

OFF-THE-RECORD REMARKS

✓ Distinguished Career as such

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

✓ at-large

American FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.

✓ See Ruck
✓ See Johnson
✓ Capt. Harriman

MAY 26, 1966

Fellow Trustees
Smithsonian Institution

Ladies and gentlemen of the Foreign Service

Association, I am happy to renew my acquaintance with you.

I see many friends here -- some of whom I have had the pleasure of meeting abroad, others with whom I have worked here in Washington, or at the United Nations when I was a member of our delegation there some years ago.

I believe the Foreign Service represents the best in American government.

✓ V.P.
✓ Truly me either
✓ Bob Woodward

Presidential Seal
V.P. Seal

Humphrey
Pres.
at-large

You represent the best in our Federal Service

- 2 -

↳ Its officers combine resourcefulness and energy, insight and intelligence, integrity and patriotism to a degree that is remarkable in any group of men or women.

↳ Every year those from outside the Service who participate in Foreign Service Review Panels express their amazement at the caliber of officers which they are reviewing. To those who know the Foreign Service, this should not be a surprise.

↳ Unfortunately this is not appreciated by all. I remember well that in the Senate the Foreign Service usually came under attack once a year -- at the time the foreign aid bill was considered.

↳ One of my colleagues -- because he was frustrated or angered by the actions of a foreign government, by the burning of a library or attacks on an embassy -- usually vented his frustrations on the Foreign Service. This I always considered unjust and did not hesitate to say so.

Laurels

But I did not come here to heap fresh laurels on you. I thought rather that I would take this opportunity to discuss briefly a subject that has concerned me, and I am sure you as well -- the image of the United States in the world.

In real life, unlike in Shakespeare, the sweetness of the rose depends upon the name it bears. Things are not only what they are. They are, in very important respects -- what they seem to be.

We must begin by facing a painful fact, In much of the world, the image of the United States is that of the guardian of the status quo. It is that of the harried mother who tells her maid: "Go find out what the children are doing, and tell them to stop it."

This might be a cause for real regret even if the status quo were reliably durable or widely popular. But it is neither.

Change is the law of life. A philosopher of ancient Greece once said that: "You cannot step twice into the same river, for fresh waters are ever flowing upon you."

I understand that some members of the Foreign Service complain that things aren't what they used to be. But, they never were.

The status quo is not widely esteemed.

In most of the world and during most of recorded history, it has favored a privileged minority. The majority have not been happy about it.

Until recently, most people have regarded poverty, hunger, disease and ignorance as written in the stars. But today throughout the world, vast majorities of people in many lands regard the status quo not as an inheritance to be enjoyed -- but a burden to be cast off. And they are conscious of their ability to do this.

Trouble - seen by US Community
→ Aggression

There ~~may be~~ ^{are} people who ~~regret~~ ^{look back to} the good old days,

But there are a ~~lot~~ more people who are much more interested in good new days.

A great power is exposed to a temptation from which the legendary King Canute was immune. He knew perfectly well that, whatever he said or did, the tide would keep steadily rolling in.

↳ In contrast, a great power can, if it chooses to do so, hold back the tides of change, perhaps for many years. It can, in the countries where its strength can be exerted, seek to uphold those people and those institutions which maintain the status quo.

↳ In the short run, this may seem the easy and comfortable thing to do. It spells stability, it spells continuity.

It is certainly not without its compensations for the diplomat stationed in such a country. His cable traffic can be light. His reports can sound the theme: "Everything is serene." He can hope to complete a tour of duty unblemished by controversy.

At home, the Foreign Office or State Department can feel that here, at least, is a capital that keeps no one awake nights. And they may even give their mission a share of the credit.

Behind this facade, however, the forces for change may be building up. If change cannot take place gradually and peacefully, it is all too likely to erupt suddenly and violently.

If we were to always support the status quo -- that is a dying past and the privileged few who benefit from it -- we would likely end up losers, perhaps heavy losers. It is much safer to bet upon the future and the majority who will shape it.

It is not easy. It requires extraordinary effort, and the courage to take risks -- not only in the Foreign Service, but in all of us.

↳ In many ways, we Americans are today a conservative people -- for the very good reason that we have so much that is worthwhile to conserve. ↳ It is not easy for us to realize that most other peoples have not been similarly blessed by history.

↳ Also, it is often much easier for us to communicate with the minority than with the majority. The privileged abroad are more likely to speak English, to dress like us, and to hold ideas which do not shock or even disturb us.

The majority do not speak English or any language but their own. ↳ Their clothes, manners and ideas may be different than ours. ↳ Their poverty and misery may indeed be almost too much to bear.

It is for this reason that many Europeans who lived in Asia or Africa developed the so-called "tropic stare" -- the ability to look without really seeing.

Even contacts with people in the same walk of life can be seriously misleading.

A businessman may look like any American businessman. Yet he may be working in a way outdated in America by Henry Ford.

The same can be true of military men. A friend of mine told me that many conversations with army officers in the country where he was stationed went like this:

"A wonderful country, the United States. The months I spent there in training were the best in my life. I'd like my son to go to West Point."

A pause usually followed, and then an observation something like this:

"You have a wonderful democracy in America. Of course, it wouldn't work here!"

Sometimes, I fear, Americans who keep hearing this wind up half-believing it. After all, the people who say it live in the country and must know something about it. Moreover, they are on top, and therefore they must be doing something right.

Too often, however, they are like the man who fell from a forty-story building. Passing a friend at a window on the 20th story, he shouted:

"Don't worry! I'm all right so far!"

Our America today is a troubled, self-critical, self-questioning America. But it is an America not afraid of change, not clinging to the status quo.

In this fortunate America, the under-privileged are a relatively small minority.

But, nonetheless, great efforts of will, imagination, and human empathy are being required to meet the challenge of poverty, injustice and discrimination here at home.

↳ Should we have any reason to believe that lesser effort will suffice in nations where the under-privileged are a vast majority?

↳ Our affluence divides us from much of the world. *-But*
In our struggle against racial discrimination, poverty, ignorance, and disease we are joining hands with the whole human race.

↳ It is this America which we need to reflect and express in all of our contacts abroad.

While you here are on home duty, I know you will give a high priority to getting reacquainted with today's America -- to finding out what is being done, and talking to the people who are doing it.

I believe it will help you understand better the interests and desires of those vast multitudes around the world who are now in the process of transforming their own society. For if our representatives abroad are to be effective they must be sensitive to the aspirations of the less favored majorities, not just the privileged minorities.

This means that our representatives must be capable of dealing with new groups that are emerging as powerful forces in the reshaping of societies. In many of these, political parties, labor unions, peasant federations, university student federations, and the new communications media elite play an important role.

If the Foreign Service were to leave these groups to others and concentrate only on the chanceries and foreign offices, there is little chance that the State Department could play the architectonic role in American foreign policy that it should play.

This means that in many cases -- without displacing
others -- the Foreign Service officer must assume a more
activist role in representing this country abroad ~~than has~~
~~been the case up until now~~

In conclusion: Actions speak louder than words.

What is going on here in America speaks well for America.

It is an appealing message, a compassionate message, a
noble message -- and we must see that it gets through.

By virtue of the responsibilities you presently bear and
the greater responsibilities you will hold in the future,
this is your privilege and your opportunity.

#

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION LUNCHEON

Thursday, May 26, 1966

I came here for one purpose. I want to talk to you as a friend and as an associate in this great government of ours. I want you to know that so far as I am concerned, the people in our Foreign Service and the people who represent our country in other services of our government overseas -- and that includes the military services -- are the finest that this nation has to offer.

It's a great Service, the Foreign Service. You sometimes suffer the darts and arrows of criticism and even abuse. Remember that much of this comes because, in the kind of world in which we live, there is a great deal of frustration. Problems are not easily solved. Even the nature of the problem may not be easily understood, much less the cure. Therefore, people do strike out, almost in anger and many times even in an emotional frenzy. And, if you are going to strike out at somebody, why not strike out at somebody a long way from home, like the Foreign Service? That is an easy group to pick on.

Now this doesn't mean that we are without blame, nor does it mean that everyone in the Foreign Service, USIS, AID is working at the peak of his performance. But it does mean that, in the main, we have developed

in our country a remarkable degree of dedication to public service on the part of those who represent this government abroad. If it makes you feel any better, I assure you that I say this in many other parts of America and not just here before you.

I commend you and thank you for your work which you perform. I trust that you feel that your work is a dedication and not just a job. If there ever was a time that our nation needed people who are dedicated and committed to the duties that they are called upon to perform, it is now. I believe that, in view of our responsibilities, we have to do better than other people, that we cannot judge ourselves by anybody else's standards. We have to set our own standards and try to fulfil them.

I think that we must encourage one another to achieve excellence in our work. I have said to many audiences that anybody nowadays can do what is possible. When I hear people say that something is possible, that means you can go out and get anybody to do it, because we have perfected machines, management techniques and skills that make it possible for the average well-trained person to do what is possible. The true glory of America is to do what is impossible. It was once considered impossible to have a government of the people, by the people and for the people. We have it. It was once thought impossible to make a so-called capitalistic system responsive to human needs and human welfare. But we did it. Doing the impossible is what makes us stand out as a great nation and a great people.

Now we must show that we can achieve a society that can live in peace and in a spirit of social justice. We are still working on that, and it will be the ultimate test of our society -- whether a society that is multi-racial, multi-religious, multi-ethnic, whether a society that is diverse rather than monolithic, whether that kind of a society can live in peace and tranquility and accomplish the goals that we have set for ourselves.

Now I wish to discuss briefly a subject that has concerned me, and I am sure you as well -- the image of our United States in the world.

In real life, unlike in Shakespeare, the sweetness of the rose depends upon the name it bears. Things are not only what they are. They are, in very important respects -- what they seem to be.

We must begin by facing a painful fact. In much of the world, the image of the United States is that of the guardian of the status quo. It is that of the harried mother who tells her maid: "Go find out what the children are doing, and tell them to stop it."

I don't say that is what we are. But, regrettably, many people have this impression. Indeed, a goodly number of our fellow-citizens help to spread it. That is their right, but it is also my right to dispute them.

Democracy as we know it respects discussion and dissent -- but also from those of us who have been entrusted with responsibility, it requires decision. For those on the outside who do not have to be held responsible for policies and programs, discussion and dissent are adequate, and we

guard this right of theirs with our lives. Those of us who bear the responsibilities may indulge in discussion and dissent within the councils of our government, but ultimately a decision has to be made. That is the difference between the outsider and the insider.

Those on the outside frequently seek to make it appear that we are old, fat, stuffy guardians of yesterday, and we have to face up to the fact that this has an impact upon our foreign relations.

Change is the law of life and this world is changing. A philosopher of ancient Greece once said that: "You cannot step twice into the same river, for fresh waters are ever flowing upon you."

There isn't anything that doesn't change. And it is our task as officers of this government to be sensitive to these forces of change, to listen to the restive movement of peoples and societies and try to adjust our policies accordingly, so that we can help give direction to change.

A great power is exposed to a temptation from which the legendary King Canute was immune. He knew perfectly well that, whatever he said or did, the tide would keep steadily rolling in.

A sufficiently powerful nation can for a while hold things as they are and a Foreign Service officer can report to the head office: "All is quiet in my capital." And it may momentarily please your Secretary of State or your Minister of Foreign Affairs. But ultimately the dam will break and the flood

will come. What appeared at the time to be a very comforting statement to a superior becomes a deluge -- a deluge of violent change which inundates both the person who gave the original false report and those who attempted to base policy upon it.

I for one don't believe that all the troubles in the world are due to communism. Even if there were no Communists, we would still face a troubled world. We would face troubles from population pressure, troubles from the restiveness of new peoples seeking their own identity, troubles because of technological advances, troubles because of better and more rapid communications.

Modern communications have made it possible for people to know that they do not have to live as they have always lived in the past. While some people may long for the good old days, there are a whole lot more people who are much more interested in seeing some good new days. They are looking for a change for the better. And I am sure I don't need to remind you that two-thirds of this world is not like our part of the world. It is sick, it is poor, it is backward, industrially. Much of it is burdened by the problems and the poverty of centuries. It is diseased, poorly housed. It is the world of the poor.

President Johnson spoke at Howard University last year of the other America -- the America of the poor. He said that there were two Americas -- The America of the four-fifths, a very good America and the other America.

The only graphic demonstration you need of that is to visit any city. If you go from the beautiful areas of a city to the others, it's like another world. Indeed, it is for all practical purposes another world . . . dirty, dilapidated, broken down.

Slumism is more than the deterioration of buildings -- it is the degradation of the people, their frustration, hopelessness, despair, bitterness, hatred, and anger.

It is here, right in our own country, and make no mistake about it. Your government is fully aware of it and is urgently trying to find ways and means to remedy this danger within our midst.

I think the greatest single danger that faces this country at home today is the division of our people -- not on the basis of race, not on the basis of region but on the basis of social culture, on the basis of opportunity. There are a vast number of our people who are the victims of deprivation. They are broken in body, broken in spirit, broken in mind -- and they live in broken-down buildings in the deteriorating sections of our great cities. It threatens the very peace and tranquility of this country. It is Watts. It is Harlem. It is the slums of Philadelphia. It is the back streets of Birmingham and other cities.

The same conditions exist in many parts of the world. And, while the Communist movement is a constant threat, and while we all ought to study

its strategy, its tactics, its many diverse forms, we ought not in any way to delude ourselves. Even if there never had been a Karl Marx, a Joseph Stalin or an Engels or a Lenin, there would be serious difficulties in this world and we'd be involved in them and have to face up to them.

So I want my America and your America to identify itself with change. Not with change just for the sake of change, but with the fact of change. I want the people of the world to know through you about our country. It is very difficult for the rich man who lives on the top of the hill to be respected, much less loved, by the poor man who lives in the bottom of the valley. The gulf between them is not merely one of geo-graphical distance, it is a gulf between different worlds.

This is why we need to know more about Asia. We need to know more about Africa. We are a European-oriented people and most of you in this room, with few exceptions, are basically European-oriented. It is understandable. This is our background. This is our culture. This is what our children have been taught. This is what you were taught.

I graduated from a great university and I studied in the field of foreign relations. I can honestly say that in the 1930's there were only two courses in the whole university on any area of Asia and none on Latin America. Even today, many of our young people are unacquainted with these areas except for what they read in some weekly or daily publication.

I am a politician. That means that I must know a great deal about many people. When I go abroad I like to be able to talk to people in some depth about my own country. I don't want them to get all of their information out of a ten-page pamphlet.

We have the task of leading, but we also must have understanding and support at the local level. This is why I have said we must know more about Asia -- every part of it. And the same with Africa. It is an urgent message that we need to get to the American people, because time is running out.

I think this is the reason we are having trouble in Congress. Many of our problems relating to foreign policy arise because, once we moved away from the European sector, we started to lose our followers, because they didn't have any idea what line to follow. What they heard was not relevant to their experience. We can get along fairly well with Latin America. People have been told that these are our neighbors, even though they're further away than some other nations, so there is something of a sentimental attachment. But you and I know that we have other neighbors in this world and we are going to have to know more about them. Now in many ways our nation is viewed by others as a conservative nation -- and not surprisingly, perhaps, since we have much that is worthwhile to conserve.

Also, it is often much easier for us to communicate with the privileged minority than with the majority in many parts of the world. The privileged abroad are more likely to speak English, to dress like us, and to hold ideas which do not shock or even disturb us.

The majority do not speak English or any language but their own. Their clothes, manners and ideas may be different than ours. Their poverty and misery may indeed be almost too much to bear looking at.

It is for this reason that many Europeans who lived in Asia or Africa developed the so-called "tropic stare" -- the ability to look without really seeing what they didn't want to see.

We can't afford that luxury, nor should we indulge in it -- because we have become a world power without succumbing to the arrogance of power.

If there is any complaint to be made about America, it is not that it abuses its power but that, on occasion, it has hesitated when the duties and burdens of responsibility called for it to exercise power.

When I speak of power, I don't speak just of atomic power or military power. When I speak of national security, I don't talk just of our military hardware. National security is a Foreign Service Officer, a consular officer, a man that runs a USIA library, an AID official, a Peace Corps person. It is Food for Peace. It is our representation in the United Nations. National security is this economy too.

That is why I believe that much of the organizational structure of our legislative body today is out of date. When we go to speak about our foreign policy we are supposed to go to the Foreign Relations Committee. But our foreign policy also includes our trade policy, and you have to go to the Finance Committee for that. It also includes the use of our military or even the positioning of it. You go to the Armed Services for that one. It also may include our budgetary policy. We have compartmentalized the legislative responsibilities in the areas of national security in an old-fashioned way as if national security today could be neatly divided into separate chapters in a large book.

What the Secretary of the Treasury does may more vitally affect the security of this country than what the Secretary of Defense does. What he is able to do with respect to world monetary policy, what effect it has on our balance of payments and our foreign trade -- may very well have a greater impact upon our national security policy than anything that Dean Rusk or Bob McNamara can say or do for the next two or three years.

Somehow or other we have to get this message across to the American people -- that, when we speak of national security we are speaking also of what contract a trade union may negotiate, and its possible inflationary effect, or what a big corporation may do in terms of its price structure or restrictive trading policies. I don't know how we are going to bring this message home

clearly to the people, but it needs to be done because they need to understand it.

Now, let us talk finally about America today as you ought to see it and as you ought to portray it. Our America is a troubled, self-critical, self-questioning America, but it is an America not afraid of change, not clinging to the status quo. I don't ask you^{to} go abroad and say, "Look, I am the leader of the revolution." I do ask you to remember in your own heart and mind that you are a product of a revolution.-- and the only genuinely progressive revolution that has taken place for many, many years. I ask you to remember that this nation is essentially a very compassionate, humanitarian, progressive, forward-looking nation. I ask you to get it out of your mind that you are a representative of a conservative country, unless you mean by conservative, conserving that which works, improving that which we have and adapting it to new needs and new problems.

I think we simply have to carry the banner of legitimate change -- and not only orderly change, because all of our own change is not so orderly either. We didn't get the Voting Rights bill because everything was orderly, and we didn't get the Civil Rights Act in 1964 because somebody reasoned it out. It was reason plus a degree of directed disorder. It was the capacity of those in positions of leadership to adjust themselves to the forces that were relevant and evident.

This is an economically progressive nation -- the largest economy in the world, the most effective and the most productive. Our economy has given more benefits to more people than any other. It is the most humanitarian economy in the world. I remind you that many of our private corporations give better fringe benefits than all of the federal, local and state programs for social welfare put together. The combination of the two makes America a very socially progressive country.

We need to get that message across to the people of the world. We need to let the two-thirds who are illiterate, hungry, diseased, impoverished, frustrated, and bitter understand that we have perfected a system that answered the needs of the two-thirds of our own people who in the past were illiterate, hungry, and impoverished. And surely one of the ways that we can tell this message is by citing the fact that we are working for further progress here at home now. This is why I have believed for a long time that domestic policy and foreign policy are inseparable.

The manner in which we conduct ourselves at home has a great impact on the manner in which we will be received abroad. To my way of thinking, one of the most significant foreign policy acts ever passed by Congress was the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It could have even more impact abroad than at home. And we ought to embrace it. We ought to be the tribunes of progressive thought, not radical thought that destroys what is good, but progressive thought that releases men's hopes and ambitions. This is my expression of personal

philosophy to you. I believe that our security is to be found primarily in our spirit, in our identity with people. This is a pro-people country, not a pro-dollar country.

The Communists have made a mockery out of the precious word "democracy." They have taken the lexicon of democracy and adulterated it and corrupted it. Let us not permit them to do it. Let us make our identity with democracy unmistakably clear.

Let every officer of this government be a living symbol of the spirit and the progress of this nation. Be proud of your enterprise system. We don't have to apologize for it. The best way to explain economy is to ask somebody to come and see how it works -- partnerships, cooperatives, corporations, public ownerships, the greatest admixture of pragmatism that the world has ever known. The best thing about this economy is what it does for people. Let somebody else write about it. Just point out what it does for people, for you. Most of us are living examples of the vigor of our economy, and we have a message to tell.

Let us talk about representative government, recognizing that it is not always without its difficulties. Let us make it clear that we, too, have had some demonstrations and some violence, and we are not afraid when we witness this. You don't build nations just by charting them out on a blueprint.

We were sitting here talking about the difficulties in Vietnam. I'd like to have the men and women of this audience go to the Library of Congress and get the record of the violence that has taken place in this country since 1957 in the field of civil rights -- the murders, the destruction of property, the burning of churches. You talk about pagodas. We have had plenty of churches bombed and little children killed in their Sunday-school classes. We've had a man in the uniform of the armed services of the United States shot on a highway and we have had a jury system that did not even bring those guilty to punishment.

This doesn't mean our system is bad. It means it has some weaknesses. It means that we ought to have a little understanding and tolerance for what goes on in other parts of the world. We had our Shay's rebellion; we had our secessionists; we had our Civil War. We have our John Birch societies and a few other things. And we have lived through them.

We ought not to panic when we see other people going through difficulties. We ought to remember that this too shall pass, providing that we are willing to apply ourselves without fear to the task. It is when the going gets tough that you separate the men from the boys. It is when the going gets tough that you separate a government that wants to help people from one that merely want to dominate them.

In military terms, I have no doubt as to what our capacity is. No power or combination of powers on the face of this earth can overwhelm us.

Our test, however, should not be a military one. We are not the Prussians of the second half of the 20th Century. We don't need to be known as the militarists. We are the humanitarians of the 20th Century. We can help build nations and reconstruct societies and we can train people to help themselves if we have the will to do it. If we are willing to put the same determination into helping to build nations that we are showing in putting a man on the moon -- the same perseverance, the same dedication of resources and will -- there isn't any doubt in my mind that many areas of this world will benefit greatly, not from our domination but from our assistance, not from our desire to rule but from our desire to help.

If you feel as I do, I hope that you will go away from this meeting remembering that you are put on this earth for one great purpose -- not to rule or to take, but to serve the people. Remember at all times that we have a message of liberation and emancipation to give to this world such as no other nation on the face of this earth can give.

I for one am proud to be one of its advocates. I would like to be an apostle of a ~~w~~orking, effective, progressive democracy. I think we have an ideology. I think we have a faith. And I don't intend to leave the field of ideology and faith and dedication to the enemy. I intend to pre-empt it for those of us who believe in human history.

#####

[Transcript]



DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON

June 3, 1966

Dear Ted:

Enclosed is a typed transcript of the Vice-President's speech last Thursday to the American Foreign Service Association. We have gone over the tape a number of times and this is a second draft. In spite of that, I have no doubt you will find some errors in the transcription.

We would appreciate your returning an approved copy to us at your earliest convenience. If we can receive it by the end of this week or the beginning of next week, we can reprint the speech in its entirety in the July issue of the Foreign Service Journal.

Many thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Steve".

Stephen Low
Special Assistant to the
Deputy Undersecretary

Enclosure

Vice-President's speech

Mr. Frederick Van Dyk
Assistant to the Vice-President,
Executive Office Building.

REMARKS

by

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

American Foreign Service Association Luncheon

Thursday, May 26, 1966

* * * * *

Thank you very much. Thank you, President Johnson. It's always the same wherever I go. But I want to say that this President Johnson is kind to me also and has given me a good deal of working room today. Mr. Secretary, my good friend, Secretary Rusk, my dear and good friend Ambassador Harriman, and all of the distinguished officers of this Department of State, members of the Foreign Service and others who serve our nation in varied posts around the world and our guests and friends. I am delighted that Secretary Johnson has seen fit to give me, as I say, some walking and working room here today, by saying that I can talk to you informally, that you of course are not to repeat anything that I say to the press or to the media unless it is something really good. If you don't mind I'd like to have you check that out with me just before you mention it. And if you don't have time to check it out with me, I've got another suggestion as to whom you might check it out with.

You may have noted that your President and our good friend, Alexis Johnson, said that I was a sort of Ambassador-at-Large and then he made some comment as to what that phrase "at large" might connote or what it might mean. Well, it is a rather dangerous description because it does really permit one to really roam at large and today I am apt

to do that. And then he spoke of my distinguished career as such. I wasn't sure just what he meant by that. I do want to say that in this age of specialization that I am one of the few general practitioners about and they haven't trained many general practitioners of late in the healing arts or in any other of the skills and arts so I come to you as a sort of the self-trained general practitioner. It's a bit dangerous, slightly unpredictable and any of the treatment that may be forthcoming is uncertain as to its curative effect.

But I am here to talk to you about our foreign policy. I thought Dean Rusk would like to know what I thought our foreign policy ought to be. I haven't been away from the United States Senate very long and I still have some ideas about our foreign policy. I don't think it is fair that he put all of these distinguished Foreign Service Officers, some of whom are retired only in terms of their prepaid professions, right in front of me to intimidate me. I have seen you fellows before, I want you to know...when I served on that illustrious, famous, the most powerful committee in the United States Senate, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee...it got powerful after I left for some reason.

Which reminds me, I could, no, I think I should give you a little conditioning as to what is about to come and how much attention you should give to it. One always ought to consider a person's remarks within a frame of reference as we say in the academic community. Or, as they put it, in an environment. Now when you look up here on the wall to your right and to my left, you see the Presidential Seal. And that Presidential Seal is a very imposing work of art and it is a

symbol of the power and strength and compassion and meaning of our country. You will note that the eagle has in its claws the arrows and that of course is the symbol of the strength of this nation, its security. And then in the other, the olive branch. Now also you will note that the eagle's wings are upswept, it is taking off and it is moving. Now I don't know whether the Secret Service, yes, they've got the Vice Presidential Seal down here and I'd like to have you take a look at that for a while. This is just a way that Congress and the President and the Government have of reminding one of his position. The Vice Presidential eagle -- his wings are down, subdued, only one arrow -- and I want you to know I am saving that. And even the olive branch looks a little bit picked on you know. It's like some sort of a plant disease had hit it. But such is the Office of the Vice Presidency. But I want to tell you at least I have a seal and for this I am grateful.

And, I think you were also reminded that I do have some form of security. I am the President of the Humphrey Drug Co., Inc. It is losing money but I am the President of it anyway.

Well, I didn't come here just to have a moment of levity with you. Even though I must say that that is a worthy exercise in this city. Of course, if we have too much of it, people will say that we are not serious enough. I remember when I was campaigning for the Senate in 1948 I had the reporters write that I just didn't have the Senatorial image but I got the votes, but I didn't have the image. They said that I was taking things too lightly. That I ought to be more like Lincoln. And I had to dig into Carl Sandburg to let them know that Lincoln also told some stories and occasionally had a happy moment. So, Mr. Secretary, if you smile today we will be able to justify it and I will speak to all the

columnists, friend and foe alike. It is nice to find a fellow trustee of the Smithsonian Institute. It is good to find out that this Association needs two Vice Presidents. How would you like to be one Vice President with a boss who works 80 hours a week? This is what you get for asking me to be informal. I wanted to come here primarily for one purpose. I want to talk to you as a friend and as an associate in this great Government of ours. I can heap laurels of praise upon you and I surely want you to know that as far as I am concerned that people in our Foreign Service, people who represent our country in other services of our Government overseas and that includes, may I say, the military services, are the finest that this nation has to offer.

It's a great Service, the Foreign Service. And while you suffer the darts and arrows of criticism and sometimes abuse, remember that much of this comes because ⁱⁿ the kind of world in which we live there is a great deal of frustration. Problems are not easily solved. Even the nature of the problem is not easily understood, much less the cure. Therefore, people do strike out, almost in anger and many times just in emotional frenzy. And if you are going to strike out at somebody, why not strike out at somebody that seems quite a ways from home, like the Foreign Service. That is an easy group to pick on. Or the Civil Service. When I used to campaign for Senator back in my State and my opposition would always berate and downgrade our civil servants, I got a list of the civil servants from the State of Minnesota and I would go from community to community and say that I want you to know that this scallywag that is running against me is opposed to so-and-so, and thinks that this person

is nothing but a bureaucrat and a ne'er-do-well, and I was able to feed the fires, may I say, of political hostility, in many areas in my State. As long as you can identify these great governmental institutions on an impersonal basis you can get by with this criticism for a while. Now this doesn't mean that we are without blame nor does it mean that everyone in the Civil Service, the Foreign Service, USIS, AID, whatever it may be, it doesn't mean that everyone is working at top notch performance or is a gifted and talented individual. But it does mean that in the main we have developed in our country a remarkable degree of dedication to public duty and to public service on the part of those who represent this Government at home and abroad. And if it makes you feel any better, let me say that I say this in many other parts of America and not just here before you. So I commend you for your work and thank you for the work which you perform. I might add that I hope that you will feel and I trust that you do that your work is a dedication, it is a commitment, it is not just a job. Because if there ever was a time that our nation needed people that are dedicated and committed to the duties that they are called upon to perform it is now. I am one of those Americans that believes that we just have to be better than other people...that we cannot judge ourselves by anybody else's standards...we have to have our own measurements, our own standards and try to fulfill them.

I note that you are going to hear from Dr. John Gardner but he has an advantage over me; he is a specialist and he will be able to talk to you in considerable detail and with great relevance to his subject matter. But he is also a man that believes in excellence and that is his credo. I believe in it too. I can't always fulfill it but I believe in it. I can't always fulfill it but I believe in it. I think that we must

encourage one another to do our work in a spirit of excellence. I have said to many audiences that anybody these days can do what is possible. And when I hear people say, well that seems possible, that means you can just go out and get anybody to do it because we have perfected machines, techniques, management techniques and skills that make it possible for just ordinarily well trained people to do what is possible. The story of America is to do what is impossible. It was once decreed impossible to have a government of the people, by the people and for the people. We have done it. It was impossible to make a so-called capitalistic system responsive to human needs and human welfare. But we have accomplished it, we did it. It was impossible to split the atom but our scientists performed it, accomplished it. It was once decreed impossible to have a transplant of human organs from one body to another but it has been done. It was impossible to penetrate outer space but that has been accomplished. The impossibilities are what makes us stand out as a great power and a great nation and a great people. It has been impossible to some people at least to be able to have a society that can live in peace and in a spirit of social justice. We are still working on that and this will be the final test of our own society...whether or not a society that is multi-racial, multi-religious, multi-ethnic, whether a society that is diverse, filled with diversity, one that is not a monolith, whether that kind of a society can live in peace and tranquility and accomplish the goals that we have set up for ourselves. We are being tested today on that -- racial tension, economic difficulties, regional problems.

By and large, I think we have made real progress, at least we have made great progress in the last century from the days of a war that divided our nation, a terrible war, the Civil War, to this day when most of our problems at least are limited to demonstrations, some violent and some non-violent; but at least not war here amongst ourselves. So we ought to know about our country and know its history and know its standards... and the standards that we hold for ourselves ultimately will be the standards that we hold for our country.

Now I have looked over at times the reports that have been made by people who have been recruited to examine into our Foreign Service. And these Foreign Service Review Panels express their amazement at the caliber of the officers that represent this government in our embassies and our consular services overseas. And as I have said, some of this isn't appreciated by all. And the only way that I know that we can make this message become fully appreciated is to continue to press forward in the improvement of the standards of our service and indeed in the improvement of the standard of our performance. But you know/^{what}I have said about politics that what's true, while ultimately the most important, in public life what seems to be true is also very important. In real life, unlike in Shakespeare, the sweetness of the rose depends in a very substantial way upon the name that it bears. Things are not only what they are, they are in very important respects what they seem to be. Now we just have to begin to face this painful fact that in much of the world the image of the United States, and that word image really gets me, I must tell you, because there is a certain amount of fakery to it you know.

What is more important is what you are, not what you seem to be. That is most important in terms of integrity. But regrettably, I repeat with sadness, regrettably what we seem to be has a tremendous impact. I guess this is what they call public relations. Well the public relations or what seems to be of the United States, the image, at least as it is conveyed by those who do not care for us and who compete with us or oppose us, is that the United States is the guardian of the status quo. It is that of the harried mother who tells her maid go find out what the children are doing and tell them to stop it. I don't say that is what we are be-
^{it}cause I intend to show you that/is not. But regrettably this has been spread around. And a goodly number of our own fellow citizens help spread this image which is their right and my right to dispute them.

You see I am one who believes in the right of dissent. I could quote John Stuart Mill on it but that wouldn't help particularly. I am one that believes that one is never quite sure that what he is doing is right. And as I said to a group yesterday, democracy as we know it respects dissent,-- discussion and dissent...but also for those of us that have been entrusted with responsibility it requires decision. For those on the outside that do not have to be held responsible for policies and programs but are merely involved in the refiner's fire of cross examination, discussion and dissent is adequate, and we guard it preciously with our lives. But for those of us like the Secretary of State or the President of the United States who may indulge in discussion and dissent within the councils of our government, ultimately a decision has to be made. That is the difference

between the outsider and the insider. Now those on the outside frequently will make it appear as if we are old, fat, stuffy guardians of the yesterdays, and we have to face up to the fact that that has an impact upon our relationship. Because change is the law of life and this world is changing. I noticed that a new nation came into its own today. What is it? The 129th? That surely is change. When we stop and think of the membership of the United Nations now as compared to 20 years ago -- 15 years ago -- vast change. A philosopher of Ancient Greece once said you cannot step twice into the same river. Fresh waters are ever flowing upon you. There isn't anything that doesn't change. And it is our task as officers of this government to keep our eyes upon that force of change, to be sensitive to these forces of change, to listen to the restive movement of people and things and societies and try to adjust our policies accordingly, to help give direction to change. And not to stand like old King Canute and try to hold back the tides because as you know he found out that he couldn't. And we have to understand that we can't. A powerful nation can for a while hold things as they are and a good Foreign Service officer can report to the head office that all is quiet in my capital. And it may momentarily please your Secretary of State or your President or your Minister of Foreign Affairs if you are in another country. But ultimately the dam will break, the flood will come and what appeared temporarily to be a very comforting statement to a superior, becomes a deluge, a deluge of violent change which inundates both the person who gave the original false report and those who attempted to base policy upon it.

I don't happen to be one of the people that believes that all the troubles in the world are due to communism. I remember the message, I

believe it was President Kennedy -- when he said that even if there were no communists we would still face a troubled world. Well that is a fact. Troubles just on the basis of population, troubles on the basis of the restiveness of people who seek their own identity, troubles because of invention and science, troubles because of communication. The communication media itself has made it possible for people to know that they do not have to live as they once lived. What I am attempting to say to you then is that while some people may think there are good old days, there are a whole lot more people who are much more interested in some good new days. They are in the flow of change. And I am sure I don't need to remind you but maybe it's just as well to say it once again that two thirds of this world is not like our part of the world. It is sick, it is poor, it is backward, industrially, much of it torn by ancient centuries of old problems and prejudices. It is diseased, poorly housed... it is the world of the poor.

President Johnson in speaking at Howard University about a year ago spoke of the other America and that was the America of the poor, and that was the America of the poor negro and the sharecropper, and the poor white world and he said that there were two Americas -- the America of the four-fifths, our America, a very good America and then there was the other America. And all you need to have that graphically demonstrated to you, the only graphic demonstration you need of that is to go to any city as I have been doing lately. And you go into these beautiful areas of the city and you say... what a magnificent, what a magnificent city! Everything the poet described a city to be, the city beautiful, and within five minutes you go into another area, like it's another world. And it is

for all practical purposes, another world... a jungle, dirty, dilapidated, broken down. I call it slumism, not only the deterioration of people but the degradation of people, the degradation, not the deterioration of buildings, but the degradation, frustration, hopelessness, despair, bitterness, hatred, anger. And it is there, right here in our country. And make no mistake about it. But at least we know it. And most of us are trying to do something about it and your government is fully aware of it and is desperately trying to find ways and means to remedy this condition of danger within our own midst. I happen to think the greatest single danger that faces this country today at home is the division of our people - not on the basis of race, not on the basis of region but on the basis of social culture, on the basis of opportunity. There is a vast number of our people who are the victims of deprivation. And they are a broken body, broken spirit, broken mind, and live in broken run-down buildings and deteriorating sections of our great cities. And it threatens the very peace and tranquility of this country. It is Watts. It is Harlem. It is the slums of Philadelphia. It is the back streets of Birmingham and other cities. The same thing is true in the world. And while the communist movement is a constant threat, and while we all ought to be students of it, and we all ought to know its strategy, its tactics, its many diverse forms, we ought not in any way delude ourselves. Even if there never was a Karl Marx, a Joseph Stalin or an Engel or a Lenin, there would be serious difficulties in this world and we'd be involved in them and faced by them and having to face up to them. So I want my America and your America to identify itself with change. Not with change just for the sake of change but with the facts of change. I want

the people of the world to know through you about our country. The most difficult task in the world is for the rich man that lives on the top of the hill to be respected, much less loved, by the poor man that lives in the bottom of the valley. The gulf between them is not merely one of geographical distance, it is the gulf of a different world. And this is why some of us have said we need to know more about Asia. We need to know more about Africa. We are a European-oriented people and most of you in this room with few exceptions are basically European-oriented. It is understandable. This is our background. This is our culture. This is what our children have been taught. This is what you were taught.

Listen, I graduated from a great university and I studied in the field of foreign relations and I can honestly say that in the 1930's there were but two courses in the whole university on any area of Asia and none on Latin America. And many of you know that in the 1930's that was the predicament. And many of our young people even today are unacquainted for all practical purposes except what they read in Time and Newsweek or in Look - (I don't want to leave Bill Attwood out of this) - or in some other weekly or daily publication. We are unacquainted. And when I say unacquainted I don't mean just by the names of the countries even though many of our people can't even get that far.

I am a politician, I hope. And to me that is an honorable phrase. That means that I must know a great deal about many people. And when I go abroad I like to be able to talk to people in some depth about my country. And I don't want them to get all of their information just out of a ten page pamphlet for which they paid ten cents. You cannot know

about a nation as complex as Indonesia by what little I know. And I think I have had some pretty good breaks in life. I have had many years of university education. I consider it, at least they told me at least I was an educated man. I confess my colossal ignorance about these areas of the world except for what I have been able to learn as a member of Congress and in the Executive Branch of this government. And a public policy in this country is based upon public knowledge... not just on yours.

We have the task of leading, of being the teacher but we also must have a body of understanding and support at the local level. This is why we have said we must not only know more about Asia but every part of it, every little part of it, every big part of it. And the same with Africa and it is an urgent message that we need to get to the American people because time is running out. I think this is the reason we are having trouble in Congress.

Many of our programs that relate to foreign policy is because once we moved away from the European sector we started to lose our followers because the followers didn't have any line to follow. It wasn't relevant. What they heard was not relevant to their experience. Oh, we can get along fairly well with Latin America because there is a sentimental attachment. People have been told that these are our neighbors even though they're further away than some other people. So there is a sort of a sentimental attachment. But you and I know that we have other neighbors in this world and we are going to have to know more about them. Now in many ways our nation is, at least as it is viewed by others, a conservative nation -- conservative people...and I suppose ~~that~~ ^{they give} for a very good reason we have much to conserve. And then too, I think we got this image somewhat

somewhat because it is much easier for us to communicate with a minority than with a majority in many of the nations of the world.

The privileged abroad are more likely to speak English, to dress like us and to hold ideas which do not shock us or even disturb us. So, therefore, we spend a good deal of time with them. And it is for this reason that many Europeans who lived in Asia or Africa developed the so-called 'tropic stare'. The ability to look without really seeing anything or only seeing that what you wanted. Now, we can't enjoy that luxury, nor can we afford it because we are today a world power without arrogance of power, and I repeat it, without arrogance of power.

If there is any complaint to be made about America, it is not that it over uses its power but that on occasion it has possibly hesitated when the duties and burdens of responsibility called for it to use power. And I don't mean just military power. I noticed the other day what a tremendous impact the message of the Secretary of Defense made when he indicated that our security was more than military hardware. I am delighted that our friend, Bob McNamara, made that statement but I want to say that I have heard this statement by the Secretary of State, by our President and I hope by myself and others. But possibly because it came from the Secretary of Defense it had a headline quality to it. But this is the position of every responsible leader in this country. When we speak of power we don't speak just of atomic power or military power. When we speak of national security we don't talk just of our military hardware. National security is a Foreign Service Officer, a consular officer, a man that runs a USIA library, an AID official, a Peace Corps person. It is Food-for-Peace. It is our representation in the United

Nations that may be more national security than some other things that we can put together. National security is this economy too. This is why I believe that much of the organizational structure of our legislative body today is out of date. When we go to speak about our foreign policy we are supposed to go to the Foreign Relations Committee. But our foreign policy also includes our trade policy, and you got to go to the Finance Committee for that one. It also includes the use of our military or even the positioning of it. Then you go to the Armed Services for that one. It also may include, very frankly, our budgetary policy. We have compartmentalized on an old fashioned system the legislative responsibilities in the areas of national security as if national security today could be neatly divided into separate chapters in a large book. Talk about integration, national security is totally a fully integrated policy.

What the Secretary of the Treasury may do may more vitally affect the security of this country than what the Secretary of Defense does or does not do. What he is able to do in world monetary policy, the impact of this great nation in terms of new monetary policy ... what happens to our balance of payments, what happens to our foreign trade ... may very well have a greater impact upon foreign national security policy than anything that Dean Rusk or Bob McNamara can say or do for the next two or three years.

Somehow or another we have to get this message to the American people that when we speak of national security we are speaking also of what a trade union may do in its negotiations as to whether or not inflation will take its impact... or what a big corporation may do in terms of its price structure or its restricted trading policies. I don't know

how we are going to bring this message clearly to the people but it needs to come because they need to understand it.

Now, let us talk then finally about our America today as you ought to see it and as you ought to portray it. Our America is a troubled, self-critical, self-questioning America, but it is an America not afraid of change, not clinging to the status quo. I don't ask you to go abroad and say, look ... I am the leader of the revolution, but I do ask you to remember in your own heart and mind that you are a product of a revolution, and the only progressive revolution that has been known for many, many years. I ask you to remember that this nation is essentially a very compassionate, humanitarian, progressive, forward looking nation. I ask you to get out of your mind that you are a representative of a conservative country...unless you mean by conservative, conserving that which works, improving that which we have and adapting that which we apply to new needs and new problems. I think we simply have to carry the banner of legitimate change and not only orderly change because all of our change is not so orderly either.

We didn't get the voting rights bill because everything was orderly, and we didn't get the Civil Rights Act in 1964 because somebody reasoned it out. It was reason plus a degree of directed disorder. It was the capacity of those in positions of leadership to adjust themselves to the forces that were irrelevant and evident. This is an economically radical nation...the largest economy in the world, the most effective economy in the world, the most productive economy in the world, the economy that has given more benefits to more people than any other economy in the world, the most humanistic and humanitarian economy in the world. I remind you that many of our private corporations give better fringe benefits than

all of the federal, local and state programs put together for social welfare. Your pensions from General Motors or the Ford Motor Company or the DuPonts, or from other corporations far exceed what you get out of social security. But the combination of the two makes America a very socially progressive country. We need to get that message to the people of the world. We need to let the two-thirds that are illiterate and hungry and diseased and impoverished and frustrated and bitter understand that we did perfect a system that answered the needs of our two-thirds that were illiterate, hungry, and impoverished because many of our people have been that way. And surely one of the ways that we can bring this message is the fact that we are working on it here at home now. This is why I have believed for a long time that domestic policy and foreign policy were inseparable.

The manner in which we conduct ourselves at home surely has an impact on the manner in which we will be received abroad. To my way of thinking, one of the most significant foreign policy acts ever passed by Congress was the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It can have more impact abroad than it even has at home. And we ought to embrace it. We ought to be the tribunes of progressive thought, not radical thought that destroys that which is good, but progressive thought that which releases man's hopes and his ambitions. This ^{is} more or less a message of my personal philosophy to you. I am one that believes that our security is to be found primarily in our spirit, in our identity with people. This is a pro-people country, not a pro-dollar country. We are a pro-bono publico country. This is a people peoples' country. The communists have made a mockery out of the

precious words of democracy. They have taken the lexicon of democracy and adulterated it and corrupted it but let us not let them do it. Let us have our identity unmistakably clear. Let every officer of this government be a living symbol of the spirit and the progress of this nation. Be proud of your enterprise system. We don't have to apologize for it. And it isn't to be found in Adam Smith's book. Some basic tenets, yes, but I must say that the best way to explain the American economy is to ask somebody to come and see how it works ... partnerships, cooperatives, corporations, public ownerships, the greatest admixture of pragmatism that the world has ever known. And the best thing you can say about this economy is what it does for people. Let somebody else try to write about it. Just point out what it does for people, for you. Most of us are the examples of this economy, and we have a message to tell. Let us talk about representative government and recognize that it is not always without its difficulties. Let us make it clear that we, too, have had some demonstrations and some violence, and we are not afraid when we see this. You don't build nations by just charting them out on a board or on a blueprint.

You were sitting here a moment ago and talking about the difficulties that your and my beloved America has gone through as we think of Vietnam. I'd like to have the men and women of this audience go to the Library of Congress and chart the violence that has taken place in this country since 1957 and in the field of civil rights ... the murders, the destruction of property, the burning of churches. You talk about pagodas. We have had

plenty of churches bombed and little children killed in their Sunday-school classes. We've had men in the uniform of the armed services of the United States shot on a highway and we have had a jury system that did not even bring them to punishment.

This doesn't mean our system is bad. It means it has some weaknesses. And what it really means is you ought to have some basic understanding and toleration and tolerance of what goes on in other parts of the world. We had our Shay's rebellion - we had our secessionists - we had our Civil War, and our John Birch societies and a few other things. And we have lived through it. We have a story to tell and we ought not to panic when we see other people going through difficulty. We ought to remember that this too shall pass, providing that we are willing to apply ourselves without fear to the task. It is when the going gets tough that you separate the men from the boys. It is when the going gets tough that you separate a government that wants to help people from those that merely want to dominate people, and the more difficult the task, I think, the more we need to apply ourselves to it.

I can only say to you that militarily, I have no doubts as to what our capacity is. No power or combination of powers on the face of this earth can overwhelm us. Our test, however, should not be a military one. We are not the Prussians of the 20th Century, the second half of the 20th Century. We don't need to be known as the militarists. We are supposed to be a people of social organization and social structure. We are supposed to be the humanitarians of the 20th Century and we are and we can build nations and we can help reconstruct societies and we can train

people to help themselves if we have the will to do it. If we are willing to put the same determination in helping to build nations that we are to put a man on the moon, with the same dedication, with the same perseverance, with the same dedication of resources and will, there isn't any doubt in my mind at all that many areas of this world will benefit greatly, not from our dominance but from our assistance, not from our desire to rule but of our desire to help.

So, if you feel as I do, I hope that you will go away from this meeting and others remembering that you are put on this earth for one purpose - to serve, to give -- not to rule or to take, but to serve the people and to remember at all times that we have a message of liberation and emancipation to give to this world as no other nation on the face of this earth can give.

And I for one am mighty proud to be one of its tribunes, one of its advocates. I'd like to be an apostle of a working, effective progressive democracy. I think we have an ideology. I think we have a faith. And I don't intend to leave the field of ideology and faith and dedication to the enemy. I intend to be able to pre-empt some of it for those of us that believe in human liberty.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org