

Mr. Woodson Larry  
TAS/Ed Ventiane

## FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE FUTURE

Charles Frankel  
Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and  
Cultural Affairs

In the midst of immediate, urgent crises it may seem strange to talk about foreign policy for the future. But it is very important that all of us Americans recognize that our country needs a long-term policy. It is very important for all of us to recognize too that for some time now our country has been working at a long-term policy -- a policy that is not meant to solve today's crises but to prevent future crises of the sort we face today.

Indeed, you can tell a nation's character not only by the way it behaves in times of crisis and reacts to things that are in the foreground of its attention. You can tell a nation's character by what it remembers not to forget. You can tell a nation's character by what it continues to do for the long pull, even though immediate fears, immediate needs, immediate hopes are bound to pre-occupy it.

What are the main guidelines for a foreign policy for the future? What should the United States do if it wants to follow a policy that is right for the future?

What a nation chooses to project as its future and the future of the planet is a reflection, in the first place, of what it thinks of itself here and now. It is a reflection of what it wishes to be. It is a reflection of what it thinks is best and strongest and most worth preserving in what it possesses.

When we talk about the future and foreign policy for the future we are testing our sanity and balance, our ability to think objectively about ourselves, and, not least, the breadth and freshness of our imaginations. If we ask ourselves what we would like the future to be, how we would like the United States to behave in order to produce the future we want, I think we can begin with some clues.

The clues are provided by one of the unusual features that characterize the United States right now. The United States, to use the hackneyed phrase, is in a position of world leadership. Whether or not we sought that leadership is irrelevant. History and destiny appear to have thrust it upon us. And the United States, as a nation occupying a position of first rank in the world, it is a very unusual nation. Why?

We are the first world<sup>o</sup> power that has been, in so large a degree and in so many ways, a democratic nation. We are the first world power that has been based on a government in which the broad masses of the people participate and in which the ultimate legitimation for all that is done is the consent of the governed.

Whatever label you may wish to apply to American policies, whether you would applaud or condemn actions of the United States government abroad, the fact is that we are a power whose presence cannot be forgotten any place in the world — even when we are not present, even when we do not use our power. And the fact is that we are the first power of this sort that has rested on a broad, democratic base. I say this merely descriptively, neither to warn nor to praise nor to promise. I say it descriptively because it has an immense implication.

We in the United States have a system of government based on the consent of the governed. Consent is, of course, the essential principle on which we must operate in any of our Relations with other parts of the world. We don't know how to do things over the long run any other way, and other nations expect of us this way of conducting ourselves. Therefore whatever relations may have been in the past between the more powerful and the less powerful nations, in the future — if the United States is still important and still what it is today — relations between our country and other countries must be based on the concept of equality and mutual sympathy between different people.

This, then, is a first guiding principle for our foreign policy, present or future. But there is a second very interesting and quite singular feature of the United States as a world power, which also gives us a lead to the future.

Our country began — indeed, it is almost unique in having begun — with a philosophical declaration of principle. Our country began not the way most nations begin, just in history and tradition and tribalism. Our nation began the way a club or an association begins — with a conscious joining of forces, with a declaration of purpose. And one of the key phrases in our declaration of purpose, our Declaration of Independence, is the phrase, "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

It was out of a decent respect to the opinions of mankind that our Founding Fathers explained themselves. And today it must be out of the same decent respect that we Americans try to explain ourselves to ourselves and to others.

A century ago a distinguished statesman representing a nation with major world responsibilities said, "Whatever you do, never apologize and never explain." Whether or not that was right a century ago for another nation, it cannot be right for us today or in the future.

This means that our foreign policy for the future must contain as an indispensable element a serious effort to understand other people and to be understood by them. And it must contain as a fundamental element a deliberate process of communication, of exchanges of ideas and people and works of art and science and literature. We cannot have the kind of foreign policy appropriate to us as a nation unless we connect that policy with a genuine effort to teach and, even more, to learn from others.

But there is still a third respect in which the United States as a world power is rather singular, if we look at our country from the long historical point of view. We are a nation that belongs in one sense or another to most other nations. Why?

In the first place we are the first international nation, the first genuinely international nation. Our ties go out almost everywhere. People in dozens of countries have relatives in this country who came here carrying the dreams of generations of people from the old land. Culturally and ethnically everybody has a stake in us. And this is quite new.

But even more we are a nation in whom everybody has a stake because we are the nation that was the author of the first great revolution. It is odd that we Americans should talk about the Communists as though they were the makers of revolution in the modern world. Whether you like it or not, for better or worse, it is we Americans who started this revolutionary business. It is we Americans who spread the ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity that now have all the world turbulent, unsettled, discontented, and on the move.

We are by tradition a proud, revolutionary people. And every person in other countries who believes in these democratic ideals cannot help looking at us and asking, "How are they doing? Are they living up to what they proclaim? Have they forgotten what they stand for?" And perhaps most of all, "Will they remain true to what they stand for?"

Although we are powerful, then, there is a new relationship between ourselves and those with whom we deal. We are in a real sense a domestic symbol for them. We represent a problem for them. We represent a hope. We represent a problem or a hope that is not to be solved or realized within our borders but within their borders.

Now I don't mean that other nations should use the United States as a model. I don't think the world is that simple. I don't think our way of life or system of government is necessarily the model for all other countries. Certainly the foreign policy of the United States rests on the deep principle that different systems, different types of government really ought to be able to work together peacefully.

Nevertheless our ideals are world ideals. They are ideals that quite simply have moved around the world and have moved the world. As long as that is so, what we do at home and what we do abroad is everybody's business, whether or not we or they like it.

Finally, the United States is a quite unusual world power because the source of our power in a sense lies quite beyond our control. The United States is not in the position it is because it followed certain governmental policies or because it has adopted a certain military posture. It is in the position it is because it has the most advanced technology in the world, because it is a rich country, and because it is now a main storehouse of intellect, art, science, and education on which the whole world leans.

Our power exists not by deliberate decision of congress or the government. Our way of life has a contagion not because Madison Avenue works hard on it. We are where we are because our technology and science and our culture have a radiance and a power that move out to other countries.

They don't always like it. This is one of the problems with which we in foreign affairs have to deal. But it is worth remembering that if people in other countries complain about the American influence -- for example, bad movies or supermarkets or the disappearance of domestic servants -- you ought to reflect that no law requires a foreigner to stand in line to see a movie, no law requires him to leave domestic service and flock to the factories. It looks as though, for better or worse, other people really, of their own free will, desire some of these things.

In any case, then, the United States is a major power. The United States is in a position of leadership not so much because we deliberately will to be, but basically because we are what we are: an immensely powerful nation technologically, intellectually, and socially.

Now what does all this mean? I take it that in the future these facts will probably still be facts. I take it that in the future, therefore, we shall have to be very sure that our relations with other nations are built on a foundation of equality, are based on genuine and continuing consultation and communication, are responsive to the ideals and expectations of others. Perhaps most of all, we shall have to ensure that our relations with others involve a process of mutual education.

American technology, American science, American culture are basic phenomena which for better or worse are having an influence on the whole world. We ourselves have not learned how to harness that technology, how to use our science or intelligence with wisdom. Other countries may be able to teach us much. As they modernize, as they move in response to the same currents with which we are moving, we shall have to educate one another.

Why the stress on education? Because the essence of the future is rapid, indeed accelerating, change. Folklore, tradition, the wisdom even of parents and teachers, if I may say so, is not going to be enough. In order to survive, all societies will have to be committed to a continuing process. Of education and re-education of their citizens. And in order to survive, all societies will have to engage in cooperative educational ventures across their borders. Only in this way can societies arrange their affairs so that they can work successfully together.

What are we doing here and now to produce this foreign policy for the future? Our government has been engaged in a number of ventures that represent an effort to build policy for the future. Ever since World War II, for example, the Department of State has carried on an extensive program of educational and cultural exchange, now the so-called Fulbright-Hays program, as well as a number of other programs of this sort.

Just last year the Agency for International Development (AID) introduced certain major changes in its assistance programs, shifting their balance. That shift is reflected in a projected increase of about 82 per cent in AID's commitments to its educational programs since fiscal year 1966. The fundamental premise of the shift was that progress and development begin and end with human beings, not with roads or factories. If the human beings can advance, the roads and factories will come in their own good time. If the human beings do not advance, roads and factories will disappear.

Beyond this, Congress in the last session passed the International Education Act, which had been recommended by President Johnson in early 1966 as part of his new thrust in international education. This Act rests on the premise that we Americans must develop, even more than we have yet done, a capability for international cooperation. This development must begin in our schools. It must begin with new curricula, new attitudes, new information at all levels of our educational system.

If we can move this year, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be able over the long term to support innovations in research, faculty organization, and student programs in universities and schools that have the object of improving the American people's knowledge and sympathy for things beyond their borders.

Indeed, there are two or three very important matters which, despite all the urgent crises we face, should not be forgotten if we are going to have a foreign policy for the future. The first is to keep up the levels of the State Department's programs in educational and cultural exchange.

The second is the brother program provided by the International Education Act. This aims at building here at home, in the United States, a domestic power in international affairs, in international studies. This power, we think, is as important as the power to do mathematics or physics.

Approximately ten years ago, Mr. Khrushchev made a major contribution to American education. He pointed out that mathematics and physics are not really useless. Now, ten years later, the rivalries, hostilities, and animosities are still going on, and very often we have skirted seriously close to the end in our dance of death. Yet there has been, overall, some measurable improvement, some measurable degree of moderation, in the behavior of the great states.

Now, ten years later, we have to ask ourselves whether our people are capable of carrying forward over the long haul, with resolution and understanding, the kind of foreign policy our nation must have if mankind is to live in peace. I think our educational system is more parochial than our world responsibilities. I think the federal government has an obligation to help instill into that system a broader world perspective. That is what the International Education Act is all about.

Beyond that, we are trying in all our programs to work in a spirit of binational and multinational cooperation. We have greatly spurred the programs that we carry on under the UNESCO umbrella. The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, on which Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, immediate past president of the National PTA, is a most important figure, has been immensely valuable to us. I think the United States policy toward UNESCO is much more affirmative, much more disposed to join in experimental projects that look hopeful, than eight or ten years ago. Why is this so?

It is because we have discovered that we must communicate; because we have discovered that communication is not advertising; because we have discovered that when you are a very big nation even a whisper on your part sounds like a shout. So you have to find the right context, the right clubhouse, the right forum in which to engage in a dialogue of equals.

You cannot build that clubhouse yourself. You should not. You cannot put your flag up in front. You should not. You should meet on neutral ground. And UNESCO is one such neutral and increasingly valuable forum.

What I am talking about, in the end, is not just foreign policy. I am talking, as must be plain, about education. It is important to develop a new educational policy in the United States because that new education policy will indeed be a new foreign policy.

A foreign policy for the future is a policy that will place the adults of the future in a world with which they can cope. It begins, therefore, with education in the present. We can no longer imagine that education has merely a peripheral relation to foreign affairs. Nothing we do at home is more important for the future shape of our affairs than what we do now in our schools. As President Johnson said in his Smithsonian Address in the fall of 1965, "The conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms."

Obviously, only a clairvoyant can say with Precision what the future will be like. We can't plan the education of our children today by using a detailed blueprint of the future to guide us. But, in broad terms, we can say what the future will be like and what will be demanded of the adults of the future. And so we can say something about our educational tasks.

First, the adults of the future will have to recognize, and events will force them to recognize, that foreign affairs are domestic affairs. Political boundaries insulate no country--least of all our own--from the commotions, revolutions, frustrations, and aspirations of people in other parts of the world.

Second, the adults of the future will need minds and imaginations large enough and supple enough to allow them to live confidently and calmly in such a world. They must be people who know fundamental facts but who grasp something more than the bare facts. They must understand why we live in so turbulent a century. They must accept the concept of human diversity and be able to use this concept every day when they form opinions and make decisions.

Third, the adults of the future must understand that international relations, for all their drama and excitement, are at their best when they aren't dramatic and exciting. In a peaceful world the daily business of nations is negotiation, compromise, the adjustment of interests--all rather boring and very civilized. The adults of the future will have to resist the atavistic impulse to see international relations as a melodramatic confrontation between good and evil. They will have to resist the urge to simplify and to sloganeer.

Fourth, the adults of the future will have to have the power to see as well as to think. Perhaps you recall the wonderful scene in George Bernard Shaw's play Saint Joan. When Joan is taken to the pyre for the burning, a British chaplain who had called for her execution goes out to see what he had asked for. He returns hysterical and says, "We blind ourselves with words. I didn't know, I didn't see. I didn't know what it was I wanted."

We today--and certainly our children when this world is theirs--will have the capacity to see through the words, to pierce the abstractions, to tear away the stereotypes. Like mental curtains tougher than iron, these stereotypes prevent us from seeing that people on the other side aren't evil. They keep us from recognizing that the living truth is always more ambiguous than any label we attach to it.

Adults in the future will have to have a capacity that men have very rarely had with regard to understanding things remote from them. Broadly speaking, the farther away something is, the less real it becomes. If it is human beings, the more strange they seem and the less human. But this is a trait we can no longer afford, because there is no "far away" any longer. Our minds and imaginations have to catch up with the new physical facts.

Can this be done? Obviously the great burden lies on parents and teachers. Governments can, at best, indicate the need and offer the kind of encouragement that makes meeting the need more nearly possible. In any event, it is to needs like these that the International Education Act is pointed. The preamble of this Act states its purpose: to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources--to the end that this and future generations of America shall be assured ample opportunities to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacity in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures.

- 2 -

The point of such education is domestic as well as foreign. It is good education not only because it will be good for our foreign relations, but in the end because it is the best thing for the minds of young Americans themselves.

Montaigne said, "Young bodies are supple. One should therefore in that age bend and ply them to all fashions and customs." Young minds, too, are supple, and when people are young, one should bend and ply their minds to all fashions and customs.

The knowledge that life is different elsewhere is knowledge about one's own life. It is relevant to understanding not only others but one's self. There is an old German saying that the fish is the last creature in the world to discover the existence of water. The way the fish discovers water, unhappily, is to arrive on dry land.

We must learn that there are different elements, and that different people find different elements native to them. We must learn somehow to respect these different elements and even to swim in all of them. The appreciation of diversity is one of the best ways to expand the intelligence and sympathy of young people. This, quite simply, is a fundamental objective of education.

In pursuing the great goals of educational exchange, of international educational cooperation, therefore, we pursue in the end more than a foreign policy for the future. We pursue an educational policy for the future. We are talking about new ways to arrive at classic goals of what has been known as liberal education.

All of us--parents, teachers, citizens, officials--have a common interest in building around the world a pattern of cooperative association with other parents and teachers. Then in the future when there are crises--and there will be--we shall be able to approach them with somewhat greater confidence. Stored up in the bank, we shall have large reserves of sanity and moderation and human charity.

(Reprint of two articles which appeared in the National PTA Magazine (September - October 1967) and which, in turn, were based on an address to that organization's national convention in May 1967.)

12/29/1967/bjs