

NOT FOR RELEASE BEFORE 2130 HOURS, THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1967

Television Interview With
Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey
on "Meet The Press"
Originating From Sender Freies, Berlin
2130 Hours, Thursday, April 6, 1967

Full Transcript of TV Show as Taped at
1000 Hours, Thursday, April 6, 1967
by Channel 1 - Bonn, Germany

PARTICIPANTS:

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey
Dr. Peter Pechel, Moderator
Dieter Guett, ARD Coordinator for Eurovision
Paul Noack, Deputy Editor in-Chief, Muenchener Merkur
Wolfgang Wagner, Bonn Correspondent of Tagesspiegel
Rolf Menzel, Washington Correspondent of Sender Freies Berlin

BEGIN TEXT :

INTRODUCTION: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. Welcome to the television press conference of Sender Freies Berlin. Our guest this evening is the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Vice President, we are thankful that during your European visit you have found the time to answer questions of German newsmen.

MR. HUMPEREY: I have had a very wonderful visit in the Federal Republic, particularly in Bonn. We have received the warmest of hospitality, a very friendly reception, and during our time here I've had the opportunity of discussing in considerable detail a number of matters which are of great importance to our two governments. I've met with the President of the Federal Republic, the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor, with members of the Bundestag, and members of the press, television and radio, so it has been a fine experience and I want to thank the people of the Federal Republic of Germany for their courtesy and kindness to us.

MODERATOR: May I first introduce my colleagues:
Dieter Guett, Coordinator, on the subject of
politics, for German television;
Paul Nowak, Assistant Managing Editor,
Muenchener Merkur;
Rolf Menzel, Washington correspondent for
several German radio stations;
Wolfgang Wagner, correspondent for several
daily papers.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, much speculation has been heard about the purpose of your trip. Would you tell us briefly the main purpose of your trip?

MR. HUMPEREY: The main reason for my visit to Europe was to come to see Europe as it is today, and not to think of Europe as I knew it in some years past -- to update myself in the realities of

European political life and economic development. Because there really is a new spirit in Europe. I think the Europeans are seeing themselves more and more as Europeans. And I do believe that for our relationships, that is the relationships between the United States and our allies and friends in Western Europe, to be constructive, to be meaningful, and to be current, one needs to know what is happening in Europe now. So I came to learn, I came to listen, and I came to explain American policy where there may be some doubts about that policy. And I think it has been rather productive and a rewarding journey.

QUESTION: As you know, the German Chancellor has criticized the inadequacy of cooperation between Washington and Bonn. Is, and was, this criticism justified, and what effect did it have in Washington?

MR. HUMPHREY: My visit with Chancellor Kiesinger was a very constructive and helpful one. I think it was helpful to both of us and to both of our countries. It gave us an opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings that might have existed, but more importantly, to talk to one another face to face, and to lay on the table the many issues and problems that great nations have. I found the Chancellor a very engaging, a very forthright leader. I found him extremely well informed about matters relating to my country, as well as his own. I think that as a result of our conversation we can say that misunderstandings, if they did exist, have surely been minimized and removed. But more importantly, we spent our time looking to the future and not to the past. Talking about the relationships of the Federal Republic of Germany for today and tomorrow rather than trying to plow over old ground. Building on what we've accomplished these past twenty years and looking forward to the next twenty years. I must say, as one in public life, that there is a tendency in the media -- and you'll forgive me -- for seeming to exaggerate

what might appear as a criticism or a difference. Those of us in public life seem to prefer to accentuate that which we find in common, which lends itself to building together. And I can go away from Bonn, Germany, after my visit with the Chancellor and say that it was one of the most important visits in my political life; that I go away feeling that our relationships have been strengthened, that the ties between the Federal Republic and America are the better.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, Bonn has avoided making a choice between French and American policies. In your opinion is it a realistic policy to evade this decision, or are there, in your opinion, areas where a decision is compelling and which would be these areas?

MR. HUMPHREY: Nations, like human beings, have a variety of friends. We don't all have friends exactly alike. The United States looks with approval and support upon the improved, friendly relationships between France and Germany. We think this is absolutely essential for a strong, independent and free Europe. Therefore, we do not feel that German policy with France is contradictory to German friendship with the United States. We not only support it, we encourage it. Every nation has to pursue a policy that is in its own self interest. And treaties and alliances that do not meet self-interest seldom last. The fact is that it is to the self-interest of the United States and of the Federal Republic that there be this close cooperation between Germany and France. It is to the security interests of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany that our alliance be strong. And the Federal Republic, under this Chancellor and under others, has never in any way downgraded the relationships with the United States. Where France can be helpful, France will be helpful. Where the United States can

be helpful, the United States will be helpful. We have our relationships with other countries and other parts of the world that the Federal Republic doesn't see in the same light as we do. So again may I say, we are trying to build together these blocks of firm structure for a strong Atlantic alliance, a meaningful cooperation between our respective countries, and I see no conflict of interest at all in what the Federal Republic is doing.

QUESTION: The nightmare of German politics seems to be an American-Soviet deal at the expense of Germany. Are such fears justified?

MR. HUMPHREY: No, they are not justified and I hope that that nightmare can be dispelled at once and that there can be a much more happy dream and a happy reality. I wish to state for my government that we will make no arrangements with any country that will in any way prejudice the rights or the security of the Federal Republic of Germany. Nor would we do so for any other country. We keep our commitments. The fact that we're in Viet-Nam today indicates that we keep our commitments. This is a very painful and grievous and costly commitment that we are keeping. We believe that it is essential that we have close cooperation amongst our friends and allies. We believe also that allies must have faith in one another. So let me say to the German people and to the officers of their government, as I've said privately, now let me say publicly: The United States of America was one of the architects of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We do not intend to be its destroyer. We intend to continue to build on that. The United States of America wants better relationships with the Soviet Union and with all nations in the world. So does the Federal Republic. We encourage the Federal Republic of Germany to improve its relationships with

the Eastern European countries. We support them in that endeavor. We encourage them to improve their relationships, if possible, with the Soviet Union. We support that endeavor. There is again, may I say, no conflict of interest. We're living in one world. We must learn how to live together peacefully. I think the best way for us to live peacefully is to have as much unity of purpose as possible.

QUESTION: To be safe, should we in Europe adjust ourselves to the possibility that the number of U.S. troops stationed in Europe will be reduced?

MR. HUMPHREY: There will be no reduction in American forces in Europe taken by my country on its own - that is unilaterally. We're talking now about the security of Western Europe and when we talk of the security of Western Europe, we're talking about the security of the United States of America as well. We did not become a member of NATO just because we were good Samaritans. We thought it was important that the free nations of the West join together, unite together, in common and collective defense. Now we built this great structure together and we are going to continue to maintain it together, so that anything that relates to the defenses of NATO must be done after consultation in cooperation with all of the partners and no nation has the right, under NATO agreements, to unilaterally on its own - take care of its own wishes without at least informing others. Now we believe in a strong defense, and the matter of troop deployment, taking into consideration modern science and technology, new weapons systems, mobility of manpower and material - all of that is brought into the considerations and discussions of NATO strength and NATO defense. If there are any changes made in the number of men and the amount of material, it will only be if it is agreed upon after

consultation amongst the partners of NATO.

QUESTION: If there is a reduction of troops, would this be a goodwill gesture towards Moscow, or would this be made dependent on whether Moscow, too, will undertake a reduction of troops?

MR. HUMPHREY: It is my hope that, if there can be a reduction in forces, that it can be a reduction of both sides of the line, so to speak. Goodwill gestures are always helpful in any set of circumstances. I have a feeling that the Soviet Union is hard pressed in terms of its own defenses. It therefore appears to me very desirable that the NATO countries urge upon the Soviet Union reduction of forces, if and when - and I repeat, if and when - there is any reduction of forces on the NATO side. The balance of deterrence is what is really important here. We are going to take whatever steps are necessary in NATO with one thought in mind -- the security of the NATO partners. Hopefully, this will not add to the tensions, but reduce tensions; but the important thing for us to keep in mind is the high priority - the priority of NATO. And what was that priority? Security for the partners and the members of NATO, and whatever happens in NATO should be directed towards that objective. Now you may very well improve the security of the NATO countries by goodwill gestures, by closer cooperation -- for example, we cooperated together in building the defenses of NATO. There may be a time that we need a NATO, as NATO members, to cooperate together as we build bridges to the East. You see, I don't happen to believe, again, that even unilateral action moving to the East without consultation and discussion is desirable. We must learn to live as a family, to talk together, to be reasonable, to reason, as my President says many times, quoting from the old biblical prophet Isaiah, "Come let us reason together"; and we will have to gather

around the NATO Counsel table and design policies and programs that are mutually beneficial and that in no way sacrifice the rights or the securities of the partners. Otherwise a partnership means nothing. A partnership to the people of the United States and the government of the United States means a partnership of independent people who stand in their own right, determined to protect their own security as well as the security of their partners, working together in equality, working together in a sense of political integrity.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, today in Berlin you drew a parallel between this city and South Viet-Nam. Is not one of the differences that South Viet-Nam can be defended with bombs, while Berlin cannot be so defended?

MR. HUMPHREY: Well, there are always some differences, but the point that I was seeking to make is this. That three times, to my recollection, the safety and the security of West Berlin has been threatened. In, I believe, three times since 1948, 1961, 1963 - whatever the dates were - and each of those three times the United States of America made it crystal clear, absolutely clear, to the Soviet Union and to the forces of the East that we would defend Berlin with American manpower - American resources. As we said, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. That's the way we built our country, and you may recall this is exactly what the late President Kennedy said about America's commitment to Berlin. So the fact that we didn't have to use bombs is something for which we are prayerfully and reverently grateful, but by standing firm, by the Alliance holding together and being firm - by the partners standing together - we didn't have to go to the battlefield. In Viet-Nam that did not happen, so we, in Viet-Nam, had to go to the battlefield. But we were prepared to do so. I think there

is a lesson to be drawn from this. We were prepared to tell Mr. Kruschchev in 1962 that his missiles could not be in Cuba and that was a very dangerous confrontation, but we met that danger. We were prepared to meet open aggression in Korea in 1950. We had hoped that we would not have to meet that militarily, but we did, and we met it. We have been prepared to meet aggression and the violation of treaties in South Viet-Nam. Regrettably, this time it had to be with force of arms. But what I was trying to say to the people of Berlin is, the integrity of the American commitment is the best protection of the peace. We intend to keep that commitment. We intend to keep our promises and we are proving it in Viet-Nam today.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, it has been said that you have brought a better version of the non-proliferation treaty to Bonn. What are the changes which you have brought with you?

MR. HUMPHREY: First of all, there is no non-proliferation treaty. I think this is very important that we all understand that. There are preliminary sections of, preliminary drafts, that are being circulated amongst the partners of the Western Alliance and with the Soviet Union of what we hope will ultimately turn out to be a draft non-proliferation treaty. But these preliminaries go through many, many changes and one of the developments that has taken place in recent months is that some people have assumed that there was a treaty already drawn and drafted between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, as if it were an accomplished fact. What really had happened was that there were certain provisions and proposals -- tentative in form -- that were tentatively agreed upon or, at least suggested, and then they were a subject of discussion in the committee of 18, the disarmament committee

in Geneva, and later on amongst the members of the NATO Alliance and also in the Warsaw Pact countries. Now those preliminary drafts are being changed many times. There are some recent changes, and those changes that have been suggested are very much the result of discussions that have taken place here in Europe. Discussions that have taken place in Germany, in Italy, in other countries, to accommodate what was quite obvious -- some needed improvements in the tentative drafts. We hoped that after these consultations with each of our NATO partners, individually, and then going to the NATO Council, and consulting collectively in the Council, we will then be able to go to the Soviet Union with what we have agreed upon here in the West, as a proposed draft treaty and then, hopefully, get the Soviet Union to tentatively agree on a draft treaty and to table that treaty in Geneva. When you say "table it" you know what I mean -- put it down for further argument before the committee of 13, the disarmament committee in Geneva. So it's a long process. I wish people wouldn't assume that these things come quickly. You know designing a treaty is like building a great skyscraper, a great massive building. The architect changes the design about every week, and you have to wait and see what ultimately comes out of it. Even as you finish the building, particularly if it's a house, your wife is apt to want to have the doors changed or something, so it doesn't come quickly or easily.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, do you believe that the German desire for reunification is reconcilable with American objectives for a reduction of tensions?

MR. HUMPHREY: I do, sir. I not only consider that the German wishes for unification are compatible, I want it quite clear that the German wish for unification is a part of American foreign policy. There is no variance here at all. It is my view that the best way to secure this very necessary objective

of German unification -- the bringing together again of the German family --- is through the step by step improvement of relationships between the West and the East. The building of bridges between the two sectors in Europe. And I mean to say that in Berlin itself, for example, you find here -- where one out of every four West Berliners has a relative in East Berlin -- where they have learned -- where the pressures here for those families to unite are very big and very great. Out of their experience, out of their ingenuity, their imagination, out of the example set in West Berlin, I think you start to build the fabric that unites a people despite walls, despite all the impediment that is put up. So to finalize my answer to you, I see no real conflict between the reunification, or the unification, of Germany and our effort to have better relationships with the Soviet Union. Quite frankly, until there is a settlement in Central Europe, where nations are brought back together, there cannot be the kind of peaceful coexistence that is required over the long term for a peaceful world. So they are not only compatible, they are necessary. What I should say is that they are not incompatible; both of these things are necessary to have the policy of the forward look of a unified Germany and at the same time to realize that the way to obtain this is through the tedious and patient, imaginative process of peaceful works of diplomacy, of cooperation. And may I also add, by maintaining the united strength of the West. You see, I don't see there's any conflict there. I think that you cannot obtain this goal individually or alone. And yet I do believe that Germany must have the right to probe in diplomacy, to try to find her own answers, but at the same time to try to work out in consultation with her partners the ultimate solution.

QUESTION: I would like to return to the non-proliferation treaty, Mr. Vice President. When it comes to signing the NPT, won't the U.S. and the Soviet Union have different motives for signing?

MR. HUMPHREY: It's very hard to know what someone else's motives are. I cannot speak for the Soviet Union. But I can speak for my country. We are interested in the non-proliferation -- the Non-Proliferation Treaty, as it's called -- relating to nuclear weapons, for one purpose above all. We think that the proliferation, the extension, the expansion of nuclear armament amongst many more nations adds to the danger in the world -- is another threat to the possibility, to the hope of peace. It means more fingers on the nuclear trigger. It means the possibility of accident that could lend itself to a catastrophic nuclear war. We believe that the nuclear proliferation -- the Non-Proliferation Treaty -- is in the interests of mankind. We know that those who are called to sign it and asked to join in promoting it make some sacrifices. There is no doubt about that. Sometimes it is a sacrifice in terms of pride, sometimes it is a sacrifice in terms of a man's political position in his own country. But you cannot have peace in this world without sacrifices. You cannot have freedom in this world without sacrifices. My country is sacrificing in Viet-Nam now for a people that is a long way away from us, because we really believe that it is for their freedom. We were prepared to sacrifice and are prepared to sacrifice once again here in Berlin, if need be - in West Germany or any place else for the freedom of other people. You do not get peace and freedom, which are the greatest gifts that can come to mankind, cheaply. They come because you need them, because you want them. And I happen to believe that the Non-Proliferation Treaty is high on the agenda of man's search for a peaceful world. And may I say that I think that treaty can be arrived at

and agreed to without endangering any of the interests of any of the countries. We can protect the whole matter of civilian nuclear peaceful technology. In fact, it will improve. Once the proliferation matter is prohibited -- once there is a way set up to stop nuclear weapons proliferation -- you will see civilian nuclear technology blossom, because the fear of the weapons spread will be out. You will see nations begin to feel more confident with one another, and knowing that at least one element of danger has been removed. I think this is a great step toward social, economic progress in a peaceful world.

QUESTION: Mr. Humphrey, I would like to return once more to the German problem. Do you believe it would contribute to a reduction of tensions if a rapprochement between the two parts of Germany went as far as the practical recognition of the DDR?

MR. HUMPHREY: I am just not prepared to give an answer to that, except to say that that does not fit within our present policy considerations. The German people are going to have to take a good hard look at their own relationships with their own people in Europe. We do not think that the East Zone represents a nation. It represents a regime, but not a nation. The people of the Federal Republic of Germany will have to talk these things out themselves. What is most important is that there be a free Germany. And a Germany that the Germans themselves want -- that is free and independent and able to carry out its own decisions without violating the commitments which have been made already to other partners in the West. I don't think this will come easily, but that does not make it any the less desirable. As a matter of fact, it makes it more desirable. I do think that it is important that trade patterns be set up, that there be a freer movement of people, that commerce be improved between the Eastern Zone and the Federal Republic of Germany. I think that it is terribly important that the Federal Republic extend its

diplomacy, seeking exchange of diplomats and diplomatic recognition with the countries of Eastern Europe. And I think as all of that happens, then you begin to perfect and refine the ways in which you again bring the German nation back together . . . in peace and in freedom. That is the way I think it best could be done. Now may I say you don't define the intricacies of a delicate matter of foreign policy in a short television show. As a matter of fact, this is going to require not 25 minutes, but maybe many years. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't start it.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, French President de Gaulle is of the opinion that the Oder-Neisse line is a permanent frontier. What is the opinion of your government on this subject?

MR. HUMPHREY: The opinion of our government on this subject is that these are all matters that must be resolved in a general European settlement. It does not contribute to the solidarity of policy between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany and other nations in the West for the United States to be prematurely, unilaterally making policy decisions relating to other peoples interests without adequate consultation and agreement with other people. Now, some people may disagree with that position, and I'm not here to chastise anyone else who takes a different position. But my government believes that a partnership is a partnership. And it doesn't mean that one partner does all the talking, or takes all the responsibility, or lays down all the ground rules. It means that the partners can pursue in a very real sense an independence, integrity, in the spirit of cooperation. So when you talk about boundaries that relate to other peoples' interests, you ought to consult other people. That is the way we see it. And I don't want to be misunderstood. I'm not chastising anyone else. But this is my government's policy and I think it is a sound one.

QUESTION: Ladies and Gentlemen, our broadcast is nearing an end. There remain only three minutes for a glance into the future. Mr. Vice President, do you believe it important, for propaganda reasons, that the first man to land on the moon be an American?

MR. HUMPHREY: Well, it would be all right. We hope that that will be the case. Let me put it this way, that what we want above all is when we land on the moon we learn something from this experience in research in space. It would have been even much better, might I say, if the Soviets had accepted our offer of a joint moon project. We could have all saved time and money. And maybe the best example of peaceful cooperation that the world could have had was if you've had an American and a Soviet landing on the moon together. I think they'd have had to get along all right and it would have pooled much of the great scientific space research. But our moon program -- what we call our Apollo program -- is going along quite well. We've had one tragic disaster, as you know, where we lost three of our astronauts --- three very personal friends of mine. This is a terrible price to pay for scientific advance, but it is a price that our nation knew that it might pay sometime and the families of the loved ones knew they might pay. So we're moving along.

FINAL REMARKE BY THE MODERATOR: Ladies and Gentlemen, you saw and heard the television press conference with the American Vice President. Thank you again, Mr. Vice President, that you answered our questions for the German public. May I wish you, also on behalf of my colleagues, a happy journey back to America. Good night. END TEXT

[This may have been used in The Bonn TV Interview? Apr. 6]

[Apr. 6?]



Foreign Service of the
United States of America

INCOMING AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

ACTION
VICE PRESIDENT
(10)

CONFIDENTIAL

Classification

Control: 1628/1-2

Recd: 3/29/67
P343

TALKING POINTS FOR EUROVISION

O 280052Z MAR 67
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO RUFHOL/AMEMBASSY BONN IMMEDIATE 2899
RUDKTH/AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE IMMEDIATE 938-939

STATE 164380/1-2

TOVIP 10

FOLLOWING COMPRISES QUESTIONS AND TALKING POINT REPLIES FOR VICE PRESIDENT'S BONN TV APPEARANCE AS APPROVED HERE.

QUESTION #1 -- THE US COMMITMENT TO EUROPE.

MR. VICE PRESIDENT: MANY PEOPLE HERE IN GERMANY AND ELSEWHERE IN WESTERN EUROPE ARE SAYING THAT THE UNITED STATES -- BECAUSE OF VIET-NAM -- HAS LOST ITS PERSPECTIVE. YOU HAVE A HALF-MILLION MEN IN VIET-NAM. YOU SEEM TO BE NEGLECTING THE VISION OF A GREAT SOCIETY IN THE UNITED STATES AND CUTTING THE CLOTH OF YOUR FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS TO FIT A BUDGET DISTORTED BY THE VIET-NAM WAR. ANOTHER COMPLAINT HEARD IN EUROPE IS THAT YOU SEEM TO BE MORE INTERESTED IN IMPROVING RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION, E.G., THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY, THAN IN MAINTAINING YOUR TRADITIONAL ALLIANCE IN WESTERN EUROPE OR IN ENCOURAGING EUROPEAN UNITY.

TALKING POINTS:

A. ON ALLIANCE:

1. AM HERE TO LOOK INTO PRESENT AND FUTURE ISSUES FACING ALLIANCE.
2. AMERICAN COMMITMENT TO EUROPE IS INVIOABLE.
3. HOPE FOR FUTURE LIES IN PERMANENT COOPERATION BETWEEN EUROPE AND AMERICA: IN DEFENSE, IN ECONOMIC AND MONETARY MATTERS, IN NEGOTIATIONS WITH EASTERN EUROPE, IN AMELIORATING "THIRD WORLD" PROBLEMS OF HUNGER, IGNORANCE, DISEASE.
4. BASIC MUTUAL PLEDGE OF NA TREATY REMAINS -- ATTACK ON ONE IS ATTACK ON ALL. US SUPPORTS ALLIANCE FULLY.

CONFIDENTIAL

Classification

REPRODUCTION FROM THIS COPY IS PROHIBITED UNLESS "UNCLASSIFIED"

INCOMING AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

PAGE TWO

CONFIDENTIAL

Classification

Control:

1628/1 & 2

Recd:

B. ON VIET-NAM:

1. RE VIET-NAM, US POLICY CONSISTENT WITH OBLIGATIONS UNDER UN CHARTER 10:
 - A. OPPOSE AGGRESSION;
 - B. PROMOTE SELF-DETERMINATION;
 - C. ASSIST IN NATION BUILDING.
2. VIET-NAM THREAT TO PEACE -- A THREAT WHICH CANNOT GO UNCHALLENGED.
3. IF AGGRESSION IN VIET-NAM NOT STOPPED HURTS CREDIBILITY OUR WILLINGNESS DEAL WITH IT ELSEWHERE. MUST MEET IT.
4. REMAIN READY TO NEGOTIATE A SETTLEMENT, AS RECENT OFFER OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON DEMONSTRATED -- OFFER WHICH HO CHI-MINH REJECTED FLATLY.
5. WHAT WESTERN EUROPEANS WOULD CONDEMN THESE PURPOSES? WOULD AMERICA'S COMMITMENT TO EUROPE BE BELIEVED IF AMERICA FAILED HONOR COMMITMENTS ELSEWHERE?

C. ON NPT:

1. NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY NOT AT SACRIFICE OF EUROPE.
 - A. IS IN INTEREST OF HUMANITY.
 - B. GREATER THE NUMBER NATIONS POSSESSING NUCLEAR WAR MAKING CAPACITY, GREATER DANGER TO PEACE AND SURVIVAL. SECURITY OF ALL SERVED BY NON-PROLIFERATION.
 - C. PROPOSED TREATY DOES NOT PREVENT UNITED EUROPE FROM INHERITING THE NUCLEAR STATUS OF ONE OF THE CONSTITUENT STATES.
 - D. LIMITING SPREAD NUCLEAR WEAPONS WOULD NOT LIMIT PEACEFUL USES ATOMIC ENERGY.

CONFIDENTIAL

Classification

REPRODUCTION FROM THIS COPY IS
PROHIBITED UNLESS "UNCLASSIFIED"

TELEGRAM

Foreign Service of the
United States of America

INCOMING AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

PAGE THREE

CONFIDENTIAL
Classification

Control: 1628/1 & 2

Recd:

QUESTION #2 -- EAST-WEST RELATIONS IN EUROPE.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH OF OCTOBER 7, 1966, WAS WIDELY INTERPRETED BY GERMANS AS A SIGNAL THAT THE U.S. ACCEPTS THE STATUS QUO IN EUROPE, I.E., THE DIVISION OF GERMANY. CAN YOU COMMENT?

TALKING POINTS FOR REPLY

- A. CAREFUL READING OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH SUGGESTS OPPOSITE. RECORD CLEAR THAT US SUPPORTS UNIFICATION GERMANY BECAUSE:
1. ACCORDS WITH WISHES GERMAN PEOPLE;
 2. DIVISION OF GERMANY NOT CONDITION OF POST-WAR EUROPE;
 3. DIVISION OF GERMANY COULD THREATEN PEACE.
- B. BUT SOVIET UNION HAS NOT SHARED THIS DESIRE AND
1. INSTALLED UNDEMOCRATIC COMMUNIST REGIME IN EAST GERMANY;
AND
 2. NO EVIDENCE TODAY USSR WILLING SEE EAST AND WEST GERMANY JOINED IN FREEDOM.
- C. NEVERTHELESS, IN RECENT YEARS SOVIET POSTURE HAS CHANGED:
1. HAS RECOVERED FROM DEVASTATION WW II
 2. SOVIET BEHAVIOR SEEMS LESS MILITANT.
 3. GREATER FREEDOM NOW EXISTS IN THE COMMUNIST WORLD -- PARTICULARLY IN EASTERN EUROPE WHERE MORE PERSONAL FREEDOM.
- D. OTHER ENCOURAGING DEVELOPMENTS ARE LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY AND TREATY BANNING USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN SPACE.
- E. FRG TOO HAS RECOGNIZED NEW ATMOSPHERE IN EUROPE.
1. HAS TAKEN NEW INITIATIVES IN EASTERN EUROPE.
 2. ESTABLISHED DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH ROMANIA.
 3. US WELCOMES SUCH STEPS AND IS PREPARED TO ASSIST.

CONFIDENTIAL
Classification

REPRODUCTION FROM THIS COPY IS
PROHIBITED UNLESS "UNCLASSIFIED"

TELEGRAM

Foreign Service of the
United States of America

INCOMING AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

PAGE FOUR

CONFIDENTIAL

Classification

Control: 1628/1 & 2

Recd:

- F. HOW CAN THIS PROCESS AID SOLUTION GERMAN PROBLEM? AS I SAID RECENTLY AT FULTON, MISSOURI, THIS PROBLEM IS AT THE HEART OF A POSTWAR EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT. REUNIFICATION DIFFICULT GOAL BUT NECESSARY IF EUROPEAN STABILITY AND PEACE TO BE ASSURED.
- G. TWO POSITIVE TRENDS MAY MAKE ACCEPTABLE SOLUTION POSSIBLE:
1. RELAXATION TENSIONS CAN REDUCE FEARS GLOBAL CONFLICT;
 2. IDEOLOGICAL OBSTACLES TO EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT FADING AWAY.
- H. COOPERATION NEEDED NOT ONLY BETWEEN EAST AND WEST BUT ALSO BETWEEN USSR AND US, AND WITHIN WESTERN EUROPE.
1. USG DEDICATED TO ENLARGING AREA COOPERATION:
 - A. US-SOVIET CONSULAR AGREEMENT
 - B. EAST-WEST TRADE LEGISLATION
 - C. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION
 2. IMPORTANT THAT POLITICAL FRAMEWORK WESTERN EUROPE DEVELOP SO FRG AND OTHER STATES FORM LARGER EUROPEAN ENTITY. THEN EXAGGERATED FEARS OF NATIONAL AMBITIONS WOULD CEASE AND POSSIBILITY SOLUTION OF DIVISION GERMANY WOULD EMERGE.
- I. HOWEVER, PROSPECT OF UNITY NOT IMMINENT. IT POSSIBLE, AND HOPE ALL GOOD EUROPEANS WILL WORK FOR IT. MUST ENSURE THAT THESE TWO TRENDS GO FORWARD TOGETHER. BUT MUST NOT LOSE SIGHT OF GERMAN PROBLEM IN MOVING TOWARDS DETENTE.

QUESTION #3 -- EUROPEAN UNITY

DOES THE US STILL FAVOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND FURTHER GROWTH OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY, AND IF SO, WHAT DOES IT EXPECT TO RESULT?

TALKING POINTS FOR REPLY

- A. SINCE MARSHALL PLAN, US HAS FAVORED UNIFICATION WESTERN EUROPE.
 1. ECONOMIC ADVANTAGES INTEGRATION RECOGNIZED.

TELEGRAM

Foreign Service of the
United States of America

INCOMING AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

PAGE FIVE

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Classification

Control: 1628/1

Recd:

2. TECHNOLOGICAL GAP AN ASPECT OF NEED FOR WEST EUROPEAN INTEGRATION. RAPID TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS DEPENDS LARGELY ON SCALE OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND MARKET SIZE NO SINGLE WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRY CAN MANAGE OR PROVIDE ALONE.
- B. MORE IMPORTANT IS RELATION ECONOMIC INTEGRATION TO POLITICAL FUTURE EUROPE; ALTERNATIVES ARE
 1. EUROPE OF TRADITIONAL NATION STATES CAUGHT UP IN OLD RIVALRIES;
 2. OR LARGER ENTITY GIVING NEW POLITICAL LIFE AND MEANING TO EUROPE.
- C. IS QUESTION FOR EUROPEANS TO DECIDE. PROCESS CANNOT BE HURRIED OR PUSHED FROM OUTSIDE. BOTH US AND EUROPE BETTER OFF IF EUROPE MORE UNIFIED. IN PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WORDS:

"A UNITED WESTERN EUROPE CAN BE OUR EQUAL PARTNER IN HELPING TO BUILD A PEACEFUL AND JUST WORLD ORDER;
"A UNITED WESTERN EUROPE CAN MOVE MORE CONFIDENTLY IN PEACEFUL INITIATIVES TOWARD THE EAST;
"UNITY CAN PROVIDE A FRAMEWORK WITHIN WHICH A UNIFIED GERMANY COULD BE A FULL PARTNER WITHOUT AROUSING ANCIENT FEARS."

QUESTION #4 -- THE FUTURE OF NATO

DOES THIS MEAN THEN THAT NATO WILL HAVE A DIMINISHING ROLE IN THE FUTURE?

TALKING POINTS:

- A. CERTAINLY NOT.
 1. ROLE OF NATO IMPORTANT AS LONG AS MASSIVE FORCES, BOTH CONVENTIONAL AND NUCLEAR, CONFRONT EACH OTHER IN WESTERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.
 2. ALTHOUGH SOVIET VIEW OF RELATIONS BETWEEN COMMUNIST AND NON-COMMUNIST WORLDS APPEARS RESTRAINED, MUST NOT LET DOWN OUR GUARD UNILATERALLY.
- B. FUTURE ROLE OF NATO BLENH OF STRATEGY AND DIPLOMACY.
 1. ALLIANCE A LIVING ORGANISM. MUST ADAPT TO NEW TASKS.

TELEGRAM

Foreign Service of the
United States of America

INCOMING AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

PAGE SIX

CONFIDENTIAL

Classification

Control:

1628/1-2

Recd:

2. ALLIANCE INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT FRAMEWORK IN WHICH ATLANTIC NATIONS CONSULT AND CONCERT POLICIES.

QUESTION #5 - THE KENNEDY ROUND

YOU HAVE BEEN TO GENEVA WHERE THE KENNEDY ROUND NEGOTIATIONS ARE BEING CONDUCTED. THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO BE COMPLETED VERY SOON. DO YOU THINK THEY WILL BE SUCCESSFUL?

TALKING POINTS:

- A. BELIEVE SO. SUCCESS IS IN INTEREST ALL PARTICIPANTS.
- B. NEGOTIATIONS NOW IN CRITICAL PHASE:
 - 1. DECISIVE BARGAINING NOW UNDERWAY.
 - 2. NEGOTIATIONS RECIPROCAL. EVERYONE MUST BE SATISFIED HE GETTING FAIR BARGAIN.
- C. KENNEDY ROUND MORE THAN TARIFF BARGAINING; NEGOTIATIONS HAVE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL IMPORTANCE.
 - 1. PROMISE GREAT BENEFITS FOR EXPANDED WORLD TRADE.
 - 2. CEMENT ECONOMIC FRAMEWORK OF ATLANTIC ALLIANCE.
 - 3. CAN REDUCE COMMERCIAL BARRIERS BETWEEN COMMON MARKET AND EFTA.
 - 4. OPEN NEW MARKETS FOR LDC'S.
- D. AGRICULTURE IMPORTANT.
 - 1. TRADITIONALLY, FARM PRODUCTS EXEMPT FROM MAJOR REDUCTIONS IN TRADE BARRIERS. THIS NOT HEALTHY.
 - 2. WE FAVOR EXPANDED WORLD TRADE AND EXPANDED AGRICULTURAL COMPETITION. BENEFITS CONSUMERS.
 - 3. ATTACH IMPORTANCE TO LIBERALIZATION AGRICULTURAL TRADE IN KR.
- E. CANNOT ALLOW FELLOW HUMAN BEINGS IN LDC'S STARVE WHILE

TELEGRAM

Foreign Service of the
United States of America

INCOMING AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

PAGE SEVEN

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Classification

Control: 1628/1-2

Recd:

INDUSTRIALIZED RICH COUNTRIES AFFLUENT. GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS MUST SEEK SECURE COMMON COMMITMENT SUPPLY GRAINS TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES ON TERMS THEY CAN AFFORD.

F. KENNEDY ROUND, IN SHORT, OF UTMOST IMPORTANCE. IMPERATIVE HAVE SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION.

QUESTION #6 - DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

YOU HAVE SPOKEN SO FAR ABOUT FOREIGN AFFAIRS. WHAT ABOUT THE DOMESTIC PROBLEMS THAT THE ATLANTIC NATIONS FACE?

TALKING POINTS:

A. KEY PURPOSE DEVELOPED COUNTRIES IS IMPROVE QUALITY THEIR SOCIETIES.

1. EUROPEAN COUNTRIES PIONEERS THIS FIELD -- A GOOD EXAMPLE IS GERMAN PIONEERING OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICAL INSURANCE PLANS.

2. EXCITING THINGS HAPPENING IN US:

A. WAR ON POVERTY

B. OUR YOUTH PROGRAM

C. MEDICARE

D. AID TO EDUCATION

B. CAN LEARN FROM EACH OTHER; CAN AND SHOULD EXCHANGE INFORMATION, EXPERIENCE, AND EXPERTS.

RUSK

J C P

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Classification

REPRODUCTION FROM THIS COPY IS
PROHIBITED UNLESS "UNCLASSIFIED"



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