

2
Royal Empire Society Essay

Very good, in spite
of lapses and
spelling.

1942

- Class A

"The freedom of Mankind will depend on
much closer collaboration between the
British Commonwealth of Nations and the
United States of America

R. D. Mac Donald.

Waitaki Boys' High School

Oamaru

New Zealand.

Books of Reference

'America in World Affairs' Allan Nevins

'Let It Roll' Sir Rowland Evans

'Anglo-American Trade Relations'

British-American Co-operation Movement
pamphlets.

"The Freedom of Mankind will depend on much closer collaboration between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America."

With the successful conclusion of the war all students of international affairs must admit that the pooling of the moral and material resources of the British Empire and of the United States would, not only be the most effective safeguard for world peace, but that it would also triumphantly vindicate before the world the basic principles of liberty, justice, and tolerance with which the two democratic, English speaking peoples are so strongly associated. What combination of powers would dare face two such splendid nations led by the indomitable British spirit and backed by the immense resources of America?

After the Great War few, if any envisaged that we should again be at war with Germany twenty-one years later. But with the termination of this ^{here} war, must be no mistake; there must be no sickening wave of sentimentalism after this war. Germany must be watched; she must be policed. British and American statesmen must not be overcome by waves of idealism and sentimentalism. They must be realists if civilization is to be stabilised on enduring foundations of equity and tolerance.

While undoubtedly the war has done much to draw the two English speaking nations closer together, even before the war British foreign policy had for its main objective the cultivation of the most cordial relations with America. So too, the Washington

Pact, the Kellogg Pact, and the London Naval Pact attested America's emergence into full realization of her obligations to the international community.

For, whatever the outcome of the present conflict, the United States knows that she must prepare to assume a new and responsible role in a world that will not be the familiar, secure world that she has known for the past hundred years. She is already preparing for that role. For, she knows, that in cooperation with Britain she will have to take the lead in sustaining the democratic way of life. If the freedom of mankind is to be assured, if we wish to remove to a higher plane in life, it is imperative that America and Britain should collaborate to the fullest possible extent. America now knows that in a century in which distance is of no account that it is impossible for her to pursue her old isolationist policy.

For a whole century America was removed from the European conflicts and was content to shut herself off from the rest of the world. Woodrow Wilson was the first American statesman of this century to see that it was impossible to continue this isolationist policy in an age where distance is of practically no account. He saw that Americans could no longer take for granted the old comfortable pattern of the nineteenth century and he at least began to visualize the outlines of a new American system.

One of the greatest blunders after the last war was the eagerness and the speed with which all controversial questions were settled. The history and the politics of Europe are so

complicated, with so many conflicts and shadings, that it would be impossible to arrive at an adjustment satisfactory to all parties.

The successful termination of this war must be followed by an armed Anglo-American peace. The old debt of England and the new debt probably will never be paid to America, therefore a feasible suggestion is that America should take a half interest in all the strategic positions in the world, including Gibraltar^a, Suez, Singapore, and the Falkland Isles.

In order to satisfactorily police the world, Britain will have to occupy and maintain strategic sites in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, France, Spain, Italy, North Africa, the Balkans, the Near and Middle East and India. At some point, perhaps at the Straits of Malacca or Singapore, America will have to occupy and maintain a series of strategic positions through the East Indies, the Orient, Hawaii, Alaska, the Canal zone, the Galapagos Islands, on towards the straits of Magellan, then the Falkland Isles, Dakar, the Canary Islands, Cape Verde Islands, Madeira Islands, Azores and thence to Greenland. There are so many strategic positions to be occupied and maintained that it will require the combined efforts of both America and Britain. The combined American and British navies will be required to maintain these outposts.

The ultimate aim of the post-war world will be an economic and social betterment for the less privileged because it is the little man who is winning this war and he deserves more.

Both America and Britain are moving towards the welfare of all citizens, but not toward any dictatorship of the proletariat headed by a despotic or oligarchic inner circle. The leadership of the post-war world will come from that type of man possessing professional and technical ability, rather than from the leaders of mass movements, agitators, demagogues or professional so-called reformers.

In the future world, industry will have to watch unemployment. While no business can employ men when it is not economically justifiable to do so, at the same time business collectively must defeat the problem of unemployment. Hitler is an example of ^{the product of} frustration. The presence in any country of millions of unemployed is a potential danger menacing civilization.

The British definitely need a strong partner, a senior partner to run the world. Not only have we in Britain been guilty of formulating policies which have run us in to serious difficulties but we have had to turn to America for help. After the last war Britain had to assume a great many ~~difficulties~~ responsibilities and, although she discharged many with competence, she is not strong enough at the present time to take alone the task of straightening out the difficulties that are sure to arise from this war. Great Britain with a population of less than fifty millions rules nearly a quarter of the world's population and nearly a quarter of the world's land. But Britain is neither strong enough, nor modern enough in her industry, to discharge the task of world leadership alone. Compared with America the

the British Empire has not advanced very far since the Great War. Our development of resources, of potential industry and of economy as a whole, has lagged greatly behind that of America. Thus what Britain wants is a partner to help run the world and that is precisely the role in which America will function in the years to come.

The advances in transport and in communication are so rapid and great that military security or adequate defense can be had only on a global or spherical plan. The forces and the resultants of this war will oblige America to participate in the development of the resources of the British Empire on a basis of full equality in every respect with British citizens.

It is America's view, that the interests of the Western Hemisphere as a whole, can be served and developed best in collaboration with simultaneous development of the British Empire. The Western Hemisphere together with the British Empire control more than three-quarters of the world's mineral resources and production, as well as fibres, foods, and general plantation produce.

The British ~~Empire~~^{Islands} are as much a part of America's defense system as Panama, Cuba, Hawaii, the Philippines, Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, and the Atlantic Islands are the defense of the Empire. If America aids in the defense of the Empire, she must have equal rights in the development of its resources, while if Britain helps in the defense of America and American possessions she must have equal trade rights with America.

The world must be organized on the

basis of open markets, with trading conducted by individuals and private enterprise and not by governments. Governments must cooperate to prevent international monopolies from retarding the necessary price adjustments to bring about full use of the world's resources. A realistic attitude toward world trade is essential, and America this time will have to accept the products of other nations in payment for her goods and in liquidation of the debts that have collected.

Raw materials played an important political and economic role after the last war. The have-not nations made desperate efforts to become self-sufficient and their lack of industrial raw materials and food was a contributing cause of the present war. Raw materials are a fundamental consideration in the industrial and technological development of nations. Independence therein is the desire and ambition of all industrial nations. No nation is self-sufficient in all elements. As Britain and America control the greater part of the world's raw materials they will have to collaborate and make sure that every country has an adequate supply. There must be a better equality of opportunity throughout the world.

We should remember that work is done as much at the bottom as at the top, and that when any group is left out of society it automatically becomes an enemy of society, and then becomes an enemy of the enterprise system. In the post-war world we will need to rebuild the great middle classes, upgrade many in our lower income brackets so that they may develop the interest, the philosophy and the general conservatism like that

possessed by the great middle classes that controlled our political destiny towards the end of the last century.

State power has created the difficulties, so state power should remove those difficulties. In other words state power has been responsible for the war, so state power should conclude the war. But state power should be limited to that and private enterprise should be allowed to take over the reins of office once the war is successfully concluded. The reconstruction of the world and the development of many resources, all must be under private enterprise. There is no stagnant economy and no limitation of industrial frontiers. In the future there is only unbounded opportunity for American industry and the private enterprise system.

If the politicians do not sell China short and if Russia can be purged of Communism, out of these wars four great nations will arise - the Chinese Empire, the Russian Empire, the British Empire, and the United States of America. These four blessed with great natural resources, great internal markets, and great manpower probably will be the most important nations and exercise the greatest influence in world affairs for many years to come.

But undoubtedly the most important factor in the maintenance of world peace will, however, be constant collaboration between America and the British Empire, united by common interests. These interests existed, indeed, after the last war, but vision and statesmanship were then lacking. There are more and more indications in the United States that this time we can count on her collaboration. Mr Sumner Welles, in a recent speech in Washington, frankly spoke

of the opportunity which was offered to and rejected by the American people after the first world war, and of the unenlightened selfishness which dictated that rejection. Now they were reaping 'the bitter fruits' of their folly. The American Under Secretary of State affirmed his belief that the responsibility would not again be shirked. Mr Henry A. Wallace, the Vice-President of the United States, in an address to the Free world association said plainly. 'We failed in our job after the first World War. We did not know how to go about it to build an enduring world-wide peace. We did not have the nerve to follow through and prevent Germany from rearming. We did not stow whole-heartedly to create a world where there could be freedom from want for all the peoples. But from our very errors we learned much...!'

This is a reversal of the long-established American attitude of disclaiming responsibility for the world crisis, and for the welfare of the rest of the world, and as a prerequisite to any constructive policy it is of immense gain to the United Nations. Nothing could be more dangerous to our common victory and more favourable to Germany and Japan than a policy of American imperialism denying world-wide responsibilities.

Why should America and Britain not coöperate? Both countries have much to offer each other. The great disadvantage of one country having to overcome the other's language is here eliminated as we both speak a common tongue. The Americans have been brought up with British ideals always close at hand and, therefore probably understand us better than any other nation. Both Britain and America's systems of justice

rest on a common foundation - Magna Carta. Their liberty is derived from the eternal spring of freedom - government by the people. Divided they are impotent to stop another and more terrible war than that in which we are at present engaged. United they are powerful enough to police the seas and save the world from all wars.

That is why an Anglo-American entente is the only practical scheme by which the peace of the world may be preserved from recurrent anarchy. It is an indispensable factor not only for the winning of the war but more especially for the stabilising of the peace. No other combination of powers can hope to stand up to the terrific power that a united America and Britain could bring to bear.

What can be more logical than to again call upon the new world to redress the balance of the old. The British dominions know that their security depends as much upon the United States as upon Great Britain. Had it not been for the United States it is feasible to believe that both Australia and New Zealand might now be under Japanese rule.

Some students of international affairs are not even satisfied with closer collaboration between the United States and Britain but, like Clarence Streit of America, advocate that a definite, organic, federal union should be established. There are arguments for both sides but I believe that any clear thinking person could see the insuperable difficulties that would have to be overcome for such a union to be a success. No doubt such a union has much to offer but, in our generation at least, it can be considered a practical impossibility.

With the establishment of peace we must take care that our trade relations with America do not decline. In the dominions particularly, we have found it often difficult to establish satisfactory trading agreements with America. America is such a vast continent and she produces such a diversity of products that there are few articles of produce that we can supply. But with the conclusion of the war new avenues are sure to be opened and the British Empire must make every effort to explore them.

The combined trade of the United States and Great Britain amounts to over forty per-cent of the entire foreign commerce of the world. Therefore a trade agreement between the United States and the British Empire which will open their markets more widely, not only their ^{mutual} trade but, through most-favoured-nation treatment, to the trade of all the other countries, should have a far-reaching effect in appeasing economic stress and contributing indirectly towards world peace.

The significance of such an agreement at present cannot be overestimated. The United States and the United Kingdom are the leaders in world trade. Between them they buy twenty-eight per-cent of all the imports of the world and sell 24 per-cent of the world's exports. Statistics, however, fail to measure the importance to international trade of American and British policies. If they collaborate in the time of peace they could control so much of the world's resources and raw materials as to make it impracticable for any combination of powers to strike against them.

Elsewhere, trade and financial arrangements have been subjected to rigorous state control, but in these countries foreign trade is still

predominantly an individual business enterprise. Quota restrictions are not unknown to them, but their reliance for the controlling of trade is still placed in taxes on imports. Although historically England has stood for free Trade and the United States for Protection, recent developments have brought them nearer to common ground. Furthermore, their methods of applying import tariff, owing to a common heritage of legal and political institutions show many marked similarities.

Most significant in the present situation is their common adherence to the principle of equality of treatment in their commercial relations with foreign countries, and to the guarantee of such treatment by the most-favoured nation clause in commercial treaties. Neither country has been strictly consistent in applying the principle. Under the stress of trade competition each has made exceptions and each has taken refuge in strained interpretations. But whereas elsewhere, the validity of equal treatment is challenged if not openly rejected it still remains the corner stone of both English and American commercial policies.

The economic ^{cooperation} of the United Kingdom and of the United States, by promoting a greater volume of exchange would hasten the return in each country of stable prosperity. On this ground alone the pending agreement may prove a landmark in economic history. For more than twenty years the business world has been distracted by tariff warfare. The complicated obstacles which have been placed in the way of trade across national frontiers have become almost unbelievably obstructive. They are largely responsible for the failure of international trade to regain its pre-depression

proportions. An Anglo-American agreement will help to open the channels of world trade. Through the operation of the most-favoured nation clauses, the reduction in the English and American tariffs will be extended widely to the trade of many countries. Both England and the United States have been urging freer trade as a remedy for the world's business depression. While their own policies remained nationalist and isolationist, their preaching fell on deaf ears. Now, however, they are about to add practice to precept. It is their great opportunity to demonstrate to isolationists the world over the validity of the democratic formula of international economic cooperation.

The implications of the trade agreement extend far beyond matters of trade and industry. Permanent world peace is the heart-felt desire of the people of both nations; it is the objective of their foreign policies. Direct steps to prevent war through political understandings or alliances must be rejected as unwise and impracticable. But both countries can unite in an attempt to remove the causes of war. In framing a trade agreement aiming to open their markets more widely not only to their mutual trade but also to the trade of the world, they are moving in the direction of economic appeasement and world peace.

To bring the two great nations of liberty-loving Anglo-Saxon peoples into line for world peace—that is the task to which every church, every loyal citizen, every woman who hates war, must lend all their strength and give all their 'Moral Energy'. The conjoined might of the British Empire and of the United States of America must be used to redress the balance, and guarantee a future for the world, and a peaceful civilization wherein each race may develop its individual talents for

the communal welfare. The spirit, the traditions, the resources of these two great peoples are equal to the task. Fleeced by two great leaders who have the will, they can do no other. Both fight for their preservation against a common foe. Both fight for even ~~for even~~ a greater end than this. They fight in order that democracy may live, that liberty may endure, and that man's life may be a free evolution in peace to the full flowering of mankind and the highest standards of abundant life.
