

Verbundkatalog Kalliope

Ends and Means.

Mann, Klaus

Nutzungsbedingungen

Bei zahlreichen Dokumenten auf monacensia-digital.de sind die Urheberrechte bereits abgelaufen. Sie sind gemeinfrei und dürfen ohne weitere Rücksprache mit der Monacensia weiterverwendet werden.

Bei den Dokumenten, bei denen noch Urheberrechte bestehen, müssen für eine Weiterverwendung stets die Rechteinhaber*innen angefragt werden sowie eine Publikationsgenehmigung der Monacensia eingeholt werden. Das Zitatrecht bleibt hiervon unberührt.

Zur Erteilung einer Publikationserlaubnis wenden Sie sich bitte an:

Monacensia im Hildebrandhaus
Literaturarchiv
Adresse: Maria-Theresia-Straße 23, 81675 München
E-Mail: monacensia.literaturarchiv@muenchen.de

Terms of use

The copyrights for numerous documents on monacensia-digital.de have already expired. They are in the public domain and may be reused without further consultation with Monacensia. In the case of documents for which copyrights still exist, the copyright holders must always be contacted for further use and publication permission must be obtained from the Monacensia. The right to quote under copyright law remains unaffected by this. To obtain permission for publication, please contact:

Monacensia im Hildebrandhaus:
Literaturarchiv
Address: Maria-Theresia-Straße 23, 81675 München
E-Mail: monacensia.literaturarchiv@muenchen.de

Ends and Means

The first chapter of a book by Aldous Huxley, "E & M", (1937) begins with the following ~~words~~ statement: "...."

And, on page 10 already, Mr. Huxley draws this conclusion - which is to reappear throughout the whole of the book as one of its leading thoughts:

"...."

We don't want to scrutinize the question if it is precisely correct to say that ^{there has been} a perfect "agreement" among all prophets and reformers "from Isaiah to Karl Marx." The objections to this theory are obvious and, of course, ~~even more~~ familiar to a man of ~~his~~ so comprehensive a background as Huxley's. He knows better than we do the innumerable differences between the various patterns of utopian promises and prophecies. What he wanted to point out is the mysterious resemblance among all of them - that common hope and supreme promise - : "the Golden Age of liberty, peace, justice and brotherly love." It is in this ultimate prospect ~~and~~ ~~parad~~ that Alexander the Great and Christ, Mohammed and Lenin meet each other. For even the conquerors wanted ^{increase happiness, & bring about} to rule the world in order to make it happy....

^{maybe so}
This ~~is true~~ ^{is the relation} for all movements and programs that were derived from our civilization, or that could adapt themselves to the basic scheme of it... It is not true, however, for those conquerors who invaded the realm of our civilization from outside - greedy as the wild beasts, or obsessed with a utopian scheme that was completely foreign to our tradition and nature... The Huns ~~did~~ had certainly no interest in establishing "liberty, peace, justice and brotherly love." Nor consider it the Nazis their historical task to promote those sublime ideas. It is, quite on the contrary, their aim and purpose to ~~destroy~~ eliminate the influence of those noble notions. The simple explanation for this staggering fact is that the Nazis do not belong to this vast.... of our civilization that has existed "for nearly 30 cent.s"

^{Essentially destructive... nihilistic... to humiliate}

there is an clear mind that ESS
intrinsic diff. between a state
the civilizing, construction tendencies
of mankind on the one hand and
on the other, the basic impulses
his destructive impulses - those affecting
We have offered to all forms of progress and order
although H. did not share it. meaning
to emphasize the particular importance
Yet this recognition particularly important
do us, with sum of good to which
problems we find to deal with.

"is of course,
might be

The notion "one civil" is of course, a somewhat European as it might be understood in a reference to German civilization as such (including the ancient Egyptian and so East, as, to one Canadian, only to one the legacy of Greece and Rome and the civilization of Christianity. There is a however in definition and limit the concept of "civilization".

That is why all eschatological doctrines are compatible with each other - whether socialistic or Christian, mystic and rationalistic -, while the gap between our concept of life and the Nazi ... is insurmountable...

Huxley's theory - that there is a basic agreement as to the aims - is, therefore, not applicable to our present problem and the struggle we are confronted with now. There is no agreement as to the ultimate aims; but there is, sometimes, similarity of the means... *paradoxically enough* ... Resemblances

Different reasons... The most obvious one is the completely eclectic character of the Nazi philosophy and the Nazi methods. What they present as their "aim" - the destruction of Marxism, or the destruction of plutocracy, or the greatness of Germany - is nothing but pretext, trick.... It would be erroneous to say that they stain a great

aim by employing dubious or hideous means... One might rather venture to state that, sometimes, they use, as if by mistake, good means for

the sake of their aim which is, always and intrinsically, utterly evil... But, again, we have doubts if the term "good" makes very much sense when applied to a type of men to whom the such moral categories have no validity, indeed, no reality what so ever. It may be, then, more accurate to speak of timely means which they Nazis employ

for their atavistic purposes... "Good means": fight against reactionary cliques - eliminating certain traditional privileges (but with the purpose of establishing an even more tyrannic and infinitely

more ruthless ~~gang~~ régime of ruling gangsters...) - Timely means: their way of using the vast apparatus of modern technique in the interest of education and propaganda... But what sinister sort of an

education! what abominable form of propaganda!...

This is no longer for the same reason
ends and means for the same reason
for the simple reason that there are no ends.

Mr. Huxley's ideas: using ideas of liberalism, etc.

McPherson

the of all departments, etc.

This time, the device may be more appropriate

paradoxically enough

indivisible as law is nothing they would not

American propaganda parties, N.Y.B.A. 1...

Differentiation between "means" and "aims" is different

TS

✓ This essential fact ~~that confronts~~
events are completely new
situation: it confronts us
with a new moral alternative.
~~For~~, it may ~~have~~ been correct
to speak of a ~~discrepancy~~ ^{incompatibility}
between ~~ends~~ ^{means} and means in the
cases discussing the history of the
Catholic Church or the French ^{Revolution} ~~Revolution~~
Russian ~~Revolutions~~. In all these
cases ~~it was correct~~ it was pertinent
to point out that the application
of immoral aims is ~~at~~ ^{to} the
point and to endanger the moral
purpose. There was, indeed, a
very clear and highly significant
discrepancy between two intrinsic
ethical ~~concepts~~ ^{concepts}. One the one side
~~was~~ ^{represented} by the Jesuits and later
by the Russian communists - who
to ~~insisted~~ ^{insisted} told us that the aim
in every case and under all circumstances
justifies the means; on the
other side, the intrinsic moralists
insisted ~~the~~ ^{the} supposition always
a certain basic agreement
as to the ends

There is, then, a new danger: first, that certain tendencies and ideas... could be stained and morally compromised by the very fact that they were used by the Nazis; second, that we might be tempted, or even forced, to adapt our own behaviour up to a certain degree to the Nazi tactics, for the simple reason that this may prove the only feasible way to meet and to ^{defeat} reject them. It is the latter we are most concerned with - the danger ^{of our} ~~that we could~~ ^{ment} acquiesce in Nazi standards while we fight against them... *callons*

For, if it is true that there is no such thing as an original Nazi philosophy, it is true as well that there exists a phenomenon that deserves the designation of a new style created by the Nazis. It is a very eclectic style, to be ^{sure} ~~true~~ - a hideous bastard style containing and intermingling all sorts of ingredients. Yet, it possesses a certain boisterous sham-novelty and still seems to exercise a considerable ^{before a certain modality...} attraction. Let us presume, however, that the spell of this gangster ^{and recognize in its appalling} style is more or less worn-out by now; let us take it for granted that the overwhelming majority of all men and women - both in the countries suppressed by and fighting - are thoroughly fed up with that filthy pell-mell pseudo-revolutionary slogans and baseness: the fact remains that we ~~cannot~~ are not in a position anymore to check the sickening assault of ~~the~~ a motorized underworld - unless we adjust ourselves to some of their methods... This had not to be so, ^{There would be no war and no M.} necessarily. ~~If~~ the moral attitude of the democracies ~~would~~ had been more determined and more courageous... However, ~~as things~~ in view of the present state of affairs there is no choice any more. War has become the only way of getting rid of a moral pest which we usually ^{be} identify with the name of the German Führer. The mere fact that we are forced ~~to meet it~~ to recognize the necessity of this war and have to advocate its ruthless continuation, is almost amounts to a moral triumph

*No dilatory in handling
with murderers. Swift.
callons*

This process of a gradual

Now
But this process of assimilation
cannot be ^{voluntary} ~~voluntary~~ ^{extensively} ~~extensively~~
the ^{dominant} ~~dominant~~ ^{American} ~~American ^{agriculture} ~~agriculture~~
The challenge of total ^{could not be} ~~could not be~~
~~not - a process~~ ^{forced} ~~forced~~ ^{U.S.} ~~forced~~~~

~~Democracy is no~~
~~secret to most~~ ^{authorities} ~~authorities~~
to their own government ^{this} ~~this~~
implies a ^{that a} ~~that a~~ ^{entire} ~~entire ^{liberty} ~~liberty
have to be sacrificed ^{the President} ~~the President
^{without any doubt} ~~without any doubt~~~~~~~~

~~assured~~ was genuine ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{at} ~~at
when he assured the nation
that there is no question of
~~eliminating~~ ^{any} ~~any~~ ^{imposed} ~~imposed~~ ^{democratic} ~~democratic~~
rights: Only some "privileges"
have to be remembered.~~

the abandonment of any ^{imposed} ~~imposed~~
democratic rights ^{completely} ~~completely~~
out of the question.

- Only certain "privileges" may have to
be ~~maintained~~ ^{guaranteed} ~~guaranteed~~

^{these} ~~these~~ ^{notions of this} ~~notions of this
^{that} ~~that~~ ^{such as} ~~such as ^{liberty} ~~liberty ^{and} ~~and ^{property} ~~property~~
^{and} ~~and~~ ^{the} ~~the ^{land} ~~land~~~~~~~~~~~~

of Hitlerism. For it was the Nazis and Fascists who have always
~~at least in their more genuine moments~~
preached the charm and elating qualities of modern warfare - while
~~additions of~~
we, the progressive and liberal principles, have rejected the obnoxious
glorification of mass slaughter. But now we have to accept ~~propose~~
the cruel sacrifices and must recommend their: simple because
they are indispensable in order to win the war, and because we ~~realize~~
~~that~~ deem the victory of the democracy as the only ~~suppo~~ ^{condition since you can} prerequisite

for ~~any~~ the maintenance and development of civilized human life.
~~wanting a better future but eliminating the~~
... ~~knowledge~~ ^{man - but a}

This ^{may} determine our action in many details but does by no means
the intrinsic problem of the ^{relation of} ~~intrinsic interrelation between the~~
means ^{to} and the ends... The problem remains relevant, indeed, it is more
~~and more~~ ^{urgent} ~~urgent~~ now than ever... 5 33

The theoretical solution ~~seems~~ could be formulated without difficulty.
It is so convenient to use big and convincing words - such as
"democratic ^{autocracy} ~~self-discipline~~", "militant ~~democratic~~ humanism", "discipli-
ned freedom," etc. Also, it is only too easy to ^{explain all} ~~explain~~ trespasses
and moral offenses a government may commit, ~~in times of war as well~~
~~as under less dramatic circumstances~~, as a sort of accessory mistakes
and minor - slightly disturbing ^{perhaps, without} ~~but hardly~~ of any principle impor-
tance and completely understandable considering the cruel pressure
of the crisis... ^{Undoubtedly} This ~~kind of~~ indulgence of various errors
and defects in our own ranks is justified and even necessary - up to
a certain degree. It would be absurd to weaken the moral strength of
one our own the very side whose victory we ~~have recognized as~~ ~~it~~
desire and consider of vital importance for the future of mankind.

"Unity in the face of the enemy demands suspension of party and
political stride." These are words recently used by Clement R. Attlee,

H. to D. defined
any price
because his victory adds to
the

leader of the British Labor Party and a member of the War Cabinet. But he had said before:"....." - And he continued:"....."

Not to give up the very thing for which we are fighting....: here it is - one of the paramount problems inherent in our present plight: the gist of these reflections. The question is how much liberty must we sacrifice while defending the ^{very} principle of liberty?

~~How much to what degree must we renounce our ^{various} critical capacities, our scepticism, our natural tastes and predilections, our natural aversion of ~~some~~ brutal force?~~ The question is whether a democracy can manage to remain democratic ~~when~~ in the full and genuine sense of the term, when struggling for her very life against a ruthless aggressor. The same question, applied to the private sphere, might be formulated as follows: Can an independent intellectual succeed in ~~maintaining~~ ^{in liberty} maintaining his independence and his intelligence if he adheres wholeheartedly to the ~~tactics~~ and practices of a belligerent government? ~~For the truism that the possession of power, and the determination to keep it, is apt to corrupt the character~~ ^{does not cease to be} ~~remains valid - in spite of the undeniable fact that there are others, who have infinitely more power, and want to expand it, and are infinitely worse, and who must be defeated at any price.~~ ^{on the inimical side, world with a mad man ...}

But a victory is thinkable that would be, technically, a plain triumph of our side and yet, in a deeper sense and at the bottom, a victory of those hostile forces that we want to check... For, what would be the moral meaning of our victory if we had, ~~during~~ accommodated ourselves, during the struggle, too thoroughly to the moral standards of the ne enemy? ~~What would be the use of defeating Hitler if we had condescended completely to the baseness of his methods? No "emergency" could serve as an excuse for so signal a moral failure. The apologists of the Russian revolution, too, kept~~

Undeniably, there is a problem: it would be futile ^{to neglect or} to belittle it. For, there can be no doubt that in times of highest dramatic tension such as ours, a two-fold effort is demanded of ^{all} thinking and independent men: ^{we have} to exert ^{ourselves} ~~themselves~~... to give ^{ours} ~~their~~ very best..., and, at the same time, ^{must} to renounce, up to a certain degree, our critical capacities, our scepticism, some of our natural animosities and predilections. But the term "up to a certain degree" is again somewhat vague and elusive. Up to what degree ~~should~~ have we to accomodate ourselves to the ~~militant~~ grim necessities of this period? How far are those ~~intellectual~~ ^{and} moral sacrifices and compromises to go without staining and distorting the very cause ~~that~~ for the sake of which we accept them?

These are questions that cannot be decided upon in general and en bloc: they have to be examined and contemplated in each individual case. It is, as most things in life, a ~~problem~~ matter of instinct and tact, of moral and intellectual poise...

Needless to say that it is a matter that concerns not only the responsible men - those who have to make the actual decisions. It is one of the foremost characteristics of democracy that, ~~according to its principle and~~ theoretically and empirically, the reactions of the public opinion are at least as relevant as the ~~intentions~~ decisions of the administration... And public opinion is composed of millions of individual instincts, feelings and reactions. Each individual reaction counts. ^{Disagreement between humanitarian and militant policies}

Let us consider some concrete instances... The moot question of whether or not one should feed the women and children ~~occupied by~~ living in certain zones ~~that~~ not formally occupied by H. but virtually belonging to his sphere of influence. Many aspects involved... even from the political point of view, let alone the humanitarian angle. For it may seem distasteful to estrange the French from the British

^{low could} cause. Besides, the French people ^{are} ~~are to~~ take active part in the ^{organization} establishment of a truly new order, after H.'s fall, if one makes them starve to death...? On the other hand, the Vichy Government is undoubtedly on the other side of the fence - a potential ally of H. and a virtual enemy of the Anglo-Saxon democracies. Furthermore, it is ~~since it is~~ ^{the} Nazi Germany that must be blamed for the suffering of Europe and our policy must be to make the suppressed peoples ^{increasingly} conscious of this essential fact. The growing discontent of the subjugated nations is, in fact, one of the most significant assets ~~of~~ of England's political strategy. It can, therefore, hardly be in the interest of Britain (i.e. in the interest of the democratic cause) to mitigate the hardships due to the Nazi aggressiveness. ~~Besides, a single glance at~~
 This is just one of the ~~other~~ problems which not only the governments have to face but up about whose outcome public opinion will have to decide as well.

Or, it is so convenient to speak about a "disciplined liberty", and that all classes and groups ought to ~~bring~~ make sacrifices... Reality is, unfortunately, infinitely more complex. Let us consider - if only casually ~~in~~ and in an inadequate way - so crucial an example as the American labor problem. The strikes in the defense industry ^{cancel} ~~are apt~~ ^{but to} to alarm the public and to arouse the gravest suspicions and apprehensions. Moreover, the ominous resemblance with conditions in France is apt to increase the general apprehension... Yet, even the utmost gravity of the situation must not induce us to draw rash conclusions. It is correct (and easy) to say that labor should ~~not exploit~~ ^(a more cooperative spirit) ~~he~~ display more discipline and good will in view of considering the state of a national emergency almost unprecedented in the history of this country. ^{Also} ~~it is~~ ^{also} true that labor endangers its own influence in the developments to

These are problems ~~we~~ that have
to face, to sometimes
to decide - vigilantly,
realistically, in a constant
to with tactical and - it

How could we help
to be heedless of the
means ~~to~~

come if it sabotages now the tremendous efforts of this government and this people to make good former negligences and to live up to the demands of so decisive a moment.

But, on the other hand, we have to scrutinize ^{most ~~careful~~ concern} the ^(interest) problem of guilt and responsibility in each particular case. ~~We hardly need refer to the French parallel to it would be a disastrous error to take it for~~ Any prejudiced and one-sided point of view would be disastrous... We must not take it for granted that either side is ~~fully~~ entirely culpable in this stride. To whom did the chairman of the Judiciary Committee refer when he ^{from Douglas's} used, the other day, ~~those~~ ^{his} frightening words about the electric chair, the ~~frightening~~ determination to recommend the electric chair, without hesitating "one split second," "for all enemies of the defense program." These are frightening words, They must have been aimed at both parties - ^{at certain sections} ~~the~~ industrialists as well as ^{certain} ~~the~~ restive unions. It would be absurd to curtail the rights

of labor and to spare big business in a fight for democratic progress. ^{This would mean to exploit the emergency in the interest of big business} True, there may be some among the union leaders who try to sabotage efforts, out of their principle disapproval of the war or ~~for~~ out of their antagonism towards the present administration... But there might also be industrialists who are inclined to exploit the emergency ^{to embarrass the New Deal, to crush the unions...} for their own interests... This is not the place to discuss the implications... in a more detailed way: to decide whether in any

specific case the disturbances were caused by the employers or ~~by~~ ^{The "Unholy Alliance" between the extreme right and} the employees. This is too vast and involved a topic to be discussed ~~in~~ in so fragmentary a fashion. What we want to point out is ~~only that~~ only that the danger of emotional simplifications and vague generalizations. ~~It is obvious~~ That "everyone ought to make sacrifices" is obvious enough. ~~But it is less~~ What seems so much more complicated is to define and to limit the sacrifices required of ~~and~~ the various groups and classes within our society and of the single individual within the classes.

The fact is that 90% are not as badly injured as we give out as voluntarily my advantages...

"Disciplined liberty"... :it sounds fine, and it could be fine... But ~~there is a form of~~ if the epithet "disc." is emphasized too strongly the beautiful notion "liberty" might eventually lose its elating impact - while the very existence of liberty would be endangered if it failed to acquiesce in a certain amount of sensible self-restriction. It is, again, a matter of measure and shades.

The example of the freedom ^{for instance} of the press seems particularly appropriate, as it is one of the inalienable axioms of the democratic creed. To abandon it, if only temporarily, would imply the most dangerous risks.... Even ^{a warning of} ~~to warn against~~ certain ^{"54 books"} books from strikes as an ominous symptom - particularly if the warning comes from a ^{bit was} ~~post~~ who holds a responsible position representative of the American nation. To incite public indignation against pacifist writings produced under the terrific pressure of the first World War... is it compatible with the dignity of a liberal intellectual? But the indictments of such men as ~~Romano~~ Hemingway, Aldington, Dos Passos ^{tell} contain the truth, and nothing but the truth... Moreover, it was this very type of literature ^{which} ~~that was first~~ upon ~~the heads~~ ^{which} heaped vituperation, and which then was burned in the cities of the Nazi Germany. Who wants to imitate so ignominious an example? Besides, we don't need to be afraid of a realistic presentation of ~~the~~ the horrors of war. For the our acceptance of the necessity of the present war as a necessity does by no means imply that we adhere to the fascist theory of the heroic beauty, the adventurous greatness of modern warfare... Why should we conceal the ugliness and boredom, the abjectness and cruelty of modern mass slaughter ^{now} from? Why We must not deny what we have hitherto believed. We call this war a necessary evil, and it may be allowed, ~~to~~ considering the utter strain of this moment, to stress the "necessary" in a somewhat stronger way than the depressing word "evil." But still we insist on the ^{essentially} evil character of war. It would be, therefore, absurd

And how about the liberty
of the press? which is certainly
one of the

Our feelings are strongly divided
when we see what the nation
that the saboteurs and various
types of fifth-columnists are
still allowed in this country
to spend their malignant lies.

It is, indeed, rather frightful
to see that some national
magazines of a national reputation
and a considerable nation with
influence over their columns?
The application of
the application of
drastic measures
such as the drafting of
plants as front governments

How the same steps compatible
with the principles of democracy?
And they are indispensable to
the government a super
for the sake of the danger
program on which this
democracy depends.

to denounce a pacifist novel, written years before the evil was to become once more inevitable, as high treason...

One might say that
If the freedom of the press is curtailed, it is already virtually lost. But, again, the prerequisite of absolute freedom is moral maturity and a keen feeling of each writer's high responsibility in these days of crisis. A democratic government may be indulgent of the its antagonists... Perhaps, it is even wiser to let them talk rather than to give them the aureole of martyrdom. But the matter ^{things} becomes more delicate if the so-called supporters of democracy lower them-

selves to become the agents of Fascism. It is discouraging that a "national magazine", such as Callier's, opens its columns to that garrulous champion in ocean flights and political distortions, C. L. ... to the dubious *editorial* *garden* *antagonists* *of* *the* *popular* *colony* *men* *to* *defeat*

(P.3, hand-written...)

Education, Is this the self-discipline that ~~sounds so~~ - that much-vaunted solution of the antithesis between liberty and authority?....
..... But censorship would be worse... ~~it is~~ Either to jeopardize the victory in this vitel struggle by, or to betray the very ideas for which the struggle is fought: it seems always the same painful and perplexing dilemma... There is, ^{indeed} no ~~patent~~ solution no ready-made answer... In the political sphere everything is relative, imperfect, dubious... A certain amount of tactical compromise is inevitable... *Absolute compatibility between means and ends - impossible*
It is a matter of primacies and relativities...

... Yet, our determination must be firm and unshakable: to promote the relatively good in its fight against the absolutely ~~bad~~ evil.

We have to be vigilant and realistic.... Must scrutinize our conscience, in every individual case: Is here the immorality of the tactic such that it compromises the aim?

complicity
disfaisable ...

But Collins is only interested
in the its evolution — and
the Col. L. in the history
of A. Hitler.

The effort to fight against Hitler
induces a certain amount of
assimilation to a certain degree
of Hitlerism. Already and
acquiescence of in war (in a
bitter loss) as a possible
instrument to bring a long
moral decision, indicates a
certain compliance on one part
of the immediacy of the
having view.

The paramount question that
these points is: How can democracy
manage to remain democratic in the
full sense of the term, while
struggling for very life against
the total aggression?

The paramount question ~~following already from all these~~ points is: How can democracy manage to remain democratic, in the full sense of the term, while struggling for her very life against the totalitarian aggressor?

Or, to ask the same question with regard to our personal plight and sphere of activity: Can an independent intellectual become an admitted partisan of a belligerent government, without jeopardizing his creative detachment and integrity?

Our solution is - that there is no clear-cut, absolute solution; or rather, that all apodictic formulas lavishly offered to us, are too vague, too general, too grandiose. "Disciplined freedom," "militant decency," "dynamic democracy," - all these are fine things to recommend, to praise and to claim. The question is only how to live up to such ideal patterns. How can we reconcile our pacifist and liberal convictions with the hard necessities of the crisis? Up to what degree are liberty and discipline compatible with each other? On what point does discipline degenerate into brutal force - our determined will to resist into an hysterical obsession?

It is all a matter of balance, measure, intellectual instinct, moral intuition and political tact. - a matter with many facets, many imponderables involved. Our decision has to be made, not just once for all, but in every individual case - according to the inescapable demands of the hour and ~~the~~ ^{the advise of} our own conscience. The consideration determining our actions and attitude must be both ethical and realistic, - in every individual case. The moral axiom - that questionable means can never be instrumental in bringing about good ends - becomes a futile and even disturbing when applied rigidly, regardless of the actual circumstances confronting us. There exist, in this imperfect world of ours, certain differences between the comparatively good and the completely bad. If we recognize that the democratic allies are better than the totali=

Blindless to say that the
actual ~~contents~~ of a specific
immediate ~~that~~ reform is not the main
distinction of its ethical
impact. Every thing depends
on the spirit in which it
has been conceived and applied
be it ~~desired~~. A democratic
people will ~~must~~ new
content ~~itself~~ be put off
with grandiose and illusion
words. "Displ."

That ~~we~~ the people ~~raise~~
to ask if ~~any~~ new burden
to question the ~~division~~ and
sense of any ~~new~~ burden
imposed on them by ~~that~~
representatives. Do we have
to accept it because
on behalf of the fight
against fascism? Or
should we share it off
as it may ~~women~~ fascism
in our country?

The paramount question ~~following clearly from all these points~~ is:
How can democracy manage to remain democratic, in the full sense of the
term, while struggling for her very life against the totalitarian
aggressor?

Or, to ask the same question with regard to our personal plight and
sphere of activity: Can an independent intellectual become an admitted
partisan of a belligerent government, without jeopardizing his creative
detachment and integrity?

There is only one language in which this is possible
Our solution is - that there is no clear-cut, absolute solution; or
which has its parts in a number of problems
rather, that all apodictic formulas lavishly offered to us, are too vague,
and most questions that can only be solved from
case to case, a good
too general, too grandiose. "Disciplined freedom," "militant decency,"
"dynamic democracy," - all these are fine things to recommend, to praise
and to claim. The question is only how to live up to such ideal pat=
terns. How can we reconcile our pacifist and liberal convictions with
the hard necessities of the crisis? Up to what degree are liberty and
discipline compatible with each other? On what point does discipline
degenerate into brutal force - our determined will to resist into an
hysterical obsession?

It is all a matter of balance, measure, intellectual instinct, moral
intuition and political tact. - a matter with many facets, many im=
ponderables involved. Our decision has to be made, not just once for
all, but in every individual case - according to the inescapable demands
of the hour and ~~to~~ *the advice of* our own conscience. The consideration determining
our actions and attitude must be both ethical and realistic, - in every
individual case. The moral axiom - that questionable means can never
be instrumental in bringing about good ends - becomes a futile and even
disturbing when applied rigidly, regardless of the actual circumstances
confronting us. There exist, in this imperfect world of ours, certain
differences between the comparatively good and the completely bad.
If we recognize that the democratic allies are better than the totali=

H. must be defeated: ^{AP}
and considered ^{have to}
be determined by this
primary axiom.

The next is a matter partly
of facts partly of
moral instinct. One intelligence
must ~~advise~~ tell us, from
case to case, if this
unpleasant measure for
that restriction is indeed
indispensable for the
sake of this paramount
necessity — that H.
must be defeated. One
must be ^{we ought to defeat} ~~ethical~~

At the same time, our common
instinct and ~~moral~~ common
sense to find out if any will
of the changes democracy ~~may~~
has to undergo while fighting
for her life, is ~~at~~ such that
it might stain our course
and ^{this} ~~disgrace~~ our ultimate victory
of its ethical
meaning.

8
~~considers it a significant piece of writing?~~ Ought we to acquiesce in censorship?

But what, then, is it we are fighting for?

+++

The problem is highly intricate - full of grave implications. Moreover, it is composed of several sub-problems, each of which is utterly involved and has many aspects. Nevertheless, the solution has to be simple.

We may have to recapitulate our suppositions and the conclusions we have drawn up to now.

1.) Our abhorrence of everything the Nazis, or those who ape the Nazis, stand for, is not primarily based on our disapproval of the means they employ (detestable as most of them may be), but on their principles, or rather, on the complete lack of principles - the perplexing nihilism of their movement.

2.) The question of whether or not the ends can justify the means is, therefore, irrelevant with regard to the Nazis and our own attitude towards them.

It is, however, highly relevant to our own conduct and our moral decisions.

3.) We recognize the necessity of the present war and consider its outcome as a matter of life or death for our civilization and everything we believe in. We are of the opinion that Hitler's triumph would represent the most fatal calamity man has been stricken with since the beginning of his history. Also, we are convinced that any form of a "negotiated peace" that allows Hitler to remain in power and fails to disarm the dangerous German people, means nothing short of a plain Nazi victory. Hitler's defeat does not guarantee a priori the establishment of a perfect democracy all over the world; but it is the indispensable prerequisite for any constructive effort on behalf of such happy developments.

4.) Our adherence to the cause of certain belligerent, or semi-belligerent, nations implies, necessarily, that we acquiesce in certain methods and practices which are far from being unobjectionable. War has always been hideous, boring and inhuman - and is even more so today because of its utter incompatibility with the standards of modern technique. But since this war has become inevitable, thanks to a staggering accumulation of sad and stupid mistakes, there is no sense in insisting that it is nasty to throw bombs or to blockade people. Obviously, these are very ugly things to do. But Hitler must be defeated.

5.) The fight against Hitler induces democracy to assimilate herself, up to a certain degree, to Hitlerism. Our acquiescence in war (i.e. brutal force) as a possible instrument to bring about moral and social decisions, indicates in itself a certain compliance on our part to the admitted immorality of the Nazis.

