



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel
167

Box
60

Folder
1024

A new Secretary of State; a new foreign policy?, 1959.

SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE

May 3, 1959

DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER

A NEW SECRETARY OF STATE: A NEW FOREIGN POLICY?

Recently John Foster Dulles resigned as Secretary of State and Christian A. Herter has succeeded him in office. The circumstances under which Mr. Dulles resigned are deeply regretted by everyone. He is a gravely sick man and the prayers of all men of good will are with him in his dread ailment. Whether one agreed or disagreed with his policies in office, no one could question his integrity, his patriotism, his dedication. He brought to his task strong and honest convictions - and he gave to his country the fullest measure of unselfish devotion in a trying and critical period in the history of the world. It is too soon for history to make a final evaluation of his role, or to pass a verdict on the success or failure of his career as Secretary of State. All the issues with which he dealt are still in the very fluid state. No final solution to any international problem has as yet been reached, - and the wisdom of his insights and judgments and actions are yet to be either justified or challenged by coming events. In a sense, when you come to think of it - in a sense, a formal evaluation may never be made, and if made may never be universally accepted. In times such as these - times of global reconstruction - reorganization - times seething with revolutionary, social and political ideas and experiments which will require not months or years to reconcile or to compose - but actually generations - in such times, which to quote Edwin Markham, the poet "Humanity betrayed, plundered, profaned and disinherited - cries protest to the Judges of the World, a protest that is also prophecy" - in such times no one - no man in charge of

foreign policies of the United States - confronted with^{many, if not} most of the problems of such confused and perilous times - no one could be credited with either total success or charged with total failure. The affairs of the world are too vast - too complex - ~~even~~ too extended and continuous in time and space for any one man - for any one country to encompass them fully and to regulate them and arrange them. The best that one can hope for is that the leadership of such a man in such high office or in such a country - that their leadership in the world affairs would not be altogether so wrong, so blundering as to be seriously injurious - or, at best, that it give mankind some slight forward push in the right direction.

I watched the other night a television program in which Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery of Great Britain was being interviewed. In the course of a very interesting and provocative hour's interview, this famous military leader availed himself of many timely observations on the pressing issues confronting mankind today. With many of his opinions I found myself, as I'm sure you have, and many others - I found myself in full agreement. He spoke, among other things, of America's post-war world leadership. He thought that "it had been intermittent" - "not as good as it might be" - "rather suspect" characterized by "lack of decision at the top level". And with most of his opinions I believe most Americans would readily agree. I doubt, however, that they would go along with Montgomery in his opinion that "American leadership had slipped a little" because President Eisenhower, former Secretary of State Dulles, and now Secretary Herter aren't very well, very fit physically. Now, the foreign policies of these men were not very different after their illness~~ness~~ than before their illnesses and these foreign policies did not differ very much from those of their predecessors in office.. And very few Americans would go along with Marshal Montgomery when he set out to

extoll the British world leadership above American leadership. The British, he declared, had the "experience of centuries" in world leadership - but the ~~xxx~~ United States had "quite a bit to learn". And what, one is inclined to ask, ~~xxxxxxx~~ did the British do with this "experience of centuries" - what did they do with it? Munich, Chamberlain and the prelude to the second world war? And before Munich, the worst experience of the centuries, ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{lead them} indirectly to contribute to the triumph of the Axis over democracy in Spain and the destruction of the Spanish Republic - and after Munich - lead to Bevin and Palestine and the blundering policies there which finally lead to the surrender of the mandate - and generally speaking, what about this experience of centuries which lead to India and the disintegration of the British Empire. No, I am afraid the hope of the world today does not lie with the "more consistent" leadership of Great Britain, as the Marshal suggests. There has not been and there is not likely to be any such consistent leadership there or elsewhere in the free world. They all have made their serious mistakes and they will all continue to make serious mistakes. The most that the world can hope for - the free world - is that collectively the free world will profit from its past mistakes and will be more flexible - less dogmatic - less penny wise and pound foolish - and more courageous in their loyalty to their own basic traditions of freedom and justice and human equality.

We hope that our new Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, will bring to his difficult tasks a measure of this very flexibility of which I am speaking - the willingness to try a new approach, which even some of the friends of Mr. Dulles found lacking in him. We had a firm and inflexible line and that was to surround and contain the Soviet Union. We attempted to encircle it with a solid military wall. And to that end we made many military pacts and alliances,, - even with our former enemies - even with those countries under dictatorships. We made, for example, a pact with Nazi Germany - or the Western part of it. We made it central in our defense plan of Europe against Communism. We poured our arms and we poured our visions into it. We re-armed Germany and are re-arming Germany. Altho in 1945, after the second

World War at Potsdam, we had agreed with our Allies to demilitarize Germany completely. We decided all war potentials, - war plants - aircrafts, arms, warships, everything - should be completely destroyed, so that Germany never again would be able to make war upon the rest of the world. Today we are thinking only of providing arms to Germany and have provided arms to Germany ~~witkout~~ and are actually considering guided missiles and nuclear warheads. We are doing for Germany after the Second World War what some of our Allies did for Hitler after the First World War, in the hope that Hitler would fight and destroy communism for them. Hitler actually made an alliance with Communist Russia and when this alliance had served his purpose, he broke that alliance and later on Hitler was helped to his destruction by this very Russian Communism working in cooperation with the United States and the free nations of the world.

Our efforts to contain the Soviet Union have not been successful. In the last five years, the Soviet Union has made substantial gains outside Europe - in the Near East - in the Far East - in Africa - not through military penetration but through economic and cultural penetration and through skillful propoganda. In Europe, Communism has made no advances since 1948 and the influence of Communist parties - the great communist parties of Italy, for example, and in France has actually declined - but not because of our military alliances against Russia - but because Communism has ~~made~~ ^{not} basic appeal for Western Europe and conditions are not congenial there for its spread. And Neutralism - Neutralism - that is the determination of smaller peoples not to become involved in the former struggles between the East and the West is gaining even in Europe and certainly in Asia and Africa. In their world of poverty and over-population - they are not impressed, these peoples, by our cry to rally to the defense of democracy against dictatorship - a free enterprise against state-socialism. They want food

and clothing and schools and hospitals - regardless of who helps them to get them.
And they want peace. All our military experts/^{also}want peace. But these military experts are, in the main, convinced that only maximum military preparedness~~x~~ for war will insure peace. That, of course, is contradictory to everything that has happened in history. Maximum military preparedness never prevented war and never will. And believing as they do - these military leaders of these countries - the countries which can extend aid and relief - where are all these countries where aid and relief are extended? They are armed with weapons of war and insist on bringing them into a net-work of military alliances. Most of these nations don't want it and it is precisely here that communist propoganda scores most heavily. It is precisely here that is the most fertile soil for the cold war and our own most generous foreign aid is most suspect.

Therefore, it is my humble opinion - and that of many others - that because of the old, rigid line of containing communism through military alliances and through an armament race has not been successful and because Russia is rapidly catching up with us with nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles and in some categories have already out-distanced us - it is now, in our judgment, imperative to shift the emphasis - and some of our Allies have already recognized this fact. We must no longer make our antagonism to the Soviet our chief pre-occupation. Rather we must explore every promising avenue for living peaceably in the same world with the Soviet Union and with all the communist states - where joint population exceeds those of the free world. We must not remain prisoners of our own propoganda of the past, because the old way - the old life - can lead only to the abyss.

There is no other alternative than to try a new approach. Everyone says
It
it's unthinkable!-/will mean the end of mankind. No military man, unless he is
deranged, will today advocate war - it must of course mean nuclear war - as a means
of destroying communism.! I came across the other day this information - this
prognostication of what a nuclear war would mean. Dr. Pauling of California, Nobel
Prizeman, Foreign Member of the Royal Society, writes as follows:

"We may get a good idea of what would happen to the United States in a
nuclear war from the testimony given before the Special Subcommittee on Radiation
of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy by Dr. William W. Kellogg and
Mr. Charles Shafer....They described in some detail the predicted effects of a
hypothetical attack on the United States with thermonuclear weapons. "

"This analysis has led to the conclusion that over one half of the
people in the United States would be dead at the end of sixty days after the attack,
as a result of injuries received during the first 24 hours. The additional radiation
effect during the period after 24 hours might be such as to cause the deaths of
some additional millions or tens of millions.

"I conclude that, in contemplating a possible nuclear war," writes
Dr. Paulding , " We should estimate that between one half and three quarters of the
people in the United States would be dead at the end of sixty days." And the
figures are so staggering we cannot grasp them at all.

"Let us make an estimate for the world as a whole. Casualties might
well be as great, proportionately, in the U.S.S.R., with 225 million people, in
Europe as a whole, with 425 million, and in some of the adjacent regions in which
there may be military bases. Altogether, about one billion people in the world
might be in the regions in which there would be heavy nuclear attack. Between
one half and three quarters of this total might be dead within sixty days after the
attack - between 500 million and 750 million."

N Now the danger, of course, is not that a nation deliberately will set in motion a nuclear war - the danger, as Prime Minister Harold MacMillan pointed out the other day, stems not from the intent of any nation to start a nuclear war, but rather from accidents or miscalculations - a strain on someone's nerves - from some mistake. Someone will pull the trigger or push the button too soon.

It is clear that we must reduce the tensions of the world - put a stop to this mad race in nuclear weapons which threatens the very survival of humanity. The test will come, or a test will come next week in Geneva when the the Foreign Ministers of the East and the West meet to discuss Berlin - Germany - perhaps affecting and/other problems ~~which threaten~~ the peace of the world. Now the question which presents itself to us is, "Will these Foreign Ministers meet as they have met in the past only to repeat old slogans, worn-out ideologic cliches and catch-phrases utter and ~~xxxx~~ mutual recriminations as they have done in the past for propoganda purposes and for the press and radio back home?" Or will they earnestly and sincerely make a fresh start towards reasonable negotiations, having in mind the future as well as the present - in a spirit not of competitive cold war but in a spirit of give and take and thus pay the way for a Summit Conference - where major agreements can really be reached, which will tend to tranquilize our world and remove the danger of man's total undoing.

Berlin is important - and so is Germany - but not nearly as important as humanity. The present arrangement of Berlin - the present Status of Berlin is a part of a post-war exigency - contingency which followed the Second World War. It was never intended as a permanent settlement or as a logical settlement for that purpose. A divided Berlin, administered by an inter-allied governing authority with representatives of each of the four powers is an anomaly - as is a divided Germany generally. Certainly a solution can be found - but not as long as Russia

will think of East Germany as an advanced military out-post for the Soviet and as long as the Allies think of West Germany as an outpost for the West - and will be hoping for the unification of Germany so that it may join Nato as part of West Europe's defense system against the Soviet Union. Russia will never permit it. Russia fears Germany. It will never permit Germany to become a member of Nato. Germany can be unified - now, or by stages through a federation of the two Germanies but only if it is neutralized and all foreign armed forces are withdrawn from it. This would have been far easier to do five or ten years ago but it is not yet too late and the West has no reason to fear such a federation because the West is in possession of two-thirds of the territory of Germany and three-fourths of the population of Germany and most of the industrial resources.

Back in 1951 I spoke here at the Temple on "Shall We Re-Arm Germany?" and the booklet was published at the time and in this address I said, expressing my opinion then:

"The decision at Potsdam taken by Truman, Churchill and Stalin was a wise decision. It was dictated by real statesmanship. Germany should never be rearmed. It should be permanently demilitarized. Like Switzerland, it should be neutralized. The North Atlantic Pact nations and the Soviet bloc of nations should agree to neutralize Germany. The armies of the allies and of the Soviet Union should be withdrawn from Germany. East and West Germany should be permitted to reunite. The present division is unnatural. If it is permitted to remain, it will be a source of never-ending conflict and political disturbance in the heart of Europe. A united and militarized Germany will be a menace to the world. A united and demilitarized Germany ~~will~~ may be the way of pacifying the whole continent of Europe. The German people will then have the opportunity to rebuild their life, if they so desire, on truly democratic lines and in peaceful ways."

All the events of the past eight~~s~~ years seem to have substantiated this approach. And if this can be accomplished - the Summit Conference preceded by this conference of the Foreign Secret~~aries~~ - if this can be accomplished - other steps toward pacification in other areas of the world will follow and other conferences - Summit Conferences and Foreign Minister Conferences will be held and we shall be entering the era of lessening tensions and in ag~~fe~~reement on large scale general will be disarmament ~~xx~~ possible. This, in my humble judgment, is political realism. All else is what some one has called "doctrinaire incompetence". There is no victory possible in the world today except the victory of compromise. A total prayerful hope is that victory in war is a total defeat for everyone. And my ~~prayerxxxxxxforxxxx~~ ~~peacexxxxxx~~ our own beloved country and its new Secretary of State will be able to give this kind of new, positive, healthful, courageous leadership in the world today.



- 1) John Foster Dulles has resigned as Secy, State - and Christopher A. Herter has succeeded him in office.
- the circumstances under which Mr. D. resigned are deeply regretted by everyone. He is a genuinely great man, and the prayers all over the world will be with him in his dear ailment.
- = whether one agreed or disagreed with his policies in office - 40
one could question his integrity - his patriotism - his
dedication. He bore to his tasks strenuous and honest con-
ventions - and he gave to his country the best measure of
useful devotion, in a most trying and critical period
in the history of the world.
- = It is, too soon, for history to make a final evaluation
of his role, or ^{a verdict on} the success or failure of his career
as Secy of State. All the issues with which he dealt
are still in a very fluid state. No final solution
to any international problem has as yet been reached -
and the wisdom of his insights, and judgments and
actions are yet to be either justified or challenged by
events.
- = In a sense a final evaluation may (never be made)
universally accepted.
- In times such as these - times of global reorganization -
seeing with revolutionary
social and political ideas ^{and experiences} which will require not
months or years to ~~reach~~ and compare but generations -
for these times - when to quote Edwin Markham - "humanity
(redoubt - plundered, profaned and disintegrated - cries protest
to the Judges, the World, a protest that is also prophetic"

- no one in charge, the foreign policies of the U.S. - confronted² with many if not most of the problems of these confused and perilous times - can even be credited with total success or charged with total failure. The affairs are too vast - too complex - too extended ^{and continuous} in time and space - for any one man - for any one country, to encompass them fully - and regulate ~~them~~ and arrange them.

The best that one can hope for is that the leadership of such a man or such a country ^{in world affairs} has not altogether so wrong-headed ^{and} blundering as to be injurious - or, at best, that it gave mankind some slight push in the right direction..

2/ I ~~watched~~ ^{watched} the other evening ^{on a television program} in which Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery ^{G.C.B.} was being interviewed. In the course of a very interesting and provocative hour's interview - the famous military leader delivered ~~himself~~ of many apt and timely observations on the pressing issues before mankind to-day. With many of his observations I found myself in full agreement. He spoke of America's post-war world leadership. He thought that it "had been intermittent" - "not as good as it might be" "rather suspect" characterized by "lack of decision at the top level". With that, I believe most Americans would readily agree. ~~He~~ I doubt, however, that they would go along with him in his surmise that "American leadership had slipped a little" because Pres. Eisenhower, former Secy of State Dulles and "Gen. Hertz" ^{are} "aren't very well, very hot".

(3)

the ~~police~~ foreign police & these men - were not very different after than before their illness - and ~~did not~~ ~~not~~ differ very much from ~~their~~ predecessors in office -

And very few Americans would go along with Marshal Montgomery in ~~his~~ extolling British leadership above American leadership. The British, he declares, have the "experience of centuries" in world leadership but the U.S. had "quite a lot to learn"

And what, one is inclined to ask, had the British done with their "experience, centuries". Churchill and Chamberlain saved the world here! - and ~~before~~ before that, in directly contributing to the invasion, the Axis over democracy in Spain and the destruction of the Spanish Republic - and after that - Berlin and Pabst - and generally speaking, the disintegration, the U.S. Empire.

No - I am afraid - the hope, the world does not lie with the "more consistent" leadership of G.B. - as the Marshal suggests. There has been, and there is not likely to be any such consistent leadership there as elsewhere in the free world. They all have and will continue to make their serious mistakes.

The most that can be used as hope is that collectively the free world will profit from its past mistakes - and will be more flexible ~~and~~ less dogmatic - ~~and~~ more concerned - in being loyal to its own traditions of freedom and equality.

15
- ^{as if you are} ~~in the heart of the continent~~
- not their military penetration - but their economic and cultural penetration - and skillful propaganda. In Europe - Communism has made no advances since 1945 - and the influence, even parties in Italy and France has actually declined - but not because of our military advances - but because Communism has not been applied for W. Europe - and the countries are not con-
genial for its spread.

Neutrals - the determinations not to become involved is the power - they do but the East and the West is gaining even in Europe. And certainly in Asia and Africa. In their world poverty and over-population they are not impressed by our cry to rally to the defense of democracy against dictatorship - a free enterprise against state socialism. ~~Most of them~~ They want food - clothing - and schools and hospitals - regimes, who help them to get them -

They want peace. All are military experts of course. ~~also~~ want peace. But they are convinced that only maxi-
mum military preparedness for war will win peace. -
which - of course - it never did - and never will.

And, believing as they do, they would arm all these nations, who receive our aid and relief with weapons, guns - and bring them into a net-work of military

alliances. Most, then don't want it - and it is foreshadowing (6)
here that Comm. propaganda scores heaviest; and is the
most fertile soil for the Cold War. - and our own most
generous policy and program is most susceptible

5/ And because the ~~old~~ old rigid line of containing Communism
than military alliances ^{and} has not been successful and
than an armament race
Russia is rapidly catching up with us in nuclear
weapons and intercontinental missiles - and in some
categories has already outdistanced us - it is now
imperative to shift the emphasis - Sov. arms
have already reemerged this fact.

We must no longer make antagonism to the Soviet
our chief pre-occupation. Rather we must explore
every promising avenue for living peacefully in the
same world with the Soviet Union (and with other
Communist states where great populations exceed those
of the free world. We must not remain permanently an army
propaganda. The old way can lead only to an abyss.

6/ There is no other alternative -

War, every day, is unthinkable! It will mean the
end of mankind. No military man, unless he is de-
ranged, will to-day advocate war as a means of destroying
Communism! (Intro p. 117. Followings).

7/ But the danger as Piran historian Harold Macaulay

pointed out the other day, stemmed not from the intent (1)
of any nation to start a nuclear war. but rather from
accidents or a miscalculation - a chain of careless
moves - a mistake!

7/ We must reduce world tensions to put a stop to
this mad race in nuclear weapons which threatens
the very survival of the race.

The test will come next week in Geneva when
the Foreign Ministers of East & West meet to
discuss Berlin - Germany - and the peace, the world.

Will they meet only to repeat the old slogans of war
work - out ideology catch phrases to utter mutual
recriminations for propaganda purposes? And the
press back home?

Or will they earnestly sincerely make a
fresh start - towards reasonable negotiations - having in
mind the future as well as the present - is a start
at cold war - but of give and take - thus paving
the way for a brotherly handshake - where major agreements
can really be reached - which will tranquilly undo
undo - and remove the danger of man's total undoing?

8/ Berlin is important and so is Germany - but not
more as important as humanity
the present status of Berlin is a post-war contingency.

It was never regarded as a permanent European settlement. & ~~It is~~ a divided Britain, administered by an inter-allied governing authority, with representatives, each, the 4 powers, is an anomaly - as is a divided Germany generally.

Certainly a situation can be found, but not as long as the Russia thinks East Germany as an outposts military outpost for the Soviet - and the allies think West Germany - as an outpost for the West - and are hoping for the unification of Germany to add in so that it may join NATO - as part of Europe's defense system of the Soviet

Russia will never permit it - Germany can be unified - immediately or by stages thus a confederation of the two German states - but all of it is neutralized - and all frozen armed forces withdrawn. This would have been done 5-10 yrs. ago. But it

is not too late every now the West has no reason to fear a Federation for the West has 2/3, more 3/4 of population and most of the resources.
9/ In 1951 - Shall we re-arm Germany? (Inote)

10/ If this can be accomplished - other steps of pacification in other areas, the world will follow - other conferences, Foreign Ministers have other important conferences. He will have entered an era of increasing trust - and agreements on large-scale general disarmament may be possible.

This is political realism - All else is what some-one has called "doctrinaire incantations" -

For there is no other victory possible - but victory, compromise - a total victory in war was a total defeat for every one! -