

Resume taken from articles by Whittaker Chambers and Dean Acheson, April, 1956.

The key, as Chambers and Acheson see it, is the "New Look" in Soviet policy, based upon an equally new theory "he that is not against us is for us"; which explains why the Soviet offers loans and aid to carefully chosen target areas "with no strings attached" and challenges us to do the same; because whatever we do brings us no advantage, or even appreciation on the part of the recipient; obligates us to make up deficiencies where such exist in our own or Soviet aid; and to give to other territories with equal liberality in order to avoid playing favourites. We thus find ourselves playing Uncle to the whole world, and obtaining no commitments for what we do, but rather abuse and hatred for what, in their opinion, we have failed to do. It is the old truism that to lend money you make an enemy, whereas to refuse at the outset you can keep a friend - but on an International scale.

In conjunction with this memorandum you should not fail to read also an article by Dean Acheson, U. S. News & World Report, June 13th issue, page 116.

Whittaker Chambers: "The liquidation of Stalinism opens an unparalleled struggle for men's minds - Communists are realists - they will count on the long pull - which will presently be intense in the minds of millions. The West will not hear, let alone understand, this great drama of history that bears directly on its fate. The West will have to match, from some depths within itself - the threat to it of the great turn, the drama now playing out among its inveterate enemies."

"Communism has concluded that the power pattern has changed - that a definite stage of history is ending and a new one is beginning: this calls for new tactics in order for Communism to work successfully in it. New tactics whose end result, if successful, would foreclose that stage of history in a world wholly Communist. The new balance of forces was revealed in last year's (1955) Geneva Conferences.

"Geneva disclosed how little, vis-a-vis the Communist empire, the West had left to bargain with. The West had nothing that the Communists wanted enough (short of total or piecemeal submission), nothing they feared enough (short of total atomic war). And total atomic war they knew they need not fear. (Because the West has foolishly and repeatedly assured Russia - and the world - that we will never resort to war unless first attacked.*)"

"Western diplomacy found itself obliged to treat with Communism at a level no higher than that of a family dealing with kidnappers for its stolen children. Yet the meaning of this shift in power balance, which in history is of something the same order as the sinking of land masses into the sea would be in nature, seemed scarcely to dent the West's awareness. The Geneva Conferences dramatized that the atom bomb is no longer the shield of the Free World. (The advantages at the time of the Korean war had already been thrown away. *) Both sides possessed retaliatory power deadly enough to make resort to atomic war mutually suicidal. But behind the deadlocked weapons situation lay a political situation ultimately much graver for the West. The key to this situation had been China. Wrote Henry Adams in 1903 'My statesmanship is still all in China, where the last struggle for power is to come. If Russia organizes China as an economical power, the little drama of history will end in the overthrow of our clumsy Western civilization - in that event, I allow until 1950 to run our race out'. (The "Tanaka Memorial" of 1927, by Baron Tanaka to the Japanese Emperor, sought to forestall such a development, by interposing a Japanese version of the same theory.

(EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE D)

- 2 -

To conquer Asia we must first conquer China; to conquer China we must first conquer Manchuria; and if we can conquer Asia, we can conquer the world. The bone of contention between Russia and Japan in the Russo-Japanese war of 1905 was Korea - Port Arthur and part of Manchuria - the stepping stones to the attainment of domination in Asia. Baron Tanaka looked further - to the world-dominating potential of an organized and industrialized Asia, with its hordes of humanity and wealth of raw materials. Henry Adams, and Homer Lea, saw the same vision - "THE YELLOW PERIL". *)

"It was the fall of China that finally shifted the basic power balance in the world - so gravely complicated the problems of the West. It is scarcely 35 years since Russia convened the great 'Congress of Peoples of the East' - called on the Far Eastern, Indian and Moslem masses to war against Imperialism. The incredible shape of things to come was shadowed forth by a proclamation calling for a 'Holy War under the banner of the Comintern'. They laboured to give force to Lenin's strategy on the 'Colonial Question': its end purpose to strike at the West from the rear, and by rousing Asia, Africa and Latin America, to add their force to Communism, while depriving the West of overseas markets and sources of raw materials which are a foreign base of its economic life. The rise of the Soviet Union as an industrial power, re-inforced by the production and scientific and technological brains of half of Germany and all of Czechoslovakia, would enable (them) to take the road into the Colonial markets, and initiate a trade competition which must necessarily have a political face. It could all be done, too, under the shield of the atomic bomb. . . .

"There must have come a moment when the keen eyes of Communism, ranging over the West and non-Communist Asia, were caught by a stunning insight which may be summed up in the phrase THOSE WHO ARE NOT AGAINST US, ARE FOR US - for Communism the problem was how to convert the amorphous sentiments called 'Internationalism' or 'Neutralism' (sic) from negative to positive forces; from forces merely dividing the West's will to resist Communism into its marching allies. The answer was to refine the cruder forms of Communist aggression - into subtler forms.

"Nikita S. Khrushchev keyed this tactical shift - spelled out the steps of the new tactic: 1. Peaceful coexistence; 2. Peaceful trade competition; etc. - their core meaning - four words 'NO THIRD WORLD WAR.'

Khrushchev claimed that Communism now spoke for a majority of mankind, counting on the Communist side, the friendly masses of India - Indonesia. Khrushchev called for an active struggle against the war danger and militarism, for closer relations with socialist countries, etc.

"President Harry Truman took the Communists over the brink. That spoiled the game. The United States lost the Korean War because it was afraid of the threat of a bigger war. The West was afraid. But the Communists must have been terrified, and with much better reasons. The last thing in the world Communism could want was world war. The West made a fool of itself in Korea, throwing away almost at once, out of its fear of general war, what General MacArthur's strategy and the courage of American men had won.

"The current Communist peace strategy is buying time for mainland China to emerge as a new Communist industrial massif.

"The whole world craves peace. Men and women simply look at their children and grandchildren and think: It Must Not Be.

"Communism has not changed. Communist aggression against the West will not end. New, subtler, massive forms whose disintegrating energies are beamed first at specific soft spots around Communism's continental frontiers and far across them."

Dean Acheson: "The primary duty of any society is to survive. We still believe in the orderly spread of democracy. We still believe in economic progress through individual thrift. We believe that peace and disarmament will come through world organization. Our lawyers talk about world peace through world law. The Russians expect that by 1965 they will achieve military superiority over the United States. That in 10 or 15 years they will equal the industrial production of the United States. I believe that there is very little doubt that this will be the case - if plans and actions are projected on their present design. Finally, they expect at the end of this decade - unquestioned Russian hegemony in Asia and Africa - they expect this change will produce such a loss of raw materials for the West, and such a loss of markets that the whole balance of power will be completely shifted in favour of the Soviet Union. They believe - that they are better equipped than anybody in the West to deal with these peoples newly come to freedom - that their authoritarian system is better adapted to guide them than ours. These are not foolish expectations - if present courses are continued; they are most reasonable.

"We have an idea that there will be friction between Russia and China - and out of this friction we are going to be relieved. I see no basis at all - in fact I see less possibility of friction between Russia and China than at this moment I see between United States and its Allies. We have a belief that the Soviet Administrative system will break down. This is pure folklore.

"What do the Communists mean by the words 'Peaceful Coexistence' and 'Status Quo' - Peaceful Coexistence: protracted conflict. Status Quo: everything the Russians have is theirs, and everything that you have is open to them to get. Status quo means that the West cannot use force - the Communist Powers can use force - it is an 'internal matter' whether it is Korea or Hungary or Indo-China. Every time we use force it is an international matter, and this is wrong.

"The Russians are never going to rely upon foreign trade - they're not spread all around the world - they're not trying to do good - no quart of milk for every Hottentot.

"The first duty of society is to survive; it isn't to make the world safe for democracy - to bring about the Kingdom of Heaven on earth - it's to survive - that is the No. 1 necessity. In 15 years this world is going to be too dangerous to live in. The great task is to convince the Russians - by brutal means, if necessary - that their interest, and our interest are identical in the limitation and control of armaments! (Why did we not do this once and for all during the Korean War - we had the bomb, and they did not; God sent us an opportunity, which will never again return, and the justification for its use, when the Chinese entered Korea with Russian arms and backing. We had the opportunity, and the weapon, and failed to strike the blow. *)

* Remarks by author.

"---if we go along exactly as we are doing now, they would reach their objective. If we make a great effort of our own, then the whole thing may change. BUT WHERE THIS EFFORT IS COMING FROM, I HESITATE TO SAY AT THE PRESENT TIME." (Then where is the REMEDY. *)

Remarks by the author --

The conclusions drawn in the foregoing summary are substantially accurate, and the men who drew them knowledgeable in their respective fields; the fatal deficiency, however, is the failure to prescribe any positive policy whereby the Communist tide may be rolled back within its own borders, and contained. They reject as inadequate the policies now in force, and state quite plainly that Communism will sweep over the entire world unless decisive measures are taken. SOMETHING must be done. That SOMETHING is not defined; and in the meantime they have stated that within its own borders Communism is not assailable, will not collapse as a result of internal failure, and is not subject to erosion.

It should, by this time, be evident that we have not found the key to the problem, and that time is running out for the West. "The American way of life" is not the cure. Our conception of economic progress through individual thrift is not convincing as compared with the Communist dish - the far more rapid process of "Nationalization" and "Expropriation" of other peoples' property, as that which is taking place in Cuba today, and which is proving to be a "best-seller" in the backward countries. Expensive as it may have been, the aid of backward countries does not, and will not meet the situation. Cream puffs, pop-guns, Cadillacs and bubble-gum will not provide more than a temporary diversion, distributed among the "upper crust" without providing any basis for the over-all improvement of living standards amongst the lower classes. In due course the mass is stirred by Communist propaganda, or by the will to a better existence, into an eruption which will blow the top off the rickety farce democracies upon which we build our defences. (Formosa, Indonesia, Korea - and even Japan), with the recurrent risk of having these territories fall an immediate prey to Communist infiltration and domination, and the Communists play for keeps.

Promises of aid calculated to improve and to raise the standards, and dangled at the end of a 50-year rainbow are worse than useless; they want your wealth - they want it immediately - and they want it for free; failing which they will play you off against the Communists, leaving themselves entirely free, as they believe, to play both sides against the middle (Neutralism) and pick the eventual winner before the chips come down in the final shake.

Anything approaching the fabulous wealth and prosperity of the West, and particularly the United States, is for the backward peoples of Asia and Africa as remote, impracticable and unattainable as would be the mass colonization of the Moon, Venus and Mars. If the birth-rate were retarded, or even stopped dead, it would require from 25 to 50 years of concentrated effort to bring about such a transformation - given all available aid from the West, under conditions of world peace, and the indispensable requisite of self-help and "individual thrift"; and no one is prepared to wait for 25 years.

Assuming, then, that the fields are white already to the Communist harvest, and that by half-measures in aid to backward peoples - with no strings attached - we are carrying the burden of world-welfare together with the sole liability for failure anywhere, it should be manifest that we are simply feeding and nurturing from our blood stream the cancer which, when it has grown, will eventually strangle us.

WHAT THEN IS THE REMEDY - THE SOMETHING THAT MUST BE DONE?

To recapitulate:

1. Communism is not likely to fail within itself.
2. The West is not gaining, but losing - as matters now stand - and it would appear that less than two decades will suffice to seal its fate.
3. China and Russia will not develop frictions which will relieve the West.
4. The Communist objectives have not changed, nor will they change. Their objective is the destruction of the United States and all that it stands for. "We will bury you".
5. Our present policies are not adequate, and no means, under the present rules, are in sight to meet the threat and turn back the Communist attack.
6. We have lost the initiative to the Communists in the minds of the backward peoples, and the nations who are finding their freedom from Colonial domination. They are slipping toward the Communist orbit.
7. What we now do involves us in an unlimited liability for the well-being of the entire world, without any strings or obligations on the other side, and without benefit to us in our struggle with Communism. We are blackmailed into giving aid and comfort to potential enemies.
8. Much of our aid is actually a subsidy to Communism which relieves the Russians from a burden which they could scarcely, under present conditions, afford to carry. We thus relieve them of the liability.
9. The "status quo" and "peaceful coexistence" are terms which do not mean what we think they mean - they tie our hands and leave the Communists entirely free. They are devices which enable the cancer of Communism to spread, whilst time is gained for the organization of the Yellow Giant into an industrial power. The peoples of Africa and Asia are being trained in the schools of Peking and Moscow to return eventually to their native lands as organizers for Communism.
10. The policies of Communism are aggressive - those of the West supinely passive and defensive.
11. The West is spending much of its strength in the arms race, the missile race, and world-wide aid; the "New Look" in Communist strategy precludes a third world-war, and much of this effort is therefore thrown away - though still essential to our safety. Time is of the essence - if it were but an intensive effort toward a goal such as was the invasion of Hitler's Fortress Europe, all might be well: but it is an effort without a goal - without an objective - without even a determination how to use it, or to use it at all - or even the threat to use it; because the West has repeatedly stated that they will never be the aggressors, and the Soviet Union will see to it that there will be no cause for nuclear war.
12. "If the trumpet giveth an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle" and the West enters the lists saddled with the Ten Commandments bridled with the Sermon on the Mount, and wielding the futile sword of Moral Force, scorned by the Communist side. It should be abundantly evident WE MUST SCRAP THE PRESENT RULE BOOK OR LOSE THE BALL GAME: WE MUST MEET THREAT WITH THREAT, BLOW WITH BLOW, FIRE WITH FIRE, and PLOT WITH COUNTER PLOT, or be destroyed.

The Remedy --

1. Break off all relations with Russia - and all her Satellites - and expel their diplomatic representatives and all their citizens from our territory.
2. Serve notice here and now upon the Communist Bloc that we will suffer no interference or encroachment within our spheres of influence, and that we will take immediate and active measures to ensure that our decision is respected; and that we are prepared to act on the instant and with whatever force and weapons may be necessary, even to the extent of all-out war.
3. Serve notice on all the nations of the world that the United States will recognize no neutrals - but only friends or foes - and that they must choose now and declare themselves - the Communist doctrine in reverse - "He who is not for us, is against us".
4. Give aid, armaments, weapons, financial facilities, preferential trade, educational and cultural facilities to those who side with us, and place a complete embargo on all who side against us, or who are unwilling to declare themselves.

By so doing we would throw an intolerable burden of liability upon the Communist Bloc, relieving ourselves at the same time of the burden of feeding those countries who have drawn aid from us whilst flirting with the Communist side.

By so doing we would deny to the Communists freedom of entry and travel which they now enjoy throughout the Free World, (whilst we on our part are excluded from any contact or influence within the Iron Curtain countries.)

This is WAR on a different plane - but nonetheless war, and it should be recognized as such. The Allies of the United States (France, Britain, Canada, etc.) might protest, but in the face of a determined United States they would be compelled to cooperate. Those who refused to comply would soon regret their decision, and the door could be left open. The alternative would be their collapse - and they cannot but know it.

The countries of Africa and Asia who voted for the Communist Bloc would find themselves marooned and cut off from the rest of the world - through breakdown of communications, transportation, financial facilities and channels, and even the bare necessities of everyday life.

The remedy is drastic - but so is war; and by action now it may be possible to avoid the ultimate certainty of war - or the alternative of the destruction of all that we hold dear both for ourselves and for our children.

Time is against us - the tides are against us - we must act now, or lose by default and without the privilege of employing the expensive defences to which we are devoting such a great proportion of our wealth - our modern "Maginot Line" - as expensive and as futile as its name implies.

NOTE:

And what of the United Nations? Let it shift for itself; and if the Communists are denied residential rights in the United States, or access through its territory, presumably they might find some inconvenience, which should disturb no one but themselves: and in any event, what would United Nations do in event of an all-out war?



Mr. Allen Dulles,
Central Intelligence Agency,
2430 "E" St., N.W.,
WASHINGTON, D.C.