time. If freedom fails in (a) restricting the scope of wars; (b) securing ~~pannananb~~ a medium of exchange between increasingly large areas of the world then the dominating empire will emerge with its corollary of iteral slavery and ensure peace and division of labor within its confines.

The greatest single step towards the relative division of labor and the enlargement of peace is represented by the empires. They are semi-autarch and semi-peaceful.

The regulated economy allows cooperation in freedom i.e., irrespective of internal regimes. All except the predatory empire ~~in~~ are acceptable. The tame empire is not a utopia anymore.

But the will to cooperation must be positive and institutionalized. It is the new form of that peace interest which the Nineteenth Century produced and which we should retain and develop at all costs.

Internally we must have regulated markets. And the inevitable centralization must be met by positive will to freedom for minorities where Great Britain is the model.

Regulated market means markets with no supplementary markets for labor land and money.

The security is possible in a society wealthy enough to banish want without even raising the question of the motive to work.

- The freedom of arbitrary rejection of job to be limited.
- The freedom of arbitrary dismissal limited.
- The freedom of unlimited profits limited.
- The unlimited rights of private ownership limited.
- The public spirited forms of enterprise fostered.
- The plastic society achieved. The helpless society transcended.

The concept of freedom reformed. Christianity transcended. The philosophy of the common man established.

.....

*The CCA in the HE will restore the universal pattern & then become master of his own world.*

~~Two~~ chief figures  
 here  
 Le Sherm of the book <sup>is</sup> the Communist and  
 his and the Woolver William of burpant  
Combridge walk walk.

23000  
1918

These things to be shown:

(1) that industrial are not about any  
 "what kind, with Germany", but  
 what kind about war? (No word?)

(2) that the united public about  
~~concern~~ the intents as well  
manifested, that the cause

of the movement, the ful of France,  
 the Rain by, threaten  
 to prop change.

(3) that the CC is concerned in why  
these public bring up.

The CC + U.P.

Table of Contents length

About the system  
 self-regulating market system  
 10 mls. per  
 300  
 witnesses.

a table of contents  
 The table is not in the book + (the is not  
 show to both

110  
 1015  
 1015

# Ad: Council Man's Master Plan

The new political demand a new broadcasting service.

The exploded theories include:

- (a) the fiction of the 'masses' which have no political judgment;
- (b) the fiction that some mysterious kind of 'education' is needed in order to understand politics;
- (c) the fiction of politics as a jungle of intrigue, ambition, chance and vested interest in which there is neither meaning nor logic.

The true axioms ~~which are~~ revealing these are:

- (a) the axiom of the common man whose common sense is the actual and factual basis of politics in a democracy; *(of the conclusive evidence of the fullness of the*
- (b) the ~~non-existence~~ political judgment on ultimate issues *is rooted in* common human experience;
- (c) the axiom of the basic rationality of man and of politics: i.e., that the ~~inevitability~~ *of taking risks* provides for the element of chance in all human action; but that barring ~~that~~ *at* chance ~~is~~ *as* human situations leave only simple alternatives one of which is ~~certain~~ *as* to be ~~realized~~ *is* realized, as ~~any~~ *is* proposition of ~~non~~ geometry.

These axioms involve:

- (a) the debunking of ~~'psychology'~~ *mass-* ~~which~~ *is* never, in the long run, a cause, but always ~~unaffected~~ *effect* of political situations; consequent debunking of the ~~myth~~ *legend*
- (b) the ~~debunking~~ *that "dissatisfaction"* is in all countries equally a factor in politics;
- (c) the debunking of political prophecies which ~~pretend~~ *pretending* to be certain which of ~~the~~ *two* alternatives will actually occur;
- (d) the debunking of the ~~unsubstantiated~~ *opposite,* pseudo-scientific prejudice that ~~we cannot know anything~~ *we cannot know anything* about politics ~~and that~~ *basis* one person's view ~~is~~ *is* as good as another's, not only on ultimate ~~issues~~ *issues*, but also on current ~~details~~ *issues*.

This leaves room for an entirely new type of political comment, which only needs a touch of humor to camouflage its academic origins. It might be called, for instance, 'Ignoring the Obvious', or 'Through the Looking Glass' or 'The wrong end of the Telescope' or 'Seeing the Forest and the Trees' or 'Afterthoughts and Perspectives', or something similarly expressive of the slightly removed viewpoint. Actually, the talks would have to be held extremely topical, not in the obvious, but in the true sense.

10 or 15 minutes should prove entirely sufficient.

Range of subjects: Analysis of the global war.

- Military and political command (Napoleonic pattern)
- Non-military factors in modern strategy.
- Is there ~~any~~ total war otherwise than in the defensive? i.e. on one's own territory?
- Why were four best military writers so consistently wrong in this war? strategy?
- What is the connexion between finance and ~~strategy~~ Between democracy and strategy?
- The subject of morale: <sup>ultimate reason for the war</sup> ~~The need of~~ morale for any kind of action, individual or collective, sporting, economic, political military or otherwise.
- When does morale ~~decide~~ <sup>decide the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>(outcome)</sup> and who does military ~~decide~~ <sup>decide</sup> morale?   
 ~~the~~ <sup>(outcome)</sup>

many of

~~difference in the position of different parts of the population to~~  
~~the question of the~~

that  
First - ~~but~~ the masses have no political judgment of their own.

As against that you have the evidence of the facts, hard statistical facts, of the greatest exactitude. The Gallup polls prove that the masses in this country have been consistently<sup>a</sup> head of their leaders. Now mind you that does not prove them right, they may have been just a ahead of the mistakes made later by their leaders.

But that isn't the point. The <sup>o</sup>point is whether the masses have or have not an opinion of their own, or whether it is made for them. In this respect the evidence is <sup>absolutely</sup> conclusive.

Second <sup>4</sup> Listen to <sup>people's</sup> ~~the~~ arguments <sup>political</sup> indisscussion. The issue is <sup>maybe anything</sup> ~~let us~~

~~say, war and peace, free trade versus protection, prohibition versus anti-prohibition, / or anything else~~. The blues and the bluffs will argue anything and will / deny the othersides contenti

tion what ever it be. Listening to the arguments it is difficult not to get convinced that you are listening to a pair of fools, for the argument has obviously nothing whatever to do with the issues involved. They are arguing the rights and wrongs of

incidents which propganda has dumped into the issue, ~~then~~ shoals of red herrings are started and <sup>each</sup> ~~every one of the~~ herring is chased to some subterfuge where he ~~keeps~~ <sup>is</sup> hiding ~~from the~~ light of the truth, until some fresh herring attracts attention

and the game of confusing the issue starts all over again,

*I cannot help conceding that this is true.*  
That is true.

*But* ~~the~~ <sup>fallacy of the argument, implicit</sup> explanation is quite simple, shown: The arguments <sup>(adduced</sup> which people give for their opinions, and the actual arguments, on which <sup>people</sup> they make up their minds, are <sup>are</sup> entirely different sets of arguments.

The former are numerous and foolish, the <sup>arguments adduced</sup>

*arguments which are actually operative*

the ~~latter~~ are few and to the point,  
~~(not very different from~~

It is ~~unusually~~ private life. One makes up one's mind about a matter in business or in family life, ~~rightly or wrongly, on one or two~~ and taken up a position in consequence, rarely three arguments. But once one has made up one's mind, ~~one is~~ prepared to defend it against ~~unseen~~ any oncomer, and the arguments then used may be simply repartees, to what the other man ( or woman ) says, ~~with very little, indeed,~~ mostly with no connection at all, with the original, and relevant points of argument.

Let me put it this way. There comes a point in every public discussion - and the more heated and the more confused it is, the more likely is this to happen- when a man comes home tired and disgusted, ~~and utterly~~ fed up, and in undressing he ~~sharpened~~ delivers himself in a kind of pondered and cynical ~~and~~ <sup>reckons</sup> sententious way of ~~what~~ John Doe. personally ~~thinks~~ is ~~the~~ at the bottom ' of all this pother'. Now, watch: What he is now going to say will usually be rather cynical, at least he ~~thinks~~ intends it to be so. It will have hardly any reference to the heated discussions of the day; and--it will be very simple. ~~John Doe~~ <sup>now</sup> John Doe, /believes himself to be clever; he believes himself to be at his best; he will not be bamboozled. that is why he tries to be cynical. /And what he now delivers himself of-- that's my point- <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>truly</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>0</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>throughly</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>reasonable.</sup> It is not necessarily ~~right~~ <sup>true</sup>; but it bears reference to the things he ~~believes~~ are really important: and - <sup>here's</sup> ~~this~~ <sup>THEREFORE</sup> ~~is~~ my second contention.- HE CANNOT/ BE FAR WRONG .

For a very simple reason: ~~John Doe~~ The things he believes are really important are the few things which actually matter: <sup>to him</sup> I would list them <sup>crudely</sup> as ~~follows~~ follows, (and contend that he cannot be far wrong about either of them:)

(a) his income, (b) <sup>his income</sup> what he can get for ~~it~~ (c) the security of his existence job life and otherwise. (d) whether he on the whole feels happy or bascially fed up with ~~things~~ things. That is all he cares for- and jolly well right he is; and it takes something to say that anybody was a better judge of his long run ~~income~~ <sup>money wages</sup>, his long run real wages, his long run security

of job or limb, his long run feel about life and its livability than John Doe himself.

here 's the trouble. For he But- it is intejected-/he does not judge the matter from the long run view , but from the short ~~run~~ view. He will ~~surely~~ go in for inflation, if that gives him higher income; he will go in for rationising if that gives him cheaper prices; he will stand for free competition of for planning, which ever gives him more secur ty ~~than the danger to his country and to his peace with his neighbours~~ , and every time he will disregard the long term effects of his desires-- the ruin of the currency, the increase in cut throat competition, the grwoth of bureaucracy, ~~and so on~~ and so on .

I appeal

Against this ~~appeal~~ <sup>or on ultimate issues</sup> to the facts . For it is precisely on big decisions/that the average man is apt to be sound- that is what the poll shows. And eveytime he is credited with ~~making~~ taking the short view, he actually takes the long view. This was ~~also~~ true on the question of aeró aircraft; on the war issue; on rationing; on taxation, on ~~working hours~~ working hours; on , ~~man~~ man power; on every other issue, ~~and so on~~

The explanation is again quite simple: the ultimate issues are simply the long run issues. On definite short run issues, ~~the~~ man is much more apt to be mistaken, but these are the comparatively unimportant issues . They are technical, they can be and perhaps should be dealt with by the expert. But the basic ~~is~~ issue , is by its very nature outside the competency of the expert, because the only person who really knows the rights and wrongs of these issues is the person whom they <sup>must</sup> ultimately ~~must~~ affect and that is the again the common man.

~~Take~~ Take capital issues : like war and peace. I maintain that ~~there~~ there is no expert on the question of life and death. We all come into life once and move out once; nobody has more experience or less on this point. Now the question of war and peace is



precisely on this : Whether <sup>as it is</sup> ~~life is~~ ~~or~~ not worth living , and what risks we should reasonably take to ~~change~~ change in order to make it livable.

Nothing more ridiculous than the ~~call~~ call for the expert who is supposedly an authority on whether I should prefer to live or die. ~~And~~ And ~~this~~ this is precisely the true long run question- and yet who but the common man should be able to pronounce upon it.

But in the same way there is no expert on the value of liberty; <sup>no expert on</sup> the various sides and shades and aspects of liberty; ~~there~~ there is no expert on the value of security in life; or whether adventure or security are worth more under the given conditions; ~~there~~ there is no expert on the types of happiness we are constantly gambling against one another; there is no expert on the question whether I prefer stable money and restricted jobs to less stable money with more ~~cert~~ cert inty of jobs. All ~~the~~ expert <sup>series one</sup> usually knows <sup>to the common man,</sup> is that which is entirely unessential, /because ~~the~~ <sup>series No 2</sup> experts / <sup>series one.</sup> have long since discovered any fallacy in the arguments of experts ~~of course,~~

~~Of course,~~ I may now be in danger of having proved ~~too~~ much , for if I have my way, then, it seems, the common man would always be right, and it would be entirely inexplicable why ~~there~~ there are still differences of opinion, seeing that only one view can be right at a time.

Now I dont argue anything of the kind . I ~~only~~ restrict my view to ultimate issues in critical situations, and exclude all ~~the~~ issues which are not basic, ~~and~~ i.e. do not decide the the fate of the community in some essential respect. Now, ~~quite~~ naturally views will differ according to the experiences and interests of the various strata , and if they vote accordingly ~~in opposite ways~~ this merely proves that they have voted according to their interests. But still reasonably , and- that is all I contend.

*Second*

Now I come to a second fallacy on the masses and democracy, and it is that democracy is ~~an~~ <sup>simply a matter</sup> ~~matter~~ of education.

Against that I should like to put up a counter thesis which is that although education is not only a good thing, but one of the things ~~in the absence of which~~ <sup>neither</sup> individual ~~nor~~ <sup>make and</sup> community life ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> ~~unfit~~ <sup>very much</sup> worth living - it has very little to do with democracy.

The ~~reason~~ <sup>reason</sup> again is simple. Democracy is a way of life and as a method of ~~decision~~ <sup>decision</sup> it is about the contents of life. Now these are not matters about which there is any ~~school~~ <sup>set</sup> knowledge. One man's knowledge is as good as an other's. And it is a simple fact that the way of life of democracy was not developed by so-called educated people nor was it practiced by them nor was <sup>it</sup> even preferred by them, but it was practiced by communities of simple people like those of the History of the Apostles, <sup>quaker commu</sup> on the ~~frontier~~ <sup>frontier</sup> ~~villages~~ <sup>villages</sup> of the early ~~frontiersmen~~ <sup>frontiersmen</sup> or the pilgrim father's on board the Mayflower. None of these communities can boast to have been especially educated. Poor ~~fishermen~~ <sup>fishermen</sup> at the best; ~~men~~ <sup>obscurer</sup> small ~~trades~~ <sup>trades</sup> people who had fled from Northern England in ~~Elizabethan~~ <sup>to Holland</sup> times; poor ill educated ~~frontiersmen~~ <sup>these</sup> - were the inventors of ~~this~~ <sup>of democracy</sup> idea and technique. The notion that education is needed to understand democracy or to practice it, is a misunderstanding which deserves <sup>to be cleared</sup> ~~being~~ <sup>being</sup> cleared up. because it obscures the general human ~~importance~~ <sup>import</sup> and the general human validity of the democratic idea.

The truth is that common human experience is at the back of democracy, and ~~that~~ where that experience includes tolerance, patience with the views of dissenting minorities, there democracy itself will be tolerant and <sup>not</sup> enforce ~~no~~ more uniformity than necessary to give ~~full~~ effect to the decisions of the majority. ~~TTTTTTTT~~

The third change in the nature of politics <sup>is</sup> the passing of the conviction that politics is ~~about~~ <sup>merely</sup> ~~nothing else but~~ <sup>power and interest</sup> ~~intrigues and ambitions~~ <sup>merely</sup>, a jungle

Dionetio vllies of the gr. unkn...

who have we reviewed  
Best main content of the  
semi development; the  
change; the absence of ideas...

Fr Engel, Conght, P. Toyubee Mantoux  
or Wittmann has been swept  
checked by Clapham, Lincoln  
other schools. On this point we  
understandly side with the of polygenists  
materialists, whose general  
approach has been irradical  
by the results of European by the  
social anthropology and general  
economic history. March The claim  
about the place of science of  
the general of science  
European science has been much  
advanced by the works,  
Chamberlain & H.  
Knight. Since the agenda  
of science has been found  
neglect of the works, Marx, to  
those works into individual  
aspect of science of  
to works of the works of  
Weber, Mantoux, Conght P.  
had found works of  
works of works of  
to found works of works  
Marx and Mantoux  
works of works of

blind  
of / chance and ~~un~~interests, human passions and irrational ambitions.

As against that I want to set the growing conviction ~~that~~ of the basic rationality of man and of politics.

Chance cannot of course be eliminated ~~from~~ from politics. *But can it be removed from it?* A war that was certain to break out may be averted by the sudden death of the chief ~~actors~~ actors; an inevitable fall in prices and consequent unemployment may be averted by the chance discovery of large ~~fold~~ fields as actually happened in the middle of the Century both in California and Australia. But this only means that some measure of risk is inevitably linked with any political prediction or forecast; that we cannot be safe from the action of chance however prudently we have mapped our course.

But that does not mean at all, that politics is not rational.

Take, again our private life and existence. Who would argue that our life is not largely under the sway of rational plans, decisions, attitudes, moral purposes and the promptings of duty and affection, <sup>on the</sup> just ~~as~~ one had, passion and ill considered emotion on the other. The fact of chance which may deflect the ~~un~~ rational ~~course~~ course of things in life does not prevent us from thinking about moral life as ruled by reason and the laws of reason. In other words, all we do is to ~~take~~ account for chance by facing risk- an entirely usual happening.

The same is the case in politics. Barring chance human situations leave only simple alternatives, this is the law of private life. But precisely the same is also the <sup>also</sup> law of public life, or politics. Barring chance, political situations leave ~~un~~ simple alternatives, and these alternatives <sup>are</sup> as inevitable as those which govern private life. There are situations which allow of no other solution than fight; other situations allow also the solution of compromise; but in every situation the number of basic alternatives is limited, and therefore the forecast of the future is possible, as long as we restrict ourselves

Almond the whole field of  
classical & modern  
in the last decade  
Pantheism and

Note

This bird's eye view of man's present  
condition sums up what appears to  
be the converging results of  
several social disciplines. Primitive  
economies have been ~~reorganized~~ <sup>founded</sup> ~~reorganized~~  
by ~~the work of~~ <sup>Thurnwald</sup>  
supplemented by <sup>Malinowski's</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>history</sup>  
~~On the~~ <sup>in the</sup> ~~ancient~~ <sup>modern</sup> ~~investigations~~  
Rostovtzeff's <sup>on</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>medieval</sup> ~~economic~~  
~~history~~ <sup>has shown</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>continuous</sup> ~~and~~  
~~is outstanding~~ <sup>is outstanding</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>dialectical</sup> ~~character~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>institutional</sup> ~~change~~  
has been ~~again~~ <sup>powerfully</sup> ~~reasserted~~  
by ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~organistic~~  
gradualism of <sup>Victor</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>Thunp</sup>  
On the mercantile period <sup>the</sup>  
trend of <sup>Thunp</sup> ~~started~~ <sup>by</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>Thunp</sup>  
(1884) <sup>and</sup> ~~by~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~Thunp (1904) <sup>has</sup> ~~been~~  
recently <sup>been</sup> ~~related~~ <sup>by</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>Thunp</sup>;  
(192?).  
On the industrial Revolution <sup>the</sup> ~~was~~  
~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~clearly~~ <sup>clearly</sup> ~~seen~~ <sup>seen</sup> ~~whether~~ <sup>whether</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~a~~ <sup>a</sup>~~  
thing has ever happened at all, at least  
as the sudden, dramatic change in  
house affairs, which led to the  
social changes that <sup>are</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>being</sup> ~~being~~ <sup>discussed</sup> ~~discussed~~  
today. On this vital subject even  
that a curriculum

to these alternatives. I agree that this is most unsatisfactory. When it is certain that one of the two partners must win and the other lose ~~the one is/able to say that~~ <sup>only</sup> either the one or the other will win. This almost sounds like a bad joke. But if one looks at it more closely, the matter is not quite as bad. Although I may be burning to know which will win, I may ~~be~~ yet be interested to know for certain ~~which~~ which two events I can expect to happen - alternatively, i.e. either the one or the other.

Something similar happens, after all, in private life. How often the warning of a friend may take on the form: Mind, once you put yourself into this situation, there will be only the choice for you to stay or quit; or: to ~~man up~~ go in for the venture or cut it out; to stand up for your views and take the consequences or back out of these views too late. And so on. Are such views entirely worthless? S rely not: They in effect, help us to make up our minds, since they clarify the situations we are in by clarifying the situation we would get into by taking one or another decision. And although they are not able to foretell what will happen, they help us by telling us ~~for certain~~ for certain that one of two things must happen.

This, I submit is the nature of political forecast. And if we do not expect more from it, we will hardly ever be cheated. I repeat - Barring chance the political situation allows only a very few alternatives, and with the certainty of a geometrical proposition we can ~~foretell~~ <sup>bound</sup> foretell that one of them is ~~bound~~ to happen. True, nobody knows for certain which will happen, since that precisely is the matter still under decision. But that is far from saying that the student of politics cannot offer a view which has more chance of being right than he who has not studied the nature of the alternatives. With one important qualification; That on the really decisive issues, the common man's view is worth as much as his; on less important one's however, he has more chances to be right than the common man.

Democracy is well grounded <sup>d</sup> in the rationality of man.

Maxwell, Sarabell, Parson, [unclear] [unclear]

The History of the Industrial Revolution  
Economics has been, perhaps, (and I am afraid)  
the Industrial Revolution as conceived  
by Marshall, Taylor & A. D. Noyes has  
been more generally denied to  
have ever happened at all. For  
of known, Redford, Clapham, others  
Hobson and <sup>Hugh</sup> Redford. On this point <sup>most</sup>  
we unhesitatingly side with the  
~~in the~~ <sup>in the</sup> ~~Industrial~~ <sup>Industrial</sup> ~~school~~. The  
new economics <sup>owe</sup> <sup>to</sup> Keynes & his  
followers <sup>an understanding of</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>relations of</sup> <sup>state</sup> <sup>to</sup> <sup>capitalism</sup>  
Relations of state <sup>to</sup> <sup>capitalism</sup> : Hans  
Freyer.

This bird's eye view of man's  
present predicament shows up what  
appears to be the author to be the  
results of several ~~social~~ disciplines  
converging <sup>for</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>social</sup> ~~anthropology~~  
~~general~~ ~~economic~~ ~~history~~. ~~with~~  
A number of social sciences  
that have been revolutionized  
in this last generation, but few  
of the attempts at ~~the~~ <sup>an</sup> ~~inquiries~~ <sup>into</sup> ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~  
~~new~~ ~~apparent~~ ~~new~~ ~~knowledge~~ ~~are~~ ~~apparent~~  
~~On~~ ~~outlines~~ ~~have~~ ~~been~~ ~~made~~  
yet.

Drafty Ms for Favre & Rinehart

COMMON MAN'S MASTERPLAN

This book is addressed to the general reader and discusses the urgent problems of our time from the point of view of the common man.

While the various shades of anti-democrats each have their own story of the world catastrophe - ~~the democrat has~~ yet to produce ~~his~~ <sup>the democrat has</sup> ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> own.

This story should tell in simple language how it all started; where responsibility ~~should be located for the past~~; <sup>lay for past mistakes.</sup> what was unavoidable and should ~~therefore be no~~ <sup>not be a</sup> subject for recrimination; and what ~~were~~ <sup>failures</sup> avoidable ~~failures~~, whether ~~their source was~~ <sup>they sprang from</sup> moral, intellectual or political ~~weakness~~.

This story should be ruthlessly frank. It should ~~finish of the~~ <sup>discard the</sup> illusions concerning the nature of international peace systems such as were fostered by hosts of wishful thinkers entrenched in the pacifistic and economistic camps. The all too simple view which assumes war to be merely due to <sup>a</sup> ramp of international financiers or big armament makers should be discounted. Only then ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> it possible to propose methods which can be seriously expected to reduce the probability of wars, to restrict the scope of those that occur, and to ensure that <sup>if they occur.</sup> the aggressor be the loser.

This story should be consistent. There was not an independent observer in the 1920ies but agreed that Europe had <sup>o</sup> too many sovereign potentates; that there were too many ~~necessary~~ political frontiers; and that the liberum veto of the Liliputs was at its best a nuisance, and at its worst a dangerous breeder of anarchy. <sup>It is amazing how</sup> ~~all too~~ many tend to forget this today. The consistent democrat must staunchly oppose reactionary insistence on antiquated boundaries, while rigidly maintaining the right to ~~national~~ cultural freedom - a right much too



frequently trodden under foot by the selfsame governments who insist on ~~their~~ inflated territorial acquisitions and hypertrophical sovereignties.

The story should be intelligent. We should recognise progress even <sup>where</sup> ~~when~~ the forces of evil <sup>are using it as their vehicle.</sup> ~~use it to forge ahead~~. If Germany's masters have opened the path to a united Europe, to regulated economies and to the displacement of the gold standard we should not rush back thoughtlessly into the past, only because the doors of the future were thrown open by those who wanted to dominate that future for their own criminal advancement.

This story should be true. We must at last face the facts - all the facts. We must not shirk those <sup>facts</sup> which seem to contradict our ideals, but take a straight look at them and redraw the outlines of our ideals, where they conformed only loosely to the facts. Do not let us squeamishly <sup>hide</sup> ~~wrap~~ ourselves <sup>behind</sup> ~~in~~ complacent references to past formulations, <sup>These</sup> ~~which~~ may have admirably fitted other situations but ~~which~~ <sup>one</sup> would (today betray) the essential faith of their authors, if ~~we~~ attempted to wangle the <sup>formulations</sup> ~~use~~ instead of submitting to <sup>the facts</sup> ~~the facts~~ and restating the truth in their light.

This story should be complete. Not in the ~~subjective~~ sense ~~of~~ <sup>the pedant or antiquarian,</sup> ~~that~~ of ~~the pedant~~ who imagines that he who has all the facts has all the truth. He may have merely collected all the words of a dead language. But completely <sup>life</sup> in the sense that it should envisage the scene of man's collective ~~action~~ <sup>life</sup> in all its breadth and depth, and that it should formulate <sup>the</sup> ~~its~~ <sup>all-round,</sup> ~~its~~ <sup>in its own way,</sup> task for democracy is either a form of life or it is nothing. <sup>But</sup> ~~the~~ life is the fullness of all actions and meanings, ~~the~~ the pervasive substance which acts and reacts upon all things. So let us range over the whole field of communal exist

hence—the political, cultural, and social, the economic, financial and technological, the military, educational and artistic, the scientific, philosophical and religious. Man's life is not <sup>this or that; not</sup> ~~the~~ the one or the other; society lives by and through each; democracy is kindred to <sup>them</sup> all.

This story should be practical. Not in the sense of ~~suggest~~ suggesting popular solutions for supposedly burning issues while evading ~~the~~ essential ones for fear of being called academic, <sup>But</sup> in the responsible sense ~~of the word~~ which implies that no one should advocate beliefs to which he does not feel able to live up himself. Demands however "high-minded", which by their very nature can not be realized, are not idealistic but meaningless; and he who obstructs in the name of such ideals the achievement of the possible is not an idealist <sup>merely</sup> but a social nuisance. The idealist is he whose values correspond to the nature of human society, and who is bent on achievement even when there is nothing thrilling about the details he is hammering out. Yet such realism <sup>should not be</sup> ~~is never~~ permitted to become an excuse for the complacent acceptance of avoidable ills, for society ~~is destined to~~ allow the fulfillment of the best in man, and it is only the unselfish realist who can be trusted to aim at the best.

This story should be the story of the common man. If Jesus exalted the poor, he did not do so because <sup>he deemed</sup> the poor ~~were~~ better than others, but because the poor man was the common man of the time. ~~Every and any~~ A society can consist of working and labouring people ~~and of them~~ alone; but no society can consist of rich people alone. The rich man is not <sup>any</sup> worse than the working man, but he should put up with the fact that he is not the common man, and it is to the needs ~~and the measure~~ of the latter that society should <sup>be adapted.</sup> ~~conform~~. A human society is one in which the common man feels at home; the wealthy should be content with his wealth and not

expect public esteem merely on account of his wealth. The expert should serve the common man, and not attempt to make ~~them~~ <sup>him</sup> serve ~~him~~; <sup>the expert</sup> ~~for the~~ <sup>On the</sup> fundamental questions of government ~~need no~~ <sup>there can be ~~exist~~ no</sup> specialists. ~~Such~~ <sup>Questions</sup> ~~concern~~ <sup>like these concern</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> value of ~~the elements of~~ human life itself, and there is no expert in the matter of death and life. Whether a community should or should not risk the lives of its members; whether it should turn to one or the other chief task of existence; whether it should accept one or another ultimate rule of conduct is for the common man to decide, ~~and there is no expert to know more about it.~~ <sup>All the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>common</sup> ~~man~~ <sup>needs,</sup> is ~~the~~ <sup>such</sup> information <sup>as</sup> the government is in duty bound to provide him with. It has been confirmed by statistical proof that the common man is a safer judge of the essentials of a vital issue than the so-called educated person (while on unessential ~~issues~~ <sup>and non-</sup> vital issues the latter may be more reliable). The anti-democratic argument of the alleged educational and cultural handicaps of the common man derives from mere prejudice. Education is no safeguard against social superstition as witnessed by the vicious untruths sponsored and spread by the intellectuals of the 1920ies who served as the hotbed of fascism. The miasma of cultural degeneration thrived in academic circles and it was the common man who was least susceptible to that emotional epidemic.

This story should be about the unsolved problems of our time.

What we need is not so much a clarification of intentions ~~of~~ <sup>as</sup> of the situation we find ourselves in.- not of values but of facts. Complacency resulted in intellectual failure to comprehend the meaning of the events. <sup>So</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>how</sup> we of the democracies alone remained in the dark about the problems, the dangers and the tasks of the age. These unsolved problems caused the catastrophe, shaped the course of events, and still dominate the situation. On a complete understanding of these problems the common man

must base his masterplan if he is to become the conscious ruler of his own world.

The story of the unresolved problems should drive home the following recognitions:

1. That post war reconstruction is not about "What to do with Germany" but what to do with the unsolved problems of the world. No conceivable treatment of Germany will resolve them.
2. That these unsolved problems led to World War I and were only partly resolved by the destruction of the feudal empires of the Hohenzollern, the Habsburg, the Romanov and the Sultan-Khalifs; that the between-war period was entirely dominated by them, including the rise of Hitlerism, British appeasement, the Russian bogey, the collapse of France, the gay Twenties, and the wasted Thirties in America.
3. That these unsolved problems centered around the antiquated international system of absolute sovereignties and an automatic gold-standard on the one hand, of a national life based on unregulated economies on the other. Between them they corroded the civilization with unemployment and unrest, deflations and super-wars.
4. That the Hitlerian crime wave could be successful only because it ~~was~~ <sup>benefited from</sup> ~~use of the pressure~~ of these unsolved problems which were bursting the world wide open; in ~~this~~ <sup>the Hitlerian</sup> venture ~~some~~ <sup>of</sup> the ~~obstructive~~ <sup>most</sup> features of the old world ~~pattern~~ perished including nuisance sovereignties, the gold standard fetish as well as chaotic markets. But if Hitlerian barbarism was "hitchhiking on the great transformation", it was only because ~~it~~ <sup>it could</sup> ~~pretended~~ <sup>to offer an</sup> ultimate solution ~~was~~ <sup>even though it was that of</sup> slavery for all under the heel of the Nordics of the Munich beer garden. <sup>tic methods</sup>
5. That the survival of democracy depends upon the measure of their success in tackling the global tasks of the time. If freedom fails ~~to~~ (a) <sup>to</sup> restrict ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> scope of wars, (b) <sup>or</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> secure ~~a~~ <sup>e</sup> medium of

exchange between increasingly large areas of the planet, then the war-waging slave empire will triumph and ensure peace and division of labour within its confines of death.

6. That the greatest single step towards ~~the~~ <sup>area</sup> division of labour and the enlargement of the peace <sub>L</sub> is represented by essentially autarch and essentially peaceful empires the co-operation of which is institutionally safeguarded, ~~the~~ <sup>empires such as</sup> the U.S.A., Latin America, Great Britain, the U.S.S.R. and a similarly peaceful federation of a German Central Europe, China, India, and some other regions.

7. That the will to co-operation between the empires must be positive and institutionalized. It is the new form of ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> peace interest which the nineteenth century produced, and which we should retain and develop. All but the predatory empires are ~~acceptable~~ <sup>eligible under the new dispensation</sup>. The tame empire is no more an utopia.

8. That the nineteenth century was ~~essentially~~ <sup>peacefully</sup> imperialistic ~~since~~ <sup>since</sup> ~~under~~ the gold standard the leading powers insisted on spreading their business pattern to all countries and forced them to accept their institutions, without which trade was then not possible. We should model ourselves on China which is and was based on the tolerance of other peoples' ways of life.

9. That ~~essentially~~ self-sufficient empires can regulate their economic life in the way they please and live at peace with others. ~~That~~ <sup>must be</sup> ~~is possible only if~~ the helpless method of free trade ~~is~~ <sub>L</sub> superseded by direct responsibility of the governments for economic and financial relations with other governments.

10. That, internally, we must have regulated markets which remove labour and money from the scope of anarchy. ~~That~~ <sup>that is</sup> The inevitable increase in centralization <sub>L</sub> involved must be met by the positive will to freedom

for all minorities - racial, religious, regional or otherwise - made  
effective with a single-mindedness modelled on <sup>England's</sup> ~~achievement~~ achievement.

-----