

Outline Memorandum on Journey of  
Harold Stassen and Robert Matteson  
through Asia and Africa and around  
the world.

Departed from Philadelphia December 2nd flying  
west through Alaska to Japan.

Conferences with:

Prime Ministers -  
Yoshida - Japan  
Phibun Songgram - Thailand  
Mohammed Natsir - Indonesia  
Jawaharlal Nehru - India  
Liaquat Ali Khan - Pakistan  
David Ben-Gurion - Israel  
Daniel Malan - South Africa

General Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo

Dr. Albert Schweitzer in Lambaréné, French  
Equatorial Africa

Numerous economic, defense, agricultural, labor,  
industrial, education, health, university, and  
other officials in the countries visited.

United States Ambassadors -  
Merle Cochran - Indonesia  
Edwin Stanton - Thailand  
Loy Henderson - India  
Avra Warren - Pakistan  
John Erhardt - South Africa  
Walter Gifford - United Kingdom

Travelled 34,000 miles by air via twelve different  
international airlines.

Statement of Harold Stassen upon Arrival in New York,  
January 9, 1951.

I return from this journey with the belief that even though there are very real dangers of world war, nevertheless if America follows wise policies the prospects of world peace are brighter today than at any time in the past three years.

These are the three principal reasons for my belief:

First: The whole world is **awakening** to the extreme evils of Communist imperialism.

Second: People everywhere, including the Iron Curtain countries, want peace and freedom, and the Russian Kremlin faces a counter-revolution, which will include the Red Army itself, if it begins an aggressive war.

Third: America and the other peace-desiring nations are rearming and thereby filling the vacuum spots of weakness all around the world.

\*\*\*\*\*

I return with a number of strong convictions about what future American policy should be. In view of the grave nature of these fundamental policy questions, and in the light of the major discussion which has arisen through the addresses of the Honorable Herbert Hoover and Senator Robert Taft, I will not give any quick answers on these policy questions today. But I will make a

major national broadcast within the next ten days. This address will include a forthright discussion of my views and will give the evidence for my conclusions.

\*\*\*\*\*

The most inspiring conference of my entire journey was with Dr. Albert Schweitzer; the most informative conference was with General Douglas MacArthur; and the most encouraging was with Prime Minister Nehru.

\*\*\*\*\*

The most thrilling and meaningful experience was Christmas Eve spent in Bethlehem.

E.C.A. - India

---

Atlantic Part

---

American Division

---

Size and Speed of Preparedness Program

---

\* Korea

---



Psychological Leadership

Back Embroider to Hunt

---



Policy too  
exclusively military

Charles Paul Hoffman

\* Discussions for Western Europe  
Psychologically

Getting out of Korea

Somosa - Chiang Kai Shek

An Omen - Indo China \*

M m - China Aggressor  
True Britain

Stein Dgt on Japanese Arms

Veto versus Asia China

Smaller Practical Internationalism

Common Sense

United Nations - Rebuilt  
backward peoples

Sound Investment

without increasing our total commitments  
wisely - a large portion to Asia

Memoranda  
more shots

7th

①

## Movie Shots

Return from journey through  
Asia and Africa and  
around the world.

Three significant facts

1. Trouble in Russia
2. Whole world awakening
3. Free people everywhere rising

May make mad move to all out war  
~~Encouraged~~  
but long odds are they will not.

Encouraged - Measured Optimism  
Calm Courage - Confidence

(2)

Back Eisenhower

3/4 of Republican Senators  
will do so.

Those few <sup>Senators</sup> who speak out  
contrary do not represent Repu-  
lican & foreign Policy

---



(3)

Korea is a deliberate  
bloody trap -

---

State Dept & President  
fell into

---

Two alternatives to trap

Fight through

Pull out

Refuse admittance to UN

Deny Formosa

Close off supplies



(4)

Broad foreign policy  
~~beginning a~~

Instead of defensive containment

defeatist retreat  
from Europe  
+ pull out

Positive Dynamic

Objective -

Win a Victory, for  
civilization and freedom,  
over communist imperialism,  
without a world war.

---

5

Counter Revolution  
for freedom

Not under State Dept.

Take voice of Congress  
out of State Dept  
& make it a part

---

6

Strengthen U.N.

Be real Champions of freedom  
Fast majority of Republicans in and out  
of Congress  
Sensible Practical  
Internationalism

---

Best hope of Peace

Best hope of security  
for America.

Best hope <sup>Under God</sup> for  
progress  
for mankind

---



Master copy  
with revisions

around world

I have just returned from an observation trip<sup>^</sup> on which I revisited many places I have previously seen under conditions of war and of the reconstruction following war. On my return to the United States I sensed the same feelings of increasing anxiety and concern which are to be found the world over. There is the deep personal concern of those whose loved ones are in the battle lines. And there is the despair of all people everywhere around the globe at the prospect of a new world conflict more horrible than any which has gone before.

In reporting to you I can do no more - and no less - than give you an account of what I have observed and heard first hand from leaders in the countries visited, and then my own appraisal of the prospects for the future, and for the maintenance of peace and justice under law in this world. I cannot profess to greater powers of perception or greater wisdom than others who have had the same opportunities for such first hand study. Certain things are clear and sure. Others are not and as to those may God give this nation and the free world and its leaders the power and the wisdom to make sound choices and decisions before it is too late.

In spite of the gravity of the position of the forces of the free world in many places on the globe I sincerely believe that a third world war in this generation is not inevitable. On the contrary the developments of recent months show weaknesses of the Communist world which encourage me to the belief that peace is possible without appeasement or compromise.

Because of the grave nature of the decisions before us and the complexity of the problems involved I will undertake to,



make this report and draw these conclusions in several discussions.

<sup>all the</sup> No one can assume to have all the answers. No one can discuss the problems and possible solutions in the brief space of a single speech.

<sup>past year</sup> In the ~~period of less than one year~~ the leadership of this country has moved from one extreme to the other in its attitude toward the threat of Russia and Communism. This <sup>same</sup> pendulum-like process led administration leaders to scoff at those of us who expressed concern in the period from 1946 to early 1950 when the major steps of this country in foreign policy seemed almost to be designed to weaken the Free World and strengthen the Communist World step by step. When some of us urged, three years ago, that shipments of vital materials to Russia should be stopped the present administration (including Mr. Acheson) said that these warnings were "hysteria". I refer to this not in any spirit of bitterness but to emphasize my surprise at the state of mind of many leaders as I find it now - on my return (after 5 weeks absence). That state of mind is now at the other arc of the pendulum and is one approaching hysteria in its frantic rush to make up for years of unconcern about the threat of Communist Russia. Actually the attitude of hysterical fear and alarm is just as wrong as the previous attitude of unconcern toward Russian aims. Both are wrong because this country needs only to assess its position calmly and then, with confidence in its own powers and aims, and in its friends, set up <sup>strong</sup> defenses to the dangers to which those in power have so long been blind.

When that is done, and it must be done, no power on earth can defeat this nation.

#2-A

For five years since the end of World War II our country has been following under its present leadership a foreign policy declared to be one of containment of Communism. This was basically a negative defensive policy which was explained from time to time as one of "waiting for the dust to settle", and as "holding the line". The Asia policy of these same leaders persisted up to a few months ago in dealing with Chinese Reds as <sup>simple</sup> peasant leaders attempting to bring about a land reform. All this has resulted in 5 years of steadily increasing and expanded strength and power of the Communist controlled area of the world, the loss of freedom of millions of people, the weakening of the United Nations and the consequent increase of the danger of war. This policy and a last minute reversal of the announced abandonment of Korea has produced the blunder of Korea - a <sup>policy</sup> ~~blunder~~ which <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ a diplomatic and political blunder - and one for which no clear definition of aims as yet exists.

History will, I am confident record these past five years as the worst handling of foreign policy of ours or any country in any five year period in the world's history. Those are strong words but the suffering ~~and~~ of those whose lives or freedom paid for these blunders justify strong words as a preliminary to strong and positive action. There is today no clear positive foreign policy to cope with the crisis we face and it is therefore the duty of the Republican Party by open debate to forge a policy which men of all parties can understand and support.

I have found that some people have difficulty reconciling my statement that the chances for peace appear better to me now than before I left the United States. In the process of turning about face from unconcern about Russian arms and hysteria at the threat to our security the administration takes the poorest view of our own strength and power and the most exaggerated view of Russian strength. This might be a good approach if it were not carried to an extreme. Based on much evidence and careful study of that evidence and the views of informed leaders in many countries, I have reached my conclusion that peace without appeasement or compromise is possible. My conclusion is based on three factors.

First - The whole world is awakening to the terrors and evils of Russian Communist Imperialism. Very little remains anywhere in the world of the fuzzy thinking of the immediate post-war years when Russian aims were regarded as desire for peace and security only and the Chinese Reds were officially catalogued as "Agrarian Reformers" with <sup>only</sup> social and economic objectives. ~~The "Agrarian Reformer" concept of the Reds is as dead as some of the other tragic mistakes made by the Free World.~~

Second - In the countries nearer the Communist Iron Curtain there is much to be seen and learned that gives a truer perspective about the real strength of Russia. In recent months many people have escaped Russia in spite of the rigid border controls, and at point after point is confirmation of the accounts of the difficulty which the Communists have in maintaining slave labor forces of millions of Russians and others. The absolute discipline and control



essential to a slave state is not easy to maintain. Prisoners escape, soldiers desert and find their way to freedom. No longer do we enforce the return of these victims of terror as the State Department did for so long. On its borders the Communist World has recently taken steps like those of Nazi Germany 10 years ago. Trees are cut down over large areas on the borders, searchlights cover large areas and borders are patrolled by armed guards now as intent on preventing those attempting to leave as <sup>to</sup> preventing invasion. In spite of these measures men do escape and bring with them evidence that all is not well within. the enemy lines, as Russia would have us believe. The Communist Party which numbers only three million out of nearly two hundred million people in Russia proper is subject to stresses and strains which, while they do not appear clearly nevertheless exist and are important deterrents to Russia's plans for world domination by force. But these factors do not seriously hamper the process of undermining the governments of the free world and so long as Communist Plan can have bloodless victories the internal weaknesses will not appear.

Third - America and the other free nations desiring peace are awakened and rearming and this new strength and power is filling the vacuum of weakness and indecision. The attitude of unconcern or disbelief that any nation could so soon again harbor dreams of world conquest, is now dispelled and slowly but surely free men are getting ready to band together for defense.

The debate on what our policy should be has produced some sound ~~and~~ conclusions but it has also produced much <sup>error</sup> confusion which clouds the real issues. It is the responsibility of each one to state plainly and frankly what America should do and why



we should follow the course proposed. Tonight and in the near future I will undertake to assert my convictions. Some of these positions are not new. Some are expanded or reinforced by what I saw and learned in the past six weeks. Those who assert disagreement have the obligation to state with equal frankness the fundamental bases on which their conclusions are founded.

1. There can no longer be any doubt that the leaders of Communist China and their present policies are direct instrumentalities of Communist Russia.

2. There can no longer be any doubt that the leaders of Communist Russia have directed their policies and their plans ever since World War II - and before - on the destruction and domination of the free world. It follows that all the free world must stop at once shipments of vital materials to any part of the Communist World. (This will be an indirect reminder of your position.)

3. That the developments in Korea are but one step in the over-all Russian plan and the U. N. must recognize this and deal with it as such. The U. N. must therefore give full and complete support to the defense of Korea sufficient to meet the military or else the U.S.A. should withdraw its forces.

4. There can be no such thing as committing "limited forces" to meet an enemy of unlimited force - either in Korea or in Europe.

5. Western Europe and its resources and productive capacities are vital ~~key~~ points in the world strategy and should be held for our ~~own~~ defense as well as their own. To abandon them, immediately, or by the slow process of "limited" defense will deny the

#6

Free World and re-inforce the Communist world with those assets and resources.

6. We should make it clear to the countries of Free Europe - and to Russia - that if the free nations will put forth their maximum effort to defend themselves we will fight side by side with them - but that we cannot and do not propose to assume the burdens of defense for them. The basis for this action will be the report and recommendations of General Eisenhower whose experience and abilities make him the best qualified single person to judge the needs, ~~and~~ capacities and efforts of the European countries.

# VITAL SPEECHES

## OF THE DAY

Vol. XVII—No. 8  
25 cents a copy

FEBRUARY 1, 1951

TWICE A MONTH  
\$5.00 A YEAR

- Communist China an Aggressor Against United Nations** . . . . . By Warren R. Austin  
INTEGRITY AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY MUST BE MAINTAINED U. S. Representative at UN Gen. Assembly—Page 226
- American Foreign Policy** . . . . . By Harold E. Stassen  
VICTORY WITHOUT A WORLD WAR President of the University of Pennsylvania—Page 228
- Communism, the Superfoe** . . . . . By Daniel A. Poling  
IN FAR EAST, IN EUROPE AND IN AMERICA Editor, Christian Herald Magazine—Page 231
- Controls the Only Answer** . . . . . By Charles E. Wilson  
THE POWER OF LAW MUST BE INVOKED Defense Mobilization Director—Page 236
- Latin America Progress and Defense** . . . . . By Manuel R. Garcia-Mora  
THE BACKYARD OF THE UNITED STATES Professor of Political Science, University of Detroit—Page 239
- Mid-Century World** . . . . . By Ruth Alexander  
WHOSE WORLD HAS IT TURNED OUT TO BE? Economist, Lecturer and Columnist—Page 242
- Freedom to Work** . . . . . By Robert T. LeFevre  
AMERICAN WAGE EARNERS DILEMMA Extension Director, Wage Earners Committee of the U. S. A., Inc.—Page 245
- The Road to Economic Freedom** . . . . . By James Muir  
THE SHORTEST AND SAFEST TO SOCIAL PROGRESS President, The Royal Bank of Canada—Page 253
- Reactor Program of the Atomic Energy Commission** . . . . . By Lawrence R. Hafstad  
OUTLOOK FOR INDUSTRIAL PARTICIPATION Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.—Page 249

IMPARTIAL

CONSTRUCTIVE

AUTHENTIC

THE BEST THOUGHT OF THE BEST MINDS ON CURRENT NATIONAL QUESTIONS



of us—most of the world—together in equality and security. Time—and time enough—has already gone by. We must act while we can, for if we wait, we may find our young unity permanently broken up.

Mr. President, my Government has given lengthy and careful thought to the problem that confronts us. My Government believes that the United Nations should not shrink from facing up to the aggression that is being committed in Korea by the Chinese Communist regime of Peiping.

That aggression is part of the world-wide pattern of centrally directed Soviet imperialism. It is an aggression which clearly serves no legitimate Chinese national interest, but only the interests of that expanding power which, under the guise of throwing off the yokes of an old and discredited colonialism, would impose a new and far more rigorous colonialism upon the peoples of Asia struggling to emerge to full national independence.

The United Nations has had experience with this expansionist power in the past. The chain of crises has run from Iran through Greece and Berlin back across the world to Korea. The United Nations has learned from these past experiences that each crisis was met only by standing together. In each crisis, our standing together has had the eventual effect of bringing the Soviet imperialist power to a standstill. Our united resolution has compelled at least temporary stabilizations.

We must hope that by our united resolution we can once again bring those responsible for this new aggression to realize that flinging its armies against the United Nations is in the long run neither prudent for the regime nor helpful to the welfare of the Chinese people whom Peiping now controls. I hope that realization will not be too long delayed.

Because the aggression in Korea is part of a world-wide pattern, my Government believes that the actions we take in the United Nations must be tailored to fit that pattern. Our program of action must take into account the distribution of power in the world and the imminence of danger elsewhere. What is important, in our view, is that by facing up to this threat to the collective security of the world, the United Nations discourage present or future aggression.

My Government believes that the United Nations should now adopt a resolution which notes the facts and recommends action consistent with the facts. The facts are that the Peiping regime has rejected efforts to bring about a cease-fire in Korea, has rejected proposals aimed at a peaceful settlement, and has continued its invasion of Korea and its attacks upon the United Nations forces there.

In view of these facts, it is clear to my Government that the Peiping regime has committed aggression and that the General Assembly must say so. We believe that the General Assembly should call upon the Peiping regime to cease hostilities against the United Nations forces and to withdraw its forces from Korea. We believe that the General Assembly should affirm the determination of the United Nations to continue its efforts to meet the aggression in Korea. We believe the General Assembly should call upon all states and authorities to lend their assistance to the United Nations, and to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressors.

By doing these things, the General Assembly would decide in principle that collective measures should be taken to meet the aggression in Korea. In our view, it would be well for the Assembly to call upon some such body as the Collective Measures Committee to consider what future collective measures should be taken. We believe that this body should undertake this study immediately and should report back to the General Assembly as soon as possible with its recommendations to the members.

My Government believes that the General Assembly should also reaffirm that the policy of the United Nations is to bring about a cease-fire in Korea with a view to peaceful settlement and the achievement of the United Nations objectives in Korea, by peaceful means. For this purpose we believe there should be in existence a United Nations group which will at all times be ready to use its good offices to this end, whenever the Peiping regime decides that it prefers peace to armed aggression against the United Nations.

I believe that for the common cause of collective security, the great majority of members here present will want to choose this course. We can do no less if the United Nations is to maintain its integrity and the principle of collective security is to survive.

## American Foreign Policy

VICTORY WITHOUT A WORLD WAR

By HAROLD E. STASSEN, *President of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.*

*Broadcast over the American Broadcasting Network from Washington, D. C., January 15, 1951*

**M**Y fellow Citizens: This evening, with your permission, I will bring you a report of what I have seen and heard on my recent journey through Asia and Africa and around the world. Because of the very grave importance of the world situation to the American people at this time, I will speak very frankly and will make a comprehensive statement of my conclusions as to our foreign policy. But that does not mean that I wish to be dogmatic or arbitrary nor that I claim to have all the answers. I submit my observations for your own consideration and your own conclusions.

There are three broad sets of facts which are of great importance.

First of all, I received information all around the outside of the vast Communist empire of the discontent and unrest within the Soviet Union and within the Iron Curtain countries. This includes the Red Army itself. During this past

year the cruel oppression of peoples inside the Communist territories has increased, concentration camps have expanded, the borders are guarded with increasing force and vigilance against people escaping from inside, and still they do slip through with amazing stories of tragedy and unrest among the thirty million Moslems, the forty million Ukrainians, the Poles, the Czechs, and others. There is trouble inside Russia. There is trouble inside the Iron Curtain. There is trouble inside the Red Army. These peoples, just like those on the outside want peace, they want more freedom, they want their rights as human beings.

Second, I found that the whole world is rapidly awakening to the extreme evils of Communist imperialism. This I learned first hand from the lips of leaders and of citizens all around the globe. Very little remains of the fuzzy thinking of the immediate post war years when many thought that in



some manner Communism would be the wave of the future and would turn out to be benign.

Third, Not only America, but in fact all nations were arousing themselves to rearm, to strengthen their security internally and externally. The determination not to be taken over by this Communist cruelty, their will to fight, their preparations for defense, were increasing steadily.

Thus from my total study during this journey I conclude that although there continues to be grave danger of a world war, yet if America will follow wise policies the prospects of peace are in fact brighter than at any time in the past three years. I realize of course that this note of optimism sounds strange amid the wave of scare headlines and of jittery speeches which have recently been made.

May I emphasize again that I do not foreclose the possibility of a mad move to total war by the Kremlin. But I sincerely place the heavy odds on peace, because I believe the Kremlin faces a counter-revolution which will include the Red Army itself if it starts an all out war and thus inevitably opens up its borders.

I believe further that the Kremlin knows that if it starts a world war tomorrow, the Soviet Union will lose and America will win.

May I also add, that in giving this optimistic appraisal, I am not one of those who have been unable to see the rising Communist menace in these past years. More than three years ago I began to repeatedly call attention to the evil designs, the outlaw methods, the dark dangers of Communist imperialism. I endeavored as long ago as 1947 to stop the shipment of machine tools and atomic devices and war materials to the Soviet Union, to clamp down legally on the Communist parties as subversive agents serving a foreign power, to strengthen our own air forces and armed strength.

But the tendency in those years in the administration and in many leaders of my own party was to scoff at the dangers, to deny the facts, to neglect taking action, and to be soft toward disloyalty.

In recent months however, the Korean aggression, the Chinese Communist attacks, and the widespread revelations of spying and treachery, have brought home to all these Communist dangers.

Now I find that the reaction of leaders has swung over to the opposite extreme and the strength of Communism is being greatly over-rated. A definite tendency to counsel despair, to predict defeat, to act timidly, is apparent on every hand.

I strongly urge tonight that my countrymen do not make the mistake of shifting over to this extreme over-valuation of the Communist strength.

Let us with calm courage take careful stock of the world situation and move together under wise policies.

One of the most frequent exclamations these days is the declaration that "America cannot defend the whole world, cannot defend every continent, cannot place soldiers on every front."

Of course America cannot do this, but if we think through clearly we will realize that this is not the task which America faces.

The correct question to ask is this. "If the Communist Soviet Union of Russia starts an all out World War III can the United States defeat Russia?"

The answer to that question is that of course we can! It would not be easy. It would not be done by marching land armies into that vast territory. But I do not have the slightest doubt that if Russia started an all out world war tomorrow America would defeat Russia! If Russia starts next year, or the year after, or the year after, America will defeat Russia!

This is the fact to keep in our minds. Because there will

be no all out world war in our generation unless the Russian Communist Kremlin starts it. Thus the primary point for American planning is not one of how to hold this or that piece of ground, but how to defeat Russia if her Communist leaders start an all out war.

With these facts in mind let us turn our attention first to the broad question of our American foreign policy and then to the specific difficult detailed questions now before us.

For five years, since the end of World War II, under the present national administration, our country has been following a foreign policy of "containment" toward Communism. It has been the announced objective of American foreign policy to contain Communism and prevent it from spreading. This negative defensive policy, carried on amid phrases such as "waiting for the dust to settle" and "holding the line," has resulted in five years of increasing peril to our country, of loss of freedom of hundreds of millions of people, of stupendous gains for Communism, of weakening of the United Nations, and of dimming the bright hopes of peace. These five years under a policy of containment have now been climaxed with a blundering, bloody mess in Korea. Forty thousand American men, and some thousands of those of other United Nations have become casualties and neither the United Nations nor the administration of our country seems able to decide one way or the other what to do in Korea. These American and United Nation forces still face overwhelming numerical odds in the bleak, treacherous mountains and valleys of Korea.

These have been five years of the worst handling of the foreign policy of our country than any similar period in the history of any major nation in the world.

This bad record, and the consequences of it, have led a few of the members of our Republican Party in the United States Senate to speak out recently for a policy that has been variously described as a "realistic recognition of our own self-interest and essential security," and has also been labelled as "retreatism" or "defeatism." The objective of this proposed foreign policy is that America should pull in its commitments to such area as it alone can defend against military attack from the Soviet Union.

By whatever name the proposed policy is described, it is clear in reading the addresses made in the Senate by these few members of our Republican Party that the position urged is that all of continental Europe, including Holland, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Austria, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Italy, Greece and Turkey; all of the Near East including Israel, Iran, Turkey, Iraq and Arabia; all of Asia including India, Pakistan, Burma, Thailand and Indo-China, or a total of one billion peoples with vast resources, should at this time be abandoned by America to whatever designs the Russian Communist imperialists may have upon them.

I say with deep conviction such a course for America would be utter folly. Such a course for America would be so narrow and shortsighted and selfish that America would decay inwardly from the gravity of its own sin. Such a course would abdicate the position of world leadership which by the grace of God America now occupies, and would be false to the fundamental teachings of our great religions. Such a course would be wrong militarily. It would be wrong morally. It would even be wrong monetarily.

I hold that the majority of the Republican Party, including a two-thirds majority of the members of the Republican Party in the Congress, do not follow that view, and have never in the past ten years followed such a view.

I do not claim personally to be the spokesman for the Republican Party. I do not claim to officially represent the

Republican Party. In fact under our political system in America, a political party which does not have a president in office does not have any one official spokesman.

But I do sincerely believe that the views I express more nearly represent the majority Republican view in foreign policy than do the views expressed by these few Senators, and it is my intention to do everything in my power, working with all Republicans who are like-minded, to rally and develop Republican policy in support of a sensible, practical internationalism.

My fellow countrymen I submit that this policy urged by a few of the Republican members of the United States Senate would be an even worse policy than that which has been followed by the administration. It is a policy of despair which is not worthy of our great America. It must not be followed.

The foreign policy which I urge that our country should follow is one of an affirmative powerful advocacy of the principles and practices of the basic concepts of America which are drawn from our philosophy of life, that man was meant to be free, that man has a spiritual value and an inherent dignity, that there is a God. It might be broadly described in this one sentence statement of its objective.

*The objective of American foreign policy should be to win a victory, for civilization and freedom, over Communist imperialism, without a world war.*

Each phrase of this sentence is important. The objective should not be defensive or negative but positive—to win a victory. The victory should be for civilization and freedom of mankind, not narrowly for America or our own selfish interests. The victory should be over Communist imperialism, as our policy should clearly recognize that Communist imperialism with its godlessness, its cruel oppression, its evil designs of world domination, is a menace to the fundamental objectives of all mankind. And finally our policy should be to attain these objectives without a world war as clearly the fighting and the winning of such a war at best would mean a terrible toll of human lives, a vast sea of suffering, a tragic road for mankind to climb to regain material and moral and spiritual civilization.

In the application of this policy to the difficult detailed questions of the hour, the policy itself becomes more clear.

Following such a policy will require that a major program should be organized and initiated to encourage and assist man everywhere, including those within Russia and the Iron Curtain countries, to resist oppression, cruelty, and godlessness and to struggle for their human rights and independence.

Such a program should be directed by an able man, especially qualified, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It should not be under the State Department. The Voice of America should be taken out of the State Department and be made one part of the new program and should itself be changed to a vigorous championship of freedom and human rights everywhere.

A set of specific long range goals should be established which are right and sound and have strong appeal.

These might well include the following:

The establishment of separate national sovereignty and true independence of the Ukraine, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary.

The release of all of the millions of political prisoners now in concentration camps and under forced labor in the Soviet Union.

The giving of the Russian lands to the Russian peasants for their own farming.

The granting of the right of genuine labor unions to organize and bargain collectively everywhere in the world.

The winning of the right of all the people to worship God as they choose.

The establishment of a free democratic and united Germany, under a representative government with human rights for all of the people East and West.

The return of the Manchurian assets to a new Democratic China.

It should be a program of counter-revolution designed ingeniously to get through and under and over the Iron Curtain with ideas, information, and assistance to the hundreds of millions of peoples who are now oppressed under Communist dictatorship.

It would stir up their demands for freedom, to make it evident that they could not be used for aggressive war, and to encourage them to resist and resist and resist the cruel oppressions until the future freedom which must come to them or to their children.

This peaceful offensive would be carried on against the handmaidens of Communism, oppression, discrimination, poverty, misery, ignorance, want and imperialism, with equal vigor.

Under our proposed dynamic and affirmative foreign policy America would solidly back up and support General Dwight D. Eisenhower in his new responsibility of stimulating, organizing and preparing the defense of Western Europe as a further deterrent to World War. This support would include munitions and men in fair and necessary proportions to those supplied by the nations of Europe themselves, in accordance with the carefully considered recommendations and report of General Eisenhower. He is the ablest, most inspiring and ideally suited leader for his task. He should be backed up and not undermined.

Clearly also America must itself rearm. Greatest emphasis and top priority should be given to our Air Force as it is most important to keep the Kremlin leaders convinced that if they move into an all out war they will lose air superiority over their own country and will lose the war. But the others branches of the service, the Navy and the Army must also be rapidly strengthened.

In doing this we should nevertheless keep in mind that there is a greater likelihood of a long period of tensions and of non-war conflict. Thus we must keep our economy sound and stable for the long pull, lest we lose at home the very goals we seek in the world. This means as I see it a three-year spurt to catch up on armed strength dissipated in the past five years, and then a somewhat smaller armament program for the ensuing years, if no war has come.

It also means heavier taxes these next years to pay at least 85% of the total bill currently to prevent serious inflation and to take other measures in accordance with the recommendations of the outstanding new administrator of our economic and production program, Mr. Charles Wilson.

Within the limits of our total commitments we must also organize an ably directed program toward the underprivileged raw material areas of the world in Asia and Africa.

This progress should be under an able administrator reporting to Mr. Wilson. The point four program should be taken out of the State Department, the remnants of ECA in Asia should be pulled together, and all should be consolidated and coordinated in this new department to take the place of the present limping confused American program in that part of the world.

To give some direct indication of how important this is, let me state that in my judgement India is now the next main target of world Communism. The Communist campaign



against India is in its early stages but it is stepping up rapidly. In my judgment the goal of the Communists is to undermine the confidence of the people of India in Premier Nehru, to stir up unrest amidst their conditions of poverty and semi-starvation, to bring pressures through the occupation of Tibet to the North, and Indo-China to the East, and to close in using every one of their nefarious methods, against India.

I believe that this objective of the Communists in this program has been quite evident ever since the fall of China to the Chinese Communists. And yet under the confused policies of our State Department, even though our country since the war has furnished over fifty billion dollars to assist other peoples in other parts of the world, we have not furnished a single dollar to help the three hundred millions of peoples of India, who have had the most severe economic and social and readjustment problems of all the countries of the world. Only in the last few weeks has one million dollars been earmarked in Point 4, and even on this minute assistance, feet have been dragging in the American State Department and nothing has yet been spent. I see no hope of real results in these economic, social, educational programs unless they are taken out from under the State Department and given the same kind of major executive leadership and coordinated attention that Paul Hoffman so successfully gave to the European Recovery Program.

The foreign policy which I advocate would also include leadership toward strengthening the United Nations and rewriting the charter. The inadequacy of the present organization is now apparent to all.

It would include a firm stand against admission of Red China into the United Nations, with its record of aggression against United Nations forces, even though it is necessary to withdraw all forces from Korea if the other members of the United Nations decide not to take the risks of world war which would be involved in the counter-attacks by air on Manchuria.

Our new American foreign policy would of course rule

out preventive war or aggressive war.

It would of course rule out appeasement.

It would rule out the willing abandonment of any peoples anywhere to Communist imperialism.

It would refuse to turn over Formosa to Red China.

It would permit the reasonable rearmament of Japan and Western Germany.

There should also be stricter insistence on the unquestionable patriotism and loyalty of all governmental officials in key departments. The most significant success of the Communists in the years since the war have been through Communist members and sympathizers in the highest and most crucial governmental and scientific positions.

There should also be more complete control of all exports from free nations to Communist nations, to prevent the building up of Communist war machines. The means of developing atomic weapons, of making munitions, of building tanks and aeroplanes, and provision of fuel and weapons of destruction, have all been furnished directly to the Communist countries by the free countries in these past three years.

In military policy I believe that there should be no more Koreas. In other words never again should our country blunder into an impossible military situation, reversing pre-existing plans, and spending the blood of its young men fighting Communist satellites of whom there are no end in number, and whose defeat accomplishes little in the main world struggle.

If we face the future with calm courage, if we take up actively and with intelligence a program for a peaceful offensive in non-military matters, if we are prepared to go to the heart of the trouble if war comes, if we keep a careful balance and stability in our own economy at home, then I am optimistic that in spite of these bad five years, in spite of the evils of Communism, we can win through for future freedom and better conditions for the peoples of America and for all mankind without the horror of a third world war. I have this deep confidence, because I have an abiding faith that our cause is right and just. It will prevail.

# Communism, the Superfoe

IN FAR EAST, IN EUROPE AND IN AMERICA

By REVEREND DANIEL A. POLING, D. D., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,

President and Editor, *Christian Herald Magazine*; President, *World's Christian Endeavor Union*.

Delivered before the Economic Club of Detroit, Michigan, December 4, 1950

**I** HAVE never received a more generous and gracious introduction than I have received from you, Stan. I would like to sit out there and hear the guy talk, after listening to you.

I count it a distant privilege to be here today. Not all of you will agree with all that I say, but I believe that when you go away you will say, "He called them as he saw them." "He believed what he said, and the materials that he brought, in his opinion, at least, justified the saying."

You may have heard the story of the young man who went away from his small home town, achieved distinction and came back. The Mayor of the village, a man not of letters but of great earnestness, introduced him as follows:

"Our home town hero, has rose from obscurity. Now he brings it back to us."

These are confused hours, and we are often confused in our thinking, but measurably there is confusion because some

who possess the facts have not felt inclined to release them. There is always inconvenience and embarrassment and possible social pain in releasing facts which contradict viewpoints seriously and sincerely held.

Our American freedom is at once an inheritance and an achievement. We have it because of those who paid the price. The Founding Fathers and the Founding Mothers — Puritans in New England, the Dutch and the Jews on Manhattan, the Swedes and the Quakers in Pennsylvania, the Catholics in Maryland, the Cavaliers in Virginia, the Scotch-Irish in the Carolinas, and those who traveled into the West, pitching tents and building altars; going on until they pushed the frontiers of freedom deep into the Pacific. But also and always freedom must be achieved. It must be re-won in each generation, and in some measure at least, reborn in you and in me. "Freedom is not free," as General Bradley wrote four years ago.



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)