



news release

FROM THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE PUBLICITY DIVISION 1730 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON 6, D.C. FEDERAL 3-8750

FOR A.M.'S RELEASE
SUNDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1964

B-3851

"THE PURSUIT OF PEACE"
TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY
BY

HUBERT HUMPHREY
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
SOUTH BEND, INDIANA
OCTOBER 10, 1964

In the present era as in the past, no issues move men more deeply than those of war and peace. The Bible tells us to "Pursue peace" -- and mankind has, since the beginning of time, condemned the horrors of war. If discord and strife, wars and the threat of wars have persisted throughout history, it is perhaps as St. Augustine says: that men make war not because they love peace the less, but rather because they love their own kind of peace the more.

Today a new era has come. Since that day at Alamogordo when man acquired the power to obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face. And the vision of it has sobered all men and demanded of them a keener perception of mutual interests and a higher order of responsibility.

In the nuclear age, the deliberate initiation of full-scale war as an instrument of national policy has become an absurdity. Originally a means to protect national interests, war today can assure the death of a nation. Although we will continue to repel all threats of intimidation, we shall continue to realize that the threat of nuclear blackmail should play no part in our own conduct of affairs with other nations.

Today, in the year 1964, our vision of the absurdity of war and the necessity for peace is enlarged because two great and good men have given us their vision of the path to peace -- Pope John XXIII and John F. Kennedy.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy asked friend and foe alike to "begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction."

In his encyclical "Peace on Earth," Pope John XXIII proclaimed:

(more)

"Justice, right, reason, and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of controls.:

The world will long remember the Presidency of John F. Kennedy -- because he did "begin anew" to explore the problems which "unite us instead of laboring those problems which divide us."

He did begin anew to formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms.

He did begin anew to initiate negotiations with the Soviet Union to restrict the spread of the deadly atom.

He did begin anew to focus the machinery of our government on the question of peace and disarmament -- by establishing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, a measure which, I am proud to say, I proposed in 1959.

In all these undertakings, John Kennedy moved us forward on the long, hard path to peace.

The history of our era taught him that peace is best preserved through strength -- strength used with restraint, with wisdom, and with a clear sense of perspective.

In 1961, President Kennedy and the Democratic Congress moved to insure that our strength would be preeminent, that our balanced military power could deter or defeat any foe in any foreseeable situation.

The range of our power and the determination of our leadership were proven in the confrontations with the Soviet Union over Berlin and Cuba. Our strong resolve and steady restraint convinced the Soviet leaders of the folly of further provocation.

Faced with this massive array of strength, Chairman ~~Khrushchev~~ concluded that an all-out war with the United States must be avoided -- for in such a war "the survivors would envy the dead."

But strength is a means, not an end. It can only open the avenues to peace; it is up to us to walk the path of peace.

(more)

John Kennedy understood this. In the wake of the Cuban missile confrontation, he moved to press for sanity. In June of 1963, at American University, he issued an historic plea to both sides to "re-examine our attitude toward peace." He called for renewed efforts toward a "more practical, more attainable peace -- based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions -- on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned."

His plea was not in vain. In October 1963, President Kennedy signed a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.

It was just one year ago today that the test ban treaty entered into force.

Because of this treaty, the development of effective nuclear weapons systems by other nations is today less likely.

This treaty has won respect throughout the world for the United States as the guardian of peace. It has inspired increased hope for the future of mankind on this planet.

The people of this country overwhelmingly supported the test ban. More than four-fifths of the Democrats in the Senate voted in favor of the treaty. So did 25 of the 33 Republican Senators, including the distinguished Republican leader, Everett McKinley Dirksen, who said: "I want to take a first step, Mr. President. I am not a young man -- one of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone, he knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step."

I regret that Senator Goldwater failed to follow the leadership of Senator Dirksen and his colleagues. He knew what happened at Hiroshima. But he voted against the treaty. And he has indicated that if he were to be elected President, he would consider repudiating it.

It is not surprising that Senator Goldwater would consider repudiating the test ban treaty, as he apparently believes that war is inevitable. He stated in an interview for the New York Post in 1961:

"Someday, I am convinced, there will either be a war or we'll be subjugated without war...real nuclear war...I don't see how it can be avoided -- perhaps five or ten years from now."

I do not believe war is inevitable. And I am convinced that most Americans -- whether Democrats or Republicans -- do not believe that war is inevitable.

(more)

The nuclear test-ban treaty was the first step in the path to a more enduring peace. We have taken other steps as well.

We have agreed to prohibit the stationing of weapons of mass destruction in space. A United Nations resolution, jointly sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union, called on all countries to refrain from such action. It was adopted by acclamation -- without a single dissenting vote.

This resolution was hailed by leaders of the free world as a vital step toward keeping the world of space open to peaceful exploration, not to military exploitation.

This year, in addition, the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union announced cutbacks in their planned production of fissionable materials for use in weapons. This was the first concrete pledge to slow down the race for larger nuclear stockpiles. As President Johnson has stated, such a race can be provocative as well as wasteful.

The need for instant communication between the United States and the Soviet Union -- to avoid the miscalculation which might lead to nuclear war -- was proven during the Cuban missile crisis. Since that time, we have established a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow to avoid such miscalculation.

The agenda for the future is long -- and President Johnson has let the world know that it will not go unattended.

We must seek additional measures designed to prevent war by miscalculation or accident. We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of selected observation points. We must seek to restrict the nuclear arms race by restricting transfer of nuclear weapons, by converting fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, and by outlawing underground tests, with adequate inspection and enforcement.

If we desire a break-through in arms control, we should lend our support to regional arms control agreements. We might well begin with Latin America.

Nuclear weapons would serve no useful purpose whatsoever in preserving the security of this area. Any possible external military threat to the security of the Latin American continent can and will be repulsed by the United States.

(more)

The introduction of nuclear weapons would provoke a rivalry that would imperil the peace of the hemisphere. It would endanger the precarious economies of countries which already possess military forces too large for their security needs and too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance.

The first and foremost task in the pursuit of peace, therefore, is to control nuclear weapons. But nuclear rivalry is not the only barrier to peace in the world today.

As Pope John XXIII stated in his encyclical Mater et Magistra, "Given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists." If control of nuclear weapons is the central issue in improving relations between East and West, the narrowing of the gap between rich nations and poor is essential to harmony between North and South.

In Latin America, in Asia and Africa, the threat to peace -- lies in the shocking inequality between privileged and impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between booming industrial regions and primitive rural areas. The challenge to peace -- yes, the threat to peace -- in these areas is the revolutionary challenge of an unjust social order, a social order in which true peace -- peace based on justice -- is impossible.

As a people who have been "more blessed with this world's goods," we must heed Pope John's plea to assist "those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery and hunger and who lack even the elementary rights of the human person."

We must do this out of compassion -- for we are our brother's keeper. And we also do it out of self-interest as well -- for our lot is their lot, our future their future, our peace their peace. This planet is simply too small for the insulation of the rich against turbulence bred of injustice in any part of the world.

Our efforts to preserve lasting peace must continue to include substantial economic and technical aid to the Southern half of the world. And among our programs of assistance, none have matched the success of the Peace Corps.

(more)

Here at Notre Dame, which is a training center for Volunteers going to Latin America, you are well aware of the role which American young men and women have played in bringing health and education -- in inspiring hope and lightening the burden -- for countless thousands of underprivileged people in far-flung nations of the world. These young Americans realize that there is a moral imperative to service beyond that of mere self-service -- that individual Americans can make a daily personal contribution to promoting peace throughout the world.

If the memory of John F. Kennedy is revered around the world, it is in great part because he initiated programs which furthered the pursuit of peace -- the creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the signing of the Test Ban Treaty, the establishment of the Peace Corps, the launching of the Alliance for Progress, and the reorganization of our foreign aid program to enable us better to meet the challenge of social revolution in the nations of the Southern half of the world.

John Kennedy's legacy is a living legacy. And each of these programs was supported by, and now commands the firm support of President Johnson.

The dual challenge to peace posed by the arms race and the threat of violent revolution can only be met in the long run through a stable and effective system of international law. The basis for that system -- the great hope for that system -- is the United Nations.

The United Nations has proven its value as an institution for world peace. Our faith in it is strong -- and our hope is firm that it will one day become what it was intended to be: a world society of nations under law -- not merely law backed by force, but law backed by justice and by popular consent.

The final alternative to war can only be world law. And the best hope of achieving world law is through the United Nations.

This was the plea of Pope John and his predecessors.

This was President Kennedy's great dream. Again and again he affirmed the ideal of world law as the most essential goal of mankind in our time. He said that we must end the arms race or the arms race will end the human race. He called for the creation of a workable world law as the one best way to achieve that purpose.

But until world law holds sway and until more comprehensive arms control agreements are achieved, we are still faced with the task of keeping the peace. My pledge to you is that this Administration will always seek to blunt the conflicts which may lead to war, not to escalate them. We will always strive to avert war by using our awesome power with prudence and restraint. And we shall always seek to avoid a posture which would leave no alternative but inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. And we shall seek to avoid provoking holocaust by reckless use of nuclear ultimatum.

Today, in the great tradition of Pope John and John F. Kennedy, President Johnson has asked that we look beyond the cold war which has "consumed our energies and "often limited our horizons." While remaining strong, he understands that we must focus attention on problems which will persist well beyond the cold war. These problems, the President has said, are "the obstacles to man's effort to build a great world society -- a place where every man can find a life free from hunger and disease, a life offering the chance to seek spiritual fulfillment unhampered by the degradation of bodily misery."

President Johnson has announced that the United States intends to make 1965 International Cooperation Year -- to renew our policies and to plan for the future. He plans to call a "White House conference to search and explore every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace."

President Johnson knows that it is easier to destroy than to build. It is easier to make war than to think, persuade, reconstruct, and act responsibly. President Johnson knows, and we know, that responsible action is the only way to proceed. President Johnson knows that most Americans -- indeed most people on this planet -- yearn to build a world where peace is more than simply a hiatus between wars.

To those who ask "Why Not Victory" -- we reply: Why Not Victory indeed -- victory over war itself, victory for peace, victory for mankind.

#

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
University of Notre Dame
South Bend, Indiana
October 10, 1964

Senator Humphrey. Thank you very much. I just wanted you to know how much television time costs.

Congressman Brademas, and Senator Bayh, the students, faculty and friends of these great universities and colleges, Notre Dame and St. Mary's, Bethel. (Applause)

I am just delighted to be here on this great campus of Notre Dame University.--(Applause) -- that has as its President one of the truly outstanding men of our time, Father Hesbergh. (Applause)

And what a privilege it is to be in this great Stephan Hall, such a marvelous structure,-- (laughter) -- to see this great audience and to know that tonight we can discuss matters of serious import.

Before I do that, may I say that Notre Dame did very well today. (Applause) What you did to the Air Force Academy Lyndon Johnson is going to do to an Air Force Reserve General. (Applause)

To permit me just to sneak in a little praise for the home town team, Minnesota won, too. (Laughter) (Applause)

I am singularly honored to be on this platform with the Congressman from this District. I heard how he was introduced here as the Favorite Son, so to speak, of a very fine college and he quickly amended that, but this gentleman, John Brademas, is known in Congress as one of the hardest working, most talented and gifted members. (Applause)

His work in the field of education is known to all of you. And his tremendous effort on behalf of this community of South Bend, where many a worker through no fault of his own was laid off the job at the Studebaker plant, this gentleman through his own efforts has been able to convince both the President and the Congress that because of the special nature of the problems in South Bend that the President will appoint a special commission and committee to look into this local situation and to bring about some remedy for people that need that help.

This is the kind of a Congressman you ought to support. (Applause)

I am sure you know that we have a little election going on and in a few weeks it will be over, and we do hope that by the time that great day arrives we will have had an opportunity to discuss the great issues that face the American people. It seems to me that in a campaign besides just the shouting and the booing or the cheering and the jeering, there ought to be some thinking. And tonight I want to talk with you about a problem that I think is central to our time, and that issue is the one of war and peace because no issue moves men more or more deeply than the concern over the future of our planet, over the future of our people.

The Bible tells us to pursue peace, and mankind has since the beginning of time been condemned to the horrors of war. But let me set the record straight. The horrors of war are different now. A new era has come and we ought to talk in terms of that new era. (Applause)

Since that day at Alamogordo, out in the desert of New Mexico, when men acquired the power to obliterate themselves from

the face of the earth, war has worn a new face, and the easy shop talk or platform talk about the issues of peace and war do not become a nation that has the responsibility today for peace.

In the nuclear age the deliberate initiation of a full scale war as an instrument of national policy has become an absurdity that even to talk about is mad. War today can assure the death not only of armies, not only of a nation but of several nations.

Although we will continue to build our strength as an instrument of peace and continue to repel all threats in any form of intimidation or aggression, let it be clear that we shall also continue to realize that the threat of nuclear blackmail should play no part in the conduct of the affairs of this government with other nations.

Today our vision of the absurdity of war and the necessity of peace is enlarged because of the lives and works of two great men, Pope John XXIII and John F. Kennedy. (Applause)

In that memorable inaugural address, President Kennedy asked friend and foe alike to "begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction."

That ought to be a warning and a challenge to every living soul.

In his great Encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, Peace on Earth, Pope John XXIII proclaimed for all mankind and all time:

"Justice, Right, Reason, and Humanity urgently demand that the race should cease, that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned, that nuclear weapons should be banned, and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of controls."

I say to this audience that if a great man, the greatest spiritual leader of our time, can ask us to think in terms of arms control, the control of nuclear power, could ask us to think in terms of peace, then to talk of peace is not cowardice or appeasement but to talk of it is the noblest work of mankind and the courage of giants. (Applause)

Now, the world will long remember the Presidency of John Kennedy because he did begin anew to explore problems which unite us instead of laboring those problems which divide us.

Oh, how I wish that some spokesman today would remember these words. Unite us rather than belaboring problems that divide us.

He did begin anew to formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms. He did initiate negotiations for a nuclear test ban treaty. He did begin anew to focus the machinery of government on the question of peace by establishing an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency which I was proud to have sponsored and successfully so. In

all of these undertakings, John Kennedy moved us forward and he moved us forward on the long hard path of peace, that path of peace which he said we must pursue, that peace is the process to be sought and to be gained.

History teaches us that peace is best preserved through strength, but strength used with restraint, strength used with wisdom, and with a clear sense of perspective, and in 1961 President Kennedy and the Congress moved to insure that our strength would be preeminent, that our balanced military power would be able to deter or defeat any foe in any foreseeable situation.

The range of our power and the determination of our leadership has been proven again and again, in Berlin, in Cuba, in the Gulf of Tonkin, but strength is a means, not an end. It can only open up the avenues to peace, and it is up to us to walk in the paths of peace.

President Kennedy understood this. In the wake of the Cuban missile crisis he moved to press for sanity. In June of 1963, in that memorable address at American University, he issued a historic plea to both sides to re-examine our attitude towards peace. He called for renewed efforts towards a "more practical, a more attainable peace based on not sudden revolution in human nature but upon a gradual evolution in human institutions, on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are the interest of all concerned.

His plea was not in vain. It was only a few months later that the Test Ban Treaty was signed and tonight we celebrate the first anniversary of its effective date. (Applause)

Through this treaty we did curb the poisoning of the atmosphere from radioactive debris and indeed kept the purity of the milk that our children might drink.

This treaty won respect for America. It won us the respect as the guardian of peace. It gave new inspiration and new hope for the future of mankind on this planet, and our people supported it overwhelmingly, and the Congress supported it, the Senate supported it.

So did 25 of the 33 Republican senators, including the distinguished leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, Mr. Dirksen.

But the Senator from Arizona failed to follow that leadership. He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he voted against the treaty, and he has indicated that if he were elected President he would seek to have it repudiated.

Apparently the Senator believes in the inevitability of war and he stated so in an interview in the New York Post in 1961. Listen to these sad words:

"Someday, I am convinced, there will either be a war or we'll be subjugated without war....I don't see how it can be avoided -- perhaps five or ten years from now."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, President Johnson and Hubert

Humphrey do not believe that war is inevitable and I do not believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people believe that war is inevitable.

We believe that it is the task of statesmanship to see that freedom is preserved without the terrible tragedy of thermonuclear war that can destroy all of life on this planet. (Applause)

But we did not stop with this first step. A resolution was adopted in the United Nations to ban the orbiting of nuclear weapons of mass destruction in outer space. We insist on keeping outer space not for the exploitation of war but for the exploration of peace. Also have nations entered into agreement to cut back on the production of fissionable material because a nuclear arms race is not only wasteful, it could be exceedingly dangerous. To avoid miscalculation which might lead to war, we established the "Hot Line" between Moscow and Washington. This was brought to our attention, the need of it, in the Cuban crisis, but the agenda for the future is what we should think of, and it is long.

President Johnson has let the world know that it will not go unattended. We must seek additional measures to prevent war by miscalculation and accident. We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of observation posts, and we must seek to restrict the nuclear arms race by restricting transfer of nuclear weapons, by converting fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, and by outlawing, under proper international controls and safeguards, underground testing.

Now, if we desire a breakthrough in arms control, we should lend our support to regional pacts, and I have suggested from time to time one in the Latin American area. How foolish it would be for Latin American countries, impoverished as many of them are, to engage in the costly process of nuclear weaponry. If there is any threat to any country in Latin America, this nation is committed to the defense of that country and to repel every form of aggression.

The first and foremost task we face, therefore, is the control of nuclear weapons, but nuclear rivalry is not the only barrier to peace in the world today. Pope John XXIII stated in his Encyclical "Mater et Magistra": "Given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists."

And you and I know that the narrowing gap between the rich nations and the poor is essential to harmony between the nations of the world.

In Latin America and Asia and Africa the threat to peace lies in the shocking inequality between the privileged and the impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between booming industrial regions and primitive rural areas. The challenge to peace, yes, the threat to peace in these areas is the revolutionary challenge of an unjust social order, a social order in which true peace, peace based on justice, is impossible.

Now, as a people who have been blessed with this world's goods, I think we need to heed Pope John's plea to assist those who are less blessed, and we must do this out of compassion, but we should also do it out of self interest, for our lot is their lot. Our future is their future, and our peace is their peace.

Here at Notre Dame, which is the training center for the volunteers of the Peace Corps going to Latin America, you are well aware of the role which American young men and women have played in bringing health and education, in inspiring hope and lightening the burden for countless thousands of underprivileged people in the far-flung nations of the world. And may I say as the legislative author of the Peace Corps Law, everlastingly grateful we are to Notre Dame for having taken this great initiative in giving support to the Peace Corps as our best effort of America overseas. (Applause)

Now, my friends, the memory of John Kennedy is revered around this world. It is in great part because he initiated programs which furthered the pursuit of peace.

The creation of the Arms Control Agency is on the great historical record of John Kennedy. The signing of the Test Ban Treaty, the establishment of the Peace Corps, the launching of the Alliance for Progress, the reorganization of our foreign aid, the strengthening of the United Nations, the inspiration to millions of people throughout the world that America stands for peace: all of this breathes as the life and the works and the words of a man who gave his life for peace, our late and beloved President John Kennedy. (Applause)

But we do not speak of the dead. John Kennedy's legacy is a living legacy. And each one of these programs was supported by members of Congress, some of them in the Republican Party, some of them in the Democratic Party. Most men and women saw the need of following this initiative of peace, and now this great legacy of John Kennedy commands the firm support of the man that he selected as his helper, as his strong right arm, President Lyndon Johnson. (Applause)

The dual challenge to peace posed by the arms race and the threat of violent revolution can only be met in the long-run, as we know, through a stable system of international law. And the basis for that system, long-range as it may be and the great hope for that system is the United Nations.

The United Nations, my friends, has proven its worth. It has proven its value. And even though the spokesman of the opposition may have his doubts about it, in fact, has recommended that we abandon it, let it be clear that President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey feel that the United Nations is a worthy institution and ought to be supported and strengthened by the United States of America. (Applause).

Here reminded by scholars and spiritual leaders alike that the final alternative to war can only be world law and the best hope for achieving world law is through the United Nations.

This was the plea of Pope John, his predecessor, and

now the Holy Father. This was President Kennedy's great dream. Again and again he reaffirmed the ideal of world law. He knew that we must end the arms race or the arms race may well end the human race. And he called for the creation of a workable world law system as the one best way to achieve that purpose.

But we are realists and until the world law holds sway, and until more comprehensive arms control agreements can be achieved under true, effective international inspection, we are faced with the task of keeping the peace with what means we have.

And my pledge to this wonderful audience at this great university dedicated to peace and to understanding and to tolerance and to the good life, my pledge is that this Administration will always seek to blunt the conflicts which could lead to war. We will never seek to escalate them. We will always strive to avert war by using our awesome power with prudence and restraint.

We know that our power is not for the purpose of conquest. Our power is for the purpose of justice and of peace. In the great tradition of Pope John and John Kennedy, President Johnson has asked that we look beyond the Cold War which has consumed our energies and often limited our horizons, and while remaining strong he understands that we must focus attention on problems which will persist well beyond the Cold War, and these problems, as he said, are the obstacles to men's efforts to build a great world society, a place where every man can find a life free from hunger and disease, a life offering the chance to seek spiritual fulfillment, unhampered by the degradation of bodily misery.

I wonder, my fellow Americans, why it is not proper even during the heat and the turmoil of the campaign for us to have ideals, to dream, to plan, to reach out to new horizons of human endeavor. Why is it that we must only view with alarm as some do or merely defend the status quo as others? Why should we not try to build from where we are? Why should we not dedicate our knowledge, our enlightenment, our bodies, our souls to a better world, to a better lot for humanity?

It seems to me that this is the spirit of a young nation.

President Johnson has announced that the United States will make 1965 the year of international cooperation. Oh, I know I can hear some people say that this is but another further indication that we are soft on something or other. But let me make it quite clear, those who are soft are those who are always talking so tough. They are the ones, if you please, that have no confidence. They are the ones that lack faith. They are the ones that underestimate the true power of America.

Only the strong can afford to be kind. Only the strong can afford to be just. Only the strong can afford to negotiate and lead in the paths of peace, and thank God that the United States of America is blessed with the strength to fulfill this purpose. (Applause)

I am sure that our President knows, and he knows that most Americans, indeed most people on this planet, yearn to build a world where peace is more than simply a pause between wars. Peace must be more than the absence of hostilities. It must be more than just the lack of arms. It must be in a sense a positive life in which the harmony of people builds what President Johnson calls the Great Society.

Our nation has been built by people who believe that they could accomplish the impossible. I know the doubters will say, "Why do you have talk of peace in a time like this?" Because the time to talk peace is when the world faces the dreadful specter of its own destruction. The time to arouse men's minds and hopes is while there is yet time to be used to save us from destruction.

We have everything to lose and yet we have so much to gain, everything to lose if by miscalculation or impulsiveness the nuclear trigger should be detonated, and everything to gain if we can use science and technology and our knowledge and enlightenment through the humanities.

If we can use those great forces of culture and science, we can build a world fit for God's finest creation, mankind. And I say to those who ask as they do from public platforms why not victory, as if instant victory could come like some proprietary or patent medicine, as if instant victory could come by the wish of it, I ask them and reply to them why not victory indeed? Victory over war. Mankind had better contemplate that. Victory for peace. Because that is the only way that humanity ought to live. And indeed victory for mankind because without the victory over war, without the victory for peace, there is nothing for mankind except death and destruction and misery and pestilence and disease.

I am everlastingly grateful that I have been able to live in a time and serve in a government when two presidents, yes, more than that, when every president within my memory from Franklin Roosevelt to Harry Truman to Dwight Eisenhower, to John Kennedy, to Lyndon Johnson, every president has planned and worked for the cause of a just and enduring peace, and I say to you that anyone that feels that peace is not possible, anyone that feels that war is inevitable, has already forsaken his right to even think of serving in the highest office of this land. (Applause)

As we leave this hall tonight, I ask those of you that believe in the future to feel that the gains that we made are worth preserving and feel that the opportunities of tomorrow can be ours, I ask each and every one of you that are in that faith to redouble your efforts.

I ask you not to match, not to match the innuendo and the half truth that is hurled at us. I ask you only to speak the truth. I ask you to think in terms of the good of this country. I ask you to support a man who unites our people rather than divides them. I ask you to support someone who labors to unite us rather than belabors division, and I ask you to support a President of the United States who had the confidence of a man who served us for 1,000 dramatic days.

I have said from every platform and I repeat it from this one tonight that if Lyndon Johnson was good enough to have the trust and the confidence and the faith of John Kennedy, and I watched these two men work together for better than three years, then I say to this audience tonight if he was good enough for our late and beloved President, he is good enough for you and he is good enough for me and he is good enough for America, and I think America will elect him.

Thank you.

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

Remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Press Conference
Pick-Oliver Hotel
South Bend, Indiana
October 10, 1964

Question. Senator Humphrey, Senator Goldwater is making a speech tonight in Salt Lake City, Utah, and making a very strong recommendation that there be a constitutional amendment to allow prayers in public schools. What is your feeling on it?

Senator Humphrey. Well, this matter, as I recall, was before the House of Representatives, one of its subcommittees of the full committee, and if my memory serves me correctly, rather a substantial number, a large number of church leaders of all faiths came in and testified in opposition to such an amendment.

As I recall, too, the committee when it started its hearings had considerable support in this subcommittee for the amendment but as the hearings went on and the religious and spiritual leaders of the nation were heard from, leaders that are deeply concerned about the matter of separation of church and state and the Constitution of the United States, the committee changed its mind.

I am sure that Senator Goldwater knows these things. It would appear to me that the American people would support most of their spiritual leaders in this matter.

Question. How do you feel about it, Senator? Are you favoring such an amendment?

Senator Humphrey. No, I am not. And I might add that I don't really feel that I need to get any spiritual advice from Senator Goldwater. I have been able to get that from my mother, from my ministers, my church. I even hesitate to take any political advice from him. When you feel reluctant to accept political advice, I don't think you really ought to venture into spiritual consultation with one like Senator Goldwater.

Question. Senator, you have been out for several weeks now and three weeks are left to go. Could you make any appraisal of how you think the campaign is going, maybe in terms of the states that you think the Democrats will carry, the number?

Senator Humphrey. Joe, that is kind of a guessing game. I just would say that we will carry enough. We hope that we will carry a rather substantial number of them, but we have a lot of work to do. I would want to encourage those who are the supporters of President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey and the Democratic ticket to redouble their efforts. I would want to warn them that in the next two to three weeks we can expect the opposition to become desperate, as they are. They are already indulging in the politics of desperation, reaching hither and yon for anything they can get their hands on to hit us with.

It would be very good if they would discuss some

important issues before the country, issues relating to the growth of our cities, the expansion of our economy, improvement in the expansion of our education, the health of our people, communication and transportation, fiscal policy, international relations, and discuss these matters thoughtfully.

It would be very helpful to the American people if such a discussion could take place.

Question. Senator, how do you feel about sending former President Eisenhower to Viet-Nam to assess the situation?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I really think somebody ought to have asked President Eisenhower about that before the announcement was made. I am sure that he is always intrigued by the interest which a declining candidate has in a great man.

Mr. Goldwater reached in and pulled that one out of his grab bag without ever having consulted the former President.

I am sure that President Johnson has been in consultation with President Eisenhower and President Truman and others about Viet-Nam. These are little tricks and gimmicks that really don't indicate a great deal of thought but again indicate politics of desperation.

Next?

Question. Senator Humphrey, during John F. Kennedy's Administration there was a great deal of theaters, federal aid to theaters, and there was a great deal of thought about it, and with the assassination this seems to have died.

What are the chances of this being enlivened, then, once -- if you are to get in?

Senator Humphrey. Oh, with all due respect, may I say that we have passed for the first time in the history of this country a bill to establish an Arts Commission and with some beginning aid to the cultural activity on the domestic level.

We had aid prior to that in terms of our international programs but never before in terms of our domestic activities.

Senator Clark of Pennsylvania, Senator Javits of New York, and myself, along with Senator Pell of Rhode Island, were the authors in the Senate and Frank Thompson of New Jersey was the author in the House of Representatives. Your own Congressman, John Brademas, was keenly interested in the strong support of our cultural activity in the Arts Commission bill.

We think that this is the first forward step that has been made by our government in reference to supporting cultural activities in the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. The late President supported this, as you know, very actively. I was more or less his agent in the Congress on the Senate side.

Question. Senator, Senator Goldwater has been saying

lately that the undecided voters are switching over to him. Do you think that is true, and if so, what can you do about it?

Senator Humphrey. I don't think it is true, and I don't think he thinks it is true, but I appreciate his predicament and if it encourages him so that he can carry on until November 3rd, I think it is fine that he believes this.

I really believe that when November 3rd comes around that there will be a substantial majority for President Johnson.

Mr. Goldwater changes his mind often. Sometimes he has the undecideds. Sometimes he feels he doesn't. Sometimes he admires the late President Kennedy, and then at other times he attacks him.

It is very difficult to keep up with this moving target.

Question. Senator, if the Democrats win in November, the November 3rd general election, as you predict, do you foresee a reorganization of the Republican Party?

Senator Humphrey. I would surely foresee, as I am sure you do, the very bitter struggle within the Republican Party for the control of that organization. I have a feeling this is the only reason that Mr. Nixon is out on the stump, because Mr. Nixon's views as expressed in writing and in word are so contrary to what Mr. Goldwater says that if those two can stand on the same platform and say that they agree, then one of them is misleading the American public, one or the other.

Question. How about Bill Scranton?

Senator Humphrey. It would go for Mr. Scranton. Mr. Nixon and Mr. Scranton are both traveling around the country quite a little indicating their support of Mr. Goldwater, but I think what they are really doing is keeping in touch with the Party organization, and I want to say that I don't blame them.

I believe that the Party organization would be in more responsible hands if either one of them were in charge, but that is a matter for the internal housekeeping of the Republican Party.

Question. Senator, what kind of reception have you had in the Midwest when you discussed the farm problem? I represent New Paris Farmers Exchange.

Senator Humphrey. Very well, sir. The Midwest of course, today is not only agricultural. It is a balanced economy. There is a great deal of industrial development in the Midwest.

But we all recognize, those of us that live in Midwestern states, the importance of the agricultural sector to the total economy, and I have had good reception when I have discussed, for example, the feed grain program in the Far West and in the Midwest where the wheat producing areas are.

In the main the wheat program is looked upon favorably, but I want to make it clear that this Administration feels, and the new Administration of Johnson and Humphrey feels, that we ought to re-examine our farm programs without any preconceived notions or any wedding to the past.

I believe that we ought to examine them in terms of our commercial exports, in terms of the type support programs that we offer, and try to get as much of a free market as possible, that is, so that the forces within the free market can operate, and that whatever protection there is from the government should not interfere with those market conditions. And I believe we can do it.

I have asked for the establishment of a National Food and Fiber Commission, Agricultural Policy Commission, upon which we would have prominent agriculturists as well as economists and legislators and others to serve, to examine the entire agricultural program.

So may I say in conclusion that we are going to give it a brand new look but in the meantime we are not going to throw overboard policies and programs that sustain farm income.

Question. Senator, on this control -- on the authorization to use factual, so-called tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, are there conditions aside from total nuclear war under which the NATO commander will have the authority to use these? Do conditions exist now under which the NATO commander might have the use of nuclear weapons without getting permission, express authority from the President?

Senator Humphrey. Sir, nothing that I know of. And I think that General Eisenhower, again, along with other responsible officials, or other responsible Americans, has made it quite clear that the details of these matters ought not to be discussed too much because you involve national security and highly classified information.

But speaking for myself only, I know of no such conditions, and I know of no authority that is given to field commanders or NATO commanders.

I only know that the President of the United States has the responsibility for the control of the nuclear weapons. And I want to make it quite clear that nuclear weapons are not conventional and no one ought to associate them as conventional. There isn't any such thing as a conventional nuclear weapon, and once you have used one, whether it is small or large, you open up the whole matter of nuclear warfare and we ought to face that. You don't have any cutoff point.

Question. Senator, would you say that this current campaign has been a more vindictive type of campaign than campaigns that you have seen in your political past?

Senator Humphrey. Well, I would say that the campaign

of the opposition has been based primarily on personalities, innuendoes, half truths, distortions, innuendoes.

How in the name of common sense can anybody have any respect for a man that says one week, as he said in Seattle, that John Kennedy used the Cuban crisis, that he managed -- of 1962 -- for his political purposes and then only a night or two ago, to praise John Kennedy for having been so courageous in the instance of the Cuban crisis?

How can you have any respect for a man that on one day says he thinks President Johnson is soft on communism and then says, "Well, let's wait a while and see how that works, and if it would, good, we will repeat it."

What kind of cynicism is this?

This is an utter lack of respect for principle and I consider that kind of a campaign a very low level campaign in American public affairs.

I would hope that something might be done to amend it, but I don't see that. I see the opposition viciously attacking our President, injecting every possible innuendo and half truth into it, and we are prepared for that.

I think the American people will reject that kind of talk. They expect more from their President than that.

Well, I believe that is it.

Thank you.

Question. Thank you, Senator.

#####

Press Release

"The Pursuit of Peace", Notre Dame University, South Bend, Indiana

For release ~~on~~ ~~October 10, 1964~~

in address by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Sunday HM's, October 11, 1964

Senator Humphrey said tonight, "To those who ask 'Why not Victory', we reply: Why not Victory -- victory over war itself, victory for peace, victory for mankind."

In an address entitled "The Pursuit of Peace" given at Notre Dame University at South Bend, Indiana, Humphrey said, "My pledge to you is that this Administration will always seek to blunt the conflicts which may lead to war, not to escalate them. We shall always seek to avoid a posture which would leave no alternative but inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation. We shall seek to avoid provoking holocaust by the reckless use of nuclear ultimatum."

"Today a new era has come. Since that day at Alamo-gordo when man acquired the power to obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face. And the vision of it has sobered all men and demanded of them a keener perception of mutual interests and a higher order of responsibility."

Humphrey said that Goldwater talks as if nuclear war is inevitable, and that it was, therefore, not surprising that he was one of the 8 out of 33 Republican Senators who refused to vote for the test-ban treaty. Humphrey quoted Dirksen's words in support of the treaty:

"I want to take a first step, Mr. President. I am not a young man -- one of my age thinks about his destiny

a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone, he knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step."

Humphrey praised the Democratic Administration's attainment of the atmospheric test-ban treaty, and the resolution prohibiting the orbiting of nuclear weapons in outer space, the creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow.

"We must seek additional measures designed to prevent war by miscalculation," Humphrey said. Humphrey advocated the establishment of a network of observation points to safeguard against surprise attack, the restriction of the transfer of nuclear weapons, the conversion of fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, the outlawry of underground tests with adequate inspection, and the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America.

Humphrey also said that the Alliance for Progress, unswerving commitment to the United Nations, the foreign aid program and the Peace Corps were also highly important in keeping the peace.

Humphrey praised President Johnson for continuing in the "great tradition" of Pope John XXIII and John F. Kennedy in his devotion to the pursuit of peace.

~~Roger Branigan~~
~~John Brademas~~

Talbot (Hushery)

Stephan Center

NOTES PROVIDED BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS FOR INTRODUCTORY

REMARKS PRECEDING SPEECH BY SENATOR HUMPHREY AT NOTRE DAME

Congrats on the football

— ~~asford Academy~~ —

~~General~~
Reserve General

I am happy to come here to speak in behalf of two
 outstanding Senators, Vance Hartke and Birch Bayh, and
 an outstanding Congressman, John Brademas. Of particular
 interest to residents in this area is the role that John
 Brademas has played in the Congress. John has made the
President aware of the special problems here in South Bend
and the President has responded by appointing a special
committee to look into the local situation caused by the
closing of the Studebaker plant. John has labored diligently
 for the people of his district. He has also made a major
contribution in the field of education through his outstanding
work on the House Education and Labor Committee. I know the
 people of this district will send John Brademas back to
 Washington in January.

Students of Notre Dame
 St Marys
 Bethel

THE PURSUIT OF PEACE

Address of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

University of Notre Dame

South Bend, Indiana

October 10, 1964

today as
In the present ~~eras~~ eras in the past, no issues move
men more deeply than those of war and peace. The Bible
tells us to "Pursue peace" -- and mankind has since the
beginning of time condemned the horrors of war. [If dis-

cord and strife, wars and the threat of wars have
persisted throughout history, it is perhaps as St.
Augustine says: that men make war not because they love
peace the less, but rather because they love their own
kind of peace the more.]

[Today a new era has come. Since that day at Alamo- *Alamo-Gordo*
gordo when man acquired the power to obliterate himself
from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face. [And
the vision of it has sobered all men and demanded of them
a keener perception of mutual interests and a higher order

of responsibility.]

↳ In the nuclear age, the deliberate initiation of full-scale war as an instrument of national policy has become an absurdity. [Originally a means to protect national interests,] War today can assure the death of a nation. Although we will continue to repel all threats of intimidation, we shall continue to realize that the threat of nuclear blackmail should play no part in our own conduct of affairs with other nations.

↳ Today, ~~in the year 1964,~~ our vision of the absurdity of war and the necessity for peace is enlarged because of two great and good men [have given us their vision of the path to peace] -- Pope John XXIII and John F. Kennedy.

↳ In his inaugural address, President Kennedy asked friend and foe alike to "begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-

destruction".

↳ In his encyclical "Peace on Earth", Pope John XXIII proclaimed:

↳ "Justice, right, reason, and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of controls."

↳ The world will long remember the Presidency of John F. Kennedy -- because he did "begin anew" to explore the problems which "unite us instead of laboring those problems which divide us!!

↳ He did begin anew to formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms.

↳ He did begin anew to initiate negotiations with the Soviet Union to restrict the spread of the deadly Atom.

JFK

he did begin anew to focus the machinery of our government on the question of peace and disarmament -- by establishing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, a measure which, I am proud to say, I proposed in 1959 *and successfully sponsored JFK*

In all these undertakings, John Kennedy moved us forward on the long, hard path to peace.

History ~~of our country~~ *has shown us* that peace is best preserved through strength *but* strength used with restraint, with wisdom, and with a clear sense of perspective.

In 1961, President Kennedy *and the Democratic Congress* moved to insure that our strength would be preeminent, that our balanced military power could deter or defeat any foe in any foreseeable situation.

The range of our power and the determination of our leadership were proven in the confrontations with the Soviet Union over Berlin and Cuba. *Our* strong resolve and steady restraint convinced the Soviet leaders of the folly

of further provocation.]

out [Faced with this massive array of strength, Chairman Khrushchev concluded that an all-out war with the United States must be avoided -- for in such a war "the survivors would envy the dead."]

But strength is a means, not an end. It can only open the avenues to peace; it is up to us to walk ^{the path of} ~~the~~ peace.

John Kennedy understood this. In the wake of the Cuban missile ~~crisis~~ ^{crisis}, he moved to press for sanity.

In June of 1963, at American University, he issued an historic plea to both sides to "re-examine our attitude toward peace". He called for renewed efforts toward a "more practical, more attainable peace -- based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions -- on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned".

and His plea was not in vain. In October 1963, President

Kennedy signed a treaty banning nuclear tests in the

atmosphere, in outer space and under water. *It was just 1 year ago today that the test-ban treaty went into force.*

Through this treaty, we have curbed the radioactive poisoning ~~by contamination~~ from nuclear tests of the air

we breathe, and the milk our children drink. ~~Because of~~

~~this treaty, a limit is put on the development of even~~

~~larger nuclear weapons than those which now exist --~~

~~terror weapons which would help no nation's security,~~

~~but would threaten the security of all mankind. [Because~~

~~of this treaty, the development of effective nuclear~~

~~weapons systems by other nations is today less likely.]~~

This treaty has won respect throughout the world

for the United States as the guardian of peace. < It has

inspired increased hope for the future of mankind on

this planet.

our People
~~The people of this country~~ overwhelmingly supported

the test ban. More than four-fifths of the Democrats in the Senate voted in favor of the treaty. So did 25 of the 33 Republican Senators, including the distinguished Republican leader, ~~Everett McKinley~~ ^{Senator} Dirksen, who said:

"I want to take a first step, Mr. President. I am not a young man -- one of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have it written on my tombstone, he knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step."

~~I regret that~~ ^{But} Senator Goldwater failed to follow the leadership of Senator Dirksen and his colleagues.

He knew what happened at Hiroshima. ~~But he~~ ^{he} voted against the treaty. And he has indicated that if he were to be elected President, he would consider repudiating it.

It is not surprising that Senator Goldwater would
consider repudiating the test ban treaty, as ~~he~~ ^{The Senator} apparent-
ly believes that war is inevitable. He stated in an

interview for the New York Post in 1961:

"Someday, I am convinced, there will either
be a war or we'll be subjugated without war ...
real nuclear war ... I don't see how it can be
avoided -- perhaps five or ten years from now."

But

Pres. Johnson and

I do not believe war is inevitable. *And I am*

convinced that most Americans -- whether Democrats or
Republicans -- do not believe that war is inevitable.

The nuclear test-ban treaty was the first step in the path to a more enduring peace. ^{But} We have taken other steps as well.

~~We have agreed to prohibit the stationing of weapons of mass destruction in space.~~ A United Nations resolution, jointly sponsored by the United States and

the Soviet Union, called on all countries to ~~refrain from~~ ^{refrain from} stationing weapons of mass destruction in space from such action. It was adopted by acclamation --

without a single dissenting vote.

This resolution was ~~hailed by leaders of the free world~~ ^{USA} a vital step toward keeping the world of space open to peaceful exploration, not to military exploitation.

This year, in addition, the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union announced cutbacks in their planned production of fissionable materials for use in weapons. This was the first concrete ^{pledge} ~~action~~ to slow down the race for larger nuclear stockpiles. ~~As~~

Such a race can be provocative as well as wasteful.

President Johnson has stated, such a race can be provocative as well as wasteful.

L. On
The necessity for instant communication between the United States and the Soviet Union -- to avoid the miscalculation which might lead to nuclear war was proven during the Cuban missile crisis. Since that time, we have established a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow to avoid such miscalculation.

But The agenda for the future is long -- and President Johnson has let the world know that it will not go unattended.

We must seek additional measures designed to prevent war by miscalculation or accident. We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of selected observation points. We must seek to restrict the nuclear arms race by restricting transfer of nuclear weapons, by converting fissionable materials to peaceful purposes,

and by outlawing underground tests, with adequate *international*
inspection and enforcement.

If we desire a break-through in arms control, we
should lend our support to regional arms control agree-
ments. We might well begin with Latin America.

(in the hands of Latin American countries)
Nuclear weapons would serve no useful purpose
~~would~~ in preserving the security of this area. Any
possible external military threat to the security of the
Latin American continent can and will be repulsed by
the United States.

The introduction of nuclear weapons would provoke
a rivalry that would imperil the peace of the hemisphere.
It would endanger the precarious

out
economies of countries which already possess military forces too large for their security needs and too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance.]

The first and foremost task in the pursuit of peace, therefore, is to control nuclear weapons.

↳ But nuclear rivalry is not the only ^{barrier} challenge to peace in the world today.

↳ As Pope John XXIII stated in his encyclical Mater et Magistra, "Given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists." ↳ If control of nuclear weapons is the central issue in improving relations between East and West, the narrowing of the gap between rich nations and poor is essential to harmony between North and South.

In Latin America, in Asia and Africa, the

the threat to peace -- lies in the shocking inequality between privileged and impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between booming industrial regions and primitive rural areas. The challenge to peace -- yes, the threat to peace -- in these areas is the revolutionary challenge of an unjust social order, a social order in which true peace -- peace based on justice -- is impossible.

As a people who have been "more blessed with this world's goods", we must heed Pope John's plea to assist "those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery and hunger and who lack even the elementary rights of the human person."

We must do this out of compassion -- for we are our brother's keeper. And we also do it out of

self-interest as well -- for our lot is their lot,

our future their future, our peace their peace.

Keep
This planet is simply too small for the insulation
of the rich against turbulence bred of injustice in
any part of the world.

Peace Corps
Our efforts to preserve lasting peace must
continue to include substantial economic and technical
aid to the Southern half of the world. And among our
programs of assistance, none have matched the success
of the Peace Corps.

Peace Corps
Here at Notre Dame, which is a training center
for Volunteers going to Latin America, you are well
aware of the role which American young men and women
have played in bringing health and education -- in
inspiring hope and lightening the burden -- for
countless thousands of underprivileged people in
far-flung nations of the world. These young Americans

realize that there is a moral imperative to service
beyond that of mere self-service -- that individual
Americans can make a daily personal contribution to
promoting peace throughout the world.

 the memory of John F. Kennedy is revered around
the world, it is in great part because he initiated
programs which furthered the pursuit of peace -- the
creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency,
the signing of the Test Ban Treaty, the establishment
of the Peace Corps, the launching of the Alliance for
Progress, and the reorganization of our foreign aid
program to enable us better to meet the challenge of
social revolution in the nations of the Southern half
of the world.

 John Kennedy's legacy is a living legacy. And
each of these programs was supported by, and now commands
the firm support of President Johnson.

L The dual challenge to peace posed by the arms race and the threat of violent revolution can only be met in the long run through a stable and effective system of international law. The basis for that system -- the great hope for that system -- is the United Nations. *strengthened.*

L The United Nations has proven its value as an institution for world peace. Our faith in it is strong -- and our hope is firm that it will one day become what it was intended to be: a world society of nations under law -- not merely law backed by force, but law backed by justice and by popular consent.

The final alternative
The ~~answer~~ answer to world war can only be world law. And the best hope of achieving world law is through the United Nations.

This was the plea of pope John and his predecessors.

This was President Kennedy's great dream.

Again and again he affirmed the ideal of world law as the most essential goal of mankind in our

time. He ~~said~~^{knew} that we must end the arms race or

the arms race will end the human race. He called

for the creation of a workable world law as the one best way to achieve that purpose.

But until world law holds sway and until more comprehensive arms control agreements are achieved,

we are still faced with the task of keeping the

peace. My pledge to you is that this Administration

will always seek to blunt the conflicts which may

lead to war, not to escalate them. We will always

strive to avert war by using our awesome power with

prudence and restraint.

~~And we will seek to avoid~~
~~we shall always seek to avoid a posture~~
~~which would leave no alternative but~~
~~inglorious retreat or nuclear retaliation.~~

We shall seek to avoid
provoking^a holocaust by the ^{reckless} use of the nuclear
ultimatum. *Our Power is for Peace!*

~~Today,~~ in the great tradition of Pope John
and John F. Kennedy, President Johnson has asked
that we look beyond the cold war which has "consumed
our energies" and "often limited our horizons".

While remaining strong, he understands that we
must focus attention on problems which will persist
well beyond the cold war. These problems, ~~the~~
~~President has said,~~ ^{are} "the obstacles to man's
effort to build a great world society -- a place
where every man can find a life free from hunger
and disease, a life offering the chance to seek
spiritual fulfillment unhampered by the degradation
of bodily misery".

President Johnson has announced that the

Out

United States intends to make 1965 International
Cooperation Year -- to renew our policies and to

plan for the future. He plans to call a "White
House conference to search and explore and canvass
and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach
and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace".

Our President knows -- and we all should know --

that it is easier to destroy than to build. It is
easier to make war than to think, persuade,
reconstruct, and act responsibly. He knows, and

we know, that this is the only way to proceed. He

He knows that most Americans -- indeed most people on
this planet -- yearn to build a world where peace is
more than simply a ~~pause~~ ^{pause} between wars.

To those who ask "Why Not Victory" -- we reply:
Why Not Victory indeed -- victory over war itself,
victory for peace, victory for mankind.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org