A house divided in itself cannot stand. And allies who do not even own in one house yet, have no mailbox in which the letter of unconditional surrender could be posted.

The debate on peace terms has centered on the contents of the peace; it has neglected the issue in whose name it will be proposed. Small Germany surrender to England, Russia, the United States and a little bit of France.

The Allies surrendered in this manner. The result was that Italy and divided to receive the surrender. The surrender of unconditional surrender is not as simple as it sounds; one must have the power to dispose of the surrendered power.

No, true, in this entity which can receive the incredibly efficient form of economic, this whole concern, going in the spirit of peace. The overall bit of this central question is interest to abstract thinking. Our intellect always tries to state the truth objectively. Politics, however, puts the truth which we represent to persons, first. Untrue might have done most things very much in the way in which [....] will do them. The true difference—never admitted by the intellect but always acted upon at the polls—is that it makes all the difference whether Dewey does it or Roosevelt.

Applied to the peace, the rule means that we still are at war because there is no real recipient of a genuine offer. The allies have not formed one ear to listen to Germany. Accordingly,
the German try to break to every ally in his own way. And Mr. Himmler felt pretty sure during the winter last year that eventually he could do Bolshevism and secure a separate peace. What else can these people think? Of course, they have lost the war. Of course, they must surrender. But if the British take the arm, if the Americans flood Germany with their armies and school teachers, if the Russians keep shooting even through a stove, the Germans have no incentive to sustain the day of collapse. It could be a collapse, they think, since there is nobody to stop the core of the historical core who, of course, could surrender. It would happen in a HINDENBURG-free-for-all. Created life does not dissolve in this manner. One of my friend must say: "as this war is, and as either is, Germany still has some kind of bad existence and existence is preferable to non-existence.

People who doubt this truth. In their various seats nothing is quite serious, try to take out of their library the works of Lenin, the great Berliner humanist and philosopher, of Kleist, the violent German, of Nietzsche, the good European. He place which in the United States is held by Patrick Henry's famous "Give me liberty or give me death", is held in the middle of a crowded Europe by their unanimous choice of: "Madness is better than non-existence." Madness has appealed to the Germans if it was the only way of keep in alive at all, while Carnegie said: "make money, my son. If you can, honestly, but make money," the German tradition in a small world without those roads and without goldmines ran: "keep alive, by son. If you may, reasonably, but keep alive." And so, "Give me madness if non-existence is the
only alternative", is a word really enacted upon our eyes. This line brings us indispensable corrections. They are more "horror than report". Germany has never wanted...

Germany will not surrender before it has done more than begun the muddle of a deed that a beaten foe had been established which will end with general affairs in the name of the enemy. Neither of the superpowers are anything but "national". The German would have to see some firm reality "the world", before they could feel that they would not be "sruled" over them.

The Russian are willing to surrender; their army and their state to a world according to the "state". It is in whole content of the "existence of the souls". But they say that there is no family of nations to which the prodigal son can return. And they are right so far, and either the Russians whose horizon only in the era of world permanently divided in economics, will vanish on the very day that world turns and receive Germany, as she really functions, the second critical...

Is this possible? The paradoxical answer is that it is possible and impossible both. It is impossible to have one world loosely organized for all political purposes which might occur all over the globe; it is possible to organize the world effectively with regard to all the problems concerning Germany. China, India, Africa, South America, Alaska, -- how big and unsettled all these parts of the world are! China is perhaps now at the age of the Climac in Europe, nine hundred years later. How foolish it would be to organize a Superstate or even a league with right...

/It is impossible to have one and the same organisation for both tasks.
to tackle with the making of political events. We represent different shades of rightness. Our life choices differ. We differ from each other. The United States and Britain are both perilous one particle or the potential expansiveness to make peace of power. A section of the world is "pale" at this hour.

Unfortunately, American always deal in the whole sell in their overt actions. Hence, adventures are not conceived in a binary or the universal terms. This is the hypocrisy of our event; the solution found then was correct for our own situation; it is hypocritical to us, but the experience that led to it was inevitable of the whole sell or might. The reality is that we cannot do the opposite. In the abstract, the solution is thought of all one, but it is necessary right to be one except in the particular instance. This particular instance is where the American president to a particular form of action meant to sacrifice the possibilities of a whole organization. In the abstract to this particular historical task, nobody in any form in history is an obstructionist. The Choctaw Indians, in our, the obstruction must the unfortunate. If we speak with the aid of King Gusto, this finest and most abstract of the modern idealists.

Twice in a generation, the Americans have tried to glue a world again to open to. They have preferred madness to the absolute mythologies of national sovereignties. The allies can put an end to the slaughter-- the announcement of the United States in August 1939 that they would send ten thousand airplanes over, would have sufficed--then-- if they constitute a historical point, a
receiving and alone existence is as inadmissible that the sermons be at convinced this that the world as an obstacle around us as the stumbling block.

All the systems point, unfortunately, in the opposite direction. With the exception of Berlin, the military occupation is expected to proceed by separate armies. Technically, this may be right and necessary. Politically, it is terrible to announce this separate procedure. The German must realize that despite the different uniforms, one world speaks to them in occupying them. In the same, the unity could not be really reality, unity cannot be more present, such a link is too easily found out. The political or psychoLOGICAL mistake foresees does the lasting mistake. I am afraid that Mr. Adnet is right when he thinks the great powers may grow tired of this occupation and leave the letter to France exactly as in 1918. This would mean that the second world war was lost as the first.

Why is this true? Because these are the world revolution made-in-ussr so often crudely sacrificed to the Bolshevics. The world revolution made in uSSr is a very small part of the upheaval caused in the period 1914 to 1944. This world war revolution was anti-ideological, anti-nationalistic. It set out to overcome the partisan split in any one ideology. For this reason, it was not represented by any one party or nation but forced all of them, great and small, to becomemere actors in its Total Drama. Not the mean Total. The so-called totalitarianism is not understood if one does not see the ghost against which they all fought: The approaching one world made its entrance in the form of world wars, and these wars, in turn, pressed the permanent
interaction of the world's economies.

In this scene, Hitler embodies the last counter-revolution, the world war revolution. Germany is the center of this earthquake of our time, not Russia. Bolshevism is peripheral compared to the pressures from the whole world, pressures on central Europe, and compared to the fissures produced there under this pressure like the real separation of Czechs and Germans within Bohemia. One thing had happened before the Germans went and
for long, the Hitler's counter-revolution lasted as long as the pressures and fissures remain and produce the impression of a world in ancestry, left to accident.

The fifty and one voices of Japan, France, the United States, Chile, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Soviet Russia, Poland, Ireland, Baltic, Columbia, Canada, Turkey, Argentina, Russia, Holland, Finland, Belgium, China, pressured on Central Europe's daily routines by threats in economic chances from every corner of the universe at once. All the divisions the United States have within and all that the whole for America can make so much in pride and hope, for Germany existed outside herself, not in the form of divisions but of pressures.

This made the Hitler's Sabbath complete. The very moment all these pressures became organized and articulate, they will appear normal and then Germany could exist in form. The impression of normalcy keeps our minds balanced. Anyone might have lost his mind, under the circumstances.

If the whole world as one partner will trade with Germany as the other partner, the world will have to constitute itself as the one correspondent of economic activities on the one end and of the line; then, Germany can constitute herself as the
other correspondent on the other. This would defy any orientation which now is lacking, to form any such unity, is the perpetual problem of organized society. The abstract form of organization of all the nations of the world could not have each real ear or mouth to talk to any nation because, in its entirety, it would contain all the nations inside its organization. These kinds of world organizations are good for stamp collectors and post-departments. They never add to the stature of their individual members. They preclude their full pledged existence. The union which we have in mind, would do here: it would, by its very existence, lend lending a world status as the world's economic foundation.

The ear and the mouth will make Germany respond immediately, must be visible and audible. They must have the authority to dispose of Germany's coal and to import coffee or to hire two million German workers for the reconstruction of Russia, etc., etc.

This ear and this mouth will have to represent the economies of the world, despite their variety, as one board of production and trade and labor. We deliberately say production, trade, labor. Money talks won't do, this time. Money is a secondary question because the division of labor between the various economies is our issue in this world upheaval. The form of ears which it has taken, must not blind us to the issue. It had to be that because all the entrenched ideologies of the nations had to be broken down sufficiently to hammer this unwanted fact home that a new degree of the division of labor needed acceptance.
The error of pure capitalism was that it did not consider itself as unlimitable. The fallacy of pure Marxism has been to confuse the world revolution and the communist party activities. The world revolution by world wars is a technical and material travail brought on by the wields and the changing demands and not by Karl Marx or historians. Ownership of the proletariat, ownership by individuals—utterly irrelevant questions compared to the greater human question of solidarity in the division of labor all over the globe. The trade of the 19th century was a harmless man making and exploring the world's markets. Today, the degree to which the world will divide its labor permanently, is paramount to every other consideration.

And this comes to a head in Germany. She cannot come back to reason without finding some such division of labor explicitly articulated and organized. We began too seriously, no doubt mental case, but she had plenty of reason to lose her mind. I have advised her ever since 1913 to take the plunge into such a new discussion of her existence as the world's economic foster child. But only now do I fully realize how hostile the whole world was to this only way out. Russia wanted her to swallow communism, the neutrals wanted her to be a nice little sovereign nation, America wanted to invest in her, nobody wanted her as that which she actually was, the center of Europe and therefore the necessary first step in a gradual order of the whole world.

Don't we lose our mind when we have not one person who recognizes our identity? The one step which would have made her defeat in the first world war meaningful to her, was denied: the
world spoke of tariffs to him between the two wars. Tariffs are the opposite of the positive solution for which America cried out: in the division of labor, the self-supporting village once appeared a great progress. City and state organized economies, colonial and imperial economies followed. Cities and continents superimposed even more. And now the world as one unity alone can determine the very existence of the world economy.

The frame of reference within which Germany, France and some rational existence is the whole world; this point needs full consideration: it seems that Europe is too small for Germany. Because Europe is not the frame of reference for the American problem, the frame of a United States of Europe is a dream of 1850. The United States of Europe—besides achieving the very ends for which America entered the war—would almost be started out of the real significance of this stability. The world and nothing but at least the Western world includes Russia, the European nations, etc., must make ready to receive the surrender of Germany as the recipient of the crisis and still cry in the economic wilderness so long and so violently until the neighbors get together and answer collectively. Then, all the military aspects of the struggle will collapse as though they never had been. The illness of a people's armies is colossal as long as their life is contained inside the territory controlled by these armies. But a people like a man always expects to disarm into the next integration in which these limitations no longer exist. We humans are born peculiarly disarmed and feel pretty much that all our sinful armor is of a transient nature. After which we disarm again since this is our more permanent nature.
Sometimes war may be justified on certain but not all wars are wanton and continuous. Here small nations may have brought a war. The justification of a little war is not a breach of the peace but some indifference and isolation of parts finally destined for each other. The world's nations were and are indifferent to one another's economies. It will be evident over their own lower standards of life... war arises on the conflict with which this indifference—or in the case of other wars some similar indifference—impossible. War, for this reason, is not absolutely negative. It exposes some preceding lack of integration, lack of solidarity. It brings out the need for some further degree of solidarity. We never need to set war against its real background. We always compare war to peace and then, we reject it. But the fanaticism certainly created by terrible wars the first unity which Christianity could have been possibly understood. No Christ without Jesus. Hence it is worth notice that wars do not break out for the things peacefully settled. They break out for the things not yet settled at all.

These world wars are rooted on an issue never raised before. How far is one division of labor to comprise the whole western world? All the other issues are more perceived to this one. Of course, the cultural law produced by universal education always pays the recognition of a new war issue. For, our school teachers are expected to teach the children the ideals of their parents and grandparents. And this is influential when most of the people who hold public opinion, mistake textbooks of history for actual experience.

Hence, it happens that the real issue is overlaid for a long
time by so called war aims. In the listing of war aims, the
parties concerned simply dream out loud their visions, war aims
are extensions of the prewar world in the interest of one of the
two parties. Unfortunately, all the time, this prewar world re­
cedes from reality by the war itself. Finally, the changes brought
by the devastation become so impressive that the wish-dreams
disappear or shrink at least to dimensions in which peace on
the real issue becomes possible. This time, for twenty years,
all the more extended dreams of the prewar world and their
say. All these dreams have more and more disintegrated the world.
Perhaps, the humans that, by now, may be willing to replace the
mechanical text of post-war reconstruction by the core religious
questions: how can we listen to the issue raised by the war itself,
regardless of our religious or philosophical or political or eco­

nomical preferences and predilections. After a righteous war, there
simply is no reconstruction of our own houses of cards. A war
should make new... and out of its necessities, a new, unthought-of order arise.

Words speak louder than the noises of Dr. Wilf or Dr. Rosen­
tent or Dr. Van slant. This time, the choice is between an
all inclusive abstract plan for a world issue or the creation
of a world office authorized to take decisions for the world,
Inc., in its economic dealings with Germany. History moves
forward by specific institutions. It collapses from abstract
generalities.

The very minute the Germans can see and touch and believe
that the divisions of capitalism and communism are achieved and
that the world recognizes the task of common work by settlin up
the office to which Germany can effectively respond economically, the Germans no longer need their army. Then, despite their situation surrounded by innumerable states, they can surrender since for them, the world then would have become one. Before, they can't.
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