

the aspirations of millions in Europe and Asia. More than that, the American attitude seems to be trapped in a suicidal fatalism: it leaves propaganda and political maneuvering as the exclusive concerns of the Communists.

An America which would go to a summit meeting with its present program would come back empty-handed, because that program contains no active, no creative, political element. An America which would go to a summit conference prepared, let us say, to challenge the Russians to withdraw troops from East Europe in response to an American withdrawal from the West, such an America would have the chance of scoring a significant political victory.

•

These three points are, of course, only the immediate steps which a reorientation of American policy toward political realism might necessitate. Deeper, more basic changes would ultimately have to take place.

In Asia, for instance, where China stands as the symbol of totalitarianism, and India of democratic industrialization, the United States must be committed to a policy of *massive* aid to the latter nation. The gap between the American funds directed to Chiang and those granted to Nehru is literally incredible. It will have to be drastically closed if India's freedom is to be saved.

Indeed, until American policy finds some way of genuinely reaching the dynamic and democratic

forces in this world—the masses of the colonial revolution, the workers of Europe—it will move from failure to failure. For the path of the present policy, of the subordination of political and social concern to military strategy, is a path toward disaster and defeat.

And here the impact of Sputnik has been dangerous in a peculiar sense. We are in the midst of a mood of crash-programism, of demands for more and more missile research, and this creates the delusion that the fundamental problem for us is technological. But the fundamental problem is deeper and more complex than that. We face a revolutionary change of historic proportions. Millions who were not active participants on the stage of history yesterday have become protagonists today. In such a situation, only a revolutionary policy can serve freedom and save peace. But we—and by “we” I mean not only John Foster Dulles and the Republicans, but Dean Acheson and the Democrats as well—have talked vaguely of democracy and “the free world,” but at the same time served a policy based on the illusion that the primary and immediate threat of Communism was military. In the doing, Communism has won millions of volunteers to its banner.

Unless this is changed, unless the United States realizes that the major challenge from Communism is political, we may soon face a terrible reality: not the reality of nuclear bombs dropped from a Sputnik, but the reality of millions of men who would be free deluded into the service of slavery because the defenders of freedom obscured their cause.

OUR DOMESTIC DEFENSE

The Russian satellites have shaken us out of our complacency more effectively than anything in American history. This may be the consummation of a process that began with the stalemate in Korea, the first time that our armed forces were not victorious in war. Perhaps this accounts for a certain stubbornness, possibly an obtuseness, in dealing with Communist China, a sort of unwillingness to face unpleasant facts contrary to our conception of the proper order of things in our universe. The Sputniks leave us with no alternative but to accept the reality of grave and present danger . . .

A new stress on human values, on democratic values, is necessary for the struggle in the present danger. In the final showdown, the conflict between the East and West will not be resolved by missiles or bombers, but in the hearts of men.

Free men do have the advantage, even over the technical efficiency to which the oppressed may be driven by their oppressors. They do have the advantage of independent thought, of loyalty to their way of life, even when the government changes, and of vindication by history. We must continue to counter-

act the Communist idea by the democratic idea. And this means we must continue to emphasize and implement the free way of life.

It won't be easy. It will mean higher not lower taxes; it will mean more work for our children in the schools, not less. It will mean higher standards of productivity for industry and labor. It will mean the granting in fact as now in law of full equal rights to all the people of this land. It will mean the continued demonstration in spite of the increased technical efficiency that the welfare of the individual human being is central to our way of life.

This country was built on the conviction that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness were the right of all. It encouraged human dignity, it fashioned a new nation and through the generations a united nation out of the many groups that came from other lands. There is something precious, distinctive, unique, at the heart of our democracy. It is worth sacrificing for, and, if necessary dying for. But it is also worth living for.

PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN