



news release

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE • PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION • 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037 • 202/333-8750

For Release PMs
Thursday, September 26, 1968

For Further Information:
Ev Munsey, ext. 201
DC-519

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY DEFINES NEW 'STRATEGY FOR PEACE'

San Francisco, Calif., September 26 -- Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey today said that the United States can no longer "play the role of global gendarme. The American people don't want it, and the rest of the world won't accept it."

Speaking at the Commonwealth Club, the Vice President proposed a UN "peacekeeping fund, beginning with \$20 million to help the UN to launch emergency operations without delay and to provide for UN forces to "patrol borders and supervise free elections." One of his first tasks as President, said Mr. Humphrey, would be to "call a new San Francisco Conference to re-dedicate the United Nations on its 25th Anniversary and to seek new ways of making it work for peace."

The Vice President also recommended prompt ratification by the U.S. Senate of the UN treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons; regional and multi-lateral responsibility among small and medium sized nations; and "global effort at economic development." The text of the Vice President's remarks follows:

. . . . more

REMARKS BY
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
COMMONWEALTH CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

SEPTEMBER 26, 1968

Today I want to talk about peace -- about our role in achieving peace and in maintaining it.

During the next decade, we Americans will continue to have major responsibility for preserving world peace. But how we fulfill that responsibility will change.

Today we face new conditions:

-- Though the tragic events in Czechoslovakia remind us that the cold war period is not over, it is giving way its central role on the world stage to a global movement toward individual freedom and human emancipation.

-- The Communist countries no longer pose a monolithic threat.

-- There is a need and a new chance to accelerate our efforts toward control of the arms race.

-- New nations are moving into a period when they look more toward self-development and less toward ideological conflict.

-- Western Europe and Japan are able to stand on their own two feet, and want to do just that.

-- And a new generation in the United States and other industrial countries rejects the old premises of war and diplomacy. They want to see more emphasis placed on human and personal values -- having enough to eat... being able to learn ... living free of fear. And it is for our generation to help them realize their hopes -- of a world free from the tyrannies of war and oppression.

* * *

Our world role in the next ten years will be different from that in the last.

There are pressing problems at home which cause us to place careful priorities on allocation of resources abroad.

Revival of strength in other free countries does enable them to assume greater burdens.

Experience of recent years does suggest areas in which our foreign policy-making could be improved.

PAGE TWO

I welcome this period of debate and review ... this opportunity to join in the scrutiny of policy ... this opportunity to define a new strategy for peace.

Fundamental to this strategy is the rejection of those proposals which rely exclusively on American power as the guarantor of security in areas of the developing world where we are now involved.

Southeast Asia is a good example.

Our Nation has been deeply concerned about our involvement in Vietnam.

And, as a result of that concern, there is a temptation to pull back and withdraw from further responsibility outside the familiar Atlantic world.

But the lesson of Vietnam is not that we should turn our backs on Southeast Asia -- or on other nations or peoples in less familiar parts of the world neighborhood.

The lesson is, rather, that we should most carefully assess our national interests ... carefully define our goals and priorities ... and within those interests and priorities, that we should formulate policies which will fit new American guidelines.

In Southeast Asia, for instance, I believe we should follow three basic future guidelines:

Self-Help;

Regional and multilateral responsibility;

Selective American assistance.

The Self-Help principle should apply both to national security and to economic and social development.

Regional and multi-lateral responsibility will be the only way in which small and medium-sized nations -- particularly those living near the borders of the great powers -- will be able to gain the collective strength necessary both to withstand the pressure of internal subversion and indirect aggression, and to muster the economic and social resources which few have within their own limited means.

Not only should we continue to encourage regional cooperation -- such as we see in the Alliance for Progress, the Asian and African Development Banks and regional security organizations -- but we should also avoid, where possible, unilateral involvement, either militarily or economically -- where multilateral means are available.

PAGE THREE

Selective U. S. assistance will be a necessity as we carefully measure just what is, and is not, in our national interest.

The era is certainly past when we alone were the only reliable source of assistance to nations under pressure from aggression and from poverty.

The task now is not to march alone, but to march in such a way that others will wish to join us in a new strategy for peace, broadly based and shared by many nations.

* * *

There will be no peace for any American -- or any other person on this earth -- until nations stop the piling up of weapons of mass destruction, and the spreading of these weapons around the world. We must halt the spread of nuclear terror before it halts humanity.

I have devoted much of my life to these ends -- as Chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee ... as sponsor of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

... and as principal Senate supporter of the Test Ban Treaty.

As Vice President, I traveled last year to Geneva and to other European capitals to encourage the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty -- which should be promptly ratified now.

I will seek an agreement with the Soviet Union on offensive and defensive missiles ... an end to nuclear testing under adequate safeguards -- the control of chemical, radiological, and biological weapons ... and a halt to regional arms races in the Middle East and elsewhere.

There can be an end to these deadly arms races and I mean to exert the leadership of this nation to bring that about.

Mr. Nixon does not share my commitment to control the arms race.

He wants to postpone Senate action of the Treaty prohibiting the spread of nuclear weapons.

This position not only jeopardizes the peace of the world -- but it encourages nations to pour tens of billions of dollars into the arms race ... dollars that bring no more security, and put us again on that slippery slope to nuclear war ... dollars urgently needed for the economic and social development here in America and abroad.

The choice is clear. We can have a President who equivocates on these matters of life or nuclear death.

. . . . more

PAGE FOUR

Or we can have a President who will act to turn back the arms race and save mankind from self-destruction.

I say we need a man who understands both the prospects of success in this area -- and the consequences of failure.

* * *

New conditions also require the improvement of institutions for peace.

I pledge to you here in San Francisco where the United Nations was born some 23 years ago that one of the high priorities of my Presidency will be to strengthen the peacekeeping and peacemaking capacity of the United Nations.

This is our third step toward a new strategy for peace: To make the U. N. the instrument for controlling conflict it has so far failed to be.

The United States cannot play the role of global gendarme. The American people don't want it, and the rest of the world won't accept it. We know better today than yesterday that "the illusion of American omnipotence -- in Dr. Brogan's phrase, "is an illusion."

But the alternative to American peacekeeping cannot be no peacekeeping. It must be peacekeeping by the United Nations or by regional agencies.

The basis of any world peacekeeping system must be a commitment to non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. But this policy will only work if it is respected by all states, large and small -- and if there is an effective instrument in the United Nations to serve the interests, not if individual nations, but of peace itself.

A policy of mutual non-interference is not just an ideal -- it is the only way to preserve peace in this world. But it will work only if the pledges of non-interference are backed up by United Nations forces which can patrol borders, and supervise free elections.

U. N. peacekeeping efforts have brought practical results in Cyprus, in the Congo, and in Kashmir.

As President of the United States, I will do everything in my power to place international peacekeeping soldiers in troubled areas. Rather than American soldiers. Nowhere would a United Nations peacekeeping force be more welcome than in Viet Nam to administer free elections and verify the withdrawal of foreign troops.

But the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations can be enlarged only if its members -- particularly those who have no powers -- will earmark and train units of their armed forces for international peacekeeping assignments.

To aid in this effort, I propose:

-- to use our military assistance program to help less-developed countries prepare units of their armed forces for UN and regional peace-keeping assignments;

-- to launch a new effort to resolve the UN's financial and constitutional crisis;

-- to call for a United Nations peacekeeping fund, beginning with twenty million dollars to help the UN to launch emergency operations without delay.

If we want peace -- we, and all nations -- must be prepared to pay for it.

One of my first steps as your next President will be to call a new San Francisco conference to rededicate the United Nations on its 25 anniversary, and to seek new ways of making it work for peace -- especially in the area of international peacekeeping.

I will appoint, early in 1969, a commission for peace to be composed of leading American citizens who will have a mandate from me, as your President, to develop specific proposals for the new San Francisco conference and to work with similar commissions from other member nations to plan for the 25th anniversary conference in April 1969.

United Nations peacekeeping must go hand in hand with United State peace-keeping. The United Nations needs not just a fire department, but a better means of fire prevention.

Here in the United States, we have learned the value of factfinders and mediators to mobilize opinion behind a reasonable settlement of disputes. I urge that the United Nations establish a permanent panel of highly-skilled factfinders and mediators to apply themselves to disputes that threaten world peace.

The ending of conflict, the mediation of crises will be of little use if we do not strike at the causes of future conflicts before they begin.

. . . . more

Therefore, the fourth element in a New Strategy for Peace must be a global effort at economic development -- what Pope Paul called "The New Name for Peace."

I have visited many of the new nations. I have talked to their leaders and to their people. I know their needs and desires.

As President Kennedy once said: "If we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich."

But today, the time has come for a new approach to world development. We have learned that national burdens can be lifted -- if international burdens can be shared. We need not merely a new level of effort, but a greater emphasis on multilateral cooperation.

This will be a new philosophy of aid, where we help nations to development without facing what has been called "the temptation to do good" -- the temptation to insist not only that virtue be done, but that our particular version of virtue be implemented in our particular way.

This new approach to aid-giving will not relieve us of the need to play our full part in providing help to poorer countries.

Indeed, the action of the Congress this year in mutilating the Foreign Aid Bill was irresponsible -- and will only make it more likely that someday people will try to do by war what we now fail to do for peace. We must re-evaluate our priorities -- so that a 70 billion dollar defense budget to work for peace today does not eclipse these modest programs to provide the peace for tomorrow.

But we are not alone. New efforts should be made in the coming years to enlist the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the global war on poverty. Development should mean cooperation -- not competition -- because the peace it provides is in our common interest.

The fifth element in this new strategy for peace should be new efforts to promote international understanding through the use of exciting developments in communications technology -- including the communications satellite. Through satellites, man cannot only transmit between central ground stations -- he can broadcast directly to village and home radio and TV receivers.

I propose reciprocal TV and radio exchanges with other countries, including the countries of Eastern Europe. Let us offer the Soviet leaders the opportunity to talk to the American people on TV in return for the same privilege for our leaders to the Soviet Union.

Other countries may have difficulty with these proposals, but we in America have an open society. And we can lead in the quest for an open world.

* * *

I have spoken to you today of several aspects of the conduct of our future foreign policy.

None of these things will, of course, be effective unless we as a people first make the decision that America should continue to play an active role in the world at large -- and that we should not, despite our problems at home, draw back within ourselves.

Over these past few years, we have come to regard our power almost with guilt. And there has always been within us the old instinct to avoid foreign entanglement.

But I believe we should regard our power not as something to be cast aside, but as an active instrument for human betterment.

NATO, for instance, provides a necessary military shield to the Western Alliance.

But the power that lies within NATO need not be only military power, but also coordinated economic, social and political power exercised on behalf, for instance, of bridge building to the East and lessening of world tensions.

In all our alliances and international institutions, we must see the possibilities, not only of entanglements and trouble, we must see the possibilities of pushing forward the forces of freedom and human emancipation which are now sweeping throughout the world.

We must understand that our vast power must not be too easily used... that it must not be used in any way which might lead this Nation to become overbearing or too enamoured of power. That would be dangerous.

Yet, at the same time, we must understand that the absence of the use of power can be equally dangerous.

To turn within ourselves, or to stand aside, in the face of rapid and tumultuous change would be to leave ourselves the helpless victims of history rather than its progenitors.

So I call on this nation to stay at this business of international responsibility. I ask America not to become disillusioned with the troubles they find in the world at large, but to see the enormous possibilities still unmet.

. . . more

PAGE EIGHT

This above all will require something America has always found difficult: Patience.

It has been said that we are a Nation not of long distance runners, but of sprinters. And there is truth in that.

But in year 25 of the nuclear age, we must finally learn that peace will never be a short-run game, but always a marathon.

A New Strategy for Peace will be the work of many years. But in the long run, it is the only alternative.

Ordinary people in this country and throughout the world are turning to leaders who offer them programs for cooperation rather than conflict.

This I ask of you today: Which Presidential candidate ... which political Party, is best equipped to lead the US in the quest for peace?

Which Presidential candidate ... which political Party is best equipped to turn back the arms race ... to strengthen international peacekeeping machinery ... to accelerate development aid through multilateral agencies ... and to move with courage for world understanding?

* * *

Our New Strategy for Peace will succeed only if it can inspire a new generation of Americans who are new to the Nation's politics at home and abroad.

And our search for a New Strategy for the Peace will succeed only when we find an honorable end to a tragic war.

As President, my first priority will be to end the war in Vietnam.

And in pursuing that goal in Vietnam, as in all other areas of national policy, I repeat: The policies of tomorrow will not be limited by the policies of yesterday.

I believe that we can pursue a New Strategy for Peace and succeed.

As President Kennedy stated at American University in June of 1963:

"Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable, that mankind is doomed, and that we are ripped by forces we cannot control.

"We need not accept that view. Our problems are man-made; therefore, they can be solved by men. And man can be as big as he wants."

President Kennedy was right. We can have peace. We shall have peace. That is my pledge to the American people in this campaign.

III - 9/23/68

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

COMMONWEALTH CLUB

SAN FRANCISCO

A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE

Today I want to talk about peace -- about the American role in achieving peace, and in maintaining peace.

During the next decade, we will continue to have major responsibility for preserving world peace. But the way in which we fulfill that responsibility will change.

Today we face new conditions:

-- The cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union is waning -- though not ended.

-- The Communist countries no longer pose a monolithic threat.

-- There is a need and an opportunity of accelerating mutual efforts toward arms control.

-- The new nations are moving into a period when they increasingly look toward self-development.

-- Western Europe and Japan can stand on their own two feet, and they want to do just that.

-- A new generation is emerging in the United States and other industrial countries which rejects the old premises of war and diplomacy and which wants to see more emphasis placed on human and personal values -- like having enough to eat ... being able to learn ... living free of fear.

There are pressing problems at home, which place some limits on what we can do abroad.

Revival of strength in other free countries does enable them to assume greater burdens.

Experience of recent years does suggest areas in which our ways of making foreign policy could be improved.

So, as a candidate for President, I welcome this period of debate and review -- this opportunity to join in the scrutiny of policy, this opportunity to define a "new strategy for peace."

To begin with, a new strategy for peace must include a shift away from the exclusive reliance on American power as the guarantor of security ~~in Asia and in other~~ areas of the developing world where we are now involved. We should adopt the principle that other countries must assume greater responsibility for shaping their future, and apply this principle to post-Vietnam problems in Asia and Africa.

I believe it is time that we convert the phrase "no more Vietnams" from a slogan into a sound -- and attainable -- objective of U.S. policy.

How do we both avoid future Vietnams and help to secure a lasting peace in Southeast Asia? ~~Let me deal with these two issues separately.~~

Avoiding future Vietnams does not mean turning our back on Southeast Asia -- or on nations or peoples in any other part of the world whose freedom is threatened. It does mean redefining

the character of the U.S. role and exercising our power cautiously and critically.

We should follow three basic guidelines in meeting future threats to Asian peace: (1) self-help; (2) regional and multilateral responsibility; (3) selective U.S. assistance.

Self-help in achieving national security means that the threatened country must demonstrate its willingness to assume primary responsibility for meeting aggression and externally-supported insurgency through plans, programs, and combat military operations.

Regional and multilateral responsibility means that the Southeast Asian nations must concern themselves with each other's security in the future and must develop means to deal with externally-supported insurgencies. The U.S. should continue to encourage regional cooperation among these countries. If it is the view of the nations of a region that aggression is taking place against a member or neighboring country, this should have great weight on the action of external powers. Unilateral action by the great powers should be avoided and assistance sought from international sources.

Selective U.S. assistance means that the U.S. should be prepared to fulfill specific and clearly-defined mutual defense commitments but should not seek to do what Asian nations are not prepared to do for themselves. Our military presence in a troubled area should be kept at the minimum level required to meet our responsibilities.

These three principles -- self-help, regional and multilateral cooperation, and selective U.S. assistance -- should

represent the basic guidelines for U.S. ~~policy~~ policy in Southeast Asia.

Thus, in meeting future threats to developing nations, as in ending the Vietnam war itself, strengthening the ability of other countries to meet wider responsibilities will be the first step in a new strategy for peace.

There will be no peace for any American -- or any other person on this earth -- until we stop the piling up of weapons of mass destruction and the spreading of these weapons to countries around the world.

I have devoted much of my life to these ends -- as Chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, as sponsor of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and as principal Senate supporter of the Test Ban Treaty.

As Vice President, I travelled to Geneva and to other European capitals to encourage the signing of the non-proliferation treaty.

As President, I will give new impetus to our search for effective control of the arms race.

I will seek to implement the non-proliferation treaty -- which should be promptly ratified now.

I will seek an agreement with the Soviet Union on offensive and defensive missiles -- an end to nuclear testing under adequate safeguards -- the control of chemical, radiological and biological weapons -- and a halt to regional arms races in the Middle East and elsewhere.

The Republican candidate shares no such commitment to control of the arms race. He has called for postponement of Senate action on the treaty prohibiting the spread of nuclear weapons. His policies would not only jeopardize the peace of the world -- they would pour tens of billions of dollars into the arms race -- dollars that would bring no more security, but would put us again on that slippery slope to nuclear war -- dollars which we urgently need to rebuild our cities and provide a decent life for all Americans.

So the choice is clear. Do you want a President who equivocates on these matters of life or nuclear death? Or do you want a peace President who will act to turn back the arms race and save mankind from self-destruction?

More and more, we will pursue our new strategy for peace through multilateral organizations, the most important of which is the United Nations. I am happy to be able to pledge -- here in this city of San Francisco, where the United Nations was born some 23 years ago -- that one of the high priorities of my presidency will be to strengthen the peacekeeping and peacemaking capacity of the United Nations.

This is the third step in a new strategy for peace: To make the UN the instrument for controlling conflict it has so far failed to be.

The United States cannot play the role of global gendarme. The American people don't want it, and the rest of the world won't accept it. But the alternative to American peacekeeping cannot be no peacekeeping. It must be peacekeeping by the United Nations or regional agencies.

The basis of any world peacekeeping system must be non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. But this policy will only work if it is scrupulously respected by all states, large and small -- and if there is an effective alternative in the United Nations to serve the interests, not of individual nations, but of peace itself.

As President of the United States, I will make clear that American power will never be used to prevent any nation from choosing any kind of government it wants. And I will ask the leaders of other governments -- including the Communist states -- that their power not be used to prevent nations from choosing the governments they want -- even if this leads to non-Communist governments.

Such a policy of mutual non-interference is not just an ideal; it is the only way to preserve peace in this world. But this means will only work if the pledges of non-interference are backed up by international machinery which can patrol borders, supervise free elections, and otherwise verify compliance with the rules of non-interference.

The UN peacekeeping efforts have brought practical results in the Arab-Israeli conflict, in Cyprus, in the Congo, and in Kashmir. Even Communist countries now recognize the need to contain local conflicts that might draw in the great powers and trigger a nuclear war.

As President of the United States, I intend to do everything in my power to place international peacekeeping soldiers in troubled areas, rather than American soldiers. Nowhere would a United Nations peacekeeping force be more welcome than in Vietnam where it could

administer free elections and verify the withdrawal of foreign troops.

To enlarge the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations, its members -- particularly those who have no responsibilities for peace as great powers -- should earmark and train units of their armed forces for international peacekeeping assignments.

To aid in this effort, I propose

-- To use our Military Assistance Program to help less-developed countries prepare units of their armed forces for UN and regional peacekeeping assignments;

-- To make available one or more of our overseas military bases as training and supply centers for United Nations peacekeeping efforts;

-- To launch a new effort to resolve the UN's financial and constitutional crisis;

-- To call for a United Nations peacekeeping fund, fixed initially at 20 million dollars, to permit the UN to launch emergency operations without delay.

UN peacemaking must go hand-in-hand with UN peacekeeping. The United Nations needs not just a fire department, but a better system of fire prevention.

Here in the United States, we have learned the value of fact-finders and mediators to mobilize opinion behind a reasonable settlement. I urge that the United Nations establish a permanent panel of highly-skilled factfinders and mediators to apply themselves to disputes that threaten world peace.

The United States should take the lead in establishing such a system. I believe our country should accept the process of factfinding and mediation by the United Nations or other international agencies in any dispute to which we are a party anywhere in the world. We will not bind ourselves in advance to accept the findings of such efforts, but we cannot neglect such efforts in our search for peace. If President, I would begin this policy by asking the United Nations to help with the search for peace in Vietnam.

The fourth element in a new strategy for peace should be a global effort at economic development. Pope Paul said that "Development is the new name for peace."

As President Kennedy once said, "If we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich."

The time has come for a new approach to world development -- not merely a new level of effort, but a new emphasis on multilateral cooperation.

As President of the United States, I will propose that the overwhelming share of international assistance be channeled through the United Nations and regional agencies, where costs and responsibilities are widely shared. This includes such institutions as the World Bank, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asia Development Bank, and other regional institutions.

This new approach to aid-giving will not relieve us of the need to play our full part in providing help to poorer countries. The action of the Congress this year in mutilating the foreign aid

bill was irresponsible -- and in the long run will only make it more likely that we will someday have to do in war what we have failed to do for peace. It is time to re-evaluate our priorities -- so that a 70 billion dollar defense budget to work for peace today does not eclipse these modest programs to provide the building blocks of peace for tomorrow.

New efforts should be made in the coming years to enlist the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the global war on poverty. Development should be a cooperative -- not a competitive enterprise -- because the peace it provides is our common interest.

Even if we cannot reach this objective right away, we can try to move towards it on a case-by-case basis where East and West recognize a measure of common interest. Let us begin by encouraging the Soviet Union to join the World Bank consortium for India.

The fifth element in a new strategy for peace should be new efforts to promote international understanding through the use of the most exciting development in communications technology -- the communications satellite. Through satellites man can not only transmit between central ground stations -- but can also broadcast directly to village and home radio and TV receivers.

I propose reciprocal TV and radio exchanges with other countries, including the countries of Eastern Europe. Let us offer the Soviet leaders the opportunity to talk to the American people on TV in return for the same privilege for our leaders in the Soviet Union.

Other countries may have difficulty with these proposals. But we in America have an open society. There is no reason why we should not lead in the quest for an open world.

I have mentioned five elements in a new Strategy for peace. They are only a partial list of the initiatives that I would undertake to promote the common interest of mankind in welfare and peace.

This new strategy cannot be adapted overnight. It will be the work of many years. But in the long run it is the only viable alternative for America between an assumption of too much world responsibility and a new retreat into isolation that can only lead to greater problems ... and an end to hopes for peace.

I believe the war in Vietnam has shown us the absolute necessity of developing stronger international institutions to help us share the burdens and the responsibilities of peacekeeping and development.

The common people not only in this country but in all countries will turn increasingly to leaders who offer them programs for cooperation rather than conflict.

Therefore, I ask of you which Presidential candidate and which political party is best equipped to lead the U.S. in the quest for peace?

Which Presidential candidate and which political party is best equipped to avoid future "Vietnams," to turn back the arms race -- to strengthen international peacekeeping machinery--

to accelerate multilateral development aid -- to preserve and develop the human environment -- and to move boldly for world understanding?

Our tradition assumes a high degree of participation by the people in the making of critical national policy decisions. Involvement by the people will continue to be a necessity if national decisions are to be truly reflective of the national will. For foreign policy is the people's business in 1968 just as politics is their business.

We understand especially today that a new strategy for peace for a new decade stands little chance of success unless it can inspire the new generation of Americans who renew the nation's political processes, wear our armed forces uniforms, and in the long run determine the success or failure of American policy at home and abroad.

But our search for a new strategy for peace will lead no where until we end our engagement in a ^{tragic} ~~tropic~~ war -- a war which has consumed our energies, divided our people, tarnished our reputation, and limited our vision.

As President, my first priority will be to end the war in Vietnam.

In pursuing that goal, the policies of tomorrow need not be limited by the policies of yesterday.

My belief that we can successfully pursue a "new strategy for peace" is based on the conviction eloquently stated by President Kennedy at American University in June of 1963. He said:

"Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable, that mankind is doomed, that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

"We need not accept that view. Our problems are man-made; therefore, they can be solved by men. And man can be as big as he wants."

#

COMMONWEALTH CLUB
San Francisco, California
Thursday, September 26, 1968

Vice President Humphrey. Ladies and gentlemen, I come to you not only as the Vice President of the United States, which is a high honor for me, one for which I will be eternally grateful, but I trust that you will also permit me to speak to you as a candidate for the highest office within the gift of the American people, the Presidency.

The Commonwealth Club has offered spokesmen -- American spokesmen and spokesmen throughout the world an opportunity to state their views in an atmosphere of understanding, confidence and tolerance and forbearance this great club that has been the forum for the statement of high national policy and international goals. I come here today hopefully to be able to discuss with you some of the thoughts and observations and my hopes and dreams of a new strategy for peace. First of all, the highest goal of mankind should be peace. Statesmanship is not measured by the victories won on the battle fields, but rather the achievements of peace that are won in the hearts of men and the achievements of peace that are accomplished through the fine art of diplomacy.

Peace is the crowning glory of civilization. War is the throwback to man's primitive nature.

A political campaign ought to challenge the best that is in us. Sometimes it is rather difficult to see that. It ought to. This is why I have said from every platform where I am privileged to speak that it is nothing short of tragedy for this country that the major political candidates seeking the highest office of President do not appear on the same platform at the same time before the same audiences.

I know this does not always appeal to partisans. I am an old hand at party politics and I think I understand what it means to address a partisan audience. But we have been admonished through Scripture and through philosopher to seek the truth. And truth is not always sought nor is it even the prize in a political campaign where all you do is to address the partisan group.

And I once again say in all respect for my opponents in this campaign that we really owe it to this nation as mature citizens, men who at least some people thought were capable of handling the difficult assignment of the Office of the Presidency. We owe it to the American people to let them hear us speak thoughtfully, understandingly, with meditation, with knowledge. I know how to address an audience with bombast and oratory. But I also think that because of the difficulties that beset this country, this period of crisis that we face, the dangers that are evidenced in this world, that this campaign above all others should be one of sobriety, of responsibility, of reason, of judicial judgment, of ideas. The noise of a campaign does not determine its quality. Every political campaign in a period of crisis above all else should be a period of education, inspiration, meditation. And we face such a crisis today -- with conflict at home, with some voices trying to divide this country into separate camps -- black against white, rich against poor -- with some voices once again being raised to tell us that the cold war is again upon us, with some voices telling us that there is no way out except for the recent America.

I think that at this period of time, we need rational discussion of the issues. Democracy has many qualities. Winston Churchill

once said it is the worse possible form of government except all others. Maybe he was right. But I know that democracy for its survival requires discussion, debate, and also the ferment of dissent. It also requires decision. But there can be no rational decision without discussion, without debate, dialogue, and even the challenge of dissent, which is the fresh breeze that comes into the intellectual arena.

I have a simple formula for my idea of democracy; dissent, yes; disorder, no. And I think that is the formula that is needed now, or the standard that is needed now in our nation as never before.

So I want to talk to you about peace and I want to make it very clear that the making of peace is the work of giants, not pygmies, physically or intellectually, morally or spiritually. I want to talk to you about our role in achieving peace and maintaining it. Because during the next decade, we Americans will continue to have a major responsibility for preserving world peace. There is no escape from it. But how we fulfill that responsibility will change, because it is a changing world. Today we face new conditions and tomorrow will -- there will be another set of conditions.

So for those that want simple, dogmatic doctrinary answers, there are none. The first sign of a civilized man is that he understands that change is inevitable. And he learns how to adjust himself to it and to direct those forces of change in the constructive patterns. Though the tragic events in Czechoslovakia of recent days remind us that the cold war period regrettably is not over, it is giving way, nevertheless, its central role on the world's stage to a global movement for its individual freedom and human emancipation.

The central fact of our time is not despotism and tyranny, but emancipation -- participation, individualism, here at home and throughout the world. The Communist countries no longer are a monolith and no longer do they pose a monolithic threat.. The breeze of freedom and emancipation is sweeping over Central Europe and other parts of the world. There is a need and a new chance, therefore, to accelerate our efforts.

In one area of the peacekeeping, the control and the slowdown of the arms race, new nations are moving into a period when they look more toward self-development and less toward ideological conflicts. Western Europe and Japan, just to mention a few areas, are today better able to stand on their own two feet and they want to do just that -- not by excluding us but in their own spirit of pride and strength. And a new generation in the United States and other industrialized countries rejects the old premises of war and cold war diplomacy. They want to see more emphasis placed on human and personal values, such as having enough to eat, being able to have the opportunity to learn, and living free from fear.

And it is for our generation -- my generation -- to help this new generation realize its hopes of a world free from the tyrannies of war and oppression, to help realize what Franklin Roosevelt laid down as a hope and as a promise, the four freedoms. And indeed, two of them above all -- freedom from fear, freedom from thought, freedom to speak, freedom of conscious.

Now, our world role in the next ten years will be different from the last decade. This is not to repudiate the past, it is merely to accept the future. There are pressing problems here at home which cause us to place careful priorities on the allocation of our resources at home and abroad -- revival of strength in other free countries does enable them to assume greater burdens for self-defense and for international cooperation, and for us to be wedded to the idea that only America can stand guard and help save this suffering world is to show that we are the victims of addiction to a generation gone by. The experience of recent years does, and I repeat does, suggest areas in which our foreign policy-making should be changed and could be improved. I have said as a candidate, and sometimes I am questioned a great deal by the media about it as to what I mean, that my first objective when I am permitted to serve this nation as its president will be to reassess, to reevaluate, to re-study all of our commitments abroad: in Southeast Asia, Europe, Latin America, wherever it is. This is not to say that we abandon what we have already committed. It is merely to take inventory and any man that takes over the management of a concern -- business or public -- the first thing he ought to do if he is a sensible man and a prudent man is to take inventory, to assess the situation in his eyes, with his eyes, with his observance, with his advisers; not necessarily to abandon anything, but if need be to abandon what needs to be abandoned; not necessarily to turn your back on the yesterdays but, if need be, if the times of tomorrow require it, to have the courage to do it. In other words, to live for tomorrow and not to worship the achievements of yesterday. (applause)

Now, I welcome this period of debate and review and I regret that it is a sort of one-man debate. I welcome this opportunity to join in the scrutiny of policy, policy that I helped make as Senator, policy that I have at least advised on as Vice President. I was privileged to be brought up by a father who was a good merchant. We changed our merchandising practices a dozen times in the life of our business without ever taking the name off the store. (applause)

I want to say that if you ever plan on staying in business, you never accept the other fellow's inventory; you make your own.

Even if he is your best friend. (applause)

So I welcome the opportunity to define a new strategy for peace. I only wish I had a few more participants. First and fundamental to this strategy is the rejection of those proposals which rely exclusively on American power as the guarantor of security in areas of the developing world where we are now involved. And Southeast Asia is a good example. Our nation has been deeply involved and concerned about ~~xxx~~ Viet Nam, and as a result of that concern, there is a temptation today on the part of too many to pull back and to withdraw from further responsibility outside the familiar Atlantic world. Asia seems so remote to some. And yet it is half the population of this earth. For us to ignore it, for us to pretend it is not there is to me not only ridiculous but dangerous.

But then, what do we do about it? The lesson of Viet Nam is not that we should turn our backs on Southeast Asia or on other nations or peoples in less familiar parts of the world neighborhood. The lesson is rather that we should most carefully assess, in that area as in other areas, our national interest, carefully define our goals and priorities. And within those interests and priorities, then we should formulate policies which will fit new American guidelines.

Remember that on January 20, 1969, a new President, a new man will take the office and take the ~~xxxxxx~~ oath of office for the Presidency of the United States. I have said from a dozen platforms and in my acceptance speech for the nomination of my party that we are coming to the end of an era and entering the dawn of a new day. I believe that. Therefore, we must design goals and programs and policies and objectives for the new day, building on that which is good and sound, having no hesitation whatsoever as a great people and a great nation to cast aside that which may have served its purpose or may have had no useful purpose at all.

In Southeast Asia, I believe that we should follow three basic future guidelines as follows: first, self help -- people want to be free, they have to demonstrate it -- regional and multilateral responsibility; selective American assistance. The self help principle should apply both to national security and to economic and social development.

Regional and multilateral responsibility will be the only way in which small and medium sized nations, particularly those living near the borders of the great powers, will be able to gain the collective strength that is necessary both to withstand the pressure of internal subversion and indirect aggression and to muster the economic and social resources which few have within their own limited means. Not only should we continue to encourage regional cooperation such as we see in the Alliance for Progress, the Asian African Development Banks and the Regional Security organizations, but we should also avoid where possible unilateral involvement, either militarily or economically, where multilateral means are available.

Now, what does that mean in simple terms? We cannot remake the world in our design. Let's try to make this world safe for diversity, not a world of uniformity. (applause)

Selective American assistance -- let's define that. That will be a necessity as we carefully measure just what is and what is not in our national interest. For example, were all of the commitments made by the late John Foster Dulles in our national interest? If they were, then regardless of the author, we should underwrite them. If they are not, regardless of the author, we should no longer underwrite them. It is just that simple. (applause)

This is to abandon no one, but it is to think of our national interest, and the President of the United States has a primary obligation. He takes an oath of office to defend this country from enemies foreign and domestic. He takes an oath of office above all to think of this country and its well being. Now, that does not mean isolationism. It most likely means the most sensitive and the most clearly defined kind of international cooperation. But just as the son of a successful father seeks to live his own life and build his own career, so each new generation of Americans must do the same.

This is not to downgrade the achievements of the family. It is only to add a new dimension to the importance of the family. That is the way I see it. (applause)

So the time is certainly past when we alone were the only reliable source of assistance to nations under pressure from aggression or from poverty. The task now is not to march alone but to march in such a way that others will wish to join, to follow us, to be the leader and not the solo player, to be the leader in a New Strategy for Peace, broadly based and shared by many nations.

Now, there will be no peace for any American or any person on this earth until nations stop piling up these weapons of mass destruction and the spreading of these weapons around the world. I am simply

saying, and I will repeat it from every platform that I am privileged to hold, we must halt the spread of nuclear terror before it halts humanity. (applause) Now, I have devoted much of my public life to these ends: as the sponsor of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as the Chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Disarmament, as the principal Senate supporter of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and as Vice President, I traveled last year to Geneva and to six European capitals to encourage the signing and the development of the so-called Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty designed to stop the spread of nuclear weaponry, technology, and the spread of weapons themselves. I can't help but have, well, deep concern and fear when I think of what might happen in this world in nuclear weapons were to fall into the hands of the competitors and the enemies in the Far East, if nuclear weapons were to be in the hands of Mr. Nasser, of Ho Chi Min, of the government of South Vietnam, the government of North Korea, the government of South Korea, Castro in Cuba. And yet, ladies and gentlemen, that is exactly where we are now. We are at that point where at least eight to twelve nations at this hour have the technical and scientific and engineering capacity to develop nuclear weaponry and their means of delivery.

I think that is a dangerous situation. Time is running out and there are super powers that would be more than happy to spread these weapons amongst others if the arms race goes unhalting. Every time a nation gets these dangerous weapons, the level of danger is raised. One erratic response by an erratic leader or a leader that has no judgment could precipitate a total nuclear confrontation. This is the issue above all others that will affect the lives of children yet unborn and the young of this generation.

As President, because as Senator and Vice President, I felt the same way, I will be dedicated to the effective control and the immediate slow-down of the arms race. And I will seek to implement that treaty that stops the spread of nuclear weaponry which I believe should be promptly ratified.

I remind this great audience that we failed once to ratify the Versailles treaty and we lived to see a Hitler. We saw the death of the League of Nations. We contributed to the seeds of World War II by our inaction, by our failure to ratify a treaty. (applause)

I shall repeat as long as I am strong enough to say it that the Republican nominee, a respected man in public life, has a moral obligation to call upon the Senate of the United States, along with myself calling upon that same Senate, to promptly ratify that non-proliferation treaty as a means of peace. (applause)

To frighten the American people by the memories of the darker days of the cold war, to drag out the old speeches to communist peril -- all of that has no relevance whatsoever to a treaty that is in our national interest, a treaty that does not curb our strength, that does not deny us the means of self-defense, but a treaty that will stop the spread of this dangerous weaponry.

Mr. Nixon, you owe it to your country, you owe it to your sense of decency and conscience to rise above the political advantage which may momentarily come by rattling the skeletons of fear of the cold war and communist peril and joining with me in calling upon the Senate of the United States to act as statesmen rather than men of doubt and indecision. And I beg of this audience today (applause) to call on him.

Now, the choice is clear, we can have a President who equivocates on these matters of life or nuclear death, equivocates on matters like seeking an agreement with the Soviet Union on offensive and defensive missiles, which I shall do, an end to nuclear testing under

adequate safeguards, the control of chemical, radiological and biological weapons, and a halt to regional arms races in the Middle East and elsewhere. I will seek an agreement, I will seek to find ways of agreement, pursuing relentlessly every knowing way of diplomacy to gain these objectives. There can be an end to these deadly arms races and I mean to exert the leadership of this nation to put it to an end.

Your defense budget now is \$80 \$80 billion. How much more do you think you ought to spend? Well, let me make it clear, there will be no end to the spending unless we expend ourselves in a constant pursuit of the means of diplomacy and negotiation to arrive at a mutual understanding and agreement, halting this dangerous arms race.

So I say that we need a man who understands the prospects of success in this area and the consequences of failure. We can have a President who equivocates on these matters or we can have a President who will act to turn back the arms race and save mankind from self destruction.

Now, new conditions will require improvement in the institutions for peace and I want to pledge to you here in San Francisco, where the United Nations was born 23 years ago, that one of the high priorities of my Presidency will be to strengthen the peacekeeping and the peace making capacity of the United Nations. I have served in that United Nations. (applause) I have served in it, studied it, and as Senator been chairman of the subcommittee that dealt with it. I think it has the hopes of mankind for peace in its very make-up. Therefore, the third step for the new strategy for peace is to make the United Nations the instrument for controlling conflict it has failed to be.

Now, the United States cannot play the role of global gendarme. We not only should not, but we cannot. The American people don't want it and the rest of the world won't accept it. And we know better today than yesterday that "the illusion of American omnipotence, in D. W. Brogan's phrase, "is an illusion." But the alternative to American peacekeeping cannot be no peacekeeping. It must be peacekeeping by the United Nations for regional agencies or regional groupings. The basis of any world peacekeeping system must be a commitment to non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, but this policy will only work if it is respected by all states, large and small, and if there is an effective instrument in the United Nations to serve the interest, not of individual nations but of peace itself. A policy of mutual non-interference is not just an ideal, it is also a way to preserve the peace. But it will work only if the pledges of non-interference are backed up by the United Nations forces which can control borders and supervise free elections. And United Nations peacekeeping efforts have produced practical results in Cyprus, in the Congo, and in Kashmir. And as President of the United States, I will do everything in my power to place the international peacekeeping soldiers in troubled areas rather than American soldiers.

And no where would a United Nations peacekeeping force be more welcome than in Viet Nam to administer free elections and to verify the withdrawal of foreign troops when the time of cease fire and a negotiated political settlement is arrived at. But the peacekeeping capacity of United Nations can only be enlarged if its members, particularly those who have no responsibility for peace as great powers, will earmark and train units of their armed forces for international peacekeeping assignments. And therefore, to be practical and specific, I propose to use our military assistance programs to help less developed countries prepare units of their armed forces for the United Nations and regional peacekeeping assignments.

I propose to launch a new effort to resolve the United Nation's financial and constitutional crisis.

I propose to call for a United Nation Peacekeeping fund, beginning with a contribution from this nation of \$20 million to help the United Nations launch emergency operations without delay.

If we want peace, we and all nations must be prepared to pay for it and we ought to take the lead. (applause) One of my first steps as your new President will be to call a new San Francisco Conference, Mr. Mayor, to rededicate the United Nations on its 25th anniversary, right here in San Francisco, Mr. Mayor -- (applause) and to seek new ways of making it work for peace. I will appoint early in 1969 a national commission for peace, to be composed of leading American citizens representing many different points of view who will have a mandate from me as your President to develop specific proposals for the new San Francisco Conference and to work with similar commissions which we shall ask for from other member nations to plan for the 25th Anniversary Conference in April 1970. It can be done. We must dare to try. (applause)

Now, there is a fourth element in the new strategy for peace. It must be global -- a global effort for economic development; as Pope Paul called it, "the new name for peace." I have visited many of the new nations and I have talked to their leaders and their people. As President Kennedy said, "if we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich."

But today, the time has come for a new approach to world development. We have known that national burdens can be lifted if international burdens can be shared. We need not merely a new level of foreign assistance effort but a greater emphasis upon international, multi-lateral cooperation. This will be a new philosophy of aid for me, where we help nations through development without facing what has been called the temptation to do good, the temptation to insist not only that virtue be done, but that our particular version of virtue be implemented in our particular way. The new approach to aid-giving will not relieve us of the need to play our full part. Indeed, the action of the Congress this year in mutilating the foreign aid bill was out right irresponsible and will only make it -- (applause) mind you, my fellow Americans -- will only make it more likely that some day, people will try to do by force and war what we now fail to do for peace and economic development. We must therefore re-evaluate our priorities so that a \$70 billion defense budget to work for peace today does not eclipse these modest programs to provide for peace tomorrow.

There is something wrong in this country, my friends. (applause) But we are not alone. New efforts should be made in the coming years to enlist the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the global war on poverty. Development should mean cooperation, not competition, because the peace it provides is in our common interest.

The fifth element of this New Strategy for Peace should be new efforts to promote international understanding through the exciting developments in communications technology, including communications satellites. Through these satellites, man can transmit between central ground stations and can broadcast directly from village, home, radio and T.V. receivers. I therefore will propose reciprocal radio and T.V. exchanges with other countries, including the countries of Eastern Europe. Let's dare. Let's be adventuresome. We have nothing to lose. In the competition of ideas there is no danger that the stale stench of totalitarianism can in any way out work or in any way overcome the fresh breeze of freedom. I see no reason to be afraid.

Let us offer the leaders of the Soviet Union the opportunity to talk to the American people on T.V. and radio in return for the same privilege of our leaders in the Soviet Union. You say it won't work? Well, let's try it and let's keep at it. (applause)

Some countries may have difficulty with these proposals, but we are an open society and we should lead in the quest for an open world.

I have spoken to you today of several aspects of our foreign policy. It is a serious speech and regrettably, I suppose, an extended one. But this is serious business. But none of these things will of course be effective unless we as a people first make the decision that America should and must continue to play an active role in the world at large and that we should not, despite our frustrations and our problems at home, draw back within ourselves.

Over these past few years we have come to regard our power and strength almost with a sense of guilt and there has always been with us that old instinct to avoid foreign entanglement. But I believe that we should regard our strength and our power not as something for which we should apologize, or to be cast aside, but as an active instrument for peace and human betterment. NATO, for instance, provides a necessary shield for the Western Alliance. And today, after the tragic events in Czechoslovakia, we are once again compelled to recognize its vital importance to peace and security. But the power that lies within NATO need not only be military power. It can also be coordinated economic and social and political power to be exercised on behalf of bridge-building to the east and lessening of world tensions. In our alliances and international institutions, therefore, we must foresee the possibilities of pushing forward the forces of freedom and human emancipation that are now sweeping the world. But we must understand that our vast power must not be too easily and readily used, that it must not be used in any way which might lead this nation to become overbearing or to be enamored of its power. That would be dangerous.

Yet at the same time, we must understand, that the absence of the use of power, when such is needed, can be equally dangerous. Therefore, we must be judicious and thoughtful, and to turn within ourselves or to stand aside and in the face of rapid and tumultuous change would be to leave ourselves the helpless victims of history rather than progenitors. So I call upon this nation and this place to stay at this business of international responsibility. It is one world and it is the world of mankind. There is no way to get off or get out except through death.

So I call on you, my fellow Americans, not to become disillusioned with the troubles that we find in the world at large, but rather to see the enormous possibilities that are still unmet.

This above all will require something that America has always found difficult -- patience, persevering patience. It has been said of this nation that we are not a long distance runner but a nation of sprinters. I hope not. But in the year 25 of the nuclear age, we must finally learn that peace will never be a short-run game but always a marathon. A new strategy for peace will be the work of many years, but it is worth it.

Ordinary people in this country and throughout the world are turning to leaders who offer them programs for cooperation rather than conflict. I ask of you today which presidential candidate, which political party is best equipped therefore to lead in the quest for peace. Which presidential candidate, which political party, is best

equipped to turn back the arms race, to strengthen international peacekeeping, to accelerate development through multi-lateral agencies, to move with courage through reconciliation for world understanding? Only if we can inspire this new generation of Americans who are new to the nations political process. That new generation will, in the long run, determine the success or the failure of American policy at home and abroad. And our search for the new strategy for peace will succeed only when we find an honorable end to the tragic war that now besets us. And as President, my first priority, if that war is still with us, will be to find an end to the war -- not by yielding to aggression, which violates every principle of peace, but by pursuing relentlessly, with creativity and innovation and daring the processes of negotiation. And I do believe that the platform of my party, which recognizes that the search for peace involves risks, is a sound document. It points the way to the goal of an honorable and acceptable peace in Vietnam, and as candidate, I shall be guided by that platform. And in pursuing that goal in Viet Nam, as in all other areas of that policy, I will repeat for you today my commitment. The policies of tomorrow will not be limited by the policies of yesterday. I believe that we can pursue a new strategy and succeed. President Kennedy thought so, too, and I worked with him as I have with President Johnson in those objectives.

Here is what he said in that memorable address at American University, and I leave you with these words: "Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable, that mankind is doomed, and that we are ripped by forces we cannot control.

"We need not accept that view. Our problems are man-made; therefore, they can be solved by men. And man can be as big as he wants."

President Kennedy was right. We can have peace if we work for it, if we sacrifice for it. And we shall have peace if we have the strength and the courage to relentlessly pursue it.

I say to you that this is my pledge to the American people in this campaign. A President must be an apostle of peace. He must give his life if need be for the cause of peace, because there is no greater cause and there is no greater honor.

Thank you very much.

Question. Since the Democrats have been running the country since 1932 except for the Eisenhower years, when the Republicans had the White House, don't the Democrats have to accept the full responsibility for the situation we are in?

Vice President Humphrey. That is a good Republican question. I will give you a good Democratic answer. No, that is all.

I must say in all candor that the Executive Branch of the Government has tremendous power. It influences decisions of policy. I can tell you the Democrats need not be blamed for the economic shortcomings. Let me be very frank about it. The war in Korea was over. For this, President Eisenhower deserves great credit. But the dividends of that peace were never felt in America -- not a bit. There was no war on poverty, there was no federal aid to education, there was no effort made to really come to grips with the problems of our cities. There were no manpower training programs for our unemployed. The rate of unemployment went up to approximately seven and a half percent, there were three recessions in eight years, \$175 billion of lost income because of unemployment. The gross national product was increasing at the rate of two and a half percent, which is stagnation. Presently, an average good rate is about four and a half. Five accelerates the economy too much. The wholesale price index went up 9.2 percent in the Republican years. It has gone up 9.5 percent in the Democratic period of seven and a half years. Personal income, family income for a family of four adjusted for the cost of living went up .9 percent in the Republican eight years. It went up 32 percent in the Democratic eight years. The major drain on the gold reserve started in this country under the Republican Administration and was kept a great secret. There has never been a year of the Democratic Administration since 1961 in which we had as large a payments deficit in the balance of payments as we had in the Republican years. So they did not manage the gold supply well, they did not manage the economy well, the unemployment rate grew, there were no efforts made to clean out our slums, there was no war on poverty, there was not one single worker being trained in the manpower training program and I just refuse to accept responsibility for that because I tried to do something about it and so did our fellow Democrats.

Question. Our next questioner wants you to assess President Johnson's effect on your campaign.

Vice President Humphrey. Well, I get that question quite often. Let me say first of all I am very pleased to have had the President announce his open support. I had no doubt that it would be announced.

President Johnson has many, many friends, and like any man in public life and like myself, he has many people who are, I don't think his enemies, but in opposition to him. I don't consider my Republican associates and neighbors my enemies. I just consider them my problem, you see.

I believe that the Administration's programs have not really had the attention that they justly deserve and I want to make it very clear to this audience, I am very proud, very proud to have had some hand in seeing to it that programs such as the federal aid to education which has helped our universities, our students -- there are a million students in our universities today that are there from low income and middle income families because of student loans and scholarships made possible by this Administration. There are

a million students in our universities today that are there from low income and middle income families because of student loans and scholarships made possible by this administration. There are nine million youngsters that have had a totally inadequate education that are being given a better education because of federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. I believe we have made many advances in consumer protection. I think we have done many things that are very important in the field of health. I do not stand before an audience and apologize for Medicare. I know Mr. Nixon said it was going to be a cruel burden on the American people. He said it would not work. But it does. Apparently, he has not been talking to the old folks; I have. It does. It has been a God-send. It has not hurt the medical professions or the hospitals. In fact, they have never done better in their lives, believe me. And the people that have been the beneficiaries have had the best of medical and hospital care. I think the President's support is helpful. I am proud to have served with this President.

But I want to make it just as clear that when I become the President, I will be the President of the United States, just as he has been the President of the United States, and just as no Vice President or ex-Vice President or ex-President controls policy now, no Vice President, ex-Presidents or ex-Vice Presidents will control policy when I am President, period.

Question. Our next questioner is worried, Mr. Vice President, about your recent talks on Social Security and asks how can you justify raising Social Security taxes and how do you expect to increase Social Security and at the same time meet our military needs?

Vice President Humphrey. That is a very fortunate question. That speech was very carefully worked out by not only social scientists who believe in social security but by actuarially experts. I said that we should increase social security benefits by 50 percent over the next four years in three stages and this comes in part from an expanding economy if you have a Democratic administration. Because with the same tax rate, you get more money. Now, we will have to increase somewhat the base on which that tax rate is applied.

I also say that for those extras that you must provide, such as some of the extra care for the totally disabled, you have to dip into the general revenues and there is no reason at all that you should not.

you
Let me just take/for a moment to an area that is not in the social security field. A mentally retarded child is entitled to all the educational opportunities that a normal child is. It is nothing short of outrageous and immoral that that child is not given that kind of care in this country. And if you have to send that child to a private school, then that should be a reimbursable item in your taxes. It definitely should, just the same way it is true of a totally disabled person under social security. He may not have had a chance to pay into the funds. It is through no fault of his own. But he is an American and he is totally disabled. And a country that is going to have a trillion dollar economy by 1972 ought to be able to provide for the handicapped, the mentally retarded and for the elderly.

Now, if you have to have a little in the general revenues to do it, we can afford it. Your federal taxes have not gone up. You are paying fewer dollars in taxes today than you paid in 1964 despite the war, despite the expenditures for your cities, despite the war on poverty. The taxes today are less on the average citizen of the middle and low income and high income today than they were in 1964.

"Now, if you can morally justify that and feel good about it knowing the number of people that don't have the break that you and I had, then you feel a little better than I do. I happen to support a tax policy that encourages investment and productivity in this country. I do it in Social Security as well as in the general revenue. I make it very, very clear that we can afford under social security by raising the base and indeed, if need be, by going into the general revenue, to pay every one of those benefits to senior citizens. They are entitled to life in human dignity. By doing so under my proposals, you will take literally thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands of people off welfare, where your property tax base takes care of it.

This is equitable. The property tax is becoming confiscatory. The property tax is destroying the incentive for home ownership. The progressive federal income tax is a progressive tax. If you make a lot, you pay more; if you make a little, you pay less. It is fair.

One of the ways to help communities like San Francisco or San Mateo or wherever else it may be to be able to perform the social services this community ought to perform is to help it relieve some of the welfare costs that are a tremendous burden upon the local community. And the Social Security system provides that and if we have to dip into the general revenues to do it, it will be a God-send to the home owner and particularly to the older home owner, who is hanging on desperately with a little income to a little house that is still their last opportunity to be an individual citizen. I'm going to work for it, so you may just as well know what you have got.

Question. Our next two questions relate to riots and disorders. Will you please comment on the events in Chicago?

Vice President Humphrey. There were two kinds of events that became mingled in the media. There was one event that was taking place in the convention hall, which I thought was an excellent convention -- hard fought, sometimes bitter. But that is not unusual. They had a hard fight at the Constitutional Convention. Let me remind you that one hundred were invited, 55 came, 16 walked out in disgust and only 38 stayed. We Democrats did a lot better than that.

The last time we had anybody walk out, it was Strom Thurmond, and he joined Richard Nixon.

May I say that is one of the improvements in the Democratic Party.

We had an open convention, we changed the rules, we democratized our party in its selection of delegates, we seated new delegations because there had been violation of the principle of equal treatment and equal participation. We did not perform perfectly because we are human beings and fallible. But I would rather have all the torment and the trials and the tribulations and the anger and the debate of the Democratic Convention than to have gone through that boring experience of a national wake which took place down in Miami. I must be very honest about it.

I know my Republican friends are not going to like that and I want to be very honest with you, I think Miami is a lovely place to go to. I don't think it is the right place for a political convention, but it is a great place for a vacation and that is what some folks had. And they are going to have a longer one as a result of it, I might add.

Now, what happened outside? Frankly, things that were ugly, men, destructive, and most unfortunate. Whose fault? I think there is

fault on both sides. I am not trying to straddle it, it is just a fact. The fact of the matter is that there was a hard core of destructive people, a small, disciplined hard core who have said that they are going to have two to three hundred more Chicagos around this country, their leaders, who have said that they are going to break up their meetings, who have said that if need be, they will go into the ballot box and lie on the floor and force the police to drag them out and charge police brutality. That is what they have said on the public record and you have seen it on television as well.

Regrettably, that hard core of nihilists and anarchists, agitators and provocateurs, who are in the minority in this country and they don't represent anything but a militant small group. That hard core provoked a fight with the police and the police, not well disciplined, started a fight and when the provocateurs got through, they left the kids up front.

Somebody asked me what would you do in a riot, and I said get away. That is what should have happened. I don't think we can excuse breakdown in discipline. There was great harassment, there was great provocation.

Now, my fellow Americans, I want to speak right from the heart to you. I have been the subject of a great deal of this kind of harassment. I believe any abridgement of the right to speak or assemble is a danger to this democracy. I have been told by letter, by word, by official resolution, by a hard core group in this country that they are out to destroy the Democratic Party and destroy this nation. And when I go to many a meeting, they are there, getting far too much attention, I might add, too. But they are there. And they are determined to destroy.

I am not going to let them do it. I am not going to let them intimidate me or you and you must not let them do it, either. Hitler's storm troopers started that way. They never had a majority. They were a hand full of militant anarchists, destructive people. And the United States of America cannot afford racists on the one hand who arouse people's passions over race than ask this country to be divided into two nations, separate and unequal and it cannot afford to have the extremists on the left or whatever side they seem to be, the anarchists that are out to destroy. I welcome the chance in this year 1968 to stand in defiance of most of them. And I have had to suffer from them. Let me just quickly say a word about this business of law and order, because the next question leads to it: How do you feel the present wave of disorders in the country can be brought to an end? I guess this is referring not only to the violence -- by the way, there was much less violence this summer than the predictors predicted. I want you all to go back and pick up your newspapers of April this year and May. I ask you to do it. I ask you to see what percent, I want you to take every radio and television tape and read what was said. It said we would have all over America violence, the cities would be burned. And we listened to the Stokely Carmichaels and the Rap Browns and gave them equal time. But that did not happen. Sure there was some -- too much. But the amazing thing is that there was as little. I think we owe a great debt of gratitude to some of the leaders in the black community and other communities, the thoughtful leaders, the decent people, people who have suffered untold trouble, people who have been the victims of vicious discrimination and inequity. Nevertheless, they love their country enough to try to cool it and to hold this country together. And they need a President that will work with them. And I am going to help them if I get the chance.

I have been Mayor of a city. I have listened to all this chatter about law and order. The first thing a man does when he takes the oath of office is to know that that is his first obligation. It is sort of like when you get married, one of the first things you do is put the ring on the finger. That is expected. Law and order.

I served as a mayor of my city for two terms, the City of Minneapolis, and I saw that my police department was properly equipped. I saw that it had some new training in human relations and law enforcement techniques, and I doubled their pay and gave them a 40-hour week. Two-thirds of the law enforcement officers of this country have less than a living wage and you want them to be out there and protect your homes.

And when you speak of law and order, remember this, that the poor are the victims of disorder and crime more than anybody else. And in many areas of this country, regrettably, it is the poor who are suffering the most from lawlessness and crime. They deserve equal law enforcement, equal law protection, and they are not getting it. And many of the people in the ghettos as we call them, in the slums, are begging for better law and order. They are not trying to contribute to it, they are begging for it.

I am pledged to law and order. Violence cannot be condoned. But you are not going to get it by putting bumper stickers on saying support your police. That is not enough. You are going to get it when you are willing to pay your police, train your police, recruit better police, put more police on and give them training not only in how to use a gun and a club but how to use their mind, how to make judgments. That is also good. This is going to require cooperation from the federal and state governments, particularly the federal government. You are going to have to improve your narcotics control of this country, definitely. We are going to have to do a great deal and we are going to have to be willing to pay the bill. But all the people that have given the most rabble rousing speeches of law and order have never said how much they are going to pay for it.

Mr. Wallace has the highest rate of murder in his state than any state in the union, so if he wants to have a little law and order, I will give him a good laboratory to work in. He can start right out. That is a good place to start.

And the Vice Presidential candidate on the Republican ticket is the Governor of the State that has the fourth highest rate of crime in the United States. He has a good place to start and I won't say where Mr. Nixon lives, because I am not sure, but both of those states have a crime rate, too.

But the State of Minnesota under Governor Muskie, when he was governor, had the fourth lowest rate of crime. The State of Minnesota has the 16th. So if you want to put it on statistics, we have got 'em coming and going. But I don't think that proves a thing.

What's really important is that law and order is one side of the coin. Civil order and civil justice are the other side. Mr. Nixon said he wanted to double the rate of prosecutions. All right, Mr. Nixon. Then he went on and attacked me for wanting to increase the amount of money for the war on poverty. It is just a fact and if Richard Nixon does not know it, let it be said in this place and we will put it in print, that the largest numbers of crime are committed in the areas of poverty, the largest numbers of victims of crime are the poor themselves and the people who commit the largest number of crimes on the poor are the poor. If Mr. Nixon does not know that, he does not have the qualifications to be President.

those pilots. But we did not apologize, not one bit. Because there was nothing to apologize for.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, if we have violated territorial waters and I have no evidence that indicates it, and I have looked over a good deal of the material, but if there is any proof that at any time we violated those territorial waters, then as a big country and a strong country, if we have committed a wrong, we should acknowledge it. And I am prepared to do that, but I am not prepared to yield to blackmail in my private life or public life, as a private citizen or a public citizen. Once you start it, you are ruined and you are nothing from there on out. So that is the way I feel about it.

Question. Vice President Humphrey, there is time for but one more question. Before asking it, I want to say I am very pleased to have had you as guest today. You have complimented this club by occupying it twice this year, once as your party's candidate for the nomination and now as the candidate for the President. In behalf of the thousands of members of the Commonwealth Club, many of whom are gathered here today, we wish to express our sincere appreciation for your informative remarks. We should all be grateful that there are in America today good men who have the courage to seek the Presidency and to assume its awesome responsibilities. After this final question, the Club will stand adjourned and I am going to make it a rather easy and pleasant question.

When we San Franciscans put you over the top in November, are you going to deprive us of our great Mayor?

Vice President Humphrey. I really have not had much time to talk to this good man about it, but I tell you what, I hope he keeps his suitcase packed.

May I just say that I am honored to be a friend of your great Mayor and he is a great Mayor of a great and beautiful city. It is one of the beautiful cities of the world. I love it here very much. I am very pleased to be with your attorney general, one of your great public officials, and your old governor of the state, whom I think of as the truly great governor of this state, when he served your state in those eight years, Pat Brown.

May I thank every member of this club for the courtesy you have extended. It is to me a high honor to come here. I would be less than honest with you if I did not feel each time that I come here a little bit nervous because I know that this club has a great history. Today I tried to speak to you from the mind and from the heart. I believe I had a message for you that indicates something of my feelings of what you can expect from me. But I want to leave you with this: One of the joys of politics is the chance to get to know this country and its people. I have traveled every state of this land. And I am not a pessimist about America. I know I am accused all the time of being overly optimistic and I read the profound columnists who tell me that sometimes I don't see the problems. But ladies and gentlemen, I have never known of a doctor that helped a patient by telling him that he was going to die. I never have. I've never known a spiritual leader that lifted a man by telling him that he was beyond redemption. I think we know the problems in America. What we need to know are some of the solutions. We know the difficulties that beset us. But I think it is very good for this country to let its voice be heard throughout the nation that we are a confident people, that despite our difficulties, we are a great people, and even with them, we may be a great people. I hope we will let the people know in this election that we are a united people, not

of one mind but one spirit. I want to see this election a national referendum on the subject of human equality and equal opportunity. I want to make it manifestly clear that in the year 1968, we redeem the pledge of the Emancipation Proclamation for once and for all and that we are going to stand as one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That is mighty good doctrine, friends, and it is mighty sound philosophy. It is good politics and anyway, it is what I believe and it is my dream of this country.

Thank you very much.

San Francisco, California
OBRERO RALLY
September 26, 1968

Mr. Alioto. I am not going to stand here and present the Vice President to you because you know him as the outstanding champion of all of those causes that are important to you and are important to me. But I am going to introduce you to the Vice President. I have already told him that we are very proud in San Francisco of our Spanish surname community, we are very proud of that community. I have already told him. (applause) I have already told him that when my election was on the line last November, this community came through almost one hundred percent and was very, very instrumental in insuring that election. He already knows that. I have already told him, too, that I promised you at the time that you were going to have more and more representation in city government and he knows that we have had the appointments, folks like Anita Martinas, Carmen Domingos, Alben Gonzales, the very first man appointed to the cabinet, as you know, Bob Gonzales on the Board of Appeals, and just recently, the very first Spanish surname San Franciscan ever appointed to our Board of Education, Dave Sanchez. (applause) He knows how important you are to me, how important you are to San Francisco, and we know how important his election is going to be to you.

The Vice President of the United States. (applause)

Vice President Hub Hrey. Damas y caballeros, buenos noshes, and buona suerte -- how's that?

Viva el obrero. Viva Alioto.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, you are just wonderful. You are marvellous. You know how to make one feel good. May I just say to a very fine man a special thank you, a very special thank you. I believe tonight we would all like to give a great big Viva to Abel Gonzalez: Viva Abel Gonzalez.

And I want you to know, Abel, if you ever come to my town, there will be a sign up there saying Bienvenido, Abel Gonzalez.

The Mayor and I are very honored to be here tonight, very, very pleased that we can come to this Obrero Hall and that I have had the privilege of learning of some of the good ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ work that has been going on here. Here is an instance of self-help. Here is an example of cooperation of people in the community, and here is an example of your government working with the people.

Just a few moments ago, I was upstairs looking into the language training center, seeing this marvellous equipment that has been made available and knowing and learning that many, many people have taken training here only to go on and get a good job.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, that is what we are trying to do and that is what we must do more and more throughout this country. There are literally thousands and thousands of our fellow Americans who, through no fault of their own, have never had a chance for productive work. They need training. Sometimes they need training in language; sometimes they need training in skill. But we know one thing, that with a little training, with a little help, they can go on out to become productive citizens. Self respecting citizens, wonderful people in the community that can provide for their family, just exactly as you are doing here in Obrero Hall and just exactly as my friend, Abel Gonzalez, has worked to make this possible amongst your community.

I want to congratulate you from the depths of my heart. I want you to know if I am permitted to be your President, the programs we have made a start on now will become broad throughout this land. Every mother in this audience ought to have the right, if she wishes to go to work, to have a day care center for her child --every mother. Every boy and girl in this audience ought to have the right, and in this community, for that kind of health care which means good health. And every person in America ought to have the right to the best education that this great and powerful and rich country can provide. I am one of those people in public life that believes that with education, we find the key to opportunity. With training -- sometimes, as I said, in language, sometimes in a ~~xxxxxxx~~ bilingual school, sometimes in a center like this, but with education -- elementary, secondary, and then higher education, vocational education -- with that, we overcome economic problems that affect so many people. The best answer to poverty is a pay check and the best way to getting a pay check is to get an education. And that is what you are doing here.

Senor Gonzalez may I just say that we look forward now to the day in the not too distant future when every little child aged four to six will be able to go to a pre-school center, a Head Start program. Everyone, no matter what race, creed, or color will be able to get their starting and learning early, and why?

I wonder how many people know here tonight that a child between the ages of four and seven learns more than at any other period in his life. It is at that period of time that that child needs the best diet, the best teachers, the best schools, the best playgrounds, and the best neighborhood.

We are going to build an America in which we have better neighborhoods where friends can live. We are going to build an America that is not known for its military power as much as it is known for its education and its health and its jobs. We are going to build an America in which every person, Spanish surname, white or black, rich or poor, can stand up and be proud to say I am an American, I am a citizen of this great United States of America. Now, that is not only a promise, that is a pledge. I want to be your President for one reason and one reason only. I believe there is so much talent in this country yet to be discovered, I believe there is so much ability in this country yet to be found, I believe there is so much wealth in terms of human resources yet to be developed and enriched. And if we work together, the people and their President, the people and their Congress, the people and their mayor, the people working together in this country -- we can do anything that we want to do for the good of our people. The best thing that America can do for the world is to show that we know how to live together as a family of people.

The example that we set here of respect for each other, of unity, the example that we set here for overcoming poverty, the example that we set here of neighbors regardless of their station in life, their color, their race or their creed, of being able to work together as one people -- that example will do more for peace in this world and human betterment than any amount of money that we can send any place in the world.

Ah, my good friend, I see that button, too.

My dear friends, let me just say that last night, I was in Sacramento and I was not unmindful of the plight of our farm workers and our migrant workers. I think many of you know that I have had the privilege of visiting with Cesar Chavez. I think many of you know that I am one of the men in public life that has said to growers and workers alike, either bargain or boycott.

I think you know that I have said that that worker in the fields is entitled to all the protection of the laws of this country, entitled to bargain collectively so that he can get a good wage, entitled to get a good wage so he can raise his family. And when I am your President, we will have those rights, make no mistake about it.

So, my good friends, as the Mayor taught me to say before I came over here, and here is what he said --when you conclude your address, Mr. Vice President, speak with that good Norwegian accent and say to the friends, which I wanted to say anyway, Unidos Venceramos.

Are there any that don't know what that means? United we succeed, United we can go to the White House.

Thank you.

REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
COMMONWEALTH CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO
September 26, 1968

Jack Taylor
Pat Brown
Tom Lynch

A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE

∟ Today I want to talk about peace -- about our role in achieving peace and in maintaining it.

∟ During the next decade, we Americans will continue to have major responsibility for preserving world peace. But how we fulfill that responsibility will change.

∟ Today we face new conditions.

∟ Though the tragic events in Czechoslovakia remind us that the Cold War period is not over, it is giving way its central role on the world stage to a global movement toward individual freedom and human emancipation.

← The Communist countries no longer pose a monolithic threat. *The breezes of freedom and emancipation are sweeping through Central Europe.*

← There is a need and a new chance to accelerate our efforts toward control of the arms race.

-- New nations are moving into a period when they look more toward self-development and less toward ideological conflict.

-- Western Europe and Japan are ^{*better*} able to stand on their own two feet, and want to do just that.

-- And a new generation in the United States and other industrial countries rejects the old premises of war and cold war diplomacy. ← They want to see more emphasis placed on human and personal values -- having enough to eat ... being able to learn ... living free of fear. ← And it is for our generation to help them realize their hopes -- of a world free from the tyrannies of war and oppression..

*Freedom from Fear
Freedom from want
Freedom from oppression
Freedom to speak
Freedom to*

Our world role in the next ten years will be different from that in the last.

There are pressing problems at home, which cause us to place careful priorities on our allocation of resources abroad.

Revival of strength in other free countries does enable them to assume greater burdens for Self Defense + International Cooperation.

Experience of recent years does suggest areas in which our foreign policy-making could be improved.

I welcome this period of debate and review ... this opportunity to join in the scrutiny of policy ... this opportunity to define a New Strategy for Peace.

First and Fundamental to this strategy is the rejection of those proposals which rely exclusively on American power as the guarantor of security in areas of the developing world where we are now involved.

Southeast Asia is a good example.

Our nation has been deeply concerned about our involvement in Vietnam.

∠ And, as a result of that concern, there is a temptation to pull back and withdraw from further responsibility outside the familiar Atlantic world.

∠ But the lesson of Vietnam is not that we should turn our backs on Southeast Asia -- or on other nations or peoples in less familiar parts of the world neighborhood.

∠ The lesson is, rather, that we should most carefully assess our national interests ... carefully define our goals and priorities ... and within those interests and priorities, that we should formulate policies which will fit new American guidelines.

∠ In Southeast Asia, for instance, I believe we should follow three basic future guidelines:

Self-help;

Regional and multilateral responsibility;

Selective American assistance.

The self-help principle should apply both to national security and to economic and social development.

Regional and multilateral responsibility will be the only way in which small and medium-sized nations --- particularly those living near the borders of the great powers --- will be able to gain the collective strength necessary both to withstand the pressure of internal subversion and indirect aggression, and to muster the economic and social resources which few have within their own limited means.

Not only should we continue to encourage regional cooperation -- such as we see in the Alliance for Progress, the Asian and African Development Banks and regional security organizations -- but we should also avoid, where possible, unilateral involvement, either militarily or economically, where multilateral means are available.

Selective American assistance will be a necessity as we carefully measure just what is, and is not, in our national interest.

The ^{Time}~~era~~ is certainly past when we alone were the only reliable source of assistance to nations under pressure from aggression and from poverty.

The task now is not to march alone, but to march in such a way that others will wish to join us in a New Strategy for Peace, broadly based and shared by many nations.

Second

There will be no peace for any American -- or any
other person on this earth -- until nations stop the piling
up of weapons of mass destruction, and the spreading of these
weapons around the world. ^{And} We must halt the spread of
nuclear terror before it halts humanity.

↳ I have devoted much of my life to these ends -- as
Chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee;

... as sponsor of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

... and as principal Senate supporter of the Test Ban Treaty.

↳ As Vice President, I traveled last year to Geneva and to
other European capitals to encourage the signing of the non-
proliferation treaty. ^{nuclear}
designed to stop the spread of nuclear weapons

As President, I will be dedicated to effective control of
the arms race.

I will seek to implement the non-proliferation treaty ---
which should be promptly ratified now.

✓ I will seek an agreement with the Soviet Union on offensive and defensive missiles ... an end to nuclear testing under adequate safeguards ... the control of chemical, radiological and biological weapons ... and a halt to regional arms races in the Middle East and elsewhere.

There can be an end to these deadly arms races, and I mean to exert the leadership of this nation to bring that about.

✓ Mr. Nixon does not share my commitment to control & halt the arms race.

✓ He wants to postpone Senate action on the treaty prohibiting the spread of nuclear weapons.

✓ This position not only jeopardizes the peace of the world -- but it encourages nations to pour tens of billions of dollars into the arms race ... ^{nuclear} dollars that bring no more security, and put us again on that slippery slope to nuclear war ... dollars urgently needed for the economic and social development here in America and abroad.

The choice is clear. We can have a President who equivocates on these matters of life or nuclear death.

Or we can have a President who will act to turn back the arms race and save mankind from self-destruction.

I say we need a man who understands both the prospects of success in this area -- and the consequences of failure.

* * * *

New conditions also require the improvement of institutions for peace.

I pledge to you -- here in San Francisco, where the United Nations was born some 23 years ago -- that one of the high priorities of my Presidency will be to strengthen the peacekeeping and peacemaking capacity of the United Nations.

↳ This is our third step toward a New Strategy for Peace: To make the United Nations the instrument for controlling conflict, ~~it has so far failed to be.~~

↳ The United States cannot play the role of global gendarme. ↳ The American people don't want it, and the rest of the world won't accept it. We know better today than yesterday that "The illusion of American omnipotence," in D. W. Brogan's phrase, "is an illusion."

↳ But the alternative to American peacekeeping cannot be no peacekeeping. ↳ It must be peacekeeping by the United Nations or by regional agencies.

↳ The basis of any world peacekeeping system must be a commitment to non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. ↳ But this policy will only work if it is respected by all states, large and small -- and if there is an effective instrument in the U.N. to serve the interests, not of individual nations, but of peace itself.

∟ A policy of mutual non-interference is not just an ideal -- it is the only way to preserve peace in this world.

∟ But it will work only if the pledges of non-interference are backed up by United Nations forces which can patrol borders, and supervise free elections.

∟ United Nations peacekeeping efforts have brought practical results in Cyprus, in the Congo, and in Kashmir.

∟ As President of the United States, I will do everything in my power to place international peacekeeping soldiers in troubled areas, rather than American soldiers. ∟ Nowhere would a United Nations peacekeeping force be more welcome than in Vietnam to administer free elections and verify the withdrawal of foreign troops.

But the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations can be enlarged only if its members -- particularly those who have no responsibilities for peace as great powers -- will earmark and train units of their armed forces for international peacekeeping assignments.

To aid in this effort, I propose:

-- To use our military assistance program to help less-developed countries prepare units of their armed forces for UN and regional peacekeeping assignments;

-- To launch a new effort to resolve the U.N.'s financial and constitutional crisis;

-- To call for a U.N. Peacekeeping Fund, beginning with 20 million dollars to help the United Nations to launch emergency operations without delay. If we want peace -- we, and all nations -- must be prepared to pay for it.

One of my first steps as your next President will be to call a new San Francisco conference to rededicate the United Nations on its 25th Anniversary, and to seek new ways of making it work for peace -- especially in the area of international peacekeeping.

I will appoint, early in 1969, a Commission for Peace to be composed of leading American citizens who will have a mandate from me, as your President, to develop specific proposals for the new San Francisco Conference and to work with similar commissions from other member nations to plan for the 25th Anniversary Conference in April 1970.

United Nations peacekeeping must go hand in hand with United States peacekeeping. The United Nations needs not ~~only~~ ^{only} a fire department, but a better means of fire prevention.

Here in the United States, we have learned the value of fact-finders and mediators to mobilize opinion ~~behind a~~ *for a* reasonable settlement of disputes. I urge that the United Nations establish a permanent panel of highly-skilled fact-finders and mediators to apply themselves to disputes that threaten world peace.

↳ The United States should take the lead in establishing such a system.

* * * *

But The ending of conflict, the mediation of crises will be of little use if we do not strike at the causes of future conflicts before they begin.

Therefore, the fourth element in a New Strategy for Peace must be a global effort at economic development -- what Pope Paul called "The New Name for Peace."

I have visited many of the new nations. I have talked to their leaders and to their people. ~~I know their needs and desires.~~

∠ As President Kennedy once said: "If we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich."

∠ But today the time has come for a new approach to world development. ∠ We have learned that national burdens can be lifted -- if international burdens can be shared. We need not merely a new level of effort, but a greater emphasis on multilateral cooperation.

∠ This will be a new philosophy of aid, where we help nations to development without facing what has been called "The temptation to do good" -- the temptation to insist not only that virtue be done, but that our particular version of virtue be implemented in our particular way.

This new approach to aid-giving will not relieve us of the need to play our full part in providing help to poorer countries. Indeed, the action of the Congress this year in mutilating the foreign aid bill was irresponsible -- and will only make it more likely that someday people will try to do by war what we now fail to do for peace. We must re-evaluate our priorities -- so that a 90 billion dollar defense budget to work for peace today does not eclipse these modest programs to provide the peace for tomorrow.

But we are not alone. New efforts should be made in the coming years to enlist the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the global war on poverty. Development should mean cooperation -- not competition -- because the peace it provides is in our common interest.

* * * *

↳ The fifth element in this New Strategy for Peace
should be new efforts to promote international understanding
through the use of exciting developments in communications
technology -- including the communications satellite.

↳ Through satellites, man ~~cannot~~ ^{can} only transmit between
central ground stations -- and ~~can~~ ^{can} broadcast directly to
village and home radio and TV receivers.

↳ I propose reciprocal TV and radio exchanges with
other countries, including the countries of Eastern Europe.

↳ Let us offer the Soviet leaders the opportunity to talk to the
American people on TV in return for the same privilege for
our leaders in the Soviet Union.

↳ Other countries may have difficulty with these proposals,
but we in America have an open society. And now we can
lead in the quest for an open world.

* * * *

∟ I have spoken to you today of several aspects of the conduct of our future foreign policy.

∟ None of these things will, of course, be effective unless we as a people first make the decision that America should continue to play an active role in the world at large -- and that we should not, despite our problems at home, draw back within ourselves.

∟ Over these past few years we have come to regard our power almost with guilt. And there has always been within us the old instinct to avoid foreign entanglement.

∟ But I believe we should regard our power not as something for which ~~to be cast aside~~, but as an active instrument for human betterment, peace and human betterment.

NATO, for instance, provides a necessary shield to the Western alliance. And today, after the tragic events in Czechoslovakia again are compelled to recognize its vital importance for Peace & Security.

↳ But the power that lies within NATO need not be only military power, but also coordinated economic, social and political power ^{to be} exercised on behalf, ~~for instance~~, of bridge building to the East and lessening of world tensions.

↳ In all our alliances and international institutions, ~~we must see the possibilities not only of entanglements and trouble~~

↳ We must see the possibilities of pushing forward the forces of freedom and human emancipation which are now sweeping throughout the world.

But We must understand that our vast power must not be too easily used ... that it must not be used in any way which might lead this nation to become overbearing or too enamoured of power. That would be dangerous.

↳ Yet, at the same time, we must understand that the absence of the use of power ^{when such is needed} ~~can be equally dangerous.~~
can be equally dangerous.

↳ To turn within ourselves, or to stand aside, in the face of rapid and tumultuous change would be to leave ourselves the helpless victims of history, rather than its progenitors.

↳ So I call on this nation to stay at this business of international responsibility.

↳ I ask Americans not to become disillusioned with the troubles they find in the world at large, but to see the enormous possibilities still unmet.

↳ This above all will require something America has always found difficult: Patience. — *Persevering Patience!*

↳ It has been said that we are a nation not of long distance runners, but of sprinters. ~~And there is truth in that~~

↳ But in Year 25 of the Nuclear Age, we must finally learn that peace will never be a short-run game, but always a marathon.

↳ A New Strategy for Peace will be the work of many years. But in the long run, it is the only alternative.

↳ Ordinary people in this country and throughout the world are turning to leaders who offer them programs for cooperation rather than conflict.

↳ This I ask of you today: Which Presidential candidate ...
which political party, is best equipped to lead the United States
in the quest for peace?

↳ Which Presidential candidate ... which political party
is best equipped to turn back the arms race ... to strengthen
international peacekeeping machinery ... to accelerate development
aid through multilateral agencies ... and to move with courage
for world understanding? — ~~and~~ reconciliation

* * * *

~~The necessity for~~
that the search for peace involves
risks, ~~but risks in~~
~~peace-making are less~~
~~costly than risks of~~
It points the way to the goal
of an honorable and acceptable
peace in Viet-nam.
As Candidate + President I shall be guided by that Platform

But Our new Strategy for Peace will succeed only if it can inspire a new generation of Americans who are new to the nation's political process. ~~That younger generation~~ will wear our armed forces uniforms and in the long run ~~will~~ determine the success or failure of American policy at home and abroad.

And our search for a New Strategy for Peace will succeed only when we find an honorable end to a tragic war.

As President, my first priority will be to end the war in Vietnam — not by yielding to aggression.

And in pursuing that goal in Vietnam, as in all other areas of national policy, I repeat: The policies of tomorrow will not be limited by the policies of yesterday.

I believe that we can pursue a New Strategy for Peace and succeed.

which violates every principle of peace, but by pursuing relentlessly the process of negotiation. I do believe that the platform of my party which recognizes

~~I am reminded:~~

As President Kennedy stated at American University
in June of 1963:

"Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable, that mankind is doomed, and that we are ripped by forces we cannot control.

"We need not accept that view. Our problems are
man-made; therefore, they can be solved by men. And man
can be as big as he wants."

President Kennedy was right. We can have peace.
We shall have peace. That is my pledge to the American
people in this campaign.

#

916-372-7775
Samm. Keith

Inefficient transportation services increase the costs of local industry and commerce. They rob citizens of their time and comfort. They isolate many residents from better places to work, to shop and to enjoy their leisure time. They penalize especially the poor and the handicapped.

The challenge today is to provide balanced, efficient, and adequate transportation for our cities. It is a responsibility we all share--the private citizen and the public community at the local, the state and the national levels.

The Bay Area has responded to this challenge. The ~~prop~~
Bay Area Rapid Transit system is a model program for an American
city--one well suited not only to the needs of the present, but
planned to serve for years to come, ~~xxxxxxwhichxxxxxxdesiresxxxxxx~~

It demonstrates the potential

~~Виклхуи ххеррехтеекхнхххххх~~ of urban mass transportation.

But your experience in the Bay Area also demonstrates some
 Currently BART's progress is being blocked by ~~your government~~ -- against the wishes
 of the people -- at the state level. Yet
 of the difficulties that can arise. Urban areas alone do not have
 the resources for complete transportation system support. They must have
 help.

This administration has ~~xxxxxx~~ taken some giant steps forward toward providing support for planning, ^{and} financing ~~xxxxxx~~ transportation for our cities. It has done a ~~xxx~~ great deal to provide technical assistance, while preserving ~~xxxxxxx~~ local authority over the shape ~~xxxx~~ and direction of the sytem itself.

This is what we were doing when we pushed through the ~~the~~ *a central source of funds for BART* -- Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, ---while 54% of the House Republicans voted to kill the bill entirely..

This is what we were doing when we pushed through appropriations
to support transportation programs, ^{including your own} --- while 97% of the House
Republicans voted to cut ^{those} funds ~~for urban transportation~~.

This is what we were doing when we established a separate department of Housing and Urban ~~D~~evelopment to give special attention ^{all} to the problems of the cities---while 96% of the House Republicans voted in opposition.

This is what we were doing when we supported the Model Cities program, which has brought ~~new life~~ so much to the Bay Area--against the opposition of 89% of the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

This is a very important point. I think these figures speak for themselves.

We must not permit the traffic jam to become the symbol of
the American metropolis. ~~You have~~ ^{has} refused to let ~~the~~ ^{it} be
~~happen~~ ^{happy} true in the Bay Area.
The Bay Area ~~has~~ ^{has} accepted its responsibility.

This administration has demonstrated its determination to be

of assistance. ~~We will continue to do so.~~ (As President, I ~~would~~ ^{will} continue to do so. (We must not put our faith in ~~the~~ those who have rejected their own responsibility for this vital ~~part of~~ facet of urban development.

SPECIAL MESSAGE FOR S.F. RESIDENTS

THE LIFE OF A CITY DEPENDS ON ITS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.

INEFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION SERVICES INCREASE THE COSTS OF LOCAL INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE. THEY ROB CITIZENS OF THEIR TIME AND COMFORT. THEY ISOLATE MANY RESIDENTS FROM BETTER PLACES TO WORK, TO SHOP AND TO ENJOY THEIR LEISURE TIME. THEY PENALIZE ESPECIALLY THE POOR AND THE HANDICAPPED.

THE CHALLENGE TODAY IS TO PROVIDE BALANCED, EFFICIENT, AND ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION FOR OUR CITIES. IT IS A RESPONSIBILITY WE ALL SHARE -- THE PRIVATE CITIZEN AND THE PUBLIC COMMUNITY AT THE LOCAL, STATE AND THE NATIONAL LEVELS.

THE BAY AREA HAS RESPONDED TO THIS CHALLENGE. THE BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM IS A MODEL PROGRAM FOR AN AMERICAN CITY -- ONE WELL SUITED NOT ONLY TO THE NEEDS OF THE PRESENT, BUT PLANNED TO SERVE FOR YEARS TO COME. IT DEMONSTRATES THE POTENTIAL OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION.

BUT YOUR EXPERIENCE IN THE BAY AREA ALSO DEMONSTRATES SOME OF THE DIFFICULTIES THAT CAN ARISE. CURRENTLY BART'S PROGRESS IS BEING BLOCKED -- AGAINST THE WISE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE -- AT THE STATE LEVEL. YET URBAN AREAS ALONE DO NOT HAVE THE RESOURCES FOR COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM SUPPORT. THEY MUST HAVE HELP.

THIS ADMINISTRATION HAS TAKEN SOME GIANT STEPS FORWARD TOWARD PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR PLANNING, AND FINANCING TRANSPORTATION FOR OUR CITIES. IT HAS DONE A GREAT DEAL TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, WHILE PRESERVING LOCAL AUTHORITY OVER THE SHAPE AND DIRECTION OF THE SYSTEM ITSELF.

THIS IS WHAT WE WERE DOING WHEN WE PUSHED THROUGH THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964 -- A CENTRAL SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR BART -- WHILE 54% OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICANS VOTED TO KILL THE BILL ENTIRELY.

THIS IS WHAT WE WERE DOING WHEN WE PUSHED THROUGH APPROPRIATIONS TO SUPPORT TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS -- INCLUDING YOUR OWN, WHILE 97% OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICANS VOTED TO CUT THESE FUNDS.

THIS IS WHAT WE WERE DOING WHEN WE ESTABLISHED A SEPARATE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT TO GIVE SPECIAL ATTENTION TO ALL THE PROBLEMS OF THE CITIES -- WHILE 96% OF THE HOUSE REPUBLICANS VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

THIS IS WHAT WE WERE DOING WHEN WE SUPPORTED THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM, WHICH HAS BROUGHT SO MUCH TO THE BAY AREA -- AGAINST THE OPPOSITION OF 89% OF THE REPUBLICANS OK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

I THINK THESE FIGURES SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES.

WE MUST NOT PERMIT THE TRAFFIC JAM TO BECOME A SYMBOL OF THE AMERICAN METROPOLIS. YOU HAVE REFUSED TO LET THIS BE TRUE IN THE BAY AREA. THIS ADMINISTRATION HAS DEMONSTRATED ITS DETERMINATION TO ASSIST.

AS PRESIDENT, I WILL CONTINUE TO DO SO.

WE MUST NOT PUT OUR FAITH IN THOSE WHO HAVE REJECTED THEIR OWN RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS VITAL FACET OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

END OF TEXT

PLS ACK. "THUMBS" EDWARDS

OK

COMMONWEALTH CLUB III

Draft #I

OPR I WANT TO CALL 810442 1613--I THK. THEY HAVE A CALL COMING IN
ON OUR OTHER MACHINE. IS THERE ANOTHER NBR FOR HHH HQ TOLEDO?
THIS IS SXXX 710 822 9211. MIN GETTING BUSY PLS TRY LATER OKOP
HHH TOLEDO

DEM FOR HHH DC
TO TED VAN DYK FROM JOHN RIELLY: FOLLOWING IS MY QUICK AND ROUGH
RE-WRITE OF GARDNER DRAFT WHICH ARRIVED HERE SUNDAY AT 7 P.M.
WILL POLISH FURTHER TOMORROW. PLS. CALL MONDAY AND GIVE REACTION
ON STRUCTURE.

SPEECH BY VP HHH BEFORE THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB, SAN FRANCISCO,
A NEW TXXX STRATEGY FOR PEACE

TODAY WE ARE ENGAGED IN A TRAGIC WAR--A WAR WHICH HAS CONSUMED
OUR ENERGIES, DIVIDED OUR PEOPLE, TARNISHED OUR REPUTATION, AND
LIMITED OUR VISION.

AS PRESIDENT, MY FIRST PRIORITY WILL BE TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM.

IN PURSUING THAT GOAL, IF THERE IS ONE THING WE HAVE LEARNED, IT
IS THAT THE POLICIES OF TOMORROW NEED NOT BE LIMITED BY THE POLICIES
OF YESTERDAY.

DURING THE NEXT DECADE OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR PRESERVING WORLD
PEACE WILL CONTINUE. BUT THE WAY IN WHICH WE FULFILL THAT RESPONSIB-
ILITY WILL CHANGE.

THERE ARE SXXX (U-LINE) PRESSING PROBLEMS AT HOME, WHICH PLACE
SOME LIMITS ON WHAT WE CAN DO ABROAD.

THE REVIVAL OF STRENGTH IN OTHER FREE COUNTRIES DOES (U-LINE) ENABE
XX ENABLE THEM TO ASSUME GREATER BURDENS.

CHANGE IN THE COMMUNIST WORLD HAS (U-LINE) ALTERED THE THREAT
WE FACE--THOUGH IT HAS NOT ENDED IT.

THE EXPERIENCE OF RECENT YEARS DOES (U-LINE) SUGGEST AREAS IN
WHICH OUR PROCEDURES FOR MAKING FOREIGN POLICY COULD BE IMPROVED.

SO AS A CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT I WELCOME THIS PERIOD OF DEBATE
AND REVIEW--THIS OPPORTUNITY TO JOIN IN THE SCRUTINY OF POLICY, THIS
OPPORTUNITY TO DEFINE A "NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE."

ONE OF THE FIRST NECESSITIES IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE IS A
SHIFT AWAY FROM THE EXCLUSIVE RELIANCE ON AMERICAN POWER AS THE GUAR-
ANTOR OF SECURITY IN THE DEVELOPING NATIONS. OTHER COUNTRIES MUST
ASSUME GREATER RESPONSIBILITY FOR SHAPING THEIR FUTURE. THIS PRINCIPLE
SHOULD GOVERN OUR APPROACH TO POST-VIETNAM PROBLEMS IN ASIA AND AFRICA.

AS FAR AS I AM CONCERNED, "NO MORE VIETNAMS" IS MORE THAN A
SLOGAN; IT IS A SOUND--AND ATTAINABLE (U-LINE)--OBJECTIVE OF US
POLICY.

THE SOUTHERN HALF OF THE GLOBE IS GOING TO BE TURBULENT CORRECTION/
A TURBULENT AREA FOR A LONG TIME. THAT TURBULENCE IS PART OF THE

2 Draft #1 IF PEACE IS TO BE PRESERVED, WE WILL HAVE TO FIND WAYS OF AVOIDING GREAT POWER MILITARY INVOLVEMENT. THIS MEANS TWO THINGS: SELF-HELP (U-LINE) AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT (O-LINE).

THERE ARE SOME THREATS TO PEACE, OF COURSE, WHICH ONLY US POWER CAN DETER--NOTABLY, LARGE-SCALE AND OVERT AGGRESSION. WE SHOULD BE PREPARED TO FULFILL DEFENSIVE COMMITMENTS, APPROVED BY THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT, WHICH COVER THIS THREAT.

THE MORE LIKELY THREATS TO PEACE IN DEVELOPING ARAXXX AREAS ARE INDIRECT AGGRESSION AND LOCAL CONFLICT.

IN MEETING INDIRECT AGGRESSION, SELF-HELP (U-LINE) WILL BE THE KEY TO SUCCESS. THIS MEANS ENCOURAGING AND HELPING THE GOVERNMENT CONCERNED TO TEND EFFECTIVELY BOTH OTXX TO ITS OWN DEFENSE AND (U-LINE) TO THE CONCERNS OF ITS OWN PEOPLE.

IN MEETING LOCAL CONFLICT, REGIONAL INVOLVEMENT (U-LINE) WILL SERVE US WELL. THIS MEANS ENCOURAGING GROUPINGS OF THE DEVELOPING NATIONS--IN LATIN AMERICA, AFRICA, AND ASIA--TO PLAY THEIR FULL PART IN COMPOSING OR ENDING THSKXX THESE CONFLICTS.

THUS, IN MEETING POST-VIETNAM THREATS, AS IN ENDING THE VIETNAM WAR, STRENGTHENING THE ABILITY OF OTHER COUNTRIES TO MEET TXXXWIDER RESPONSIBILITIES WILL BE THE FIRST STEP IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE.

THE SECOND ESSENTIAL STEP IS TO CONTROL THE ARMS RACE.

THERE WILL BE NO PEACE FOR ANY AMERICAN--OR ANY OTHER PERSON ON THIS EARTH--IF WE DO NOT STOP THE PILING UP OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND THEIR SPREAD TO OTHER COUNTRIES.

I HAVE DEVOTED MUCH OF MY LIFE TO THESE ENDS--AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE DISARMAMENT SUBCOMMITTEE, AS SPONSOR OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY, AND AS PRINCIPAL SENATE SUPPORTER OF THE TEST BAN TREATY.

AS PRESIDENT, WXXX I WILL GIVE NEW IMPETUS TO OUR SEARCH FOR DISARMAMENT.

I WILL SEEK TO IMPLEMENT THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY--WHICH SHOULD BE PROMPTLY RATIFIED NOW.

I WILL SEEK AN AGREEMENT WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE MISSILES--CESSATION OF NUCLEAR TESTING UNDER ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS--CONTROL OF CHEMICAL, RADIOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS--AND A HALT TO REGIONAL ARMS RACES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND ELSEWHERE.

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE SHARES NO SUCH COMMITMENT TO DISARMAMENT. HE HAS CALLED FOR POSTPONEMENT OF THE TREATY PROHIBITING NUCLEAR SPREAD. HIS POLICIES WOULD NOT ONLY JEOPARDIZE THE PEACE OF THE WORLD--THEY WOULD POUR TEN S OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS INTO THE ARMS RACE WHICH WE URGENTLY NEED TO REBUILD OUR CITIES AND PROVIDE A DECENT LIFE FOR EVERY AMERICAN.

SO THE CHOICE IS CLEAR. DO YOU WANT A PRSKXX PRESIDENT WHO WILL DO EVERYTHING IN HIS POWER TO TURN BACK THE ARMS RACE AND SAVE MANKIND

43
OUR PURSUIT OF A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL INCREASINGLY BE MADE THROUGH MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS, THE MOST IMPORTANT OF WHICH IS THE UNITED NATIONS. I AM HAPPY TO BE ABLE TO SAY--HERE IN THIS GREAT CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, WHERE THE UNITED NATIONS WAS FOUNDED SOME 23 YEARS AGO--THAT ONE OF THE HIGH PRIORITIES OF MY PRESIDENCY WOULD BE STRENGTHENING THE PEACE-KEEPING AND PEACE-MAKING CAPACITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

STRENGTHENING THE INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY FOR MAKING AND KEEPING THE PEACE IS THE THIRD STEP IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE. NATIONS, LIKE INDIVIDUALS, WILL NOT DISARM UNLESS THEY HAVE SOME SUBSTITUTE MEANS OF PROTECTING THEMSELVES AND THEIR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS.

THE UNITED STATES CANNOT PLAY THE ROLE OF GLOBAL POLICEMAN. THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DON'T WANT IT, AND THE REST OF THE WORLD WON'T ACCEPT IT. BUT THE ALTERNATIVE TO AMERICAN PEACEKEEPING CANNOT BE NO PEACE-KEEPING. IT MUST BE PEACEKEEPING BY THE UNITED NATIONS OR REGIONAL AGENCIES.

THE BASIS OF ANY WORLD PEACEKEEPING SYSTEM MUST BE NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF OTHER COUNTRIES. SUCH A POLICY WILL ONLY WORK IF IT IS SCRUPULOUSLY RESPECTED BY ALL STATES, LARGE AND SMALL.

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WILL MAKE IT CRYSTAL CLEAR THAT AMERICAN POWER WILL NEVER BE USED TO PREVENT ANY PEOPLE FROM CHOOSING THE GOVERNMENT IT WANTS--EVEN IF THAT IS A COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT. AND I WILL ASK OF THE LEADERS OF COMMUNIST POWERS THAT THEY NOT USE THEIR POWER TO PREVENT A PEOPLE FROM CHOOSING THE GOVERNMENT IT WANTS--EVEN IF THAT BE A NON-COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT.

SUCH A POLICY OF MUTUAL NON-INTERFERENCE IS NOT UTOPIAN. IT IS THE ONLY FORMULA TO PRESERVE PEACE IN THIS WORLD. BUT THE FORMULA WILL ONLY WORK IF THE PLEDGES OF NON-INTERFERENCE ARE BACKED UP BY INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY WHICH CAN PATROL BORDERS, SUPERVISE FREE ELECTIONS, AND OTHERWISE VERIFY COMPLIANCE WITH NON-INTERFERENCE RULES.

THE UN PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS HAVE BROUGHT PRACTICAL RESULTS IN THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT, IN CYPRUS, IN THE CONGO, AND IN KASHMIR. EVEN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES NOW RECOGNIZE THE DESIRABILITY OF CONTAINING LOCAL CONFLICTS THAT MIGHT DRAW IN THE GREAT POWERS AND TRIGGER A NUCLEAR WAR.

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I INTEND TO DO EVERYTHING IN MY POWER TO PLACE INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING MACHINERY TIGHTLY IN TROUBLED AREAS RATHER THAN AMERICAN SOLDIERS. AND I PLEDGE TO WORK FOR A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FORCE IN VIETNAM TO ADMINISTER FREE ELECTIONS AND VERIFY THE WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN FORCES.

THE UNITED NATIONS NEEDS A GREATER CAPACITY TO PLAY A PEACEKEEPING ROLE. ITS MEMBERS SHOULD CORRECTLY ITS MEMBERS SHOULD EARMARK AND TRAIN UNITS OF THEIR ARMED FORCES FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ASSIGNMENTS.

TO AID IN THIS EFFORT, I PROPOSE:

...TO USE OUR MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO HELP LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES PREPARE UNITS OF THEIR ARMED FORCES FOR UN AND REGIONAL PEACEKEEPING ASSIGNMENTS;

...TO MAKE AVAILABLE ONE OR MORE OF OUR OVERSEAS MILITARY BASES AS TRAINING AND SUPPLY CENTERS FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS;

...TO LAUNCH A NEW EFFORT TO RESOLVE THE UN'S FINANCIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS;

...TO CALL FOR A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FUND, FIXED INITIALLY AT 20 MILLION DOLLARS, TO PERMIT THE UN TO LAUNCH EMERGENCY OPERATIONS WITHOUT DELAY.

UN PEACEMAKING MUST GO HAND-IN-HAND WITH UN PEACEKEEPING. THE UNITED NATIONS NEEDS NOT JUST A FIRE DEPARTMENT, BUT A BETTER SYSTEM OF FIRE PREVENTION.

HERE IN THE UNITED STATES, WE HAVE LEARNED THE VALUE OF FACT-FINDERXXX FINDERS AND MEDIATORS TO MOBILIZE OPINION BEHIND A REASONABLE SETTLEMENT. WHY SHOULD NOT THE UNITED NATIONS HAVE A PANEL OF FACT-FINDING XXX FINDERS AND MEDIATORS FOR DISPUTES THAT THREATEN WORLD PEACE?

UN MEMBERS SHOULD AGREE IN ADVANCE TO ACCEPT THE PROCESS OF FACT-FINDING AND MEDIATION, EVEN IF THEY RESERVE THE RIGHT TO REJECT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS WITH WHICH THEY DISAGREE.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD IN ESTABLISHING SUCH A SYSTEM. AND I BELIEVE OUR COUNTRY SHOULD ACCEPT THE PROCESS OF FACT-FINDING AND MEDIATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS OR OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES IN ANY (U-LINE) DISPUTE TO WHICH WE ARE A PARTY ANYWHERE (U-LINE) IN THE WORLD.

THE FOURTH ELEMENT IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE SHOULD BE A GLOBAL EFFORT AT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. POPE PAUL SAID THAT "DEVELOPMENT IS THE NEW NAME FOR PEACE."

WE MUST DEAL WITH THE SOURCES OF CONFLICT. UNLESS THE WORLD CAN DO A BETTER JOB AT RAISING LIVING STANDARDS INLTIN AMERICA, AFRICA AND ASIA, THERE WILL BE NO LASTING PEACE. AS PRESIDENT KENNEDY ONCE SAID: "IF WE CANNOT HELP THE MANY WHO ARE POOR, WE CANNOT SAVE THE FEW WHO ARE RICH." (NOTE: THAT LAST SENTENCE IS A SEP. PARA.)

THE TIME HAS COME FOR A NEW APPROACH TO WORLD DEVELOPMENT--NOT MERELY A NEWLEVEL OF EFFORT, BUT A NEW EMPHASIS ON MULTILATERAL COOPERATION.

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IS XXX I PROPOSE TO CHANNEL THE OVERWHELMING SHARE OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS AND REGIONAL AGENCIES, WHERE COSTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES ARE WIDELY SHARED. THIS INCLUDES SUCH INSTITUTIONS AS THE WORLD BANK, THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK, THE ASIA DEVELOPMENT BANK, AND OTHER REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

ALL THIS WILL NOT RELIEVE US OF THE NEED TO PLAY OUR FULL PART IN PROVIDING HELP TO POORER COUNTRIES. THE ACTION OF THE CONGRESS THIS YEAR IN NUTILATING THE FOREIGN AID BILL IS SHOCKING--IF NOT IRRESPONSIBLE. IT IS TIME TO REEVALUATE OUR PRIORITIES::SO THAT A 70 BILLION DOLLAR DEFENSE BUDGET NO LONGER GLIDES THROUGH CONGRESS UNSCATHED WHILE MODEST PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF PEACE ARE SCUTTLED.

NEW EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE IN THE COMING YEARS TO ENLIST THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON POVERTY. DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE A COOPERATIVE--NOT A COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE.

EVEN IF WE CANNOT REACH THIS OBJECTIVE RIGHT AWAY, WE CAN TRY TO MOVE TOWARDS IT ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS WHERE EAST AND WEST RECOGNIZE A MEASURE OF COMMON INTEREST. LET US BEGIN BY ENSCOOQUAGIING OPR I WAS CALLING 810 44 2 1618 YPUR NO PLS THIS IS R XXX THE PHILB THE LTRS BUNCH UP. THIS IS THE PHILA OPR ARE U CLG YES YOUR NO PLS, 710 822 9211 OK BY PLS TRY LLATER BY PLS TRY LATER WHY NOT NOW? THE LINE IS STILL BUSY THEY WERE ON W/EE GET TING BSY WILL REPT LINE TX HHH TOLEDO

FOR INDIA.

THE FIFTH ELEMENT IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE SHOULD BE A GLOBAL EFFORT TO PRESERVE AND IMPROVE THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT.

THE UNCONTROLLED EXPLOITATION OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COULD SPELL DISASTER FOR MANKIND.

UNCONTROLLED INDUSTRIALIZATION AND URBANIZATION--COUPLED WITH UNREGULATED POPULATION GROWTH--WILL UNDERMINE THE BASIS OF A DECENT LIFE ON THIS PLANET. AND THIS IS THE ONLY PLANET WE HAVE.

TO MAINTAIN THE BALANCE OF NATURE, TO EXPLOIT NATURE'S ABUNDANCE WITHOUT DESTROYING IT, TO PRESERVE AN ENVIRONMENT COMPATIBLE WITH HUMAN DIGNITY--THESE ARE IN THE INTEREST OF ALL--REGARDLESS OF NATIONALITY, RACE, OR IDEOLOGY.

AS PRESIDENT I WILL COMMIT THIS COUNTRY TO A GLOBAL EFFORT TO PROTECT AND DEVELOP THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT--TO CONTROL THE POLLUTION OF AIR, RIVERS AND OCEANS--TO PROTECT WILDLIFE AND NATURAL AREAS--TO INCREASE THE MARINE HARVEST--TO EXPLOIT THE RESOURCES OF THE DEEP SEA BED--AND TO USE NUCLEAR POWER TO BRING FRESH WATER XXX FRESH WATER FROM THE SEAS.

MANY OF THESE THINGS CAN BE DONE BY INDIVIDUAL NATIONS ALONE, BUT THERE ARE XXX PARTS OF THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT THAT DO NOT BELONG ENTIRELY TO ANY ONE NATION--THE HIGH SEAS, THE DEEP SEA BED, INTERNATIONAL RIVERS, MIGRATORY ANIMALS--WHOSE EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT REQUIRES INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

EVEN IN DEALING WITH ITS OWN ENVIRONMENT, EVERY PEOPLE CAN BENEFIT FROM THE SHARING OF NATIONAL EXPERIENCE. WE NEED JOINT PROGRAMS OF RESEARCH AND RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE ON COMMON PROBLEMS OF INDUSTRIALIZATION AND URBANIZATION.

THE SIXTH ELEMENT IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE SHOULD BE NEW EFFORTS TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING.

ONE OF THE BEST WAYS TO PROMOTE COOPERATION BETWEEN PEOPLES IS TO USE THE MOST EXCITING DEVELOPMENT IN COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY--THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE. THROUGH SATELLITES MAN CAN HAVE NOT ONLY TRANSMISSIONS BETWEEN CENTRAL GROUND STATIONS--BUT ALSO DIRECT BROADCASTING TO VILLAGE AND HOME RADIO AND TV RECEIVERS.

I PROPOSE RECIPROCAL TV AND RADIO XXX EXCHANGES WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, INCLUDING THE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE. LET US OFFER THE SOVIET LEADERS THE OPPORTUNITY TO TALK TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON TV IN RETURN FOR THE XXX SAME PRIVILEGE FOR OUR LEADERS IN THE SOVIET UNION.

OTHER COUNTRIES MAY HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH THESE PROPOSALS. BUT WE IN AMERICA HAVE AN OPEN SOCIETY. THERE IS NO REASON WHY WE SHOULD NOT LEAD IN THE QUEST FOR AN OPEN WORLD.

I HAVE MENTIONED SIX ELEMENTS IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE. THEY ARE ONLY A PARTIAL LIST OF THE INITIATIVES THAT I WOULD UNDERTAKE TO PROMOTE THE COMMON INTEREST OF MANKIND IN PEACE AND WELFARE.

WE WILL NOT REALIZE THIS NEW STRATEGY OVERNIGHT. IT WILL BE THE WORK OF MANY YEARS. BUT IN THE LONG RUN IT IS THE ONLY VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR AMERICA BETWEEN AN ASSUMPTION OF DISPROPORTIONATE WORLD RESPONSIBILITY AND A RENEWED RETREAT TO ISOLATION.

I BELIEVE THE WAR IN VIETNAM HAS SHOWN US THE ABSOLUTE NECESSITY OF DEVELOPING STRONGER INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS TO HELP US SHARE THE BURDENS AND THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF PEACEKEEPING AND DEVELOPMENT.

THE COMMON PEOPLE NOT ONLY IN THIS COUNTRY BUT IN ALL COUNTRIES WILL TURN INCREASINGLY TO LEADERS WHO OFFER THEM PROGRAMS FOR COOPERATION RATHER THAN CONFLICT.

PEACEKEEPING
MENT AID TO
ECRUB PREVIOUS LINE
MENT AID--TO PRESERVE AND DEVELOP THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT--AND TO MOVE
BOLDLY FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING.

MAKE NO MISTAKE ABOUT XXXX ABOUT IT--THIS IS YOUR CHOICE. WE CAN
ENTRUST THIS COUNTRY TO THOSE WHO HAVE THE WILL AND THE IMAGINATION TO
LEAD THE WORLD TO NEW PROGRAMS OF COOPERATION--OR WE COULD PUT IT IN
THE HANDS OF THOSE WHO HAVE ALWAYS PREFERRED TXXX THE POLITICS OF
COLD WAR AND CONFLICT.

IF I AM PRESIDENT, THERE IS NO IDEA TXXX THAT I WILL LEAVE
UNEXPLORED IN THE SEARCH FOR PEACE. TO MARK THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE UNITED NATIONS I WILL APPOINT A COMMISSION ON PEACE, COMPOSED
OF A SMALL NUMBER OF PRIVATE CITIZENS KNOWN FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS
TO PEACE AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.

THIS COMMISSION WILL BE NO PBXXX PUBLIC RELATIONS EXERCISE. IT
WILL HAVE READY AND REGULAR ACCESS TO THE PRESIDENT AND TOP OFFICIALS
OF THE GOVERNMENT. IT WILL HAVE A STAFF AND FUNDS TO CARRY ON ITS
ACTIVITIES, TO CONTRACT FOR NECESSARY RESEARCH, AND TO TAKE PART
IN INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS.

I WILL ASK THIS COMMISSION TO ISSUE A REPORT IN 1970--ON THE
PRACTICAL STEPS THAT WE CAN TAKE TO STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS
AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES IN THE CAUSE OF PEACE.

OUR TRADITION ASSUMES A HIGH DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION BY THE
PEOPLE IN THE MAKING OF CRITICAL NATIONAL POLICY DECISIONS.
INVOLVEMENT BY THE PEOPLE WILL CONTINUE TO BE A NECESSITY IF NATIONAL
DECISIONS ARE TO TRULY REFLECT THE NATIONAL WILL. FOR XXX FOR
FOREIGN POLICY IS THE PEOPLES BUSINESS IN 1968 JUST AS POLITICS IS
THEIR BUSINESS.

WE UNDERSTAND ESPECIALLY TODAY THAT A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE
FOR A DXXX NEW DECADE STANDS LITTLE CHANCE OF SUCCESS UNLESS IT CAN
INSPIRE THE NEW GENERATION OF AMERICANS WHO WEAR THE NATIONS UNIFORMS,
RENEW THE NATION'S POLITICAL PROCESSES, AND IN THE LONG RUN DETERMINE
THE SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF AMERICAN POLICY AT HOME AND ABROAD.

THIS COMMISSION ON PEACE WILL OFFER A NEW CHANNEL FOR PARTICIPA-
TION BY AMERICAN CITIZENS IN THE FOREIGN POLICY OF OUR COUNTRY.

MY BELIEF THAT WE CAN SUCCESSFULLY PURSUE A "NEW STRATEGY FOR
PEACE" IS BASED ON THE CONVICTION ELOQUENTLY STATED BY PRESIDENT
KENNEDY AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN JUNE OF 1963. HE SAID:
"LET US EXAMINE OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD PEACE ITSELF. TOO MANY OF US
THINK IT IS IMPOSSIBLE. TOO MANY THINK IT UNREAL. BUT THAT IS A
DANGEROUS, DEFEATIST BELIEF. IT LEADS TO THE CONCLUSION TATXXX
THAT WAR IS INEVITABLE, THAT MANKIND IS DOOMED, THAT WE ARE GRIPPED
BY FORCES WE CANNOT CONTROL.

"WE NEED NOT ACCEPT THAT VIEW. OUR PROBLEMS ARE MAN-MADE; THERE-
FORE, THEY CAN BE SOLVED BY MEN. AND MAN CAN BE AS BIG AS HE WANTS."

THE END

I AM GOING TO REPEAT NOW THE PARA IN ITS ENTIRETY WHERE THE INTER-
RUPTION OCCURRED:

EVEN IF WE CANNOT REACH THIS OBJECTIVE RIGHT AWAY, WE CAN TRY
TO MOVE TOWARDS IT ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS WHERE EAST AND WEST
RECOGNIZE A MEASURE OF COMMON INTEREST. LET US BEGIN BY ENCOURAGING
THE SOVIET UNION TO JOIN THE WORLD BANK CONSORTIUM FOR INDIA.

OKAY:--ANY QNS BEFORE I SPLIT? OVER

To Ted Van Dyk
Introduction for UN speech
From Eugene O'Donnell

I have come to San Francisco not only because I love your city and its people -- not only because San Francisco is surely one of the most breathtakingly beautiful cities in the world.

Today I have come to San Francisco as a candidate for the Presidency because I want to talk about the United Nations where it was born. I have come here to speak with you about ways that we can strengthen the United Nations' peace-keeping potential.

I have come to San Francisco to propose that one of my first steps as your next President will be to call a new San Francisco Conference to re-dedicate the UN on its 25th Anniversary, and to seek new ways of making it work for peace.

I will appoint early in 1969 a Commission for Peace, to be composed of leading U.S. citizens who will have a mandate from me as your President to develop specific proposals for the new San Francisco Conference, and to work with similar commissions from other member nations to plan for the 25th Anniversary Conference in April 1970.

We have often asked ourselves during the recent troubled years, "Why is it that the United Nations has not been able to bring peace to Vietnam?" What can we do to strengthen the U.N.'s peace-keeping procedures so that it can deal more effectively with conflicts, especially conflicts involving great powers.

What can we do so that the United States will not have to bear, alone, the unwanted burden of resisting aggression or restoring peace? One answer surely lies in fortifying the U.N. for its role in the peaceful settlement of conflicts.

I am deeply concerned about measures directed toward permanent peace, and I want to talk about some of these measures here today.

But I am no less concerned about ending the war in Vietnam, ending it honorably, and by measures of a negotiated settlement that will in itself contribute towards permanent peace.

I have already said, and I say again with all the fervor at my command, that if the fighting in Vietnam has not ceased by the time I become President, I will do everything within my power to aid the negotiations and to bring a prompt end to this war.

As I said in my acceptance speech, "The policies of tomorrow need not be limited by the policies of yesterday.

"And if it becomes my high honor to serve as President of these States and people, I shall apply that lesson to the search for peace in Vietnam, as to all areas of national policy."

This determination to find new answers, better ways of peace-making and peace-keeping applies also to the United Nations. We must take a new look at its procedures. Twenty-five years is almost a generation. The world has changed since 1945. It is time to explore new steps to make the U.N. work better.

OUR NEW ~~SEXX~~ STRATEGY FOR PEACE ~~WLXX~~ WILL BE
LEAMINGTON MPL

SAN FRANCISCO
COMMONWEALTH III
Thurs., Sept. 26

DEM FOR HHH DC
H
DEM FOR HHH DC
ATTENTION: TED VAN DYK

FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF THE VP'S REMARKS BEFORE THE
COMMONWEALTH CLUB, SAN FRANCISCO: "A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE"

TODAY I WANT TO TALK ABOUT PEACE -- ABOUT OUR ROLE IN ACHIEVING
(ULINED) PEACE, IN MAINTAINING (ULINED) IT.

DURING THE NEXT DECADE, WE AMERICANS WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE MAJOR
RESPONSIBILITY FOR PRESERVING WORLD PEACE. BUT HOW WE FULFILL (ULINED)
THAT RESPONSIBILITY WILL CHANGE.

TODAY WE FACE NEW CONDITIONS:

--THE COLD WAR ^{era} ~~BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION~~
IS WANING -- THOUGH THE TRAGIC EVENTS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA REMIND US
THAT IT IS NOT OVER.

P --THE COMMUNIST COUNTRIES NO LONGER POSE A MONOLITHIC THREAT.

--THERE IS A NEED AND A NEW OPPORTUNITY TO ACCELERATE OUR EFFORTS
TOWARD CONTROL OF THE ARMS RACE.

--NEW NATIONS ARE MOVING INTO A PERIOD WHEN THEY LOOK TOWARD
SELF-DEVELOPMENT.

--WESTERN EUROPE AND JAPAN CAN STAND ON THEIR OWN TWO FEET, AND
THEY WANT TO DO JUST THAT.

--AND A NEW GENERATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER INDUSTRIAL
COUNTRIES REJECTS THE OLD PREMISES OF WAR AND DIPLOMACY. THEY WANT
TO SEE MORE EMPHASIS PLACED ON HUMAN AND PERSONAL VALUES -- HAVING
ENOUGH TO EAT ... BEING ABLE TO LEARN ... LIVING FREE OF FEAR. AND
IT IS FOR OUR GENERATION TO HELP THEM REALIZE THEIR HOPES -- OF A
WORLD FREE FROM THE TYRANNY OF WAR.

OUR WORLD ROLE IN THE NEXT DECADE WILL BE DIFFERENT FROM THAT IN
THE LAST. THERE ARE (ULINED) PRESSING PROBLEMS AT HOME, WHICH PLACE
SOME LIMITS ON WHAT WE CAN DO ABROAD.

REVIVAL OF STRENGTH IN OTHER FREE COUNTRIES DOES (ULINED)
ENABLE THEM TO ASSUME GREATER BURDENS.

EXPERIENCE OF RECENT YEARS DOES (ULINED) SUGGEST AREAS IN WHICH
OUR ~~FOREIGN~~ FOREIGN POLICY COULD BE IMPROVED.

I WELCOME THIS PERIOD OF DEBATE AND REVIEW -- THIS OPPORTUNITY
TO JOIN IN THE SCRUTINY OF POLICY -- THIS OPPORTUNITY TO DEFINE A
"NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE."

2
FUNDAMENTAL TO THIS STRATEGY -- THE REJECTION OF THOSE PROPOSALS WHICH RELY EXCLUSIVELY ON AMERICAN POWER AS THE GUARANTOR OF SECURITY. SECURITY IN AREAS OF THE DEVELOPING WORLD WHERE WE NOW ARE NOW INVOLVED. OTHER COUNTRIES IN ASIA AND AFRICA MUST ASSUME GREATER RESPONSIBILITY FOR SHAPING THEIR FUTURE.

?
I BELIEVE IT IS TIME THAT WE CONVERT THE PHRASE "NO MORE VIETNAMS" FROM A SOGAN INTO A SOUND -- AND ATTAINABLE -- OBJECTIVE OF U.S. POLICY.

THIS DOES NOT (ULINE) MEANTURNING OUR BACK ON SOUTHEAST ASIA -- OR ON NATIONS OR PEOPLES IN ANY OTHER PART OF THE WORLD WHOSE FREEDOM IS THREATENED. IT DOES (ULINE) MEAN IN SOME INSTANCES REDEFINING THE CHARACTER OF THE U.S. ROLE AND EXERCISING OUR POWER WITH CAUTION AND RESTRAINT.

record?
WE SHOULD FOLLOW THREE BASIC GUIDELINES IN MEETING FUTURE THREATS TO ASIAN PEACE: (1) SELF-HELP; (2) REGIONAL AND MULTILATERAL RESPONSIBILITY; (3) SELECTIVE U.S. ASSISTANCE.

FIRST, THERE SHOULD BE SELF-HELP (ULINE) IN ACHIEVING NATIONAL SECURITY. THE THREATENED COUNTRY MUST DEMONSTRATE ITS WILLINGNESS TO ASSUME PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY TO MEET AGGRESSION AND EXTERNALLY-SUPPORTED INSURGENCY.

SECOND, THERE MUST BE REGIONAL AND MULTILATERAL RESPONSIBILITY (ULINE). SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS MUST CONCERN THEMSELVES WITH EACH OTHER'S SECURITY IN THE FUTURE AND MUST DEVELOP MEANS TO DEAL WITH INSURRECTIONS SUPPORTED FROM THE OUTSIDE. THE U.S. SHOULD CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE REGIONAL COOPERATION AMONG THESE COUNTRIES. UNILATERAL ACTION BY THE GREAT POWERS SHOULD BE AVOIDED AND ASSISTANCE SOUGHT FROM INTERNATIONAL SOURCES.

THIRD, THERE MUST BE SELECTIVE U.S. ASSISTANCE (ULINE). THE U.S. SHOULD BE PREPARED TO FULFILL SPECIFIC AND CLEARLY-DEFINED MUTUAL DEFENSE COMMITMENTS BUT WE SHOULD NOT SEEK TO DO WHAT ASIAN NATIONS ARE NOT PREPARED TO DO FOR THEMSELVES. OUR MILITARY PRESENCE IN A TROUBLED AREA SHOULD BE KEPT AT THE MINIMUM LEVEL REQUIRED TO MEET OUR RESPONSIBILITIES.

IN MEETING FUTURE THREATS TO DEVELOPING NATIONS, AS IN ENDING THE VIETNAM WAR ITSELF, STRENGTHENING THE ABILITY OF OTHER COUNTRIES TO MEET THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES WILL BE THE FIRST STEP IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE. AND WE WILL APPLY THIS SAME PRINCIPLE TO ENDING THE WAR IN VIETNAM.

THERE WILL BE NO PEACE FOR ANY AMERICAN -- OR ANY OTHER PERSON ON HIS EARTH -- UNTIL NATIONS STOP THE PILING UP OF THE WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND THE SPREADING OF THESE WEAPONS AROUND THE WORLD. WE MUST HALT THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR TERROR BEFORE IT HALTS HUMANITY.

I HAVE DEVOTED MUCH OF MY LIFE TO THESE ENDS -- AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE DISARMAMENT SUBCOMMITTEE.

...AS SPONSOR OF THE ARS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,

...AND AS PRINCIPAL SENATE SUPPORTER OF THE TEST BAN TREATY.

3
AS VICE PRESIDENT, I TRAVELLED TO GENEVA AND TO OTHER EUROPEAN CAPITALS TO ENCOURAGE THE SIGNING OF THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY.

AS PRESIDENT, I WILL WORK TIMELESSLY IN THE SEARCH FOR SOME EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF THE ARMS RACE.

I WILL SEEK TO IMPLEMENT THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY -- WHICH SHOULD BE PROMPTLY RATIFIED NOW.

I WILL SEEK AN AGREEMENT WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE MISSILES -- AN END TO NUCLEAR TESTING UNDER ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS -- THE CONTROL OF CHEMICAL, RADIOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS -- AND A HALT TO REGIONAL ARMS RACES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND ELSEWHERE. THERE CAN BE AN END TO THESE DEADLY ARMS RACES AND THEY CAN COME NOW.

MR. NIXON DOES NOT SHARE MY COMMITMENT TO CONTROL THE ARMS RACE. HE WANTS TO POSTPONE SENATE ACTION ON THE TREATY PROHIBITING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS. THIS POSITION NOT ONLY JEOPARDIZES THE PEACE OF THE WORLD -- BUT IT ENCOURAGES NATIONS TO POUR TENS OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS INTO THE ARMS RACE -- DOLLARS THAT BRING NO MORE SECURITY, AND PUT US AGAIN ON THAT SLIPPERY SLOPE TO NUCLEAR WAR -- DOLLARS URGENTLY NEEDED FOR THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT -- HERE IN AMERICA AND ABROAD.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR. WE CAN HAVE A PRESIDENT WHO EQUIVOCATES ON THESE MATTERS OF LIFE OR NUCLEAR DEATH. OR WE CAN HAVE A PRESIDENT WHO WILL ACT TO TURN BACK THE ARMS RACE AND SAVE MANKIND FROM SELF-DESTRUCTION. I SAY WE NEED A MAN WHO UNDERSTANDS NOT THE PROSPECTS OF SUCCESS IN THIS AREA -- AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE.

NEW CONDITIONS TODAY ALSO REQUIRE NEW INSTITUTIONS. MORE AND MORE, WE WILL PURSUE OUR NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE THROUGH MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS, ESPECIALLY THE UNITED NATIONS. I REMIND YOU -- HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO, WHERE THE UNITED NATIONS WAS BORN SOME 23 YEARS AGO -- THAT ONE OF THE HIGH PRIORITIES OF MY PRESIDENCY WILL BE TO STRENGTHEN THE PEACEKEEPING AND PEACE-MAKING CAPACITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

THIS IS OUR THIRD STEP TOWARD A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE : TO MAKE THE UN THE INSTRUMENT FOR CONTROLLING CONFLICT IT HAS SO FAR FAILED TO BE.

THE UNITED STATES CANNOT PLAY THE ROLE OF GLOBAL GENDARME. THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DON'T WANT IT, AND THE REST OF THE WORLD WON'T ACCEPT IT. WE KNOW BETTER TODAY THAN YESTERDAY THAT "THE ILLUSION OF AMERICAN OMNIPOTENCE" -- IN DR. BROGAN'S PHRASE, "CULINED" IS AN ILLUSION."

BUT THE ALTERNATIVE TO AMERICAN (ULINED) PEACEKEEPING CANNOT BE NO PEACEKEEPING. IT MUST BE PEACEKEEPING BY THE UNITED NATIONS OR BY REGIONAL AGENCIES.

4 THE BASIS OF ANY WORLD PEACEKEEPING SYSTEM MUST BE A COMMIT-
MENT TO NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF OTHER COUNTRIES,
BUT THIS POLICY WILL ONLY WORK IF IT IS RESPECTED BY ALL STATES,
LARGE AND SMALL -- AND IF THERE IS AN EFFECTIVE INSTRUMENT IN THE
UNITED NATIONS TO SERVE THE INTERESTS, NOT OF INDIVIDUAL NATIONS,
BUT OF PEACE ITSELF. 5

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES I WILL MAKE CLEAR THAT
AMERICAN POWER WILL NEVER BE USED TO PREVENT ANY NATION FROM
CHOOSING THE GOVERNMENT IT WANTS. AND I WILL INSIST THAT LEADERS
OF OTHER GOVERNMENTS -- INCLUDING THE COMMUNIST STATES -- NOT TO
USE THEIR POWER TO PREVENT NATIONS FROM CHOOSING THE GOVERNMENTS
THEY WANT.

SUCH A POLICY OF MUTUAL NON-INTERFERENCE IS NOT JUST AN
IDEAL -- IT IS THE ONLY WAY TO PRESERVE PEACE IN THIS WORLD. BUT
IT WILL WORK ONLY IF THE PLEDGES OF NON-INTERFERENCE ARE BACKED
UP BY UNITED NATIONS TROOPS WHICH CAN PATROL BORDERS, AND SUPERVISE
FREE ELECTIONS.

THE UN PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS HAVE BROUGHT FRUSTRATING RESULTS IN
CYPRUS, IN THE CONGO, AND IN KASHMIR. EVEN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES
NOW RECOGNIZE THE NEED TO CONTAIN LOCAL CONFLICTS THAT MIGHT DRAW
IN THE GREAT POWERS AND TRIGGER A NUCLEAR WAR.

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WILL DO EVERYTHING IN MY
POWER TO PLACE INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING SOLDIERS IN TROUBLED
AREAS, RATHER THAN (UNLIKE) AMERICAN SOLDIERS. NOWHERE WOULD
A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FORCE BE MORE WELCOME THAN IN VIETNAM
TO ADMINISTER FREE ELECTIONS AND VERIFY THE
WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN TROOPS.

BUT THE PEACEKEEPING CAPACITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS CAN BE
ENLARGED ONLY IF ITS MEMBERS -- PARTICULARLY THOSE WHO HAVE NO
RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PEACE AS GREAT POWERS -- WILL MAKE MARK
AND TRAIN UNITS OF THEIR ARMED FORCES FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING
ASSIGNMENTS.

TO AID IN THIS EFFORT, I PROPOSE

-- TO USE OUR MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO HELP LESS-
DEVELOPED COUNTRIES PREPARE UNITS OF THEIR ARMED FORCES FOR UN
AND REGIONAL PEACEKEEPING ASSIGNMENTS;

-- TO LAUNCH A NEW EFFORT TO RESOLVE THE UN'S FINANCIAL
AND CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS;

-- TO CALL FOR A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FUND, BEGINNING
WITH 20 MILLION DOLLARS TO KEEP THE UN READY TO HELP THE UN
TO LAUNCH EMERGENCY OPERATIONS WITHOUT DELAY. IF WE ALL WANT PEACE
WE AND ALL NATIONS -- MUST BE PREPARED TO PAY FOR IT.

BUT THIS IS NOT ENOUGH -- UN PEACEMAKING (UNLIKE) MUST GO HAND-
IN-AND-AND WITH UN PEACEKEEPING (UNLIKE). THE UNITED NATIONS NEEDS
NOT JUST A FIRE DEPARTMENT, BUT A BETTER MEANS OF FIRE PREVENTION.

5
HERE IN THE UNITED STATES, WE HAVE LEARNED THE VALUE OF FACT-
FINDERS AND MEDIATORS TO OXYMOBILIZE OPINION BEHIND A REASONABLE
SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES. I URGE THAT THE UNITED NATIONS ESTABLISH
A PERMANENT PANEL OF HIGHLY-SKILLED FACTFINDERS AND MEDIATORS TO
APPLY THEMSELVES TO DISPUTES THAT THREATEN WORLD PEACE.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD IN ESTABLISHING SUCH
A SYSTEM. I BELIEVE OUR COUNTRY SHOULD ACCEPT THE PROCESS OF
FACTFINDING AND MEDIATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS OR OTHER INTER-
NATIONAL AGENCIES IN (UNLINE) ANY DISPUTE TO WHICH WE ARE A
PARTY (UNLINE) ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD. WE WILL NOT BIND OURSELVES
IN ADVANCE TO ACCEPT THE FINDINGS OF SUCH EFFORTS, BUT WE CANNOT
NEGLECT SUCH EFFORTS IN OUR SEARCH FOR PEACE. AS PRESIDENT, I
WILL BEGIN THIS POLICY BY ASKING THE UNITED NATIONS TO HELP WITH
THE SEARCH FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM.

* * *

THE ENDING OF CONFLICT, THE MEDIATION OF CRISES WILL BE OF
LITTLE USE IF WE DO NOT STRIKE AT THE CAUSES OF FUTURE CONFLICTS
BEFORE THEY BEGIN.

THEREFORE, THE FOURTH ELEMENT IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE
MUST BE A GLOBAL EFFORT AT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT -- WHAT POPE PAUL
CALLED "THE NEW NAME FOR PEACE."

I HAVE VISITED THESE COUNTRIES. I HAVE TALKED TO THEIR
LEADERS AND TO THEIR PEOPLE. I KNOW THEIR NEEDS AND
DESIRES.

AS PRESIDENT KENNEDY ONCE SAID, "IF WE CANNOT HELP THE
MANY WHO ARE POOR, WE CANNOT SAVE THE FEW WHO ARE RICH."

BUT TODAY THE TIME HAS COME FOR A NEW APPROACH
TO WORLD DEVELOPMENT. WE HAVE LEARNED THAT NATIONAL BURDENS
CAN BE LIFTED -- IF INTERNATIONAL BURDENS CAN BE SHARED. WE
NEED NOT MERELY A NEW LEVEL OF EFFORT, BUT A GREATER EMPHASIS
ON MULTILATERAL COOPERATION.

THIS WILL BE A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF AID, WHERE WE HELP NATIONS
EXPLORE THEIR OWN WAY TO DEVELOPMENT -- WITHOUT FACING WHAT
HENRI DUNANT CALLED "THE TEMPTATION TO DO GOOD" -- THE TEMPTATION
TO INSIST NOT ONLY THAT VIRTUE BE DONE, BUT THAT OUR PARTICULAR
VERSION OF VIRTUE BE IMPLEMENTED IN OUR PARTICULAR WAY.

THIS NEW APPROACH TO AID-GIVING WILL NOT RELIEVE US OF THE
NEED TO PLAY OUR FULL PART IN PROVIDING HELP TO POORER COUNTRIES.
INDEED, THE ACTION OF THE CONGRESS THIS YEAR IN MUTILATING THE
FOREIGN AID BILL WAS IRRESPONSIBLE -- AND WILL ONLY MAKE IT
MORE LIKELY THAT SOMEDAY PEOPLE WILL TRY TO DO BY WAR WHAT WE
NOW FAIL TO DO FOR PEACE. WE MUST RE-EVALUATE OUR PRIORITIES --
SO THAT A 70 BILLION DOLLAR DEFENSE BUDGET TO WORK FOR PEACE TODAY
(UNLINE) DOES NOT ECLIPSE THESE MODEST PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE THE
PEACE FOR TOMORROW.

BUT WE ARE NOT ALONE. NEW EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE IN THE
COMING YEARS TO ENLIST THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE IN THE
GLOBAL WAR ON POVERTY. DEVELOPMENT SHOULD MEAN COOPERATION -- NOT

6
TOTOTOPMXX COMPETITION -- BECAUSE THE PEACE IT PROVIDES IS
OUR COMMON INTEREST.

LET US BEGIN BY ENCOURAGING THE SOVIET UNION TO JOIN THE
WORK BANK CONSORTIUM FOR INDIA.

* * *

THE FIFTH ELEMENT IN THIS NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE SHOULD BE NEW
EFFORTS TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING THROUGH THE USE
OF EXCITING DEVELOPMENTS IN COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY -- INCLUDING
THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE. THROUGH SATELLITES MAN CAN NOT
ONLY TRANSMIT BETWEEN CENTRAL GROUND STATIONS -- AND CAN BE
BROADCAST DIRECTLY TO VILLAGE AND HOME RADIO AND TV RECEIVERS.

I PROPOSE RECIPROCAL TV AND RADIO EXCHANGES WITH OTHER
COUNTRIES, INCLUDING THE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE. LET US
OFFER THE SOVIET LEADERS INTXX THE OPPORTUNITY TO TALK TO THE
AMERICAN PEOPLE ON TV IN RETURN FOR THE ANX SAME PRIVILEGE
FOR OUR LEADERS IN THE SOVIET UNION/.

OTHER COUNTRIES MAY HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH THESE PROSALS
BUT WE IN AMERICA HAVE AN OPEN SOCIETY. AND NOW WE AN XX CAN
LEAD IN THE QUEST FOR AN OPEN WORLD.

THERE ARE FIVE ELEMENTS IN THIS NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE -- A
STRATEGY THAT WILL BE THE WORK OF MANY YEARS. BUT IN THE LONG
RUN IT IS THE ONLY VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR AMERICA BETWEEN
ASSUMING TOO MUCH WORLD RESPONSIBILITY AND RETREATING INTO AN
ISOLATION THAT CAN ONLY LEAD TO GREATER PROBLEMS ... AND AN
END TO OUR HOPES FOR PEACE.

ORDINARY PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY AND THROUGHOUT THE WORLXX
WORLD ARE TURNING TO LEADERS WHO OFFER THEM PROGRAMS FOR
COOPERATION RATHER THAN CONFLICT.

THIS I ASK OF YOU TODAY: WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE ...
WHICH POLITICAL PARTY, IS BEST EQUIPPED TO LEAD THE U.S. IN
THE QUEST FOR PEACE?

WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE ... WHICH POLITICAL PARTY
IS BEST EQUIPPED TO AVOID FUTURE "VIETNAMS." ... TO TURN BACK
THE ARMS RACE -- TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING
MACHINERY -- TO ACCELERATE DEVELOPMENT AID -- THROUGH MULTI-
LATERAL AGENCIES -- AND TO MOVE BOLDLY FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING?

7

OUR NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL SUCCEED ONLY IF IT CAN INSPIRE A NEW GENERATION OF AMERICANS WHO RENEW THE NATION'S POLITICAL PROCESSES, WEAR OUR ARMED FORCES UNIFORMS, AND WHO IN THE LONG RUN WILL DETERMINE THE SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF AMERICAN POLICY AT HOME AND ABROAD.

AND OUR SEARCH FOR A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL SUCCEED ONLY WHEN WE END A TRAGIC WAR -- A WAR WHICH HAS CONSUMED OUR ENERGIES -- DIVIDED OUR PEOPLE -- AND LIMITED OUR VISION.

AS PRESIDENT MY FIRST PRIORITY WILL BE TO END THE ARMY WAR IN VIETNAM.

AND IN PURSUING THAT GOAL, THE POLICIES OF TOMORROW NEED NOT BE LIMITED BY THE POLICIES OF YESTERDAY.

I BELIEVE THAT WE CAN PURSUE A "NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE" AND SUCCEED. AS PRESIDENT KENNEDY STATED AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN JUNE OF 1963:

"LET US EXAMINE OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD PEACE ITSELF. TOO MANY OF US THINK IT IS IMPOSSIBLE. TOO MANY THINK IT UNREAL. BUT THAT IS A DANGEROUS, DEFEATIST LIKE BELIEF. IT LEADS TO THE CONCLUSION THAT WAR IS INEVITABLE, THAT MANKIND IS DOOMED, THAT WE ARE RIPPED BY FORCES WE CANNOT CONTROL.

"WE NEED NOT ACCEPT THAT VIEW. OUR PROBLEMS ARE MAN-MADE; THEREFORE, THEY CAN BE SOLVED BY MEN. AND MAN CAN BE AS BIG AS HE WANTS."

PRESIDENT KENNEDY WAS RIGHT. WE CAN HAVE PEACE. WE SHALL HAVE PEACE. THAT IS MY PLEDGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN THIS CAMPAIGN.

#

END OF TEXT.

PLS ACK. TAE

DEM FOR HMM DC
HELLOOOOOOOO OUT THERE
PLS ACK

COMMONWEALTH
I BELIEVE IT IS TIME THAT WE CONVERT THE PHRASE "NO MORE
VIETNAM" FROM A SLOGAN INTO A SOUND -- AND ATTAINABLE SE. OBJECTIVE
OF U.S. POLICY.

what happened in 1953, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 60
the previous years
create the
rodgers
in Vietnam (1960s?)
the 1960s?

THIS DOES NOT (ULINE) MEAN TURNING OUR BACK ON SOUTHEAST ASIA
OR ON NATIONALS OR PEOPLES IN ANY OTHER PART OF THE WORLD WHOSE
FREEDOMS THREATENED. IT DOES (ULINE) MEAN IN SOME INSTANCES
REDEFINING THE CHARACTER OF THE U.S. ROLE AND EXERCISING OUR
POWER WITH CAUTION AND RESTRAINT.

WE SHOULD FOLLOW THREE BASIC GUIDELINES IN MEETING FUTURE
THREATS TO ~~PEACE~~ (3) SELF-HELP; (1) REGIONAL AND (N) MULTI-
LATERAL RESPONSIBILITY; (2) SELECTIVE U.S. ASSISTANCE. (1)

1. ~~wherever possible~~ THERE SHOULD BE SELF-HELP (ULINE) IN ACHIEVING NATIONAL
SECURITY. THE THREATENED COUNTRY MUST DEMONSTRATE ITS WILLINGNESS
TO ASSUME PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY TO MEET AGGRESSION AND EXTERNALLY-
SUPPORTED INSURGENCY.

2. ~~where possible~~ 1st. ~~where possible~~ THERE MUST BE REGIONAL AND MULTILATERAL RESPONSI-
BILITY (ULINE). SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS MUST CONCERN THEMSELVES
WITH EACH OTHER'S SECURITY IN THE FUTURE AND MUST DEVELOP MEANS
TO DEAL WITH INSURRENCIES SUPPORTED FROM THE OUTSIDE. THE U.S.
SHOULD CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE REGIONAL COOPERATION AMONG THESE
COUNTRIES. UNILATERAL ACTION BY THE GREAT POWERS SHOULD BE
AVOIDED AND ASSISTANCE SOUGHT FROM INTERNATIONAL SOURCES.

2. ~~where possible~~ THIRD, THERE MUST BE SELECTIVE U.S. ASSISTANCE (ULINE).
THE U.S. SHOULD BE PREPARED TO FULFILL SPECIFIC AND CLEARLY-DEFINED
MUTUAL DEFENSE COMMITMENTS BUT WE SHOULD NOT SEEK TO DO WHAT ASIAN
NATIONS ARE NOT PREPARED TO DO FOR THEMSELVES. OUR MILITARY
PRESENCE IN A TROUBLED AREA SHOULD BE KEPT AT THE MINIMUM LEVEL
REQUIRED TO MEET OUR RESPONSIBILITIES.

IN MEETING FUTURE THREATS TO DEVELOPING NATIONS, AS IN ENDING
THE VIETNAM WAR ITSELF, STRENGTHENING THE ABILITY OF OTHER COUNTRIES
TO MEET VIDER RESPONSIBILITIES WILL BE THE FIRST STEP IN A NEW
STRATEGY FOR PEACE AND WE WILL APPLY THIS SAME PRINCIPLE TO ENDING
THE WAR IN VIETNAM.

THERE WILL BE NO PEACE FOR ANY AMERICAN -- OR ANY OTHER PERSON
ON HIS EARTH -- UNTIL NATIONS STOP ~~the~~ PILING UP THE WEAPONS OF
MASS DESTRUCTION AND THE SPREADING OF THESE WEAPONS AROUND THE
WORLD. WE MUST HALT THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR TERROR BEFORE IT
HALTS HUMANITY.

I HAVE DEVOTED MUCH OF MY LIFE TO THESE ENDS -- AS CHAIRMAN
OF THE SENATE DISARMAMENT SUBCOMMITTEE.

...AS SPONSOR OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY;

...AND AS PRINCIPAL SENATE SUPPORTER OF THE TEST BAN TREATY.

AS VICE PRESIDENT, I TRAVELLED TO GENEVA AND TO OTHER
EUROPEAN CAPITALS TO ENCOURAGE THE SIGNING OF THE NON-PROLIFERATION
TREATY.

AS PRESIDENT, I WILL WORK TIRELESSLY IN THE SEARCH FOR PEACE AND FOR
EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF THE ARMS RACE.

I WILL SEEK TO IMPLEMENT THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY -- WHICH
SHOULD BE PROMPTLY RATIFIED NOW.

3
I WILL SEEK AGREEMENT WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE MISSILES -- AN END TO NUCLEAR TESTING UNDER ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS -- THE CONTROL OF CHEMICAL, RADIOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS -- AND A HALT TO REGIONAL ARMS RACES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND ELSEWHERE. THERE CAN BE AN END TO THESE DEADLY ARMS RACES AND THEY CAN COME NOW.

Too sudden nixon

MR. NIXON DOES NOT SHARE MY COMMITMENT TO CONTROL THE ARMS RACE. HE WANTS TO POSTPONE SENATE ACTION ON THE TREATY PROHIBITING THE SPREAD OF UNNUCLEAR WEAPONS. THIS POSITION NOT ONLY JEOPARDIZES THE PEACE OF THE WORLD -- BUT IT ENCOURAGES NATIONS TO POUR TENS OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS INTO THE ARMS RACE -- DOLLARS THAT BRING NO MORE SECURITY, AND PUT US AGAIN ON THAT SLIPPERY SLOPE TO NUCLEAR WAR -- DOLLARS URGENTLY NEEDED FOR THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT -- HERE IN AMERICA AND ABROAD.

Choice

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR. WE CAN HAVE A PRESIDENT WHO EQUIVOCATES ON THESE MATTERS OF LIFE OR NUCLEAR DEATH, OR WE CAN HAVE A PRESIDENT WHO WILL ACT TO TURN BACK THE ARMS RACE AND SAVE MANKIND FROM SELF-DESTRUCTION. I SAY WE NEED A MAN WHO UNDERSTANDS BOTH THE PROSPECTS OF SUCCESS IN THIS AREA -- AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE.

Mr. Nixon, the unequal man, who lives in the shadows, who delays, who postpones, who will not

NEW CONDITIONS TODAY ALSO REQUIRE NEW INSTITUTIONS. MORE AND MORE, WE WILL PURSUE OUR NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE THROUGH MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS, ESPECIALLY THE UNITED NATIONS. I PLEDGE TO YOU -- HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO, WHERE THE UNITED NATIONS WAS BORN SOME 23 YEARS AGO -- THAT ONE OF THE HIGH PRIORITIES OF MY PRESIDENCY WILL BE TO STRENGTHEN THE PEACEKEEPING AND PEACE-MAKING CAPACITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~
THIS IS OUR THIRD STEP TOWARD A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE : TO MAKE THE UN THE INSTRUMENT FOR CONTROLLING CONFLICT IT HAS SO FAR FAILED TO BE.

THE UNITED STATES CANNOT PLAY THE ROLE OF GLOBAL GENDARME. THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DON'T WANT IT, AND THE REST OF THE WORLD WON'T ACCEPT IT. WE KNOW BETTER TODAY THAN YESTERDAY THAT "THE ILLUSION OF AMERICAN OMNIPOTENCE" -- IN EW. BROGHAN'S PHRASE, "CULINE" IS AN ILLUSION."

BUT THE ALTERNATIVE TO AMERICAN (CULINE) PEACEKEEPING CANNOT BE NO PEACEKEEPING. IT MUST BE PEACEKEEPING BY THE UNITED NATIONS OR BY REGIONAL AGENCIES.

THE BASIS OF ANY WORLD PEACEKEEPING SYSTEM MUST BE A COMMITMENT TO NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF OTHER COUNTRIES. BUT THIS POLICY WILL ONLY WORK IF IT IS RESPECTED BY ALL STATES, LARGE AND SMALL -- AND IF THERE IS AN EFFECTIVE INSTRUMENT IN THE UNITED NATIONS TO SERVE THE INTERESTS, NOT OF INDIVIDUAL NATIONS, BUT OF PEACE ITSELF.

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES I WILL MAKE CLEAR THAT AMERICAN POWER WILL NOT BE USED TO PREVENT ANY NATION FROM CHOOSING THE GOVERNMENT IT WANTS. AND I WILL INSIST THAT LEADERS OF OTHER GOVERNMENTS -- INCLUDING THE COMMUNIST STATES -- NOT TO USE THEIR POWER TO PREVENT NATIONS FROM CHOOSING THE GOVERNMENTS THEY WANT.

A POLICY OF MUTUAL NON-INTERFERENCE IS NOT JUST AN IDEAL -- IT IS THE ONLY WAY TO PRESERVE PEACE IN THIS WORLD. BUT IT WILL WORK ONLY IF THE PLEDGES OF NON-INTERFERENCE ARE BACKED UP BY UNITED NATIONS TROOPS WHICH CAN PATROL BORDERS, AND SUPERVISE FREE ELECTIONS.

Force

not instead of never

~~THE UN PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS HAVE BROUGHT PRACTICAL RESULTS IN CYPRUS, IN THE CONGO, AND IN KASHMIR. ~~THEY HAVE~~ COMMUNIST COUNTRIES NOW RECOGNIZE THE NEED TO CONTAIN LOCAL COMBUSTIBLES THAT MIGHT DRAW IN THE GREAT POWERS AND TRIGGER A NUCLEAR WAR.~~

omit

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WILL DO EVERYTHING IN MY POWER TO ~~PLACE~~ *train* INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING SOLDIERS IN TROUBLED AREAS, RATHER THAN (UNLINE) AMERICAN SOLDIERS. NOWHERE WOULD A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FORCE BE MORE WELCOME THAN IN VIETNAM. ~~THE UNITED STATES WILL ADMINISTER FREE ELECTIONS AND VERIFY THE WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN TROOPS.~~

BUT THE PEACEKEEPING CAPACITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS CAN BE ENHANCED ONLY IF ITS MEMBERS -- PARTICULARLY THOSE WHO HAVE NO RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PEACE AS GREAT POWERS -- WILL ~~EMERX~~ *earn* EARN AND TRAIN UNITS OF THEIR ARMED FORCES FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ASSIGNMENTS.

(Alternative insert)

TO AID IN THIS EFFORT, I PROPOSE

-- TO USE OUR MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO HELP LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES PREPARE UNITS OF THEIR ARMED FORCES FOR UN AND REGIONAL PEACEKEEPING ASSIGNMENTS;

-- TO LAUNCH A NEW EFFORT TO RESOLVE THE UNS FINANCIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS;

-- TO CALL FOR A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FUND, BEGINNING WITH 20 MILLION DOLLARS TO KEEP THE UN ~~KXXX~~ TO HELP THE UN TO LAUNCH EMERGENCY OPERATIONS WITHOUT DELAY. IF WE ~~AX~~ WANT PEACE WE AND ALL NATIONS ~~WILL~~ *are* PREPARED TO PAY FOR IT.

BUT THIS IS NOT ENOUGH -- UN PEACEMAKING (UNLINE) MUST GO HAND-IN-HAND WITH UN PEACEKEEPING (UNLINE). THE UNITED NATIONS NEEDS NOT JUST A FIRE DEPARTMENT, BUT A BETTER MEANS OF FIRE PREVENTION.

HERE IN THE UNITED STATES, WE HAVE LEARNED THE VALUE OF FACT-FINDERS AND MEDIATORS TO MOBILIZE OPINION BEHIND A REASONABLE SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES. I URGE THAT THE UNITED NATIONS ESTABLISH A PERMANENT PANEL OF HIGHLY-SKILLED FACTFINDERS AND MEDIATORS TO APPLY THEMSELVES TO DISPUTES THAT THREATEN WORLD PEACE.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD IN ESTABLISHING SUCH A SYSTEM. ~~I BELIEVE OUR COUNTRY SHOULD ACCEPT THE PROCESS OF FACTFINDING AND MEDIATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS OR OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES IN (UNLINE) ANY DISPUTE TO WHICH WE ARE A PARTY (UNLINE) ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD. WE WILL NOT BIND OURSELVES IN ADVANCE TO ACCEPT THE FINDINGS OF SUCH EFFORTS. WE CANNOT NEGLECT SUCH EFFORTS IN OUR SEARCH FOR PEACE. AS PRESIDENT, I WILL BEGIN THIS POLICY BY ASKING THE UNITED NATIONS TO HELP WITH THE SEARCH FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM.~~

Too much like Council Amendment

*Delicate
delicate - jk*

THE ENDING OF CONFLICT, THE MEDIATION OF CRISES WILL BE OF LITTLE USE IF WE DO NOT STRIKE AT THE CAUSES OF FUTURE CONFLICTS BEFORE THEY BEGIN.

THEREFORE, THE FOURTH ELEMENT IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE MUST BE A GLOBAL EFFORT AT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT -- WHAT POPE PAUL CALLED "THE NEW NAME FOR PEACE."

many of the newly emerging nations

I HAVE VISITED ~~THESE~~ *many of the newly emerging nations*. I HAVE TALKED TO THEIR LEADERS AND TO THEIR PEOPLE. I KNOW ~~THEIR~~ *THEIR* NEEDS AND DESIRES.

5 AS PRESIDENT KENNEDY ONCE SAID, "IF WE CANNOT HELP THE MANY WHO ARE POOR, WE CANNOT SAVE THE FEW WHO ARE RICH."

BUT TODAY THE TIME HAS COME FOR A NEW APPROACH TO WORLD DEVELOPMENT. WE HAVE LEARNED THAT NATIONAL BURDENS CAN BE LIFTED IF INTERNATIONAL BURDENS CAN BE SHARED. WE NEED NOT *Simply* A NEW LEVEL OF EFFORT, BUT A GREATER EMPHASIS ON MULTILATERAL COOPERATION.

THIS WILL BE A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF AID, WHERE WE HELP NATIONS FIND THEIR OWN WAY TO DEVELOPMENT -- WITHOUT FACING WHAT HENRI DUMERY CALLED "THE TEMPTATION TO DO GOOD" -- THE TEMPTATION TO INSIST NOT ONLY THAT VIRTUE BE DONE, BUT THAT OUR PARTICULAR VERSION OF VIRTUE BE IMPLEMENTED IN OUR PARTICULAR WAY.

THIS NEW APPROACH TO AID-GIVING WILL NOT RELIEVE US OF THE NEED TO PLAY OUR FULL PART IN PROVIDING HELP TO POORER COUNTRIES. INDEED, THE ACTION OF THE CONGRESS THIS YEAR IN MULTILATERAL THE FOREIGN AID BILL WAS IRRESPONSIBLE -- AND WILL ONLY MAKE IT MORE LIKELY THAT SOMEDAY PEOPLE WILL TRY TO DO BY WAR WHAT WE MAY NOW FAIL TO DO FOR PEACE. WE MUST RE-EVALUATE OUR PRIORITIES -- SO THAT A 70 BILLION DOLLAR DEFENSE BUDGET TO WORK FOR PEACE TODAY (CLINE) DOES NOT ECLIPSE THESE MODEST PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE THE PEACE FOR TOMORROW.

BUT WE ARE NOT ALONE. NEW EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE IN THE COMING YEARS TO ENLIST THE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON POVERTY. DEVELOPMENT SHOULD MEAN COOPERATION -- NOT

COMPETITION -- BECAUSE THE PEACE IT PROVIDES IS OUR COMMON INTEREST.

LET US BEGIN BY ENCOURAGING THE SOVIET UNION TO JOIN THE NEW BANK FOR DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA.

* * *

THE FIFTH ELEMENT IN THIS NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE SHOULD BE NEW EFFORTS TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING THROUGH THE USE OF EXCITING DEVELOPMENTS IN COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY -- INCLUDING THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE. THROUGH SATELLITES MAN CAN NOT ONLY TRANSMIT BETWEEN CENTRAL GROUND STATIONS -- AND CAN BE BROADCAST DIRECTLY TO VILLAGE AND HOME RADIO AND TV RECEIVERS.

I PROPOSE RECIPROCAL TV AND RADIO EXCHANGES WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, INCLUDING THE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE. LET US OFFER THE SOVIET LEADERS IN THE OPPORTUNITY TO TALK TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON TV IN RETURN FOR THE SAME PRIVILEGE FOR OUR LEADERS IN THE SOVIET UNION.

OTHER COUNTRIES MAY HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH THESE PROPOSALS BUT WE IN AMERICA HAVE AN OPEN SOCIETY. AND NOW WE CAN LEAD IN THE QUEST FOR AN OPEN WORLD.

THERE ARE FIVE ELEMENTS IN THIS NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE -- A STRATEGY THAT WILL BE THE WORK OF MANY YEARS. BUT IN THE LONG RUN IT IS THE ONLY VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR AMERICA BETWEEN ASSUMING TOO MUCH WORLD RESPONSIBILITY AND RETREATING INTO AN ISOLATION THAT CAN ONLY LEAD TO GREATER PROBLEMS ... AND AN END TO OUR HOPES FOR PEACE.

OUR LEADERSHIP IN THE WORLD AND THROUGHOUT THE WORLD LEADERS WHO OFFER THEM PROGRAMS FOR COOPERATION RATHER THAN CONFLICT.

THIS I ASK OF YOU TODAY: WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE ... WHICH POLITICAL PARTY, IS BEST EQUIPPED TO LEAD THE U.S. IN THE QUEST FOR PEACE?

6. WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE ... WHICH POLITICAL PARTY
IS BEST EQUIPPED TO AVOID FUTURE "VIETNAMS." ... TO TURN BACK
THE ARMS RACE -- TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING
MACHINERY -- TO ACCELERATE DEVELOPMENT AID -- THROUGH MULTI-
LATERAL AGENCIES -- AND TO MOVE HOLILY FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING?

OUR NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL SUCCEED ONLY IF IT CAN
INSPIRE A NEW GENERATION OF AMERICANS WHO RENEW THE NATION'S
POLITICAL PROCESS, WEAR OUR ARMED FORCES UNIFORMS, AND WHO
IN THE LONG RUN WILL DETERMINE THE SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF AMERICAN
POLICY AT HOME AND ABROAD.

AND OUR SEARCH FOR A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL
SUCCEED ONLY WHEN WE END A TRAGIC WAR -- A WAR WHICH HAS CONSUMED
OUR ENERGIES -- DIVIDED OUR PEOPLE -- AND LIMITED OUR VISION.

AS PRESIDENT MY FIRST PRIORITY WILL BE TO END THE ARMY WAR
IN VIETNAM.

AND IN PURSUING THAT GOAL, THE POLICIES OF TOMORROW NEED NOT
BE LIMITED BY THE POLICIES OF YESTERDAY.

I BELIEVE THAT WE CAN PURSUE A "NEW NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE"
AND SUCCEED. AS PRESIDENT KENNEDY STATED AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN
JUNE OF 1963:

"LET US EXAMINE OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD PEACE ITSELF. TOO MANY
OF US THINK IT IS IMPOSSIBLE. TOO MANY THINK IT UNREAL. BUT THAT IS
A DANGEROUS, DEFEATIST LIKE BELIEF. IT LEADS TO THE CONCLUSION
THAT WAR IS INEVITABLE, THAT MANKIND IS DOOMED, THAT WE ARE HELPED
BY FORCES WE CANNOT CONTROL.

"WE NEED NOT ACCEPT THAT VIEW. OUR PROBLEMS ARE MAN-MADE.
THEREFORE, THEY CAN BE SOLVED BY MEN. AND MAN CAN BE AS BIG AS
HE WANTS."

PRESIDENT KENNEDY WAS RIGHT. WE CAN HAVE PEACE. WE SHALL HAVE
PEACE. THAT IS MY PLEDGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN THIS
CAMPAIGN.

END OF TEXT.

PLS ACK. TAE

DEM FOR HHH DC
0000000000 OUT THERE
ACK

OUR NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL BE
LEAMINGTON MPE

DEM FOR HHH DC

H

DEM FOR HHH DC

ATTENTION: TED VAN DYK

FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF THE VP'S REMARKS BEFORE THE
COMMONWEALTH CLUB, SAN FRANCISCO: "A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE"

TODAY I WANT TO TALK ABOUT PEACE -- ABOUT OUR ROLE IN ACHIEVING
(ULINE) PEACE, IN MAINTAINING (ULINE) IT.

DURING THE NEXT DECADE, WE AMERICANS WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE MAJOR
RESPONSIBILITY FOR PRESERVING WORLD PEACE. BUT HOW WE FULFILL (ULINE)
THAT RESPONSIBILITY WILL CHANGE.

TODAY WE FACE NEW CONDITIONS:

--THE COLD WAR BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION
IS WANING -- THOUGH THE TRAGIC EVENTS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA REMIND US
THAT IT IS NOT OVER.

P --THE COMMUNIST COUNTRIES NO LONGER POSE A MONOLITHIC THREAT.

--THERE IS A NEED AND A NEW OPPORTUNITY TO ACCELERATE OUR EFFORTS
TOWARD CONTROL OF THE ARMS RACE.

--NEW NATIONS ARE MOVING INTO A PERIOD WHEN THEY LOOK TOWARD
SELF-DEVELOPMENT.

--WESTERN EUROPE AND JAPAN CAN STAND ON THEIR OWN TWO FEET, AND
THEY WANT TO DO JUST THAT.

--AND A NEW GENERATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER INDUSTRIAL
COUNTRIES REJECTS THE OLD PREMISES OF WAR AND DIPLOMACY. THEY WANT
TO SEE MORE EMPHASIS PLACED ON HUMAN AND PERSONAL VALUES -- HAVING
ENOUGH TO EAT ... BEING ABLE TO LEARN ... LIVING FREE OF FEAR. AND
IT IS FOR OUR GENERATION TO HELP THEM REALIZE THEIR HOPES -- OF A
WORLD FREE FROM THE TYRANNY OF WAR.

OUR WORLD ROLE IN THE NEXT DECADE WILL BE DIFFERENT FROM THAT IN
THE LAST. THERE ARE (ULINE) PRESSING PROBLEMS AT HOME, WHICH PLACE
SOME LIMITS ON WHAT WE CAN DO ABROAD.

REVIVAL OF STRENGTH IN THE OTHER FREE COUNTRIES DOES (ULINE)
ENABLE THEM TO ASSUME GREATER BURDENS.

✓ EXPERIENCE OF RECENT YEARS DOES (ULINE) SUGGEST AREAS IN WHICH
OUR ~~NEW STRATEGY~~ FOREIGN POLICY COULD BE IMPROVED.

I WELCOME THIS PERIOD OF DEBATE AND REVIEW -- THIS OPPORTUNITY
TO JOIN IN THE SCRUTINY OF POLICY -- THIS OPPORTUNITY TO DEFINE A
"NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE."

✓ FUNDAMENTAL TO THIS STRATEGY IS THE REJECTION OF THOSE PROPOSALS
WHICH RELY EXCLUSIVELY ON AMERICAN POWER AS THE GUARANTOR OF
SECURITY. SECURITY IN AREAS OF THE DEVELOPING WORLD WHERE WE NOW
ARE NOT INVOLVED. OTHER COUNTRIES IN ASIA AND AFRICA MUST ASSUME
GREATER RESPONSIBILITY FOR SHAPING THEIR FUTURE.

①

SAN FRANCISCO

COMMONWEALTH III

Sept. 26, 1968
Thurs

DEM FOR HHH DC

910-490-2614 CLG COLLECT ON CONF OF THREE STAS
IS IT OK @
DEM FOR HHH DC

910-490-2614 CLG COLLECT ON CONF OF THREE STAS
HOLD LINE PLS P
RY XXX
RDY WITH CONF UNATTENDED STAS
710-- XXX
710-822-9210 DEM FOR HHH DC
710-822-1916 HHH CITIZENS FC
GA PLS TU

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
COMMONWEALTH CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
SEPTEMBER 26, 1968

FOR RELEASE: THURDDXXX THURSDAY PM'S

"A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE" (ALL ULINED)

TODAY I WANT TO TALK ABOUT PEACE -- ABOUT OUR ROLE IN ACHIEVING PEACE
AND IN MAINTAINING IT.

DURINGTHXXX

DURING THE NEXT DECADE, WE AMERCXXX AMERICANS WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE
MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR PRESERVING WORLD PEACE. BUT HOW WE FULFILL
THAT RESPONSIBILITY WILL CHANGE.

TODAY WE FACE NEW CONDITIONS:

- THE COLD WAR ERA IS WANING -- THOUGH THE TRAGIC EVENTS IN
CZECHOSLOVAKIA REMIND US THAT IT IS NOT OVER. IT IS GIVING WAY ITS
CENTRAL ROLE ON THE WORLD STAGE TO A GLOBAL MOVEMENT TOWARD INDIVIDUAL
FREEDOM AND HUMAN EMANICIPATION.
- THE COMMUNIST COUNTRIES NO OXXX LONGER POSE A MONOLITHIC THREAT.
- THERE IS A NEED AND A NEW CHANCE TO ACCELERATE OUR EFFORTS TOWARD
CONTROL OF THE ARMS RACE.

- ②
- NEW NATIONS ARE MOVING INTO A PERIOD WHEN THEY LOOK TOWARD SELF-DEVELOPMENT AND LESS TOWARD IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT.
 - WESTERN EUROPE AND JAPAN ARE ABLE TO STAND ON THEIR OWN TWO FEET, AND WANT TO DO UXXX JUBXXX JUST THAT.
 - AND A NEW GENERATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES REJECTS THE OLD PREMISES OF WAR AND DIPLOMACY. THEY WANT TO SEE MORE EMPHASIS PLACED ON HUMAN AND PERSONAL VALUES -- HAVING ENOUGHXXX EOXXX ENOUGH TO EAT...BEING ABLE TO LEARN...LIVING FREE FXXX OF FEAR. AND IT IS FOR OUR GENERATION TO HELP THEM REALIZE THEIR HOPES -- OF A WORLD FREE FROM THE TYRANNIES OF WAR AND OPPRESSION.

* * *

OUR WORLD ROLE IN THE NEXT TEN YEARS WILL BE DIFFERENT FROM THAT IN THE LAST.

THERE ARE PRESSING PROBLEMS AT HOME, WHICH CAUSE US TO PLACE CAREFUL PRIORITIES ON THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES ABROAD.

REVIVAL OF STRENGTH IN OTHER FREE COUNTRIES DOES ENABLE TEXXX THEM TO ASSUME GREATER BURDENS.

EXPERIENCE OF RECENT YEARS DOES SUGGEST AREAS IN WHICH OUR FOREIGN POLICY -MAKING COULD BE IMPROVED.

I WELCOME THIS PERIOD OF DEBATE AND REVIEW...THIS OPPORTUNITY TO JOIN IN THE SCRUTINY OF POLICY...THIS OPPORTUNITY TO DEFINE A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE. (CAPITALIZE NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE)

FUNDAMENTAL TO THIS STRATEGY IS THE REJECTION OF THOSE PROPOSALS WHICH RELY ESXXX EXCLUSIVELY ON AMERICAN POWER AS THE GUARANTOR OF SECURITY IN AREAS OF THE DEVELOPING WORLD WHERE WE ARE NOW INVOLVED.

SOUTHEAST ASIA IS A GOOD EXAMPLE.

OUR NATION HAS BEEN DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM.

AND, AS A RESULT OF THAT CONCERN, THERE IS A TEMPTATION TO PULL BACK AND WITHDRAW FROM FURTHER RESPONSIBILITY OUTSIDE THE AMXXX FAMILIAR ATLANTIC WORLD.

BUT THE LESSON OF VIETNAM IS NOT THAT WE SHOULD TURN OUR BACKS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA -- OR ON OTHER NATIONS OR PEOPLES IN LESS FAMILIAR PARTS OF THE ROXXX WORLD NEIGHBORHOOD.

THE LESSON IS, RATHER, THAT WE HXXX SHOULD MOST CAREFULLY ASSESS OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS...CAREFULLY DEFINE OUR GOALS AND PRIORITIES...ANSXXX AND WITHIN THOSE INTERESTS AND PRIORITIES, THAT WE SHOULD FORMULATE POLICIES WHICH WILL FIT NEW AMERICAN GUIDELINES.

IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, FOR INSTANCE, I BELIEVE WE SHOULD FOLLOW THREE BASIC FUTURE GUIDELINES:

SELF:XXX

SELF-HELP;

REGIONAL AND MULTILATERAL RESPONSIBILITY;
SELECTIVE AMERICAN ASSISTANCE.

THE SELF-HELP PRINCIPLE SHOULD APPLY BOTH TO NATIONAL SECURITY AND TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

③
REGIONAL AND MULTI-LATERAL RESPONSIBILITY WILL BE THE ONLY WAY IN WHICH SMALL AND MEDIUM SIXXXX SIZED NATIONS -- PARTICULARLY THOSE LIVING NEAR THE BORDERS OF THE GREAT POWERS :- WILL BE ABLE TO GAIN THE COLLECTIVE STRENGTH NECESSARY BOTH TO WITHSTAND THE PRESSURE OF INTERNAL SUBVERSION AND INDIRECT AGGRESSION, AND TO MUSTER THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESOURCES WHICH NONE HAVE WITHIN THEIR OWN LIMITED MEANS.

NOT ONLY SHOULD WE CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE REGIONAL COOPERATION -- SUCH AS WWXX WE SEE IN THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, THE ASIAN AND AFRICAN EXXX DEVELOPMENT BANKS AND REGIONAL SEECURITY ORGANIZATION BUT WE SHOULD ALSO AVOID, WHERE POSEBXXX POSSIBLE, UNILATERAL INVOLVEMENT EITHER MILITARILY OR ECONOMINXXX ECONOMICALLY, WHERE MULTILATERAL MEANS ARE AVAILABLE.

SELECTIVE U.S. ASSISTANCE WILL BE A NECESSITY AS WE CAREFULLY MEASURE JUST WHAT IS, AND IS NOT, IN OUR NATIONAL INTEREST.

THE ERA IS CERTAINLY PAST WHEN WE ALONE WERE THE ONLY RELIABEXXX RELIABLE SOURCES OF ASSISTNXXX ASSISTANCE TO NATIONS UNDER PRESSURE FROM AGGRESSION AND FROM POVERTY.

THE TASK NOW IS NOT TO MARCH ALONE, BUT TO MARCH INNSUCH A WAY THAT OTHERS WILL WISH TO JOIN US IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE, BRAXXX BROADLY BASED AND SHARED BY MANY NATIONS.

* * *

THERE WILL BE NO PEACE FOR ANY AMERICAN -- OR ANY OTHER PERSON ON THIS EARTH -- UNTIL NATIONS STOP THE PILING UP OF EXXX WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION, AND THE SPREADING OF THESE WEAPONS AROUND THE WORLD.

WE MUST HALT THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR TERROR BEFORE IT HALTS HUMANITY.

I HAVE DEVOTED MUCH OF MY LIFE TO THESE ENDDS -- AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE DISARMAMENT SUBCOMMITTEE;

...AS SPONSOR OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY;

...AND AS PRINCIPAL SENATE SUPPORTER OF THE TEST BAN TREATY.

AS VICE PRESIDENT, I TRAVELLED LAST YEAR TO GENEVA AND TO OTHER EUROPEAN CAPIXXX CAPITALS TO ENCOURAGE THE SIGNING OF THE OXXX NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY.

ONE MIN. PLS.

DDPP

RDY WITH CONF GA PLS TU

GILL VXX BEGIN PARA AGAIN.

AS PRESIDENT, I WILL BE DEDICATED TO EFFECTIE CONTROL OF THEE ARMS RACE.

I WILL SEEK TO IMPLEMENT THE NON-PROFXXX PROLIFERATION TREATY :: WHICH SHOULD BE PROMPTLY RATIFIED NOW.

I WILL SEEK AN AGREEMENT WITH THE SOVEXXX SOVIET UNION ON OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE MILLXXX MISSILES...AN END TO NUCLEAR TESTING UNDER ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS :: THE CONTROL OF CHEMICAL, RADIOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICL WEAPONS...AND A WXXX HALF TO REGIONAL ARMS RACES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND ELSEWHERE.

THERE CAN BE AN END TO THESE DEADLY ARMS RACES AND I MEAN TO EXERT THE LEADERSHIP OF THISNATION TO BRING THAT ABOUT.

4 MR. NIXON DOES NOT SHARE MY COMMITMENT TO CONTROL THE ARMS RACE.

HE WANTS TO POSTPONE SENATE ACTION ON THE TREATY PROHIBITING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

THIS POSITION NOT ONLY JEOPARDIZES THE PEACE OF THE WORLD -- BUT IT CXXX ENCOURAGES NATIONS TO POUR TENS OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS INTO THE ARMS RACE...DOLLARS THAT BRING NO MORE SECURITY, AND PUT US AGAIN ON THE SLIPPERY DXXX SLOPE TO NUCLEAR WAR ...DOLLARS URGENTLY NEEDED FOR THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, HERE IN AMERICA AND ABROAD.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR. WE CAN HAVE A PRESIDENT WHO EQUIVOCATES ON THESE MATTERS OF LIFE OR NUCLEAR DEATH.

OR WE CAN HAVE A PRESIDENT WHO WILL ACT TO TURN BACK THE ARMS RACE AND SAVE MANKIND FROM SELF-SXXX DESTRUCTION.

I SAY WE NEED A MAN WHO UNDERSTANDS BOTH THE PROSPECTS OF SUCCESS IN THIS AREA -- AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF AXXX FAILURE.

* * * *

NEW CONDITIONS ALSO REQUIRE THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTITUTIONS FOR EXXX PEACE. I PLEDGE TO YOU -- HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO, WHERE THE UNITED NATIONS WAS BORN SOME 23 YEARS AGO -- THAT ONE OF THE HIGH PRIORITIES OF MY PRESIDENCY WILL BE TO STRENGTHXXX STRENGTHEN THE PEACEKEEPING AND PEACEMAKING CPXXX CAPACITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

THIS IS OUR THIRD STEP TOWARD A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE: TO MAKE THE U.N. THE INSTRUMENT FOR CONTROLLING CONFLICT IT HAS SO FAR FAILED TO BE.

THE UNITED STATES CANNOT PLAY THE ROLE OF FLXXX GLOBAL GENDARME. THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DON'T WANT IT, AND THE REST OF THE WORLD WON'T ACCEPT IT. WE KNOW BETTER TODAY THAN YESTERDAY THAT "THE ILLUSION OF AMERICAN OMNIPOTENCE -- IBZD.W. BROGAN'S PHRASE, "IS AN ILLUSION."

BUT THE ALTERNATIVE TO AMERICAN PEACEKEEPING COXXX CANNOT BE ON PEACEKEEPING. IT MUST BE PEACEKEEPING BY THE UNITED NATIONS OR BY REGIONAL AGENCIES.

THE BASICXXX BASIS OF ANY WORLD PEACEFXXX PEACEKEEPING SYSTEM MUST BE A COMMITMENT TO NON-PXXX INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF OTHER COUNTRIES. BUT THIS POLICY WILL ONLY WORK IF IT IS RESPECTED BY ALL STATES, LARGE AND SMALL -- AND IF THERE IS AN EFFECTIVE INSTRUMENT IN THE UNITED NATIONS TO SERVE THE INTERESTS, NOT OF INDIVIDUAL NATIONS, BUT OF PEACE ITSELF.

A POLICY OF MUTUAL NON-INTERFERENCE IS NOT JUST AN IDEAL -- IT IS THE ONLY WAY TO PRESERVE PEACE IN THIS WORLD. BUT IT WILL WORK ONLY IF THE PLEDGES OF NON-INTERFERENCE ARE BACKED UP BY UNITED NATIONS FORCES WHICH CAN PATROL BORDERS, AND SUPERVISE FREE ELECTIONS.

UN PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS HAVE BROUGHT PRACTICAL RESULTS IN CYPRUS, IN THE CONGO, AND IN KASHMIRE.

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WILL DO EVERYTHING IN MY POWER TO PLACE INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING SOLDIERS IN TROUBLED AREAS, RATHER THAN AMERICAN SLXXX SOLDIERS. NOWHERE WOULD A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FORCE BE MORE WELCOME THAN IN VIETNAM TO ADMINISTER FREE ELECTIONS AND VERIFY THE WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN TROOPS.

BUT THE PEACEKEEPING CAPACITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS CAN BE ENLARGED ONLY IF ITS MEMBERS -- PARTICULARLY THOSE WHO HAVE NO RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PEACE AS GREAT POWERS -- WILL EARMARK AND TRAIN UNITS OF THEIR ARMED FORCES FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ASSIGNMENTS.

5
TO AID IN THIS EFFORT, I PROPOSE:

--TO USE OUR MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO HELP LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES PREPARE UNIS XXX UNITS OF THEIR ARMED FORCES FOR UN AND REGIONAL PEACEKEEPING ASSIGNMENTS;

--TO LAUNCH A NEW EFFORT TO RESOLVE THE U.N.'S FINANCIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS;

--TO CALL FOR A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FUND, BEGINNING WITH 20 MILLION DOLLARS TO HELP THE UN TO LAUNCH EMERGENCY OPERATIONS WITHOUT DELAY. IF WE WANT PEACE -- WE, AND ALL NATIONS -- MUST BE PREAXXX PREPARED TO PAY FOR IT.

ONE OF MY FISXXX FIRST STEPS AS YOUR NEXT PRESIDENT WILL BE TO CALL A NEW SAN RXXX FRANCISCO CONFERENCE TO REDEDICATE THE UNITED NATIONS ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY, AND TO SEEK NEW WAYS TXXX OF MAKING IT WORK FOR PEACE -- ESPECIALLY IN THE AREA OF INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING.

ugh I WILL APPOINT, EARLY IN 1969, A COMMISSION OXXX FOR PEACE TO BE COM PSED XXX COMPOSED OF LEADING AMERICAN ITXXX CITIZENS WHO WILL HAVE A MANDATE FROM ME, AS YOUR PRESIDENT, TO DEVELOP SPECIFIC PROPOSALS FOR THE NEW SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE AND TO WORK WITH SIMILAR COMMISSIONS FROM OTHER MEMBER NATIONS TO PLAN FOR THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE IN APRIL 1970.

UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING MUST GO HAND IN HAND WITH UNITED STATES PEACEFXXX PEACEKEEPING.. THE UNITED NATIONS NEEDS NOT JUST A FIRE DEPARTMENT, BUT A BETTER MEANS OF FIRE PREVENTION.

HERE IN THE UNITED STATES, WE HAVE LEARNED THE VLXXX VALUE OF FACT-FINDERS AND MEDIATORS TO BXXX MOBILIZE OPINION BEHIND A REASONABLE SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES. I URGE THAT THE UNITED NATIONS ESTABLISH A PERMANENT PANEL OF HIGHLY-SKILLED FACTFINDERS AND MEDIATORS TO APPLY THEMSELVES TO DISPUTES THAT THREATEN WORLD PEACE..

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD IN ESTABLISHING SUCH A SYSTEM.

THE ENDING OF CONFLICT, THE MEDIATION OF CRISES WILL BE OF LITTLE USE IF WE OXXX DO NOT STRIKE AT THE CAUSE SSXXX CAUSES OF FUTURE CONFLICTS BEFORE THEY BEGIN.

THEREFORE, THE FOURTHXXX FOURTH ELEMENT IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE MUST BE A GLOBAL EFFORT AT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT-- WHAT POPE PAUL CALLED "THE NEW NAME FOR PEACE."

I HAVE VISITED MANY OF THE NEW NATIONS . I HAVE TALKED TO THEIR LEADERS AND TO TEXXX THEIR PEOPLE. I KNOW THEIR NEEDS AND DESIRES.

AS PRESIDENT KENNEDY ONCE SAID: "IF WE CANNOT HELP THE MANY WHO AREPXXX ARE POOR, WE CANNOT SAVE THE FEW WHO ARE RICH."

BUT TODAY THE TIME HAS COME FOR A NEW APPROACH TO WORLD DEVELOPMENT. WE HAVE LEARNED THAT NATIONLXXX ANXXX NATIONAL BURDENS CAN BE LIFTED -- IF INTERNATIONAL BURDENS CAN BE SHARED. WE NEED NOT MERELY A NEW LEVEL OF EFFORT, BUT A GREATER EMPHASIS ON MULTILATERAL COOPERAYXXX COOPERATION.

6 THIS WILL BE A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF AID, WHERE WE HELP NATIONS TO DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT FACING WHAT HAS BEEN CALLED "THE TEMPTATION TO DO GOOD" -- THE TEMPTATION TO INSIST NOT ONLY THAT VIRTUE TO BE DONE, BUT THAT OUR PARTICULAR VERSION OF VIRTUE BE IMPLEMENTED IN OUR PARTICULAR WAY.

THIS NEW APPROACH TO AID-GIVING WILL NOT RELIEVE US OF THE NEED TO PLAY OUR FULL PART IN PROVIDING HELP TO POORER COUNTRIES. INDEED, THE ACTION OF THE CONGRESS THIS YEAR IN MUTILATING THE FOREIGN AID BILL WAS IRRESPONSIBLE -- AND WILL ONLY MAKE IT MORE LIKELY THAT SOMEDAY PEOPLE WILL TRY TO DO BY WAR WHAT WE NOW FAIL TO DO FOR PEACE. WE MUST RE-EVALUATE OUR PRIORITIES -- SO THAT A 70 BILLION DOLLAR DEFENSE BUDGET TO WORK FOR PEACE TODAY DOES NOT ECLIPSE THESE MODEST PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE THE PEACE FOR TOMORROW.

BUT WE ARE NOT ALONE. NEW EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE IN THE COMING YEARS TO ENLIST THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON POVERTY. DEVELOPMENT SHOULD MEAN COOPERATION -- NOT COMPETITION -- BECAUSE THE PEACE IT PROVIDES IS IN OUR COMMON INTEREST.

* * * *

THE FIFTH ELEMENT IN THIS NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE SHOULD BE NEW EFFORTS TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING THROUGH THE USE OF EXCITING DEVELOPMENTS IN COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY -- INCLUDING THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE. THROUGH SATELLITES, MAN CANNOT ONLY TRANSMIT BETWEEN CENTRAL GROUND STATIONS -- AND CAN BE BROADCAST DIRECTLY TO VILLAGE AND HOME RADIO AND TV RECEIVERS.

He I PROPOSE RECIPROCAL TV AND RADIO EXCHANGES WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, INCLUDING THE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE. LET US OFFER THE SOVIET LEADERS THE OPPORTUNITY TO TALK TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON TV IN RETURN FOR THE SAME PRIVILEGE FOR OUR LEADERS IN THE SOVIET UNION.

OTHER COUNTRIES MAY HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH THESE PROPOSALS, BUT WE IN AMERICA HAVE AN OPEN SOCIETY. AND NOW WE CAN LEAD IN THE QUEST FOR A OPEN WORLD.

THERE ARE FIVE ELEMENTS IN THIS NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE -- A STRATEGY THAT WILL BE THE WORK OF MANY YEARS. BUT IN THE LONG RUN, IT IS THE ONLY VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR AMERICA BETWEEN ASSUMING TOO MUCH WORLD RESPONSIBILITY AND RETREATING INTO AN ISOLATION THAT CAN ONLY LEAD TO GREATER PROBLEMS...AND AN END TO OUR HOPES FOR PEACE.

ORDINARY PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY AND THROUGHOUT THE WORLD ARE TURNING TO LEADERS WHO OFFER THEM PROGRAMS FOR COOPERATION RATHER THAN CONFLICT.

THIS I ASK OF YOU TODAY: WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE...WHICH POLITICAL PARTY, IS BEST EQUIPPED TO LEAD THE U.S. IN THE QUEST FOR PEACE?

7
WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CIXXX CANDIDATE...WHICH POLITICAL PARTY IS BEST
EQUIPPED TO AVOID FUTURE "VIETNAMS,"...TO RSXXX TURN BACK THE ARMS
RACE...TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATOXXX INTERNATNOXXX INTERNATIONAL PEACE-
KEEPING MACHINERY...TO ACCELERATE DEVELOPMENT AID...THROUGH MULTI:
LATERAL AGENCIES...AND TO MOVE BOLDLY FOR WORLD UNDERSTAINXXX
UNDERSTANDING?

* * * *

OUR NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL SUCCEED ONLY IF IT CAN INSPIRE A
NEW GENERATION OF AMERICANS WHO ARE NEW TO THE NATION'S POLITICAL
PROCESS, WEAR OUR ARMED FORCES UNIFORMS, AND WHO IN THE LONG RUN
WILL DETERMINE THS SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF AMERICAN POLICY AT HOME AND
ABROAD.

AND OUR SEARCH FOR A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL SUCCEED ONLY WHEN
WE FIND A XXX SN HONOXXX ANNHXXX AN HONORABLE END TO A TRAGIC WAR.

AS PRESIDENT, MY FIRST PRIORITY WILL BE TO END THE AXXX WAR IN
VIETNAM.

AND IN PURSUING THAT GOALKKXX GOAL, AS I HAVE SIAD BEFORE, THE
POLICIES OF TOMORROW WILL NOT BE LMXXX LIMITED BY THE POLICIES OF
YESTERDAY.

U

I BELIEVE THAT WE CAN PURSUE A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACEEAND SUCCEED.

AS PRESIDENT KENNEDY STATED AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN JUNE OF 1963:

"LET US EEXAMINE OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD PEACE ITSELF. TOO MANY OF US
THINK IT IS IMPOSSIBLE. TOO MANY THINK IT UNREAL. BUT THAT IS A
DANGEROUS, DEFEATIST BELIEF. IT LEADS TO THE CONCLUSION THAT WAR IS
INEVITABLE, THAT MANKIND IS DOOMED, AND THAT WE ARE RIPPED BY FORCES
WE CANNOT CONTROL.

"WE NEED NOT ACCEPT THAT VIEW. OUR PROBLEMS ARE MAN-MADE; THEREFORE,
THEY CAN BE SOLVED BY MEN. AND MAN CAN BE AS GCXX BIG AS HE WANTS."

PRESIDENT KENNEDY WAS RIGHT. WE CAN HAVE PEACE. WE SHALL HAVE PEACE.
THAT ISMXXX IS MY PLEDGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN THIS CAMPAIGN.

#

THE END.

SAN FRANCISCO

COMMONWEALTH III

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
COMMONWEALTH CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
SEPTEMBER 26, 1968

FOR RELEASE: THURSDAY PM'S

"A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE" (ALL UPPERCASE)

TODAY I WANT TO TALK ABOUT PEACE -- ABOUT OUR ROLE IN ACHIEVING PEACE
AND IN MAINTAINING IT.

DURING THE NEXT DECADE,

WE AMERICANS WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE
MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR PRESERVING WORLD PEACE. BUT NOW WE FULFILL
THAT RESPONSIBILITY WILL CHANGE.

TODAY WE FACE NEW CONDITIONS:

- THE COLD WAR ERA IS WANING -- THOUGH THE TRAGIC EVENTS IN
CZECHOSLOVAKIA REMIND US THAT IT IS NOT OVER. IT IS GIVING WAY ITS
CENTRAL ROLE ON THE WORLD STAGE TO A GLOBAL MOVEMENT TOWARD INDIVIDUAL
FREEDOM AND HUMAN EMANCIPATION.
- THE COMMUNIST COUNTRIES NO LONGER POSE A MONOLITHIC THREAT.
- THERE IS A NEED AND A NEW CHANCE TO ACCELERATE OUR EFFORTS TOWARD
CONTROL OF THE ARMS RACE.
- NEW NATIONS ARE MOVING INTO A PERIOD WHEN THEY LOOK TOWARD SELF-
DEVELOPMENT AND LESS TOWARD IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT.
- WESTERN EUROPE AND JAPAN ARE ABLE TO STAND ON THEIR OWN TWO FEET,
AND WANT TO DO JUST THAT.
- AND A NEW GENERATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER INDUSTRIAL
COUNTRIES REJECTS THE OLD PREMISES OF WAR AND DIPLOMACY. THEY WANT
TO SEE MORE EMPHASIS PLACED ON HUMAN AND PERSONAL VALUES -- HAVING
ENOUGH TO EAT...BEING ABLE TO LEARN...LIVING FREE
OF FEAR. AND IT IS FOR OUR GENERATION TO HELP THEM REALIZE
THEIR HOPES -- OF A WORLD FREE FROM THE TYRANNIES OF WAR AND
OPPRESSION.

OUR WORLD ROLE IN THE NEXT TEN YEARS WILL BE DIFFERENT FROM THAT IN THE LAST.

THERE ARE PRESSING PROBLEMS AT HOME, WHICH CAUSE US TO PLACE CAREFUL PRIORITIES ON THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES ABROAD.

REVIVAL OF STRENGTH IN OTHER FREE COUNTRIES DOES ENABLE THEM TO ASSUME GREATER BURDENS.

EXPERIENCE OF RECENT YEARS DOES SUGGEST AREAS IN WHICH OUR FOREIGN POLICY -MAKING COULD BE IMPROVED.

I WELCOME THIS PERIOD OF DEBATE AND REVIEW...THIS OPPORTUNITY TO JOIN IN THE SCRUTINY OF POLICY...THIS OPPORTUNITY TO DEFINE A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE. (CAPITALIZED NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE)

FUNDAMENTAL TO THIS STRATEGY IS THE REJECTION OF THOSE PROPOSALS WHICH RELY EXCLUSIVELY ON AMERICAN POWER AS THE GUARANTOR OF SECURITY IN AREAS OF THE DEVELOPING WORLD WHERE WE ARE NOW INVOLVED.

SOUTHEAST ASIA IS A GOOD EXAMPLE.

OUR NATION HAS BEEN DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM.

AND, AS A RESULT OF THAT CONCERN, THERE IS A TEMPTATION TO PULL BACK AND WITHDRAW FROM FURTHER RESPONSIBILITY OUTSIDE THE AMERICAN FAMILIAR ATLANTIC WORLD.

BUT THE LESSON OF VIETNAM IS NOT THAT WE SHOULD TURN OUR BACKS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA -- OR ON OTHER NATIONS OR PEOPLES IN LESS FAMILIAR PARTS OF THE WORLD NEIGHBORHOOD.

THE LESSON IS, RATHER, THAT WE SHOULD MOST CAREFULLY ASSESS OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS...CAREFULLY DEFINE OUR GOALS AND PRIORITIES...ANSWER AND WITHIN THOSE INTERESTS AND PRIORITIES, THAT WE SHOULD FORMULATE POLICIES WHICH WILL FIT NEW AMERICAN GUIDELINES.

IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, FOR INSTANCES, I BELIEVE WE SHOULD FOLLOW THREE BASIC FUTURE GUIDELINES:

SELF-HELP

SELF-HELP:

- REGIONAL AND MULTILATERAL RESPONSIBILITY;
- SELECTIVE AMERICAN ASSISTANCE.

THE SELF-HELP PRINCIPLE SHOULD APPLY BOTH TO NATIONAL SECURITY AND TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

REGIONAL AND MULTI-LATERAL RESPONSIBILITY WILL BE THE ONLY WAY IN WHICH SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZED NATIONS -- PARTICULARLY THOSE LIVING NEAR THE BORDERS OF THE GREAT POWERS -- WILL BE ABLE TO GAIN THE COLLECTIVE STRENGTH NECESSARY BOTH TO WITHSTAND THE PRESSURE OF INTERNAL SUBVERSION AND INDIRECT AGGRESSION, AND TO MUSTER THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESOURCES WHICH NONE HAVE WITHIN THEIR OWN LIMITED MEANS.

NOT ONLY SHOULD WE CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE REGIONAL COOPERATION -- SUCH AS WWKXX WE SEE IN THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, THE ASIAN AND AFRICAN EKKX DEVELOPMENT BANKS AND REGIONAL SECURITY ORGANIZATION BUT WE SHOULD ALSO AVOID, WHERE POSSIBLE, UNILATERAL INVOLVEMENT EITHER MILITARILY OR ECONOMICALLY, WHERE MULTILATERAL MEANS ARE AVAILABLE.

SELECTIVE U.S. ASSISTANCE WILL BE A NECESSITY AS WE CAREFULLY MEASURE JUST WHAT IS, AND IS NOT, IN OUR NATIONAL INTEREST.

THE ERA IS CERTAINLY PAST WHEN WE ALONE WERE THE ONLY RELIABLE SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE TO NATIONS UNDER PRESSURE FROM AGGRESSION AND FROM POVERTY.

THE TASK NOW IS NOT TO MARCH ALONE, BUT TO MARCH IN SUCH A WAY THAT OTHERS WILL WISH TO JOIN US IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE, BROADLY BASED AND SHARED BY MANY NATIONS.

* * *

THERE WILL BE NO PEACE FOR ANY AMERICAN -- OR ANY OTHER PERSON ON THIS EARTH -- UNTIL NATIONS STOP THE PILING UP OF EKKX WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION, AND THE SPREADING OF THESE WEAPONS AROUND THE WORLD.

WE MUST HALT THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR TERROR BEFORE IT HALTS HUMANITY.

I HAVE DEVOTED MUCH OF MY LIFE TO THESE GOALS -- AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE DISARMAMENT SUBCOMMITTEE;

...AS SPONSOR OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY;

...AND AS PRINCIPAL SENATE SUPPORTER OF THE TEST BAN TREATY.

AS VICE PRESIDENT, I TRAVELLED LAST YEAR TO GENEVA AND TO OTHER EUROPEAN CAPITALS TO ENCOURAGE THE SIGNING OF THE OKKX NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY.

ONE MIN. PLS.

PRPP

RDY WITH CONF GA PLS TO

CALL VXX BEGIN PARA AGAIN.

AS PRESIDENT, I WILL BE DEDICATED TO EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF THE ARMS RACE.

I WILL SEEK TO IMPLEMENT THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY :: WHICH SHOULD BE PROMPTLY RATIFIED NOW.

I WILL SEEK AN AGREEMENT WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE MISSILES...AN END TO NUCLEAR TESTING UNDER ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS :: THE CONTROL OF CHEMICAL, RADIOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS...AND A HALT TO REGIONAL ARMS RACES IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND ELSEWHERE.

4
THERE CAN BE AN END TO THESE DEADLY ARMS RACES AND I MEAN TO EXERT
THE LEADERSHIP OF THIS NATION TO BRING THAT ABOUT.

MR. NIXON DOES NOT SHARE MY COMMITMENT TO CONTROL THE ARMS RACE.

HE WANTS TO POSTPONE SENATE ACTION ON THE TREATY PROHIBITING THE
SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

THIS POSITION NOT ONLY JEOPARDIZES THE PEACE OF THE WORLD -- BUT IT
ENCOURAGES NATIONS TO POUR TENS OF BILLIONS OF DOLLARS INTO
THE ARMS RACE...DOLLARS THAT BRING NO MORE SECURITY, AND PUT US AGAIN
ON THE SLIPPERY SLOPE TO NUCLEAR WAR ...DOLLARS URGENTLY NEEDED
FOR THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, HERE IN AMERICA AND ABOARD.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR. WE CAN HAVE A PRESIDENT WHO EQUIVOCATES ON
THESE MATTERS OF LIFE OR NUCLEAR DEATH.

OR WE CAN HAVE A PRESIDENT WHO WILL ACT TO TURN BACK THE ARMS RACE
AND SAVE MANKIND FROM SELF-DESTRUCTIVE DESTRUCTION.

I SAY WE NEED A MAN WHO UNDERSTANDS BOTH THE PROSPECTS OF SUCCESS
IN THIS AREA -- AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE.

* * * * *

NEW CONDITIONS ALSO REQUIRE THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTITUTIONS FOR
PEACE. I PLEDGE TO YOU -- HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO, WHERE THE
UNITED NATIONS WAS BORN SOME 23 YEARS AGO -- THAT ONE OF THE HIGH
PRIORITIES OF MY PRESIDENCY WILL BE TO STRENGTHEN THE
PEACEKEEPING AND PEACEMAKING CAPACITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

THIS IS OUR THIRD STEP TOWARD A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE: TO MAKE
THE U.N. THE INSTRUMENT FOR CONTROLLING CONFLICT IT HAS SO FAR FAILED
TO BE.

THE UNITED STATES CANNOT PLAY THE ROLE OF GLOBAL GENDARME. THE
AMERICAN PEOPLE DON'T WANT IT, AND THE REST OF THE WORLD WON'T
ACCEPT IT. WE KNOW BETTER TODAY THAN YESTERDAY THAT "THE ILLUSION
OF AMERICAN OMNIPOTENCE -- 1920.W. BROGAN'S PHRASE, "IS AN ILLUSION."

BUT THE ALTERNATIVE TO AMERICAN PEACEKEEPING CANNOT BE ON
PEACEKEEPING. IT MUST BE PEACEKEEPING BY THE UNITED NATIONS OR BY
REGIONAL AGENCIES.

THE BASIC BASIS OF ANY WORLD PEACEKEEPING SYSTEM MUST
BE A COMMITMENT TO NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF
OTHER COUNTRIES. BUT THIS POLICY WILL ONLY WORK IF IT IS RESPECTED
BY ALL STATES, LARGE AND SMALL -- AND IF THERE IS AN EFFECTIVE INSTRUMENT
IN THE UNITED NATIONS TO SERVE THE INTERESTS, NOT OF INDIVIDUAL
NATIONS, BUT OF PEACE ITSELF.

A POLICY OF MUTUAL NON-INTERFERENCE IS NOT JUST AN IDEAL -- IT IS
THE ONLY WAY TO PRESERVE PEACE IN THIS WORLD. -- BUT IT WILL WORK ONLY
IF THE PLEDGES OF NON-INTERFERENCE ARE BACKED UP BY UNITED NATIONS
FORCES WHICH CAN PATROL BORDERS, AND SUPERVISE FREE ELECTIONS.

5
ON PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS HAVE BROUGHT PRACTICAL RESULTS IN CYPRUS,
IN THE CONGO, AND IN KASHMIRE.

AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, I WILL DO EVERYTHING IN MY POWER
TO PLACE INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING SOLDIERS IN TROUBLED AREAS, RATHER
THAN AMERICAN SLEXX SOLDIERS. NOWHERE WOULD A UNITED NATIONS PEACE-
KEEPING FORCE BE MORE WELCOME THAN IN VIETNAM TO ADMINISTER FREE
ELECTIONS AND VERIFY THE WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN TROOPS.

BTXXX BUT THE PEACEKEEPING CAPACITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS CAN BE
ENLARGED ONLY IF ITS MEMBERS -- PRYXX PARTICULARLY THOSE HUXXX WHO
HAVE TTXXX NO RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PEACE AS GREAT POWERS -- WILL
 earmark and train units of their armed FORXX FORCES FOR INTERNATIONAL
KXX PEACEKEEPING ASSIGNEXXX ASSIGNMENTS.

TO AID IN THIS EFFORT, I PROPOSE:

- TO USE OUR MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO HELP LESS-DEVELOPED
COUNTRIES PREPARE UNIS EXX UNITS OF THEIR ARMED FORCES FOR UN
AND REGIONAL PEACEKEEPING ASSIGNMENTS;
- TO LAUNCH A NEW EFFORT TO RESOLVE THE U.N.'S FINANCIAL AND
CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS;
- TO CALL FOR A UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FUND, BEGINNING WITH 20
MILLION DOLLARS TO HELP THE UN TO LAUNCH EMERGENCY OPERATIONS WITHOUT
DELAY. IF WE WANT PEACE -- WE, AND ALL NATIONS -- MUST BE PREAXXX
PREPARED TO PAY FOR IT.

ONE OF MY FISKXX FIRST STEPS AS YOUR NEXT PRESIDENT WILL BE TO CALL
A NEW SAN RXXX FRANCISCO CONFERENCE TO REDEDICATE THE UNITED NATIONS
ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY, AND TO SEEK NEW WAYS TXXX OF MAKING IT WORK
FOR PEACE -- ESPECIALLY IN THE AREA OF INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING.

I WILL APPOINT, EARLY IN 1969, A COMMISSION OXXX FOR PEACE TO BE COM
PSED
XXY COMPOSED OF LEADING AMERICAN ITXX CITIZENS WHO WILL HAVE A MANDATE
FROM ME, AS YOUR PRESIDENT, TO DEVELOP SPECIFIC PROPOSALS FOR THE NEW
SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE AND TO WORK WITH SIMILAR COMMISSIONS FROM
OTHER MEMBER NATIONS TO PLAN FOR THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE IN
APRIL 1970.

6 UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING MUST GO HAND IN HAND WITH UNITED STATES
PEACEKXX PEACEKEEPING.. THE UNITED NATIONS NEEDS NOT JUST A FIRE
DEPARTMENT, BUT A BETTER MEANS OF FIRE PREVENTION.

HERE IN THE UNITED STATES, WE HAVE LEARNED THE VLXX VALUE OF FACT-
FINDERS AND MEDIATORS TO BXXX MOBILIZE OPINION BEHIND A REASONABLE
SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES. I URGE THAT THE UNITED NATIONS ESTABLISH
A PERMANENT PANEL OF HIGHLY-SKILLED FACTFINDERS AND MEDIATORS TO
APPLY THEMSELVES TO DISPUTES THAT THREATEN WORLD PEACE..

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD IN ESTABLISHING SUCH A SYSTEM.

THE ENDING OF CONFLICT, THE MEDIATION OF CRISES WILL BE OF LITTLE USE
IF WE OXXX DO NOT STRIKE AT THE CAUSE SXXX CAUSES OF FUTURE CONFLICTS
BEFORE THEY BEGIN.

THEREFORE, THE FOURTHXXX FOURTH ELEMENT IN A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE
MUST BE A GLOBAL EFFORT AT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT-- WHAT POPE PAUL
CALLED "THE NEW NAME FOR PEACE."

I HAVE VISITED MANY OF THE NEW NATIONS . I HAVE TALKED TO THEIR
LEADERS AND TO TEXXX THEIR PEOPLE. I KNOW THEIR NEEDS AND DESIRES.

AS PRESIDENT KENNEDY ONCE SAID: "IF WE CANNOT HELP THE MANY WHO
AREPXXX ARE POOR, WE CANNOT SAVE THE FEW WHO ARE RICH."

BUT TODAY THE TIME HAS COME FOR A NEW APPROACH TO WORLD DEVELOPMENT.
WE HAVE LEARNED THAT NATIONLXXX ANXXX NATIONAL BURDENS CAN BE LIFTED --
IF INTERNATIONAL BURDENS CAN BE SHARED. WE NEED NOT MERELY A NEW
LEVEL OF EFFORT, BUT A GREATER EMPHASIS ON MULTILATERAL COOPERAYXXX
COOPERATION.

THIS WILL BE A NEW PHILOSOPHY OFAXX OF AID, WHERE WE HELP NATIONS
TO DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT FACING WHAT HAS BEEN CALLED "THE TEMPTATION
TO DO GOOD" -- THE TEMPTATION TO INSIST OXXX NOT ONLY THAT VIRTUE
TOXXX BE DONE, BUT THAT OURPARTIUXXX OUR PARTICULAR VERSION OF VIRTUE
TXXX BE IMPLEMENTED IN OUR PARTICULAR WAY.

THISNEW APPROACH TO AID-GIVING WILL NOT RELIEVE US OF THE NEED TO
PLAY OUR FULL PART INPROVIDING HELP TO POORER COUNTRIES. INDEED,
THE ACTION OF THE CONGRESS TME XXX THIS YEAR IN MUTILATING THE FOREIGN
AID BILL WAS IRRESPONSIBLE -- AND WILL ONLY MAKE IT MORE LIKELY THAT
SOMEDAY PEOPLE WILXX WILL TRY TO DO BY WAR WHAT WE NOW FAIL TO DO FOR
PEACE. WE MUST RE-EVALUATE OURPXXX OUR PRIORITIES -- SO THAT A 70
BILLION DOLLAR DEFENSE BUDGET TO WORK FOR PEACE TODAY DOES NOT
ECLIPSE THESE MODEST PROGRAMS TO PROVEXXX PRODUVXXX PROVIDE THE
PEACE FOR TOMORROW.

BUT WE ARE NOT AOXXX ALONE. NEW EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE IN HE XXX THE
COMING YEARS TO EMXXX ENLIST THE SOVIETY UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE
IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON POVERTY. DEVELOPMENT SHOULD MEAN COOPERATION --
NOT COMPETITION -- BECAUSE THE PEACE IT PROVIDES IS IN OUR COMMON
INTEREST.

7
THE FIFTH ELEMENT IN THIS NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE SHOULD BE NEW EFFORTS TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING THROUGH THE USE OF EXCITING DEVELOPMENTS IN COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY -- INCLUDING THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE. THROUGH SATELLITES, MAN CANNOT ONLY TRANSMIT BETWEEN CENTRAL GROUND STATIONS -- AND CAN BE BROADCAST DIRECTLY TO VILLAGE AND HOME RADIO AND TV RECEIVERS.

I PROPOSE RECIPROCAL TV AND RADIO EXCHANGES WITH OTHER COUNTRIES, INCLUDING THE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE. LET US OFFER THE SOVIET LEADERS THE OPPORTUNITY TO TALK TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON TV IN RETURN FOR THE SAME PRIVILEGE FOR OUR LEADERS IN THE SOVIET UNION.

OTHER COUNTRIES MAY HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH THESE PROPOSALS, BUT WE IN AMERICA HAVE AN OPEN SOCIETY, AND NOW WE CAN LEAD IN THE QUEST FOR A OPEN WORLD.

THERE ARE FIVE ELEMENTS IN THIS NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE -- A STRATEGY THAT WILL BE THE WORK OF MANY YEARS. BUT IN THE LONG RUN, IT IS THE ONLY VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR AMERICA BETWEEN ASSUMING TOO MUCH WORLD RESPONSIBILITY AND RETREATING INTO AN ISOLATION THAT CAN ONLY LEAD TO GREATER PROBLEMS...AND AN END TO OUR HOPES FOR PEACE.

ORDINARY PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY AND THROUGHOUT THE WORLD ARE TURNING TO LEADERS WHO OFFER THEM PROGRAMS FOR COOPERATION RATHER THAN CONFLICT.

THIS I ASK OF YOU TODAY: WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE...WHICH POLITICAL PARTY, IS BEST EQUIPPED TO LEAD THE U.S. IN THE QUEST FOR PEACE?

WHICH PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE...WHICH POLITICAL PARTY IS BEST EQUIPPED TO AVOID FUTURE "VIETNAMS"...TO TURN BACK THE ARMS RACE...TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL PEACE-KEEPING MACHINERY...TO ACCELERATE DEVELOPMENT AID...THROUGH MULTILATERAL AGENCIES...AND TO MOVE BOLDLY FOR WORLD UNDERSTANDING?

OUR NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL SUCCEED ONLY IF IT CAN INSPIRE A NEW GENERATION OF AMERICANS WHO ARE NEW TO THE NATION'S POLITICAL PROCESS, WEAR OUR ARMED FORCES UNIFORMS, AND WHO IN THE LONG RUN WILL DETERMINE THE SUCCESS OR FAILURE OF AMERICAN POLICY AT HOME AND ABROAD.

AND OUR SEARCH FOR A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE WILL SUCCEED ONLY WHEN WE FIND A WAY TO AN HONORABLE END TO A TRAGIC WAR.

AS PRESIDENT, MY FIRST PRIORITY WILL BE TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM.

AND IN PURSUING THAT GOAL, AS I HAVE SAID BEFORE, THE POLICIES OF TOMORROW WILL NOT BE LIMITED BY THE POLICIES OF YESTERDAY.

U

I BELIEVE THAT WE CAN PURSUE A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE AND SUCCEED.

AS PRESIDENT KENNEDY STATED AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN JUNE OF 1963:

"LET US EXAMINE OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD PEACE ITSELF. TOO MANY OF US THINK IT IS IMPOSSIBLE. TOO MANY THINK IT UNREAL. BUT THAT IS A DANGEROUS, DEFEATIST BELIEF. IT LEADS TO THE CONCLUSION THAT WAR IS INEVITABLE, THAT MANKIND IS DOOMED, AND THAT WE ARE RIPPED BY FORCES WE CANNOT CONTROL.

"WE NEED NOT ACCEPT THAT VIEW. OUR PROBLEMS ARE MAN-MADE; THEREFORE, THEY CAN BE SOLVED BY MEN. AND MAN CAN BE AS BIG AS HE WANTS."

PRESIDENT KENNEDY WAS RIGHT. WE CAN HAVE PEACE. WE SHALL HAVE PEACE. THAT IS MY PLEDGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN THIS CAMPAIGN.



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