



Paul Hoffman addresses students during his recent visit to the Caltech campus

WORLD AFFAIRS ARE YOUR AFFAIRS

By PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
*Chairman of the Board
 Studebaker-Packard Corporation*

BEFORE DISCUSSING WORLD AFFAIRS, I should, I believe, confess to you that I started out in life as both an insulatonist and an isolationist. That is partly because I was born within the shadow of the *Chicago Tribune* Tower, and partly because in my boyhood days I used to hear William Hale Thompson, the mayor of Chicago, boast that if King George of England ever dared enter our fair city, he would "poke him in the snout." At the time this seemed to me to be true red-blooded Americanism. It took World War I to convince me that we could not live alone, no matter how much we might like to do so. Strangely enough, some people remain unconvinced of the correctness of this viewpoint even after two world wars.

My first real immersion in international affairs came in 1942, when I was asked to take the national chairmanship of United China Relief. I demurred, saying that

I had plenty to do at home, and that China was a long, long way off. Vincent Sheean, who was one of the group trying to interest me, answered by remarking: "Some day you will find out that the Yangtze River flows down Main Street." And not too many years thereafter I did find out; China became a very personal place to me, because my youngest son was an officer of the United States Army stationed in Chungking during the last year of World War II.

Actually, if we face up to the historical facts, we realize that happenings in faraway places have affected your lives and mine more vitally than most events here at home.

I am not sure as to just who did what to whom in Europe prior to 1914 to bring on World War I. Nor am I certain that historians are correct when they say our failure to stop Japanese aggression in Manchuria

in 1931 was responsible for World War II. The hotter fuse that we let burn may have been Mussolini's drive into Ethiopia, or Hitler's brazen grab of the Saar.

The one thing of which I *am* certain is that happenings far away from Pasadena brought about my brother's enlistment in the Army in 1917, and his two years of service in Europe; and that it was a series of events in remote parts of the world that made it necessary, beginning December 7, 1941, for some of you or your older brothers to leave home—in many cases not for months, but for years—to take part in military actions all over the earth.

A further fact of which I feel certain is that World War I and World War II were not of divine origin. They were the result of things men did or did not do, both over the years and at moments of crucial decision. They could have been prevented if men, human beings such as you and I, had acted with sufficient intelligence at the right times.

Even after two world wars, as I have observed, we still find some people who believe we can fence off the United States and live in comparative isolation. They say we can make ourselves self-sufficient. These people are apt to think of themselves as being hard-boiled and realistic. They are not. They are just the opposite. They are dangerous dreamers. *Realistic* Americans today know very well that the United States is not self-sufficient, and is growing less self-sufficient each year.

I could use up my full time with proof that we are living in an interdependent world. But I am sure that that is not necessary. If I read the signs of the times correctly, most of the American people and all college students are well aware of the futility of attempting to go it alone. However reluctantly, they accept American participation in world affairs as a practical fact of life.

Objective viewpoint

I should like to offer two suggestions as to the basic attitude we ought to prescribe for ourselves in our consideration of international affairs.

First of all, with the responsibilities now resting on us, we dare not let our emotions prevent our giving *objective* consideration to the *facts* in any given situation. We are the most powerful nation in the world today and therefore our judgments are world-shaking in their impact. We can contribute much to the stability of the world by being sure that when an issue reaches a head and final decisions are necessary, our judgments will be mature, enlightened and aimed objectively at what is best for America and the world in the years ahead. We need to get all the facts, pro and con, and face those facts squarely. We must not shut off debate by name-calling or taboos. We must encourage it. By no other means can we obtain all the information that must be weighed.

For example, let's talk about the turbulent issue of whether Red China should be admitted to the United Nations. I do not believe she should, and I have good

reasons to support that belief. Nevertheless, I hope that I could achieve sufficient objectivity to listen attentively to the arguments of those who believe she should be admitted.

In essence, my first point is that, when we are forming a judgment, we must get all the facts, or the facts will get us.

The second basic attitude we should hold is that we want peace, and are willing to wage the peace with the same patience, imagination and dedication we always employ in waging war. Peace is not simply a vacuum left by the absence of war. It is not something that comes to us automatically, or through the strategies of a small circle of government representatives sitting in conference rooms here and there. Certainly least of all is it one of the American dreams that wishing will make come true. We can win peace only by waging it, individually and collectively, with constant devotion and effort.

The Summit Conference

We must not only want peace, but, if we are to meet our responsibilities to the world, we must make the peoples of all nations understand how deeply we yearn for peace. President Eisenhower did us and the free world a service of pervasive significance by the results he achieved at the Summit Conference in Geneva. I was greatly concerned prior to Geneva because of the growing feeling throughout Europe that Russia was earnestly seeking peace and we were dragging our feet, and the even more dangerous feeling in Asia that we were actually throwing road blocks in the way of peace. In four days President Eisenhower, by both words and deeds, made America's position so clear that today world opinion recognizes that if anyone is blocking peace it is not America but Red Russia. No man ever accomplished so much in so short a time.

In the year of 1951 I published a book, *Peace Can Be Won*. At the time I didn't realize that since the beginning of time people have been writing on this subject, and that several thousand years ago a treatise appeared in which views similar to mine were expressed. I hardly need to tell you that in the centuries since that treatise appeared it has been war—not peace—that has been the lot of man. Despite that, I still hold the view that peace can be won.

In an effort to appraise present prospects for peace, I recently spent some time in Europe. I wanted to find out, if I could, what the new Russian leaders are up to. What's behind the smiles? Is their changed attitude a result of economic or political unrest? What concessions are they willing to make to put an end to the tensions which are responsible for what we call the cold war?

I discussed this subject with many of Europe's outstanding leaders, a number of whom are very knowledgeable as to the situation within Russia. Here is what I learned.

Speaking first of the situation within Russia itself,

the reports all indicate that while the Russian people are, according to our standards, poorly housed, poorly clothed, and poorly fed, they are considerably better off under the new regime than they were under Stalin. On the political front Russia is still, of course, a police state, but several hundred thousand political prisoners have been released and there has been some let-up in the activities of the internal police. As a consequence, the general attitude of the Russian people can be best expressed by the phrase, "They never had it so good." No one seemed to feel that there was any basis whatever for any hope of internal revolt. One interesting fact was reported by a number of my informants—that Stalin has now become a bad name in Russia. What a country!—a demigod one day, a devil the next.

As far as the Russian leadership is concerned, the consensus is that it rests securely in Khrushchev and Bulganin. They have always operated as a team and are operating as a team today, with Malenkov, who resigned his prime ministership of his own free will, a trusted adviser but not a policy-maker. Molotov and Zhukov seem to be regarded solely as technicians in their respective fields.

I heard no comment that would indicate any change in basic goals so far as the present leadership is concerned. A Communized world under the control of Mother Russia is still what they are striving for.

Russia's younger leaders

Several of my informants who have spent much time in Russia recently felt that they detected among the younger leaders a somewhat different attitude toward world Communism from that which holds in the case of the present leadership. These young leaders do not have the same deep distrust of the West nor the revolutionary zeal of the present leaders. They apparently are much more interested in making a success of the Communist experiment within Russia than in imposing the Communist way of life on the rest of the world. This might well mean that if they came into power they would be much more amenable to a basic shift of policy.

What has happened is a change of tactics. Stalin, in his plans for world conquest, relied upon the basic technique of divide and conquer, of splitting off one nation after another from its alliance with the free world. So do Russia's new leaders, but, whereas Stalin relied upon scowls, threats and peripheral military actions, such as those in North Korea and French Indo-China, to accomplish his purpose, the new leaders are relying upon smiles and alluring trade offers.

They are pointing out to Germany the fact that her prosperity is the result of her not having to carry the burden of a military establishment and they are urging that she resist militarization and instead devote herself to the arts of peace, indicating the great potentialities which lie in a program for modernizing industry in Red China. They are saying, "Join us in the greatest adventure of all times."

They are saying to Greece: "All your financial troubles stem from the fact that 40 percent of your budget goes into the military. The reason for this largely lies in your fear of Bulgaria. We will arrange a non-aggression pact with Bulgaria which will guarantee your security. Turn your talents to the arts of peace and we will buy all your surplus products."

Dangerous phase in the cold war

If my European informants are correct in their analysis of the present status of the struggle between the Kremlin and the West, we are definitely entering into a new and more dangerous phase in the cold war. Honey has always attracted more victims than vinegar, whether it is flies or nations we are talking about.

Does this mean that the outlook is bleak and that we have nothing to look forward to except a drift from a cold war to a hot war, and then into World War III? Definitely not, in my opinion, for several reasons. In the first place, neither the people of Russia nor the leaders of Russia want a general war. As far as the leaders are concerned, this is not the result of any moral scruples, but simply because it does not fit into their program.

Furthermore, we have made progress toward peace, a progress made possible because the free world has been blessed with leaders who are wise enough to see that to win the peace we have to wage it with as much boldness, daring and imagination as we would apply to waging war. We are winning the peace because these leaders worked together with vision, transcending purely national interests, and saw to it that nothing was allowed to keep the free nations from waging the peace with a common strategy. As proof of our progress, I call attention to the following events which have taken place since 1946:

Forcing the Soviet army to evacuate Iran: May 1946.

Economic recovery of Europe through U.S. aid: April 1948 to date.

Survival of Yugoslavia outside the Soviet orbit with Western aid: June 1948 to date.

Breaking the Soviet blockade of Berlin by airlift: June 1948—August 1949.

Creation of NATO: April 1949.

Defeat of the Communists in Greece: October 1949.

Settlement of the Dutch-Indonesian war: November 1949.

Halting aggression in Korea: June 1950—July 1953.

Settlement of the Kashmir war between India and Pakistan: August 1953.

Cease-fire in Indo-China: July 1954.

Settlement of Trieste dispute: October 1954.

Agreement on rearmament of West Germany: May 1955.

We must not only keep on waging peace, but we must wage it with new intensity and with a new program that

takes full account of the fact that the cold war has entered upon a new and more dangerous phase.

First, however, as I have already said, the basic Russian tactic is to divide and conquer. The Russians will, in the future, as they have done in the past, try to create divisions *within* each free nation and *among* the free nations. We must see that they do not succeed in either endeavor.

Here in America we must close ranks. We must not permit self-seeking politicians to create an impression that there is any division in America on the subject of Communism. Not too long ago they had the peoples of the world outside America believing that tens of millions of Americans were Communist sympathizers. This is, of course, flagrantly untrue. Never have our people been more united than in their opposition to this weird ideology. Out of our 163 million people only a handful of treasonable or maladjusted individuals—perhaps some 25,000—want any part of it.

The need at this moment is to intensify those activities which have so far brought us limited success. The free world must continue to make a common cause of waging peace, and, furthermore, the peace must be waged in the only way that can bring continued success, and that is simultaneously on four fronts—the military, the economic, the psychological and the political. Only by such action can the Kremlin be brought to a point where it will yield something more than a change in tactics; namely, a change of policy to one of “live and let live.”

Buying time

We must maintain sufficient military strength to prevent any encouragement to aggression. NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which became a living force under President Eisenhower and has been further nurtured by General Alfred Gruenther, should be strengthened, not weakened. We should encourage in every way possible, as President Eisenhower is doing, progress toward universal disarmament. We would, in my opinion, dissipate our chance to make progress in this area if we permitted any deterioration in our present military strength. We know that that strength does nothing but buy us time, but it is time we need in which to try to win the peace by peaceful means.

On the economic front the Western world should join forces and extend help to those new democracies in the Far East which are struggling desperately to achieve self-sufficiency. These new democracies are in competition with Red China. The question of whether they remain free depends on whether they are able to compete successfully with Red China in bettering the lot of their peoples economically, socially and educationally. We of the Western world must not only help them to help themselves—we must accord them the respect due sovereign nations, and, above all, avoid any insistence that they develop along patterns pre-conceived by ourselves.

On the psychological and informational front we must

increase our efforts to promote understanding among all the free nations, particularly as between the free nations of the West and of Asia. Independence has come to these new nations only within the last few years, but their wisdom can be counted in centuries. Conversely, they have much to learn from us. Perhaps the most important thing they have to learn is that the West has progressed because the West has provided a climate in which men as individuals can grow, develop and reach real stature, that the true values of Western civilization lie in the realm of the intellect and the spirit—material welfare is a by-product.

Winning the peace

This strengthening of the ties between the West and East is one of the political goals we should seek. We stopped the march of Communism in Western Europe because the nations of the Western world were united in their battle for freedom. The need now is to make common cause with Asian free nations. This does not mean that we should try to force them to choose sides. At this time the important goal is to promote the kind of understanding which will bring us together in spirit.

The emphasis I am putting on promoting closer unity among the free nations does not mean that we should not work diligently for a better understanding as between the free world and Russia. The more those young Russian leaders see of the West, the more certain we can be that if they gain power, their influence will be toward really important concessions for the relief of tensions. We, too, will gain by travel in Russia because we must acquire a much wider knowledge of Russia and her people if our planning for peace is to be realistic.

In this program for an intensified waging of the peace the United States has a vital role to play. We are the strongest free society in the world. We must remain so and grow stronger. We can best accomplish that aim by holding fast to the concepts of freedom and justice which are our great heritage. We must strive to make our Bill of Rights a living document and to see that equality of opportunity for everyone, regardless of race or creed or color, is a fact rather than a pious hope.

We must follow the lead of our President and dedicate ourselves anew to making in America a demonstration of a free, just and unafraid society at work. No police system could keep the news of this demonstration from reaching the peoples of the world, even those behind the Iron Curtain. Such a demonstration can be America's unique contribution to the winning of the peace. It would come close to assuring the building of a world opinion which in time would force the Soviet leaders, whoever they might be, to a genuine change of policy—a policy which would give the satellite countries the right to choose their own form of government and would enable the nations of the world—even those with different ideologies—to live together amicably. It is not too much to hope that it could shape the beginnings of the first durable peace that men have ever built.