

everything, even our irrational and conflicting prejudices.

Do we mean it when we say: "Everything for victory"?

Greater patriotism hath no man than that he lay down his prejudices for his country!

I am convinced that the American people will dissolve all obstacles to the most complete inclusion of the Soviet Union in the United Nations, and her collaboration with our country in its leadership.

#### CHAPTER XIV

### GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES

IT IS generally assumed in public debate in this country that the greatest solidarity exists between the "two great Anglo-Saxon powers," the United States and Great Britain. Such shallow thinkers as the "Union Now" propagandists base their "program" for the whole world upon this assumption. But it remains unfortunately true that contradictions between the two countries present some of the most stubborn practical problems to be solved in the welding together of the United Nations.

What is the nature of these contradictions? For answer to this question, let us turn again to a speech, already quoted in our first chapter, delivered by a scientific employee of monopoly capital to a gathering of investment bankers at the end of 1940. A few of Dr. Jordan's phrases will bear repetition at this point to make clear the nature of the obstructions to Anglo-American co-operation within the United Nations:

"Whatever the outcome of the war, America has embarked upon a career of imperialism, both in world affairs and in every other aspect of her life. Even though, by our aid, England should emerge from this struggle without defeat, she will be so impoverished economically and so crippled in prestige that it is improbable she will be able to maintain the dominant position in world affairs which she has occupied so long. At best, England will become a junior partner in a new Anglo-Saxon imperialism, in which economic resources and the military and naval strength of the United States will be the center of gravity."

The same ideas formed the basis for Henry R. Luce's programmatic manifesto on "The American Century" issued about the same time.

This "utopian imperialism" of the Jordan-Luce school has already suffered shipwreck on the rocks of a war which did not develop according to the text-books. It is no longer talked about in public, it has become slightly disreputable and passé. But the harsh realities noted by Dr. Jordan, the destruction of the foundations of the sprawling British colonial empire, have indeed raised problems which continue to bedevil the relations between the two governments and to present problems for the United Nations. Today even Herbert Hoover acknowledges the dream-like unreality of the projected Uncle Sam-John Bull partnership in an amalgamated Anglo-Saxon imperialism to replace the old world structure. But the rejected Jordan-Luce utopianism has not yet been replaced by any coherent set of policies to regulate British-American handling of such problems as Latin American relations, India, Africa, Spain, Vichy France, and so forth. The United Nations

has as yet only the vague generalities of the Atlantic Charter for guide.

Into the gap thus created there is the constant intrusion of conflicts upon particular questions which express the continuing antagonisms of two rival imperialist powers unable as yet to rise above their imperialist natures even while they are fighting a war which has become irrevocably a Peoples' War of National Liberation.

It is a task of the United Nations, and all who would help hammer out policy for the United Nations, to conciliate, soften, and find solutions (temporary or permanent) for these conflicts between Great Britain and the United States, as well as of the problems arising between these great powers on the one hand and the weaker powers and colonial peoples on the other. That is our purpose in discussing the question here. It is no service to the common cause to avoid such problems, or to ignore the essentially imperialist character of the forces which create them.

Such problems are inherent in the economic, social, and political order which dominates Great Britain and the United States. That order is what is generally known as capitalism in that stage of development in which monopoly capital holds the dominating position. Monopoly capital is the decisive factor in modern imperialism and it dominates both the United States and Great Britain. Once monopoly capital has come into power, only the most profound and far-reaching revolution (the introduction of socialism) can eliminate it. Since we have laid down as the thesis of this book the problem of winning victory for the United Nations, including capitalist and socialist countries, without any necessary fundamental changes in the regime of each country, it is clear that we do not place the abolition of imperialism in our program for victory;

according to our understanding of imperialism, its abolition requires the abolition of capitalism itself.

When Sumner Welles said: "The age of imperialism is ended," he was using the term "imperialism" in a less fundamental sense than I am using it in this argument. Mr. Welles clearly meant to say that the age of great colonial empires is ended, and not that the age of monopoly capital is ended. It is in that sense that his words must be understood if they are to have any practical meaning. But the disappearance of the great colonial empires does not abolish the innate imperialistic nature of monopoly capital, nor subdue its strivings for world domination, which merely take other forms. It is not any supposed disappearance of these innate imperialist tendencies from the United States and Britain that makes it possible to characterize this war as a Peoples' War of National Liberation, but the fact that the war, breaking out of the bounds of imperialism, has presented all nations, even the imperialist powers, no alternative between destruction at the hands of the Axis or victory on the condition of alliance with the Soviet Union and the liberation of nations, the abolition of the colonial system. Thus have even conscious imperialists been conscripted by history for a war which is essentially anti-imperialist.

Most writers on the war are exceedingly vague and confused on the nature of imperialism and its role in this war. For some of them this is the result simply of lack of understanding; for others it is deliberate mystification of their readers, to avoid delicate problems. It is probably the latter which causes the well-known writer on international questions, Vera Micheles Dean, to say: "The relationship known as imperialism will exist, in one form or

another, as long as some peoples are economically advanced and others are economically backward.”\*

This is true only if we add that the advanced country is capitalist, with monopoly already beginning to dominate its life. That is what Mrs. Dean avoids saying, and thereby avoids the essential character of imperialism. It is a demonstrated fact that in the Soviet Union, where there is no capitalism, the relations between the economically advanced republics and the backward ones have developed without anything that may be described as exploitation or oppression or imperialism. But it must be admitted that Mrs. Dean's formula is accurate as describing the inevitable tendency of British and United States relations to backward countries—so long as this tendency is not overruled by a higher power, a power which has now appeared in the necessities of war which demand liberation of nations in order to have them on our side for victory, or in order to prevent them from falling victim to the Axis' false promises of independence. This anti-imperialist influence of the war needs is made more powerful and finds its spokesmen within Britain and the United States in the naturally and traditionally anti-imperialist elements of the population, first of all in the labor movement. Within the United Nations it is represented by China, to some extent by the smaller nations, and most decisively by the Soviet Union.

In this chapter we are concerned primarily with the problems that arise from the rivalries between Britain and the United States on the basis of past and present imperialist interests. Clearly, it is most destructive of United

\* Vera Micheles Dean, *The Struggle for World Order*, p. 50. New York, 1941.

Nations solidarity, if the United States is embarked on a campaign to use the war as the occasion to take over the British Empire with John Bull as a junior partner—if he behaves himself. In an earlier stage of the war, the British imperialists had to smile and pretend to like it when Dr. Jordan and Mr. Luce announced their grandiose plans for a new American empire built upon their ruins. But that day is long past, ever since it became clear that all nations are in the same boat together, and that a certain “equality of sacrifice” as between Great Britain and the United States will be imposed willy-nilly by the exigencies of war.

It also appears that the Soviet Union will have an increasing role within the United Nations in softening the antagonisms between Great Britain and the United States. The Soviet Union, clearly without any interest in perpetuating imperialist control over India and the other subject peoples, is even less interested in “handing them over” to the United States, and is ready to contribute to a fight to the death to keep them out of the hands of the Axis.

Within Britain and the United States the forces which will contribute most to cementing Anglo-American solidarity are those which will most insistently demand and fight for the abolition of all imperialist policies and practices *which stand in the way of victory in the war*, in the first place each in his own country, and in the second place as a common policy of the United Nations. Thus, in the United States, when the *Daily News* of New York comes out for the second front in Europe *on condition that the British* must open and maintain this front, with the United States cheering from the sidelines, that is nothing but a way of undermining Anglo-American relations, disrupting the United Nations, and sabotaging the second

front. Those Americans who are really strengthening Anglo-American relations, building the United Nations, and helping to realize the second front, are *only* those who insist that the United States participate fully in the offensive against the enemy with men and matériel, carrying the maximum possible share of the burden.

The problems raised by India will be examined in another chapter. It is necessary, however, also to note India as a factor in Anglo-American relations. It should be clear that the Jordan-Luce point of view, whether openly expressed or working behind the scenes, makes of India a factor very disturbing and embittering in these relations. British imperialists, always mindful of the American imperialist dreams, are suspicious of every act from the United States which tends to support the independence aspirations of the Indian people, seeing it as merely a Machiavellian way of breaking off parts of the British Empire so as to attach them to the American Empire. They are confirmed in this suspicion by speeches like that of Senator Reynolds, one of the most reactionary spokesmen of American imperialism, suddenly a "friend of India"—in the same way as are the Japanese. And when, to allay that suspicion, Americans give their unquestioned support to the British in India, that merely confirms the British imperialists in their stand-pat determination to crush the Indian national movement, and thus makes a bad matter worse. No American can help the British solve the Indian problem without himself beginning with a clear repudiation of the Jordan-Luce dream of "American Empire."

We cannot, of course, soothe the susceptibilities of the British imperialist circles by assuring them that the United States is going to help them re-establish the status quo of

colonial empire as their share of the fruits of a common victory. Neither can we put the dissolution of the British Empire as a goal of the war. But we can, and clearly must, as a precondition for effective collaboration in the war of Britain and the United States as they now exist, make it absolutely clear that no advantage will be taken by one over the other as a result of the common war, that United States policy in relation to the colonial empire system will be determined solely by war needs, affecting all powers alike, and not by any special American grasping for power.

Just as we have both imperialist and anti-imperialist forces and political trends within the United States, so also has Great Britain. In both countries the obstacles to close collaboration in the war arise from the imperialist forces, and conciliation and adjustment depend upon the assertion of the anti-imperialist forces. Even Herbert Hoover admits "the rivalries between imperialisms have made for war" and "we know of no case where it has made for durable peace."\* The problems of Anglo-American relations are made easier as the imperialist tendencies within each country are subordinated and pushed into the background; they become more difficult to the extent that the imperialist tendencies assert themselves. The imperialist tendencies hold positions of power, but suffer from the fatal handicap that their assertion endangers the common victory over the Axis; the anti-imperialist tendencies are still not well organized and have no clear understanding of their task, but they are driven to assert themselves more and more by the necessities of war, and from the very nature of the war the future belongs to them.

\* Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson, *The Problems of Lasting Peace*, pp. 234-35.

It is the war, and the consequences of war, which has shattered the system of colonial empire, the foundation of the old regime in Great Britain. It is not the rival aspirations of American imperialism which has brought this about. And to the extent that this colonial system must be dismantled in the course of the war by action of the great powers themselves, there is clearly but one effective motive for this, the motive of military necessity. While the leopard can never change his spots, yet the leopard acts differently in a forest fire than when stalking his prey in the green forest. "Needs must when the devil drives," and the Axis devil is driving us all.

It is the historical fatality of the British Empire that its greatest source of strength, the colonial system, became its point of greatest weakness, its Achilles' heel. But the death of a colonial system does not mean the death of the nations involved in it, nor of the nation that dominated it, provided its people can adjust themselves to new times, new policies, and new relationships. Britain is threatened with extinction, not by the loss of her colonies, but by defeat at the hands of Hitler. The dismantling of the colonial structure has thus, in the light of the war, no more significance than the tearing down of obsolete and indefensible fortifications in order to replace them with a modern system of defense in depth.

The United States can facilitate or hinder this solution of Britain's war problem, which becomes one of the common problems of the United Nations as a whole. If there are powerful voices raised gloatingly in the United States forecasting how in the future Britain's realignment lays her open to conquest by an "American Empire" (whether that conquest be peaceful or violent), such voices are seriously damaging the war effort, rupturing the threads of

confidence between the United States and Britain, sabotaging victory. Every demonstration of United States' determination to repudiate such a "course of empire," every strengthening of the anti-imperialist forces in the United States, makes the transition easier for Britain, strengthens confidence between the nations and hastens the moment of victory.

American imperialism has developed without a great colonial empire. It thus has certain advantages in relation to the British type of imperialism, especially now with the certain dissolution of the colonial system resulting from the war. These theoretical advantages form the basis of the dreams of the Jordan-Luce school of imperialism, which envisages the liberated colonies automatically falling into the clutches of American monopoly capital through the operation of finance, investments, and loans. What the Jordan-Luce school has not taken into consideration, however, is that the American type of imperialism actually depended upon the existence of the British colonial type and upon the world structure built around it. The American imperialists considered that old world as a drastic limitation upon them. But they forget that when the limitation is removed, there is removed at the same time the basic factors of the world order under which they had learned to operate, and that they have nothing to take its place. American imperialism arrived at its subjective maturity just in time to see the world slipping out of the hands, not only of the British colonial system, but of any possible world system of imperialist rule.

The imperialist rivalries which bedevil the relations between Britain and the United States are thus the automatic carry-over from a pre-war world which is already gone beyond power of recall. The quicker and the more thor-

oughly this fundamental fact can be made clear, the better for Anglo-American relations. For such an understanding will clear the way for dealing with these relations from the approach of the true national interests of the peoples, and of the tasks of winning the war.

There is one clear and overriding interest common to the British and American peoples, as to all the United Nations, and that is the interest of survival, of victory in this war, and the establishment of a tolerable post-war world. Everything else must be subordinated to this common interest. And a common course must be hammered out in practical life, on the anvil of war. That which proves disastrous in the war must be ruthlessly searched out and eliminated; that which helps to victory must be found and built up and carried through to the end. Wherever it leads us, the one thing we need to know is that it leads us away from a world of Axis enslavement and the death of civilization.

## CHAPTER XV

### CHINA AS CITIZEN OF THE WORLD

THE Republic of China is a member of the United Nations and has a decisive voice in its leadership. For the first time, China has been accepted as a full citizen in the world family of nations. This is a measure of the fundamental changes in the world from the days when in 1919 China waited in the anterooms of Versailles, only to be forced at last to walk out without signing the peace treaty

because, although China was one of the victor nations, the treaty took away from her one of her greatest provinces. Yes, the world has changed, and now China takes her place among the "great powers." No treaty can be imposed upon the world at the end of the present war except one which the representatives of China have had their hand in writing, and which is acceptable to the Chinese people.

The story of the emergence of China as a self-determined citizen of the world is a story of struggles against foreign oppression, against native reactionary militarism, against puppets of foreign powers, struggles between tendencies in the national movement, and for the past five years against large-scale Japanese invasion. It is a story of the hammering out of a national will and a national consciousness in a nation of over four hundred millions population, with a backward economy and a social order which carries over the remnants of the oldest Asiatic feudalism. China is a modern miracle, raised up against the pressure of machine-made imperialism by the almost naked hands of a people armed chiefly with clear minds and steel wills. It is an epic which we know only in fragments. The unsung heroism of many millions of men and women directed by some of the most brilliant minds to be found anywhere on this earth has created modern China.

It is probable that historians will date the opening of the present global war with the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931. That was the beginning of a continuous chain of aggressions by the Axis powers which brought the world into its present condition. And it must be said that, aside from the achievements of the Soviet Union in the war against the Nazi invaders, which are quite incomparable with anything else in history, China has stood