

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FOR THE PRESS

NOVEMBER 14, 1966

NO. 273

CAUTION - FUTURE RELEASE

FOR RELEASE AT 12:30 P.M., E.S.T. (10:30 A.M., M.S.T.) MONDAY,  
NOVEMBER 14, 1966. NOT TO BE PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED, QUOTED FROM,  
OR USED IN ANY WAY.

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK  
SECRETARY OF STATE  
AT THE  
UNIVERSITY OF DENVER CONVOCATION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1966 AT 10:30 A.M., M.S.T.

I.

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to pay my respects to this fine university, and especially to its pioneering in the study of international relations, beginning forty years ago. The work of Ben Cherrington, and his colleagues and successors in your Social Science Foundation, has not only benefitted this community and state, and neighboring areas here on the top floor of the continent ..... it has been a national asset. And we in the Department of State feel a special proprietary interest in Dr. Cherrington ..... for he was the first Chief of our Division of Cultural Relations, by appointment of Secretary of State Hull in 1938.

II.

There are many facets to the relations between the university campus and our foreign policy. I use the broader term, university campus, without derogation to the schools and departments specializing in international studies. The functions of the larger unit and the more specialized ones overlap. And it is not only the graduate students in international studies who need to know something about our foreign policy and the world around us.

The ordinary citizen needs awareness and understanding of other cultures, nations, and peoples. He also needs some understanding of the essential relationships between our people and other peoples: that is, some knowledge of the fundamentals of our foreign policy -- its premises,

its

its goals, its principal components, and its intimate connection with the welfare of our citizens.

Foreign relations, world affairs, international relations -- call them what you will, they have ceased to be distant, peripheral, or separate from internal and personal affairs. The first concern of our foreign policy is the preservation of our national life -- in the familiar words of the Preamble of our Constitution, "to secure to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of liberty." This is not just rhetoric. In the atomic age, it is the deepest of realities. We can no longer find security in isolation from other parts of this small planet. A paramount obligation of our diplomacy -- as of the military forces and all the other instruments which support it -- is, and must be, to preserve the safety of our society. Our foreign policy is as close to the citizen as the member of his family, or of his neighbor's family, who is fighting in Viet-Nam or standing guard elsewhere on the ramparts of freedom. It is inseparable from his livelihood, his family, his hopes for his children.

Most citizens cannot be experts on all phases of our international relations. Even those who give full time to them must specialize in some degree, or have the help of specialists. But the citizen needs to know enough to discharge intelligently his duties as a voter. And, above all, he needs the habits of thought that will enable him to make thoughtful judgments. There is no substitute for a basic liberal education.

These broad fundamental contributions of the university are not confined to its campus. There is the unending challenge of adult education -- both for the citizen who has left the college campus and for the citizen who never reached it. We in the State Department have a lively  
interest

interest in this in the field of international affairs, and try to do our share of the job by keeping the news media fully informed, and by providing printed material and speakers for many interested non-governmental groups.

Among the other tasks of the university -- and increasingly of the school of international studies -- is the education of those who intend to make their careers in professions requiring knowledge of various aspects of international affairs. Our career diplomatic service has long ceased to be a preserve for the graduates of a few Ivy League colleges. Every state and territory and nearly 500 universities and colleges are now represented in our Foreign Service. Every year we take 200 or so of the best young men and women produced by colleges and universities throughout our nation. In last year's group of 190 new officers, 137 had attended graduate school and nearly half had graduate degrees.

International institutions need ever-increasing numbers of qualified personnel. And the needs of corporations and banks engaged in international business for suitably educated and trained persons is rising year by year.

The American universities of our time have a special historic role in helping the developing countries to train the administrators, the teachers, and the specialists in many fields whom they must have in order to move ahead into the modern world. We have done, and are doing, this through American colleges and universities overseas, by providing teachers and specialists to the developing countries, and by bringing men and women from those countries here for education and training.

As

As President Johnson said in his message to Congress on the International Education Act in February of this year:

"Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of our international relations."

The President was referring, not only to assistance to the developing countries, but to the broader role of our educational institutions in the great and growing international communities of knowledge. Science is international. Technology is international. And, year by year, the various peoples of the world are learning more about each other's arts and literature.

Your government helps to further these international contacts among scholars in many ways, including educational and cultural exchange programs. It fosters international cooperative programs among scientists and technical experts in many fields, from oceanography to the exploration of space, from the desalting of water to the control of disease.

It is a definite policy of your government to promote such cooperative efforts to deal with natural hazards and other common problems of man as man, not only with friendly nations but with our adversaries. We believe that man's struggle with nature is a common interest that provides a basis for cooperative efforts which will help to wear away barriers that now divide the human race. Contacts and exchanges have expanded between our scholars and those of the Soviet Union, as well as with the smaller Communist nations of Eastern Europe. And we have made it clear that we would be glad to see contacts restored between the scientists and scholars and medical experts of our country and those on the mainland of China.

In short, your government adheres to two truths that President Johnson emphasized in his address at the bicentennial celebration of the birth of James Smithson, founder of the Smithsonian Institution:

"....learning

"...learning respects no geographic boundaries" and "partnership between Government and private enterprise can serve the greater good of both."

In that address, in September 1965, President Johnson proposed the development of a broad International Education Program. A committee appointed by him addressed itself to that challenge and made recommendations. In his special message to Congress in February, the President set forth his program. And two weeks ago, at Chulalongkorn University in Thailand, he signed the International Education Act of 1966, which brings into law an important element in that program: the strengthening of education in world affairs in American institutions.

This Act needs an appropriation -- perhaps this will come initially by supplemental appropriation in January. I believe it can do much to strengthen educational centers concerned with international affairs and thus increase the ability of our government and people to conduct international relations intelligently and with steady focus on our national interest in building a reliable world peace. Grants under this Act will be made by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Some years ago, in what were simpler times -- for me at least; I was a foundation executive -- I sat on a committee of nine organized by the Ford Foundation at the request of Secretary of State Herter. Our assignment was to study the role of the American universities in world affairs, and we made a report on that subject in 1960. Among other things, that report defined what the committee thought should be the relationship between the government and the universities:

"Government would provide the means to do the educational tasks, at home and abroad, that the universities cannot undertake unaided. The universities would rise to the educational responsibilities which world affairs place on them and on their sister institutions in other nations."

The

The report also said:

"Where government draws on the universities, it has a traditional obligation....to respect their integrity in the pursuit of free inquiry...."

Those principles have guided this Administration in its relations with the universities and will continue to guide it under the International Education Act. In short, after the government has done its essential part, it should -- and will -- get out of the way, and let the educators get on with their business.

I would emphasize also still another aspect of the relations of the academic community to our international relations and foreign policy. That is the creative function of the scholar in expanding knowledge, in exposing illusions, superstitions, and prejudices, in devising new approaches, in generating new ideas.

The colleges and universities provide the government with information and analyses on an enormous scale. The Office of External Research in the Department of State has information on more than 5,000 foreign affairs studies currently under way in American universities. It receives approximately 200 new academic papers each month.

We draw on the graduate schools of international studies and the wider university communities for information, ideas, and personnel. Over the years, our Policy Planning Council in the Department of State has taken some of its members and many of its consultants from the academic community. The various bureaus of the Department of State are expanding their panels of consultants in the universities and graduate schools of international studies.

I welcome thoughtful analyses and proposals from any source, I am delighted when somebody comes up with a new idea that can survive the initial test, which is careful examination. We are proffered many ideas and proposals, but not as many of them are as new as their

authors

authors sometimes suppose. Some are blueprints which have little, if any, relationship to practicability. And some are old ideas long since discarded by those carrying the burden of responsibility.

There is a fundamental difference between an opinion -- or a conclusion -- and a decision. An opinion or a conclusion can be changed at the pleasure of the author without harm to anyone, including himself, unless he places a high value on consistency. The man who has the responsibility for making a decision has to live with the consequences. And when the decisions are those in the realm of foreign policy and national defense which must be made by the President, the nation has to live -- or perhaps perish -- with the consequences.

I must confess that I am somewhat puzzled by those who put forward as "new" ideas, notions which we and others paid dearly for embracing in times only recently past. For example: the notion that peace can be secured by appeasing aggression....that when an aggressor proclaims his intentions, you shouldn't pay any attention, because he is just indulging in big talk....that all he needs is tender psychiatric help....that if you let him take just one more bite, he will be satisfied....that what happens in the Western Pacific is no concern of ours because it is a long way off. The young people of my generation heard all those things said about Manchuria, Ethiopia, the rape of Czechoslovakia. They were a "long way off"....no concern of ours.

I was in the Oxford Union on the night in 1933 when the Union adopted the motion that its members would not fight for King and Country. Six years later the brilliant philosopher who led the debate in favor of the motion said: "Sorry, boys, we weren't thinking of Hitler. Get out and fight." He might have added "without the weapons and the training and the allies you would have had if I and people like

me

me hadn't been so stupidly short-sighted." And without the preventive measures that might have obviated the Second World War.

Some seem to have forgotten the clearest lesson of this century. And others try to explain it away by arguing that Hitler and his allies were unique phenomena -- that there are no longer any dangerous aggressors.

I am fully aware of the differences between Hitler and Mussolini and the Japanese militarists, on the one hand, and the aggressors of more recent years. But the differences cannot obscure the common element -- the phenomenon of aggression.

And our national interest in preventing or eliminating aggression is not confined to the Western Hemisphere or the North Atlantic community. Our national interest in security and peace is global. That does not mean that we must intervene in every quarrel. But it does mean that we have an interest in the rule of conduct among nations. And it does mean that we should exert our influence -- and if necessary, use our power -- to try to prevent a great war and to build a reliable peace.

Our deep interests in the Western Pacific and East Asia are not new. We fought to repel aggression against the Republic of Korea. And four successive Presidents of the United States, after extended consultation with their chief advisers, have concluded that the security of Southeast Asia, and of South Viet-Nam, in particular, is very important to the security of the United States.

We have evinced our important national interest in the security of Southeast Asia generally, and South Viet-Nam in particular, through many actions and pledges, of which the most binding was the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, which the Senate approved with only one dissenting vote. And Secretary of State Dulles said specifically  
to the



to the Foreign Relations Committee that that Treaty applied to an armed attack by "the regime of Ho Chi Minh in North Viet-Nam."

But, our interest in South Viet-Nam extends far beyond that nation and Southeast Asia. It involves the most far-reaching issues -- not only for us but for the world as a whole.

Let me read from a considered statement:

"....the interest and concern of the United States -- whether in the Far East, in any other part of the Pacific area, in Europe, or anywhere else in the world -- are not measured alone by....exceptional conditions peculiar to the particular area....

"The momentous question....is whether the doctrine of force shall become enthroned once more and bring in its wake, inexorably, international anarchy and a relapse into barbarism; or whether this and other peaceful nations, fervently attached to the principles which underlie international order, shall work unceasingly....to promote and preserve law, order, morality, and justice as the unshakeable bases of civilized international relations.

"We might, if we could reconcile ourselves to such an attitude, turn our backs on the whole problem and decline the responsibility and labor of contributing to its solution. But let us have no illusions as to what such a course of action would involve for us as a nation.

"It would mean a break with our past, both internationally, and domestically. It would mean a voluntary abandonment of some of the most important things that have made us a great nation. It would mean an abject retreat before those forces which we have, throughout our whole national history, consistently opposed.

"It would mean that our security would be menaced in proportion as other nations came to believe that, either through fear or through unwillingness, we did not intend to afford protection to our legitimate national interests abroad, but, on the contrary, intended to abandon them at the first sign of danger....

"All

"All this we would be doing in pursuit of the notion that by so doing we would avoid war. But would these policies, while entailing such enormous sacrifices and rendering the Nation more and more decadent, really give us any such assurance?

"Reason and experience definitely point to the contrary ....."

These paragraphs I have just read are from one of my distinguished predecessors: Cordell Hull, on March 17, 1938.

Today we have to consider not only our national interests -- the most vital of which is a peace that is safe for free institutions -- but the commitments that we have made in our efforts to achieve such a peace. Besides our general commitments under the United Nations Charter, we have specific pledges to more than 40 allies. Were either our adversaries or our friends to believe that those pledges are worthless, the prospects for a reliable peace would vanish overnight. We must take particular care not to mislead those who would impose their will on others by force or threats.

We shall not have a chance to learn any lessons from a Third World War. We must remember and apply the tragic lessons of the Second World War.

But we look beyond the turmoil and the crises of the present. Our objective is a peaceful and orderly world -- the kind of world sketched out in the Preamble and Articles One and Two of the United Nations Charter. That is the goal to which we committed ourselves as a nation and people when we helped to write, and signed, the United Nations Charter. It is a goal which is anchored in our basic interests and ideals. And, we believe, it expresses aspirations that are shared by men and women in every part of the earth.

\* \* \*