

124
85

**FACULTY
RESEARCH
EDITION**

of

**The Savannah State
College Bulletin**

SAVANNAH STATE COLLEGE LIBRARY
STATE COLLEGE BRANCH
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

Volume 10, No. 2

October, 1956

published by
SAVANNAH STATE COLLEGE
State College Branch
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

FACULTY RESEARCH EDITION

Published by

THE SAVANNAH STATE COLLEGE

Volume 10, No. 2

Savannah, Georgia

October, 1956

William K. Payne, President

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

W. H. M. Bowens

J. Randolph Fisher

Joan L. Gordon

Calvin L. Kiah

Alonzo T. Stephens

Ben Ingersoll

R. Grann Lloyd, Chairman

Articles are presented on the authority of their writers, and neither the Editorial Committee nor Savannah State College assumes responsibility for the views expressed by contributors.

1

Contributors

William H. M. Bowens, Director of Audio-Visual Center

Ella W. Fisher, Instructor in Physical Education

Phillip J. Hampton, Instructor in Fine Arts

Thelma M. Harmond, Assistant Professor of Education

Madeline G. Harrison, Assistant Professor
and Assistant Librarian

Luella Hawkins, Associate Professor and Librarian

Walter Larkins, Assistant Professor of
Languages and Literature

R. Grann Lloyd, Professor of Economics and Chairman of
the Instructional Staff Committee on College-wide
Improvement of English

Alonzo T. Stephens, Associate Professor of Social Sciences

Althea M. Williams, Assistant Professor and
Assistant Librarian

Martha W. Wilson, Assistant Professor of Mathematics

The Savannah State College Bulletin is published in October, December, February, March, April, and May by Savannah State College. Entered as second-class matter, December 16, 1947, at the Post Office at Savannah, Georgia, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

34834

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Student Reading at Savannah State College Library	50
<i>Luella Hawkins, Althea M. Williams and Madeline G. Harrison</i>	
A Critical Analysis of Selected Freshman and Sophomore Test Scores and Quality Point Ratios of 87 Savannah State College Students Enrolled in the Gen- eral Education Curriculum	5
<i>Martha W. Wilson</i>	
The Status of Audio-Visual Edu- cation in South Carolina's Ac- credited Negro High Schools	11
<i>William H. M. Bowens</i>	
The Report of An Experimental Study Designed to Improve English Usage	24
<i>William H. M. Bowens, Ella W. Fisher, Thelma M. Harmond, Walter Larkins, and R. Grann Lloyd</i>	
An Historical Analysis of the Growth of America's Massive Retaliatory Foreign Policy	28
<i>Alonzo T. Stephens</i>	
Impressions of College Art	43
<i>Phillip J. Hampton</i>	

An Historical Analysis of the Growth Of America's Massive Retaliatory Foreign Policy

By Alonzo T. Stephens

An old slogan, "The best defense is the best offense," has become the United States' slogan for her foreign policy. With Thule, Greenland, the United States' huge 480 acre military installation five hours from Moscow, with Alaska, California and New York within a few hours flying time of Russia, a new theory of defense is in the making. Many experts and lay Americans feel that our chief defense reliance must rest upon our offensive capability. They also believe that we must be able to destroy the enemy's airfields, atomic facilities, submarine bases and launching sites and to pose the threat of "bigger and better retaliation" against the enemy's cities.

Many Americans are unaware of the new foreign policy. How did it originate? Why did we change? In 1782 John Adams made this famous statement: "America has been long enough involved in the wars of Europe. She has been a football between contending nations from the beginning . . ." ¹

The United States from 1607 to 1783 was but the farthest fringe of Europe; she was Europe's frontier. Georgia was established as a buffer colony to protect the Carolinas from the Spaniards and the Indians. Between 1689 and 1815 England and France fought seven times. Four of these wars were fought while the Americans were still colonials. Colonial experience convinced the leaders of the United States that it was decidedly to the advantage of the new nation to stay on its own side of the Atlantic. Geography made possible its partial fulfillment during the national period, therefore, isolation from the wars of Europe became the American foreign policy. After the Spanish-American War this concept was gradually abandoned because we had become imperialistic.

During the American Revolution, the foreign affairs of the United States were directed by the Second Continental Congress, a confederation with representatives from the thirteen colonies. The members of this body had the memory of the Seven Years War, 1756-1763, (The French and

¹Thomas A. Bailey, *A Diplomatic History of the American People*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., p. 1.

Indian War, 1754-1763), to guide their thinking. In November 1775 the thirteen-state confederation commissioned Arthur Lee, a Virginian, to seek peace with England. On March 3, 1776 this body sent Silas Deane to France as a "commercial" agent. Both commissions were granted prior to the Declaration of Independence.

Our first military alliance came during the year of the American Revolution. The Americans were reluctant to enter into a military alliance with France for the memory of the involvement in the conflicts of Europe was still painfully fresh. However, faced with the necessity of help, America and France on February 6, 1778 signed two pacts. Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane following closely the "Plan of 1776" received a liberal treaty of amity and commerce, which granted privileges to American shipping. The second and more important treaty, that of alliance, carried these important provisions: Both France and America would fight England until American independence was assured; both nations would consult the other before signing a "truce or peace" with Great Britain; and each of the two nations guaranteed the possessions of the other in America against all other powers, particularly Great Britain and Spain. The French terms were received with rejoicing in the United States, despite the growth of the isolationist tradition, because the American colonies were in dire need of outside help.

This treaty of Alliance was our first military alliance. It was also to be our last for many years. By the end of 1780 Britain was fighting with her back to the wall. Catherine II of Russia and Vergennes of France took the lead in organizing the Baltic Nations into the Armed Neutrality of 1780 which discouraged the British and inspired their enemies. By April, 1782 John Adams secured from the Netherlands a formal recognition of the independence of the United States.

The alliance with France paid off, for on September 3, 1783 the British recognized the complete independence of the United States. The thirteen colonies now had become a legal nation.

Immediately after the end of the Revolutionary War Great Britain set out to mend relations between herself and the young American nation, a policy which resulted in our ultimate isolationist tradition. On November 19, 1794, George Hammond and John Jay signed a treaty which states "that the United States would under no circumstances join the Armed Neutrality." Jay was damned for such action. Nevertheless the Jay Treaty helped to hasten a settlement with Spain. On October 27, 1795, the Madrid government concluded a treaty with Thomas Pinckney which gave the

United States free navigation of the Mississippi, the right to deposit goods at New Orleans, the boundary of Florida at the 31st parallel, and a promise from Spain to restrain the Indian on the American frontier.²

It is important to understand that the Americans regarded the Treaty of 1778 as a war measure against Great Britain. On April 22, 1793 George Washington issued his Neutrality Proclamation which signaled the withdrawal of the United States from old world embroilments a manifesto of diplomatic independence.³ Washington's valedictory came on September 19, 1796 upon which occasion he said: "It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world . . . We may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies. . . ." ⁴

The Federalist party established as the polestar of American diplomacy the policies of peace, neutrality, non-interference and nonintervention. Jefferson was to modify this policy through embargo and neutrality; Madison was to have war; Monroe was to have isolation and the Monroe Doctrine and the United States was to become less and less involved in the affairs of Europe until 1898.

The American nation went through the horrible Civil War without becoming involved in a military alliance. The thirty years following this conflict the nation became a world power being made possible in part by the unwritten agreement to the Monroe Doctrine by Great Britain. In the years 1898 to 1900 the expansionists and imperialists overpowered the isolationists and Americans began to think about such things as the "open door" for China, the Panama Canal for themselves, based on the theories of the "end justifying the means" and "a mandate from civilization."

The Russians, by 1867, having ruthlessly "furred out" Alaska, were eager to unload their frozen asset on the United States. Russia wanted to strengthen the United States as a barrier against their ancient enemy Great Britain. The Republicans with the ardent expansionist, Secretary of State Seward, purchased the frigid territory for the bargain price of \$7,200,000 and started the Department of State on a path of expansionism while the average American was still preoccupied with reconstruction and internal problems. Why did Congress sanction the purchase of Alaska? Russia had been friendly to the North during the Civil War and

²Bailey, *op. cit.*, p. 68 (See also S. F. Bemis', *Pinckney's Treaty*, Baltimore, 1926); and A. P. Whitaker's *The Spanish-American Frontier; 1783-1795* (Boston 1927).

³C. M. Thomas, *American Neutrality in 1793*, (N.Y., 1931), pp. 47-48.

⁴J. D. Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, (Washington, 1896), I, 223.

“we did not feel that we could offend our great and good friend, the Czar, by hurling his walrus-covered icebergs back into his face. Besides, the territory was rumored to be teeming with furs, fish and gold. . . .”⁵

Marcus Alonzo Hanna, the iron millionaire and President-maker, believing in the Hamiltonian functions of government selected ex-Congressman William McKinley of Ohio to keep the United States on the road of expansionism. With 271 to 176 electoral votes the Republicans were sure in 1896 that the Americans wanted an empire. Alexander Hamilton again triumphed from the grave and the apostles of Big Business had a field day.

Following are some of the notable sentiments in William McKinley’s speech at the Pan-American Exposition at Buffalo, September 5, 1901, which were received with great enthusiasm:

Isolation is no longer possible, or desirable. We must not rest in fancied security that we will forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not. We must encourage our merchant marine. We must have more ships. They must be under the American flag. We must build an Isthmian canal. The construction of a Pacific cable can no longer be postponed.⁶

A mournful interest soon attached to William McKinley’s last public address delivered to the great throng at Buffalo, for Thursday, September 5, was a long ovation to him. This statement explains the reason for the need for possessions overseas.

Our industrial enterprises, which have grown to such great proportions, affect the homes and occupations of the people and the welfare of the country. Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problems of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention.⁷

McKinley made the observation that a policy of good will and friendly trade relations would prevent reprisals for reciprocity treaties which would be in harmony with the spirit of the times as measures of retaliation were not. In asking for larger commerce and truer fraternity he said:

⁵Thomas A. Bailey, *The American Pageant: A History of the Republic*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1956, p. 481.

⁶G. W. Townsend, *Memorial Life of William McKinley*, Washington: Memorial Publishing Company, 1901, p. 146.

⁷*Ibid.*, 148.

We must build the Isthmian canal, which will unite the two oceans and give a straight line of water communication with the western coasts of Central and South America and Mexico. Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness and peace to all our neighbors, and like blessings to all the peoples and powers of the earth.⁸

William McKinley's death, the Spanish-American War, Dewey's guns in the Pacific and Theodore Roosevelt's inauguration was in reality a gigantic coming-out party. An exhilarating new spirit suffused America. Roosevelt, with his impulsiveness and radicalism, out-Bryaned Bryan and announced after McKinley's death that he would carry out the policies of his distinguished predecessor.⁹ The Rough Rider had both a big stick and a big voice.

The hand-picked William Howard Taft was selected by Roosevelt to carry out American policies, a situation comparable to the selection of Martin Van Buren by Andrew Jackson in 1837.

Woodrow Wilson reversed the diplomacy of Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft. His theory of diplomacy was not based in terms of material interest. He negotiated thirty pacts during 1913 and 1914 based on conciliation. Wilson thought of "Human Rights" and "Property Rights" and sought neutrality. Wilson made a genuine effort to pursue a strict neutral course during the first World War, but soon found himself gravitating more and more to the side of the allies. Woodrow Wilson managed to keep America neutral throughout the war which in the end spelled his defeat in the League of Nations and the defeat of his program for World Peace.

The great rejection of Wilson's Fourteen Points, even though four-fifths of the Senators professed to favor the treaty, haunted the American people in the decade following the election of Warren G. Harding. Traditionalism, southern sectionalism, isolation, disillusionment, plain ignorance and politics all confused the picture. Harding winning the election of 1920 by a 404 to 127 electoral margin was mistaken as a mandate against the League of Nations. The public-smashing Wilsonism adopted the slogan "Return to Normalcy."

The ultimate collapse of the Treaty of Versailles was in part the United States' idea of claiming advantages and opportunities without duties or responsibilities. The United States made its own restless bed when it buried its head in

⁸*Ibid.*, 150.

⁹Bailey, *The American Pageant*, p. 636.

the sands. President Harding was unsuited for his new position. In the Senate he had followed the party whips on domestic legislation and Henry Cabot Lodge on foreign policy and issues concerning peace. It was too much of a task for him to change with so much conditioning prior to assuming the role of President of the United States.

America's foreign policy reached its nadir under the administration of "Silent" Calvin Coolidge, the homespun vice-president who took over the presidency in August 1923. In the 1920's the revisionist historians wrote that Germany had not been solely responsible for the war which began in 1914. In this age of uncultured materialism and jazz-and-gin, citizens of the United States became cynical while prohibition spawned gangsterism and hypocrisy flourished. During most of the campaign of 1924 Coolidge remained quietly in Washington, for he seemed to feel that active campaigning was undignified. He responded to Democratic attacks with complete silence. Perhaps the Democratic slogan, "A Vote for Coolidge is a Vote for Chaos,"¹⁰ best describes his administration in both the domestic and foreign fields. In Paris, on August 27, 1928, the Kellogg-Briand Treaty was signed by fifteen powers. War as an instrument of national policy was solemnly renounced but no explanation was given as to how such a renunciation was to be enforced.

In the 1928 election scramble, it seemed that the former chairman of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, Chairman of the Interallied Food Council during the recent war and Secretary of Commerce under both Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge was the man suited for the job as president of a nation recognized as a major power. Hoover made his fatal step when he adopted full measure the policies of his former Republican executives. Life was full of promise and America's future looked rosy, but the picture looked far from promising. "Two cars in every garage and two chickens in every pot had little foundation in reality."¹¹ On October 24, 1929, only seven months after Hoover took office, the market crashed and the Republicans, the nation and the world were headed toward impending disaster.

Franklin D. Roosevelt and his "New Deal" diplomacy was dedicated to the policy of the good neighbor. He recognized Russia as a sister nation on November 16, 1933 and made efforts to open markets for foreign trade. During the Seventh International Conference of American States, which met at Montevideo in 1933, Roosevelt supported the idea that "no state has the right to intervene in the internal or

¹⁰Stefan Lorant, *The Presidency*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951, p. 563.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 577.

external affairs of another.”¹² On December 28, 1933, Roosevelt announced that the “definite policy of the United States from now in is one opposed to armed intervention.” From 1933 to 1939 the United States remained neutral allowing purchasers of munitions to operate on a “come and get it” and “cash on the barrel head” basis.¹³

In December, 1941, the United States still was working on the basis of lend-lease. This bill passed the Senate by the vote of 60 yeas and 31 nays, while in the House the vote was 317 yeas and 71 nays. American public opinion favored lend lease while Congress was divided. On December 7, 1941, the Japanese brought the war to America. After this horrible conflict during which time we signed the Atlantic Charter and made extensive secret plans for war against the Axis powers, America was rapidly moving into a new phase of international relations. The people of the United States were now determined that the end of World War II should bring peace in our time.

For the first time in history the United States was now making serious efforts to make military pacts during peace time. Modern technological advances made this action necessary. American public opinion was only to follow the natural course which had been dictated by the scientists. Man must follow a natural law, that of survival and defense based on offense. This theory was over a century in the making—how long it would be the basis of the United States’ foreign policy no one could truthfully say.

In 1947 the United States concluded the Rio Pact under which the signatory nations pledged themselves in the event of aggression against any one of them, to provide assistance to that nation on request. This pact was signed by the United States and twenty Latin American Republics. A second pact, the North Atlantic Treaty, was signed in April, 1949, under which the United States and thirteen North Atlantic Nations agreed to regard and attack on all, and to aid the one attacked.

In August, 1951, the United States and the Philippine Nation signed a treaty by which they served notice on any “potential aggressor” in the Pacific area that they would stand together in the face of any armed attack from outside. Then in September, 1951, the United States and Japan signed a treaty under which the United States is granted the right to keep land, sea and air forces in Japan as a means of contributing to the maintenance of peace and security in the Far East.¹⁴

¹²Bailey, *op. cit.*, p. 739.

¹³See *The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*. (New York: 1938), II, p. 545.

¹⁴*The New York Times*, Sunday, July 19, 1953, p. E. 5.

The Anzus Pact, a treaty signed in September, 1951, between the United States, New Zealand and Australia, under which each member-nation acknowledges that an attack in the Pacific area against any of the others will involve all, concluded the pacts of the Truman administration.¹⁵ This was a new road for the democratic party. It was also a new foreign policy for the American people.

This new foreign policy although constructed by the Truman administration, was soon to be enlarged by the present Eisenhower administration. He promised that aid to Europe would be continued with the Allies matching United States contributions, according to their capabilities. Mr. Eisenhower promised that his "new foreign policy" would be the true product of bi-partisanship based on cooperation between the President and Congress. He also promised that it would be coherent and global. More specifically in January 1953, Mr. Eisenhower said in his State of the Union message: "The policy we embrace must be a coherent global policy. The freedom we cherish and defend in Europe and in the Americas is no different from the freedom that is imperiled in Asia."¹⁶

After making it clear that our foreign policy must make the free world secure, Mr. Eisenhower continued:

1. The policy we pursue will recognize the truth that no single country even one so powerful as ours, can alone defend the liberty of all nations threatened by Communist aggression from without or subversion within.
2. Mutual security means effective mutual cooperation. For the United States, this means that as a matter of common and natural interest, we shall give help to other nations in the measure they strive earnestly to do their full share of the common task. No wealth of aid could compensate for poverty of spirit. The heart of every free nation must be honestly dedicated to the preserving of its own independence and security.¹⁷

The President stressed the hope that our policy would foster the advent of practical unity in Western Europe. The fact that Germany and Austria were not united made this statement very important. He again stated that "only a more closely integrated economic and political system can provide the greatly increased economic strength needed to maintain both necessary military readiness and respectable living standards."¹⁸ All informed persons can readily see

¹⁵*Ibid.*

¹⁶*The New York Times*, February 3, 1953, C., 12.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁸*Loc. cit.*

that this was not a "new foreign policy," but merely an approval of the Democratic policy which would be continued under the present administration under the label of the "Republican Party."

This new foreign policy concept was based upon the idea that the Soviet would reverse her policy by the end of the war or shortly after. The Orthodox Marxian conviction that a war such as World War II would lead to a fatal capitalistic crisis undoubtedly caused a Soviet shift. Some writers have advanced the view that the Soviets thought the United States would return to isolationism and withdraw from the European Continent. Here the United States did not take the road she took following the end of World War I. The power conflict between the United States and Russia is enhanced by the fact that both of them are economically fairly self-contained.¹⁹ As a result both nations have resorted to pacts and treaties within their respective orbits.

By 1948 the United States set as its basic foreign policy the support of any government that faced Soviet pressure and communist menace, and Turkey and Greece came within the first line of defense. The embarkation on the Truman Doctrine brought not only an historic and revolutionary turn in the United States foreign policy, but served to halt further Russian encroachment in the West and in the Near East.

The century-old Straits (Dardanelles) problem was raised during negotiations with the Allies at Yalta and later at Potsdam. This new significance in American presence in the Middle East posed difficult problems, for it meant that the United States could not play the role of an "honest broker," a Third Power which in a benevolent and disinterested way would attempt to mitigate international rivalries in the area. In 1951 the real problem for the United States in its Middle Eastern policies was identical with that of Britain, namely, how to achieve a lasting and wise Anglo-American cooperation which would secure this vital area for the free World. The British represent the power on the ground and the Americans represent the ultimate economic and atomic power.

On September 26, 1953, Spain abandoned her traditional policy of neutrality, which had kept her outside two world-wide conflicts in this century by signing a defense agreement giving the United States the right to use a number of Spanish air and naval bases for the defense of Western Europe and the Mediterranean. The accord extends for ten and possibly twenty years. It is understood that the United States would proceed with the development and

¹⁹Anatole G. Mazour, *Russia Past and Present*, New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1951, p. 716.

construction of four major airports, two in Southern, one in Central and one in Northern Spain, and of naval facilities in two harbors, Cartagena and Cadiz.

According to the report sent to the *New York Times*, the United States Congress has appropriated "a total of \$226,000,000 to implement the agreements which were signed in Madrid by Alberto Martin Artago, Spanish Foreign Minister, and James C. Dunn, United States Ambassador to Spain."²⁰ Of that amount \$141,000,000 would be used for military assistance and \$85,000,000 would be used for economic programs in Spain.

This United States-Spanish pact was long debated and in the end military necessity triumphed over ideological factors. Two factors appear to have contributed most to the decision to sign a pact with Spain: (1) The passage of time, which allowed wartime convictions against the Fascist nature of Franco Spain to go stale, (2) the mounting threat of Communist aggression.

Senators Tom Connally, the late Arthur H. Vandenberg and Robert A. Taft and Senator Pat McCarran all worked toward a treaty with Spain. In 1946 Washington conforming to a United Nations resolution, refused to send an ambassador to Madrid. However, this policy was seen to be in error by 1949 when a reapproachment between Washington and Madrid began to gain force. In January, 1950, Dean Acheson, wrote Senator Connally that the withdrawal of the United States Ambassador from Spain "had been a mistaken departure from established diplomatic procedure." Even now leading officials point out that the acceptance of the pact does not imply approval of further integration of Spain into the fabric of Western defense.²¹

The United States-Spanish pact contains a preamble and five articles. The preamble reads:

Faced with the danger that threatens the western world, the Governments of the United States and Spain, desiring to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security through foresighted measures which will increase their capability and that of the other nations which dedicate their efforts to the same high purposes to participate effectively in agreements for self-defense have agreed as follows: . . .²²

By 1956 thoughtful Americans had an answer to the question: What Spain does with United States dollars? In Barcelona, Madrid, and a dozen other Spanish cities fa-

²⁰*The New York Times*, September 27, 1953, p. 15.

²¹*The New York Times*, September 27, 1953, p. 15.

²²*The New York Times*, September 27, 1953, p. 16.

miliar American signs appear—General Electric, Firestone, Esso, Westinghouse, General Tire, Caltex-Socony, Vacuum, Armstrong Cork, South American and Spanish-American names such as Sociedad Espanola de Construccion Babcock and Wilcox.²³

American businessmen are paged in the leading hotels, especially the Castellana-Hilton and the Palace in Madrid. Machinery made in the United States is at work the length and breadth of the Spanish peninsula in an attempt to carry out the Spanish-American agreement of September 26, 1953, a joint defense of western Europe against communist aggression. It was estimated that at the peak in late 1953 and early 1954 at least 1,000 Americans entered Spain each month.²⁴ Latest Spanish statistics place the number of transient Americans at 6,363. This figure did not include American tourists nor the 1,623 Americans listed as residents.

This new foreign policy has as many obligations as it has ramifications. It is based on public opinion and each person in America will share in its application regardless of his political or economic status. Most Americans are concerned because it is costly and yet they are told it is cheaper to arm to prevent war than to wait, save and contribute later in an attempt to win a war.

Mr. Eisenhower speaking at his White House News Conference on October 8, 1953 acknowledged the fact that the Russians had developed a highly explosive bomb when he said:

The development has not come as a surprise. We had always estimated that it had been within the scientific and technical capabilities of the Soviet to reach this point . . . The Soviets now possessed a stockpile of atomic weapons of conventional types, and we furthermore had to conclude that the powerful explosion of August 12 last . . . was far in excess of the conventional types.²⁵

What about the cost of this so-called new foreign policy? According to a report published in the New York Times, Monday, October 19, 1953, foreign aid by the United States was higher than any other year since World War II. In the 1952 fiscal year gross foreign aid amounted to \$5,098,000,000 and the net was \$4,606,000,000. For the fiscal year end June 30, 1953 the total cost of foreign aid was \$7,030,000,000 an increase instead of the promised decrease.²⁶

²³Alden H. Syphen, ed., "What Spain Does With United States Dollar," *Nations Business*, September 1955, Vol. 43 No. 8, p. 28-29.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 30, 70.

²⁵*The New York Times*, October 9, 1953, p. 12.

²⁶*The New York Times*, October 19, 1953.

Meanwhile the world was still in a state of disorder. The foreign ministers of France, the United Kingdom and the United States met in London, October 16, 17, and 18, 1953. In London they discussed topics which were global. The agenda included talks on the German Peace Conference, the Austrian Peace Conference, the problem of Trieste, the problem of Israel, problems in the Far East, the problem of a consolidated truce in Korea and the problem of unrest in Indo-China.²⁷ Americans were now learning world history faster than the history of their own land.

The question now comes to the point when one may ask, "can we live in our world in peace sharing our economic goods with each other?" Russia and even France, our ally in Western Europe, are trying to find a solution to this question. It is now known that these two countries have an agreement under which France promised to deliver during July 1953-1954 period 100,000 tons of rolled steel products; 3,000 tons of lead; 3,000 tons of cork; 200 mechanical cranes; 25 steam boilers; 800,000 meters of woolen, linens and artificial silks; 8,000,000 steel cables and numerous agricultural products. This information was available to Senator Joseph McCarthy.²⁸ Completing the other end of the bargain, the Soviet Union promised to deliver to France 400,000 tons of crude oil; 200,000 tons of anthracite; 6,000 tons of asbestos; 75,000 tons of lumber; 65,000 tons of corn and various other products including 160,000,000 francs worth of furs, caviar, canned crabs and salmon.²⁹ It seems that France adopted Mr. Eisenhower's slogan, "trade not aid."

Senator William F. Knowland of California had a partial solution. He advocated the establishment of an International Council of Free Asia to pool the economic resources and thus combat Communism. This organization would be apart from the collective security system in the Pacific. It must be remembered that the attempt to establish and maintain collective security failed after World War I. America must take the leading role in preventing a recurrence of the Ethiopian and Manchurian episodes of the 30's. America was warned that she could not rely solely on her alliances and a \$370,000,000 continental air raid warning system, which was developed at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology defense laboratory. These will not suffice. Dr. Lloyd V. Bukner says the project would cost only \$100,000,000 annually. These defense projects cost plenty.³⁰

In 1953 the foreign policy of the United States was not

²⁷*Ibid.*

²⁸*The New York Times*, October 19, 1953.

²⁹*Ibid.*

³⁰*The New York Times*, October 20, 1953.

new. History tells Americans it was shaped in the 20's and perfected in the following decade. The 1953 modeled foreign policy was only an expanded policy, it was bigger; time alone would determine whether it was better.

In the Far East twenty-nine nations met at Ban-dung, Indonesia in April 1955. This was a significant meeting because it was perhaps the largest assembly next to the United Nations. It marked the first time that Asian and African nations got together without the participation of any Western power, and it represented more than half the population of the globe, about 1.3 billion peoples. Although the American State Department did not give an indorsement to the Conference, Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., Democrat of New York, attended as an unofficial observer. This conference served notice to the United States to develop a more positive attitude toward Asia and the Far East. Mr. Powell contested Premier Chou En-lai's statement that the United States was attempting to wreck the Ban-dung meeting. Powell in stating what he hoped would be the United States policy said:

The United States should radically increase its aid to Southeast Asian countries with no strings attached. The United States should start actively resisting colonialism everywhere.³¹

At the start of the election year 1956 many events in addition to the Ban-dung conference were left to Mr. Eisenhower for guidance. The President recovering from a collapse of the heart announced his willingness for a draft. Eisenhower asked for action in the dispute between Afghanistan and India, the United States promised to stand behind Pakistan in her dispute with Afghanistan, an new look at Western strategy was the issue at a Conference at Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico, the United States, Britain and France held discussions in Washington on the problems of intervention in the Middle East.

In South America the diplomats of the Latin American Republics complained that they were being neglected. Korea was unsettled, Germany was unsettled and there was trouble in South Africa and North Africa. To add to these global problems the domestic situation in the United States was at low ebb. Things were not too bright a decade after World War II.

One good move had been seen by the beginning of 1956. American Negro musicians, athletic and comedy teams were being used to help clear the vision. In Moscow, the Negro opera, **Porgy and Bess** received thirteen bursts of applause. It was plain that these Negro teams were effectively spreading good will for the United States and

³¹*The New York Times*, April 18, 1955.

Russia. India enunciated the "Panch Shila" policy. This policy meant that India intended to maintain mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty; nonaggression; noninterference in internal affairs; equality and mutual benefit; and peaceful co-existence.³²

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in January 1956 described the Republican foreign policy as a "brink of war" victory. He credited his victory to America's readiness to fight with atomic weapons. This strong action ended the Korean war; prevented the Chinese Reds from openly intervening with their armies in Indo-China; and finally stopping the Reds' threatened invasion of Formosa. Dulles may credit his mistakes to having to follow Eisenhower who at times was not positive. At a press conference on Middle East problems March 7, 1956 the President started an explanation in this fashion:

As a matter of fact, I think, I am not sure, but I think there's some of these export licenses that are still existing, although whether the material has been paid for, I am not sure.³³

Perhaps the best explanation to the whole concept of the foreign affair situation is the speech made by Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas in the Senate. Fulbright in assailing Dulles' "brink of war" idea on February 27, 1956 said:

Some of the problems lie wholly beyond his (Dulles) control. Some have been gathering force long before most of us here were born. And no one among us can dispose of them with a flick of the wrist. We may, in fact, have to reconcile ourselves to the fact that our grandchildren may be wrestling with some of these same problems that tax us here today.³⁴

In 1956 President Eisenhower would be faced with many problems he did not have to face in 1952. He would have to stand on his record, and that record would be found unexplicit. With the domestic issues crowning out foreign affairs in an election year, much of what should be debated would not be undertaken or, if considered, would not be understood by a majority of Americans.

In 1956 the massive retaliation concept would be a child of ten years. This policy was of Anglo-American origin in that it was initiated by former Prime Minister Winston S. Churchill in Missouri in 1946 in the now famous "iron

³²Norman D. Palmer, "India's Outlook on Foreign Affairs," in *Current History*, Vol. 30, February, 1956, pp. 65-72.

³³*The New York Times*, March 8, 1956. (See President Eisenhower's Press Conference on Foreign and Domestic Affairs).

³⁴*The New York Times*, February 28, 1956.

curtain" and "cold war" realization. This "new" policy was made American and positive by Harry S. Truman. It was adopted by Dwight D. Eisenhower. India and Red China influenced its development in Asia and the Far East. Russia's rise as a world power and an economic competitor forced its development to the 1956 stages of development.

In 1956 there was no question that the new Communist economic drive in Asia was making headway. The Communist's willingness to relieve Asian countries of their surplus agricultural products in exchange for industrial equipment or to lend them money to buy Soviet equipment was more appealing than the Western approach. Representative Edna Kelly, Democrat of Brooklyn, charged on March 10, 1956, that President Eisenhower was asleep at the job of policy-making in a time of unrivaled crisis.³⁵

Massive retaliation is based on the assumption that Russia would attack the United States. The United States has a tradition of nonaggressiveness. In summary, the observation of Herodotus, the Greek historian and "Father of History" is still important, for "where wisdom is called for, force is of little avail."

³⁵*The New York Times*, March 11, 1956.