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Purpose and Problems of This Thesis

The purpose of this thesis is to present, evaluate and criticize as systematically as possible John Foster Dulles' major concepts of international relations. Several questions arise when attempting to study Dulles' ideas. Does he have a systematic theory? What are his basic assumptions? This thesis will attempt to answer these questions.

The contemporary nature of this study makes it necessary to set a time limit to its scope. It is felt that the most significant limiting date would be January 1953. At this time Dulles became Secretary of State. The material presented will represent the views Dulles brought to this office. It is realized that perhaps Dulles will not be able to put his ideas into practice and that his views may change in the course of his administration. However, major consideration to these factors will not be given because of the comparatively short period of time Dulles has been in office.

The problem involved is to find out what Dulles really believes. The material relied upon will be mainly Dulles' books and speeches which were not written when he was an official representative during the Democratic Administration or as an adviser to the presidential candidates of the Republican party. It is felt that these books and speeches more clearly represent Dulles' personal views.

The statements made as a United States representative and as adviser to Republican candidates are nevertheless important. They will
be used to show how Dulles' activities have either been consistent or inconsistent with what seem to be his personal views. They will also be used to show how Dulles operates to attain his own goals.

Are what seem to be major inconsistencies in Dulles, upon investigation understandable? Dulles is an ambitious man. He does have definite convictions. For many years he has coveted the post of Secretary of State in order to translate his ideas into practice. In order to attain this post his public utterances have often been at variance with what seem to be his personal views. Does he alter his position temporarily to gain the support of groups whom he thinks can best help him gain his own ends? When he does attain that end is he likely to revert to his original position?

The first task of this thesis is then to determine what are Dulles' concepts of international relations. What is Dulles' ideal type of international society? How does he see the world today? What, in his views, are the major forces molding international relations? How does he propose to change the existing situation to attain his ideal?

The second task of the thesis will be to evaluate and criticize Dulles' ideas. This section will deal with the validity of his views; the logical implications of his arguments; and the inconsistencies in his thinking. There is difficulty in establishing a criterion to test the validity of his ideas. In some cases it is the word of Dulles against someone else and only history will prove who was correct. However, as Secretary of State he can to some extent influence the course of history. The problem will be approached in three ways: 1) examin-
ation of the internal logical consistency of his own views at different times and in different circumstances; 2) point out ideas, judgments or predictions he has made in the past which since have been proven erroneous; and 3) compare Dulles' ideas with other contemporary writers.

The implications of Dulles' views are extremely important. The position he holds today carries with it a certain amount of power and influence to reshape American foreign policy and consequently the world situation. This thesis will attempt to answer the question: What may be the implications and consequences if his ideas are put into practice?
Introduction: Background

Early Life, Education and Law

John Foster Dulles was born in 1888, the son of Allen W. Dulles and Edith Foster Dulles. The early years of his life were spent in upstate New York where his father was a Presbyterian minister and a professor of theology at Auburn Theological Seminary.

After graduating from Watertown High School, he decided on law as a career and entered Princeton. He received his B. A. degree from Princeton in 1908 and from there went to Paris for a year to study international law at the Sorbonne, after which he returned to the United States and received his L. L. B. at George Washington University in 1911.

Dulles has been well known for many years in the fields of corporate and international law. Early in 1911 he began his law practice in association with the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell in New York city. He became a partner in the firm in 1920 and by 1944 was a Senior Partner.¹ Sullivan and Cromwell is a long established firm, one of the largest and most potent in the United States.

Back in Theodore Roosevelt’s administration it was linked with the revolution of Panama from Colombia that

¹ “John Foster Dulles”, Current Biography, (1944), 180
prepared the way for the canal treaty between the United States and Panama. For two generations at least it has represented, among others, major corporations with large interests abroad. Money and foreign affairs have been Dulles' business preoccupations for some forty years. His firm occupies six floors at 28 Wall Street, and consists of 20 partners, 60 or 70 associates, and about 70 stenographers.

The character of Dulles' and the firm's clients have been the reason for rather severe criticism of their activities. There have been charges that Dulles had rather close connections with several cartels; that he represented Franco in a case against the United States Treasury; and that he was closely connected with the financier Harrison Williams, once characterized as the "Samuel Insull of the East."

2. Forrest Davis, "The GOP's Mr. Hall", Saturday Evening Post, (Sept. 9, 1944), 47.
4. Ibid.
As is usual for partners in leading law firms, he has also had other positions of importance in the business world, serving in 1947 as Director of the American Amalgamated Chemical Company, the American Bank Note Company, Babcock and Wilcox Company, the Bank of New York, and the International Nickel Company of Canada.

**Governmental and Quasi-Governmental Activities**

Dulles has a long record of activity of governmental or quasi-governmental nature. His grandfather, John Watson Foster, Secretary of State in Benjamin Harrison's Cabinet, first introduced Dulles to international life in 1907 when his grandfather took him to the Hague Conference as his secretary.

There is a long list of missions Dulles has performed for the United States government. They include:

- Special Agent for the Department of State in Central America, 1917
- Assistant to the Chairman of the War Trade Board, 1918
- Counsel for the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, 1918-1919
- Member of the Reparations Committee and Supreme Economic Council, 1919
- Legal Advisor on the Polish Plan for Financial Stabilisation, 1927
- United States Representative at the Berlin Debt Conference, 1933

---

Delegate to the Council of Foreign Ministers, London, 1945
Delegate to the San Francisco Conference, 1946
Delegate to the Moscow Conference, 1947
Delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, 1947-1948
Adviser to the President, 1950
Ambassador at Large in charge of negotiating the Japanese
Peace Treaty, 1951
Secretary of State of the United States, 1953-

Partly through his association with Thomas Dewey, which began in
1935 when they met at a luncheon and Dulles attempted to get Dewey into
Sullivan and Cromwell, Dulles has become widely known as one of the
leading spokesmen for the internationalist wing of the Republican
Party. Dulles has been active in the Republican Party as adviser on
foreign affairs and a participant in bi-partisan cooperation, a prin-
ciple which he has strongly advocated.

He was not generally active in domestic politics until his un-
successful effort to unseat Herbert H. Lehman in the New York Senatorial
campaign in 1949. Of this it is said, "he ran against his better
judgement". He has served as foreign affairs adviser to Dewey and
Eisenhower in their Presidential campaigns.

Dulles played a very important role in the drafting of the Repub-

             38-46.
12. Statement made to author by Foster Rhea Dulles.
lican platform in 1952; his efforts were rewarded when the party came into power and he was made Secretary of State in January, 1953.

Religious Activities

Since 1937, Dulles has been active in religious organizations, mainly the Federal Council of Churches in America. During World War II and the post-war years this organization was active in making proposals for world organization and world peace.

Influences on Dulles' Thinking

When studying the philosophy of any person it is necessary to understand what factors have influenced their lives and their thinking.

Religion

One of the outstanding influences on Dulles' thinking is his religious background stemming back to his great-grandfather who was a missionary to India. His father, a Presbyterian minister, made sure that his religious education was not neglected. One writer claims that, "as a boy he lived in a preacher's manse, memorised the Bible and read Pilgrim's Progress on Sunday as a comic relief from three compulsory sessions of his father's church". In addition to this, his mother was also very religious. The boy was expected to go into the ministry, but the lure of international diplomacy as he had witnessed it surrounding his grandfather, John Watson Foster, proved to be more compelling than the pulpit. Thus, as noted, he chose international law.

13. Ibid.
Although Dulles never consciously gave up his religious convictions with which he had been indoctrinated during early life, it was not until 1937 that he realized that his father's religious ideas were no less important than the worldly wisdom of his grandfather. Dulles would say that he is not a conventionally religious man: "Christianity is no substitute for knowing your facts." But after a trip to Europe in 1937 where he attended two conferences, one religious, one secular, he returned to this country convinced that diplomacy was not enough for the solution of world problems. He felt that there must be a Christian ethical content in any lasting peace. The first conference he attended that year was composed of leading European intellectuals "who approached the problem of world peace like a lot of scared old women." They wished to keep intact the status quo or only change in terms of their own advantage.

From this conference he went to England to take part in a conference of churchmen at Oxford called to discuss the same problem that the intellectuals had shied away from. The bold approach that the churchmen took assured Dulles that "the western nations must recover their lost sense of spiritual purpose."

Internationalism

Dulles' interest in international affairs, as noted previously, dates back to the influence of his grandfather John Watson Foster.
His grandfather Foster had played a prominent role in the Treaty of Shimonoseki, at the termination of the Sino-Japanese War, in 1894-95. His grandfather introduced the boy to the life of the capitol and took him to the Hague Peace Conference.

Dulles' career in international relations was also aided by his uncle, Robert Lansing, Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson. His uncle obtained a position for him as special agent for the Department of State in Central America in 1917, and was also influential in obtaining him a position as Counsel to the American Delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919-20.

No doubt the year spent at the Sorbonne where he studied international law at the Ecole de Droit, and also studied extracurricularly under Henri Bergson, the pragmatic philosopher, had influence on his thinking. Some people have thought that his book *War, Peace and Change* reflected the thought of Bergson who stressed fluidity and experimentation, striving to keep pace with the changing forms of reality. This idea may be true, for one of Dulles' major emphases is upon change as a law of life, including international life, and that if change is not provided for peacefully, it will come violently.

In answer to the question as to who most influenced his thinking, Dulles has said, "Woodrow Wilson, who was a professor and president of Princeton when I was there". There was a long-standing

21. Information obtained in correspondence with Mr. Dulles.
friendship between Dulles and Wilson, partly because of the former's outstanding scholastic record at Princeton, and partly through a long-standing acquaintance of the Dulles and Wilson families. Both men were Presbyterians and were greatly influenced by Calvinistic teachings.

In order to be realistic about the question of Dulles' thinking on international matters, the fact that he had connections with an international law firm whose business may depend upon stable international relations, must be considered. His concern with the codification of international law and provision for change has probably resulted from his legal training and practice.

22. Statement made to the author by Foster Rhea Dulles.
Chapter 1 The Ideal World Society

I Dulles' Position

It cannot be argued that John Foster Dulles has systematically constructed an ideal type of world society. However, he has discussed principles upon which such a society should be based. He has also implied what the functions of this society should be. An attempt can be made to construct as systematically as possible "The World of John Foster Dulles".

Assumptions

Dulles believes that we can and must develop a world society which can live in peace and without serious disruptions brought about by modern wars. He bases this belief upon two fundamental religious premises.

He believes that there is a moral law which provides the sanction for man-made law. This assumption rests upon the belief that: "...there is a divinely ordained purpose in history, moral considerations are ultimate, and that man through his laws cannot disregard the moral law with impunity just as he cannot disregard the physical laws of the universe without wrecking himself."

The second premise Dulles holds is: "Every individual being has dignity and worth which no man-made law can desecrate." This premise

2. Ibid.
rests on the assumption that the "...individual is created by God in his image, is the object of God's redemptive love and is directly accountable to God." 3

These are the basic assumptions upon which his ideal society would be based. If men organize a society in accordance with these basic beliefs they can have peace within the society. The Western Democracies, Dulles says, have based their institutions upon these principles. Their governments have been governments of law, made and changed by representative processes. They have recognized that majorities are not infallible and thus protected the rights of minorities. "Every man has been allowed to follow the dictates of his own person and conscience." 4 Institutions have been designed to reflect the moral law and respect human dignity.

Government is carried on by men who are chosen and responsible to the people as a whole. Dulles holds that it was believed wrong for one man to possess arbitrary power over his fellow man for this would lead to corruption of the rulers and abasement of the ruled. 5 It was also believed that the judgments of the individual were more accurate in reflecting the moral law than the judgments of arbitrary and self perpetuating rulers.

Dulles argues that this form of government can most adequately provide peaceful means of change. "Change is an inexorable law of life." 6 If change is not provided for peacefully it disrupts in vio-

---

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
lent form, which destroys the good it seeks. Internationally, change has not been provided for peacefully. Institutions must be provided for international change upon the foundations of the moral law.

Dulles believes that the task can be accomplished. Today only about twenty percent (20%) of the world's population are governed in accordance with the moral law. However, the moral law is a universal law. Many religions reflect it. Thus, Dulles argues, over some period of time it will be possible to form governments all over the world in accordance with the moral law. Christians have a great responsibility in bringing about this ideal society. "Christians believe that through Christ the moral law has been revealed with unique clarity. Christians ought therefore to be especially qualified to form moral judgments which are discerning and to focus them at the time and place where they can be effective." The Christian church is a universal world-wide institution whose influence can be directed toward the establishment of governments based upon the moral law.

A peaceful society then is a moral imperative. It is also possible to attain such a society. If man is to escape destruction he must establish his institutions in accordance with the moral law. The type of institutions required are best exemplified in the Western Democracies. The existence of the Western Democracies proves the possibility of establishing a society based upon these principles. The prob-

lem now becomes one of establishing an international society based upon these principles.

**International Organization**

According to Dulles, the foundations of a world society are individual, free societies founded upon the principles of the moral law, and the dignity of the individual.

A free society in turn depends on individuals who exemplify Christian qualities of self control and of human brotherhood, and who treat freedom not as license but as occasion for voluntary cooperation for the common good.

Freedom, Dulles describes as "...not license to self indulgence but the right to live under the compulsion of the moral law which includes the second command 'to love one's neighbor'."

Controls, in Dulles' society, are the acceptance by the individual of moral law. Human freedom must be limited. In a free society the limits are self-imposed. There are laws in a free society but these laws are based upon a standard of conduct voluntarily adopted to control their behavior. Statutes are the codification of moral law.

Dulles concedes that in a modern complex society the demand for government action increases. There is need for more central guidance. But state control should not be substituted for self control. The

---

9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
13. Ibid., 595.
14. Ibid.
role of government is "..limited by the principle that government
action expresses but does not replace voluntary acceptance of social
responsibility. Government action must stop short of seeming to shift
social responsibility from the individual to government.

Free societies best reflect the Christian concept of man, Dulles
contends. They also best assure peaceful change. They present the
most likely reflection of the moral law in government.

Dulles is not seeking a perfect society. He recognizes that any
system which is based upon human nature, which is imperfect, is bound
to have imperfections.

Upon this foundation of free societies Dulles constructs his
ideal type of international organization. The organization will be a
true community of nations based upon the principles of cooperation
and mutual concern implicit in the moral order. The goal of this
organization is the maintenance of peace. Peace, Dulles says, is a
"..condition of community diversity and change". Community would be
provided in the sense that there would be no barriers to the interstate
movement of goods, people or ideas. There would be diversity due to
freedom of thought and belief and every man would have the right to
persuade others to agree with him. Change would be provided through

15. John Foster Dulles, War or Peace, (New York: The MacMillan Com-
pany, 1950), 260.
17. Ibid.
18. Dulles, War or Peace, 219.
a Just and Durable Peace, 1942, John Foster Dulles Chmn. In appen-
dix of A Righteous Faith, A Symposium by John Foster Dulles and
20. Dulles, War or Peace, 60.
laws made and changed peacefully.

The international organization would exist by the common consent of nations. "The interdependent life of nations must be ordered by agencies having the duty and power to promote and safeguard the general welfare of all peoples." According to Dulles, the interdependent lives of nations include international trade, military establishments and just about any activity which affects international relations.

The organization will be composed of men who put that general welfare above loyalty to their particular nation.

The organization would be charged by Dulles to study constantly the international situation with a view to detecting maladjustments in their incipiency, and propose ways of coping with these situations before they come under violent leadership. Implicit in this power is some surrender of sovereignty of the individual nations. His organization calls for an international police force under the control of international law. The codification of international law would be an important function of Dulles' organization. It would concern itself not only with the rights and duties of states, but with individuals as well. "The individual is the primary unit of value in

21. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
27. Dulles, War or Peace, 149.
any community." Therefore international law must be concerned with
the individual as well as the state.

Summary

Dulles believes that the world can and must organize itself and
establish its institutions in conformity with the moral order. This
necessitates the development of free societies which will form the
foundation of an international organization. The latter will be given
the power to direct changes in accord with the moral order. Peaceful
change can be brought about. If developments become so violent that
the resort to armed action is required, they can be repressed by an
international police force which will enforce international law.

Dulles is not concerned with the actual mechanics of the organ-
ization. He does not attempt to answer such questions as how the men
who are responsible for the decisions of the organization are to be
chosen. Nor does he discuss the remaining powers of nations. He does
not deal with the structure of the organization, though he does feel
that the organization is necessary, and must be given certain powers.

II Evaluation and Criticisms

Inconsistencies

What Dulles says on one occasion and what he does and says on
other occasions are often incompatible. He hankers for what he terms
a spiritual society. However, there are instances that raise doubts
of his sincerity. On the surface he appears to be characterized by a

28. Ibid.
"...thin and achromatic spirituality".

He claims to adhere to a belief in the dignity of every human being. He says a free society depends upon individuals who exemplify qualities of self control and human brotherhood. This may be compared with his performance in the 1949 New York senatorial contest. Dulles' anti-semitic remarks to an upstate New York audience, that a look at the faces of the people of New York City would indicate why they vote as they do, scarcely corresponds to his stated belief in human brotherhood and human dignity.

Dulles attempted to pick up votes in that campaign by an attack on Lehman based upon the deep hostility that prevailed against the Communists. He attempted to show that although Lehman wasn't actually a Communist he did not fight against Communism. He also stated that the Communists were backing Lehman. In a speech in Binghamton he said:

He (Lehman) saw the evils of communism the same as I did but I ask what did he do about it? Did he get out and fight so that he aroused the antagonism of the Soviet Union? The answer so far as I know, he has said his daily dozen of anti-Communist words but he has never fought them so that they fight back. I know he is no Communist but I also know that the "Communists are in his corner. That he and not I will get the 500,000 Communist votes that last year went to Henry Wallace."

Lehman denied these charges and pointed out that the Daily Worker has consistently opposed him.

Dulles made a statement to the World Council of Churches in 1948 that the Western Democracies (the United States included) best insure peaceful change. Yet in the 1949 campaign, Dulles deplored the trend toward statism and said that unless it was checked we would have to fight our way back through revolution. He did not say what we were to go back to. Dulles' approach to domestic problems is very conservative. He seems to favor a laissez-faire economy, which may not permit the social and economic changes which are necessary in the present day complex society. It is difficult to understand his position in light of his emphasis upon the need for change in a peaceful society. If Dulles is advocating going back by means of revolution this is inconsistent with his belief in peaceful change.

Dulles has not always held the view that only free societies can form the basis of a peaceful world. In a speech to the World Council of Churches in 1946 he said that no political system is necessarily incompatible with Christianity. However, several leading churchmen such as Reinhold Niebuhr objected to Dulles' statement. They felt that this would mean that Christianity could embrace such doctrines as Fascism and Nazism. Whether it was the influence of these churchmen or Dulles' rising fear and hatred of Communism which changed his mind

35. Ibid.
is not known. But one year later he was convinced that only free societies were compatible with Christianity.

Dulles states that in his ideal society there would be no barriers to the interstate movement of goods. This indicates that he would be in favor of lower tariffs, perhaps no tariffs at all. In his book *War, Peace and Change*, in 1939 he advocated the breaking down of tariff barriers. However, when he was a member of the Senate in 1949 he supported the peril point amendment which weakened the reciprocal trade agreements act. Dulles might defend himself by saying that in the present world situation tariff barriers are still necessary. They may aid in defeating Communism by severing its channels of trade or strengthening United States industries. The defeat of Communism is a preliminary step in the attainment of his ideal society. Therefore his actions were not inconsistent with his basic premises. As far as is known, Dulles has not defended his actions with this argument. In this writer's opinion it would seem that if Dulles expected to attain his ideal society he would begin to support policies such as lower tariffs which he advocates in his ideal society.

Dulles has said that the ideal international organization should be composed of men who put the general welfare above loyalty to their particular nation. This seems a bit inconsistent with the recent

United States government policy of attempting to pressure Trygve Lie into making United Nations employment practices consistent with the wishes of the United States. Dulles does not seem concerned with whether the United Nations employees are putting the general welfare above that of their particular nations. He is only concerned with the welfare of the United States.

There are instances which leave some doubt as to whether Dulles is as sincere as he would have one believe. When he has the opportunity to support policies he advocates for his ideal society he often does not. He is prone to change his mind when confronted with criticism or when it is more expedient to do so. He quite often appeals to emotional responses which he criticized other statesmen for doing in his book in 1939.

Validity

Whether or not Dulles actually adheres to his position in actual practice, the validity of his ideas may still be questioned.

Dulles insists that there is a moral law which man must recognize or be destroyed. The moral law has been most clearly revealed in the teachings of Christ. Dulles infers that the Christian concept of the moral law is the most valid. He does not account for the fact that eighty percent (80%) of the world's population has existed this long without recognizing the Christian concept of the moral law. The Hindu concept of moral law may be as equally valid as the Christian concept. There is no absolute standard of law to be applied to all individuals. Otherwise we could not account for differences in the interpretation of
the moral law.

Dulles' definition of freedom falls with his insistence on a moral law. If freedom, as Dulles defines it, is the right to live under the compulsion of the moral law, then freedom depends on the acceptance of the moral law. If one does not accept the moral law then one can not be free. This can not be freedom. Freedom is the removal of restraints. It is the quality of being free, not being coerced by the moral law.

Another assumption Dulles makes is the belief in the fundamental rights of individuals. He holds that men are endowed by God with certain inalienable rights and duties, revealed in the words of Christ. But each individual may interpret Christ's words differently. Dulles does not approach this problem. However, these rights and duties are social rights rather than God-given and they are determined by the individual members of society or society itself. As Hans Kelsen says:

Duties and rights presuppose the existence of a normative order or a system of norms, prescribing or permitting a certain behavior for men and this normative order can only be established by acts of human beings.

Kelsen goes on to say that: "...only human beings are capable of creating norms, that is rules obligating and authorizing men." The state-

41. Ibid.
ment that rights are God-given is meaningless and scientifically incorrect.

Comparison and Implications

It is interesting to examine Dulles' position in relation to the recent controversy going on in the field of international relations between the idealist and the realist positions.

Dulles' conception of international political behavior can not be readily categorized in terms of a utopian or realist position. It may be said that he fuses both positions in his thinking. This can be demonstrated by evaluating his ideas in terms of what seems to be accepted definitions of the idealist and realist positions.

Hans Morgenthau defines the utopian as one who believes:

...that a rational and moral political order derived from universally valid abstract principles can be achieved here and now. (The utopian) assumes...the essential goodness and infinite malleability of human nature and attributes the failure of the social order to measure up to the rational standards to lack of knowledge and understanding, obsolete social institutions or the depravity of certain isolated individuals or groups. It trusts in education, reform and the sporadic use of force to remedy these deficiencies.\[42\]

The utopian position rests on two propositions: the struggle for power on the international level is associated with non-democratic forms of government and will disappear with the triumph of democracy throughout the world; and secondly, conflicts between democratic and

non-democratic nations are not to be conceived of as power struggles but as struggles of good and evil resulting in the triumph of good. Woodrow Wilson, according to Morgenthau, exemplified most clearly the position of the utopian.

The realist, according to Morgenthau:

believes that the world, imperfect as it is from the rational point of view, is the result of forces which are inherent in human nature. To improve the world one must work with these forces.... This being inherently a world of opposing interests and of conflict among them, moral principles can never be fully realized, but at best approximated through the ever temporary balancing of interests and the ever precarious settlement of conflicts.45

Kenneth Thompson points out that rivalries and some form of strife are the rule, not a historical accident.

Dulles fits into the utopian category with some reservations. He does believe that a rational and moral political order, derived from universally valid abstract principles is not only possible but necessary. However it is not possible here and now, if Morgenthau is to be taken literally.

Dulles believes that there are universally valid abstract principles, as said previously. The moral law and the concept of human dignity are two most important ideas in Dulles' thinking. The moral law applies to all—not just Americans, but the Indians, Chinese, and

44. Ibid.
and Arabs as well. Although the moral law applies to all peoples, it has been recognized by only a small percentage of the world's population. Before a rational and moral order can be achieved on an international scale, these universal moral principles must be accepted and adhered to by the world's population. They must, in turn, organize their national communities in accord with it, and in accord with the concept of human dignity. If they don't the world will eventually destroy itself.

These moral principles have most clearly been enunciated in the Christian religion. Therefore, according to Dulles, Christians have a supreme responsibility to enlighten the other peoples of the world. When the peoples of the world recognize these principles they will organize their societies in a way which will most clearly reflect the moral law. The democratic society most clearly meets this requirement. Therefore other societies must become democratic. When the world becomes a collection of free societies, recognizing these universally valid moral principles, the foundation has been laid for an international society. The international society can then be organized in accordance with moral law. The international government will reflect in its laws and institutions the moral law and the concept of human rights. We then have an international democratic society. The world can then live in peace. Force would be used only in extreme cases to control isolated cases of individuals who oppose the majority.

Dulles holds that the establishment of a truly international so-
society can not be realized at the present time since only about twenty percent (20%) of the world's population live in free, democratic societies. However, through the influence of Christianity and other religions (although they are not as potent) this situation can be remedied. Even at the present time there is some consensus of moral judgements although they have not been translated into action. Through the United Nations we can attempt to reach agreements of a moral nature and translate them into concrete action. The United States, which has been organised in accord with the moral law, can through its example and conduct, help bring about the development of free societies throughout the world.

Due to the presence of democratic and non-democratic societies in the same world, Dulles would admit that this is naturally a world of opposing interests and conflict. He would also admit that moral principles can not be realized at the present time. Solutions to the world's problems must be the result of the balancing of interests and the settlement of conflicts. In this respect he represents the realist position. He holds that until the world reaches the point of accepting the moral law and organising itself in accord with it, conflicts are inevitable. He argues, however, that eventually if man wishes to survive, he must and will recognize the moral law. Eventually it will be possible to have a rational and moral political order based upon universally valid abstract principles. In this sense Dulles approximates Wilson's position that the struggle for power and the resulting consequences is associated with non-democratic governments which do
not reflect the moral law and will disappear with the triumph of democracy throughout the world. As a corollary to this struggle between the democratic and non-democratic nations, are struggles between good and evil which can only end in the complete triumph of good. The democratic government most clearly reflects the moral law. Therefore all governments must be democratic if the world is to survive. Therefore non-democratic governments must be eliminated.

In light of this discussion and in terms of the definitions used, Dulles most clearly represents the utopian school of thought in international politics. This conclusion can be reached with the reservations pointed out: that Dulles does not believe that a true international society can be attained immediately, but only after democratic governments have been established throughout the world. This in turn depends upon the acceptance of the moral law.

Consequences

The practical consequences of such a position as Dulles holds have been ably described by Morgenthau in his articles and books. If Dulles holds the view that there is a moral law and the world, not just the United States, should abide by it, this may lead to a religious crusade to impose this law upon nations who do not adhere to it. If a peaceful world depends upon democratic societies, then we must

48. See Morgenthau, In Defence of the National Interest, "Another Great Debate".
destroy undemocratic ones. If the undemocratic nations hold that their values are superior or equal to ours, this can only lead to disaster as the result of large-scale wars. At the present time Soviet Communism represents to Dulles the most important undemocratic force. That is why we must seek its destruction. We can do this by liberating the peoples under their domination. If the Soviet Communists refuse to have these peoples liberated then a war may result. So that in the attainment of a peaceful society we may have to subject ourselves to wholesale destruction if we follow Dulles' proposed course of action.
Chapter 2  Dulles' Conception of the World Today

I  Dulles' Position

Dulles has been concerned for many years with the means of establishing international peace. *War, Peace and Change*, written in 1939, deals with the problem in great detail. In this book he enunciates most clearly his conceptions of what the world has been and is. Some of these principles still underlie a great deal of his thinking in relation to the present crisis.

Nature of Man

According to Dulles, we live in a world in which conflict is inevitable. This is due to the nature of man and the world. Man is by nature a selfish creature. There are basic human needs which demand satisfaction. These needs are both material and non-material. The material requirements include food, shelter and clothing necessary to perpetuate life. The non-material needs include love, beauty and religion. Man realizes his own finite character and seeks self exaltation by identification with some external Cause or Being which appears more noble and more enduring than he is himself.

Man realizes he cannot satisfy his desires in a state of isolation. The desire to satisfy one's needs leads to association with others. This gregarious tendency does not insure individual self-satisfaction. On the contrary, it inevitably leads to dissatisfaction.

---

This is the result of desires which are irreconcilable, due to a material shortage of goods and the existence of strange Gods.

The conflict which arises, involves a struggle between those who are primarily satisfied and those who are dissatisfied and wish to acquire at the expense of others. Dulles terms these two contenders the static and dynamic elements of society. These terms still remain important factors in Dulles' thinking.

When these conflicts arise some means of settlement is found. The primitive solution, according to Dulles, was force. This solution proved unsatisfactory because of the inconveniences and difficulties it entailed. Man, being a rational being, devised means of settling these conflicts peacefully. Two solutions have operated successfully on the smaller group level: the ethical and the political. In the first category, the ethical, "...efforts are directed to states of mind".

...desires are spiritualized and selfishness in its crude form is transmuted into a sense of duty to fellow man and the attaining of a satisfaction by performance of that duty.5

The other efforts were directed to establishing a political authority to determine by law which of the conflicting desires would prevail. Conflicts are accepted but are channeled into non-violent form:
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...the setting up by social groups some
arbiter who creates rules of conduct de-
signed to create a society wherein a
fair balance is established between the static
and dynamic. 6

The nature of these two solutions in their present form have
prevented the attainment of peaceful solutions on the international
level. They are, in essence, the cause of the rise of nationalism
and its consequences.

The ethical solution has minimized the selfish qualities of
man. But man is also an emotional being.

In only a small segment of our lives are
our acts dictated by reason. In the main
we act unthinkingly under the impulse of
emotional and physical desires or in ac-
cordance with tradition or the customs
of the social group of which we happen to
form a part. 7

Modern communication takes advantage of this human quality. Radio,
movies, loudspeakers have increased the ability to generate mass
emotional appeal. Those who control these devices can effectively
utilize emotional appeal to build that form of patriotism which leads
to intense nationalism.

Nationalism is built upon the personification of the nation.
This personification portrays the nation as a living being endowed with
heroic qualities "...who lives bravely and dangerously in a world of in-
ferior and even villainous other nation personalities". 8
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of the nation hero personality meets a fundamental and natural need. The need for excitement, drama and romance, Dulles believes, is satisfied in the personification of the state. The nation also serves the basic need of identification with some superior and noble being which was referred to earlier.

The individual, according to Dulles, is both selfish and emotional. In his attempt to find solutions to minimize and reconcile conflicts, man has created a situation which tends to elevate these conflicts to the international level. The ethical solution has developed the sacrificial qualities of man which are put at the disposal of the nation. This, in turn, allows the nation to carry on wars which result in wholesale disaster. More of this will be discussed in the development of nationalism.

The Development of Nationalism.

Man in his rational attempt to solve the problem of force, created a political authority to reconcile conflicts. In Dulles' view, the rise of nations has been an evolutionary phenomenon. In the initial stages, authority was vested in the father of the family. "As families came into contact and association with each other, and larger social groups came into being, a new authority was established such as a chief or mayor." This process continued until today we "have a world of nations each of which has a supreme authority superimposed
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upon a multitude of subordinate and more localized authorities." One may ask why the development stopped at the national level. Dulles' explanation to this question is found in the nature and role of government.

The function of authority, or government, as Dulles perceives it, is to establish a fair balance between the static and dynamic element of society. It must provide and enforce the rules to carry out this task. When the group is small, the task of authority is quite simple. Protection of life and property are the essential tasks of government. As society grows more complex, the difficulties of government increase.

The task of appraising relative satisfaction and dissatisfaction, of diagnosing cause and effect and of prescribing rules calculated to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number becomes a task of great difficulty.12

In order to camouflage their own inadequacies, Dulles contends that the group authorities depend upon the existence of external hostile groups. He holds that group authorities could discharge their duties without regard to external groups, but due to two human traits they seek to develop for themselves a role far beyond what is intended for them to fulfill. The two traits are that:

1. Those who possess power invariably seek to enlarge and perpetuate their power. They do this by picturing external difficulties which necessitate large concentrations of power in their hands.13
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2. (the) individual tends to personify the group authority and to identify therewith to such an extent that they derive vicarious pride from the power of the group authority.

These traits serve as a deterrent to the establishment of any effective world authority.

Conflicts on the international scale which involve totalitarian war can not be explained in terms of individual selfishness, but in terms of nationalism. Nationalism, in his thinking, is the result of the personification of the nation. Due to the emotional qualities of the individual, the nation is given a fictional personality. The teaching of history, the press, and the group authority establishes "...nation as a living and heroic personality, always gloriously right but always menaced by the planning and plotting of other nation personalities". The role of the nation has been enhanced by portraying the role of the Diety or the Benefactor. The individual has come to depend upon the state for satisfaction of material and spiritual needs. Since the individual turns to the state for the satisfaction of an increasing number of wants, some of which must be met beyond the national domain, the authority must extend its power to deal in the international realm. The group authority is expected to obtain trade, economic or territorial advantages for the
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The mechanism for obtaining these advantages is power politics. The game of power politics necessitates a possession of power. Power in turn is derived from the creation of a strong national will. This calls for a high degree of national unity and patriotism.

It is thus natural that the group authority should seek to maintain and intensify the nation-hero and the nation villain concepts and to accentuate in group members a sense of identification with and dependence upon their own nation personification.

Once the personification of the nation has been achieved, the individuals can be called upon to make great sacrifices which are necessary to carry on modern warfare. Under the impulse of emotion, and particularly in aid of a cause, man is capable of great sacrifice.

In the past, religions have invoked this quality. Due to the failure of religion in modern times, the nation has filled the needs which religion has neglected. He says:

Religion has in the main, left it to the false gods of patriotism to evoke the self sacrificial qualities in mankind. The personified nation has to a marked degree preempted the role of that higher spiritual entity with which every man desires to feel some identification.

The personality of the nation state is not a static thing. It fluctuates in relation to the imaginations of the people who create it. At times it may be dynamic and at other times it may be static.
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Certain types of personality are more conducive to war. Dulles' description includes:

One is the crusading hero, who champions the cause of justice and succors the oppressed. Another is the ambitious hard working and deserving youth who is repressed and prevented from realizing his potentialities by the greed, indifference or falsely assumed superiority of those who surround him.

In general, dynamic qualities are a prerequisite to the execution of a totalitarian war.

The international scene is made up of some sixty (60) nation-personalities. The ethical solution which has been successful in minimizing conflicts between individuals does not apply to the nation. Instead, the ethical solution has been perverted to reinforce the personified nation. The sacrificial qualities of the individual are called upon to protect and enhance the nation. The political authority of each nation requires this in order to increase its own power and conceal its own deficiencies in providing a fair balance between the static and dynamic.

The problem of force is now similar to the earlier one that existed between individuals. The solution involves the application of the ethical solution and the political solution of these nation-personalities. Totalitarian warfare is the only means of settling basic conflicts which now exist between nations. Other means for the settlement of conflicts must be tried.
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The ethical solution must be directed to the individual. It should aim at correcting the perversion of the spirit of self sacrifice. Efforts would be directed toward diluting the nation hero-deity benefactor concept. It calls for a spiritual revival which places the sacrificial qualities of man at the disposal of a truly universal ideal.

Dulles realises that the ethical solution can not be completely successful for some time. Therefore the political solution must be resorted to.

We must treat the problem as one created by a group of personified nations each commanding the allegiance and sacrificial devotion of its peoples and each having desires and ambitions conflicting with those of others. 21

Communism

Communism exemplifies a modern effort to combine the ethical and authoritarian solutions, Dulles believes. 22 Under this system of government, the party leaders "...assume primary responsibility for insulating in the individual a spirit of self sacrifice, and of self subordination and cooperation in promoting what is conceived as the welfare of the group. The functioning of religious leaders is discouraged since their conception of the object of sacrifice may not coincide with that of the group authority." 23 Communism seeks a specific harmony of desires as an end, and accepts force as a legitimate
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means to this end. The quality of self sacrifice is put at the disposal of the Communist cause which accepts the use of forcible or coercive measures as a means to the end. Corollary to this is that the cause is equated with the human authority which itself uses force to achieve its end. 24

What Dulles is saying is that Communism has a cause, which is to promote a certain harmony of interests. The creed appeals to the individual to sacrifice self interests to attain this harmony. However, Communism uses violence and coercion in its attempt to gain its ends; therein lies its evil.

When Dulles wrote War, Peace and Change in 1939, in which he stated most clearly his conception of the world and formulated his solution to violence on the international level, he recognized that the development of ideologies such as Communism and Fascism might alter his analysis somewhat. These ideologies were based upon competing philosophies of government. Previously, conflicts were rooted in nationalistic causes. Ideological penetration to affect changes in the status quo could proceed without resort to totalitarian warfare. He prophesied that this "...trend may evidence the beginning of a new era akin to that of religious wars when force will be employed internationally without formal declaration of war and under the banner of governmental philosophies". 25 At the time he did not feel that these
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ideologies of Fascism, Communism, or Democracy transcended nationalism. They were, rather, "...adjuncts to nationalism, representing Causes which the nation-hero espouses.... Even were the trend to become more marked it would not invalidate the general principles to
which we come...".

In the light of these remarks it is interesting to examine Dulles' most recent statements with regard to Communism. Changes in the world situation have led him to reformulate his conception of the world to some extent.

Today, according to Dulles:

There exists a great power -- Russia -- under the control of a despotic group fanatical in their acceptance of a creed that teaches world domination and that would deny those personal freedoms which constitute our most cherished political and religious heritage.

The enemy is not the Russian people; they desire peace as much as any other people. The group that constitutes the threat is the "...small, fanatical Soviet Communist Party". In order to understand this threat and combat it, Dulles attempts to analyze the Communist Creed.

No nation's foreign policy can be ascertained merely from what its officials say. More important are the philosophy of its leaders and the actual manifestations of that policy in what is done.
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He believes that the primary guides to present day Communism are the works of Stalin. His analysis of Communism is drawn mainly from Stalin's Problems of Leninism. According to Dulles, the basic premise of Soviet foreign policy is the fact that the world is one, and peace is indivisible. The primary purpose of that policy is to achieve peace, security and opportunity for the Soviet Union. Since the world is one, and peace is indivisible, peace and security depend upon eradicating the non-Soviet type of society.

Peace is a condition where everyone agrees with everyone else, where there is no disharmony and where the productive machine is running smoothly.... Those who do not conform are like grit in the wheels of the machine and have to be cleaned out.

Soviet Communism is, according to Dulles, "...based upon an atheistic, Godless premise. There is no moral law, there is no justice, and there are no God given rights". Because of this lack of a moral code, the Soviet Union and the United States cannot agree on fundamental premises. Because of this lack of a moral code the Soviet Union proceeds in its conquest with the most expedient methods without regard for an ultimate judgment by the Supreme Being.

Dulles finds in the Communist Creed a duty to extend the Soviet system to all the world. This is a matter of expediency, for the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot exist safely in only a few countries. The capitalist countries will attempt to destroy the system. Dulles extracts the following from Stalin:
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Since the imperialists will inevitably seek to destroy Communism by war, the Communist Party, it is taught, must as a matter of defense, take the offensive and overthrow the non-communist governments, first taking over the weaker countries, perhaps those which have been colonial dependencies. In that way there will be a gradual extension of Socialism, which will more and more encircle the stronger imperialist nations. 33

When this encirclement is nearly complete the final blow will be struck and "...the single state union realized". 34

According to Dulles, Communism is aiming at the encirclement of the Western nations. When encirclement is nearly completed the final step may be war.

The party is highly organized, he says. There is close discipline. Unity of will is achieved by periodic purges. The Soviet State is the instrument of the party. The state suppresses any resistance to party aims. 35

The methods the party uses are based on terror and fraud. Propaganda and coercion are the means of carrying out party objectives. The party promotes revolutions in colonial areas. In non-colonial areas there is penetration designed to put in key positions men who are ruled by party discipline. Intensive radio and press propaganda stirs up discontent wherever possible. By ruthlessly oppressing all opponents who fall within their power, Communist leaders terrorize many opponents still beyond it. These methods are devised to wage
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a class war and not necessarily a nationalistic war, Dulles believes. He derives from this the principle that the Soviets will not start a general war or a nationalistic war until the advantages of class warfare are exhausted.

Dulles realizes that Soviet foreign policy is powerful. It is powerful because it is a natural projection abroad of domestic policy. It is attempting to dominate the world using the same methods that it used to come into power in Russia. It attempts to achieve on the international level what it has achieved on the national level -- political harmony. Its means are propaganda and force. "It is a natural, simple, and positive policy."

Communism gains additional strength from being revolutionary.

Change is the law of life and those who seek change have the exhilaration of seeming to move with an irresistible current of history.

Dulles further contends that:

The dynamic aspect of Soviet foreign policy is even more effective because it moves into a world which seems largely a vacuum as far as faith and order are concerned.

There are three main reasons why Communism has made great gains according to Dulles. These are:
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One is that Soviet Communism saturates the world with propaganda that has universal appeal. Secondly, the Soviet Communist party has perfected a superb organization to direct aggression throughout the world. The third reason is that Soviet Communism has the advantage of the offensive.43

Dulles emphasizes that the advances Soviet Communism have made are tremendous. Over 700,000,000 people have been brought under the control of the Communist government of the Soviet Union and affiliated Communist governments. The control of strategic areas and the natural resources that goes with them, in Asia and Central Europe, has given the Soviet bloc overwhelming power. "The program of encirclement has made great gains."45

The Western World

Dulles sees the world now as being divided into two competing and diametrically opposed blocs. Soviet Communism has represented the dynamic, aggressive power. The Western freedom-loving powers have for the most part, represented the static element. According to one of Dulles' basic principles that the dynamic will prevail over the static, this condition can only result in disaster for the Western world.

The United States in particular seems to have lost the spirit which made it a great nation. He says:

Our nation was founded as an experiment in human liberty. Its institutions have reflected the belief of our founders that men
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had their origin and destiny in God; that they were endowed by him with inalienable rights and had duties prescribed by moral law, and that human institutions ought primarily to help men develop their God given possibilities. We believe that if we built on that spiritual foundation we would be showing men everywhere the way to a better and more abundant life. 46

From this belief our nation, unchallenged, grew powerful materially. Our influence and prestige in the world came naturally because of what our nation stood for. Foreign powers did not attempt to threaten us because their peoples could not be brought to destroy the Great American Spirit which they shared. 47

These conditions prevailed for over 150 years. However, as our material power grew our spiritual power waned. We became more concerned with accumulating material benefits than serving as an experiment in human liberty. 48 Our sense of world mission lessened.

The result of this concern with material things has resulted in our loss of influence over other peoples throughout the world.

The Western democracies have so slight a hold on the masses of mankind that they eagerly listen to those who do not even show they can establish a good society at home. 49

If we had had more moral influence over the countries which have succumbed to Communism, these peoples would not have been tricked by the
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propaganda of the Communists. The Western nations should have appealed more directly to these peoples.

They (the Western Democracies) should have more rapidly advanced the self government of dependent peoples. They should have been better neighbors to peoples not just nations. 50

In our overemphasis upon material objects we have lost sight of the spiritual values of liberty and freedom. The tendencies toward overpowering governments in economic and social areas prove that we are willing to sacrifice our freedom for material objects. This dependence upon material objects gives us little to offer the other areas of the world which Communism doesn't offer them.

Our concrete policies to combat the advancement of Communism have been negative. The Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the Military Assistance Program, and the intervention in Korea have merely been reactions to some of the many Soviet threats. Dulles believes these policies were necessary at the time but if our policies had been more "dynamic" to begin with, the occasion for such action would not have arisen.

Our policies have largely involved emergency action to try to contain Soviet Communism by checking it here or blocking it there. We are not working, sacrificing and spending in order to be able to live without this peril but to be able to live with it, presumably forever. These policies will exhaust us, morally, politically and economically. 53
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Dulles believes that Communism has made unparalleled advances because we have lacked a righteous and dynamic faith. Communism, which is bent on encirclement of the Western nations and finally domination of the world, has been highly successful. It has been able to be so because the free world has attempted to combat it with negative policies.

The Present State of International Authority

The League of Nations and the United Nations represent primitive forms of world government, according to Dulles. The very existence of the group of personified nations as described above, makes it obvious that a world government could not be expected to be more than primitive.

Dulles' definition of a true political authority is one which "...provides and enforces rules, in substitution for individual force, to reconcile inevitable conflicts". The establishment of a political authority presupposes agreement on fundamental moral principles:

The rules which the human (political) authority can usefully enunciate must, as we have observed, be consonant with the mores of the community. These in turn are largely formed by ethical conceptions which from time to time prevail.

In the world today, there still is not a consensus of moral judg-
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ment upon which to base international law. Even if such a consensus of opinion existed, it is doubtful whether nations would surrender to any degree the amount of sovereignty which would be required to establish an effective world authority. The nature of the personified state obviates the possibility of any substantial amount of sovereignty adhering to an international authority. If political authorities surrendered their power to an international arbiter they would surrender their power over their own nation state. This would be a contradiction to Dulles' assumption that political authorities tend to enlarge and perpetuate their power.

The United Nations does not have the full powers of a political authority. However, the United Nations could direct change in the world order through moral pressure if agreement can be reached. Much of the disappointment which arises from the operation of the United Nations is the result of expecting it to do things it was not created to do.

One of the fundamental assumptions upon which the United Nations was organized was the continuing collaboration of the great powers to enforce the peace. It was realized that if one of these powers was the aggressor the effectiveness of the organization would be curtailed. At its inception, Dulles was opposed to this reliance upon the political unanimity of the great powers. He did not think it could be depended upon to enforce the peace. He put more faith in the General

57. Dulles, War or Peace, 41.
Assembly. Although he realized that the General Assembly would not have the power to enforce police action in case of aggression, it could be counted on to invoke the power of world opinion on the aggressor.

The effectiveness of the United Nations is harassed because of the fundamental cleavage of the two worlds, says Dulles.

The United Nations cannot suppress or reconcile the differences between the materialistic, atheistic philosophy of the Communist party and the spiritual faith that animates the leaders and the peoples of the non-Communist states. The United Nations cannot stop those who hold strong beliefs from feeling a strong sense of mission and seeking to spread their beliefs in the world. The United Nations cannot compel communists to give up their belief in class war or their use of fraud, terrorism, and violence so long as it seems these methods get results.

With the present conditions in the world the United Nations could not do these things, nor could it be made to do them. "It takes more than a vote to calm a world scene made turbulent by those who combine fanatical beliefs with tremendous power." Even a police force of mighty power and strength would not suffice. Dulles does not believe the basic divisions of the world could be obliterated in this manner.

The General Assembly, Dulles feels, provides the most effective organ of the United Nations today. It provides the place for discus-
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sions which lead to the formation of judgments of right and wrong.

The Assembly has been successful as an agency for peace. The settlement of the political problems in Iran, Greece, and Israel, for example, can be attributed mainly to the efforts of the Assembly, Dulles believes.

The United Nations also provides an atmosphere which promotes world order and international harmony. Friendship and understanding are promoted. An important asset of the United Nations has been to expose hypocrisy. The peace offensives of the Soviets have been exposed by their concrete policies. The United Nations, Dulles believes, has been a place to consolidate the views of the Western peace-loving states. This has served to make obsolete the concept of neutrality.

In the opening sessions of the United Nations the conflict between Soviet Russia and the United States was looked upon as simply two powers seeking world domination. The old game of power politics was considered necessary with some countries staying neutral and Great Britain serving as the balance. Dulles does not actually refer to this as power politics, but it is, it would seem, implicit in his thinking. However, it became apparent that it was only Soviet Russia which was bent on world domination. Neutrality disappeared, and the free world consolidated its position.
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Summary

In the past fourteen years Dulles' conception of the world and the forces operating on the international scene has altered. This is understandable due to the changes which have taken place in the world during this period of time.

He no longer conceives of the world as being made up of some sixty nation-personalities, each with desires that conflict with the desires of other nations. Nationalism is no longer the only disrupting cause of international tensions.

According to Dulles, peace today is threatened by a despotic group which is intent upon world domination. The world, although still composed of some sixty nations which still maintain a high degree of sovereignty, is divided into two camps. On the one hand there is the Soviet Communist group intent upon world conquest. On the other, there are the Western nations who see their existence threatened by this force. The Western countries have attempted to present a united front against Communism through the present international organization, the United Nations. The effectiveness of this organization is curtailed, however, because of the basic cleavage which exists in the world today. The problem is no longer one of competing nation-personalities alone, but a struggle of two forces, oppression and freedom, as well.
II Criticism

Inconsistencies

It can readily be perceived that Dulles is a man of inconsistencies. One writer has asked the question "When is Dulles Dulles?". Another has suggested that he is schizophrenic. The possibility exists that he is a demagogue.

Dulles' thinking contains basic conflicts. The isolationist of 1939 is incompatible with the internationalist of 1952. The statesman in the Democratic administration was essentially different from the politician of 1944, 1948-49 and 1952. Dulles the churchman is irreconcilable with the power politician. The student of Dulles is confounded by this perplexing problem. Can some attempt be made to clarify these inconsistencies and see if there is any explanation for them?

War, Peace and Change vs. War or Peace

A striking contrast is found between the book Dulles wrote in 1939 and the one he wrote in 1950. War, Peace and Change, considered as abstract theory, had much to commend it. Dulles' analysis of the powerful force of nationalism and the reasons for the rise of nationalism were quite profound. His thesis that peace could only be pre-

served through timely change showed considerable insight into the problems of international relations. "Few will quarrel with the thesis that some kinds of change are necessary and inevitable or that they should be effected as peacefully as possible."67 In practice however, Dulles may have been arguing in favor of appeasing the Axis powers. Their aggressions and conquests may have been the changes to which it was necessary to make peaceful adjustments.68 In 1939 he made three speeches in which he referred to the Japanese, Germans and Italians as dynamic people who should be given more Lebensraum.69 In March 1939, he said he would not oppose violent participation in foreign affairs by this country if our policies were based upon a genuine understanding of the present situation and was intelligently designed to achieve a world order whereby recurrent crises might hereafter be avoided. Unfortunately this prerequisite seemed at that moment nonexistent.70 He went on to say that "...the United States was in a position to choose deliberately its own policy. .... There is no reason to believe any totalitarian state would or could attack us".71 He also attacked measures short of war saying: "They inflame sentiment against us; they destroy our possible influence with the totalitarian peoples."72

He was in favor of selling supplies to all nations on a "cash
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and carry basis". In October of that year he said:

For the United States to fulfill its destiny of showing the way to a permanent constructive world peace it is imperative that this nation stay out of the present conflict. 73

Aggression was linked to the resentment, bitterness and disparagement arising from the inequalities that the social system placed upon the Axis countries. As late as December 1940, Dulles was criticizing Western statesmen for being blinded by nationalism.

In fairness to Dulles, it must be pointed out that although we now know that there was a great danger from the Axis powers, Dulles was not alone in his opinion that there was little danger of attack from them. It is also conceded that, at least, Dulles was consistent in his actions with the theory he proposed in his book. However, Dulles' War or Peace written in 1950, dealing with Soviet Russia represents a complete reversal of the theory and practice he proposed with reference to Nazi Germany and Japan.

In 1939 he proposed that we should adjust peacefully to Axis expansion. In 1950 he was one of the most vehement spokesmen for stopping Communism. In War or Peace the exact program he condemned in 1939 was proposed. Now, according to Dulles, "...the prerequisite for even the possibility of peace was the use of force or threat by
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the nation hero to achieve complete agreement on unilaterally dicta-
ted terms". In *War or Peace* and many of his recent speeches, he
employs some of the techniques which in 1939 he felt led to intense
nationalism and totalitarian warfare. He was conscious of the fact
that those who possess power seek to enlarge and perpetuate their
power by depending on the existence of external hostile groups. Since
World War II he has been warning the nation of the fanatical group
in Russia which is seeking the destruction of Western civilization.
In 1939 he was also aware of the language of villain imagery and the
oversimplification of history, used to give the nation a living and
heroic personality. Yet Dulles' interpretation of history as present-
ed in *War or Peace* shows no distaste for villain imagery or qualms
about oversimplifying history.

Dulles' recent appeals to the United States to regain its histor-
ic mission and its righteous and dynamic faith are a bit ironic in
terms of his description of the type of nation personalities conduc-
tive to war. "One is the crusading hero, who champions the cause of
justice and succors the oppressed." In 1939 he said dynamic qual-
ities are a prerequisite to the execution of a totalitarian war. In
the 1952 Republican platform he wrote, "...we offer policies which are
dynamic". If we accept Dulles' analysis of the type of nation per-
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sonality conducive to war, it may seem that the Republican platform was advocating policies for the preparation for totalitarian warfare.

It does not seem possible that Dulles has completely forgotten the principles he espoused in 1939. But why has he completely reversed his position? Can we infer that Dulles cared little for his theory as such? It may be possible that War, Peace and Change was a convenient position for the head of a law firm dealing quite profitably with a number of dynamic Nazi cartels. Dulles' recent position may be the result of a deeply embedded fear of Communism or any threat to capitalism. Therefore he will use the methods he so ably outlined in 1939 which lead to totalitarian warfare to destroy Soviet Communism.

Politician vs Statesman

Another outstanding example of Dulles' often incongruous position was his performance in the 1952 presidential campaign.

On March 23, 1952 Dulles announced he was going to resign his post in the State Department in order to be able to freely criticize Administration policies. This would indicate that during the previous five years while he was associated with the Administration, he was carrying out policies he did not feel defensible. If this was true, then he should have had some moral qualms.

Dulles did prove to be one of the most vehement critics of the Administration. He wrote in the Republican platform:

The present administration in seven years has squandered the unprecedented power and prestige which were ours at the close of World War II ... Russia proceeds confidently with its plan for world conquest. We charge that the leaders of the administration now in power have lost the peace we so dearly earned by World War II.81

When he served the Administration, Dulles made directly contrary assessments. He consistently supported the Administration's policies. Even as a Republican member of the Senate in 1949, he eloquently defended the Marshall Plan and made a plea for the passage of the North Atlantic Treaty. He said:

Soviet Communist tactics cannot prevail against such a curative and creative program as we have been evolving the past two years. .... With all due reservations, I feel that we are on the way peacefully to resist and I hope eventually to throw back Soviet Communism.83

As late as May 1952 Dulles said, "The last five years have been years of achievement and our peoples have already surmounted a great peril."84

Korea is another point of conflict in Dulles' thinking. The Re-
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publican platform charges "...that the administration plunged us into
85
war in Korea without the consent of our citizens". Previous to this
statement, Dulles had been one of the strongest supporters of the
Korean intervention. Several days before the Korean war broke out he
told Syngman Rhee's government: "...you are not alone". On the first
of July of 1950 he said, "What we are doing today is the Spirit of
86
'76". He was referring to the embarkation of United States troops
on Korean soil. As late as May 1952 he praised Truman's decision to
send troops into Korea. He said: "President Truman's decision that
the United States should go to the defense of the Korean Republic was
88
courageous, righteous and in the national interest."

An interesting interpretation of past history as presented in the
Republican platform by Dulles was the condemnation of the Administra-
89
tion for not defending the Baltic republics. These countries were
seized two years before the United States had entered World War II.
At this time, Dulles was urging that we stay out of the senseless
struggle to preserve national sovereignties. In addition, Dulles
should have known that the United States never recognized the annex-
90
ation of these countries by the Soviet Union.
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Dulles has admitted that he had as much to do with writing the
platform as anyone else. It has never been repudiated by him. Yet
how does he reconcile the two completely distinct positions of sup-
porting the Administration and condemning it? Dulles has given two
contradictory answers to this question. During the Republican con-
vention in 1952, he was asked by a reporter how he could reconcile
the two positions. The answer was that as an individual he could not
do so, but as a platform writer he was merely stating the Republican
92
93
case against the Democratic Party. During the Senate hearing on his
nomination for Secretary of State he elaborated:

Under our constitutional system we have a
general election every four years.... One
side presents his case, and the other side
presents the other, as two lawyers do when
they go into court. At this stage the two
parties are not judges and they are not
judicial. In my opinion they should not be...... I admit in the campaign words are
used that are somewhat more extravagant
than those used in a period of judicial
contemplation." 93

This would indicate that perhaps Dulles realized there were some
harsh charges in the platform that privately he would not agree with.
But, since this was a presidential campaign and he wanted very much to
become Secretary of State, he would "hold his tongue in check" and
wait for the election. But neither will Dulles let us assume that.
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Although in most of his speeches before July 1952 and particularly in *War or Peace*, Dulles repeatedly claimed credit for helping formulate policies which had frustrated the Communists, he said last summer he was only acting as an agent of the State Department. Last summer Senator Paul Douglas pointed out that in view of the fact that in 1949 Dulles had secured the passage in the United Nations General Assembly of a resolution for the withdrawal of troops from Korea, there was a certain incongruity in accusing the government of dereliction of duty in complying with the resolution. Dulles replied that in sponsoring the resolution he had merely acted as an agent of his government, citing the United Nations Participation Act which says in substance that our United Nations representatives must take orders from the president. However, this does not justify all the eloquent speeches he made in favor of the withdrawal.

This raises the important question: how do we know what Dulles really believes? In spite of his political demagoguery, there seems to be some pattern of thought. Essentially, he seems to back most of the Democratic administration's foreign policy. In his first speech after he assumed office, he claimed that any new policies would not repudiate any of the major policies under Truman. His major criticism of the past administration's policies were that they did not go far enough — they were not "dynamic".

Coexistence

Until 1949, Dulles claimed that coexistence with Soviet Russia was possible. In fact for several years he spoke in terms of a dynamic, competitive peace. In 1946 he said:

A new equilibrium must be established in the world between the faith and institutions of the Soviet Union and the Western World....It must be determined how much constructive influence each society can exert in the world.  

Peace would not be the conventional rigid type but a "...condition of vigorous effort to redress wronge and to advance the general welfare of mankind". This could be attempted through the competition of the two societies for the support of the other peoples of the world. In 1949 he said: "...if we could persuade Communism to limit itself to peaceful methods then I believe we could get along peacefully in the world. Our differences would not be the kind that would be resolved by fighting each other".

Since then Dulles has reconsidered the possibilities of coexistence. In 1953 he said:

We shall never have secure peace or a happy world while the Communists dominate one third of its population and are trying to extend it.

There are perhaps justifiable reasons for Dulles' shift. The Korean War, and other manifestations of Soviet Communism do question the possibility of coexistence.
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Validity

There are three outstanding examples of Dulles' erroneous judgments. The first was the prediction that there was no danger of attack from the Axis powers. Secondly, the prediction that there could be continuing collaboration of the Big Three in the postwar world. Thirdly, he felt that there was no danger of aggression in Korea previous to the North Korean attack. It may seem that, at times, Dulles is blinded by optimism. However, he was not the only well informed citizen who was guilty of this blindness.

There are times when Dulles' interpretation of history seems a distortion, either naive or opportunistic. As was pointed out above, there were many instances of the distortion of historical fact in the Republican platform. In his own book, his interpretation of American history seems to ignore vital facts. His reading of history results in what Morgenthau terms the belief in "American omnipotence" and is expressed in the crusading spirit and the disparagement of traditional methods of diplomacy. The belief in omnipotence stems in part from the historic experience of being spared from the threat of conquest by a foreign power. This of course was due primarily to geographical factors. Dulles, however, accounts for this as being the result of our dynamic faith and the fact that no foreign ruler could bring his people to attack us. We grew to be a great nation because we were a spiritual society, not because of raw materials, geographical fac-
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tors and technology. Our foreign policies were not imperialistic, because we were moral, not because we could pursue continental expansion without the subjugation of others.

Dulles' emphasis upon a righteous faith and a dynamic policy reflect his belief in this interpretation of history. He believes we are threatened today because we have forgotten the source of our past strength. If we regain that tradition we will be able to combat communism successfully as we did other evil forces of the past.

"Along with this interpretation of historic experience there is a sense of moral mission." The United States has a duty to see to it that right prevails in the world. Dulles refers to our moral mission throughout his writings. "We believed that if we built on that spiritual foundation we would be showing men everywhere the way to a better life. ...World mission was a central theme." This interpretation raises some questions. How does he account for Theodore Roosevelt's "Big Stick Policy", intervention in Cuba, Panama and the Spanish American War? If these were missions they were economic missions rather than spiritual.

Comparison and Implications

Dulles' conception of the problems that face the world today rests upon certain assumptions that have been questioned and criticized by other spokesmen in the field of international relations.
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Nature of the Conflict Between the USSR and the United States

The major problem which exists in the world today is the conflict between the United States and Soviet Russia. Dulles realizes that a conflict exists. The assumption he makes as to the nature of this conflict will necessarily determine the measures he will propose to resolve the conflict.

Dulles assumes the issue between the Soviet Union and the United States is that of world revolution, an objective to which the Soviet Union is irrevocably committed. Hans Morgenthau critically analyzes this position and points out the implications. He notes that if one assumes, as Dulles does, that what confronts us as long as the Soviet government reigns in Moscow is the threat of world revolution, the only way to resist the threat is to extirpate it at the roots. This inevitably leads to the problem of not how to preserve peace but when to go to war. This type of thinking envisages the conflict as a struggle between good and evil which can only end in the complete triumph of good over evil.

Writers, such as Morgenthau and Lippman, do not conceive of the threat as being world revolution but rather Russian imperialism. In this case the traditional methods of diplomacy and political policy can be employed to meet the threat. Diplomacy can be used to prepare the way for a peaceful settlement of the conflict. Morganthau’s and
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Lippman's arguments rest upon the historic imperialism of the Czars. Lippman points out that the Western expansion of the Russian sphere of influence has always been a Russian aim.

It was the mighty power of the Red Army not the ideology of Karl Marx, which enables the Russian government to expand its frontiers. It is the pressure of that army far beyond the new frontiers which makes the will of the Kremlin irresistible within the Russian sphere of influence.¹¹⁰

As these writers point out, it is essential to understand the pattern and plan of Soviet aggrandizement before policies can be devised to counteract it. If Dulles does not realize that the threat is Soviet imperialism rather than world revolution, his policies may lead to disaster.

The assumption that world revolution is the intent of the Soviets has a corollary in the assumption that coexistence of the two powers is impossible. Dulles assumes that the Soviets will not be satisfied until they have completely dominated the world. He certainly is not going to stand by and let the United States be dominated by Soviet Communism. The only solution is to destroy it. Since Dulles does not see that perhaps the Soviets have deeply rooted imperialistic aims which could be handled by the traditional diplomatic
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methods he cannot admit to the possibility of the two great powers existing in the same world.

*Decadent Communism.*

Dulles assumes that Soviet Communism bears within itself the seeds of its own decay. In this respect he and George Kennan (the author of the so-called *containment policy*) have similar views of Soviet Communism. Dulles differs from Kennan in that he would accelerate the process of decay with his liberation policy. It is upon the assumption that Communism can be frustrated that he bases his policy of liberation. Whether or not Soviet Communism does contain the seeds of its own destruction is questionable. There is little actual evidence to prove that Soviet Communism will destroy itself or that we can help it along. This is a very optimistic prediction upon which to base a well reasoned foreign policy.

Dulles' criticism that the Democratic administration's foreign policy was based upon the negative principle of containment may not be well founded. Containment was negative only in so far as it avoided the use of armed force in aggressive action. The containment policy was devised to meet the outward thrust of Soviet power. At that time the United States was militarily weak and we could do little more. The *Truman Doctrine*, Marshall Plan and Korean intervention were certainly more than negative action.

---

Chapter 3 Dulles' Policy for the United States

I. Dulles' Position

Dulles' solution to the present problem must be understood in the context of his general conception of change. His first proposition is that change is the result of the dynamic prevailing over the static. Change per se is not necessarily good. Certain existing institutions deserve to be preserved. Man cannot prevent change from occurring but he can direct it and influence the form and rate at which it occurs. "He can deflect the impact of change away from values if not things." Dulles contends that if the demands for change can be detected, in their initial stages, they are more malleable. When left to develop more intensely, gaining momentum, the demands became more violent and drastic. For example if the demands of the German people for more economic and social opportunity before 1933 had been heeded, the likelihood of the rise of Hitler and the resulting consequences would have been less probable.

Prerequisites

Soviet Communism is now the dynamic force in the world. However, as will be seen, Dulles stresses the importance of a dynamic United States policy. Up to the present we have been static. Now we should
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become dynamic. Our dynamism should be of a different type than the Communists'. Our dynamism must be based upon moral principles. The Communists base theirs upon materialism.

A second proposition of Dulles is that non-material forces are more powerful than those that are merely material. Ideas are more effective than goods, he contends. Our ideas should conform to the moral law. The moral law determines between right and wrong and in the long run, only those who conform to this law will escape disaster. Changes we propose in the international realm must be based upon these propositions.

The solutions Dulles suggested in 1939 to provide peaceful change still form the basis of his proposals at present. He does make some alterations which can be expected due to the changes in the world since 1939 as he sees it. The ethical solution, which is directed to the individual, places a great deal of importance upon a spiritual revival. Nationalism partly resulted from the deification of the state. Religion failed to provide for man's need to identify himself with a Supreme Being. To counteract this tendency the sacrificial qualities of the individual must be put at the disposal of a truly worthy cause which transcends nationality. The most favorable cause would be religion.

The finest human qualities of human nature are at once too delicate and too powerful
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to be put blindly at the disposal of other humans who are primarily concerned with their own kingdom, not bringing into being of the Kingdom of God.  

The trend toward paternalism in government must also be combated. The role of government is to provide a fair balance of the static and the dynamic. The role of government is not to provide material benefits directly. Material benefits result from individual effort.

Dulles' emphasis upon a spiritual society reflects these principles of a nation-deity and nation-benefactor concept.

Communism at present seems to represent both the nation-deity and nation-benefactor to the individual, according to Dulles. Therefore attempts must be made to bring religion and freedom to these dominated peoples. This seems to be the aim of Dulles' well known policy of liberation. If we can break down these concepts, we can bring about the disintegration of Soviet power.

The Western nations must also heed the dangers of the paternalistic God-like state. The offensive against Communism should not be taken in the guise of nationalism but under the true banner of Democracy and Christianity. Only if we truly exhibit these qualities of Democracy and Christianity within our nation, can we serve as an ex-
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ample to the dominated peoples.

The political solution which has been realized in the United States is an important factor in Dulles' solution to the world problems. The need for an international organization to direct changes in the world has been provided in form if not substance. Dulles utilizes the United Nations in his formula for peace.

These are the underlying assumptions in Dulles' concrete proposals for the solution of the present crisis. The application of these principles are directed to a different end and the emphasis on a spiritual revival has increased, but the principles are the same.

Dulles conceives of Soviet Communism as the main threat to a peaceful world. He says:

...the deadly serious threat of encirclement by the Russian communists and their allies is the basic and main concern of United States foreign policy.

Dulles does not believe that we can have a peaceful world while the Communists dominate such a great share of the world and are trying to extend this domination.

We shall never have secure peace or a happy world while the communists dominate one third of its population and are trying to extend it. Enslaved peoples desire to be free. For our own selfish interests they ought to be free.

He does not believe the policies he formulates call for a preventive war. He believes that the destruction of Communism can be accomplished by peaceful means. If the methods which the Communist use can be frustrated by peaceful means, Communism will destroy itself. The defeat of Communism will be the result of its own inability to govern the enslaved peoples. The foreign policies of the United States and other non-communist countries must be directed to this end.

Dulles believes that before we can attempt to carry these policies out, we must develop the will to destroy Communism. This calls for a righteous and dynamic faith.

A Righteous and Dynamic Faith

One of the main reasons Communism has been succeeding is due to the fact that "... (it) has a creed, a creed of world wide import .... (the Great Soviet experiment) ...is catching the imagination of the people of the world just as we did in the nineteenth century with our Great American experiment". Dulles feels that we have lost the zeal we had before the twentieth century. Now the Soviets have filled the spiritual vacuum. We have subordinated the spiritual development of the individual to emphasize the development of the material life. This results in having little more to offer people than the Russians offer. Now we must regain that faith in a spiritual society which greatly influenced our founding fathers and gave hope and faith to the world.

Dulles says:
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We cannot successfully combat Soviet Communism in the world and frustrate its methods of fraud, terrorism and violence unless we have a faith with spiritual appeal that translated itself into practices which in our modern complex society gets rid of the sordid degrading conditions of life in which the spirit cannot grow.

The solution is to regain faith in a spiritual society.

A spiritual society seeks material welfare by relying on and developing the individual's sense of duty to his fellow man and his willingness to exercise self control and self restraint in the discharge of that duty.

In the spiritual society there is a minimum of government control.

If we have this faith, we can through our "conduct and example" give hope and faith to the captive people of Soviet domination.

We must not be afraid to recapture faith in the primacy of human liberty and freedom and hold to the religious view that man is destined by God to be more than a material producer and that his chief end is something more than physical security.

These are the prerequisites, then, to Dulles' strategy to defeat Communism. We must regain faith in our own political and religious heritage; we must by our example here at home bring hope and faith to the captive peoples; and we must seek the eventual liberation of these peoples.

Dulles' program to defeat Communism involves two major areas -- military defense and political offensive.
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Military Defense

Dulles assumes that we must deter aggression by being militarily strong.

A militarily strong United States is not just a selfish program for the United States. All the free nations of the world want the United States to be strong. ...They feel that United States military strength is the only shield they have against Russian terrorism. 13

Dulles realizes the scope of the problem in defending the free world. He is conscious of the power the Russians command in terms of manpower, resources and territory. He does not feel that we can build a line around Soviet territory and attempt to defend the adjacent territories in that manner. That is his criticism of our past policies. They have attempted to construct a Maginot line around the world. This he believes would mean spreading our strength too thin and lead to bankruptcy. The solution Dulles envisages is:

...for the free world to develop the will and organise the means to retaliation instantly against open aggression by the Red armies so that if it occurred anywhere we could and would strike back where it hurts by means of our own choosing. 14

For example if the Soviets attacked in the Middle East, we would retaliate with strategically placed air power and atomic weapons if necessary. This would eliminate spreading small forces throughout the
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world which are not very effective.

Dulles' idea involves the creation of a community police force. With provisional threat of punishment, the aggressor would be less inclined to start a war. His program consists of setting up bases throughout the world from which striking forces could operate in case of Soviet aggression. He suggests maintaining observers along frontiers to report any aggression. The United Nations Peace Observation Commission could supply these observers.

He recognizes the "...need for determining in advance by common consent, given by constitutional and United Nations processes, that this power would be used instantly, but only if Red armies of the Soviet Union or its satellites, including China, engage in open armed attack."

Dulles does not believe this will provoke a general war. It will deter a war. The Russians, he feels, are not ready to start a general war. They had ample opportunity in the recent past when we were virtually weak. When we are militarily strong there will be even less reason to start a war. The reasons why the Russians have not and probably will not use their armies in the near future are:

1. Any government that makes open armed attack on another nation will make itself universally abhorred.
2. Until the West is weakened by closer en-
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circlement, the Soviet Union would not risk a general war which the free nations could win thanks to their present industrial superiority. (That is why we must take the political initiative and prevent encirclement from proceeding further.)

3. Since the Red army is not a distinctive Communist organization the party leaders have always questioned its abiding loyalty to them especially if ordered to wage aggressive war beyond Russian soil.

4. The Soviet leaders give priority to political rather than military methods.

5. The Politburo respects the power of United States atomic weapons.

These deterrents, plus the additional weight of a community punishing force, would reduce the risk of a general war, Dulles thinks. Power is the key to success in dealing with the Russians. The Russians respect power. Power includes military, economic and moral factors.

Dulles warns against letting the military be the sole determinant of policy. Although we must be militarily strong, "...this fact does not necessarily mean military considerations ought to dominate our foreign policy". The military is a weighty instrument in the hands of the diplomats by the power it wields in deterring future aggression.

The Political Offensive

"Once the free world has established a military defense it can undertake a political offensive." Our political offensive would be
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based upon the principle of the dynamic prevailing over the static; the dynamic consisting of ideas based on moral principles. The political offensive is directed toward the liberation of the captive peoples.

Dulles justifies his program for liberation on two imperatives. One is moral, the other expedient. We have a moral commitment to free the peoples of Soviet dominated countries. It is the expression of a faith in the God-given rights of men to live in freedom. It would prove to the world that the faith of our founders in our political system would inspire just governments throughout the world is still the basis of our government. "We are still the hope of the oppressed."

A policy of liberation is expedient "...in defending ourselves against an aggressive, imperialistic despotism. In order to roll back the Soviet despotism we must foster and aid the discontent of the captive counties, making it more difficult for the Soviets to rule.

Dulles assumes that there is already widespread discontent in the areas now under Soviet domination. Two examples he cites are:

(1) widespread discontent even within the Soviet Union itself. The Russian people are on the whole a religious people. They cannot be happy at the restraints placed upon their Russian Orthodox church.26
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Still more unhappy are the peoples in the overrun countries. In central Europe religion has long been a more dynamic force than in Russia.... Also in these areas there is a love of country which is powerful and makes the people resent the domination of Russia.27

Everywhere within Communist domination there is dissatisfaction.

Dulles believes that discontent is inherent in the methods of the Communists. Their use of fraudulent propaganda to come into power is one example. When the promises they make are not fulfilled the people become dissatisfied. The Communists have no intention of fulfilling most of the promises. In addition, they are not capable of improving conditions as they promise.

Dictatorships are arbitrary and inflexible. There is little delegation of responsibility. This results in the incapacity to be creative and constructive in the captive countries.28

The policy of liberation aims at preventing these people from being broken in mind and spirit which Communism seeks. The way the Soviets consolidate their position and complete encirclement is "...by monopolizing the physical means of access to men's minds and hearts. This is the purpose of the Iron Curtain".29

Dulles does not believe his policy of liberation would precipitate a general war. Encirclement would be frustrated. War, he contends, is most likely when encirclement is completed. "Peace depends
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upon the growing internal difficulties of the Soviet Union and its inability to consolidate its position.

The weaknesses of Communism are the "underlying distrust and suspicion within the top leadership and the lack of mobility which comes when there is little delegation of authority." These weaknesses are fatal under pressure.

The despotism of Soviet Communism needs to be subjected to the pressures which would come if we spread everywhere truth and hope and the conviction that the American people are uncompromisingly dedicated to the cause of human liberty and will not be willing to sacrifice that cause to make a self-serving deal with the despotic masters of the captive peoples.

**Techniques**

Specific acts and techniques of liberation stem from an overall propaganda program. Dulles has suggested a governmental department with adequate authority and resources to wage the war of ideas.

The planning of such activities could be centered in a high ranking authority, similar to the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the E. C. A., Dulles believes. We should meet the Soviet challenges on their own ground. They have made great gains through propaganda techniques. We must do the same.
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Specific steps to be taken are:

1. We could make clear on the highest authority of the President and Congress that the United States policy seeks as one of its peaceful goals the eventual restoration of genuine independence in the nations of Europe and Asia now dominated by Moscow and that we will not be a party to any deal confirming the rule of Soviet despotism over alien peoples which it now dominates.

2. We could welcome the creation in the free world of political task forces to develop a freedom program for each of the captive forces.

3. We could stimulate the escape from behind the Iron Curtain of those who can help develop these programs.

4. The activities of the Voice of America and Free Asia could be coordinate with these freedom programs.

5. We could coordinate our economic, commercial and cultural relations with these freedom programs, cutting off or licensing intercourse as seemed most effective from time to time.

6. We could end diplomatic relations with these present governments which are in fact puppets of Moscow, if and when that would promote the freedom programs.

7. We could seek to bring other free nations to unite with us in proclaiming, in a new Declaration of Independence, our policies toward captive nations.  

These policies will lead to a peaceful separation from Moscow, Dulles believes. They are based upon the assumption that there are inherent weaknesses within the Communist parties. If these weaknesses are capitalized upon and pressure exerted, the parties will disintegrate.

The Role of the United Nations

Dulles believes that the United Nations can play an important role in the world today. Although it does not maintain an international police force, it does hinder future aggression by reflecting moral judgments. The importance of moral judgments can be enhanced, Dulles thinks.

We shall do well to think of the United Nations as a place where discussion leads nations and people to form judgments which will influence their future conduct. Votes in the Assembly have practical significance if they measure underlying power in the world that is swayed by moral judgment.35

He implies that these moral judgments should reflect the number of guns, aircraft and manpower which could be used to enforce such decisions. Actually it would not be the moral judgments that deter aggression but the military might available. The moral judgments would reflect the will to use the military.

Dulles' idea of building up military strength to deter Russian aggression includes United Nations support. The statements he makes about predetermining by common consent, through constitutional and United Nations processes the use of retaliatory measures and of United Nations observers along the frontiers assumes United Nations support. He does not specify whether the United Nations would simply approve of United States action or whether the members of the United
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Nations would help supply the means of retaliation. In terms of what he says about the impossibility of an international police force at the present state of the world, it is difficult to determine just how this retaliatory force would be organized. It may be that he plans to use the already existing regional pacts such as the European Defense Pact to carry out action.

It is clear however that the main role of the United Nations is the formation of moral judgments and the will to enforce them. Dulles admits that the United Nations is still weak in terms of power. United States policy should aim at strengthening the power and prestige of the United Nations. The United Nations should not only be strengthened but should become the cornerstone of United States foreign policy. Dulles is not suggesting anything as radical as substituting the United Nations for United States policy or relieving the United States of major responsibilities of its own. He believes that this country should work through the United Nations.

Dulles has several proposals for strengthening the United Nations and making it into a more effective organization to preserve the peace.

The United Nations should reflect the reality of the world situation. Therefore its membership must be universal. Both the United States and Russia have prevented the admission of states on the basis of Article Four of the UN charter which provides that membership is
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open to all peace-loving states which accept the obligations of the 41
Charter and are able and willing to carry them out. Objections to
the membership of Italy, Eire, Jordan, by the USSR, and Rumania, Bul-
garia and Hungary by the United States rested on the contention that
they did not fulfill the conditions provided by Article Four. Dulles
does not believe that membership should be based on an ethical basis
of good or bad.

I have come to believe that the United
Nations will best serve the cause of
Peace if its assembly is representative
of what actually is and not merely rep-
resentative of the parts which we like.
Therefore we ought to be willing that all
nations should be members without attempt-
ing to appraise closely those which are
good and those which are bad. 42

He realizes that by making the United Nations membership univer-
sal, the favorable balance of power toward the United States may be
upset. However, he is willing to risk this in order to have a world
organization which is representative of the actual world situation.

Another proposal Dulles makes for strengthening the United Na-
tions is a system of weighted voting which would reflect more accur-
ately the power behind Assembly decisions. The greater powers
would have more votes than the smaller ones. The system of weighted
voting would be in addition to the present system and would not re-
place it. It would be similar to the system used in the United States
Congress. Dulles proposes a dual voting system. The present system
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of one vote representing the sovereign equality of each nation would be retained. Plus this, additional votes would be given to members depending upon population, productivity and power. He feels that Assembly decisions would then more accurately represent the power behind them.

The veto power of the Security Council should be curtailed to apply to matters of substance and not procedure. This is provided for in the Charter. "..but in fact it is applied to matters that in essence are procedural and do not in any way touch the substantive rights of any nation.

The United Nations Assembly should be the center for developing international law. It can proceed without hindrance of the Security Council and the latter's power of the veto. The Assembly, Dulles holds, can serve as a place for forming moral judgments upon which international law can be based. Any body of international law must deal with the individual and not exclusively the State.

Attempts at collective security must necessarily proceed along regional lines or some other association of the free world under Article 51 of the Charter. Dulles has approved as necessary the North Atlantic Pact and the Rio Pact of the Americas. However, he sees a danger of drawing precise lines of defense which these pacts imply, and he

44. Ibid., 196.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid., 283.
seems to prefer a more inclusive association of the free world. This he implies in his proposal for a community-punishing force.

Dulles hopes that the changes he proposes will be attempted in 1956 when the Charter comes up for revision.

The Unification of Western Europe

A very important task, Dulles feels, is the unification of Western Europe. Unification is necessary for two main reasons.

1. To build a strong (economically and militarily) European community to deter Russian aggression. 2. To provide for the peaceful integration of Germany into the Western community.

He contends that the reason for the past two World Wars has been the temptation that disunity has provided the aggressors. Each of these countries provide a rich conquest in terms of industrial strength and resources. Separately they cannot defend themselves against aggression. Collectively they could.

The strength of Western Europe depends upon German resources. In order that Germany may not become a military threat to the rest of Europe, she must be integrated into the community. Integration calls for strong counterbalancing forces which could be provided in a Federation.

Dulles sees no justifiable reason why Western Europe cannot unite.
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"The people have much the same beliefs and traditions and practices."\(^49\)

The only thing that prevents unification is that "...the tradition of national independence has become so deeply rooted that many politicians, officeholders, businessmen and beneficiaries of state aid feel that the least change involves risks for them. Those interested in protecting the status quo have had enough power to do so."

Western Europe to be strong must bury these nationalistic traditions. Dulles hopes that the pattern of unification will follow a federal type of government similar to the U. S. government.

Our unique political experience in the U. S. with the federal system is a rich reservoir on which to draw political ideas which can serve Europe and many other areas.\(^52\)

He believes that the United States has the moral right and responsibility to demand unification. We have the moral right to demand it because twice in the past thirty years we have helped save Europe from despotism. We have spent millions of dollars to rebuild Europe. Now they must help prevent another conflagration. It is to our self interest to have Europe unite. This is to prevent the loss of strategic areas in Europe. Our self interest coincides with the welfare of the European people.\(^54\)

\(^{49}\) Ibid., 212.  
\(^{50}\) Ibid., 214.  
\(^{51}\) Ibid., 216.  
\(^{52}\) Dulles, "A Policy of Boldness", op. cit., 157.  
\(^{53}\) John Foster Dulles, "Europe Must Federate or Perish", Vital Speeches (Feb 1, 1947), 236.  
\(^{54}\) Dulles, War or Peace, 217.
Policies in Asia

Dulles stresses the importance of the problems of the Far East and the Pacific. His interpretation of Stalin revealed that encirclement would proceed through the domination of the colonial areas. Therefore, according to Dulles, we must devise policies which will prevent this domination of colonial areas.

Essentially Dulles holds that our policies toward Asia should bear in mind the following considerations:

1. Any policies regarding Asia and the Pacific must be a logical development of the policy of a peaceful evolution to national independence. They should reinforce not undermine the independence of new nations.
2. Any policies for Asia and the Pacific must recognize the distinctive religions and cultures.

More concretely, our policies toward Japan can serve to show the Asiatics that freedom and democracy are to be preferred to Soviet Communism. Japan plays a key role in Dulles' solution to the problems of Asia.

The mood of the people of Japan, like the mood of other free peoples who are close neighbors of Asian communism, will in the long run depend on the actions and attitudes of other free nations. If they persevere in positive policies in support of real national independence in Asia, Japan will be a dependable and able coadjutor.
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If Japan is to become a dependable ally she must have access to raw materials and economic opportunities.

"As a long range proposition ... it can be said that it is obviously abnormal that Japan should be permanently divorced from raw materials and markets which are close at hand. But even accepting the fact that we do not need to conclude from it that Japan must eventually become a Communist satellite. There is another assumption and a sound assumption, that is that the present situation on the mainland must be changed....In other words we must and can assume that there will be a change from the present China situation which now compels the free nations temporarily to restrict closely their economic relations with the mainland of China.....We should assume the impermanence not the permanence of the present Moscow oriented rule of China."  

From this it can be concluded that Dulles proposes to extend his policy of liberation to China, perhaps utilizing the Japanese as a wedge between China and Moscow.

**Inconsistencies**

Dulles is caught in somewhat of a dilemma. He tries to be both power politician and churchman.

Dulles recognizes that in the world today there exist two competing ideologies: Communism, based upon a creed which is immoral, and Democracy, which is based upon a creed which is moral. According to him, there is no basis to believe that these two positions can be reconciled.

Since his ideal society rests upon the foundation of free so-

---
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cieties throughout the world, and, if he truly wants to realize this ideal society, he must change the existing situation.

He realizes that at the present time he is operating in a world in which power politics is the most important means of settling conflicts. Thus his dilemma. If he is to pursue his policies successfully, he must also resort to power politics. Max Lerner makes this observation about Dulles quite clear when he says:

The crucial trouble with Dulles' world is that he tries to be both a churchman relying on spiritual values and a power politician relying on an overwhelming balance of force. He cannot make the two parts of his intellectual world meet or tie the loose strings together. The result is that when Dulles appeals to the spiritual he sounds more unctuous than others, and when he maps out plans for strengthening Germany or Japan, he sounds more cynical than others. 60

Dulles' policy of a strong military establishment is an example of his dependence upon power politics. His policy of liberation he admits is a case of both expediency and a moral imperative. We have a moral duty to liberate these people. It is also to our self-interest to keep the Communists from retaining an overwhelming amount of power.

Hans Morgenthau points out, and I would agree with him, that the expediency of such a position may be invalidated by the utopian setting (or in the case of Dulles, the moral imperative). The moral

imperative demands that all the dominated countries including Soviet
Russia should be liberated. It does not take into consideration a
hierarchy of interests. Morgenthau points out:

...while the Soviet Union has a general
interest in keeping all captive nations
in that state, what is the hierarchy of
its interests in keeping, say Poland,
Eastern Germany and Bulgaria captive?
If we assume as we must on the historic
evidence of two centuries that Russia
would never give up control over Poland
without being compelled by force of arms,
would the objective of the liberation of
Poland justify the ruin of Western civil-
ization.....?61

Dulles does not seem to think these factors are important. If we
have a strong military establishment, the Russians will not provoke
a general war. Thus we can go ahead with our policy of liberation
without fear of the Soviet's retaliating in terms of armed force. Al-
though Dulles is conscious of the strength of Soviet power, he seems to
underestimate it in this case.

Dulles has reiterated constantly that we must regain our sense of
mission to bring hope to the captive peoples of the world.

Morgenthau points out that a nation with so all-embracing a moral
mission obviously needs enormous power.

Since the accomplishment of that moral
mission appears to be ordained by the
moral purposes of the universe, nature
must have endowed the nation with power
commensurate with its mission.

61. Hans Morgenthau, "Another Great Debate", American Political Science
Review, 64, (Dec 1952), 981.
62. Hans Morgenthau, In Defense of the National Interest, (New York:
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The belief in American omnipotence and a sense of mission, Morgenthau says, lends itself to the substitution of a crusade for a foreign policy. The political crusade is alleged omnipotence pursuing a universal moral goal. In light of Dulles' policy, a strong military force, and liberation, which is essentially the pursuit of moral goals, it seems that he may be guilty of the intellectual error which Morgenthau discusses.

If one takes the position of conducting a moral crusade, the traditional methods of diplomacy are no longer useful. Negotiations are submission to evil forces, compromise would be appeasement, agreement on spheres of influence would be immoral. The conflict must result in the unconditional surrender of the evil forces. For if any one holds, as Dulles does, that Communism is immoral, then any concessions to it would be immoral. Dulles refers several times to the fact that

...we will not be party to any deal confirming the rule of Soviet despotism over alien peoples.65

He says that we must spread the truth that:

...the American people are uncompromisingly dedicated to the cause of human liberty and will not be willing to sacrifice that cause in an effort to make a self serving deal with the despotic masters of the captive peoples.66

These statements indicate that Dulles will not resort to the traditional means of diplomacy, which some thinkers believe are the most
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successful means of dealing with Communism. Actually, Dulles could not, if he holds to his basic assumption of the belief in the moral law. To submit to Communist demands would be to submit to immoral forces.

The fusion of power politics and moral principles is also apparent in his proposals for the unification of Western Europe and the strengthening of the United Nations.

Western Europe should be unified because it will deter Russian aggression, Dulles says. It should also be unified because it has been the source of past conflagrations. The structure of government should be federal. Here Dulles assumes that what was best for the United States will be best for Europe. He sees no reason why unification cannot take place. The only thing that prevents it, he thinks, is nationalism. Nationalism as a force was recognized clearly by Dulles in 1939 in War, Peace and Change; it seems today that he minimizes its power.

He seems to want to use the United Nations as not only a forum for consolidating moral judgments but as a place for building up power to enforce these moral judgments. Here again may be seen the reliance upon power. United States policies should seek support in the United Nations. He contends that at the present time we must work with the others among the freedom loving nations. Although we cannot be completely successful because of the opposition from the Soviets, we must attempt to develop a body of international law. Dulles assumes that there is a consensus of moral opinion upon which international
law can be based. He would invoke this moral opinion against Soviet aggression. The question which arises is whether such a world public opinion exists and whether it exerts any restraining influence upon the international policies of governments.

Morgenthau points out:

The contrast between the community of psychological traits and elemental aspirations on the one hand and the absence of shared experiences, universal moral convictions and common political aspirations on the other, is far from providing evidence for the existence of a world public opinion, rather it demonstrates its impossibility as humanity is constituted in our age.67

The barrier of nationalism and its alliance with modern communications, have served to reduce the possibilities of world public opinion.

The nation is still the focal point for men's loyalties. Inevitably the members of the human race live and act politically, not as members of one world society applying standards of universal ethics, but as members of their respective national societies guided by their national standards of morality. Morgenthau, for example, says:

When a nation invokes world public opinion or the conscience of mankind in order to assure itself as well as other nations that its international policies meet the test of standards shared by men everywhere, it appeals to nothing real. It only yields to the tendency with which we have dealt before, to
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raise a particular national concept of morality to the dignity of universal law binding upon all mankind. for the religious there is the will of God to support their cause and believers witness the strange and singularly blasphemous spectacle of one and the same God blessing through his ministers the arms on either side of the battle line and leading both armies either to deserved victory or to deserved defeat. 69

If this is true, the possibility of developing a body of international practices within the United Nations is slight. For Dulles admits that the codification of law is dependent upon a consensus of moral judgment prevailing in the society. His approach to international law and organization seems to fall into the error which has been prevalent in our time. It is also easy to understand because of his basic assumptions. This error has been described by Kennan. It is the legalistic-moralistic approach to international problems. 70 Kennan describes this approach as "...the belief that it is possible to suppress chaotic and dangerous aspirations of government in the international field by the acceptance of some system of legal rules and restraints". This belief stems from the successful experience of our government in establishing a common institutional and judicial framework for resolving conflicts. Those who hold this belief do not see why the same solution cannot be applied to the international field. Kennan points out several weaknesses of this approach. In the first place, it assumes that all nations, like ours, are reasonably content with the interna-
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tional borders and status. This Kennan holds is not true. We tend to
underestimate the maladjustments and discontents throughout the world.
Secondly, while this concept is often associated with a revolt against
nationalism, it tends to increase nationalism and enhances sovereignty.
"It envisages a world of exclusively sovereign national states with full
equality of status." It ignores the law of change. Finally, the
legalistic approach is faulty in its assumption concerning the possi-
bility of the use of sanctions. Collective action can lead as easily
as any other to complete destruction if the aggressor is a powerful
country.

The association of the legalistic approach with the moral ap-
proach has even more disastrous consequences. The carrying over of
right and wrong judgments on the affairs of nations leads to total
wars. If a nation breaks the law it is immoral. Wars fought in the
name of moral principles seek their ends in total domination.

In 1939 Dulles seemed to be aware of the weaknesses of this ap-
proach. His discussion of dynamic nations, allowance for change, re-
strictions of treaties and international law on change showed that he
was aware of these factors. At present, his concern with developing
international law, the establishment of an organization of equally sov-
ereign nations, his moralistic approach to international problems, all
indicate that he no longer considers these weaknesses as important.

72. Ibid., 98.
73. Ibid., 100.
The question arises as to what has caused Dulles to ignore some of his earlier insights into international relations. His analysis of nationalism was quite acute. He recognized the fact that wars in the future may be carried on under the guise of competing philosophies of government, which is what has happened. Is it because the world situation has changed so drastically, or is it due to the fact that Dulles has changed, or is it a combination of both?

No doubt the situation in the world has changed. Now the United States is faced with an extremely powerful hostile force. In 1939 we were also faced with a hostile power — Fascism. However, Dulles seems to feel that the threat today is much more powerful than existed then. Perhaps this is true. But does it account for his emphasis upon moral issues?

Perhaps the changes in Dulles' thinking are due first of all to his elevation to positions of power, and secondly to the importance which he now places upon religion.

Frederick Schuman has pointed out that holders of power invariably present their policies in terms of moral abstractions. This does not mean that Dulles does not believe what he says. In light of his statements regarding the moral law, justice, liberty, etc., he is probably sincere in his belief that we must oppose Communism because it is "immoral".

There is also the possibility that this dependence upon religion

and fear of Communism is the result of what Schuman describes as: 76 "psychic insecurity". This is the result of the increasing insecurities which result from the American economic system. Doubts are prevalent as to the superiority of the system. Thus Communism has provided a scapegoat for inner doubts and guilts. Aggression and frustration are turned against Communism. Fear of Russia is the stimulus.

Dulles also turns to Christianity. He sees in Democracy the political embodiment of Christianity. Democracy can now be defended in terms of the latter. Thus the political crusade not only results in bringing the true political religion to the world but also the true theological religion.

Comparison and Implications

One of the most controversial aspects of Dulles' program of action is the liberation policy. Liberation is aimed at increasing the internal difficulties of Soviet despotism to such a degree that their ability to carry out external adventures becomes limited. The question arises as to the possibility of such a program.

In the first place Dulles assumes that there is considerable discontent in the USSR due to the restraints placed upon the Russian Orthodox church. However, as one writer points out:

The appeal to Russian religiosity has been tried many times since Pope Benedict XV on May 1, 1917, immediately

76. Ibid., 810.
after the Russian Revolution issued the Dei Providentus detaching the Roman Catholic Churches Congregation for the Eastern Church from the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith and making in its own right a crusading agency. Pope Pius XI went further with the Sancta Dei Ecclesia in 1938 after the worst of the Soviet purges. The Jesuits have never ceased their efforts to save the religious Russians from the Stalinist anti-Christ. 77

This suggests that a program based upon such an objective as religious feelings may be quite futile.

Another assumption of this policy is that increased pressure on the satellite countries would accelerate a break away from Moscow. Actually the fear of American intervention in the domestic affairs of these nations may drive them closer to Moscow. It may be that the way the Soviet leaders can keep such a stranglehold on the satellites is by the threat of United States intervention. 78

What would have happened in Yugoslavia if we had proceeded with Dulles' policies? Schlesinger, in his criticism of Burnham's theoretical justification of liberation, points out that, if we had proceeded on this policy, it is very unlikely that we would have Tito as an ally today. The policy would have ended relations with Tito, established King Peter as head of the government in exile, sent in arms and agents to Michailovich's guerillas, inundated the Yugoslavian people with leaflets, and made a public commitment to overthrow the Communist regime. 79

It is very unlikely that Tito would have been able to pull away from the Moscow regime and ally his government with the Western nations.

An additional weakness of this policy was pointed out above. The expediency of such a program is to be questioned. Is the Soviet Union likely to stand by if we attempt to liberate a country like Poland? What would happen if the propaganda and subversive activity do encourage a Polish resistance movement and the Communist leaders in that country are not able to cope with it and appeal to the Russians for help? If the Russians intervene we would consider it an act of aggression. In that case we would have to come to the aid of Poland which would result in a full scale World War. The policy of liberation seems to lead inevitably to wholesale destruction.

**Western Europe**

Dulles' plan for Western Europe shows little insight into the problems which exist in this area. His attempt to impose a federal type of government on the Europeans to insure European unity meets severe criticism. His conception of the Marshall Plan's purpose to insure this unity was an oversimplification. The Marshall Plan and assistance under the Mutual Security Act have been designed to strengthen the ability of Europe and Britain, and through Britain, the Commonwealth, to recover from the last war, to withstand Communism and play their part in the North Atlantic Alliance. They were not devised to impose the federal form of government upon Europe. Dulles raises the question of whether EDC was used to ward off the Communist threat or
Dulles' policy of righteousness also creates resentment among the Europeans. He says that Europe has always been a fire trap. We have a moral right to change the situation. Dulles insinuates that the United States has always been without sin in the past. This attitude of moral superiority may do more to break any semblance of an alliance of the United States and Europe, rather than create a unified Western World.

Chapter 4  Conclusions

Although Dulles has written two books and made many speeches about the world situation and international relations in general, it is sometimes difficult to understand clearly just how he does conceive of the world. Part of this lack of clarity is due to the fact that Dulles does not delineate his position with the accuracy of the scholar. He makes many ambiguous statements and does not elaborate upon them. Consequently one is sometimes led to assume that Dulles means one thing when actually he may mean something else.

There are some important concepts which Dulles does not discuss at all. The problems of sovereignty, national interest and power are not treated in his writings. It is not known whether Dulles' omissions are due to a lack of interest or awareness, or whether they are so obvious to him that he does not feel discussion is necessary.

For these reasons, it cannot be said that John Foster Dulles has a systematic theory. On the other hand, he is not without a theory of international relations. He does have definite ideas about certain aspects of the world situation. He visualizes an ideal type of society and sets forth the principles upon which this society should be based. He has proposed policies which, in his estimation, will improve the existing situation and move toward his stated ideal.

The ideal society he envisages is based upon lofty and well meaning principles. No one would deny that a world society based upon true brotherhood and love for one's fellow men would be the ideal attainment.
A society which substitutes internationalism for nationalism would possibly be a more peaceful society. However, Dulles' dogmatism and insistence upon the Christian concept of brotherhood and love set certain limits on his notion of an ideal international society.

Dulles' picture of the world today, as expressed in what may be considered his personal views, takes account of the forces of nationalism, the danger of Communism and the present measures devised to cope with Communism. His analysis of nationalism is quite sound. It is questionable whether or not he sees the real danger of Communism today. His support of the basic principles upon which the United Nations is founded indicates his appreciation of the tasks confronting that organization and the difficulties it faces in meeting them.

The policies he proposes for the United States, which in his judgment would lead to the attainment of the ideal society do not seem well founded in fact or expediency. The policy of liberation could easily lead to a total disastrous world war. His proposals for the federation of Western Europe show little insight into the problems of that area.

It has been pointed out that Dulles does not always adhere to what seems to be his personal view. He is not consistent. His actions sometimes completely repudiate his statements. At other times he has made statements which contradict previous statements. This is especially true when he is engaged in political activity as was evidenced by his behavior in the 1952 Republican campaign. This raises the question of the type of man Dulles really is. How can we really
know what he means and what he is likely to do as Secretary of State?

It may be argued that while Dulles does have certain convictions, i. e., religious and moral, he sometimes finds it necessary to compromise his principles in order to attain certain goals. It is well known that Dulles has long aspired to the office of Secretary of State. In writing the Republican platform and during the campaign he distorted facts and contradicted previous positions in order to present a case which would win votes for the Republican Party. In the event of a Republican victory he felt he would be assured the post of Secretary of State. Now that he has attained that office he seems to be reverting to his original position as much as possible. In this case, he may have felt that it was necessary temporarily to compromise his principles in order to gain the support of groups that would put him in power, thereby being enabled to translate his ideas into practice. In such an interpretation, his inconsistencies are explained largely as accommodations to expediency.

A second alternative may be that Dulles' moral position and his appeals to religious convictions and sentiments are superficial. They may be a cloak for more deeply rooted convictions about free enterprise and nationalism. His desire for what he terms a spiritual society with a minimum of government controls and emphasis upon the individual may be interpreted as a dislike for government intervention. His insistence upon the United States regaining its spiritual mission may be a disguise for a program of American imperialism. He may be advocating
the rehabilitation of the world in the image of the United States. In this case his inconsistencies may be more dangerous.

A third alternative may be that Dulles really does not know what he wants. He was sternly indoctrinated in childhood in Presbyterian teachings. These may have become deeply rooted in his thinking. Yet when he faces actual situations he finds he cannot act according to these principles and be successful. He may be torn between the way he would really like to act and the needs of successful achievement. In this case, Dulles reflects the confusion of a major segment of modern day society.

There remains the possibility that Dulles does not recognize or appreciate his own inconsistency. In view of his intellectual powers, however, it does not seem too likely that he doesn't realize that during the Republican platform he contradicted statements he had made only two months before. It does not seem very probable that he is unaware of what he is saying from one day to the next.

These, then, are the alternatives to the question: "How do we know what type of a man Dulles is, and how will he act in the future?" It is not possible at this time to say definitely what Dulles' motivations are. Nor is it possible to predict with any accuracy what Dulles' actions may be in the future. All one can properly do at this stage is present Dulles' ideas, inquire into their implications and validity, and suggest possible motivations for his actions.
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