least transitory success. It requires some effort to anticipate the character of a Fascist world state which would make Huxley's "Brave New World" appear like an idyl of rationalism and humanism.

If Fascism be too archaic and rigid to bring about a permanent solution of the problems of our century, its failure would enhance the chances of Bolshevism. The latter stands ready to unite the planet along the lines of a federal one-party state administered by a cosmopolitan elite drawn from the hitherto submerged classes and races. Whether a Communist world empire brought about by a combination of wars and revolutions would still have much in common with original Communist aspirations for universal brotherhood and real equality may remain most doubtful. That it would exhibit a higher degree of rationality and creativity than the Fascist universal empire can reasonably be maintained. The practice of racial and national equality and the introduction of a measure of social reform would contribute to that superiority. It is less certain that Bolshevism, originating in the backward agrarian parts of the world, could ever develop the military, economic, and mental qualities necessary to conquer, integrate, and permanently keep the most advanced parts of the world, particularly if faced by strong Fascist or Democratic competitors. Both World Fascism and World Bolshevism would exhibit that same constitutive weakness which Toynbee emphasizes in previous "Universal States", a weakness apparent in all great empires which, as a response to a historical crisis, were established and maintained primarily through the use of force.

In view of such weighty deficiencies on the part of the extreme Left and the extreme Right, the middle-of-the-road solution inevitably suggests itself. Through a democratically planned world federation, a reconstruction of our civilization could be envisaged that might proceed without recourse to war, dictatorship, and revolution. It would aim to achieve a new world equilibrium based on the less expensive and more human methods of rational accommodation and compromise. Such a course of action, if it is to succeed, would have to constitute a delicate synthesis of nationalism and internationalism, of individualism and collectivism, of change and stability, of unity and variety. One cannot help wondering whether the extent of polarization, antagonism, and distrust already prevalent in our civilization can still allow a "third force" of tolerance and reason to win out in the desperate race against time. Situations do occur when the "malady" of a society, like that of an individual, has progressed to a point where medical treatment becomes inadequate and surgery must be resorted to - although the patient may possibly die from the operation.

If thus our civilization had proven too diversified for any one regenerative power to rehabilitate it and too polarized for a synthesis of the antagonistic forces to reconstruct it, it then would have to go "the