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BORN IN UNIONTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA, on New Year’s Eve, 1880, George Catlett Marshall is America’s most recent exemplar of the citizen-soldier, an enduring tradition begun by George Washington. Steadfast in purpose, upright in character, and modest in claim, Marshall became a General of the Army, the architect of its victory in World War II, and the inspiration for the rebuilding of a shattered postwar world.

The young Marshall attended historic Virginia Military Institute and was named VMI’s First Captain in his senior year. This is more testimony to his character and his sense of duty than to his scholastic achievements. In 1902, soon after graduation and his commissioning as a second lieutenant, Marshall and Elizabeth Carter Coles of Lexington, Virginia, were married.

During World War I, Marshall demonstrated his extraordinary capacity for organization and leadership on the staff of General John J. Pershing, commander of the American Expeditionary Force in France. Between World Wars I and II, he served as Pershing’s aide in Washington, D.C., as well as with troops in China, at Fort Benning, Georgia, and at other posts throughout the United States. As the United States reduced its army in the name of disarmament, however, he, like others in his profession, found those years professionally frustrating.

Elizabeth died in 1927 and Marshall’s restrained nature became more evident. His marriage to Katherine Boyce Tupper Brown in 1930 began a happier time. In 1936 she accompanied him to Vancouver, Washington where he served as commander of Vancouver Barracks until 1938.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Marshall Army Chief of Staff on September 1, 1939.
In 1949, at the age of 69 and in poor health, Marshall nonetheless agreed to serve as president of the American Red Cross. In 1950, at the outset of the Korean conflict, President Truman recalled him to governmental service as Secretary of Defense.

In 1953, Marshall received the Nobel Peace Prize, the only professional soldier ever so honored. The prize recognized the Marshall Plan, which provided an alternative to totalitarianism and gave Europe's countries the economic strength by which they might choose freedom.
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Located on Officers Row in the Vancouver National Historic Reserve, the Marshall House was built in 1886 as quarters for the commander of the Department of the Columbia. The elegant Queen Anne Victorian style was used for the house, with the anticipation of entertaining dignitaries and hosting receptions. General Marshall lived in the house in 1936 & 1937.

Today, the Marshall House is open to the public and can be rented for meetings and special events.

Russian Transpolar Flight Landing

In 1937 the first non-stop flight over the North Pole from Moscow, Russia to the United States landed in Vancouver at Pearson Field. The Soviet aviators—pilot Valeri Chkalov, copilot Georgiy Baidukov, and navigator Alexander Belyakov—were entertained by General George C. Marshall at the Marshall House.
IT IS A GREAT PLEASURE FOR ME TO BE HERE TODAY. Twenty-eight years ago, at the beginning of the writing of the Marshall volume concerning the period that Marshall served here, I interviewed him in 1956 and 1957. In one of those interviews he said, “I want you to go to several of my posts and see something of the conditions under which I lived and see something of the people among whom I worked.” Among the chief places that he wanted me to see was this particular place, because he probably had the happiest two years of his career before World War II at Vancouver Barracks.

I came out here for another reason in that year, 1960. I was told that there was a meeting here (and we figured out that it probably was on the second floor of the restaurant that stood here) of Civilian Conservation Corps boys, now grown up, who had been here at the time that Marshall commanded the Fifth Brigade covering Oregon and Washington, including the supervision of 27 of those camps. As they talked that evening, they brought to light not only the importance of this post to them, but also the importance of the work that George Marshall had done to carry out his ambition, as he told his advisors and staff people, to make these men, men, and second, to make them employable.

One of the people I wanted to see here was a famous area lawyer. When I told him I was coming to the west coast in 1960 to interview people from Los Angeles and San Francisco on north, he said, “Well, I’ll be trying a case in San Francisco, so let us fly north together.” And it was a wonderful way to hold an interview. To have him bring to life again, the kind of place that Marshall knew and loved. I remember as we came in view of the mountains he said, “Now you look out there and you could see what he could see from his house in Vancouver Barracks.”

I remember that I was here about 28 years ago, because I heard the results of the Kennedy-Nixon election while staying at the Hotel Benson. This is the first time I’ve been back to this particular place since that time, but it’s always stayed in my mind and in my heart. If you read the chapter I devote to Marshall’s time here, you will understand why—not only he, but I, have a particular place in my heart for Vancouver Barracks.
I’m glad to be a part of this celebration. I think it is a tremendous thing that you have done. As a veteran of World War II, I share the feeling that many of you share—that all of you, whether you were a veteran of that war or not, from seeing various groups that took part in this thing today. I think that all of us get a great pleasure out of recalling what we owe to organizations such as those represented today and could understand why General Marshall would have been so pleased if he could have been here today to see what took place.

Keep in mind what Marshall had done before he came here. He had served as the Chief of Operations of First Army in the victory of the Argonne fighting in World War I. After that war, he became Pershing’s Chief Aide for five years. He then served three years in China. Afterwards, he became the head of instruction at Fort Benning—the infantry school, in which he either trained or had as instructors, 169 future generals, who had a tremendous impact on the army. From there, he served at Fort Scraeven, Savannah, for a short time in Charleston, and went from there for two years to the Illinois National Guard in Chicago.

From ’36 to ’38, he came here to Vancouver. From here he went east in ’38 for a short time as Chief of War Plans, and for a slightly longer time, as Deputy Chief of Staff. Finally, in 1939, he became head of the Army and the U.S. Army Air Force, which he headed for more than six years. Almost immediately after the end of World War II and the conclusion of his term there, he was sent to China to try to bring peace among the various factions there.

At the conclusion of that mission, Truman asked him to serve as Secretary of State, and, in that undertaking, he put through the Marshall Plan. He helped to start NATO. He said, “That the people who helped win the peace—win the war, would now help to win the peace.” He held that out again and again as a challenge to young people throughout the United States.

Because he developed a bad kidney, which had to be removed, leaving him ill, he resigned. When Mr. Truman called him back shortly to head the American Red Cross, he worked as if he were raising an army. When that was finished, he was called back again to be Secretary of Defense in some of the darker days of the Korean War. He served for one year to help get the American Army back on the footing that it had enjoyed at its peak in World War II.

I had the privilege of going from Heidelberg, where I was working at theater headquarters, in December, 1953, to Oslo, Norway to see Marshall receive the Nobel Prize for Peace. This man, who was known within the Army but not too well throughout the United States, had developed within him the capacity to do all those things before he left Vancouver. He’d shown in the years here the reasons why he was able to do the same sort of thing on the world stage that he did here on a smaller stage. Because what he showed here, in his first experience as a general officer, was the capacity to lead and inspire, the capacity to build, in the period when the American people were not inclined to have much of an armed force.

At the time he became Chief of Staff in 1939, we did not have the armed force that was permitted—200,000 men. The first months that he was in office, he worked to build up that force. Before he finished, the U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force totaled eight and one-third million. Now, he never wanted to go back to a standing army.
He never wanted to have a tremendous burden of taxes imposed in order to have a tremendous army. He felt that type of thing was Prussian or Japanese or totalitarian. What he argued for, in particular, was what he called the citizen-soldier. Universal military training—the training of all young men and women of military age, with a minimum amount of military training and refresher courses for a period of years so you had a pool of such men and women.

He drew inspiration from the type of experience he had here because a great part of what he taught and what he attempted to do here, was to help develop the sense of responsibility among young people.

One of the biggest jobs that he ever carried out—first in South Carolina and in Georgia, was helping to build the first Civilian Conservation Corps camps. The CCC camps were set up at Mr. Roosevelt’s suggestion, in order to give unemployed young men, most often off the streets of the cities of the country, an opportunity to do useful work, particularly in preserving the forests and the soil. When he arrived in Vancouver, that was his chief responsibility.

The armed forces under his control were not numerous; the largest part of his work was the supervision of those 27 CCC camps. He said, “If I could have had a little military discipline and given a little military training, it would have been the greatest job I could want.” The only military discipline he could impose was expulsion. Yet in his two years here, he managed to get a number of people, many of them reserve officers, called back into the service. He managed, by inspiring those people, or, sometimes, by getting inventive individuals who found ways to impose discipline without having the authority to do so. One man, as I discovered, found that he was able to have order in his particular CCC camp by putting at the head of it, a former champion of a Golden Gloves Tournament. Another man wanted to stop a practice that some of the camps had gotten into throwing some of their instructors in the river. This man found that he could get a street fighter and turn him into a constructive type by putting him in charge. Marshall carried on a number of constructive programs, which made of those people the type of citizen that you would enjoy sitting down with, as I did here, and listening to.

Many of them had come from New York or from Chicago and had never seen a rural area. I think their work in the woods here helped to inspire them to a love for a different kind of society; many of them settled here. It was a pleasure to see these men stand up and say: “I had no background. I was in danger of going into prison and that experience caused me to want to do something else with my life.”

Among Marshall’s Vancouver officers was a Lieutenant Colonel Walton Walker, who ended up as one of Patton’s great corps commanders. Walker commanded the Twentieth Corps in Europe, and then became the Eighth Army Commander under MacArthur in Korea, where he served until he was killed in a tragic car accident. Others in Marshall’s group included men who went on to high positions and included some who were friends. One of his battalion commanders, for example, he had met in the Philippines in 1902. I talked again with four-star General Sam Walker, who likes to boast that as a nine-year-old, he was the only youngster of that age who was ever babysat by General Marshall. General Walker remembered also that when Marshall went to Washington to serve as Chief of Staff, he spent a month as the guest of the Walkers.
When Marshall discovered that previous commanders of this post had not developed any sort of affinity for the local community, his goal was to work with the people of Vancouver and Portland. He spoke to every group that asked him to speak. He sent representation to parades like this—to take part in activities like this, with the result that for years thereafter, he had large and continuous correspondence with local people. I think that he had the longest correspondence with Erskine Wood, who took Marshall fishing down on the Metolius. Wood spoke often about the type of man that Marshall was until just a few years ago, because Wood lived to be over 100, and was one of our great supporters of the Marshall Foundation.

Marshall was interested in the history of Vancouver Barracks. He wrote numerous letters extolling not only the beauty of the area and its fishing, but also extolling the history he found here and the type of people he found here. The point I would like to make is just this: he was on the very edge of rising to the height of his capacity at the end of the two years that he served at Vancouver Barracks. He drew from his experience here, and the knowledge he got of the civilians who would become the civilian soldier that he commanded later. He drew from his close association with the civilian community, which he would have to deal with as a soldier and later as Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense. And he drew from the healing qualities of the outdoor life he was able to live, as well as a life free of many of the tremendous burdens that he had later. He drew an inner strength that I think helped him get through those next six years. So, I think you will be able to say on this Veterans Day that part of the work that went into the great success of George Marshall came of those two fine years that he spent in Vancouver Barracks.
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IT IS SUCH A GREAT PLEASURE TO BE BACK IN THE “GREAT NORTHWEST” AND VANCOUVER after too many years away. I am grateful to Mayor Hagensen and the City of Vancouver for inviting me to speak about the greatest soldier-statesman of the twentieth century, General George C. Marshall.

I assume that one of the reasons I am privileged to return here and to appear before you is that I lived at Vancouver Barracks in those pre-World War II years of 1936 and ’37 in a set of quarters on “Officers’ Row” next to the Marshall family. It was then and there that I first became acquainted with General Marshall and over the next 23 years had the opportunity to know him and see him periodically until his death in 1959.

Just-promoted Brigadier General Marshall arrived at Vancouver Barracks from assignment in Chicago with the Illinois National Guard in October 1936. My father, then Lieutenant Colonel Walton Walker, had arrived earlier that year with my mother and me.

General Marshall’s assignment was to command the Fifth Brigade of the 3rd Division and, additionally, to assume responsibility for 35 Civilian Conservation Corps Camps, better known as CCC camps, located in southern Washington and Oregon. My father was appointed his executive officer and served in that capacity until we left Vancouver in the summer of 1937.

As an eleven-year-old youngster attending the 7th grade at Harney Elementary School, there are many events of those years that are dimmed by the passage of time, but my recollection of events in which I was involved with General Marshall are unforgettable.

General Marshall was especially fond of children and there are numerous stories of his fondness in the works of his biographers. As a youngster, I was fortunate in living next door and later with him, and was perhaps able to see more of the human side of this remarkable and considerate man. He was always interested in my progress through high school and college and over the years encouraged me in my studies and army career. I would like to return to the Vancouver era later. But first let me say a few words about General Marshall and the legacy he leaves behind.

In my view, he ranks with Washington, Lincoln, Lee and Theodore Roosevelt as one of the greatest men our nation has produced, and it is borne out by his extraordinary record of service. From the Philippine insurrection that marked America’s first colonial adventure at the beginning of this...
century through two world wars, the Cold War and the Korean conflict, Marshall was a participant in almost every major event and issue that marked the emergence of the United States as a superpower.

The record makes clear that during the early 1900's, from the time he was a lieutenant, Marshall filled roles as a leader, educator, staff planner and tactician normally held by one much senior to him in rank. In the process, he developed an extraordinary reputation among his peers and seniors and was identified early in his career as destined for greatness.

During World War I, as colonel on General Pershing's staff, he was the principal trainer of a massive U.S. Army expeditionary force and planned its largest, most complex, and successful military operations at St. Mihiel and the MeuseArgonne. Seventy-two years ago this week, on 11 November 1918 the guns of that war fell silent. General Pershing referred to Marshall as “the finest officer produced in that conflict.”

Between 1939 and 1951, Marshall was a key architect of U.S. policies, serving as World War II Army Chief of Staff, Ambassador to China in 1946, the Secretary of State who initiated the Marshall Plan, President of the American Red Cross and Secretary of Defense during the Korean War.

In 1953, General Marshall was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for “the most constructive, peaceful work we have seen in this century, the European recovery program.” Marshall stands unique among all others who have received this prestigious award. For most of his life General Marshall served as an army officer. Never before had the Peace Prize gone to a professional soldier.

In his 50 years of service, Mrs. Marshall described their assignment at Vancouver Barracks as “two of the happiest years of our lives.” General Marshall was back with troops here and working with young men in the CCC, two tasks he enjoyed more than any other: organizing and training men. Years later in 1952, Marshall wrote of his Vancouver tour “altogether, we experienced one of our most delightful periods of army service and one that we look back on with additional warmth because there followed from the very month we left the northwest long years of fearful strain and struggle with a world turmoil which has not yet subsided. Those days along the rivers of the Northwest, among its magnificent mountains and by the picturesque seashore appealed to us as a pleasant dream in comparison with the troubled days that followed. The best that I can say today is that we would love to live those two years over again, each day as it was, each of our friends as they were.”

General Marshall, a keen student of history since childhood, was fascinated with the history of Vancouver Barracks and delighted with his quarters, which he described as the “most spacious and luxurious we have ever seen in the army.”

I recall that General Marshall was particularly fond of his garden and the grounds around his quarters. Because we lived next door and the lawns of our quarters adjoined one another, my parents were careful to keep our grounds neat and attractive. On his way home from his office one evening, he observed me striving to cut the grass with an old push lawn mower. He had a habit of always teasing and joking with me and said: “Sam, I want you to wait a few minutes while I go get my movie camera. I won’t even have to put it in slow motion. That is the slowest motion grass cutting I have ever seen.”
He loved to ride and it would seem almost daily that I would see him saddled up riding off accompanied by his Irish setter “Ponty.” I had a six-year-old English setter with the unimaginative name of “Boy Dog” which was my constant companion. General Marshall never failed to espouse the better hunting qualities and beauty of his Irish over my English setter. This, of course, became a rather routine part of bantering back and forth between us.

On one occasion there was no joking though. Two of my Army “brat” buddies and I had broken into the indoor post swimming pool and had littered the pool with everything from life preservers to rocks and cans. Apprehended, we were instructed to report to General Marshall’s office the next day through our parents. After being ushered in, General Marshall lectured us on the gravity of our crime and that soldiers were going to have to clean up our dirty work, which was unacceptable. He further informed us that the pool would be drained, and that we would remove the debris and scrub it down so that it was cleaner than before. I believe I saw a little twinkle in his eye as we were dismissed, but I didn’t pause to inquire.

It is interesting that Marshall spent a great part of his Army career dealing with civilian rather than with military issues and people. His experience with the National Guard and CCC in multiple assignments served him well as Chief of Staff building a victorious citizen army. He welcomed and enjoyed these civilian contacts and had great faith in the concept of the citizen soldier. From his contacts he understood the civilian point of view as perhaps few military men did. He made a concerted effort to be involved with the neighboring civilian communities—something that pleasantly surprised business and political leaders used to command who preferred to remain aloof and isolated.

Here in Vancouver and Portland, Marshall established the closest and most cordial ties by invitations to the post, supporting civic celebrations and accepting scores of speaking engagements.

He was a driving force in helping Vancouver protect its history by appealing to the War Department for the establishment of a replica of the old Hudson Bay Trading Post on the reservation. He also undertook a major rehabilitation of the post, a garrison which had not had a new building provided by the government in 33 years.

General Marshall truly relished his work with the CCC. The CCC, you recall, placed thousands of unemployed young men from cities in rural camps where they were paid to reforest areas, repair bridges, improve roads, parks, and other conservation works. Because the heavily forested Northwest provided abundant opportunity for conservation, young men from all over the country were drawn into camps in this area. The army was involved from the beginning in organizing and operating the camps, processing over 275,000 trainees. Marshall took particular satisfaction in seeing the visible transformation of the young men in camp. Mrs. Marshall wrote that General Marshall was fascinated by the opportunity to build up the minds and bodies of the youth of the country. Marshall himself called the CCC, “the greatest social experiment outside of Russia” and “wished he could have been its National Director.” The fact that his visits and inspections were all in the majestic outdoors of the Northwest added to his enthusiasm.
One day that I recall vividly was the landing of three Russian fliers at Pearson Airfield, and the great mass of people that descended upon the post that Sunday morning in 1937. The Marshall home was guarded, and I confess that I didn’t know really what was going on. All I really remember is that the Russians had flown non-stop over the north pole and had landed at Vancouver Barracks—a feat comparable to Lindbergh’s flight across the Atlantic. Marshall handled the ensuing spectacular with much press visibility and great finesse and received great acclaim for his part in their reception.

Many officers recall General Marshall’s austere, icy manner; his cold, frightening blue eyes, and his aloofness. From all accounts, Marshall did distance himself from those who worked for him, but he also had a great sense of humor and was a great practical joker. He frequently demonstrated this through poetry. I recall delivering a family Christmas-New Years-birthday gift to his home. When I arrived, he presented me in turn with a wrapped gift of a bottle of brandy to my parents. Attached to the gift was a little verse to me—a parody of Felicia Heman’s poem. It began:

“The boy stood on the burning deck whence all but he had fled” and it finished with:

“So Sam, old boy, just drink this drink and you won’t give a damn if the ship does sink.”

Forrest Pogue, Marshall’s official biographer, writes that the 20 relaxed and happy months that the General spent at Vancouver were a kind of physical and spiritual conditioning for the trial ahead. He left Vancouver Barracks with the regret of the citizens of this area. On both sides there was genuine love and affection.

In this century his legacy has cast a huge shadow. Today, our army bears his stamp. He built the victorious army of World War II. He forged an alliance for the free world and devised a plan to build a devastated Europe. What began would bring down the Berlin wall and lead to the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact.

In the long run, it could be said that George Marshall contributed to the end of the Cold War, the reunification of Germany and the reshaping of the Soviet Union.

Winston Churchill in a more eloquent tribute put it this way:

“In war he was as wise and understanding in counsel as he was resolute in action. In peace he was the architect who planned the restoration of our battered European economy, and, at the same time, labored tirelessly to establish a system of western defense. He had always fought vigorously against defeatism, discouragement, and disillusion. Succeeding generations must not be allowed to forget his achievements and his example.”

This is the legacy of General George C. Marshall.
GENERAL COLIN L. POWELL
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THANK YOU SO VERY, VERY MUCH, SENATOR GORTON, MY GOOD FRIEND, for that very, very kind introduction. Senator Gorton, Mayor Hagensen, President Williams, members of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I can’t tell you how very, very pleased I am to be here in Vancouver, especially to be here at Hudson’s Bay High School.

I want to send a special greeting to the many thousands of students around the region who I am told are watching this on television in their classrooms as part of the Veterans Day program. I want to suggest to them that they pay very, very close attention, because at the end of these proceedings I’m going to administer a quiz, which will be worth 20 percent of your final grade.

Also, I want to make sure you can all see. My God, I hope you don’t need oxygen up there.

This is my first visit to Vancouver and I can’t imagine a better way to have begun this day than with the ceremony I participated in earlier this morning at Vancouver Barracks.

A little while ago, I had the privilege of unveiling a monument dedicated to four Medal of Honor recipients who are buried in the Post cemetery. One soldier received his Medal for valor during the Civil War, another during the Spanish American War, the other two, including a black cavalryman, received theirs during the Indian Wars. They all now rest together with hundreds of their fellow soldiers in honored glory on a beautiful hill above the Columbia River.

The Medal of Honor is the highest tribute a Nation can give to those who put their lives at risk above and beyond the call of duty. A total of 3,400 Americans have received the Medal of Honor. There are only 211 living Medal of Honor recipients, and most of them are here today. These are men of peace who know the horrors of war.

I heard one of them say once that it was his prayer—his most fervent prayer—that the Society’s membership roll grow no longer, that not another name ever be added to the Society’s rolls. We all share that prayer, and we know that if there is
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ever another recipient of the Medal of Honor it will be because these heroes and their comrades and their buddies were willing, if necessary, to make the supreme sacrifice for peace, for freedom, and for their fellow man.

So we thank them, and we will forever be grateful to them and to their families, and may I ask them all to stand so these young people can see them, and their families.

It’s a great pleasure for me to present the third Marshall Lecture, and to follow General Sam Walker and Mr. Forrest Pogue, Marshall’s great biographer, is indeed an honor.

I’m often asked which of the world’s generals and admirals I admire most and which ones I may have used as examples for my own life and my own career, and when I give some thought to this question, dozens of names flood through my mind — Washington, Grant, Lee, Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, Nimitz, Halsey, MacArthur, Vandegriff, and on and on.

Yesterday in Pittsburgh I had the opportunity of meeting another great general, an American hero, and I had the privilege of presenting to him a Congressional Gold Medal given to him by the Congress for his contribution, and that great general was General Matthew B. Ridgway, now 96 years old, but still very much a marvelous and wonderful soldier and one of my heroes.

But in this pantheon of American generals and admirals who were heroes, one stands out head and shoulders above all the rest, a towering figure, a soldier of the highest order, a statesman of unparalleled ability, the man Winston Churchill called the last great American: George Catlett Marshall. George Marshall serves as an inspiration to all of us who serve America today.

He is a symbol of selfless service, of total dedication, of commitment to ideals and principles. He never refused the call of duty wherever duty called him to go, and in 1936, duty called him here to Vancouver. He spent two challenging but pleasant years here. His time here seemed almost a predestined pause before the storm of World War II would engulf him for seven tragic years.

He often spoke of his pleasant days here, of Vancouver Barracks, of the many people he influenced in the Civilian Conservation Corps, of the sheer majesty and beauty of the great Pacific Northwest and of the magnificent people who lived here.

From Vancouver, General Marshall went to meet and prevail over the challenge of fascism in the most horrible war the world has ever endured, and when his superhuman efforts in that savage war were finished, his President and his nation called him back to serve as Secretary of State.

They wanted him to deal with the challenge of a new tyranny, a new tyranny that was seeking to enslave the minds and the bodies of humanity — the new tyranny, communism — and his first act in dealing with this fresh challenge was one of the most remarkable humanitarian acts in this century, if not in all of history: the Marshall Plan.

The Marshall Plan gave our former World War II enemies the means to re-enter the world, the means to grow again, the means to become functioning, free members of the world community, and his participation in the development of our national strategy of containment gave us the means and the methods to combat communism at its weakest points; and, we have seen so dramatically in the past few years, the means ultimately to defeat it.
In this new trial, General Marshall didn’t live to see the full success of his work. He lived long enough to see the strength and vigor of a rebuilt Europe, and of a rapidly rebuilding Japan, and he saw the beginning of the effort to rebuild South Korea, but he was not here to see the collapse of communism in 1989, in 1990, and in 1991. He might have dreamed, but could never know, that the principles and values he held so dearly would triumph so completely in the end.

He would never know, but could dream, that Europe would be whole and free, as it is becoming. He would dream but never know that Japan and Korea would become the economic dynamos that they have become. He would see that from the bombed-out ruins of war, nations have come back to economic prosperity, to freedom, to democracy, and respect for the dignity of the human person. He would see that in the world at large an economic partnership is developing, just as he envisioned it would, with the principle of free trade operating at the heart of the system.

Today, I believe that General Marshall would be very, very proud of the role played in this victory by the armed forces and by the diplomats and by the soldiers and by the statesmen. I’d like to believe that he would also have been proud of the role that America’s armed forces have played in recent crises dedicated to the principles of democracy and freedom.

In Desert Shield and Desert Storm we saw 540,000 of the best and the brightest men and women in America answer the call of arms to defeat an invasion. We saw them work, sweat, and wait in the desert and in the skies and on the seas around the Arabian Peninsula, and then, in a fury of blinding speed, we saw the defeat of the fourth largest army in the world.

Soon after, when the warriors were through, we saw them perform different kinds of missions, missions that General Marshall would fully have understood. In northern Iraq, in Operation Provide Comfort, we saw tough, grizzled, battle-hardened soldiers and marines work day and night to supply Kurdish refugees with the essentials of life. They saved half-a-million people. I am as proud of what those young men and women did during Operation Provide Comfort as I am over what they did in Operation Desert Storm.

And in May of this year, half-way across the Indian Ocean, we saw other marines stop on their way home from Desert Storm and help the typhoon-ravaged people of Bangladesh put their lives back together. Our marines were called “angels from the sea” by the Bangladeshis who were so much in need, and so that’s what we called that operation — Operation Sea Angel.

General Marshall would have been proud of these great men and women who followed in his tradition, because truly, they are both soldiers and diplomats for America. General Marshall knew what it was to have such men and women under his command, and he also knew how difficult it can be if you don’t have them.

He faced a crisis of war in Europe with a military force that had been neglected on the altar of wishful thinking, and that wishful thinking had brought his soldiers broomsticks instead of guns and his airmen flour sacks instead of bombs. Were he here today, he would encourage us to take advantage of the demise of communism and make our armed forces smaller, but he would advise us with equal intensity never, never to repeat the mistakes of the 1930’s.

I believe he would also remind us that we should never be as unready as we were in the beginning.
of 1950 when the North Koreans struck south. Later, as Secretary of Defense, General Marshall would have to deal with that unreadiness first-hand, so he knew.

But more than anything else, I believe that if General Marshall were here today, the thing he would be most, most proud of, surely must be the young men and women who are serving their country in today’s armed forces. These young men and women are a cross-section of America. They come from all walks of American life. They’re clean, they’re smart, they’re dedicated, they’re trained and they’re motivated, responsible, reliable, patriotic, loyal, drug-free, respectful, caring.

You saw them all on television. You saw them day-in and day-out during Desert Shield and Desert Storm. I used to tell my buddy Norm Schwarzkopf, “Norm, you and I need to stay off the tube. Every time one of us gets into an interview situation, we get in trouble, and the solution to this is just keep letting the troops tell our story,” and they told a wonderful story, a story that the American people loved, and fell in love with them.

I could spend the next two hours describing some of the stories that have to do with our young men and women, but I want to tell you just a couple, because I don’t have several hours. One of my favorites has to do with the first day of the air war, and the pilots were returning to their bases in Saudi Arabia.

For most of those young pilots, it was the first time they had gone into combat. They trained long and hard, but it was the first time they were putting it on the line, and after they landed there were a lot of reporters around wanting to talk to them. Some of them felt like talking, some didn’t feel like talking, and I remember this one particular pilot, a young lieutenant, walking away from his fighter, and you could tell he was drained.

He had just been through the most seminal experience of his life, to fly over Baghdad with people trying to shoot him down and to penetrate through to accomplish his mission, and he didn’t feel like talking to anybody about it right then, but the reporter, as they sometimes can be, was very persistent.

So the young man is walking along, and he’s got his helmet under his arm, his oxygen mask is dangling at the end of the hose, he’s still got his gravity suite on and all his paraphernalia, and sweat’s pouring down out of his head, having removed his helmet after five hours in the cockpit, and he’s walking past the reporter, and the reporter is breathlessly saying, “What was it like? What was it like? Tell me, tell me, tell me.”

And the young lieutenant, short, like a little barrel, he looks over at the reporter as he’s walking away — he’s not going to stop — and he said, “I thank God I accomplished my mission and I got back safely. I thank God for the love of a good woman. I thank God I’m an American, and I thank God I’m an American fighter pilot. That’s your interview.”

I’ll never forget the night before the war began, when I was touring around Saudi Arabia visiting the troop units. The last thing I had to do that evening at the end of about 14 or 15 hours of visiting these great, great young people, was to visit the 121st Evacuation Hospital, one of these MASH-type inflated hospitals, and once you start to tour a hospital you have to go everywhere in it, have to shake every hand.
It was before the battle, so there weren’t many patients there — two people who were ill and a couple of accident victims — but you could see in every ward and every operating room the doctors and the nurses were getting ready. There was anxiety, there was concern, there was also the sense of dedication and commitment to do well that which lay ahead, and it was a sergeant major at the hospital who was taking me around. The colonel had sort of fallen behind, and the sergeant major was showing me everything — every ward, every bed, every storage room.

And at the end of the tour — it took over an hour — I said to him, “Sergeant Major, my God, you’re proud of this place. You really have it ready, don’t you?” He said, “General, it is ready, and we’ll do our job. But there’s a special reason why it’s ready: 24 years ago, in Vietnam, when I was a private and not a sergeant major, they brought me in, all shot up, to this hospital — the 121st — and saved my life, so you damn well know I’m going to be ready to do it for any young American up there who needs it when the time comes.” That was the 121st Evac Hospital.

And then there were my beloved Marines. I worried about the Marine part of the operation because they had the toughest job. The two Army Corps were going to be swinging around to the west. The 7th Corps in armored vehicles, the 18th Airborne Corps in armored vehicles and helicopters, they would move fast. I was quite confident the Iraqis wouldn’t be able to target them very well, but we needed the Marines to launch a supporting attack straight north into Saddam’s so-called line of death, the barbed wire, the mines, the oil-filled trenches that were going to be set afire.

The Marines needed to do that — the 1st and 2nd Marine Divisions — in order to fix the enemy in that position so he wouldn’t move, so he wouldn’t swing to the left to try to counter the Army corps. We didn’t want the Marines to get too engaged, just fix the enemy, with a supporting attack. If it gets too rough, just hold what you’ve got and we’ll cut them off.

I worried about that, because the Marines were going in their fatigue jackets, not in armored vehicles. It was the place where we could perhaps take the greatest losses. And then a week before the ground war I got a call from my buddy Norm — and Norm said, “You ain’t gonna believe this.” I said, “Norm, I’ll believe any damn thing you tell me.”

And he said, “For the last week, Marine infantrymen from the reconnaissance units have been crawling through all that stuff. They’ve been crawling all night and hiding all day, and they have penetrated all the way through. They’ve gone through the mine fields, they’ve gone through the wire, they’ve gone through all the obstacles, they know where the enemy is, and they already have lanes through, and when the ground war begins it will be like Broadway, going right through those obstacles.”

No Stealth airplane did that, no Nintendo technology did that. None of the fancy stuff you saw did that. That was done by Marine infantrymen crawling in the dirt the old-fashioned way.

When the war came, those lanes were open and my beloved Marines from the 1st and 2nd Marine Division just punched right through and were in Kuwait City. It wasn’t all serious. I remember the day I visited with the 24th Infantry Division and they were pretty settled out there in the desert.
They’d been one of the earliest units to arrive, and so they had pretty much gotten to know the area. They knew all the Bedouins in the area, and there were lots of camels out there in the middle of that desert, and they were making friends with the camels, and the camels had gotten used to tanks rolling around and Bradley fighting vehicles, and helicopters. They said the interesting thing was, though, that every afternoon, when the trucks would arrive, the camels would look, and they would wait for the orange mail bags to be tossed off the back of the trucks for the troops, and all the camels for several miles around would come running to the troops because they knew that the orange mail bags meant chocolate chip cookies from home.

Then there was another night — we could be here all afternoon. I love this. There was another night, after a long day in the field, I was landing in Riyadh, and as I was landing my aide said there was a group of air policemen out here and we want you to give a medal to one of them — a Bronze Star. I said, what for? The war hasn’t started. Why is he getting a Bronze Star? He said, it’s from last year. He did something very gallant last year, and the medal has just come through. He didn’t know that he’s getting this medal, and he sure doesn’t know that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is going to present it, so he’s just standing out there in ranks so we’ll call him up. This was the week before Christmas last year, and so we landed, and I went in front of the formation, and they called the sergeant and he came up in front of me, and he was terrified.

This poor fellow could not imagine what he had done wrong, to be presented with a problem of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff about to get into his business. So I said, sergeant, I’m very pleased to give you this Bronze Star medal with the record of citation, and he almost fainted on me. I said to him, “Well, sergeant, last year at Christmas it was Panama. This year at Christmas it’s Saudi Arabia. Where would you like to go next Christmas?” And he did faint on me.

One final story. It’s my favorite one. My buddy Sam Donaldson — America’s buddy. Sam did a wonderful piece, where he went out and visited one of our army units, a unit of the 7th Corps, and he went with General Franks, the commander of that unit, who lost a leg in Vietnam. He went with General Franks and they visited with this tank company, and about five of the soldiers in that tank company got a chance to say something to Sam, and it was about a week before the ground war began so they knew it was coming, and they were getting ready.

The camera first cuts to a white sergeant, and the sergeant, about mid-30s, knows his business, says well, we’re getting ready for it. These kids are trained. Don’t worry about a thing. We’re going to be just fine. We’re going to do well.

Then he cut to the young Chinese-American soldier, who said something along those same lines. Then he cut to a very, very young white soldier with a thick southern accent, who essentially said, I’m proud to be here. I think I’m going to do just fine. I’m proud to be an American, and I’m proud to be in the United States Army.

Then he cut to another sergeant who clearly was senior sergeant in the organization. He had a little gray around the temples and a few creases around his eyes, and you could just see him looking fatherly-like over this, saying we’re going to be just fine.
Then the final shot was a young private sitting on a case of rations, and behind him you could see the buddies in his company and you could see that some were white, some were black, and they cut to the faces and some were Hispanic, all the variety that Americans come in, and the camera went to a close-up on the young man again, and he said, “We’re going to be just fine. I’m not worried about a thing. You want to know why? Because I’m with family. This is my family. They’re going to take care of me, I’m going to take care of them, and I’ve got nothing to worry about as long as I’m with family.”

And then all of his buddies behind him, using that expression that we all heard so much over the last eight or nine months, they all reinforced what he said by saying, Hua — hua — hua, right on. Eight-thousand miles away over the desert, facing danger — they were family. It didn’t make any difference what color they were, or where they came from, whether they were rich or poor, they were all Americans 8,000 miles away from home, and I keep saying to myself, that spirit that we had out there then, we’ve got to bring back to America. We’ve got to make sure it exists. Not one of us should be happy until that spirit of family exists in every school, in every community, in every workplace around this country.

One of the protest groups out here today who would have preferred that I not come — the Aryan Nation. We can’t have that in this country. We can’t have that in this country. We’ve come too far to have groups like Aryan Nation deter us from our destiny. Deter us from the concept of family.

Anyway, now that everybody has seen my wonderful young kids on television, the question I get as I go around the country is, how did you get them like that? What made them so good? Is it transferable?

Well, as General Marshall would tell you, in the armed forces we’ve been doing it for years and, we’ve been very consistent in our methods. We start out with our young men and women by having the highest expectations of them and for them. Our philosophy is that you only get back what you expect, so if you start low you end low. If you start high they will meet that goal. So we have the highest expectation for them and it rarely fails.

We then impose discipline and standards. They learn our way of doing things. You can’t teach and train people in an unstructured environment, an unstructured setting.

We make sure that they measure up to our standards, because if there are no standards there can be no learning, and throughout this learning process they’re rewarded when they do it right and encouraged to do even better, and they’re helped and if necessary punished when they do it wrong until they learn how to do it right.

We take them through a set training pattern. We also educate them. Training teaches them skills and education teaches them to think. Through both processes we do meaningful things, and we do them to specific standards, high standards, and we evaluate rigorously. We don’t waste their time. It’s too valuable. It’s their time, it’s their life. We’re using it, and we don’t waste it.

Throughout our training and education we stress teamwork and the concept of family. We tell them that people are betting their lives on the actions of a buddy, and we tell them that they are betting their lives on other people’s actions.
We make our young men and women learn self-responsibility, self-accountability, and we motivate them constantly, so constantly that it gradually turns into self-motivation. Gradually, they are teaching others.

Then finally we tell them we love them. In fact, I like to think of the charge that all military leaders hold in sacred trust from the moment we raise our hand to pledge our oath to the Constitution, that is to love your soldiers and your sailors, your airmen, your marines, and your coast guardsmen. Love them with all your heart and your mind and your body and your soul, and we make sure that they understand that.

From what I’ve seen so far here in this high school in the Vancouver area, I think you’re trying to do the same kind of things with your young people. I’m not trying to recruit you. I’m not trying to bring you in my armed force. I just hope that some of this is transferable back into your community, because the fact of the matter is that my troops are very much like the young men and women in this gym and students who are watching us on television in this region, and I want to encourage every one of you youngsters here to continue to be like my great armed forces team. Be disciplined. Be disciplined in what you do. Develop perseverance. Get a good education. Finish high school.

We only accept, now, high school graduates. Over 98 percent or higher of the young men and women we get are high school graduates. Why? Because they’re better educated? Yes. But the real reason is because if they finished high school, it tells us that this young man, this young woman, at an early stage in their life, were willing to stick with it, were willing to apply themselves, were willing to overcome obstacles, would not let anything deter them from that goal, and that can be used by us to make a good soldier, or sailor, marine, or airman. Be a good citizen. Care about this country. Get involved in this country. Work hard.

I work hard. People have often asked, “What’s the secret of your success, general.” I work like a dog. I worked like a dog as a lieutenant, I work like a dog as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There is no other secret of success. Give a damn. Care, go out of your way, take care of those who are in need. Don’t do drugs, don’t overindulge in alcohol. It’s destructive behavior.

Not too long ago, I was in San Diego, and I dropped in on a recruiting office. They didn’t know I was coming. It was an exciting afternoon. People don’t like the Chairman to show up unannounced anywhere, any time. So I told my folks, don’t tell anybody anything, we’re just going to the recruiting station. So we didn’t, and people started flapping around.

I said hello to the Army recruiters, and they were doing great. I spoke to the Navy recruiters, and I went to the Air Force recruiters, and then finally I went into a little room where two Marine sergeants were the recruiters. One of the sergeants came up and reported to me, the other one was talking to a young man. I didn’t want to interrupt.

Then suddenly the young man left, and the sergeant was free. He was the sergeant in charge, and I sat and talked to him. I said, “I didn’t want to interrupt you. Your work with that young man was more important than talking to me.” And he said, “We were finished, General.” I said, “Well, did you get him to join?” He said, “He’s not going to join. We can’t take him.” I said, “Why not?”
He said, “Because he’s been doing drugs a lot of years. He was in jail, and he’s still not clean.”

I said “Well, why is he still coming here then? You know you can’t take him.” He said, “Because he wants to talk about it, and I want to talk to him to see if I can do something with him.” He said, “You know what he tells me, General? Every time he comes in here — he’s now 27 years old. You know what he tells me? He said to me, “Sarge, I want the life I never had. I want the life I never had.”

Drugs took the life he never had. Drugs will continue to take the life he will never have. Drugs run the risk of destroying a good part of this nation’s youth. It’s unacceptable behavior. I believe that we’ve got to get equally tough on them through this country, in every school, in every community. Doing drugs is dumb.

I want you all to be good family members, I want you all to love one another, I want you to be tolerant and forgiving, I want you to show kindness. I want you to remember your heroes and follow in their footsteps.

George Marshall was a hero. The Medal of Honor recipients here with us today are the greatest embodiments of all heroes. Each of them loves his fellow man more than his own life. But heroism is not limited to soldiers, nor to others who regularly put their lives on the line or who occupy high office or who are otherwise noteworthy. Heroism shows up in all sorts of places, in your home — my parents to this day remain my greatest heroes — in your church, in your school, where every teacher is a hero to you. In your work place and all over your community. A volunteer who takes care of someone less fortunate is a hero. Everyone of you young people can be a hero. All it takes to be a hero in this country is to care. To care about yourself and take care of yourself. To take care about others, to care about the future of this wonderful country. All it takes is for each of you to make your contribution, to making this a better world.

I want each of you listening to me to believe that you are going to be a hero. You’re going to be a hero because you live in the greatest country in the world, a country that asks so little and gives — gives so very much, a country that God has blessed and called America. Thank you.★
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SOME HERE MIGHT WONDER WHY it is that an organization such as the George C. Marshall Foundation, dedicated to preserving the memory and ideals of a career Army man, should have an admiral as its president. I think that General Marshall would not have been surprised, because he was one of this country’s foremost proponents of the greatest possible understanding and closest possible cooperation among the services, of unity of command in crisis periods, of joint staffs and operations. General Marshall has long been the Navy’s favorite ground soldier, and for more than a generation one of its nuclear submarines was named in his honor.

Of course, General Marshall was anxious that his side win the annual Army-Navy game. And sometimes the services’ rivalries could be amusing. In 1951 he told the graduating class at the Naval Academy that when he had gone to Brazil on a goodwill mission in 1939, everywhere he went Brazilian bands played Anchors Aweigh. The Brazilians, it seems, liked the song and were entirely unaware of the diplomatic problems of greeting the Chief of Staff of the Army with a song whose refrain calls for the Midshipmen to “sink the Army.”

But General Marshall also understood the destructive results of inter-service rivalry taken to excess, and he campaigned vigorously against it. For example, in September 1942, he sent a memorandum to all the Army’s higher commanders directing them to take steps to suppress foolish talk and bad blood between the Army and Navy—which he said smacked more of the reactions of schoolboys than of commissioned officers. He once said that, as Army Chief of Staff, he was the only Army officer authorized to criticize the Navy.

One could give a whole talk on General Marshall’s positive attitudes toward and excellent relations with the Navy, but that is not my purpose here today. His relations with the Navy were only one aspect of his determination to be a problem solver and not a problem maker—an attitude which, I’m sure you will admit is easier to assert than to accomplish, and an attitude that, it seems to me, is rarer than it ought to be.

I really don’t want to talk about Marshall’s military career at all but about the broader aspects of his public service.
What is “Public Service?”

“Public service” is a rather ambiguous term nowadays. Every person who works for government at any level is a servant of the people; [every one of the millions of people in those areas of the private sector that we call “service” industries serves the people.] Most of these people are hard-working and dedicated. Certainly, the inconveniences and even dangers of being in the military service in peacetime demand an attitude of dedication, professionalism, and patriotism.

But there is another aspect of “public service.” It means more than serving in a profession that is dedicated to performing some function required by government; more than doing your duty in reasonably efficient fashion, although both of these are essential components in public service. The kind of public service that I want to talk about now is the non-self-serving duty to the larger community above and beyond the demands of professionalism and the call of duty. It means doing more than is necessary or even reasonable because it needs to be done for the benefit of the commonwealth. Sometimes it means doing necessary jobs that are unpleasant, time-consuming, or perhaps even inimical to professional advancement.

George Marshall was not a praiseworthy public servant simply because he was a hard-working army officer for 44 years, although certainly his professional contribution to the American public’s good was outstanding. It is what he did in addition to that required by good professionalism that makes him an outstanding example of the public servant.

George Marshall’s Public Service as an Army Officer

The militia tradition was still quite strong in America when George Marshall began his career in 1902. Equally strong was the tradition of militia failure in war. Stronger still was the professional soldiers’ general disdain for the militia—or National Guard as it was coming to be called. And while Marshall recognized the weaknesses and flaws in the citizen-soldier concept, he also understood that these were the men who would fill the ranks in any future conflict, because the regular Army was very small, widely dispersed, and rather isolated from civilian society—in fact, it was still an Indian-fighting outfit in 1902.

For a professional soldier, the National Guard could be a minefield of career-threatening trouble, and most regulars avoided duty with the Guard, and such duty was not usually viewed as career-enhancing. Marshall was different; he found his numerous contacts with National Guard units between 1908 and the mid-1930’s to be stimulating, rewarding opportunities. First, he could subject school theory to field training—which is always a bit disconcerting. Second, unlike most of his contemporaries, he understood that these were the men he really had to understand and to be able to lead in wartime. He made a point of maintaining close contacts and good relations with the Army’s reserve components, not because it was likely to help his career—few people thought it would or did—but because it was right, and the security of the country demanded it.

When he was assigned to be Senior Instructor to the Illinois National Guard at the depths of the Depression in 1933, ‘34 and ‘35—a job he did not want—he spent enormous amounts of his free time as editor of the Guard’s magazine, because
it needed to be done, and giving speeches to businessmen’s groups to convince them of the Guard’s value, because it needed to be done.

In the 1930’s Marshall worked hard to support the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC), at a time when this was unpopular, particularly on college campuses. Marshall’s involvement with ROTC was entirely outside his regular duties and was certainly not particularly career-enhancing, but he believed that it was right and necessary. Marshall was the Reserve Corps’ friend; he believed that the corps was militarily valuable at a time when most professional soldiers were highly dubious. He pressed the Army to improve ROTC and Guard armories, equipment, training and education. He himself used Reserve officers whenever he could. The War Department was full of Reserves in responsible positions during World War II at Marshall’s insistence and because of his confidence in their abilities.

Public Service While at Vancouver Barracks

As you all know, General Marshall loved the too-brief period he spent here in Vancouver between 1936 and 1938 as commander of the 3rd Division’s 5th Brigade and the 35-camp Civilian Conservation Corps District. He loved the cordial and hospitable people here, the scenery (which he found fascinating), and the rose and dahlia gardens around his house on Officers’ Row.

I would like to cite three examples of General Marshall’s public service while here—that is, his acting above and beyond the call of duty for the public good.

The first example has to do with Reserve Officers who ran much of the CCC business throughout the country. General Marshall was not content merely to permit relations between the Regulars and the Reserves to grind along as they had done for years. He was determined to improve the value of the Reservists to the government, while at the same time enhancing the Reservists status in the eyes of the Regular Officers. One way he had of doing this was instructing the reservists in giving oral reports and in public speaking.

One former Vancouver District Reservist, Marvin Gilmore, wrote to Marshall in 1942 recalling the dry runs Marshall had put him and other Reservists through at Vancouver in preparation for presentations on CCC matters to the Regular Officers. Gilmore recalled that it was his first experience on a public platform, and he succeeded only because of Marshall’s generous assistance and patient coaching. At the time Gilmore wrote, he was considered a veteran instructor in the Regular Army’s Infantry School at Fort Benning. General Marshall replied that what Gilmore had learned in Vancouver was proving its importance during the war emergency. If an officer merely knows, Marshall said, and is without the ability to impart his information, to register it on the minds of others, his value to the government is strictly limited. But how many officers other than George Marshall made the effort to train men like Gilmore in this manner?

Marshall’s determination to be a teacher did not end with officers. My second example concerns the young men in the CCC itself. He did many things for their benefit that were not required by the rules—or even thought of by most other’s in his position. But certain actions come immediately to mind—each of them small in the great scheme of things, but of importance to the individuals who benefited from General Marshall’s efforts.
A great believer in the value of education, Marshall set about reforming the rather haphazard educational system that was attached to the CCC business. Many CCC men were from inner cities or from depressed rural areas, and their education for the modern work force had suffered greatly during the Depression. He reformed and closely supervised the instruction that was made available to the CCC men in their free time—instruction that Marshall aimed at giving them marketable skills after their year of CCC work. He personally wrote letters of recommendation to potential employers for those men who vigorously applied themselves to their work and their lessons. When he left Vancouver in 1938, a cartoon appeared in the CCC District newspaper showing Marshall driving off to Washington and CCC men, letters of recommendation in hand, off to get jobs. The caption was a letter of recommendation for General Marshall from the CCC boys: “We know you always placed our welfare first.” Marshall’s job did not require or even recommend such an effort—but it needed to be done.

My third example of General Marshall’s public service while in Vancouver concerns the Army’s relations with the civilian community. Marshall had always rejected the traditional isolation of the Regular Army from civil society and had gone out of his way to encourage interaction between whatever post he managed and the local community. He had done this while at Fort Screven and Fort Benning in Georgia, at Fort Moultrie in South Carolina, and at Guard Headquarters in Chicago, as I have mentioned. But the full fruition of his policy came while he commanded Vancouver Barracks. When he arrived here in October 1936 he discovered that there was little contact between the post and the people of Portland and other nearby cities. He immediately set about accepting as many invitations to speak as he could, not because he liked to do this—he didn’t—but because it needed to be done. An Army isolated from the disdained by the people it was supposed to serve was a weakness and a danger to the nation.

You all have seen one of the more obvious fruits of General Marshall’s campaign to better civil-military relations here—the reconstruction of Old Fort Vancouver. Local leaders had been attempting, without success, to get part of the Vancouver Barracks reservation set aside for this project. But the Army was reluctant to give up any more of the post, because its leaders feared that what they called the nibbling away of posts was going too far. Marshall disagreed, and he was instrumental in overcoming Army opposition to the project in 1937 and ’38. He thought the Old Fort project might become the most interesting historical monument in the Northwest, a splendid thing to animate the pride and historical sense of the region’s young people. He did not have to support this project; he simply believed that it needed to be done.

Examples of Marshall’s Public Service After Vancouver

General Marshall’s dedication to performing public services—because they needed doing and not because they were required or because they helped his career—obviously did not end in Vancouver. As Charles Martin, the Governor of Oregon in the mid-1930’s, had predicted in 1936, Marshall soon became Chief of Staff of the Army—a position of greater responsibility and importance in the 1940’s than that of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs is now.
Let me briefly mention some examples of General Marshall’s determination to do more than was expected of him during World War II.

Marshall of course knew that the millions of men in the Army would soon be voting veterans. So it is obvious that he needed to maintain high morale, not only because it made the soldiers more efficient as fighting men, but also because it helped to preclude certain postwar political problems for the Army and the nation. He believed in coddling the soldiers whenever possible, and then demanding that they fight to the death when required. His concern manifested itself in hundreds of little things: insistence upon having Post Exchange stores right behind the front lines—even on the beaches at Normandy; his directions to supply certain luxury items such as orange juice or turkey with cranberry sauce for Thanksgiving; his constant pressure on commanders to award medals and honors very soon after the deed and not, as had previously been the case, years later.

His educational bent demonstrated itself in his determination to make interesting—and thus more attention-holding and valuable—the formerly deadly dull Army training films. He recruited Hollywood directors and technical people—Frank Capra is perhaps the best example—to improve the quality of the Army’s message to both civilians and soldiers, despite considerable opposition inside and out of the military regarding the propriety of this, because he believed that it was crucial that the citizen and citizen-soldier understand the reasons why the military operated as it did and why things were happening as they were. The less difficult, less time-consuming approach would have been for General Marshall to let the Army bureaus do as they thought best instead of constantly checking up on them, prodding and questioning them, and making suggestions; but he knew that the long-term consequences were likely to be bad for the individual, the army, and the nation.

General Marshall, likewise, went to considerable lengths to keep the citizen-soldier in touch with home through showing feature films and traveling shows. One of his pet projects was the creation of a corps of Special Services officers whose job was to lead the soldiers in producing their own entertainment from local materials and talent. During the war, the Army took over Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Virginia (where I live and work) to train such leaders. You have heard of some of the students who attended: Red Skelton, David Wayne, Phil Foster, Melvin Douglas, and golf legend Ben Hogan.

Many Americans were stuck in small, isolated garrisons far from the stimulus of war’s danger—in places like Greenland, Ascension Island, Aruba, Central Africa, Persia, or the Himalayas. General Marshall personally wrote to the commanders of such garrisons to ask them what he could do for them, such as supplying sports or other recreational equipment, or art supplies for the newspaper. Just having the Chief of Staff ask how things were going and sympathizing with their plight was a big morale booster.

Another of General Marshall’s plans involved the creation of an armed services university in Europe. By V-E Day, the Army had accumulated a million books in Paris to educate—not merely to entertain or to placate—those soldiers who had to stay in Europe after the war.

One could describe at considerably greater length than I intend to General Marshall’s determination
to do things for the public good that needed to be done, even though they were not required of him. My last example comes after he thought he had retired for the third time—first from the Army in 1945, then from the thankless China mission in 1946, and then from the difficult post of Secretary of State in early 1949. He was now 68 years old and had been in government service for 47 years. But an institution that he revered was having difficulties, especially with criticisms from veterans that Marshall was certain were unjust. He became President of American Red Cross, not because he needed a job, but because he believed that his experience with the Red Cross dating back to World War I made him the logical choice to undertake the rebuilding of that organization because he knew the truth in answer to veterans’ complaints. For a year he subjected himself to an exhausting round of travel, speeches, and ceremonies that ultimately returned the Red Cross to its normal pinnacle of respect. It was one of those jobs that General Marshall knew had to be done.

Doing more to help the people of your locality, state, or nation than is required by your job or profession is true public service. Marshall was, to use a modern phrase, a very bright “point of light.”

What Is the Marshall Foundation Doing to Encourage Public Service?

To emphasize Marshall’s idea that one owes a certain level of selfless public service to the community, even if such service is not convenient or financially profitable, the Marshall Foundation established its Public Service Leadership Conference in 1985. Our idea is to bring together at the Foundation a selected group of young professionals to study a national issue such as the environment, the changes in Eastern Europe, or the Pacific Basin. These young people—in their late twenties or early thirties, that is—about the same as Marshall when he began working with the National Guard—who are far enough into their careers to be past the struggles of beginning, are encouraged to think like Marshall—to seek ways, above and beyond the call of duty any professionalism, of serving their fellow citizens.

One need not be a famous soldier or a well-to-do professional to contribute usefully to the community’s welfare. George Marshall was certainly neither for most of his career. But we can all make those small contributions that make the world a bit better. Public service is not really work, although it may be hard or difficult; as Marshall wrote from his home over on Officers’ Row here to a man he had helped out of a jam in the Army in the early 1920’s, “It is fascinating to try to do something constructive.” ★
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The motto that guides a military life is devotion to duty, honor, country. In our nation’s history, no American has better responded to that motto’s demands than George Catlett Marshall. In truth, he stands next to George Washington himself. Marshall served with true honor, unsurpassed sense of duty, and deep devotion to our country.

His whole life seemed to be directed toward what he contributed to our country—and to the wider world—at a time of deep and desperate need.

Many 50-year commemorations of World War II and its early aftermaths are now going on around the world. It is therefore especially timely to recall his words and works as General of the Army during the war, and later as Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense—a leader among leaders of that period.

It is appropriate also to do so here in Vancouver—an important part of the years that prepared him for the great responsibilities that lay ahead. By looking back, we can discern the values that inspired him, and the methods of leadership that made him so effective. We can well ask, where did these values and leadership abilities come from? What can they tell us today?

We know that they have a message. For we often hear that another Marshall Plan is needed—Eastern Europe, in the former Soviet Union, in Latin America. Or another Marshall is needed, to focus and conduct our foreign policy, or our security operations. These calls are for the kind of thinking and action that General Marshall, in his era, exemplified, and that brought us success. We need to draw from him lessons and guidelines for the new security issues that we, his successors, must now confront and resolve. Much has application to peace and security today worldwide—for example, the importance of economic progress and well-being (which were the immediate concerns of the Marshall Plan in Europe). In Europe we see this need not only in Poland and Czechoslovakia—which were forced by the Soviet Union to withdraw from the Marshall Plan in 1947—but also in the other nations of Central and Eastern Europe now independent, together with the Baltic republics and the individual republics of the former Soviet Union itself.

In his time General Marshall saw issues of security and human well-being posed in the starkest possible terms, and responded to them. In World War II, the German seizure of much of Europe and the Japanese attack in the Pacific, followed
by Hitler’s declaration of war against the United States, were met not only by the creation and commitment of massive U.S. military forces in multiple theaters of war, but by political courage and decisive leadership, and by the conversion of our powerful economy into the “arsenal of democracy” as it was then well called. A crucial measure of U.S. power was the economic output of our factories and farms. And when the war ended, he saw that economic recovery was indispensable to a strong, stable and secure Atlantic Community.

Now as we look to our future, we need the help that Marshall’s legacy can give us as we seek to understand and deal with security issues of a new kind, in a new era.

We must respond to a transformation previously unimaginable—an end to the Cold War that threatened the world from World War II to the period of glasnost, perestroika, and “new thinking” initiated by Gorbachev in the Soviet Union a short 7 years ago.

The Cold War—which I call World War III, carried out without use of the weapons of war that were available to both sides—has ended, but we are by no means at the end of history. New risks, new dangers and the rise of new orders of violence now confront and challenge us. Saddam Hussein in the Persian Gulf, conflict in Somalia, carnage in what was Yugoslavia, instability in the former Soviet Union, possible nuclear weapons proliferation in North Korea, are only a few of the problems on the security agenda.

To see how General Marshall’s legacy could help us today, it is first in order to review some of the highlights of what he was and what he did—the dual components of the legacy he left us.

**The Marshall Legacy**

Above all, the name of George Catlett Marshall will forever be linked to one of the greatest achievements of modern history. This is of course the help to the recovery, rehabilitation and prosperity of a post-war Europe that lay in ruins—allies and enemies alike. The Marshall Plan provided the decisive margin—an American initiative called by Churchill the “most unsordid act in history.”

As Secretary of State, General Marshall brought to this issue the same talent for action at the critical time and critical place that he had developed during his long years of military service. But more than that, he brought a deep understanding of the way great national programs, such as the nation’s military programs, should respond to our country’s needs, and accomplish the country’s high policy goals through well-planned action.

He had this broad perspective and clear sense of purpose, joined with an extraordinary ability to go straight to the heart of a problem, and to act on it effectively. It was surely in part a gift, but it was a gift reinforced by years of service to the highest order.

As a young Army officer serving in the Philippines under General Franklin Bell, he quickly showed mettle. In World War I as chief of operations under General Pershing he planned a shift of front for an entire field Army that is still a military classic. As Deputy Commandant at the Infantry School at Ft. Benning in the 1920’s he took careful note of the officers who showed particular ability for the kinds of command responsibility he would later entrust to them in the Second World War. He guided the preparation of the book “Infantry in Battle” which many a young officer found to be a treasure of lessons of judgment, decision, and leadership. Here in
Vancouver, commanding the 5th Brigade of the 3rd Division, plus 35 CCC Camps, he carried forward, and developed further, his thinking and practices regarding leadership, and deepened his understanding of how to work successfully with young Americans in a structured environment. Later Marshall’s own words recalled the enjoyable years he spent here:

“All together, we experienced one of our most delightful periods of Army service and one that we look back on with additional warmth because there followed from the very month we left the Northwest long years of fearful strain and struggle with a world turmoil which has not yet subsided.”

“Those days along the rivers of the Northwest, among its magnificent mountains, and by the picturesque seashore appealed to us as a pleasant dream in comparison with the troubled days that followed.

“The best that I can say today is that we would love to live those two years over again, each day as it was, each of our friends as they were.”

When sent out to take charge of reserve affairs in Illinois, he schooled the units in maneuver and realistic field operations. And then as Chief of the War Plans Division and Acting Chief of Staff of the Army, he finished off his preparation for the heavy responsibilities that lay ahead for him as Chief of Staff.

He had deep understanding of what is to me the dual mission of the Army:

★ To fight our country’s wars, or be prepared to do so, in order to provide security for our people, our homeland and our way of life;

★ And at the same time, to safeguard the lives and well-being of our troops.

Always mindful of the human dimension, he never lost his understanding and care for the individual soldier. It was he who said, “When we are tired, cold and hungry at the end of the day, it is the leader who puts aside his personal discomfort to look to the needs of his soldiers.”

In those long years between the wars, he became known for going beyond the formalistic or the mechanical, for insisting on independent thinking to find timely solutions to realistic problems, always ready to go against “school solutions” in recognition that the challenges to be faced could never be so stereotyped.

Some years ago, General Matthew Ridgway, who himself as a young staff officer once served directly under General Marshall when Marshall was Chief of Staff, said “We seek leaders with the vision to see, the wisdom to choose, and the courage to act.” In General Marshall our country found such a leader at a time of critical need.

As the war clouds gathered and spread in World War II, his was a key role in the call-up of forces, and in their retention in service by a one-vote margin in Congress just four months before the war began. That was his first great task—to create the weapon: that is, to mobilize, train and equip the forces; choose the leaders; train the commanders; build the Army from 112,000 to 7,700,000 and deploy its fighting elements overseas.

His second great wartime task was to direct the employment of the force, that is, to guide the military conduct of the war, working with the highest military and civilian leaders—Admirals King and Leahy, General Hap Arnold, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and the major theater commanders General MacArthur and General Eisenhower. General Marshall’s papers-recently
published by the Marshall Foundation up to May 1943, the end of the North African campaign—
a revelation in setting out the problems he faced,
and the ways he dealt with them. At an early
point he reached the firm conclusion that it would
be necessary to defeat Germany first and Japan
second, and never deviated from that conviction.
He faced up resolutely to determining what the
task would require, calling for integrated studies
of our needs, to replace the improvisation and
piece-mealing that has beset the earlier support
of allies and our own mobilization.

As the instigator of the 1941 “Victory Plan,” he
was indeed the “organizer of victory” in the ac-
colade given to him by Winston Churchill.

Through all that he did there ran an extraordinary
ability to see and to define what needed to be
done, and a strength of character in hewing to
the mainline, resisting diversion and dissipation of
effort, finally gaining, pressing and never losing
the initiative in Europe and against Japan.

The stories of his leadership methods are legion:
“Put it on a single page for me—if you can’t get
the key issue for decision on a single page, you
haven’t thought it through.” And “Don’t bring
me problems; bring me proposed solutions.”
General Maxwell Taylor once told the story of
how he as a young major in Marshall’s office
took in a paper presenting a disagreement be-
tween two of Marshall’s Assistant Chiefs of Staff.
He said, “Taylor, what do you think my deci-
sion should be?” To Taylor’s reply “Sir, I hadn’t
thought about it” Marshall said, “Please do so”
and handed it back. General Taylor said “It took
only once.”

In the last year of war I myself was back in the
United States in the Operations Division, often
called General Marshall’s Command Post. My
direct contacts were relatively few—though I as-
sure you, memorable.

Late in the war, Secretary Stimson called from the
White House to say that President Truman, who
was meeting with President Osmeña of the Phil-
ippines, wanted to sign an agreement the next
day defining our U.S. future base needs to make
clear that this issue would not delay Philippine
independence. On his return to the Pentagon he
told my boss, General (Big-Abe) Lincoln, another
staff officer (Col. Phil Greasley) and me what was
needed, and that in his view it should be short
and a statement of principles. But he then added
“But General Marshall disagrees with me; go
around and talk to him.” You know, I am sure,
how much these two men respected each other.
You should also know they were probably the
two best informed men in Washington about
the Philippines and this specific issue. Secretary
Stimson had himself been Governor General of
the Philippines early in the century. And General
Marshall had distinguished himself there. I myself,
born in Granite City, Illinois, had never been west
of San Francisco. General Marshall simply said,
“If it doesn’t spell out the specifics, it will soon
be worthless.” Then the two men stood in the
doorway between their offices where the door
was never closed, and talked to us briefly. Each
adhered to his view. Finally General Marshall—and
this is the point of this long story—turned to us
with a frosty twinkle and said, “I think that’s all
the help we can give you.”

Suffice it to say, we worked all night, with staff
help, and came up with a compromise document,
the statement of principles favored by Mr. Stin-
son to be signed by the two presidents, attaching
as part of the agreement, a detailed listing of the
bases favored by General Marshall. By 1030 the
next morning the document was signed by the two presidents. Looking back, I would say the experience gave graphic meaning to General Marshall’s guidance to the staff, “Man is made for action.”

It was clear to me as to all of us just what kind of man we were looking for—selfless, incisive, with a power of concentrated thought and commitment that made him a leader among leaders. He once wrote to some school-children in Virginia that the most important factor in developing leadership is character, which involves integrity, unselfish and devoted purpose, a sturdiness of bearing when everything goes wrong, and a willingness to sacrifice self in the interest of the common good. He added that discipline is vital to the soldier, and self-discipline probably is one of the very important factors in the life of a man or a woman. These are the demands he imposed on himself. In each of those attributes he was a model for the kind of leaders on which our nation’s security will depend in order to deal with the new security problems we must now contend with.

With the end of the Second World War, a new set of dangers had to be faced. The countries of Europe, battered and devastated by the war, gravely weakened both economically and politically, were struggling hard to feed themselves and restart their industries and essential commerce. In the midst of this they found themselves endangered by a hostile and threatening Soviet Union, which had fastened its control through military occupation over the war-torn countries of Central and Eastern Europe and was pressing an attempt through subversion, industrial strikes, and disruption to gain control over Western European countries as well—Italy and France in particular. The Soviet leaders were intransigent in their refusal to permit recovery in Germany, and were demanding territorial concessions from Greece and Turkey. The winter of 1946-1947, one of the most severe in this century, brought deep distress and privation throughout Europe.

In February 1947, the British informed the United States that Britain could no longer carry the burden of supporting Greece and Turkey against Soviet pressures. President Truman quickly proposed a program of U.S. assistance to those countries. Going further, he laid down the Truman Doctrine, giving assurance of support for countries whose freedom was threatened. The Congress, in acting on his proposals, called for an integrated study to define and present the needs in aggregated form. Perhaps this sounds familiar to you when we look at the problems that now exist throughout Eastern Europe.

Serving as Secretary of State by that time, General Marshall took the lead in this integrated effort. In clear recognition of the direct linkage between security and economic health and rehabilitation, he initiated a thoroughgoing series of studies during the spring of 1947. The work of George Kennan proved to be of key importance. I myself participated during that time in a parallel interdepartmental effort—State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee Document 360—as the Army working member. Other efforts went forward as well. General Marshall, with this work in hand identifying the action needed, then made the famous proposal at Harvard, on June 5th, 1947, that came to bear his name as the Marshall Plan, and the world suddenly changed.

The Marshall Plan as it developed had many important aspects. I will highlight only a few that seem to me to tell us something today.
• It took the initiative in the battle against hunger and economic disruption.

• It brought hope and positive goals to ascendancy over fears and passive reaction to each new day’s crisis-dancing at the end of a Russian string, as we called it in those days.

• It caused the Europeans to draw together to organize their response to his proposal, in the process finding mutually reinforcing strength in their close cooperation.

• It brought Germany—at least its Western sectors—into constructive association with its former enemies. Just think of what that meant. By that action Germany ceased to be an enemy.

By no means did success come easily, or overnight. One weak government followed another in many countries, though the Marshall Plan provided a sturdy, sustained center-line of policy and effort. A Soviet supported coup was carried out in Czechoslovakia and destroyed its democratic system of government-Czechoslovakia like Poland having been forced by the Soviets as I earlier mentioned to withdraw from the Marshall Plan even after they had joined. The Soviets cut West Berlin off from the West, but were thwarted in their efforts to starve the city out by the Berlin Airlift, organized and conducted by the West—with the United States taking the primary role.

In 1949 came the great companion piece to the Marshall Plan: the North Atlantic Treaty. It built on the previously existing Western European Union—the collective security institution of the European countries—but now brought in the United States and Canada as well. Initially it was not much more than the classical paper alliances of the past, but following the Communist attack in Korea was expanded in an unprecedented initiative to provide in peacetime a collective force-in-being in Western Europe. In December 1950 General Eisenhower was appointed to organize that force; his work went forward rapidly with the strong and active support of General Marshall, who had been recalled from retirement once more in the fall of 1950 to take over as Secretary of Defense after the initial crushing defeats we had suffered in Korea. In Europe, one of Secretary Marshall’s first actions was to press the NATO allies to initiate steps looking toward the rearming of West Germany, bringing it into close association with the West.

By reinforcing each other, the Marshall Plan and NATO together brought remarkable progress to the West. Europe moved rapidly to rebuild economically. An increased sense of security was established, to the point where Eisenhower reporting a year later in 1952 could speak of “an expanding spiral of strength and confidence.” A noticeable degree of political strengthening of many kinds took place—a further development of common purpose, progress toward improved relations between France and Germany, and resolution of past disputes without wasting substances on old quarrels. Governments became increasingly effective as success in the recovery became widespread.

In the years that followed right up to the present day, NATO and OECD—the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development which grew out of the Marshall Plan—have continued as cornerstones of the Western security, prosperity and stability that we still enjoy today. They have put a model of constructive cooperation before the rest of the world, and have provided key institutions for the collaboration between the United States and the other Western-style democracies.
on which much of the whole world’s hope for the future now rests—all part of the Marshall legacy. When we see Russia today asking to join NATO, as Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary as well as the Baltic nations are also doing, we have some idea of what a great contribution to stable peace and security NATO provides.

NATO does this in two ways—first it provides a forum for deliberation, consultation and development of common policy positions by its Council in permanent session, where the United States is represented by its Ambassador; in doing so it binds the nations together; second NATO provides a collective force-in-being, the command in Europe being headed by an American general, the Supreme Allied Commander Europe. Under his direction NATO continues to conduct a common military evaluation of any and all threats to its security, to prepare coordinated defense plans and force improvement programs, and to develop common procedures for air defense, communications, air operations and the like. These procedures were used with great success by the countries that carried out the war in the Persian Gulf, and are ready for use in whatever future military effort-peace-keeping and the like—NATO may be called upon to undertake.

At a time that has seen the end of the Cold War and the dismantling of the Soviet Union, we have been brought to a new and different world, a post-war phase similar to 1945-50 in the range of new problems and the many uncertainties we face, but very different in that the great overshadowing Soviet threat is gone.

Marshall faced challenges, but saw through them to opportunities if decisive action were taken. We, in contrast, live in a time of great opportunities, but must recognize challenges in them if we fail to act on them wisely enough and early enough.

Security Issues and Opportunities

As we look to the security issues that lie ahead—the risks, the needs, the tasks—we see a new agenda, a new set of problems and questions, on which there will be need for the wisdom and the strengths of many George Marshalls. They include such questions as the future role and place of a Germany now reunited, the future of a Russia undergoing enormous political and economic trauma, the many destabilizing dangers that exist through Eastern Europe from ethnic or nationalistic conflicts.

As the starting point toward seeing where our interests lie in these circumstances we should first consider just what we mean by security for our country. The approach that I have found useful in the past, and still do today, is to look at security as simply the safeguarding of the well-being of our people—our economic and political well-being as well as our physical safety—against interference by force from outside sources. We may ask ourselves as specifically as we can just where and how American well-being is at risk in the international arena from the use of threat of force or violence.

If we do so, we quickly see that there do exist significant present and future challenges to our security. They are accompanied, I am happy to say, by opportunity if we are prepared to grasp it. Let me say a brief word about the most important of them.

In Central and Eastern Europe, Poland and its neighbors, having achieved their independence, are now embarked on the process of building
prosperous, expanding market economies. The process has been painful and severe, and much remains to be done. But there is no sign of giving up, nor so far of the kinds of internal discord that could halt further progress. Understandably, however, they still feel far from fully secure, lying as they do in the shadows of Germany and Russia, their past oppressors. The linkages they are building with NATO, although less than they desire, are a great source of confidence to them. America’s friendship, its moral and technical support, and its financial assistance—even though necessarily limited at this time—have been essential to the re-emergence of these countries as free nations on the world stage, and will be an essential element in our future relationships with them. What we are seeing is truly the fulfillment of Marshall’s goals.

The Baltic republics, now also freed from the Soviet grasp, face much the same set of problems, but they have further to go, and they start with substantial handicaps. Integrated as they were into the Soviet command-type economy, and dependent on products from the other republics, they have faced greater hardship in achieving stable market-based systems. With large ethnic Russian populations, and Russian military bases on their territory, they confront difficult political problems that are yet to be fully and finally resolved, though much has already been done. They are moving to build and strengthen ties with us and with the countries of Western Europe—ties that will be indispensable to a stable, confident future, deep as they are in those same shadows of Russia and Germany.

The gravest challenges by far are found in Russia and the other republics of the former Soviet Union. After 70 years of political and economic misrule, they have only barely begun the climb out of the utter morass into which they were led. Regrettably, there is all too little tradition of initiative, management or quality and efficiency on which to build. Most of what was there three generations ago was deliberately destroyed in the Stalin purges that took more than 10 million lives. The problem is deeper than their economic system; it is the whole economic culture left behind by the Communist experience. Reform was brought into a gridlock by the old guard parliament’s opposition to Yeltsin. It remains to be seen whether he can now move effectively ahead. They are still deep in the trauma of the shift to market prices. His goals have been the right ones—private property, market prices and convertible currency—and Western Europe like the United States is seeking to be of help. The troubles of all these republics remain a matter of deep concern, as the threat of instability and possible chaos hangs over them. On our side we must be steadfast in our cooperation and constructive support—as in Marshall’s own words—“against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos.”

Western Europe has its own problems—recession and troubled governments among them—and serious issues confront their steps toward greater unity. There are still questions about the future relationship between the United States and Europe, which remains fundamental to the future security for all. One may hope to see enough wisdom and statesmanship not to weaken the very structures that have brought the West where it stands today. These still stand as a centerpiece of stability in a time of turbulence and turmoil in Eastern Europe.

In the euphoria after the fall of the Berlin Wall, one could hear talk of the end of NATO. There is now, happily, much less of that. Though NATO’s future is by no means yet fully defined, it is still
the most promising route to security, stability and peace in the area. The need is to keep the forum that NATO provides active and vital, and keep the collective force, at reduced levels, at the necessary state of readiness and trained effectiveness. The continuing importance of the Atlantic Community and America’s participation therein has been well demonstrated. The close and cooperative association built up through the Marshall Plan and NATO is a priceless asset of the West and should be the basis of our future policy.

In the world beyond, following Saddam’s attack of Kuwait and his threat to Saudi Arabia-crucial sources of the oil the world runs on—there is now a sharper understanding of risks the future may hold. The coalition that defeated Iraq made effective use of NATO’s common procedures and advanced weaponry. The need for a committed capability to act in behalf of our top-priority interests should not be in doubt. As Marshall saw the looming danger in the 1930’s, we today should recognize the continuing dangers in an interdependent but turbulent world. At the same time we must apply Marshall’s sense of what is truly vital to us. We cannot do everything, but must be selective in deciding where and how to become enraged. Especially where the use of military force is involved we must be clear as to our objective, sure of public understanding and support, thoroughly prepared to act swiftly and decisively, and able to limit our commitments to well-thought-through interests.

Within the United States itself we need to keep clear the importance of our overseas connections—their importance to our economy and to our continued security. If we were to recall nothing else from George Marshall’s legacy, we should remember that healthy economic strength and military security go together hand in hand, and that wise and effective U.S. involvement in the world outside will be essential to American well-being at home.

Let me conclude now with a brief summary of some of the major issues we in the United States must face as we look to the future:

- A helping hand to the nations of Central and Eastern Europe, to those of the Baltic and to those of the former Soviet Union.
- Support for NATO as a continuing cornerstone of strength and stability, even as we re-align its plan to fit the new need of today.
- Maintaining the positive relations with Germany and Japan that stand as one of the finest achievements of the post-World War II period.
- Dealing with the nuclear threat in ways that not only keep it from spreading, but drastically reduce the numbers of weapons in the world’s arsenals, while keeping them under the tightest possible controls as long as they continue to exist.
- Recognizing the close interweaving of the domestic and the overseas interest on which U.S. well-being depends.

For all these issues, and many others, the legacy of George Marshall points the way of wisdom, responsibility and statesmanship. Let us be grateful for what he has left us.
AMBASSADOR ROZANNE L. RIDGWAY
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I AM WELL AWARE OF THE HONOR THAT ATTENDS SELECTION AS THE GEORGE C. MARSHALL LECTURER, but since early this morning I’ve been wondering why the City of Vancouver needs anyone to come visit to tell them how to best honor the memory of George C. Marshall. I have been impressed since about 7:30 a.m. with a sense of community, a sense of service, a sense of volunteerism of a proportion I have only rarely seen in all of my travels around the world. So I find that I’m here to learn today, to take away an example, as much as I am to share with you an insight into the life of General George C. Marshall.

Obviously I’m flattered to follow not only Marshall’s distinguished biographer, Forrest Pogue, but also my uniformed colleagues in public service, in particular Colin Powell with whom I served in Washington for nearly five years, and General Andrew Goodpaster. Last year General Goodpaster was introduced here as Chairman of the Marshall Foundation. Insofar as I am the Co-Chair of the Atlantic Council, and General Goodpaster is the other Co-Chair, he is my colleague on a daily basis as we both continue our public careers. Each of these men — the generals, Admiral Marryott — who preceded me is part of the American military tradition where the influence of General Marshall — his integrity, his discipline, his vision, his commitment to serving the nation — is readily palpable. He is the example for them, indeed a very stern example for them, of the responsibilities of leadership and sacrifice. I, on the other hand, come from what I would call the civilian side of the government house, where General Marshall spent only a very few years. However, it is in fact in connection with those very few years — it is outside the office of the Secretary of State where one sees his accomplishments as expressed in the Nobel Prize awarded to him in 1953 — that he garnered international tribute not only as a soldier but as a peacemaker — a tribute to a statesman of uncommon quality and achievement presented by a grateful world. In fact, had he not spent those few years as Ambassador to China, as Secretary of State, as Secretary of Defense — years out of uniform, years in which General Marshall helped the world’s greatest democracy, our country, come to realize that it would have to provide leadership and resources to rebuild our shattered allies, to assist defeated adversaries and to defend the Western world from the challenges of aggressive communism — had he not had those years of service out of uniform, General Marshall
would still be acknowledged, as he was called, as the “organizer of victory” in World War II. Cadets would still study the lessons of his leadership and would still learn about duty, honor and country. He would even today inspire pride and principle in our military.

General Marshall was indeed a great American general, but it was his vision as a statesman, his toughness and, still, his sensitivity to what was happening beyond our shores, his ability to see and persuade others to see that we could not remain aloof, that America had interests in how the rest of the world fared — it was that capability that expanded his reputation to legendary, indeed global, proportions. It is that set of activities that makes his name today synonymous with enlightened and successful international engagement by the United States.

Behind the legend, behind the awe-inspiring accomplishments lay some very interesting vignettes that I would like to use to describe more of my world and the world in which General Marshall spent his last professional years, the world of diplomacy. I’d like to take advantage of the presence of all of these wonderful students to step off the main road of this lecture onto a few side roads known as “recruiting for public service.” It’s said — and there are enough uniforms of high rank in this room to be able to validate this legend — it is said that General Marshall, about the time he was Deputy Commander of the Army’s Infantry School, began to keep a little black book of officers who showed talent and potential. Years later as he took command of the Army, as he turned to the black book for America’s generals in World War II, he found the names of men who indeed did lead and did bring success to the allied and Western leadership to the challenge in World War II, men who became historic generals and leaders. They were an extraordinary lot that emerged from that little black book. Had he been doing the same thing in diplomacy over those years, I have no doubt General Marshall would have identified talent and potential for America’s ambassadors. He probably would have identified also those diplomats who served in a political-military liaison role during World War II. But, I’m sorry to say for sure in both cases, whether there was a military black book or a diplomat’s black book, those identified would all have been men. So let me speak briefly today, since I have a captive audience, and since it is acknowledged that I am the first woman to do this lecture, about the progress of women in American diplomacy.

For years the American Foreign Service had convinced itself that diplomacy was an inappropriate career for women. Finally in 1924 it allowed women to sit for the first time for the annual national examination, an examination I would urge everyone here interested in public service and international affairs to take. It is still a national examination, still given annually. The first woman entered the ranks of America’s career diplomats in 1926. Of course, Foreign Service is fundamentally an overseas business, and eventually the question arose, well, she’s been in Washington long enough, where can we send her? Switzerland, it was decided, was a likely congenial setting. My colleague here from Finland knows that in the early days of diplomacy Finland also was considered such a congenial place for women. Postings in Latin America were discarded as too dangerous because of the imagined prospect of unwanted attentions from Latin suitors. So the American Ambassador to Switzerland was notified that his Embassy was going to have the honor of posting the very first woman diplomat from the United
States. He did not take it well. The archives of the Department of State — this was before shredding machines, mind you — the archives of the Department of State are replete with the exchanges between the Department of State in Washington and the American Ambassador in Bern, Switzerland, on the topic of sending women diplomats to Switzerland. The Ambassador was not able to persuade Washington to cancel the assignment and finally, as a last and final argument, he sent in a telegram, still in existence, in which he noted there was no office space for a new junior diplomat, that he was going to have to put this woman in the file room, and anything sent to or put in the Embassy file room had never been seen or heard from again. He wondered also, by the way, what the Department of State considered the requirements of diplomatic dress to be. Was the lady to wear a top hat? And as for diplomatic dining — you can tell how long ago this was — did she leave the table before the cigars were passed? All of the questions were set aside. He was told to be careful about that file room, and the woman went to Switzerland. She was subsequently joined in her career by other women, not many, but some. And it was not until 1953, the year that General Marshall left his last assignment for the United States as Secretary of Defense, that a woman reached ambassadorial rank from within the career service.

Why? Well, for one thing, diplomacy wasn’t an easy life. Twenty years ago, in fact, the Foreign Service, having allowed women to enter in 1924, found in 1970 that the courts demanded that the Department of State eliminate the regulation that automatically ended the career of any woman who married. Until 1970 — I’ve just seen some mouths drop — until 1970 male diplomats could have spouses, women could not. Now, unlike the documents about the woman going to Switzerland, I have never seen the documents that explain the reasoning that argued that women could not be married and also be diplomats. My familiarity with some of the thinking of those days suggests that a conclusion was reached somewhere along the line that, in diplomacy, men married, but women were seduced, that husbands had wives, but wives had lovers, that wives were an essential part of a diplomat’s credentials, but husbands were a hindrance, or worse, they were murky characters of dubious motives. Whatever the case, in 1970 the courts said enough of that. And since 1970 the progress of women — as indeed the progress of men — from outside the traditional schools of the East, the progress of young Americans through a new, vitalized American Foreign Service has been just nothing short of startling. Today, even with the challenge of accommodating two-career families, the challenge of interrupted career ladders, the challenge of being bold enough to raise children in a different culture, today nearly 50% of each entering American diplomatic class is female.

The story at the top of the diplomatic ladder is different. It takes time for social change to make its way up the ladder, and it is a competitive ladder in anybody’s business; it is a competitive ladder here in Vancouver in any business chosen; it is a competitive ladder in Washington. And sometimes it takes 25 or 30 years to climb the rungs. But progress has been made and is being made on all fronts.

I’d like to sort of end this little departure, based on General Marshall’s little black book, with a story from the last years of my own career. In the late 1980s in Moscow, in preparation for one of the five Reagan-Gorbachev summits, Secretary of
State George Shultz and Edouard Shevardnadze, the then Foreign Secretary of the Soviet Union, were having a routine but rather impassioned exchange on the subject of human rights and social change in each of our societies. Secretary Shultz made a very uncompromising presentation on the human rights situation in the Soviet Union and then gave the table to Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. Foreign Minister Shevardnadze began to read to George Shultz from a Soviet talking paper which demanded an American accounting for the situation involving the rights of women and minorities in the United States. Shevardnadze read it without looking up. When he had finished, he looked at last at Secretary Shultz in anticipation of an answer. The answer came very quickly, seriously but with a bit of a twinkle. George Shultz said to Edouard Shevardnadze, “I’ll be very pleased to report on the situation of the rights of women and minorities in the United States, but I really prefer to leave the response about what has been achieved and what still needs to be done with respect to women and minorities to my two colleagues seated with me here today — the National Security Adviser, General Colin Powell, and the Assistant Secretary of State for Europe and Canada”...myself.

Let me talk about what was on the table between Secretary Shultz and Minister Shevardnadze. It was the question of the ending the 45 years of confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, ending the confrontation between East and West, between democracy and totalitarianism. This was the period in which the challenge of confrontation dominated American foreign policy, the period in which the institutions of American foreign policy were those forged in the late 1940s by General Marshall and by a simply sparkling team of American thinkers, military and civilian, in the area of international policy. Those 45 years, as many of you know full well and perhaps can feel in your soul, were years in which American foreign and security policy was exclusively about fighting communism. General Goodpaster, often looking at that period, says, you know, that was really World War III, it was global, and thank heavens, it’s over.

Now we’re midway through the decade of the 90’s, we’re anticipating the arrival of a new century, and one has to ask, as did George Marshall in 1947 as he took over the office of Secretary of State, what kind of world now lies beyond our borders? What international challenges and opportunities, what issues are going to touch upon our lives here at home? What partnerships and institutions are available and which need to be created to ensure that those who share our values, who share our purpose are enlisted in the never-ending effort to build a principled, prosperous and peaceful world? Inevitably as we look at the daunting problems here at home, problems that are remarkably similar to those of the mid 1940’s, one asks, must we really continue to lead?

Let me take a moment to share with you the context which I have for the world in which we live. You might not agree with it, but I think there’s enough substance in it to cause some thinking. As I see it, at the end of this century, as at the very beginning, the United States is facing a world in transition. It is in a way a very incomplete century. As we entered the century, the collapsing of empires, among them the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the German Empire, the Russian Czarist Empires, had yielded up a world war. As we leave the
century, three wars — two hot, one cold, all global — have not fully resolved the geo-political issues of the first war. And the last war — the Cold War — has left its own special ruins. The dilemmas in foreign policy that a surrounding uncertain and competitive world have posed for what is always an internationally reluctant United States are the same today as they were at the opening of the century. The continuing collapse of empires — today the collapsed Soviet empire — leads the United States once again to try to define itself out of active engagement in conflict or, failing that, to try to assign to international institutions the task of coping with an uncertain and unpredictable world.

I believe that with the world on our doorstep several broad points in fact offer a framework for American policy and policy makers in the next several years. First, the period of historic transition in which the world now finds itself is going to be more than a few years long. It is going to include issues and conflicts of times past. It is going to include issues that flow from the end of the Soviet Empire and the reordering of global and regional relationships that proceed from that event. They are the issues that flow from the success of the policies put in place by General Marshall and the team from the 40’s. This period of transition will include as well the emergence of new nations as major international players and the coming to fore of challenges and opportunities that stem from new technologies that are embracing borders. If history is once again on the move, so, too, are people — as migrants, as refugees, as workers, as students, as tourists — on the move for survival, on the move for opportunity.

Second, the agenda of the past with its nearly singular focus on the East-West relationship and in particular the superpower relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union, is being replaced by an agenda of considerably longer length and broader scope. But it is less immediately visible, and it has less immediately perceived relevance to our national security. So that, even as we are dealing with the requirement of reducing the nuclear arsenal of the United States and reducing the nuclear arsenals of the states that have succeeded the Soviet Union, we see a growing market in conventional arms, or better, we try to see the growing market in conventional arms. But it is a more obscure challenge. We find that we’re having to deal with issues of what some in Washington today are calling the new international security agenda — not weapons, not nuclear arms, not even conventional arms, but the conflict among economic growth, energy, and the environment. Some would predict, for example, that the new agenda includes problems of water, agriculture, health, and migration, and that the poverty of the crowded cities of Africa is as likely to produce the next great global conflagration as is the competition between the superpowers.

Finally, the great changes and shifts are producing new conflict in parts of the world not previously a part of our daily consideration. How many of you today, if I stopped and passed a piece of paper, could write down for me the names of the five new Central Asian republics, with capitals? I must tell you it would give me pause also, and I would probably have them written on my cuff so that I would not be embarrassed publicly to admit that I, too, had some difficulty remembering the new states, the new capitals, the new leaders. Yet they press upon us to be acknowledged and to take their place in the world’s community of na-
tions, competing for resources, markets and for financial assistance. The changed situation also is providing a framework for addressing and ending old conflicts, and so even as old conflicts re-ignite and new states arrive on board, old conflicts are being resolved. Certainly the most helpful in our current time frame is the emerging peace in the Middle East. In East and Central Europe we see countries which have resumed their national identities, in which the processes of democracy and open economies are beginning to take hold. And in the end of the Soviet Empire we see the emergence and the return to the world community of states we once had considered lost, that is, the states of the Baltic region. True, we do see in many of these states the return of centuries-old conflict, a rising to the surface of animosities and hatreds beyond our understanding. Our eyes today may be on the former Yugoslavia, and in particular Bosnia-Herzegovina, but there is across the Eurasian landscape a multitude of conflicts, some of whose origins reach back several centuries. Also, each day brings reports of religious troubles in India; the tragedy of Somalia has its origins in the African past, and we’re troubled and challenged by Haiti and by Rwanda.

Of course, there is more to the transition from the older order to the new than the phenomenon of conflict. Nations are positively reordering their relations between and among each other and are rethinking the policies they had been pursuing. We see, for example, new ways of looking at the world in Southeast Asia, in Latin America. The excitement in our own Hemisphere as nations throw off the language of the past and the forms of the Cold War and emerge to make their own decisions within the context of their own culture and their own history is an excitement that is really quite contagious. Hard thinking is taking place in Europe about the definition of Europe and who will be a European. The prospects are extremely positive. Even in Germany and Japan, where there is a reluctance to take a larger role in the world that is emerging, we do see the beginning of trends that favor engagement elsewhere. Everywhere, from the Atlantic world to the Pacific, from north to south, in Africa as in Northern Europe, change is in the air. Where it will lead is not yet clear, but surely much that is good will come of it.

In that world, what do we want to say about the United States in the area of foreign policy, what do we want to say other than, “foreign policy - who needs it?” It is perhaps consistent with what Americans believe to be their unique history and their special role in the world that only Americans seem to need a cause, seem to need an enemy, seem to need a physical, visible threat to inspire us to engage internationally. It is perhaps a combination of the traditions and mythology that flow from George Washington’s admonition about entangling alliances and the Wilsonian dream expressed even today by President Clinton as “our historic mission.” Americans have a distaste for spheres of influence, balances of power, realpolitik, even though, truth to tell, we have benefited from every one of such concepts throughout our history. We have a preference, in fact, for “civilizing missions” and making the world safe for democracy. We have a preference that people be grateful when we offer them civilization and democracy. We have not been willing to sign on for the long term. In fact, only when actually, identifiably threatened or attacked — this was the case of all three of those global conflicts of this century — only then do we seem able to sustain a foreign interest and engagement. So the question at the end
of the century, as it was in the middle, as it was
the question way before President Truman and
General Marshall, is whether the United States
can afford once again to withdraw, to disengage,
to be aloof, to leave it to others, to refuse to pay
the price of small wars to avoid the large ones, to
do so not because we’re isolationists — in fact,
the shelves of Wal-Mart are so full of goods from
everywhere that we all know that we’re economi-
cally interdependent — but to refuse to engage
because we can’t agree that any of the specifics
of the international world really matter.

Well, what is at stake for America, and what kind
of a world do we really want to have emerge
from this transition? Let’s take the frosting off the
issue of why we engage internationally and say
quite simply that the United States wants to make
sure that the world external to it — the world
beyond our shores — is favorable to American
interests. We’re not trying to save anybody, we’re
trying to make sure the world is favorable to our
interests. We want to make sure that it fosters
our economic and social prosperity. We want to
make sure that it does not threaten our physical
being. The word is security. As a mature, complex
nation and society, both our prosperity and our
security are affected by events beyond our bor-
ders. Quite simply, an uncertain, unpredictable,
conflict-ridden world does not serve our most
selfish interests in the free flow of ideas, people,
resources and goods that is fundamental to our
own prosperity. Indeed, the United States can-
not prosper in a poor world. We cannot prosper
in a world mined in conflict. We cannot prosper
in a world in which there is rampant denial of
human rights. And so we have before us a new
international agenda. It is not clear who the en-
emy is. It is not clear precisely what the threat to
our security is. We cannot run up the flag at a
precise time and moment of battle. There is no
clear beachhead, and there is not an expert in
Washington today that could tell you with confi-
dence — he could tell you with bravado but not
with confidence — where the next beachhead
is likely to be. The challenge today is to ensure
that the United States is sufficiently engaged
internationally to be present when our interests
are challenged, to be present when there is an
opportunity to advance our interests, and to
ensure that when the moment comes to act we
have friends and allies and that we have means to
put our interests forward most constructively.

Must we lead? Americans don’t like the role.
We tell everybody we don’t like the leadership
role. Every so often we look up and we say, well,
where’s everybody else? We don’t want to be the
world’s policeman even if we could afford it, and
we certainly can’t. We know we have a domestic
agenda, and I’m sure at campaign time — elec-
tion time — the domestic agenda is very much
before us. We know we have an agenda that
needs to be addressed. We’d probably like to be
left alone in the world to get to it. But I must tell
you I think it’s going to take more than solitude to
find the answers to our domestic problems, and
if we in fact engage in that solitude and ignore
the world beyond our borders, at the end of that
solitude we will find that we have a larger degree
of problems. That world — the world beyond our
shores — is confusing. Adversaries have become
partners, partners have become competitors.
We’re ambivalent. We like clear choices. We want
to be able to advance human rights. We want
to protect the environment. We want to foster
democracy. We don’t like the ambiguities that
come from needing allies — and as I say, having
partners who are adversaries and partners who
are competitors.
I happen to believe — and I happen to believe in a manner consistent with the Marshall tradition — that we have only one clear choice, and that is to be part of the events of the next decades — to work to get our house in order, to be brave enough to make the choices that need to be made, to be generous enough to understand that we must bring everybody along to a new level, and to urge others through a reputation for wisdom, a reputation for statesmanship, to join us internationally in the partnerships and coalitions that task-by-task and challenge-by-challenge will solve the problems.

It is in our own interest to take the lead with others in shaping the world as it prepares for the new century. It is, I believe, in cities such as Vancouver that one finds in the Marshall tradition that America does know how to lead, that America can produce the leaders, and that when we do decide to act, we can act in a manner that gains the admiration and applause of the world. I happen to think we are at such a moment in our history now. I look forward to the appearance of that Marshall figure who will define the challenge for us and help us to realize the promise of the future.

Thank you very much.
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ALL OF US WHO HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO WORK WITH, OR FOR, GENERAL GEORGE C. MARSHALL develop the deepest respect for him. From my own perspective, what impressed me the most about the General was that he understood the practice of American democracy. He knew that to lead the United States takes more than wise policy, it takes skilled and deliberate consensus building, especially when it comes to implementing necessary unpopular policy. These were lessons I observed firsthand from General Marshall at a time when, despite widespread isolationism, he was contemplating asking the public to approve legislation authorizing our first peacetime draft. I believe that experience bears close thought today, as we face new challenges in foreign policy in an era when the public, once again, lacks much enthusiasm for American engagement abroad.

I first encountered General Marshall in August 1940. Colonel William Draper, a former business partner of mine and then an aide to General Marshall, asked me to come to Washington to work with an Army team organizing effort to bring
about the enactment into law of the original Selective Service bill. Draper had recommended me to the General for work, that today, would be called that of a systems analyst; someone who can project how a given set of people, talents, organizational arrangements, and rules and procedures can be made to work so as to produce intended results. In the work that followed, I had the opportunity to observe General Marshall, and learned from a master how the American democratic process can be brought to work in its best and most effective way.

Marshall was keenly aware of the popular and political resistance within the country to any military buildup, suggesting as it did pending U.S. involvement in the war in Europe. He believed that, for a reluctant public to accept conscription, the initiative for legislation should not come from the Army but from civilian leaders. Instead of taking the lead in pushing for a draft, the Army should design a bill and program meriting public acceptance and then should vigorously support key legislators in making the most effective case for Congressional approval.

General Marshall also insisted upon certain basic principles that he held should guide our approach to drafting the program. The draft system had to be, and appear to be fair, it had to be understandable and it had to be administered largely by grass-roots people, local people the draftees knew and understood. The most difficult specific problem turned out to be assuring equity between various localities. While some planners preferred giving disproportionate deferments to mechanics and engineers in industrial centers such as Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland and Buffalo, keeping skilled people in place for the necessary build up of equipment and material this could be viewed as being unfair by communities with no such industries. However, the armed services themselves needed large numbers of mechanics and engineers, so it was possible to design a process of selection which would surmount the problem.

Once the civilian-sponsored bill appeared before Congress, General Marshall took an active role in pushing the legislation necessary to implement it. To help muster Congressional support, Marshall made frequent trips to Capitol Hill committee hearings and became the Army’s best and most eloquent spokesman. Marshall’s methods reflected his deep-felt appreciation for wisdom of the methods of American democracy. He understood that to implement something as potentially unpopular as a peacetime draft, an administration should not try to impose such policy by decree but should instead cultivate the process of developing widespread acceptance for it. It is a lesson I carried with me afterwards in my own policy making career as I struggled with the tension between policy and practice. It is also an example in cultivating practical political support I believe we ought to reexamine if we are not to miss current opportunities of great international significance for American leadership.

Perhaps the most important development arising from the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, is that the United States now finds itself in an extraordinary situation, unmatched since perhaps the days of Rome. It presently (but not necessarily for long) dominates the world political and economic system; it is something more than first among equals, but something less than a hegemon. The next most influential powers are at once our political allies and rivals, sharing our basic values, while still pursuing their individual economic and political...
interests. In short, the world exists very much on our terms; at least we are in a unique position to influence its future if we so choose. The question is whether we plan actively to embrace the new challenges and opportunities or passively to allow events to take their own course.

The great task now before American policy makers is twofold. First, they must develop a coherent approach to the optimum future direction of U.S. foreign policy in this new environment. Second, they must gain the necessary support for that policy from an increasingly isolationist American public, not unlike the one Marshall faced over a half a century ago. The two problems go hand in hand. Not only do U.S. foreign policy goals need fresh reappraisal in light of both domestic and international political changes but, to obtain support at home for renewed U.S. engagement abroad, we must also reexamine the methods or means of reaching those goals. It is there, in the notion of committing precious U.S. lives and limited resources abroad that public support for American engagement abroad is flagging. As in Marshall’s approach to the draft, to gain public support, the purposes and means of American engagement abroad must be and appear to be necessary, wise and fair.

In reappraising our foreign policy, I believe that the first challenge for U.S. policy makers is to learn how to play a new international game, but with less compelling influence than we had prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union. The changing importance of U.S. military power in foreign policy is one example. Not only is there less domestic support for the use of American troops abroad, U.S. military power no longer carries the same weight that it once did. Superpower rivalry lent the United States a powerful voice in the affairs of the world. National security is no longer the central preoccupation of U.S. foreign policy makers, nor is a superpower struggle the unifying strategic question of international relations. While military power will continue be the iron fist within the velvet glove of diplomacy generally, its application in American foreign policy will wisely remain restricted.

A more difficult challenge for policy makers will be to put aside familiar foreign policy assumptions, among them our reliance upon established structures and relationships. One example of this is our relationship to Europe, which has been altered by both the end of the Cold War and by the reunification of Germany. In the past, Western Europe looked to the U.S. as a counterbalance to the Soviet Union and NATO, complemented by our special link to Britain, rapidly became the U.S. entree into European political affairs. While we will continue to maintain troops there, U.S. political leverage in Europe is already reduced. Furthermore, the political balance on the continent has been transformed; we must reexamine what influence we wish to have there and how best to preserve it.

The most important development in Europe has been the reunification of Germany, the policy ramifications of which, we have not yet fully addressed. We are only beginning to understand the impact of a united Germany, which will dominate Europe for the foreseeable future. Germany, its full sovereignty restored, has pursued a vigorous foreign policy, independent of both NATO and the EU, based mainly upon its economic power. It has drawn closer to Russia and has developed strong investment ties in central and eastern Europe. Each of these developments have profound implications for bilateral relations with the U.S.,
as well as NATO and the EU. At the very least we must continue to strengthen our ties with Germany, for its voice in Europe will be the loudest and through it, and not only through NATO and the UK, reforge our partnership with Europe.

We should be evaluating how the developing German-Russian link may diminish the effectiveness, or relevance, of NATO in ensuring European stability and security. In light of a growing Berlin-Moscow relationship, it may be time to begin to think beyond NATO as the cornerstone of European security and instead about how Russia might be anchored in Europe. Encouraging close ties between Berlin and Moscow will help to engage Russia with Europe and the West and may well help promote European stability better than attempting to address Russia either through or in NATO. In addition, our principal security problem is no longer to defend against a specific foe. Therefore, I believe that the applicability of traditional security alliance structures such as NATO has eroded, at least as a response to aggression or instability in an increasingly unpredictable and fluid environment. Instead, I believe a more flexible approach to foreign policy is needed, especially outside of Europe.

I propose that our over-arching foreign policy goal should be deliberately based on promoting international stability, both from a security and economic standpoint, but not necessarily based on fostering peace or an enforced status quo. Our guiding principle should be to expect conflict, preventing it where reasonably possible, but also to control subsequent escalation. While it is clearly in U.S. and world interests to promote solutions to conflicts without use of force, simply attempting to keep the peace oversimplifies the pressures behind conflict as well as the options and resources available to find solutions. We cannot hope to resolve all conflicts, nor can we always act effectively to clean up those we are unable to forestall.

For example, a continuing challenge to stability will be minority, self-determination and sovereignty issues. These range from human rights problems to nationalist or separatist movements to insurrections. Each case has complex roots and they occur globally. The United States should try to accommodate and protect international diversity, yet how do we accept diversity without allowing it to further destabilize and divide states? Instead of attempting to suppress conflicts and associated problems of intervention, as they occur, a wiser policy would be to help institutionalize and lead international reaction to diversity issues earlier, before they reach a crisis. A U.S.-led effort to set up better consultation among states over diversity issues might help create more stable transitions. It might also help avoid tragedies such as the destabilizing breakup of Yugoslavia.

At a broader level of stability, we must also seek new solutions to more traditional types of conflict, specifically responses to international aggression. Politically, the U.S. should not try to act unilaterally in response to aggression, and often will no longer have the resources or domestic support to do so. From both domestic and international perspectives, our approach in the Gulf crisis was correct and should serve as the general model for future responses: U.S. led action in the U.N. followed by diplomatic and military coalition building. This effort anticipated both the need for U.S. not to be seen abroad as intervening at will, but rather under UN auspices, as well as the problems of stretched U.S.
resources and dwindling public enthusiasm for taking on the world’s problems alone.

While there is disagreement over our own financial priorities and a problem of consensus in direction, the central reservation of the U.S. public seems to be a feeling that this country should not be expected to shoulder and solve the world’s burdens alone, not that it should not lead. As it stands, the nature of those burdens will not allow such purely unilateral or independent U.S. solutions in any case. The requirements and solutions for global stability—both in terms of conflict but also economic stability—transcend borders. It is from this approach of deliberate multilateralism that a new domestic consensus can be built and after it a new international consensus towards embracing a high profile U.S. global role.

Let me propose some fundamental principles which might guide a new multilateral approach to international stability policy under U.S. leadership, and which like Marshall’s approach to Selective Service, might form the basis of consensus. I propose that all these be grouped under a new system of regional stability partnership and institutional coalition building in response to crises.

First, I propose the ongoing and close cultivation of principal or anchoring regional partners based on parallel or coinciding interests. These would not be allies in the military sense, rather they would be political partners or proxies that share security and political interests and responsibilities in the region. As solid regional leaders, they would have greater leverage over their neighbors and would help in resolving disputes. In exchange the U.S. could offer to target developmental projects in these countries, thus more effectively spending a shrinking foreign aid dollar. An added benefit might be that such programs would become the primary conduits for U.S. aid, casting U.S. partnerships as a special reward for policy coordination.

The creation of these partner states would also lay the groundwork for the second fundamental of new policy: setting up in more stable times the institutional nucleus of ad hoc coalitions for response to crisis and conflict. I would envision our partners as spearheading coalition-building, allowing for a swifter reaction to emerging problems and perhaps facilitating peaceful solutions before force is used. In essence, we would be encouraging regional conflict resolution under U.S. leadership, but through regional players. This would allow us to distance ourselves when our direct participation could exacerbate the situation or when domestic support was limited, yet allow considerable behind the scenes leverage with the leading player in the region.

Finally, stability partnership could form part of the institutionalization of burden-sharing. A well-publicized tenet of such a new policy should be that the cost and blood of response to aggression would be shared. The partnership arrangement should be structured with regional burden sharing in mind although it is unlikely that we could always expect or demand it. A further question would be the participation of non-regional states or allies in coalition burden sharing, as in the case of the Persian Gulf War. Since such coalitions would be ad hoc to begin with and would vary by region, it would be difficult to predict participation of states outside of the region.

Under such promising beginnings for the post Cold War era, I see no reason why there cannot be a second American Century, this one based upon superior American foresight. Without territorial ambitions and as the dominant partner
in an interdependent environment, the United States has a unique leadership role in and responsibility for shaping the evolution of contemporary international relations. We began to demonstrate this new leadership during the Gulf crisis, but dropped it when it came to the Balkans. We cannot afford again to squander the opportunity to revitalize a positive and politically sustainable global role for the United States.

The domestic political problem of foreign policy boils down to reestablishing with the American public a consensus on what the future U.S. global role should be. That role should be a permanent departure from the prewar past, and a new engagement with the world. I believe that the groundwork is in place for a broadening acceptance among the American people for an America active in world affairs, but I also believe that it will again take the skill of leaders like George Marshall, dedicated to the practice of democracy, to strengthen acceptance into lasting support.
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MAYOR POLLARD, CO-CHAIRMEN TONKOVICEH AND CHRISTIAN, AND MEMBERS OF VANCOUVER’S MARSHALL COMMITTEE, DISTINGUISHED GUESTS AND STUDENTS, I want you to know that I fully appreciate and am most grateful for the honor and high compliment of being this year’s Marshall Lecturer, and Mayor Pollard, I thank you for that great and flattering introduction.

At the time I began my work in the Chief of Staff’s office, the staff consisted of Colonel Orlando Ward, Majors Maxwell Taylor, Omar Bradley and Lawton Collins and Captain Walter Bedell Smith. As these men were shortly promoted to the rank of brigadier general and given command assignments, the Chief of Staff’s office was staffed with reserve officers. I remained there throughout the war. I returned to Richmond in December 1945 when General George C. Marshall retired and was succeeded as Chief of Staff by General Eisenhower. It was a fascinating and challenging four years and gave me the opportunity to become intimately acquainted with General Marshall, both personally and professionally—an experience that has been invaluable to me throughout my life. But this is a talk about George C. Marshall, not me.

General Marshall, at age 59, was selected by Franklin D. Roosevelt, out of the blue and over 34 more senior generals, to be Chief of Staff of our Army and Air Force in September 1939—the very day that Hitler invaded Poland. From that time until his death 20 years later in 1959, he made a greater impact upon his contemporaries through sheer force of character alone than anyone I can call to mind.
I regret that neither time nor the scope of this lecture permit a discussion of (1) George C. Marshall’s World War I experiences, (2) his service and intimate relationship with General Pershing after World War I, (3) his formal and often difficult relationship with General MacArthur, (4) his modus operandi, so to speak, with those such as Winston Churchill, Field Marshal Montgomery, George Patton and Joe Stilwell to say nothing of F.D.R., Henry L. Stimson and Admiral King, (5) the equally interesting story of Marshall’s relationship with Air Force General “Hap” Arnold and how George C. Marshall kept the lid on the burning issue of a separate and independent Air Force until the end of the war, or (6) the fascinating story of the ill-fated mission to China in 1946 trying to deal with Chaing Kai-Shek and the Communists or even finally (7) the story of the complete and highly successful reorganization of the State Department which he implemented when he became Secretary of State. Among his greatest admirers have been those who served with him in the State Department such as Dean Rusk, Dean Acheson, Chip Bolin and George Kennan and the several officials from the State Department who have, among others, run the Marshall Foundation in Lexington, Virginia, in recent years. Quite obviously, his impact at the State Department was equal to his impact on the Army and Air Force during his six years as Chief of Staff.

Remember, he built and shaped from a pitiful 200,000 person Army the colossus of 8-1/2 million men and women that, by early spring 1945 was closing in on the battered Axis in western Europe and the Japanese home land. Remember, he launched the economic plan that put post-war Europe back on its fee. Remember, he reinforced the supremacy of civilian control when he recommended to President Truman the firing of General MacArthur for insubordination; and, remember, he was a major force in forging the N.A.T.O. Alliance, implementing the Berlin Airlift and developing the atomic bomb.

The story of how George C. Marshall lead the rearming of the Republic in the early 1940’s, a time of deeply and widely felt isolationism and raucous domestic politics, defines the public man himself. A citizen soldier whose patriotism, military acumen and administrative skills moved Winston Churchill to salute him on the eve of Victory in Europe (V-E) Day as “the true organizer of victory”.

The personal qualities of General Marshall, this courtly, austere officer in public with the icy blue eyes, formal public manners and serious countenance differed 180 degrees from the warm, relaxed, compassionate, considerate man of simple tastes in private life who had a saving sense of humor and a passion for simple justice. His public persona was the result of overpowering self discipline which he cultivated purposefully to suit his style of leadership. The aura he was able to create intentionally of an impersonal, wholly objective and serious public servant who would tolerate no interference with the performance of his public duties, coupled with his unshakable integrity and profound intellect, enabled him to achieve a position of respect with the media and the Congress as well as with President Roosevelt and Secretary Stimson that no other public figure even approached. This, of course, resulted in his being able to influence the media and the Congress to accept and support his views as to how to mobilize, train and equip the forces necessary to achieve victory. To Congress and the public, he spoke with candor, admitting mistakes, accepting
responsibility for error, explaining what a great nation must do to put its house in order.

Marshall was the consummate politician when it came to the media and the Congress,—subtle, yet forceful. His manner of speaking, his bearing, his unfailing courtesy were all part of an act which was profoundly successful.

But really what kind of man, what kind of person was this austere, aloof, public servant? In private life, Marshall was a remarkably considerate and thoughtful man. He was naturally a person of genuine humility and compassion. He had numerous god children to whom he wrote regularly as well as many old friends, families of soldiers, who had been wounded or killed, many young people, several French citizens whom he had known since World War I, with several members of the British nobility and with Queen Frederica of Greece and even Madame Chaing Kai-Shek. All this can be seen in General Marshall’s papers which are being published by the Marshall Foundation at Lexington, Virginia—already four of the planned seven volumes have been published and are available.

General Marshall was a large man in every sense of the world. Six feet tall, of erect bearing, straight sandy hair turned partially gray and trimmed weekly. He had the most intense blue eyes, a rather pleasant countenance with a long upper lip, a stubbly chin and an almost pug nose. On the whole he gave the impression of sturdiness yet trimness. He wore glasses for reading which he often misplaced. They were simple magnifying glasses obtainable anywhere and we kept several pair in strategic locations.

He had no children but Mrs. Marshall’s three children by a former marriage were always close to him. The youngest son Alan, who was an infantryman, was killed in the intense fighting at Anzio Beach in Italy. When the message came of Alan’s death from General Mark Clarke, we gave it to George C. Marshall. He stopped what he was doing and went immediately to Fort Myers to inform Mrs. Marshall and to remain with her the balance of the day.

My first impressions of General Marshall, whom I had never met before December 8, 1941, were the overwhelming power and force of his presence and his imperturbability under unrelenting pressure. It was truly awesome! He gave the impression that he was almost devoid of emotions but when angry or annoyed he could be glacial and his silence withering. He obviously had a real temper but he controlled it magnificently. He often said he could not afford to get angry for “that would be fatal—it’s too exhausting”. His favorite saying was “Don’t be a deep feeler and a poor thinker”.

At the same time the General constantly had great concern for the feelings of others, including his immediate staff. That is, so long as they avoided trivia and performed efficiently and unobtrusively. He was particularly impatient with verbosity and protocol and he had a large dose of irreverence for pomposity. I believe his often brusque and aloof manner was a cover to save precious time and conserve his energy in the midst of war that made incredible demands on both. After all, bear in mind, he was behind his desk in Washington trying to keep at least six major balls in the air at the same time (1) to mobilize and equip a winning Army and Air Force under a single command, (2) to keep the President and the Secretary of War informed, supportive and happy, (3) to maintain a cordial and working relationship with the often difficult Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. King, (4) to deal with the Congress and the captains...
of industry on the political issues of the draft, appropriations and war production, (5) holding off the Japanese while planning and selling to the British the plan to first attack and defeat the Axis powers head on the European continent, (6) promoting and supervising for FDR and the Secretary of War in total secrecy the planning and construction of the Atomic Bomb. No wonder his value of time and his hatred of ponderousness were so strongly felt.

The man who was probably more closely associated with Marshall over the longest period of time and who some describe as his “alter ego” was the late Robert A. Lovett. Bob Lovett was in the War Department during the entire war as Assistant Secretary for Air and was in the General’s office almost daily. He was later Undersecretary of State when Marshall was the Secretary and he held the same post in the Defense Department when Marshall was Secretary of Defense. Shortly before his death, Mr. Lovett made the following observation concerning the General which I think best describes his personal qualities:

“... I find myself wondering why so little attention has been paid by historians to some of the traits of character and virtues of General Marshall which seem to me to be of cardinal importance in his noble life.

First of all, I recall with wonderment, which quickly turns to something akin to reverence, his boundless generosity of mind and action under all circumstances.

Next, I recall his complete lack of envy both in thought and action and his willingness to hear new ideas.

Above all, I remember his grace of spirit which served to give him the incredible strength needed to bear the constant pressures placed upon him. The General was unflappable. He had style, was modest and had innate consideration of others and natural courtesy. It was therefore a great pleasure and privilege to do his bidding.”

One of the most vivid impressions I have of General Marshall was his quiet confidence in his own ability to handle people and arrive at sound judgments. There was no doubt that he was quite aware of his ability to run the Army and the war better than anyone else. His great personal force was apparent to all who saw him, though partially concealed by his calm manner and soft voice. Anyone seeing him just walking from his car to the doorway of the War Department might not know who he was but there was no doubt as to what he was. He had the presence of a great man–simple, able and candid and a very good advocate because he knew his stuff. When he came to a conclusion as to what was to be done, he said it with such firmness and such solidity that you just agreed with him and you knew he was right. I was constantly impressed with his great analytical powers and his clarity of expression. He not only had a high standard of character but the ability to express it. There was just something about him that immediately gave you a sense of loyalty to his purpose and a desire to help him fulfill that purpose.

The late Dean Acheson, as Secretary of State, had a very close relationship with General Marshall over a number of years after the war. He was impressed by the phenomenon of the General’s impelling presence. Secretary Acheson in his memoirs wrote:

The moment General Marshall entered a room everyone in it felt his presence. It was striking and communicated force. His figure conveyed
intensity, which his voice, low, staccato and incisive, reinforced. It compelled respect. It spread a sense of authority and calm. There was no military glamour about him and nothing of the martinet.

I was constantly struck with Marshall's direct, no nonsense approach to his responsibilities and his gift of the common touch. Staff members were under the strictest injunction to walk into his office without saluting (never, no never, open the door without going in--to peep in or hover was fatal), take a seat and wait until the General recognized you. At his signal you were to proceed immediately and directly with your business. He would listen with great intensity and then shoot rapid-fire questions. He listened with complete concentration, his sharp blue eyes directly on you as he sat zero degrees straight in his chair with his arms folded. He often asked your views or recommendations. When the presentation involved a paper that he was expected to sign he would take it and read it, pen in hand, almost always making corrections, additions and deletions, stamping his individual style on the document. Rarely did he approve a document without making changes.

The stories of his leadership methods are legion: “Put it on a single page for me--if you can’t get the key issue for decision on a single page, you haven’t thought it through.” And “Don’t bring me problems; bring me proposed solutions.”

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, then-Colonial Dwight D. Eisenhower was transferred from General Kreuger’s Army Headquarters in Louisiana to the Operations Division of the War Department General Staff on Marshall’s personal orders and promoted to Brigadier General. He remained there for a brief period before he was promoted to Major General and sent to England to begin the planning of the invasion of Europe. During Eisenhower’s tour of duty in the Operations Division he and the Division Chief, General Leonard Gerow, were busily engaged in preparing replies for General Marshall to the messages General MacArthur was firing daily from Bataan. The two officers came daily to the Chief of Staff’s office with their drafts and the Chief invariably made his usual corrections and changes. On one occasion, however, I recall seeing Eisenhower emerging from the Chief’s office with his famous broad grin and a paper in his hand which he patted vigorously as he said, “Hot damn, I finally got one right”. It contained none of General Marshall’s famous ink marks of deletions and additions.

In contrast to his aloof and seemingly impersonal manner in his office, in private and when traveling, Marshall was friendly, talkative and interested in your personal life. He was completely devoted to his family, Woe be it to any officer who failed to give him promptly any message from Mrs. Marshall whom he obviously loved and adored. He depended on her always as his closest friend and companion as well as a wife. Most of us had lunch each day in a small dining room opposite the Sec. of War’s office, but not Marshall. He regularly went home to Fort Myers 5 minutes away every day and lunched with Mrs. Marshall and took a ten minute nap.

In the fall of 1944 the General called me in his office one morning and said: “my stepdaughter, Mrs. Winn and her son Jimmy, age three, are visiting us--and I see by the paper that the Ringling Bros. Barnum & Bailey Circus is in town. I’d like to take Jimmy this afternoon, will you arrange it and bring your three-year-old son, Merrill, along.” I made the arrangements and when we got to the
circus entrance in the General’s official limousine, knowing how much the General detested giving autographs and being accosted by strangers, I told the driver to meet us after the show at a telephone pole I pointed out. The circus was great. “Weary Willie” the famous clown came up in the stands to amuse the two boys. After the circus was over and we got to the designated telephone pole with the crowd beginning to pester the General for autographs—there was no driver! No limousine! And I thought: This is the end of my Washington tour of duty; I’ll probably be the next recruiting officer in Attu, Alaska. I actually climbed up the pole and, to my great relief, spied the limousine at the next pole. We got away after some pushing and shoving. The General was obviously annoyed but the excitement of the two boys talking about the circus on the way home saved my skin.

Marshall’s tastes for recreation and diversion were simple. Inside that ramrod exterior was a not very good fisherman or hunter who loved to try but seldom found the opportunity. A so-so farmer who loved to garden. A driver who would pick up soldier hitch-hikers without introducing himself when he was driving alone, out of uniform, to his house in Leesburg, Virginia. He liked nothing better than horseback riding and he rode daily before partaking a hearty breakfast and arriving at the War Department at seven forty-five. When he acquired his home in Leesburg early in the war, he took obvious pleasure in gardening, trimming hedges and pruning roses.

General Leslie Groves of the Manhattan Project (atomic bomb) was kept waiting in my office one day before seeing the Chief to obtain secret authorization for a several-million-dollar increase in the project funding. When Groves came out of the General’s office shaking his head he said the General apologized for keeping him waiting explaining that he was filling out an order for seeds for his spring garden which he had forgotten to do earlier. The entire order was $6.42.

General Marshall was most perceptive in many different ways and he had a great sense of humor. On General DeGaulle’s first visit to Washington early in the war when he was the leader of the French Resistant Movement in opposition to the pro-German Vichy Government, General Marshall gave a dinner for him. It was my job to arrange the dinner. I went to the Mayflower Hotel and got everything set, including a copy of the printed menu with the French colors and stars and everything. I proudly took the menu into the General. He took one look, shook his head in disgust and said: Are you trying to create an international incident? I said no, sir, what is the problem? He said don’t you know we just can’t serve Vichyssoise to General DeGaulle—I think you had better change it to cold potato soup and tossed the menu back to me with a benign grin.

Marshall’s combination of dignity and humility were remarkable. During the war General Marshall directed the Secretary of the General Staff that if he received any decorations, honorary degrees or had a book written about him he would transfer him to the most undesirable post in the Army. The General’s simplicity and modesty were also reflected in the uniform he wore as Chief of Staff—always plain and simple, even when it bore five stars, with no fancy braid or gadgets or special hats. He permitted no flags or emblems on his car. He stubbornly avoided the social scene in Washington and shunned publicity and public acclaim. I am told that when one of his aides—without permission—sent a bodyguard to accompany
him on a trip to Princeton, the Secretary of State curtly ordered: “Have this stopped. I’d rather be murdered than embarrassed to death.”

Marshall had a fabulous memory. He appeared never to forget anything important except the names of his staff. He was able to store in his mind seemingly endless information and call it forth at will. He was most persuasive with the Congress in dealing with the adoption and extension of the draft and the periodic requests for increase in appropriations to increase the size of the Army. It was his practice never to deliver a prepared statement. Often he had one prepared which he studied thoroughly the day before. Then he would customarily tell the Committee Chairman that he was there at the Committee’s request and would attempt to answer their questions. After a few questions were asked he would proceed with an extemporaneous monologue in a most persuasive manner that covered the subject fully. This communicated a sense of authority and competence that generally resulted in his getting what he wanted. He moved Congress as few have ever done and he was equally as persuasive with our allies.

Marshall exhibited his prodigious memory and mastery of his subject in the occasional press conferences he held in his office. These were attended by 40 to 50 correspondents and radio commentators (no TV in the early 40’s). They would enter the room and take their seats. After a few pleasantries with the likes of Arthur Krock, Walter Lippman, Hansons Baldwin, Westbrook Pegler, Fulton Lewis, Jr. and others with whom he was personally acquainted, he would invite each one present to ask their questions. After hearing all the questions he would talk for 25 or 30 minutes without interruption during which time he seemed to answer every question that had been put to him without exception quite often looking at the person who had posed the question. The conferences generally adjourned when he had finished without further questions being asked. The silence of the press corps and radio commentators was powerful evidence of their respect and the completeness with which he had responded to their questions.

Marshall’s humanity and consideration for others was manifest in the intense concern he had for the welfare, both mental and physical, of the soldiers in the Army. He was constantly inquiring, on all his inspection trips, and otherwise, about the adequacy of supplies for the men, the location of the PX’s and the promptness with which medals were awarded. In many, many ways he showed that their welfare mattered greatly to him.

There is one example of this aspect of Marshall’s humanity and personal concern for his troops that is not widely known or appreciated. As the 8-1/2 million many Army was about to be mobilized and trained, Marshall frequently discussed with his immediate staff the great dilemma he faced personally of how to make the soldiers know and understand why they were fighting, why they were being asked to leave their homes and risk their very lives, when it was his responsibility ultimately to demand that they fight to their death if necessary. He felt that the training films and indoctrination speeches prepared by the Army Signal Corps and the Personnel Branch of the General Staff were unimaginative, uninspiring and ineffective. He felt that the Signal Corps and the Army Pictorial Service were not set up to produce, on a confidential basis, sensitive and objective troop information films without becoming involved in time-consuming distractions and
criticism from the media and the Congress. He personally conceived the idea of establishing a special Moral Branch in his office headed by Frederick T. Osborn, the C.E.O. of one of America’s leading pharmaceutical firms and a man of high civic standing and impeccable character.

Early in 1942 with General Osborn’s concurrence but without the knowledge of anyone else, General Marshall personally telephoned Hollywood’s leading motion picture producer Frank Capra (the equivalent of, I suppose, Steven Spielberg of today’s fame) and asked him to come to Washington to see him. He just told Capra he wanted to talk to him alone.

Capra described the interview as follows in his autobiography entitled “The Name Above the Title.”

“I walked to the door marked CHIEF OF STAFF and entered. There he sat behind a desk, gray, spare, undistinguished, quietly checking off items on a list. I was impressed by the intense concentration of this quiet man. Scribbling something quickly, he turned to me, smiling faintly—but only with his eyes.

“Good morning, Capra, he said. You know, it’s a constant inspiration to realize how many of our fine minds are giving up careers and family life, and putting on uniforms. Yes, in a total dedication in this terrible emergency.” His eyes held and searched mine. “And that’s fine. That’s America. Mr. Capra—you have an opportunity to contribute enormously to your country and the cause of freedom. Are you aware of that, sir?”

All I could blurt out was, “Well, General Marshall, I-I mean if you’re asking me does it scare the heck out of me, I’ll have to say, yessir. It does!”

With utter frankness Marshall talked for about an hour. He told Capra we were raising a very large army—around eight million—and that we were going to try to make soldiers out of boys who, for the most part, had never seen a gun. He said they were being uprooted from civilian life and thrown into Army camps. And the reason why was hazy in their minds.

“Within a short time,” he explained to Capra, “we will have a huge citizens’ army in which civilians will outnumber professional soldiers by some fifty to one. We may think this is our greatest strength, but the high commands of Germany and Japan are counting heavily on it being our greatest weakness. “They think our boys will be too soft, they say, too pleasure-loving, too undisciplined to stand up against their highly trained, highly indoctrinated, highly motivated professional armies. They are sure the spirit, the morale of their individual soldier is superior to ours. He has something to fight and die for—victory for the superman; establishing the new age of the superstate. The spoils of such a victory are a heady incentive.

After a pause Marshall asked Capra: “Now, how can we counter their superman incentive? The General went on to answer his rhetorical question. Well, we are certain that if anyone starts shooting at Americans, singly or collectively, Americans will fight back like tigers. Why? Because Americans have a long record of survival when their skins are at stake. What is in question is this: Will young, freewheeling American boys take the iron discipline of wartime training; endure the killing cold of the Arctic, the hallucinating heat of the desert, or the smelly muck of the jungle? Can they shake off the psychological diseases indigenous to all armies—boredom and homesickness?
In my judgment the answer is ‘Yes!’ Young Americans, and young men of all free countries, are used to doing and thinking for themselves. They will prove not only equal, but superior to totalitarian soldiers, if—and this is a large if, indeed—they are given answers as to why they are in uniform, and if the answers they get are worth fighting and dying for.

Marshall then addressing Capra directly said: “And that, Capra, is our job—and your job. To win this war we must win the battle for men’s minds. Osborn and I think films are the answer, and that you are the answer to such films. Now, Capra, I want to nail down with you a plan to make a series of documented, factual-information films—the first in our history—that will explain to our boys in the Army why we are fighting, and the principles for which we are fighting.”

Capra replied: “General Marshall, it’s only fair to tell you that I have never before made a single documentary film. In fact, I’ve never even been near anybody that’s made one.”

“Capra,” he said, with a slight edge to his voice, “I have never been Chief of Staff before. Thousands of young Americans have never had their legs shot off before. Boys are commanding ships today, who a year ago had never seen the ocean before.”

Capra replied: “I’m sorry, sir. I’ll make you the best damned documentary films ever made.”

He smiled and said: “I’m sure you will. We are all being asked to do what we never dreamed we could do. I’m asking you to tell our young men why they must be in uniform, why they must fight. These films are a top priority. I’ll send you and Osborn a directive to that effect. Take charge as you have in Hollywood. Any serious hitches, report them back to me. Any questions?”

Capra replied: “Plenty, sir. But I’ll find the answers.”

Frank Capra, commissioned a major, armed with the directive from General Marshall with adequate direct financing from the General, enlisted the greatest talents in America, Maxwell Anderson, Charles MacArthur, Anatole Litvak, Tony Veilleux, Robert Heller, Kurt Welch and many other authors and playwrights and without anyone in the Congress or the White House knowing anything about it produced the famous “Why We Fight” series of one hour training films.

1. Prelude to War—presenting a general picture of two worlds; the slave and the free, and the rise of totalitarian militarism from Japan’s conquest of Manchuria to Mussolini’s conquest of Ethiopia.

2. The Nazis Strike—Hitler rises. Imposes Nazi dictatorship on Germany. Goose-steps into Rhineland and Austria. Threatens war unless given Czechoslovakia. Appeasers oblige. Hitler invades Poland. Curtain rises on the tragedy of the century—World War II.

3. Divide and Conquer—Hitler occupies Denmark and Norway, outflanks Maginot Line, drives British Army into North Sea, forces surrender of France.

4. Battle of Britain—showing the gallant and victorious defense of Britain by Royal Air Force, at a time when the shattered but unbeaten British were only people fighting Nazis.

5. Battle of Russia—History of Russia; people, size, resources, wars. Death struggle against Nazi armies at gates of Moscow and Leningrad. At Stalingrad, Nazis put through meat grinder.
6. Battle of China—Japan’s warlords commit total effort to conquest of China. Once conquered, Japan would use China’s manpower for the conquest of all Asia.

7. War Comes to America—Dealt with who, what, where, why, and how we came to be the U.S.A.—the oldest major democratic republic still living under its original constitution. But the heart of the film dealt with the depth and variety of emotions with which Americans reacted to the traumatic events in Europe and Asia. How our convictions slowly changed from total non-involvement to total commitment as we realized that loss of freedom anywhere increased the danger to our own freedom. This last film of the series was, and still is, one of the most graphic visual histories of the United States ever made.

These were the seven Why We Fight films that were to revolutionize not only documentary filmmaking throughout the world, but also the horse-and-buggy method of indoctrinating and informing troops with the truth. Primarily made by the Army for the Army, they were used as training films by the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The British, Canadians, Australians, and New Zealanders used them as training films for their armed forces. Translated into French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Chinese they were shown to the armed forces of our allies in China, South America, and in various parts of Europe and Africa.

One film was shown to the American people in theaters. By an order from Winston Churchill all were shown to the British public in theaters. The Russians showed Battle of Russia throughout all their theaters. And in the chaotic months of occupation after the war, American Embassies played the Why We Fight series in enemy countries, charging ten cents for admission. The State Department has stated that these showings enriched our treasury by more than $2,500,000—a sum six times greater than their original cost. Thus, the Why We Fight series became our official, definitive answer to: What was government policy during the dire decade 1931-41?

It was Marshall’s humanity and his experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps here in the State of Washington that lead him personally to conceive and add a new revolutionary concept to the American Army, a Morale Division which catered to the welfare of the mind and soul of a soldier. For the first time a heart was implanted into a military system that had referred to service-men as “bodies” and “numbers”.

The most remarkable example of Marshall’s personal character occurred when the time came to choose the Supreme Allied Commander for the invasion of Europe; most everyone, from Churchill to the entire American military establishment, thought General Marshall the perfect choice. Yet when President Roosevelt pressed him for a recommendation, General Marshall, with a devout belief in civilian control, refused to lift a hand on his own behalf, insisting the president must be free to make the choice.

These are General Marshall’s actual words in describing the conference with the President, taken from a taped interview with Dr. Forest Pogue his biographer:

As I recall [Mr. Roosevelt] ... asked me after a great deal of beating about the bush just what I wanted to do. Evidently, it was left up to me. Well, having in mind all this business that had occurred in Washington and what Hopkins had
told me, I just repeated again in as convincing language as I could, that I wanted him to feel free to act in whatever way he felt was to the best interest of the country and to his satisfaction and not in any way to consider my feelings. I would cheerfully go whatever way he wanted me to go and I didn’t express any desire one way or the other .... Then he evidently assumed that concluded the affair and that I would not command in Europe. Because he said, “Well I didn’t feel I could sleep at ease if you were out of Washington.

This account shows no emotion yet it dealt with the greatest drama of his life; the voluntary renunciation of his enduring ambition and the handing over of the Supreme Command to General Eisenhower, whose way to the Presidency it then made possible.

When FDR finally selected General Eisenhower to lead what became the Normandy invasion, General Marshall never expressed any regret and reveled in his subordinate’s success.

Though many may have forgotten George C. Marshall, his memory and heritage live on in Lexington, Virginia, where a private foundation, The Marshall Foundation, maintains a library of his records and memorabilia which is most impressive and is visited by thousands each year. I hope many of you here today can visit this library and museum. I strongly recommend it. Each spring, the two top senior ROTC students from every college ROTC unit in America are invited by the Foundation to Lexington for a three-day seminar on Marshall and leadership. The Army funds this project and each year the C/S and Secretary of Defense or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff come and speak. It is an impressive group of future leaders–95 of the over 250 were female last year. General Colin Powell, Chairman of the JCS spoke in Lexington in 1993, having the following to say about Marshall in addressing the ROTC students:

“...I turn to Marshall often for inspiration and wisdom. And the better I understand the challenges he had to face, the better I understand what a giant he truly was...

“...The values that made George Marshall one of the greatest of Americans, are not values that apply only to long dead heroes. They are the very real measures of a person’s worth in every generation, and they will be for as long as there is a human civilization worth defending.”

What is it about George Marshall that reaches across the years to touch so many Americans? He was certainly no flamboyant general. He was not a “character”. There were no pearl-handled revolvers or corncob pipe or crusty anecdotes to spice up the Marshall legend and there was no hand grenade strapped to his chest. He never wrote a book to tell his story, despite numerous lucrative offers, always saying he had been well paid for his service and did not need to be paid twice for doing his duty. He never ran for public office. He never sought popularity. He never exploited his fame. He never sought or asked for favors or recognition. He was a man driven more than anything else, by sense of duty, by the powerful, overpowering obligations of service. When he finally gave in and agreed to an official biography to be written by Forrest Pogue and to the eventual publication of his papers, it was with the expressed and explicit stipulation that no financial gain or monetary profit or compensation, of any kind should come to him or to the benefit of his family as a result of the publication and sale. His lifetime in the Army, he once observed,
had been more than honor and reward enough. He often said what he had done as a soldier was simply not for sale.

To those who knew and loved General Marshall, it was no accident that the architect of military victory in Europe, should, as Secretary of State, be the architect of the Marshall Plan to help Europe recover from “hunger, poverty, deprivation, and chaos” nor was it a surprise to us that he was honored with the Nobel Peace Prize. Such was his essential humanity and his commitment to public service and community involvement.

I close with a quotation which summarizes in a few words what I have tried to say. It comes from a new book just published in September of this year. It is the biography of America’s famous diplomat, David E. Bruce, former Ambassador to England, France, and East Germany and a major factor in the administration of the Marshall Plan. The author of the biography, after referring to Marshall as the architect of victory in the war and a latter day embodiment of Roman civic virtue, quotes Ambassador Bruce’s description of General Marshall:

“(Marshall) radiated a sort of majesty about his selflessness. He was ‘a wonderful combination of strength, understanding, and almost gentleness. He always spoke to the purpose. Although he never thundered like a prophet, you found yourself clinging to every syllable he utters, afraid of missing any of it.’ He was not a man to be trifled with, an impressive personality, soft spoken and charming, but not one with whom anybody would dare to take liberties. His moral character was almost physically apparent.”

I hope I have given you this morning, some insight into the sterling and exceptional personal qualities of this most remarkable man of the twentieth century to whom each of us owes so much and the strong positive effect these personal qualities had on his unparalleled success as a preeminent leader in time of war and in preserving the peace. It was through the NATO Alliance, the policy of containment and the plan to rebuild Europe, in all of which Marshall played the dominant role, that the peace was preserved. I doubt that there has ever been a more impressive record of success in the history of statesmanship. ∗
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I am proud and pleased and honored to be with you where I have felt the warmth of Vancouver, the legacy of George Marshall and the friendship of many of you. And it is very special because tomorrow I will be at the United Nations where we (the members of the permanent five: Britain, France, Russia, the United States and China) will receive a potential diplomatic solution to this crisis in Iraq. And I hope it will be a diplomatic solution we can support. So there is a lot at stake right now in terms of our national security interests in the Persian Gulf.

But, when I come out to Vancouver and I see the great military tradition and the foreign policy legacy and the warmth of people like (Mayor) Royce (Pollard) and Jane Jacobsen, who put this event together, I am very grateful. I was just over at the Marshall House where Mary Rose and a great number of staff welcomed me...I saw many of you there...and you showered me with gifts, which I will take courtesy of the U.S. Air Force back to Washington and New York.

So I want to say thank you. I also want to thank Mayor Pollard, who found out one of my weaknesses–cigars. And he gave me a couple of very good ones...not Cuban. But there have been some very nice gestures from all of you.

It is a great honor to be here. Again, I’m sorry I couldn’t be here in November. But, as Royce said, I am going to make a personal commitment either by video or some other means to come to talk to the young people. It would behoove us if we gave the Vancouver USA singers another great hand.
I want to read you a prepared statement because, sometimes, those of us in politics get a little glib. And we don’t deliver our message. Today, I want to deliver a message of what’s in America’s interests and talk a little about the United Nations. But most importantly, I want to talk about the legacy of George Marshall because, after all, this is why we are here, this is what we are celebrating.

Let me first say what a great honor it is to be here. I want to personally thank Mayor Royce Pollard and the City of Vancouver, on behalf of my staff, for all the incredible work you have put into this evening.

I’m sorry I couldn’t be here in November, but little things like Saddam Hussein tend to take up much of my time.

I am told that this is the second fastest growing county in America, and I am not going to let Saddam Hussein, for the second time, spoil my visit here.

One of the great perks of my job—besides my venerated title of his excellency and plenipotentiary—is traveling around the United States talking directly to the American people about the importance of both the United Nations and, perhaps Gen. Marshall’s greatest legacy, U.S. engagement and leadership in the international arena.

I know that when I come to Washington state that I’m usually preaching to the choir.

If there is one part of America that doesn’t need convincing about the importance of U.S. engagement it should be this region.

More than almost anywhere else in America, the Pacific Northwest is seeing tangible benefits from international engagement.

Nearly half a million jobs in Washington alone are supported by international trade.

Exports are up by 16% and the trade balance here is one of the best in the country.

And in Oregon, more than 100,000 jobs dependent on trade and exports are up by almost 50%.

To those from Portland, Oregon who are in the crowd, I am sorry I had to cancel out on you tomorrow morning. I apologize for that. But I have to go back where, once again, we will not just take up this diplomatic initiative of the Secretary-General but will meet with the President in the afternoon.

Of course, any state like Washington with the proud legacy of Senator Scoop Jackson—one of the great foreign policy legislators in our history—needs no reminding that our engagement in the world is about more than commercial links or naked self-interest.

If there is one lesson we can draw from this century it is that when America leads, when America remains engaged and when America uses its vast power in a benevolent and enlightened manner, the prospects of a tomorrow brighter and safer than today are significantly enhanced.

George Marshall understood this and it’s one of the reasons he dedicated his life to ensuring that the promise of freedom and democracy was a reality across the globe.

As a student of American history, I have long considered George Marshall to be one of the truly great Americans of our century, and I salute the City of Vancouver for ensuring that his legacy is passed down to the next generation.
You are doing that here today, not just by starting this lecture and attending this lecture series, but by ensuring that the home where he lived and had his meetings and had his strategic thinking is preserved.

While he was first and foremost an American patriot, George Marshall dedicated his life to ensuring that the promise of freedom and democracy was a reality, not just in America, but across the globe.

He understood that as the world’s greatest force for peace and democracy, America’s vast responsibilities of global leadership required a vision transcending naked self-interest or parochial concerns.

And as a soldier and a statesman, he helped to create institutions that advance America’s interests by serving the world.

In World War I, as an aide to General Pershing, George Marshall fought to bring peace and stability to a European continent exhausted from four years of horrific conflict.

Here in Vancouver, George Marshall taught the generation of young men who passed through the Vancouver Barracks and the Civilian Conservation Corps the importance of leadership, commitment to service and dedication to duty—traits that would serve them well in the troubled times to come.

Soon after, as Army Chief of Staff, he guided America’s crusade to free millions from the yoke of fascism and totalitarianism.

After the war, his simple but immeasurable and important Marshall Plan threw “a lifeline to sinking men,” and ensured that the people of Europe would rebuild their shattered nations. Today, four of the seven richest nations in the world are Marshall Plan recipients.

Clearly that will be his greatest legacy, the rebuilding of Europe.

Finally, his efforts in helping to create NATO guaranteed that the threat of communism would remain forever contained from infecting all of Europe.

Yet today, we see that legacy of George Marshall when nations are clamoring to join NATO, nations that in the past objected to NATO’s intentions.

It is no exaggeration to suggest, as some historians have, that George Marshall may be as responsible as any American alive for the eventual fall of the Berlin Wall, the reunification of Germany and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

As we gather this evening to celebrate his legacy, we must ensure that the principles that guided his life are not forgotten by the next generation of Americans.

Today, America enjoys an unrivaled position of economic, political and military strength. In fact, some have suggested that not in 500 years has the gap between the number one nation and its closest rival been so vast.

And as George Marshall said of America 50 years ago, in words that ring true today, “We are young in world history, but these ideals of ours we can offer to the world with the certainty that they have the power to inspire and to impel action.”

As a global power, America cannot shirk from the responsibilities of international leadership and we cannot turn our back to the enormous challenges, threats and opportunities facing this nation. We see those challenges in Asia, your gateway here in Vancouver, where a growing
financial crisis threatens the economics of some of our largest trading partners and in time could come to affect Americans directly—particularly on those who rely on foreign trade for their livelihood.

We see direct threats in the spread of infectious disease across porous national borders, the continued degradation and destruction of the environment and the growth of international crime syndicates.

And we see opportunities when we consider the enormous economic potential of emerging democracies in Latin America, Asia and Africa.

Today, we can look to a future that is far brighter—one that George Marshall never realized—but that was set in motion by his actions and by his leadership.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, democracy has begun a global march unprecedented in human history. From Nicaragua to Namibia and South Korea to the former Soviet Union, freely elected leaders, a vibrant and open press and the right to gather and speak one’s mind are accepted and recognized aspects of civil society.

Today, national leaders understand that open economies, free markets and technological advancement are a far greater barometer of national strength than policies of conquest.

Across the world, people are living longer, children are receiving a better education, fields that once lay fallow are today being cultivated, precious natural reserves are being protected and millions are making the most of new-found economic possibilities.

But, as we’ve seen through history these opportunities can also be squandered.

At the beginning of this century, a best-selling book argued that the interdependence of world economies would ensure that no nation would ever again go to war against another. Of course, as we all know, the optimism of that time would soon be drowned out by the first rifle shots and cannon fire of the bloodiest and deadliest of all centuries.

Today, America and the world finds itself in a similar position, but one where the economic, political, military and cultural strength of the United States is unparalleled. And with that great power comes responsibility—a responsibility to ensure that a century, which began in war, ends at peace.

So, when the world calls for American leadership and when our national interests are jeopardized, we have a responsibility to respond. Today, at this very moment, in the Persian Gulf, we are seizing the mantle of international leadership, sometimes being criticized, but recognizing that mantle was one that George Marshall understood too well.

Today, more than ever, the United States remains committed to what has been a trying but consistent effort over the past seven years: ensuring that Iraq’s ability to threaten its neighbors is minimized and that its capability to produce weapons of mass destruction (anthrax, poison gas, killer diseases inflicted on its own people) are significantly curtailed.

Because, after nearly two decades of brutal and dictatorial rule, what we have in Iraq is a situation that requires response. Today, the U.N. suspects that Iraq maintains ingredients to make 200 tons of VX nerve gas, 31,000 chemical weapons munitions, 17 tons of growth media for biological agents as well as long-range missiles and large quantities of anthrax.
On their own, these weapons are obviously quite dangerous. But, in the hands of Saddam Hussein, who has repeatedly used them, they represent a grave and unacceptable threat to international peace and security.

Unless U.N. inspectors are able to do their job effectively, we are compelled to protect our national interests and seek all possible means in ensuring that the threat Saddam poses to his neighbors and to the world is reduced.

The stakes are high. Let me be clear: if force is used against Iraq the burden of responsibility will fall squarely on the shoulders of Saddam Hussein. We do not seek to use force, we would prefer a diplomatic, peaceful solution. Our policy is diplomacy backed by the threat of force. The events of the past have taught us that the only response to those would thwart the will of the international community and engage in illegal behavior is firmness, determination and, if necessary, force.

If we fail to act today, Saddam and all those who would follow in his footsteps by producing or using weapons of mass destruction will believe they can act with impunity tomorrow. For your future and your children’s future, we cannot allow that to happen.

Now, if anything positive has come out of the events of recent months it is to remind Americans of the essential roles of the United Nations in maintaining America’s national interests.

The U.N. Inspection team is a U.N. agency. An agency that has destroyed 38,000 chemical weapons since the Gulf War. It is an entity that contains 17 percent Americans but is represented in its make-up by 43 countries. What we need to do in the days ahead is hope that peace will come through diplomacy, through the United Nations, through the efforts of the Secretary-General. But it is clear that America cannot retreat from its principles in insisting:

- Number one, that for all of these sites there should be free, unimpeded access, unconditional...to every single site, presidential, sensitive. That Saddam Hussein not have the right to say “In this site, it is out of bounds.”

- Secondly, that the composition of the UN inspection teams be one that is not politicized, that is maintained for professional integrity. What we want to do in Iraq is to simply bring stability to this region. What we want to do is contain Saddam Hussein. Our objective is not to invade the nation. Our objective is to say to Saddam Hussein, “We will not allow you to continue building weapons of mass destruction, we will seek to diminish your capacity to build these weapons, their delivery systems...and we will stop nowhere to ensure that this happens. We will not tolerate your predisposition to threaten your neighbors.”

Somebody has to step up to the plate. Great Britain and America and 18 other nations have said that, if necessary, they will go through the use of force.

I have traveled around the world in Asia, Africa and Latin America and many nations that have not spoken out to those who are opposed to our objectives, and they have stated that they will stand with us. This is not a battle between Iraq and the United States. It is a battle between Iraq defying the international system, defy the world order, defying U.N. Security Council resolutions. This is a country that provoked the United States
to war seven years ago. We won that war and one of the conditions of the cease-fire was the ability of the U.N. inspection teams to destroy these weapons that were used on our own soldiers, that were used on the Iraqi people, that were used on Iran, that were used throughout the region...and the United States will not shirk back from this responsibility.

So, I come to you here, hoping, as an American policy maker, that perhaps a peace initiative, perhaps a diplomatic arrangement will succeed in the days ahead. I cannot preclude the fact that America, too, has to look at how this affects the international system and our national interests, and I know our friends in Great Britain will, too. And hopefully others in the U.N. Security Council that have stood for compliance by Iraq, that have stood for free and unfettered access to all of these sites, that have stood behind us as we have rallied the world to stop these practices by this brutal dictator, will once again stand behind us.

I am right now feeling that the American people want to discuss this issue fully. When we commit men and women in uniform to war, the American people want to know why, they want to know the reasons, they want to know the goal, they want to know the objective. And sometimes, despite polls saying that 72 percent of the American people support the policy, there are those who dissent, there are those who show up at Ohio State University with our foreign policy makers, who showed up in Minnesota and showed up right here, and in a very civilized fashion gave me a piece of paper saying they were opposed to war. That is our system. That is democracy. That is an open society that can disagree. Those are the legacies that George Marshall stood for, ensuring that America can be defended by men and women to protect those ideals of dissent. And if we snuff out those ideals of dissent, even though I can tell you in Minnesota I only gave about 30 percent of my speech because I was drowned out, that the men and women here in Vancouver Barracks fought for those individuals to be able to do that to me and anybody in a position of power.

So, as I come here and spend time with Royce, and want to stay here longer, and want to be able to be part of the generation of new Vancouver young people who hopefully I will address in the future, I want to say to you that as an American policy maker, as someone in the President's cabinet, it has reinforced me to go back and say to the President that we have Americans here who care deeply about the country, who want to know more answers and have more questions about our policies. But that deep down they know the price, many times, for unpopular action is American leadership because you have had this legacy before in this great community. I thank you, may God bless you, invite me back and I will be here.★
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GOOD AFTERNOON AND HELLO VANCOUVER! Mayor Pollard, thank you for that introduction.

Governor Locke, I deeply appreciate your being able to join us today. My friend Senator Murray, Senator and Mrs. Hatfield, General Smith, Dr. Erickson, Mr. Eccleston, President Sweet, Elizabeth Rainey, Jeff Raun, teachers, students, guests and friends, I am delighted to be here and thank you all for coming.

It is a great honor to participate in what I consider to be one of the foremost lecture series in the United States. And I want to begin by thanking the Hudson’s Bay volleyball team for giving up your practice so we could use your gym. I would also like to extend a special greeting to the thousands of students around the region who, I am told, are watching this event on television.

Earlier this year, in New Zealand, I said that one of my role models was Xena, the Warrior Princess. Tomorrow being Halloween, I thought I would offer that image to help you stay awake while I speak.
Seven years ago, this lecture was delivered by Colin Powell, who said that of all the military leaders in American history, General George Marshall stood head and shoulders above the rest.

It is an astonishing truth about the person we honor in this lecture series that the first thing I did when I became Secretary of State was hang in my office a portrait of the greatest diplomatic leader in American history, former Secretary of State George Marshall.

Winston Churchill called Marshall “a great American, but more than that.” For by his vision and capacity for decision, Marshall helped lift an entire continent from its knees.

In recent years, we seem to have observed the fiftieth anniversary of everything from the end of World War II to the founding of the United Nations to the breaking of the color line in baseball.

Today brings to mind another such anniversary. For it was in 1948 that Congress approved the famous plan that bears George Marshall’s name. That plan extended a lifeline of billions of dollars in aid and technical help to a Europe devastated by war.

By offering that lifeline, America helped unify Europe’s west around democratic principles, curbed Communist inroads and planted the seeds of a trans-Atlantic partnership the fruits of which we are still harvesting.

Just as important was the expression of American leadership that the Marshall Plan conveyed. After World War I, America had withdrawn from the world, shunning responsibility and avoiding risk.
Others did the same. The result was unchecked aggression in Asia and the rise of great evil in the heart of Europe.

After the trauma of World War II and the soul-withering horror of the Holocaust, it was not enough to say that the enemy had been vanquished—that what we were against had failed.

Marshall’s generation was determined to build a lasting peace. And the message that generation conveyed from the White House, from both parties on Capitol Hill, and from the millions of average Americans who donated to the relief effort, was that this time America would not turn inward; this time, America would lead.

Today, almost a decade after the Cold War’s end, it is not enough for us to say that Communism has failed. We, too, must heed the lessons of the past, accept responsibility for the future, and lead.

Because we face no superpower rival, our task is different than that faced in Marshall’s day. But although it may seem less dramatic, it is no less important. For the choices we make will determine whether the world begins the new century falling apart in crisis and conflict; or coming together around basic principles of political and economic freedom, the rule of law, and a commitment to peace.

If we are wise and strong enough, our citizens will benefit from a world economy that has regained its footing and resumed broad-based growth. We will find it safer and more rewarding to study, trade, travel and invest abroad. And our armed forces will be called upon less often to respond to urgent and deadly threats.

In such a world, more people in more nations will recognize their stake in abiding by the international rules of the road and in seeing that others do so as well. Nations will be more likely to work together to respond to new dangers, prevent conflicts and solve global problems. There will be a growing and principled consensus about what is fair and unfair on trade, and what is right and wrong on human rights.

The most we can hope, in our time, is to build a solid foundation for such a world. It is, nevertheless, a tall order. And fulfilling it will require that we pass some rigorous tests, both as a government and as a people.

First, and most generally, we must fortify the relationships that comprise the heart of the international system, while helping nations that are weak, troubled or in transition to participate more fully.

This is the job that dominates the day to day diplomacy of the United States.

For example, in Europe, we are striving to fulfill the vision Secretary Marshall proclaimed but the Cold War prevented: the vision of a Europe whole and free, united as President Clinton has said, “not by the force of arms but by the possibilities of peace.”

Last year, NATO invited the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary to join in reality the alliance for freedom that their peoples have always embraced in spirit. And across the continent, militaries whose guns were once pointed at each other are now deployed beside each other building peace in Bosnia and planning for the security of Europe’s future.

In Asia and the Pacific, we see a region of immense dynamism and optimism despite the current financial problems.
To build security, we have broadened our military cooperation with our close ally Japan. We have urged North Korea to end its dangerous and self-imposed isolation. And we are engaged in a strategic dialogue with China aimed at expanding cooperation in areas where we agree and making progress on others, such as human rights and trade, where we do not yet see eye to eye.

In Africa, poverty, disease and disorder have cut off millions from the international system. But Africa is a continent rich both in human and natural resources. Its best leaders understand the need to end the devastating civil and cross border conflicts that slow economic and social progress. They understand, as well, the need to pursue reforms that help private enterprise and democratic institutions gain a foothold.

As President Clinton’s visit to the region earlier this year reflects, we are committed to helping all those in Africa who believe in human freedom and are prepared to do what is necessary to help themselves.

Closer to home, through the Summit of the Americas process, we have forged a hemispheric commitment to defend democracy, expand commercial ties, fight the war against drugs, and maintain peace from Patagonia to Prudhoe Bay. It is encouraging that Colombia’s new President Pastrana, with whom President Clinton and I met earlier this week, seems determined to lead his long-troubled country into a new era of stability and law.

Strengthening the bonds that hold the international system together is an ongoing challenge. A second challenge, new and urgent, is responding to the global financial crisis.

Over the past quarter century, the vision of expanded trade and free markets that was embodied in the Marshall Plan has helped prosperity to spread, not only in Europe, but around the world. Hundreds of millions of people have lifted themselves out of poverty. Even with the current crisis, per capita incomes in Korea and Thailand are 60% higher than a decade ago.

These policies have paid especially high dividends here in the American Northwest, where the economy is an export powerhouse, and the boom in trade with Asia has provided good jobs in everything from computers to shipping to agriculture.

Now, however, these policies are being tested. The crisis of financial confidence which began in Southeast Asia has spread to East Asia and Russia and now endangers economies in our own hemisphere. There remains a risk that leaders in some nations will panic and turn to the false god of protectionism or the impossible goal of isolation in today’s global economy.

The Administration is determined to get the prosperity train back on track.

To this end, President Clinton has outlined a bold plan for restoring growth and preventing the further spread of the crisis in financial confidence.

We are doing all we can to help American firms remain competitive in Asia.

Congress has approved our share of resources for the International Monetary Fund.

The independent Federal Reserve Board has cut interest rates—twice. And Japan has finally begun to take the steps needed to get its huge economy moving in the right direction.

The best news, however, would be if the shock of this crisis results in a commitment to sounder and more transparent financial practices around the
globe. It is encouraging that some of the countries hit hardest, especially Thailand, Korea and Brazil, have responded by deepening their commitment to democracy, fighting corruption and undertaking difficult economic reforms.

As we look ahead, we know that the health of the global economy will depend on maintaining and expanding the commitment to open trade, open markets and open books. But we also know that there are problems that markets alone cannot solve.

This is a lesson we learned in our own country when we adopted laws to ensure the integrity of our financial system and created programs to help our citizens cope with economic dislocations.

The changes needed to put the global economy back on track will not occur overnight. The economies most directly affected must continue to take the medicine that will help them get well. Our allies in Europe and Asia must do their part in restoring growth.

And our international financial institutions must do more to help countries cope with the social hardships created by the current crisis, and develop better strategies for preventing future ones.

A third major challenge to the international system is posed by the competition among different nations and peoples for land, resources and power.

This challenge is as old as history itself; but as the years go by and technology continues to advance, it is ever more urgent. Today, sophisticated weapons are more available, more deadly, more mobile and less expensive than ever before.

Our task is to do all we can to restrain and channel such competitions, so that differences are resolved peacefully and with respect for the legitimate rights of all.

To do this, we must help people in trouble-plagued regions to place their hopes for the future above bitter memories of the past; to put reconciliation above revenge; and to transform old battlegrounds into the common ground of mutual security and the search for a better life.

Americans may be proud that around the world our country is standing shoulder to shoulder with the peacemakers against the bombthrowers; supporting the Good Friday agreement in Northern Ireland; trying to end conflict in Central Africa; working with our partners to implement the Dayton Accords in Bosnia; and—as we have seen so dramatically these past two weeks—striving to overcome obstacles to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The memorandum signed by Israeli and Palestinian leaders in Washington last week reaffirms that negotiations work. It demonstrates that, regardless of their differences, Israelis and Palestinians want to find an alternative to protracted conflict and that they recognize that a viable negotiating process can get them there.

The agreement brings tangible benefits to both sides. Palestinian jurisdiction over lands on the West Bank will increase substantially, and new economic opportunities have been created. Israel will benefit from the Palestinian commitment to wage an unprecedented, systematic and structured effort to fight and defeat terror.

Enormous obstacles remain, but by creating circumstances for launching permanent status negotiations, both sides will now have a chance to talk about the issues that will define and resolve a real Israeli-Palestinian peace.
The understandings reached at the Wye Plantation provide further evidence that the peace process is resilient and can overcome severe setbacks. But it still has a long way to go. Last week, Israeli and Palestinian leaders made the hard choices required to reach an agreement. Now they must make the hard choices necessary to implement that agreement and to set the stage for further progress.

Our effort to build peace in the Middle East and elsewhere is not international social work, as some suggest.

It is smart for America, because we are better off when regional conflicts do not arise, threatening friends, creating economic disruptions and generating refugees. And it is also right for America to help others avoid unnecessary bloodshed, and enable people to enjoy what President Clinton has called the quiet miracle of a normal life.

A fourth challenge we face is the need to repel threats posed by governments and factions that have contempt for international standards of law and human rights.

Our foremost effort here is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and poison gas.

Some point to the South Asia nuclear tests earlier this year and to the spread of missile technologies and say that arms control is futile. They say that because nonproliferation rules are sometimes broken, we should accept a world with no such rules at all. That is dangerous nonsense. Certainly it will take more than treaties to keep Americans secure.

We need the best defense we can devise, the best intelligence we can develop and the best emergency planning we can prepare. But we also need the best legal framework we can establish to detect and diminish these threats and discredit those who brandish them. By so doing, we can cut the number of weapons we might one day face, and reduce the chance that the deadliest arms will fall into the wrong hands.

For example, we will be safer if we keep working with Russia to reduce nuclear arsenals and prevent nuclear smuggling. We are determined that no nukes should become “loose nukes.”

We will be safer if, through our diplomacy, North Korea’s dangerous nuclear program can be forever put to rest, and we are able to persuade that country to end its reckless development and sale of missile technologies.

We will be safer if we can give enforcement teeth to the Biological Weapons Convention, and if we can develop a sound bipartisan approach to the issue of ballistic missile defense.

And we will be safer if we can bring the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty into force. Its purpose is to ban nuclear explosive tests of any size, for any purpose, in any place, for all time. There could be no greater gift to the future.

To protect our security, we must also wage and win the battle against international terror.

As the U.S. Embassy bombings in Africa so tragically demonstrated, well-financed terrorist leaders such as Osama bin Laden have vowed to kill Americans worldwide. Their goal is to cause our country to abandon its friends, allies and responsibilities. To that, I can only say, that the nation whose finest planted the flag at Iwo Jima and plunged into Hell at Omaha Beach will not be intimidated.

Our flag will continue to fly wherever we have interests to defend. The President has requested,
and Congress has approved, funds to help us better protect our people. And we will fight the struggle against terror on every front on every continent with every tool, every day.

In Kosovo, another threat to international stability has arisen as a result of the repression perpetrated by Serbian President Milosevic.

In recent days, NATO’s threat to use force if necessary to end Serb atrocities has led to the withdrawal of troops and allowed civilians displaced by violence to begin returning home. International monitors, backed by NATO overflights, will seek to ensure that President Milosevic lives up to the promises he has made.

Meanwhile, we are urging the parties to find a political solution that would end the crisis and bring democratic self-government to the people of Kosovo.

Fifth and finally, we face the challenge of sustaining progress around the world towards democracy and respect for human rights.

Now, there are those who cling to the false sense of order that comes when political dissent is stifled and everyone knows his or her place. They haul out the old stereotypes and say that, “Well, freedom may work in some places, but the people in such and such a country are not ready; they do not really want it; they do not really need it.” To use a diplomatic term of art, that is balderdash.

No society can reach its potential unless its people are free to choose their leaders, publish their thoughts, worship their God and pursue their dreams.

This is a lesson we have learned time and again this century, from South Africa to South Korea and from Central Europe to Central America. It is a lesson we hope will be applied now in Cambodia, Indonesia and Nigeria. In each country, new leaders have an historic opportunity to bring their nation into the democratic fold. If that is their choice, the United States will do all it can to help.

We must also be willing to speak out for human rights and for religious and political freedoms whether they are under assault in a small country such as Burma or a big country such as China. And if we are told to mind our own business, we must respond that human rights are our business because, as Martin Luther King once said, “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.”

We must strive, as well, to improve working conditions around the world. Because I suspect you are like me. When we buy a blouse or a shirt, we want to know that it was not produced by people who were under-age, under coercion, in prison or denied their basic right to organize.

We Americans cannot and will not accept a global economy that rewards the lowest bidder without regard to standards. We want a future where profits come from perspiration and inspiration, not exploitation.

We must also do all we can to advance the status of women, because no country can grow strong and free when denied the talents of half its people.

In years past, we have made enormous progress. But today, around the world, terrible abuses are still being committed against women. These include domestic violence, dowry murders, mutilation and forced prostitution. Some say all this is cultural and there’s nothing we can do about it. I say it’s criminal and we each have an obligation to stop it.
Last but not least, the United States must continue to lead the world in its support for the international war crimes tribunals, because we believe that the perpetrators of genocide and ethnic cleansing should be held accountable, and those who see rape as just another tactic of war must pay for their crimes.

Some decades ago, in the depth of Cold War tensions, Walter Lippman wrote about the realities of his time in words that may serve as a warning to ours.

“With all the danger and worry it causes ...the Soviet challenge may yet prove...a blessing” [wrote Lippman]. “For...if our influence...were undisputed, we would, I feel sure, slowly deteriorate. Having lost our great energies because we did not exercise them, having lost our daring because everything was...so comfortable. We would...enter into the decline which has marked...so many societies...when they have come to think there is no great work to be done. For then the night has come and they doze off and they begin to die.”

Although Mr. Lippman was often right during his career, I am convinced that on this point he was wrong.

For almost as long as I have been alive, America has played the leading role within the international system. And today, from the streets of Sarajevo to villages in the Middle East, from classrooms in Central America to courtrooms at The Hague, the influence of American leadership is as deeply felt as it has ever been.

This is not the result of some foreign policy theory. It is a reflection of American character.

We Americans have an enormous advantage over many other countries because we know who we are and what we believe. We have a purpose. And like the farmer’s faith that seeds and rain will cause crops to grow; it is our faith that if we are true to our principles, we will succeed.

Let us, then, do honor to that faith. As we seek to find our way through an era of great turbulence and new dangers, let us reject the temptation of complacency and follow instead the example set for us by Secretary of State and General George C. Marshall.

Let us be doers. And by living up to the heritage of our past, let us together fulfill the promise of our future—and enter the new century free and respected, prosperous and at peace.

To that mission, this afternoon, I pledge to you my own best efforts, and respectfully summon your support.

And I thank you once again for the opportunity to be here with you this afternoon.★
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THANK YOU VERY MUCH, SENATOR Hatfield and my friend Governor Locke. It’s always wonderful to have the governor of a large and important state like Washington with a wife who works for NBC, because he almost never fails to mention the NBC news organization when he refers to his wife as well.

Mr. Mayor, thank you, and my good friends who are there from the Greatest Generation book, but especially to the citizens who I know have been such generous hosts to all of them out there this weekend.

I’m obviously very sorry that I can’t be with you today in person in Vancouver. I cannot tell you how much I looked forward to this occasion, but the news and my day job do have ways of interfering with the best-made plans. Frankly, I’m just off the airplane from Moscow. I left here on Tuesday night, flew through the night to Moscow, conducting the interview with Vladimir Putin, the new president, last night in Moscow. Went without sleep, got on the plane early this morning so I could get back through Frankfurt and into New York in time to share this time with you.

There is an important summit meeting, as I’m sure many of you are aware, this weekend in Moscow between President Clinton and Vladimir Putin. We begin the 21st century with a whole new relationship between these two most powerful countries in the world. Think about it: During World War II they were allies, then for the Cold
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War we were bitter enemies pointing at each other nuclear arsenals capable of destroying life on earth as we know it. And now, in many ways, the United States is the benefactor and the protector of Russia’s future. Russia will have to decide for itself which direction it goes in. But until it is stable, the United States will have a continuing role in terms of national security and economic stability for that great country. So that, too, is something we all have to be thinking about.

I have been thinking about what the man that we honor here today would think of this world as we enter a new century. As you know, I returned from Moscow after the first interview with President Putin. He is the first of Russia’s democratically elected presidents of the 21st century, a former KGB agent whose grandfather was a cook for Stalin. That résumé is a breathtaking example of the range of change in the world that we occupy: from Stalin, one of history’s most cold-blooded and murderous tyrants, to the agency that enforced the oppressive policies of Communist rule, now to a freely elected president, albeit one with an uncertain vision and a monumental challenge as he takes the reigns of power in that country.

Perhaps General Marshall would not be astonished. After all, remember what he witnessed in his lifetime—flight, electricity, telephones. The splitting of the atom. Two world wars. The end of the British Empire. The rise of communism. The pre-eminence of the United States. Indeed, one of the remarkable traits of George Catlett Marshall was his ability to anticipate change—great, sweeping, cataclysmic change—and to prepare his country for it. Shortly after he left Vancouver, he had the daunting task of preparing America for war at a time when many in the United States were passionately opposed to the idea of getting involved in what was widely perceived as a foreign war with no effect on the United States.

At the time, he was a freshly minted general; a man in his fifties who had labored in the outpost of American military life, continually serving his country and his calling as a military man who knew the world was a dangerous place and that peace was an elusive condition in the turmoil of the mid-20th century. I believe that a thousand years from now, historians will look back with a sense of wonder at what General Marshall was able to accomplish in such a short period of time, with critics in high places and low constantly questioning his judgment and his actions.

From 1939, when the U.S. armed forces consisted of just 200,000 enlisted men armed with outdated weapons, an army that was so anemic it ranked behind Bulgaria and Portugal on the world’s scale. From that shameful condition, General Marshall was able to build, train and send to war a fighting force that eventually consisted of more than 12 million Americans in uniform. Moreover, he accomplished this urgent and critical assignment within three years, while war was roiling across the Atlantic and throughout the Pacific. He was quite simply, more than any other single individual, the architect of victory in World War II. A man so vital to the war effort that President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill agonized over the difficult decision of whether he should command the D-Day invasion (which we’ll be celebrating Monday and Tuesday of next week), or whether he should stay in Washington to oversee the war abroad and the political needs at home. General Marshall, who had spent his entire life preparing for the command that now would not be his, accepted President Roosevelt’s
decision without protest. The President said to him, “I would not sleep well at night knowing that you were out of the country.”

That six-year stretch of Marshall’s life—from 1939 to 1945 and victory, his primary role in saving the world—that alone would mark him as a great man. But of course, there was so much more. As Secretary of State, he would prove that he was as great a strategist in peace as he was in war. Without victory in World War II, the world today would be a much different place. With victory, but without The Marshall Plan for rebuilding Europe, what chaos would have ensued? Would we have had a third world war? With victory, but without The Marshall Plan for rebuilding Europe, what chaos would have ensued? Would we have had a third world war? Would we have had a third world war? He was, indisputably, in every aspect of his life—from second lieutenant through Chief of Staff, from Secretary of State to Secretary of Defense and Nobel laureate—a great man. That he has been underappreciated by popular opinion in our lifetime is a travesty. I’ve been going to New York bookstores on a kind of a random search to see how many books there are about George C. Marshall. You’ll find a lot about Charles Manson and Marilyn Monroe in the “M” section, but very few, if any at all, about this remarkable American who was so critical to the preservation of peace—not only for this country, but for the world during the 20th century.

I suspect that Marshall himself would not protest. For he was, by all accounts, self-confident and a true judge of a life lived honorably and well, if not always on the front pages or on the altars of the public culture. Besides, his legacy lives on. For this great man was the godfather of the people that you honor today: the greatest generation. The men and women who came of age during the Great Depression, when economic despair was on this land like a plague, when there were great bands of migrant workers drifting across America, living from day to day. When, in homes and families, young people quit school to go to work. Not to buy a video game or to go to a theme park on Saturday. They quit school to go to work to put food on the family table and to buy clothing for their siblings. Then, when there was just the faint glimmer of some hope on the horizon at the end of the 30’s, this same generation was asked to go to war on two fronts: thousands of miles across the Pacific, thousands of miles across the Atlantic.

And they answered the call. Mark Hatfield, going down to enlist the day after Pearl Harbor, for example. Bob Bush telling his mother that he wanted to be a medic because he wanted to help people and not hurt them. And their stories were repeated a million-fold across America. From the ranches of western South Dakota to the barrios of the Southwest, to the hard, hot pavement of places like New York City and Chicago, to the Ivy League halls of the academies of privilege. Men went into uniform. And so did women. And those women who could not fight stayed at home to fill the role of the men on the assembly lines, to look after the children, to work harder in the fields of America so that they could produce more food. They went without sugar and nylons and a lot of the things that we take for granted today because the entire country was focused on one objective: to win the war against Hitler and Japan, to preserve freedom as we know it and as we have expanded on it. That generation did that. That generation that had, as its godfather, George C. Marshall, won the war.

And when the war was over, those men and those women in uniform came home to a country that they now wanted to build again. They married in record numbers. They went to
college in record numbers. They gave us great new art and science and industry. They weren’t perfect; it took them too long to recognize the importance of racial equality in our society, and much too long to recognize gender equality. But those women and those ethnic minorities who were members of that generation, they didn’t give up on the American dream. Many of them fought their way into battle and suffered the most shameful kind of discrimination when they came home. But they persisted. For they knew what they had been through could only lead to a greater life for all of us if they put their shoulder to the wheel. And they did just that. They expanded our political freedoms here at home. And then—led again by George C. Marshall—they did, I believe, one of the most remarkable acts of any country that was a victor in war in the history of mankind. They rebuilt their enemies-Japan and Europe—devastated by war. Think of the grief and the resentment and the strident nationalism that would have grown out of those two proud countries, Germany and Japan, if the United States and the West had not stepped in to rebuild them and to restore the idea of democracy in Germany and the idea of democracy which was introduced into Japan. George Marshall was a visionary who helped the greatest generation affect these remarkable and lasting and historic changes.

That generation, of which I’ve written, did not give up on this country when its values were challenged during the 60’s. There was a great schism in America, but their children, young men and young women, and the members of the greatest generation learned from each other. And they found what I believe is the greatest testimony to the greatest generation. They found common ground. The genius of America—this immigrant nation for all of its attendant strengths and natural resources, its political system that stands unchallenged in the world—the greatest genius of this country is our ability to set aside our ideological divisions, our heritages, our economic interests when there is a common challenge and become greater than the sum of our parts.

That generation learned that first during The Depression and then during the war and then in the rebuilding of America after the war. Now I worry that there are great fault lines running across that common ground. If that was the “We” generation, we have, I believe, allowed ourselves to become too much the “Me” generation—worried too greatly every day about our own selfish interests. We’ve divided America up into special fiefdoms, each concerned only with its narrow place on the playing field of politics, or the economy, or the popular culture.

Now this generation, at the turn of another century, has come back into our lives. And through their stories and by example they remind us again of their legacy. The legacy that was put before them by George C. Marshall which they made great sacrifice to bring to life, and never lost their vision or their values as he had outlined for them first in war and then in peace.

And I would hope that one hundred years from now, when you have another speaker at the George Marshall lecture, that first of all he or she will be able to be there in person and not just off an airplane from Moscow. But I would hope that one hundred years from now another speaker at the George Marshall lecture would be able to say that we finally have a full and keen appreciation of this great American and what he did for all of us. And we have, as well, a rich and renewed appreciation of his children, the greatest genera-
tion. And most of all, we’ve learned from them at the beginning of a new century the importance of restoring the American ideal of common ground and common objectives—whatever our background, whatever our geographical location in America, whatever our ideology.

There are challenges out there for all of us. We’re privileged not to have to face a great depression. Indeed, we are living through the greatest economic boom in the history of mankind. There has never been as much prosperity as there is at this moment. And this weekend in Moscow when President Clinton and President Putin get together—as President Putin told me last night—he would like to introduce to the president the idea that the United States and Russia would jointly work on a missile defense system that would provide an umbrella against so-called “rogue” nuclear powers. That’s how far we’ve come. That’s the kind of world that we inhabit today.

So it’s up to each of us as individuals and collectively as a society to make a pledge that we will continue the work started by George C. Marshall and the members of the greatest generation. And that one hundred years from now another speaker will look back and say, “That, too, was a great generation. It continued the legacy of a great man and a great generation.”

Thank you all very much.
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I AM DEEPLY HONORED BY YOUR invitation to participate in the General George C. Marshall Lecture Series. Like most Americans of my generation, I admired and respected the leadership he demonstrated not only in war but also in peace.

Many historians have suggested that were it not for the General’s wisdom and influence in articulating the Marshall Plan and persuading the Congress to adopt it, the victory of World War II could easily have eroded into another world war.

Today, because of his wisdom, Europe is relatively stable. Most of the world is at peace, and we Americans have nor been called upon to participate in another world war since the fall of 1945. America and the world owe much to this great leader.

Two weeks ago, I participated in a ceremony at the United States Military Academy at West Point. During that visit, I was constantly reminded of the motto of West Point: “Duty, Honor, Country.”
General Marshall was a senior first captain at Virginia Military Institute. Although the three sacred words of West Point were not the motto of Virginia Military Institute, his life was one of duty, honor, and country.

These three words have been a part of this history of this land since the time of our revolutionary war. And yet today, many Americans find repeating these words to be somewhat difficult, for they perceive it might be too pretentious and not quite sincere. Nevertheless, these words have been, and I hope will continue to be, an important part of America’s character.

It was duty that made young Americans withstand the bitter winter cold, without shoes and without food, during the dark days of Valley Forge. These men left their farms, their families, and their fortunes to fight for a country that was not in existence at that time, and they carried out their duties with courageous honor.

A few weeks after December 7, 1941, the U.S. Selective Service Commission issued a directive designating all Americans of Japanese ancestry as “4-C,” or “enemy alien.” It meant that under no circumstance could we of Japanese ancestry serve in the military of the United States. We could not be drafted nor could we volunteer.

Soon thereafter, Executive Order 9066 was issued by the White House establishing 10 internment camps at which to house all Japanese–citizens
and non-citizens—residing on the West Coast of the United States. Officially, these locations were designated as concentration camps. None of the inmates had committed any criminal acts nor were they ever tried in a court of law.

Such was the hysteria of war at that time.

And so, we young Americans of Japanese ancestry immediately began petitioning the President of the United States to be permitted to put on the uniform of the land, if only to prove our loyalty and demonstrate our commitment to the essence of the three sacred words: “Duty, Honor, Country.”

After several months of consideration, the President of the United States issued another Executive Order establishing a special army combat team consisting of Japanese-American volunteers, with words I will always remember: “Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry.”

With that, the 442nd Regimental Combat Team was established, made up primarily of Caucasian-American officers and Japanese-American enlisted personnel. I was one of them. I was 18 years old at the time.

On the day I was scheduled to leave my home to put on the uniform of the Army and enter a new life, I was accompanied by my father, and we rode together in a streetcar to the assembly point. He was quiet man; he was not an intellectual in any sense of the word. But the few times he spoke, he spoke words of wisdom. As we approached the point of departure, he cleared his throat and simply said, “This country has been good to us. We owe much to this country, and if you must give your life for it, do so with honor.”

It was a simple statement, which I readily understood. I hope that if the time should come when I may be called upon to say those words to my son, I will have the strength and character to do so.

I am proud, but humbled, to report to you that the United States Army declared the 442nd Regimental Combat Team as the most decorated unit of its size and length of service in the history of our nation. Of the thousands of medals received by the 442nd soldiers, 20 were Medals of Honor.

I spoke earlier of the “4-C” designations and the interment camps. As an American, I am proud to report to you that this nation not only acknowledged those decisions as mistakes, but also took steps to rectify its errors and most importantly, issued an apology. Only a strong, confident nation could ever do that. To serve a country like the United States is, indeed, an honor.

We Americans should not be reluctant or afraid to use the words. “Duty, Honor, Country,” because they are necessary if we are to continue enjoying the good life we have become accustomed to. These words have inspired many Americans to stand in harm’s way, in our behalf, if necessary, and if called upon to do so, make the ultimate sacrifice. Yes, I am grateful to realize that there are many Americans willing to do so.

Four weeks ago, I returned from an official trip that took us to Beijing, Singapore, Jakarta, and Manila. Two weeks before that trip, I was in Pakistan, Uzbekistan, and Afghanistan. There were two common threads in those trips.

One, the spectre of terrorism was always present in those lands.
And second, I was deeply moved to know that there were men and women who believed in those three words and serving in those far away places on land, sea, and air, ready to fight our battles if need be, and ready to give up their lives if called upon to do so.

Today I have the high honor and privilege of serving our nation as Chairman of the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I have been a member of this Committee for the past 30 years. Throughout my service, I have followed a simple philosophy: to prevent war, we must be prepared for war.

At this moment in history, if we should ever show weakness, non-commitment, or disunity, we will most certainly be subjected to great pain. I can assure you, that to the extent possible, I will do everything to prevent such a catastrophe. “Duty, Honor, Country” compel me to do that.

Some have suggested that our taxpayers are overburdened. There is truth to that. Some suggest that too much is spent on defense. I question that. As far as I am concerned, it is not too much to support to the fullest any man or woman who is willing to stand in harm’s way and give up his or her life in our behalf.

Our country is not perfect, but we acknowledge that and we are constantly taking steps to improve ourselves. Today our country is powerful. But we do our best to use this power to bring about peace and stability on this planet, not for territorial material gain.

Our land has the most diverse populace in the world, and as such, we acknowledge that we have social and ethnic problems. But we are doing our best to prove that diversity is a strength and not an obstacle to progress.

Looking about you, I can see the evidence of our nation’s diversity.

And this diversity of talented and patriotic Americans will develop the leaders of tomorrow—not just military leaders, but leaders in the political community, leaders in the academic community, and leaders in the business community.

Yes, I envy today’s generation of young people because, although we may have many challenges and obstacles in the future, I know that through their leadership, we will overcome them.

I envy them because I believe they will live in a better America, a better America where the sacred words of, “Duty, Honor, Country” will have a meaning and relevance.

To all of you, I wish you Godspeed. God be with you. God bless America.★
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LET US NOW PRAISE FAMOUS MEN“, WE ARE URGED BY THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES, and the definition of fame, first offered in this chapter of the Old Testament, would certainly cover General George C. Marshall. “Men renowned for their power; giving counsel by their understanding...Leaders of the people by their counsels, wise and eloquent in their instructions.” The career of this great soldier-statesman, the epitype of the American citizen, qualifies him for this Biblical Hall of Fame as a man of power and wisdom.

But one reason why I and others have so admired him is for his qualities as a man and not solely for the chapters that he wrote into the history of his times. Read to the end of these verses in Ecclesiastes and we are reminded of those men “who have no memorial; who are perished, as though they have never been...but these were merciful men, whose righteousness hath not been forgotten...their memory shall remain forever, and their glory shall not be blotted out.”

In speaking of George C. Marshall today, I want therefore to suggest one or two things we can learn about how to handle the problems of our age from the way in which he handled the problems of his; but I also want to focus on some lessons we can learn for ourselves from the way that General Marshall “ran the race” as a man.

If Marshall had retired at the end of the Second World War we would have still had cause to celebrate an illustrious career. A military commander who rapidly built up America’s armed strength. A leader who managed, with tact and authority, a glittering top brass of allied commanders—men like Eisenhower, MacArthur, Patton and Montgomery. He was hugely successful. In a written tribute when he stepped down, the British Joint Chiefs of Staff quoted these lines of poetry:
Rt. Honorable Christopher Patten
“Friend to truth! Of soul sincere, In action faithful, and in honour clear; Who broke no promise, served no private end, Who gained no title, and who lost no friend.”

He was soon recalled to duty—first as President Truman’s point man in China, as war between the Nationalists and Communists tore the country apart, then as Secretary of State.

In that post he shaped the world in which we have lived for the past 50 years and certainly helped to create the Europe in which I grew up.

As Secretary of State Marshall based his foreign policy on three principles.

First, he believed in the absolute indispensability of international cooperation to deal with global problems. He understood that this was a far more effective way of achieving American objectives than going it alone. He was one of the creators of new systems of global governance that gave the world half a century of unparalleled prosperity and—if not always peace—certainly greater stability. After the First World War, Woodrow Wilson had been instrumental in securing the establishment of the League of Nations. It did not prove a success but George Marshall correctly drew the conclusion that the international community should improve on what had gone before, rather than abandon the attempt altogether. So he played an important part in the creation of the United Nations. The UN has had a mixed record since, but over the decades it has acquired a growing legitimacy and moral force. And the current Secretary General Kofi Annan has strengthened these developments by the intelligent, tough-minded and dignified way in which he has carried out his duties. UN resolutions may not always be complied with but countries are obliged to take notice of them. In the case of Iraq, the fact that Saddam Hussein has breached so many UN resolutions has solidified world opinion against him and holds out the possibility of a broad measure of international support for action to force Iraq, at last, to comply with its obligations under those resolutions. Marshall also played a key part in the creation of NATO. And it was NATO which not only helped save Western Europe from communism, but, through its steadfastness, helped free Eastern Europe just over a decade ago. Marshall was also clear on the benefits to Europe of joining together in what is now the European Union. A Union which has made a third European civil war literally inconceivable.

As these examples show his ideas are just as relevant today. I don’t believe it’s sensible or even possible to define the national interest without regard to the wider world. Remember those first pictures of the earth from space? I thought then that we would never look at our planet in the same way again. There’s no ejector module from spaceship earth—well not yet anyway! It is true, of course, that the United States is the only superpower, but the case for working within international structures is, I believe, just as cogent for you as it is for less powerful countries. As President Eisenhower once put it: “no nation’s security and well-being can belastingly achieved in isolation but only in effective cooperation with fellow nations.” There are several reasons for this.

“No man is an island entire unto himself and therefore do not ask for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee” wrote one of England’s greatest poets, John Donne. In the modern world the concept of the purely national has become harder and harder to define. An essay entitled “Who is
us?” published in the Harvard Business Review more than a decade ago argued, for example, that efforts to protect national industry through subsidies and tariffs were increasingly self-defeating because national labels bore less and less relation to the underlying economic realities. Such policies tend to hurt your own consumers as well those of your companies who depend on imports for their own production.

There are many other reasons. Working with others is in your interest because, big as you are, you cannot do everything yourselves. For instance the European Union has made and is making a substantial contribution to the essential task of post war reconstruction in Afghanistan without which the military victory over the Taliban would be short lived. So you need allies. They are not always comfortable. As Winston Churchill remarked, “In working with allies they sometimes develop opinions of their own”. But they are necessary, opinions and all.

Indeed, it is precisely because you are the biggest power that you need to work with others. Your very strength inevitably, if unfairly, provokes resentment and jealousy. So it is all the more necessary to avoid, if at all possible, going it alone in defiance of others.

Perhaps most fundamentally of all, globalization, along with the good which it has produced, has a darker side. I do not need to read the litany of horrors—from drug trafficking, which has become a bigger industry than iron or steel or cars, to climate change and environmental degradation with its implications for poverty and security, from illegal migration, to the spread of AIDS and other communicable diseases; and, of course, terrorism with a global reach. As Kofi Annan said “Only concerted vigilance and cooperation among all states offers any real hope of denying terrorists their opportunities “Your country needs and is receiving the full support of the European Union in our joint fight against Al Qaeda and other such organizations. We may have “opinions of our own” at times but we are your staunchest allies.

The final reason why Marshall’s instinct for international cooperation was and is justified is that the multi–national institutions that you helped to create are needed today more than ever if we are to enjoy a free and prosperous world. We need, that is, a United Nations; an International Monetary Fund; a World Bank; a World Trade Organization. These are the organizations which provide a structure for the civilised resolution of global disputes and a civilised approach to the new global agenda. It is in the US national interest that they should be strengthened.

Yet the credibility and legitimacy of such institutions is under threat. Democratic legitimacy is a fragile commodity, slow to build and quick to destroy. At the international level it is especially problematic because the concept of a world society is not one towards which people are naturally attracted by sentiment or tradition. Nationally, we have our flags, our anthems and our myths. At the international level it is much harder to build loyalty and legitimacy, and more tempting to throw brickbats.

If the US and the European Union do not support these institutions and try to give them deep democratic roots, they will lose their authority—and the world will be poorer for it.

So Marshall was absolutely right about international cooperation. But his second guiding principle was a broad understanding of what constitutes power in the modern world. Of course
he always recognized the importance of military power to security. Not surprisingly he resisted too rapid a U.S. disarmament after the Second World War. Under President Truman he believed in dealing with Communism using a combination of military containment and economic and political measures. But he also argued powerfully and persuasively against the “tragic misunderstanding that a security policy is a war policy.” He recognized that power arises not just from economic strength but also from the strength of ideas. He emphasized: “the tremendous moral strength of the gospel of freedom and self-respect for the individual.” That is just as true today as it was in his day. American power is not just military. It is also based on the strength of your technology, your culture and your universities. And despite recent challenges from terrorists, it is our shared ideals of democracy, the rule of law and due process which are in the ascendant.

Marshall’s third principle was the importance of economic and social advance in the fight for security. This was at the heart of the Marshall Plan for Europe: “Our policy” he said in his great commencement address at Harvard in 1947, “is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos... its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist.”

On another occasion he argued that “democratic principles don’t flourish on empty stomachs... people turn to false promises of dictators because they are hopeless and anything promises something better than the miserable existence that they endure.”

His policy worked triumphantly in Europe. It was an astonishingly far-sighted, generous and successful policy. In 1945 Europe was a bombed out ruin, living in year zero. Its economy was smashed and its institutions had been destroyed. Millions of displaced people were on the move looking for new homes. A generation of young men had been cut down in their prime. And people, not just in Germany, were having to come to terms with the horrors of the holocaust. Not a very good prospect for investment, you might have thought. Marshall thought differently. He understood that a stable peaceful Europe was in America’s interest. It was economic failure and political instability which had forced America into a World War and America wanted peace. And of course a prosperous Europe could be a strong trading partner for the US. Modern Europeans owe a huge debt to your country—to the brave soldiers who gave their lives on blood-stained Omaha beach so that our continent could be free certainly, but also to George Marshall who helped us off our knees after the war was over. Our prosperity, our rebirth from the depths of despair, we owe in no small measure to his statesmanship.

That same far-sighted generosity is needed more than ever today. Poverty does not excuse or cause violence and terrorism. But just as in rich countries higher crime tends to be concentrated in places where there is poverty and hopelessness; so in rogue states, violence and terrorism tend to flourish where swamps of misery and human degradation exist. It is morally unacceptable, and politically and economically destabilizing, that so many millions of our people attempt to scratch out a miserably inadequate existence from their immediate surroundings. It cannot be right that more than a billion of our fellow human beings
I said before that you live in a land of incalculable opportunity—open, free, rich, blessed by nature, blessed by history and the endeavours of past generations, blessed by present power and might. “E pluribus unum” is your country’s motto inscribed on the Presidential seal and you have been unwaveringly true to it. Emma Lazarus’ wonderful poem located on a plaque in the museum under the Statue of Liberty describes perfectly the values which lie at the heart of your republic:

“Give me your tired, your poor, Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, The wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door.”

Over the centuries you have opened that golden door to freedom and opportunity for millions of people from all over the world and, when I look around this room today, what a rich harvest you have reaped. In Europe too often we have tried to throw up walls against those seeking a better life for their families. As a result the Old Continent is getting older. Your country knew better. I was my country’s last governor of the last colony of our former empire, Hong Kong. It was a privilege to work with its people; a people teeming with talent who created the most astonishing economic success story ever known. All I had to do was cut taxes every year and watch revenues rise, a politician’s dream. Many years ago two young people left from Southern China for America. They had a son who lived for many years in a housing project and worked in his father’s restaurant and grocery store. He learned the importance of hard work and made it to one of your top universities, Yale. Today that Chinese-American is your governor. From Jamaica came two other young people who
settled in your country. They too had a son, Colin Powell, your Secretary of State, a man I respect as much as any statesman I have ever met. So you are truly blessed to be growing up in the US. But with those blessings comes a responsibility to live up to your nation’s ideals and hand them on, strengthened, to generations to come.

I’ve addressed groups of people of your age all over the world. Many have not had your good fortunes. Let me tell you about one such group. It was about 15 years ago. I was Britain’s Minister for Overseas Development–our equivalent I guess of running USAID (United States Agency for International Development). I was visiting Ethiopia–a country I’d visited many times during its famine years. But this time the purpose of my visit was to see not Ethiopians but Sudanese.

The Sudanese were refugees from the terrible civil war raging even then between the Islamic north of their country and the Christian south. We should perhaps remember that war is still being fought all these years later despite the present—I hope successful—efforts by the United States and the international community to end it.

The Sudanese refugees that I was going to visit were assembled in two camps on the edge of the Nile River flood plane in the scrubland of Southwest Ethiopia. You had to be pretty desperate to seek refuge in those days in a country as poor as Ethiopia. Typically these refugees from the Christian south had trekked for weeks across the parched landscape of their country to find a haven from the war. The majority of them were young men and boys who had left their schools with their classmates and had been led on this terrible odyssey by older pupils.

It was indeed a terrifying journey and many died on the way—no food in their stomachs, armed groups hunting them down, the African sun scorching overhead. I remember asking one young boy—he was about the same age as my teenage daughters at the time—how he had managed to lead his group of younger companions through the countryside to security. How had they found the way? “It was quite simple” he replied matter-of-factly, “we just followed the dead bodies.”

About 12,000 of those who had got to the camps were of school age and the UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) had organized some rudimentary schooling for them. They had built mud classrooms and provided a few blackboards and pieces of chalk. Every young person who had matriculated in the camp was dragooned into teaching in the school. I had taken two or three footballs to present to these rather unusual pupils and they asked if I would present these small gifts at a meeting of the whole school and if I would say a few words to them.

Well, all 12,000 were drawn up in a great circle around me and I stood on a box with a megaphone and an interpreter and shouted a few words of encouragement. At the end of my remarks, the head teacher who was a Lutheran pastor asked if they could say “thank you” by singing the Lord’s Prayer in their own language, Dinka. I smiled my agreement and they sang their hymn. And then, under the broiling midday sun, they asked if they could also sing to me a verse from Isaiah. It sounded wonderful, though of course I had no idea what it was. I rather assumed they might be singing that passage about beating swords into plowshares. Anyway, I said goodbye and flew back to the capital of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa. In the same plane that crashed a couple
of weeks later, killing a distinguished member of the US Congress and the officials who were with him.

Lying in bed that night, in the comfortable bungalow residence of the British Ambassador to Ethiopia with the fans spinning slowly overhead, I noticed there was a Gideon Bible on my bedside table. I picked it up to find the passage whose chapter and verse I had been given in the book of Isaiah. I leafed through the pages and found the text. The young Sudanese who had experienced that journey from hell had been singing to me “the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined.”

You have not lived in darkness, you have lived in the light. The light shone on you without you having to make that cruel passage through any valley of darkness.

But that puts an especially onerous burden on you—the burden of duty to see that others who are not quite as lucky as you get their share of the light, get their chance of a marginally better life.

And don’t ever believe that you—a single individual—can’t make a difference. Unless you try to make a difference through your own life, no one else’s life will change for the better. Progress depends on a thousand and a thousand more individual acts by often silent and unrecognized men and women. You can change the world.

One of my favorite novels, George Eliot’s “Middlemarch” ends with these words ‘the growing good of the world is partly dependent on unhistoric acts; and that things are not so ill with you and me as they might have been, is half owing to the number who lived faithfully a hidden life, and rest in unvisited tombs.”

So you may not grow up to be a General and statesman like George Marshall, memorialized by lectures and monuments and chapters in history books. But you can grow up to be a citizen like George Marshall, certain that your righteousness will not be forgotten, that your memory will remain forever, and that your glory—an American citizen and a citizen of the world who has done his or her best—will never be blotted out.★
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“LOOK BACK, LOOK AROUND, LOOK AHEAD”

THANK YOU SO MUCH, LT. GOVERNOR OWEN FOR THOSE KIND AND GENEROUS WORDS. This is a thrilling welcome and I am thrilled to see so many Red Cross youth here today. I also want to thank Mayor Pollard. I am so glad to see you were reelected since I was afraid if you weren’t they might invite someone else. Most of all I’d like to thank Celebrate Freedom and the Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust for this wonderful opportunity to talk with you today and learn about Vancouver’s rich history. I am in awe when a look at the list of speakers before me.

You may be wondering why I came here to speak today about George C. Marshall. We in the American Red Cross are pretty busy right now. I’ve just come from California and have seen firsthand the amazing work being done by the Red Cross there to help the fire victims. You might have wondered if I was going to show up with those terrible fires, but I wouldn’t have missed this because George C. Marshall has long been a personal hero of mine.

When I read through past Marshall Lectures, I was delighted to see that Madeleine Albright mentioned that she moved a portrait of Marshall into her office when she became Secretary of State, because that’s precisely what I did when I took the helm at the American Red Cross on August 5th, 2002. I found out that the Red Cross had a huge photograph of General Marshall, and I immediately asked for it to be hung right across from my desk. When we recently moved to another building I took the picture with me and put it in the exact same place. Now, whenever I need some inspiration, there he is.

Let me tell you a story that will give you an idea of the kind of inspiration I’m talking about. At the end of World War II, after having served as Army Chief of Staff, General Marshall was exhausted. He gave his farewell address and headed to his farm in Virginia.

Just as soon as he was getting settled, the phone rang. It was President Truman. He wanted Marshall to go to China as his special envoy. And Marshall agreed to end his retirement that very same day he started it.
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Well, a year later, President Truman called again! This time, he asked Marshall to become his Secretary of State. Marshall said yes, and the Marshall Plan is only one of his many accomplishments during his tenure. Then he retired once more.

Now, Truman couldn’t argue. General Marshall was 68 years old, and he was determined to rest. But only because he had to have a kidney removed!

It was another ten months before President Truman called back on the telephone to Marshall. This time, he asked him to lead the American Red Cross.

I want you to think about something. I want you to consider how different our world might be if George C. Marshall had Caller ID!

No, I really want you to consider what drove this man to say yes every time his country called on him. And I want you to consider what it was in his character that made him the right man for the job every single time.

I also want you to contemplate why this 68-year-old man who had serious surgery, this man considered by many to be the foremost military leader and statesman of his country, this man who had promised his long-suffering wife that he would, quote, “undertake no further public tasks without her approval”, why did he jump at the chance to go to a non-profit, volunteer-led group like the American Red Cross?

Well, one clue can be found in the speech for which Marshall is best known—the speech announcing the Marshall plan to help Europe recover from World War II. By the way, I think it is really interesting he didn’t deliver this critical speech before Congress or at some big international summit. He chose instead to address students, at Harvard University. He told the students:

“Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos.”

Many of the fundamental tenets that guided Marshall’s plan are echoed in another famous document: The Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. Those principles are Humanity, Impartiality, Neutrality, Independence, Voluntary Service, Unity, and Universality. The Red Cross clearly was an organization that was on the same page as Marshall.

It’s important to know, too, that the American Red Cross served as a magnet for the good intentions of the American people in World War II. There was a Red Cross chapter in nearly every community, and it was the logical place for people to assemble and find ways to help. When blood and plasma were needed by the British military and later the U.S., the American Red Cross began collecting it, that was really the origin of today’s blood services, 13.4 million pints of it. When Japan’s bombs rained on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Red Cross-trained first aiders, many of them Japanese Americans, were among the first on the scene.

The Red Cross recruited 70,000 nurses to serve in the military, and it helped military families exchange 42 million messages, emergency messages during the war, just as, I should mention, we are doing today in Iraq. Red Cross workers went overseas with the troops to improve the morale of Allied soldiers. At home, Red Cross Gray Ladies helped out at understaffed medical facilities and Red Cross production workers knitted sweaters and made surgical dressings. They assembled parcels of food and medicine to be distributed to 1.4 million Allied and U.S. POWs.
Marshall admired Red Cross volunteers and the compassion that their efforts demonstrated. Most of all, though, I think he believed that when dedicated people are organized with inspired leadership, they are a force for peace.

And that promise Marshall made to his wife? What happened to it? He kept it; he consulted her. She was, in fact, fortunately an active Red Cross volunteer and of course, she said yes. The war was over, and people didn’t think the Red Cross needed them anymore. One of Marshall’s greatest talents was his ability to look back at history, look around for ways to implement its lessons, and look forward to a more peaceful world. He knew that the American Red Cross was needed in times of peace just as much as the American Red Cross was needed in times of war.

Military families still needed the Red Cross. Large-scale blood donation was a creature of World War II, and Marshall did not want to see it die in peacetime, he looked forward and felt it could be critical in future disasters and conflicts. Equally important was the Red Cross role in disasters, not just in responding, he wrote, but in, “mobilizing the sympathy of the nation when situations require it and converting that sympathy into material help.”

“In its finest sense,” he concluded, “this service exemplifies the time-honored American tradition of American neighbor helping neighbor.” And it still does, as I saw the last two days in California, where Red Cross workers have sheltered and provided comfort to thousands of people put out of their homes by the wildfires. The devastation is truly incredible, whole neighborhoods and towns burned out. The Red Cross will be assisting for many weeks and months into the future.

The spirit of the Marshall Plan and the man who inspired it is alive in the work we do today at the American Red Cross. The notion of extending a hand to those in need, not to subjugate, but to enable; the concept of picking up the pieces of shattered lives and helping victims construct a brighter future; the idea of empowerment. All of this continues today.

It continues through the 70,000 disasters the Red Cross responds to each year with a workforce that is 97% volunteer. People ask “what is it like leading an organization that is almost completely volunteer? Will the Red Cross show up?” The answer is yes, always have and always will! Through the 12 million people who learn lifesaving skills like first aid and CPR through the Red Cross; through half the nations’ blood supply given to the Red Cross by donors. Through programs to lessen suffering abroad, like an initiative that is aimed at wiping out the single leading cause of vaccine-preventable death among children in Africa – more deaths than AIDS, more than tuberculosis, and more than malnutrition. Believe it or not, the killer that I am describing is measles, and we’re leading an effort with the UN and the World Health Organization, among others, to vaccinate 200 million African children.

There are parallels, too, between Red Cross volunteers and George Marshall’s concept of the “citizen soldier”, always trained, always ready for whatever the world throws our way. General Marshall waged a lifelong campaign against isolationism. He knew that what happens in the rest of the world is going to sooner or later affect us in the U.S.

I had the privilege of directing the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies at Garmisch, Germany, an organization formed
at the end of the Cold War to help civilian and military officials from new democracies develop national security organizations based on democratic principles. Our mission there was very much a continuation of the work begun half a century earlier with the Marshall Plan to build trans-Atlantic and pan-European cooperation. I think George Marshall would have approved.

You know, I never saw combat during my 29 year career with the Navy, in part because I was a woman. But did you know that George C. Marshall spent little time on the front lines either? In fact, the man who led the fight during World War II did it from behind a desk in Washington. He was the mastermind behind the D-day invasion, but President Roosevelt refused to let him go overseas to command it—saying that he would not be able to sleep with Marshall out of the country.

Marshall’s frustration may, in fact, have been the fuel that sustained some of his greatest accomplishments. Listen to one of my favorite Marshall quotes that I have used often:

“The less you agree with the policies and direction of your senior, the greater the energy you should apply to carrying that out.”

I sort of wish I had heeded that advice one time when I had a difficult teacher, but that’s a different speech!

Now, what can each of us learn from Marshall’s legacy? Certainly, we can learn honor and duty from the man who never said no to his president. We can learn integrity and compassion from the general who was always concerned about the wellbeing of his troops.

Those are wonderful qualities to attain, but what can we do?

First, we can look back at history’s lessons and learn from them. World War II, the Cold War, and the horrible events of September 11, 2001, are compelling evidence that we must always be prepared for democracy to be challenged.

We must look around for opportunities to work with others to keep our communities safe. Whenever people organize with good intentions, they can improve themselves, they can improve their society, and even their world.

Finally, we must look forward. At the end of World War II, General Marshall looked into the future and he saw the potential for greater peace in Europe and in the world. And for his efforts he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. You might be interested in knowing that the very first Nobel was awarded to another man who also had a plan: his name was Henry Dunant, and he was the founder of the International Red Cross.

I was asked to speak to you today about the importance of non-profit organizations in our society as a way of giving back and as a function of a democratic society. I have seen some of the best examples of my life this very week, in California, where I watched volunteers do such important work for people who were left with not only material wounds but also deep psychic wounds by the wildfires.

I don’t know how many of you saw this week’s episode of The West Wing, but that captured to a “T” what the Red Cross is all about. President Bartlett tours a town wiped out by a tornado. Looking at the devastation and the debris, he urgently asks, “But where are all the people?”

They are, of course, sheltered in the gym, and fed and cared for by the American Red Cross. In one
scene, the President offers to help a Red Cross volunteer as she washes up after preparing dinner for the displaced families. She’s a school bus driver, and you find out that four of her charges have perished in the tornado. Yet, she’s there in the cafeteria, washing up after others worse off than she, she’s making a difference.

The Red Cross provides people with the means to actualize their best impulses. It enables them to give their time, their money, their blood with the knowledge that it will move the needle. It will save lives. It will restore hope.

And so, if you can remember one thing I have said today, it is this: When we combine our passion with the passion of others, the value of our efforts multiplies. And when we serve, no matter how we serve, where we serve, we really can change the world. Just like George Marshall. Just like the Red Cross. Thank you.
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Mr. Kicklighter commanded at every level from company through division. He commanded the 25th Infantry Division, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, from 1984 to 1986. He served in staff assignments from Battalion to Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. From 1987 to 1989, Mr. Kicklighter served as the Director of the Army Staff at the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. From 1989 to 1991, he commanded the US Army Pacific, and upon completion of this assignment, he retired from active duty as a Lieutenant General. In July 1991, he became director of the nation’s effort to thank and honor World War II veterans during the 50th anniversary commemoration of World War II. He served as Deputy Under Secretary of the Army for International Affairs from September 1995 until July 1999.

Mr. Kicklighter’s military honors include the Distinguished Service Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Legion of Merit with three Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Bronze Star. His civilian awards include the Presidential Citizen Medal, two Department of Defense Medals for Distinguished Public Service, and the Distinguished Civilian Service Award. As director of the Iraq Transition Team, Mr. Kicklighter was awarded The Department of Defense Medal for Distinguished Public Service in October 2004.

Mr. Kicklighter was a member of the Habitat for Humanity, International, Board of Directors for five years (three years as chairman). He left the board in November 2001. He is married to the former Elizabeth Exley. They have three adult children and five grandchildren.
GOVERNOR GREGOIRE, LT GOVERNOR OWEN, MAYOR POLLARD and other distinguished guests, especially our honored guests today – the World War II veterans and your families – all veterans and your families, and members of our armed forces and your families, ladies and gentlemen.

Good morning! It is great to be here. Mayor Pollard, thank you for inviting an old soldier to join you in commemorating the 60th anniversary of World War II and in honoring General George C. Marshall, who was instrumental in bringing that war to a victorious end.

From 1991 until 1995, it was my honor to lead the team that planned and assisted our nation in the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of World War II. It was truly a labor of love as a grateful nation thanked and honored the World War II veterans, their families, and those that served on the home front. We also remembered the families who lost loved ones in that war.

The same national pride that made our 50th anniversary a success is here in Vancouver. The message is clear: that our nation and this community will never forget our veterans and that we owe them our freedom, which we will never take for granted.

There is another spirit present here today … and that is the spirit of General George C. Marshall, who was, without question, the architect of victory over tyranny 60 years ago.

General Marshall would have enjoyed this weekend—not because of any tribute to him, he was a man who never sought or enjoyed the spotlight or public acclaim – but he would have loved being with you, our veterans.

The Marshall Lecture series has had some wonderful speakers. My mission today is to add some meaningful light to the already brightly lit stage of General Marshall’s life. This challenge is made easier by the extraordinary life of General Marshall, who was instrumental in bringing World War II to its victorious conclusion, and in helping to secure the resulting peace with the Marshall Plan. His devotion to duty, selfless service to his country, courage and honor is an extraordinary example of a servant–leader who we should all strive to emulate.

Marshall served forty-four (44) years in the Army, including six (6) years as Chief of Staff which covered the World War II period. Shortly after retiring to his beloved home in Leesburg, Virginia, President Truman sent him to China for a year to mediate the civil war between Nationalists and Communists. Marshall returned to DC in late 1946 and became President Truman’s Secretary of State serving for two (2) years. After retiring again in 1949 because of illness, General Marshall became the President of the American Red Cross. President Truman once again called General Marshall to public service in 1950 as Secretary of Defense. He retired for the last time in 1951 and died in 1959.
General Marshall's career paralleled America’s rise to global power and its acceptance of global responsibilities. Raised in Uniontown, Pennsylvania, Marshall attended the Virginia Military Institute, where he graduated in 1901 as first captain. Commissioned a 2nd lieutenant in the United States Army, Marshall distinguished himself in a variety of posts in the Philippines and the United States, before volunteering to sail to Europe with the 1st Division in 1917 to enter World War I.

Marshall’s reputation for telling it like it is was displayed when General John “Black Jack” Pershing visited the 1st Division. Pershing criticized its commanding officer, unfairly in Marshall’s mind, and Marshall rose to defend his commander. He placed his hand on Pershing’s arm to prevent him from leaving, and then pointed out the failures of Pershing’s own staff in properly supporting the Division. Marshall’s fellow officers were sure that this was the end of his military career. But they were wrong! Pershing was so impressed by Marshall’s candor that he had him reassigned to his own staff.

In 1927, he became the assistant commandant at the infantry school in Fort Benning. This was one of the most significant assignments in Marshall’s career. He had the opportunity to train a new generation of ground force leaders. Many of the officers who served in World War II passed through his classrooms. Forrest Pogue estimates that during Marshall’s years there, 150 future generals of World War II were students and 50 more senior military leaders in World War II were instructors that worked under Marshall’s tutelage. Years later, when Marshall was chief of staff and tasked with building the officer corps of a rapidly expanding army, he knew the caliber of leaders required, and, more importantly, he knew where to find them.

From 1932–1938, he worked with various national guard units and the civilian conservation corps, learning how to motivate civilians. He was promoted to Brigadier General at age 56 and assigned to command the 5th Brigade of the 3rd Division here at Vancouver barracks, and headed up the regional Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) district. It is reported that the tour of duty at Vancouver barracks were some of the happiest times for General and Mrs. Marshall.

In 1938, Marshall was recalled to DC to be war plans officer on the army staff. He saw total war coming, and worked to prepare the army. When FDR chose him as chief of staff, the army was, in Marshall’s own words, “…ineffective. Our equipment, modern at the conclusion of World War I, was now, in a large measure, obsolete. In fact, during the postwar period, continuous paring of appropriations had reduced the army virtually to the status of that of a third-rate power.”

From this undermanned and under-equipped army of 175,000, Marshall built a global fighting force of over eight (8) million men and women. He showed his organizational genius by mobilizing ground and air forces under one command, successfully dealing with the captains of industry in rapidly equipping the armed forces, skillfully dealing with Congress and the President on any number of issues and supervising General Leslie Groves and the Manhattan Project, which built the Atomic Bomb.

He structured and staffed the military leadership that led the allies to victory, placing men like Eisenhower, Arnold, Bradley, MacArthur and Stilwell in their commands. When it was time to pick the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, a command Marshall desired and had been preparing for all his life, he remembered what FDR had
told him, “I can’t sleep well when you are out of town.” General Marshall, putting the country above his own desires, as he always did, recommended Eisenhower to lead the allied effort in Europe.History was changed!

Winston Churchill said in 1945, “…what a joy it must be to Marshall to see how the armies he called into being by his own genius have won immortal renown. He is the true ‘organizer of victory.’”

General Marshall’s devotion to duty, commitment to excellence, and ability to grasp the big picture influenced a rising generation of military leaders; among them was Omar Nelson Bradley.

Marshall first met Bradley when Bradley was an instructor at the Infantry School. The two men, of similar dispositions and philosophies, cemented a personal and professional relationship that Bradley credited as the most profound influence on his military career and his private life.

Bradley was high on General Marshall’s list of men capable of leading American troops into battle. Our troops needed leaders in whom they could trust without question, leaders who inspired confidence and duty and sacrifice. At army headquarters, that leader was Marshall… in the field, the man the dogface soldiers most admired was Omar Bradley. As two leaders in a mighty team of leaders, Marshall and Bradley were unbeatable, as our enemies soon found out.

Today, as we commemorate the end of World War II, we are also commemorating the vision and determination of a cadre of leaders, inspired by Marshall and linked to Bradley in a true band of duty-bound Americans in uniform.

Few tributes to Marshall’s leadership exceeded the words of Eisenhower, who said, “…your example has been an inspiration and your support has been my greatest strength. My sense of obligation to you is equaled only by the depth of my pride and satisfaction as I salute you as the greatest soldier of our time and a true leader of democracy.”

Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, both giants in their own right, said that George Marshall was the greatest person that they had ever known.

One of the greatest tributes to Omar Bradley was delivered after the war, when President Truman nominated him to take the reins of the Veterans Administration. Truman knew he was tapping into a powerful resource of compassion and leadership, and a man who had earned the respect and devotion of an entire generation of citizen-soldiers.

Every Secretary of Veterans Affairs who has led America’s second largest department has had the daunting task of filling General Bradley’s very large boots. It is the sound of those boots that I often hear in the hallway outside my door at VA headquarters.

Marshall’s post-war legacy stands alone in the annals not only of American history, but in world history. The Marshall Plan literally rebuilt the very foundations of Europe and Japan, and, in my opinion, prevented World War III. Many speakers more eloquent than I have done justice to Marshall’s influence on world affairs in the 20th Century.

What is less-well-known is that the same personal ethic and sense of national purpose that energized Marshall’s blueprints for a just and lasting peace for all nations, also fueled Bradley’s mission to care for the 16 million men and
women who were returning home from World War II.

It was a daunting task – restoring a generation of warfighters to their civilian lives … helping them regain their places in the society they left behind … opening doors to opportunities they put aside to defend freedom. But Bradley, like his mentor George Marshall, knew the only path to success is the decisive path, and he, like Marshall, succeeded in his mission to rebuild the peace at home.

At the Veterans Administration, we never forget Bradley's reminder to his staff that “we are dealing with veterans, not procedures–with their problems, not ours.” In the sixty years that have passed since the end of World War II, our mission has not wavered from General Bradley's well-marked path.

Our guests of honor today–our World War II veterans–are living proof of America's steadfast commitment to meet tyranny on any battlefield. You fought the most destructive war in history against great odds. Almost 60 million people lost their lives, mostly women, children and the elderly, who were overrun by the war. You won that war and not only saved this great nation but also literally saved the world. When you returned home, 400,000 did not return with you. They gave all their tomorrows to protect our special gift of freedom. All your tomorrows is a very high price to pay when you are 18 or 19 years old. You came home…took off your uniform…said very little about the war…rolled up your sleeves and built this strong, free and beautiful America.

When our country faces tyranny that threatens our rights and liberties, heroes emerge from among us to take up the sword of justice. Those heroes are our service men and women from every generation, and there is no way to properly thank and honor them for all the sacrifices that they made in the name of freedom.

On September 11, 2001, this nation was stunned when we were brutally attacked by terrorists. Innocent men, women and children were murdered, just because they were Americans. More people died on 9/11 than were killed during the attack on Pearl Harbor.

From the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and in a meadow in Pennsylvania…to the mountains of Afghanistan and the streets of Baghdad, we are now engaged in a brutal Global War on Terrorism. More than 2,000 of our sons and daughters have made the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq and Afghanistan. Thousands have been severely wounded. I have visited Iraq seven (7) times and Afghanistan twice in the last eighteen (18) months during my duties with the departments of Defense and State, and observed these men and women up close. They volunteered to be in the armed forces. They are truly professionals and magnificent! I do not have words to adequately describe my pride in them.

I was always so impressed with the courage and commitment of the men and women in uniform and of the civilians who are serving with them. They are proud to follow in your bootprints and striving to live up to your legacy. They know why they are fighting–to protect our homeland and our way of life, just as you did 60 years ago.

Somewhere in our military today there is another George Marshall. Maybe she is a young Captain, learning lessons in logistics that will serve her well when her generation is again called upon to defend freedom on battlefields yet unknown.
And somewhere among the ranks is tomorrow’s Omar Bradley, directing our troops against those who would spill the blood of innocent civilians in the name of a perverted cause.

We may not recognize their names today—but history will—just as it will illuminate the leadership of George Bush, whose example of steadfastness and commitment to win the Global War on Terrorism and protect the American people inspires the troops that he leads.

We have taken the battle in the war on terror to the enemy. We have taken the offensive. We are not sitting as victims, merely waiting for another blow to fall. We are instead steadily diminishing the enemy’s ability to field agents of terror. This is a noble battle.

Our nation was never more united than in World War II when we became the Arsenal of Democracy almost overnight. The men and women fighting this Global War on Terrorism need and deserve that same level of national unity and support. They have it today and we must not let it diminish as it did in Vietnam.

At the close of the 20th Century, the New York Times asked Steven Ambrose, the great American historian, to nominate whom he thought was the most outstanding person in the 20th Century. Without hesitation, his nomination was “G.I. Joe.” You!, who did not fight for fame or fortune, but for freedom. You!, who knew right from wrong and good from evil. You!, who fought to destroy the evil that was in the world at that time.

God bless you and those serving in Iraq and Afghanistan and the families they left behind…and may God continue to bless America.

Thank you! ★
GENERAL PETER PACE
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GENERAL PETER PACE was sworn in as sixteenth Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on September 30, 2005. In this capacity, he serves as the principal military advisor to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Council, and the Homeland Security Council. Prior to becoming Chairman, he served as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Pace holds the distinction of being the first Marine to have served in either of these positions.

General Pace was born in Brooklyn, NY and grew up in Teaneck, NJ. A 1967 graduate of the United States Naval Academy, he holds a Master’s Degree in Business Administration from George Washington University and attended Harvard University for the Senior Executives in National and International Security program. The General is also a graduate of the Infantry Officers’ Advanced Course at Fort Benning, Ga.; the Marine Corps Command and Staff College, in Quantico, VA; and the National War College, at Ft. McNair, Washington, DC.

In 1968, upon completion of The Basic School, Quantico, Va., General Pace was assigned to the 2d Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division in the Republic of Vietnam, serving first as a Rifle Platoon Leader and subsequently as Assistant Operations Officer. He was later assigned to Marine Barracks, Washington, DC, where he served in a number of billets, to include Security Detachment Commander, Camp David; White House Social Aide; and Platoon Leader, Special Ceremonial Platoon.

General Pace has held command at virtually every level, and served in overseas billets in Nam Phong, Thailand; Seoul, Korea; and Yokota, Japan. While serving as President, Marine Corps University, then Brigadier General Pace also served as Deputy Commander, Marine Forces, Somalia, from December 1992 - February 1993, and as the Deputy Commander, Joint Task Force - Somalia from October 1993 - March 1994.

After an assignment as the Director for Operations (J-3), Joint Staff, Washington DC, then Lieutenant General Pace served as the Commander, U. S. Marine Corps Forces, Atlantic/Europe/South. He was promoted to General and assumed duties as the Commander in Chief, United States Southern Command in September 2000.

As the Vice Chairman from October 2001 to August 2005, General Pace served as the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, Vice Chairman of the Defense Acquisition Board, and as a member of the National Security Council Deputies Committee and the Nuclear Weapons Council.

General Pace’s personal decorations include: Defense Distinguished Service Medal, with two oak leaf clusters; Defense Superior Service Medal; the Legion of Merit; Bronze Star Medal with Combat V; the Defense Meritorious Service Medal; Meritorious Service Medal with gold star; Navy Commendation Medal with Combat “V”; Navy Achievement Medal with gold star; and the Combat Action Ribbon.
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U.S. SENATOR PATTY MURRAY: Thank you. Mayor, thank you so much. I am really excited to be here, to be part of this year’s George C. Marshall Lecture and I’m honored to introduce our distinguished speaker, General Peter Pace. General, you have been to the Senate several times to brief me on military operations, so today I want to turn the tables and brief you about this audience and this community.

And there are three things I thought that you ought to know. First of all, and you may have already caught this, any time you say “Vancouver,” you need to the say “America’s Vancouver,” trust me. Trust me, the mayor gets a commission every
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time someone says that. Secondly, this is a community that really values its past and it’s working to keep it alive from the beautiful barracks to the reserve and beyond. Third, this community respects the sacrifices we make during wartime, from Fort Vancouver to the statue honoring the woman who worked at the Kaiser Shipyard during World War II.

General, we’ve assembled a great audience for you with more than 1,500 students, along with citizens and many elected leaders, including Congressman Brian Baird. I personally want to thank Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust, Celebrate Freedom, the Bank of Clark County and Hudson’s Bay High School for making today’s program possible.

General, you are here at a very critical time in our nation’s history. We all want America to be stronger. To me that means returning to the core values that have sustained our country for more than two hundred years: Democracy, respect for others, and recognition that we are all in this together.

One of the best examples of those core values was the Marshall Plan. George Marshall helped turn war-torn countries into democracies and ultimately, allies. Today we have so much to learn from General Marshall and I’m pleased that we have such an accomplished speaker for this year’s lecture.

It’s been said that General Pace’s life story is the story of the American Dream. Peter Pace was born in Brooklyn and raised in New Jersey. His parents immigrated to America from Italy and his father was an electrician. Peter Pace graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy and then went to Vietnam where he served as a rifle platoon leader in places that saw some of the war’s deadliest battles.

General Pace has served in Somalia, Thailand, Japan and Korea and he has held command at virtually every level. In addition, he earned a Master’s in Business Administration from George Washington University. In 2001, he was named Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In 2005, he became the sixteenth Chairman and the first Marine to hold that post. As chairman, he does not directly command combat forces. Instead, he serves as the top military advisor to the President, the Defense Secretary and the National Security Council.

General Pace understands the consequences of the war. To this day, he keeps a photo on his desk of the first Marine who was killed under his command in Vietnam and he’s not afraid to speak truth to power. Once, he was standing beside his boss, the Defense Secretary, at a press briefing. The secretary said that if American troops saw inhumane treatment, they only needed to report it. General Pace stepped forward twice and said, “American troops had an absolute obligation to stop any inhumane treatment.” As one reporter put it, “Officers in Iraq and the Pentagon took heart in what they saw from the new chairman, someone willing to state out loud what the U.S. Military stands for and aspires to, even if it contradicts his boss.

General Pace’s family understands military service. Both his older brother and his son served in the armed forces and he understands the opportunities that make America great. As he put it himself, “There is no other nation on the planet that would allow an immigrant son to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.”

As many of you here know, I voted against authorizing the Iraq war four years ago, but I also know that we need to listen to our military
experts whether they are telling us good news or bad news. I have always appreciated General Pace’s frank assessment of the challenges that we face and I am very honored that he is with us here today. So please join me in giving a warm Clark County welcome to our guest, the Chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff, General Peter Pace.

GENERAL PETER PACE: Thank you. Thank you all very much. Thank you. With that kind of a reception, I should just sit down and not spoil it (laughter.) Senator Murray, thank you ma’am, for those very, very generous words. More importantly, ma’am, thank you for your leadership. And I know that taking care of veterans is a passion for you. We all -- all of us who wear the uniform, all who wore it, and all who will wear it have benefited from your good leadership. In that regards, ma’am, we thank you for that.

You know, there’s a senator and a governor and a congressman and a mayor and a lot of elected officials here. There’s my commander from Vietnam and several Naval Academy classmates and several Marine Basic School classmates here today. If I may, I’m going to ignore all of you (laughter.) Because you can only talk to one audience at a time and the audience I’d like to talk to are the high school students who are here, because you are America’s future.

It’s a great privilege for me to come here before you and give what’s called a lecture. I hope it’s a discussion. I plan on talking a little bit and answering some questions, but I do hope that what I say today will have some meaning to you.

Before I get directly to the students though, there is one group that I want to come back to and those are the Gold Star Families who are here today. There’s no way that I or anyone else could possibly understand what you have sacrificed, except other Gold Star Families. And there’s no way that we can replace what you have lost. I hope somehow, in being here today, that you can understand and recognize and appreciate as we do that without your loved one’s sacrifice, this nation would not have the opportunity to do exactly what we are doing here today, to gather as we see fit; to talk about issues as we see fit; to agree and disagree with each other publically. And the loved ones that you have lost were fighting against those who would take that from us and we thank you for that.

To the students who are here today, I have just three basic messages. One is whatever you do with your lives, make a difference. General Marshall made a difference to millions and millions of people around the world. Not to embarrass her, but it’s kind of fun to do so and I’ve got the microphone(laughter). Senator Murray was told in the 1980s, by a politician, she could not make a difference. She did not listen to that guidance and she went out and rallied some 13 thousand families and saved a preschool program in a local community. Millions of people, thousands of people, and then there are the personal people who make a difference.

To me, the man’s name has already been mentioned but I’ll say it again. Lance Corporal Guido Farinaro, United States Marine Corps. Killed in Vietnam July 1968. Guido’s life had impact on many people, but I know for a fact he had a significant impact on one for sure and that is me. Guido was killed by a sniper in Vietnam and I made a promise to him that day that I would serve this nation as long and as hard as I could, that his sacrifice would not be in vain. There’s a little bit more to that story and I’ll come back to it in a minute.
But the point is that individuals can have impact on millions of people or thousands of people or only one person, and have served this nation and the good Lord in ways that are incredibly honorable. For you who are still thinking about tests and grades and what’s coming next, I understand that. But I would commend this to you, follow your dreams. Don’t let anybody tell you you cannot make a difference. Don’t let anybody tell you that what you want to do is not something you should do. This nation will allow you to do whatever it is you set your mind to do. And as long as you’ve got the education and the determination to do it, you can make it happen. I envy you, the life that’s going to unfold before you and I challenge you to make it the life you want it to be.

As you embark on that, I would ask you to check your moral compass regularly. Remember, I told you that Guido Farinaro was killed by a sniper. He was the first Marine I lost in combat. I was outraged. I was his lieutenant. I was so mad that I called in an artillery strike on the village from which the sniper fired. And my platoon sergeant, who was an E5 sergeant at the time and now is a retired Sergeant Major Marine named Reid B. Zachary, who lives here in the Great Northwest. Sergeant Zachary didn’t say a thing to me, he just looked at me. And I knew by the look on his face that I was about to do something wrong and I called off the artillery strike and did what I should have done in the first place, which was maneuver through the village. And when we did that, we found nothing but women and children. I do not know how I could live with myself today had I done what initially I almost did.

I tell you that story because if you do not check your moral compass and know what you will allow yourself to do before you are presented with the challenges, you may end up doing something you thought you never would allow yourself to do. Now it’s not always about combat. It can, in fact, deal with drugs. Will you or won’t you? It has to do with drinking. Will you or won’t you? It has to do with a myriad of things that when the opportunity is presented to you, it is most often when you are the weakest. And if you haven’t had a chance to think it through, you may end up doing something you never thought you would do. Last, you have two things that no one can ever take from you. One is your name. The other is your integrity. Only you can give those away.

In my almost 40 years of service, I’ve come to understand and appreciate courage. I first came to understand and appreciate courage in combat. But as I’ve gotten older and as I have been sitting around the seats of power, I have come to admire the courage that comes when a conversation is going in one direction and someone sitting around that table has the temerity to say “I see it different, I disagree. Here is why I disagree.” Now that person does not always carry the day, but that person can always go home feeling pretty darn good about themselves.

If you always tell the truth as you know it and accept the fact that you may not know all of the truth, but if you will tell the truth as you know it, if you will look people in the eye and just do exactly that. You may not always have everyone’s agreement, but you will always have everyone’s respect. And you’ll be welcome not because you are or you are not part of the team, but because people know that you are thoughtful, you are direct, you are honest, and you will look them in the eye and tell it as you see it.

I think I’ll stop talking at you and start answering
your questions. Who’s got the first question?

SPEAKER: General, thank you very much for your remarks. We have, with us today, student representatives from the Vancouver and Evergreen School Districts who will come forward. They’ll introduce themselves, General, and they’ll ask you a question.

First student, please.

KENDRA BROADWATER: Good morning, General Pace. My name is Kendra Broadwater and I’m from the Vancouver School of Arts and Academics and I would like to thank you for answering a few of our prepared questions for you this morning.

When U.S. troops occupy a country, what is expected of them in terms of how they treat the citizens, mutual respect, and making concessions for cultural differences? How might this ideal relationship between troops and civilians be maintained in Iraq?

GENERAL PETER PACE: Any time that U.S. military force is used, we want to and should only use that amount of force necessary to get the job done. That means, to the best of our ability, only applying power to the known enemy and, to the best of our ability, avoiding damage. It’s called collateral damage — I don’t like the term — avoiding collateral damage to civilians. Once we have attained the military objective, then, remembering that the proper relationship between the military and civilians in our form of government is civilian control of the military. Then as best we can, inside of that country, to be able to turn over responsibility for governing that country to the elected leaders of that country. That doesn’t happen quickly as you can tell by recent events. It doesn’t happen quickly. It isn’t easy, but it’s the right thing to do.

And in the process of assisting in that regard, the U.S. military should apply the kind of support that we equate in this country to our police forces. Is the crime in America’s Vancouver? (I’m trainable.) Yes, there is. But there’s a police force that keeps that crime level below the level of which the mayor and the government can function. And that then becomes the function, in my mind, of our forces overseas in other countries; assisting to keep the amount of violence in a town or a city or a province below the level of which that government can function. And if we do that and we respect the customs and courtesies of the local people, then I think we are doing a very difficult job about as humanely as possible.

Did that answer you question?

KENDRA BROADWATER: Yes.

GENERAL PETER PACE: Thanks.

SPEAKER and SPEAKER: Good morning, General. I’m Jennifer Pesut from Mt. View High School and I would like to ask you how your previous war experience influences your decisions as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

GENERAL PETER PACE: Thank you. It influences me, I hope, every single day. I do have Lance Corporal Guido Farinaro’s picture under the glass on my desk. I see him multiple times a day. He reminds me of my responsibilities. He reminds me that my decisions and my recommendations impact today’s lance corporals and lieutenants and captains. It is also personal from the standpoint of being able to give my best advice, to be able to sit there and talk to the senior leadership of this nation and be able to understand and, hopefully, convincingly articulate what is really going on in a battle that’s going on, or what people are...
probably thinking about the battle that’s going on and being able to relate to that.

I often use a phrase when I’m talking to people in Washington that this is the impact that this will have on PFC Pace — Private First Class Pace. This is the impact that this decision will have on Lieutenant Pace. To kind of mentally transport myself back to when I was a lieutenant in combat, but also to make sure that when we’re talking that everyone around the table recognizes that this is about real human beings and that -- and they do, but it never hurts to remind ourselves that this is about real human beings who are willing to sacrifice their lives for this country and we darn well need to take the best care of them that we can as we give them the missions we send them on. So that’s part of how it impacts me daily.

Thanks, Jennifer. KUNAL VASWANI: My name is Kunal Vaswani and I’m from Skyview High School and before I ask my question, I just want to say thank you for coming to Vancouver and speaking to us, we really appreciate it.

And so my question is Iran has continued to enrich uranium and to prevent United Nations investigators from entering Iran, despite threats of sanctions by the United Nations. Should such behavior continue, what will be the United State’s policy towards Iran?

GENERAL PETER PACE: As the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I am the Senior Military Advisor to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Council, the Homeland Security Council and the Congress when they ask me. Nowhere in anything I just said did I say I was Secretary of State (laughter.) So your question is a really good one and I recommend you consider inviting Secretary Rice here next year to answer it (laughter.)

DARCY CAHILL: Good afternoon, General Pace, I’m Darcy Cahill from Hudson’s Bay High School and I’d like to thank you for coming to our school today and for answering some of our questions for us. So my question for you today is do you have any advice for young men and women who are looking into going into the military?

GENERAL PETER PACE: Yeah! Put your right hand in the air (laughter.) If you are thinking about joining the military, God bless you. Our nation needs as many dedicated patriots as we can find. This is a tough, tough battle that we’re in and I would encourage those who want to go right away, by all means to do so. I also encourage those who are trying to decide between going to college and joining the military, go to college first and then come on in.

But I also want to point out what I believe is true. Someone before in the press conference, one of the students, asked about the draft, or what I thought about having everyone serve. My personal belief is that not every young person needs to serve the nation in uniform. But I think it would be really good if every young person found a way to pay back this country either through civic community work or Peace Corps or any other way that acknowledges that through accident of birth, we live in this incredible country and that we want to be able to pass on that opportunity to our kids and our grandkids.

So for those who want to join the military, God bless you. We need you. We’ll welcome you with open arms. For those who want to serve the country some other way, please go do that. And if I could encourage everybody listening to me to find a way to help give back to this country what it’s given to you.
PATRICK HENDLEY: Good afternoon, General Pace. My name is Patrick Hendley, I’m from Fort Vancouver High School. And our question to you is what is your opinion of how things are going in Iraq? What’s being accomplished there? How are we struggling? And how will sending additional troops help?

GENERAL PETER PACE: How much time have we got? (Laughter) It is not going as well in Iraq as I would have predicted had you asked me that question this time last year. This time last year, we looked like we were going to be having 28 thousand of Iraqi troops and police trained. By December of 2006, it looked like they were going to be able to take over the provinces and although we did, in fact, train up those troops, what happened in the mean time was the bombing of the Holy Mosque in Samarra. And that created exactly what Al-Qaeda wanted it to create, which was violence between Sunnis and Shiites... That violence was more than the Iraqi armed forces could handle by themselves.

As we went through the year, it became evident that we would not be able to draw down U.S. forces and then it became apparent that we may very well have to plus up. We spent several months, we, the Joint Chiefs, spent several months working with teams of officers who had been recently in Iraq. General Abizaid, the commander of U.S. Central Command, did the same thing with his team in Tampa. General Casey was at that time the commander in Baghdad, he was doing the same thing there.

We worked for several months on the various options. We then fed our information up the chain of command to our civilian leaders, who were doing the same kinds of things. And we said to them that adding additional troops, by itself, was not going to be sufficient. That to be successful, we needed a three-legged stool. One, security; two, good governance on the part of Iraqis; and three, economic opportunity. You could not have good governance and economic opportunity without security. But simply providing security wasn’t going to get it by itself and, therefore, if the plan was to plus up on all three legs, then it made sense from our view to add the additional troops.

The troops are going in. Prime Minister Maliki and his team in Iraq are providing the kinds of leadership that they promised they would provide. And the international community needs to start coming online now with job opportunities and the like. If those three things come together, it will still be a difficult time for the Iraqi people, but they will have the kind of opportunities that may not be exactly like what we have here in Vancouver, but will be a whole lot better than what they had under Saddam.

So, this is a thinking enemy. We have made the adjustments that we need to make. There’s no doubt in my mind that the enemy is going to make some adjustments, and we’re going to have to adjust to those. But if we stick with this and if we plus up on the good governance and the economics as well as the military, then we can be successful.

SPEAKER: General, we have time for one more quick question. Chris, if you would. After the questions are over, take the students there so the General can meet all of the students, including those who particularly did not get a chance to ask a question.

General, final question.
BROOKE BEKKEDAHL: General, my name is Brooke Bekkedahl and I’m honored to welcome you on behalf of Columbia River High School. As a General, what would you say is the greatest challenge or conflict that you have faced?

GENERAL PETER PACE: I think it’s an ongoing challenge, and that is to have the wisdom to know what is right and the courage to do it. And I get up every morning and I ask the good Lord for both of those things. I have a great team that I work for. It’s a wonderful Joint Staff in Washington, D.C. and we have fabulous Americans serving in uniform. But the biggest challenge is to understand the totality of the challenges, militarily, that face our nation today. Then, what is the best way to face those challenges, and then how to articulate it in a way that makes sense to those who have the ultimate responsibility to make the decisions.

It’s a good thing, in my mind as chairman, to go to work humble every day, because we have the world’s best, most capable military force. (Applause) And to aspire to lead that military force or to aspire to lead two or three people instead of two or three million people, whatever leadership position the good Lord gives either one of us, it’s good to remember our own limitations and to reach out and study and think and listen and work hard so that our decisions are based on as much experience that we have, ourselves, and that we’ve gained from others so that we can do the right thing for as many people as possible.

SPEAKER: Thank you. General, final thoughts?

GENERAL PETER PACE: My final thought is that that went quick. It really is a distinct honor for me to be here. If I could, because my bride is sitting in front of me and every time I look at her, it reminds me to say thank you to all the families here of all the military men and women. Those of us who serve in uniform do so with great pride. But when we’re in danger, we know it. And when we are in danger, at least if you happen to be a Marine, you’re surrounded by other Marines and that’s not a bad place to be (laughter.)

Our loved ones don’t know when we’re in danger so they think we’re always in danger. And, therefore, I believe that staying home and waiting is more difficult than going and doing. And our families serve this nation as well as anyone who has worn a uniform so thank you to them. (Applause.)

Lastly, if I had had a list of things I always wanted to do, I would not have even dreamt of putting myself on the list to come here to America’s Vancouver to talk with you all. Having done so now, I can tell you that I will put it on a lot of other people’s lists. (applause) This is an incredible exercise in freedom and it’s a wonderful opportunity for us to look at the younger generation coming up and take great pride and comfort in knowing that when we’re gone, you’ll be here and this nation is going to be just fine.★
JONATHAN (JON) B. JARVIS officially became the 18th Director of the National Park Service on October 2, 2009. A career ranger of the National Park Service, who began his career in 1976 as a seasonal interpreter in Washington, D.C., Jarvis takes the helm of an agency that preserves and manages some of the most treasured landscapes and valued cultural icons in this nation.

Prior to taking the helm as Director, Jarvis most recently served as the Regional Director of the Pacific West Region, with responsibility for 58 units of the National Park System in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, Nevada, Hawaii and the Pacific Islands of Guam, Saipan and American Samoa. He oversaw 3,000 employees with a $350 million annual budget.

Jon Jarvis moved up through the National Park Service as a protection ranger, a resource management specialist, park biologist, and Chief of Natural and Cultural Resources at parks such as Prince William Forest Park in Virginia, Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas, Crater Lake National Park in Oregon and North Cascades National Park in Washington. His first superintendency was at Craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho and he later served as the Superintendent of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve in Alaska from 1994 until 1999. He became the Superintendent of Mount Rainier National Park in August of 1999. In 2001 he completed training in the Senior Executive Service Candidate Program of the Department of Interior and in September of 2002, became the Regional Director of the Pacific West Region.

Jarvis served as president of the George Wright Society, 1997-98, a professional organization that sponsors a biennial conference on science and management of protected lands around the world. Mr. Jarvis has published and lectured on the role of science in parks at conferences and workshops around the U.S. In his previous positions, Mr. Jarvis has obtained extensive experience in developing government-to-government relations with Native American tribes, gateway community planning, FERC relicensing, major facility design and construction, wilderness management and general management planning.

A native of Lexington, Virginia, Jarvis has a B.S. in biology from the College of William and Mary and completed the Harvard Kennedy School Executive Program in 2001. He and his wife Paula have two children, Benjamin and Leah.

THANK YOU, ELSON, for your very kind and generous introduction. And thank you all for joining me here today.

As you know, 30 days ago, the Deepwater Horizon oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico exploded in a fireball, killing 11 men and causing what we may be one the worst environmental disaster this nation has ever seen. It may be equally devastating to the local economy of the communities of the Gulf.

I am serving as an Incident Commander along with the US Coast Guard and the Environmental Protection Agency as a part of the Unified Command out of Mobile, Alabama. We have the responsibility to protect the coast lines of Mississippi, Alabama and portions of Florida.

I flew here from that oil spill last night when I am done here, I will return to the Gulf to assist with the response.
Jon Jarvis
Director, National Park Service
There are really two fights in the gulf: one to stem the oil from spewing out of the well at 5000 feet below the surface. That is one mile down, in the pitch dark and under tremendous pressure. We are not even sure how many gallons are coming out but estimates range from 250,000 gallons to over a million per day. Engineers and scientists from all over the world are working around the clock to solve this complex problem. They have been able to insert a tube within the riser pipe and are capturing some of the oil. They hope to kill the well next week with something that is called a top kill. Watch the news, and hope we get it stopped.

The other fight is to protect the fish, wildlife, beaches and people along the gulf coast. There are seven national parks like Gulf Islands National Seashore and the Everglades National Park. An additional 33 national wildlife refuges representing nesting areas for pelicans, sea turtles, nurseries for fish and shrimp and the feeding ground for millions of water and shorebirds. These parks are also the lifeblood of tourism to the area. Gulf Islands National Seashore alone attracts over 5 million visitors a year.

Depending upon the winds, Gulf Islands National Seashore is within only 10 to 20 miles of the giant oil slick and should we get a strong southerly storm or worse yet a hurricane, the oil will come ashore with its suffocating and toxic effects.

The good news is that we have been working around the clock for weeks to prepare for that event. We have deployed over a million feet of boom to protect sensitive wetlands and sea grass beds. We have teams out every day cleaning up tarballs and monitoring for oil. We are making a difference.

As Incident Commander I represent the Department of the Interior which includes the National Park Service and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The Department has dispatched over 400 employees to the Gulf to assist. They are biologists, archeologists, health professionals, rangers, public information specialists and workers to help deploy floating booms to protect the parks and refuges.

More than 17,000 federal, state, and local government workers, private industry, nonprofit groups, and local citizens – people just like you – are all working together, dedicated to plugging the leak, cleaning up the mess, and restoring the ecosystems and economies damaged by the spill.

And to holding British Petroleum (BP) accountable and figuring out what went wrong, so that it can never happen again.

As soon as I heard of the spill, I mobilized National Park Service teams to begin to protect our fragile coastline and create baseline assessments before the oil hit. Baseline is a scientific approach to documenting how many birds, their species and distribution, water quality, and condition of the estuaries. Once we document current conditions, and the oil comes, we can determine scope of liability from BP and guide our cleanup and restoration efforts. BP has made the commitment to pay for all the clean-up.

One of the sad lessons from previous oil spills is that what starts in a split second, will take the ecosystem and the local economy years – if not decades – to recover.

So we also are putting in place monitoring systems to identify, track, and analyze long-term effects of the oil spill on everything from the birds to the beaches entrusted to our care.

This is going to be a long process and I have been deployed to the Gulf until we get this solved.
However, I was granted permission to come here to present the Marshall Lecture because the response to this oil spill by the public servants from the Department of the Interior, and other public agencies is in truly in the spirit of George C. Marshall.

When crisis came, he served his country. We are now doing the same.

I must say that it is great to be back in the Northwest. This is my 34th year with the National Park Service and I have lived all over the country but there is no place like the Northwest. I lived here for many years, hiked the cascades, and worked on the issues we all care about while I was park biologist at Crater Lake, Chief of Resources at North Cascades and Superintendent at Mount Rainer National Park.

I have also had the great pleasure of visiting Fort Vancouver many times – always finding it an incredibly interesting, fascinating, and fun place.

So it feels like I’m home, with friends who have invited me to be part of a very special day.

I am honored to have been invited to deliver the Marshall Lecture, part of Fort Vancouver National Trust’s Celebrate Freedom program.

And I am humbled to join the roster of those who have stood at this podium before me – people like Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell and Peter Pace, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, and Senator Daniel Inouye.

But most of all, I am grateful for the opportunity to talk with this huge crowd of young people here in the audience at Hudson’s Bay High School and what I understand are thousands listening in from schools around the state.

How many of you have been to a national park? Raise your hands!

We rangers have many great stories about parks, park wildlife and visitors. I have hundreds and I am just going to jettison the rest of the speech and tell stories.

Not really, but one of my favorite stories is that of a visitor coming into Yosemite National Park at the entrance station. He turned to the ranger and said “Sir, I have only two hours to visit Yosemite, what should I do”.

The Ranger looked at him and said, “Sir, you should just sit down on that rock over there and cry.”

We live in a fast paced society, but our national parks are there for you to slow down and listen to the wind in the pines.

- To Breath the fresh air.
- To Marvel at a night sky and the Milky Way.
- To watch a deer graze unafraid.
- To jump into an icy mountain lake for a few seconds, while screaming
- To go on a walk with a ranger, who will tell you the story behind the scenery

Each of you is welcome to your parks, so please do come visit one of your 392 national parks!

And while it is no substitute for the real thing, sometimes technology can offer a taste of what that national park experience can be.

Last fall, PBS aired filmmaker Ken Burns’ latest production, The National Parks: America’s Best Idea. The film was a sweeping history of national parks with Burns’ trademark: awesome imagery paired with incredible research and interviews.

I asked Ken Burns at one of the showings did he know that the real story behind the national parks was a story of ordinary people who did extraordinary things. He replied that he knew
about Teddy Roosevelt and John Muir but the others were a revelation.

People like George Melendez Wright.

Wright was a gregarious young Hispanic from a wealthy California family who grew up with an interest in nature. Working at Yosemite National Park in the late 1920s after earning a degree in forestry and zoology from the University of California, Wright became convinced that park actions were upsetting the equilibrium of nature.

Those were the days when the park service encouraged tourists to feed the bears, put out all fires, kept buffalo in corrals, and routinely shot predator species!

Wright proposed a first-ever survey of wildlife and plant life conditions in the national parks. The results of his four-year project turned National Park Service natural resource management practices on their head.

The result was at the age 29, Wright was handed the job of heading up a new national Wildlife Division set up to craft management policies to guide all parks.

The premise of those policies, that all life in the parks is protected, and not manipulated just for entertainment, or for just pretty species like deer, guides us even today.

In that capacity, Wright joined Marjory Stoneman Douglas – also featured in the film – in pushing for the creation of Everglades National Park, the first park ever established solely for the preservation of animals and plants and the environment needed to sustain them.

Douglas was a journalist, feminist, and environmentalist whose book, The Everglades: River of Grass, helped sway public support for what many saw simply as a swamp to be drained and developed. In her words:

“There are no other Everglades in the world. They are unique...in the simplicity, the diversity, the related harmony of the forms of life they enclose.”

I was recently in the Everglades and am happy to say that we are working hard to restore the Everglades to its natural function, to undo a century of destruction to its water and wildlife.

Burns also introduced viewers to Charles Young who was born into slavery, became the third African American to graduate from West Point, and the first to be superintendent of a national park.

In 1903, Young and his men – part of the famed Buffalo Soldiers – were sent to Sequoia to protect the park from poachers – a function carried out by the U.S. Army in the years before the creation of the National Park Service in 1916.

While there, Captain Young and his troops completed the first road into the Giant Forest of Sequoia, an accomplishment no prior superintendent had been able to achieve.

In 1902, a year before Captain Young was sent to Sequoia, another young Army officer was being commissioned as a second lieutenant. This was the start of the illustrious military and diplomatic career of George Marshall who utilized his potent strategic skills to win a world war...and then cement the peace by rebuilding a broken Europe.

But before George C. Marshall became General Marshall, he served as Commanding General here at Vancouver Barracks with oversight over the Civilian Conservation Corps – or CCC – in the Pacific Northwest.

During those years, Marshall managed not a war, but threw his service to our nation’s struggle to survive.
At the height of the Great Depression, one out of four Americans was out of work. Those that had jobs lived in constant fear of losing them. Fathers and mothers were unable to properly feed and clothe their children, or provide them with adequate shelter.

Families were separated, with men often taking to the road or rails in search of work, any work. Hundreds of thousands of Americans ended up in “shantytowns,” idle, hungry, homeless, and disillusioned.

For many, there appeared to be no way out, no salvation from this horrific time.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt hit the problem head-on in his first inaugural address in 1933:

“Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time, through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources.”

The Civilian Conservation Corps was one of President Roosevelt’s most important programs to move our country out of hard times.

The CCC offered millions of young men a paycheck…and the opportunity to learn a trade.

But perhaps the most important thing the CCC offered was hope.

Hope that the next day would be better than the last.

Hope that their hard work was not only rebuilding their lives and families – but their country.

During the depression, my grandfather had the fortune to have a job on the railroad, but my father went into the CCC and was stationed in a camp in the south. That experience made him a hard working man all his life, who believed in public service. He served in World War 2 as well and then as mayor of my home town. It also instilled in him the love of the outdoors and a respect for nature that I carry in my blood.

Here in the Northwest, the CCC built fire trails, bridges, and campgrounds. They constructed thousands of miles of fence and roads. They fought fires, built lookout towers, and planted trees.

The accomplished this without a nail gun, power drill, or chainsaw but with sweat, brute strength, team work and ingenuity.

Led by skilled local men, some of the boys became fine craftsmen who did exquisite work still visible today – some 70 years later – places like

- the larger-than-life stature of Timberline Lodge in Mount Hood National Forest
- the large timbered, log structures at Mount Rainier National Park
- the mountain top fire lookout towers in what is now North Cascades National Park.

I understand that there may be a few of the CCC boys or their families in the audience today. If so, please stand up.

We owe each of you a debt of gratitude for taking care of our parks and forests and getting this country back on its feet.

Applause

- The men of the CCC.
- The 400 National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife employees at the Gulf oil spill.
George Melendez Wright.
Marjory Stoneman Douglas.
Captain Charles Young.

Each made a difference for their family, for their community, for their country, each in their own way. General Marshall devoted his entire life to service, in the military, as a diplomat, and as head of the American Red Cross.

My father and the other CCC men were proud that their public works projects were valuable, and that the paychecks they sent home were for real work. Marjory Stoneman Douglas rallied citizens to protect a River of Grass.

Charles Young showed that the color of a man’s skin had nothing to do with his ability on the battlefield or in a national park.

George Melendez Wright, not satisfied with the status quo, changed the way the National Park Service views the world.

The thousands of men and women who volunteered to go to the Gulf to save an ecosystem and an economy from oil.

They each made a difference, and so can you.

Many of you in the room – well at least the high school students! – are nearly the same age of those young men who joined the CCC for the paycheck and the hope.

Today, many of our fellow citizens are once again looking for a paycheck…and for hope.

Because our nation is once again facing serious problems.

We’re weathering a global economic crisis. Innocent people lost their jobs, their homes, and their self-respect. Unemployment is high across the country, not like the depression but high enough that it hurts. I know that Clark County is also suffering.

We are at war on two fronts and battling international terrorism that threatens not only our nation, but every nation on the planet.

A changing climate from global warming is challenging us with more intense fires, less potable water and melting glaciers.

Our waistlines are enlarging, people are more disconnected with nature and civic discourse too often dissolves into uncivil discord.

Ken Burns said we have a little too much pluribus and not enough unum.

And in the Gulf of Mexico we have unfolding a crisis.

But like FDR, I believe there are no unsolvable problems if we face them courageously – and we face them together.

A friend of mine recently said that disasters bring out the best of humanity.

In the Gulf we have already registered thousands of volunteers who want to come and help.

And that’s why I said when I started that I was grateful for this opportunity to talk with the high school students here today.

Because we need you.

We need you to be brave enough to protect our nation and its people on the streets of American cities and those far away.

To be so passionate about the future that you will teach the next generation, find cures for diseases that ravage our society, and discover how to generate energy without pollution.
Public service takes all these forms…and many more.

For those of us in the National Park Service it is a calling, a mission.

For us, public service starts with the honor of being entrusted with the care of nearly 400 places that explain who we are as Americans.

At a major conference about the future of the National Parks in 2000, a prominent historian said “the National Park Service has the responsibility to make this experiment in democracy succeed”. Medal of Freedom Winner, author and historian David McCullough challenged the National Park system to reawaken an interest in American history by connecting people to the places where our history was made.

To put it another way, why would a new American citizen, recently immigrated to the United States and having taken the oath of U.S. citizenship, need to visit Gettysburg or Yorktown? Does he or she really care about the details of Pickett’s charge across the cornfields, or Cornwallis’ surrender to General Washington, or should he/she visit because it is here that the fires of democracy raged, American blood was shed, and today he/she can enjoy the freedoms of our society?

The cultural parks of our country are the places where civic engagements, often confrontational, occasionally bloody, have shaped who we are as a people. Selma to Montgomery, Brown versus Board of Education, Manzanar Japanese American Internment Camp, the Statue of Liberty, Ellis Island, Flight 93 are all parks of national significance, where not only do we learn of the people who left their marks on our future, but through this intimate contact with place, we learn how to take the next generation to a higher and better place.

The natural parks of our country, in addition to their intrinsic beauty and great resources, stand as testimony to this nation’s willingness to impose self restraint on the forces of private ownership and extractive development.

The 392 units of the National Park System are a collective expression of who we are as a people, through the preservation of the places where our values were forged in the hottest fires. They are an aggregate of what we Americans value most about ourselves. They also deliver messages to future generations about the foundation experiences that have made America a symbol for the rest of the world.

They represent the best of the best of the places to learn about American values.

The National Park Service loves sharing those places and their stories with more than 280 million visitors every year, helping them learn about history, explore the great outdoors, or just have some fun. And it also means revitalizing communities across the country through incentives for historic preservation and the creation of close-to-home recreational opportunities.

To do this takes a workforce of more than 20,000 employees, and legions of partners, including nearly 200,000 volunteers who last year contributed nearly 6 million hours of time to their national parks.

All of us – employees, partners, and volunteers – share a common commitment to make sure that you will always be able to walk in a primordial rain forest at Olympic or reflect on our young nation’s bloodiest battle at Gettysburg.

And in your own community, to tour Fort Vancouver, where American settlers sought supplies
and a respite from the hardships after a long and arduous journey on the Oregon Trail.

The National Park Service invites you to not only visit your national parks, but to be inspired by them, to be rejuvenated and to hear your calling to step up as this country needs everyone of you to do and be your best.

To help us protect and share the legacy they represent so that others can learn and be inspired.

To be one of those people who makes a difference.

Not far from here, a young man is doing just that, putting his mark on a national park.

From the third through fifth grade, Michael Liang went to a two-week environmental day camp at Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in Michigan. He got inspired.

Starting in 2004, at the University of Michigan, he spent his summers interning and then working as seasonal ranger at North Cascades.

In grad school the last two years at the University of Washington, Michael has continued working for the park doing science communication.

Last year, Michael got his Masters degree and accepted a full-time permanent position at North Cascades.

And now he has come full circle. He’s working on a native plant project with elementary school kids from Concrete, Washington, the Kulshan Creek Neighborhood program to help underserved kids stay out of trouble, get outside, and visit the park, and teaching video storytelling techniques to high schoolers in the park’s climate change program.

The national parks inspired Michael.

And now he inspires us.

Here a bit closer to home, I had the opportunity to meet Aaron Ochoa when I was here at the park last year. Aaron grew up in Vancouver. He graduated from Columbia River High School in 1997 and immediately entered the U.S. Army. Aaron served in Iraq and Korea. After finishing his military service, he went back to school in 2005. Aaron went to Clark College and received his Associate’s Degree. While at Clark, he paid his way through school by way of the GI Bill and the work study program at Fort Vancouver. He was then hired by the park as a summer seasonal.

After graduating from Clark College, he entered Washington State University, the Vancouver Campus. We were fortunate enough to hire Aaron at that point through a student hiring authority. That was last August. Aaron graduated from WSU-Vancouver on May 15th – just a few days ago. In June, Aaron will become a full time Park Ranger at Fort Vancouver. Aaron, in a few short years, has served our nation in many ways. He has chosen the role of public service as his career. Aaron is making a difference. We are grateful that he has joined our ranks. Aaron, can you please stand?!?! Welcome to the National Park Service."

Aaron and Michael join the ranks of thousands of people who have devoted their lives to making the world better through their service. They like George Marshall give us hope and inspiration. You too can make that kind of difference.

Thank you for your invitation to be here today. Thank you for considering my invitation to be a visitor, a volunteer, or an advocate for your national parks.

Thank you!
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It’s a pleasure to be here with you today. I have to tell you it’s a pleasure to be anywhere but Washington DC. Thank you to the Fort Vancouver National Trust for the honor of giving the 18th annual Marshall Lecture. I’m pleased to see so many members of the Vancouver community here. I want to thank Sterling Bank and all of those supporting this lecture and all of those activities of Fort Vancouver, especially those aimed at educating and inspiring young people.

With this in mind, I’d like to share some thoughts this morning about General Marshall, my personal hero and role model, and what can teach us about character and service. Now I do so, keenly aware that some of the students here this morning are not here entirely voluntarily, and all of you would still rather be on spring break.

This is the time of year when college acceptance letters are beginning to arrive and seniors are gearing up for life beyond high school. I had pretty good grades in high school, so I thought I was pretty smart. Then I went to college and during the first semester of my freshman year at William and Mary, I got a D in Calculus. My father called me long distance from Kansas, and in those days a long distance call was a big deal. He said, “Tell me about the D.” And I said, “Well Dad, the D was a gift.” And years later when I was president of Texas A&M university, I would tell freshman that I learned two lessons from that D. First, that even if you’re fairly smart you won’t succeed if you don’t work hard. And second, I am standing proof that you can survive a D as a freshman and go on to make something of yourself.

When I went to graduate school at Indiana studying Russian and soviet studies, I met with a recruit with the Central Intelligence Agency, an organization I had never considered working for. I wanted to be a history professor.

At First CIA tried to train me to become a spy, and I have to confess that my efforts were less James Bond and more Austin Powers - and I obviously don’t mean that in a good way.

One of my first training assignments was to practice secret surveillance with a team of trainees shadowing a woman CIA officer around downtown Richmond, VA.

Our team wasn’t very stealthy, and some good citizen of Richmond reported to the Richmond police that three disreputable men - that would be my fellow trainees and me - were stalking this poor woman.

My two colleagues were picked up by the Richmond police, and the only reason I didn’t get arrested was because I’d lost her so early in the exercise.

So both the CIA and I decided that I wasn’t really cut out to be a spy, so I became a CIA analyst - one of those who assess and interpret all the information that comes in from agents in the field and satellites in the sky. That led to a career that allowed me to witness and participate in amazing moments in American history.

So it may take you a few miss-steps and perhaps even a few embarrassments before you find that thing that you’re good at and that you love, whether you go to college or not, but keep at it.

In the nearly 47 years since joining the government, I’ve worked for 8 presidents. As a result I’ve learned many things about service and about leadership from all the great men and women that I’ve been privileged to serve or work with in some capacity, including, I may add, the recently departed Margaret Thatcher.
But the leader who educated and inspired me the most was a leader that I never met or worked with, and that was General George C Marshall, and how he lived his life, and how he served his country. As Secretary of Defense, his portrait was on the wall behind my desk, hanging alongside my other hero, his partner in command, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Marshall was the gold standard for what I consider the most important character trait, and that is moral courage.

Late in 1917 during World War 1, George Marshall was on the commander’s staff in France conducting an exercise for the American Expeditionary Force. General Blackjack Pershing, then US Commander, was in a foul mood. He dismissed critiques from one subordinate and then another, then stalked off.

But then Captain Marshall took the arm of General of the Army Pershing, spun him around, and told him how the problems they were having resulted from not having a necessary manual from Pershing’s headquarters.

And Pershing said, “Well you know we have our problems.”

And Marshall said, “Yes I know you do General, but ours are immediate and every day, and have to be solved before night.”

If you haven’t been in the military, it is hard to convey the vast gulf in rank, status, and power between the commanding general in a war and a junior officer, and correspondingly, how courageous it was for Marshall to stand up to Pershing - not for the purpose of being disrespectful or insubordinate, but to tell the general the hard truth of what he needed to know - in this case, the readiness of his army as he prepared for battle.

Sure enough, after this meeting, Marshall was approached by other officers offering their condolences, and the fact that he was sure to be fired and sent to the trenches. Instead, Marshall became an invaluable advisor to Pershing and Pershing a great mentor to Marshall.

So Marshall has a lot to teach us about courage - the courage to do what is right and necessary, and not just what is popular. Educational institutions and business and government experts all talk and teach a lot these days about teamwork. About teambuilding and consensus and collaborative efforts - and that’s good. However, the time inevitably will come, someday, when you see something going on that you know is wrong or unwise. And you will at some point be called upon to stand alone and say “This cannot be allowed.” Don’t kid yourself - that takes moral courage.

Courage was a quality Marshall never lost, even as he climbed military ranks and reached senior positions. Twenty years after the confrontation with Pershing, Marshall, now a one star general, was sitting in the White House with President Franklin D. Roosevelt and all his top advisors and cabinet secretaries. War in Europe was looming, but still a distant possibility for America. And in that meeting Roosevelt proposed that the US Army - which at that time ranked in size somewhere between that of Switzerland and Portugal - should at that point have lower priority for funding and equipment than providing assistance to Great Britain to keep them in the fight.

FDR’s advisors nodded - building the US Army should wait. Then FDR, looking for the military’s endorsement for a decision he’d already made, said “Don’t you think so George?”
Marshall, who hated being called by his first name, even by a president, said “I’m sorry Mr. President, but I don’t agree with that at all.” The room went silent. The treasury secretary told Marshall afterward, “Well, it’s been nice knowing you.”

It was not too much later that Marshall became Chief of Staff of the Army.

Marshall in this case performed the ultimate act of loyalty to his commander in chief, which was to give his honest opinion instead of currying favor by going along with the consensus. But Marshall also was loyal when Roosevelt decided against him. He didn’t run to the Congress, he didn’t leak to the press, he saluted and obeyed. Both in offering honest advice, and obeying without complaint, Marshall kept his integrity intact - understanding that once someone compromises his or her integrity, it is difficult, if not impossible, to get it back.

The actor John Wayne, as far as I’m concerned a great American philosopher, once said “There is right and there is wrong. You gotta do one or the other. You do one and you’re living, you do the other and you may be walking around, but you’re as dead as a beaver hat.”

Character has been described as how you behave when no one else is looking. Character and integrity do not suddenly appear when you’re an adult or assume positions of responsibility. Your character is formed from the day you know right from wrong - that telling the truth is good, and lying and cheating are bad. Your character is being built today. Try to model it after Marshall and others like him.

Second, Marshall is also a model for us when it comes to service, putting the interests of others, above all one’s country, before self. Consider that when General Marshall retired as Army Chief of Staff in November 1945, he’d been on active duty for more than 43 years - a career in which it took him 15 years to make Captain and 34 years of service to get his first star. He’d been Chief of Staff for more than 6 years, through the greatest war the world had ever seen. If there was anyone who ever deserved a leisurely retirement with his family it was George Marshall.

But a week after retiring, Marshall had arrived in Leesburg, VA; the phone rang and it was President Truman, and he wanted Marshall to be his special envoy to China. As Marshall’s biographer had put it, arms were stacked but the soldier’s task had not ended. Marshall accepted on the spot, and as a result of taking on that assignment and the others that followed - Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense - George Marshall, the great architect of victory in World War II, would be practically tarred and feathered in a polarized America. Joseph McCarthy and others would vilify him for allegedly losing China and for supporting President Truman’s firing of General MacArthur. A newspaper cartoon of the period depicted Marshall as a senile old clown, cutting out paper dolls.

Fortunately Marshall’s reputation and legacy survived this shabby treatment, and his memory is honored in ways large and small all across this country, including the event that brings us together today.

A third and final point. When Marshall served here at Fort Vancouver, he had no idea what lay ahead for him. Neither did Ulysses S. Grant when he was here. When I was 17 – your age - I was a kid in high school in Wichita, Kansas. I came from a very middle class family; neither one of
my parents went to college. I wasn’t a straight A student, I wasn’t a student athlete; I wasn’t president of student government. I had no idea what lay ahead for me. So as you sit here today, you also have no idea where your path will lead—don’t be afraid to dream big. Remember that path must have a solid foundation of character and integrity, and you are building that foundation now.

I would close with this thought, and a bit of insight from public service spanning almost five decades. The criticisms to which one can be exposed in public service, the sacrifices, the hard work—despite all of that, what drew Marshall and countless others to service is a willingness to serve a cause greater than their own comfort, their own convenience, and their own self-interest. If you scratch deeply enough, you will find that most of us who serve, no matter how outwardly tough or jaded or egotistical, are, in our heart of hearts, romantics and idealists and optimists. We actually believe it’s possible to make the lives of others better, and the world a better place. That is a spirit that I hope you will embrace in your youth - and never lose.

Thank you!★
The Fort Vancouver National Trust

- Coordinates the Celebrate Freedom programs including the Flag Day Ceremony, Veterans Day Parade, Marshall Public Leadership and Youth Leadership Award programs and the General George C. Marshall Lecture Series.

- Operates Pearson Air Museum and manages event rentals and the museum’s events including Open Cockpit Day, Aviation Summer Camp and Christmas at Pearson.

- Manages the Fort Vancouver National Site retail operations including the Fort Vancouver Bookstore and Pearson Air Museum Bookstore.

- Serves as cooperating association to the National Park Service at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

- Holds the master lease for Officers Row and West Barracks properties, which enables the Trust to manage property operations, renovations and development at the Fort Vancouver National Site.

- Facilitates the site’s Education Master Plan and Long Range Plan operational and program priorities in conjunction with its Partners.

- Provides financial support to the National Park Service for education programs.

- Promotes the Fort Vancouver National Site as a visitor destination through marketing and communications, management of the group tourism program and coordination of public and private events.

- Spearheads resource development efforts through planned giving programs, corporate and individual donor solicitations and grant writing.