THE WORLD SITUATION AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Philip Van Slyck, Editor
Program Materials, Foreign Policy Association

The topic you have assigned me is a challenge of no small magnitude. It is not only broad; it is also multidimensional. It offers an opportunity to examine some of the dimensions we usually take for granted. It suggests we should examine not just events, but also their significance; not just U. S. policies, but also the strategy behind these policies; not just the situation of the moment, but also the time dimension into which present strategies and policies may be leading us.

Recurrently, I shall deal with the theme of "leadership," since this is the critical factor in which I believe we share responsibilities and opportunities. I mean leadership in many senses—national leadership functioning creatively in the midst of unprecedented global historical changes; leadership in the nation, as well as in the world community, on behalf of those values and institutions in which we believe; leadership within the American educational community, wherein you and I share particularly grave responsibilities.

DIMENSIONS OF OUR TIMES

Some Physical Dimensions

Ours is a world divided. It is a world in which a handful of industrialized democracies, largely with a common cultural heritage, account for more than half of all the world's productivity and for nearly half of all the world's trade. We are a diverse and dynamic community, who have found common cause at the core of a coalition allied against the growing power of Communism.

Half the world in which we live—the southern two-thirds of our globe—is in the midst of the most momentous and revolutionary upheaval in history. An economic, social, and political transformation is liquidating empires and unleashing irresistible forces of nationalism, self-determinism, and rising human expectations. This is the emerging world.

One-third of the world is Communist. This is the growing totalitarian empire which already includes one-third of the world's population and one-fourth of its land territory, and which accounts for nearly one-third of all the world's productivity.

All this world is in the process of fundamental change in relations between men and their environment, and between men and men. The

universal goal is to accept and use change on behalf of mankind. The major ideological contest in this world is a contest for the management of change.

We might compare the principal protaganists in this contest. They are, of course, the chief spokesmen for two irreconcilable ways of life, the Soviet Union and the United States. In demographic terms, the Soviet Union has 33 million more people in 5 million more square miles of territory. It approaches 60 percent of our productivity, but it hopes in a decade or so to surpass us. Their labor force consists of 96 million; ours 74 million. Of particular interest is the fact that nearly 50 percent of the Soviet labor force is in agriculture, 12 percent being the comparable figure for the United States. The Soviet Union—for well-known reasons—has no unemployment; we still have 3.7 million unemployed. Their armed forces are 3.9 million to our 25 million.

Time Dimension

One hundred years ago—or even 40 years ago—Communism was no more than a "spectre haunting Europe," to use Engels' phrase. Now the Soviet Union is the second greatest industrial power in the world, and may well be the number one military power in the world. Through war and cold war expansion of its influence, Communism has absorbed 14 nations or parts of nations, with nearly three quarters of a billion people. In the past four years the Soviet Union has become a power in the Middle East and in Africa. China has become a power in South and Southeast Asia. Aid, trade, even the stockpiling of gold and the manipulation of world commodity prices, are current and effective weapons of Communist foreign policy. We are now witnessing a new gregariousness in the once mysterious leaders of the Kremlin, who today journey about the world dispensing advice, threats, and propaganda. In this short space of four years Communist leaders have demonstrated not only their power, but also their skill in managing and manipulating tensions on the world scene, on their own behalf.

In just this past year we have seen them score unprecedented triumphs across the diplomatic table: They have achieved "parity" in the new disarmament committee. They have maneuvered the United States into the semblance at least of "bipolar" negotiations. They have badgered the United States into virtual acceptance of another summit conference. They have, with or without ultimatum, placed the U. S. and its allies on the defensive in Berlin.

Some Attitudinal Dimensions

The attitudinal dimensions, in the long run, may be decisive in the contest.

We, in the United States, are basically content with our way of life and with the progress of our history to date; therefore, we are suspicious of any proposals for a change in the *status quo*. We have an impulse to be a moral force in the world—great, good, and generous; but we have doubts about whether our policies in this direction have really paid off. We are mindful of the competition from the other system, but we are a little unsure of the rules of the contest or of the scope of the challenge. Certainly we are incredulous that we can be beat at our own game—that is, if the game is "productivity"; but is it? We dread war, hope for peace, are grateful that total war has not yet come, and seize at any opportunity for "relaxation of tensions"; yet we are a little wistful that "peace" is not really total. Like our President, we Americans are willing to "go anywhere for peace."

The Communists have an entirely different set of attitudes. They have a doctrinaire faith that their system is superior, that it is the inevitable wave of the future. They have an impressive array of recent accomplishments to feed their confidence. They have a compulsion to "push" history, to manage conflicts and tensions toward Communist objectives. The basic Communist objective is to overturn the existing international order, which is based on pluralistic economic, political, and ethical principles that are incompatible with the materialist view of history. Because this is their objective, and because of the particular history of this conspiracy, Communists are experts in revolutionary tactics. Basically, Communism is a mechanistic philosophy, blended with a bit of nineteenth century mysticism about inevitable laws and irresistible forces of evolutionary development. It is a philosophy which can accept some of the goals of affluence which we also accept, but for different reasons. It is a philosophy which rejects the values and concepts of individual freedom for which we stand. These elements of the Communist attitude spell a radically different view of "war" and "peace." The goals they seek and the weapons to which they are committed permit no sharp distinction between the two. They are at home in an area of maneuver anywhere between war and peace.

THE ISSUES WE FACE

This conflict in our respective attitudes toward "peace" is more than a matter of semantics; it is critical. It is a revealing expression of the irreconcilable differences in attitude. Nikita Krushchev's visit in this country, bearing his sales message of "peaceful coexistence," makes it vitally important to understand this irreconcilability.

Peace, like survival, is merely a condition for doing or not doing something in which we believe. The peace in which we now live is a phony peace, a shooting peace. It has been so for fifteen years—in

Iran, in the Greek civil war, in East Europe and Hungary, Korea, Taiwan Straits, Vietnam, Laos, and the Indian border. And it will continue to be a phony peace. Our task is not to lament the absence of "real peace," but to recognize that we must work to achieve *our goals* in spite of the fact that peace is not yet within reach. This is the nature of the conflict in which we are engaged.

The real challenge we face is whether we, as a people and a nation, are willing and able to accept the role of vigorous leadership at this moment in history. Survival? Of course, this is a precondition for all we do and it calls for a military effort we may not yet be making. But the issue goes far beyond defense and survival. The leadership we are called upon to exert is on a world scene—to perfect a world order in which we and other peoples can live in peace. It is leadership within the nation, on behalf of America's fulfillment. It is leadership in the area of education, where America's future reposes, and where you and I have particular responsibilities.

The challenge to our leadership is to determine what the world is becoming, and what we would like it to become, and how much of the future we can shape, condition, or mold. We need to know how the world is changing, why it must change, understand what is in the *status quo* that is worth preserving, and what unrealized aspirations are worth fighting for.

We cannot be nebulous. We cannot "work for peace" without knowing or caring what peace will bring. We cannot build effective policies on "strengthen the UN" or on a "world of law" or on "democracy and self-determination." Communism, too, favors these goals but defines them quite differently.

Not only must we define our principles and understand their implications; we must also test them and put them to work. If we believe in economic growth and social development for all the world's people, then we must express this belief in our trade, aid, and related policies. If we champion human rights in our state documents for world consumption, then we must practice these rights in our schools, polling places, and the economic fringes of our overcrowded cities. America was born of a revolutionary movement; it has yet to carry the benefits of that revolution to all its people. There may be even more revolutionary concepts toward which we are yearning, but which we have yet to define.

This problem of world leadership has still another aspect. We must soon recognize that the careful definition of our principles and the occasional practice of them, is not enough. We must be willing to use *all* the tools and weapons of our national power on behalf of

those principles. In these terms, military policy becomes something more than "national defense." It becomes a way of putting muscles to our words.

To touch only for a moment on current U. S. military policy, I refer you to a book written by Strategic Air Chief General Thomas S. Power, which has not yet been cleared for publication by the Pentagon. In one passage which has leaked into the press he says this nation will never again "have the time to plan, to rally, and to act after the aggressor has struck. . . . If he were to strike today, he would find us ready to strike back but ill prepared to ward off his blow."

On the testimony of General Powers, and dozens of other thoughtful critics of current U. S. policy, the strategy of deterrence and massive retaliation has brought us to a point of frustration. We, by our own choice, have given ourselves only three alternatives: retreat, stalemate, or nuclear disaster.

We may indeed be failing in the military leadership task. We may —and many critics say so—not be doing enough in counterweapon development, in anti-submarine devices, anti-missile devices, adequate warning and dispersal, and a range of other urgent recommendations that have been by-passed year after year on budgetary considerations. We may not have the flexible military capacity to deal with the kinds of military challenges we have had to face in the past fifteen years and may have to face for decades ahead. We have not accepted, at the federal level, the responsibility even to defend the people and property of the continental United States. Although competent studies have indicated an adequate civil defense program could make the difference between 50 and 120 million American survivors in a surprise nuclear attack, we have not even drawn up the blueprints for a national civil defense program.

These, and other critical questions of our strategic power to work for our objectives, are not simply technical problems—the technicians disagree among themselves. Fundamentally these are grave citizen issues which only an alert, informed, and aroused citizenry can bring to a head.

The challenge to America's leadership is not exclusively on the world scene. It also confronts America in terms of the society we are building ourselves. It has to do with searching out common causes in the world, with understanding and working for the preservation of those elements of the open society which we share with most of our key allies. It also has to do with the conservation, enrichment, and fulfillment of our own human and natural resources. In this society of

affluence, it has to do with building our communities, expanding job opportunities, and enriching the lives of our citizens; and extending the benefits and opportunities of democracy to our entire citizenry. It also has to do with education. The ultimate dimension of all we value lies in the future. Our contribution to the future will be our investment in education.

For two years, America has been engaged in a momentous and sometimes acrimonious debate on education. Unfortunately, the debate has been largely negative in character. It started negatively as a shocked and guilty reaction to the first Soviet sputnik. It continued negatively as pamphlet after pamphlet of expert opinion argued that we must not or need not "sovietize" our educational system, nor must we "Europeanize" the system, nor must we have federal interference, nor must we tolerate central planning, nor do we really need drastic overhaul. In other words, we may feel guilty and we may worry, but we need not act.

A few have proposed positive programs for improving our educational system. Some have suggested that the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union is real and important and that the national interest calls for a higher level of excellence in American education. Some have called for better education, saying this is important whether or not we are in competition with the Soviet Union. I suggest both these views are as correct as they are compatible. The challenges we face, and the goals for which we strive, are both valid benchmarks. American education at every level is inseparable from our national goals and our means for attaining those goals.

The need for better leadership in these trying times has been widely discussed. But we cannot have *great* leadership in a democracy unless the people make *great demands* on their leaders; we cannot have wise national policies unless the people have the wisdom to support these policies. The ultimate task is a citizenry that is great in its wisdom. Only education can do that job.

It is very fitting that we discuss the contemporary challenge to American education. The land-grant colleges and state universities are remarkably well equipped, in tradition and know-how, to accept the leadership role in meeting this challenge.

This uniquely American system of higher education has, for nearly a hundred years, been intimately associated in a working partnership with federal, state, and county governments, and with the people. As an educational system it is experienced in adult education, youth education and guidance, home demonstration and counseling, technolog-

ical education and service, and education in the humanities. Further, it is an educational system dedicated to meeting the needs of the people it serves.

In the most fundamental sense the land-grant institutions represent all we have been talking about that is good, dynamic, and viable in American society—all that is worth preserving and perfecting. It expresses the basic concept that divides us from those with whom we are struggling—that free men can learn to manage their own destinies. The focus in our society is on this free man. Our future lies not in an impersonal mechanism of history, but in the creative ingredient of history —man.

This conflict is the lowest denominator of the contemporary struggle, and education deals head-on with this issue. We as educators occupy the key role. We have our choice between repeating platitudes or accepting the real challenge, between business as usual and a vigorous seizing of opportunity.

I look in these terms with particular interest on the emerging programs and educational activities of the land-grant system. As you approach your hundredth birthday you have an unprecedented opportunity to become, in the fullest and most critical sense, truly "democracy's colleges."