

Grinnell
Speech

I am very happy to be at Grinnell College today as a member of your symposium on "How to Prevent World War III", particularly happy, because here in the great Midwest in that area which has been traditionally called a center of isolationism, you are calling together a nationwide conference to consider the great and awful problems of foreign policy and international politics that confront us today. You give the lie to that stale, flat untruth that the Midwest still possesses an isolationist mentality. Although we are gathered here today in solemn conference to ask how the world civilization can live, we are at least celebrating the ^{NATIONAL} burial of isolationism. And so it is particularly ^{HEARTENING} ~~appropriate~~ that thinkers from all over our nation should be called here today by ^{BY A COLLEGE IN IOWA} Iowa to discuss the problems of ^{INTERNATIONALISM} ~~isolationism~~.

The question to which I am to speak is: What kind of a future do we want? I realize that the whole conference will be discussing the question of whether we are going to have a future, and that I am given a more optimistic subject which ^{ASSURES YES} affirms that there will be ~~an~~ future. Nevertheless our themes are connected and related; ^{When} depending on ~~how~~ you answer the question "What Kind of a Future Do We Want?", you will ^{HELP} ~~in part~~ determine whether you will have a future. This I can say: That those who cling selfishly and stubbornly to the past will have no future. If we want a future, we must be prepared to give up some of the past. } JAR 1/3

When I speak of the future, I am not speaking of the long-run future. I am not speaking of that glorious day when we all own helicopters, live in glass houses, and do our work by push buttons; partly because I would find that kind of future uninteresting

and partly because I am no Utopian. I am not going to sketch that blueprint of that happy world without conflict or problems. I wish rather to speak of certain short-term goals. John Maynard Keynes once said that in the long run we'll all be dead. He was saying this in answer to the classical economists who assured hungry people that in the long run the economic system would right itself. ^{MEANT POINT WAS} ~~He was saying~~ that an obsession with far distant and impractical goals usually keeps us from doing anything at all. ^{Now A} ~~of the~~ Chinese proverb says that a journey of a thousand miles begins with one step. Those who have their eyes glued to the far horizon find that their legs are paralyzed at the prospect of the enormous distance before them. Today, with the atom bomb, problems of an industrial civilization, the terrible upheaval of a post-war world, and the resultant moral confusion, many men and women find that they cannot take the first step. The goal of freedom, peace, prosperity and happiness seems too distant. Let us remember that the journey of a thousand miles begins with one step and that the process of living is in the journey and not in reaching the goal. ^{BUT NO GOAL} ~~PROBLEM: FIND THE GOAL; TAKE OUR FIRST POSITIVE STEPS~~

I should like to discuss with you some of the beginning steps we must take. They are hard and painful, but they will push us on the way.

^{Overused} We won the war; we are not winning the peace. This is the simple proposition which confounds and bewilders every one of us. ^{we lose grammar} What we mean is the thing we fought and were killed for is now being lost. Why war--if not for peace? And if peace, does not follow the war, then why war? Why the terrible destruction, killing and misery, poverty and disease and infinite human suf-

fering? This is the simple and terrible riddle that mystifies us.

The mystery becomes even greater when we realize that our will to win the peace ~~wasn't~~ ^{ISN'T} as strong as ~~was~~ our will to win the war. We lack the energy, the drive, the imagination, and capacity for sacrifice that characterized our successful campaigns in the second World War. We do not wage peace with the same passionate intensity with which we wage war. We have lost our unity of purpose--the sense of belonging to the same community with the same goal. Let us face the facts frankly. The end of the war found us living in a moral vacuum. The peace which should have been a climax to the war was really an anti-climax, and when peace came we did not know what to do with it because we did not know what we wanted to do with it. Many of the men and women who risked their lives for the community would not even take time out to vote for the community. Men--yellow, black and white--who equally risked their lives on the battlefield now became members of minority groups with second class privileges. The citizens who worked overtime and double time to feed the arsenals of warfare now took vacations. To the war we gave our all; to peace we give considerably less.

and the sustained war efforts of Britain etc.

WAR PSYCHOLOGY WAS DESTROY THE EVIL OF FASCISM IN GERM. ITALY AND JAPAN AND YOU DESTROY THE EVILS OF THE WORLD UNCONDITIONALLY SURRENDER

Now I know that we can explain this in terms of fatigue. I know that we can say we wanted to resume our interrupted lives. In fact the slogan was "back to normalcy". But that is exactly the point. A movement going back to normal will only find the

Today the airplane, the telephone, telegraph and radio have brought all the inhabitants so close to each other that the Biblical question "Who is my neighbor?" can be rephrased to ask, "Who is not my neighbor?" And in this small world we are being crowded and pushed by hostile philosophy--the philosophy of Communism. One of the most grievous errors of our time has been to regard Communism as an economic doctrine. It is not. It is an economic, social and political doctrine. As such it offers a moral, not merely an economic, challenge to the West. It is easy to say that there is little morality in Communism. That is true. Lenin himself argued that the end justifies the means, and that fraud, deceit, and cruelty are legitimate weapons in the revolutionary struggle. The Communist movement today is a movement utterly lacking in principle. In the name of social justice it has terrorized and brutalized its own people and those of other nations. It has debauched its art and literature. It has produced greater inequalities than the capitalistic system. It has revived pagan worship of its temporal rulers, and finally given to the world the definitive example of what we today call the police state.

But even though all these things are true about Communism, it still presents a moral challenge. For it is a faith--a religious faith--a dogmatic faith--and it is always on the move. It cannot be met, it cannot be stopped by simple conservatism. A conservative is right when he says our society and all its faults is better than any Communist society. But he is wrong if he thinks just saying that is sufficient to defeat the spiritual challenge of

Communism. In sports we say the best defense is a good offense. And this is also true for politics. Wherever there is injustice--social, economic or political--there is a political vacuum into which the organized resources of the Communist group go. Wherever there is injustice, there are potential Communists waiting to be converted to the "faith". Because the Communist answer to injustice is a good answer? No, but because it is an answer. And if there is no other answer, then the Communist answer will win. If all other claimants to the position of moral leadership default, then Communism will take undisputed possession of the field. The only way Communism can win is by democratic default. That is just the way in which it can win.

If later history records the victory of Communism, it will not say that Communism won. You cannot win if there is no opposition. It will say that democracy defaulted. Let me give you an example.

The inability of western civilization to meet a moral challenge was demonstrated by the Maginot Line philosophy. This philosophy said: The best defense is simply to maintain what we have. It was a philosophy which permeated all of Europe. Its slogan was "do nothing." It glorified inaction, and it maintained the only good change was to go back farther into the past. History tells us only too clearly that the Maginot Line philosophy was no match for the dynamics of German warfare. German fascism was barbaric and evil, but it was inventive and imaginative. It created so many new techniques of warfare that the French never knew what hit them. In the competition of military warfare Germany

SPEECH TO COMMITTEE TO PREVENT WORLD WAR III, GRINNELL, IOWA
June 11, 1948

I am very happy to be at Grinnell college today to seriously seek with you the "how" of preventing World War three. I am especially happy, in fact, that this particular symposium is being held in Grinnell, Iowa. Iowa, as part of the great Midwest, has been traditionally termed the center of American isolationism. Our invitation here is further proof that Iowa's mental iron curtain is a tradition long dead. Here today in Iowa, we gather from all over the nation to discuss the problems of internationalism. What used to be the stamping grounds of isolationists is now the meeting place for internationalists. And as we meet with each other in this conference to discuss the great and terrifying problems that beset us, we can at least start with confidence that America is moving forward: we have left behind the horse-and-buggy age of isolationism.

I am starting more advantageously than most of the program speakers. *They are seriously addressing themselves to the problem of whether, in fact, there will be a future.*
~~The~~ The question to which I have been asked to form some answer presupposes optimism. It asks: "What kind of future do we want?" and it surely must imply that we are really going to have a future seeking after all. But the kind of future we want ~~is~~ not only necessitates our having a future. ~~It is also the other way around.~~ It is also the other way around. Knowing the kind of future we want is also necessary if we are to have that future at all. For this should be clear to everybody--that if we try to make our tomorrows look like some vague and nostalgic remembrance of our yesterdays, we shall make nothing at all. If we want a future, we must be prepared to give up something of the past.

When I speak of the future, I am not speaking of the long run future. I am not speaking of that glorious day when all of us can land helicopters on ~~the~~ glass-top homes of our great grandfathers who are

shore-1- next-to-the-
(beginning George page 2, last paragraph)

RIGHT - DOES THIS MEAN WE HAVE TO ALTER FIRST PARAGRAPHS

WE HAVE NO GOAL

But we, today, have no goal and what is more we are generally in a moral stalemate that keeps us from even moving the small steps ahead that lead upon the long journey toward world peace. 1)

Yet we are the same people who stepped out boldly, with assurance, with energy and with imagination to win the greatest war in world history.

The moral conviction behind that energy, that assurance, that courage and great effort must surely have carried over to the peace, must surely be with us now in our great task to painfully build a new, good world. But it is not. Our moral conviction that drove us to victory is no longer with us, (and we are not building a new world.) And what's more if our wartime morality was with us, we would nevertheless fail. It would not be enough.

For look back and (analyze) your wartime self. Examine and (dissect) attitudes and remember what you felt. What you will find, I'm sure, is a simple morality of comparison; you will find a decision based simply on necessity. You will find a forced decision, one that was born of a sneak attack against us, one that put the issue to us point blank: do you let our civilization go under or do you move dynamically to protect it. And the alternative to action was concentration camps, and murder of minorities, and dictatorship supremacy of a few nations over the world. And the evidence on the other side--for maintaining our civilization ~~by~~ military ~~defense~~ was a high standard of living, a high degree of personal liberty and a reasonably high degree of governmental responsibility to the people. To most Americans, the decision was not difficult. Faced with a "conquer or be conquered" choice, Americans consciously and unconsciously weighed the values of the two civilizations offered, and Americans consciously or unconsciously decided that our way of living was worth a devastating war to protect.

YESTERDAY WE HAD A GOAL. CAPACITY FOR SERVICE

complicated

WHAT WAS IF WE HAD DURING THE WAR. AMBIGUOUS

TOO LONG

that ours was the justification and

Given the nature of that decision--its simple negativeness--that forced to choose between a fascist civilization and our own, we chose our own--also forced ^{the} ~~the~~ whole attitude ~~toward the war~~ which we held toward the war. That attitude can be pictured in the ~~the~~ often-repeated slogan or battle cry that we held on to, the battle cry of "unconditional surrender". ~~For we made the decision, of the choice of civilizations,--the choice of the lesser of two evils, if you will---not when we were prepared to make a decision, and not when we could say, "Our way of life is prepared to stand judgement ~~but~~ and we are proud to stand for its code of ethics and its standard of values."~~ No; we made the choice between Americanism and Germanism or Japaneseism when they forced us to make it. And our choice was a simple weighing in of evidence. And, having decided that the comparison favored what we had, ~~it was natural for us to feel that the only evil ~~in~~ we had to face, the only threat to peace and to the good life was German, Italian and Japanese fascism. And so the cry for "unconditional surrender"--if that was all we had to fear, we better tear it out by the roots and trample down every possible vestige of its being. And so we did. They forced us to make a choice between ruthless fascism and our own kind of being, we made that choice and wiped out the particular ruthless fascism that forced our decision. And we ~~find now that we are impelled beyond our power to resist apparently, toward the same kind of decision ~~as~~ we were forced to make~~ in 1941.~~

↕
 PEACETIME
 DECISION MORE
 COMPLEX
 BACK TO
 USUALLY
 NORMAL

We are doing little or nothing to build a civilization right here that we can at any time put to a decision--that we can at any time say to the world: the values our world lives by are the great and true values of mankind. Instead, we wait as we have waited all the years of our nationhood, We wait for a dynamic, constantly moving, constantly challenging civilization to say to us: Make a decision, my



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