

**The original documents are located in Box D13, folder “Michigan Bar Association, Junior Bar Section, September 27, 1950” of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

### **Copyright Notice**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

*Junior Bar Section of Michigan Bar Assn*

Wednesday, September 27th 1952

Michigan citizens should be rightfully proud of Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, the foremost statesman in the United States now and for the last two decades. As a member of the minority party he, more than anyone else, was responsible for the success of bipartisanship in foreign affairs. He carried his full part in formulating and implementing the creation and support of the United Nations, the European Recovery Program and our national policy in the Western Hemisphere. All of Michigan, in fact the entire world, excepting perhaps Stalin and his cohorts, at this moment regret his present ill health and wish him a speedy and complete recovery.

There have been some critics of a bipartisanship in foreign policy. Actually where a sincere bipartisan effort has been made our foreign policy has been successful. Substantial progress has been made in Europe under the able guidance and leadership of Mr. Paul G. Hoffman. Despite Europe's economic and military post war weaknesses Communism has been on the defensive. The best evidence of the success of foreign policy bipartisanship is the fact that Communists did not strike in Europe but in Asia where bipartisanship has never existed.

Some may contend that bipartisanship has directed our Far Eastern foreign policy. To remove any doubt in this regard the following quotations from speeches by Senator Vandenberg should be a part of the record.

On March 18, 1947 Senator Vandenberg, then Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, said: "This bipartisan foreign policy has been confined within relatively narrow limits. It has applied to the United Nations. It has applied to peace treaties in Europe. It



has applied to nothing else. I have had nothing to do, for example, with China policies or pan-American policies except within the United Nations, and at times I have been satisfied with neither.

On February 10, 1949 Mr. Vandenberg said: "It did not apply to everything - for example, not to Palestine or China."

It is regrettable that bipartisanship was not tried in the Far East. If such a policy had been given a chance it is quite likely that success against Communism instead of failure would have been the result in that part of the world.

The importance of Asia cannot be underestimated in the titanic struggle between Communism and those who believe in freedom and liberty. Only Asia has great undeveloped natural resources and great undeveloped human resources. More than half the people of the world live in Asia. Which way are they to go? To Russia or to the United States. That is likely to be the decisive question of this century.

At the end of World War II the Soviets had approximately 200 million people under their control. Now, with their satellites in Europe, and what they have seized in Asia, the Reds dominate almost 600 million. We of the free/<sup>western</sup> world are almost 500 million people. The two roughly balance. The scales can be tipped by the 700 million people on the periphery of China. What happens to Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, Indochina, Siam, Malaya, Burma, India, Pakistan and even Iran will decide the fate of our way of life.

Some foreign policy makers contend that the United States could write off China with her 500 million people and then build up



the countries around her. That policy, as recent experiences have indicated, is not sound. China is like a giant hand and the surrounding countries like the outstretched fingers, or to put it another way, China is like the hub of a wheel with the surrounding countries the spokes in the wheel. What happens in the hub controls the spokes and the fate of the hand determines fate of the fingers.

Unfortunately we have lost China to Communists and we are now fighting in the Korea finger. If the United Nations forces push the North Korean forces to the 38th parallel, and I am certain that will be the case, and even if we move the Communists back to the Manchurian border, they can move into that same finger again, as soon as our attention is turned elsewhere into other fingers such as Indo-China, the Philippines or Burma. The problem is simply China. The Reds can bleed us to death with China under Kremlin domination.

The record shows that Communist leaders have always underestimated the importance of China. In 1937, Chow En-lai, now Prime Minister of the Communist regime in China, wrote Earl Browder, then head of the Communist Party in the United States, the following:

"Comrade, do you still remember the Chinese comrades who worked with you in China 10 years ago?"

Earl Browder was in China in 1927 to help the Reds seize complete control of that country but Chian Kai-sek and his believers in a free and independent China withstood the Communist forces.

In the same year, Earl Browder received a letter from Mao Tse-tung, now President of the Communist regime in Peking. The following sentence in that letter is important in understanding overall Kremlin strategy:



"We feel that when we achieve victory (in China), this victory will be of considerable help to the struggle of the American people for liberation."

Other evidence is likewise available. In the Daily Worker for December 2, 1945, William Q. Foster, head of the Communist Party in this country, said:

"On the international scale, the key task, as emphasized in Comrade Dennis' report, is to stop American intervention in China."

The Kremlin to date has been successful in achieving victory in China. The United States after World War II lost its golden opportunity to set up a government in China that would be independent of the Soviets. Until such a government is in control in China the United States and her allies will never be secure from the imperialist designs of the U.S.S.R. Let's not forget one fact, which is all too clear, that Communists in Asia are Communists and not simple agrarian reformers.

In conclusion, there are several points which should be brought out. First, in both world wars we ourselves helped bring on the trouble by putting expediency ahead of principle. In the thirties we helped the aggressor, Japan, instead of the victim, China. In the forties we bribed Russia by giving her China's territory and then appeased Communism in China while denouncing those who were resisting it.

Second, twice in one decade the United States made the same mistake of imagining that what happened in Europe was more likely to get us into war than what happened in Asia.



The United States has always been secure from war in the Pacific as long as Japan had a free China, friendly to America, in the west. Our nation can be free from Soviet aggression if a free China exists on the mainland of Asia. Our Pacific policy must be tailored to fit this pattern and that means our State Department should not be deluded by the present Chinese Reds who are Communists and under the complete domination of the Kremlin.

