

NEWS FROM: DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
2600 Virginia Avenue
Washington, D. C.
Telephone: 202/333-8750

Release for Tuesday PMs
October 8, 1968

For Further Information:
Ev Munsey, Ext. 201
DC-585

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY PROPOSES
REGULAR SUMMIT MEETINGS

Washington, D. C., October 8 -- Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey today proposed annual meetings between the United States and the Soviet Union "at the highest level" as a step toward world peace.

Pointing out that both countries have a special responsibility because of the "awesome power" they share, he said that these regularly scheduled meetings could be the basis of a "new diplomacy, free of the publicity, free of the high expectations, that surround irregular summit meetings." He pledged, however, that such meetings would take place only after consultation with our Allies in Western Europe as outlined in the report of his Task Force on European Affairs issued last week.

In a wide ranging foreign policy speech delivered to the UPI Editors Luncheon, Humphrey reminded the Soviets that, as President, he would take the risk of stopping the bombing of North Vietnam. This would test the resolve of the Soviets who have said they want to "build a lasting peace in Vietnam," he said. Mr. Humphrey emphasized that once the bombing was stopped, the "major responsibility for seeing that Hanoi does not show bad faith" will be the Soviet Union's.

Stating that he had "no illusions" about dealing with the Russians, the Vice President said that "Soviet government and Soviet society today are a web of contradictions." He cited the contrast

. . . more

between Russian hostility to the United States and her need to cooperate with us to prevent nuclear war; between the desire of the Soviets to dominate eastern Europe and the internal stirrings of the Soviet people in a search for liberty. We must pursue policies, said the Vice President, "that can help induce both restraint and rationality in Soviet behavior."

Mr. Humphrey also outlined a six-point plan for peace in the Middle East that called for an agreement between the United States and Russia "that provides for the security of all these Middle East countries. And let us do it now."

The text of his speech is attached.

. . . more

REMARKS
VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY
UPI EDITOR'S LUNCHEON
TUESDAY OCTOBER 8, 1968

U.S. -- SOVIET RELATIONS

There are three great issues in this campaign: the securing and protection of peace...the ending of division and restoration of unity to all American people and the continuation of our social progress...and our dynamic economy. Today, I want to talk with you about the first of these issues...peace.

Nothing is more crucial to the peace of the world than our relations with the Soviet Union: This is the most fateful reality of our times.

We have seen that misunderstandings between Washington and Moscow can have grave consequences...for the peace of the world...for all mankind.

In this nuclear age, America must have leaders who are wise...and strong... if we are to deal with the Soviets for peace...and not for war. The next President will face a situation that is delicate...sensitive...dangerous...and yet also promising. We must have a President who is experienced...tested...and equal to the task.

For six years--even during periods of tension--we persisted in our patient efforts to expand the area of common agreement with the Soviets...We opened a "hot-line", and used it last year during the Middle East crisis...We concluded a Test-Ban Treaty...a Civil Air Agreement...a Consular Agreement...We widened the areas of contact between our two peoples...We helped negotiate a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons...we prepared to talk about halting the strategic arms race.. These were steps toward peace.

I personally initiated some of these steps; I strongly supported them all.

I have talked at length...and seriously...with Soviet leaders about the grave and difficult issues of our times.

I talked with Mr. Khrushchev--not in a kitchen. But in the Kremlin, not about the merits of color television, but about the question of human survival. I conferred with Mr. Kosygin in New Delhi about peace in South East Asia.

I have no illusions. We know we are dealing with a totalitarian government, still unresponsive to the needs and wishes of its people...a closed society...a government unmotivated by our basic concern for personal freedom and free expression...which asserts what it considers to be its interests with callous disregard for the opinions of mankind.

I know there will be setbacks...that there is no easy road to lasting peace. But we must persevere--whatever the obstacles, whatever the trials.

The American people must confront certain basic truths: The day is past when we can talk of the relationship between our two countries solely in terms of hostility...But we are still far from the day when we can speak of it in terms of real cooperation.

Soviet government and Soviet society today are a web of contradictions.

--The Soviets are still committed to an ideology of conflict; but they now also understand the dangers of mutual extinction through nuclear war, and temper their hostility towards us with a willingness to reduce the likelihood of that nuclear war.

--They still seek to maintain their domination, even at high political cost, over the peoples of Eastern Europe; But they are now also facing the erosion of their empire and the onset of internal problems. They cannot forever resist the human urge for liberty.

--The Soviet leaders are more conservative and doctrinaire today than at any other time since Stalin's death; their political system today is sterile...bureaucratic...inimical to social talent...hostile to social innovation. Yet Soviet leaders now confront a restless society--chafing under political restraints ...with an alienated intellectual community...and with its national minorities becoming more restless.

These contradictions make the situation more volatile and dangerous. In resisting the winds of freedom at home and abroad, the Soviet leaders are over-reacting. This underlines our need to pursue policies that are relevant to the present...and the future...that can help induce both restraint and rationality in Soviet behavior.

Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia...the brutal stifling of the most hopeful move towards liberty and democracy in Eastern Europe...and new threats to the Federal Republic of Germany...confirm our belief that our desire for improved relations with the Soviet Union must not jeopardize our alliances...that we must be ever vigilant...even as we pursue the path to peace.

The Soviets must understand; we are willing to negotiate on the central problems of war and peace; but we are not indifferent to what happened in Czechoslovakia.

We are not indifferent to threats--to us or to our allies.

We must be firm and resolute in our own defense--and we are.

We must reassert our irrevocable pledges to our allies in Western Europe--and we do.

But we must also not turn aside from the effort to reduce the threat of nuclear war, both now and for all time.

Last week, I proposed a series of steps designed to strengthen our relations with Western Europe...to guarantee that steps we take towards reducing tensions with the Soviet Union do not jeopardize the interests of our NATO partners.

I repeat them now:

- Annual meetings of the heads of allied governments;
- New joint scientific and technological programs;
- An educational common market spanning the two shores of the Atlantic;
- A European caucus within NATO, leading to the possible appointment of a European as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe.
- And no unilateral withdrawal of Western forces.

Within that framework we must now return to the search for ways to reduce the threat of nuclear war...and to preserve the peace.

We would not honor nor aid the efforts of the gallant Czechoslovaks by retreating now into an old hostility...by reviving the Cold War.

Rigidity on our part merely strengthens the hand of Soviet militants who argue that no accommodation is possible with the West. By seeking peaceful solutions...We can encourage those elements in the Soviet Union who believe that their best hope of survival--not of gain--lies in our joint concern to prevent a nuclear war.

These forces are nurtured by a climate of peace: They wither in the frosty winds of the Cold War.

We must not falter in the search for peace.

First, there is now a treaty before the Senate of the United States that would help prevent the spread of nuclear weapons around the world. This treaty must be ratified now, before it is too late.

We must also proceed to negotiate a halt to the nuclear arms race...in both offensive and defensive missiles. No addition of weapons--either by the Soviets or ourselves--can give either of us one iota more of security. Each new weapon only brings nearer the day when we will be unable to stop the plunge into nuclear war.

In 1954 a single, primitive atomic bomb destroyed an entire city. Today, the U.S. arsenal counts: 1,000 Minuteman missiles, carefully protected below ground; 41 Polaris Submarines carrying 656 missiles, hidden beneath the seas; 600 long-range bombers, equipped with 2,200 nuclear weapons. And we have several thousand nuclear weapons in Europe.

We have provided all this strength...many times over what we would ever need...to have the widest margins of strength for our security.

PAGE FOUR

But this is not enough to guarantee a lasting peace. We know that a nuclear exchange by the United States and the Soviet Union would leave at least 240 million people dead...and put an end to all our hopes...our dreams...for years...perhaps forever.

We have become so used to this idea that we no longer think it abnormal. We forget that our whole world structure depends for its stability on the precarious architecture of what Winston Churchill called the balance of terror. This is no longer an adequate safeguard for peace.

We must find another way. We must have these talks to control the arms race...talks that will in no way jeopardize our security...but will strengthen it, by making us all more safe.

The latest methods of inspection--including reconnaissance satellites and a variety of sensors give us hope that we can devise methods for each country to verify the other's good faith...

If these talks have not started by next year, I will make every additional effort to convince the Soviet leaders of the urgent necessity for these talks. We know, and they must be made to know, that the pace of technology is already taking us into a new cycle in the arms race which it may soon be too late to stop.

There are economic costs, as well...50 to 100 billion dollars...of unneeded expenditures in the next several years that could be better used in eliminating the causes of wars...and to meet our major needs at home.

The success of these talks would enable us to do more--to seek world-wide reductions in arms expenditures...the commitment of these funds to improve the quality of man's life.

I call upon Mr. Nixon to join with me in urging that these talks begin now... that the treaty for non-proliferation be ratified now. These issues concern us all--I will not make them a partisan matter, and Mr. Nixon should stop trying to do so.

In this election, the American people must assure the world that we are determined to pursue the cause of peace. To do this, we must elect leaders who will turn aside from the sterile platitudes of confrontation...and commit themselves to that search for peace.

I have now made specific proposals--with the advise of America's outstanding experts: on peace in Southeast Asia...on the problems of Europe's future...on controlling the arms race. And I make new proposals, today.

You, the representatives of a free press...have a special concern with the people's right to know. You know where I stand on these issues.

But where does Mr. Nixon stand? You...and all Americans...have a right to know.

Second, if we are to remove the specter of nuclear war from the world...we must do more.

For months, the Soviets have said they would take steps to build a lasting peace in Vietnam...to influence Hanoi...as soon as the United States stopped the bombing of North Vietnam.

I have now said that I would take that risk...for peace.

Our good faith must be matched by theirs.

The Soviet Union has major responsibility for seeing that Hanoi does not show bad faith...that they negotiate frankly...forthrightly...to bring an end to the war in Vietnam.

As soon as the bombing stops, I will call upon the Soviets to show...that they can also act for peace.

Let them call upon Hanoi to start negotiating seriously.

Third, the Nuclear Age calls for new forms of diplomacy, less of ritual...more conducive to frank, informal contacts.

As President, I will ask the Soviet leaders to join with us in regular scheduled annual working meetings at the highest level. Why? Because we share with the Soviet Union a special and parallel responsibility conferred on us by our awesome power...a power that must be used for peace. I propose to make these informal meetings into forums for a new diplomacy...free of the publicity...free of the high expectations...that surround irregular summit meetings.

I pledge to you...and to our allies in Western Europe...these regular talks with the Russians will only occur after the close allied consultations that I proposed last week.

We are partners in peace with our NATO allies...and we must go forward together to build that peace.

In the search for lasting peace, these meetings must not become mere vehicles for propaganda, nor springboards for illusion. If there are to be regular summits, they must entail common work...for peace.

Fourth, the policy of the West--collectively and individually--towards the Communist states must be flexible...seizing opportunities for peaceful engagement whenever the Communist states show themselves responsive.

We are not interested in stirring up futile unrest...we are for peace...
economic development.

In my statement released last Sunday, I called for new approaches towards the problem of European security...towards ending peacefully the partition of Europe. My long-range vision is that of a larger Europe:

- A Europe restored to its proper role in world affairs;
- no longer divided;
- no longer the focus of United States-Soviet rivalry;
- But the source of growing international cooperation.

We should also not embitter American-Chinese relations by taking sides in the Sino-Soviet dispute. We can increase the chances of accommodation with each country. by maintaining a flexible and open attitude toward both.

An isolated China is a dangerous and militant China. We must keep probing patiently to see if there is a change of heart and will on the part of Peking's leaders. Widening the contacts between our two peoples is to everyone's interest.

But here ... as in Europe ... as in our relations with the Soviets ... we must be vigilant ... as well as open-minded.

Fifth, we must reduce the risk of confrontation between ourselves and the Russians in the Middle East. This is the area of the world now emerging as the most explosive danger spot ... a major threat to peace. Let me speak about the critical problems that we face there.

The stability of the Middle East is now at stake ... for several reasons:

- Both the Soviets and ourselves have major interests in this historic and vital area.
- The steady growth of the Soviet Fleet in the Mediterranean could of itself lead to a future confrontation of Naval power;
- The hostility of the Arab states towards Israel, and the continuing Arms race, pose the danger of renewed warfare;
- The Soviet Union has contributed to this danger by its rapid delivery of sophisticated arms to the area;
- And there is the clear possibility that one or more middle Eastern countries will acquire their own nuclear weapons.

For all these reasons, we face grave decisions ... and we must make them soon.

We can let events drift and tensions increase. But if we do, the Middle East will quickly become the most likely area of the world to spark a nuclear confrontation.

This is the course that I fear the Soviet Union has been following. It is playing a risky game ... risky for itself ... for ourselves ... for all mankind.

But we can choose the path of patient work for peace.

We can meet the challenge of economic development ... to help the Middle Eastern nations develop jointly their great wealth of resources ... for the use of all mankind.

We can work to make the Mediterranean -- not a sea of conflict -- but a sea of friendship.

We can act ... to keep nuclear weapons from this area by pursuing our commitment to non-proliferation; we can try to prevent the recurrence of local wars through the United Nations and other means; and we can seek to resolve the causes of these wars.

This is our best ... and only ... choice.

I say, let us make that choice.

The search for peace depends on our convincing the Soviets to turn their efforts in the Middle East to peaceful development ... economic development ... Our interests in the stability of the region are parallel. Its volatility ... and the danger that we could be brought into nuclear confrontation by a Middle East war ... demand that we work together to preserve the peace.

Over time we can bring permanent peace to the area only if we can convince the Soviets to join our commitment to ending hostility ... tensions ... fears ... that make the Middle East a tinder box of war.

But let me be clear: We continue our firm commitment to the security of the State of Israel. We will take no steps in the Middle East that do not conform to this basic interest.

We must look again at the flow of arms to Middle Eastern countries. We cannot minimize ... or ignore the flow of Soviet Arms into the region -- thereby upsetting an already delicate balance.

To re-establish that balance ... to preserve the security of the region ... I believe that we must provide Israel with phantom aircraft. And we will continue to support Israel with the weapons it needs if there is a further threat to its existence. Israel will not be insecure through any failure on our part.

But there is a painful lesson to be learned -- arms beget arms.

And in the future ... we cannot hope for peace ... permanent peace ... lasting peace ... unless there are comprehensive agreements among the major suppliers of arms to the area -- and by the recipient countries, themselves. This arms race must not go unchecked -- for the sake of the people in the region ... for the sake of all of us.

The Soviets say they want an agreement. Let them show their good faith ... let them join with us to end this arms race ... let us conclude an agreement that provides for the security of all these Middle East countries. And let us do it now.

But the local countries must act, as well. The absence of outside arms supplies will not end the continuing political struggles in the Middle East. If there is to be peace ... the nations there must work for peace.

The resolution of conflict ... steps on the road to a final peace ... depend on the will of the Arabs and Israelis, themselves, but we Americans ... and the Soviets ... can help. We can support and encourage forces of moderation in the Arab world.

And we can stand behind the efforts of the United Nations in its patient work -- its unflagging commitment to the end of conflict ... strife ... and war.

I believe that there are six basic steps that must be taken:

1. The existence of the State of Israel must be accepted by all of its neighbors;
2. The boundaries of all these countries must be transformed into agreed and secure frontiers;
3. The State of Israel must have free navigational rights in all international waters, including the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba;
4. The arms race must be ended;
5. The international community must assist in solving the human tragedy posed by the Arab refugees;
6. The resources of the Middle East must be used for human and economic development rather than war and destruction.

These are six firm steps toward peace. But let me be clear about the road ahead. There can be no easy solution to the conflict in the Middle East ... that will end the old enmities that have embittered generations ... and three times brought the Middle East to war. We must be patient ... we must be just ... we must work for peace.

As President, I shall make available my good offices -- through the United Nations and directly ... to the search for peace and understanding in the Middle East.

I shall be a peace President. And I shall dedicate myself to finding peace in the Middle East just as I pledged to do in Vietnam.

And I shall call upon the Soviet Union to join me in these efforts.

We must take the first steps toward peace ... and we must take them now.

As Pope Paul said, "Development is the new name for peace."

I know this may sound bold; but peace in this region will not be built by the timid.

Our effort must be a combined effort in which we and the Soviet Union join with other major powers ... and with the countries in the region in the tasks of economic development. This cooperation should begin with a program for the desalinization of water ... and go on to other tasks.

I do not expect a sudden success ... an overnight end to conflict, but I do expect ... that quiet counsel ... patient effort ... can lead these countries to the distant day of peace.

This is my new strategy for peace ... in Southeast Asia ... in Europe ... in the Middle East ... and to halt the arms race.

We may sometimes fail ... but we must not fail to try.

President Kennedy once said: "Our problems are man made. Therefore, they can be solved by man." And we can do it.

I look forward to a time ... when the quarrels that now divide the world in continual strife ... sometimes in war ... give way to the achievement of common purpose ... the rational use of resources ... talents ... ideas ... to develop economies ... end poverty and famine ... provide education. "The desert shall rejoice -- and blossom as the rose."

This is our vision of the future ... our goal ... and we must dare to try.
I do.

#####

UPI ADDRESS
Statler-Hilton Hotel
Washington, D. C.
10/8/68
Questions & Answers

Question. Mr. Vice President, Gladie Block, Cincinnati Enquirer. In his recent book, General LeMay said that he favored military superiority, not parity. In this room yesterday morning, George Wallace said he favored military superiority, not parity, yesterday afternoon, Richard Nixon said the same thing. Could you tell us whether your program which you have just outlined means that you favor parity or military superiority?

Vice President Humphrey. There isn't any doubt but what if you are going to rely upon the military as your sole means of defense or whatever kind of future that you have, that you need to have a margin of superiority. That is what we presently have. There is not any doubt about that. And if that is the limit of your vision, then, yes, we must have military superiority.

But I want to submit to all of those who have made their response that the question of maintaining that superiority is a very delicate and dangerous one and also a very costly one. I do not believe that you should get locked in, locked into a question of who can produce the most arms. There is not any doubt but what this country, if you want to, with its wealth, can out-arm anybody if that is your vision of the kind of world that you want.

But I happen to think that the peace of the world is too important to be left to the generals or the pseudo generals, or even the security of the world. I think that while we must maintain our defenses and hopefully -- hopefully -- have them strong enough to be able to resist any attack, which means a superiority, I would hope that we would look to our defenses merely as a shield of defense and protection that would permit us to reach out around that shield to peaceful engagement, trying to reduce the arms, to halt the arms race, to promote economic development, to secure understandings and agreements that are mutually advantageous in such things as the non-proliferation treaty, the nuclear test ban treaty and other means of arms control.

My concern is, sir, in candor that I don't think you prove yourself qualified for the presidency by saying that all, that you consider the defense of your country requires military superiority, period. I think the defense of this country also requires a strong economy. I think it requires a united people. I think it requires a kind of self respect and pride. Above all, I think it requires a dedication to what this country means to its citizens and to the world.

So there are lots of factors in what we call defense -- momentary military superiority in a nation racked by depression and dissention is no superiority at all. But military superiority as a means of obtaining a peaceful world, of bargaining, of negotiating from strength, of having a broader vision of the world than merely an armed camp, yes. (applause)

Question. Mr. Vice President, my name is Joe Nixon, from Wabash, Indiana.

Vice President Humphrey. It seems like I have heard that name before.

Question. You have talked about the responsibility of the international community and you have talked about what the United Nations can do in certain areas. Why can't the Viet Nam situation be presented to the United Nations for a recommendation and a solution and this be implemented by the United States?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, for one reason, the countries that are involved in the dispute -- that is, at least two of them, north and South Viet Nam -- are not active participants in the United Nations.

Secondly, it is the judgment of both ourselves and the Soviet Union, and I believe of others, that this is a task that is beyond the capacity of the United Nations. However, we have never failed to solicit the good offices of the United Nations and we have on other occasions accepted the proposals of the good offices of the Secretary General, which we did a little over a year ago last February, February 1967, as I recollect.

But the Security Council would be sorely divided on this matter and the General Assembly seems to have had no particular desire to take it up.

We are prepared to accept the good offices of any international body to seek a solution. But we do not think that it is in the interest of the United Nations to give it a duty to perform in peacekeeping beyond its capacity. We do believe, however, that if there could be some process that could lead to a cessation of hostilities, the United Nations could perform a very valuable purpose and function in seeing to it that that cease fire was properly policed, in seeing to it that free elections were properly supervised, and hopefully, seeing to it that economic reconstruction could be undertaken. The United Nations is not capable of doing everything. It is capable of doing many things. And I believe that it is a matter of good judgment and sense to ask it to do that which it can best do.

But let us be clear, Mr. Goldberg, the former representative of the United States to the United Nations did present the American proposal to the United Nations for the consideration of United Nations' helpfulness in trying to bring this struggle to an end.

It got no place. And that just is one of the sad facts of our time.

Question. Mr. Vice President, John Emery, Houston Chronicle. The Democratic Party was left pretty badly divided following the National Convention, a fact which is reflected by the polls. Time is running out. Do you see any evidence of the party unifying, or whatever it is that you see that might contribute to your election in November?

Vice President Humphrey. There is no doubt but what our party was torn and fractured. I have been serving as a sort of political doctor trying to heal its wounds. I am happy to tell you that the healing process looks like it is coming well. I have been administering proper medications and even filling a few prescriptions. I am happy to tell you that more and more people are taking a look at the patient, that the color has returned to its rather saddened cheeks of some weeks back. There is a new sparkle in the eye, there is a new verve to the whole body. And I think that we are going to do all right. We are going -- what is important is not what happens in the first week of October or even the first week of September. What is important is what happens in the first week of November. I believe we -- I won't say necessarily by design; maybe by necessity -- have paced ourselves properly. I see a rising tide of support. I expect the polls to show us a little better. I do not expect any sudden reversal or any sudden dramatic movement.

But I will tell you what I do expect. I expect that when voters go into the privacy of that voting booth, they are going to think twice before they vote for a candidate that appeals to racial prejudice, to divide this nation, and they are going to think twice before they vote for a man who literally has refused to speak out in any detail on any of the major issues that confront this nation. I think it would be a very interesting exercise if we could have people just spread out before the American people the public record of these candidates.

I ask you to do so. I want you to take a look at what bills and what proposals Mr. Nixon ever put before Congress. I want you to take a look at my record. I want you to take a look at Mr. Wallace's record. I want you to take a look at his record of law enforcement. When he was Governor of a state, that state had the highest rate of murder in the United States. When I ran a police department, I ran it. And I want you to take a look at our proposals, the specific proposals. And I will have something more to say about it next Saturday night. And I want you to take a look at the legislative record which gives you some idea of what a man is thinking about.

I don't say that a legislative record tells you what he will do in the future. It gives you some indication of what he might do. I have never known a publisher or an editor of a newspaper that did

not take a look into a man's background before he hired him. And if he didn't, the paper does not last long.

You might want to see just what kind of journalism he is capable of producing. And I would like to have an impartial body of editors of the UPI take a good look at just what legislation in 1946 to 1953 did Mr. Nixon sponsor, speak for, encourage, or which ones did he speak against? Then I want you to do the same thing to me and I do not want you to say that this is all that we should decide, but it would be good to take a look at that record.

Then I want you to take a look at our record in the cause of peace, where he stood on the nuclear test ban treaty, which every sensible citizen in this land and I think in the world knows is for world good and our good, when he called it a cruel hoax, and when I stood there in the Senate as its sponsor and when John Kennedy signed it and said, Hubert, this is your treaty.

I want you to take a look at the Peace Corps, the disarmament agency, the food for peace program. I want you to take a look at that record, I think people are going to take a look at it, because I am going to talk to them about it. This is why I want to have Mr. Nixon here, Mr. Wallace here, me here, and I will get -- I don't like to get too far to the right. I am so used to being in the middle, I will stay in the middle.

I would like for us to have a chance to talk about these things in an intelligent, informed manner. Tremendous problems. I heard the other day about cities. Mr. Nixon, I want to know what you ever proposed for a city. I ran one and I have been the liaison officer for four years with this government and every mayor in the United States. I have had more look at their problems than any American. And I want to know what he knows about cities. Yet he had the audacity to say the other day that as the government strained to do more, the public was constrained to do less, which was not true. Unless he thinks John Gardner and the Urban Coalition are doing nothing. There is more going on today in the private community, in corporate business, in trade unions, in church business, in non profit organizations, to help our cities than at any period in history.

I want somebody up here to debate me about it. If you have any representative here of Mr. Nixon, I will take him on, I am raring to go.

Question. Nick Hymes from the Columbia Daily Herald, Columbia, Tennessee. One of the big issues in our area and one which is working to your detriment is that of the HEW guidelines. I know many there, I know many people who are certainly not racists are distinguished by what they consider the capricious and high handed methods of some of the HEW people who come there and hand down rulings. I wonder, if you are elected President, will you look into these rulings and the applications of the guidelines and possibly move to check them?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, the gentleman asked questions relating to school desegregation. The concern some people have expressed over the rather capricious action of some of the officials of the Department of HEW -- Health, Education and Welfare.

Do I state your question?

Question. Let me say first of all that to implement the court decision and the legislation, it is necessary that the federal government have some powers and some authority. I am the author of the legislation. I handled that bill through the Congress. I believe that the emphasis on that bill is to encourage the local school boards to take the initiatives that are required under the legislation, to find ways and means of school desegregation within their respective school areas and communities. And I am happy to tell you that in about 90 percent of the cases, that is what has happened. We have some school boards, regrettably, however, that have thought that somehow or other, they did not have to do that. Therefore, officers of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have come out to insist that those, that certain guidelines be applied and if they were not, that funds be withheld.

Now, the truth is very few districts had any funds withheld. There has been very great patience and tolerance here. And I have encouraged that, to be honest with you. Because I have realized there are many grave difficulties. But I want to say that because we have had guidelines, and I believe in them, we have had more activity and more progress in desegregation and in the ultimate improvement of the educational structure for every American in the last two years than in all of the years since 1954 in the Brown case, since the court decision. We have had a great deal of progress.

Now, there is always some over ambitious young lawyer that decides that he can do it faster than anybody else. But that does not mean that we ought to get away from the guidelines. On the contrary, those guidelines are needed. And I would not want to deceive you, because I don't have a message for Tennessee and another one for Minnesota. Because we have some problems even there and they have some in Boston and they have some in New York City. This is no easy problem any place.

If I am the President, I will surely ask the Department of HEW to have guidelines to encourage the overall practice and performance of desegregation of our school system. I will ask that they have some sense. I will take a good hard look at them and how they are applied. I don't think the guidelines are wrong at all.

But I want it quite clear that I believe that it is in our national interest to have these schools desegregated. I think it is in our national interest to have these guidelines and I don't think that you can rely strictly on the court decision. I have no intention to do so, but I am surely a reasonable man and I have every intention to take a look and see how it is being operated, with the prospect and the hope in mind of encouraging activity rather than discourage it.

(applause)

First, I want to disassociate myself entirely from Mr. Wallace's observation yesterday at the Press Club about the press being full of lies. That is frequently not the case.

* * *

I think the quest for truth has been one of the most encouraging aspects of this campaign. Mr. Nixon, as you know, has a truth squad following me around. I'm flattered ... He can use all he can get.

* * *

We call them the "Peeping Stoms."

* * *

They had a little mechanical failure the other day. Everytime they pushed the 'who's ~~lying~~ *lying*' button on their lie detector, it said 'Nixon's the one.'

* * *

So they finally scrapped it, and now they're a lot more comfortable. They're just using a Ouija board and doing what comes naturally -- telling it like it was.

* * *

Since you are all editors, I just want to put in a plug for the working press who have been with me on this campaign. It is not the best financed, most comfortable campaign on the road this year, and we move pretty fast. It's hard work, and I want you to know that they are doing a darn fine job.

#

~~Russ Wiggins~~
~~Joe Ball~~

✓ Ben Bradlee -
V.P. Wash Post
L Bronnman -
L Speak out.
L Under wraps -
L Do you disagree with the President.

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

U. P. I. EDITOR'S LUNCHEON

WASHINGTON, D. C.

OCTOBER 8, 1968

↳ There are three great issues in this campaign: The securing
and protection of peace ... the ending of division and restoration of
unity to all ^{the} American people ... and the continuation of our social
progress ... and our dynamic economy. Today I want to talk with
you about the first of these issues ... peace.

↳ Nothing is more crucial to the peace of the world than our
relations with the Soviet Union: This is the most fateful reality
of our times.

↳ We have seen that misunderstandings between Washington and Moscow can have grave consequences ... for the peace of the world ... for all mankind.

↳ ~~In this nuclear age, America must have leaders who are wise ... and strong ... if we are to deal with the Soviets for peace ... and~~

~~not for war~~ ↳ The next President will face a situation that is delicate, sensitive ... dangerous ... and yet also promising. We must have a President who is experienced ... tested ... and equal to the task. *hopefully*

↳ For six years -- even during periods of tension -- we *have* persisted in our patient efforts to expand the area of common agreement with the Soviets ... we opened a "Hot-Line", and used it last year during the Middle East crisis ... we concluded a Test Ban Treaty ... a Civil Air Agreement ... a Consular agreement ... we widened the areas of contact between our two peoples ... we helped negotiate a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons ... we prepared to talk about halting the strategic arms race. ↳ These ~~are~~ *are* steps toward

peace. *They represent the Process of Peace.*

I personally advocated some of these steps; I strongly supported them all.

I have talked personally at length ... and seriously ... with Soviet leaders about the grave and difficult issues of our times.

I talked with Mr. Khrushchev -- not in a kitchen, but in the Kremlin; not about the merits of color television, but about the question of human survival. I conferred with Mr. Kosygin in New Delhi about peace in South East Asia.

I have no illusions. We know we are dealing with a totalitarian government, still unresponsive to the needs and wishes of its people ... a closed society ... a government unmotivated by our basic concern for personal freedom and free expression ... which asserts what it considers to be its interests with callous disregard for the opinions of mankind.

I know there ~~will~~ may be setbacks ... ~~that~~ there is no easy road to lasting peace. But we must persevere -- whatever the obstacles, whatever the trials,

↳ The American people must confront certain basic truths! The day is past when we can talk of the relationship between our two countries solely in terms of hostility ... but we are still far from the day when we can speak of it in terms of real cooperation,

↳ Soviet government and Soviet society today are a web of contradictions.

-- The Soviets are still committed to an ideology of conflict; but they now also understand the dangers of mutual extinction through nuclear war, and temper their hostility towards us with a willingness to reduce the likelihood of that nuclear war,

-- They still seek to maintain their domination, even at high political cost, over the peoples of Eastern Europe, but they are now also facing the erosion of their empire and the onset of internal problems. They cannot forever resist the human urge for liberty.

↳ The Soviet leaders are more conservative and doctrinaire today than at any other time since Stalin's death, their political system today is sterile ... bureaucratic ... inimical to social talent ... hostile to social innovation. ↳ Yet Soviet leaders now confront a restless society -- chafing under political restraints ... with an alienated intellectual community ... and with its national minorities becoming more restless.

↳ These contradictions make the situation more volatile and dangerous. ↳ In resisting the winds of freedom at home and abroad, the Soviet leaders are overreacting. ↳ This underlines our need to pursue policies that are relevant to the present ... and the future ... that can help induce both restraint and rationality in Soviet behavior.

↳ Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia ... the brutal stifling of the most hopeful move towards liberty and democracy in Eastern Europe ... and new threats to the Federal Republic of Germany ... confirm our belief that our desire for improved relations with the

Soviet Union must not jeopardize our alliances ... that we must

be ever vigilant ... even as we pursue the path to peace.

↳ The Soviets must understand ^{that} we are willing to negotiate on the central problems of war and peace; but we are not indifferent *shocked + dismayed*

with to what happened in Czechoslovakia.

↳ We are not indifferent to threats -- to us or to our allies.

↳ We must be firm and resolute in our own defense -- and we are.

↳ We must reassert our irrevocable pledges to our allies in Western Europe -- and we do.

↳ But we must also not turn aside from the effort to reduce the threat of nuclear war, both now and for all time.

↳ Last week, I proposed a series of steps designed to strengthen our relations with Western Europe ... to guarantee that steps we take towards reducing tensions with the Soviet Union do not jeopardize the interests of our NATO partners.

I repeat them now:

-- Annual meetings of the heads of allied governments;

-- New joint scientific and technological programs;

-- an educational common market spanning the two shores
of the Atlantic;

-- A European caucus within NATO, leading to the possible
appointment of a European as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe.

-- And no unilateral withdrawal of Western forces.

↳ Within that framework, we must now return to the search
for ways to reduce the threat of nuclear war ... and to preserve the
peace.

↳ We would not honor nor aid the efforts of the gallant
Czechoslovaks by retreating now into an old hostility ... by reviving
the Cold War.

↳ Rigidity on our part merely strengthens the hand of Soviet militants who argue that no accommodation is possible with the West. ↳ By seeking peaceful solutions ... we can encourage those elements in the Soviet Union who believe that their best hope of survival -- not of gain -- lies in our joint concern to prevent a nuclear war.

↳ These forces are nurtured by a climate of peace; they wither in the frosty winds of the Cold War.

↳ We must not falter in the search for peace.

First, there is now a treaty before the Senate of the United States that would help prevent the spread of nuclear weapons around the world. This treaty must be ratified now, before it is too late.

↳ We must also proceed to negotiate a halt to the nuclear arms race ... in both offensive and defensive missiles. No addition of weapons -- either by the Soviets or ourselves -- can give either of us one iota more of security. ↳ Each new weapon only brings nearer the day when we will be unable to stop the plunge into nuclear war.

↳ In 1945 a single, primitive atomic bomb destroyed an entire city. Today, the U.S. arsenal counts: 1,000 Minuteman missiles, carefully protected below ground; 41 Polaris Submarines carrying 656 missiles, hidden beneath the seas; 600 long-range bombers, equipped with 2,200 nuclear weapons. And we have several thousand nuclear weapons in Europe.

↳ We have provided all this strength ... many times over what we would ever need ... to have the widest margins of strength for our security.

↳ But this is not enough ... to guarantee a lasting peace. We know that a nuclear exchange by the United States and the Soviet Union would leave at least 240 million people dead ... and put an end to all our hopes ... our dreams ... for years ... perhaps forever.

↳ We have become so used to this idea that we no longer think it abnormal. We forget that our whole world structure depends for its stability on the precarious architecture of what Winston Churchill called the balance of terror. This is no longer an adequate safeguard for peace.

↳ We must find another way. We must have these talks to control the arms race ... talks that will in no way jeopardize our security ... but will strengthen it, by making us all more safe.

↳ The latest methods of inspection -- including reconnaissance satellites ... and a variety of sensors ... give us hope that we can devise methods for each country to verify the other's good faith.

↳ If these talks have not started by next year, I will make every additional effort to convince the Soviet leaders of ^{their} urgent necessity. We know, and they must be made to know, that the

pace of technology is already taking us into a new cycle in the arms race which it may soon be too late to stop.

The Soviets must come to know that we cannot and will not permit them to win an arms race.

↳ There are economic costs, as well ... 50 to 100 billion dollars of unnneeded expenditures in the next several years ... that could be better used in eliminating the causes of wars ... and to meet our major needs at home.

↳ The success of these talks would enable us to do more -- to seek world-wide reductions in arms expenditures *and* the committment of these funds to improve the quality of man's life.

↳ I call upon Mr. Nixon to join with me in urging that these talks begin now ... that the treaty for non-proliferation be ratified now. ↳ These issues concern us all -- I will not make them a partisan matter, and Mr. Nixon should stop trying to do so.

↳ In this election, the American people must assure the world that we are determined to pursue the cause of peace. ↳ To do this, we must elect leaders who will turn aside from the sterile platitudes of confrontation ... and commit themselves to that search for peace.

↳ You, the representatives of a free press ... have a special concern with the people's right to know. You know where I stand on these issues.

↳ I have now made specific proposals -- with the advice of America's outstanding experts -- on peace in South East Asia ... on the problems of Europe's future ... on controlling the arms race.
↳ And I make new proposals, today.

But where does Mr. Nixon stand? You ... and all Americans ... have a right to know.

↳ Second, if we are to remove the specter of nuclear war from the world ... we must do more.

↳ For months, the Soviets have said they would take steps to build a lasting peace in Vietnam ... to influence Hanoi ... as soon as the United States stopped the bombing of North Vietnam.

↳ I have now said that I would take that risk ... for peace.

I've outlined specific steps to that end - Sept 30th

bat

Our good faith must be matched by theirs.

↳ The Soviet Union has major responsibility for seeing that Hanoi does not show bad faith ... that they negotiate frankly ... forthrightly ... to bring an end to the war in Vietnam.

↳ As soon as the bombing stops, *with Hanoi show good faith* I will call upon the Soviets to show ... that they can also act for peace!

↳ Let them call upon Hanoi to start negotiating seriously.
↳ Third, the nuclear age calls for new forms of diplomacy, less of ritual ... more conducive to frank, informal contacts.

↳ As President, I will ask the Soviet leaders to join with us in regularly scheduled annual working meetings at the highest level. Why? Because we share with the Soviet Union a special and parallel responsibility conferred on us by our awesome power ... a power that must be used for peace. ↳ I propose to make these informal meetings into forums for a new diplomacy ... free of the publicity ... free of the high expectations ... that surround irregular summit meetings.

↳ I pledge to you ... and to our allies in Western Europe ...
these regular talks with the Russians will only occur after the
close allied consultations that I proposed last week.

↳ We are partners in peace with our NATO allies ... and we
must go forward together to build that peace.

↳ In the search for lasting peace, the meetings with the
Soviets must not become mere vehicles for propaganda, nor spring-
boards for illusion. ↳ If there are to be regular summits, they
must entail common work ... for peace.

↳ Fourth, the policy of the West -- collectively and individually --
towards the Communist states must be flexible ... seizing opportunities
for peaceful engagement whenever the Communist states show them-
selves responsive.

↳ We are not interested in stirring up futile unrest ... we
are interested in creating gradually a sense of common responsibility
for peace ... for economic development.

In my statement released last Sunday, I called for new approaches towards the problem of European security ... towards ending peacefully the partition of Europe. My long-range vision is that of a larger Europe:

- A Europe restored to its proper role in world affairs;
- No longer divided;
- No longer the focus of United States -Soviet rivalry;
- But the source of growing international cooperation.

↳ We should also not embitter American-Chinese relations by taking sides in the Sino-Soviet dispute. ↳ We can increase the chances of accommodation with each country, by maintaining a flexible and open attitude toward both.

↳ An isolated China is a dangerous and militant China. ↳ We must keep probing patiently to see if there is a change of heart and will on the part of Peking's leaders. ↳ Widening the contacts between our two peoples is to everyone's interest.

But here ... as in Europe ... as in our relations with the Soviets ... we must be vigilant ... as well as open-minded.

↳ Fifth, we must reduce the risk of confrontation between ourselves and the Russians in the Middle East. This is the area of the world now emerging as the most explosive danger spot ... a major threat to peace. Let me speak about the critical problems that we face there.

The stability of the Middle East is now at stake ... for several reasons:

-- Both the Soviets and ourselves have major interests in this historic and vital area;

-- the steady growth of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean could of itself lead to a future confrontation of naval power;

-- the hostility of the Arab States towards Israel, and the continuing arms race, pose the danger of renewed warfare;

-- the Soviet Union has contributed to this danger by its rapid delivery of sophisticated arms to the area;

-- and there is the clear possibility that one or more Middle Eastern countries will acquire their own nuclear weapons.

For all these reasons, we face grave decisions ... and we must make them soon.

We can let events drift and tensions increase. But if we do, the Middle East will quickly become the most likely area of the world to spark a nuclear confrontation.

This is the course that I fear the Soviet Union has been following. It is playing a risky game ... risky for itself ... for ourselves ... for all mankind.

But we can choose the path of patient work for peace.

We can meet the challenge of economic development ... to help the Middle Eastern nations develop jointly their great wealth of resources ... for the use of all mankind.

We can work to make the Mediterranean -- not a sea of conflict -- but a sea of friendship.

We can act ... to keep nuclear weapons from this area by pursuing our commitment to non-proliferation; we can try to prevent the recurrence of local wars through the United Nations and other means ... and we can seek to resolve the causes of these wars.

This is our best ... and only ... choice.

I say, let us make that choice.

The search for peace depends on our convincing the Soviets to turn their efforts in the Middle East to peaceful development ... economic development.

Our interests in the stability of the region are parallel.

Its volatility ... and the danger that we could be brought into nuclear confrontation by a Middle East war ... demand that we work together to preserve the peace.

Over time we can bring permanent peace to the area only if we can convince the Soviets to join our commitment to ending hostility ... tensions ... fears ... that make the Middle East a tinder box of war.

But let me be clear: we continue our firm commitment to the security of the State of Israel. We will take no steps in the Middle East that do not conform to this basic interest.

We must look again at the flow of arms to Middle Eastern countries. We cannot minimize ... or ignore ... the flow of Soviet arms in into the region -- thereby upsetting an already delicate balance.

To re-establish that balance ... to preserve the security of the region ... I believe that we must provide Israel with Phantom Aircraft. And we will continue to support Israel with the weapons it needs if there is a further threat to its existence. Israel will not be insecure through any failure on our part.

But there is a painful lesson to be learned -- arms beget arms.

And in the future ... we cannot hope for peace ... permanent peace ... lasting peace ... unless there are comprehensive agreements among the major suppliers of arms to the area -- and by the recipient countries, themselves. This arms race must not go unchecked -- for the sake of the people in the region ... for the sake of all of us.

The Soviets say they want an agreement. Let them show their good faith ... let them join with us to end this arms race ... let us conclude an agreement that provides for the security of all these Middle East countries. And let us do it now.

But the local countries must act, as well. The absence of outside arms supplies will not end the continuing political struggles in the Middle East. If there is to be peace ... the nations there must work for peace.

The resolution of conflict ... steps on the road to a final peace ... depend on the will of the Arabs and Israelis, themselves. But we Americans ... and the Soviets ... can help. We can support and encourage forces of moderation in the Arab world.

And we can stand behind the efforts of the United Nations in its patient work -- its unflagging commitment to the end of conflict ... strife ... and war.

I believe that there are six basic steps that must be taken.

1. The existence of the State of Israel must be accepted by all of its neighbors;
2. The boundaries of all these countries must be transformed into agreed and secure frontiers;
3. The State of Israel must have free navigational rights in all international waters, including the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba;

4. The arms race must be ended;
5. The international community must assist in solving the human tragedy posed by the Arab refugees;
6. The resources of the Middle East must be used for human and economic development rather than war and destruction.

These are six firm steps toward peace. But let me be clear about the road ahead. There can be no easy solution to the conflict in the Middle East ... that will end the old enmities that have embittered generations ... and three times brought the Middle East to war. We must be patient ... we must be just ... we must work for peace.

As President, I shall make available my good offices -- through the United Nations and directly ... to the search for peace ... and understanding in the Middle East.

I shall be a Peace President. And I shall dedicate myself to finding peace in the Middle East just as I pledged to do in Vietnam.

And I shall call upon the Soviet Union to join me in these efforts.

We must take the first steps toward peace ... and we must take them now.

As Pope Paul said, "Development is the new name for peace."

I know this may sound bold; but peace in this region will not be built by the timid.

Our effort must be a combined effort in which we and the Soviet Union join with other major powers ... and with the countries in the region ... in the tasks of economic development. This cooperation should begin with a program for the desalinization of water ... and go on to other tasks.

I do not expect a sudden success ... an overnight end to conflict. But I do expect ... that quiet counsel ... patient effort ... can lead these countries to the distant day of peace.

This is my new Strategy for Peace ... in South East Asia
... in Europe ... in the Middle East ... and to halt the arms race.

We may sometimes fail ... but we must not fail to try.

President Kennedy once said: "Our problems are man made.
Therefore, they can be solved by man." And we can do it.

I look forward to a time ... when the quarrels that now
divide the world in continual strife ... sometimes in war ... give
way to the achievement of common purpose ... the rational use of
resources ... talents ... ideas ... to develop economies ... end
poverty and famine ... provide education. "The desert shall rejoice --
and blossom as the rose."

This is our vision of the future ... our goal ... and we must
dare to try. I do.

#

U. S. - Soviet Relations

26 - Soviet
Speech

Nothing is more crucial to the peace of the world than the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Each nation has enough nuclear power to destroy the world many times over.

Each of us is deeply involved in the affairs of the world.

We know that major misunderstandings between Washington and Moscow can lead to grave consequences...for the peace of the world...for all mankind.

For six years, we undertook a series of patient efforts designed to expand the area of common agreement between ourselves and the Soviets... we opened a "hot-line" ...we concluded a Test-Ban Treaty...we helped negotiate a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons...we prepared to talk about halting the strategic arms race.

I personally initiated some of these steps; I strongly supported them all.

I have talked with Soviet leaders about the grave and dif-

of our times
ficult issues in this decade and the last .

I talked with Mr. Khrushchev -- not in a kitchen, but in the Kremlin. And I conferred with Mr. Kosygin in New Delhi.

I have no illusions. We know we are dealing with a totalitarian government, unresponsive to the needs and wishes of its people...a closed society...a government unmotivated by our basic concerns for human welfare...which asserts what it considers to be its interests with brutal disregard for the opinions of mankind.

I know there will be setbacks...that there is no easy road to lasting peace.

The American people must confront certain basic truths:

The day is past when we can talk of the relationship between our two countries solely in terms of hostility...but we are still far from the day when we can speak of it in terms of real cooperation.

Soviet Government and Soviet society today is a web of contradictions.

--the Soviets are still committed to an ideology of hostility and conflict; but they also now understand the dangers of mutual extinction, and temper this ideological hostility towards us with a willingness to make commitments to reduce the likelihood of nuclear war.

--they will maintain their domination, even at high political cost, over the peoples of Eastern Europe; but they are also now facing the erosion of their empire and the onset of internal problems. They cannot forever resist the human urge for liberty.

--the Soviet leaders are perhaps more conservative and doctrinaire today than at any other time since Stalin's death; their political system today is sterile, bureaucratic, inimical to social talent---hostile to social innovation. Yet Soviet leaders now confront a restless society---chafing under political restraints---with an alienated intellectual community...and with its national minorities becoming more restless.

These contradictions permit no simple conclusions. They require us to search for policies that are relevant to the present, that can help induce both restraint and rationality in Soviet behavior.

Recent Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia...the brutal snuffing out of the most hopeful move towards liberty and democracy in Eastern Europe...and new threats to our Ally, Western Germany...have confirmed our belief that our relations with the Soviet Union must not jeopardize our Alliances..that we must be ever alert...even as we pursue the path to peace.

4

Let the Soviets understand: our willingness to negotiate on the central problems of war and peace does not mean indifference to what happened in Czechoslovakia. It does not mean indifference to their threats -- whether directed at us or at our allies.

Let there be no doubt in Moscow that in the face of Soviet threats we would execute firmly -- and with all the force necessary -- our commitments to our allies in Europe.

We must be firm and resolute in our own defense -- and we are.

We must reassert our irrevocable pledges to our allies in Western Europe -- and we do.

But we must also not turn aside from the effort to reduce the threat of nuclear war, both now and for all time.

Last week, I proposed a series of steps designed to strengthen our relations with Western Europe...to guarantee that steps we take towards reducing tensions with the Soviet Union do not jeopardized the interests of our NATO partners.

I repeat them now.

Within that framework we must now return to the search for ways to reduce the threat of nuclear war...and to preserve the peace.

We would not honor nor aid the efforts of the gallant Czechs by retreating now into an old hostility...by reviving the Cold War.

Rigidity on our part merely strengthens the hand of Soviet militants who argue that no accomodation is possible with the West. By seeking peaceful solutions..we can encourage those elements in the Soviet Union who believe that their best hope of survival -- not of gain -- lies in our joint concern to prevent a nuclear war.

Their forces are nurtured by a climate of peace; they wither in the frosty winds of the cold war.

I say, lwt us never falther in the search.

First, there is now a treaty before the Senate of the United States that would help prevent the spread of nuclear weapons around the world. This treaty must be ratified now, before it is too late.

Mr. Nixon says we should wait. Wait for what? Another nation to have nuclear weapons? Wait until ten more do?

We can take no one seriously...as leader..statesman...who would play partisan politics with this issue of life...and nuclear death.

I call on Mr. Nison to change his mind...to show he can be

a statesman...for the sake of all Americans...for the sake of all mankind.

Second, we must also proceed to negotiate a halt to the nuclear arms race...in both offensive and defensive missiles. No addition of weapons---either by the Soviets or ourselves---can give either of us one iota more of security. Each new weapon only brings nearer the day when we will be unable to stop the plunge into nuclear war.

This is not an issue that can be decided next year. By then, the pace of technology will already be taking us into a new cycle in the arms race which it may then be too late to stop.

There are economic costs, as well...billions of dollars... that could be better used in eliminating the causes of wars...and to meet our major needs at home.

I call upon Mr. Nixon to join with me in urging that these talks begin now. This issue concerns us all --- it cannot be a partisan matter.

Third, if we are to remove the specter of nuclear war forever from the world...we must both do more.

For months, the Soviets have said they would take steps to build a lasting peace in Vietnam...to influence Hanoi...as soon as the

VF-10-5-68
United States stopped the bombing of North Vietnam.

I have now said that I would take that risk..for peace.

The Soviet Union has major responsibility for seeing that Hanoi does not show bad faith...that they negotiate frankly...forthrightly...to bring an end to the War in Vietnam.

Let the Soviets now show...that they can also act for peace.

Let them call upon Hanoi to start negotiating seriously.

Fourth, the nuclear age calls for new forms of diplomacy, free of ritual...conducive to frank, informal exchanges of views.

As President, I intend to ask the Soviet leaders to join with us in annual working and ^{formal} internal meetings at the highest level.

I propose to make these meeting forums for a new diplomacy...free of the publicity...free of the high expectations...that surround irregular summit meetings.

In the search for lasting peace, we cannot let our joint meetins become mere vehicles for propaganda. If there are to be regular summits, they must entail common work...for peace.

I plecte to you...and to our allies in Western Europe... these regular talks with the Russians will only occur after the close allied consultations that I proposed last week.

Fifth, we must strive to reduce the tensions between ourselves and the Russians in the Middle East---^{and} that area of the world emerging as ^{an} ~~the world's~~ most explosive danger spot...and ^a the major threat to peace.

There are four reasons for my concern about the future stability of the Middle East:

--both the Soviets and ourselves have major interests in the area, and its major ocean routes;

--the steady growth of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean could of itself lead to a future confrontation of naval power;

--the hostility of the Arab states towards Israel, and the continuing arms race, pose the danger of renewed warfare;

--and, there is the clear possibility that one or more Middle Eastern countries will acquire their own nuclear weapons.

For all these reasons, we face grave choices...choices that we must make soon.

We can permit events in the Middle East to drift...and tensions to increase. If we do, the Middle East will quickly

But let me be clear: we continue our firm commitment of the security of the State of Israel. We will take no steps in the Middle East that do not conform to this basic interest.

We must look again at the flow of arms to Middle Eastern countries.

I believe that the security of the region can best be preserved by providing Israel with Phantom aircraft. And we will continue to support Israel with the weapons it needs if there is a further threat to its existence. Israel will not be insecure through any failure on our part.

But in the future...we cannot hope for peace...permanent peace... lasting peace...unless there are comprehensive agreements among the major suppliers of arms to the area. This arms race must not go on unchecked.

The Soviets say they want an agreement. Let them show their good faith...let them join with us to end this arms race...let us conclude an agreement that provides for the security of all these Middle East countries. And let us do it now.

But the local countries must act, as well. The absence of outside arms supplies will not end the continuing political struggles in the Middle East. If there is to be peace...the nations there must work

for peace.

The resolution of conflict...steps on the road to a final peace... depend on the will of the Arabs and Israelis, themselves. But we Americans...and the Soviets...can contribute powerfully to the search for peace...And we can stand behind the efforts of the United Nations ~~to~~ in its patient ~~work~~ work for peace.

I believe that there are six basic steps that must be taken:

1. The existence of the State of Israel must be accepted by all of its neighbors;
2. The boundaries of all these countries must be transformed into agreed and secure frontiers;
3. The State of Israel must have free navigational rights in all international waters, including the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba;
4. The arms race must be ended;
5. The international community must assist ~~the~~ in solving the human tragedy posed by the Arab refugees
6. The resources of the Middle East must be used for human and economic development rather than war and destruction.

These are six firm steps towards peace. But let me be clear

about the road ahead. There can be no easy solution to the conflict in the Middle East. . .that will end the old enmities that have embittered generations. . .and three times brought the Middle East to war. We must be patient. . .we must be just. . .we must work for peace.

As President, I shall make available my good offices -- through the United Nations and directly. . .to the search for understanding in the Middle East.

And I shall call upon the Soviet Union to join me in this effort.

We must take the first steps towards peace. . .and we must take them now.

I do not expect a sudden success. . .and overnight end to conflict. But I do expect. . .that quiet counsel. . .patient effort. . .can lead these countries to the distant day of peace.

We may sometimes fail. . .but we cannot fail to try.

President Kennedy once said: "Our problems are man made. Therefore, they can be solved by man." And we can do it.

I look forward to a time. . .when the quarrels that now divide Arabs from Israelis in continual strife. . .sometimes in war. . .give way to the achievement of common purpose. . .the common use of resources. . .

talents. . .ideas. . .to develop economies. . .end poverty and famine. . .
provide education. . .and to "make the desert bloom" .

This is our vision of a future Middle East. . .our goal. . .and
we can work to have that lasting peace.

If the Soviet Union and ourselves can work together in the Middle
East for economic development. . .to secure the peace. . .we can go
on to other areas. . .other problems. . .towards an improvement of
Soviet-American relations.

We can secure the world against nuclear war.

We can temper conflict with a new concern for peace.

We must work to ~~make~~ build that world of peace.

End



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