result. If pacifism results in oppression, he must be willing to suffer oppression.

C. Isolationism in Various Forms. There are many people who believe that America still can and should avoid foreign entanglements. They believe we should in no way concern ourselves with power struggles in Europe or Asia. We should, they feel, avoid any economic dependence on the outside world as well. We should take no responsibility for economic well-being elsewhere. Our military concern should be only to protect their conception of America. It is on this point that isolationists disagree. Some would defend only the United States and Canada; others the whole of the Western Hemisphere; and others would use our sea and air power to anchor our defenses on Japan, Formosa, the Philippines in the Pacific and the United Kingdom in the Atlantic. In any case, however, they would not concern themselves with Europe, Asia or Africa.

Isolationism ignores history. It was the sensible foreign policy for America when the balance of power in Europe and colonial domination in Asia combined with the geography of the Western Hemisphere made the United States secure for domestic development. These historical facts made the Monroe Doctrine feasible. Isolationism does not recognize that the world is different in the middle of the twentieth century.

Like the advocates of pacifism, isolationists must realistically face the possible consequences of this policy and be willing to accept them. If we once burn our bridges behind us it will be difficult to rebuild them.

1. It would likely mean the end of the United Nations as an instrument for international order.

2. It would probably mean that Russia would move into western Europe and the Near East and control the industrial production of western Europe and the oil production of the Near East.

3. We have no assurance that England or Canada would support such a policy. If they did not the United Kingdom could hardly serve as the anchor in the Atlantic. Would we make Canada a dependent state?

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY
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III. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

In spite of all the confusion and heated debate, America does have a postwar foreign policy. A pattern for postwar foreign policy has emerged. It has often been weak, halting, and confused but there is a pattern which is consistent with the historical pattern.

From Washington's time, American foreign policy has had a short-run immediate objective and a long-run objective. The short-run objective has been to foster and maintain power relationships to protect the national interest. The long-run objective has been the development of
a rule of law in relations between nations. During much of our history before World War I, the balance of power in Europe and our geography permitted us the luxury of giving little attention to the short-run more immediate objective. Many of the recognized mistakes in American foreign policy during and since World War I stem from a preoccupation with the development of world order to the exclusion of intelligent concern for the national interest.

There is little disagreement among Americans about the objectives of our foreign policy. National security - survival as a nation - is the immediate objective upon which we are in general agreement. It is necessary for survival of freedom in the world and most Americans have a keen sense of mission for extending free institutions in the world. Americans are also generally agreed that we want peace between nations and American foreign policy as it has evolved assumes that full scale war with Russia is not inevitable.

Americans are in very general agreement about the moral values upon which our aspirations for peace, security, and freedom are founded. Our heated debate over policy often conceals these basic agreements and Americans themselves are apt to forget them.

Secretary of State Acheson, in a speech outlining the six main elements of what he called our strategy of freedom, had as his sixth point "Firm adherence in all our actions, at home and abroad, to the moral values which give meaning to our lives." He explained this as a means of demonstrating in action the Western democratic values we would like to see the rest of the world accept.

What are these moral values that are to guide our actions at home and abroad so that we may demonstrate democracy? "He who would move the world must first be given a place to stand." Most of these values stem from or are related to the Christian faith. But they are widely held by people who claim no personal faith. Our concern for the dignity of the individual is at the core of these values. A listing of these values includes:

A. The Dignity of the Individual Human Being and the Human Rights Which Stem from It.

1. The Sanctity of Human Life. Preservation and enrichment of human life is important in all cultures but is especially so in ours.

2. Equality with Responsibility. The Declaration of Independence states that "all men are created equal" but we believe this only with modification. We don't believe all men are born with equal inherent ability. We believe all men are equal before God and, therefore, we have provided in our institutions that they are all equal before the law. We talk a good deal about equality of opportunity. We believe that all men should be provided opportunity and held responsible for developing their inherent abilities. We have begun to implement this belief. Income taxes and especially inheritance taxes are evidence as is free public education. Discussion about minimum welfare standards is concerned with providing more equality of opportunity.

3. Liberty with Responsibility. Liberty or freedom is definitely a limited concept. An individual is free to choose and make decisions,
but he must be held responsible for the consequences of his choice. He may not exercise his choice to relinquish this right and responsibility. He cannot choose slavery. He cannot give up his right to reconsider in representative government. He must suffer the consequences of his choice but he also has the responsibility to recognize his errors and try at whatever stage he is to rectify them.

B. Justice

1. *Equality Before the Law.* This concept has primarily to do with individuals but we hold as an ideal, at least, that it should also apply to nations. Justice is concerned with protecting rights with responsibility.

2. *Natural Law.* The idea of "the rule of law" as against the arbitrary rule of man probably stems from the concept of "natural law."

C. Economic and Social Responsibility

Wealth, political power, and influence are sacred trusts to be exercised with due consideration for the individual rights of others and a concept of justice based on individual rights. Free institutions are a search for means to hold individuals, organizations, or governments responsible for the consequences of their actions. A good case can be made for the idea that the institution of private property is a means by which individuals can be held responsible for the consequences of their actions.

D. A Sense of Mission for Democratic Values

This is a value to be viewed with extreme caution in foreign policy. It is probably related to the theological concept of election or destiny. The religious interpretations of this concept have led in the past to questionable national policies. (Illustrations are the Christian crusades or national actions based on the Hebrew interpretations of the concept of the "chosen people.") If used in judicious subordination to the other democratic values, however, this moral value can make an important contribution to demonstrating democracy in the world.

E. Intellectual Honesty

There are basic conflicts among moral values. These conflicts must be realistically faced. Recognition of the need for compromise is essential. But when compromise is necessary, we must honestly face the fact that compromise is being made.

It has been effectively argued that protection of the national interest is the highest moral duty a nation has. In international relations if this moral duty is subordinated to other moral duties it may mean national suicide and national neglect of the government's responsibility to protect individual moral values for its citizens. Yet we must face the fact that protecting the national interest may involve compromise with other moral principles.

As the laws and the institutions for making and administering laws are developed in the United States, these moral values underlie and
influence all that is done. They provide a commonly accepted home base to which everything can be related even though the problem of conflict and compromise is ever present.

In international relations and in developing a foreign policy, we face a different order of difficulty. There is more than conflict and compromise within a framework of moral values that are commonly held. Lacking the common ground of moral values on which we can operate, we must of necessity, resort to implementing our basic moral values in our foreign policy only if, by power and diplomacy, we can implement them.

It is in this framework of objectives founded on deeply imbedded moral values that our postwar foreign policy has evolved. It is a product of the world situation, and our heritage of objectives based on moral values. Our policy may be divided into three phases:

A. The Policy of Collective Security

Barbara Ward calls this the policy of containment of Russian Imperialism. It is, however, broader in scope than that. In its broadest application it is directed at the problem of eventually attaining world order. Under this general heading is our effort to strengthen the United Nations, work with and through the United Nations, and be responsible to the United Nations.

Regional groupings of nations within the United Nations framework are also a part of the policy of collective security. The Atlantic Pact and the efforts at integration within the Atlantic community are illustrations of such regional groupings. The American States is another such regional grouping. Conceivably such an arrangement might be developed among the free nations of Southeast Asia though it is as yet hardly to the stage of thoughtful planning.

Collective security must be implemented by military mobilization. A rapid build up of military strength at home and among our friends is essential to collective security. This mobilization must be carefully carried out with due regard to the priorities that will provide a maximum of power as a deterrent to war and not as a provocation of war.

B. Economic Cooperation

Economic cooperation is related both to the first and the third phases of our foreign policy. It is designed to increase the economic strength of the West in the struggle for power. As such it contributes to collective security. But it is also designed to aid in the positive task of demonstrating democratic principles in action. It is the building of "healthy societies in which the vitality and the promise of freedom find practical expression in comparison with which the decadence and despair of communist tyranny is starkly opposed."

C. Demonstrating Democracy in All Our Actions at Home and Abroad

This involves applying our system of moral values to the social and economic problems at home and in the world. It involves the problem of compromise, but where compromise is necessary, it should be faced frankly as such, with neither moral cynicism nor weak ineffective rational-
ization. If Titos and Francos must be dealt with to promote collective security, we must face the fact that compromise is involved in our relations with them.

It is in relations with the peoples in the free part of Asia that difficult problems of communicating and demonstrating our moral values are particularly acute. Morgenthau states two principles in the struggle for the minds of men.

"A political ideology, in order to be effective must reflect the life experiences of those it endeavors to reach." The people of Asia want freedom from Western imperialism and they are no longer passive about starving. People who have not experienced our kind of liberty are not likely to want to fight for it, but they are willing to fight for nationalism or social and economic justice.

"Ideological warfare is a mere function of political policy. It can be worse than the policy it is meant to support; it can never be better." We must try to understand the social revolution in Asia, then develop a political policy consistent with our moral values and our national interest. Our political policy in Asia has not been clearly consistent with either, largely because of popular misunderstanding of Asia in America.

In demonstrating democracy to the world, there is the problem of negotiation to relieve tension between communism and the West. Many authorities believe such negotiation is not only possible but imperative. Secretary Acheson has said we must be ready to negotiate international disputes on the basis of justice rather than, as Russia does, on the basis of power. In dealing with a military dictatorship, negotiation without power is, of course, impossible, but with power negotiation can be tempered by justice.

THE BASIS FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION
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For the purposes of this study the second phase of American foreign policy has been singled out for detailed consideration. What are the problems which economic cooperation attempts to aid in solving? What are the alternative choices? These same questions could be raised for collective security or for the policy of attempting to demonstrate democracy as the best answer in the ideological struggle. The remainder of this presentation will, however, be confined to economic cooperation as an example of the development of some of the possible alternatives.

IV. ECONOMIC COOPERATION

We, in the United States, have only 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of its area but we produce about half of the whole world's industrial output. Measured in almost any terms we have the highest level of living of any people in the world.

Our high level of living is not an accident. It is the result of