

1961

The Dynamics of Neutralism

Edward Younger

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Younger, Edward (1961) "The Dynamics of Neutralism," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 14 : No. 3 , Article 2.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol14/iss3/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE READER

The material contained herein is for the professional education of officers of the naval service. The frank remarks and personal opinions are presented with the understanding that they will not be quoted. Under no circumstances will this material be released to individuals or organizations other than active members of the officer corps of the armed services. It shall not be republished or quoted publicly, as a whole or in part, without specific clearance in each instance with both the author and the Naval War College.

Naval War College Review was established in 1948 by the Chief of Naval Personnel in order that officers of the service might receive some of the educational benefits of the resident students at the Naval War College. Distribution is in accordance with BUPERS Instruction 1552.5A of 23 July 1958. It must be kept in the possession of the subscriber, or other commissioned officer and should be destroyed by burning when no longer required.

The thoughts and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author, and are not necessarily those of the Navy Department or of the Naval War College.

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE
REVIEW

Issued Monthly
U.S. Naval War College
Newport, R. I.

THE DYNAMICS OF NEUTRALISM

A lecture delivered
at the Naval War College
2 November 1960

by

Professor Edward Younger

Gentlemen: I have the opportunity this morning to initiate the study on the uncommitted nations. I would like to assure you, as I move into this subject, that there are a great many things about the uncommitted nations I do not know, and I approach this series of lectures with a great deal of humility; don't be surprised if, in many cases, questions are thrown back to you for answers when they're too hot for me to handle. That's an old trick one picks up after many years of teaching.

At this point I wish to stress, now that I have had the pleasure of listening to so many fine lectures, of going to the seminars, of hearing you participate, and of getting my words in too, that I am learning just about as much as you are. If this continues on through the year, I shall have to begin to pay tuition to the War College, because I am actually building up another doctoral specialization. So far, my stay at the War College has been a very exciting experience, one of the two or three most exciting ones I have ever had in my adult years. I know that you too are enjoying it as much as I.

When the topic, neutralism, was assigned to me for a lecture, I was gratified to see in the title the word "dynamics"—"The Dynamics of Neutralism." Actually the roots of neutralism go deep in history; these roots have spread rapidly, not only in depth but also horizontally; and today the foliage is running like a kudzu vine. The number of neutralist nations daily

increases, and the number of people within nations accepting the ideals and illusions of neutralism hourly multiplies. So there is no doubt of its dynamism.

Neutralism is a twin of neutrality. The terms are often used interchangeably; still there are fundamental differences. Neutrality assumes a state of war. It is a condition of being on neither side, of keeping out of shooting wars. It has a strictly legal status as well as a diplomatic or political function. Neutralism on the other hand embraces policy, attitude, and sentiment. It is an ideal but at the same time a realistic political device. Neutralism today demands of the neutralist nation dissociation from the Cold War and efforts to mitigate the harshness of the struggle, while at the same time gaining the greatest national advantage possible from the struggle.

Both concepts are older than the words themselves. Let us look very hurriedly at their historical roots. Neutrality was the term most frequently used until the past decade, although neutralism has also been used some in the past. Three or four centuries before Christ, the Mauryan Kingdoms of India were practicing a kind of neutrality with other nations, and wherever existed political organizations approximating national states in ancient times, the concept of neutralism was evolving. In early Greece, neutrality arose to mitigate the conflicts between Hellenic city-states, and no doubt an incipient neutralism existed in the minds of some of the people. With the rise of Rome and the advent of Pax Romana, the concept of neutrality yielded to one world or world empire. During the Middle Ages it stayed dormant under the cover of feudalism, and Christianity was the unifying influence. With the rise of modern national states and the waning of the Middle Ages, however, neutrality re-emerged, and by the time Columbus discovered America in the late 15th century, it had become very well known among political leaders.

Within the next two or three centuries, during the period of discovery, exploration and colonization in the New World, neutrality began to approach the status of law. At the same time neutralism emerged as a term indicating indifference primarily to religious controversies that were then shaking Europe. But it was in the 19th and early 20th centuries that neutrality made real headway, and it was primarily because of the United States, the world's greatest neutral in modern history, that it developed so rapidly and strongly. The 19th century, remember, was a century of great relative peace; international law and neutrality, vigorously supported by the United States as a part of international law, made more progress than in any other century in history.

The type of neutrality advanced by the United States during the 150 years from about 1790 to 1940 came to include also the present concept of neutralism. At one time or another, it was expressed and operated as an ideal, a sentiment, a policy, a means of political action and finally as law. It was first of all a political device employed to assure American independence and to increase American trade. Wise American leaders at the end of the Revolution beheld a weak, tottering republic requiring peace and time in order to grow strong. If the young Nation committed herself to any of the warring European nations, she might become an international puppet, on the losing side in a war with her independence snuffed out. Better to remain neutral, gain time, grow strong and hence stay independent. Moreover, neutrality would promote economic growth. Trade had been a vital element in the lifeblood of the American colonies. With independence and peace, the young republic found herself cut off from world trade by European colonial monopolies. Only a policy of neutrality in future wars would assure American participation in the rich trade of all belligerents. So, in the 19th century, the United States took the lead in crystallizing the laws of neutrality, in stressing neutral duties and also

neutral obligations. Neutrality was strong underpinning for the central policy of isolationism; it got enshrouded also in the glowing American nationalism of the century; and thus neutrality became an ideal, a sentiment, merging into neutralism.

On the eve of the First World War, Woodrow Wilson declared that the people of the United States would be neutral not only in deed but also in thought, carrying the idea of impartiality to a very great extreme. In time, the United States was drawn into the war mainly because her neutral rights were violated by the Central Powers, especially by Germany. President Wilson was determined that international law—the laws of neutrality—would not be sacrificed, and in trying to maintain these laws he almost inevitably, but unintentionally, led the nation into the war. After the war, the obsessive isolationism which gripped the nation until the outbreak of the Second World War was a harbinger of present-day neutralism in other countries; it can be compared in many respects to the kind of sentimental, intellectual neutralism existing among the intelligentsia and some of the masses of France, West Germany, Britain, Japan, and most of the other neutralist nations today. Associated with this neutralism is a distrust of the United States, a distrust of the wisdom of her leaders, a fear of her blunders and a fear of world conflagration. This attitude is similar to the distrust and fear Americans held for the "broils of Europe" a century and a half following her independence.

The word neutralism was used in the debates on the eve of the First World War in Italy; it was involved in the question of whether or not the Italians would be drawn into the war. Again, immediately following the Second World War, the concept of neutralism began to be discussed elaborately in certain French newspapers. Although time this morning will not permit a discussion of neutralism among our Western European allies, I shall briefly comment on French neutralism

a little later. Before getting into specific nations, however, let me first analyze at random the complex of factors, forces, and conditions making it so popular around the world today.

Much of it is instinctive; much arises from sheer fear of atomic destruction. No individual wishes to jump into a fight between neighbors or friends unless it is crystal clear that his own interests are at stake and he stands to gain more by taking sides than by staying out. Masses of people, national leaders and national states similarly react. Americans, I have already suggested, almost instinctively perceived in the 19th century that it was wise to keep out of European alignments, to take advantage of the rivalries and wars of major powers and to grow strong. Today the enormous destructive potential of atomic war has whetted this instinct for non-alignment. The fear of total destruction in an atomic war is a powerful influence operating on the popular mind in Western Europe, England and Japan.

In Asia and Africa, neutralism springs up especially from glowing nationalism, from emotions charged by struggles for independence, from yesterday's colonialism and imperialism. It is a fierce expression of independence, and it is fostered in varying degrees by the recency of revolution, serious internal domestic troubles, and realistic national interest. Political leaders of the new nations, seeking to modernize, to maintain political stability, and to establish unity, feel that they cannot afford to take sides, especially with the once colonial West. Direct commitments might mean rejection at home by the nationalist movement. On the other hand, anti-Western, anti-colonial epithets are valuable in maintaining control at home and in establishing national unity. The colonial past still colors internal politics, and consequently non-alignment and neutralism are devices used to curry political favor, to bolster morale, and to sharpen moral fervor for the cause of national unity and achievement.

By pursuing neutralist policies, political leaders of the new nations (often of weak, tottering governments) can gain prestige for themselves not only at home but also abroad. They can take advantage of their strategic political position in the bi-polar world today and gain political and economic concessions for their country. They would be less than intelligent if they did not realize that they are courted both by the Free World and the Communist Bloc. The flattering attention paid to these leaders by Khrushchev at the recent United Nations meeting illustrates the prestige advantage to be gained both by the neutralist governments and the major power able and willing to capitalize on neutralism. Photographs of Khrushchev and Sukarno, of Khrushchev and Nasser, of Khrushchev and Nkrumah are no doubt appearing today in peasant mud huts and shanties throughout Indonesia, Egypt and Ghana.

By building fences abroad, let me repeat, these neutralist leaders were not only building up their prestige at home; they were also increasing their stature among the other neutralist nations and, in effect, creating something of a Third Force—a vague, magnetic attraction for rising nations by which they can use their "floating votes" to gain concessions, influence world affairs, and increase their prospect of importance. The Third Force can also help prevent war, neutralist spokesmen maintain, and give the newly developing countries time to grow strong. Through the Third Force and by other means of diplomacy the neutralist nation, whether weak or strong, can achieve a position of power, not through military strength which she usually does not have, but from her peculiar strategic political position geared to the nature and drift of power politics in the world today. This, of course, is a clear example of the *real politik* aspect of neutralism.

The neutralist leaders believe that they can use this peculiar strategic political position between the

Free World and the Communist Bloc, let me say again, to gain economic assistance, to modernize their countries, and to meet the demands of the Revolution of Rising Expectations sweeping the underdeveloped parts of the world. In Asia, Africa and Latin America the aspiration to modernize is obsessive and impelling. Unless we can do it at once, they declare, we will certainly go Communist. They are perhaps correct, for Communism has taken deepest root in those countries with a large peasant population, whose first efforts to industrialize failed or were too slow--Russia and China. So the neutralist leader who seeks economic assistance from both the United States and Russia is not necessarily playing off one side against the other for sinister reasons. More than likely he sincerely believes that he must modernize his country at once in order to stave off revolution at home, achieve decent national objectives and stay in power. He is therefore willing to accept help from all comers. The plain fact that a neutralist nation can get help from both sides is a powerful dynamo behind the spread and adoption of neutralism today. After all, the committed nation receives help from only one side.

Leaders in the underdeveloped countries, moreover, do not want to spend money for alliances and military preparedness--money desperately required for economic development. They do not want to join power blocs for fear they will be drawn into war. Not only do they wish to avoid war themselves; they do not want war to break out between the two great power centers. In either case their efforts to industrialize would be paralyzed or postponed, they fear. Better to remain neutral, they argue, and devote their efforts along with other neutralist nations to maintaining peace.

Populations at random in the various nations are further conditioned for neutralism by prejudices built in by history, by fundamental racial, ethnic, and cultural differences, and by what they read. Unfortunately, in tone the resultant neutralism is

often anti-Western, anti-American, and seemingly if not always in fact pro-Russian. Some speaker has declared recently that Asians and Africans have a pathological distrust of the white man. While this statement is exaggerated, there is some truth in it. Unfortunately, too, distrust of the Western white man seems at most times to be greater than distrust of the Russian or Communist white man. This distrust springs in part from the colonial past, but also in part from the enormous propaganda effort of the Communist Camp, which led by Russia has successfully identified itself with Asian and African nationalism.

But lying at the base of such distrust and sometimes towering above all other factors is bitter, incipient racial prejudice on the part of both white and non-white. While the Western democratic white man struggles haltingly to rid himself of racialism, the Communist propagandist fills the non-white with race hatred, and among non-white populations the demand for racial equality is growing faster than white enlightenment can seemingly develop new patterns of conduct. The aspirations of the underdeveloped people in Asia, Africa and Latin America cannot be satisfied by purely economic and political means. Their eyes are now fixed on the goal of equality in terms of respect, regardless of color, creed, or nationality. Although the Communist Bloc have their own race prejudices and problems, through totalitarian methods they keep them effectively concealed from the uncommitted peoples. And they are also convincing the uncommitted, underdeveloped non-white people that they are free from racial prejudice. It is hard to exaggerate the importance of racialism in assessing the causes for the rapid spread of neutralism; and its importance for the Free World is magnified by its increasing pro-Communist bias.

In addition, in Asia especially, neutralism as a sentimentality or an ideal stems from fundamental but not unbridgeable philosophical and cultural

differences. Although all human beings have aspirations, characteristics, and drives in common, once they are engulfed by great cultures, certain basic differences in outlook and approach on life emerge. Old and in many cases moribund Asian civilizations have been flushed up and re-invigorated in modern times by the fertilization of Western liberal democratic thought stressing the dignity of the individual, humanitarianism, and progress. Still, many Asians argue that the Western approach to life based on empirical research, differentiation, and specialization, leads to a rigid inflexible society, governed by exclusive principles and intolerant of other peoples and ideas. On the other hand, they hold, Asian societies with greater experience in synthesizing conflicting ideas and cultures are eternally seeking and finding greater harmony and tolerance. The irony of all this is that in reality the Asians have a much greater practical bent than they realize, and while today the pragmatic, quick approach to modernization along Western lines is winning easy acceptance among them, the West is setting the pace in the quest for synthesis, harmony, and world values.

Finally, a favorable climate for neutralism has been created by the wide reading of works on Marxism. Even in the United States where reading Marx caught on slowly, his writings began to influence thinking early in the 20th century and helped to generate an economic interpretation of history. In Africa, and especially in the Middle East and Asia, almost two generations of the rising élites, those who led the independence movements and those who in large measure still control affairs today, grew up on a reading diet of Marxism. To these molders of public opinion, it seemed that Marx's interpretation of capitalism and imperialism accurately described the situation in their land, and his emphasis upon revolution promised freedom from colonialism. The reading of Marx therefore, which distilled dislike for capitalism, distrust of the West, and softness for Communism, today keeps

alive a craving for neutralism, again with a bias for the Communist nations.

Up to this point I have analyzed those causes that encourage the growth of neutralism at random among various nations and peoples of the world. Now let us turn to some specific regions and national states, where additional factors are operating to give neutralism its present dynamism. In South and South-east Asia, neutralism among countries like India, Indonesia, and Burma, has been encouraged by their proximity to their two powerful neighbors, Russia and Red China. This is best exemplified by the most influential neutralist leader in the world today, Nehru of India. From education a product of the West, and firmly committed to democracy and free institutions, still he fears that alignment would bring the Cold War to India at once; and sooner or later, armed invasion from the Red Chinese or Russians, or both. India of course is not strong enough militarily to resist attack from either of these powers; and, engaged in a desperate struggle to modernize, she is unwilling to commit her natural resources to elaborate military preparedness. Moreover, like the other newly developing nations in the region, India is pressed hard at home by a closely-knit, dangerous Communist Party. Nehru, consequently, while pursuing from time to time a vigorous anti-Communist line at home, cautiously avoids a foreign policy of alignment which might aggravate Moscow or Peiping to the point of their directly intervening in behalf of the Indian Communist Party.

At international conferences, at the several foreign capitals, Nehru and his fellow neutralist leaders try to commit the major powers, especially those nearest at hand, to policies which assure their own security. In all probability Nehru, for example, managed to get Chou En-lai invited to the 1955 Bandung Conference in order to commit Red China, in clear view of Afro-Asian nations, to a policy of peace and

negotiations. No doubt Nehru had in mind the highly complicated and disputed border between India and Red China. For similar reasons he probably persists in seeking the admission of Red China to the United Nations. With Russia or Red China under the full glare of world public opinion, Nehru can attune India's strategic political position to the most favorable balance of forces at the moment and use it to protect his borders, enhance India's prestige in the world, especially in South Asia where he wishes India to be dominant, and continue to receive economic aid from both sides. And finally in the case of Nehru, world peace is also a consuming ideal inherited from the national Indian conscience conditioned by history and the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi. Neutralism in a divided world is a status corresponding most nearly to the deep-seated Indian tradition of tolerance for peoples and creeds and of non-violence for achieving political goals.

South Asian attitudes toward Russia, Red China, and the West of course differ considerably. China is closer and more to be feared. In recent years, in Tibet and along the Indian border, she has exploded the myth of Asian nationalism that Asians will not attack Asians. As in the United States, wishful thinking prevails in South Asia that Sino-Russian discords may reach such degree that Russia serves as a balance against China. In any event, Russia is farther away. Geographically a part of Asia and containing Asian peoples, Russia appeals to Asian nationalists. Through her supple propaganda, she has convinced South Asians that her record on colonialism and imperialism in Asia is clean. Because of her brilliant economic and technical progress, she elicits great admiration in this poverty-ridden part of the world, especially among those who have been habitually readers of Karl Marx. So, for Russia, there is an underlying sympathy which crops out seemingly as pro-Russian, anti-Western neutralism.

In the Middle East the results are basically the same although some of the reasons are different. There Arab nationalism is perhaps more emotional and irrational than nationalism elsewhere in the world. There too the Russians have a more appealing record than the Western powers on colonialism and imperialism. In the post-World War II years, moreover, it was the Western powers who sought to build up a defense zone which ran counter to burning Arab aspirations to control Middle Eastern affairs without any interference whatever from outside sources. The Western build-up of a security system which led to the Baghdad Pact was an important reason for the adoption by Nasser of an anti-Western brand of neutralism. But even more important is the presence of Israel established by the West and liberally supported by funds from the United States. Israel provides the rallying cry for Arab nationalism. Opposition to Israel is the only issue on which the Arab nations can agree. No Arab leader feels that he can stay in power if he pursues a policy of alignment with a Western nation like the United States which helped establish and still supports Israel. On the other hand, Nasser and his fellow Arab neutralists have been unwilling to embrace Communism. Like Nehru they have conducted anti-Communist campaigns at home, sought economic aid from both the Free World and the Communist Bloc, and pursued other foreign policies which appear to Americans as pro-Russian. Paced by Nasser, the Arab nations have also demanded and received arms from both sides. Finally neutralism, with a pro-Communist bias, fits Nasser's schemes to carve out a dominant position for Egypt among the emerging people of Africa. It enables him to capitalize on Sino-Russian efforts to drive Western influence from Africa while asserting leadership over the bloc of neutralist African nations now flirting with Communist Russia and China—mainly Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Morocco, and the Lumumba forces of the Congo.

Nearly all of the new African nations have aspirations common to the neutralist. Some have

publicly proclaimed neutralist positions and some are pursuing neutralist policies without proclaiming them. Only a few have been willing to admit openly to alignment with either the Free World or the Communist Bloc. All of them are seeking quick modernization and are tempted by economic and technical aid, no matter what the source. And of course they are united in their demands for absolute racial equality, political independence, and the end of colonialism. These demands, too, are powerful factors operating against alignment with the West. Still it is doubtful that Nasser or any other neutralist leader can mold a majority of African nations into a hard part of an organized neutralist Third Force because of the conflicting interests of these new nations as well as the conflicting ambitions of their leaders. Nor does it seem likely that the present efforts at rapprochement between Nasser's Egypt and the United States will be entirely successful in the light of conflicting aims and policies of the two countries in Africa and of the American relationship with Israel.

In Japan *chūritsu*, meaning neutralism, expresses a sentiment extremely popular among nearly all classes and connotes something intrinsically good and desirable. Even more popular is the term *dokuritsu* meaning independence. In Japan as in many of the newly developing nations, independence and neutralism are closely associated in the popular mind. Curiously, *dokuritsu* has become more popular as a slogan since the 1951 Japanese-American Defense Pact ended American occupation and restored Japan to an independent position. But as a popular concept in Japan, independence means reducing the ties with the United States and achieving a state of neutralism eventually. For the present, however, most of the Japanese are reconciled to maintaining alignment with the United States as a practical, advantageous arrangement. The United States, while giving Japan a market for her goods and providing her with a defense system at low cost, also is a powerful friend, capable of speaking in her

behalf with strength and prestige at a time in history when Japan feels isolated in the world and not fully accepted by her sister Asian nations.

Japanese neutralism can best be analyzed by dividing it into three types. The first, pseudo-neutralism, is the deceptive brand advocated by the extreme left—the Communists, numerous adherents from the Socialist Party, and many from the teachers and labor unions. This vociferous group is using neutralism as a rallying cry in order to bring Japan under eventual Communist control. Their agitation last spring was very effective in channeling student discontent into mass riots against the Defense Pact and the visit of President Eisenhower. The second type is sentimental, nostalgic, illusory. It includes the great middle group of Japanese, easily the majority, who cling to General MacArthur's statement of 1950 that the normal position of Japan should be the Switzerland of Asia. This large group illusively dreams of an opulent Japan, at peace and trading with all nations, her neutrality guaranteed by the community of nations. The third type is espoused by the extreme right which demands that Japan re-arm at once, pursue a course midway between the Free World and the Communists, and stand ready to exert military power to achieve her objectives.

In 1960, the Japanese drive toward neutralism, triggered off by the U-2 incident, made enormous strides. To destroy the Defense Pact with the United States, drive out the Americans, and push Japan into a neutralist position is the immediate Sino-Russian objective. The U-2 incident crystallized neutralist and anti-American sentiment in Japan, and was the signal for a stepped-up, vituperative propaganda campaign from Moscow and Peiping against the Defense Pact. The resulting mass riots and the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit was a cheaply won victory for the Communists in East Asia. Conversely, it was a stunning blow to Premier Kishi, to orderly

government in Japan, to the Defense Pact, and to Japanese and American prestige. And although the present pro-American government is almost certain to win the November elections, still the Communists have tested their weapons—mass demonstrations, student riots and strikes—and found them effective. There is no good reason to expect that they will not use them again and again as Japan continues to slip slowly but unmistakably toward neutralism.

Growing South American neutralism today is nourished by most of the factors already analyzed but especially by intense nationalism and the passion to modernize and raise living standards. Its anti-American tone is a product of Communist propaganda, of past relations with the United States, of envy and jealousy of United States achievements and power, of fear of United States future intervention, of disappointment from alleged recent neglect by the United States, and finally from an underlying anti-United States cultural nationalism. Only the last item here named needs further comment.

Latin American cultural nationalism draws sharp distinctions between culture in the United States and that to the south. In the United States, it is alleged, culture is materialistic, coarse, and inferior; in Latin America, idealistic, refined, and superior. Perhaps a majority of the literary figures in Latin America hold this view, and most of the poems and novels produced there in the 20th century emphasize these themes and draw these distinctions. Latin American literature unfortunately is rarely translated and read in the United States; hence, Americans are only now becoming aware of this deeply imbedded source of anti-Americanism. Similarly Latin American knowledge of culture in the United States is too shallow to recognize the myth of this interpretation. The two cultures of course are products of Western civilization and are much more nearly alike than different. For deeper understanding and greater appreciation,

they require more study and knowledge from both sides, a goal easy to achieve and exciting in the achieving. The extent of the adoption of neutralism as official policies by Latin American nations will be vitally influenced by the Castro Revolution in Cuba. If it succeeds, many other leaders captured by the Castro ground swell will follow his example. Significantly, Castro has diligently courted the neutralist nations as well as the Communists.

Growing neutralism in Western Europe also rests on many of the factors already analyzed. This morning I wish to comment on only one additional characteristic, peculiar especially to France. Neutralism sprouted up in France immediately following the end of the Second World War. Advocated by left-wing elements, and by some moderates with close attachments to the United States, it received a volley of discussion in certain French newspapers. Fundamentally, it was based on the fear from these groups that alignment with victorious America, apparently moving rapidly to the right, might hamper social reform at home. The advent of the McCarthy Era gave this view deeper rooting. On the right simultaneously extreme nationalists, called Gaullists, feared that the United States, allegedly tampering with the colonial empires of Europe, would expedite the independence movement among people under French colonial control. As time went on, these two elements have tended to fuse, creating a fertile soil for the continued growth of neutralism. Similar factors, I wish to suggest, may also be operating in Britain and West Germany.

In conclusion let me repeat that neutralism is indeed a dynamic movement. Although somewhat dampened in South Asia, it is increasing in Africa, Latin America, and Japan; it is near the surface elsewhere, even among our allies in Europe. Although a neutralist bloc closely organized and firmly committed to common goals does not at the moment seem likely, still the neutralist nations may very well exert decisive

influence on issues of vital importance to the United States such as disarmament, the admission of Red China to the United Nations, the future of Dag Hammarskjold and Patrice Lumumba, and of the future location and re-organization of the United Nations. More directly, a neutralist group may be able from time to time to prevent a dangerous impasse between the Big Two, to keep negotiations going until agreement is reached.

On the other hand we discern that Communists under the cloak of neutralism steal into positions of power and seize control of governments. We cannot fail to see too that the Communist Bloc, exploiting with finesse the obvious advantages which history and geography have put in their hands, have more effectively come to terms with neutralism than we have done. Wherever possible they have identified themselves with it, and are ever seeking to direct it against the United States.

As Americans, we are understandably concerned at the apparent anti-American, pro-Communist tone of much of today's neutralism. This anti-American tone does exist, no doubt, and this morning I have sought to explain why. Still, I believe we are inclined to misunderstand the origin and to exaggerate the extent of this tone. Most neutralist nations pursue policies designed to achieve their own national goals; Nehru is primarily for India, not for or against the United States or Russia. In pursuing their own national interests, their policies from time to time will in fact run counter to the wishes of the major powers. This we expect and concede; our leaders no longer hold that it is "immoral" to be neutral.

To face up to the problems of neutralism, both our people and our leaders must diligently keep taking stock of ourselves and our institutions in order to eradicate so far as possible the causes underlying the rising tone of anti-Americanism. Americans live in a goldfish bowl today, we must realize. Can anyone

doubt that race riots, reckless talk about foreign cultures, or offensive personal conduct abroad are at once heard and seen around the world? Can we afford to forget that the Communist propaganda machines are relentlessly grinding away to keep foreign peoples from forgetting our own faults?

Our diplomacy moreover must be made persuasive in terms of the specific aims and aspirations of the neutralist nations whenever possible, and at all times in terms of the attention, courtesy, and respect we pay the leaders of the neutralist nations. By this I do not mean that we should sacrifice our basic interests and national goals in misguided, truckling efforts to curry the favor of say, Nehru, Nkrumah, or Nasser. Our long-range objectives must be steadfastly pursued with all the means at our disposal despite neutralist opposition. But realism demands that our policies and approaches should be made with a clear understanding of the sources of neutralist international conduct—not with fear nor necessarily with acceptance. Whether we like it or not, neutralist nations are here in the world in numbers and force. With deeper understanding, with more flexible policies, with greater diligence, with fuller cooperation from our people and with firmness, our leaders can cope successfully with the problems of growing neutralism, although we cannot expect the neutralist nations to pursue policies *always* favorable to us.

BIOGRAPHIC SKETCH

Professor Edward Younger

Present Position: Ernest J. King Chair of Maritime History, Naval War College; on leave from position of Professor of American History, University of Virginia.

Schools:

Arkansas State College, B.A. degree, 1932.
Oklahoma State University, M.A. degree, 1938.
George Washington University, Ph.D. degree, 1942.

Career Highlights:

1928-37 Teacher, Principal, Superintendent in Public Schools of Arkansas and Oklahoma.
1937-38 Teaching Fellow, Oklahoma State University.
1938-42 Teaching Fellow, George Washington University.
1942-45 Lieutenant and Lieutenant Commander, U.S.N.R. On active duty in Naval Aviation during the Second World War.
1945-46 Lieutenant Commander and Instructor in History, U.S. Naval Academy.
1946-61 Assistant, Associate, and Professor of American History; also Graduate History Adviser and Foreign Student Adviser, University of Virginia.
1957-58 Fulbright Professor of American History and Politics, Allahabad University, India.
1961 (Summer) Lecturer, All-India, on American history and foreign policy under auspices of American Leaders and Specialists Program, American Embassy, New Delhi.

Publications: A Selected List

John A. Kasson: Politics and Diplomacy from Lincoln to McKinley. Torch Press, 450 p. 1955. (Phi Beta Kappa Prize, University of Virginia.)

Inside the Confederate Government: Diary of R.G.H. Kean. Oxford University Press, 244 p. 1957. (Book of the Month Selection, Civil War Book Club.)

"Woodrow Wilson: The Making of a Leader," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, LXIV, October 1956. (A Wilson Centennial Lecture.)

"Indians and Americans: On a Better Understanding," *Allahabad University Magazine*, India, XXXV, January-March 1958. (A lecture given before both Indian and American audiences.)

"American Attitudes Toward Foreign Policy in the Nineteenth Century," *United States in World Affairs*, Madras, India, 1958. (The first in a series of lectures given before South Indian audiences.)