

3K-11

SURRENDER TO WHOM?

A house divided in itself cannot stand. And allies who do not even room 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. Shall Germany surrender to England, Russia, the United States and a little bit of France?

The Italians surrendered in this manner. The result was that Italy was divided as in Solomon's judgment between Hitler and Alexander. To receive an unconditional surrender is not as simple as it sounds; one must have the power to dispose of the surrendered powers.

Who, then, is this entity which can receive the inexorably efficient German body of economy, this going concern, going in the midst of ruins? The oversight of this central question is inherent to abstract thinking. Our intellect always tries to state the truth objectively. Politics, however, puts the truth which we represent as persons, first. Mr. Dewey might have done most things very much in the way in which F.D.R. 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 German offer. The allies have not formed one ear to listen to Germany. Accordingly,

the Germans try to speak to every ally in his language. And Mr. Himmler felt pretty sure during the whole last year that eventually he could go bolshevik and secure a separate peace.

What else can these people think. Of course, too, have lost the war. Of course, they must surrender. But if the British take the Ruhr, if the Americans flood Germany with their movies and school teachers, if the Russians keep Stettin (even though through a stoore), the Germans have no incentive to hasten the day of collapse. It would be a collapse, they know, since there is nobody to whom the core of the historical core pure Germany, could surrender. It would disappear in a *flack* first-for-all. Created life does not dissolve in this manner. And so my German must say: And as this war is, and as bitter is, Germany still has some kind of and existence and existence is preferable to non-existence.

People who fight this truth in their parlors where nothing is quite serious, may take out of their library the works of Lessing, the great German humanist and philosopher, of Kleist, the violent Prussian, of Nietzsche, the good European. The 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~~ ^{is} appealed to the Germans ^{because} if it ~~is~~ ^{is} the only way of keeping 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 elbow room and without goldmines ran: "Keep alive, my son. If you may, reasonably; but keep alive." And so, "Give me madness if non-existence is the

only alternative", is a German reality enacted before our eyes. This lies behind the indescribable atrocities. They are more horrid than reported. Germany has a soul within.

Germany will not surrender before it has seen true beyond the shadow of a doubt that a league form has been established which will deal with German affairs in the name of the world. Neither Mr. Stalin nor Mr. Churchill nor Mr. Stettinius represent anything but a single nation. Are Germans would have to see some firm reading "the world", before they could feel that they would not be humiliated but honored.

The Germans are willing to surrender their army and their state to a world superior to the ^{national} state. This is the whole content of the "divine light of the gods". But they say that there is no family of nations to which the prodigal son can return. And they are right so far. And Hitler and Himmler whose horizon ends inside the era of a world permanently divided in economics, will vanish on the very day that a world which can receive Germany as she really functions, has become articulate.

Is this possible? the paradoxical answer is that it is possible and impossible both. It is ~~impossible~~ possible to have one world loosely ~~politically~~ organized for all political problems 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 Cluniacs in Europe, nine hundred years back. 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 battle with the whole of politics. We represent different stages of ripeness. Our life cycles differ. We must remain dis-united politically. The United States are unable to surrender one particle of their potential expansiveness to some piece of power. No part of the world is "ripe" at this hour.

Unfortunately, Americans always deal with the whole world in their politics. Nothing seems worthwhile which is not conceived in comprehensive and universal terms. This is the hypocrisy of American life. The solution found there is correct for the American situation; it is hypocritical for the world. But the Americans pretend that the formal inclusion of the whole field was valid. It is quality of mind, we are apt to suppose, that counts with Germany. In the abstract, the world may be thought of as one. But it is nowhere ripe to be one except in one particular instance. This particular instance is Germany. While Americans condescend to a particular form of world order and sacrifice the generalities of a world organization in the abstract to this particular historical task, Germany is more apt to history than the abstractionist. Alliances can be killed, if only, his abstraction remains unshaken. Why we plead with the ghost of Bligny Root, this finest and most abstract of the American idealists?

Twice in a generation, the Germans have tried to find a world organ to speak to. They have preferred madness to the obsolete 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 listening post, a

receiving end whose existence is so indubitable that the Germans become convinced: this time the world has coalesced around us as the stumbling block.

All the symptoms 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 harmless. Politically, it is terrible to announce this (separate) procedure. The Germans must realize that despite the different uniforms, one world speaks to them, in occupying them. But in this case, the unity would have to be really real; unity cannot be a mere pretense. Such a lie is too easily found out. This political or psychological mistake foreshadows the lasting mistake. I am afraid that Mr. Bidault is right when he thinks the great powers may grow tired of this occupation and leave the matter to France exactly as in 1921. This would mean that the second world war was lost as the first.

Why is this tricky? Because these wars are the world revolution ~~made-in-russia~~ so often wrongly ascribed to the Bolsheviks. The world revolution made in Russia is a very small part of the upheaval embodied in the period 1914 to 1944. This world war revolution was anti-ideological, anti-nationalistic. It set out to overcome the partisan shouts of 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 become mere actors in its Total Drama. And ~~we~~ 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, presented the permanent

interaction of the world's economies.

In this sense, 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 pressing on central Europe and compared to the fissures produced there under this pressure like the mad separation of Czechs and Germans within Bohemia. But things had happened before the Germans went mad.

How long can Hitler's counter-revolution last? As long as the pressures and fissures remain and produce the impression of a world in anarchy, 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, Bulgaria, Canada, Turkey, Argentina, Rumania, Holland, Finland, Belgium, China, pressed on Central Europe's daily routines by threatening economic changes from every corner of the compass at once. All the divisions the United States have within and of which the demand for Americans can take so much in pride and hope, ^{attached} for Germany existed outside herself, not in the form of division but of pressures. This made the ~~Hitler~~ Sabbath complete. The very moment all these pressures become organized and articulate, they will appear normal and then Germany could calm down. The impression of normalcy keeps our minds balanced. Anybody 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~~ end of the line; then, Germany can constitute herself as the

other correspondant on the other. This would give her orientation which now is lacking. No form ears and a mouth, is the permanent problem of organized society. The abstract world organization of all the nations of the world would not have such real ear or mouth to talk to Germany because, in its theory, it would contain all the nations inside its organization. So, it could talk to none. These kinds of world organizations are good for stamp collectors and post departments. They never add to the stature of their individual members. They presuppose their full fledged existence. The organ which we have in mind, would do more: it would, by its very existence, give Germany a world status as the world's economic founder.

The ear and the mouth which 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 banks won't do, this time. Money is a secondary question because the division of labor between the various economies is our stake in this world upheaval. The form of ears which it has taken, must not blind us to the issue. It had to be war because all the entrenched ideologies of the nations had to be broken down sufficiently to hammer this unwanted fact home that a new degree in the division of labor needed acceptance.

(1-5-41)

The error of pure Capitalism was that ~~it~~^{it} thought of 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 Fords and the Risorgimento Morgans and not by Earl Browder or Bridges. 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 map making and exploring the world's markets. Today, the degree to which the world shall 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 her finding some such division of labor explicitly articulated and organized. She is, and I am utterly serious, now doubt a mental case. But she had plenty of reason to lose her mind. I have advised her ever since 1918 to take the plunge into such a new dimension 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 for Germany. 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 her between the two wars. Tariffs are the opposite of the positive solution for which Germany laid 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. Unions and continents superseded even these. And now the world as one whole alone can determine the very existence of the German economy: The frame of reference within which Germany ~~alone~~ can find 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 German problem, the dream of a United States of Europe is a dream of 1860. The United States of Europe-- besides deferring the very ends for which America entered this struggle-- would cheat mankind out of the real significance of this calamity. The world and nothing but at least the Western world including Russia, the European nations, U.S., must make ready to receive the surrender of Germany. as the recipient, she cries and will cry in the economic wilderness so long and so violently until the neighbors meet together and answer collectively. Then, all the military aspects of the struggle will collapse as though they never had been. The fitness of a people's armies is colossal as long as their life is contained inside the territory defended 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 shining armor is of a transient nature. After which we disarm again since this is our more permanent nature.

Sometimes wars may be unjust and wicked. But not all wars are wanton and superfluous. There shall be wars and Jesus brought a sword. The justification of a righteous war is not a break of the peace but some indifference and isolation of parts finally destined for each other. The world's nations were-- and are-- indifferent to each other's economies. They are at each other's throats over their own ideas of standards of living. War brings on the

conflict which makes 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, some non-solidarity. It brings out the need for some further degree of solidarity. We never seem to get war against its real background. We always compare war to peace and then, we reject it. But the Roman Empire certainly created by terrible wars the first unity in which Christianity could have been possibly understood. No Christ without Caesar. Hence it is worth noting 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 fought on an issue never raised before: How far is one division of labor to dominate the whole western world? All the other issues are minor compared to this one. Of course, the cultural lag produced by universal education always delays 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 mould 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 wishes. War aims are extensions of the prewar world in the interest of one of the two parties. Unfortunately, all the time, this prewar world recedes from reality by the war itself. Finally, the changes wrought 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 mere extension dreams of the prewar world had their say. All these dreams have more and more disunited the world. Perhaps, the human mind, by now, may be willing to replace the mechanical task of post-war reconstruction by the more religious question: how can we listen to the issue raised by the war itself, regardless of our religious or philosophical or political or economic preferences and predilections? After a righteous war, there simply is no reconstruction of our own houses of cards. A war should make space. And out of its sacrifices, a new, ~~unthought~~ unthought-of order grows.

Wars speak louder than the schemes of Mr. Liff or Mr. Rosenberg or Mr. Vansittart. This time, the choice is between an all inclusive abstract plan for a world league or the creation of a world office authorized to make 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 shelved and that the world recognizes the task of common work by setting up

-22-

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.

Four Wells
Norwich, Vt.

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy