U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy Conference on

"PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN THE INFORMATION AGE"

September 15-16, 1987
Department of State
22nd and C Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

ABOUT THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

The Commission is an independent, bipartisan body established by Congress to oversee the international information and educational exchange programs of the United States Government.

The Commission's recommendations affect significant policies and programs of the U.S. Information Agency, including the Voice of America, international educational exchanges, the WORLDNET television service, the Radio Marti program, and American embassy press and cultural activities.

Commission members are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission submits reports to the President, the Congress, the Secretary of State, the Director of USIA, and to the American people.

Membership:

Chairman:

Edwin J. Feulner, Jr.,
President, The Heritage Foundation

Vice-Chairman:

e. robert (bob) wallach,
Lawyer-Counselor, and Dean,
Hastings Law School Center for Trial and Appellate Advocacy

Tom C. Korologos,
President, Timmons and Company

Priscilla L. Buckley,
Senior Editor, *National Review*

Hershey Gold,
Chairman of the Board, Super Yarn Mart

Richard M. Scaife,
Publisher, The Tribune Review Publishing Company

Herbert Schmertz,
Vice President for Public Affairs, Mobil Oil Corporation

Bruce Gregory, Staff Director
Karl Fritz, Deputy Staff Director

U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy

301 Fourth Street, S.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20547
(202) 485-2457

TRANSCRIPT

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION

ON

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Conference on

"PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN THE INFORMATION AGE"

September 15-16, 1987
Department of State
22nd and C Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

C O N T E N T S

C O N T E N T S

Tuesday, September 15, 1987

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

5:15 pm — Registration:

The Loy Henderson Conference Room
(Please use 23rd Street entrance only)

5:45 pm — Welcome:

Chairman Edwin J. Feulner, Jr.
U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy

Introduction:

Commissioner Priscilla L. Buckley

Address:

The Honorable George Shultz
Secretary of State

6:30 pm — Reception:

The Thomas Jefferson Room
(By invitation only)

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION OF SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE SHULTZ

CHAIRMAN FEULNER: Good evening and welcome to our celebration of the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy's fortieth anniversary. My name is Ed Feulner. I am the Chairman of the Advisory Commission.

I apologize to all of you for the last minute changes in the schedule. As all of you are aware, it was our hope that Secretary Shultz would deliver the keynote speech this evening after dinner. Unfortunately, from our perspective, his schedule had to be altered. However, we are truly gratified that even with Foreign Minister Shevardnadze in town, he is able to join with us at this time and share his thoughts on the important subject of public diplomacy.

Let me begin then by saying just a few words about the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. It is a bipartisan, Presidentially-appointed Commission whose members are confirmed by the Senate. Our role is to oversee the U.S. Government's public diplomacy programs. We report annually on U.S. public diplomacy to the President, the Secretary of State, USIA Director Wick, the Congress, and to the American people.

The conference will be introduced with a keynote address by Secretary of State George Shultz, whom I am delighted to see entering the room at this moment.

[APPLAUSE]

To introduce the Secretary, let me introduce my distinguished colleague, Priscilla Buckley, whose career as a writer and Managing Editor of National Review is well-known to all of you. She now serves as Senior Editor of National Review, where she continues to provide her wisdom and guidance. She is a former UPI correspondent in Paris, and she has been a member of the Advisory Commission since 1982. She was the primary author of the Commission's report last year on "Soviet Advocacy and the U.S. Media."

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The first speaker is known to all of you. What you may not know is that this conference is being held to consider ideas the Secretary raised more than a year ago. Among the Advisory Commission's responsibilities is the obligation to meet periodically with the Secretary of State to discuss the conduct of American public diplomacy. This is one of our more pleasant obligations.

Secretary Shultz is a kindred spirit, and he is sympathetic to the Commission's belief that public diplomacy is indispensable to the achievement of our foreign policy objectives. He has long supported and actively participated in USIA's information and educational exchange programs.

Our conversation with Secretary Shultz in a meeting last summer turned to his thoughts on the "Information Age" --

thoughts developed over many years as a scholar and statesman. He mentioned a speech he had given in Paris on the shape, scope and consequences of the "Information Age." That speech, the Secretary told us rather ruefully, had sunk without a trace. My fellow Commissioners and I, however, found his thoughts on the subject fascinating, and the kind of visionary thinking this nation needs.

From that meeting came the idea of this conference. Mr. Secretary, it is your own fault that you are here tonight. As Richard Weaver has noted, "ideas have consequences." Our Commissioners strongly share your concern that our nation needs a strategy for the new world taking shape around us, a world shaped by the information revolution. We share your belief that this new world presents too many risks and too many opportunities for us to play a passive role in it.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are honored and especially pleased that the Secretary has taken this time out of his schedule stretched thin by the visit of Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. It would have been understandable for him to bow out of this evening's engagement with us. That he did not is evidence of the importance he attaches to public diplomacy.

On behalf of the Advisory Commission and all of us here, let me extend a warm welcome to one of America's finest public diplomats, the Secretary of State of the United States of America, Mr. George Shultz.

[APPLAUSE]

REMARKS BY
THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE
U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1987

Public Diplomacy in The Information Age

(Applause)

Thank you. I am delighted that Ed Feulner [Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy] and his committee took me up on my suggestion, and gives us an opportunity to pursue this topic.

I must say, as I found myself getting ready for the meetings with the Soviet Foreign Minister -- which I've been involved in all day long, starting at 8:00 this morning and just now pausing before we go on to our casual conversation over dinner -- I thought to myself, "How did I get myself involved in so many things all at once?" On the other hand, I think there's a certain importance added by the fact of this meeting with the Soviet Foreign Minister, because it is in many respects our competition and our concerns with the Soviet Union that drive at least some -- not all, but some -- of our concerns about public diplomacy.

So let me say that this conference is about something of fundamental importance to our foreign relations, America's voice in the world of the future. Secretaries of State are not blessed with the power of prophecy, but I'm an optimist about our future, for whatever that's worth to you.

The future looks bright for America because we are a vital and vibrant democracy. The openness of our system, the innovativeness of our people, the vast energies of our society -- all these can help us meet the difficult challenges of a changing world.

But will we meet them? Or will we shrink from them and retreat into isolationism? Will we commit the resources necessary to conduct the kind of foreign policy that will play to our democratic strengths? These are the hard questions we must ask ourselves tonight.

If only we will let them, America's democratic values can carry us boldly into the future as a global power, just as they carried us forward from the Age of Reason through the Industrial Era into what I think of as the Age of Information.

Freedom and intellectual curiosity are the wave of the future; not some foreordained vision of evolutionary stages

driven by class conflict. Take a look at history. Contrary to Marxian prediction, the appeal of Western democracy was not extinguished by the harsh conditions of the factory and the sweatshop. Nor could the power of democracy be destroyed by depression and two devastating world wars.

On the contrary. The modern world that emerged from the despair and destruction of the first half of this century looked to the democratic ideals and respect for human rights as the best means of securing lasting peace and economic well-being in the post-war era.

In our own country in this century, Americans pressed for their rights, clinging tenaciously to the democratic ideals that promised a better future for their children -- individual liberty, private enterprise, equal opportunity in employment and education; civic activism to promote peaceful change. And, when our democracy was threatened, the American people rose in its defense and prevailed.

In the end their children and grandchildren did come to live in an America and in a world that was at once more prosperous and more secure than that of their fathers. The alliances and economic institutions designed by farsighted American policymakers at the close of World War II have brought to us and to the world unprecedented levels of economic growth, social progress and security in the ensuing four decades.

In good part by our example, democracy -- a child of the Age of Reason -- is transforming our modern world. From Spain and Portugal a decade ago to a trend that now encompasses Latin America from Argentina to El Salvador, from the Philippines to South Korea, the surge toward democracy is the most powerful political movement of our time.

The spread of democracy in this new era also means that conduct of U.S. foreign policy is becoming a truly public exercise, both at home and abroad. Throughout the world, higher levels of development and education have drawn more people into the political process; and advances in technology have given unprecedented reach to political views and public opinion.

As I had occasion to say last month before Congress, in our democratic politics, everybody wants to get into the act. The players are many, the roles they play are often competing, and the plot is becoming more and more complex. The same thing can be said for politics around the world.

The almost instant and global awareness of current events, as conveyed through electronic media, focuses public concern on foreign policy issues from human rights to trade sanctions to our Strategic Defense Initiative. Church activists, humanitarian groups and individual Americans are involved in pressing their agendas abroad as well as at home.

And, foreign governments and their representatives gained ready and direct access to our domestic media and those of

other countries, thus taking their views essentially unfiltered to large audiences -- over the heads, or under the seats, of their own governments.

In short, the speed of communication and easy travel means that the Secretary of State and even the President cannot function as autonomous, unchallenged directors of policy. We have to work hard to provide leadership and cohesion, and to marshal understanding and support for our policies both at home and abroad. This is the new reality that must be taken into account if any U.S. foreign policy initiative is to be effective.

In this age of change, America's open, democratic system will remain our greatest asset. The Information Age is our age. Indeed, much of the change accelerating around us today is driven by the scientific and technological advances that are the fundamental product of our democratic way of life. Current trends are going our way. It is already clear that knowledge, communication and information -- and the ability to use them effectively -- are profoundly transforming global economic, political and security relationships. Countries such as ours that are full participants in the global flow of ideas, people and information will be in the best position to meet the future's challenges and to reap its rewards.

In corners of the globe as far-flung as Africa and China, we have seen an encouraging trend toward free market-oriented solutions to the problems of economic growth. Nations burdened with authoritarian, if not totalitarian, political systems are beginning to see that economic advance in our age requires openness to information and ideas and slowly they are placing a great emphasis on individual creativity, entrepreneurship and decentralization of responsibility. Even the Soviet Union is finally facing up to the need for openness, economic restructuring and, at least by their lights, democratization.

As Secretary of State, I have found that the most persuasive case I can make for the American position in dealing with other governments is the idealism and strength projected by our democratic society. More than ever, the United States must promote foreign policies that reflect our democratic values. We must conduct a style of public diplomacy that is capable of conveying our democratic message to a varied and ever more vast world audience.

Today, our foreign affairs agenda is crowded with complex issues we would not have contemplated even a generation ago. The world is not just at our doorstep; it is already in our living rooms, and we're in their living rooms. It is a world to which we must stay tuned, in which we must keep actively involved, and with which we must stay in constant dialogue. We cannot tune out even if we wanted to, given the global reach of our relationships and commitments. The spotlight is on us, and the microphones are always open. It is up to us to use our platform well and project America's domestic message clearly, consistently and effectively.

And what is that emerging world to which we must convey our democratic message? A world where the dispersion of scientific and technological know-how is causing a wider distribution of economic, military and political capabilities; a world of heightened economic, technological and political competitiveness; a world that is ever more interdependent economically as information systems create global financial and trading markets -- a fascinating thing going on in the area of trade, as I see it. It isn't simply that we think of some products that are made here, some products that are made somewhere else, and we trade in those products and compete in those products. That's not the case.

If you take an automobile or a refrigerator or a wiring board for a computer, or any almost typical product, what you find is that it's made up of components from many different places.

So if we were to say, let us lay down a barrier between ourselves and the rest of the world, as many who believe in protection seem to want to do, what we would be saying is, let us restructure the whole way in which we go about producing a product. It would be devastating. That's something different than we've seen before, and it is something that has happened as we have moved more and more into this age of information.

Our democratic message must reach a world community in which pressures for political and social change have accelerated and contact among contrasting cultures is pervasive and ever-more intense.

Our voice must be heard and understood by a world audience that is still widely differentiated in terms of development. We must speak to a world that is still riven by age-old ethnic, religious and regional strife, even as the availability of sophisticated weapons make these conflicts more deadly. We must appeal to a concerned world public about dangers to the environment and about the misuse of modern weaponry by terrorists and drug traffickers, even as we apply new technologies in a cooperative international effort to eradicate these modern day scourges.

But America's voice is not the only voice the world hears. I do not have to remind you here tonight that the potential of advanced communications technologies and the importance of world public opinion has not been lost on the Soviet Union.

The new leadership, under Mikhail Gorbachev, has been adept at employing public diplomacy to convey its message of glasnost and perestroika. America always stands ready to encourage a freer flow of ideas, people, and information as is called for in the Helsinki Final Act, and we welcome any genuine advances that promise to bring our peoples closer together.

While America's very freedom and enterprising spirit give us a natural advantage in the Information Age, we cannot afford

to be complacent, particularly in the field of public diplomacy. In the short run, we can be vulnerable to those who would exploit our very openness and who would manipulate communications technologies for purely propagandistic purposes. We estimate that Radio Moscow transmits well over 2,000 hours per week, while the Voice of America broadcasts just over 1,000 by comparison.

We must not forget that the single voice of state propaganda does not compete with any chorus of domestic opinion. It admits no interplay of ideas, interests and issues, and it sounds forth insistently day in and day out. When the world listens to America's voice, it hears an entire chorus, at times a cacophony. It hears the rich, varied and sometimes confusing sounds of a vital, democratic society.

In this era of accelerating change, more than ever the United States will require a style of public diplomacy that gives full expression to our abiding democratic message.

None are more aware of this than the Advisory Commission and the U.S. Information Agency. It is a credit to the leadership of many of you in this room that one of the major foreign policy achievements of this Administration is the reinvigorative role and enhanced technical capabilities for public diplomacy. Pragmatic funding and careful planning in the recent past have permitted us to draw upon a wealth of electronic and other communications resources to project our policies, convey our interests and bring our democratic message to an ever broader audience.

Without a dedicated effort during President Reagan's administration to rebuild and consolidate our information and cultural programs, many of our foreign policy goals would have gone unrealized. And they may still be imperiled if we cannot provide the necessary resources due to severe constraints on our foreign affairs budget imposed by Congress.

The draconian cuts Congress has made on the foreign affairs budget over the past three years now threaten the lifeblood of our entire foreign policy effort, including our public diplomacy programs.

The need for instantaneous, reliable communications links around the globe is perhaps the most obvious and immediate demand we must continue to meet. We cannot continue to compete successfully in the arena of world public opinion when VOA has been forced to cut its broadcast hours by ten percent in Fiscal Year 1987; when 12 overseas USIS mission posts and centers have been closed; and when international visitor, youth and book programs have been slashed. It doesn't make any sense from the standpoint of our interests.

With the cuts Congress is proposing in the fiscal '88 Foreign affairs budget, these downward trends can only get worse. Public diplomacy -- the projection of our views and lifestyle abroad -- has no true domestic constituency, much less a national consensus upon which to forge budgets in

Congress that do justice to the needs of America's international public diplomacy. We must do more to convince the public and their Congressional representatives of the importance of meeting those needs.

Now is certainly not the time to be short-sighted about the importance of public diplomacy. In a world where no one country can dictate economic, political or military events, the need for international cooperation, for coalition forging and confidence-building becomes ever more apparent.

It is just as important for us to understand and to shape public attitudes -- abroad and at home -- as it is to receive and interpret the latest computer-generated statistics or esoteric intelligence reports. People-to-people programs are more important than ever. We should do more to encourage the work of groups such as the National Endowment for Democracy and the Asia Foundation.

I have no doubt that America's democratic message will prevail, provided we allocate the resources we need to compete. The dramatic worldwide trend toward democratic government is our most meaningful basis for optimism. The visionary American decision-makers of the post-war era set in motion global trends that have shaped our present and are moving us toward an even more promising future.

It is now for us to be as creative as they were, as we address the challenges of a world of fast pace and transformational change.

Only yesterday, I addressed a workshop organized by the National Academy of Sciences on the information and communications revolution and U.S. foreign policy. I asked the National Academy of Sciences workshop participants, from academic and business circles, to think boldly and systematically about the consequences of the technological and scientific advances of the Information Age for our conduct of foreign affairs.

The workshop discussion was lively and useful. Although diverse views on many issues were expressed, the participants unanimously agreed that we are entering an era when things will be qualitatively different.

We are entering a future that can bring unprecedented prosperity and security at home and abroad. At the same time, America will face enormous challenges across the entire spectrum of our economic, social and political relationships.

Yet, in all the changes that will come, one thing is certain: America's traditional values of individual liberty, democratic institutions, free enterprise and human ingenuity will be central in establishing a better world for ourselves and for the world community.

That is the essence of America's democratic message, the message that we must convey through our public diplomacy.

I thank you for letting me start this meeting out, Ed, and I hope that you'll dig into some of the ins and outs of the Age of Information, as I see it, and come to grips with its vast implications for us. I think you will wind up agreeing with me that as we grapple in what should be our world, our kind of change, the role of public diplomacy must be a central one. And it is so much in our interest to apply the resources and the effort as represented by the people in this room, to see that we do our job to make our views clear and to prevail in seeing to it that the better world that's there for us actually does materialize.

Thank you so much for listening me out.

(Applause)

* * * * *

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

6:30pm	Dinner The Thomas Jefferson Room (By invitation only)

TOAST HONORING CONGRESSMAN DANTE B. FASCELL

BY

CHAIRMAN EDWIN J. FEULNER, JR.

CHAIRMAN, U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

CHAIRMAN FEULNER: Ladies and Gentlemen, once again welcome to the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy's conference on "Public Diplomacy in the Information Age." As my wife pointed out during dinner, I am not George Shultz here to give the primary speech. Those of you who missed our earlier activities should be informed that because of the visit of Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, the Secretary is unable to be with us at dinner this evening.

But the Secretary did in fact deliver a very eloquent and provocative address entitled "Public Diplomacy in the Information Age" just before dinner downstairs in the Loy Henderson auditorium. We are very grateful to him for taking the time to address this subject.

What we are going to do tonight in lieu of a formal address is to have brief remarks from a few people who we -- as an independent, bipartisan group of observers -- believe have really helped make public diplomacy what it is today in terms of its vital and central role in U.S. foreign policy.

The first person who I would like to pay special tribute to today is well known to everyone in the public diplomacy community. He is a champion and supporter and a real friend of public diplomacy. He has worked longer and harder than anyone to advance America's informational and educational exchange programs, to see that they are vigorously directed and that they have adequate resources. More than twenty years ago, he was the first member of Congress to call attention to the global changes taking place in communications technology. He recognized that new technologies and the American tradition of open communications create new opportunities and new challenges for the United States -- the same challenges that Secretary Shultz addressed this afternoon.

A decade ago Chairman Dante Fascell presided over the most extensive hearings ever held on public diplomacy. The result of those hearings was the concept and organization of public diplomacy that we know today. That concept and that organizational framework have worked well, and we believe it is a tribute to his vision and tireless leadership.

Tonight my colleagues and I on the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy are pleased to take a few moments to honor a man and a friend who has done so much for America's public diplomacy. I'd ask you, if you would please, to raise your glasses with me and salute the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable Dante Fascell.
Mr. Chairman.

[APPLAUSE]

TOAST BY MR. DANTE B. FASCELL

CHAIRMAN

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: Ed, ladies and gentlemen. Ed, thank you very much. That was very gracious, but I look around this room and I see so many other people who made their real contribution, because they have the job of implementing what it takes. As a matter of fact, I'm just embarrassed to see so many wonderful people, who have contributed so much to where the real struggle is in this world today, as I see it.

Let me just say that I think (and it's difficult to do because everybody has their own opinions and their own ideas) that we need to put aside whatever differences exist to concentrate on what the common goal is. As somebody said, that remarkable somebody, let's keep our eyes on the doughnut hole instead of the doughnut. And that's what we need to do in the public diplomacy business.

We have great support in the Congress, and yet as a member of Congress for some thirty years now, I'm not sure even the Congress begins to understand the real struggle despite the valiant efforts of all of you who are out there who are part of this. And the Director of USIA, who has struggled valiantly and won some real battles in getting the budget up. We still don't have the money and we don't have the national commitment yet -- despite everybody in this room. We need to keep working on it -- that's our goal -- and it doesn't make any difference about the party or the ideology or anything else, really. We got enough trouble without that.

I would like to conclude these brief remarks by paying my thanks and my respects to those men and women who have had a real keen interest in and understanding of this problem. Those who are in the service, both in the State Department and the USIA, and particularly those who serve on the Advisory Commission, past and present who understand this problem and give generously of their time and their effort and their money in order to make it possible for us, the people of the United States, to stay in the forefront of public diplomacy.

We have a golden opportunity now, because the one thing we can be sure of is that change is constant, nothing else is. We, the Americans ought to have the confidence and the capability of writing that change, both technologically and mentally. I believe we can do that, and with your leadership, Ed, and the Advisory Commission's and that of others at State and USIA and related agencies, we can continue to do that.

I can assure you that some of us in the Congress at least -- I can't make that claim for everybody, unfortunately -- some of us want to continue to help you in every way. So if I had a glass and if I had a hat, I would first tip my hat, and I would then raise my glass to the Advisory Commission and all of those who serve so well.

TOAST HONORING THE PEOPLE OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

BY

COMMISSIONER TOM C. KOROLOGOS

CHAIRMAN FEULNER: When I introduced my colleagues on the Advisory Commission earlier this evening in the Loy Henderson Room, I noted the conspicuous absence of one member of the Commission who fortunately is now able to be with us. I indicated that he was doing other pro bono work here in Washington by accompanying Judge Bork before the Senate Judiciary Committee. He once took a phone call from me, and when we were in the middle of a conversation I heard a buzzer in the background. He said "Damn it Feulner, I've got to get off, I've got a paying client on the line." So every once in a while he really does work for paying clients.

But those of us who know him, know that far and away a disproportionate amount of his time is in fact given on a pro bono basis for his country and for the things he believes in. Tom Korologos is a legend in his own time, and it's our pleasure as his colleagues on the Advisory Commission to serve with him. I would ask him now if he would please come up and propose another toast. Tom.

[APPLAUSE]

COMMISSIONER KOROLOGOS: Thanks, Ed, that's about how we worked it out. Actually it's "a legend in his own mind." I came up to Chairman Fascell tonight, and I said, "How are you on Bork?" He said fine, so I called up and said we got Fascell, except that he doesn't vote in the Senate. I hope Peter heard what the Chairman said about the Public Diplomacy Commission. You get that down? Where's Galbraith?

After spending the day with stare decisis and Madison and Marbury, it is a pleasure for me to come down here and talk to real people and say a few words about the people who really matter in public diplomacy. Actually we have all this beautiful technology, all these satellite dishes, all these wonderful Wangs, all these wonderful things, but in the end it's the people, both home and abroad, who make the system work. I'm of course speaking of the Public Affairs Officers, the Press and Information Officers, the Cultural Affairs Officers, the VOA correspondents, the Wireless File writers, the TV broadcasters, the Foreign Service Nationals, the typists, and the guys in the field.

My wife Joy and I had the privilege of representing the Advisory Commission and the USIA on a trip to China. We just came back a week ago, and I was struck again -- with all this talk of satellites and microchips -- that we should not lose sight of those unsung Americans from Washington to Shanghai who really do tell America's story.

You can push all the buttons you want in Washington, Marvin [Stone, Deputy Director, USIA], but unless a PAO picks the message up out in the field, it's not going to get there. The first time I find out some Washington guy is trying to send the Wireless File straight to an editor -- you think Bork is having trouble getting confirmed -- wait till I run up against him.

The people in public diplomacy, the trained officers, they know radio, they know exhibits, they know survey research, they know television, they know the foreign languages, they know the people that make foreign societies tick, and they know America. They know danger. They've been shot at. They've been killed. In some countries they have trouble finding housing; in Shanghai and Beijing, they live in hotels.

It is my privilege tonight to honor those people here and overseas who really made it work. There are some here tonight. I'm talking of Ray Benson, Stan Burnett, Karl Fritz, Carl Howard, Marlin Remick, Michael Armacost. These guys are the heart of "Public Diplomacy in the Information Age." I salute you and offer a toast to the people in Washington and the field who make it happen.

TOAST HONORING THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY
BY
THE HONORABLE MARVIN STONE
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Thank you Tom [Commissioner Tom C. Korologos]. I read in Time magazine this week a very laudatory story about you; it's a handsome picture of you. I thank God your picture wasn't on the cover, because you know what happened to the last lobbyist who had his picture on the cover of Time.

If Charlie Wick were here -- he was called away and I am sorry that he isn't -- he would seize this opportunity to thank the Commission as a whole, because I know that Tom was speaking for the Commission as a whole. And I know how Chairman Feulner feels about you, and the Director thanks you too.

I think it is a tribute to the Commission's travels -- these guys do get out and hit the road -- and their sense of understanding about what our people do in the field that brought Tom to this podium tonight. These are families that get jerked around year-after-year, two years here, three years there. You find a PAO in Paris, but more likely an officer is going to end up in Paraguay. There is one in London, but there is also one in Upper Volta. It's hard to understand the sacrifice that State Department and USIA and AID officers make overseas. I spent ten years of my life as a correspondent, and I ran into them all the time. One must have a deep appreciation for their sacrifice for the country.

On satellites and mini-computers, I think there is an efficiency in using them. They are giving us tools we have never had before, but at the same time you've got to have someone to aim that ammunition. You can't go willy nilly with Worldnet or the Voice of America or Radio Marti or the Wireless File or any of our other mass media tools. You have got to have that officer in the field.

You've got to have someone sit down with an editor and try to convince him or her of our point of view, because when you get a columnist in Die Welt or the Times of London writing a column favorable to our position, I can tell you it's a lot more help to this country than any speech a U.S. public official can make. And that's what the guys in the field do. They do it all the time.

And we shouldn't forget the Foreign Service Nationals who work for us as xerox operators or assistant librarians or assistant cultural officers, who in many countries are downgraded by their compatriots for working for an American organization. My experience has been they care about what they are doing. They really do believe in the underlying strengths and values of this country, and they do a great job for us.

And the civil servants back here in Washington, these are the people who pass the ammunition to the troops in the field.

I was in a meeting today with the Assistant Minister of

Culture from Hungary. He had come over as an International Visitor for 30 days, and it wasn't until today, the day he arrived, that he decided where he wanted to go. He wanted to go to six cities. We have people right now scrambling on the phone calling college campuses, calling libraries, calling vocational schools. One of our interests is to make sure that we win this man over. He is going to go back to Hungary as a friend of this country if the job is done right. We have been doing this for years in this Agency.

Let me just conclude by talking about the young people coming in. I've sworn in I think the last three junior officer training classes, and I see these fresh faces full of energy. These are people who are going out into the field, most of them, and you have to tell them you are going to have bad times and good times out there. But if you don't believe in what you are doing, don't pack your suitcase. And I'll tell you, it is just so refreshing because of the enthusiasm they bring into the Agency. They catch the spirit very quickly, but more importantly, they recharge the batteries of everybody. We are very lucky, both at State and at the Agency to have this inflow of tremendous interest. We are getting awfully good people.

Finally, I want to thank the Commission. I think it was very gracious of Tom and the Commission and the Chairman to pay tribute to the people who toil in the vineyards. We forget about them most of the time. So my return toast is to the Commission and to the Chairman for the thanks you've paid a lot of people who deserve those words. Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

TOAST BY DR. OLIN ROBISON
PRESIDENT, MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE

[Prior to the following remarks by Chairman Feulner and Dr. Robison, Chairman Feulner presented plaques honoring the distinguished service of the following former members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy: Dr. John Hope Franklin, Mae Sue Talley, Lewis Manilow, Neil Sherburne, Jean McKee, Leonard Silverstein, and Olin Robison.]

CHAIRMAN FEULNER: The President of Middlebury College, Olin Robison, is a distinguished educator and political scientist. He is a former official with the Peace Corps, the Department of State, formerly Provost for Social Sciences at Wesleyan, and an occasional opponent of mine on the MacNeil-Lehrer News Hour and other ventures along the way. Since 1975, he has been the President of Middlebury College. He was the Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, appointed by President Carter, and served on the Commission from 1978 to 1984. Olin.

[APPLAUSE]

DR. OLIN ROBISON: It's a very, very great pleasure to be here this evening. I noticed that Ed was almost cracking up as he introduced me, because he knows that I know stories about him that he hopes I'm not going to tell. Actually he's bribed me, and I am bribable on these things, but he won't know until I am finished.

There is a story going about Moscow these days that the Politburo, in their usual manner of dealing with things, became quite concerned about the alarming increase in the number of automobile accidents in and around Moscow. They debated this at some length and eventually decided that it had to be dealt with quite firmly. As a result, an edict was laid down that all of the traffic speed laws were to be rigidly enforced. There were to be absolutely no exceptions. Tickets were to be given, and people were to be disciplined very harshly. The following weekend, Secretary General Gorbachev went out to his dacha in the country. He was having a good time, and he stayed over Sunday night, and on Monday morning, he got a bit of a late start back. He went out to get in his limousine, and it's well-known that he likes to drive, so he told his driver, "You get in the back, I'll drive." So into Moscow they went at a rather high-speed, and as they came into the outskirts of the city, they passed a couple of motorcycle policemen. Knowing their duty, one of them mounted his machine and took after the limousine, not knowing who it was. He eventually stopped it, and a short time later was back in the station where his colleagues said, "Well did you give him a ticket.?" He said "No, no I didn't." The first one said "You are are going to be in big trouble; don't you know who it was?" He replied, "Well I tell you, I don't know who it was, but he had Gorbachev as his driver."

It is the good fortune of public diplomacy in this country that for a great many generations, as Washington generations

are measured, it has had Dante Fascell as its driver. And I would simply feel negligent if I did not add my words to those that have already been spoken by Ed.

The fact is that I think no one, literally no one, has given so unreservedly, so unstintingly, and with such energy, hard work, devotion and passion to this enterprise as has our friend Dante. He and Jean Marie are friends of all of ours, and this is kind of a family gathering here despite the extraordinary elegance of these surroundings. And the theme that Dante has reminded all of us about over and over again -- as there have been arguments about budgets, as there have been arguments about technology, arguments about policy, arguments about appointments and people and all those things -- is the fundamental issue that this country is committed to the free movement of people, ideas, and information across international boundaries. He has been unstinting in this throughout Democratic and Republican administrations.

I am privileged to work with a lot of young people; I am also privileged to speak around the country a great deal. And one of the things that has seemed to me to be a great irony is that when most Americans think of what it is we represent abroad, it is not in fact the stuff that goes on mostly in this building. Or across the river at either of those buildings or out at Fort Meade in that building or any of the rest of them. It is in fact what goes on at USIA. And the irony is that there is an extraordinary base of support for what this Agency does, despite what we have chosen to do in limiting the dissemination of knowledge about this Agency among our own population. It is the activity for which there is the most support and the least understanding.

Now I suppose that is going to go on for a long time, but I think what it says to us is that the activities, of the work of this Commission, the activities of the people who have been celebrated in the remarks made by Ed and Marvin, the basic untiring understanding and knowledgable support of people like Dante Fascell is at the very center of U.S. foreign policy. It is at the very center of the projection of this country abroad.

And one of the things I understand and appreciate is that this support is not Republican, it is not Democratic, it is not independent, it is simply American. And I think that's what we celebrate here tonight. And so I ask you to join me in raising a glass to our common effort, which I honestly believe represents the basic desires of the American people for what this country stands for in the world overseas and how we ought to be represented. It is a good work and it's good to be part of it.

[APPLAUSE]

Whereupon at 9:30 p.m. Chairman Feulner closed the after dinner remarks and announced the conference would reconvene at 9:30 a.m. the following day.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Wednesday, September 16, 1987

8:30 am — Registration and Coffee

The Loy Henderson Conference Room

9:30 am — Welcoming Remarks:

Chairman Edwin J. Feulner, Jr.

"International Communication in the 1990's"

Moderator:

Chairman Edwin J. Feulner, Jr.

Panelists:

The Honorable Dan Mica (D-FL)
Chairman, House Subcommittee on International Operations

The Honorable Leonard Marks
Former Director, U.S. Information Agency; and
Chairman, Executive Committee,
Center for Strategic and International Studies

The Honorable William Schneider
Former Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science, and Technology; and
Senior Fellow, Hudson Institute

MR. FEULNER: Good morning. I am Edwin Feulner, Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy is an independent, bipartisan body created by Congress to oversee the international information and educational exchange programs of the United States Government.

We submit an annual report to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Director of USIA, and to the Congress. In addition, on occasion, we submit special reports on various subjects, such as our report on embassy security and its implications for the role of public diplomacy, which was issued about a year-and-a-half ago, and our study of last year, authored by Commission member Priscilla Buckley, on U.S.-Soviet media relations.

This conference is a forum for leaders in the foreign affairs, Congressional, media, business, labor and academic communities to come together, take a step back, and reflect on public diplomacy gains of the 1980s and the challenges we will be facing in the 1990s.

In other words, we are here to allow the public diplomacy community in Washington to pause, to look thoughtfully at where we are heading, and to assess the recent gains, expansion, and long overdue reinvestment in public diplomacy efforts that have been undertaken by this administration.

I think it's important that we will have statements by key figures on the value of public diplomacy, and its importance to U.S. foreign relations. Statements by the President, at 11 o'clock this morning, by Secretary Shultz whom I hope all of you had the opportunity to hear last evening, by Director Wick, who will be speaking to us at lunch, by leading members of the Congress -- House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Fascell, who was with us last evening, and Chairman Dan Mica, of the House International Operations Subcommittee, who is with us this morning, and by other experts.

It is our hope that the proceedings will be published in timely fashion so that others who are unable to be with us today will be able to share some of the insights that we all gain from today's conference.

What do we mean by public diplomacy? Well, public diplomacy in fact is a new label for a relatively old concept. Public diplomacy we believe supplements and reinforces traditional diplomacy. One of its roles is to explain U.S. policies to foreign publics, to provide information about American society and its culture overseas; to enable overseas visitors to come and see for themselves; to experience the diversity of our culture through exchange programs. And, finally, to assess foreign policy opinion for our policy-makers so that, in the words of a former director of USIA, Edward Murrow, public diplomacy can be "in on the takeoff as well as the landing" on various foreign policy initiatives.

These are not just worthy enterprises that happen to coexist in an organizational chart at USIA. In fact, each of them supplements and reinforces the other, so that we believe the whole becomes really greater than the sum of its parts.

Public diplomacy succeeds through the steady, wise use of all the resources available over time; not just "one shot" dramatic efforts.

Our first panel this morning will be on the theme "International Communication in the 1990s." This topic broadly suggests a series of questions: How is the information age, the new communications technology and public opinion that Secretary Shultz addressed last evening, shaping America's foreign relations? What developing technologies hold promise for public diplomacy in the future? How does the United States arrive at informed choices, coordinated policies and resource decisions in the broad arena of public diplomacy?

Here to help us answer these questions are a distinguished member of Congress and two former leaders from within the executive branch. Our principal speaker this morning, Chairman Dan Mica, is a fifth term Democrat from Palm Beach, Florida. His Florida district is the fastest-growing district in the United States today. When he first came to Congress, his peers recognized his leadership ability by electing him president of his freshman class. He now serves as deputy whip and a member of the Steering and Policy Committee, and most relevantly for our purposes today, he is Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations; so he has oversight of American embassies, and if any of you has had an opportunity to discuss his findings when he visited Moscow not long ago, I am sure you will find those very, very interesting, although perhaps just a bit off the subject today.

He also, of course, has oversight for the State Department, so in some respects I presume that Secretary Shultz and everyone in the building works for you, Mr. Chairman, and of course for USIA, where his support for public diplomacy is well known and, I'm sure, appreciated by Director Wick and everyone within the public diplomacy community.

He served on the Inman Task Force on Embassy Security and to our mind, having had the opportunity to work with him for a number of years, he has become the most informed member of the House of Representatives on current communications policy and public diplomacy programs.

His credentials as a Member of the House are impressive, and his credentials as an expert on the Information Age are just as impressive, and we are delighted that he is able to kick off this panel this morning.

The two discussants on Dan Mica's panel are equally distinguished. The Honorable Leonard Marks, a man of many parts; attorney, diplomat, scholar, banker, long recognized as a leading authority in telecommunications policy. He has headed American delegations to the World Administrative Radio

Conference (WARC), other international conferences, the former director of USIA, former director of COMSAT, Former chairman of the International Conference on Communications Satellites; a predecessor of mine as Chairman of the Advisory Commission on International Education, and as I said, has led numerous delegations. I have the honor of serving with him now on our UNESCO review panel, where his fair and open mind has managed to accommodate a wide variety of opinions in the last two years that we have worked together on that.

He also, of course, serves as Chairman of the Center for Strategic and International Studies Board, where we consider him a friendly competitor in the think tank business across town. But he is indeed a true expert in the field of public diplomacy; and Leonard, we are glad you could be with us this morning.

The second commentator this morning will be the Honorable William Schneider, Ph.D. from New York University in economics, Senior Fellow of the Hudson Institute, Adjunct Scholar of the Heritage Foundation, currently serving as a private consultant to corporate America. Until recently, Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, for a period of about five years.

He was originally in the Reagan administration as the OMB Associate Director for National Security Affairs, where his interest in public diplomacy was re-ignited from his early days as a ham radio operator on board a U.S. flag tramp steamer, which again would lead to some interesting discussions, but perhaps not this morning.

An economist, defense analyst, an expert on communications technology, and an old friend. We are delighted you could be with us as well. Bill.

At this time, the ground rules for this morning's program are to begin with the principal address by Congressman Mica, followed by comments from Leonard Marks and Bill Schneider. In the remaining time, we will take questions from the floor. I am told that all the microphones will function, if you press the red button, the red light will appear and, as if by magic, it will immediately work.

We will then have to end this panel promptly at 10:45, allowing a brief break before the President of the United States joins us.

At this time it is my very great pleasure to turn the podium over to the Honorable Dan Mica. Dan.

[Applause.]

MR. MICA: I have a few props I have brought with me today. I do not usually do this.

Let me just start out -- before I even get my remarks out -- and say, Bill and Leonard, that it's great to be here;

Charlie Wick. It is good to be inside this building.

[Laughter.]

Let me tell you, we got here early, and we have walked around this building. We have been upstairs, downstairs and around -- this is a member of Congress I.D. card. There's only one for each Congressman and Senator in the United States. He told me it was no good -- but he said my aide's card was good.

[Laughter.]

True, at the gate out here.

So, Leonard, with the communications age, we are going to have to get something a little better than this card. It is good to be here, and there are a few things I would like to talk about.

There are so many areas of this subject that I want to discuss in 15 minutes -- how do you start this timer here? See, even here they have a digital timer. There it goes. We're off and running.

I had trouble narrowing down what I wanted to talk about here today to 15 minutes. This is, for Dan Mica, a love of my life. I thought I would take a few precious moments of your time and show you a few little gadgets that I own and I collect. I have some of the oldest radios you have ever seen; I have them in my office. I think Charlie has seen them -- some of the old wooden ones. I have some of the newest devices. They are all over my house and office. I will show you just a few things that I thought about coming here today.

Ed, I start out with your letter. I have his letter inviting me to come, and it says, "If you would accept, we would like you to focus on the theme of conceptual changes in the way we think." Let me tell you, folks, I think that is 90 percent of the problem. The way you approach a problem, the way you think about a problem, begins the solution process, and I think that is so important.

I think it takes creative thinking. I commend Charlie Wick for Worldnet and the work that he has done there. Whoever started Voice of America as well as those at the time of Marconi. All of these are new ways of thinking, with people saying "it wouldn't work."

I was telling my assistant, in doing some research on this last week, that Thomas Edison, with his light bulb, went to some government official. Some of you may have read this. They said the glowing filament was a nice parlor trick but wasn't worthy of any investment. They were not thinking right.

So just think in terms of what we do in our daily life. For instance, and most of you are in the same position I am in -- although some of you may be independently wealthy -- you have got to increase your income. And you go to your

accountant and you talk to your family. How are we going to do it? I need 10 percent a year more. You are always thinking about earning more money. You can go to many accountants in this town and find ways to reduce your taxes by 10 percent, and you have accomplished the same thing. Just a little different thinking.

Back to this building. Henry Kissinger was appointed by President Nixon years ago. I guess by my first term in office he was out. The Shanghai Accords: for years they could not write an agreement because it said "Taiwan" or it said "China." Neither side would ever agree to any piece of paper that had those words. Someone came up with the idea -- "the land mass on each side of the Formosa Straits." A brand new way of thinking, a brand new relationship for the world.

In Moscow, our trip, as you indicated, did not really have a lot to do with today, but it had everything to do with today. Before you ever saw on your TV screens the fact that the Moscow embassy was bugged, we spent 18 months with our security people; our CIA, DIA, State Department trying to figure -- we knew it was bugged; we could not figure out how. We went through that building looking for microphones. We were looking with magnifying glasses and equipment. It turned out, the entire building is a microphone.

The Soviets had come up with a new way of thinking, and we are still trying to figure that out. So it is important.

Now, we have gone from an industry, international telecommunications, that did not even exist in a real sense, in an economic sense, less than a billion dollar industry a few decades ago, to $300 billion. That ought to ring a bell. Cap Weinberger's budget is about $300 billion. He is liable to be worried about this industry.

A $300 billion industry, larger than the budgets of most nations of the world.

I brought something, Charlie. I did not know you would be here, but you gave this to me. Do you remember this? I collect all kinds of things, but this is an original tube from the Voice of America. You have seen them; it is a vacuum tube. That is what started the industry out.

I want to show you a little piece that replaces this, in just a minute. That tube was the beginning of an industry, the beginning of a way of thinking, and even the development of that tube was thought to be a fad by many in the early days.

Then we move on to some other items, and I have one here. I think you have seen these in stores. This is mine, this is a little AM/FM stereo pocket television/video computer monitor. It is everything in one. Runs on four little batteries. There is a little input on the side. You can connect it to a watch or a little display; a card the size of a credit card, and it becomes a computer screen; it is a TV.

Telecommunications is coming so fast. The communications era is changing so fast from this video, this tube -- which took a football field full to start to broadcast VOA -- to what in here represents hundreds of these tubes.

I also had a little beeper here I was going to show you. I took it off to show my staff this morning and left it on my desk. The newest pager for Congress, I do not know if you have seen them, but not only does it beep, but you can put it on "silent" when you do not want to bother anybody; and it vibrates. Now let me tell you some great stories about that...

I also have a headline; talk about new and innovative technologies, and how they are coming so fast. Congress sometimes is the old horse in technology. This is yesterday's Roll Call, the Capitol Hill newspaper. Chic Hecht, Senator Hecht, has started a firestorm on Capitol Hill. You know what he did? He sent out, under the frank, postal patron, the first video cassette congressional newsletter ever sent. And don't you know? 534 other Senators and Congressmen were down at the studios, asking about how to do it the next morning. They are already investigating this.

This is interesting because this is a little bit of what we are going to talk about. Chic Hecht sent a videotape letter to constituents. It may be the case of technology outracing ethics rules, and it has gone to the Ethics Committee: Did we do something wrong?

That is what we are talking about here today. Standards, integration, coordination, what we can do, what we cannot do.

The cellular telephone; I do not have to hold that up, you have all seen it. You do not have to be acquainted with this nowadays in this town. Maybe out in the Midwest and some areas, but in this town, this is standard fare. I have called Charlie Wick, reached him on the phone. I tell the story, I represent Boca Raton and Palm Beach, two beautiful areas, very wealthy. One of my best supporters and friends I called for advice. His secretary said, "He's not here, but I'll connect you to him in the car phone." I got the car, and the individual answered and said, "Well, we switched cars. I'm a friend of his, but he's in my car. Here's the phone number, he's right in front of me. We're driving down I-95." New technology.

Let me go to the last two items. This is probably less known; this is something I use around the house. It goes like this, but I think this drives home the point: it's not just a small TV, not just a cellular phone or vacuum tube, this is a TV transmitter. This is a transmitter station, audio and video.

I will tell you how I use it. I plug it into a VCR, and any TV in my neighborhood can turn in to channel 13, which is a blank channel, and watch whatever film I am watching on my VCR. It is a transmitter and it has a thousand different uses.

Think of what you can do in a community with a satellite

broadcast to a little transmitter, and set up a TV station. For educational, for cultural, or diplomatic purposes. We could hook this up and broadcast this to the street outside with a little modification. It can be done. But the bottom line is, this is actually a tie clip, or it was made into a tie clip.

Everything that I have shown you -- plus computers that we use, and I have a couple computers at home -- can all be put on this chip that I have in my hand. Now the chip itself isn't the size of what it takes. There is a little window in the center cut out, and there is something in there maybe a tenth the size of my fingernail where we can put all of that information today.

The bottom line is the changes are coming, they are here, they must be recognized by our government, by our President -- and I think he is starting to recognize, as we all are, the potential here. Even changing the way Congress operates.

In fact, Charlie Wick arranged for us -- we had the first international hearing. The Congress sat at a panel; the witnesses were TV cameras, the witnesses were actually in Panama and other countries of the world.

Fantastic. Now, I have to tell you, with regard to the potential for junkets, and stopping them, it sent chills down the spines of my colleagues because there would be no reason to travel. But nonetheless, it can be done. That was a test, and we expect in future days you will not see as often a Secretary of State hopping on a plane to go here and there, but entering a teleconferencing room with his counterpart in the same room in an embassy or facility or USIA facility around the world for international problems; not just conferences and discussions and seminars -- which are all important -- but for final policy-making decisions.

Now the problems are there, and that is what we are going to talk about. Coordination, it is not really coordinated. In fact, there are efforts to stifle coordination, to license journalists, to keep you out, to close the borders, the whole nine yards. Integration; systems are not integrated, the approaches, the decibels, the frequencies are not appropriately assigned.

I think it is time for our government, and I think our government is doing it, to take a lesson from some of the groups like Weight Watchers or Alcoholics Anonymous. The first step is to recognize that this is here, it is real, to accept the technology. It is not a fad, it is not the filament in the light bulb that Edison was told to go away with; it is here to stay.

You know in my own area, I mentioned Boca Raton, the fastest growing city in the United States. They tried to stop growth. The city council, good stalwarts of the community, conservative leadership, said "We don't want outsiders in." Anybody who wanted to develop -- a builder of a factory, a

plant -- went to the council and was turned down, denied. He would then go to the courts and win. We had a quilt-work around the community; a factory next to a residence, a factory next to a playground -- a mishmash.

The next council that came in -- was thrown out on that. We will have a unified plan; we will work with the county, with the state, with the nation. In the last 20 years since that has happened, Boca Raton -- one of the most magnificent communities in the United States -- bought every foot of beachfront, from the north end of their city to the south end, more beachfront than any place on the east coast of Florida for a city.

It showed that it could be done, and they have controlled growth while they did it. Governments are withholding, individuals are withholding, departments and agencies are not cooperating, and we are ending up with a quilt-work. We need to all accept and we need to get the rest of the world to accept that we need that master plan, and it has to happen. I have a recommendation I will give you on it.

I will tell you this: if knowledge is power, and no one disputes it, I think that it is now being translated in the Soviet Union, of all places, that lack of knowledge is weakness; economic, political and military weakness. I, for one, think that is part of the underpinnings of glasnost. I believe that.

There are military considerations, economic and political; but there is a knowledge factor that is coming into being. First let me tell you that we equate glasnost to openness. I am told, in fact, and the individual who told me may be in this room, that in the dictionaries of Gorbachev's college days, the term glasnost would not mean "openness"; that is the contemporary interpretation. The traditional interpretation is "public relations."

Very interesting point. I think he started to understand, you cannot withhold that computer, you cannot put a guard at every copy machine, you cannot stop the technology; the flat dish is coming, direct broadcast satellites are coming -- you can jam here and you can jam there, but I can turn these dials and re-tune this broadcast equipment with a small screwdriver. We will be able to do it; we can do most of it right now.

So we think of the Soviets as trying to be open for their sake and for all the positive reasons of humanity, and I hope and pray there is some of that there, but I think they have looked at our technology, I think they have looked at the satellites in the skies.

I didn't want to get into this, but yesterday was USA Today's fifth birthday. They said it could not be done. With 1.8 million readers, I think it is bigger than the New York Times. Transmitting by satellite to 30 locations; one in Zurich, one in Singapore -- USA Today has same day delivery all over the world. Now maybe none of that caught the Soviet's

attention; maybe this did. Here is today's Business Week. You see what the headline says? I do not know how you say that in Russian, but it says "Hello anywhere."

And that is what it is all about. I think the military planners, the economic planners, and the capitalists of this world understand that we have got to integrate, we have got to bring these systems together, we have got to coordinate, we have to find some common standards, because it is in all of their interests to do it, and it can be done, and it is starting right here. You have some of the best leadership on this globe in this room to tackle these problems.

I might also add that the communications ability of some of the equipment I have had here for education, for changing the face of lesser developed nations, for changing the face of Third World communities is just mind-boggling.

Those cellular phones, thousands can be put into one crate load, and five or ten antennas, and you do not have to follow the traditional American concept of putting down lines. You can have a whole town with phones, or a whole government outfitted overnight. You can have classrooms around a continent, if you have the will and the desire to do it.

I think that part of it boils down to something that is not talked about too much in diplomatic circles, but more in military circles; the balance of power. One of the bottom lines is American security or military readiness, and I believe that the communications battle that we are about to fight today -- that we have begun to fight -- is not a skirmish, and not like Nicaragua, not like Afghanistan, the Middle East; skirmishes where people can sit aside, watch it and read about it; it is the equivalent of a nuclear war for this world.

It is a military battle, in diplomatic terms, for the hearts and minds of the world. Our polls, your polls, Charlie Wick, the government polls, our secret intelligence information have been showing us we have been losing that battle. The young people of Europe do not recognize the problems, and why we fought in Europe in World War II. We have to win that battle. We have to get back in. It is a part of our military equation as well as our diplomatic equation.

I for one am going to redouble my efforts in the Congress to try to increase, if I can, funding for some of the programs that we have talked about here today. The more I study it, the more I see the importance. I see that for every dollar we spend in international telecommunications, we can probably save ten or twenty or fifty in military hardware. It is important; it is something that I am going to re-dedicate myself to.

Finally, I am going to try my best to think in new ways, as I told you; that is what Ed said. We have to find new ways to approach these problems. Maybe one of the first things we should do -- and I would like to echo a call made two years ago by Dante Fascell when he spoke to one of these groups -- is to create a Presidential commission on international

telecommunications, to help us with the input, to take from the work that is done here, to maintain our lead in technology, to assure our communications-related exports remain a driving force in this economy, and I think that is so important.

We have all the segments of this commission, many right in this room, and our foreign policy apparatus at our use to promote the American ideals that we are talking about as we celebrate, in just a few minutes on this Mall, 200 years of the Constitution. We need to get the message out. I call it affirmative action for democracy.

There is nothing wrong, there is no reason to be ashamed that you are an American or that we are pushing democracy, as some would have you believe, if you read the papers today.

So I close with this: H.L. Mencken, I think said: "For every complex problem there is a simple solution -- which is usually wrong."

[Laughter.]

There is no simple solution. With the technology, the engineering, and the diplomacy and the politics that we are dealing with today, it is as complex as any problem, any Manhattan Project we have ever undertaken. But if we think a new way, and my last example: A seminar like this was called in, I believe it was, the 1700s. It is a documented seminar, involving the President and leaders (such as we have here) of their time, to move the mails on Pony Express in a faster way around the colonies and the continent.

They were given three or seven days, a very short time to make a quick recommendation, because there was a great deal of complaining about the slowness of the mails and the service. The recommendation, made by the top scientists of the day, was to immediately breed horses with longer legs.

They were thinking the old way. They were thinking to do things the way they had done them. That kind of thinking will not help us here today. We have got to think in new ways; the computer chip and the technology in the satellite and the diplomacy that can be transmitted; not just individuals shuttling on airplanes. It will help us diplomatically, politically and militarily; and I think we can get our message to the rest of the world far better and have it more well-received than any competing government on the face of the earth.

Thank you for allowing me to be with you.

[Applause.]

MR. FEULNER: Thank you, Dan, for setting the stage so marvelously and for rising to the challenge of beginning today's program in such a stimulating and provocative way.

I would ask Leonard Marks to come up, if he would, and respond. Leonard?

[Applause.]

MR. MARKS: Mr. Chairman, Dan Mica, being here today is deja vu. In this room, at this table in 1969, about 40 countries gathered to talk about Intelsat. I happened to have had the privilege of being present at that time, and I can tell you that nobody envisioned that less than 20 years later Intelsat would cover the globe with over 100 countries as members, and would create multi-billion dollar industries and revolutionize the way people think all over the world.

Now, I don't have the bag of tricks that Dan Mica has, but I have a few statistics to illustrate to you what is happening in the field of international communications. Let us go back to the early days when the first experimental satellite was launched.

1965, Intelsat I was launched; it had 240 voice circuits. That was absolutely astounding; 240 telephone calls could be transmitted across the Atlantic simultaneously or on television programs. It was the miracle of the ages.

In 1966, the second Intelsat was launched, with 1,200 voice circuits. In 1968, Intelsat III had 1,500 voice circuits. In 1975, Intelsat IV-A provided 6,000 voice circuits plus 2 television channels and in 1986, Intelsat V had 15,000 voice circuits and 2 TV channels.

Now let me tell you what is coming in 1989, Intelsat VI, with 120,000 voice circuits and 3 television channels simultaneously. So from 1965 to 1989, we progressed by 50-fold.

Now if you think that that is dramatic, let me tell you about the next step in communications. You have all read and heard about fiber optics. Just as we could not have envisioned the dramatic increase in voice communication with Intelsat, I don't think we have any idea where we are going with fiber optics.

I want to read you a quotation from a scientific magazine. I hope it is true:

"The past ten years have seen dramatic advances in how much an optical fiber can carry and how fast. The current experimental limit is 4,000 million bits, about the information contained in a 30-volume Encyclopedia Britannica, transmitted every second over a span of 117 kilometers.

With the information capacity limit still perhaps five orders of magnitude away, it is likely this progress will continue through the coming decade. If the capacities of optical fiber were fully exploited --"

Now listen to this:

"-- the entire present telephone voice traffic in the

United States could be carried on a single fiber. The contents of the Library of Congress could be transmitted in a few seconds. We have apparently discovered an inexhaustible medium for communications."

That's what lies ahead in international communications, for the 1990s.

But for whom? How many countries? Well, if you look around the world you will find there are probably nine countries that have the techniques and the equipment that Congressman Mica showed you.

There was a devastating, sobering report delivered by the International Telecommunications Union last year; the Maitland Report, and I think that you will have to sober down and look at some of the statistics that they reported for the rest of the world.

Ninety percent of the world's population does not have access to a telephone, let alone satellites and optical fibers. Of the 600 million telephones in the world, 75 percent are concentrated in nine countries. That's the western world. Ninety-five percent of the world's population lives in countries with 10 telephones or less for every 100 persons. Over 50 percent live in countries with less than one telephone for every 100 persons.

AID publishes or provides an information bulletin every month called the World Development Forum and I read it carefully, and this month's issue contains the following:

"Development: Only a phone call away. In China, executives sometimes send their drivers with written messages to colleagues, where no amount of dialing seems to do any good. Normally mild-mannered businessmen have stormed and raged and thrown handsets at hotel walls after hours of fruitless dialing. In Indonesia, the rule of thumb is five aborted tries for every successful connection. And a bank in downtown Jakarta had to go a full month without a telephone. In rural areas of the Philippines, someone needing to call overseas may have to travel a week to reach a decent phone."

That is the situation that exists in most of the world. So when we talk about the information technologies in the '90s and how USIA shall practice public diplomacy, let us recognize that there are two worlds. We must use the devices which Congressman Mica has just pointed out. We must have Worldnet; and I, too, commend Charlie Wick and the USIA, Al Snyder, for what they have done. They have paved the way for a very dramatic and revolutionary concept; but that is only for a handful of people.

Now how do we communicate in the '90s with the rest of the world? I believe there is no substitute for radio. In many of these countries, literacy is 20 percent; and there are no daily newspapers, there are no magazines for the 80 percent of the population that cannot read; and for the literate population,

there are very few newspapers, there are very few thoughtful magazines.

But the people who are illiterate are not stupid. They can listen to radio. And the inexpensive transistor radio that you can hold in the palm of your hand can be found in the most remote village.

I had an experience on the Afghan border a number of years ago; the most primitive place that you can imagine, along the Khyber Pass. I went to a little stall; there were no paved roads, it was a dirt, mud hut, and they were selling electronic devices, transistor radios. Through my interpreter I asked what you could hear. And the salesman was very astute. He turned on the switch, he dialed, and he says, "That's the Voice of America."

Now Charlie, that is a success story that is duplicated throughout the world. So our fundamental weapon in the war of ideas must be shortwave radio, and we just concluded a conference in Geneva, the ITU, where we saw the competition for radio frequencies. Every country wants radio frequencies so it can get its message out.

We have been able to maintain a leadership. We don't broadcast as much as some other countries; the Soviet Union, but we do our share, and I hope, Congressman Mica, that your committee recognizes that we must not reduce the appropriation or the facilities of the Voice of America, we must augment them.

Let me return to something that is even more fundamental: books. For years, people have recognized that the book is the citadel of knowledge. Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "Books are bullets in the battle for men's minds." The British have said for centuries, "Trade follows the book."

Now what are we doing in that war of ideas through books? The last reliable statistics that I could find for the Soviet Union were 1983. In that year, the Soviets distributed 83 million copies of books in 56 languages. Now, do not be misled and feel that these were all Lenin and Stalin diatribes; they were not. They were cultural books, they were textbooks, they were scientific books; and 83 million copies were distributed in 56 languages.

Now during that comparable period, Congressman Mica, what do you think the USIA appropriation permitted them to distribute? Of the 83 million copies that the Soviets distributed, 24 million were in English. The USIA distributed 571,000 copies.

The Soviets do not have Spanish as one of their languages, but they published in that year 11.6 million books. Now we are worried about Central America, our neighbor to the south. We do not compete.

My message today is, the information technology for the

'90s is absolutely astounding. We are at the threshold of a vast new era, where electronics will remain supreme for a small part of the world. We must recognize that; we must compete for that small audience. But for the larger audience, let's not overlook the fact that the tried, the true, the traditional means of communication must be the shortwave radio, the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, Radio Marti, Radio Afghanistan -- whatever it is that we can tell our neighbors by radio, books.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

MR. FEULNER: Thank you very much, Leonard Marks.

Bill Schneider?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. The subject of this conference is one that very effectively lends itself to the infectious enthusiasm for the technology that is being invested in this field, as Congressman Mica has shown; and I certainly share that enthusiasm, and I think everyone else does that works on it.

I think the nation is fortunate that we have had this juxtaposition of a President who both understands the value of communication in modern society and is able to effectively employ it, with Charlie Wick as Director of USIA, who is particularly well attuned to this and has done as much as anyone in modern times to facilitate advancing American interests through the effective use of international communications technologies and Congressman Mica, among others in the Congress, who have understood the importance of communication to our national interests abroad as well as our economy, and have done so much to effect it.

International communication is one of those phrases that is in some sense like the phrase "national security." As national security means much more than simply national defense, so, too, does international communication mean much more than simply the sending and receiving of messages.

What I think is the proper concept to focus on is the integration of telecommunication technologies with information processing technologies and transportation technologies. What all of this is doing is in effect collapsing the cost of moving a bit of information or an electron over a distance.

Leonard Marks has ably described the rapid pace of technological innovation in the telecommunications field. When this is combined with innovation in information processing, where the cost of processing information has declined by more than a factor of a thousand since the computer was developed, and with the revolution that is underway in international transportation, you have the integration of these going beyond the ability of any government to control.

Indeed, when authoritarian or totalitarian governments try to control this technology, they are likely to suffer an early arresting of their economic development, because of the intimate linkage between international communications technology and economic development.

Further, for authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, this kind of technology, because it is beyond the control of governments to interfere with, is likely to increase pressures for democratization and encourage the maintenance of existing democratic institutions.

Moreover, it will have the effect cumulatively of reducing the effectiveness of institutions in authoritarian regimes because of the loss of the state monopoly over access to information.

From the American perspective, these trends are ones that we are in a uniquely powerful position to exploit to support our national interests and the interests of other free societies, while at the same time diminishing the ability of totalitarian regimes to threaten us and to maintain the effectiveness of their totalitarian institutions.

I think from the perspective of this particular conference and my own experience working in the Department of State, these technologies have the property of placing time on the side of the United States in terms of bringing democracy and peace and stability to the international community.

All of the trends that are associated with this technology; the ability to inform, the ability to allow individuals to inexpensively and effectively gain access to information, is something that I think is going to have an incalculable influence on our own development.

Having been associated with our foreign assistance activities for a number of years, the grim statistics that Leonard Marks pointed to, of the relatively limited access that many countries currently enjoy to telecommunications technology, are exactly the kind of characteristics that are most directly affected by the net effect of all of these technological changes on price. The price of these is coming down so rapidly in both absolute and relative terms that it will be possible, in my judgment, for many of the developing countries to in effect skip a stage.

As Congressman Mica pointed out, the advent of cellular communication for telephone will enable many countries to avoid the very costly process of building a telecommunications infrastructure of the kind we have built up over these many years. And this, I think, can serve to accelerate the process of development.

I think the trends that have taken place in the past several years in American policy of liberalizing the domestic telecommunications market, contributing to the liberalization of the international telecommunications market, and staying in

a position where the ability of private initiative and private enterprise to develop and adapt this technology to modern needs is going to serve us very well.

Indeed, I think when this organization has its 50th anniversary, we are going to be able to have a discussion about the way these technologies have been applied, that even in Congressman Mica's bag of tricks, he is unlikely to have anything in there that even closely parallels what he has today; and indeed, he will probably come to the 50th anniversary session with a flatbed.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

MR. FEULNER: Thank you, Bill Schneider.

Who would like to make the first intervention, comment or question? We ask you please to use the microphones throughout the room, identify yourself for the official recorder.

MR. RICHARDSON: I can be heard, I think.

MR. FEULNER: Ambassador Richardson.

MR. RICHARDSON: My name is John Richardson, Chairman of the Board of the National Endowment for Democracy.

I think the speakers have all given us a wonderful and clear and important image of the changing technologies that are going to change the business of public diplomacy. What I have missed so far is a discussion of what seems to me the necessity of enlarging the definition of public diplomacy; because, as I understand it, and Ed gave the accepted definition at the beginning, we talk about providing information about America, enabling key people to come here to learn about us, advising policy-makers on public opinion, and explaining U.S. policy.

Well, that leaves out this telephone system that Leonard Marks talked about, which is two way communication, interactive communication. It really brings out what is perhaps most significant about Worldnet, which is also a two-way process; and it leaves out much of the exchange programs that the USIA already conducts, which influences the American capacity to understand others. All of that, it seems to me, suggests a need for one additional element: that is, the interactive aspect.

Second, the National Endowment for Democracy, the Asia Foundation, the East-West Center and many others, businesses throughout the world, provide the kind of assistance to the process of opening up economies, to the process of opening up minds, to the process of opening up educational systems, which is a whole different thing.

Trade unions are strengthened in the Philippines, or business is opened up, the market is opened up in another

country; and that is by assistance from groups such as I have mentioned, and that is part of public diplomacy; it is strengthening the same democracy that you have been speaking about as being the best way to make this a more peaceful and better world for the United States.

MR. FEULNER: Is that true or false?

MR. MICA: True. I will just make a quick point in defense of the USIA and the Advisory Commission. The report that they put out on public diplomacy indeed does mention, and I read this whole report; it mentions the East-West Center, telecommunications, interactive broadcasting, the book program -- all of the items that Leonard has mentioned and that you mentioned. They are important, and it is a part of the entire definition.

For Dan Mica, the definition would be all-inclusive, not exclusive. I can quote -- I guess you know I think very highly of Dante Fascell, but I can recall a comment he made that, telecommunications, international diplomacy is, as he put it, as general as philosophy and as concrete as the telephone.

MR. FEULNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ambassador Richardson, for broadening our perspective a bit.

Who else would like to make an intervention?

MS. NORTON: I am Shirley Mueller Norton from the Institute of International Education. I just wanted to ask you to comment on the possibility of having an electronic component of exchange programs. For example, not thinking of it in terms of supplanting exchange-of-person programs, but in terms of supplementing them, ways to get at that elusive follow-up activity that we always want to build into exchange programs but never quite manage. Maybe providing telephone time, as Wilson Dizard of CSIS would suggest, to returning foreign scholars.

How can we use the technologies that you have been talking about to really enhance the traditional person-to-person programs we all believe in?

MR. FEULNER: Bill Schneider, would you like to begin?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I think one of the characteristics of the way in which the telecommunications technology and information processing technology is evolving is the kind of thing that is going to facilitate and expand it; electronic communication that will supplement exchange of persons.

The cost of doing so have heretofore been sufficiently high to be a disincentive to using that sort of technique. But it is quite easy, indeed, it frequently understates the trend of costs, to simply extrapolate them. The statistics that Leonard Marks pointed to I think suggest a very rapid decline in costs as this technology comes on line; which I think can be thought of as a very useful vehicle for supplementing and

making it quite possible to fit into the meager appropriations that we currently are obliged to live with in this field.

MR. MICA: Let me make a comment, if I may.

To me, it comes to that new way of thinking, and I think education is a prime example. Now first, let me just say I agree 100 percent with Leonard Marks, that the radio is the basic, it is the beginning; but I think we are going to skip many, many steps. When we talk about building universities in underdeveloped countries and the money isn't there, we could drop in, by helicopter, a mobile classroom with a dish on top, and we could use it on two shifts a day, almost around the clock, for advanced training. I don't know how many of you have attended big universities. In my day, everybody had a live professor. I have children going to universities now. Almost all the freshmen classes are on the screen; almost all of them. They have some ways to interact, but interaction is important.

It can be done. Education is fertile ground for this use. In health, health care. The finest surgeon at Johns Hopkins or in Houston, you name it, can diagnose with equipment that can be dropped in, the size of a briefcase, almost anyplace on the globe; and you have the best consultants in the world if you want to use that.

The military is already doing this. I must tell you, I have kidded with Charlie Wick and others about taking all of the State Department budget and rolling in into the Defense Department budget, because then we get all the money we need.

But the bottom line is, they have mobile hospitals that can be dropped in. I saw a demonstration of one, with a dish on the roof for transmitting cardiac information that can be dropped into a remote region and set up to use the best surgeons in the world for consultation. In about two hours it is all built.

It is there, the technology is there. We have got to rely on the basics of radio, but if we think in new terms, this world could be educated in a tenth of the time we ever thought it possible.

MR. FEULNER: Leonard?

MR. MARKS: Let me say that a great deal of this has been tried and more has to be done. For example, in Alaska you have the electronic doctor in the remote villages; people have radios, and they are instructed by shortwave when there's an emergency, on how to operate or deliver a baby, or whatever may happen.

In the international field, several years ago it was decided that we would try an experiment in educational television; and so American Samoa was chosen. Every thatched hut schoolroom was given a television set, and seven television transmitters were placed on the mountain. Transmitter number

one for grades one and two, and so forth for the twelve grades. A single teacher or a film was shown simultaneously to all of those schools on that television screen; and the school teacher would supplement the instruction that came over the air.

In Salvador, the AID financed a project similar to that. It has begun, but we have not devoted enough resources or enough attention. It will work; it has worked.

MR. FEULNER: If I may be permitted perhaps a final note on that subject, I would just say that some of the very exciting programs under Al Snyder's domain, Worldnet at USIA, where two-way teleconferencing was a new concept, something extraordinary and very unusual, just two and a half or three years ago, today is becoming an ordinary, daily or at least weekly routine type of event, where we have dishes, now, virtually at every embassy around the world; whereas a couple years ago, this was a mere concept.

So as the chairman so eloquently stated, we are moving very, very rapidly in these areas and I think you will see more personalized, particularized interplay of that sort of thing, as follow-on to educational exchanges; not just the superstars, George Shultz or someone coming on and doing a live press conference, but small groups on both sides in the educational arena as well as high tech science in medical and other affairs.

Sir?

MR. PETERSON: I would like to build on these last two comments by saying, as we get into this very exciting domain in which the United States ought to clearly be the world leader, we ought to be aware of the fact that we have a danger, also; and that is that we can, as this technology develops, mis-communicate to millions of people instantly.

That is, unless we have the kind of in-depth understanding of other cultures, other peoples, the way they are going to receive our communication, we have the potential to mis-communicate instantly to millions of people; and the way that we can avoid that problem is through the kind of careful marriage of the new technologies with traditional means that we have used, particularly exchanges, to be able to understand how messages are received and to in effect really tailor our messages so that they are not misunderstood.

The kinds of comments that I could make would go back to General Motors marketing the Chevy "Nova" in South America, a car that in Spanish says it "doesn't go." Those kinds of things we really need to be careful to avoid.

By the way, my name is Norm Peterson, with the Liaison Group for International Educational Exchanges. So I work with exchanges, and have a kind of vested interest there; but I would be interested to know if you have any comments about avoiding that kind of mis-communication.

MR. MICA: We in the Congress never mis-communicate.

[Laughter.]

MR. MICA: I guess you raise a caution note that we all have to be aware of; and I have seen it in politics. Some of my colleagues have tried to substitute computers for campaigning. A computer can do a great deal, but the ones that relied on them totally have lost.

Nothing substitutes for the human being, for human knowledge, for coordination, for interaction. These are tools, and that's how we have to understand them. They are tools, they have to be utilized -- we have to have safeguards -- and it comes back to the coordination, the standards, the procedures and so on, because you are absolutely right, I can think of a couple of messages. I should not get into this. A former Secretary of State grabbed a microphone and said, "I'm in control." And that flashed out across the world and it's something that he is contending with today, from ten years ago. That quick, and it's out there. They say you can't un-ring a bell.

MR. FEULNER: On that cautionary note, which I think re-emphasizes a point that I made in my opening remarks last night; and that is that as we celebrate USIA's, public diplomacy's increasing role, that we must not only talk about high tech and where we are going in these broad terms, but we must also celebrate and commemorate the people who are involved in public diplomacy around the world; not just the USIA people in their various posts around the world, but also the individuals here at home involved in the educational exchanges and the international visitor (IV) programs and the other aspects of a very comprehensive program, developed over the last 40 years, education on the one hand and advocacy on the other hand.

In this afternoon's panel, where we will be honored to have Chairman Pell, who is interested in the educational arena, where we will have former Senator Fulbright, whose name indeed rings magically around the world for the program named after him. I am sure we will have an opportunity to again look at those questions in more detail.

In the meantime, it is my great pleasure to again thank Chairman Mica for introducing this panel, for Leonard Marks, for Bill Schneider, for their very incisive comments and responses to the challenge that Dan Mica put forth to us. I thank all of you for being here.

At this moment, we are going to now take a very brief break. I remind you all that you must be back in the room at 11 o'clock, at which time the Secret Service will seal the doors. We expect the President to arrive promptly at 11:15, but if you are not in the room by 11 o'clock, you will not be admitted. Thank you again, gentlemen.

[Applause.]

MR. FEULNER: Ladies and gentlemen, our President has been a vocal advocate of public diplomacy. In his 1982 Westminster speech, he made clear that America must accept its responsibility as the leader of the free world, and must assert the virtues of an open society.

Under the guidance of Director Charles Wick, the U.S. Information Agency has met the challenge of its mission, proclaiming the strength of free and open democracy.

Ladies, and gentlemen, it is my privilege to present to you the President of the United States.

[Applause.]

Address by the President of the United States

Before the U.S. Advisory Commission
on Public Diplomacy
at the Department of a State
September 16, 1987

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Thank you all very much.

It is an honor to be able to join you on this, the 40th anniversary of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. It also happens to be a pleasure. First, because looking out today I see so many good friends: George Shultz, Charlie Wick, Ed Feulner, Priscilla Buckley -- I could go on and on, but then there is a second reason. You see, the way I look at it, this is sort of a professional get-together. Whether it is Worldnet, Radio Marti, or in my case the Presidency itself, everyone in this room is in the same business, the business of making bully pulpits even bullier.

But thinking about what I would say here today, I did a little reading on the topic of diplomacy. It turns out that diplomacy has produced a certain amount of humor, and I thought that, with George Shultz's permission, I might begin this morning by sharing with you an item that I especially enjoyed. It's an exchange that took place in the 1930s between Charles G. Dawes, American Ambassador to Great Britain, and Henry Prather Fletcher, at one time our ambassador to Italy.

Dawes said: "American diplomacy is easy on the brain but hell on the feet." And Fletcher said: "It depends on which you use."

[Laughter.]

Well, now you'll notice that this exchange has to do with "diplomacy," not "public diplomacy." It conjures up the traditional system in which relations between countries had less to do with the people of those countries than with their governments, when small numbers of diplomats often settled matters of world importance among themselves.

I suppose the most famous example of the old diplomatic system, of diplomacy proper, was the 1815 Congress of Vienna, when representatives of the ruling classes; Metternich, Castlereagh, Talleyrand and others, gathered to divide the map of Europe. You know, whenever I picture those wily aristocrats double-crossing each other all day -- then going to glittering balls in the evening -- well, I am reminded of an old piece of doggerel: "Diplomacy is to do and say the nastiest thing in the nicest way."

Diplomatic practices in the old days aside, it goes without saying that today, trained diplomats remain of tremendous importance. Yet in this information age, this age of the mass media and the micro-chip, of telecommunications satellites above the planet and fiber optic cables underground,

in this new age traditional diplomacy alone is not enough. The United States must speak not just to foreign governments, but to their people, engaging in public diplomacy with all the skill and resources that we can muster.

Castlereagh spoke to Metternich, but leaders today must speak to the people of the world.

The advances our administration has made in public diplomacy budgeting, programs, and technology have been dramatic. To name only a few, since 1980 the USIA budget has nearly doubled. Exchange programs for students have doubled. Worldnet has wedded satellite technology to public diplomacy. Radio Marti has begun broadcasting into Cuba. And it is a matter of no small historical importance that five times during these years, a President of the United States has, by way of Voice of America, directly addressed the people of the Soviet Union.

All these accomplishments have been made possible by individual men and women, those unsung but utterly dedicated Foreign and Civil Service professionals who run our nation's public diplomacy. I understand that hundreds of our public diplomats will read these remarks or listen to them on tape, so let us take a moment now to express the nation's gratitude. To you, our public diplomats, whether stationed here in Washington or in posts from Rome to Shanghai: in a difficult world, you tell America's story, and America gives you her thanks.

America's story, as I have said, during these six and a half years we have dramatically improved our ability to tell America's story around the globe; but I would submit that we have done still more. I would submit that we have given the story itself new content, and on this, the very day before we celebrate the bicentennial of our Constitution, I would like you to join me in considering the renewed power, the renewed sense of hope, that America's story holds for all the world.

Begin, if you will, by casting your minds back to the 1970s. And as you do so, place yourself outside the United States, perhaps in a nation of the Third World, or in the position of a dissident in the Soviet Union.

When you look at the United States, you see that it grants its people freedom, but in the 1970s, this freedom might strike you as mere license, for the United States appears to be in decline. By 1979, indeed, the American economy is in disarray. America's military strength has been permitted to atrophy, while at the same time the United States has diminished in stature around the world.

But what perhaps strikes you most is the way the American leaders talk about their country -- in effect, America's public diplomacy. For all its troubles, the United States is still prosperous, still free. Yet America's leaders speak of uncertainty, self-doubt, guilt, and that word, malaise.

You are well aware of the world struggle, the struggle of

ideas, economic vitality, and military strength. As you look ahead to the next decade, the decade of the Eighties, you are less than optimistic about the United States. Yet now that the decade of the Eighties is here, now that the decade of the Nineties, indeed, is nearly upon us, the American situation has changed dramatically, and with it, the nature of our public diplomacy.

In a moment I will return to our vantage point as a Soviet dissident or a citizen in the Third World, but permit me to speak first about what has happened here at home.

Tax cuts, the rebuilding of our defense, a cutback in government regulations, a determined, continuous effort to hold down the expansion of government spending -- these are the policies that have been instrumental in all that we have accomplished; the proximate causes, if you will, of our renewed economic vitality and renewed strength in the foreign policy arena.

Yet I speak deliberately when I refer to these policies as "instrumental," for they have merely served as the instruments of ideas. Ideas like limited government and individual initiative. Ideas like the view that America has a mission to stand up in the world for human freedom.

Our administration has spoken out for these ideas again and again. The American people have responded, and government policy and the very scope and shape of government itself has been changed.

This connection began speaking out, and the formation of policy may seem obvious, but it has enormous significance for a conference concerning itself with public diplomacy. For what it means is this: not by force, not by coercion, but by speaking out, we have changed the course of history.

Disraeli said, "With words we govern men." Of course, it is less our intention in the United States to govern than to serve, but in all the long American story, words have indeed proven fundamental. The basic act of the American Revolution was not the call to arms, but the Declaration of Independence, an act that in effect called the nation into being. And the act that has sustained our republic for two centuries now, providing the rule of law for our fathers, as it does for us, as it will for our children and grandchildren, was the writing of the Constitution. Several thousand words, mere words, on four sheets of parchment. But what power.

This brings me back to our public diplomacy. For, just as by speaking out we have changed the course of American history, I believe that our public diplomacy represents a powerful force, perhaps the most powerful force at our disposal for shaping the history of the world.

In this administration our public diplomacy has been marked, first, by shaking off the malaise of years past. That malaise and self-doubt had never been in accord with an

objective assessment of America's world position; had never been in accord, in short, with the facts.

So it is that in speaking to the people of other nations, we have chosen to reassert the record: It is not the democracies that have backward economies. It is not the Western world in which average life expectancy is actually falling. It was not the democracies that invaded Afghanistan, or suppressed Solidarity.

But second, we have gone beyond a mere statement of the facts, beyond reminding the world of the actual historical record, vital though that is. We've dared in our public diplomacy to articulate a vision; dared not just to defend the status quo, but to speak of a new age of liberty.

Consider this year alone. In April we asked that a date be set for the rapid and complete withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan. In Berlin this June we called for tearing down the Wall. This July we urged the Soviets to rescind the Brezhnev Doctrine and establish genuine self-determination in Eastern Europe. As I said last month in Los Angeles, containment is not enough. Our goal has been to break the deadlock of the past, to seek a forward strategy, a forward strategy for world freedom.

There is a third element in our public diplomacy, one that bears directly upon issues that are being raised at this conference. Permit me to call this, if you will, the moral element.

You see, even as the 1970s were marked by talk about national malaise, they were marked as well by talk about some sort of moral equivalency between the United States and the Soviet Union. One version of this view saw both nations simply as military and economic units, struggling to determine which would become the greater power. Another version admitted that the Soviet Union had its moral shortcomings, but pointed out that so did the United States, after all.

Yes, our country has its shortcomings, but there is no moral equivalency between democracy and totalitarianism. There is no moral equivalency between turning the proud nations of Eastern Europe into satellites and joining the nations of Western Europe in the defense of their freedom. And, my friends, there is no moral equivalency between propaganda and the truth.

As I said, this touches upon issues being raised at this conference. We all know of the tremendous progress we are seeing in communications, a virtual riot of new technology. But we know as well that the Soviets are serious about using these new technologies for their own purposes. Already, to name just one example, Soviet television can be received in Western Europe, North and Central America, Southeast Asia, North Africa, and the Middle East. The Soviet message, even if it is propaganda, now reaches around the globe. But there is, as I suggested, that moral point, that crucial distinction

between what is true and what is not.

Describing his experience in a prisoner-of-war camp during the Second World War, Laurens van der Post writes that, in reading official propaganda sheets, he and his fellow prisoners evolved a technique for telling the true from the false. This was possible, van der Post writes, because, quote: "Every thought, every articulation of meaning, from painting to music, carries within it evidence of its correspondence to the truth by the impact it makes on our senses and imaginations."

The truth -- the truth will make itself known.

Permit me to close now by telling you two stories that show this to be true; and in doing so, return to our vantage points in the Third World and the Soviet Union.

First, the Third World. Imagine, now, the situation of a man of integrity and dignity in Cuba. His name is Ricardo Bofill. As an academic, he became a professor of Marxist philosophy. During the 1960s, he was a leading member of the Communist Party. Yet today he knows that Castro has betrayed every ideal the revolution seemed to espouse; and at the cost of constant threats and harassment, Ricardo Bofill serves as President of the Cuban Committee for Human Rights.

Like all Cubans, Ricardo Bofill is bombarded, day-in and day-out, by the Castro regime's propaganda. Even so, he and thousands of others recognize, without hesitation, the one news source that tells the truth. Bofill recently wrote: "It seems to me that there will arrive a moment concerning the situation of Cuba when it will be necessary to speak of the time before and after the broadcast of Radio Marti. The ability to answer the monologue that Fidel Castro has sustained for nearly 26 years has finally evolved."

Well, to all those involved with Radio Marti, you will never receive higher praise than the words of that brave man.

Now imagine yourself in the position of a Jewish dissident in the Soviet Union. For speaking out on human rights, you are imprisoned in labor camps where you spend nearly nine years. Then one day, you are marched across a bridge in Berlin, to freedom. Your name is Natan Scharansky. And when you meet the President of the United States, you say this:

"Thank you for telling the truth in your speeches. They were smuggled into the gulag."

I have a letter that testifies to that at home. It came to me by way of USIA and was smuggled out of the gulag. The letter is only about two or three inches in width. It is only about three-quarters of an inch in length. And yet there is a message on there thanking us for maintaining freedom and keeping it alive in the world, and it is signed by eleven women prisoners, all on that tiny piece of paper. I don't know how they wrote it, but I know you cannot see the words without a magnifying glass.

There are some of the things that come up -- I, as some people here at the head table know, have become a collector of stories that the citizens of the Soviet Union tell among themselves, revealing they have a great sense of humor but also a cynicism about their system; and just yesterday, I added a new one to the collection.

A man just arriving from Europe, riding in a taxicab -- the taxicab driver said to him, "There is the tallest building in Moscow." And he looked out and he said, "Well, where? Where is it?" He said, "There, that building." And this American said, "That two-story building is the tallest building in Moscow?" He says, "Yes. From there you can see all the way to Siberia. It's the KGB headquarters."

[Laughter.]

Well, they gave us hope, the people said in the gulag there. Surely, this is your mission, as public diplomats; and surely this is our mission as a nation, to stand for freedom and to give hope.

On the day in Berlin that I faced the Wall, and speaking to a very large audience on the west side in West Berlin, advocated the tearing down of the Wall. I could see rows of East German military police fully 100 to 200 yards from the Wall, with their backs to the Wall and me speaking. They were there to keep any East Berliners from approaching the Wall where they might be able to hear through the loudspeakers what I was saying.

Yes, public diplomacy. And all of you do give hope to more people in the world than perhaps you even realize. So I guess all I really wanted to say is thank you all, and God bless you.

[Applause.]

MR. FEULNER: I think those words of both encouragement and inspiration mean a great deal; not only to those of us who were privileged to hear them here in the Henderson Conference Room at the Department of State, but to the many others around the world who will hear them in the days and weeks ahead.

At this point, our program is in temporary recess. Those who will be attending the luncheon should use the elevators to the eighth floor. Everyone is invited back to the afternoon panels. The first panel, on "Public Diplomacy and East-West Relations," will begin at 1:45 in this room. The second panel, on "Public Diplomacy: the View from Congress," with the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Pell, former Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, William Fulbright, and a senior member on the Republican side of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mitch McConnell, will begin at 3 o'clock.

Again, as I mentioned earlier, it is our hope that these entire proceedings will be published in the relatively near

future and will serve as a sounding board and a collection of new ideas as public diplomacy moves into the next decade.

At this time, the meeting stands in temporary recess. Thank you all. [11:35 a.m.]

12:00 pm

Luncheon

The Benjamin Franklin Room
(By Invitation Only)

Introduction

Vice Chairman e. robert (bob) wallach

Address:

The Honorable Charles Z. Wick
Director, U.S. Information Agency

"Public Diplomacy: Building for the Future"

CHAIRMAN FEULNER: As Vice Chairman of the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, bob wallach is a distinguished trial attorney and advocate of human rights. He is the Dean of the Hastings Law School Center for Trial and Appellate Advocacy in San Francisco. He served with great distinction as the United States Representative to the UN Human Rights Commission. He, as I said, is a Democrat; he is the Vice Chairman of U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy and has served in that capacity since 1982. He is a dear friend, and it is my pleasure to welcome him to the podium at this time to introduce our guest speaker. bob.

[APPLAUSE]

VICE CHAIRMAN WALLACH: Thank you Ed and good friends. There isn't anybody in this room that doesn't know Charlie Wick, so I am going to set aside if I may, with all due respect to the staff of the Advisory Commission, the formal introductory remarks given and just say a very few words.

It is one thing to be perceptive and insightful about that which has become commonplace and easy to see. But we are in the age of communications and -- without denigrating any of us, especially those of you here, who understand that we are now within the most dramatic period of communications -- the most revolutionary concepts are coming upon us at a rate and a pace that is difficult to absorb. We are doing the right thing, both in this conference and in the many other ways in which we recognize the new challenges presented by the age of communication.

But it's quite another thing to have entered such an arena and seen it before it was so capable of being seen. Secretary Shultz saw it and observed it and communicated it and we were fortunate enough to be among those who were able to respond.

Six years ago Charlie Wick came to Washington and there were those that said, "Who is this man taking this valued position?" And there were those who said they knew the reasons, and they were the classic reasons of friendship and successful activities in the entrepreneurial field. And there were those who knew that he is a wonderful bon vivant, and a very good piano player, and a terrific teller of jokes, and a delightful human being in all respects, and that he has this wonderful, unbelievable, unique and totally essential support mechanism in Mary Jane Wick. And it took a lot of people a good bit of time to understand that none of this was inconsistent with his being one of the most thoughtful, intelligent, energetic and committed American citizens that this Agency has had the privilege to have as its Director.

It's no deprecation of prior administrations (regardless of their political base) of the U.S. Information Agency to say that timing and circumstances are in large part the product of creativity. But without the person capable of responding to that timing and circumstances the creativity is not to be attained. It was a marvelous synergy of events that brought Charlie Wick to the position of Director. He brought with him the technological concepts of which we are so proud -- Worldnet being so much preeminent, yet not at all diminishing the importance of Voice of America and our other means of communication.

But even beyond that, for those of us who had the privilege on the Commission, and we all have, of travelling either with Charlie or going to posts before he arrived or posts after he had been there, to know that he infused a human quality (that was spoken of last night so eloquently) that in the U.S. Information Agency has perhaps, with all due respect to his predecessors, never occurred before. Yes, they were scared to death of a Charlie Wick arrival, and yes, they worked harder than they had ever worked before, and performed as they never thought possible for them to perform while he was there and when he left there was exhaustion and exhilaration and a knowledge that what they were doing was important for America and here was a man who made that importance a reality here in Washington.

It is the greatest privilege as Vice Chairman of our Advisory Commission to introduce to you, your friend and again a great American, our Director, Charles Wick.

CHAIRMAN FEULNER: As Vice Chairman of the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, bob wallach is a distinguished trial attorney and advocate of human rights. He is the Dean of the Hastings Law School Center for Trial and Appellate Advocacy in San Francisco. He served with great distinction as the United States Representative to the UN Human Rights Commission. He, as I said, is a Democrat; he is the Vice Chairman of U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy and has served in that capacity since 1982. He is a dear friend, and it is my pleasure to welcome him to the podium at this time to introduce our guest speaker. bob.

[APPLAUSE]

VICE CHAIRMAN WALLACH: Thank you Ed and good friends. There isn't anybody in this room that doesn't know Charlie Wick, so I am going to set aside if I may, with all due respect to the staff of the Advisory Commission, the formal introductory remarks given and just say a very few words.

It is one thing to be perceptive and insightful about that which has become commonplace and easy to see. But we are in the age of communications and -- without denigrating any of us, especially those of you here, who understand that we are now within the most dramatic period of communications -- the most revolutionary concepts are coming upon us at a rate and a pace that is difficult to absorb. We are doing the right thing, both in this conference and in the many other ways in which we recognize the new challenges presented by the age of communication.

But it's quite another thing to have entered such an arena and seen it before it was so capable of being seen. Secretary Shultz saw it and observed it and communicated it and we were fortunate enough to be among those who were able to respond.

Six years ago Charlie Wick came to Washington and there were those that said, "Who is this man taking this valued position?" And there were those who said they knew the reasons, and they were the classic reasons of friendship and successful activities in the entrepreneurial field. And there were those who knew that he is a wonderful bon vivant, and a very good piano player, and a terrific teller of jokes, and a delightful human being in all respects, and that he has this wonderful, unbelievable, unique and totally essential support mechanism in Mary Jane Wick. And it took a lot of people a good bit of time to understand that none of this was inconsistent with his being one of the most thoughtful, intelligent, energetic and committed American citizens that this Agency has had the privilege to have as its Director.

It's no deprecation of prior administrations (regardless of their political base) of the U.S. Information Agency to say that timing and circumstances are in large part the product of creativity. But without the person capable of responding to that timing and circumstances the creativity is not to be attained. It was a marvelous synergy of events that brought Charlie Wick to the position of Director. He brought with him the technological concepts of which we are so proud -- Worldnet being so much preeminent, yet not at all diminishing the importance of Voice of America and our other means of communication.

But even beyond that, for those of us who had the privilege on the Commission, and we all have, of travelling either with Charlie or going to posts before he arrived or posts after he had been there, to know that he infused a human quality (that was spoken of last night so eloquently) that in the U.S. Information Agency has perhaps, with all due respect to his predecessors, never occurred before. Yes, they were scared to death of a Charlie Wick arrival, and yes, they worked harder than they had ever worked before, and performed as they never thought possible for them to perform while he was there and when he left there was exhaustion and exhilaration and a knowledge that what they were doing was important for America and here was a man who made that importance a reality here in Washington.

It is the greatest privilege as Vice Chairman of our Advisory Commission to introduce to you, your friend and again a great American, our Director, Charles Wick.

CHAIRMAN FEULNER: As Vice Chairman of the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, bob wallach is a distinguished trial attorney and advocate of human rights. He is the Dean of the Hastings Law School Center for Trial and Appellate Advocacy in San Francisco. He served with great distinction as the United States Representative to the UN Human Rights Commission. He, as I said, is a Democrat; he is the Vice Chairman of U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy and has served in that capacity since 1982. He is a dear friend, and it is my pleasure to welcome him to the podium at this time to introduce our guest speaker. bob.

[APPLAUSE]

VICE CHAIRMAN WALLACH: Thank you Ed and good friends. There isn't anybody in this room that doesn't know Charlie Wick, so I am going to set aside if I may, with all due respect to the staff of the Advisory Commission, the formal introductory remarks given and just say a very few words.

It is one thing to be perceptive and insightful about that which has become commonplace and easy to see. But we are in the age of communications and -- without denigrating any of us, especially those of you here, who understand that we are now within the most dramatic period of communications -- the most revolutionary concepts are coming upon us at a rate and a pace that is difficult to absorb. We are doing the right thing, both in this conference and in the many other ways in which we recognize the new challenges presented by the age of communication.

But it's quite another thing to have entered such an arena and seen it before it was so capable of being seen. Secretary Shultz saw it and observed it and communicated it and we were fortunate enough to be among those who were able to respond.

Six years ago Charlie Wick came to Washington and there were those that said, "Who is this man taking this valued position?" And there were those who said they knew the reasons, and they were the classic reasons of friendship and successful activities in the entrepreneurial field. And there were those who knew that he is a wonderful bon vivant, and a very good piano player, and a terrific teller of jokes, and a delightful human being in all respects, and that he has this wonderful, unbelievable, unique and totally essential support mechanism in Mary Jane Wick. And it took a lot of people a good bit of time to understand that none of this was inconsistent with his being one of the most thoughtful, intelligent, energetic and committed American citizens that this Agency has had the privilege to have as its Director.

It's no deprecation of prior administrations (regardless of their political base) of the U.S. Information Agency to say that timing and circumstances are in large part the product of creativity. But without the person capable of responding to that timing and circumstances the creativity is not to be attained. It was a marvelous synergy of events that brought Charlie Wick to the position of Director. He brought with him the technological concepts of which we are so proud -- Worldnet being so much preeminent, yet not at all diminishing the importance of Voice of America and our other means of communication.

But even beyond that, for those of us who had the privilege on the Commission, and we all have, of travelling either with Charlie or going to posts before he arrived or posts after he had been there, to know that he infused a human quality (that was spoken of last night so eloquently) that in the U.S. Information Agency has perhaps, with all due respect to his predecessors, never occurred before. Yes, they were scared to death of a Charlie Wick arrival, and yes, they worked harder than they had ever worked before, and performed as they never thought possible for them to perform while he was there and when he left there was exhaustion and exhilaration and a knowledge that what they were doing was important for America and here was a man who made that importance a reality here in Washington.

It is the greatest privilege as Vice Chairman of our Advisory Commission to introduce to you, your friend and again a great American, our Director, Charles Wick.

CHAIRMAN FEULNER: As Vice Chairman of the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, bob wallach is a distinguished trial attorney and advocate of human rights. He is the Dean of the Hastings Law School Center for Trial and Appellate Advocacy in San Francisco. He served with great distinction as the United States Representative to the UN Human Rights Commission. He, as I said, is a Democrat; he is the Vice Chairman of U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy and has served in that capacity since 1982. He is a dear friend, and it is my pleasure to welcome him to the podium at this time to introduce our guest speaker. bob.

[APPLAUSE]

VICE CHAIRMAN WALLACH: Thank you Ed and good friends. There isn't anybody in this room that doesn't know Charlie Wick, so I am going to set aside if I may, with all due respect to the staff of the Advisory Commission, the formal introductory remarks given and just say a very few words.

It is one thing to be perceptive and insightful about that which has become commonplace and easy to see. But we are in the age of communications and -- without denigrating any of us, especially those of you here, who understand that we are now within the most dramatic period of communications -- the most revolutionary concepts are coming upon us at a rate and a pace that is difficult to absorb. We are doing the right thing, both in this conference and in the many other ways in which we recognize the new challenges presented by the age of communication.

But it's quite another thing to have entered such an arena and seen it before it was so capable of being seen. Secretary Shultz saw it and observed it and communicated it and we were fortunate enough to be among those who were able to respond.

Six years ago Charlie Wick came to Washington and there were those that said, "Who is this man taking this valued position?" And there were those who said they knew the reasons, and they were the classic reasons of friendship and successful activities in the entrepreneurial field. And there were those who knew that he is a wonderful bon vivant, and a very good piano player, and a terrific teller of jokes, and a delightful human being in all respects, and that he has this wonderful, unbelievable, unique and totally essential support mechanism in Mary Jane Wick. And it took a lot of people a good bit of time to understand that none of this was inconsistent with his being one of the most thoughtful, intelligent, energetic and committed American citizens that this Agency has had the privilege to have as its Director.

It's no deprecation of prior administrations (regardless of their political base) of the U.S. Information Agency to say that timing and circumstances are in large part the product of creativity. But without the person capable of responding to that timing and circumstances the creativity is not to be attained. It was a marvelous synergy of events that brought Charlie Wick to the position of Director. He brought with him the technological concepts of which we are so proud -- Worldnet being so much preeminent, yet not at all diminishing the importance of Voice of America and our other means of communication.

But even beyond that, for those of us who had the privilege on the Commission, and we all have, of travelling either with Charlie or going to posts before he arrived or posts after he had been there, to know that he infused a human quality (that was spoken of last night so eloquently) that in the U.S. Information Agency has perhaps, with all due respect to his predecessors, never occurred before. Yes, they were scared to death of a Charlie Wick arrival, and yes, they worked harder than they had ever worked before, and performed as they never thought possible for them to perform while he was there and when he left there was exhaustion and exhilaration and a knowledge that what they were doing was important for America and here was a man who made that importance a reality here in Washington.

It is the greatest privilege as Vice Chairman of our Advisory Commission to introduce to you, your friend and again a great American, our Director, Charles Wick.

REMARKS PREPARED BY

Charles Z. Wick

DIRECTOR UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

OF

40TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE OF

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEPTEMBER 16, 1987

I am delighted and honored to have the opportunity to address you this afternoon. On this 40th anniversary of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, I feel a deep sense of gratitude to those men and women who -- over the years -- have served on the Commission. Their advice and counsel have made an invaluable contribution to America's overseas information and cultural programs.

Over the past several years, it has been my privilege to work with Ed Feulner -- a man who, as Chairman of the current Commission, has worked unstintingly with great dedication. And -- other members -- e bob wallach, Vice Chairman, Tom Korologos, Priscilla Buckley, Richard Scaife, Hershey Gold, and Herbert Schmertz. To each of you, let me say that your generous and productive efforts are deeply appreciated. You have performed an important service, and we salute you!

The world today is very different from what it was 40 years ago when the Commission was formed. At that time, the international structure and order inherited from the 19th Century had collapsed and attempts to replace it were directed from two philosophically distinct and antagonistic power centers. This was the era of the Cold War.

America met those challenges with a sense of daring and determination. The Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, NATO -- these all stand as testimonials to imaginative leadership and effort. The renewed vitality of Western Europe and Japan -- protected by the shield of a strong and effective deterrence -- are a measure of its success.

Almost immediately, after World War II, America began to move boldly beyond traditional diplomacy, and speak directly to the citizens of the world. Noteworthy were our efforts to make allies of former enemies. By 1950, twelve hundred public diplomacy professionals were running 25 information centers in the Federal Republic of Germany alone.

The results were significant! Most Federal Republic cabinet members over the past 30 years have participated in our exchange programs of those early days -- long before their incumbency.

Our strong effort rested on the belief that modern diplomacy would soon have less to do with the carpeted corridors of foreign ministries than with public opinion. As our hero, Chairman Dante Fascell observed over a decade ago:

> "Today the success or failure of foreign policy undertakings is frequently affected more profoundly by what people think and say than by the workings of traditional diplomacy."

America's post-war public diplomacy effort was a major success, but it was limited. Time soon ran out on the political will to sustain a large financial burden. And, the effort to reach mass populations overseas was severely limited by the technical means available.

Eventually, the financial fuel of the effort dwindled and the public diplomacy machine started to sputter. My predecessors did the only sensible thing: with fewer resources stretched over more countries, they focused and targeted. Over 97% of our cultural and information representatives came home from Germany. In Italy, we removed all personnel from six important cities.

But, in spite of these reductions, we were still able to accomplish our mission by targeting influential journalists, scholars, commentators and others. These so-called "elites" carried America's message to their world -- often with greater credibility than the direct voice of the U.S. Government.

It was while this somewhat narrow performance was on stage that two new actors entered from the wings.

The first was the dramatic information revolution. The second -- coming more recently and riding along in the revolution's wake -- was Mikhail Gorbachev. Both actors have had a profound influence on our thinking about the future of public diplomacy.

Although the Information Age is upon us, its full and powerful sweep is still unfolding. Its force -- which began as the medieval scribes were replaced by Guttenberg's mechanical printing press -- has gathered a powerful momentum and is now shaking the social, economic, political, and ideological foundations of our world.

In increasingly rapid progression have come the steam printing press, the telegraph, telephone, tape recorder, radio, television, videocassette recorder, computer, and most recently, the dazzling array of fiber optic and international satellite communication technologies.

At each stage, the limitations of time and space have been reduced to the point now where instantaneous communication from any point in this "electronic global village" can be received by hundreds of millions of people simultaneously.

The impact on our strategy has been dramatic. The inherent need to communicate with mass publics -- a desire we had to suppress as we trimmed our sails and targeted only elite influentials -- was suddenly able to be fulfilled. Modern technology was making it economic and efficient to reach millions upon millions of people in all corners of the globe. No longer did we have to rely solely on indirect communication through elites. Now we could reach mass audiences directly.

The global reach of the new communications technology has generated a global marketplace of ideas. And, like most markets, it is characterized by disorder, conflict and the opportunity for great gain and loss.

For this reason, our failure to employ this new technology -- and to use it strategically -- can destroy the traditional

advantages that America has had in this marketplace:
-- the advantage of freedom
-- the advantage of democracy
-- the advantage of diversity

Reflect for a moment! What would history say of a great nation such as ours -- a nation born with these advantages -- which squandered its resources and failed in the marketplace of ideas?

We can fail you know! The competition, although not naturally at home in a marketplace of ideas -- or any other marketplace, for that matter -- is learning fast, is unafraid to invest, and freely uses the huge advantage of deception.

This is why we have moved decisively with the expansion of major programs and the launching of new technologies:
-- doubling Fulbright exchanges;
-- expanding our international visitors program;
-- modernizing and expanding the Voice of America;
-- creating Radio Marti;
-- creating the global satellite television network -- WORLDNET
-- and many other innovations.

We know only too well -- as does Gorbachev -- that, fed by a steadily accelerating system of instantaneous global communication -- world public opinion is rapidly emerging as a potent force capable of decisive influence over the policies and conduct of governments -- no matter how popular or how dictatorial.

Consider the following: Audio cassettes recorded in Paris by Khomeini and smuggled into Iran helped overthrow the Shah. And with disastrous consequences! Fundamentalist Moslem ideas are threatening the power balance in the Middle East. A $100 million Soviet disinformation campaign stopped the U.S. deployment of the neutron bomb. False claims -- trumpeted over the Soviet Union's National Radio of Iran -- that America desecrated the Holy Place at Mecca led to the burning of the U.S. embassy at Islamabad.

But, Free World radio broadcasting to the Polish people helped forge the united front of Solidarity. International telecommunications helped the bright lure of a democratic future sweep through El Salvador, the Philippines, and South Korea.

And the litany goes on!

Every day -- from anywhere -- a new story unfolds, ripples through the marketplace of ideas, and brings the force of public opinion to bear on the emerging events.

Today, in Beirut, Seoul, or Chernobyl, in Johannesburg, Geneva, or Managua. Millions of people -- separated by geography, but united through the modern miracle of telecommunications -- are swept into the act of participation.

As in a Greek drama -- and often guided by the loudest chorus -- a moral sense envelopes the participants, crying out for action and eventual resolution. And, increasingly, those in responsible positions are compelled to respond.

It is this modern drama that we must understand. We must understand the choruses, the actors, and those who move them.

There is no doubt that Gorbachev does. Utilizing the most modern means of satellite telecommunications, he has embarked on an adventurous public diplomacy campaign, a campaign calculated to present a new image of openness or "glasnost" to the world.

His strategy is clear -- to have Soviet-informed world public opinion pressure free world governments -- particularly those of Western Europe, Japan, and the United States -- to act in a way favorable to Soviet interests.

His strategic objective remains the same -- it is to resurrect the credibility of Marxism-Leninism, to achieve political legitimacy in the West, and to bring about the rupture of the Western Alliance by employing Lenin's own dictum that "ideas are much more fatal than guns."

Ideas? America also believes in ideas -- the ideas of freedom, democracy, and diversity -- and they give us a decided advantage. Gorbachev is limited by the oppressive bureaucratic rationalism of Marxism-Leninism.

In truth, Gorbachev's campaign of "glasnost," or openness, disguises an essentially closed society. Glasnost continues to be "gloss-over-nost," and seeks the triumph of deceit and deception over truth and honesty. A taste of Soviet "openness" does not always work to his benefit. Those with a taste of freedom soon reject constraint.

Faced with these limitations, Gorbachev has focused international attention on an apparent myth -- the myth of openness -- and he has raised the manipulation of truth to new heights while proclaiming fairness. Novosti -- the Soviet world-wide wire service -- TASS, and Radio Moscow, daily blast outrageous falsehoods about the United States, its officials and institutions.

And Gorbachev's reach is growing. Moving decisively to employ the latest communications technology, he has established an extensive system of earth receiving stations and satellites.

As the President said today, Soviet television can be received in Western Europe, North and Central America, Southeast Asia, North Africa, and the Middle East. An agreement has been signed with two television companies in Argentina to relay Soviet television programs to that country, and 20 other Latin American countries. Cable News Network (CNN) now brings Soviet news and programs into this country.

Fortunately, USIA had begun to deploy the new satellite technology prior to Gorbachev's rise to power. By combining this new technology with our traditional programs, we have forged a powerful instrument for peace.

And, we have aggressively shown that, while America continues to offer the hope of freedom, the Soviet Union -- despite the vague promises of "glasnost" -- offers little more than oppression.

We began this satellite effort in late 1983 with the creation of Worldnet. Through Worldnet, we have been able to project by satellite around the world foreign media interviews with Administration spokesmen, news and educational and cultural programs. With a Congressional mandate, we created Radio Marti to beam the truth about America and the truth about Communism to those souls trapped behind Cuba's "sugar cane curtain."

The modernization of the Voice of America's transmitting facilities -- now being jeopardized by an interruption of funds -- will insure that its messages, in 44 languages, can reach virtually all of mankind more clearly.

The slow, uncertain radio telephone -- bedeviled by atmospheric conditions in transmitting our veteran news service, the Wireless File -- has been replaced by the instantaneity and accuracy of modern satellite telecommunications.

We can now deliver this resource by satellite -- not only to our embassies and posts -- but directly to newsroom editors overseas who influence public opinion. This greatly strengthens our ability to try to compete with TASS and Novosti.

With material underwriting from the Federal Republic of Germany, we are establishing a television counterpart to our radio station in Berlin -- RIAS or Radio in the American Sector. Through RIAS-TV, we will be able to vault the "wall of suppression" which surrounds that city and to broadcast the message of freedom to the people of East Berlin and many in the German Democratic Republic.

Notwithstanding these dramatic developments, USIA continues to stress the importance of communicating through people-to-people programs.

Indeed, during the Reagan Administration, these programs have been enhanced considerably. USIA's budget for educational and cultural exchange programs -- including Fulbright scholars and International Visitors -- has more than doubled since Fiscal Year 1981. Under the President's Youth Exchange Initiative -- a program designed to correct misimpressions in youths' critical formative years -- over 22,000 additional exchanges have been stimulated by USIA's increased funding.

We have established the Central American Undergraduate

Scholarship Program to address the misperceptions about America which exist throughout the region.

We are implementing the President's U.S.-Soviet Exchange Initiative to raise mutual understanding with our principal adversary to a new level.

We are training Afghan journalists so they can report the appalling truth of their struggle to the rest of the world. We have strengthened our worldwide English teaching effort. We have developed -- in partnership with the MacMillan Company -- a new audio visual English teaching program which can be used in homes, classrooms, radio and television stations around the world.

We have expanded our book translation programs -- particularly in Central America -- and are lifting the veil of ignorance about America.

Yes, we are doing our best to propel America into this new era. But, to successfully execute a coherent strategy, all the available means at our disposal must be part of a single institutional entity. USIA has the central responsibility for American public diplomacy. The Advisory Commission has been a forceful advocate -- and constructive critic -- on our behalf.

The significance of a unified public diplomacy effort has also been recognized in the Congress. Through the untiring efforts of Congressmen Dante Fascell, and Dan Mica, Congresswoman Olympia Snowe, and others, the wise leadership of Congressmen Neal Smith and Harold Rogers, for whom USIA can only be most grateful -- the inspirational help of Senators Pell, Lugar, Hatfield, Rudman, and so many others -- we now have that unity of purpose and unity of resource to be effective.

Yet, there exists a misunderstanding of the real need for a unified public diplomacy mechanism -- a viewpoint that would splinter the effort and destroy the possibility for a well-designed, comprehensive strategy to meet the challenges of the Information Age. That would dismantle USIA into its component parts and:

-- create an independent broadcasting entity;
-- move educational and cultural exchanges to other institutions;
-- relocate information and advocacy programs elsewhere in the Government;

We strongly disagree. To do so would weaken the effectiveness of all the USIA programs. The strength of our public diplomacy depends upon utilizing the synergism of many different resources in a coordinated manner so as to effectively present the broad spectrum of American society, American political opinion, and Administration policy.

Any one of our initiatives often puts in service a synergistic group of USIA capabilities -- VOA editorials, TV, AMPARTS, Wireless File, electronic dialogues, conferences,

exchanges -- and, the coordinated relationship with 217 USIA posts worldwide with, State, the NSC, Defense, and other branches of government.

To fragment these resources will only fragment our purpose and lead to a deterioration of our mission's overall effectiveness.

Finally, let me remark that the success of America's public diplomacy depends -- ultimately -- on the kind of people we are as Americans. The moral sense of honesty and fair play that lies at the root of American life is the basic foundation for all the Agency does.

America's commitment to truth and justice, mandates USIA to pursue effective advocacy and dispassionate scholarship side by side. These principles allow us to distinguish news from editorials without diminished effect.

These principles allow us to conduct a bold defense of U.S. policy, and yet be forthright. These principles allow us to broadcast the Iran-Contra hearings as a testimony to the strength of our society. These principles allow us to send our Artistic Ambassadors overseas to be compared with professional performing artists anywhere.

Without a sense of fidelity to these two principles of truth and justice, we would fail as advocates. And we would certainly hear about it from Dan Mica, Dante Fascell, Senator Pell and the Congress, the President, and most certainly, from Ed Feulner and his Advisory Commission colleagues.

In closing, let us cast our gaze on the new emerging communications technology.

The prospects it offers America's public diplomacy stimulate the imagination. And yet -- even the most creative imagination will probably fall short of the dazzling future.

One can see the President, the Secretary of State, and others communicating instantly face to face at the flip of a switch -- over thousands of miles -- with foreign leaders.

One can see our alliances drawn closer, more immediate, and our confrontations made less prone to dangerous accident and misunderstanding.

One can see people everywhere -- people who can never hope to know America firsthand -- relaxing in their homes, hearing words and seeing pictures about life in America.

One can see these same people -- men, women, and children -- thus better able to withstand the wrenching impact of deliberate falsehood and distortion of America.

Yes, one can see a new era. Imagine with me for a moment.

The new exploding technology is opening hitherto closed

windows and doors. It is allowing freedom to shine in radiant splendor. Distances collapse.... Time evaporates.... Men and women pause.... Fresh breezes blow and warm the imagination with manifold visions of a true spring.

The landscape becomes alive with promises for a better tomorrow.

Human passions begin to stir and a sense of excitement and anticipation grips the soul.

For a "brief, shining moment" the cold, dark winter clouds of spiritual oppression and human misery -- usually broken by only an occasional, but retreating ray of hope -- those dark winter clouds...begin to recede.

I see for so many individuals -- in so many parts of the world -- the new technology becoming a light, a light that illumines the mind and warms the heart, a light that slowly, but inexorably germinates the seeds of freedom that lie in the inner recesses of the spirit.

Yes, I see a light that draws men and women closer together, uniting them in that often painful winding march to the dawning of a new spring -- realizing at last the promise of "peace on earth and good will toward men."

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS:

1:45 pm "Public Diplomacy and Changing East-West Relations"

The Loy Henderson Conference Room

Moderator:

Commissioner Herbert Schmertz

Panelists:

The Honorable John Hughes
Syndicated Columnist, Christian Science Monitor, and
State Department Spokesman

The Honorable Jim Courter (R-NJ)
House of Representatives

Mr. Raymond E. Benson
Adjunct Professor of Russian and Soviet Studies, Middlebury College; and Former Counselor for Press and Cultural Affairs, American Embassy Moscow

MR. SCHMERTZ: Welcome to this afternoon's session. We are going to be discussing "Public Diplomacy and Changing East-West Relations" in the first panel.

East-West relations presents, I think, perhaps the biggest competition in public diplomacy that we have seen, certainly in the post-war period. What we are seeing -- and I think Director Wick's comments at lunch amplified in great detail the whole situation -- is that there is competition going on in public diplomacy, particularly in Western Europe. The question is the survival of the Western Alliance as we have known it, or the survival of NATO as we have known it, and the survival of the special economic relations that exist between Western Europe and the United States as a result of new Soviet approaches in public diplomacy.

Also, what is the introduction of new technology on a large scale going to do to the internal operations and organization of a centralized state-controlled society such as the Soviet Union? What are the consequences for American policymakers of increased East-West information flows, unjammed radio broadcasts, computer links, access by Western journalists and officials, and more international exchanges?

All of these things are merging at a very rapid rate in the public diplomacy area. We are fortunate to have as our principal speaker, John Hughes, a British-born Pulitzer-prize winning syndicated columnist, who has made a name for himself both in and out of journalism. For years with the Christian Science Monitor, he is now back with the Monitor, after appointments by President Nixon as Associate Director for USIA for Programs and Director of the Voice of America.

Following a stint at USIA, he became State Department Spokesman and Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. A veteran journalist, Mr. Hughes has filed stories from all over the globe. A former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, he holds virtually every honor and recognition available to his profession that could possibly be conferred.

It gives me great pleasure, then, to present John Hughes as our first speaker.

[Applause.]

MR. HUGHES: Thank you very much, Mr. Schmertz. I hate to offer a slight correction after that very nice introduction, but it was President Reagan, not President Nixon who brought me into the government.

MR. SCHMERTZ: Heads will roll.

[Laughter.]

MR. HUGHES: It is really very pleasant to be back in this building and renew my friendship with many dear colleagues from USIA and the Voice of America and the Department of State. It is particularly pleasant to be back in a role where I do not have to answer tortuous questions from my colleagues in the press, and where I do not have to give tortuous answers crafted by the Department of State.

When American newspaper editors met for their annual convention in San Francisco earlier this year, they staged a dialogue by satellite with journalists in the Soviet Union. The intent was to gauge the effect of glasnost, Mr. Gorbachev's new policy of openness.

Peter Jennings, who in my book is the thinking man's television anchor, was the moderator, and a number of American reporters and editors asked questions of their opposite numbers in Moscow. I think perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the exchange was the cautiousness of Soviet journalists on sensitive topics, despite all the promises of glasnost.

For instance, the Americans wanted to know whether the Soviet journalists were now free to pursue investigative reporting. "Why of course, sir" responded one of the Soviet editors. "For example, there was this policeman in the provinces that we've been investigating for corruption."

"Well," said his American counterpart, "that wasn't quite what he had in mind. That, after all, was simply an instance of the press echoing Mr. Gorbachev's attack on incompetent and inefficient functionaries." What the American newsman wanted to know was whether Soviet journalists were now free to investigate the Soviet hierarchy itself.

Well, on the Soviet side there was clearly confusion and embarrassment. There was a weak reply, suggesting that such investigation was unnecessary.

But with all the irreverent doggedness that characterizes the American journalist, the American inquisitor came at it again: "Let your imagination run wild," he said. "What if top members of the Politburo were guilty of wrongdoing? What if Mr. Gorbachev was found with his hand in the till?"

You could sense the blanching at the Moscow end. And finally with a sputter, the Soviet journalist spokesman replied that such high level hanky-panky was inconceivable.

I think what the exchange seems to indicate is that for all the ballyhoo, and while glasnost means the reigns on the Soviet press may have been loosened, they have not been dropped. When the press is doing Mr. Gorbachev's will, there is openness. Otherwise, there are subjects to be avoided and tightropes to be delicately walked.

Soviet journalists are going to be careful in public, because they don't know whether glasnost will be extended or reined in. They don't know even whether Mr. Gorbachev will last. For instance, in a little-noted event last month, Boris Yeltsin, a Gorbachev protege roughly equivalent to the Mayor of Moscow, took an extraordinary drubbing from officials under him at a public criticism session. The party paper Pravda devoted a major article to it. It seems unlikely that those who challenged Mr. Yeltsin, and presumably challenged him for Gorbachev-type policies, would have done so without encouragement from other top leaders.

Just this week, we had the speech by the KGB Chief, Mr. Chebrikov, expressing a lot of unhappiness with the kinds of "reforms" that Mr. Gorbachev is introducing.

So you can understand the reluctance of some Soviet journalists to stick their necks out. And the question, I think, is whether the new vitality in the Soviet press is a manifestation of real openness, or whether Soviet journalists have simply been unleashed, as Mr. Gorbachev's pit bulls, to go after recalcitrant officials who stand in the way of change.

I do not think there can be much doubt that in its various forms, including journalism, there are sharp limits to the practice of glasnost. If you touch a sensitive nerve, the openness of glasnost quickly erodes. For example, when Western radio stations publicized nationalist demonstrations in the Soviet Baltic Republics last month, the full brunt of the Soviet propaganda machine was directed at them, charging interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs.

Similarly, the Soviets were uncertain how to handle demonstrations early this year by Crimean tartars in Central Moscow; and now they have banned public demonstrations from central areas of the capital. And for all the new flavor of glasnost, it is a very rare Soviet journalist who will document Soviet atrocities in Afghanistan.

I think Soviet journalists could not have taken much comfort from the remarks of Pravda editor, Victor Afanasyev, at their own journalists' conference in Moscow earlier this year. He voiced concern that some journalists, caught up in the campaign for glasnost, might forget that their primary task is to implement party policy. Every journalist in the Soviet Union, he said, is in fact a special kind of party worker. He stressed the need to describe positive examples of restructuring in Soviet society, and to avoid being carried away by criticism.

And despite the cautious new quest for a little truth in Soviet journalism, many examples of disinformation persist. In recent months, for example, the Soviet press has accused the

United States of intentionally spreading AIDS in Africa, of running CIA death squads, of being implicated in the assassination attempts on Indira Gandhi and Olaf Palme and the Pope; of training international terrorists in special U.S. Government-run schools, and confining fighters for civil rights in mental hospitals.

There isn't any question that Mr. Gorbachev has brought a breath of fresh air to Soviet society. During my time in government, the Soviet Union was led by a series of elderly and ailing leaders who did not inject any dynamic new initiatives into the U.S.-Soviet relationship. With monotonous regularity, we were heading off to Moscow in the cold and bitter days of winter to attend the funeral of one more departed ruler. Vice President Bush always seemed to get assigned to head the American delegation, so much so that reporters covering him developed a new slogan: "You die, we fly."

Well, clearly that's changed. We now have a young and energetic Soviet leader with a distinct sense of mission and a great deal of self-confidence, and the mission is to transform the Soviet Union from a muscle-bound and backward empire into a modern state. Its economy under Marxism is stultified; its people are disillusioned and lacking some of the necessities and services of life, let alone the luxuries.

President Reagan likes a joke he heard about the Soviet citizen who applied to buy a new car. The man asked what the delivery date would be. The government official assigned to him gave him a delivery date ten years hence. "Well," asked the man, "would that be in the morning or in the afternoon?" The official was a little perplexed. He said, "If it's ten years from now, what difference does it make whether it's in the morning or the afternoon?" "Well," replied the man, "the plumber is coming in the morning."

[Laughter.]

I don't know whether Mr. Gorbachev has enough sense of humor to laugh at that joke if President Reagan ever tells it to him, but there's not much doubt but he knows his country's economy is in disarray, because he has been bitterly critical in public of its failings.

The fact is that although we count the Soviet Union a superpower in terms of its military might, its nuclear arsenal, and some of its achievements in space, the Soviets have a good way to go before they become an economic superpower in the strict sense of the description.

So clearly, it was as an instrument to help transform the society that glasnost came into being. Mr. Gorbachev knew he would face obstruction from an entrenched party bureaucracy, so he is attempting revolution from above rather than below.

Glasnost is intended to open up thinking, to corral the support of the intellectuals, the writers, the artists, and to impose reform on a system resistant to change.

We should not be under any illusion that Mr. Gorbachev is dumping communism or eschewing socialism; quite the contrary. He wants to make the Soviet Union a better country under communism. Because Mr. Gorbachev jousts with American reporters, because he charms Mrs. Thatcher, a lady not easily charmed by communist leaders, and because his wife Raisa wears French gowns and shops with an American Express card, we should not be deluded that Mr. Gorbachev has become a born-again capitalist.

The aim is not to introduce American-style democracy to the Soviet Union; the aim is to strengthen the control of the Communist Party by strengthening the economy and proving that socialism can fulfill the expectations of the masses.

The Soviet Union is a country where the regime has had a monopoly on the information flow; it's a society which has been hobbled by secrecy; it's a society where the party has maintained power by fear and force. It's a society where the lie has oftentimes been more prevalent than the truth.

Well, glasnost is intended to change this image. Internally, glasnost is intended to enlist the support of the intellectuals against the bureaucrats; and, as I said, to make communist society more efficient. Externally, glasnost is intended to convey the image of a country becoming more sophisticated, more open, more democratic; and the Soviets are working hard at this. Their spokesmen have become more skillful and agile; the speed at which their public relations machine responds to statements and initiatives from the West has become remarkable.

Just recently, they spent $350,000 (U.S.) on an insert in the Wall Street Journal touting cooperation and opportunities for American investors.

I think glasnost is also an admission that many Soviet citizens no longer believe the propaganda that their government has fed them over the years. I think it underlines that some truth has filtered in from the outside world; and the Soviet regime is having to adapt to this fact.

So I suppose in one sense, glasnost is a kind of victory for the public diplomacy that the United States and other free nations have practiced in their relations with the Soviets. Year after year, the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, along with BBC and the radios of other free nations have been trying to penetrate the jamming curtain thrown up by the Soviets.

Year after year, despite Soviet efforts to seal off the citizens in their empire, the ideas and the facts and the truth from the West have filtered in, and undermined the myth that the Soviets have tried to disseminate about their own society and about others. So now, even if they wished, the Soviets can no longer shelter a citizenry increasingly skeptical about what their own propaganda is telling them.

Well, what should be our posture in the face of all this? I think as far as glasnost is concerned, we should welcome whatever relaxation has taken place in a hitherto rigid Soviet society. We should be realistic about its extent, and we should be cautious about its effect. Strength and vigilance are prerequisites when dealing with the Soviets, but we ought to be alert to the possibility of improving our relationship with them. There are certain gray areas between us where our interests coincide. We have an acute interest, for example, in not blowing each other up, and perhaps the disaster at Chernobyl has reinvigorated both sides in the quest for an arms reduction agreement that is intelligent, not one-sided, and can be verified.

We cannot overlook the vast disparities between our society and theirs. Probably what sets us most apart is that theirs is a system in which the individuality of man is subjugated, while ours is a system that enhances and encourages this individuality. A promising development is that the Soviets are necessarily having to open up their communications systems, means of communication have traditionally been denied Soviet citizens.

At the Monitor, we have a young woman who has just come back from a three month's exchange program at Moscow News, the weekly in Moscow. She told me that every reporter in the newsroom who wants to use the copy machine has to go to the supervisor and get a written chit of authorization. Before anything is copied, the reporter has to show the supervisor what it is they are about to copy. American newsrooms would come to a standstill with that kind of system.

Also, the Soviet Union has the lowest per capita distribution of telephones in the industrialized world; 10 per 100 citizens. Mr. Wilson Dizard, a communications expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, points out that all this is changing, that the telephone system will be doubled by the 1990s, and computerization will come to the Soviet Union. He also points out that this is all going to be much slower in the Soviet Union than in the West and he says it would be a mistake to underestimate the Soviet Government's ability to keep control over these new channels and this new information environment.

However, despite all this, more Soviet citizens will be dealing with larger amounts of information than ever before, and I think the last thing we in the international information

business should do is cut back on our efforts to project the truth into these closed communist societies. This is no time to be cutting back on the budgets for the radios, such as the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. We should see that their voices are powerful, that their programs are sophisticated, and that the sagging dollar does not hobble their operations abroad.

Radio Marti, the VOA subsidiary that broadcasts to Cuba, is a good example of international radio's effectiveness. Mr. Castro has clearly been shaken up by Radio Marti's broadcasts of interviews with a couple of prominent, recent defectors from Cuba. Cuban radio has had to revamp its whole programming to compete with Radio Marti and to answer factual Radio Marti accounts of the housing shortage in Cuba, of the incidence of AIDS among Cuban soldiers returning from Africa, and similar stories.

Closed societies fear the truth. Dictatorial regimes know that the flame of liberty flickers in the breasts of their citizens, however repressive the government propaganda machine. One of my most moving experiences as Director of the Voice of America was getting mail which had sometimes filtered through over the months via a circuitous route from the Soviet Union. It told how some Russians went out into the snow-covered birch forests at night to listen to what they described as VOA's voice of truth over their shortwave radios. And they pleaded for the broadcasts to keep coming.

Now the Soviets have stopped jamming VOA and the BBC, but we ought to continue to press them to stop jamming Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. We should use whatever new techniques are available for spreading factual information. These include the direct broadcast satellites and videocassettes and all the other marvels that we have been hearing about today.

There is no magic formula, I think, in international broadcasting to repressive societies. It is an ongoing, long term project, day after day, beaming the facts to millions whose own governments attempt to tailor and twist those facts. We don't need to hype the story.

When the Swedes find Soviet submarines poking around in their territorial waters, that story tells itself. When the Soviets shot down a Korean airliner, killing everybody aboard, the tapes that we acquired and played at the United Nations of the Soviet fighter pilots chattering as they fired their missiles was all that we needed to convince the world. When Afghan children without hands recount how booby-trapped Soviet toys exploded as they picked them up, that tells with excruciating agony the story of man's inhumanity to man, or in this case, to child.

So to conclude, whatever glasnost may ultimately turn out to mean, I think we should keep on a steady course, telling the truth as best we know it, to as many yearning people as we can reach. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. SCHMERTZ: Thank you very much, John.

Our first panel discussant is Representative Jim Courter, a Republican from New Jersey. A former Peace Corps volunteer, Representative Courter was elected to the House in 1978 and has been returned four times by very wide margins.

Recently, he served on the select committee investigating arms sales to Iran. He is a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee and an articulate advocate of a strong national defense. Representative Courter is one of the most informed members of Congress on East-West issues, and has taken a special interest in U.S. radio broadcasting, VOA, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce Representative Courter.

[Applause.]

MR. COURTER: Thank you, Mr. Schmertz. I must have written that myself -- I'll use that for some other occasion, I think.

This is a very important topic, and what I'd like to do is start out reading a couple of quotations. One is not an exact quotation, but it is a statement related to me by another individual through a spokesman of Daniel Ortega. It is my understanding this spokesman was saying that they indeed believed in a free press. And when they are talking about La Prensa and how come that was shut, he said "We believe in a free press, but La Prensa was printing nothing but lies, and we couldn't permit that."

Winston Churchill probably put it best many, many years ago when he said, "A little mouse of thought appears in the room and even the mightiest potentates are thrown into panic." I would agree with that statement.

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn said it well when he wrote, "The mighty, non-military force which resides in the airways and whose kindling power in the midst of the communist darkness cannot even be grasped by Western imagination."

My compliments to John Hughes for his outstanding remarks. I have been waiting a long time to hear someone say publicly that part of glasnost was used by Soviet authorities to get rid of some people they found uncomfortable, and Mr. Hughes rewarded my patience.

It has been power politics, as far as I am concerned, not investigative journalism. One example certainly is the replacement in May of a Ukranian KGB agent, Stepan Muka. The allegation was that he mistreated a reporter for a Soviet mining journal. But when Gorbachev broke Muka's power, he wasn't freeing up the press; he was replacing a KGB man who was a problem to the Soviet authorities.

The lesson was that the party controls the KGB. The lesson was that there is a difference between "publicity," which is one legitimate translation of the word glasnost, and "candor" and "openness," which is often our definition of glasnost.

The alternative lesson, of course, is that the KGB was being punished for heavy-handedness. Who are we kidding? The KGB's description is heavy-handedness. In fact, their work is heavy-handedness; it is the fist of the party. Often Soviets in the party want to remind the KGB that they are the body, and the KGB is the fist.

The truth, in my mind, is that glasnost is 97 percent fraud. The utility in the remaining three percent may be divisible into various parts.

One part is a means of prodding a lethargic society into becoming a more productive society. A second is a means of consolidating the powers of the new ruler and making possible public criticism of the old guard. And the third, of course, is charming the outside world, charming even leaders in this country.

You remember that one of Gorbachev's associates described him as a man with a nice smile, but iron teeth. Some people in the West immediately forget the second part and remember only the smile.

If you think glasnost doesn't work, you missed Gary Hart's speech not long ago that described Mr. Gorbachev as modern, articulate, intelligent, a far-sighted man and frankly, compared him very favorably with the leaders of the Western world.

Glasnost is the appearance of openness, and it also offers the appearance of change when in fact the Kremlin's traditional foreign policies continue. Has spying diminished in foreign countries since March of 1985 when the new man with the pleasant smile came to office? Has military production been scaled back so that the public markets have sufficient foodstuffs? Not at all.

Has that splendid tour of Krasnoyarsk radar, which was taken by some of my friends and colleagues in the House, meant the dismantlement of that radar? Or even the recognition that

after all, the Krasnoyarsk radar is a violation of the ABM treaty? In the last 18 months, did we find a pullout of Soviet troops in Afghanistan? Is that war there all settled and now over?

What we have are some interesting, if limited, disputes in the Soviet press, and some encouragement of the economy. The rest, in my mind, is insubstantial. That does not mean that glasnost does not offer us certain opportunities. I believe it does.

Formal Western complaints and petitions pertaining to the plight of ethnic minorities in the Bloc deserve a better hearing in international forums when openness and candor is the declared Soviet policy. Stern rebukes about our "meddling in internal affairs" are much more difficult if the Soviet leader is going to talk about glasnost. Fuller implementation of the provisions of the Helsinki Accords of 1975, such as those about travel and family visitation, become harder to resist with glasnost. We are in an improved position with glasnost to press for an end of jamming of international radios, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in particular, and for broader rights of foreign journalists reporting from the Soviet Bloc.

Let us use these opportunities to hold the Soviets to their slogans. Let us also recognize that glasnost is in a way a product of the Soviets' recognition of the communications revolution. Today, even an iron curtain cannot be totally shut and held at bay.

Openness about Chernobyl was a result of the inability of the party to prevent Soviet subjects from learning what had happened. I remember when my sole journey to the Soviet Union took place last year, I spoke to many residents of Moscow, and they told me that they first heard of Chernobyl not from the Soviet authorities, but from Voice of America and the BBC.

A livelier Soviet or Polish press is the Government's recognition of competition from the West; so let's press forward with our efforts to let light into the darkness.

International radio and television, aid for Solidarity, even student exchanges, if they are large enough to encompass more than selected commissar youth, are all good, both for those we touch, and also for our own interests.

The National Endowment of Democracy's slender budget should be multiplied many-fold. It has been much attacked, but it has a fine record, as my colleague from Florida, Dan Mica, mentioned earlier today.

We should be pressing forward with research on simple receiving systems; very simple, basic receiving systems, the construction of which can be explained over international

radios so that any communist bloc citizen could create his own reception device from metal, from wire, and the use and application of simple technologies.

We should be addressing a well-known problem on the periphery of the Soviet empire: The problem of meeting generous Soviet scholarship programs with strong scholarship programs of our own. We spent years talking about a massive program for Central America. I remember I was part of that debate. Jim Wright was also part of that debate.

Last year, USIA's new Central American Student Exchanges program (CAMPUS) was host to about 150 students. The Soviet Bloc is giving away seven times more scholarships in that same region than we are.

The power that public diplomacy can and should have is in my mind remarkable. We often forget that in countries where lies are the rule as well as the means of ruling, truth indeed is a powerful weapon. Because we forget it, and because public diplomacy has no real constituency in this country that I know of, it is hard getting support for the programs that tell America's story abroad.

I am only too aware of what it takes to exact from the Congress even the most basic funding for the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, Radio Marti, let alone for expanding the budget for bright new enterprises like WORLDNET television.

Even this Administration, which came in like a lion, is not giving public diplomacy the strong leadership it needs. The President who brought the National Endowment for Democracy into being now seems to be paying precious little attention to it.

I am told that in the Department of State and the National Security Council public diplomacy issues enjoy very little prestige. Certainly, staffs assigned to them in the early years of this Administration have shrunk dramatically.

It is regrettable that maintaining support is so difficult, especially when the USIA staff has grown and benefitted from the good and admirable work of Charles Wick. I wonder if we haven't lost the sense, which was so strong in 1981, that public diplomacy is -- and it is important to recognize and remember this -- a strategic concept.

I think that the current deficiencies in legislative and executive branch leadership point to a lack of confidence in the power of truth; and in the power of the idea that America is America -- that America is an idea.

As a matter of fact, I remember speaking with some immigrants that were sworn in, newly made citizens of the United States, and I was trying to explain to them that more than anything else, America is not a country; America is an idea.

As my friend Jack Kemp says: "Our problem is not that we are soft on communism. The problem is that we are soft on democracy." We are soft on our principles. We are soft on democratic ideas.

If we cannot put good information on the airwaves, on the television screen, and in the libraries of foreign countries with something like the urgency and commitment with which the communists advertise their falsehoods and their anti-Americanism, how can we prevail in the world arena of ideas? It is impossible.

The difference between what the Marxists-Leninists call the two-world system is as real today as it ever was. Gorbachev has never said glasnost would moderate or change their ideas. Nor has his wife, who is a professor of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The debate between what are loosely called East and West is a real debate. It exists; it is in earnest; and it has to be contested to be won. Even truth usually requires a spokesman. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. SCHMERTZ: Thank you very much, Congressman Courter.

During a long and distinguished foreign service career, Ray Benson has developed a deserved reputation as one of this nation's foremost experts on the Soviet Union. It is not merely a textbook understanding. He was for eight years our Counselor for Press and Cultural Affairs in Moscow, a post from which he has just recently retired. For nine years, he served in Yugoslavia.

As a Career Minister in the Foreign Service, and recipient of the Edward R. Murrow award for excellence in public diplomacy, Ray has reached the top of his profession. His achievements were recently noted in the New York Times on the occasion of his departure from Moscow.

It gives me great pleasure to present Ray Benson.

[Applause.]

MR. BENSON: Thank you, Herb.

I see old friends.

It gives me uncommon pleasure to address this group, from outside the government. That doesn't mean, I hope those of you who know me will agree, that I would say anything substantially different were I still in the Foreign Service. I hope you will agree also after hearing me speak, that my views, if not idiosyncratic, are a little bit at variance with some of those expressed here.

Now in ten minutes -- I will go beyond that, I know -- I will not be able to work through the list of topics suggested in the documents received from the Advisory Commission. But I will try.

May I say at the outset that my views are informed by the conviction that the Soviet system can change; indeed is changing, with more to come.

Another conviction, born of some experience in communist countries and eight years at post in the Soviet Union, is that what we do, what we say, and how we say it -- the information we choose to convey and the manner in which we convey it -- makes a difference.

It's the message and not the medium which counts in the Soviet Union no less than elsewhere. I would not argue with any voice raised here that we need more hardware and that we need more means of communication. I would underline what Marvin Stone said yesterday in his talk at dinner, that it is the Foreign Service Officers in the field who are the line of communication which counts with foreign audiences.

A guiding purpose of the changes in the USSR, of the needs felt by the leadership gathered around Gorbachev, certainly by Yakovlev and Dobrynin -- the "North American Mafia" as they are called -- is that the Soviet Union can not maintain itself as a functioning, modern technological society capable of satisfying its citizens, expanding its needs and desires, without substantial changes in the patterns of its social, intellectual, cultural and, primarily, economic life.

That certain aspects of the political and bureaucratic establishments would have to be changed was never in doubt. That is the reason for the lack of obvious societal changes in the Brezhnev era, especially in its later years. But there were paradoxes in the Brezhnev period of so-called stagnation, because in a certain sense, it really was not.

The currents loosened by the Khrushchev thaw broadened in many respects during the years of detente. They constituted a process of great moment, paving the way for Gorbachev, and in large part explaining his ascendancy.

Now these currents were contained within their channels. They were in many senses submerged, and that they achieved no substantial organizational forum is also obvious. The kinetic energy was not released until Gorbachev's ascendancy, but it was there.

To the specific point of this conference, my view is simple. Gorbachev's policies, which go generally under the heading of glasnost and perestroyka, offer enormous opportunities for U.S. public diplomacy efforts. The Soviets are aware of this. Not all welcome the prospects, yet not all fear them.

We should recognize that Soviet views about our expanded public diplomacy efforts are complex and not uniform. If the new circumstances offer vast new opportunities for our views to be heard in the USSR, we must now be cautious and intelligent in our purposeful efforts to improve, enhance and expand our public diplomacy programs.

We have in this new situation new opportunities to carry messages to the Soviet people -- messages which, in my view, they are without question increasingly more willing to receive.

The "control apparatus," as I put it in a recent conversation with John Hughes, may be appalled at the prospect of maintaining domestic tranquility under these new circumstances, but we must understand that now and for some time new circumstances have existed.

Criticism of the manner in which we reported on demonstrations in the Baltic states should lead to a discussion of the fact that there were demonstrations in the Baltic states. There is something new.

Surely one of the characteristics of Gorbachevian glasnost, one of its purposes, risks and all, is to open the country to increased contact with the outside world, with the United States and with the West generally. Certainly to it is make such increased contacts available to those whom the Soviets call the creative intelligentsia.

This presents the leadership with present and future risks without any question. Also without any question, in my view, is their decision to accept these risks. For the cost of inaction was, and is, in their view greater. As we hear so often in Moscow now among those dedicated to carrying out the process of change: "If not now, when? And if not us, who?"

Among the effects of the new period of glasnost is that new technologies are becoming attractive to Soviet media officials -- certainly to the general public. There is much in this for us to work on. For example, Soviet media officials are now willing to talk of cooperating with us in elaborate

media hookups. This was made clear in the meeting between Mr. Wick and Mr. Aksenov, the head of the Soviet State Committee on Television and Radio earlier this summer on possibly utilizing the WORLDNET signal to bring its programs to the Soviet network for possible use. I do not know the current status of our long-standing wish to open a VOA bureau in Moscow; it should be pressed. It's not high tech, but we should mention here that the number of private sector programs of great complexity have proliferated. American and Soviet citizens interact in a constant series of exchanges, meetings, and symposia. Academic exchange programs never possible before are now under active discussion.

The Middlebury College program that I am now directing on behalf of a consortium of colleges would have been impossible and discussions on it would have been impossible only a few years ago.

Further to the Advisory Commission's list of subjects, I confess to puzzlement by what is meant by the phrase, "the imbalance in the U.S. and Soviet systems." Certainly we have vastly different systems, which in many respects affect our ability to organize traditional and inventive public diplomacy programs to be carried out in the Soviet Union in cooperation with Soviet institutions.

Soviet society is vastly more restrictive than ours. It is more closed despite all of Gorbachev's openness. There is probably no simple way to compare it; it's an absolute. Thus, a balance, an equity, a reciprocity which we should expect to flow naturally from the very nature of the bilateral relationship has to be negotiated into being, and then stoutly defended, case by case.

Mr. Wick's initiatives prove this can now be done with specific attention to our national objectives. To be sure, again, on a case-by-case basis, one can describe differences in our systems, differences in our openness, differences in our taboos, differences in what we fear, and in what we believe is necessary if the truth is to inform our affairs and our bilateral relationship.

But as I have attempted to suggest, this does not describe the impossibility of conducting public diplomacy on an intense level with the Soviet Union. It does justify all the expense, and it explains the tedium and the frustration of the negotiations, and the later work of implementation. It also explains the highs, the psychological feedback, when we are successful.

Computers, VCRs and satellite television, another phrase in the paragraph in the letter I received from the Commission, have a variety of impacts. They elicit differing reactions in the Soviet Union. Open reception by Soviet citizens of

satellite TV beamed from abroad is the most suspect and will not be achieved soon. In my view, though, the East German experience is no doubt noted. That is, the state survives though West German television is seen almost throughout the country and has been for decades. The Baltic states can receive Scandanavian TV and remain in place. Other East European countries have been able for decades to watch West European TV freely. The communist one-party systems there continue, and if the pace of change or the pressures for it are quickened by this inflow of information, one wonders whether this has not been accepted as a good thing after all.

A last thought for us to consider as we were asked, is to discuss the impact of computers in Soviet society. In a larger frame, I will be discussing just this at an elaborate conference at George Washington University a month from now. There will be time and the occasion for full discussion there of what I take to be certain of our operating assumptions.

One is that the Soviet Union can never quite catch up to the West, to Japan, in computerization in every or any aspect. This may be correct. Another is that they are afraid to try, for it would undermine their control of the populace, making it more difficult, at best. Well, it would. There's no question. Equally certain, in my view, is that they will try it anyway. They will try to widen dramatically educational use of the computer in schools and in industry. They obviously already have them in their military and space programs and throughout the industrial support systems in these programs. Thus, my view, they will absorb the impact of the computer, and they will change in so doing, remaining a one-party communist state and no doubt no friend of ours in the international arena. We should make no mistake about that.

But under these influences, the Soviet state and Soviet society will bear decreasing resemblance to the model of a state which by its very nature cannot change at all. I think we must reject that premise. We must recognize that the changes in the USSR, back to the narrow point of reference of this conference, afford new and unusual opportunities for public diplomacy -- and for the men and women on the ground who work in support of our national objectives in our bilateral relations with the Soviet Union. Give them the money and the tools and they will do the job. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. SCHMERTZ: Thank you very much, Ray.

We have about 10 minutes, I think, for questions. As you recall, if you push the red button on the microphone, it's supposed to work.

MR. GUIRARD: My name is Jim Guirard, I'm a lobbyist and foreign policy consultant, and do a lot of work in the business of semantics in geopolitical affairs. The topic of this conference is "Public Diplomacy in the Information Age" and the electronic marvel that we have will permit us to get information around very effectively.

It also presents the potential for getting disinformation around very effectively. One of the underpinnings of our ability to get information, correct information around to ourselves and to the rest of the world, is the very language by which we speak about such things. The currency of information or disinformation is words.

The President this morning quoted Disraeli as saying it is with words we govern men. I would like to mention two or three examples and have any member of the panel comment on it. Glasnost is the topic of this panel. It seems to me that we need an antonym for glasnost. How do you express the word "closedness" or "hiddenness" or "concealment"? In discussing the nature of glasnost you need the opposite thereof.

It seems to me, for example, we might be well served in a world which has grown to despise colonialism. Why don't we call Soviet colonies, "colonies"? We call them satellites. Well, one of the marvels by which we try to communicate are little things called satellites, electronic devices that orbit the earth.

So we use euphemistic labels to describe the reality of the world, which doesn't communicate to ourselves. "Right wing death squads" in Central America are called that, and that is what those thugs should be called, but when have you heard the term "left wing death squads"? They are people's "guerrillas," "necklace's," and in the Philippines, "sparrows." I guess if they called themselves "tweety birds," we would find a way to accommodate that.

SDI, one last example, is maybe the biggest single geopolitical issue around. This Administration, despite its great support for SDI, which has been pejoratively named "Star Wars," has not yet given a name, any name, by which to communicate in public diplomacy about the Soviet SDI. It remains nameless and therefore appears not to exist. Mr. Gorbachev calls it "Star Peace," and Gerasimov calls it the SPI, "Soviet Peace Initiative," pardon the expression.

Is it not necessary, if we are going to have an effective, truthful and accurate public diplomacy, to base it on accurate and truthful language?

MR. SCHMERTZ: Any of the panel like to deal with that?

MR. COURTER: Obviously I agree with what you say. That is no surprise to anybody here. You can go on with words such as a Soviet "journalist." It implies something that in my mind doesn't exist in the Soviet Union, but we continue to use the word Soviet "journalist." They are Soviet spokespersons or whatever, but they are not journalists the way we know it.

One of the problems, I think, in dealing with the world today and with the American people's perception of that world, is that we mirror image the Soviet Union on the United States. And one of the problems you find also is in verification of arms control agreements. Can you imagine if the United States built one extra MX missile? Everybody would know about it long before it rolled off the production line. But if the Soviet Union built an extra one, we might not know about it for years and years. We just assume that verification is as easy in the Soviet Union as it is in the United States. So the point is that we have a group of words, as you say, and we put one meaning on them. I submit they are incorrect as applied to the Soviet Union.

The race is to grab the perfect word to describe something we often use. It is my understanding that Senator Kennedy came up with Star Wars, rather than Star Peace or whatever it may be. Words such as contras. Most people recognize the fact that you mean it is against something; it has a flavor that is not very pleasant.

I don't know why we do not define things properly in the Soviet Union. We seem to label them the same way that we label things in this country, when one is so distinct and different from the other. All I can do is recognize the problem, and believe me, I am frustrated about it; I have no solution to it.

MR. SCHMERTZ: Either of the other panelists like to comment? John?

MR. HUGHES: Well, I'm not sure I have much to add. I have a suspicion that readers of newspapers and listeners to radio are smarter a lot of the time than we journalists and perhaps Congressmen think; and I think you have to leave this with the people.

I think governments can be careful about their use of the language; and I think our government, in its government operations, should be. But the fact is that the press takes language and makes of it what it will, and so many newspapers are not going to call the MX missile the "Peacekeeper," and they are not going to use the correct terminology for SDI; they are going to use "Star Wars."

I think in our country you have to leave it to the people to make judgments about what biases are in the newspapers and radio stations and television stations that they read and

listen to. As far as the Soviets are concerned, I think their people are proving that they are smarter and more sophisticated than the Soviets have believed, and I think that is why we are seeing some change. It is not a solution; it is just an observation.

MR. BENSON: I would have just one thought. I would leave it to the media. They are the ones who describe events. We read about them, and we watch television and so on. They describe situations. If they choose the language and choose the cliches, it is their definitions that we are, shall we say, stuck with.

MR. SCHMERTZ: At the risk of ceasing to be a moderator, I have great difficulty accepting that.

MR. COURTER: Can I add something to that?

MR. SCHMERTZ: Sure.

MR. COURTER: What I would like to add is, if what catches on in the media portrays something that is inaccurate, why propound the inaccuracy? Why don't you try to set the record straight, so to speak?

MR. SCHMERTZ: If I could ask a question of Ray, are you suggesting that nobody should criticize the media if they get a designation inaccurately? And should we just leave it to the media and not try to correct that record?

MR. BENSON: No, no. I think 180 degrees in the opposite direction. If the thought put by our questioner is that certain situations, certain events in the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc are not correctly described -- that the words, the euphemisms we are content with do not adequately describe the situation there -- then I suggest we are entrapped by definitions, by wrong descriptions, by inadequate descriptions that are in the air because of the media. It's not you and me speaking personally; it's what we get on the radio, television and the newspapers.

Therefore, I would lay it on them to describe situations, events and so on in that way.

MR. GUIRARD: This Commission on three different occasions over the last four years has recommended the creation of a White House or an NSC-type task force to cope with this problem of disinformational language. There are certain people here who have attempted, from the NSC staff and from other sources, to effect that effort, and it has not gotten very far. There are some efforts still in force.

There seems to me to be a need for an effort on the part of public diplomacy, institutionalized as it is here, to achieve a language which is basically correct and accurate and

truthful, rather than disinformational and euphemistic. Merely to leave it to the media, to me, is an inadequate answer. Saying that we have no role, that government has no role, and that public diplomacy has no role in providing our people and the world with a truthful, accurate language is inadequate.

MR. SCHMERTZ: Yes, sir?

MR. WESSEL: Yes, I am Nils Wessel, USIA.

I think specifically in answer to Mr. Guirard's question and without going on at greater length on this point, that we heard coined at lunch today the antonym for glasnost. Director Charles Wick of USIA suggested "gloss-overnost," and I think that probably captures some of the essential meaning of the term, and we ought to try and popularize it.

MR. SCHMERTZ: Anybody else? Yes, sir.

Audience Member: Name inaudible (from USIA). I would just like to say that I don't think government officials should just leave the situation as the media created it. For example, the President speaks always of "freedom fighters" rather than contras, and when government spokesmen talk about SDI, I think we always make it a point to say SDI rather than "Star Wars." I think that is about as far as we can go with it. I do not think, in a country like this, that we can force the media to do any more. I think we just have to keep setting it straight ourselves.

MR. SCHMERTZ: Any other comments or questions?

Thank you very much. This panel is adjourned. The next panel will start in about five minutes.

[Applause.]

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

3:00 pm "Public Diplomacy: The View From Congress

Moderator:

Dr. Edwin J. Feulner

Panelists:

Senator Claiborne Pell (D-RI)
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations

Senator Mitch McConnell (R-KY)
Committee on Foreign Relations

Senator J. William Fulbright
Of Counsel, Hogan and Hartson

MR. FEULNER: Ladies and gentlemen, I invite you to resume your places so that we can proceed immediately with the final panel discussion on "Public Diplomacy: The View From Congress."

This topic suggests several questions. First, with the effectiveness that everyone in the room believes public diplomacy has, why is it so difficult to develop a constituency and tangible support for our foreign policy initiatives, and for public diplomacy efforts specifically? What is the relative value of public diplomacy in the context of competing national needs and priorities? How do we maintain a balance in public diplomacy programs between information and advocacy on the one side and educational programs on the other? Finally, what is the overall Congressional report card on U.S. public diplomacy efforts? Its strengths. Its weaknesses. And where do we go from here?

We have several panelists who will speak to these related questions. Each of them extraordinarily competent to do so.

The first is the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Claiborne Pell. This distinguished fourth-term Democrat from Rhode Island is the only member of the United States Senate who has himself experienced life overseas as a Foreign Service Officer. This gives Senator Pell the special perspective not only on the needs of foreign affairs agencies, but on their capabilities as well.

The name Pell, of course, is strongly associated with educational opportunity, and in fact through the Pell amendment, it is a great tribute to Senator Pell, that the educational exchange programs at USIA have more than doubled during the past six years.

Like Senator Fulbright, who we are also honored to have with us today, Senator Pell has been a vigorous champion of our international educational exchange programs. He also has a deep understanding of the importance of the Voice of America and USIA's field programs. Our country is indeed fortunate to have a man of his vision and understanding overseeing the foreign affairs agency.

It is my very great honor at this time to present to you the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Pell.

[Applause.]

SENATOR PELL: Thank you very much, indeed, Mr. Feulner. My old colleague, Senator Fulbright, Senator McConnell, and members of the Advisory Commission and guests.

I am honored to be asked to speak to this gathering on public diplomacy. It is a subject that has interested me for the 22 years I have now been on the Foreign Relations Committee. As time is limited, you must forgive me and my colleague if we have to disappear very hurriedly, because we are in the midst of a Senate session and there may be some roll call votes.

Public diplomacy as debated on Capitol Hill and elsewhere has come to describe two separate but related phenomena. Narrowly, public diplomacy is understood to describe the American government's international information and exchange programs. These are primarily the programs that are administered by the USIA. More broadly, though, public diplomacy encompasses all of the problems and actions of a government which influences public opinion abroad. Thus a particular policy initiative, for example, an arms control proposal or the Central American peace plan may be undertaken in part for its substantive merit, but also in part as a means of influencing foreign public opinion.

Obviously wise policies are by far the most important public diplomacy tools. No amount of expert, slick salesmanship can persuade a foreign public of the merits of flawed policy. In my view, this premise, and not some deficiency at USIA, accounts for European skepticism over some of the Administration's arms control policies.

It is a skepticism, I think, which can be overcome by a successful outcome of the current arms control negotiations. USIA's role can nonetheless be very important. I would like to address the role of three major components of the Agency's public diplomacy efforts: The advocacy function, carried out by the officer in the field; the exchange programs; and the Voice of America.

I would like to offer some thoughts on the resources and the mission of each. Overall, USIA's budget has grown significantly under the excellent stewardship of Charles Wick. In Fiscal Year 1981, USIA's budget was a little more than $300 million. For Fiscal 1989, the President has asked for more than $1 billion.

This expansion of resources is surely Charlie Wick's greatest achievement. And while the Fiscal 1989 request is not likely to be fully met, it is nevertheless an enduring monument to Charlie Wick.

Every politician appreciates the central role of a good press secretary. The press secretary not only keeps the media informed, but explains and promotes the position of our government. Overseas, this function is performed by the Public Affairs Officer and the Information Officer. Our USIA Foreign Service Officers are in my view the single most important public diplomacy tool.

I am therefore disturbed that in spite of great budget growth in USIA since 1981, and a significant growth in Washington-based personnel, the number of Foreign Service Officers abroad has remained constant at about 1040. I am dismayed at the suggestion that further minuscule budget savings be made by closing posts overseas. This year's foreign relations authorization bill addresses this problem by prohibiting a reduction in the aggregate number of USIA posts and overseas personnel.

Our free society is of course America's greatest achievement and our greatest diplomatic asset. Our educational and cultural exchange programs provide the means to exploit that asset. Dollar for dollar, I believe these are our most effective expenditures to enhance American influence abroad.

Ample proof for this assertion is supplied by the roster of Fulbright alumni who serve as heads of government, cabinet members, university presidents, high court justices, scholars, and newspaper editors in foreign countries.

I am therefore very pleased with the progress made toward implementing my amendment of 1981 to double the real funding for exchanges. I believe we can do more. My original proposal was for a ten-fold increase over 1981 levels, and I shall continue to pursue that as a longer term objective.

Our radios, VOA, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, provide publics in denied areas with information not otherwise available. This enables the foreign public to make its own judgment on U.S. policy and the policy of its own regime. It does not insure concurrence, necessarily, with United States policy.

In recent years, the VOA and RFE/RFL has benefitted from a long overdue modernization program. This has helped bring clearer broadcast signals to vital denied areas, and provide for some upgrade in programming. Unfortunately, the funds to continue the modernization program are not there. By failing to submit a budget with adequate resources to pay for vital domestic programs, the Administration has forced cutbacks in a range of international programs.

Public diplomacy is one of many victims of the Administration-induced budget crisis. Unfortunately, it is our national security that suffers.

Over the years, the mission of United States public diplomacy programs have been much discussed. At the outset of this Administration, voices were heard advocating use of public diplomacy programs for a hard sell of Administration policy.

At the VOA, this approach was embodied in the now-famous Nicolaides memo and the hard line editorials put out on the air. The exchange programs, too, were used a bit for a hard

sell. Grants were awarded to promote a specific political agenda. Thus, Fulbright-Hays money went to programs to train press spokesmen for despots -- friendly ones, such as Haiti's Duvalier and Guatemala's military junta, on how to handle the American media.

Other grants provide further examples of an effort to divert the Fulbright program to a specific propagandist purpose. In my view, this kind of hard sell is counter-productive; our free society is its own best advertisement. We do not need to tell the world that America is a grand country, a great country; we can let visitors come and see for themselves. We do not need to propagandize about our policies over the air. Rather, by providing accurate, reliable information, we can help others make their own judgments.

The Congress has generally preferred the more open approach. Thus, in response to the efforts to politicize the Fulbright program, Congress in 1983 enacted a charter for the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs so as to protect the Fulbright program. It also tightened oversight through a statutory requirement for grant notification.

Nevertheless, I am concerned that the present bureaucratic configuration, which links the advocacy function overseas with the exchange programs, inevitably subjects the exchange programs to the political agenda of an administration of the day.

Overtly political or one-sided programming can quickly erode the reputation of the Fulbright and related programs. Without its reputation, the program will not attract quality participants, and I emphasize that word, "quality," from the United States or abroad. Without quality participants, the program really is not worth doing.

VOA also suffers from ambiguity of mission. Is it an objective news service, analagous to the BBC, or is it the official mouthpiece of the United States Government? Use of VOA as a mouthpiece can raise doubts among listeners about its reliability as well as affect its quality.

As I have traveled abroad, I have heard numerous complaints about the quality of VOA programs and broadcasts, in particular, the simplistic propagandist nature of the editorials. The use of the VOA for covert actions, as in the arms for Iran scandal, also can undermine listener credibility.

Questions about both the exchange programs and the VOA lead me to question the current bureaucratic structure for the administration of these programs. Some have argued that the academic, artistic integrity of the exchange programs would be enhanced were these programs to operate in a less governmental-politicized environment.

The Smithsonian Institution provides one possible framework. I believe consideration should be given to the creation of a center, hopefully named the J. William Fulbright Center (analogous to the Wilson Center), in the Smithsonian administration to administer the academic exchanges.

Similarly, setting the VOA up as an independent corporation could be one way to resolve its identity problem. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the BBC provide two superb examples of success with this form of organization.

Finally, I am concerned that the vital information function is not as central to our foreign policy as it might be. So much of our diplomacy, nearly all of it, is public diplomacy. Yet public diplomacy is farmed out by the State Department to a separate agency.

Consideration should be given to bringing the information function back to the State Department, perhaps as a fifth career cone. Thus, information would join the political, economic, consular and administrative cones as career tracks, a fifth career track.

In addition to integrating public diplomacy more effectively into the State Department mainstream, such a structure would allow greater cross-fertilization between the public, political and informational functions. It would also give Information Officers a better shot at becoming ambassadors.

In spite of the substantial progress made by Director Wick in promoting more USIA ambassadors, and he gets full credit for that, the Agency is still poorly represented at the top level abroad. While this alternative organizational structure for public diplomacy has some obvious advantages, I recognize the drawbacks. Reorganizing an agency that was itself re-organized ten years ago is disruptive. Further, regardless of Washington-based organizational structures, the work of public diplomacy overseas would still depend upon our dedicated and capable Foreign Service Officers.

I am not at this time proposing any changes in USIA. I do believe, though, these ideas need to be explored further and I expect that the Foreign Relations Committee will hold hearings on U.S. public diplomacy later on in the year.

Most important, public diplomacy must be at the center of our foreign policy. Despite disagreements in some specifics, I believe Director Wick has taken USIA a long way in this direction. I continue to believe that resources are inadequate, and that the mission of our public diplomacy programs must be clearly elucidated. I commend the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for holding this conference, as I believe it contributes successfully to the process.

In conclusion, I would like to congratulate Charlie Wick on the truly fine job he has done and is doing. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. FEULNER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for those stimulating and, if I may say so, provocative ideas. Our second participant on the panel, Senator Mitch McConnell, is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. While a relatively new member of that Committee, he is certainly not new to Washington, since he has served as a senior congressional staff aide as well as a member of the United States Senate from his home state of Kentucky.

He is no stranger to USIA's programs, having traveled abroad on a USIA grant to the American Council of Young Political Leaders some years ago. My colleagues and I recognize that he shares the interests of all these panelists in international exchange programs. He has also developed a particular interest in USIA's English teaching programs, and he has a keen politician's appreciation of the power of mass communication, particularly the power of television.

Senator McConnell.

[Applause.]

SENATOR McCONNELL: Thank you very much, Ed. I appreciate the chance to be here, particularly with my colleague, Claiborne Pell, and our former Chairman, Bill Fulbright.

As Ed indicated, I am the newest Republican on the Committee, so I sit at the end of the minority side. That is about as far down as you can get on our Committee. I have spent, I guess you could argue, a good portion of the last ten years of my life in a business that depends extensively on effective use of communication, and that certainly is our topic here today.

From my perspective, there are a number of issues that I would like to focus on with regard to our public diplomacy efforts. First, we all know that the press secretary is one of the key advisers in any political campaign, or in the office of an elected official. Claiborne made reference to that earlier.

How to deal with public perceptions. How to frame issues in a manner that maximizes the chance of gaining the broadest and deepest public support. How to minimize the negative. All are crucial contributions that these kinds of folks make. These are the daily decisions and announcements that are the grist of public life and opinion.

So the first question we must ask ourselves is whether the U.S. press and public opinion agencies, and individuals that are expected to promote U.S. policies abroad, are included in a timely and effective way in the development of the policies they are announcing?

I suggest there is clearly a gap. Whether it is due to budget shortfall or attitudes, the public promoters should become central players or we all lose in the process. Don't let me leave you thinking we should base our foreign policy decisions on foreign opinion rather than a frank assessment of our own national interests. But I am arguing that we will be more successful in achieving a consensus of international opinion, if we have a comprehensive, sensible strategy in place in advance of making the effort.

We need to use USIA to its maximum advantage.

My next concern bears on the issue of mixed and multiple messages. Few politicians survive long sending different messages to different audiences. Sooner or later, you get caught. This points out the need to me that the U.S. Government must have support at home before it can venture abroad.

The speed and advances in international communication make it absolutely essential that our message be understood and largely supported by our own domestic audience, or we will compromise our opportunity abroad.

Contra aid is a case in point. When a majority of Americans do not know if we are supporting the Contras or the Sandinistas, our message is not getting through. Why does it surprise any of us that our allies in Europe express public doubt about this particular initiative under those sets of circumstances?

Part of the explanation for the confusion can be traced to the partisan politics of Capitol Hill. Partisan politics has no place in undercutting U.S. worldwide leadership. While I usually find it relatively easy to support the President, I can understand why some of my colleagues have a little hesitation.

However, I think members of Congress need to cooperate more frequently and more effectively than I have seen in my brief years in this town. If we cannot agree on what is legitimately important to the U.S., if we cannot separate campaign politics from national security interests, we will all suffer the consequences. We will appear unreliable both to our friends and to our foes.

My third concern, after we decide on a message, is that we must take advantage of a tool of communication that has been overlooked. On a recent trip abroad, I was astonished to learn

that almost everyone I met was trying to learn English, virtually everyone. There is an obvious international demand for the English language. It clearly would serve our public diplomacy agenda.

A quick survey convincingly demonstrates the demand. Over 80 percent of the information stored in computers around the world is stored in English. One-quarter of China's one billion people are studying English. More than half of the Soviet secondary school students wish to study English.

English instruction offers us a unique opportunity to bridge cultural and political gaps. Yet, with the demand curve going up, funding for USIA's English-teaching program has declined. In 1967, USIA had more than 150 Americans overseas, teaching English, in regional and local centers. Today the Agency has just 13. In 1986, the English-teaching budget was $1.5 million; the Pentagon spends that in two-and-a-half minutes each day.

Finally, and I know time is running short here, I wonder whether we need to address the question of timing. How can we speed up the process here in Washington and in our embassies abroad so that American views and goals are delivered to foreign audiences in a timely and accurate fashion?

Every time Gorbachev gets credit for a new treaty development, I find myself scratching my head, thinking, "In fact wasn't that our idea? Isn't that our initiative?" We are not keeping pace with the competition. We are somehow missing our cues, and we are missing our opportunities.

One solution that USIA is developing is the "Electronic Dialogue." For a few hundred dollars, they can link a distinguished American speaker with an overseas audience to exchange views. This time tomorrow, for example, 16 West and Central African scholars in Togo will view a videotape of an American academic on techniques in teaching English. They will then have a half hour to discuss his views with him over a telephone hookup. "Reach out and touch someone" is taking on important international dimensions, and in a timely and effective presentation.

In summing up, I think we have an opportunity to strengthen our public diplomacy by expanding the circle of players, making sure there is consensus on our message, that we have worked the folks back home before we venture abroad, and that we get the message out in a timely way.

USIA has a vital role to play. We should continue to look for ways to strengthen the role of USIA here in Washington and abroad, making the Agency and its employees valued advisers, strategists, and partners in the development and achievement of our national goals.

In summary, let me just say that I think clearly doing the job and doing it right is not enough. Unless you get the message out in an accurate and timely way in the public's business, you've lost a large share of the battle. I think clearly we have not marched forward to the extent that we should have, in spite of the excellent leadership in the Administration. We have not marched forward as aggressively as we should have to plug this gap.

Typically I find that everybody is most anxious, and the Chairman can certainly confirm this, when it gets around to trying to cut the budget. They always come after these kinds of activities, and it seems to me it is exactly the wrong place to be trying to save a few pennies.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here.

[Applause.]

MR. FEULNER: Thank you very much, Senator McConnell.

We are delighted to have with us this afternoon Congressman Ben Gilman from New York, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for many years. As a Republican member of the Subcommittee that authorizes funds for USIA, Congressman Gilman has a deep and serious understanding of the role of public diplomacy. He has been involved in many issues facing the Foreign Affairs Committee. He has taken the lead on human rights issues, and has been deeply involved in the drug problem, terrorism, world hunger, and Missing In Action in Southeast Asia.

It is a pleasure to welcome you to the program today, Ben.

MR. GILMAN: Thank you, Ed. Senator Pell, our good Chairman, Senator McConnell and Senator Fulbright, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be able to share the podium and to participate in this program today.

Public diplomacy plays such an important role in all of the various critical issues confronting this small globe of ours that we cannot say enough or do enough. As communications technology expands, there are many opportunities to take advantage in public diplomacy, in exchanges, and in getting our message out.

So often our Congressional committees are criticized for worldwide travel, and yet that, too, is part of public diplomacy. Some of our committees have gone out there and have explored many issues. They have hit the press in those nations and explored our views with their leaders. They have had an opportunity to meet with legislators and leaders in various governmental functions. This is a very important and integral part of public diplomacy.

I have had an opportunity in one of our committees, in the Select Committee on Hunger not too long ago, to take part in a satellite program with Kenya, on world hunger. We actually conducted a Congressional hearing with some of their leaders and our leaders on USIA's Worldnet, an experiment that we found very useful. We hope we are going to be able to take advantage of it in future hearings with other nations.

Not only was it the hearing that attracted attention, but the videotape was played over and over again, we understand, in Kenya and in some of the other nations exploring these issues. It is a new horizon that is available to us.

I recall right after the summit meeting between President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev, the President came back and addressed a joint session of Congress. That very night, after the joint session, some of us had an opportunity -- and you may have seen that satellite program -- to have an exchange with Mr. Arbatov, the chief of the Soviet Union's North American desk.

Again, we had an opportunity to take part in public diplomacy. And I recall my question to Mr. Arbatov was now that our two leaders have met, and it seems that we are about to embark on an easing of tensions, where are we going with human rights? Mr. Arbatov reminded us of their age-old, standard philosophy of human rights in the Soviet Union, that has to do with housing and full employment, and asked: "What about your homeless and your blacks and Indians?"

That was appalling, because we thought that we were off in a new direction, but again, it was an opportunity. There were many questions addressed in an exchange that evening between members of Congress and their North American desk people. We have seen Mr. Arbatov on many other such programs, and we in turn, in the Congress, are exploring a TV satellite program where we're going to have continuing exchanges with some of the Soviet leaders. Again, more public diplomacy.

Cultural exchanges are extremely important. Let me cite another example. We in the Foreign Affairs Committee several years ago, in meeting with some parliamentarians from Korea, thought it would be a great idea to have an exchange among our interns. We set up a cultural exchange program where they would send over their parliamentary interns during the summer to work in the House of Representatives, and we in turn sent over some American interns to work in the Korean parliament. We are now in our fourth year, and as a result, have had some greater understanding, some bonds of friendship, and some lifelong ties built between our two nations.

I was just at West Point this past weekend, and I had the opportunity to meet with some of the Latin American military officers who were brought to West Point for a week of courses. Again, this is public diplomacy where there is a good exchange

between our leaders and their leaders. It builds not only immediate ties, but lifelong relationships that very often are beneficial to both nations.

I think there are so many areas that we can and should be exploring that are worthwhile and where we can build and come to have better understanding between nations. I think our world of communication is opening up some vast new horizons for us, and I just hope that we are going to take advantage of all it. Many people around the world have such little knowledge of what democracy means. When you sit in the United Nations General Assembly and recognize that there are only a handful of democracies among the 159 member nations, you recognize how little appreciation there is for what democracy is all about, and what our way of life is all about.

Again, I think the more that we can do to show the unvarnished and unadorned truth of our way of life is extremely important, and I hope that we can all encourage greater participation in this great field of public diplomacy. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. FEULNER: Thank you very much, Congressman Gilman.

Our final speaker is former Senator J. William Fulbright whose name, of course, is synonymous with the most prestigious international exchange program ever conducted by this country. The Fulbright Program a partnership between USIA and the academic community, has left its mark on thousands of scholars around the world -- and I might say on thousands of Americans in this country, as well as hundreds of academic institutions here.

As the long-time Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright influenced many programs and policies dealing with America's relations with the world. But it is the Fulbright program that bears his name and most exemplifies his contributions. The Commission is indeed proud to welcome J. William Fulbright to the podium today.

Senator Fulbright.

[Applause.]

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Feulner for that very nice introduction. I am very happy indeed to share a podium again with my old friend, Senator Pell, who was on the Committee many years while I was.

Since I do not have to answer a roll call, if the members of Congress feel under any pressure to go answer one, I certainly would not hold it against them if they would like to

excuse themselves. Furthermore, I know all Congressmen hate to hear another Congressman or a former Senator speak at all. I never could stand to do it myself. So I quite understand if you gentlemen feel you need to go.

I was very interested, if I may digress a moment, in the preceding panel. There were a couple of questions that arose, for those of you who were not here, that were primarily devoted to our relations with the Soviet Union and misunderstanding, and so on. There were two questions that occurred to me.

One was when they were talking about disinformation and the difficulties our information program has in handling disinformation. We apparently are not skilled at that. Well, the answer is the exchange program, because you cannot very well disinform a student who comes and lives among you and studies and goes to the same stores and does everything you do. They usually get real information, and it is hard to fool them. That is one of the great virtues of the exchange program, which of course is what I shall talk about.

The other question arose, and these are side issues, is the difficulty Americans have in learning anything from the exchanges and the broadcasts. All of that information, that public diplomacy, apparently is designed just to tell the rest of the world how wonderful we are.

My principal purpose in introducing the exchanges legislation was to enable Americans to find out about the rest of the world and how to conduct many aspects of a civilized and organized society. After all, we are the youngest of all the major countries. We are celebrating this year our 200th anniversary. Most of the great countries are looking back on anywhere from 1000 years to, in the case of some countries in the Middle East and China, 3000 or 4000 years. I submit there is a lot we can learn from these countries.

In the distribution of Fulbright scholars, about a third of them are American Fulbrighters, with two-thirds foreigners. That is a very good proportion when you consider how many countries there are. I emphasize that in the Fulbright exchange program and all educational exchange programs are educational. They are not designed to go about and tell other people how wonderful we are. It is not really as attractive and as persuasive to other people to be told how wonderful you are as we may think. We have to have a sense of proportion in this.

Well, this is beside the point. I wish to thank the Advisory Commission, particularly Chairman Feulner, for inviting me here to this conference. It has been a long time since I have had an opportunity to participate in such a program. It gives me an opportunity to reiterate a few things.

For 40 years now -- last year was the 40th year -- I have been concentrating most of my thoughts and energies, such as they are left in an old man, primarily on this exchange program.

My interest is very simply that I think it is the most effective means available, over the long term, to erode the mutual distrust and suspicion of these two great superpowers for each other, and eventually to enable them to cooperate not only to avoid a nuclear war, but also hopefully to find solutions for many other serious problems which confront our complex, modern world.

Most problems such as the pollution of the seas, the atmosphere, disease and so on, it is endless, cannot be solved, really, on a national basis. They need cooperation through international organizations, or certainly through more than one nation. Beyond these physical and material problems, I believe the educational exchange concept, properly administered, is much the most powerful instrument to promote the idea of freedom and democratic institutions.

The new Librarian of Congress, Mr. James Billington -- who incidentally used to be Chairman of the Board of Foreign Scholarships and is a very fine scholar and historian, particularly on the Soviet Union -- was installed yesterday. He had this to say in one of his articles: "Another aspect of objective reality favorable to America is the rising importance of education, and intellectual leaders in world politics. The life of the mind has a vested interest in freedom, and an inherent bias toward free societies. "

This I think is a very important point. It is much more powerful than any kind of direct propaganda or information about democracy. There are many questions in many people's minds about democracy, because they see it so abused and so distorted in many countries that call themselves democratic.

Many countries call themselves democratic that are not democratic at all. Others that are democratic, and call themselves democratic, abuse their freedom. So it is always a question. But the intellectual leaders in world politics know that "the life of the mind has a vested interest in freedom."

Well, in emphasizing this, I do not wish to suggest that countries outside the relationship between Russia and ourselves are not important, because of course they are. But the diversion of brains and money from civilian life to the arms race is causing many problems for everyone, and therefore, if we are to develop the exchange program and other confidence-building joint ventures, it is essential that the two great powers establish more normal and less antagonistic relations.

I think most of you are aware of the original legislation, but I might recall it to refresh your memory, was introduced in September of 1945, just 30 days after the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan. That was a very traumatic experience at the time. I thought it justified that something concrete be done to possibly offset and prevent a recurrence of that kind of an activity.

The legislation was signed on August 1, and it has been going on for 40 years. There are 42 binational commissions as of the last count I saw, and they are very important. There are 27 countries where the binational commissions contribute. It is no longer purely an American-funded program. There are several countries who contribute more than we do for our bilateral programs. Most people do not know that. It is quite different from any other information program. To my knowledge, no other foreign country is contributing to the support of VOA or Radio Liberty. I am quite sure the Russians do not.

It is a unique program. I often wonder whether or not it is proper and in the interest of both of these activities that they be merged in the same agency. Most of you know, of course, that it was not in the past. President Carter, over my opposition, took it out of the State Department. Its purpose is quite different, and its technique is quite different from that of the VOA and so on. They are the traditional information programs, enjoyed and practiced by all countries, but they have a different function, a different role.

Anyway, that is a big question. I do not propose to answer it here. Senator Pell is well aware of this, and the people on the Hill I'm sure are conscious of this difficulty.

The binational commissions are another unique part of the program in addition to participation by foreign countries. The binational commission, of course, is the main reason they will do it, because they participate on a 50-50 basis in the formulation of the programs in their respective countries.

Two important aspects of the exchange program are the binational commissions and the Board of Foreign Scholarships. Its present Chairman is here, the distinguished professor from South Carolina, President Merriwether. The Board is an important part of the exchange program. There are 12 members appointed by the President, and they give policy guidance to the Agency and to that activity. I think they have done it over the years very well indeed. Their purpose is to protect its integrity as an educational activity. They are extremely important.

The binational commissions are likewise responsible to a great extent for the participation of other countries and support for the exhcange program in other countries. Many foreign countries take the program more seriously and, as I say, contribute to it.

The legitimacy of this program is based primarily upon its integrity. Recently, Professor Kenneth Pye, who is very knowledgeable about this program, wrote: "The legitimacy of the program in the eyes of other countries and American academics depends in large measure upon the perception that it is not a direct instrument of any country's foreign policy. It is inconsistent with the program's mission for a binational commission to conform to the current foreign policy of any country. It is this characteristic of the program that distinguishes it from the information programs sponsored by all major countries, and makes it over the long term the best vehicle we have to avoid conflicts between the major powers and to promote democratic institutions."

I also must mention that these binational commissions, many of which I have visited in the old days, are very fortunate, having the most dedicated staffs I think I have ever observed in governmental activities. I think they are so dedicated and work so hard and do it so well, because they feel they are engaged in an activity of great importance, far beyond their immediate personal benefits.

It is remarkable that all during these 40 years, I am not aware of a single case of any defection, any malfeasance, or any corruption of any degree on the part of the staffs or the members of the binational commissions. Naturally, I guess they are not as tempting as in some other fields, but it is quite a fine record of the people who work in it. It is important to consider also that there have been over 160,000 grantees and fellows under this program, and there have been extraordinarily few failures. Those failures, such as they were, were largely a matter of personality and difficulty in adjusting to quite different living conditions, especially with respect to professors with families. To take a family and children where housing and other basic necessities of life are so scarce and so difficult is a very difficult undertaking. It is much easier for graduate students who were intended to be the core of the program, of course.

The idea was to select the finest young graduate students with the best records, who would be the future leaders of their countries. It is remarkable that in many cases now, after 40 years, many of the leading citizens including prime ministers, but also leaders in business and especially in academia, have participated in the program. This means that there are over 100,000 influential citizens in all the important countries who know the United States, who understand and appreciate its good qualities, and who also understand its bad qualities and tendencies They would therefore be much less likely to misjudge, to miscalculate in any important decision regarding our security in the future.

I think it is a great asset, indeed, these people.

One area which we especially need to expand is exchanges with the Soviet Union. The IREX organization, the International Research and Exchange Board directed by Alan

Kasoff, a very able administrator, is an excellent program. But it is much too small and has never been very large. It is always difficult doing business with the Soviet Union, but this is all the more reason why, because of its significance, we have to do it, if we want to avoid catastrophe in the future.

It is a good program, and now the Soviets, I think, are in the mood and willing to expand it. It ought to be expanded. All they need is a little money. IREX is a kind of hybrid organization that gets about half of its funds from the USIA, from our government, and about half from private sources. It is too small, but it is an excellent organization, and the results have been very good, I think.

Education, I think, is probably the only means by which nations can cultivate a degree of objectivity about each other's behavior and intentions, and it is the means by which Russians and Americans can understand each other's common aspirations for peace. I think it is the answer to the difficulties raised by the preceeding panel, if there is a solution.

I think education and this program are to advance the aims of perception and perspective, and of empathy and the humanizing of international relations. It cannot be treated as a conventional instrument of a nation's foreign policy. Most emphatically, it cannot be treated as a propaganda program designed to improve the image of a country or to cast its current policies in a favorable light. Nor can its primary purpose be regarded as simply the cultivation of good will, which may come as a byproduct of serious educational activities, but cannot be regarded as their direct objective.

Nor can educational exchange properly be treated as an instrument of foreign policy in anything like the sense that diplomacy is such an instrument. It is indeed a corruption of the educational process, and one that is likely to fail if we try to use educational exchange as a means of advancing current political, economic or military projects.

Education can be regarded as an instrument of foreign policy only in the sense that the cultivation of international perception and perspective are, or ought to be, important long term objectives of any country's foreign policy.

The purpose of international education transcends the conventional aims of foreign policy. This purpose is nothing less than an effort to expand the scope of our human moral and intellectual capacity necessary to close the gap between human needs and human capacity in this age of nuclear weapons.

We must try, therefore, through education, to realize something new in this world -- an aim that will inspire us and challenge us to use our talents and material wealth in a new way. By persuasion, rather than by force; cooperatively rather than competitively. It should not be for the purpose of gaining dominance for a nation or ideology, but for the purpose of allowing every society to develop its own concept of public decency and individual fulfillment.

Far from being a means of gaining national advantage in the traditional game of power politics, international education is the way to change the nature of that game and to civilize and humanize it in this nuclear age and in the process modify the intentions of the Russians and the Americans toward each other.

Well, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for this opportunity. I am glad to be here.

[Applause.]

MR. FEULNER: Thank you very much, Chairman Fulbright.

Who would like to raise a question or make a comment? Sir.

MR. HOVEY: I'm Alan Hovey. Taking off on the Chairman's question as to why it is so difficult to create a foreign affairs constituency in this country, and the subsequent references by speakers to the importance of American public understanding of the value of the foreign affairs programs and the difficulties with the budget, I cannot resist the opportunity to announce, for those who are as yet unaware of it, that a movement is underway to identify the foreign affairs constituency in this country and to organize it in an effective way.

The purpose of that effort, which has now been undertaken as a joint venture by the Atlantic Council of the United States and the Citizens Network is to help assure that the resources which this country devotes to its foreign affairs agencies and programs will, over the long term, become and remain commensurate with the country's long-term interests and its position in the world.

This movement is just getting started. There is momentum building; it is too early to say how it will come out. If you are interested in knowing more about it, we have a publication which outlines the problem and proposes an approach to a solution. It is a promising beginning, and I could not resist the opportunity to advise you of it. Thank you.

MR. FEULNER: Thank you very much for bringing that to our attention.

Other comments, questions?

MR. STONE: Senator Fulbright, this is Marvin Stone back here. Should one assume from your remarks that you are so unhappy with the operation of the Fulbright program at USIA that you would be pleased to see the Education and Cultural Bureau removed from the Agency and moved over to the Smithsonian Institution, as Senator Pell suggested be considered?

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Well, Mr. Stone, as you recall, it was taken out of the State Department by President Carter. I opposed that. I think its function is quite distinct from the other, although its ultimate objective, of course, is the objective of protecting and promoting the interest of the country.

It is how you do it. It is a different way of doing it, quite different from the normal information program which I approve. I don't object to Voice of America at all, but it is a different activity. They tend to influence one another.

I remember when I was in Germany. The Germans support this program, and in recent years, they have been giving twice as much as we do to the German program. They were very disturbed -- because their government contributes -- that we were turning this into an information program, and they were not about to participate in the support of an information program.

What I mean is that I think you have done an excellent job in preserving it as well as you have under the circumstances of its being associated with an information and propaganda agency. It is a good agency, but it is a different function. You did not create it, and I think you have done a good job administering it under these circumstances.

I would like to see it in an agency such as has been suggested. There are two or three possibilities, which are not in any way connected with information or propaganda, to preserve its integrity. I think it is very important that 27 of the major countries participate in this program and contribute to it. They regard it as their program, and they feel a common interest, I think, in promoting our mutual interest.

If there is any future to the world, it is not in military affairs, and it is not in conflict with nuclear weapons. It has got to be in some form of cooperation. What better way can you do it than to raise a generation of young people who know the other countries and know how to forgive and understand their faults as well as their virtues? That is the only possibility, I think.

Our idea of competition with military means is just out of date and obsolete.

MR. FEULNER: One last question. Dave?

MR. DAVID HITCHCOCK: Same subject. I'm a Foreign Service Officer, and I've been a Chairman of Fulbright Commissions abroad as well as an embassy spokesman, sometimes during the same tour. I think that, as Senator Fulbright has said, the exchange program does have a foreign policy objective. It is just not a specific one of one administration or another administration. It has an overall, broad perspective, and an educational objective.

I never felt, as a Chairman of a Fulbright Commission in Japan -- at the same time that I was the embassy spokesman -- any difficulty whatsoever in maintaining the integrity of that Fulbright program, in keeping its objectives long range, while and at the same time I was trying to explain what the President meant on a certain day.

I think we ought to examine very carefully, if indeed there is any difference in them, if the difference is simply one of short term versus long term objectives. Surely the Congress did not give this money to the Fulbright program without some overall, long range foreign policy objective in mind.

I think the only problem is to make sure that the two, the short term and the long term, don't get mixed up. But you don't have to do that by separating the two.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Well, I said you had done a good job with it. I think, though, that it confuses many foreigners that they are together. You are an employee; you know the difference, but you are not a foreign professor or a foreign official. You are an American, and you see it from our point of view.

One of the most important parts about this program, as distinguished from USIA. . . And when I say USIA, all those media activities, they are designed -- properly so -- to tell America's story. The exchange program is not to go abroad and tell the program; it is to bring them here and let them see it. That avoids a lot of confusion and misunderstanding; and, as they said in the previous panel, disinformation.

Beyond that, it is designed especially to allow Americans to go abroad and learn. It is a great mistake for this young country, with all its potential, to assume it knows everything. Consider our experience in the last 20 years. We have gone from a very prosperous country to the biggest debtor in the world. We have gone from a very popular country, respected by everyone, with many people now very suspicious of our wisdom and what in the world have we been doing in the last few years, in deceiving ourselves in the Middle East.

There are a lot of things. We just cannot continue to believe that we are perfect and we know everything, and all the world is waiting for our wisdom. We have got to assume that we, like other people, have something to learn. That is a major part of the exchange. It is designed for Americans to learn about other countries; not to tell others. That is quite a different function, I think.

You as an agent, I mean as a worker, of course make the distinction, but a lot of people don't, looking at it from outside. I know they don't, because they were worried about it and spoke to me about it. I was out of the Senate, but still instrumental with it at that time. If I had been in the Senate, I could have prevented it, I think.

MR. FEULNER: Thank you very much, Chairman Fulbright, for those words.

I might add, in your opening comments, that you referred to Dr. James Billington, the new Librarian of Congress. Dr. Billington was here with us earlier in the day, and was actively participating in our program.

I also particularly want to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Pell of Rhode Island. I know everyone in the room looks forward with great anticipation to the prospective hearings, which I suspect were just announced to many of us for the first time today. They will be watched eagerly, and I hope that my colleagues and I might have a chance to participate in them.

We are very grateful to you, particularly for coming over here on a busy day on Capitol Hill. We are grateful for everyone who has been involved in making the last 24 hours, I think, a truly educational opportunity for all of us in terms of public diplomacy and its wide ranging dimensions.

As I listened to Senator Fulbright, I had to note down 160,000 on my pad, which is a staggering number -- an enormous tribute to you and your foresight, 40 some years ago.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Congress did it.

MR. FEULNER: Well, Congresses under both parties and administrations under both parties, but you were the one who put the bill in.

We are indeed, as citizen-representatives on a voluntary, part-time basis, involved peripherally, if you will, in the foreign policy process. We are fortunate to be able to benefit from the wise oversight from Capitol Hill from these and other able legislators.

I think we have learned that U.S. public diplomacy faces many challenges. The task is large, and the resources are never sufficient. But we are pleased that these various aspects of our program do have such broad support on the Hill.

I would be remiss in my duty if I did not thank, finally, Bruce Gregory, our Staff Director; Karl Fritz, our new Deputy Staff Director, a career Foreign Service Officer who came to us from Indonesia about a month ago and has had a real baptism of fire as he has learned the ropes in preparing for this conference; Gloria, Louise and Fran from our own staff; the many staff members who were loaned to us by USIA to help in the logistics of this conference; and finally everyone here at the State Department. It proves, I think, that the foreign policy community can cooperate on some ventures around the world, and I must say it is particularly appreciated at this time when everyone in this building was under such security pressures and time pressures with the visit of the Soviet foreign minister.

On that note, and with a final note of thanks to my six colleagues on the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, I hereby declare this meeting adjourned. Thank you all again.

[Applause.]

[Whereupon, at 4:07 p.m., the conference adjourned.]

- o O o -