

1974

John Foster Dulles : pragmatist or moralist.

Harry Park Tolles

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses>

Tolles, Harry Park, "John Foster Dulles : pragmatist or moralist." (1974). *Masters Theses 1911 - February 2014*. 2507.
Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses/2507>

This thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses 1911 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

UMASS/AMHERST



312066013812056

JOHN FOSTER DULLES :
PRAGMATIST OR MORALIST

A Thesis Presented

By

Harry Park Tolles

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

August
(Month)

1974
(Year)

Major Subject: POLITICAL SCIENCE

JOHN FOSTER DULLES:
PRAGMATIST OR MORALIST

A Thesis

By

Harry Park Tolles

Approved as to style and content by:

Peter Fliess

Peter Fliess, Chairman of the Committee

Constance Friesen

Constance Friesen, Member

Glen Gordon

Glen Gordon, Department Head

August
(Month)

1974
(Year)

To my wife

Robbyn Lynn

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE VIEWS OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES	
Childhood, Formal Education, and Early Diplomatic Experiences.....	1
Law Career and Diplomacy.....	6
<u>War, Peace and Change</u>	14
World War Two, Bipartisanship, and Politics.....	19
<u>War or Peace</u>	23
Japanese Peace Treaty, 1952 Election.....	28
II. THE ADMISSION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS	
Early Experiences with China.....	32
The Communist Revolution.....	36
Initial Support for United Nations Membership.....	45
Reversal of Position.....	49
"Red" China Policy, 1953 and 1954.....	53
The "Pragmatic Formula".....	56
III. THE "PEACEFUL LIBERATION" OF EASTERN EUROPE	
Evolution of the Concept.....	63
The Policy of Containment.....	68
1952 Presidential Campaign and the "liberation" Promise.....	73
East German Riots.....	79
"Liberation" Policy in the First Four Years.....	87

Hungarian Revolt and the "Redefinition" of Liberation.....	92
IV. CONCLUSION	
The Pragmatist Versus the Moralist.....	97
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	102

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Words are not adequate to describe my appreciation for the help of Professor Fliess, my thesis advisor, whose many hours of work and innumerable suggestions were most valuable in the preparation of this thesis.

I wish also to thank Professor Friesen whose cheerful words of encouragement bolstered my oftentimes sagging spirits.

To my mother, Katherine Tolles, goes special appreciation for her seemingly tireless efforts in the arduous task of proof reading this manuscript.

Finally, to my wife Robbyn Lynn, who over the past two years has been friend, advisor, critic, and my most ardent supporter, I give my deepest gratitude.

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Dulles' critics have labeled the former Secretary of State as a man obsessed with an overriding moralistic approach to American foreign policy. This morality, it is argued, often surfaced as a righteous indignation against what Secretary Dulles derogatorily referred to as "atheistic Communism." As a result, critics contend, Mr. Dulles was unable to deal pragmatically with real opportunities for *détente* with the Soviet Union and normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China.

This thesis will deal with such criticism by first examining Mr. Dulles' views and how they developed from his childhood to the time he became Secretary of State. With this background information covered, the balance of the work will explore two specific aspects of Dulles' foreign policy: First, the question of "Red" Chinese membership in the United Nations; and second, the policy of "peaceful liberation."

Dulles had two positions concerning the admission of "Red" China to the United Nations. Not long after the Communist revolution, he favored a policy of "Red" Chinese membership. However, when "Red" China became embroiled in the Korean War, he shifted his position to one of adamant opposition to "Red" Chinese membership. The second chapter will discuss this change of position and whether it was motivated by moral indignation or was a pragmatic decision by Dulles in order to remain in the mainstream of public opinion. Further discussion will center on Dulles' China policy and the reasons behind the failure to normalize relations with the People's Republic of China.

The policy of "peaceful liberation" was Mr. Dulles' counterproposal to the Truman policy of containment. In the third chapter, Dulles' "liberation" policy and its implementation will be studied. Further examination of this policy will raise the question of whether or not there was a potential for détente with the Soviet Union or whether it was Dulles' dogmatic determination to hold to his "liberation" policy which may have spoiled this chance. Finally, did the Hungarian revolt ultimately represent a failure of the Dulles "liberation" policy?

The conclusion of this thesis will address the questions: Was Mr. Dulles predominately an overbearing moralist as his critics assert? Was he a pragmatist operating on a basis of political expedience? Or was he, perhaps, a combination of both of these aspects?

C H A P T E R I

DEVELOPMENT OF THE VIEWS OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Childhood, Formal Education, and Early Diplomatic Experiences

The oldest son born to Reverend Allen Macy Dulles and Edith Foster Dulles on February 25, 1888, John Foster Dulles, was profoundly influenced during his childhood by both his father and grandfather. John Watson Foster, Dulles' grandfather, was a prominent American Statesman and former Secretary of State. Dulles' father was a Presbyterian minister, who for his time tended toward a "liberal" approach to religion. He emphasized that the Christian religion was not dependent upon belief in the "virgin birth." To his children, Reverend Dulles stressed the importance of religious education. As a result, the young Dulles was exposed to a comprehensive religious upbringing, including as many as three Sunday services, regular attendance in Sunday school, and Wednesday evening prayer meetings. Aside from the formal training there was a family requirement to memorize a passage from the Bible each week. This extensive religious training, Louis Gerson indicates, was not always pleasant; however, as Dulles grew older, "... he appreciated the early religious upbringing, seeing 'how relevant' it was 'in the far-flung and changing scenes of life.'"¹

It was this demanding religious education which led to the first indications of Dulles' rather remarkable intellectual capabilities.

¹Louis L. Gerson, The American Secretaries of State and their Diplomacy XVII John Foster Dulles, (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1967), p. 7.

Townsend Hoopes cites remarks from the diary of Mrs. Dulles relevant to her son's intelligence:

... he has fine acquisitive powers, and such things as interest him he very promptly takes hold of and retains ... mentally, he is really remarkable for his intellectual acuteness. His logical acumen betokens a career as a thinker ... he reasons with a clearness far beyond his age.²

Dulles' grandfather, John Watson Foster, exerted even more influence upon the young Dulles, an influence which would eventually lead Dulles to a diplomatic career culminating, in 1953, in his becoming the 69th Secretary of State. Deane and David Heller in their book note that though Dulles as a boy was devoted to his parents, he "idolized" his grandfather "... more than any other person..." it was grandfather Foster "... who guided the youthful Foster Dulles in his choice of a career."³

Every summer Mrs. Dulles, accompanied by her children, visited grandfather Foster in Henderson Harbor located on Lake Ontario in upstate New York. There the young Dulles not only learned from his grandfather how to sail and fish, but listened to his stories of diplomatic adventures which were augmented by diplomatic goings on in Henderson Harbor. In his capacity as legal advisor to the Imperial Government of China in the negotiation of the Treaty of Shimonoseki in 1895, Mr. Foster entertained several distinguished guests. This, notes Hoopes, could not help but widen and enrich the perspective of the Dulles children who viewed the

²Townsend Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, (Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Little, Brown and Company, 1973), p. 11, citing Diary of Mrs. Allen Macy Dulles, February 25, 1893, Dulles Papers.

³Deane and David Heller, John Foster Dulles: Soldier for Peace, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), p. 23.

... steady stream of distinguished visitors to Henderson Harbor: Chinese gentlemen, European ambassadors, American politicians, journalists, and other men of marked or moderate consequence who came briefly to rest and rusticate and talk.⁴

John Foster Dulles received his primary education from the Watertown public school system, because his parents could not afford a private school. Nevertheless, Mr. Dulles was proud of this education emphasizing that he, "... learned here solidly the fundamentals of reading, writing, and arithmetic, plus American history."⁵ He was particularly impressed with the way American history was taught then in public schools,

... so as to emphasize the best in our great American tradition.... Historians today seem to take pride in trying to find defects in our great national figures, and to show hypocrisy in our national conduct.⁶

At the age of fifteen, Foster finished high school. Despite his intelligence, his parents felt he was too young to enter college. As a result, in the summer of 1903, Mrs. Dulles took Foster and his sister Eleanor to Europe. They spent most of their time in Lausanne, Switzerland, where the children studied French. Afterwards, young Foster returned to Washington where he was tutored for a year in preparation for entrance into Princeton in the Fall of 1904. Foster was sixteen when he entered Princeton, a young age which certainly must have been a social if not a psychological handicap. Michael Guhin in his book remarks that,

⁴Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 13.

⁵Gerson, American Secretaries of State, p. 8.

⁶Ibid., p. 8.

"He (Dulles) was a serious student who 'kept greatly to himself' so that few of the 'classmates knew him well.' His keeping to himself was probably a product of the fact that most of his classmates were older."⁷ Townsend Hoopes noted, similarly, that in addition to being socially insecure he was academically ill-prepared as well. Hoopes points to a paper Dulles wrote for a Freshman literature course in which he,

... revealed a curious mixture of apology and defiance in the face of the undisguisable truth that the Watertown schools had not prepared him precisely in grammar or widely in literature....⁸

Dulles' education while he was at Princeton was not confined to merely academic pursuits. At the end of his Junior year in the Summer of 1907, Foster received an invitation from his grandfather Foster to attend the Second Hague Peace Conference. Upon his arrival at the Hague the young Dulles, most likely at the hand of his grandfather, was made a secretary to the Chinese delegation, "... and because of his knowledge of the French language was enabled to render useful service to the delegation."⁹ There seem to be disparate points of view as to young Dulles' competency in French. Hoopes raises this question asserting that Dulles was fluent only in English. Apparently, Dulles had a basic working knowledge of French but as for being conversant, Hoopes relates a comment from P. G. Wodehouse who remarked, "'Oui,' the man said in fluent French."¹⁰

⁷Michael A. Guhin, John Foster Dulles A Statesman and his Times, (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1972), p. 21, quoting Interview with Arthur Krock, in Princeton University's John Foster Dulles Oral History Project (February 20, 1965), p. 1.

⁸Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, pp. 18 & 20.

⁹Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 22, quoting Author interview with Henry P. de Vries, September 21, 1971.

His level of proficiency in French is really not the important factor. The question that Hoopes raises would appear to confirm my contention that it was Dulles' grandfather and not his fluency in French which was the prime influence in his getting the job. This should not, however, detract from the fact that his attendance at the Hague was a valuable experience to him. As Guhin notes,

The experience provided two basic impressions for young Dulles: first, evidence of hope and possibilities for increased cooperation between nations and, second, the fact that realities and not hope constitute the context of foreign relations.¹¹

Upon returning from the Hague, Dulles completed his Senior year at Princeton and graduated with honors, Phi Beta Kappa, and as valedictorian of his class. In addition to these honors he won the Chancellor Green Mental Science Fellowship for his essay, "The Theory of Judgment," which entitled him to a six hundred dollar scholarship to study at the Sorbonne. While at the Sorbonne, Dulles studied under Henri Bergson who became a profound influence upon his thinking. Bergson's belief that life must be, "... a continued striving after a precise adaptation to reality...", was one which Dulles would later apply to his first book, War, Peace and Change.¹² The concept of peaceful change embodied in Bergson's philosophy became a basic belief which the Hellers insist obsessed Dulles. This, in tandem with the teachings of his father, in the Hellers' words,

... led Dulles to a passionate belief in freedom, and to a belief that the colonial peoples of the world, Asians particularly, must be free to change their political institutions to achieve independence and government of their own choosing as rapidly as they could prepare

¹¹Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 22.

¹²Heller, John Foster Dulles, p. 38.

themselves to manage their own affairs.¹³

Law Career and Diplomacy

His year at the Sorbonne completed, Dulles faced the momentous decision of choosing a career. Though his father had strongly hoped his oldest son would follow in his footsteps, Foster rationalized the combination of a legal career with "lay" service to the church. Hoopes indicates that the Reverend Dulles, though disappointed, was "... apparently overcome by the maturity and logic with which he (Foster) presented the case, and both parents ended up thoroughly approving his decision to become 'a Christian lawyer.'"¹⁴

Foster chose George Washington Law School in which to study law, primarily because it was located in Washington D. C. where Foster could live with his grandparents. Dulles approached his studies with his usual expedition, completing the normal three years of studies in only two years. In the summer of 1911, he took the New York State bar examination passing it with relative ease. Despite Dulles' rather superlative academic achievements, obtaining employment in a law firm was remarkably difficult. Only after his grandfather had interceded on Foster's behalf was he able to secure a job with the law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell. Grandfather Foster had worked for Algernon Sullivan many years ago and, though Sullivan was now dead, his partner William Cromwell was touched by the remarks contained in Foster's introductory letter: "Isn't the memory of an old associ-

¹³Heller, John Foster Dulles, p. 39.

¹⁴Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 24.

ation enough to give this young man a chance?"¹⁵

Dulles' performance with the firm during his first year was very satisfactory and at the completion of this year he received a 100 percent increase in salary, from fifty dollars to one hundred dollars a month. This increase in pay was sufficient to encourage Dulles' desire to get married. His wife-to-be was Janet Avery, whom he had known since the summer of 1908. Though the salary increase was an incentive to marry, the 20,000 dollars his grandfather made available to Foster satisfied any question of financial worries. With this comfortable nest egg to rely upon, John Foster Dulles and Janet Avery were married on June 26, 1912.

In early 1917, Dulles was chosen for his first diplomatic mission. The United States was contemplating entry into World War One and had grave doubts as to the position of certain Latin American countries which the United States considered vital to her security. These countries, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and specifically Panama, were involved; and the United States feared German sabotage of the Panama Canal. Due to the fact that the law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell represented Panama in legal matters, one of their lawyers could easily travel to Panama without raising the suspicions of the Germans. Dulles was selected for several reasons: for one, he had successfully worked in Central America before and had a "working" knowledge of Spanish. More important, however, was the fact that the Secretary of State at that time was Robert Lansing, Foster's uncle and he, Lansing, chose his nephew for the job. Once again, Dulles' fortunes were improved by his family relations, but this should not detract from the good job Foster did in securing the co-operation of these Central

¹⁵Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 25.

American governments.

The mission was not entirely successful from Dulles' personal viewpoint. His discussions with the Costa Rican revolutionary government of General Tinoco were supposed to provide the State Department with information and recommendations as to the recognition or non-recognition of the new government. Dulles in a secret memorandum to his uncle had recommended the formal recognition of the new regime, a suggestion which later was rejected by President Wilson. Guhin indicates that Dulles "unequivocally disapproved" of Wilson's solution to the Costa Rican situation. The policy of non-recognition and non-intercourse was, "... negative and destructive in its operation' ... unless it were '... in aid of a specific constructive program.'"¹⁶

Dulles' approach to the Costa Rican question reflected his beliefs regarding change, specifically the recognition of new governments which ascended to power through revolutionary means:

... non-recognition, in the case of a government exercising undisputed control, is ... a measure rarely to be availed of.... The United States cannot ... lay down as a general principle, applicable even to the Caribbean states alone, the non-recognition of every government which comes into power through a revolution. (This was particularly so because) ... actual revolution is often the only effective method of preventing an indefinite perpetuation of power.¹⁷

In the final analysis, Guhin asserts "... Dulles concluded from the incident that good motives and theoretical principles of morality were guarantees of neither normally virtuous nor politically successful policies...."¹⁸

¹⁶ Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 25, citing Dulles confidential report to the Secretary of State, in Papers (May 21, 1917), p. 9.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 25, citing Dulles confidential report to the Secretary of State, in Papers (May 21, 1917), pp. 9-10.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 25.

As Dulles would later write,

The policy which we did adopt, although it could not be said to involve the slightest infraction of the highest theoretical standards of international law, in fact constituted an interference of a most burdensome nature.¹⁹

After the United States declared war against Germany, Foster attempted to join a combat unit of the army but was rejected because of poor eyesight. On a previous trip to Central America, while working for Sullivan and Cromwell, Dulles had contracted a severe case of malaria. This necessitated massive doses of quinine which had irreparably damaged the optic nerves of his eyes. However, he was commissioned as a Captain in the Army.

Serving as a lawyer, Dulles became an assistant to Vance McCormick, chairman of the War Trade Board. In this capacity he helped to draft an executive order which enabled President Wilson to seize some eighty-seven Dutch merchant ships much needed for the war effort. Dulles was eventually promoted to major and was, as Hoopes writes, "... highly regarded for exceptional competence and judgment, not only by Vance McCormick, but also by Bernard Baruch, who headed the War Industries Board."²⁰

When the war ended, President Wilson decided to attend Versailles in person. The President selected Vance McCormick and Bernard Baruch to assist him in the activities at Versailles. Mr. Baruch, in turn, chose Dulles to be his legal counsel and assigned him to the Central Bureau of Planning and Statistics. This Bureau was mainly concerned with the economic ramifications of any reparations clause finally agreed upon at Versailles.

¹⁹Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 25, citing Dulles, Annals, CXLIV (1929), 103; and Dulles, "Criticisms of Mr. Hatch's Report on 'War,'" essay written as a member of the Presbyterian General Assembly's Committee on War, in Papers (1924), p. 3.

²⁰Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 28.

The question of how much Germany should pay for damages became a central one throughout the negotiations. Both the elected British and French representatives wanted to wring every pfennig they could out of an already economically devastated Germany.

Dulles actively opposed the plan which would require outrageous reparations to compensate for all the losses of Britain, France, Belgium and the allies resulting from World War One:

... if we hold to the domain of reason, we cannot adopt such methods. To demand the gigantic total of war costs would be to jeopardize ... that specific reparation as to which Germany must clearly recognize her liability, and the satisfaction of which will tax her resources to the limit.²¹

The original principles concerning reparations were authored by Dulles and basically embodied two major points:

(1) that Germany make good the damages resulting directly from acts clearly in violation of international law, such as her violation of Belgian neutrality, which had been guaranteed by a treaty among Great Britain, Russia, France, Austria, and Prussia; and (2) that Germany make good her pre-Armistice agreement to compensate for all damages to civilian populations and their property, this being construed by the American delegation to mean direct physical damage to property of nonmilitary character and direct physical injury to civilians.²²

Australian Prime Minister W. M. Hughes contended that Britain, France, and Belgium were entitled to reparations since Britain and France were fulfilling their treaty obligations to defend neutral Belgium. Belgium was entitled to reparations as well since she was the victim. Beal notes that Hughes carried his argument almost ad absurdum maintaining that the "... Australian who had mortgaged his house to buy war bonds was as rightfully

²¹Heller, John Foster Dulles, p. 61.

²²John Robinson Beal, John Foster Dulles: 1888 - 1959, (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1959), p. 64.

entitled to reparations as a Frenchman whose home had been burned by the Germans."²³ Dulles replying to Hughes' argument commented:

... does the policeman receive his hire from the wrongdoer whom he arrests? No, in making the arrest the policeman has performed his duty - nobly, gallantly, at great sacrifice, if you will; but still his duty. And the reparations made by the wrongdoers is made to the victim - not to the guardian of the law.²⁴

The Dulles argument was sound but the political climate of Versailles was not conducive to sound thinking. The victors, still smarting from the high costs of victory, wanted to punish Germany; and no amount of logic was going to deter them from this goal. Dulles ultimately lost in his attempts to limit the war reparations when President Wilson personally decided against it. In a showdown between Dulles and the President, Deane and David Heller wrote, the President

... lapsed into mild profanity.... 'Damn!' Wilson is said to have exploded. 'I have made up my mind to yield on the reparations question.' ... It was part of the price he paid to get the League of Nations written into the Versailles Treaty.²⁵

Dulles earned the respect of those in attendance at Versailles and President Wilson personally requested that Dulles remain in Paris:

... to handle the very important and difficult matters with which you have become so familiar and which you have so materially assisted in handling. My request is justified by the confidence we have all learned to feel in your judgment and ability....²⁶

President Wilson was not the only one who recognized Dulles' talents.

After his job was finished in France, Dulles received many lucrative job

²³Beal, John Foster Dulles, p. 64.

²⁴Ibid., p. 67.

²⁵Heller, John Foster Dulles, p. 61.

²⁶Beal, John Foster Dulles, p. 69.

offers from differing law firms, including the prestigious law firm headed by J. P. Morgan. Dulles was to turn down these offers in order to return to Sullivan and Cromwell, the firm which had given him a break when no one else would. Upon learning of the offers made to Dulles, his superiors gave him a substantial raise in pay. Not too long after this he became a Senior partner of the firm.

During the inter-war years, Dulles became very well known. At one point the Hellers write, "His career was so fabulous that Life magazine once noted that he was 'reputed to be the world's highest paid lawyer' and the highest paid corporation lawyer in the history of New York City."²⁷ In 1923, Dulles again returned to the problem of German war reparations. J. P. Morgan retained him to work with the Dawes committee as a special counsel. The eventual Dawes Plan, implemented in 1924, was a series of loans which originated in the United States. Simply stated, the United States made loans to Germany who in turn would pay her reparations to Britain and France, who in turn would pay back war debts owed to the United States. In Dulles' opinion this was still an unsatisfactory solution to the reparations question for it did not do the one thing he felt vital - to establish a fixed level of debt and a date for the final payment of that debt.

Shortly after these negotiations, the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell underwent a series of significant changes. Two of the top partners in the firm died and a third retired due to poor health, leaving a void which a young and capable man like Dulles could fill. By 1926, Dulles

²⁷Heller, John Foster Dulles, p. 67.

at the age of 38 became a directing partner, a feat which was rather remarkable even for a man of his talents. During this same year Dulles undertook a job as counsel to American underwriters of a loan to Poland. The loan amounted to sixty-two million dollars and was used to shore up Poland's weak economic condition. The stabilization plan was eventually ironed out and the Polish Zloty was revalued at 11.22 cents. As Beal indicated, "... handling the legal side of such a transaction took a high degree of economic, legal, and fiscal knowledge."²⁸

Following the stock market crash of 1929, the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell represented several firms which had declared bankruptcy. Perhaps the most notable of these was the international firm of Kreuger and Toll. This firm was part of the Kreuger match empire, headed by Swedish industrialist Ivar Kreuger who had amassed corporations all over the world. In 1932, Kreuger committed suicide and some time later, after the books were audited, "... it was learned that there was a cumulative shortage of funds in excess of one billion, one million dollars - a record which easily gives Kreuger the title of greatest swindler in history."²⁹ Dulles took the job of representing the American holders of Kreuger and Toll bonds which at the time were selling for 8 cents on the dollar. Through skillful handling of the case over a period of years, his clients were eventually able to get back 80 cents on the dollar for their bonds.

For all his dealings in Europe, the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, and specifically Dulles himself, never represented any of the German car-

²⁸Beal, John Foster Dulles, p. 80.

²⁹Heller, John Foster Dulles, p. 67.

tels, in particular the infamous I. G. Farben which in future years became involved in the slaughter of Jews. Beal asserts this point rather strongly, indicating the origins of such accusations could be traced to a "... Russian publication, Moscow's New Times in the spring of 1947, apparently in retaliation for an article Dulles wrote for Life magazine in 1946 entitled 'Soviet Foreign Policy and What to Do About It.'"³⁰

War, Peace and Change

Just prior to the outbreak of World War Two, Dulles put together a book, War, Peace and Change, in which he described how best to achieve peaceful change. War could no longer be an acceptable method in achieving change due to the terrible toll modern war takes on human life in the form of both combatants and civilians. He described the basic problem as the selfishness and gregariousness of man:

The history of the human race is largely a history of the effort to reconcile selfishness with gregariousness. The elimination of the war system is the final and most difficult phase of this age-long effort. If the final effort is to be successful, it will only be by realizing that we are dealing with a part of a single problem which has troubled society, but which we have measurably learned to solve.³¹

In order to solve this problem, Dulles develops the ethical and political principles of such a solution. His ethical solution, relies upon the spiritual rather than the material desires of man. This approach is "unselfishness," and as Dulles notes, has proven only fair in

³⁰ Beal, John Foster Dulles, p. 85.

³¹ John Foster Dulles, War, Peace and Change, (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1939), p. 8.

the mitigation of human desires - it does not eliminate them. It is incumbent upon a political solution, through some governing authority, to assess the needs and desires of the group. This assessment could furnish a solution which would provide the maximum amount of satisfaction with a minimum of dissatisfaction. The problem with this, Dulles points out, is that material wants are not definable in finite values. Aside from this, if material desires are satisfied, there is nothing to prevent desires from being redefined in terms of ambition. As Dulles summarizes:

There is little evidence to support the conclusion that satisfaction can be permanently increased, and conflict of desire eliminated, merely by raising the general standard of living.³²

Next, Dulles discusses the inadequacies of international treaties among nations as a method for reducing the tendency towards violence. These treaties are not formulated by a central authority concerned with general welfare. Furthermore, they do not have the flexibility necessary in a world which is constantly changing. The enforcement of these types of treaties is problematical as well. Since they are not judged by a higher central authority we cannot, Dulles asserts, consider them law or sacred. If, however, we do consider treaties "sacred law," we fall into the "trap" of attempting to outlaw war. With the formulation of the League of Nations, notably Article 19 which was to provide for re-consideration of treaties,

We here find the first attempt to realize an international organism having authority to pass upon treaties, to apply to each the test of furtherance of world peace, to direct attention to those which might from time to time fail to meet the test and to advise their reform.³³

³²Dulles, War, Peace and Change, p. 15.

³³Ibid., p. 49

In his analysis of the causes of war, Dulles outlines the prerequisites to what he calls "totalitarian" war. Unlike preceding wars fought with standing armies, this type of war necessitates the conscripting of whole populations and the massing of all a nation's wealth for the impending struggle. This type of war derives from a "mob psychology" and results from mass media personification and idolizing of a nation's leader. It thus becomes possible to portray one's opponent as the villain while the national leader is the infallible hero. By accomplishing this, ideology is provided and wars can be fought for a "cause." The ethical solution is hampered since one is sacrificing oneself for an ideology or "cause" and the political solution cannot work if the leader is "incapable" of wrong. Therefore, with compromise being unthinkable and higher authority non-existent, the end result is that

Force, as exemplified by power politics, is the only solvent, and force is made available for the achievement of the desires of the state through the spirit of self-sacrifice which the individual group members place at the disposal of their respective political authorities.³⁴

After describing the causes of war, Dulles offers a critique of solutions which were devised to eliminate the problem. These solutions fail to cut to the heart of the matter - how to bring about change in a peaceful manner. As he remarked,

Most peace efforts have only ephemeral results because they are limited to striking directly at an undesired manifestation. There is a failure to deal with causes which, if unaltered, inevitably produce that which we would avoid.³⁵

Dulles does feel that there is a solution to the problem. This solution

³⁴ Dulles, War, Peace and Change, p. 71.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 99.

involves the "ethical" and "political" solutions he outlined at the outset of his book. To apply these principles we must, in the case of the ethical solution, somehow bring about national desires which do not conflict with other nation's desires and vice versa. Second, the personification of the state must be "diluted" so that the leaders are not viewed as heroes or "quasideity" since they do not have the quality of "unselfishness." This, however, cannot be accomplished overnight. The political solution is not an easy problem to solve either. But Dulles feels that by starting with international bodies which can be effective in the "authority" role, they might well serve to balance "... the dynamic and static desires of the personified states...."³⁶

Dulles' book War, Peace and Change, generally received favorable reviews at the time. Vernon Van Dyke commented in The American Political Science Review,

In the present situation, one naturally despairs of success for such a program yet if a significant reduction in the role of war is ever made, the path to that goal is likely to be very close to the one which Mr. Dulles here points out.³⁷

Though favorably disposed toward the Dulles thesis, especially the devil personification complex, Carl J. Friedrich writing in The Commonweal contends:

But law and order, both at home and abroad, cannot be upheld without a recognition of the fact that there are evil men, and evil actions which must be either stopped or at least confined within the narrowest possible limits. Some time ago, Borgese wrote: 'It is the disbelief in evil which either makes lukewarm the servant of good, or

³⁶ Dulles, War, Peace and Change, p. 105.

³⁷ Vernon Van Dyke, review of War, Peace and Change, by John Foster Dulles, in The American Political Science Review, XXXIII (October 1939), p. 930.

consigns him to the doom of a blind fight.' Mr. Dulles is in this danger.³⁸

Dulles' approach to peaceful change and the argument he makes to accord nations like Germany a right to make certain changes would later get him into trouble. He maintains in his book, written in 1938, most likely before the Czechoslovakian crisis, that England and France (the static forces attempting to maintain the status quo) share the responsibility for the problems of the 30's by attempting to keep Germany down. Furthermore, their refusal to exercise their power in order to maintain the status quo worsened the situation. This contention, Guhin points out, would later result in Dulles being accused of sympathizing with the Nazis. This charge, which surfaced about 1944, was made by those who generally failed to grasp fully what Dulles was postulating, and simply was not grounded in fact. From his chapter, "Application of the 'Political' Principle," Dulles notes:

Change, even in territory, is not evil of itself. Evil may be in the manner of its happening. If territory is acquired through an outbreak of pent-up energy, then attendant conditions are almost inevitably distressing and destructive of many values we would conserve. By intelligent planning and by utilizing other avenues of change, we could have assured that the territorial changes, if they ultimately proved inevitable, would have occurred as a matured development, naturally and easily, without shock or violence.³⁹

³⁸Carl J. Friedrich, review of War, Peace and Change, by John Foster Dulles, in The Commonweal, XXIX (April 7, 1939), p. 668.

³⁹Dulles, War, Peace and Change, p. 155.

World War Two, Bipartisanship, and Politics

The outbreak of World War Two had a profound effect upon Mr. Dulles in both his political and his religious thinking. Mr. Dulles expressed warnings against the combination of "spiritual and secular motives" in his first book. However, by 1942 at the bleakest point of the war, Dulles maintained that Americans need to find, "... a faith so profound that we, too, will feel that we have a mission to spread it throughout the world."⁴⁰ This faith would rest in a new League of Nations concept and the mission would be for Dulles to promote the idea throughout the United States. Hopefully, this would prevent a repetition of President Wilson's catastrophic failure to sell the League to the American people.

Following the Atlantic Charter meeting between Roosevelt and Churchill, Dulles and others of similar persuasion established the "Commission of a Just and Durable Peace." With Dulles as its chairman, this commission published several articles designed to influence the American people. The most notable, was an anthology of past pronouncements entitled, "The Six Pillars of Peace."

These six points were considerably more moralistic than his conclusions in War, Peace and Change. The prime element in the conduct of international politics was moral law, and the United States was intended to be the guiding light towards the establishment and maintenance of world peace. President Roosevelt was impressed with Dulles and appointed him, on March 26, 1943, to promote public understanding and acceptance of a United Nations.

⁴⁰ Henry P. Van Dusen, ed., The Spiritual Legacy of John Foster Dulles, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), p. 93.

In 1944, Dulles became involved with partisan politics through his association with Thomas E. Dewey. Dulles had, in 1937, attempted to hire Dewey, then a successful trial lawyer, for the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell. Mr. Dewey accepted on the condition that he first complete his job of investigating the rackets in New York. His investigation drew wide public attention and there was strong public sentiment that he run for district attorney which he did successfully. By 1944, Dewey then the Governor of New York, was nominated for President by the Republican presidential convention. Dulles became a Dewey advisor on foreign affairs and in that capacity represented Dewey in talks with administration officials. Expressing concern over the Dumbarton Oaks conference, Dulles secured an invitation to discuss matters with the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. What followed was a rather curious exchange between Dulles and the Secretary over the question of what to call the co-operation on foreign policy between the two political parties. While Dulles pressed for calling it "bipartisanship," Hull, under pressure from an irritated FDR (annoyed that such a meeting during an election year was taking place at all) won out in his interpretation of co-operation calling it "non-partisanship."

Following this meeting, Dulles became the recipient of several political attacks, the harshest of which came from Senator Pepper of Florida, who alleged that, "'Baron Kurt von Schroeder a financial backer of Adolph Hitler,' had interests in America represented by the J. Henry Schroeder Banking Company, represented by Sullivan and Cromwell."⁴¹ These charges

⁴¹Heller, John Foster Dulles, p. 99.

in future years were echoed by Russians but were never substantiated in fact. The real truth of the matter was that Mr. Dulles directed the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, in 1933, to close its office in Berlin.

Despite the partisan attacks resulting from this "non-partisan" approach, Dulles did influence the administration in its negotiations in the proposed United Nations charter. As a result, "Republican - Democratic co-operation continued as the charter negotiations proceeded."⁴² Under the leadership of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Republican of Michigan, "bipartisanship" and support of United Nations creation continued. Also, Dulles received an appointment to the founding conference of the United Nations in San Francisco as a senior United States advisor.

Between 1946 and 1948 Dulles worked in bipartisanship co-operation with the Democratic administration. He attended such meetings as the United Nations General Assembly in 1946; the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting in Moscow, during March and April 1947, with Secretary of State Marshall; and the London session of the council in November and December 1947. Dulles staunchly maintained that in the post war struggle with the new Russian adversary, bipartisanship was a very necessary element of a successful American foreign policy:

If the American people follow hither-and-thither leadership, then the greatest force in the world today becomes vacillating and undependable. Sober men elsewhere will feel that they cannot depend upon us ... and reckless men everywhere will be tempted to gamble on the fact that American power will be immobilized by internal division.⁴³

In 1948, the call of politics came again to Dulles. Dewey was rated

⁴²Beal, John Foster Dulles, p. 101.

⁴³Heller, John Foster Dulles, p. 112.

as a sure bet to become the next President, and Dulles was thought to be Dewey's choice for Secretary of State. Being involved in important United Nations negotiations in Paris concerning the Berlin Blockade, Dulles did not take active part in the election as he had in 1944. Dewey did not win and Dulles, deeply disappointed, seriously considered resigning his position as a delegate to the United Nations. He was eventually dissuaded by Secretary of State Marshall.

Dulles was not to be out of the political eye for long; in July of 1949, Governor Dewey appointed him to fill the vacated Senate seat of Robert Wagner Senior. For four months Dulles served tenaciously as a United States Senator and in that role argued effectively for approval of the North Atlantic Treaty. Dulles enjoyed his position, especially the fact that he had found an effective forum for voicing his opinions. He had no intention of running for re-election that November; but no other Republican dared to run against the announced Democratic contender, former Governor, and effective vote-getter, Herbert Lehman. Dulles, therefore, felt obliged to make the attempt. The ensuing campaign was dirty as campaigns go, with charges and countercharges. Lehman was accused of accepting communist support, while Dulles was accused of being a bigot opposed to Jews, Blacks, and foreigners. At the end, Lehman won by slightly under 200,000 votes. Though this was a fairly large margin, Dulles had done significantly better than the Republican strategists had expected.

War or Peace

With time to reflect after his senatorial defeat, Dulles turned his efforts to a second book entitled War or Peace, published in 1950. This book was a partisan approach to the problems of the time. It was, as Guhin notes, an attempt "... to describe the Russian communist threat in terms of its impact upon and meaning for American and relative stability."⁴⁴ In his first section, Dulles explains the problem as recognizing the danger of spreading Communism. This danger did not come from the Russian people, but rather the Communist party which sought world domination. Dulles notes that moral standards are ineffectual with the Communists since they are atheistic.

Some people have such high moral standards that they voluntarily refrain from using bad methods to get what they want; they believe that even good and desired ends do not justify evil means. But atheists can hardly be expected to conform to an ideal so high. The only test that they can be expected to apply is the test of expedience: Does it work? Certainly, ⁴⁵so far, Soviet Communist methods have brought amazing success.

With the problem defined, Dulles sets out to describe the policies of the United States. He notes that the policy of no appeasement was a hard lesson learned from the experience of Munich in 1938. Compromise, however, when it involves legitimate concession was an acceptable policy. As for the development of the United Nations, he comments that its establishment does not guarantee peace but has "great possibilities." After citing specific incidents in which the United Nations operates, he con-

⁴⁴ Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 57.

⁴⁵ John Foster Dulles, War or Peace, (London: George G. Harrap and Company, 1950), pp. 19-20.

cludes:

The United Nations cannot do everything. Its uses are limited by its nature. It is not a substitute for United States foreign policy, and its activities cannot relieve the United States of major responsibilities of its own. But, ... its possibilities are such that the United Nations can be, and should be, a cornerstone of United States foreign policy.⁴⁶

Dulles explains the differences between the western and communist worlds in terms of Christianity versus atheism. Though he asserts that the western powers were not always promoting a universal goal of "human betterment," he believes that:

... (the) Christian belief so conditioned material self-interest that, for the most part, individuals could not get self-satisfaction for themselves without at the same time promoting the general good.⁴⁷

The Communists sought to strike at the colonial position by severing the colonial powers from their sources of raw materials. Once separated from the colonial powers, the communists felt that the newly independent states would naturally fall into the Soviet orbit. Dulles contends, however, that western colonial policies had a "liberating quality" and that these colonies would eventually gain self-control through a gradual evolutionary process. In the final analysis it was our religion which differentiates us from the pagan empires of the past. The pagan empires were wholly materialistic, not endowed with the basic ideals of liberty and freedom. We, on the other hand, will be saved from ruin by our religion and ideals.

In his book Dulles attempted to answer the question: What needs to be done? His first answer was that we need to develop definite biparti-

⁴⁶Dulles, War or Peace, p. 41.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 75.

sanship methods, "... so that neither party can get away with a hoax."⁴⁸ For bipartisanship to be successful, Dulles lists five points: first, the responsibility for initiating bipartisanship lay with the administration; second, participation from the opposition party must be made to loyal party members; third, these people must be qualified in the foreign policy field; and fourth, they must have a hand in the foreign policy development. Once these first four requirements were met, the opposition party had the responsibility to refrain from taking political advantage of the results. The opposition party should support the results, "... through treaty ratifications and Congressional appropriations as far as their convictions permit."⁴⁹

Next, there was a need to develop world organizations, in short to admit the nations of the world which are not now members of the United Nations. The United Nations should reflect the reality of the world as it is; therefore, to keep nations out prevents the United Nations from mirroring reality. Dulles suggested that the United Nations undergo four specific changes. First, voting in the General Assembly should be changed to a "weighted" vote rather than the one nation one vote procedure. This change would reflect to some extent the population and relative strength of the nation voting. Second, the veto in the Security Council should be changed, limited to only substantive matters thereby preventing the veto from being used on procedural or organizational matters. Third, there should be universal membership conditioned only

⁴⁸Dulles, War or Peace, p. 182.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 184.

on the "moral quality" of the nation concerned. The new member must be willing to carry out the obligation of the charter. And fourth, the working procedures of the General Assembly should be streamlined to eliminate irrelevant and time consuming matters; this, Dulles felt, would guarantee the continual attendance of the leading participants. To accomplish all these changes, Dulles proposed the convening of a General conference:

... to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights in the dignity and worth of the human person.⁵⁰

Another important goal he felt we should strive for is western unity. The European Recovery Act and the North Atlantic Pact sought these goals, and Dulles supported the concept of a United States of Europe. In this way, questions, such as ownership of the Saar, would no longer have to be solved in nationalistic terms. The German rearmament problem could be solved as well if military control were exercised by a united Europe instead of a nationalistic Germany. This new and united Europe, Dulles concludes, would be sufficiently strong to defend itself against any Russian threat which might be mounted.

There also exists a need to save Asia from Communism. Our relations with Asia in the past depended on China, but now this is not possible. This, Dulles claims, was due to our misguided policies and now we need to establish a new policy. Citing NATO as an example of intelligent foreign policy, Dulles suggests that we attempt to establish a permanent "Association of Free Nations of Asia and the Pacific." "An Association for Asia

⁵⁰Dulles, War or Peace, p. 210.

and the Pacific would best start as a consultative council for those who have a common concern for national independence and human freedom and want to do something about it."⁵¹ Dulles then points out that bipartisanship in this area of foreign policy is sadly lacking, remarking that the pending Japanese peace treaty was being handled exclusively by the administration without any effort towards bipartisanship. To this approach Dulles warns: "Little can be accomplished without bipartisanship with respect to Far Eastern policies."⁵²

Dulles then turns his attention to the military, contending that the American military must be kept strong. Our military men are specialists in their field and their council should be listened to. This does not mean that they have the ultimate answer, for they are not politicians or economists, but their advice should not be disregarded. Unfortunately, as Dulles indicates, the military viewpoint has dominated in our policy making, and this has not always been in our best interest, i.e. "To get an air base at the price of good will may be a very bad bargain."⁵³

Dulles concludes:

... that advice should be weighed by those who believe that war is not inevitable, that we can and must have peace. Indeed, history suggests that only those who are willing to take some chances for peace have a good chance of winning total war.⁵⁴

His book was received with mixed emotions. William T. R. Fox writ-

⁵¹Dulles, War or Peace, p. 230.

⁵²Ibid., p. 232.

⁵³Ibid., p. 239.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 241.

ing in The American Political Science Review, commented,

War or Peace is a sensible book which ought to be widely read, even if in its autobiographical aspects it does suggest that John Foster Dulles has batted 1,000 and that his Democratic collaborators do not have quite such a spectacular batting average.⁵⁵

Basil Rauch writing in Political Science Quarterly, noted the same criticism of Dulles' historical experiences, but concluded, "John Foster Dulles' book is a sober redemption of hope after five years of discouragement."⁵⁶ Max Lerner, on the other hand, writing in the New Republic, presented an opposing point of view:

The crucial trouble with Dulles' world is that he tries to be both a churchman relying on spiritual values and a power-politician relying on an overwhelming balance of force. He cannot make the two parts of his intellectual world meet, or tie the loose strings together. The result is that when Dulles appeals to the spiritual, he sounds more unctuous than others; and when he maps out plans for strengthening Germany and Japan or building an underground of espionage in Europe, he sounds more cynical than others.⁵⁷

Japanese Peace Treaty, 1952 Election

Regardless of the reviews of Dulles' book, one positive occurrence did come not long after its publication. Due perhaps to his comments on bipartisanship, especially in relation to Asian affairs, Dulles was asked to negotiate the Japanese Peace Treaty. His status was actually that of

⁵⁵ William T. R. Fox, review of War or Peace, by John Foster Dulles, in The American Political Science Review, XLIV (September 1950). pp. 752-753.

⁵⁶ Basil Rauch, review of War or Peace, by John Foster Dulles, in Political Science Quarterly, LXV (December 1950). p. 592.

⁵⁷ Max Lerner, review of War or Peace, by John Foster Dulles, in the New Republic, CXXII (May 15, 1950). p. 18.

consultant, with the Secretary of State holding final responsibility for the treaty. Hoopes cited the comments of Frederick S. Dunn, an Asian scholar, who wrote that Dulles was not, "'The architect of the Japanese peace treaty,' but 'rather ... the (statesman) who successfully negotiated and carried out, albeit with various improvisations and innovations, a previous blueprint.'"⁵⁸ Dulles did, however, make known his philosophy to the State Department on two rather important points. First, that the peace treaty should not be vindictive as had the Versailles treaty, and second, Japan should be aligned with the free world in the cold war.

In June of 1950, Dulles along with John Allison, director of the Bureau of Northeast Asian affairs, was off to Japan with a one-week stop-off in South Korea. After inspecting the 38th Parallel and delivering a speech to the South Korean parliament in which he (Dulles) gave moral support to the South Koreans, Dulles and his party flew on to Tokyo. Five days later North Korea invaded the South and soon the situation became quite serious. This necessitated fast action in concluding the peace treaty with Japan. By September, Dulles was elevated from consultant to ambassador-at-large by President Truman and was instructed to conclude mutual security agreements with Japan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and, if he could, Indonesia. The ultimate solution, worked out by Dulles during the next four months and approved by all concerned, involved, first; a bilateral United States Japan security agreement with United States forces stationed in Japan at their invitation; second, a bilateral United States Philippine security agreement with United States

⁵⁸Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 92, citing Frederick S. Dunn, Peacemaking and the Settlement with Japan, p. 54.

forces stationed by mutual agreement on the Philippines under mutual control; and, third, a tripartite agreement with the United States, Australia, and New Zealand (ANZUS Pact) which gave Australia and New Zealand, American assurances of protection against potential future aggression.

On September 4, 1951, the Peace treaty with Japan was signed in San Francisco; however, ratification was still to come. Dulles was chosen by the administration to guide the treaty through the Senate in order to insure its passage. The final stumbling block to ratification was questions concerning Japan's foreign policy intentions. Specifically, would they recognize Nationalist China. In December of 1951, Dulles returned to Tokyo and secured Japanese agreement to recognize Nationalist China. With this accomplished, the Senate in early 1952, ratified the Japanese Peace Treaty.

The 1952 Presidential elections found Dulles back in the political fray. He campaigned very hard for Eisenhower, making speeches in twenty states emphasizing a policy of "liberation" of Eastern Europe and the "roll back" of communism. These two terms were to become quite controversial as to the exact implication of the proposed policy. Speaking to the Council on Foreign Relations in Chicago, October 6, 1952, Mr. Dulles remarked:

They (the East Europeans) need no lessons from us, nor help from us, other than the kind of support which the American people have traditionally extended to other freedom-seeking peoples, and that means most significantly, confidence that we shall not hereafter sell them out.⁵⁹

This quote led Beal to comment, "In short, what Dulles meant and what he

⁵⁹Beal, John Foster Dulles, pp. 312-13.

specifically defined was an operation no more warlike than Joshua's march around the walls of Jericho."⁶⁰ It would appear that the words "liberation" and "roll back" were ill chosen, they implied a course of action which was not intended and though the shock value which these words carried may have helped General Eisenhower to win the election in 1952 by a wider margin, they were in the long run to prove detrimental to the real cause of liberation. Eisenhower won the election and after his victory, named John Foster Dulles as his choice for Secretary of State.

⁶⁰Beal, John Foster Dulles, p. 313.

C H A P T E R I I

THE ADMISSION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Early Experiences with China

Speaking before the China Institute in New York City on May 18, 1951, Mr. Dulles remarked:

One of my most prized possessions is a letter I received when 8 years old from Li Hung-Chang, then the great Chinese elder statesman. The opening sentence of the letter reads: 'To the little grandchild of General Foster, my friend and counsellor in my hours of perplexity and trouble.'¹

This, Dulles concluded, was symbolic of the relations between the Chinese and Americans, both in the past and as it should be in the future.

As has been previously mentioned, General Foster was a legal advisor to the Imperial Government of China, and the flow of ambassadors, politicians, journalists, and diplomats who came to Henderson Harbor must have had a profound influence upon young Foster who observed this procession on his frequent visits at Grandfather's.

After Grandfather Foster had finished his duties as advisor to the Chinese in the conference ending the Sino-Japanese war of 1895, he was offered a permanent position as advisor to Li Hung-Chang. This was a lucrative job offer with an astronomically high salary including a palace complete with servants. General Foster turned down this offer explaining to Li Hung-Chang in diplomatic terms:

I had made an engagement with and a promise to my seven-year-old grandson, that I would come home in time to go a-fishing with him

¹John Foster Dulles, "Sustaining Friendship with China," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXIV (May 28, 1951), 843.

that summer, and that it would destroy all his esteem and confidence in me, if I failed in my promise!²

Not long after his return to Henderson Harbor, Grandfather Foster sent Li Hung-Chang a picture of young Foster Dulles complete with a fishing pole attached to which was an oversized fish which was half the size of young Dulles. It is this picture which most likely inspired the letter Mr. Chang wrote to Dulles. Furthermore, the stories which his grandfather told of his experiences in China must likewise have impressed the young Dulles. This influence was something that Dulles would remember throughout his life, and which resulted in his opinion that too few Americans have a satisfactory understanding of the Far East. "He never forgot his grandfather's influence and the many talks as a boy with returning missionaries and educators from India, China, Korea and Japan."³

In 1907, during his Junior year at Princeton, Foster availed himself of the opportunity to be a secretary of the Chinese delegation in the Second Hague Peace Conference. Probably this situation was arranged by his grandfather, and Foster was assigned the job of translating French. Aside from this, it appears that he took part in a solution of a diplomatic problem which threatened the success of the Conference. Simply stated, the participating nations could not agree upon the order of precedence for courtesy calls. The final solution was that these pro forma calls be made simultaneously by all the participants.

Accordingly, one afternoon young Dulles put on a Prince Albert and

²Gerson, American Secretaries of State, p. 5.

³Eleanor Lansing Dulles, John Foster Dulles: The Last Year, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963), p. 167.

high silk hat and set out in a horse-drawn carriage bearing neat bundles of cards for each of the other delegations, and thus did the honors for the Chinese.⁴

From these experiences, Dulles had a basis for the formulation of his ideas on China, which as Hoopes writes, "... seem to have been composed about equally of sentiment and illusion...."⁵

In 1938, Dulles was approached by John D. Rockefeller Jr. who wanted him to conduct a world study of missionary activities. Though unable to accept this specific assignment, Dulles subsequently made a trip to the Far East during which he decided to pay a visit to Chiang Kai-shek. These were very turbulent times for China. The Japanese had invaded China and captured Nanking, the capital. The Nationalists, therefore, had evacuated Nanking and established a provisional capital at Hankow which was under Japanese air attack.

Hazarding the fog, air turbulence, and the potential threat of being shot down by Japanese fighter planes, Mr. Dulles flew to Hankow to visit Chiang. The impression of the Chinese leader that he formulated from this meeting added to his basic concept of China. Chiang had decided to

... base his policy on the historic friendship of the United States toward China. He had reached the conclusion that, sooner or later, the United States would come into the war against Japan; and he decided that China should resist, even if it meant standing alone, until that day should come.⁶

Considering Chiang a true Chinese patriot, Dulles was profoundly impressed by his courage in the face of adversity and his resolve to resist the

⁴Beal, John Foster Dulles, p. 47.

⁵Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 77.

⁶Dulles, War or Peace, p. 225.

Japanese rather than to strike a bargain with them.

Though the main concern of the Nationalists in 1938 was with the Japanese invaders, there was also the mounting threat of a successful Communist revolution under the direction of Mao Tse-tung. Ostensibly, the Communists were fighting with the Nationalists against the Japanese; however, it would seem that they fought the Japanese only when it suited their purposes.

What most influenced Dulles at this time was that Chiang and his wife were both Christians, the importance of which should not be minimized. Townsend Hoopes cites an example of Dulles' sentiment in this respect. He mentions a dinner party Secretary of State Dulles gave. George Allen, then a senior American diplomat, recounts that Dulles' brother Allen questioned the quality of democracy under the tutelage of Chiang in Formosa and Syngman Rhee in South Korea. The Secretary's reply probably best exhibits the strong emotional value Dulles placed in Christianity as a key to leadership in the struggle for democracy:

Well, I'll tell you this. No matter what you say about them, these two gentlemen are modern-day equivalents of the founders of the Church. They are Christian gentlemen who have suffered for their faith. They have been steadfast and have upheld the faith....⁷

Dulles' future support of Chiang was based in large part upon his Christian faith; however, Dulles also desired to see a friendly China with a strong pro-Western government. Chiang could provide such a government and thereby earned Dulles' favor. "Such a China, ... would welcome partnership with us in our policy of promoting political indepen-

⁷Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, citing George V. Allen, Oral History interview, p. 11.

dence in neighboring lands. A friendly China could help everywhere in Asia and the Pacific."⁸ This was the policy of the United States during the Second World War, a policy in which China was promoted as a world power to be accorded "great power status." Dulles agreed with this policy; however, he noted that it was this enhancing of Chinese prestige in the world which would eventually work against the United States when the Communists took over. The Communist revolution in China was indeed regrettable from Dulles' perspective, especially since he felt that the United States, with the proper foreign policy and guidance, could have prevented the loss of China to the Communists.

The Communist Revolution

As I have attempted to show, Dulles' concept of China was based primarily upon attachment to the past. The Communist revolution was a two-fold blow to Mr. Dulles: first, Communism sought the destruction of Christian influence in China; and second, he feared that this change in China marked an expansion of Communist domination under the direct control of Moscow. The Communists in China were effectuating change which in Dulles' opinion conformed to his stated prerequisites to totalitarian war. China was organizing as a nation disregarding the family as the important social unit. Furthermore, they were personifying the Chinese state and its leader, Chairman Mao, in terms of the "hero" and "benefactor" while depicting the United States as a sinister evil force or in the "villain" role. This was discouraging to Dulles who had long viewed China as a nation with lit-

⁸Dulles, War or Peace, p. 225.

the potential for totalitarian war. In his book he wrote:

China, for instance, has for a long period not been nationally organized in the foregoing sense. The family has been the important social unit and the nation as such has had no hold on the popular imagination. When such a condition exists within an area, there is no danger of totalitarian war developing therefrom.⁹

But now, China, at the direction of Moscow, could be utilized for the very insidious purposes Mr. Dulles had hoped China could help to prevent.

China in 1945, he explained, after a long eight year war with the Japanese, which included the occupation of Manchuria, was bankrupt and in a state of disarray. The problem was compounded by Communist insurgents who were now taking advantage of this bad situation. The Communists in China, together with the Russian Communists, Dulles asserted, had been waiting for twenty years to have a chance to overthrow the Nationalists. Now, at the close of the Second World War, they were prepared to turn the situation to their advantage.

It was here that Dulles felt the United States erred fatally in permitting the loss of China to the Communists. The Nationalist Government after the Second World War shared in the glory of the victory and had what Dulles termed considerable military power. "It was a time - perhaps the only time - when the situation might have been saved."¹⁰ But instead of supporting the elimination of the Communist influence from the mainland, the United States promoted a policy of reconciliation. This policy called for a coalition with the Communists in order to bring about peace and unity, a lofty approach, but hardly, to Dulles' mind, a realistic one.

⁹Dulles, War, Peace and Change, p. 67.

¹⁰Dulles, War or Peace, p. 226.

"Subsequently, the United States learned what Chiang Kai-shek had already learned as to the futility of 'cooperation' with the Communists."¹¹

By August of 1948, Dulles notes, the United States recognized that their policy was in error and modified it. The new policy asserted that the United States government would not lend support of any kind to a coalition government in China. This position came three years too late, Dulles maintained, stating that:

If in December, 1945, our government had taken the position which it took three years later, then the National Government of Chiang Kai-shek might have provided a nucleus which, with United States advice and help, would have developed into a liberal and progressive government of China.¹²

The policy adopted in December 1945, was based on the decision made at Yalta, "... whereby the United States had promised to obtain for the Soviet Union great gains at the expense of China, subject to the concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek."¹³ Chiang was apprised of this agreement and Dulles postulated, he (Chiang) must have known a policy of coalition was wrong when he should, in fact, have attacked the Communists in Manchuria. Now the Communists were in power in China, and they placed the blame for all that was wrong in China on both the Nationalists and the United States.

In October of 1950, the new Communist regime in China published a pamphlet which was part of their "hate America" campaign. The pamphlet in its first section stated, "We Must Hate America, Because She is the

¹¹Dulles, War or Peace, p. 226.

¹²Ibid., p. 226.

¹³Ibid., p. 227.

Chinese People's Implacable Enemy."¹⁴ This section placed the blame of nearly all China's trouble since the Opium wars at the feet of the United States. The second section asserted that, "We Must Despise America, Because it is a Corrupt Imperialistic Nation, the World Center of Reaction and Decadency."¹⁵ This section painted a desolate picture of an impoverished America with, "... 18 million unemployed; 10 million with no housing whatsoever; 40 million who barely exist in slums; 14 thousand agents of the F.B.I. engaged in the exclusive mission of persecuting the people...", and a society which is run by big business with the youth of America manipulated by a press which is 99 percent under the control of the National Association of Manufacturers.¹⁶ Finally, "We Must Look Down Upon America Because She is a Paper Tiger and Entirely Vulnerable to Defeat."¹⁷ America, the pamphlet maintained, was a country without friends, surrounded by 830 million united peoples of China, Russia and Eastern Europe. The pamphlet spoke about the liberation of Western Europe after which, America would be truly alone with only her industrial capacity. These industries, however, were extremely vulnerable to Soviet atomic bombs, due to their concentration. In conclusion, the defeat of America would be more disastrous than the one which befell the Germans and Japanese.

This, Dulles lamented, was the regular Party line, and though he placed some of the blame upon the misguided United States foreign policy,

¹⁴Dulles, "Sustaining Friendship with China," p. 843.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 843-44.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 844.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 844.

for the most part this situation was created by an unending Soviet expansion program implemented by Lenin and continued under Stalin. He noted that as early as 1924, Stalin had maintained "... the road to victory over the West would be sought in Asia and particularly, China."¹⁸ With this in mind, Dulles points out how the Chinese Communist party was "... formed under the guiding direction of the Russian, Borodin."¹⁹ From this he concluded, rather unhappily, that Mao Tse-tung was the puppet whose strings were being directly manipulated in Moscow.

Dulles then established what he considered the facts which supported his contentions. First, he cited what he called the "disciple-master relationship" between Soviet Communism and Chinese Communism noting a quote from Mao in 1939 as typical of that relationship: "The fact that Stalin has come into the world is indeed fortunate. Today, when we have the Soviet Union, the Communist Party, and Stalin - all's right with the world."²⁰ Second, Dulles asserted that the Soviet Union paid a high fee for Communist domination in China and that this could only be viewed as self-serving. As an example of this fee Dulles cited Soviet refutation of the 1945 "Treaty of Alliance and Friendship with National China."²¹ This treaty commitment was a twenty years' pledge on the part of the Soviet Union to lend, "moral support and aid in military supplies and

¹⁸Dulles, "Sustaining Friendship with China," p. 844.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 844.

²⁰Ibid., p. 844.

²¹Ibid., p. 844.

other material resources, (which would) be entirely given to the National Government as the Central Government of China."²² Third, Mao spent three months in Moscow after his ascension to power and following his consultation, returned to Peking where he made a broadcast calling for the peoples of Southeast Asia to "... seek liberation through 'armed struggle' as part of the 'forces headed by the Soviet Union!'"²³ Finally, Dulles concluded that these policies did not coincide with what he asserted was the true interest of the Chinese people:

After 14 years of exhausting war, they desperately need internal recuperation. No one in his senses could assert that it is in China's interest to shovel its youth and material resources into the fiery furnace of Korean war to gain South Korea, an area which means little to China, but which, since the czars, has been coveted by Russia because of its strategic value as against Japan.²⁴

There were serious questions as to the validity of Mao's puppet role under the domination of Moscow. First, Mao's recognition of Moscow as the leader of World Communism reflected the reality of the situation. By Mr. Dulles' own admission, China was severely weakened by eight years of war with Japan not to mention the civil war which lasted for an additional four years. In addition, Chiang Kai-shek, upon fleeing the mainland took with him the gold reserves of China thereby further depleting China's financial stability. Mao could hardly turn to the United States for the financial aid which China so desperately needed; therefore, Moscow was the logical choice.

²²Dulles, "Sustaining Friendship with China," p. 844.

²³Ibid., p. 844.

²⁴Ibid., p. 844.

Second, admittedly, Moscow's intentions could be viewed as decidedly self-serving. The example of Moscow's treaty with Chiang merely represented a pragmatic decision on the part of the Soviets to deal with the established government. Again, by Mr. Dulles' own admission, Chiang's forces were vastly superior to the Communist forces and conceivably with United States aid, could have eliminated Mao's forces. Moscow, it could be said, recognized this fact and decided to deal with the real power in China, Chiang Kai-shek. The fact that the United States had attempted to bring about a reconciliation between Mao and Chiang must have come as a pleasant surprise to Moscow. Now the situation was different, and rejection of the treaty was no longer illogical. It should also be noted that after the war with Japan,

... over a quarter of a million Communist troops in north China swarmed into Manchuria where they received enormous stockpiles of weapons and ammunition, which the Russian army had captured from the Japanese.....²⁵

It would appear that after the United States attempted to effect a reconciliation between the Communists and Nationalists, the Soviets decided to push for a Communist takeover in China. Since a Communist government there would be preferable, the treaty with the Nationalists was meaningless.

Another point was: If Mao was in reality a puppet whose strings were pulled by Moscow, why did he continue his revolutionary struggle after the conclusion of the Soviet treaty with the Nationalists? Dulles never really answered this question. While a representative to the General Assembly of the United Nations, he spoke on the proposed study of Sino-

²⁵Franklin W. Houn, A Short History of Chinese Communism, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 65.

Soviet relations. In this speech he suggested that such a study, "... may expose a vast scheme of imperialism lurking behind an outer mask of benevolence toward the national aspirations of the people."²⁶ Dulles implies throughout the address that the Soviets intended to incorporate China into the Soviet Union in what President Truman termed, "a new colonialism - Soviet style."²⁷ Though the proposed study was to find and establish the facts, Dulles interjected his foredrawn conclusions stating:

We believe that recent events in China may present a case history which, if adequately explored, documented and reported, will serve further to alert the people of Asia and the Pacific and indeed of all the world to a danger to which none of us can be indifferent.²⁸

Dulles' third point is questionable as well. The speech Mao made in Moscow calling for the "liberation" of the peoples of Southeast Asia through armed struggle is understandable if looked at in proper perspective. The "liberation" of China was a long time goal of Mao and it is therefore logical to conclude that he viewed "liberation" of Southeast Asia as a good goal. It is important to remember that Communism came to power in China through civil war, not through the intervention of the Soviet "Red Army."

In his concluding point, Mr. Dulles asserted that China could ill afford to enter the Korean war. Korea, he maintained, was of little strategic value to China, in fact it was of more importance to Russia. But what was the real reason for China's entrance into the Korean war?

²⁶ John Foster Dulles, "Proposed Study of Sino-Soviet Relations Supported," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXIII (December 4, 1950), 909.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 910.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 910.

General MacArthur and the United Nations forces had crossed the thirty-eighth parallel and were entrenched on the Yalu river. There was much anti-communist sentiment in the United States and many prominent politicians were calling for the elimination of the communist menace from the mainland of China. MacArthur himself was known to have favored such a step.

China's entrance into the Korean war can be explained as a legitimate expression of self-defense, rather than as an act of aggression.

As Professor Houn states in his book:

The absence of territorial designs, however, does not preclude the desire to see that her small neighbors are not used by her principal antagonists for carrying on sabotage, espionage, and warlike activities against herself. Peking's policy of resolutely supporting Hanoi and the Viet Cong apparently has been (in) part prompted by this desire. So must have been the decision to send 'volunteers' to Korea in late 1950.²⁹

Dulles had formulated his views of China, and, to his mind, Mao was not the true voice of China. This conclusion was shaped by emotional attachment to the past and public sentiment of the time. As had been the case with many of his pronouncements, Mr. Dulles seemed to have been concerned with the political impact of his remarks. These remarks were subject to careful scrutiny of conservative Republicans. Although there is little doubt of Dulles' detestation of the new leadership in China, it is not likely that he considered China to be inexorably and forever linked to Moscow. He had maintained, in the late 40's and early 50's, that Communism was monolithic and under the direction of Moscow. Furthermore, he had made it clear in his book, War or Peace, that he did

²⁹Houn, A Short History of Chinese Communism, p. 221.

not consider China a case of "Titoism." However, within his concept of "peaceful liberation," Dulles asserted that a proper American foreign policy could bring about peaceful change in the Soviet satellites. Since he had asserted that China was a satellite of the Soviet Union, it would appear logical to assume that China, too, could be "liberated" peacefully. The real point in considering the China question was: What is in the interest of the United States? As Guhin concludes:

In the early stages, was it not a better bargain to have the Chinese communists identified as the tools of Soviet masters? Would not this identification tend both to hinder the effectiveness of Peking's propaganda to overseas Chinese and to lessen possible Chinese influence in the Far East, especially Japan, and Southeast Asia?³⁰

Initial Support for United Nations Membership

Mr. Dulles' support of admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations was short lived. He had based his initial position on the concept of universal membership in world organizations, as is shown in both his books.

In his first book, Dulles notes that with the withdrawal of the "dissatisfied and dynamic powers" from the League of Nations, the League was devoid of universality which "... left the League in form that which the dominating powers had already made it in fact, namely, an alliance of the satisfied nations to maintain the status quo."³¹ As a result, the League failed to perform the function for which it was established, that is to preserve the peace.

³⁰ Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 99.

³¹ Dulles, War, Peace and Change, p. 84.

When the League failed to impose effective penalties for acts of aggression, the status quo nations resorted to a policy of "non-recognition of the fruits of aggression." Non-recognition, Dulles contended, works successfully only in rare cases when, for example, the country being sanctioned is weak economically and the country doing the sanctioning is strong. Change in the world is inevitable, whether it occurs through force or through peaceful means.

For any nation to close its eyes to such changes, and to treat them as non-existent, means the election of such nation to live in a world as unrelated to reality as that of Alice in Wonderland.³²

Dulles summarized that using non-recognition as a means of showing moral disapproval was of limited value because "... international practice over the centuries has made it clear that 'recognition' merely constitutes taking cognizance of certain admitted facts. No moral judgment is involved."³³

After the United Nations was established, there was no universal membership. Dulles reasserted his universal membership argument stating that nations of the world which were not then members should be admitted into the United Nations regardless of their political ideologies. He recognized that the United Nations was limited in what it could accomplish:

The United Nations cannot stop those who hold strong beliefs from feeling a sense of mission and seeking to spread their beliefs in the world. Both Christians and Marxists, for example, feel it their duty to carry their creed into all the world.³⁴

³²Dulles, War, Peace and Change, p. 87.

³³Ibid., p. 88.

³⁴Dulles, War or Peace, p. 185.

The purpose of the United Nations was not the establishment of a police force. This could not work for neither the Communists nor the West would accept the establishment of a force which ultimately would result in half the world trying to coerce the other half into submission.

We cannot close our eyes to these realities of potential war, Dulles maintained, but rather we must seek a method by which war can be averted. Resorting to methods such as the Kellogg-Briand Pact, however, was not the proper approach; it did not avert war and probably enhanced the prospects for the Second World War. "Fundamentally," Dulles contended, "world peace depends upon world law, and world law depends upon a consensus of world opinion as to what is right and what is just."³⁵

The Communist rulers, Dulles insisted, have an "atheistic creed" denying the existence of moral or natural law. They would, however, pay heed to world opinion. Since the United Nations could provide a forum for world opinion, the Communist governments would be attentive to these judgments. This expectation is based on Dulles' belief that: "Votes in the Assembly have practical significance if they measure underlying power in the world that is swayed by moral judgment."³⁶ Thus, he felt that the opinion generated by free societies could provide a "moral substitute for war."

Central to Dulles' conception of the United Nations was the necessity to reflect as accurately as possible the reality of world power. The nations which hold power in the world should be a part of the United

³⁵Dulles, War or Peace, p. 187.

³⁶Ibid., p. 188.

Nations because, "... if the United Nations gets away from that reality it becomes artificial and exerts less influence."³⁷ Since there was a lack of universality in the United Nations, "... its decisions cannot reflect reality (because) it excludes from membership a substantial part of the world community."³⁸

Dulles' concern was with the Soviet Union's vetoing the admission to membership of all the non-communist bloc nations, while at the same time the United States was preventing the entry of Soviet bloc nations. He stated flatly, "... we ought to be willing that all the nations should be members without attempting to apprise closely those which are 'good' and those which are 'bad.'"³⁹ The People's Republic of China was no exception providing they satisfied the basic requirements for membership:

If the Communist government of China in fact proves its ability to govern China without serious domestic resistance, then it, too, should be admitted to the United Nations. However, a regime that claims to have become the government of a country through civil war should not be recognized until it has been tested over a reasonable period of time.⁴⁰

Americans distrust communists and moreover disliked communist membership in the United Nations. However, Dulles concludes, that communists are in control of thirty percent of the world's population, therefore, "... if we want to have a world organization, then it should be repre-

³⁷ Dulles, War or Peace, p. 188.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 189.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 190.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 190.

sentative of the world as it is."⁴¹ Quite clearly, the People's Republic of China was included in this assessment.

Reversal of Position

Dulles' initial support for admission of the People's Republic of China was not unique for the time. Just after the Communist revolution, the United States policy as stated by Secretary of State Acheson was:

Should the Communist regime lend itself to the aims of Soviet Russian imperialism and attempt to engage in aggression against China's neighbors, we and the other members of the United Nations would be confronted by a situation violative of the principles of the United Nations Charter and threatening international peace and security.

Meanwhile our policy will continue to be based upon our own respect for the Charter, our friendship for China, and our traditional support for the Open Door and for China's independence and administrative and territorial integrity.⁴²

The reversal of Dulles' position was not long in coming. On November 30, 1950, Chinese "volunteers" entered the Korean war. The Chinese were fighting not just Americans, but the United Nations, a situation which clearly was not palatable for Mr. Dulles. This was the turning point in his position, and he later modified his book, War or Peace, to reflect this change stating, "... the entrance of Communist China into the Korean War and its actions since then made it impossible for the United States to agree to its admission to the United Nations."⁴³

⁴¹Dulles, War or Peace, p. 191.

⁴²Raymond Dennett and Robert K. Turner, ed., Documents on American Foreign Relations, Vol. XI, January 1, to December 31, 1949, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950), p. 546.

⁴³Andrew H. Berding, Dulles on Diplomacy, (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1965), p. 133.

Whether or not any politician in 1950 could have effectively argued for admission of the People's Republic to the United Nations is doubtful.

As Guhin notes:

To favor immediate recognition publicly would have been the equivalent of playing political Russian roulette with, at best, a single empty chamber. A Gallup poll, on June 2, 1950, found 40 percent of those interviewed opposed to recognition, 44 percent undecided or without opinion, and only 16 percent in favor of recognition. More poignant was the fact that, on January 19, 1950, the House of Representatives voted against the White House request for \$60 million of new economic aid to Korea, as pro-Formosans and a Southern Democrat-Republican coalition tied their demand for more aid for the Nationalist Chinese to the administration's request for aid to Korea.⁴⁴

Some years later when Mr. Dulles was Secretary of State, he explained the reasons for disavowing his support for Chinese membership in the United Nations. The Communists in China no longer would be considered eligible for membership due to their

... opposition to the principles of the United Nations. In Korea (they) carried on war against the United Nations. (They) have been the subject of enforcement action recommended by the United Nations. In Southeast Asia (they) promoted aggression. All of these facts combine to make a case such that we do not believe that the requisite vote can be found to admit the Communist regime to represent China in the United Nations.⁴⁵

The new Secretary of State further defended his earlier position citing that when he advocated "Red" Chinese admission into the United Nations, it was in terms of a universal membership. Since that principle was not adopted by the United Nations, his proposal no longer applied.

Dulles made an emphatic point of China's "aggressor" role in Korea:

... Communist China has been found by the United Nations to be an

⁴⁴ Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 89.

⁴⁵ John Foster Dulles, "Press Release 376 - July 8, 1954, - News Conference," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXXI (July 16, 1954), 87.

aggressor and the United Nations has called for enforcement measures against Communist China. There is nothing comparable in that respect as far as the record of the Soviet Union is concerned.⁴⁶

This contention formed the backbone of his public disapproval of "Red" China. The implication was, since China was involved in the Korean war on the side of the North Koreans, the North Koreans having been declared the aggressors in the Korean war by the United Nations, she was guilty of an unforgivable sin. The Soviet Union, Dulles rationalized, had never been declared an aggressor by the United Nations, therefore, its membership in the United Nations was justifiable.

The argument appears weak based as it is on an improper comparison. First, Russia could veto any proposed United Nations sanctions against herself. Therefore, insisting that Russia was eligible for United Nations membership because she had never been sanctioned is not a solid argument. Second, had the Soviets been in attendance at the United Nations, they certainly would have vetoed the proposed sanctions against North Korea. Thus, the sanctions were voted by "status quo" nations attempting to maintain that status. This clearly conflicts with Dulles' past pronouncements from War, Peace and Change. Finally, Dulles adamantly opposed the exclusion of the Soviets from the United Nations, stating:

A world organization without Soviet Communists would be a much more pleasant organization. But they have power in the world, and if the United Nations gets away from that reality, it becomes artificial and exerts less influence.⁴⁷

Emphasized in both his books was his contention that there should be universality in world organizations. Second, a policy of non-recognition

⁴⁶Dulles, "Press Release 376 - July 8, 1954, - News Conference," 89.

⁴⁷Dulles, War or Peace, p. 188.

was unrealistic. Finally, the decision to extend recognition to a particular nation should not be made in moral terms. By these standards it would be logical to support a policy of "Red" Chinese membership in the United Nations.

In reality, however, universal membership did not exist in the United Nations during the early 1950's. Instead, the Soviets and Americans were involved in a sort of mutual non-admission squabble. The Soviets were unwilling to admit non-communist bloc nations, and the United States countered by resisting the admission of communist bloc nations. Despite this lack of universality, Dulles insisted that the Soviet Union must remain in the organization if it was to be an effective world organization. Given these views we may be permitted to conjecture that Dulles might have been prepared to accept a quid pro quo by allowing admission of one Communist nation for one non-communist nation.

Unfortunately, the Communist revolution in China and Chinese involvement in the Korean war was wholly unacceptable to the American people. The fact that Chinese troops were killing American fighting men doing their duty in "defending" democracy permitted no compromise. This new perspective fully explains Mr. Dulles' changed approach. As Guhin points out rather well, "political survival normally takes priority over political education."⁴⁸ Dulles dearly wanted to be Secretary of State. He hoped that if a Republican won the Presidency in 1952, the new President would nominate him for Secretary of State. To go out on a limb and publicly advocate United Nations membership for "Red" China, would have been nothing short of political suicide.

⁴⁸Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 101.

"Red" China Policy, 1953 and 1954

A commonly accepted view of Secretary of State Dulles was that of a man obsessed with the threat of what he often referred to as "atheistic" communism. His personal aversion to dealing with godless leaders has often been criticized at home and abroad. An example is a quotation attributed to Mme. Pandit, the sister of Prime Minister Nehru: "... when your Secretary of State and I are discussing matters, God always gets between us."⁴⁹ The clear implication for the Chinese case was that Dulles could not view pragmatically the question of "Red" Chinese membership in the United Nations.

I find this position difficult to justify; in fact, just the opposite appears to be true. According to Sir Anthony Eden and other British statesmen, it was President Eisenhower who adamantly and emotionally opposed the recognition of Peking:

... they found Dulles firm but reasonable on the subject. Dulles would evince an understanding for the British view that the United Nations was not 'a good boys club' limited to democratic nations and that refusal to admit Peking tended to whitewash Moscow.⁵⁰

Dulles' dealings with Peking during the first years of his Secretaryship reflected the general belief that the Communists in China were merely puppets under the control of Moscow. At the Summit Conference in January 1954 in Berlin, the Western powers led by Mr. Dulles accepted the Soviet agenda in order to prevent another Palais Rose (a spring conference in 1951, including the Big Four Powers, at which more than seventy meetings

⁴⁹ Roscoe Drummond and Gaston Coblentz, Duel at the Brink, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960), p. 77.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 29.

were held accomplishing nothing.) According to the Soviet agenda, the first topic for discussion was, "measures for reducing tension in international relations and the convening of a meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of France, Britain, the U.S.A., the Soviet Union, and the Chinese People's Republic."⁵¹ Dulles rejected the idea of such a conference which would include "Red" China, commenting:

The United States rejects the Soviet concept that any so-called 'five great powers' have a right to rule the world and determine the destinies of other nations.... If conferences can do nothing better than create new conferences, the whole conference method will become an object of ridicule, and we with it.⁵²

Though Dulles opposed the Soviet suggestion of a five power conference that included the People's Republic, he was not opposed to meeting with the Chinese in a different context: "... the United States had been ready ever since the Korean armistice to sit down with its Korean enemy, Red China, to settle the political question; so that could not be considered a concession."⁵³ Much of Dulles' concern over meeting with the Chinese Communists was the outgrowth of a general fear generated by past American experiences, in particular the abortive pledges of Yalta.

At this time, the China Lobby in Washington was a powerful force. The Senate had passed a unanimous resolution in opposition to any American policy which would support admission of the People's Republic to the United Nations. Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin was involved in a campaign to "rid" the State Department of security risks. Finally,

⁵¹Beal, John Foster Dulles, p. 196.

⁵²Ibid., p. 197.

⁵³Ibid., p. 204.

the results of a Gallup Poll taken in July of 1954, just after the televised McCarthy hearings from April to June 1954, found 78 per cent of the respondents opposed to any policy of admission for the Peking regime.⁵⁴

In regard to these fears, Dulles maintained,

We need not, out of fright, lay down the tools of diplomacy and the possibilities which they provide. Our cause is not so poor, and our capacity not so low, that our nation must seek security by sulking in its tent.⁵⁵

Public opinion, however, was too strong for Dulles to attempt any type of contact with the Chinese Communists at Geneva. The McCarthy hearings, televised while the Geneva conference was in session, added to Dulles' apprehension. To be seen with the representatives of Communist China would have grave repercussions at home, and the Secretary carefully avoided any contact with the Chinese at Geneva, even to the extent of compelling the British to, "... adopt the role of intermediary between the Western powers and the communists."⁵⁶

All this is not to suggest that Mr. Dulles had a burning desire for rapprochement with the Chinese Communists; however, it would be erroneous to depict him as a man so obsessed with the evil of "atheistic" communism as to be unable to make rational policy decisions concerning China. His position was far more affected by outside influences than by his own prejudices.

⁵⁴Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 100.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 249.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 249, citing Anthony Eden, Memoirs: Full Circle (London: Cassell and Company, 1960), p. 128.

The "Pragmatic Formula"

Much of the China question revolved around the debate over diplomatic recognition. It was assumed that United States' support of China's entry to the United Nations necessitated recognition. In the later years of Dulles' secretaryship, there were a few critics who insisted that the United States should recognize China. Refusal to recognize China because of moral indignation was not pragmatic reasoning. Secretary Dulles disagreed stating:

I do not mind adapting myself for pragmatic reasons to the situation that exists.... But what is the pragmatic reason ... with respect to the recognition of China? ... I think you are entitled to take into account whether these things will actually serve our interest or not. I accept the pragmatic formula.⁵⁷

The major concern, Mr. Dulles insisted, was whether or not recognition served the interest of the United States. Speaking before the international convention of Lions International at San Francisco, California, on June 28, 1957, he discussed United States policies toward "Red" China. In this speech he listed what he considered to be the major consequences of recognition of the People's Republic of China. First of all, people on the mainland who were unhappy with the present government would be "immensely discouraged." Second, United States recognition would discourage millions of overseas Chinese and Asian countries who would, "reluctantly turn to acceptance of the guiding direction of the Communist regime."⁵⁸ Third, the Republic of China

⁵⁷ Eleanor Dulles, John Foster Dulles, p. 168.

⁵⁸ John Foster Dulles, "Our Policies Toward Communism in China," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXXVII (July 15, 1957), 92.

would be betrayed, or at least they would feel that way. Dulles maintained that we were honor bound to stick with Taiwan in withholding recognition of "Red" China. Fourth, recognition would be a sign of compromise with the Communists which would weaken the resolve of free Asian nations and, as a result, lower their resistance to the spread of Communism from China.

With these four basic arguments against recognition of the People's Republic, Mr. Dulles turned to the question of admission to the United Nations. It is here that he made a curious statement which was at variance with his past position concerning world organizations. After indicating that it was not in the interest of the United States or the United Nations to have "Red" China as a member, he remarked,

The United Nations is not a reformatory for bad governments. It is supposedly an association of those who are already 'peace-loving' and who are 'able and willing to carry out' the charter obligation. The basic obligation is not to use force, except in defense against armed attack.⁵⁹

Dulles went on to cite five wars in which "Red" China was the main promoter, including Korea, Indochina, Tibet, the Philippines, and Malaya. The fact that China promoted these wars, Dulles contended, indicated that China was not interested in the maintenance of international peace and security. He concluded his argument by stating that to admit the People's Republic to the United Nations replete with her own veto would be to "implant in the United Nations the seeds of its own destruction."⁶⁰

Dulles argued that the recognition of Soviet Russia was not a pre-

⁵⁹Dulles, "Our Policies Toward Communism in China," p. 93.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 93.

cedent which would justify the recognition of "Red" China. In the first place, Soviet Russia from its inception to the time the United States extended diplomatic recognition did not commit any acts of aggression. Second, the Soviets gave the impression of wanting peace. Third, they did not violate any international agreements. Fourth, they treated American nationals with respect. And finally, their interests and ours coincided, i.e. resisting Japanese aggression.

Trade and cultural relations, in Dulles' opinion, were not beneficial to the United States. The Chinese wanted only American products which would aid their war machine. It would be foolish, Dulles reasoned, for the United States to help China build up her military strength. Second, cultural relations with the United States would give China a degree of legitimacy. This added legitimacy would influence China's "democratic" neighbors to open cultural relations, thereby providing the "Red" Chinese with an instrument for their subversive activities.

Dulles then attacked the "de facto" argument that "Red" China existed and therefore was entitled to diplomatic recognition. Diplomatic recognition was a privilege not a right. It would not serve our interests to recognize the People's Republic of China, for this recognition would increase her prestige and influence. Then there was the "inevitability" argument (that eventually we should have to recognize "Red" China) to which Dulles answered: "we do not accept the mastery of Communist forces."⁶¹ Communist governments were closed systems, Dulles asserted; they were subject to stresses which were not clearly visible.

⁶¹Dulles, "Our Policies Toward Communism in China," p. 94.

As a result, even though the Communist governments appeared firmly in control, in fact their system was in danger.

Dulles also rejected the China versus Russia approach, which posited that by dealing with the Communist regime in China we might somehow have been able to affect adversely the relations between the two giants. Basically, Dulles asserted that China and Russia were linked by ideological ties, and that these ties were too close for the United States to affect adversely, a point which I doubt Dulles seriously believed.

Dulles concluded his speech with the assertion that the Chinese people found communism repugnant. Therefore, the United States would implement whatever policy was necessary to bring about change in China. "Our policies are readily adjustable to meet the requirements of changing conditions."⁶² Essentially, this speech was a good presentation by an experienced and clever lawyer, but it is doubtful that it was a true reflection of his beliefs. His statement that Moscow and Peking were linked by ideology which prevented a break in their friendship conflicted with earlier non-public views reported by Guhin: "Dulles perceived the main objectives of United States policy toward Peking not as the dissolution of communism in China but as breaking 'the present ties between China and Moscow.'"⁶³

Although no positive evidence is available, it may not seem far

⁶²Dulles, "Our Policies Toward Communism in China," p. 95.

⁶³Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 101, citing Dulles memorandum of meeting with George Yeh, Chinese Nationalist Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Dr. Wellington Koo, Chinese Ambassador to Washington, in Papers (November 19, 1952).

fetches to suggest that in fact Dulles had tried to find an answer to the problem of adjusting relations between the United States and China.

During his first year as Secretary of State, he suggested that

... once a military truce had been negotiated in Korea itself, the subsequent political negotiations might include other Far Eastern questions as well, notably the struggle in Indo-China and even the position of Formosa. On this latter point, he deliberately allowed himself to be understood to have given thought to a possible United Nations trusteeship for Formosa....⁶⁴

The resulting uproar from conservative elements of the Republican party forced the White House to deny that any such policy was contemplated.

Mr. Dulles' initial intention to meet with the Chinese at Geneva in 1954, was considered unthinkable by conservative Republicans and the idea was dismissed. As a result, Dulles avoided any possible contact with the Chinese, a snub which Chou En-lai apparently never forgot. It is also doubtful that Dulles engineered the concept of withholding recognition on the grounds of moral or political approval; as Guhin points out, "... it was not inherent in Dulles' practice."⁶⁵ It appeared clear that Dulles' latitude in dealing with the Chinese Communists was politically limited by public pressure. He supported the establishment of contacts with the Chinese at Geneva but later in Warsaw, he was limited by domestic pressure from proceeding any further towards a rapprochement with the People's Republic of China.

In 1958, Dulles seems to have attempted to bring about some sort of reconciliation with the Chinese. In a January press conference he stat-

⁶⁴ Richard Goold-Adams, The Time of Power: A Reappraisal of John Foster Dulles, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962), p. 96.

⁶⁵ Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 103.

ed: "Any time it will serve the interests of the United States to recognize the Communist Chinese regime, we will do it...."⁶⁶ In addition, Guhin points out that in June and again in December of that year, Dulles maintained that:

... although official recognition would not serve the interests of the United States at the time, the Eisenhower Administration did and would continue to deal with the Chinese People's Republic whenever it appeared expedient.⁶⁷

He also dealt with the question of trade between Japan and China, realizing that there was a need for renegotiation of the Peace treaty with Japan to reflect this attitude.⁶⁸ He suggested to Chiang Kai-shek that the Nationalist government on Formosa "... abandon the 'civil war complex' and begin thinking in terms of an armistice along the present lines of division."⁶⁹ By March of 1959, China had invaded Tibet and became involved in a border dispute with India. China had, as Guhin notes, an "... inflexible and not infrequently hostile attitude toward the United States.... (These) were among the factors which precluded further action in the direction of possible conciliation as hinted by Dulles."⁷⁰

⁶⁶Eleanor Dulles, John Foster Dulles, p. 45.

⁶⁷Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 103, citing Dulles interview with Congressman Kenneth B. Keating on "Let's Look at Congress," in Papers (June 15, 1958), p. 2.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 103, citing transcript of remarks at Opening Session of the Far East Chiefs of Mission Conference, in Papers (March 14, 1958).

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 103, citing Dulles notes for talk with Chiang Kai-shek, in Papers (October 21, 1958).

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 103.

Dulles was not the die-hard moralist that many have depicted him to be, rather he attempted to explore the possibility of rapproachment with the People's Republic of China. His sister Eleanor Lansing Dulles summarized this when she wrote:

His foreign policy, like his philosophy of life, was a balancing - some would say a tension - between, on the one hand, the pragmatic and workable solutions, and on the other hand ideals and theory, between feasible action and perfectionist aims.⁷¹

Eleanor Dulles, John Foster Dulles, p. 168.

C H A P T E R I I I

THE "PEACEFUL LIBERATION" OF EASTERN EUROPE

Evolution of the Concept

During the brief Nazi-Soviet Pact, (1939-1941) Stalin's expansionist intentions became apparent. While Hitler was preoccupied in the West defeating France, Stalin was busy taking the Baltic States by force. After securing the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, Stalin incorporated them into the Soviet Union. He then turned his attention to Rumania. Seeking to take possession of Bessarabia and the northern part of Bucovina, he issued an ultimatum to the Rumanian government. In June of 1940, Soviet troops marched into these areas and seized control.

Infuriated by these Soviet moves, Hitler initiated plans for an early attack on the Soviet Union. On June 22, 1941, Operation Barbarossa (the German plan for the invasion of the Soviet Union) commenced and the brief period of Nazi-Soviet friendship came to an end. Subsequently, Stalin embraced the Allies in a common effort to defeat the very Nazi menace which he had exploited so successfully for Russia's territorial expansion.

Dulles was aware of Stalin's tactics and knew that problems with the new Soviet alliance would arise eventually. Anticipating, (even prior to the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor) the eventual victory of the Allies, he expressed the fear that without internal change in the Soviet Union, the United States would "... be faced with a very serious

problem, as a highly armed Russia facing a disarmed and socially chaotic Europe would be a grave menace."¹ He also expressed concern for the rights of the East Europeans. Specifically, he saw the annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviets as a first step to total Soviet domination of Eastern and Central Europe after the war.

As chairman of the "Commission of a Just and Durable Peace," Dulles devised "The Six Pillars of Peace." One of the points called for proclaiming "... the goal of autonomy for subject peoples ... (and the establishment of an) ... international organization to assure and to supervise the realization of that end."² It is this "pillar" that contained the seeds of his concept of "peaceful liberation."

As the war drew to a close, Dulles recognized that continued Soviet-American cooperation was problematical at best, though not necessarily unworkable. In a letter to Mr. Eugene Lyons, he wrote:

I do not say, and did not say, that we OUGHT to trust the Soviet Union or that they OUGHT to trust us. There are doubtless reasons on both sides for mistrust. A task of the future will be to clear up such mistrust.³

After the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, the Soviets pushed their own borders forward to encompass the eastern territory of Poland up to the Curzon line. Subsequently, they pushed Polish borders into Eastern Germany forming a new border at the Oder Neisse line. Even though the

¹Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 132, citing a letter from Dulles to Henry P. Van Dusen, in Papers (February 17, 1941).

²Henry P. Van Dusen, ed., Spiritual Legacy of John Foster Dulles, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), p. 110.

³Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 132, citing a letter from Dulles to Eugene Lyons, in Papers (February 14, 1945).

Soviets were in essential agreement that the territorial change would have to be sanctioned by a final peace settlement, German citizens were forcibly transported from the areas in question into territory of the present German Democratic Republic. The Soviets had thus eliminated a potential future problem of "national self-determination." With all the Germans removed from this area, there could never be a successful plebiscite on the return of these territories to Germany.

The Soviet fait accompli went against Dulles' basic premise of his "Six Pillars of Peace" (that the proposed United Nations should strive for the goal of autonomy for subject peoples), which he later acknowledged as perhaps being too idealistic. In light of his basic firm commitment to peaceful change, emphasized so staunchly in War, Peace and Change, Dulles welcomed United States involvement in talks with the Soviets. The fact that the United States realized that it "... should get down into the arena and battle for its ideals 'even under conditions such that partial and temporary defeat is inevitable....'" was a sound policy.⁴

It soon became apparent to Dulles and Americans in general that the Soviets were not interested in cooperation. The American public feared that American ideals had been compromised by secret agreements made at Yalta. In future years the common complaint was heard: "we were sold out at Yalta."

Dulles' illusion that meaningful and productive talks with the Soviets could be held in terms of his "peaceful change" (simple diplo-

⁴Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 133, citing Dulles, "A personal Appraisal of the Crimea Conference," in Papers (February 26, 1945), p. 2.

matic give and take) was dispelled quickly by the events at the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting in London from September to October 1945. At this meeting the Soviets asserted their conviction that peace in the world depended upon American-Russian agreement. Agreement of these two major powers would assure peace; without it, war was probable. From this Russian contention it was concluded:

... the United States, in the interest of peace, must do whatever the Soviet Union demanded as the price of agreement. If the United States did not, those who represented it would be 'warmongers.'⁵

The intransigent Russian position at the London Conference convinced Dulles that the United States had to pursue a policy of "no appeasement." The tragic experiences of Munich in 1938 should never be repeated. However, such a policy to appease the Soviets, should not prevent us from making legitimate concessions. Honest concessions were completely legitimate when they were part of a genuine compromise:

... compromise implies a genuine willingness on the part of each party to give something up, and usually something of its own, not something that belongs to another nation.⁶

By 1946, Dulles had decided to make known publicly his reservations with regard to Soviet foreign policy. In Life magazine, June 1946, he outlined his view of the basic differences between the Soviet and American positions, concluding, "It would be foolish to rest our hope of peace on any genuine reconciliation of our faith with that now held by Soviet leadership."⁷

⁵Dulles, War or Peace, p. 25.

⁶Ibid., p. 30.

⁷John Foster Dulles, "Thoughts on Soviet Foreign Policy and What To Do About It," Life (June 3, 1946), 113.

Dulles emphasized that Americans now needed to demonstrate their resolve and firm commitment to the cause of freedom, thereby preventing any "caving in" to Soviet tactics. The fact that Soviet ideology differed from ours did not necessarily stand in the way of peace. As he had insisted ever since writing his first book, the United States should not be caught making the "fatal" mistake of identifying peace with the maintenance of the status quo. It was the status quo nations (England and France) prior to the Second World War which, in his opinion had added to the causes of the war. The United States would do well to heed that lesson. Peace, after all, is difficult to achieve "... if a dynamic group seeks to impose on all others practices which violate their political and religious faith."⁸

With these remarks Dulles admonished the American people to understand Soviet aims, and to act with "restraint." Writing to Walter Lippmann he said, "If, as a people they (Americans) do not have self-restraint, then we are not entitled to freedom, and, in fact, cannot keep it long."⁹ The die was cast and one time hopes for cooperation had dissolved into the factual reality of conflicting goals and ideologies.

Mr. Dulles now began to stress moral issues:

That issue is not the issue of economic communism against capitalism or state socialism against free enterprise. It is not an issue of relative national power. Those are not moral issues. The moral issue is the issue of the free state as against the police state.¹⁰

⁸ John Foster Dulles, "Thoughts on Soviet Foreign Policy and What To Do About It," Life (June 10, 1946), 130.

⁹ Gerson, John Foster Dulles, p. 49, citing a letter to Dean Acheson, in Papers (May 9, 1946).

¹⁰ John Foster Dulles, "Free State versus the Police State," Vital Speeches of the Day XIII (September 15, 1947), 720.

His solution was to exercise moral pressure through the United Nations. This organization provided "... a place where international differences could be aired and where every nation's international acts and purposes could be subjected to the pressure of public opinion...."¹¹ thereby mitigating a harsh Soviet policy of enslavement of East Europeans.

The Policy of Containment

Dulles' 1946 article for Life, told of Stalin's apparent intent to establish a Pax Sovietica which would allow the Soviet Union to expand throughout the world. In February of 1948, a Soviet inspired political coup added Czechoslovakia to the East European bloc. The countries of Western Europe, out of concern for the growing Soviet appetite for power, countered by establishing a defensive alliance based on the March 17 Brussels Defense Pact. The Russians countered by blocking Allied (British, French, and American) military traffic to Berlin. As the Allies completed plans to unite the western zones of Germany into a free and democratic federation, the Soviets cut off all ground transportation routes to Berlin. The crisis was resolved through the successful Berlin Airlift. Now, sufficiently concerned with their security, Europeans considered political unification of Western Europe.

Dulles, a strong advocate of a united Europe, felt that a united Europe would prevent further Soviet penetration:

¹¹Dulles, "Free State versus the Police State," p. 720.

The United States cannot, and should not, go on indefinitely bolstering up peoples who have the possibility of standing independently on their own feet. I am confident that they can stand alone. If so, we will have helped to create a great sister federation, a new regional grouping such as the United Nations Charter permits and encourages. That transformation in Europe would bring to an end the present considerable risk of war. It would fill with health the present vacuum into which Soviet power is penetrating.¹²

Dulles clearly viewed the United States as being in a defensive position and felt we needed to draw the line on Soviet expansion in light of the Czechoslovakian coup and the threat to West Berlin.

Not long after Dulles made these remarks, Thomas E. Dewey was re-nominated as the presidential candidate of the Republican Party. It was widely assumed that Dulles would be his choice for Secretary of State. Dulles had been a leading proponent of bipartisanship in foreign policy and George Marshall, then Secretary of State, included him in the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly meeting in Paris that fall. Due in large part to Marshall's help, Dulles managed to avoid a Soviet-American confrontation in the Security Council over the Berlin crisis. Dulles realized that the potential Soviet veto in the Security Council, would provoke harsh reaction from conservative critics of the Truman administration. These critics who were isolationists would seize upon a Soviet veto citing it as grounds for leaving the United Nations. They would note its inability to solve crises and thus add impetus to the "preventive war" advocates who urged military solutions to conflicts with the Soviets. Furthermore, they would use a Soviet veto

¹²John Foster Dulles, "Can We Guarantee a Free Europe?," Collier's CXXI (June 12, 1948), 75.

to advocate the solution of the Berlin crisis through military force. Ultimately, Dulles wanted to avoid presenting Dewey (whom he expected to be President) "... with a full blown crisis in January ... and, equally, (he displayed) an innate caution with respect to the actual use of military force."¹³ Although Dewey lost the election, Secretary Marshall influenced President Truman to keep Dulles on the United States delegation in Paris. Subsequently, the President appointed Dulles as acting chairman of the United States delegation.

In 1949, Dulles was appointed by Governor Dewey to the Senate where he became a leading advocate for ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty, although, as Hoopes points out:

... he was concerned that a formal, semipermanent American commitment to help defend a specified group of governments in Western Europe would risk attenuation of their impulse to economic and political integration, which he judged to be the categorical imperative.¹⁴

It seems reasonable to assume that Dulles' main concern was for European unity. He had stressed as early as June 1948 that Europe should stand on its own feet. Nevertheless, in the face of strong conservative Republican (isolationist) critics such as Senator Robert Taft, he strongly supported the Truman administration on the Treaty.

By 1950, Communist expansion had been successful throughout the world. In the five years since the end of the Second World War, the Communists had solidified their position in Eastern Europe, exerting

¹³ Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, pp. 71-72.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 76.

complete control over Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania. In Asia, Mao Tse-tung had led his Chinese Communist revolution to a successful conclusion. In his second book, War or Peace, Dulles reasoned that "the Truman-Acheson policies of containment were ... sensible enough; they had temporarily rescued Western Europe, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. But they had failed to save Eastern Europe or China."¹⁵

The difficulty, as Dulles saw it, was the definition of defense lines through regional associations excluding Korea and Taiwan.

I can think of nothing that would make war, and defeat, more certain for the United States than for the American people to sit idly by while Soviet Communism completes the encirclement which it has planned in order to isolate us, to weaken us, and eventually to strangle us.¹⁶

To solve the problem, Dulles called for carrying "... hope and truth and the prospect of liberty to the peoples who are the prisoners of Soviet Communism."¹⁷ This was to be done through such instruments as Radio Free Europe.

Today the Communist structure is overextended, overrigid and ill-founded. It could be shaken if its difficulties that are latent were activated.

'Activation' does not mean armed revolt. The people have no arms, and violent revolt would precipitate massacre. We do not want to do to the captive peoples what the Soviet Union did to the Polish patriots in Warsaw under General Bor.¹⁸

¹⁵ Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 83.

¹⁶ John Foster Dulles, "How to Take the Offensive for Peace," Life, XXVIII (April 24, 1950), p. 120.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 133.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 133.

At this time, Dulles was officially Consultant to the Secretary of State, Acheson; thus his ideas were not wholly confined to the Republican party. Speaking at the International House in New York City in May of 1950, he commented:

If, as Secretary Acheson recently put it, we would 'mobilize the moral and material strength of the free world,' then we could peacefully check the Communist offensive; we could give hope to the captive peoples and so increase the internal difficulties within the present areas of Soviet control as to insure the collapse of its already overextended and overrigid structure.¹⁹

Less than a month later the North Koreans had invaded the South, and the policy of containment came under harsh criticism. In January of 1950, Secretary Acheson had outlined the American containment line as excluding Korea and Taiwan. Dulles felt this definition to be a mistake, and when he visited South Korea en route to Tokyo and the Japanese peace negotiations, he went to great lengths to assure the Koreans, at the very least, of United States moral support. Speaking before the South Korean Parliament on June 19, (one week prior to the North Korean invasion)

Dulles remarked:

The American people give you their support, both moral and material, consistent with your own self-respect and your primary dependence on your own efforts.

We look on you as, spiritually, a part of the United Nations which has acted with near unanimity to advance your political freedom....

The American people welcome you as an equal partner in the great company of those who comprise the free world, a world which commands vast moral and material power and resolution that is unswerving. Those conditions assure that any despotism which wages aggressive war dooms itself to unalterable disaster.

¹⁹ John Foster Dulles, "A Policy for Peace Insurance," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXII (May 19, 1950), p. 863.

You are not alone. You will never be alone so long as you continue to play worthily your part in the great design of human freedom.²⁰

Dulles felt that the containment policy would eventually result in Soviet miscalculation. One week later, the North Koreans invaded South Korea. Citing Khrushchev's memoirs, Hoopes notes that the Kremlin believed that the United States would avoid entering the Korean War if the North Koreans could win quickly.²¹ Dulles was in Tokyo when he heard the news of the invasion and he feared that, if the United States allowed the invasion to succeed, the Soviets would be encouraged to take even greater risks for bigger victories.

Dulles maintained a year later, that while the Soviets were mounting a "grandiose offensive," the United States solution need not be defined in purely defensive terms. Instead he advocated a moral offensive:

We must not and will not take the military offensive of general war in which there could be no victory for anyone. But there are many other types of offensive. Atom bombs have, no doubt, a deterrent power. But the cause of human liberty can find positive expression without their use. Our dynamic faith in freedom has always been the nemesis of despots. Therefore, let us not be satisfied with plans which reflect merely a defensive mood.²²

1952 Presidential Campaign and the "Liberation" Promise

As the 1952 Presidential election approached, Dulles once again was

²⁰ John Foster Dulles, "The Korean Experiment in Representative Government," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXIII (July 3, 1950), pp. 12-13.

²¹ Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 101.

²² John Foster Dulles, "The Challenge of Today," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXIV (June 11, 1951), p. 936.

hopeful of a Republican victory and with it, a possible appointment as Secretary of State. Although having participated in the Truman administration in the spirit of bipartisanship, he felt that after twenty years of Democratic administrations there was a need for change in Washington. He favored a "positive" foreign policy which he felt was lacking in the Truman administration. Part of this "positive" foreign policy was his concept of "peaceful liberation."

In March of 1952, he outlined in a speech what he considered to be the present international situation and introduced three grading principles. Reduced to its essential points:

- (1) The dynamic usually prevails over the static, the active over the passive.
- (2) In human affairs, the non-material or spiritual element is more important than the material.
- (3) There is a moral or natural law not made by man which determines right and wrong and conformity with this law is in the long run indispensable to human welfare.²³

With these principles in mind, Dulles published an article in Life entitled "A Policy of Boldness," which Hoopes called "... the matured fusion of Dulles the policy thinker, Dulles the moralist, and Dulles the politician; all the strands are there and all are now closely interwoven."²⁴ If Hoopes' account can be accepted, the Life article was the last one in which Dulles formulated new ideas. Hoopes based his conclusion on two fundamental facts. First,

... as the years passed, the once separable elements (of statesman,

²³ John Foster Dulles, "Importance of Initiative in International Affairs," Vital Speeches of the Day, XVIII (March 15, 1952), p. 333.

²⁴ Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 126.

moralist, and politician) ran together. And yet he showed an evident ability to move back and forth between them: as a pragmatic, worldly statesman, he could attack his opponents as hopeless idealists; as a preacher-politician, he could attack them as immoral appeasers.²⁵

Second, Dulles had "... privately acknowledged to his personal assistant in 1956, that he really never developed any new ideas after coming in as Secretary of State...."²⁶

With this in mind perhaps this article deserves closer evaluation as a clear exposition of his liberation policy. East Europe, he suggested, lived "... close to despair because the United States, the historic leader of the forces of freedom, seems dedicated to the negative policy of 'containment' and 'stalemate.'"²⁷ He suggested that the United States should promote the cause of "liberation" by making it known to the world that the United States "wants and expects liberation to occur." By stating these aims we "... would change in an electrifying way, the mood of the captive peoples." This would make life difficult for the Soviet captors and "create new opportunities for liberation."²⁸

Dulles then outlines seven specific courses of action which could actuate this policy. First, the United States should make it known that its foreign policy "... seeks as one of its peaceful goals the eventual restoration of genuine independence in the nations of Europe and Asia

²⁵ Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 126.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 126, citing author interview with William B. Macomber, January 7, 1972.

²⁷ John Foster Dulles, "A Policy of Boldness," Life XXXII (May 19, 1952) p. 154.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 154.

now dominated by Moscow...."²⁹ Second, he called for welcoming "... the creation in the free world of political 'task forces' to develop a freedom program for each of the captive nations."³⁰ These so-called task forces would be comprised of "proved patriots" who had the respect of their countrymen and were endowed with "practical resourcefulness." Third, he advocated helping people who could promote the aforementioned program to escape from behind the iron curtain. Fourth, he would coordinate the Voice of America and private organizations concerned with the freedom of peoples in Europe and Asia with his newly established freedom program to make these agencies more effective. Fifth, he called for the coordination of our economic, commercial, and cultural relations for the purpose of enhancing his freedom programs. Sixth, he advocated the breaking off of diplomatic relations with "iron curtain" governments if such a course of action would promote the freedom programs. Finally, he wanted to bring together all free nations in this cause to help the captive countries behind the "iron curtain."

The "liberation" policy was reputed by Dulles' critics to be a call for military intervention; however, this conclusion does not agree with the facts. Dulles clearly stated, "We do not want a series of bloody uprisings and reprisals. There can be peaceful separation from Moscow, as Tito showed, and enslavement can be made so unprofitable that the master will let go his grip."³¹ These results he concluded would not

²⁹Dulles, "A Policy of Boldness," p. 154.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 154 & 157.

³¹Ibid., p. 157.

come quickly but

... the spirit of patriotism burns unquenched (in these captive countries) ... and we can be confident that within two, five or 10 years substantial parts of the present captive world can peacefully regain national independence.³²

One week later, writing in Newsweek, "The Danger in Our Defensive Mood," subtitled "Our 'barrier thinking' builds our own Iron Curtain; Let's woo Red satellites with hope of real freedom," Dulles clarified to a certain extent what he meant by his "liberation" policy. He advocated the establishment of peaceful attractions such as the Marshall plan which would lure the satellite countries from their masters. Citing the initial enthusiasm of Poland and Czechoslovakia, Dulles noted that it took a "violent veto" from Moscow to prevent their acceptance. Now he asserted, "The plight of these countries is more desperate than it was in 1948, and the attractions of Western Europe can be made stronger as, through unity, it gains health and vigor."³³

During the campaign, the Democrats portrayed Dulles' policy of liberation, as one which would lead to war and the slaughter of many East Europeans. During the television debate between Dulles and Averell Harriman (the Democrat's presumed choice for Secretary of State), Harriman commented:

... it's very dangerous to talk about liberation because liberation in the minds of Europeans means war, and I can assure you that the word 'liberation' terrifies the people who are under Communism that we are going to be the aggressor. ... nothing can be more cruel than to try to get people behind the Iron Curtain - I have been there and I know what it is - to try to revolt and have a new

³²Dulles, "A Policy of Boldness," p. 157.

³³John Foster Dulles, "Danger in Our Defensive Mood," Newsweek, XXXIX (May 26, 1952). p. 39.

tragedy and a massacre....³⁴

By no stretch of the imagination was Dulles calling for a military crusade into Eastern Europe. This clearly can be seen from his earlier pronouncements on "activation" in his book War or Peace and "liberation" explained in his article in Life in 1950, "How to Take the Offensive for Peace." Careful reading of his 1952 Life article, "A Policy of Boldness," shows that he expected the liberation policy to bring about the type of change which had occurred in Tito's Yugoslavia. Though there was some justification in criticism of Dulles and the Republicans for overzealousness in their portrayal of liberation, there were no grounds for the accusations that liberation was the policy of "war-mongers."

Mr. Dulles and the Republicans were attempting to make inroads on the traditionally Democratic Slavic vote while at the same time trying to present a unified foreign policy platform. The Republican party encompassed widely diversified viewpoints, which made it difficult to maintain a unified platform. However, the liberation concept was not purely a Republican gambit, as Guhin has indicated: "peaceful liberation was in fact a standing principle with both parties."³⁵

Dulles' liberation policy and the manner of its presentation during the 1952 Presidential campaign was best summarized by Beal when he commented:

... what Dulles meant and what he specifically defined was an operation no more warlike than Joshua's march around the walls of Jericho. His concept was too simple for general acceptance; his slogan, 'lib-

³⁴ Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 131, citing the transcript of television program "Pick the Winner," August 21, 1952 in Papers.

³⁵ Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 172.

eration,' was gross oversimplification of what he had in mind. One of history's most monstrous oversimplifications is the equation $e=mc^2$. When Einstein produced the formula, it meant nothing by itself to those who had not gone through the enormous calculations behind it; and it took infinite labor thereafter to demonstrate that it actually was the key to releasing the energy of the atom. 'Liberation' was the distillation of a similar amount of background thought by Dulles, and he knew it would take much time and zeal to translate it from theory into practice.³⁶

East German Riots

In the wake of electioneering rhetoric and prior to the inauguration of President Eisenhower, Dulles spoke before the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches. He summarized the moral basis of his liberation concept:

When we show, so that all may see, that freedom has that meaning, that freedom means, not idleness, not self-indulgence, but self-dedication to ennobling and creative ends, then the edifice of despotism will surely crumble, because free men will have broken the hypnotic spell by which the despots hold their masses.³⁷

Within six months he was to see his prophesy come to partial fruition in the events which occurred in East Germany in June of 1953. Stalin had died in March and the new leaders in the Kremlin, who were struggling for power amongst themselves, had initiated a "new course" in their satellite countries. Times were hard for the East Germans. Since the end of the Second World War, the Russians had bled the Germans, taking "... an average of about \$1.5 billion yearly, 20% of the East German national income."³⁸ Stalin's protégé, Walter Ulbricht, chose to combat this prob-

³⁶ Beal, John Foster Dulles, p. 313.

³⁷ John Foster Dulles, "Freedom and Its Purpose," The Christian Century, LXIX (December 24, 1952), p. 1499.

³⁸ "East Germans Shatter Red Myth," Business Week, (June 27, 1953), 120.

lem by the use of work "norms," a system much hated by the workers, in which each worker received his full pay only if he produced his expected norm. If he fell below that norm, then he received only a proportional fraction of his normal pay.

Matters continued to grow worse, and in early 1953, "... potatoes, meat and coal were scarce ... the number of persons fleeing the Soviet Zone had risen sharply ... and political prisoners filled the jails."³⁹ Walter Ulbricht was firmly committed to rapid "socialization," and the deeper the government got into trouble, the tighter it made the noose. As commodities grew scarce, work norms were increased, while prices increased. It was a vicious circle in which the harder one worked, the less he got and prices continued to rise irrespective of either factor. The Soviets, prior to Stalin's death, were industrializing East Germany while taking 20% of East Germany's gross national product. Basically, it was the old "guns or butter" economics; it was not possible to have both. The one time "breadbasket" of Germany was saddled with Ulbricht's "collectivization" which severely limited the output of farm goods "... and in some areas (grain, beet, and potato) crops (from the preceding fall) remained in the ground and were lost in the (winter) frost."⁴⁰

With the change of leadership in Moscow, "hard line" socialization was ordered discontinued and new orders issued by the Kremlin became

³⁹Carola Stern, Ulbricht - A Political Biography, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Incorporated, 1965), p. 135.

⁴⁰Emrys Hughes, "In Berlin," New Statesman, XXXXVI (July 4, 1953), 8.

known as the "New Course." The "New Course" was a confusing one indeed for party officials who, heretofore, had been enforcing a hard line policy of collectivization and socialization. "It seemed as if their leaders were demanding that they undo today what they had been told to do yesterday."⁴¹

Ulbricht chose to defy the new course, apparently realizing that, being closely tied to the hard liners, he was certain to be replaced in any event should the liberals win out in the on-going power struggle in Moscow. However, if he defied these orders and the hard liners won, his chances of remaining in power would be vastly improved. "The German General Secretary, therefore, resisted the New Course not merely out of conviction, but for reasons of self-preservation as well."⁴² He now was faced with opposition within his own SED (the East German Communist Party), and it appeared he might be on his way out. The people, tired of the continuous raising of the norms and the declining supply of food and consumer goods, were amazed when they read the "New Course," printed in the June 11, 1953, edition of Neues Deutschland.

Ulbricht's domestic political opposition came from the Minister for State Security, Zaisser, and the Editor-in-Chief of Neues Deutschland, Herrnstadt, both of whom were members of the Politburo. This opposition was in some way an outgrowth of the power struggle going on in Moscow at the time. While Ulbricht was betting on the hard liners, Zaisser and Herrnstadt were siding with the liberals. The Zaisser-Herrnstadt plan

⁴¹Stern, Ulbricht - A Political Biography, p. 138.

⁴²Ibid., p. 138.

called for the removal of Ulbricht and for the installing of sweeping economic changes. Although it would be difficult to guess just what their economic plan would have been, it seems safe to assume that it would have drastically slowed down "socialization."

The climax came on the 16th of June when Ulbricht, who now was aware of the Zaisser-Herrnstadt plan, ordered a "showdown" meeting of the Politburo. It is important here to be mindful of the events outside the Party which were largely responsible for the Politburo meeting. Work norms, which were scheduled to be increased by ten percent at the end of the month, had been substantially increased ahead of time commencing with the June 5th pay checks. The workers, enraged by the severe reduction of their already tenuous buying power, demanded rescission of the new norms. Their aggravation built up to such a point that, on the 16th of June at about ten in the morning, 300 workers from Block 40 of Stalinallee began a march on the Government building. As they approached, their numbers grew larger and by the time they reached the Government building, the crowd was approximately 1,500 to 2,000 strong.⁴³ They made demands upon Selbmann, the Minister of Foundry Construction who attempted to quiet the demands for the lowering of the work norms. As the fervor of the crowd grew, they began also to demand free elections.

The demonstration made an impression upon the members of the Politburo, who met on the evening of the 16th. Now "... for the first time, Ulbricht publicly endorsed the New Course and said, 'The Party is abandoning an admittedly mistaken road and taking the right one.' But it was

⁴³Stefan Brant, The East German Rising, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Incorporated, 1957), p. 62.

too late."⁴⁴

The question remains, just what drove the workers openly to demonstrate on the 16th? Admittedly, adverse economic conditions were a strong catalyst; however, there is a possibility, even though no conclusive proof exists, that Zaisser and Herrstadt tacitly or perhaps even openly approved of a demonstration to lend support to their plan to oust Ulbricht. Although it is certain that these men agreed with the demands for reduction of the work norms, they had no desire to promote free elections or even a workers' strike.

When the news of the demonstration leaked out of East Berlin to the East German countryside, it prompted spontaneous reaction on the following day. One of the more dramatic incidents in support of the Stalin-alley demonstrations was the action of the "Henningsdorf steel workers (who) decided en mass to support the call from Stalinallee ... they disarmed the guards and broke open the security gates and 15,000 of them marched thirteen miles to Berlin."⁴⁵ This scene repeated itself all over Berlin and the suburbs and spread throughout all of East Germany. Because of these disturbances

... military formations had been tied down for weeks on end. Strikes and demonstrations had taken place in some 350 towns and villages of the Soviet Zone; it was found necessary to march Soviet troops into 150 of them.⁴⁶

The events of June 16th and the subsequent riots were a great embar-

⁴⁴ Stern, Ulbricht - A Political Biography, p. 144.

⁴⁵ Brant, The East German Rising, p. 69.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 174.

rassment to the East German regime as well as the Soviet Union. It was the first time that the captive peoples openly defied Soviet despotism, greatly enhancing Dulles' own conviction that the Soviet empire was over-extended and over-rigid.⁴⁷ It is doubtful that the Dulles liberation policy had even a minimal effect upon the events of June 1953 in East Germany. Perhaps a few secretly hoped for American help, but the assumption that such expectations might have been the prime factor or contributing element of any proportion has no basis in fact. The riots were primarily sparked by oppressive work norms, which were continually increased, in tandem with rising costs and decreasing supply. Dulles' policy was truly consistent with his pronouncements on liberation and the events in East Germany served as proof. Though many described United States' reaction to the riots as one of failure to live up to its promises, Guhin pointed out and I believe correctly that, "the process (liberation) had always been defined as a psychological and political offensive, not as a process of armed intervention in Soviet-held territories."⁴⁸

Another prominent criticism of the Dulles policy of liberation was his insistence on a cold war strategy immediately after Stalin's death. Critics maintained that after Stalin died there was a prospect for détente and perhaps even German reunification. Hoopes, noting comments from Ambassador Bohlen, asserts:

Had the West accepted Churchill's appeal for prompt parley with the Kremlin, Bohlen thought, 'this would have been a very fruitful period,' and might have 'led to a radical solution in our favor on the German question.' He readily acknowledged, however, that such hope-

⁴⁷ John Foster Dulles, "The Unquenchable Spirit of the Captive Peoples," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXIX (July 13, 1953) 40.

⁴⁸ Guhin, John Foster Dulles, pp. 177-78.

ful prospects were less clear at the time. What was clear at the time was Dulles's firm opposition to any form of detente.⁴⁹

This is a questionable argument. First, Bohlen, prior to the Senate confirmation of his appointment as ambassador to the Soviet Union, was subject to severe criticism from right-wing Republicans, presumably due to his position as Roosevelt's translator at Yalta. On March 20,

Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada, a McCarthy supporter, rose on the Senate floor to charge that McLeod (a right-wing supporter of Senator Bridges of New Hampshire, a McCarthy associate, who was placed in the State Department in order to mollify the McCarthyites) had been 'unable to clear' Bohlen 'on the basis of information received from the FBI.'⁵⁰

These charges were utterly false and are an outgrowth of the anti-communist hysteria McCarthy and his supporters were generating. Bohlen's nomination was secured when Secretary Dulles personally convinced the influential Senators Taft and Sparkman of Bohlen's integrity. Due to the influence of these two senators, Bohlen was confirmed in the Senate despite right-wing opposition. The fear that these right-wing senators created was so great, Hoopes noted, that "en route in an automobile to a second hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee, Bohlen recalled that Dulles 'asked me not to be photographed with him.'⁵¹ If that was not enough, after Bohlen's nomination was confirmed by the Senate, Dulles 'worried over Bohlen's plan to fly to Moscow a week or two ahead of his family, telling Bohlen with cold unsubtlety that such a circumstance could

⁴⁹ Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 180, citing Charles E. Bohlen, Oral History interview, p. 24.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 159, citing Robert J. Donovan, Eisenhower, p. 87.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 160, citing Charles E. Bohlen, Oral History interview, p. 16.

open him to veiled charges of homosexuality, no matter how baseless such charges might be."⁵² It is easy to conclude that any move on Dulles' part to seek détente with the Kremlin in accordance with Ambassador Bohlen's suggestion would have created an uproar from conservatives that might have been impossible to control.

Second, according to the Hoopes account, Bohlen became aware of a possible Soviet détente in April of 1953. However, by the middle of June, East Germany was rioting. Three weeks later, Beria was removed from power. That meant that the United States had two months in which to implement the new policy of détente. The United States, unlike totalitarian governments, needed time to implement bold new policy directions. Admittedly, there appears to have been a chance for bargaining with the fledgling Soviet leaders, and perhaps such bargaining might have helped the liberals in the Kremlin. However, reunification of Germany on terms favorable to the United States was at best only a long shot. There are two main reasons for this conclusion. First, the mood of the American people in 1953 was far from conciliatory towards the Soviet Union, and it is doubtful that even the popular and prestigious President Eisenhower could have convinced the American people and the United States Senate that détente was a very real possibility. Foreign policy change in a democratic society usually develops at a painfully slow rate, especially when the change is significant. An example can be found in the United States policy towards the People's Republic of China. Public opinion changed gradually until in 1968 both Presidential

⁵²Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 160, citing Author interview with Charles E. Bohlen, August 17, 1972.

candidates felt it was safe to advocate a policy of rapprochement with China. Even so, when Richard Nixon announced his planned trip to China, he received severe criticism from his traditionally conservative Republican supporters.

Second, the reason East Germany could not be "liberated" or reunified with West Germany was the fact that Ulbricht remained in power. He could assert himself not in spite of the riots, but because of them. The riots provided ammunition for Ulbricht, who now could point an accusatory finger at the "weak kneed" liberals who had foisted such a ridiculous policy as the "New Course" upon him. Although he was made to "genuflect" before the Kremlin (he had to proclaim his acceptance of the principle of collective leadership as well as engage in "self-criticism"),⁵³ he received permission to purge his opposition. Ulbricht's retention of power marked the real tragedy of June 1953, and the cause of liberation was lost.

"Liberation" Policy in the First Four Years

The action, or perhaps better stated, inaction, of the United States in June of 1953, clearly showed that Dulles' policy of "peaceful liberation" was clearly intended to be peaceful. He made that point often; however, it was usually overlooked, and Americans tended to attribute to him a grand design for a crusade into the Soviet bloc countries. Not long after coming to office, Dulles explained in a press conference the intent of a resolution on the liberation of captive peoples which was

⁵³Stern, Ulbricht - A Political Biography, p. 150.

before the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

... the underlying point is that the United States and the American people have, from their inception, always entertained the hope of liberation for all captive peoples. I have often quoted what Abraham Lincoln said about our Declaration of Independence. He said it meant hope not alone to the people of this country but hope for the world for all future time; that in due course the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all men should be free. That is the hope to which America was dedicated. It is the hope that we entertain today, and this resolution will, I believe, make it perfectly clear that the United States is never prepared to buy fancied security for itself by confirming the captivity of any of the enslaved peoples.⁵⁴

This resolution was an outgrowth of Dulles' campaign promise to make known to the Soviets, on the highest authority of the President and Congress, the intentions of the United States. "It is a straight-forward statement of American principle and American peaceful but firm purpose."⁵⁵

Speaking before the National War College after the riots in East Germany, Dulles noted that it was the lack of morality which was the Achilles heel of Soviet Communist doctrine. "We can take advantage of it," he remarked, "if - but only if - we ourselves accept the supremacy of moral law."⁵⁶ It was necessary for America to recapture the mood of its forebears, to demonstrate the spiritual, intellectual, and material richness which made this country great. He noted that it was our freedom which became a threat to despots all over the world "... because we

⁵⁴ John Foster Dulles, "Liberation of Captive Peoples," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXVIII (March 2, 1953), p. 330.

⁵⁵ John Foster Dulles, "Purpose of Resolution on Captive Peoples," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXVIII (March 9, 1953), p. 372.

⁵⁶ John Foster Dulles, "Morals and Power," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXVIII (June 29, 1953), p. 897.

showed how to meet the hunger of the people for greater opportunity and for greater dignity. The tide of despotism, which at that time ran high, was rolled back and we ourselves enjoyed security."⁵⁷

Dulles was quick, after the riots in East Germany, to point to the validity of his "activation" argument from War or Peace. Referring to the "unquenchable spirit of the captive peoples" he asserted that "such a spirit can never be repressed, and this love of freedom is more and more manifesting itself through the captive peoples."⁵⁸ Such incidents as the East German riots would force the Soviets, "... to recognize the futility of trying to hold captive so many people who, by their faith and their patriotism, can never really be consolidated into a Soviet Communist world."⁵⁹ Firmly convinced that his thesis on the weakness of the Soviet structure was correct, he proclaimed that we had the diplomatic and moral initiative:

The fact that the Soviet rulers now refuse to meet to discuss European problems is not a sign of strength, but of fear. They dare not admit of a prospect of greater liberty anywhere behind the Iron Curtain, lest restiveness increase everywhere behind that curtain.⁶⁰

In April of 1954, in an article in Foreign Affairs, Dulles steadfastly held to the original position, which he had advocated both in his book War or Peace and his 1952 Life article, "A Policy of Boldness." He

⁵⁷Dulles, "Morals and Power," p. 897.

⁵⁸John Foster Dulles, "The Unquenchable Spirit of the Captive Peoples," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXIX (July 13, 1953), p. 40

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 40.

⁶⁰John Foster Dulles, "The Moral Initiative," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXIX (November 30, 1953), p. 744.

referred to the "impossible task" of totalitarian regimes in suppressing any peoples, noting that the Soviets had to yield to the pressure of "human desires." This conclusion was based on the observation that within their own country the Soviets had made promises of more food and material goods as well as economic freedom.

This does not prove that the dictators have themselves been converted. It is rather that they may be dimly perceiving that there are limits to their power indefinitely to suppress the human spirit.⁶¹

The Secretary's concept of "peaceful liberation" was often misunderstood, since the "peaceful" intent was sometimes clouded by cold-war rhetoric. This problem surfaced at the May 1955 NATO meeting, when Paul-Henri Spaak of Belgium told Secretary Dulles privately:

... insistence on a public posture of rollback cruelly implied assistance which the NATO alliance could not realistically give; moreover, Spaak pointed out, the diplomatic position of the West was exceedingly weak on this matter because it had already extended diplomatic recognition to all of the Eastern European regimes.⁶²

Dulles insisted, however, that this was a matter of principle which he could never bring himself to forget. Later Spaak would remark:

We never spoke of this very much afterwards. Dulles wanted to maintain the principle. You must remember that he was that type of man. I greatly admired him. He was one of those rare men in my experience who really had principles, and they were high principles.⁶³

May 18, 1955 marked the start of the Geneva Summit Conference. Just prior to this, the Soviets had agreed to the signing of an Austrian Peace Treaty, long a point of contention between the United States and the

⁶¹John Foster Dulles, "Policy for Security and Peace," Foreign Affairs, XXXII (April 1954), 364.

⁶²Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 290.

⁶³Drummond, Duel at the Brink, p. 141.

Soviet Union. This action on the part of the Soviets purportedly signified their good intentions in the upcoming summit. Dulles had expressed grave doubts about the wisdom of such a summit, feeling that the Soviets were not to be trusted. After the Austrian Peace Treaty had been signed, however, Dulles, Molotov, and the other signatories made their entrance before a happy Austrian populace. Standing on the balcony of the Belvedere palace in the presence of cheering people:

A gradual change came over Dulles' face. His expression altered from polite pleasure to immense happiness and delight. He and Molotov began to exchange handshakes, and soon embraces, in response to the crowd's cries for a display of East-West harmony - the same emotional plea that was propelling Dulles toward the summit.⁶⁴

From the summit at Geneva there emerged, at least in the minds of the people of the West, a new spirit commonly referred to as the "spirit of Geneva." However, Dulles claimed that in actual fact, two of the fundamental causes of East-West tension were never considered for discussion because of Soviet objections. First, President Eisenhower raised the question concerning "the problem of respecting the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live ... (a) pledge of our United Nations wartime declaration, reinforced by other wartime agreements."⁶⁵ Second, the President asserted that the Soviets refused to discuss the subversion of free nations by the Soviet Union, a situation which could not be tolerated if the "spirit of Geneva" was to be considered genuine.⁶⁶ This "spirit" was to be dispelled a year later when the Soviets

⁶⁴ Drummond, Duel at the Brink, p. 137.

⁶⁵ John Foster Dulles, "Entering the Second Decade," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXXIII (October 3, 1955), 525.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 525.

brutally repressed the Hungarian revolt.

Hungarian Revolt and the "Redefinition" of Liberation

As mentioned earlier, Dulles' belief in "peaceful change" and "liberation" was one which he would not alter. The Hungarian revolt, as had the East German riots three years preceding, merely reinforced his judgment. The uprisings in Hungary, Hoopes indicates, "... (were) not much influenced by the prospect of Western support; tragedy there resulted from serious Hungarian miscalculation as to the limits of Russian tolerance."⁶⁷

As Ferenc A. Vali wrote in his book, Rift and Revolt in Hungary:

The Hungarian Revolution was never planned or organized; there was no central directive organ or organization in existence to plan, nor did the various student bodies that resolved to demonstrate on October 23 have any idea, much less any intention, of proceeding toward a revolution. The revolutionary inspiration came to them as a consequence of subsequent provocations which, according to the principles of mass psychology, increased their sense of resentment and favored aggressiveness.⁶⁸

At the time of the Hungarian revolt, Britain, France and Israel were embroiled in a Middle East war. President Eisenhower, who was enraged that there should be a war over the Suez Canal, told Dulles to "let Ben-Gurion have it with both barrels...."⁶⁹ The President specified that the Secretary should go to the United Nations and work for getting sanctions imposed on Israel. At the United Nations, the United States joined with the Soviets in formally opposing the Sinai invasion, and

⁶⁷ Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 179.

⁶⁸ Ferenc A. Vali, Rift and Revolt in Hungary, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 271.

⁶⁹ Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 374.

proposing a return to the 1949 agreements. While the war was in progress, the Soviets were contemplating a response to Imre Nagy's proclamation of a neutral and democratic Hungarian state:

The final Soviet decision to intervene, (was) facilitated by the Anglo-French attack on Egypt. ... the Soviet leadership, even though increasingly fearful of the revolution's spreading elsewhere, (had been) uncertain how to react and (had prepared) for several contingencies.⁷⁰

The Soviet recourse to a military solution indicates that the Kremlin considered the Yugoslavian situation as an aberration which could not be tolerated in other Soviet satellites. The Soviets felt that accepting national communism in East Europe "... would be going against the expected trend of events even in the case of Yugoslavia itself, since, ultimately, it was hoped, Yugoslavia, too, would shed its distinctive mantle."⁷¹

The timing of the events of October and November of 1956 were indeed unfortunate, and Dulles later lamented:

The UN, I am convinced, would have taken a stronger stand on Hungary had it not been for the Suez incident. I would dearly have loved to focus the eye of world public opinion uniquely on what was happening in Hungary.⁷²

He did not feel that insistence on a Soviet policy of moderation in Eastern Europe was unreasonable - "after all, what we ask for is less than what the Soviets gave Tito."⁷³ But as Professor Vali notes in his book,

⁷⁰Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, The Soviet Bloc Unity and Conflict, (4th ed.; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 231.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 232.

⁷²Berding, Dulles on Diplomacy, p. 111.

⁷³Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 179, citing Dulles draft position papers, memorandum from Dulles to Eisenhower, and memorandum from Douglas MacArthur, II to Dulles regarding the Big Four Meeting, in Papers (June 1955).

"... a 'wait and see policy prompted by the fear that interference would precipitate Soviet aggression totally misjudged the situation and the character of Soviet aggressiveness."⁷⁴ He goes on to say that neither Dulles' surgical operation (a reference to an attack of cancer which Mr. Dulles suffered about midnight of the second of November) nor the upcoming Presidential elections justified the United States' inaction. In conclusion he argued: "presumably the Hungarian issue took a distant second place in the priorities of the National Security Council in Washington as soon as the Suez conflict emerged."⁷⁵

After the Hungarian revolt, there was severe criticism of Dulles' liberation policy. Writing in The Nation on March 30, 1957, Frederic W. Collins remarked: "The Eisenhower - Dulles liberation policy, no matter how interpreted, has come to lose almost all practical meaning for its prospective beneficiaries...."⁷⁶ Collins discerned several definitions and redefinitions of liberation which he maintained was merely "an impressive exercise in climbing-down."⁷⁷ Just how much "climbing-down" Dulles really did is doubtful. In an October issue of Foreign Affairs, Dulles had this to say:

The time may come, indeed we can be confident that it will come, when the nations now ruled by International Communism will have governments which, whatever their label, in fact serve their own nations and their own peoples rather than the insatiable world-

⁷⁴Vali, Rift and Revolt in Hungary, p. 356.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 356.

⁷⁶Frederic W. Collins, "'Liberation': Evolution of a Policy," The Nation, CLXXXIV (March 30, 1957), 273.

⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 272-73.

wide ambitions of an international Party.⁷⁸

The Dulles "peaceful liberation" pronouncements were not ambiguous and even after the abortive Hungarian revolt, they were not changed.

After the revolt, Dulles said in a policy statement:

I did not mean that liberation should be achieved through the use of force. What I meant was a three-fold proposition: first, the United States should emphasize and reemphasize its sympathies for the Eastern European peoples; second, we should reassert again and again that we would never agree to their dependent condition; and, third, we should assist them in economic⁷⁹ and other ways to move peacefully toward greater independence.

In an April 1957 press conference, Dulles was asked about United States inaction during the Hungarian revolt. He replied:

... there was no basis for our giving military aid to Hungary. We had no commitment to do so, and we did not think that to do so would either assist the people of Hungary or the people of Europe or the rest of the world.⁸⁰

Basically, the entire "liberation" policy from its inception to the end of Dulles' life, was one of differing degrees of emphasis. He never changed his theory of "peaceful liberation;" yet, often these peaceful intentions became clouded in fiery rhetoric. This problem was aptly defined by Guhin when he concluded:

... in spite of the clarity of Dulles' statements on peaceful liberation and his sometimes shouting the qualifications, the impression was created of a more active 'liberation' role for the United States.⁸¹

⁷⁸ John Foster Dulles, "Challenge and Response in United States Policy." Foreign Affairs, XXXVI (October 1957), 28.

⁷⁹ Berding, Dulles on Diplomacy, p. 115.

⁸⁰ John Foster Dulles, "News Conference, March 14, 1957," United States Department of State Bulletin, XXXVI (April 1, 1957), 533.

⁸¹ Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 180.

Dulles never intended anything more militant than moral pressure. Unfortunately, the moral pressure applied by the United States had little effect upon the Soviet Union because the subject in question concerned their captive possessions in East Europe. In the final analysis, Dulles' "peaceful liberation" could only be realized over a long period of time. The policy was close to being an evolutionary policy, and Dulles often explained that "liberation" was inevitable; however, he never said that it was imminent. He tried to apply his concept of "peaceful change" (developed in his first book) to the problems in Eastern Europe. Unfortunately, many Americans wanted immediate results. When the United States did nothing materially to aid the East Germans in the 1953 riots and the Hungarians in their 1956 revolt, these same people deduced that the Dulles liberation policy was a fake.

Herein lies the basic problem with "peaceful liberation." While the moral ideal of "liberation" was to see a quick "roll back" of communism and the establishment of free and democratic states in Eastern Europe, the pragmatic and realistic goal was to influence a gradual liberalization of Soviet policy toward their Eastern European satellites.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The Pragmatist Versus the Moralist

In his concluding paragraph on Dulles, Hoopes expressed agreement with the conclusion of an unnamed diplomat who stated flatly, "Dulles was a curious cross between a Christer and a shrewd and quite ruthless lawyer."¹ Though this was a rather cryptic way of expressing the problem, it was not unfounded. Mr. Dulles was a man who possessed and displayed a high degree of logic, as can be seen from the case he presented to his parents for becoming a "Christian lawyer." Likewise, he was profoundly aware of Christianity. As the son of a Presbyterian minister, he was exposed to a great deal of Christian literature during his youth.

After his decision to become a "Christian lawyer," had been made, Mr. Dulles appeared to place more emphasis upon logic and practical solutions than on applications of morality. This, no doubt, was the result of his legal training, which stressed reliance on the pragmatic. This emphasis appears clearly in his first book, in which he questions the ability of religions to provide a solution for preventing war.

When the willingness to sacrifice is put at the disposal of a religion or other 'cause,' this will not universalize the ethical solution unless the cause be one which itself rejects the use of forcible or coercive measures and espouses non-violent human intercourse as one of its ends.²

Furthermore, "holy" wars, crusades and persecutions were merely "deplor-

¹Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles, p. 491.

²Dulles, War, Peace and Change, pp. 20-21.

able manifestations of mass violence."³

By the outbreak of the Second World War, Mr. Dulles began to emphasize religion as necessary for the survival of the United States. He stated in 1942, that Americans needed to find "... a faith so profound that we, too, will feel that we have a mission to spread it throughout the world."⁴ During the war, Mr. Dulles was chairman of the "Commission of a Just and Durable Peace." It was because of his active participation that the Commission was motivated toward high moral goals, goals which he would later describe as "perhaps too idealistic."

When Mr. Dulles became involved in politics, his moral perspective and pragmatism appeared to merge. By 1950, after becoming well acquainted with politics, he published his second book in which he emphasized that:

Our greatest need is to regain confidence in our spiritual heritage. Religious belief in the moral nature and possibilities of man is, and must be, relevant to every kind of society, throughout the ages past and those to come. It is relevant to the complex conditions of modern society. We need to see that, if we are to combat successfully the methods and practices of a materialistic belief.⁵

Upon becoming Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles was a combination of both a moralist and a pragmatist. The emphasis he would place on either one or the other would depend upon what he considered the best strategy or policy for the United States. Therefore, since a rapprochement with Communist China was politically out of the question, Secretary Dulles

³Dulles, War, Peace and Change, p. 20.

⁴Van Dusen, ed., The Spiritual Legacy of John Foster Dulles, p. 93.

⁵Dulles, War or Peace, p. 261.

emphasized the moral aspects of the situation. Thus it was morally wrong to do business with a country whose ideology, as preached by Chairman Mao, called for: the lowering of the importance of the family unit; involvement in wars of "liberation" throughout Asia; direct participation in the Korean war; and, elimination of the Nationalists from Taiwan. However, despite Secretary Dulles' moral indignation towards Communist China, the pragmatic formula necessitated dealing with "Red" China whenever to do so would be in the interest of the United States. Consequently, talks were initiated with the Chinese at Geneva and continued in Warsaw. During the last year of his Secretaryship, Dulles maintained:

... although official recognition would not serve the interests of the United States at the time, the Eisenhower Administration did and would continue to deal with the Chinese People's Republic whenever it appeared expedient.⁶

His policy of "peaceful liberation" was to some extent a pragmatic attempt to gain votes in the 1952 Presidential election. It was also pragmatic to attempt to bring about gradual liberalization of Soviet policy in the satellite countries. Dulles had no illusions of some grand military foray into Eastern Europe and likened this type of thinking to the cruel fate of Polish patriots at the hands of General Bor.

The policy was moralistic in that it called for a moral crusade against Soviet despotism and the use of moral condemnation to bring about a change. In the short run it was unsuccessful, but we may seriously doubt that Dulles had expected it to work in a short period of time. Although in his article in Life, "A Policy of Boldness," he re-

⁶Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 103, citing Dulles interview with Congressman Kenneth B. Keating on "Let's Look at Congress," in Papers (March 14, 1958).

marked that "... within 2, 5, or 10 years substantial parts of the present captive world can peacefully regain national independence....,"⁷ this was the only time he placed a time element on "liberation." In later years, when questioned about the time element, he replied that he considered this to be a conditional statement; in other words "liberation" could take place within this time span, but there was no certainty that it would. It was, in reality, another example of campaign rhetoric which unfortunately, tended to cloud Dulles' real intention behind "peaceful liberation."

In the final analysis, Dulles' policy of "peaceful liberation" and his steadfast refusal to agree to "Red" Chinese membership in the United Nations, were examples of moral ideals carried out in pragmatic order. Although these two policies were based upon norms of morality, they were chosen for very pragmatic reasons. Non-recognition of "Red" China was a policy initiated by the Truman administration, and Dulles as President Eisenhower's Secretary of State merely continued this policy as would future Secretaries of State under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Likewise, "peaceful liberation" was a policy of the Democratic Party in 1952. Though Dulles originated it, Guhin noted that it "was in fact a standing principle with both parties...."⁸

Perhaps, as Hoopes contended, Dulles was a combination of a "righteous combatant" and a "wily and amoral tactician." This characterization may not do justice to the difficulty of the cold war years. It was to his credit during his Secretaryship that, despite all the adverse criti-

⁷Dulles, "A Policy of Boldness," p. 157.

⁸Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 172.

cism, the United States averted war.

According to Khrushchev Remembers, 'Dulles knew how far he could push us, and he never pushed ... too far.' Khrushchev reportedly told his friends in 1959 that the American Secretary 'had never stepped over that brink ... and for that reason alone we should lament his passing.'⁹

However, the best appraisal of the question of moralism versus pragmatism came from Mr. Dulles' sister Eleanor:

His foreign policy, like his philosophy of life, was a balancing - some would say a tension - between, on the one hand, the pragmatic and workable solutions, and on the other hand ideals and theory, between feasible action and perfectionist aims.¹⁰

⁹ Guhin, John Foster Dulles, p. 155, citing Nikita Khrushchev, in Khrushchev Remembers, Strobe Talbott, ed., (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1970), p. 398.

¹⁰ Eleanor Dulles, John Foster Dulles, p. 168.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS BY DULLES:

- Dulles, John Foster. War or Peace. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- _____. War, Peace and Change. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1939.

BOOKS ABOUT DULLES:

- Beal, John Robinson. John Foster Dulles: 1888-1959. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1959.
- Berding, Andrew H. Dulles on Diplomacy. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Incorporated, 1965.
- Comfort, Mildred Houghton. John Foster Dulles, Peacemaker. Minneapolis, Minnesota: T. S. Dennison and Company, Incorporated, 1960.
- Drummond, Roscoe and Coblentz, Gaston. Duel at the Brink. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Incorporated, 1960.
- Dulles, Eleanor Lansing. John Foster Dulles: The Last Year. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.
- Gerson, Louis L. American Secretaries of State and their Diplomacy: John Foster Dulles. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1967.
- Goold-Adams, Richard. John Foster Dulles: A Reappraisal. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
- Guhin, Michael A. John Foster Dulles: A Statesman and his Times. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1972.
- Heller, Deane and David. John Foster Dulles: Soldier for Peace. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
- Hoopes, Townsend. The Devil and John Foster Dulles. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Little, Brown and Company, 1973.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. "John Foster Dulles." An Uncertain Tradition: American Secretaries of State in the Twentieth Century. Edited by Norman A. Graebner. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Incorporated, 1962.
- Van Dusen, Henry P. ed. Spiritual Legacy of John Foster Dulles. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

GENERAL BOOKS:

- Brandt, Stephan. The East German Rising. Translated From the German by Charles Wheeler. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Incorporated, 1957.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew K. The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict. 4th ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Houn, Franklin W. A Short History of Chinese Communism. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1967.
- Stern, Carola. "East Germany." Communism in Europe. Vol. 2. William E. Griffith, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M. I. T. Press, 1966.
- _____. Ulbricht - A Political Biography. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Incorporated, 1965.
- Vali, Ferenc A. Rift and Revolt in Hungary. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

ARTICLES BY DULLES IN JOURNALS AND MAGAZINES:

- Dulles, John Foster. "A Policy of Boldness." Life. XXXII (May 19, 1952), pp. 146-160.
- _____. "Can We Guarantee a Free Europe?" Collier's. CXXI (June 12, 1948), pp. 20 & 75.
- _____. "Challenge and Response in U. S. Policy." Foreign Affairs. XXXVI (October, 1957), pp. 27-41.
- _____. "Challenge to Liberty." Vital Speeches of the Day. XXIV (February 1, 1958), pp. 706-09.
- _____. "Danger in Our Defensive Mood." Newsweek. XXXIX (May 26, 1952), p. 39.
- _____. "Foreign Policy in the Presidential Campaign." Foreign Policy Association Bulletin. XXXII (September 15, 1952), pp. 4 & 6.
- _____. "Free State versus the Police State." Vital Speeches of the Day. XIII (September 15, 1947), pp. 719-20.
- _____. "Freedom and Its Purposes." Address before the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches. The Christian Century. LXIX (December 23, 1952), pp. 1496-99.
- _____. "How to Take the Offensive for Peace." Life. XXVIII (April 24, 1950), pp. 120-33.

- Dulles, John Foster. "Importance of Initiative in International Affairs." Vital Speeches of the Day. XVIII (March 15, 1952), pp. 333-35.
- _____ . "Our Cause Will Prevail." Life. XLIII (December 23, 1957), pp. 12-13.
- _____ . "Policy for Security and Peace." Foreign Affairs. XXXII (April 1954), pp. 355-64.
- _____ . "Red Tactics Will Vary - So Will Ours." Nation's Business. XLII (January 1955), pp. 24-26.
- _____ . "Russia Faces New Frustration." Nation's Business. XLIV (January 1956), pp. 26-27 & 90.
- _____ . "The Foundations of Peace." Vital Speeches of the Day. XXIV (September 15, 1958), pp. 706-09.
- _____ . "Thoughts on Soviet Foreign Policy and What To Do About It." Life. XX (June 3, 1946), pp. 112-126; and (June 10, 1946), pp. 118-130.
- _____ . "We Have the Initiative." Nation's Business. XVII (January 1954), pp. 24-27.

ARTICLES BY DULLES IN THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN HEREAFTER REFERRED TO AS DSB:

- Dulles, John Foster. "A Policy for Peace Insurance." Address before International House, New York City (May 16, 1950), DSB. XXII (May 19, 1950), pp. 862-63 & 873.
- _____ . "Dynamic Peace." Address before the annual luncheon of the Associated Press at New York, New York (April 21, 1957), DSB. XXXVI (May 6, 1957), pp. 715-19.
- _____ . "Entering the Second Decade." Address before the United Nations General Assembly (September 22, 1955), DSB. XXXIII (October 3, 1955), pp. 523-29.
- _____ . "Freedom's New Task." Address before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (February 26, 1956), DSB. XXXIV (March 5, 1956), pp. 363-67.
- _____ . "Liberation of Captive Peoples." Comments made on February 18, 1953, in response to questions concerning possible action by the Congress with respect to secret understandings. DSB. XXVIII (March 2, 1953), p. 330.

- Dulles, John Foster. "Morals and Power." Address before the National War College at Washington (June 16, 1953), DSB. XXVIII (June 29, 1953), pp. 895-97.
- _____ . News Conference. (December 6, 1955), DSB. XXXIII (December 19, 1955), pp. 1007-11.
 - _____ . News Conference. (March 13, 1957), DSB. XXXVI (April 1, 1957), pp. 533-37.
 - _____ . News Conference. (January 16, 1958), DSB. XXXVIII (February 3, 1958), pp. 163-68.
 - _____ . News Conference. (July 8, 1958), DSB. XXXI (July 16, 1958) pp. 87-88.
 - _____ . News Conference. (November 26, 1958), DSB. XXXIX (December 15, 1958), pp. 947-53.
 - _____ . "Our Changing World." Address made at the Statehood Day ceremonies of the Minnesota Statehood Centennial at Minneapolis, Minnesota (May 11, 1958), DSB. XXXVIII (May 26, 1958), pp. 847-50.
 - _____ . "Our Experiment in Human Liberty." Address before the Military Chaplain's Association of the U. S. A. at New York, New York (April 22, 1958), DSB. XXXVIII (May 12, 1958), pp. 755-59.
 - _____ . "Our Policies Toward Communism in China." Address before the international convention of Lions International at San Francisco, California on June 28, 1957. DSB. (July 15, 1957), pp. 91-95.
 - _____ . "Principles and Policies in a Changing World." Address before the World Order Study Conference of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America at Cleveland, Ohio (November 18, 1958), DSB. XXXIX (December 8, 1958), pp. 897-904.
 - _____ . "Proposed Study of Sino-Soviet Relations Supported." Statement before Committee I (Political and Security) of the United Nations (November 21, 1950), DSB. XXIII (November 4, 1950), pp. 908-10.
 - _____ . "Purpose of Resolution on Captive Peoples." Statement before House Foreign Affairs Committee (February 26, 1953), DSB. XXVIII (March 9, 1953), pp. 372-73.
 - _____ . "Secretary Dulles Discusses United States Foreign Policy for British Television Broadcast." Press release 635, dated October 23, 1958. DSB. XXXIX (November 10, 1958), pp. 733-39.

- Dulles, John Foster. Statement before Committee I of the United Nations (November 27, 1950), DSB. XXIII (December 18, 1950). pp. 990-93.
- _____ . "Sustaining Friendship with China." DSB. XXIV (May 28, 1951) pp. 843-45.
- _____ . "The Challenge of Change." Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (June 6, 1958), DSB. (June 23, 1958), pp. 1035-42.
- _____ . "The Challenge of Today." Address at University of Arizona (May 30, 1951), DSB. XXIV (June 11, 1951), pp. 935-37.
- _____ . "The Evolution of Foreign Policy." Address before the Council on Foreign Relations at New York on January 13, 1954. DSB. XXX (January 25, 1954), pp. 107-10.
- _____ . "The First 90 Days." Address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors and broadcast to the nation over radio and television networks (April 18, 1953), DSB. XXVIII (April 27, 1953), pp. 603-08.
- _____ . "The Moral Initiative." Address before the Congress of Industrial Organizations at Cleveland, Ohio (November 18, 1953), DSB. XXIX (November 30, 1953), pp. 741-44.
- _____ . "The Question of Formosa." Statement before Committee I (Political and Security) of the United Nations (November 15, 1950), DSB. XXIII (December 4, 1950), pp. 908-10.
- _____ . "The Task of Waging Peace." Address before the Dallas Council on World Affairs, Dallas, Texas (October 27, 1956), DSB. XXXV (November 5, 1956), pp. 695-99.
- _____ . "The Unquenchable Spirit of the Captive Peoples." (June 30, 1953), DSB. XXIX (July 13, 1953), p. 40.
- _____ . "United States Assurances to Captive Peoples." Statement before the Select Committee to Investigate and Study the Seizure and Forced Incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Treatment of Said Baltic Peoples, House of Representatives, (November 30, 1953), DSB. XXIX (December 14, 1953), pp. 818-19.
- _____ . "United States Policy on Hungary." DSB. XXXV (November 12, 1956), pp. 757-63.
- _____ . "Uniting for Peace." Statement before Committee I (Political and Security) of the United Nations (October 23, 1950), DSB. XXIII (October 23, 1950), pp. 651-54.

GENERAL ARTICLES:

- Binder, David. "Ulbricht Charges Beria Harmed Aim." New York Times, November 29, 1961, p. 22.
- Collins, Federic W. "'Liberation': Evolution of a Policy." The Nation. CLXXXIV (March 30, 1957), pp. 272-75.
- Dennett, Raymond and Turner, Robert K. ed. Documents on American Foreign Relations. Vol. XI, January 1, to December 31, 1949, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1950, p. 546.
- "Disturbances in East Germany; Various Documents." United States Department of State Bulletin. XXIX (July 6, 1953), pp. 8-10.
- "East Germans Shatter Red Myth." Business Week. June 27, 1953, pp. 188-20.
- "Fourth Anniversary of East Berlin Uprising; Message to K. Adenauer from J. F. Dulles." United States Department of State Bulletin. XXXVII (July 8, 1957), p. 50.
- Friedrich, Carl J. Review of War, Peace and Change, by John Foster Dulles. The Commonweal. XXIX, April 7, 1939, p. 668.
- Fox, William T. R. Review of War or Peace, by John Foster Dulles. The American Political Science Review. XLIV, September 1950, pp. 751-53.
- Hughes, Emrys. "In Berlin." New Statesman. XXXXVI, July 4, 1953, pp. 7-8.
- Lerner, Max. Review of War or Peace, by John Foster Dulles. New Republic. CXXIII, May 15, 1950, pp. 18-19.
- Rauch, Basil. Review of War or Peace, by John Foster Dulles. Political Science Quarterly, LXV, December 1950, pp. 592-94.
- "Repressive Soviet Measures Taken in East Berlin; Text of Joint Message by United States, United Kingdom, and France." United States Department of State Bulletin. XXIX (June 29, 1953), pp. 897-98.
- Van Dyke, Vernon. Review of War, Peace and Change, by John Foster Dulles. The American Political Science Review. XXXIII (October 1939), pp. 929-30.

