TOPIC 3:

A REASSESSMENT OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES

By

Honorable Frank Pace

Presented at
The National War College
Washington, D.C.
30 May 1973

TOPIC 3:

A REASSESSMENT OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES
By
HONORABLE FRANK PACE

(30 May 1973)

DR. SWEENEY: /Introduced the speaker./

MR. PACE: Is there a throat mike, by any chance here, because I don't like to stand behind the podium. You may have to hook it up.

The reason I said I have to be hooked up, and this is unrelated to my subject, is that I have a middle daughter named Priscilla, who has a glorious sense of humor, a blonde young lady of great charm who enjoyed the boys and treated them in a very cavalier fashion. Not being an athlete, we were amazed to find she had decided to go to tennis camp until we found that four of her favorite swains were also going.

When we went to pick her up the counselor reported a story to me that I think is an interesting one. He said that Priscilla was indeed pursued by a number of boys. One evening her favorite swain said, "Priscilla, I'll not be going out with you again."

She said, "Oh, really? Why not? That's your privilege."

He said, "I checked on your father and found he's a well-to-do man, and I don't want to be going out with the daughter of a well-to-do man."

"Well," Priscilla said, "that's perfectly all right. I frankly don't know whether my father is well-to-do or not, but if he is, he needs all that money. He can't do anything for himself." /Laughter/

Out of the mouths of babes!

This is coming back home. This is my fourteenth appearance at The National War College. I have served on the Board of Consultants. I know its strengths and the quality of its membership, so I am particularly pleased to be with you.

There are two stories that will put your speaker in perspective since you might think of me as the eminent Director of the Budget and very young Secretary of the Army.

You should know that when I first graduated from Harvard Law School and returned to my native heath of Little Rock, Arkansas, my father, who was a distinguished southern lawyer, had expected that I would join his law firm. One of the hardest things I have had to do in life was to say, "Father, I'm not going to join your law firm."

"Oh, really, son?" he said. "Why not?"

I said, "For two reasons, father. I haven't earned it, and, two, you'd dominate me."

He said, "You're wrong on both counts."

I said, "Sir, I felt you'd feel that way, but I'm still not going to join your law firm."

He asked, "What do you want to do?"

I told him I would like to go into the District Attorney's office.

He asked, "What? Work for the Government?" Then he said, "I'll help you."

So indeed I did go to work for the District Attorney, whose work encompassed three counties in the state of Arkansas. The Legislature, in its infinite wisdom, had chosen to vote an authorization for the office but no salary appropriation. So I served for three months without pay. My distinguished father was delighted to say that it was the only time I was ever adequately rewarded for my service to the Government. /Laughter/

One further story. As I was saying when we were talking earlier, I was privileged not only to be Secretary of the Army but to be Secretary of the Army in a period of the greatest flower of the American military or, frankly, the military of any time in history, and also the very special privilege of having General Marshall as Secretary of Defense. I had been selected to go with President Truman on that trip to Wake Island, where he met with General MacArthur to discuss the progress of the war. I thought it a courtly gesture on the part of the President to travel halfway across the world to meet General MacArthur; and our meetings went very well.

I was at that time 37, and I was reasonably well supported in our military discussions by General Bradley and Admiral Radford.

We heard General MacArthur, who had just pulled off that brilliant landing at Inchon, which, incidentally, none of the Joint Chiefs thought had very much chance of success; General MacArthur was a great general, and the world lost a great actor when he became a great general, spoke in those stentorian tones which sounded like they were coming down from on high. He said, "The war will be over by Thanksgiving and the troops home by Christmas." That was written in stone.

I went back and reported to General Marshall, "General MacArthur says the war will be over by Thanksgiving and the troops home by Christmas."

He said, "That troubles me, Pace."

I said, "You must not have heard me, General Marshall. I said General MacArthur reported the war will be over by Thanksgiving and the troops home by Christmas."

"Well," he said, "Pace, I heard you. My problem is that this abrupt ending of the war will not really permit the American people to understand the implications of the Cold War and understand the value of a sustaining insurance pattern in the military over the years. I am deeply troubled by it."

I said, "General Marshall, a great deal of water has passed under the bridge."

He said, "I know, Pace, but you didn't live through the end of World War II, when they rushed off to leave the tanks in the Pacific and the ships to be put in drydock. This is an

impatient nation. This understanding has not gone deep enough."

I replied, "I still think that a great deal of knowledge has been brought to us in World War II and Korea." I asked, "Would you say that I was naive if I said the American people have learned their lesson?"

He looked at me with those cold, blue eyes and replied, "No, Pace, I wouldn't say you were naive. I would say you were incredibly naive!" /Laughter/

I am not going to talk in statistical terms about budgets and priorities because you can question me on them; and I think I have some sensitivities. But it seems to me that when we are talking about priorities we really have to talk about the totality of national priorities and what is it we seek and need to do in this society in order to achieve what it is that we need to achieve --what are the things that have to be put first in the focus of our attention to deal with this subject, not in terms of how much goes to the military and how much goes here, but what are the essential values that have to be thought through and considered if we are going ultimately to make the grade.

I sat as Vice Chairman of the only National Goals Commission that has ever been established by a President in this country. We thought through, at the end of President Eisenhower's term, what it is that the country should place its primary emphasis on. There was a great deal of discussion at that time as to whether this was needed, and I think you are going to hear a great deal more

discussion in the days ahead as to whether this is needed because I deeply believe that it is. And I think that all of the things we talk about in terms of budgets and priorities need to be said in the broad framework of what does it take to permit this society to regenerate itself at this stage in history.

If we are going to talk about where we are going to go and what our priorities are, we have to look back and get a sense of where we have been. We Americans are action-oriented. We are not very much for philosophy and history. We have developed great philosophers and great historians, but we are essentially doers rather than thinkers, and we have always looked to the future rather than the past. But our past is really a very intriguing one.

You go back to the fact that young as we are (and we are always mentioning this in front of the Chinese or the Europeans), we really generated the first written constitution. We did it because the wise men of that period felt that something had to be in writing, that it was superior to the whole pattern of laws and identified the course and the dangers that were involved. We wrote it so well that with a really limited number of amendments and some wise and some unwise interpretations by the Court, this has survived what has been the most cataclysmic change in every form of pattern of life that has ever occurred in the history of man. We still live from a written constitution that has become in many ways a model for the rest of the world to pick up and follow--certainly the new nations.

I do not know what genius invested Jefferson as he sought to avoid despotism and corruption, but here was a document that was written and lived through the times, almost a rejection of the belief that change of substantial nature has to occur in any primary document for it to fit the needs of a democracy.

We also addressed ourselves to a different kind of approach to the economic problem. We developed a process of free enterprise that was infinitely freer than any that had previously existed in the history of man. Essentially, and oversimplifying it, is the belief that man, in competition in a fair market and free competition, will outproduce the planned society. It is still with us, more modified than our Constitution, more affected, some for good, some for bad, by Government participation and regulation but still the basic system, recognized as effective, and many parts of it taken over and identified as essential by the Communist nations.

And so we started off with this remarkable pair of bases. We weren't always wise in the use of the free enterprise system. We devastated the land and gutted the forests, but fortunately the impact was so small on this broad land--temperate climate, great navigable streams, water power available--so small that we could eventually repair the rapacious damage that was done in those days.

We had one other thing that always fascinated me. Remember this country had about three million people, less than the population of a great many of our larger cities. Yet, out of that population came a Washington, a Hamilton, a Jefferson, two Adams, a

Madison, a Monroe, a Clay, a Calhoun, a Jackson, a Webster--three million people! The passage of time has glossed over some of their weaknesses, but there is no way to take away from the heroic quality of these people. I don't know whether it is something in the air, like the Renaissance, the arts, and music that produces men. Washington hated the job. If you ever read his letters to Jefferson, you read of a man in deep pain who really wanted no second term. Yet, somewhere in this society came the sense and urge of men that their responsibility was to the country, and somewhere came qualities of mind and heart that were unique.

So, moving under these two systems, we came to the first great watershed in our history, which was the Civil War. The issue of slavery was met, faced and dealt with in a uniquely un-American way--that is, a war between the states. By great good fortune there stood a great man at the helm.

We always think of the Gettysburg Address, but he used a phrase that always touched me very deeply. He said, "I could not understand a man who did not feel the lash on another man's back as though it were on his own." This is very moving to me. And while Lincoln did not speak for the majority of people, he spoke as the leader. It was this sense of compassion and understanding in the leadership and the ultimate good sense of the American people given an issue, fairly presented and carefully considered, that got us past that first great watershed.

We moved on to a happy period in our life beyond the Civil War. We were busy being bold about the West, taking advantage of the greatness of the land. With a sense of destiny, you read the history of that period, every man and woman felt that there was something really very special about this America of ours and that we were doing the great job in history, that if other people paid attention to us, then they too could share our greatness.

We came to the second great watershed. That indeed was the danger that the values of this great land would go to the few and not to the many. This has been destructive in many societies in our Nation, and we have avoided it. We avoided it again because there was that unique man Teddy Roosevelt, who said, "This will not be." He left his party, left his friends, broke the trusts and set the course of America for the benefit of the many and not for the few.

He too said something that has always held very close to my mind. He said, "My heart is with the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is covered by dust, sweat and blood, who strives valiantly and errs again and again, and who in the end, if he succeeds, knows the triumph of high achievement; and if he fails at least fails while daring greatly so that his place will never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither defeat nor victory."

I cite that because when we come to sense what is important in this Nation, what Teddy Roosevelt is saying is that you cannot

be a nation of spectators. You cannot sit aside while things go wrong and expect somebody else to solve the problem. You have to be in the arena. As the Nation grows older and more sophisticated, the tendency to sit on the sidelines on the part of the citizenry becomes indeed unique.

We moved on through World War I, which showed how little we understood the world, with Woodrow Wilson with his hopes for the League of Nations and the "war to save the world for democracy," which in these days one understands is really a meaningless phrase.

We came to the third great watershed, the Great Depression. Again came Franklin Roosevelt with "You have nothing to fear but fear itself," a tremendous lift and enthusiasm to change the mood and style of a people. I was approaching maturity through that period. Unless you lived through that period you cannot realize what a breadline does to a great nation like the United States. He provided the needed lift and requirement.

At that time our Nation changed because we had essentially been a nation of business. Joining Big Business were Big Labor and Big Government. So, instead of a one-legged stool, you now had a three-legged stool. Big Government inserted itself into both Big Labor and Big Business, and a new way of life was established.

We came onto the fourth great watershed, which was World War II, in which we distinguished ourselves first by our willingness to participate. World War I had been a disappointment ideologically and philosophically. The war was somebody else's.

Yet again the instinctive sense of responsibility of the American people permitted us to participate in a war in which our non-participation could have been disastrous.

When history is written and the greatness of the United States is discussed, our treatment of the defeated aggressor will rank high in the annals of national history because never before in history had the vanquished been treated this way. Equally importantly, not only was the concept great, but the execution was unbelievably competent. General MacArthur, in reorienting Japan, brought a quality of leadership almost of emperor quality to that society (I was there in those days, watching the reorientation of the society) that has brought Japan not only out into the family of nations as a leader but established for us the toughest competitor we have ever had in the whole field of technological development. While Lucius Clay's performance in Germany is infinitely less well known and the supporting and later leading role that Jack McCloy played, to take that nation which had historically been the creator of wars in Europe and turn it into a major member of the family of nations was indeed great.

Then the Marshall Plan: With Europe on its knees we brought Europe back to real partnership and to a capacity to play its role in the world.

I was Assistant Director of the Budget at the time. I remember Mr. Truman, whom I always admired inordinately, had me over when he had Paul Hoffman over to talk to him about becoming

Administrator. Paul Hoffman was indeed a genius. Paul did not like the idea very much and was backing away a little. He said, "Mr. President, I'd like to think this over a little and talk it over with my wife."

When he left, the President, with that twinkle in his eye, said, "Frank, you know Paul really wants to take this job. I think we'd better help him a little. I'm going to announce at noon that he has accepted." /Laughter/

Paul went home. His wife said, "I heard over the radio that you have accepted," which he did. /Laughter/ It was a great thing for the United States and a great thing for the world.

I remember when we were talking about how it was to be done, again Mr. Truman had Paul Hoffman and his friend, Tex Moore, and me in. We talked about it some. Mr. Truman became bored with the details, so he said, "Frank, why don't you, Paul and Tex go into the Cabinet Room and figure out how this thing will work?" Here was the fate of Europe, $20 billion--"Go in the Cabinet Room and figure out how it will work." It was that kind of glorious identification of simplicity to the complicated.

I just want to comment here that one of the great problems we face (and all of you must sense it) is that the world has gotten so complicated that the ordinary citizen does not feel he has a real part to play. De Tocqueville was our great supporter in the early days. The real reason he was back of us was because he was fed to the teeth with the bureaucracies of Europe. He said, "In

America, if you have a problem, Sam goes and talks to John, they go get Bill and do something about it." Well, we have built ourselves a bureaucracy that must have de Tocqueville revolving in his grave because no more can Sam go to John and John to Bill and the three of them do something because it has become so complicated.

One of Mr. Truman's great strengths was his ability to make the complicated simple without misstatement. If you watch every great mountebank in the political field, you will find that he has the great capacity to oversimplify. So the ordinary fellow says, "Gee, it isn't all that complicated, the way Huey puts it /or the way George puts it/." But they do not have the capacity to simplify and at the same time avoid misstatement. One of the great requirements today is a man who has the capacity to say simple things that do not misstate.

Unfortunately, our generosity carried over to the developing countries critically important to us. We made the mistake of applying the same formula to them as we had to the developed countries. There they had the management capability, the technological ability; and the money put into that machine worked. We put money into the developing country machine, and all it did was sputter because neither the management nor the technological competence was there to really do the job. So foreign aid, which came out of that great spirit of generosity of the American people--and I keep emphasizing it because it is very important--did not really produce.

We went through Korea. I remember sitting in the Blair House (the White House was being repaired) with the President and his chief advisors and deciding that either we went in or Russia would get a false idea of what it might do. I remember deciding we needed only naval and air forces. I remember coming over that night teletype in those really Shakespearean phrases a message from General MacArthur at about 12 midnight, unless we were prepared to commit ground troops, we could write off Korea.

I remember calling the President of the United States at about 12:30, waking him. He asked, "Frank, do we need to make a decision now?"

I replied, "No, sir, but I at least wanted you to decide we didn't need to make it." /Laughter/

He said, "I guess that was worth waking me up for."

We met the next day and decided to go in. This was the beginning of the Cold War. I remember General Marshall said, "The American people will never understand this war, Pace. They're win-or-lose people, but really they're win people because they have never lost, and they cannot conceive of stalemate as an acceptable solution."

Then, of course, we had Vietnam. Out of Vietnam I think two primary principles emerged, both of which I think are beneficial. There are a great many detrimental features to Vietnam. But I think the big features that came out was that everyone involved--Russia, China, the U.S.--came to the conclusion that this

was not a profitable venture, that these things did not serve anyone's purpose. And the likelihood that they will be repeated with this kind of support seems to me, even with the problems you face in the Middle East, unlikely. Therefore, while sporadic, small wars can break out, the possibility that they will emerge into major conflagrations has been substantially reduced.

The second value of Vietnam is that it finally taught us that we are not a nation of unlimited resources. I remember as Director of the Budget I was troubled by the approach that was taken by the Council of Economic Advisers and so told the President. I said I felt we were acting as if we had unlimited resources; I did not believe we had. Finally Vietnam has taught us. President Kennedy said, "We will defend freedom wherever it is attacked around the world." That is the doctrine of unlimited resources. It is a great thought, but the capacity to execute it just does not lie in any nation.

I remember Dean Rusk said to me, "When the U.S. puts its shoulder to the wheel, something gives." Occasionally it is the U.S. shoulder that gives. /Laughter/

This permeated our general thinking, and I think its elimination is beneficial.

So we came on to this fifth watershed, which is different from any that we have ever faced before because we face a crisis of confidence, a crisis of principle, and it is here that basically our priorities must lie, because when you look at the record, we

are better than we think we are. And when you look at the need, it is hard to imagine a world without a United States that plays a real role in it. If you look at foreign affairs from a political standpoint, it is hard to remember, but back in the 1950s Berlin was a tinderbox. Anything that happened near or about or around Berlin really sent shivers up our respective backs. The thought that the head of the Russian nation could make the kind of address that he made to the West German people would have been so unthinkable that if anyone had mentioned it, they would have been put in the class with Orson Welles right away.

I remember flying back from Brussels another wonderful thing. General Marshall called me in. I had been there only about five months. He said, "Pace, I'm Chairman of the Defense Ministers, who are going to meet in Brussels. We hope to reorganize NATO, appoint General Eisenhower as Supreme Commander and bring Germany into NATO. Pace, I cannot go. I'm thinking of sending you. What is your response?"

I said, "General Marshall, I can't give you an answer to that question without some thought."

I went home and spent a sleepless night, talked to Peg, came back the next morning early and said, "General Marshall, I don't want you to think that I don't think I can do the job; I think I can. But I'm a very young man." I was 37 at the time. "Europeans respect maturity. I think you would do well to send a more mature man."

He said, "Thank you, Pace. I've decided to send you."

I said, "General Marshall, you could have spared me a sleepless night!"

"Oh, no," he said, "I couldn't, Pace. I didn't know whether I was going to send you until I heard your answer." /Laughter/

I asked, "General Marshall, may I inquire how that reflects on my judgment?" /Laughter/

These vignettes about this remarkable man are very important.

In any event, we went. We did reorganize NATO. We did appoint General Eisenhower Supreme Commander, and we did bring Germany in despite the fact that the French Minister of Defense, Jules Moch, had lost two sons in a German concentration camp.

General Collins, General Gruenther and I were flying back and flew over the Pyrenees to see whether it would be (you will remember this) possible to build a defense in Spain if the Russians chose to move across the European continent.

The reason I cite these things is because all of them are out of mind now, and the advances that have been made in terms of our relationships with Russia, particularly with China--a great credit to this Administration, a great credit to its imaginative planning and thinking--have really changed the pattern of the world beneficially to a very high degree.

Economically the score does not look so well in the foreign field. We who for years carried substantial trade surpluses by selling our surplus goods abroad for the first time have been carrying consistent trade deficits. The balance of payments is a factor in American foreign policy and in American domestic policy that never was there before, a very difficult matter to manage. The raid on the dollar, which had always been the currency of the world, is evidence of a fiscal weakness abroad and at home; and that is indeed troublesome.

You are likewise faced with the fact that we are dependent abroad for the things that keep our machinery moving. The energy crisis has really brought home to us how dependent we are on the rest of the world. You will see, as you move into the eighties, that other materials will begin to emerge where we have to find a working way in this world to bring in the things that permit us to move forward.

Domestically you have to say that both the original systems with which we started, the basic constitutional system, which continues, as always, to be less than ideal but workable under enormous demands, is with us as is the free enterprise system, modified but essentially better.

Big Labor has been a satisfying surprise. If you follow the labor movements in the world generally, you will be amazed to find the stability of our own. Most labor developments have been revolutionary. Ours have not only been nonrevolutionary; they have been primarily, for labor movements, conservative. And in

this late, difficult period when inflation represents again a major domestic threat, the attitude of Big Labor--not just the leaders but the people themselves--is a very comforting thing. If you were living in Italy or even in England and had to deal with the labor irresponsibility there, then we would indeed be in difficulty.

Big Business has matured. Big Business would like to be to itself and do its own thing but has come to recognize that it has problems and responsibilities beyond that: Its acceptance of the needs of the environment within its capacity to meet them, its acceptance of its requirements for the hiring of minorities, where Labor has been more recalcitrant than Business, in evidence of the fact that Business is beginning to step up to responsibilities that Government itself is incapable of handling alone.

I think when you look at the record in the whole field of civil rights, whether it involves color or sex or age, that given the base from which we started, we have made progress that obviously satisfies nobody. But when viewed in the light of practical reality, it represents really quite substantial strides forward, the base for further strides forward.

Inflation is a problem that is tied, as I say, to many, many things, and it is a deep and abiding problem that will not be settled by central banks or by Federal Reserve but will have to be solved by reorientation of policies that will require a certain difference in our pattern of life.

Education: Here statistically we can indeed point with pride. A nation that has 75 percent of its eligible young people graduated from high school is something no one would ever dream of; and the number of university and post-graduate students is startling.

Mark Twain once said there are three kinds of lies: lies, damn lies, and statistics. I subscribe to that fully. I believe that the educational statistics are misleading. I think that education has not done its job in this society. I think its bureaucracy has rejected the kind of technological changes that could make education really fascinating to the young when I think they are, in many instances, bored to tears. I was personally the first Chairman of the Board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in that light along with "Sesame Street," the "Electric Company," "Forsythe Saga," and "Civilisation." I had hoped that we could make a real impact in the educational process through television. It was just too tough a row to hoe. It will come in time, but education has not moved. In the armed services you have done far more, and I have felt that the armed services had a chance to be a leader here in providing new and novel educational processes that would make the military more intimately a part of the civilian society.

I think the thing that troubles me most about education, when I graduated from college there was no real problem. You had to get a job; it was just that simple. You had to earn enough

money in order to one day own a car, maybe own a house and get married. Today, with the vast amounts of available money, available credit, that purpose is not there. I find so many people graduating from universities without a purpose and without a sense of what should be done.

My wife is on the board of a fine Negro women's college in Atlanta, Spelman College. Every girl who goes to that college understands that she has a responsibility, when she graduates, to go back to her community to help to hold families together, to persuade the young to move forward in their educational process.

I believe that even more than failing to take advantage of the gifted student, our failure to place a sense of responsibility on our graduates of our universities and even our high schools is a great failing.

The armed services are at a time of great trial. You are going to have to be different than you have been. You have to be more imaginative than you have been. You have to fit more fully into the total pattern of the U.S. society than you have ever fitted before. This will not be easy. If you were able to live in the community, it would be easy. I cannot imagine a master sergeant or a chief petty officer who would not be the best citizen in the block, but by reasons of economics you are, unfortunately, separated from the society, and your quality is really known only to those of us who have had the opportunity for intimate exposure.

There will be a hue and cry for reductions in the armed services to meet the always existing needs of the civilian population. With the kind of speeches that Brezhnev is making and Chou En-lai is indicating to maintain the quality of military competence, it is going to be a very difficult but indeed a very important thing, because Brezhnev will go and Chou En-lai will go; and while I do not sense war in the offing, I can very easily see blackmail in the offing. The need to "keep our powder dry" is very great but not fully understood. The military has a challenge, not just from the point of view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff but in terms of every man and woman in understanding that this is a period of trial that calls for more than just doing their job in the military well. Quite frankly, that isn't enough.

When I left the Pentagon, my Assistant Secretaries and my aide set up a fund that established the Pace Award. Each year in the Pentagon for each officer under the rank of colonel and for the civilian who contributes the most to the Army in that year the Pace Award is given. When I see what these awardees have done beyond the call of duty, then it becomes very clear to me that this is an essential requirement for each of you.

What is the prescription? Are we going to get by this watershed or not?

A great French philosopher, Voltaire, said a simply incredible thing. He said, "Freedom is only the opportunity for self-discipline." Roll that around on your tongue and in your

mind because we start off on the premise that we have too long taken freedom for granted and that we need to understand that freedom, to the men who started this country, was the ultimate goal, and now that we have achieved it, we have to think differently than when we had it. What Voltaire was really saying was that no system works without some form of discipline, and freedom is the antithesis of discipline; therefore, only the society that understands that freedom is the basis of self-discipline is survivable. This needs to be said.

In education I think it is critical that we treat education as a responsibility and not a privilege. I think I notice in the young people, many of whom talk to me, that education is now something that one is entitled to, and, having gotten it, it is yours. It doesn't matter whether it came from the state or your daddy provided it or you worked for it; the sense that as an educated woman or man you have a responsibility to use that education to pay back your country for it is not with us--and it needs to be.

I think that wealth must be treated as a responsibility and not a privilege. One of the problems of our times is that we have caught up with that mechanical rabbit. We have been running after the dollar. As an objective, it is wonderful; as a possession, it has vast limitations. And now we have to begin, as the Rockefellers and Henry Ford did, to regard wealth as a responsibility and not a privilege. Until we do that, we will not have the heart that makes a great society.

Finally, we have to treat power as a sacred trust. We have to treat power not as something to which we are entitled but as something that gives us very specially the opportunity to contribute to our society.

How are these things achieved? I do not have to tell this group; there is only one way: leadership. You go through all the things, but somewhere there has to be a man.

I think today most of us who care forget party. There has to be a man big enough and of size enough--a Lincoln who felt the lash on another man's back as though it were on his own; a Roosevelt (Teddy) who wanted to be in the arena and wanted to fail while daring greatly; Franklin Roosevelt, who lifted a nation out of despair and moved it on. We have to have him. He must come, because these are things people must want themselves, but somebody must help them want them. Whether it can come or not, those of us who care must work to try to find such a man or such men. Would that we could have two great men run against each other and then come on with what we need! But we have to do it because America has one characteristic that no other nation has ever had; that is the characteristic of national generosity. It has run through our fiber and our vein. It has caused us to be called "Uncle Sugar." It has caused us to look a little silly. But do not mistake it; it is probably our greatest national characteristic.

Toynbee said that a historian 300 years from now, looking back on this Nation in this century, which is three-quarters over,

might say that the great thing of this period was not two world wars that were won, not the development of the airplane that has reduced the oceans and brought people together, not the enormous explosion in communication that means that problems of India or Bangladesh are at your breakfast table every morning, not even the great advances in medicine like Salk vaccine or even the tremendous development of the atom with all its implications for good or evil--but that this century might be remembered as the century in which man first dared to share the advances of civilization with all mankind. No nation can do that except the U.S.A. No one can take the leadership in that but us. So our problem is not a selfish one of national growth or survival; ours is truly a responsibility that runs beyond us, and in saving ourselves we save the world.

If any of us can move one tiny pebble on the sands of time, then life is indeed worthwhile.

Thank you.