

responsibility for his individual salvation, and the education of the individual which trains him to become a submissive, dependent servant of society. The current conflicts between a receding individualism and an advancing socialism, which are often acute in politics, cannot be ignored in educational institutions any more than any other conflict which has its basis in a faith which cannot be proved or disproved, but in which one must live.

It is unfortunate, and to me most undesirable, that political agencies should seek in any way to control or influence the administration or instruction of private schools. It is inevitable that political agencies will to some extent influence and control publicly supported institutions. It is regrettable that political powers should ever be exercised to abridge the freedom of honest educators to express their honest opinions. But it is inevitable that political controls will be exercised over public educational activities which have substantial political consequences. How long, for example, would a socialist government be willing to support public schools that produced crops of students indoctrinated with anti-socialism? A political faith animating an educational institution is of so much concern to politicians that they cannot be expected to keep "hands off" education if they have any hand in it.

It should be obvious that the way to maintain the greatest "academic freedom" is to avoid so far as possible the political supports of educational institutions which make inevitable political interferences, influences and controls. Recent political investigations have given an ominous warning to those educators who have been most hysterical in expressing their fears of what they call popular hysteria about communism.

It is one of the ironies of the hour that some of the most violent protests against political investigations of educators have come from those who, even though entirely loyal to their country and its free institutions, have played a strong part in advancing social and political policies which, if widely adopted, would soon make the political control of education far-reaching and disastrous. Although political attacks upon educators have evil consequences, this ill wind may blow some good if the vast majority of American educators are thereby persuaded that they do not want the educational, or business, or social organizations of the American people subjected to political controls and made to conform to political moralities.

If abusers of political power accomplish this happy re-education of apostate libertarians to the evils of too much government, they will, even without intention, perform a great service in the protection of both the freedom and security of the American people.

The American Mission Today

SPREAD INFORMATION ABOUT AMERICANISM NOT COMMUNISM

By JAMES A. FARLEY, *Chairman of the Board, The Coca-Cola Export Corporation, New York, N. Y.*

Delivered at Colgate University Fifth Annual Conference on American Foreign Policy, Hamilton, New York, July 16, 1953

I CONSIDER it a great privilege and honor to be invited to address this Conference. You have listened to distinguished professors, outstanding literary men and experienced diplomats. I do not pretend to match their erudition and wisdom. Nevertheless, I do feel that my experience in political and business life, over a great span of years, qualifies me to some extent to speak to you on America's mission to the world, the subject under our discussion.

Throughout my public and private career I have been compelled by nature of circumstances to face many problems realistically. I am impelled to say, however, that the dilemma which faces our free world today is so complex and threatening that it is not within the province or capacity of any individual to present a quick solution.

We are engaged now as a nation and as a leading member of a group of other free nations in a monumental struggle. At the moment, the battle is not with bullets and bombs but between two forces that advocate certain principles of life and living. It is a war of ideologies. No man can foresee or even predict with any degree of reasonable accuracy how and when this conflict will be resolved.

America which was cradled in the principles of freedom and human dignity can not retire within its own orbits and do nothing. Such a position represents spiritual sterility and mental cowardice. I do not know how long it will take us to overcome the dark forces of totalitarianism, but since we are obliged in the name of decency and good conscience to accept the challenge we shall not fail, just as we have never failed when called on to defend a righteous cause. I say defend because we are a people who are opposed to attacking others and interfering with the internal affairs of other nations. But we will defend to the last man our right to maintain our way of life in our republic.

The answer to this lies in the history of our country and in the traditions of our people who acknowledge freedom to differ without impairing national loyalty.

The United States, a republic dedicated to freedom, came into existence in 1776. It had no great military power and little foreign influence. Nevertheless, the example of America was followed throughout most of the world so that a century later much of the earth's surface was ruled by democratic governments. Clearly, America had a mission then and performed it. The mission was to show the world that free government was workable. Our pre-Civil War forefathers were convinced that the American experiment in freedom was divinely inspired, and was practical, and that America was to be a beacon light of liberty, pointing the way for others to follow. Amazingly, they did follow.

To the mid-twentieth century politician the speeches and writings of our forefathers seem a little self-centered. In the light of today they seem to lack appreciation of the fact that other peoples too have contributed to the art and practice of free government and made their own contribution to democratic living. In those days, America was nationalistic, and talked that way. Then, of course, the United States could afford that luxury of thought. Sailing ships were slow, North America was empty, and the rest of the world was far away.

This attitude does not altogether fit a modern world in which you can have breakfast in Paris and dinner the same night in New York, or in which an attack on an Asiatic peninsula like Korea could set strategists calculating whether Alaska, Seattle or San Francisco may not be threatened. And yet there is a good deal of nationalist sentiment still active in the United States.

It can be useful. It can help us to understand new and young nations just coming into independence and to appre-

ciate the intense nationalist sentiments of those countries. Some of them have come into existence as a revolt against imperialism, just as we did. Thoughtful Americans will appreciate that nationalism of these new countries springs from the same cause that made us nationalists a hundred years ago.

Our duty toward the world, I think, is still to demonstrate that free government is workable and is more desirable than any other. To fulfill it, however, we must stand by certain principles.

First and foremost, we must continue to make democracy work at home. That is the cornerstone of any American sense of mission today. This means that we have to bring our practices and our ideals into line. Freedom to take part in the processes of government and economics is not an occupation for the few or for isolated groups. It is part of the life of everyone. The American system has given a larger share of power and participation in public life and in private affairs to all of its people than any great country in history. We have trusted our people, and the trust has been repaid.

This needs some explaining abroad. Some Europeans particularly quarrel with American tastes. Some even think and say we are vulgar. These are the ones who forget that tens of millions of Americans from humble backgrounds take part in American cultural as well as American political life. Never on such a scale as here have literature and music and art and journalism and business and politics been open to a whole population. Of course we get a result different from the results where learning and the arts and government have been kept in a relatively small circle. The power and the strength and the glory of the American way is witnessed by a single fact. No group of peoples who have ever lived in America for any length of time have ever desired to leave America and go back from whence they came. A South American politician once said, "Other people talk about freedom; you practice it; and it has proved the most assimilative system in the world."

We must maintain that freedom at home. Any attempt to limit or mistrust it endangers our primary mission. Free government is workable, and we have proved it.

What we are learning today is a corollary proposition. We can not and should not attempt to export our particular form of government unless it is voluntarily sought. American democracy can not be foisted on others. Woodrow Wilson talked about the self-determination of peoples—and he meant it. This goes for us as well as for others. There are parts of the world in which American institutions and the American economic system are not wanted, and perhaps would not work. Democracy means different things to different people, depending on their traditions and their habits, their religion and their way of thinking. Our tradition calls for tolerance and respect for difference. Indeed respect for difference is one of the great forces binding us to our friends. If elsewhere peoples choose to adopt in whole or in part some of our ways they will do it because having looked at the example they want that result. Any salesman knows that you cannot force a product where it is not wanted; if it is adopted it is adopted on its own merits. The American mission thus is not the same as the mission of the Roman Empire, nor do we now talk of the "white man's burden" as they did at the end of the last century.

If the problem could be stated in those terms we could stop here or at least be smug.

However, we cannot accomplish the American mission alone. In fact, we can not live alone now, even if we wished to do so. The Wright Brothers settled that one day when they flew a contraption through the air at Kitty Hawk, if it had not already been settled when man learned to send communica-

tions from anywhere to anywhere in a split second. Safety and well-being today depend on an international system which observes some rules of morality and of law, producing international relations established more or less on the rules of fair play. We have fought two wars on that theory. It is true that from 1919 to 1939 most of the country seemed to feel that the rule of law in international affairs could be maintained if the United States lived alone in unprepared isolation and urged pious resolutions outlawing war. World War Two, I think, taught us by bitter experience that international cooperation is necessary if any rule of right and law is to be maintained. At the close of that war the atomic bomb launched from long-range aircraft blew up forever the idea that Americans are entirely masters of their own destiny. That is why I supported, as I hope you did, the formation of the United Nations, and while it has a long way to go I am free from doubt that the principle will eventually succeed. If this United Nations fails another will have to be built to take its place. As we fought to withstand aggression in Korea and to prevent new Koreas and to provide the aggressor of our time—the Communist faction—with clear-cut evidence that lawless expansion could not be permitted, so we are bound to work with others in building a world-wide community of nations.

Now this will be a long and difficult task, as anyone who travels abroad as I do knows very well. The world of nations outside our own has its realities, and its hard facts. We have to work with that world as it is, and not as we think it ought to be. We will have to work with peoples who do not think as we wish they did, and often govern themselves as we wish they did not. At the moment, we work with the other nations of the free world chiefly to assure military safety and to protect ourselves and them against lawless aggression. But while we are doing this we can help to extend and strengthen the moral foundation of the community of nations.

Even a politician reads occasionally and profits from it. A recent book by Arnold Toynbee makes the point that whenever the culture of one nation enters another a wide contact is established which continues to unforeseeable limits. A country which first becomes familiar with American manufactures and manufacturing methods eventually may come to learn the dominant principles of American life, just as close relations with Europe have made us somewhat acquainted with their ways. The salesman and the politician, the Army officer and the journalist, the engineer and the student who work abroad are carrying out the American mission for good or evil, whether they know it or not. The policy now famous as "Point Four", offering technological assistance to other countries, was perhaps one of the most imaginative ways by which America could perform its mission. Other, better, ways will continue to be developed as the days go on, as we realize more and more their importance.

A new duty is placed on the United States by this modern conception of America's mission. This is the duty to be strong nationally. Even Abraham Lincoln, struggling for peace, was willing to go to war to assure that the Union should be preserved—else there was danger, as he put it, that government of the people, by the people and for the people, might perish from the earth. We shall not achieve a community of nations at peace merely through strength; but it is perfectly clear that we shall never achieve it without strength. We are quite clear that our mission does not require us or even permit us to try to rule the world. But we are equally clear that our mission includes being a bulwark of the free world and joining in its defense. But this means the most careful attention to foreign policy. Someone observed that the British Empire was acquired in a fit of absentmindedness.

America could have the same experience if we do not draw a careful line between democratic leadership of a free world and practices which might slowly lead to an American imperialism.

The men (there are a few very noisy ones) who talk loosely about "going it alone" and who want to pull out of cooperative arrangements like the Inter-American Organization of States, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and who want to torpedo the United Nations, have not learned an important lesson. Fortunately, few in this country agree with them.

It is barely possible, of course, that the United States could make itself into an empire and organize an "American Century". But if we did we would slowly and steadily find our cherished freedom disappearing. There would no longer be freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly, and free inquiry, and fair trial, and the right of every American to look all ideas in the face. Even as we are fighting the Communist menace at home and abroad, we must be sure that we do not betray our own traditions. Under free institutions America grew. By free institutions America forged her position. Under free institutions she defended herself against totalitarian enemies, and by virtue of free institutions she has become the senior free nation of the world. We do not want a police state, or thought-control, or rule by the hysteria of fear in our system.

I have just said something about hysteria. In this connection I have been distressed to note lately the emotional reaction of some people to the elimination of certain books from our State Department information offices in various parts of the world. One would have thought that some of the people who have protested would have first ascertained the facts. The facts are, of course, that under the law the libraries which

the State Department maintains abroad were solely intended to make available books about the United States which would put us in a favorable light. It is not the duty of the United States Government to put books at the disposal of foreigners which abuse and blacken the name of the United States, and that is a matter of simple, common sense. As one editor said, we are under no duty to depict ourselves as a sodden mass. The recent turmoil would make it look as if we have engaged in cutting our total national supply of books down to one hundred, and those not necessarily the famous One Hundred Great Books. The whole episode has not added to the reputation of some people for stability of judgment.

For the first time in our history, we are called on to maintain continuously a measure of armed might. I venture to think that the arms are as strong, and no stronger, as the free institutions which bring them into being. Armed strength so supported can be trusted by America, and by the neighbors of America. Armed strength not derived from free institutions would be a danger to us and to the entire world.

As I see it then, America's mission is still to demonstrate that free government is workable, not only for the United States but for the world. Nationally, we must cherish and foster and maintain our institutions, and use them to give our own citizens progress toward wider life and fit them to be the heirs of a great civilization. Internationally, we must, in strength and not in weakness, work toward a community of nations steadily developing a wider common base in morals and in law. It will be said that this is ideal rather than practical. I can only say that, as a politician, accustomed to deal with an infinite number of practical matters, I know that a chief source of power can be an ideal, since the ideal alone gives consistency to the efforts of the day.

The Integrity of the Congress

HOUSE RULES OF PROCEDURE

By DANIEL A. REED, *Representative from New York*

Delivered in the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., June 29, 1953

MR. SPEAKER, I am disappointed at the statement that has been made here. There is a principle involved here. It is a constitutional principle. This country was organized and based on principles, not on expediency.

One hundred and seventy-seven years ago, within a few days from now, 53 men sat in Philadelphia. They were facing the greatest military power in the world. A fleet of ships was off Sandy Hook and another one was off Charleston. What kind of men were they that declared independence? What were they voting for? They were voting for principle.

There has not been a minute in the Ways and Means Committee that these men who now advocate forcing the issue—they did not have to force the issue. Four different ways were available to them. I polled that committee. I polled them twice. You, Mr. Speaker, polled them in your office and they were opposed to this iniquitous bill. The other side of the question is the settling of a constitutional principle. Are you going to yield? Are you still going to keep this sword of Damocles hanging over the committees of the House? I, for one, will not permit it. I am not surrendering here. I do not propose to betray the people of this country who are entitled to the constitutional procedures of this Government. This battle ought to be settled here and now without compromise. Let us get the votes and see where you stand—you

people who stood in that well and took the oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States—stand up like men. How far do you think we are going to get with this Republic if you have a rule like this dangling over us. Are you going to betray your constituents to whom you promised not to increase taxes, but to reduce taxes? I stand upon those pledges. Let the people exercise as they might have done weeks ago through their representatives on the Ways and Means Committee by constitutional procedure to bring out this iniquitous tax, if they so desire. Let the people exercise their rights by the orderly and constitutional rules through the Ways and Means Committee members. I have stood the unlawful threats personally rather than to let the members of our committee vote contrary to what I know were their convictions. This threat of usurpation ought to be settled now once and for always so that ambitious men seeking power will never again try to usurp the constitutional prerogatives of our committee or of any other committee of this great legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, because of the limitations of time imposed upon this historic debate, I must of necessity make my remarks very brief. This House has but 1 hour within which to decide whether it shall today abandon its established rules and bow to the expediency of the moment—1 hour in which to decide

