

March 2021

Democracy Charts Its Course

William O. Douglas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/flr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

William O. Douglas, *Democracy Charts Its Course*, 1 Fla. L. Rev. 133 (2021).

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/flr/vol1/iss2/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UF Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Florida Law Review by an authorized editor of UF Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact kaleita@law.ufl.edu.

University of Florida Law Review

Vol. I

SUMMER 1948

No. 2

DEMOCRACY CHARTS ITS COURSE*

WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

We, the democrats of the world, need to reassess our political achievements and redefine our political responsibilities.

A few years ago conservatives and liberals alike were given a lesson in the aims and tactics of Fascism. It was almost too late when we read and at last understood *Mein Kampf*. Today we face a political program of Communism which has infinitely more finesse than the Nazis were able to perfect. The well-disciplined Communists operate from their central quarters in Moscow, planning domination of the world. It is time that liberals and conservatives alike understand what that program is. *The Problems of Leninism* and *Foundations of Leninism* by Stalin must be read before it is too late. For if the Communists win their political campaigns, we, the democrats, are marked for extinction. Extinction is as complete and final whether a Nazi or a Communist be the executioner.

I. OUR BACKGROUND OF DEMOCRACY

We, the democrats, are a diverse group. Millions are laborers. Still other millions are farmers, specialists, and technicians. Millions are capitalists like the shop owners of Main Street, the factory owners of Middletown, the stock and bond holders of Wall Street. Others are socialists like those who today hold the reins of government in England and other countries of western Europe.

We, the democrats, are of different colors, different races, different religions. Our tastes in art, literature, and philosophy are as varied as the hues in the sunsets over the Berkshires or Walloway. There are differences in our religious creeds, our political faiths, and our economic theories, differences as great as those that mark the Great Plains from

*David Levy Yulee lecture delivered by Mr. Justice Douglas, March 22, 1948, at the University of Florida in the general field "Honor and Service in Politics."

the crags of the Tetons. This diversity is our strength. Since our tradition lies in freedom for the individual, we have striven with Mr. Justice Holmes to put our faith in "the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." Our democratic ideal insists that the soap box, public platform, press, and radio be open to all. The Communist organ—the *Daily Worker*—is sold in the same stall as papers representing schools of thought violently opposed to Communism.

Our literature is not standardized boiler-plate issued by a central government bureau. Our art, music, and literature are not limited by those specifications which glorify a person or party in power, which sustain belief in a particular creed or faith. One can write or paint to depict the seamy or disgraceful side of our performance, and even receive public acclaim and awards for doing it.

In these and in other ways we guarantee through the First Amendment of the Constitution what Holmes called the "free trade in ideas." We can shape opinion for this or that panacea or reform. Or we can revel in the luxury of complacency. We can nationalize an industry whose power is too great for private interests to have. We can establish a government plant to compete with it. We can rely on anti-trust remedies to control it. Or we can embrace *laissez-faire*.

We have the same freedom as to other social and economic problems, those of sharecroppers, banks, minimum wages, prices, coal mines, housing. We can experiment and proceed by trial and error. We can have revolution, if we so will it, by the peaceful route. And having had it, we can undo it four years later. We are committed to no one single panacea for all the ills of mankind, whether they be economic or spiritual. For democratic peoples the choice is not merely one of two absolutes—or, as the Chinese say, between *Motz* and *Yang*.

II. DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

The Political Absolute

Political absolutes distinguish both Fascism and Communism. Neither has room for accommodation, since they are committed to one economic and political theory. Lenin went so far as to conclude that a "classless" science was impossible. The Communist state, moreover, summons all media of communication for the propagation and defense of its political creed.

Art which is free and unrestrained can become a serious subversive influence to the totalitarian theory. The same is true of literature and music. Thus in Russia art, literature, and music have become part of a political agent's bureau of psychological warfare. They cease to be free expressions of the aspirations of men. Artists become mere illustrators of the so-called glories of a political regime. And so man's great creative genius is perverted in cheap and tawdry ways.

We, the democrats, have few absolutes. Even free speech is not so free as to override the law of libel. He who shouts "Fire!" in a crowded theatre goes to jail. Religion which sanctifies human sacrifice or other kinds of immorality has no constitutional sanction. We, the democrats, know that God works in mysterious ways, that the paths to salvation—to happiness and achievement—are not one but many, that no one economic theory is adequate to satisfy all the needs of man in the complex society of a changing world. No political or other standard is set for art, literature, and music.

We think that the right to experiment with new techniques is as important in the fields of politics, sociology, and economics as it is in art and the sciences.

This rejection of absolutes, this freedom for experimentation, marks the *first basic and irreconcilable* difference between the political philosophies of the totalitarian Right and totalitarian Left, on the one hand, and the political philosophy of the democrats, on the other.

Permanent Domination by One Group

James Madison marked the *second great and irreconcilable difference* when he stated in his *Notes on the Confederacy* that "The great desideratum in Government is such a modification of the sovereignty as will render it sufficiently neutral between the different interests and factions to controul one part of the society from invading the rights of another, and, at the same time, sufficiently controuled itself from setting up an interest adverse to that of the whole society."

Madison's statement is enduring because of the insight into the workings of every society which it embodies. The struggle inside every state has been to keep any one group or interest from getting too much power. The competition between groups has been keen and varied. Social groups—families—have produced ruling classes and kings. Churches have produced potentates. A guild has sought to fasten its hold on an economy. One or more corporations have endeavored to merge economic and political

power into a regime. Agrarian interests, mercantile interests, industrial, banking, and labor interests have vied for power and position. It is not this struggle for position between groups which is the danger. That indeed is a sign of health. Every society is an aggregation of pressure groups. Their activities are not things to deplore. The danger lies in one group's gaining the ascendancy, moving into a dominant position, and exploiting the other groups. When one group acquires that power, there is eventually a revolution. If processes of orderly change are not provided by the system of government, revolution follows the path of violence. But if government provides the machinery for change, the revolution is bloodless.

Our own history shows both examples. We threw off the heavy yoke of a king by force and arms. Our peaceful revolutions have been more numerous. By the end of the last century an industrial oligarchy had fastened its hold on the country. The money trust, the oil trust, the beef trust were not figments of the imagination of rabble-rousers. The trusts controlled the fate of workers, damned the public, and used monopoly power to crush competition. They merged political power with economic power by electing and at times buying executives, legislatures, and even courts. They used their great power to exploit both labor and the public. The workers at the lathes and in the mines and mills were part of the raw materials that went into the production of coal, steel, and lumber. And when they had served their masters' ends they were tossed aside as human wreckage—broken, bruised, and impoverished.

Then came the severe reaction. The golden voice of Bryan pleaded with the conscience of the nation. Altgeld, LaFollette, and a host of others joined the fray. But it took the reforms of the two Roosevelts and of Wilson to restore the balance of power and to bring the competing forces closer to equilibrium. Labor unions emerged strong and reliant. Some of them under evil influences exploited the workers in much the same way as had their industrial masters. But that influence passed. Unions acquired character, integrity, and brains. They grew in size and power equal to the might of the giants against whom their demands must be made.

That is but one example of the forces at work in the life of a society. The list could be extended almost indefinitely, for the process of keeping society in balance is an endless one. Strife and friction, adjustment and readjustment, are the essence of life itself. As Tannenbaum has put it, the social conflict is a "conflict between multiple forces . . . a battle to which no *finis* can be written—for conflict is part of the process of institutional

life itself, and the end of the conflict would really signify the end of life itself.”

Strife and friction are inherent in the relationship of a single biological organism and its environment. They are inherent in the relationship of man to man. They are present in every group—from the family to the state. When they relate only to details, they are not serious. When they strike deep, and accommodation is not possible, revolt may destroy the institution itself. Revolt is frequently the only remedy when one group attains a position from which it may dominate or exploit the others. The dominant group may be a king, the proletariat that Marx proclaimed, or a political party. It makes no difference. No one group with its special interests to serve can serve the needs of all. Every man needs elbow room. Men cannot be unanimous and should not strive for that goal. The Creator gave man the same amazing diversity that he gave the mountain meadows in June. Those who try to hold man to one set of aspirations, to one goal of achievement, to one pattern of conduct or belief, must resort to secret police and armies. But force is not enough, as the dictators of all times have eventually discovered. For man by nature cannot long be held in serfdom.

Those are the things that Madison knew. He did not want government so constituted that one group or interest would have the upper hand and the power to invade the rights of the other. Madison also knew that government, the State itself, can become so powerful that its interests become adverse to that of the whole society. He knew what happened whenever a private institution or class became the government. Those consequences would be duplicated if bankers or merchants, the proletariat, or farmers became the government. It is tyranny when any one interest has the power of life and death over every other interest.

Madison's theory is the democratic theory of government. We in this country have a steadfast faith in it. And the sweep of one hundred and sixty years of our experience reveals an exciting picture. It shows in dramatic fashion that the process of restoring balance between the groups which make up a society is an endless one. It shows that imbalance has been eliminated and balance restored through processes of law, with the single exception of the Civil War. All of us chafe and fret when our own pet program or grievance gets no attention. We become discouraged because our democratic processes lack perfection. But one cannot view the chronicles of our experience since 1787 and call democracy a never-never land where there is no advance over suffering and exploitation.

Communism rejects Madison's theory. Communism takes its text

from the *Communist Manifesto* published by Marx and Engels in 1848. They saw the bourgeoisie, i.e., the capitalists, having "the upper hand." Capitalists undoubtedly were in that position. Marx and Engels saw the workers viciously exploited, as they unquestionably were. Marx and Engels believed that revolution was the only path by which the workers could cast off their chains. That was certainly true in Russia; and it was probably true in numbers of other European countries one hundred years ago. And then Marx and Engels took the next big step and, for history, the most fateful one of all. They proclaimed that "the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself *the* nation." And then they called the workers of the world with the ringing words—"Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite." These were words that to many have sounded great with idealism. For the proletariat was taken to mean the people; and the *Manifesto* was construed as a charter of liberty for the common man in the Jeffersonian tradition. But such idealism as has been read into the *Manifesto* has in practice become a mockery.

Marx and Engels speak of raising "the proletariat to the position of the ruling class" as the establishment of "democracy." But it soon became apparent that "the proletariat" and the people were not synonymous. Lenin made it clear that the dictatorship of the proletariat "has meaning only when one class knows that it alone takes political power into its own hands, and does not deceive itself or others by talk about popular, elected government, sanctified by the whole people." In practice the Communists have gone one better. They have not placed the powers of the State even in the hands of the proletariat. They have placed it in the hands of one select political clique.

It is the very antithesis of democracy when any one group has permanently acquired all the powers of government. The age-old problem of society is to be free of the domination of any one class and to provide the greatest opportunity for each individual to work out his own destiny. That has been the struggle of man throughout recorded history; and man has had the greatest success in that effort under the democratic form of government. The Communists by promoting the contrary theory join the Nazis in giving to one clique the power of exploitation. They introduce a wild and primitive touch of pseudo-theology to the whole business. It is as if a revengeful god chased a devil off a throne and then, with the sceptre in his hand, became the new devil.

To turn the powers of the state over to one group is to defy the history and teaching of the governments that have produced the greatest abundance and the most enlightenment for the people. Moreover, to assume today that the basic struggle is between workers and employers, between labor and capital, is to make a most egregious error. There is conflict between those two groups. But that alone is not significant, for life itself is conflict. The significant fact is that the conflict between workers and employers is evolving into manageable forms in this country as well as in the democracies of western Europe. Recognition by law and custom of collective bargaining is the foundation of stabilized industrial relations. In addition there are emerging plans for guaranteed annual wages and other measures which recognize labor's equitable claim to a fair wage. There are and will continue to be strikes. But the occasions for them decrease as management in factory after factory recognizes labor as a working partner, as labor is given at least as great a claim against earnings as are investors. Every man has the right to work. But we need not throw away the values of western civilization and become a police state to guarantee that right.

It is true that the one most important economic problem of society lies in the industrial field. But it is not in Marx's struggle between management and labor. Management and labor together constitute the industrial power of the nation. The foremost problem—the one most pregnant with conflict—is the relation of that industrial power to the whole economy.

Control by Popular Support or Control by Fear

It is between the industrial plant and society that there is the greatest potential conflict. Our standard of living depends on the productivity of men and machines. The national income is a measure of that productivity. An economy of abundance is essential if we are to meet our obligations both domestic and foreign. An expanding economy, increased productivity, and widespread and full distribution of goods are essential if we are to raise the real income of our people to levels hitherto undreamed. These are problems of management and labor. They have a joint responsibility to society for their solution. Depression or prosperity will turn on the skillfulness of their handling.

Communism was not conceived as an answer to this problem. Communism is essentially a political idea, not a scientific blueprint for a

machine age. Indeed, Communism was launched in an economy of poverty where the problems of industrialization were yet to be faced. It has never faced, much less mastered, the complex problems of an industrial world. If it were concerned with the central industrial problem of the age, it would be moving in quite a different direction. It would then be aimed at directing and planning production and distribution—at benefiting the people of the world rather than just controlling them. It would not be obsessed with pouring mankind into one mold.

Thus the second irreconcilable difference between totalitarianism and democracy is that the former deposits all the power of the State in the hands of one clique and selects class warfare as the central problem of the age.

There is a *third basic and irreconcilable difference* that has even greater immediate significance than the other two. It is a fundamental and irreconcilable difference in political techniques.

There is a civic genius which distinguishes the politics of the democracies. It is what in this country William James called “the habit of trained and disciplined good temper towards the opposite party when it fairly wins its inning.” That was, he thought, the “only bulwark” of our people—a habit “more precious, perhaps, than any that the human race has gained.” Political parties vie for popular support. The one which wins stands or falls on its record. The others accommodate themselves to the regime of the victor. They live under the laws and policies of the party in power, though they strive to renew their strength so as to unseat the incumbents at the next election. Sometimes they do; sometimes they do not. But the important thing is that a party takes over the government only for the period during which it commands popular support. The opposition, while acquiescing in that arrangement, knows that once it takes over it will be on a purely tentative basis and can hold power only so long as it retains popular support. There is no police or army which suppresses the party which is out of power.

Communism has no such tolerance. It leaves no room for accommodation and compromise. It has one goal—to transform one small clique of men into the State. It has never compromised with that objective. The only compromise it has made is in the methods employed to reach that goal. And on analysis those compromises are merely evidence of the political finesse with which the Communists undermine democratic institutions.

Stalin makes the technique as plain as day in *Foundations of Leninism* and *The Problems of Leninism*. There are two stages in the process. The

first is the bourgeois revolution. The second is the proletariat revolution. The first is the process of taking over existing democratic institutions. It is what has just transpired in Czechoslovakia. The bourgeois revolution puts control of democratic government into the hands of the Communists not to carry out democratic programs, but to destroy the forms and processes of democratic government.

The Communists, therefore, pose as democrats for the purposes of the bourgeois revolution. They adopt democratic dialectics. They use democratic slogans. They appear as champions of liberal causes in the democracies. They are against the exploiters and for the underprivileged. They are champions of every minority. They plead the cause of justice for those who have been discriminated against because of race, creed, or color.

Actually, however (as many liberals have sadly discovered), the Communists plead the cause of justice and liberalism only so long as it aids them in their fight to win control. They want power. Their great chance of gaining it through political means, and thus completing the bourgeois revolution, is to have a weak, ineffective and faltering democratic government. Thus their political strategy is to exploit weakness, to create doubts and suspicions, to develop differences between groups. Their influence in the democratic state is essentially divisive.

If people understood that strategy, the political power of the Communists would be infinitesimal. It is because they appear to be champions of the oppressed that they gain prestige and support. Too often oppressed people, idealistic people, members of minority groups, are seduced because they find the Communists again and again on the reform side of current arguments. Or if not seduced, they are at least confused; and being confused they allow their forces to be divided. And too often the conservatives instead of fighting Communists fight liberal causes because Communists support them. Thus the Communists drive their small wedge deeper into the nation which has been marked for a bourgeois revolution.

China is a spectacular case-history of the way in which a democratic people by their default invite the disaster of Communism and the methods by which Communists win for themselves the allegiance of the masses.

Twenty years ago the Chinese Communists were a small military band located at Kiangse in Central China. The Nationalist Government waged war on them with vastly superior forces. The Communists started a long retreat—a retreat of 1600 miles to North China. There they became established at Yen-an, and since that time have grown stronger and strong-

er in popular support. Why is that so? The Chinese are freedom-loving, individualistic people whose instincts oppose a police state. Why have such numbers of them gone over to the Communists?

The Nationalist Government in China has lost *ming-shing*—the heart of the people. It is tainted by corrupt and reactionary elements. Its secret police patrol the universities and schools to discover dangerous influences—those who protest the serfdom in which the people are held, those who press for liberal reforms. It has indeed liquidated the liberal movement in China. The Communists in China have cleverly capitalized on this program of inaction and oppression which the Nationalist Government has adopted. They have taken over large segments of the Mass Education and Social Reconstruction Program which Dr. James Yen and his group of Chinese patriots launched in China some twenty-five years ago. They have adopted a program of aid to the millions of impoverished Chinese. Among other things they have undertaken to eradicate illiteracy, to inaugurate programs of public health. By reason of a political program of that nature the Communists in China daily win adherents to their cause.

Thus the Communists in their quest for power vary their tactics to suit the requirements of each particular situation. They may launch their own reforms or seek to wreck the reform governments of the democracies, whichever course seems the more expedient.

Whenever the Communists are in power they reject the accepted parliamentary techniques of the democracies. When they win an election it is for keeps. Unlike Democrats and Republicans in this country or Laborites or Conservatives in England, the Communists take over not on probation but for good. They are not there only for so long as they have popular support. They are in power for one purpose and one purpose only—to destroy the democratic government that elected them and to make their own party the State.

To do the latter they need more than the democratic traditions. Up to the time they perfect their bourgeois revolution they may have used democratic tactics alone or democratic tactics plus the threat of force. Up to then they have used “free speech,” “free elections,” political campaigns and all the other trappings of democratic political traditions. Once in power they add two of the ancient tools of tyranny—murder and terror—to their political techniques.

There is no place in their scheme of things for the “free trade in ideas” that Holmes proclaimed. One who is against the destruction of the democratic government and the substitution of a one-party, one-class

state is naturally a subversive. He may disappear mysteriously like the lieutenants or precinct leaders of parties in Poland. Or he may be tried for high crimes and treason. The important fact is that everyone around whom effective opposition might rally must be liquidated.

The Communists did not originate this political technique. Many of them were hunted men in their early lives. For the Czar used precisely the same technique against them. By western standards it is a lawless and vicious political practice. It makes fear the overriding influence in public affairs.

We in this country cannot know what it means to live in an environment of terror and fear. Jan Masaryk knew. Every mother in a police state who needs ration coupons for milk and meat for her children knows. Everyone in a police state who is dependent on a government bureau or agency for favors knows. And the greater the power of government the greater is that dependency. Once fear begins to operate in a thousand and one different ways the hold of the Communists on the democratic state becomes more and more complete. The talk of "free elections" becomes a mockery. People cease to express their opinions for fear of reprisals. The ranks of the Communists are swollen by new adherents. They win overwhelming support in the elections. The bourgeois revolution is complete. By outward appearance it has conformed to all democratic traditions. The people have spoken. And by the very best of democratic traditions the people can have any form of government they choose.

Thus the stage is set for the second phase—the proletariat revolution. It can proceed quietly and peacefully. It can follow all constitutional forms deemed wise or expedient. Like the bourgeois revolution it can be achieved without dropping a bomb or moving an army.

III. DEMOCRACY'S ANTIDOTE TO COMMUNISM

It is, of course, the right of the Russian people to have such form of government as they may choose. We, the democrats, will be the first to defend that right. When confined within their borders, their totalitarian regime is their concern, not ours. For all peoples should be free at all times to work out their own destiny. But it is that very principle, so basic to our democracy, which makes it alarming when other nations are unwilling victims of the Communist virus. Stalin announced in *The October Revolution* that the Russian Revolution constituted "the beginning and premise of the world revolution." Our very real concern is the manner in which the Communists are making that prophecy come true—the manner

in which they undermine flourishing democracies, the manner in which they win victories by default.

Many who have studied this political phenomenon of Communism conclude that war between Russia and the western democracies is inevitable. As Holmes once said, "It is not enough for the knight of romance that you agree that his lady is a very nice girl—if you do not admit that she is the best that God ever made or will make you must fight." Communists are not romantic knights. But their leaders and organizers are crusaders with a fervor that is all-consuming. They get their religion from dialectical materialism. Some say that dialectical materialism is dialectical nonsense. But it is nonetheless a faith to which men have committed their lives. It is the theology of communism.

These facts make the prospects for peace appear gloomy. But the choice is not between war and appeasement for neither will solve the problem which confronts us. For it is a basic fact which must not be overlooked that Communism to date is a political program *backed by force*. An army can be defeated and routed by guns and ammunition. But a political program is not destroyed by military might unless the victor, like the Communists, is willing to install a police state.

If we visualize the United States the victor in a war with Russia and roll the film ahead ten years, what do we see? We see a world in ruins—poverty and great illness on every hand—suffering and dislocations of life unequalled in history. That is the environment in which ideas as virulent as Fascism and Communism flourish.

These facts eloquently proclaim that the answer to the political program of the Communists is a dynamic and vital political program on the democratic front.

The Remedy at Home

The remedy on the domestic front is a relatively easy one if we have the will and faith to adopt it.

At home we must put an end to the shameful practice of branding everyone a Communist who espouses a liberal reform or promotes a program for the underprivileged. We must put an end to attacks on those who read leftist literature. We should no more ban the Communist literature than we should bar medical students from studying cancer.

If unreliable people hold important posts from which Communist activities might be promoted, they should be removed. We need not ape the Communists to combat them. Political victory over them can easily

be had within the lawful procedure of our democracy. All it needs is our earnest and wholehearted efforts.

The Communists through the use of their principle of democratic centralism have confined the differences in their ranks to the arguments within each of their cells. Once the decision of the few men in their top cell is made, it becomes the party line. It thereupon commands full allegiance from all members. This is one secret of their effective use of a minority position.

They are, moreover, active political agents at all times. They will spend their evenings ringing doorbells, writing literature, spreading their faith of dialectical materialism while the rest of us are at the movies or relaxing in social activities. By sheer persistence and waiting they will get command of meetings espousing human causes and move their agents into important posts in democratic organizations. Progressive labor leaders have shown how these political tactics can be combatted. There are not over 100,000 Communists in this country. They would be fairly impotent, though 100 times that number, if we, the democrats, took our politics seriously and threw our full energies into political organization and activity.

The political antidote to Communism is effective democratic government. For effective democratic government can remove even the pretense for saying that there are insoluble differences between the classes or groups within a nation. This can be achieved not by giving the underprivileged alms or opiates but by practical measures which recognize the human rights of all citizens and raise the standard of living at all levels of society. The words of Lincoln spoken in 1838 before the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield are advice we should not forget: "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

The Remedy Abroad

The problem on the foreign front is equally important but much more difficult. The United States has emerged from its chrysalis of isolationism into a position of tremendous political responsibility in world affairs. Its task is to take the leadership in keeping alive the great human values in western civilization.

De Tocqueville, writing over a hundred years ago, stated: "The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common-sense of the citizens; the

Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm: the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter servitude. Their starting-point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.”

Since that time the Czars have perished and another political clique controls Russia. But the distinction between the two nations that Le Tocqueville marked persists to this date. The rivalry between them has greatly increased since Communism has become an active imperialistic force in the world.

The basic rivalry between the two nations today is political. We must be equipped and prepared to meet the political program of the Communists at whatever point in the world they may select for action. Better still, we must ourselves regain the initiative by promoting in our own areas of influence tried-and-true political antidotes to Communism.

Our greatest error would be to fashion our foreign policy merely in terms of anti-Communism. We will fail miserably if we do no more than that. For then we will end by railing and ranting at the spectre of Communism but doing nothing to eliminate the conditions on which Communism thrives. If we follow that course, war will soon appear as the only alternative. And this time war could well be an Armageddon.

Our foreign policy—in its execution as well as in its formulation—must be designed to espouse and promote liberal, humanitarian programs for the masses of people of the world. It must strengthen the democratic forces in other nations and not entrench reactionary interests that thirst for power.

Most of the areas of the world are bleak and desolate when judged by the living conditions of the people. At times the people live under a serfdom of poverty and disease. At other times it is an industrial or political serfdom. The Communists are artists in exploiting these conditions. They can promise pie-in-the-sky—in fact the whole world—to those who will enlist in their political army. Revolution may indeed seem a welcome relief to those who have been exploited. It may to desperate men have the appeal of a swift and cleansing purgative that sweeps before it all the rot and filth of the old tyranny that has oppressed them.

Those impulses cannot be controlled by talk and promise of vague and remote democratic ideals. The voice of America, if it is to be powerful among the masses of people, must do more than talk of the glories of democracy. If we want the hundreds of millions of the peoples of the

world in the democratic ranks, we must show them the way with practical programs of social reconstruction.

We cannot force such programs on other nations. But we must stand ready to suggest such programs and to help work them out. We must stand ready to support *with sanctions* the liberals of any country who have programs of social reconstruction for their people. There are in many countries men who may not be in the government but who have the inner strength and vitality to formulate programs for their own people. James Yen has such a program for China—a program of mass education and rural reconstruction. It is indigenous to China and thus true to the character of the Chinese. With our backing and support it can do more than save China from Communism. It can set in motion a force that will sweep Asia and align it with the democratic forces of the world. What can be done in China can be done in other outposts.

It is increasingly evident that however necessary military aid may be, the real victory over Communism will be won in the rice fields rather than on the battle fields. The fight against Communism depends for its ultimate success on the people of the various nations, not on their governments. Thus we must support those who represent democratic values in the various countries and who have practical programs for political action. When we prop up governments that are self-seeking, corrupt, or fascist, we lose ground in the world-wide struggle against Communism. When we stand behind the liberal and progressive forces in other countries, we become, in the eyes of the peoples of the world, identified with their interests. Then the democratic cause gains strength and character. Then the flood-tide of Communism will begin to recede.

This course takes great steadfastness. It also requires the backing of a strong, alert, and mobile military machine. For weaklings never yet won a campaign—political or otherwise—against dictators. This course will bring down on our heads the rantings of the Communist bureaus of the world. We will be charged with being imperialists and intervenors. The more effective our political achievements along the democratic front the louder will be the clamor. But the values of western civilization are at stake. We cannot afford to be dilettantes. If we are, we will pay perhaps even a greater price than we paid for giving too little and too late to those who stood between us and the Nazis.

IV. CONCLUSION

Inexorable forces are sweeping the world. We are part of those forces, since we were among the first to kindle the spark of freedom. Tompkins has said that “the secular and humanistic seeds of the Renaissance could not germinate on Russian soil.” But those seeds were transported here; and they flourished. They can, if we will it, be carried to the most desolate places of the world and make freedom flourish where only tyranny and suffering have been known. This was done in Palestine. It can be done elsewhere.

De Tocqueville wrote a hundred years or so ago, “The nations of our time cannot prevent the conditions of men from becoming equal; but it depends upon themselves whether the principle of equality is to lead them to servitude or freedom, to knowledge or barbarism, to prosperity or wretchedness.” Experience with the instruments of democratic government since that date shows the bright promise, the great potential it holds. It shows that government can be just and yet civilized; fair to all classes, exploiters of none.

The survival and extension of the democratic traditions are the great challenge of the century. They present to this generation a unique opportunity for honor and service in politics and government.