

lives and property in order to safeguard their independence and liberty.

### Questions

1. Why do you think the Vietnamese nationalists begin by referring to the Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen?
2. Why are the authors of the document confident that the victorious Allies of World War II will recognize their independence?

### 156. The Truman Doctrine (1947)

*Source: "Special Message to the Congress on Greece and Turkey, March 12, 1947," Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Harry S. Truman, 1947 (Washington, D.C., 1963), pp. 176-80.*

In March 1947, in a speech announcing what came to be known as the Truman Doctrine, President Harry S. Truman officially embraced the containment of Soviet communism as the foundation of American foreign policy. The immediate occasion was a request for military and financial aid from Greece, a monarchy threatened by a communist-led rebellion, and Turkey, from which the Soviets were demanding joint control of the straits linking the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. Neither were models of democracy. To rally popular backing, Truman appealed to his strong rhetorical argument—the defense of freedom. Twenty-four times in the eighteen-minute speech, Truman used the words “free” or “freedom.” The Truman Doctrine created the language through which most American came to understand the postwar world. The speech set a precedent for American assistance to anticommunist regimes throughout the world, a matter how undemocratic, and for the creation of a set of global military alliances directed against the Soviet Union.

THE GRAVITY OF the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.

The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

One aspect of the present situation, which I present to you at this time for your consideration and decision, concerns Greece and Turkey.

The United States has received from the Greek Government an urgent appeal for financial and economic assistance. Preliminary reports from the American Economic Mission now in Greece and reports from the American Ambassador in Greece corroborate the statement of the Greek Government that assistance is imperative if Greece is to survive as a free nation.

I do not believe that the American people and the Congress wish to turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government.

• • •

The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists, who defy the government's authority at a number of points, particularly along the northern boundaries. A Commission appointed by the United Nations Security Council is at present investigating disturbed conditions in northern Greece and alleged border violations along the frontier between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on the other.

Meanwhile, the Greek Government is unable to cope with the situation. The Greek army is small and poorly equipped. It needs supplies and equipment if it is to restore authority to the government throughout Greek territory.

• • •

We have considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are in a position to extend help of the kind that is required.

• • •

The Greek Government has been operating in an atmosphere of chaos and extremism. It has made mistakes. The extension of aid by this country does not mean that the United States condones everything that the Greek Government has done or will do. We have condemned in the past, and we condemn now, extremist measures of the right or the left. We have in the past advised tolerance, and we advise tolerance now.

Greece's neighbor, Turkey, also deserves our attention.

The future of Turkey as an independent and economically sound state is clearly no less important to the freedom-loving peoples of the world than the future of Greece. The circumstances in which Turkey finds itself today are considerably different from those of Greece. Turkey has been spared the disasters that have beset Greece. And during the war, the United States and Great Britain furnished Turkey with material aid.

Nevertheless, Turkey now needs our support.

• • •

At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one.

One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

• • •

The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms.

If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of this Nation.

Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events.

I am confident that the Congress will face these responsibilities squarely.

## Questions

1. Why does Truman insist that the question of assisting Greece and Turkey involves a choice between "alternative ways of life"?
2. How does he define freedom in the postwar world?

=====

## 157. NSC 68 and the Ideological Cold War (1950)

Source: *U.S. Department of State, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950 (Washington, D.C., 1976-1980), Vol. 1, pp. 237-41.*

In the years immediately following the Truman Doctrine speech, the Cold War rapidly accelerated. In the wake of Soviet-American confrontations over southern and eastern Europe and Berlin, the coming to power of a communist government in China in 1949, and Soviet success in developing an atom bomb, the National Security Council (NSC) in 1950 approved a call for the United States to pursue a global crusade against communism. Drafted by State Department official Paul Nitze and known as NSC 68, this manifesto contained a lengthy exposition of the nature of "the free society" and claimed that the Soviet Union, motivated by a "fanatic faith," sought nothing less than worldwide domination and the elimination of freedom across the globe. Although NSC 68 was not made public until many years after it

From this idea of freedom with responsibility derives the marvelous diversity, the deep tolerance, the lawfulness of the free society. This is the explanation of the strength of free men. It constitutes the integrity and the vitality of a free and democratic system. The free society attempts to create and maintain an environment in which every individual has the opportunity to realize his creative powers. It also explains why the free society tolerates those within it who would use their freedom to destroy it. By the same token, in relations between nations, the prime reliance of the free society is on the strength and appeal of its idea, and it feels no compulsion sooner or later to bring all societies into conformity with it.

For the free society does not fear, it welcomes, diversity. It derives its strength from its hospitality even to antipathetic ideas. It is a market for free trade in ideas, secure in its faith that free men will take the best wares, and grow to a fuller and better realization of their powers in exercising their choice.

The idea of freedom is the most contagious idea in history, more contagious than the idea of submission to authority. For the breadth of freedom cannot be tolerated in a society which has come under the domination of an individual or group of individuals with a will to absolute power. Where the despot holds absolute power—the absolute power of the absolutely powerful will—all other wills must be subjugated in an act of willing submission, a degradation without the individual upon himself under the compulsion of a personal faith. It is the first article of this faith that he finds and can only find the meaning of his existence in serving the ends of the system. If the system becomes God, and submission to the will of God becomes the mission to the will of the system. It is not enough to yield one's will to the system—even Gandhian non-violence is not acceptable. The spirit of resistance and the devotion to a higher authority must remain, and the individual would not be wholly submissive.

• • •

Thus unwillingly our free society finds itself morally challenged by the Soviet system. No other value system is so wholly

able with ours, so implacable in its purpose to destroy ours, so capable of turning to its own uses the most dangerous and divisive trends in our own society, no other so skillfully and powerfully evokes the elements of irrationality in human nature everywhere, and no other has the support of a great and growing center of military power.

## Questions

1. Why does NSC 68 view the Soviet Union as different from other great powers?
2. What does it see as the essential elements of the "free society"?

## 158. Walter Lippmann, A Critique of Containment (1947)

Source: *Walter Lippmann: Excerpt from pp. 21–25 from The Cold War: A Study in U.S. Foreign Policy by Walter Lippmann. Copyright © 1947 by Walter Lippmann. Copyright renewed © 1975 by Walter Lippmann. Reprinted by permission of HarperCollins Publishers.*

Not all Americans happily embraced the Cold War. As a number of contemporary critics, few of them sympathetic to Soviet communism, pointed out, casting the Cold War in terms of a worldwide battle between freedom and slavery made it impossible to view international crises on a case-by-case basis or to determine which genuinely involved either freedom or American interests.

In a penetrating critique of Truman's policies, as expounded by diplomat George Kennan in an article signed "X," Walter Lippmann, one of the nation's most prominent journalists, objected to turning foreign policy into an ideological crusade. To view every challenge to the status quo as part of a contest between the Soviet Union, Lippmann correctly predicted, would require the United States to recruit and subsidize an "array of satellites, clients, dependents and puppets." It would have to intervene continuously in the affairs of

nations whose political problems did not arise from Moscow and could not easily be understood in terms of the battle between freedom and slavery. It would be a serious mistake, Lippmann warned, for the United States to align itself against the movement for colonial independence in the name of anticommunism—a warning amply borne out during the Vietnam War.

THE POLICY OF containment, which Mr. X recommends, demands the employment of American economic, political, and in the last analysis, American military power at "sectors" in the interior of Europe and Asia. This requires, as I have pointed out, ground forces that is to say reserves of infantry, which we do not possess.

The United States cannot by its own military power contain the expansive pressure of the Russians "at every point where they show signs of encroaching." The United States cannot have ready "unalienable counterforce" consisting of American troops. Therefore, the counterforces which Mr. X requires have to be composed of Chinese, Afghans, Iranians, Turks, Kurds, Arabs, Greeks, Italians, Austrians, of anti-Soviet Poles, Czechoslovaks, Bulgars, Yugoslavs, Albanians, Hungarians, Finns and Germans.

The policy can be implemented only by recruiting, subsidizing and supporting a heterogeneous array of satellites, clients, dependents and puppets. The instrument of the policy of containment is therefore a coalition of disorganized, disunited, feeble or disorderly nations, tribes and factions around the perimeter of the Soviet Union.

To organize a coalition among powerful modern states is, even in time of war and under dire necessity, an enormously difficult thing to do well. To organize a coalition of disunited, feeble and immature states, and to hold it together for a prolonged diplomatic siege, which might last for ten or fifteen years, is, I submit, impossibly difficult.

It would require, however much the real name for it were disavowed, continual and complicated intervention by the United States in the affairs of all the members of the coalition which we

are proposing to organize, to protect, to lead and to use. Our diplomatic agents abroad would have to have an almost unerring capacity to judge correctly and quickly which men and which parties were suitable containers. Here at home Congress and the people would have to stand ready to back their judgments as to who should be subsidized, who should be subsidized, who should be whitewashed, who should be seen through rose-colored spectacles, who should be made our clients and our allies.

Mr. X offers us the prospect of maintaining such a coalition indefinitely until—eventually—the Soviet power breaks up or mellows because it has been frustrated. It is not a good prospect. Even if we assume, which we ought not, that our diplomatic agents will know how to intervene shrewdly and skillfully all over Asia, the Middle East, and Europe, and even if we assume, which the Department of State cannot, that the American people will back them with a drawing account of blank checks both in money and in military power, still it is not a good prospect. For we must not forget that the Soviet Union, against which this coalition will be directed, will resist and react.

In the complicated contest over this great heterogeneous array of unstable states, the odds are heavily in favor of the Soviets. For if we are to succeed, we must organize our satellites as unified, orderly and reasonably contented nations. The Russians can defeat us by disorganizing states that are already disorganized, by disuniting peoples that are torn with civil strife, and by inciting their discontent which is already very great.

As a matter of fact this borderland in Europe and Asia around the perimeter of the Soviet Union is not a place where Mr. X's "unassailable barriers" can be erected. Satellite states and puppet governments are not good material out of which to construct unassailable barriers. A diplomatic war conducted as this policy demands, that is to say conducted indirectly, means that we must stake our own security and the peace of the world upon satellites, puppets, clients, agents about whom we can know very little. Frequently they will act for

their own reasons, and on their own judgments, presenting us with accomplished facts that we did not intend, and with crises for which we are unready. The “unassailable barriers” will present us with an unending series of insoluble dilemmas. We shall have either to disown our puppets, which would be tantamount to appeasement and defeat and the loss of face, or must support them at an incalculable cost on an unintended, unforeseen and perhaps undesirable issue.

## Questions

1. Why does Lippmann advise the United States to concentrate its efforts on Europe, not the rest of the world?
2. Why does he feel that the Truman Doctrine’s reliance on “satellites, clients, dependents, and puppets” violates important American values?

## 159. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)

*Source: United Nations: “The Universal Declaration on Human Rights.” Adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) of 10 December 1948. © United Nations, 1948. Reproduced with permission.*

The atrocities committed during World War II as well as the global language of the Four Freedoms forcefully raised the issue of human rights in the postwar world. In 1948, the UN General Assembly approved the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, drafted by a committee chaired by Eleanor Roosevelt, the widow of the late president. The declaration identified a broad range of rights to be enjoyed by all members of the human family, everywhere, including freedom of speech, religious toleration, and protection against arbitrary government, as well as social and economic entitlements like the right to an adequate standard of living and access to

housing, education, and medical care. The document had no enforcement mechanism. Some considered it an exercise in empty rhetoric. But the core principle—that a nation’s treatment of its own citizens should be subject to outside evaluation—slowly became part of the language in which freedom was discussed.

## THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY PROCLAIMS

This universal declaration of human rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

As a United States Senator, I am not proud of the way in which the Senate has been made a publicity platform for irresponsible sensationalism. I am not proud of the reckless abandon in which unproved charges have been hurled from this side of the aisle. I am not proud of the obviously staged, undignified countercharges that have been attempted in retaliation from the other side of the aisle.

I don't like the way the Senate has been made a rendezvous for vilification, for selfish political gain at the sacrifice of individual reputations and national unity. I am not proud of the way we smear outsiders from the Floor of the Senate and hide behind the cloak of congressional immunity and still place ourselves beyond criticism on the Floor of the Senate.

### Questions

1. What does Smith believe is the essence of freedom of speech?
2. What does her speech suggest about how the Cold War affected discussions of freedom in the early 1950s?

### 163. Will Herberg, *The American Way of Life* (1955)

*Source: Will Herberg: From Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology by Will Herberg, Copyright © 1955, 1960 by Will Herberg. Used by permission of Doubleday, a division of Random House, Inc.*

The Jewish philosopher Will Herberg was one of the more influential writers of the 1950s. Herberg pointed out an irony of American religion: while nearly all Americans professed strong religious beliefs, a majority claimed that religion made little difference in their political or business ideas. In other words, there was a sharp divide between Americans' pri-

or public convictions. The reason, Herberg argued, was that Americans' real "common religion" was not a theological belief but a commitment to what he called the American Way of life. In this excerpt, he analyzes that concept, a key slogan of the Cold War era.

WHAT DO AMERICANS believe? Most emphatically, they "believe in God": 97 per cent according to one survey; 96 per cent according to another, 95 per cent according to a third. About 75 per cent of them, as we have seen, regard themselves as members of churches, and a sizable proportion attend divine services with some frequency and regularity. They believe in prayer: about 90 per cent say they pray on various occasions. They believe in life after death, even in heaven and hell. They think well of the church and of ministers. They hold the Bible to be an inspired book, the "word of God" . . .

Yet these indications are after all relatively superficial; they tell us what Americans say (and no doubt believe) about themselves and their religious views; they do not tell us what in actuality these religious views are. Nowhere are surface appearances more deceptive, nowhere is it more necessary to try to penetrate beyond mere assertions of belief than in such ultimate matters as religion.

We do penetrate a little deeper, it would seem, when we take note of certain curious discrepancies the surveys reveal in the responses people make to questions about their religion. . . .

Perhaps the most significant discrepancy in the assertions Americans make about their religious views is to be found in another area. When asked, "Would you say your religious beliefs have any effect on your ideas of politics and business?", a majority of the same Americans who had testified that they regarded religion as something "very important" answered that their religious beliefs had no real effect on their ideas or conduct in these decisive areas of everyday life: specifically, 54 per cent said no, 39 per cent said yes, and 7 per cent refused to reply or didn't know. . . .

It seems to me that a realistic appraisal of the values, ideas, and behavior of the American people leads to the conclusion that Americans, by and large, do have their "common religion" and that the "religion" is the system familiarly known as the American Way of Life. It is the American Way of Life that supplies American society with an "overarching sense of unity" amid conflict. It is the American Way of Life about which Americans are admittedly and unashamedly "intolerant." It is the American Way of Life that provides the framework in terms of which the crucial values of American existence are couched. By every realistic criterion the American Way of Life is the operative faith of the American people....

What is this American Way of Life that we have said constitutes the "common religion" of American society? An adequate description and analysis of what is implied in this phrase still remains to be attempted, and certainly it will not be ventured here; but some indications may not be out of place.

The American Way of Life is the symbol by which Americans define themselves and establish their unity. German unity, it would seem, is felt to be largely racial-folkish, French unity largely cultural but neither of these ways is open to the American people, the most diverse in racial and cultural origins of any in the world. As American unity has emerged, it has emerged more and more clearly as a unity embodied in, and symbolized by, the complex structure known as the American Way of Life.

If the American Way of Life had to be defined in one word, "democracy" would undoubtedly be the word, but democracy in a peculiarly American sense. On its political side it means the Constitution, on its economic side, "free enterprise"; on its social side, an egalitarianism which is not only compatible with but indeed actually implies vigorous economic competition and high mobility. Spiritually, the American Way of Life is best expressed in a certain kind of "idealism" which has come to be recognized as characteristically American. It is a faith that has its symbols and its rituals, its holidays and its liturgy, its saints and its sancta; and it is a faith that

every American, to the degree that he is an American, knows and understands.

The American Way of Life is individualistic, dynamic, pragmatic. It affirms the supreme value and dignity of the individual; it stresses incessant activity on his part, for he is never to rest but is always to be striving to "get ahead"; it defines an ethic of self-reliance, merit, and character, and judges by achievement: "deeds, not creeds" are what count. The American Way of Life is humanitarian, "forward looking," optimistic. Americans are easily the most generous and philanthropic people in the world, in terms of their ready and unstinting response to suffering anywhere on the globe. The American believes in progress, in self-improvement, and quite fanatically in education. In that above all, the American is idealistic. Americans cannot go on making money or achieving worldly success simply on its own merits; such "materialistic" things must, in the American mind, be justified in "higher" terms, in terms of "service" or "stewardship" or "general welfare." Because Americans are so idealistic, they tend to confuse espousing an ideal with fulfilling it and are always tempted to regard themselves as good as the ideals they entertain: hence the amazingly high valuation most Americans quite sincerely place on their own virtue. And because they are so idealistic, Americans tend to be moralistic: they are inclined to see all issues as plain and simple, black and white, issues of morality.

### Questions

1. What does Herberg think are the strengths and weaknesses of the American outlook?
2. How does Herberg's analysis help to explain why other societies often saw Americans as intolerant of the views of others?