L61-7 C.1

PROPERTY OF THE LIBRARY
INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

WESTERN POLITICAL HERITAGE

Colonel Willis M. Smyser, USAF

NOTICE

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker. It has been reproduced directly from the reporter's notes for the students and faculty for reference and study purposes.

No direct quotations are to be made either in written reports or in oral presentations based on this unedited copy.

Reviewed by: Tom W. Sills, Colonel, USA

Date: 20 September 1960

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1960-1961

WESTERN POLITICAL HERITAGE

24 August 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION--Colonel Clarence E. Reid, Member of the Faculty, ICAF	1
SPEAKER--Colonel Willis M. Smyser, USAF, Secretary General of the Inter-American Defense Board	1
GENERAL DISCUSSION	27

NOTICE

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker. It has been reproduced directly from the reporter's notes for the students and faculty for reference and study purposes.

No direct quotations are to be made either in written reports or in oral presentations based on this unedited copy.

Reviewed by: Col T. W. Sills Date: SEP 20 1960

Reporter: Grace R. O'Toole

Publication No. L61-7

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington 25, D. C.

WESTERN POLITICAL HERITAGE

24 August 1960

COLONEL REID: General Mundy, Gentlemen: Today we start our coverage of the comparative weight of philosophies in government activities, in our Foundations Unit.

As the academic year progresses, you are going to find it more and more important to have a knowledge of the political theories of government and government processes.

In each of your succeeding units of instruction you will find that you are running into one or all three of the branches of our Federal Government--Executive, Legislative, and Judicial--and you will find that government becomes a part of your life here at the College.

We have been fortunate today in obtaining the services of one of our former instructors as our guest lecturer to open this series, Colonel Willis M. Smyser, currently Secretary General of the Inter-American Defense Board.

The subject of his lecture is "Western Political Heritage."

It is indeed a pleasure to present Colonel Smyser for his fourth lecture at the Industrial College.

COLONEL SMYSER: Thank you, Mickey. I assure you it is a pleasure and a real honor to be invited to come back to the Industrial College.

General Mundy, Admiral Patrick, Gentlemen: Since the beginning

of recorded history, man has given a great deal of profound thought to the question of how society should be organized--the problem of political organization.

As a basic question he has asked: What is the purpose of political organization? Or, to be more specific, he has asked three questions:

Vu Graph No. 1

First. What is the real function of government?

Second. What system of government can best perform this function?

Third. What are the legitimate powers of the government and the rights of the governed?

Although these questions have been pondered since the beginning of time, they are absolutely vital today. Quincy Wright, in his monumental book, "The Study of War," considers differences in political thought to be a principal cause of war throughout history. (And there have been 169 wars just in the 50-year period from 1900 to 1950). Today differences in political ideology constitute a major reason for the division of the world into opposing armed camps. Not only are there strains between political systems but also there are strains and apprehensions within our own political system and within other political systems.

As we face the problems of preservation of our way of life in a troubled world, we necessarily become more concerned about our form of government. Here, in your study of Comparative Political Thought

and Government, you have the opportunity to review the American system of government, its principles, its institutions, and its procedures, and their relationship to the efficient handling of present-day security problems. We need to understand our system of government and its cherished principles if we want to understand the problem of imposing controls over industry and manpower, the problem of regulation of our economic growth, and problems of mobilization, civil defense, adequate military forces, and similar security measures. In short, we must know the limitations and the advantages in our system if we are to do a good job in managing the competitive coexistence problem.

I'll venture a prediction right now. I predict that several times this year you will hear expressions such as: We know we should do this, or, we realize we should do that, but we just can't under our system of government, or some such indirect apology for certain of the limitations in our system, with the added assurance, of course that, in spite of these limitations, we have no desire to change the system.

Now, as an introduction to your study of government, I would like to try to stimulate your thinking, and especially your critical reasoning, about the Western political heritage in general. Let us see what answers political thinkers have given to those three initial questions which I posed. In the short period of time we have available for this talk, perhaps we can take a fleeting glimpse at 25 centuries of political ideas, and perhaps the questions that are raised will stimulate you to further investigation. At

least you will realize that most present-day problems are not entirely new. They have faced society for centuries, and past thinking does provide a perspective for our consideration of what to do today.

Chart

I have prepared a chart over here to show you the names and the time in history and some of the works of the contributors to political philosophy which I will just barely touch on in the first part of my talk. Please don't take time to read the whole chart now. As I go through the first part of my talk and mention these different political thinkers, you may glance at the chart and fix their time in history and note some of their work.

Most commentaries on political philosophy begin with Plato, and most authorities in the field claim that all political theories borrow something from Plato. It is appropriate then that we take a quick look at the Platonic concept.

Totalitarians claim Plato as their intellectual ancestor because there is so much in his writing that is explicitly undemocratic or outright antidemocratic--such as the philosopher king. On the other hand, socialists claim Plato for their champion because virtually all communistic and socialistic thought has its ultimate root in Plato.

This brings up a point that applies to all the political ideas that we shall sample. None of them is perfect or absolute. They are neither

all good nor all bad. Political philosophers were trying to answer those three initial questions which I posed; they were trying to arrive at the ideal social order; but their ideas frequently changed during their lifetimes and, if and when their philosophy ever was applied to a state, it sometimes underwent practical modification. This practical modification for utility, or pragmatism, as it is called, is especially typical of our own application of political theory.

But to get back to Plato: He wrote "The Republic" in his early maturity and "The Laws" in his old age. "The Republic" is by far the most read. He was very much concerned about the incompetence of democracy. His concept of the state was aristocratic, with government in the hands of a philosopher king and a very small elite which he called the "guardians," and whose primary attribute was wisdom. The elite were aided by auxiliaries or fighters, whose primary attribute was courage. Under the wise guardians and the courageous fighters were the workers, whose primary attribute was appetite.

His socialistic and communistic ideas are found in his belief that this elite, the guardians, and the fighters, were to lead a sort of communal life, with all causes of temptation eliminated. Families would be eliminated; love would be eliminated; wealth and property would be eliminated. There would be collective education of children under the state, instead of under parental care, and there would be state control of ideology and science.

So we find at about the year 400 before Christ a rationalization of the idea that a few wise rulers can govern the people better than the people can govern themselves. Plato was serious. He was trying to develop a utopian organization; and people, he felt, just were not capable of governing themselves, because he believed that government is a specialized art and that justice is "giving every man his due."

Plato's pupil, Aristotle, became famous in his own right. Aristotle was much more sympathetic to the concept of constitutional government and he rejected most of the communistic and socialistic ideas of his teacher. While Plato considered democracy to be a "charming form of government, full of variety and disorder and dispensing a sort of equality to equals and unequals alike," Aristotle believed that "democracy is a just form of government in which the citizens at large administer the state for the common interest."

Now, from this chart it looks as if the history of political philosophy has had a very barren period for several centuries, but this is not true. During these centuries many theories resulted. The theory of natural law, or the law of nature, as it is sometimes called, which states that all citizens have certain basic, natural rights, was developed, and also the theory of the divine right of kings. The rise of the Christian Church brought the theory of the two swords, the two centers of power--the temporal power and the spiritual power.

There were many important contributions to political thought during

this period of time.

Thomas Aquinas, Saint Augustine, and others made very important contributions. It is not possible to cover them all in this talk, so let's skip about 18 centuries, to approximately 1500.

I cite Niccolo Machiavelli because he has been much more criticized than read. His minor work, "The Prince," is quite familiar, but relatively few people are familiar with his great works, "The Discourses," and the "Art of War."

Machiavelli has given an adjective to the English language--Machiavellian--which is generally used to mean cunning, crafty, deceitful; and yet this man has been called by many authorities "the first modern thinker." He wrote the first great book on warfare, and from it has developed a huge literature of books on strategy and power politics, such as those by Clausewitz, Jomini, Mahan, and many others.

Machiavelli was the first to consider the problem of war and peace as a practical understanding of material resources. His writing focused attention on preparedness, mobilization, and such related matters as are studied right here at the Industrial College. He preceded Clausewitz in the well known concept that war is continuous with peace.

Machiavelli is remembered most for his statement in Chapter 18 of "The Prince," where he advises:

Vu Graph No. 2

"A prudent ruler ought not to keep faith when, by so doing, it would be against his interest, and when the reasons which made him bind

"himself no longer exist. If men were all good, this precept would be a good one, but as they are bad and would not observe their faith with you, so you are not bound to keep faith with them."

The real contribution of Machiavelli, however, is his concept of the art of using superior preparedness, ruthlessness, and threats of war to attain bloodless victories. This indeed sounds quite modern, doesn't it?

His main concern was for the state and he believed that the chief foundations of all states are good laws and good arms. In regard to arms, he argued violently against mercenaries and auxiliaries and in favor of a national army, which was a new concept at that time.

Now let's jump only about 150 years and look in on Thomas Hobbes. He is remembered most for his book, "The Leviathan," the first comprehensive work on political philosophy in English and published in 1651. The two primary political ideas he gave the world were the idea of a social contract and the idea of the absoluteness of sovereignty. However, he rejected the idea that the state was divinely ordained--the divine right of kings.

The political philosophy of Hobbes is sometimes stated in the form of one of the sentences from his book in which he said: "life is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." This statement must always be placed in its proper context, because Hobbes was pointing out that life is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short in the state of nature.

Human behavior in nature, according to Hobbes, was a war of every man against every man. There is no right, no wrong, no justice, no injustice, no order, no regulation, no civilization of any kind. Because such a situation is completely intolerable, and moreover it is destructive, self-preservation demands cooperation. Hobbes found that peace and cooperation have greater utility for self-preservation than violence and competition. For security, government is required, and government must have power to enforce law. For security, then, men give up the concept of self-help --the argument of the survival of the fittest--and subject themselves to a sovereign who, by necessity, has absolute power, in accordance with the contract. This, then, is one theory of the purpose and powers of government.

Much of the importance of Hobbes derives from the fact that he developed a scientific, consistent political theory and influenced the work of subsequent political philosophers, particularly John Locke, Charles-Louis de Montesquieu, and Jean Jacques Rousseau. In violent disagreement with Hobbes' state of nature, Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau believed that man is, by nature, good.

Locke's philosophy is expressed in his two "Treatises of Government," the second of which is the more important, called "Civil Government." Locke continues Hobbes' social contract idea, but he develops it in such a way as to establish the ultimate supremacy of the people over government, as it demonstrates that the sphere and powers of government are

limited by the terms of the contract. Locke also referred repeatedly to life, liberty, and property or estate as the natural rights of man.

Now, I need not point out the tremendous influence that Locke had on American political philosophy. His answers to my three initial questions are pretty much our answers: the natural rights of man to life, liberty, and property. (Incidentally, in our early state documents we find that phrase, "life, liberty, and property," but, of course, it was changed in the Declaration of Independence to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.") His theory that the purpose of government was to secure these rights; and that the source of power of government is from the people; and that there are limitations on the powers of government is our American political heritage.

Thomas Jefferson took these ideas and put them into the words that are so familiar to us:

Vu Graph No. 3

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The significant contribution from Montesquieu consists of an addition or a supplement to Locke's philosophy--the separation of powers. He accepted the ideas of natural rights, the social contract, the protective

role of government, and the limitations on government; but he went on in his "L'Esprit des Lois" or "Spirit of the Laws" to develop the separation-of-powers theory as a means to limit and control the powers of government. Montesquieu said:

"There can be no liberty where the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or body of magistrates, or if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers." This idea, as you very well know, also became a basic feature of our own government.

Now we should look briefly at another English political philosopher, Edmund Burke, who wrote "Reflections on the French Revolution." Most of us probably got acquainted with Burke in high school because of his "Speech on Conciliation," which was so often required reading along about the junior year. I suppose most of us remember studying it even if we did not understand it at the time.

An interesting aspect of his political philosophy is his theory relative to representation. I mention it because it is something for us to think about in connection with our own situation. Should your Congressman or your Senator in Washington represent exclusively your district or your State? Should he try to get for his people, for his constituents, as much of what they want as possible? Or should he concern himself first and foremost with the interests of the Nation as a whole and decide what is best for his constituents? In other words, should he be a Western Union

messenger boy, simply delivering the message of his constituents and recording their views, or should he act with power of attorney for them?

Edmund Burke had the answer to this. He defended a representative's independence of judgment and action. Once elected, the representative is responsible for the whole interest of the nation, and he owes to his constituents his best judgment, freely exercised, whether it agrees with theirs or not. He wrote these ideas to his constituents in Bristol and he spoke to them in the same manner several times. I don't think I have to add that he was not reelected to office.

In historical chronology this brings us to the time of our own political philosophers. Although the philosophy of Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Marshall, and other Americans is my favorite subject, I will have to skip over them in this talk. I understand that you will get some of their thoughts on government in subsequent lectures. So for more on American political philosophy I suggest that you read "The Federalist," which has been called America's greatest single contribution to political philosophy.

Now let's turn to just a little bit more sampling of some other political ideas.

No survey of political philosophy would be complete without a look at communism and totalitarianism, because these philosophies provide

the attack on democracy which we face today. Both of these philosophies go back to Plato, and both have had vastly more application in the world over the centuries than democracy. But both of these philosophies come more directly from a post-democracy philosopher; that is, one whose thinking was a reaction to democracy--a German, named Hegel. Hegel's political thinking is expressed best in his "Philosophy of Law," written in 1821.

The major significance of Hegel comes from two points--his dialectic as a method, which was later adopted by Karl Marx, and his idealization of the state. The term, "dialectic method," comes from the method employed by Plato, who presented his thinking in the form of dialogues of opposing ideas. According to Hegel, every idea can exist only if there is an opposite. For example, to have the concept "high" you must have the concept "low." To have the concept "true" you must have the concept "false." Hegel calls these opposing ideas the thesis and the antithesis. The interaction of these two opposing ideas produces a synthesis, and Hegel applies his opposing ideas to history.

He uses this method to show what he calls the necessity of history or the inexorable unfolding of history. He says that great men neither make nor guide history, but at the most they understand a little of it and they cooperate with forces enormously more massive than their own will and understanding. In other words, he says that history unfolds inexorably from this conflict of ideas--thesis, antithesis,

synthesis--and nothing can stop this. Great men really don't make history. They simply perceive what is taking place and they latch on to it.

The state, according to Hegel, is an end, not a means. It is far more than the association or total of its individuals; it is a being and has a spirit of its own. People exist for the state, not the state for the people. Here is a different theory about the purpose of government.

Hegel's concept of freedom was that in self-sacrifice and duty the individual finds his supreme freedom. In place of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, Hegel substitutes self-sacrifice, duty, and discipline. War, rather than peace, shows the health of a state. Many authorities say that Hegel's philosophy, as immensely significant as it has been, is really a rationalization of his wish for a powerful Germany. And Hegel had a tremendous influence on both communism and totalitarianism, particularly in the concept that the individual is merely the tool or the means and the state is the end.

The father of Marxian socialism and communism, Karl Marx, was a student of Hegel. From Hegel, Marx borrowed the dialectic as a method and developed his theory of dialectical materialism and his economic interpretation of history. As Marx put it:

"My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. With me the ideal is nothing more than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought."

In simpler words, Hegel said that experience follows the idea. Marx said that the idea follows and is the product of experience, especially economic experience.

Vu Graph No. 4

I have prepared a little diagram to help explain the dialectic of Hegel and the dialectic of Marx. This shows Hegel's dialectic--thesis and antithesis--the two opposing ideas, producing synthesis, another idea; and from these ideas you have experience. Marx said, "Yes, we have this dialectic, but what we have in these opposing forces--thesis and antithesis--are experiences, and from them we have synthesis, another experience; and any ideas that we have in this world are just a product of our experience, especially economic experience."

Marx also applies this to history. He says that all history has been class conflict--the masters and the slaves, the patricians and the plebians, the nobles and the serfs, and now the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Eventually we will have a synthesis which will be a classless society.

The philosophy of communism states:

"The mode of production of the material means of existence conditions the whole process of social, political, and intellectual life."

All the institutions of society are merely tools of the exploiters used against the masses. Morality, ethics, social customs, are all tools of the exploiters. Religion is an invention of the exploiters to keep down

the oppressed class, or, to use Marx's own words, "Religion is the opiate of the people."

Much importance is attached by Marx to the theory of surplus value. Briefly, this theory is that the workers receive only part of what they produce, and profits are siphoned off by parasitic capitalist exploiters. Thus, since the workers cannot purchase the full value of their work, surpluses develop. As surpluses develop competition increases and exploitation becomes more severe. As competition for markets increases, nations are forced into imperialistic ventures for colonies and for more markets for their surpluses, and this in turn leads to imperialistic wars. So, according to Marx, capitalism is doomed because "it sows the seeds of its own destruction."

Marx wrote in the Communist Manifesto:

Vu Graph No. 5

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, Unite!"

And later Lenin says, in "What is to be Done:"

Vu Graph No. 6

"We do not believe in external principles of morality. Communist

morality is identical with the fight to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is necessary to use cunning, deceit, unlawful method, evasion, withholding and concealing truth."

With the forceful overthrow of all existing capitalist society and its institutions, a classless society will evolve in which all means of production will be community property. The government, to use Marx's words, "will wither away and instead of government of people we will have administration of things." All will share equally in abundance under the arrangement of "from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs."

Of course, this authoritarian, communistic arrangement was not new. We saw some of it in Plato, and you will probably recall that about two centures before Marx some of these ideas were tried right here in our own country by, among others, the Pilgrim Fathers. It made no difference how much or how little any member of the Plymouth Colony produced, that production went into a common warehouse and was doled out in accordance with the authority's idea of needs.

Of course the system didn't work. Many starved and died. The second winter, Governor Bradford called them all together and said, in effect: "Look here. These ideas are not working so well. This spring I think we will discard the principle of from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs. Instead we will try the principle, to each according to his effort and his merit. Beginning

this spring each of you will have what you, yourself, produce or earn."

Now, we don't have time to go into the many fallacies of Communist philosophy. But, out of all this theory that I have just barely outlined for you, one definite thing has emerged—the dictatorship. As for the withering away of the government, that is either a long way off or else it is just window dressing.

Let me show you just one example of this Communist window dressing. Here is Article 126 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union:

Vu Graph No. 7

"In conformity with the interest of the toilers for the purpose of strengthening the socialist system, the citizens of the USSR are guaranteed by law (a) freedom of speech, (b) freedom of the press, (c) freedom of assembly and meetings, (d) freedom of street processions and demonstrations. These rights of the citizens are insured by placing at the disposal of the toilers and their organizations printing presses, supplies of paper, public buildings, the streets, means of communication, and other material conditions necessary for their realization."

Their communal life is expressed in Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution, which states that the land, waters, forests, mills, factories, mines, etc., are the property of the people. But, even though they own these things, they don't have much control over what they get from them.

The philosophy of totalitarianism also borrows from Hegel. Developed further by Fiche, Schopenhauer, Nietzche, and Trietschke, with

his concept of the supremacy of the "big blond beast," this philosophy reached its greatest point under Hitler and Mussolini. Glorification of the State, cult of race, uncontrolled leadership, duty, and self-sacrifice are some of the characteristics with which we are all quite familiar.

This philosophy holds the incredible view that the ultimate in human dignity and freedom is in the maximum power of the state, and there is a singular lack of scruples concerning method.

Hitler demonstrated this when he said:

Vu Graph No. 8

"We will incite the people, and not only incite, we will lash them to a frenzy. The pigsty of Jewish corruption, democratic hypocricy, and Marxist deception must be swept out with an iron broom.

"Arise, master race of the globe!"

Mussolini also expressed the totalitarian philosophy very well when he said:

Vu Graph No. 9

"The will for possession and power has always been the driving force in history. . . Justice, happiness, and peace are dreams; comfort is boring and senile; man is a beast of prey. . . Everything is for the State; nothing against the State; nothing outside the State. . . Welfare of individuals is <u>not</u> the object of society. . . Democracy and freedom rest upon a false faith in the reasonableness of human nature."

Well, there you have a very light sampling of political ideas from history. Admittedly, it lacked depth; it was only a veneer. But what I had in mind was to stimulate your thinking and your critical reasoning.

I earnestly suggest that you read some more about these philosophies, particularly communism. You really should understand Communist theory and practice thoroughly. It will help you to see through Communist propaganda and will help you to fit Communist action into a pattern. You will find, after you study it, that you will appreciate far more our own American political philosophy. J. Edgar Hoover had this idea in mind. In his recently published book, "Masters of Deceit," he said: "It is the duty of every American citizen to learn exactly what communism is."

Now, out of all these political ideas, I suggest that you keep two key problems in mind throughout your study of Government. As a matter of fact, they are two key problems for you to keep in mind throughout your entire course here, because they are crucial questions for us in developing our security posture.

The first is the problem of how much government.

The second is the problem of the role of the military in our Government.

The first problem--how much government--was very well stated by our friend, Edmund Burke. He said:

"The most difficult of all problems confronting social philosophers

"is that of determining what the State ought to take upon itself to direct by public wisdom and what it ought to leave, with as little interference as possible, to individual freedom."

Lincoln put it in the form of a question. He asked: "Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its own people, or too weak to maintain its own existence?"

The Founding Fathers had the answer. They said: "That government is best which governs least." But they insisted, on the other hand, that a government must have power to govern.

As a matter of fact, our Government has undergone considerable evolution, and is still changing. Our Founding Fathers hadn't the remotest idea that the Government should be a provider of low-cost housing, and they probably would never recognize the present cornucopia of handouts as their own creation.

The change began right with the Declaration of Independence, and, by the time of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, already there was a change in thinking from the idea of least government to one of a stronger government. Of the 56 men who had signed the Declaration of Independence only 8 were delegates to the convention. Patrick Henry, who inspired the Revolutionists with the memorable words, "Give me liberty or give me death," was so much concerned about liberty that he saw danger in the Constitutional Convention, which was to provide a stronger government. When he was invited to attend the Convention he said, with less memorable

words, "I smell a rat."

With our Government as it is today, critics can no longer say that it has the negative merit of not doing harm but lacks the positive merit of doing good. Our Government has become strong, centralized, ubiquitous, and all-pervasive. It is everywhere and it gets into everything, especially into your pocketbook. Yet some economists say today that we must put an even greater portion of our productive capacity to significant and worthy use.

What does this mean? I suppose it means that instead of a half-billion dollars of our gross national product by individual choice every year going for private swinning pools, it should be directed by the Government into welfare measures or preparedness measures. This may be good, but this means more government. It means more direction of our national economy, more direction of our national life, and less individual freedom.

It seems that as the external threat increases we are forced into more and more government. Maybe this is the big problem of today. Perhaps we should recall Alexander Hamilton's warning in "The Federalist, No. 8." He said:

"Safety from external danger is the most powerful director of national conduct. Even the ardent love of liberty will, after a time, give way to its dictates. The violent destruction of life and property incident to war, the continual effort and alarm attendant on a state of

continual danger, will compel nations the most attached to liberty to resort for repose and security to institutions which have a tendency to destroy their civil and political rights. To be more safe, they, at length, become willing to run the risk of being less free."

Is this the way democracy is headed? Can a nation with our philosophy, with our cherished principles of human dignity and freedom, preserve itself in the face of the communistic, proletarian threat? Or must we, in turn, head more toward a completely regulated state? If not, how far must we go and can we go in centralized organization, controls, and direction without losing what we are willing to fight for? I hope you will ponder these points seriously as you study government and as you consider the problem of developing our security preparedness posture.

The second key problem that I suggested you keep in mind, the role of the military in our Government, is of vital importance to the Nation and of keen interest to us.

Our Founding Fathers were quite opposed to an active military in peacetime. They feared military power. The Virginia Bill of Rights said that standing armies in time of peace should be avoided as dangerous to liberty, and in all cases the military should be under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power. Of the many, many such expressions by our Founding Fathers, one of the most forthright was from James Madison, who said: "I must cordially agree that a

standing army is one of the greatest mischiefs that could possibly happen."

Distrust of the military is so deeply rooted in American tradition that it has persisted throughout our national existence down to the present time. Senator Taft feared that the military was making the United States a militaristic and totalitarian nation. Hanson W. Baldwin, not so long ago, found that "The growing influence of the military in American life is dangerous to our democratic liberties." He also found that the use of former military men in political positions is dangerous, because of their "military mind." According to Baldwin, the military mind was defined as rational but not intuitive, disciplined but unable to grapple with intangibles; officers to the grade of colonel are "yes" men; generals are arrogant, closed to advice, insulated. In short, the military mind is undemocratic and the military is dangerous to democracy.

Personally, I am not at all convinced that the concept that there is such a thing as a military mind has any validity. But, in any event, I really don't have any objection to reference to a military mind. I certainly don't feel insulted. But I do feel that, if it is to be defined, the definition should include that the military mind is characterized by intense loyalty to the United States; and when I say "the United States," I mean its principles and its institutions, as well as its territories.

Just as in the case of the problem of how much government we need, we are faced with the problem of how much military we need. And, as the external threat increases, we need more and more military; and,

with more and more military, the role of the military within the Government increases.

Dr. Thomas Bailey, an outstanding authority on American diplomatic history, writing in 1948, said that a basic weakness in America is the inability of our people to recognize the intimate relationship between the military power and the national policy. He cites the incontrovertible dictum of Bismarck: "Political questions are questions of power." But he says we have a horror of power politics. The astute French statesman Clemenceau one said: "War is much too important and too serious to be left to the generals." However true that may be, foreign policy is now much too important and too serious to be left to the diplomats.

I hope you will ponder also this second key problem as you study government and as you continue your studies throughout the year.

Now let us turn briefly to a note of optimism, pessimism, and challenge, all in one. A primary virtue of our system is that it has within itself the means for orderly change and improvement. This very capacity for change constitutes the basic strength of America. Yet this strength, this capacity for growth and adaptation, faces a challenge at this point in history which will put it to a severe test as a result of today's pressures.

Dr. Erich Fromm said on a television program recently that America has the greatest society ever achieved, but he found that it is in danger

because American man is more concerned with self, job, and material production than with society. Whether this is true or not, it is a fact that anti-intellectualism does persist in our country. To so many people, numbers and size are most important. So many people think that, as long as we can count and measure, we don't have to think.

But thinking is an essential responsibility of democracy. Our Commander-in-Chief, President Eisenhower, emphasized this in his address to the graduating class of the United States Naval Academy in June 1958 when he said:

"Military officers of today must concern themselves more with the problems of maintaining the peace (problems of government and society). Command of armed forces alone is not sufficient."

In closing, let us see if we can wrap up this whole thing in a neat package. This grappling with intangibles is troublesome and annoying. It taxes the military mind.

Vu Graph No. 10

Let's turn back to those three initial questions:

What is the real function of government?

What system of government can best perform this proper function?

What are the legitimate powers of the government and the rights of the governed?

I think we have found answers to the first two, at least, to our own satisfaction, although some of these gentlemen over here (indicating chart)

tried to confuse us. As a matter of fact, about one-half of the world today does not agree with us.

Now the third question--that is the eternal question. It is the subject of orderly, gradual evolution and development. It has been the subject of violent controversy, and it is the subject of violent controversy today. It is the big problem of our time.

Now, the two key problems I suggested to you are aspects of this third question, vital aspects of the big problem of our time.

Thank you.

COLONEL REID: Colonel Smyser is ready for your questions, gentlemen.

QUESTION: Sir, we find in the newspapers today considerable and various criticism concerning the effectiveness of our American system of government. I believe you mentioned that during the year we may also in our study here take up some of these various criticisms. Would you comment on the nature of this criticism and the possible way to correct the alleged difficulties?

COLONEL SMYSER: Well, there has been a tremendous amount of criticism of the American system of government. A large part of it you can just discount. However, there has been some very responsible constructive criticism since the beginning of our Government to the present time. I am thinking of criticism like that of Alexis de Tocqueville in his

"Democracy of America," which was published in about 1840; James Bryce, in the "American Commonwealth;" Harold Laski, in "The American Presidency." Coming down to modern times we have Edward S. Forman's "Total War and the Constitution," and William Rice Elliott, who talks over here at the National War College, has written "A Need for Constitutional Reform." Also, a former Secretary here, Thomas Finletter wrote, "Can Representative Government Do the Job?"

This is instructive criticism, coupled with admiration for the system. Usually, you can divide it into two types--changes in the Constitution or a new Constitution, or changes in procedure. Some of this criticism is usual, like the problem of the diffusion of powers in the American Government. This makes for weakness, and the separation of powers makes for paralysis, at certain times, they say.

Another minor criticism is on the provision which permits Senate filibusters, the Senate Congressional seniority powers, and the ability to ball up legislation. And one that I know you all appreciate is the criticism of the budget system, the budget cycle, and the need for administrative reform.

Some of these people say we should have a new Constitution. This is one of the solutions. They say we should have a cabinet form of government in which the Chief Executive would be responsible to the party

in power. Others say that we should have provision for dissolving the parties. Henry Hazen says we need a new Constitution now. Thomas Finletter says we should change the time of elections and the periods of office of the President, the Senate, and the Congress all to either 6 or 8 years--I have forgotten which. This would eliminate the problem of having a Chief Executive of one party and a Congress of another party. This has happened about 29 times in our history. This makes for paralysis some times.

These are just some of the major criticisms and the major suggestions for changes.

QUESTION: Would you tell us briefly the basic difference between communism as Marx expressed it and the other totalitarian forms of government?

COLONEL SMYSER: Communism as Marx conceived it many people say is completely dead, that we don't have it any more, although just recently we saw some possibility of revival in the clash between China and Soviet culture, because China is adhering to the orthodox Communist line while Russia today is under a revisionist type of communism.

There are elements of similarity between the two--there is no doubt about it. We have the concept of the inevitability of the thing and the disregard for human rights. Theoretical communism is in a way more idealistic, in that we are supposed to have a classless society with everything belonging to the people, which today means it belongs to the

government. It has ultimately involved some evidence of the welfare of the individual, whereas totalitarianism, as developed by Fiche, Schopenhauer, and Mussolini glorifies the state. Although Mussoline didn't write very much himself, he had this theory and developed it. This is the theory of the supremacy of the small elite. Going back to Plato, it consisted of the idea that this small group knew best and would give the people what was good for them.

QUESTION: At the present time there is a feeling that the role of the military in the Government is pretty restricted. Do you anticipate a trend toward the expansion of the role of the military in government?

COLONEL SMYSER: Really, I don't consider myself enough of an authority to predict on something like that. I think that in the general nature of things it is inevitable. As the threat increases, more and more the military must be called into consultation. Witness the development of the National Security Council in 1947 and the expansion of its activities. Some of these people that I quoted in the answer to the first question suggested even closer cooperation between the military and the political in the formation of cabinets and councils, including Congress, the military, State, and various branches of the Government.

COLONEL REID: Colonel Smyser, speaking on behalf of the Commandant, the faculty, and the students, you certainly have set the stage for the opening of the Government Section in our Foundations Unit. We are very happy to add you to that long list of distinguished people for our visiting lecturers. Thank you very much.

COLONEL SMYSER: Thank you.