

of the masses of thinking people, without reference to particular schools of politics or philosophy, except those trends of democratic and libertarian tradition which most Americans hold in common. I have based my conception of policies entirely in the prerequisites for victory in the war, and not at all upon preconceived ideologies. That is the general scheme of this whole book. It is an attempt to find the road to unity of thought and action, on the part of persons, groups, classes, and nations who hitherto have been divided and antagonistic, but who must now unite in a life-and-death struggle against a common enemy, on pain of defeat, enslavement, and death.

The United Nations is fighting the most ferocious and formidable enemy that mankind has ever before faced. It must reach unprecedented heights of unity, determination, and heroism if it is to earn the victory. It must purify itself of everything which interferes with the struggle for victory.

Until we can unite the nation upon such an understanding of our task, we cannot win the war. We will reach the heights standing between us and victory because we must. It is a task laid upon us by history and by our character as a people. And we will not fail.

CHAPTER XIII

THE SOVIET UNION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

FOR many years I have been writing pamphlets and making speeches about the Soviet Union, the main purpose

of which was to convince my fellow Americans that co-operation between our country and the Soviet Union was in the interests of both and vitally necessary to world peace. Although my pamphlets were sold and read in considerable numbers, neither my own efforts nor those of many other persons laboring to the same end were effective in bringing about the desired end. It was my own and my party's "reward" to be labeled generally in the newspapers as "foreign agents" under the "control of Moscow." In fact it became a rule that anyone who advocated friendship and co-operation between our two countries was denounced as "un-American" and a "traitor to his country."

What we failed to accomplish by reasonable exposition and argument, however, Hitler brought into being by his brutal and crushing conquests.

The Soviet Union is now an established and welcome member of the United Nations. That is because obviously the Red Army and the Soviet people are fighting our battle for us, laying down their lives in millions, in the most magnificent struggle of all history. We Americans, as we all know, would be in a most disastrous situation but for the fact that we have the Soviet Union as an ally. The United Nations would not be in existence today but for the Soviet Union.

The American people are now making a real effort to understand our Soviet ally. They realize that they had fallen victim to the Hitlerite campaign of misinformation and calumny against the Soviet Union. Some of the most damaging misunderstandings have been largely cleared up by the writings of Mr. Joseph E. Davies, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union, whose book *Mission to Moscow* was an outstandingly valuable contribution to mutual confidence between the two countries. The book

The Soviet Power, by the Dean of Canterbury, has also finally been taken into the circles of respectability; it has been named one of the ten most important books of the year as aiding the war effort. Signs multiply daily that the American people are developing a profound affection for the Soviet Union and are even beginning to understand it.

It is worth noting that the two writers most successful in breaking down the wall of prejudice and misinformation that separated our country from the Soviet Union were a successful American capitalist and a high dignitary of the Church of England. There are always cynics who sneer when a long-suppressed truth is finally received in the circles of constituted authority, and who seem to think the truth can keep its purity only under official suppression; but I am not at all of this trend of thought and can only rejoice in the event and offer my congratulations to the men who succeeded where I had failed.

Many persons, doubtless, are still influenced by the charge that American Communists are "agents of Moscow," men without loyalty to their own country, because they approve of socialism as it has been built in the Soviet Union and propose that the United States should be re-organized along similar lines. But when capitalists and high churchmen approve of the Soviet Union, in much the same terms as the Communists have done, except that they do not believe that our country should have a similar system, then the general public finds it more possible to believe them. Only the extreme pathological type of anti-Soviet mania produces the automatic epithet of "communist" and "foreign agent" against the Dean and Mr. Davies.

The two strongest powers in the United Nations are the United States and the Soviet Union. While these two re-

mained at arms' length from one another, the formation of the United Nations remained impossible. But when these two countries at long last established a relationship of co-operation then the formation of the United Nations followed quickly thereafter. It can be said, without exaggeration, that ever closer relations between our nation and the Soviet Union are an unconditional requirement for the United Nations as a world coalition. When these relations are upon a sound footing then all other questions can be solved with a minimum of difficulty.

In a previous chapter, I have already mentioned a danger to full development of Soviet-American friendship which exists in the form of a misunderstanding, even in the center of the present rapprochement. It is said that this friendship has become possible because the Soviet Union has abandoned socialism (or communism) and is becoming again a capitalist country like the United States. Now, I think this is a serious mistake, and there is danger in allowing such a thought to become a foundation for our relationships; if and when this is proved to be false the friendship based upon the mistaken idea would collapse. But if we boldly face the real problem, which is one of friendship between a frankly socialist and a frankly capitalist government, we will remain on much more solid ground.

This question is of such far-reaching importance to the existence and growth of the United Nations that it is worth a more detailed examination.

I am not going into any extended arguments about what is socialism, and how much of it is represented by the Soviet Union. Rather, I will rest the case upon purely empirical grounds of common sense. An American capitalist, in a friendly re-evaluation of the Soviet Union, takes

a good look at that country and exclaims: "Why, this is not a socialist country, it is nothing like what I expected from my understanding of socialism!" The Soviet leader replies: "That is merely because you have been falsely instructed as to what is socialism. We are a socialist country, and far from returning to capitalism, we intend to become ever more completely socialist." Now, we have the simple problem of establishing who knows better of what he is talking about—the American capitalist or the Soviet leader. In my opinion, in this case the American capitalist must admit that perhaps the Soviet leader knows more about socialism than he does. It would be much better if we openly admit that our country is becoming good friends with the *socialist* Soviet Union and not with the returning-to-capitalism Soviet Union. It will save many future disappointments.

Actually, of course, the difference is far deeper than the proper definition of a word. There are so many capitalists in the United States, men powerful in public affairs, who have their minds firmly set in the groove of thought which considers it *impossible* for this country to co-operate with a *socialist* country, that those capitalists who see the *necessity* for such co-operation try to conciliate the others by assuring them it is not so bad since the socialist country is really going back to capitalism. It is just this conciliation of a mistake which I deem dangerous for the future, and which I therefore speak against, because it keeps us from facing and solving the real question: Is it possible to establish enduring co-operation between a socialist and a capitalist state?

On the Soviet side, this question was answered in the affirmative long ago by Lenin, and that answer has been reaffirmed and strengthened by Stalin. The Soviet Union

has long based its foreign policy upon the *possibility* and the *desirability* of peaceful coexistence and co-operation between itself and as many capitalist countries as possible, and especially the United States. This was one of the issues involved in the long struggle against Trotsky and his followers who argued against this with their so-called "theory of permanent revolution" and who finally ended as the puppets of Hitler. The Soviet leaders always expected, and prepared to defeat, the effort to destroy the Soviet republics by military invasion carried out by the most reactionary capitalist countries (Germany, Italy, and satellites), but, simultaneously, they consistently followed a policy of establishing the firmest bonds with those capitalist countries interested in keeping the peace and in checking aggressors.

On the American side, our national leaders never answered the question theoretically. In practice, up until 1933, our country acted upon the principle that it was even *impossible to recognize* a socialist country, much less co-operate with it. Only with the advent of the Roosevelt administration was this hard-boiled antagonism broken down, and the first formal relationships between the two countries established. But the dominant Republican Party leaders, and many powerful reactionary Democrats, still repeat the thesis of Herbert Hoover that it will eventually be necessary for the United States to destroy the Soviet Union in order to maintain its own capitalistic system.

It is this fundamental debate on foreign policy which is compromised and slurred over in the formula: "The Soviet Union is returning to capitalism."

It is necessary *in the interests of the United States* that our country give a clear and unambiguous answer to the

question. Just as the Soviet leaders have long declared, on their side, that peaceful and co-operative relations are possible and desirable with other countries, regardless of their internal economic and social systems, so it is now necessary for the United States, through its most authoritative leaders, firmly to establish a similar attitude toward the Soviet Union as the policy of our country.

This is implicit in the Atlantic Charter and in the Declaration of the United Nations. But it is still disputed in high quarters, and when the dispute is inconclusively ended with the compromise formula, "After all, the Soviet Union is going back to capitalism," then we know the fundamental question is still being left open for the future. But such questions, left open for the future, are the greatest danger to the United Nations, not only in the future but right now. For it demonstrates a lack of confidence among the nations. Such a lack of confidence will be felt harmfully at every moment on our difficult road to victory in the war. It will be doing Hitler's work for him.

If United States capitalists and others, believing in the superiority of the capitalist system over socialism, *hope* that the Soviet Union will some day return to that system, that is their undoubted right and no one could dream of denying it to them. Similarly the Soviet leaders, believing in socialism, may *hope* that the United States and the whole world will one day come to their point of view. But both sides, recognizing the *necessity* of present and future co-operation between the two countries, must not allow their *hopes* to interfere with close and friendly relations, must learn to work together *as they are* and not as they would like one another to be.

There are many other relationships among nations

within the world coalition that present stubborn problems of ideology or interest. The proper relations of confidence and collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union would immensely facilitate the solution of all other problems of the United Nations. How difficult and serious are some of these problems is emphasized merely by mention of the names of China and India. Who can seriously expect the proper relationships in the war to be worked out with those two great countries—over a third of the human race—except with the most intimate collaboration of the Soviet Union within the leadership of the United Nations? Thus the correct attitude toward, and relations with, the Soviet Union are seen to be no narrow interest of our two countries alone.

Great Britain has arrived at a twenty years' Treaty of Alliance with the Soviet Union, definitely envisaging long-term co-operation. The United States relations are still almost entirely developed as war relations, agreements negotiated by the President as Commander-in-Chief, and not treaties confirmed by the Senate according to the Constitution. The Soviet Union has seen fit to ignore this inequality in the binding nature of commitments on the two sides and has not hesitated on its part to confirm its agreements with the United States by its Supreme Council. It would really seem to be in our own American interests to make every effort to make our relations with the Soviet Union just as far-seeing and complete as Great Britain has done.

There is a peculiarly offensive stupidity which maintains that the United States should not develop relations further with the Soviet Union, but should use the British as a sort of broker or middleman between us. Such ideas dominated the American Federation of Labor when it re-

jected the invitation of the British trade union leaders to join a council of labor of the three countries. Such a depth of idiocy is difficult to argue with, for it begins with the rejection of reason and the deification of prejudice. It reveals a timidity and lack of self confidence unworthy of the name American.

We Americans must learn much more of the Soviet Union before we will be able as a nation fully to appreciate its high value for the United Nations. So far, our leaders of national thought have expressed surprise and amazement at the magnificent achievements of the Red Army and Soviet people in battle against the Nazi hordes. They had completely misjudged the Soviet Union. That means they were misinformed. It would seem that the time has come to straighten out our information about that great country.

Whence came the "unexpected" military strength of the Soviet Union? Military strength is directly related to the strength of the economy upon which it is based. The Red Army is strong because the socialist economy of the Soviet Union had made the most tremendous strides forward, advancing from the most backward of the great powers to the first place in Europe, and second only to the United States in the whole world. Soviet industry had multiplied its output during less than fifteen years by more than ten times, an increase of 1000 per cent. Its agriculture had been collectivized on the basis of machines and tractors, the most modern in the world. Its heavy industries had been especially developed, including completely new industries. For years the Soviet chemical industry has been producing artificial rubber, rendering them almost independent of imports. And while the United States was producing pleasure cars and refrigerators, the Soviet Union was pro-

ducing tractors, machines, tanks, guns, airplanes—in preparation for the test of fire they now undergo.

Whence came the “unexpected” morale of the Soviet people, civil and military, which has aroused the admiration of the world? Military strength is directly related to the unity of will and action of the entire people, that factor which is called morale. We had been taught by our national leaders and newspapers to believe that the Soviet regime was “imposed upon” its people, that it had no inner strength, and would fall apart at the first heavy blows. We saw exactly the opposite take place. The heavier came the blows of the Nazi assault against the Soviet Union, the higher went the morale of the people and their Red Army, the closer appeared the unity of the people with their government.

No other nation has withstood such invasion without crumpling within. Everyone knows that the Nazi regime could not survive a month of such military setbacks on its own soil. Even the United States has displayed during the eight months it has been formally at war a disquieting slowness in gathering its forces to strike the enemy, and morale remains one of our most difficult problems. But the Soviet people have been so overwhelmingly united and so completely in the war with all forces that it is the wonder of the rest of the world.

This unprecedented unity is also the product of their socialist order. Every citizen knows from daily experience that he is a full partner in the ownership of his country and everything in it. There are no special interests to create frictions, obstructions, and sabotage. There is no problem of profiteering, and “equality of sacrifice” is a reality taken for granted, not something which must be fought for and inadequately realized. And the government

arises directly out of the people and is constantly renewed by them. There are no antagonistic classes to fight over the distribution of rewards and burdens. There is the most complete “commonwealth” that history has even shown. This is the foundation of the unprecedented morale of the Soviet people.

There was no necessity that Americans should be “surprised” to learn that the Soviet Union was our strongest ally. The facts were apparent for us all, long before the war broke over the world. But our eyes were blinded to the facts. Something *inside of us* caused us to deny the reality and put our faith in fairy tales. We had been poisoned by Hitler’s secret weapon and much of the poison still lingers in our national life. For our own spiritual and intellectual health, as well as for the necessities of war, we require a national purge of this poison which has brought us to the brink of destruction.

We are not solidly building the United Nations so long as we permit the dominance in the nation’s thinking of the belief that some magic or “accident” can “explain” our alliance with the Soviet Union, or the Soviet’s mighty achievements for our side. Far from being accidental, we must learn to understand these things as the working out of natural law, of historical necessity; as something springing from the deepest forces which move all progressive humanity. That is the powerful conception which gave us Vice-President Wallace’s speech of May 8, and made of it a world-wide weapon to recruit the peoples to the United Nations’ banner. We must begin to *understand* the Soviet Union in its world historical setting, as one of the great achievements of the human race in its long forward march, like our own 1776, like the French ’92, like the Bolivar-ian revolution of Latin America, and like our own aboli-

tion of chattel slavery in the Civil War. We must understand the magnificent achievements of the Soviet Union in this war as the product of long, arduous and heroic preparation for this day when, side by side with the United States, Britain, China, and the whole United Nations, she is bearing the main brunt of the fight for humanity's future.

What disastrous pettiness of mind is it which permits a Lady Astor, in this tragic hour, to raise her shrill voice to proclaim: "The Russians are fighting only for themselves"? What moral and intellectual blindness is it that permits supposedly responsible spokesmen of American democracy to choose the hour when millions of Soviet citizens are giving their lives for our common freedom to voice the irrational fear of "control by Russia and Russia's interests"?

This is no issue of "justice and fairness toward Russia." It is a test of our own national capacity to protect our own nation, of our own national ability to think straight, of our own soundness of morality as a nation, of our own readiness for the supreme tests of *leadership at the head of the United Nations*.

It is more true today than when the words were first uttered by Woodrow Wilson that "*the treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations . . . will be the acid test of their good will.*"*

The military striking power of the United Nations, adequate to crush the Axis, is before all in the hands of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. With that power goes a tremendous responsibility. These three great nations, more directly than any others, thereby jointly

* Woodrow Wilson, *Address to Congress*, January 8, 1918.

share the terrible responsibility for victory and for reorganization of the world. Upon the quality of the joint leadership thus exercised, upon the capacity of the three greatest military powers of the United Nations to *work together* and combine all other members as freely cooperating equals, depend the moment of victory and the nature of the peace.

Nothing is gained by shutting our eyes to the fact that there are powerful forces within the United States opposing the whole concept of the United Nations *because they hold deadly enmity to the Soviet Union*. They speak lightly and even gleefully of "Hitler and Stalin destroying one another"; they express the determination that "if Hitler does not finish the job, then the United States must"; they continue and intensify their "anti-communist" campaign which even now they copy verbatim from the textbooks they imported from Hitler Germany to this country in 1933; they exploit to the utmost, for disruption of the war effort and national unity, those anti-communist laws which they slipped over on the nation during the period of confusion when they dared openly describe the Soviet Union as the mortal enemy of our country and every American Communist as a traitor to his country—flagrant copies of Hitler's program.

The United Nations is the instrument for victory. Victory is required for the survival of our nation. The Soviet Union is an essential part of the United Nations. Mutual confidence between our country and the Soviet Union and joint work in the leadership of the United Nations are absolutely necessary.

Therefore, everything without exception which interferes with this mutual confidence must be removed—

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