

REMARKS

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES  
BERNARD BARUCH COLLEGE

NEW YORK CITY

JUNE 12, 1969

Dr Weaver

Mr Schaeffer  
Mr Mandel

*Bob Hope -  
You graduates about  
to go out into the  
world - Don't go!*

*what a year!*

*First Commencement*

You have been privileged to attend college in one of the most exciting and challenging periods in the country's history.

But the forces of change and renewal we see at every hand are not unique to this country or people. Indeed, it is increasingly evident that the entire world is passing through an age of transition.

As Henry Kissinger said recently, "To a degree rare in history, world leaders are moving into a great unknown."  
"Rules for world order, written less than 25 years ago are already wearing out."

-2-

↳ "New ways for countries to deal with each other will have to be found,"

↳ This transition has many aspects, of which the social and cultural may be the most important. ~~the dimension~~

↳ But it also has a political dimension. In particular, it reflects the breakup of a world order in which the nature of power and authority has seemed reasonably clear.

↳ Old national alliances, such as the special and unique relationship between the United States and Great Britain are changing.

↳ New forces, such as Japan, which is already the third strongest economic power in the world, are emerging.

↳ In addition, it is now clear that many of the problems confronting the nations of the world will no longer yield to the powers through which the will of governments historically have prevailed -- namely the sword and the public purse.

↳ Let me be more specific. In 1832 Karl von Clausewitz laid down the dictum that 'War is not merely a political act, but also a political instrument -- A continuation of political relations -- a carrying out of the same by other means."

But today, given the unprecedented possibilities that nations now have for devastating their opponents with strategic nuclear weapons, war can no longer be considered as merely an extension of politics. The costs for all sides are simply too great.

↳ In addition, "conventional" warfare seems, in many cases, to be missing an ingredient that was vital to von Clausewitz's rule: The capacity for ruthlessness.

~~As Stewart Alsop pointed out recently, military power is a decisive military instrument only if the victor carries out its military victory with sufficient ruthlessness so as to lay the issue to rest for some period of time.~~

~~In three recent military confrontations, nations of the world have not so carried out their efforts: the Arab-Israeli War, the United States in Vietnam, and the Russian-Czechoslovakia affair.~~

~~In short, <sup>but in other words</sup> von Clausewitz's old dictum no longer works very well in 1969. The power of governments to structure others by military force has changed in its scope and character.~~

~~At the same time, there is a developing awareness that action by even the most wealthy governments cannot mobilize the external resources needed to solve the problems faced here and abroad.~~

-5-

Thus, traditional notions of the power and authority  
of national governments no longer command the allegiance  
they once did. People and nations are groping for new concepts  
which will respond more directly to the needs of today. The  
failure to find them as yet accounts for much of the uneasiness  
and questioning which exists throughout the world.

\* \* \* \*

These circumstances are brought to sharp and tragic  
focus by the continuing conflict in Vietnam.

In the final analysis, our great sacrifices of human  
life and resources have been made with only one object in  
view: to achieve the opportunity for all the people of South  
Vietnam to chart their own future through democratic procedures  
and principles.

-6-

↳ But we have learned, in the process, that peace ultimately depends on reaching a settlement acceptable to ~~all~~ the people of South Vietnam. ↳ The United States has no more right than Hanoi to impose a settlement on South Vietnam or to negotiate unilaterally the future of the 16 million South Vietnamese people. ~~Our overwhelming power and authority are as nothing when it comes to dictating peace terms to end this tragic conflict.~~

↳ But, by the same token, the United States very much has the right -- indeed, we have the obligation -- to advocate as vigorously as we can in Paris and elsewhere, our ideas for achieving a durable political settlement. ↳ In particular, we must stress the importance of bringing the National Liberation Front and the Viet Cong into the legitimate political processes of South Vietnam, provided they are willing to accept democratic procedures.

(Insert)

-6a-

*I call your attention to*  
~~I am encouraged by~~ what appears to be a political build-up

in South Vietnam by both the South Vietnamese government and the National Liberation Front. Just yesterday we read of the so-called provisional regime which has been organized by the N.L.F. There is similar evidence that the South Vietnamese are broadening the base of their government -- preparing for the day when the struggle on the battlefield will be moved into the political arena. These are extremely significant, and, in my opinion, ~~extremely~~ hopeful signs -- signs which should tell us that the chances of reaching a negotiated political settlement in Paris are brighter now than they have been for a long time.

The question which remains, however, is this: will we take full advantage of these new conditions? Will we now exercise the bold leadership which can transform potentiality into reality?

-7-

~~For some time now~~ the negotiations in Paris have been stalled over the fundamental issue of how this is to be accomplished; that is, how to establish peaceful political competition among individuals and groups which have for many years considered each other to be outlaws and subversives. ~~forces to be opposed with whatever ~~violent~~ means were available.~~ *-- violent or otherwise --*

↳ Obviously, this is an exceedingly difficult problem -- one which demands the greatest patience and skill on all sides.

↳ The National Liberation Front, supported by the North Vietnamese, has insisted upon the imposition of an interim coalition government prior to the conduct of elections. The government of the Republic of South Vietnam has rejected this proposal, citing, with considerable justification, their position as the constitutionally-elected representatives of the South Vietnamese people.

~~At this juncture, however, we~~ surely must realize that finding some escape from this impasse lies at the heart of our achieving the cessation of hostilities, ~~for which we so fervently yearn.~~ By now we have learned that neither side can win a decisive military victory. The conflict can only be ended by a negotiated political settlement which is acceptable to all major factions in South Vietnam.

Moreover, since the Paris talks began in May, 1968, more than one-third of all American deaths have occurred.

The casualties to North and South Vietnamese military units, the Viet Cong and civilians have been extremely heavy. The time for bold and decisive initiative has clearly arrived, so that these tragic human losses -- on all sides -- can be ended.

Our strategy, therefore, should be geared to these two overriding objectives: First, to find a solution to the impasse over the procedures for achieving and then implementing a political settlement in South Vietnam; and second, to stop as quickly as possible the high casualties that continue to be suffered by both sides.

It was with these dual objectives in mind that ~~last week~~ <sup>I have</sup> ~~I~~ proposed that our government seriously consider the ceasefire and free election strategy developed by the National Committee for a Political Settlement in Vietnam.

With the announcement of President Nixon that 25,000 U. S. troops will be withdrawn from South Vietnam over the next several months, the conditions are even more conducive to such initiatives by the United States.

First, we should propose in Paris an immediate standstill ceasefire by all sides to take effect as soon as agreement is reached on a schedule for mutual troop withdrawals. Our reduction of U. S. forces of 25,000 men could well be the first step that would stop the killing -- if we have the imagination and skill to seize this opportunity in the Paris negotiations.

One fact is now patently clear: further attempts by either side to improve their bargaining position by military pressure are now simply illusory. The North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong, in particular, have suffered grievous manpower losses in the past year. Indeed, it is estimated that at least 75% of the Viet Cong have gone through battle casualties and defections.

-11-

∟ In short, the conditions appear ripe for serious consideration by both sides of an immediate ceasefire. And even though it is a guerrilla war, I believe both sides have sufficient communication and discipline among their forces to achieve adherence to a ceasefire order if, and this is crucial, both sides see it in their interest to observe the ceasefire.

Second, as the key to unlocking the present political stalemate in Paris, we should propose that free elections, open to all political groups in South Vietnam, be held at the earliest possible date after the ceasefire; and that these elections be supervised by a representative Electoral Commission composed of the major political factions within South Vietnam, plus international representatives.

↳ The Electoral Commission would have jurisdiction over only the administration of the elections, leaving the normal day-to-day duties of running the country to the present government. Throughout the pre and post-election period, phased withdrawals of foreign troops could go forward toward the goal of having all such troops out of the country when the newly-elected government took office.

↳ Third, we should propose the establishment of an International Peacekeeping Corps to oversee the ceasefire, the withdrawal of all outside military forces, and the elections.

↳ The Corps would establish listening posts in province capitals and district towns to receive reports of any violations and make recommendations for their solution by majority rule, rather than the unanimity which has weakened the present International Control Commission. It would be essential, moreover, that the Corps be sufficiently large to cover the several hundred listening posts required for effective monitoring.

Following the election, the International Peacekeeping Corps would remain on duty until it had established iron-clad assurances of protection of minorities against reprisals and to prevent the killing or imprisonment of political opponents by those who won the election.

\* \* \* \*

This period of transition in the world power structure is also characterized by the urgent necessity to decelerate the spiraling nuclear arms race.

We must appreciate the urgency of freezing the strategic nuclear balance between the Soviet Union and the United States at its present levels, and then of beginning to roll back the levels of weaponry in each country.

For unless we succeed now -- and this means within the next few months -- both nations will be committed to an entirely new generation of nuclear weapons that will cost hundreds of billions of dollars, but will be meaningless in securing for either side any significant military advantage.

-14-

↳ It can be predicted, further, that as this military spending accelerates, our urgent domestic needs will continue to be neglected and our efforts to mobilize the country in eradicating poverty and deprivation will fall woefully short of need.

↳ Therefore, high on my list of priorities is the need to begin discussions with the Soviets promptly, and I mean promptly, directed toward the mutual reductions of both offensive and defensive strategic nuclear weapons.

↳ ~~To wait for Congress to act on the issue of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile -- a weapons system whose deployment I steadfastly oppose -- is neither necessary nor desirable. The fact is, it is later than we think -- precious months have already been lost.~~

-15-

The news stories this past week of the continued testing by both the Soviets and the U. S. of MIRV (multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles) surely dramatize the urgency of the present situation. ~~We have also witnessed a new deluge of allegedly sound evidence pointing to dramatic Soviet breakthroughs in strategic weaponry.~~

↳ In these circumstances there can be only one responsible course of action - - it is surely not that of frightening or stampeding the American people or the Congress on these exceedingly delicate issues. ↳ It surely is to begin arms control negotiations now -- knowing full well that we will agree to nothing that would endanger this country's military security, but also knowing that we must exhaust every opportunity to spare mankind the terrible dangers of the nuclear arms race.

\* \* \*

-16-

↳ All these imperatives I have discussed today flow from the new realities of world power and authority we must face in this age of transition.

↳ When we talk of new initiatives to end the war in Vietnam -- or of the urgency for arms control talks with the Soviets -- we are not proposing action that would weaken this country, or would leave this country vulnerable to foreign aggression.

↳ To the contrary, these are precisely the kind of steps which now must be taken to increase the total security of the United States -- a security that can be realized only in a world stabilized against the threat of nuclear annihilation ... in a world made more secure through new multi-national efforts against starvation, poverty and disease ... in a world where the level of danger has been markedly reduced.

-17-

↳ No sane human being can seriously talk about this country withdrawing from the world arena. This is hardly the issue in a world that every day becomes more compact and more interrelated -- and in a world which will continue to need for many decades American leadership, resources, technology, and concern.

↳ What we are talking about is the kind of world in which we all necessarily will live. And on this subject, I respectfully suggest, there is an urgent need in this country for free and open discussion -- a national debate where all sides refrain from questioning the motives, loyalty or patriotism of the others. ↳ To speak about arms control negotiations is not to talk of unilateral disarmament but rather it is to emphasize this planet's best hope for mutual survival.

-18-

~~In this spirit~~ I am confident that America will find its way through this age of transition ... and that there will emerge -- gradually, painfully, and haltingly -- new structures of international order to replace the old. Tomorrow, as in the yesterdays, America must represent hope and humanity.

And in this spirit, I have offered these suggestions.

# # #

## Abernathy, Copeland, Goldberg and Humphrey Address College Gra

HUMPHREY SEES  
SIGNS OF PEACETells Graduates at Baruch  
a Settlement Is Nearer

By RICHARD PHALON

Hubert H. Humphrey said yesterday that there were "extremely hopeful signs" that the chances of "reaching a negotiated political settlement" in Vietnam "are brighter now than they have been for a long time."

One such sign, the former Vice President said at the first commencement exercises of the recently created Bernard M. Baruch College, is "what appears to be a political build-up" by both South Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

There is "plenty" of evidence, Mr. Humphrey said, that the South Vietnamese are "broadening the base of their government" in preparation for the day "when the struggle on the battlefield will be moved into the political arena."

There is also a sign of hope, Mr. Humphrey continued, in the "so-called provisional regime" organized by the National Liberation Front.

His reference was to the new revolutionary provisional government of South Vietnam that has been formed by the National Liberation Front, to take its place in the Paris peace talks on Vietnam.

Called 'Propaganda Trick'  
Saigon and the State Department have discounted formation of the new group as a "propaganda trick" and "the same old wine in a new bottle."

Speaking at Carnegie Hall, where he got a standing ovation from from 1,100 Baruch College graduates and their guests, the former Vice President said President Nixon's proposed withdrawal of 25,000 troops from South Vietnam should generate still more initiative.

As he has in the past, Mr. Humphrey suggested that the United States propose "an immediate standstill cease-fire by all sides to take effect as soon as agreement is reached on a schedule for mutual troop withdrawals."

## Backs 'Free Elections'

Mr. Humphrey also said "we should propose that free selections, open to all political groups in South Vietnam, be held at the earliest possible date after the cease-fire."

The former Vice President was interrupted by applause eight times during his 40-minute speech.

Almost 800 of the students were seniors who were awarded a bachelor's degree. The rest received associate diplomas or graduate degrees in business, education, or public administration.

It was the first graduating class since the college, formerly the Baruch School of Business and Public Administration, was established last July as an independent institution in the City University of New York.

Robert C. Weaver, president of the college and former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the Johnson Administration, introduced Mr. Humphrey as "one of the most articulate champions of civil rights since the Reconstruction."

Mr. Humphrey drew laughter when he replied, "Thank you, Mr. President—it seems like I've said that a few times in my life."

"It's nice to be introduced by friends," he continued, "who on occasions like this have no respect for the truth."

One of the two seniors to graduate with the highest honor was Mrs. Helen R. Friedman, a widow who works as a secretary at William Howard Taft High School and returned to college as an evening student in 1961.

The other senior to graduate summa cum laude was Jacob Leib Todres, who received four awards for excellence in accounting and auditing.



The New York Times (by Barton Silverman)

COMMENCEMENT SPEAKER: Former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey speaking at graduation exercises of Bernard M. Baruch College of the City University of New York.

New York Times

Bernard Baruch College Commencement  
June 12, 1969

FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 1969

L+

# Experiences of New Dangers and Old Hopes Humphrey Sees Chances of Vietnam Peace Bright

By RICHARD PHALON

Hubert H. Humphrey said yesterday that there were "extremely hopeful signs" that the chances of "reaching a negotiated political settlement" in Vietnam "are brighter now than they have been for a long time."

One such sign, the former Vice President said at the first commencement exercises of the recently created Bernard M. Baruch College, is "what appears to be a political build-up" by both South Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

There is "plenty" of evidence, Mr. Humphrey said, that the South Vietnamese are "broadening the base of their government" in preparation for the day "when the struggle on the battlefield will be moved into the political arena."

There is also a sign of hope, Mr. Humphrey continued, in the "so-called provisional regime" organized by the National Liberation Front.

His reference was to the new revolutionary provisional government of South Vietnam that has been formed by the National Liberation Front, to take

its place in the Paris peace talks on Vietnam.

Saigon and the State Department have discounted formation of the new group as a "propaganda trick" and "the same old wine in a new bottle."

Speaking at Carnegie Hall, where he got a standing ovation from 1,100 Baruch College graduates and their guests, the former Vice President said President Nixon's proposed withdrawal of 25,000 troops from South Vietnam should generate still more initiative.

## Backs 'Free Elections'

As he has in the past, Mr. Humphrey suggested that the United States propose "an immediate standstill cease-fire by all sides to take effect as soon as agreement is reached on a schedule for mutual troop withdrawals."

Mr. Humphrey also said, "We should propose that free elections, open to all political groups in South Vietnam, be held at the earliest possible date after the cease-fire."

The former Vice President was interrupted by applause

eight times during his 40-minute speech.

Almost 800 of the students were seniors who were awarded a bachelor's degree. The rest received associate diplomas or graduate degrees in business, education, or public administration.

It was the first graduating class since the college, formerly the Baruch School of Business and Public Administration, was established last July as an independent institution in the City University of New York.

Robert C. Weaver, president of the college and former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the Johnson Administration, introduced Mr. Humphrey as "one of the most articulate champions of civil rights since the Reconstruction."

Mr. Humphrey drew laughter when he replied, "Thank you, Mr. President—it seems like I've said that a few times in my life."

"It's nice to be introduced by friends," he continued, "who on occasions like this have no respect for the truth."

One of the two seniors to

graduate with the highest honor was Mrs. Helen R. Friedman, a widow who works as a secretary at William Howard Taft High School and returned to college as an evening student in 1961.

The other senior to graduate summa cum laude was Jacob Leib Todres, who received four awards for excellence in accounting and auditing.

Remarks

The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey

Commencement Exercises

~~Bernhard Baruch~~ Bernard Baruch College

New York City

June 12, 1969

You have been privileged to attend College in one of the most exciting and challenging periods in the Country's history.

~~Witnessed~~ But ~~these~~ the forces of Change and Renewal we see at every hand are not unique to this Country or people. Indeed, it is increasingly evident that ~~the~~ entire world is passing through an age of transition.

As Henry Kissinger said recently, "To a degree rare in history, world leaders are moving into a great unknown.

"Rules for world order, written less than 25 years ago, are already wearing out.

"New ways for countries to deal with each other will have to be found."

This transition has many aspects, of which the social and cultural may be the most important.

But it also has a political dimension. <sup>In particular, it</sup> ~~it~~ reflects the breakup of a world order in which the nature of power and authority has seemed reasonably clear.

Old national alliances, such as the special and unique relationship between the United States and Great Britain are changing.

New forces, such as Japan, which is already the third strongest economic power in the world, are emerging.

In addition, it is now clear that many of the problems confronting the nations of the world will no longer yield to the powers through which the will of governments historically have prevailed -- namely the sword and the public purse.

Let me be more specific. In 1832 Karl von Clausewitz laid down the dictum that "War is not merely a political act, but also a political instrument -- A continuation of political relations -- a carrying out of the same by other means."

But today, given the unprecedented possibilities that nations now have for devastating their opponents <sup>with strategic nuclear weapons,</sup> war can no longer be considered as merely an extension of politics.

← The costs for all sides are <sup>simply</sup> ~~just~~ too great.

In addition, "conventional" warfare seems, in many cases, to be missing an ingredient that was vital to von Clausewitz's rule: The capacity for ruthlessness.

As Stewart Alsop pointed out recently, military power is a decisive military instrument only if the victor carries out its military victory with sufficient ruthlessness so as to lay the issue to rest for some period of time.

In three recent military confrontations, nations of the world have not so carried out their efforts: the Arab-Israeli War, the United States in Vietnam, and the Russian-Czechoslovakia affair.

In short, von Clausewitz's old dictum no longer works very well in 1969. The power of governments to structure others by military force has changed in its scope and character.

At the same time, there is a developing awareness that action by even the most wealthy governments cannot mobilize the external resources needed to solve the problems faced here and abroad.

Thus, traditional notions of the power and authority of national governments no longer command the allegiance they once did. People and nations are groping for new concepts which will respond more directly to the needs of today. The failure to find them as yet accounts for ~~some~~<sup>much</sup> of the uneasiness and questioning which ~~characterizes much of today's~~<sup>exists throughout the</sup> world.

~~A second feature of the "world today" is that we are witnessing the growth of a new set of divisions in the world -- divisions that rival and threaten to outstrip the traditional East-West confrontation.~~

(insert)

10 min

- 5A -

I am encouraged by what appears to be a political build-up in South Vietnam by both the South Vietnamese government and the National Liberation Front. Just yesterday we read of the so-called provisional regime which has been organized by the N.L.F. There is similar evidence that the South Vietnamese are <sup>broadening</sup> ~~expanding~~ the base of their government-- <sup>r</sup>preparing for the day when the struggle on the battlefield will be moved into the political arena. These are extremely significant, and, in my opinion, extremely hopeful signs-- signs which should tell us that a ~~set~~ the chances of reaching a negotiated political settlement <sup>in Paris</sup> are brighter now than they have been for ~~many~~ a long time.

The question which remains, however, is this: Will we take full advantage of these new conditions. Will we <sup>now</sup> exercise ~~our~~ the bold leadership ~~and~~ which can transform potentiality into reality?

(6)

\* \* \* \*

These circumstances are brought to sharp and tragic focus by the continuing conflict in Vietnam.

In the final analysis, our great sacrifices of human life and resources have been made with only one object in view: ~~the~~ <sup>to achieve</sup> opportunity for all the people of South Vietnam to chart their own future through democratic procedures and principles.

Peace ultimately depends on reaching a settlement acceptable to all the people of South Vietnam. The United States has no more right than Hanoi to impose a settlement on South Vietnam or to negotiate unilaterally the future of

*Our overwhelming power and authority*  
the 16 million South Vietnamese people. <sup>^</sup>

*are as nothing when it comes to dictating peace terms* ~~to~~ <sup>and this</sup>  
*tragic conflict*

But we have learned in the process that

But, by the same token, the United States very much has the right -- indeed, we have the obligation -- to advocate as vigorously as we can in Paris and elsewhere, our ideas for achieving a durable political settlement. ~~President Nixon did precisely this in his recent speech on Vietnam. And I assume he will continue such advocacy in the forthcoming talks with President Thieu on Midway Island this Sunday.~~

✓ In particular, we must stress the importance of bringing ~~dissenting South Vietnamese~~ in the National Liberation Front and the Viet Cong into the legitimate political processes of South Vietnam, provided they are willing to accept democratic procedures.

For some time now the negotiations in Paris have been stalled over the fundamental issue of how this is to be accomplished; that is, ~~find~~ <sup>how to find</sup> ~~a way to create~~ <sup>how to establish</sup> procedures for

*peaceful*

political competition among individuals and groups which have for many years considered each other to be outlaws and

*violent* subversives, ~~forced~~ <sup>forced</sup> to be opposed with whatever means were available.

Obviously, this is an exceedingly difficult problem -- one which demands the greatest patience and skill on all sides.

The National Liberation Front, supported by the North Vietnamese, has insisted upon the imposition of an interim coalition government prior to the conduct of elections. The government of the Republic of South Vietnam has rejected this proposal, citing, with considerable justification, their position as the constitutionally-elected representatives of the South Vietnamese people.

~~12~~ (9)

At this juncture, however, we surely must realize that finding some escape from this impasse lies at the heart of our achieving the cessation of hostilities for which we so fervently yearn. By now we have learned that neither side can win a decisive military victory. The conflict can only be ended by a negotiated political settlement *acceptable to all major factions in South Vietnam* which is

Moreover, since the Paris talks began in May, 1968, more than one-third of all American deaths have occurred. The casualties to North and South Vietnamese military units, the Viet Cong and civilians have been extremely heavy. The time for bold and decisive initiative has clearly arrived, so that these tragic human losses -- on all sides -- can be ended.

Our strategy, therefore, should be geared to these two overriding objectives: First, to find a solution to the impasse over the procedures for achieving and then implementing a political settlement in South Vietnam; and second, to stop as quickly as possible the high casualties that continue to be ~~incurred~~ <sup>suffered</sup> by both sides.

It is ~~with~~ <sup>was with</sup> these dual objectives in ~~view~~ <sup>mind</sup> that I ~~comment~~ <sup>comment</sup> to our government and the American people the ceasefire and free election strategy developed by the National Committee for a Political Settlement in Vietnam.

~~What are the principal elements of this strategy?~~

Last week I proposed that our government seriously consider



\$ 240.00

\$ 200.00

30

15 Th

20.00	Duckson	\$ 14.00	W&L
21.00	Suburban		
25.00	Finance	25.00	Loreys
<u>\$ 66.00</u>		9.50	Merine
20.00	Cassell	4.00	<del>Merine</del>
88.00			

\$ 52.50

20.00 Mrs. Bauer

7200 @ year

211.00 Telephone Co

\$ 93.00

With ~~President Johnson~~ ~~the~~ announcement  
of President Nixon that 25,000 U.S. Troops will  
be withdrawn from South Vietnam over the  
next ~~few~~ <sup>several</sup> months, the conditions are even  
more conducive to ~~the~~ ~~such~~ such initiatives  
by the United States.

First, we should propose <sup>in Paris</sup> an immediate standstill ceasefire  
by all sides ~~in Vietnam~~ to take effect as soon as agreement  
is reached on a schedule for mutual troop withdrawals. Further  
attempts by either side to improve their bargaining position by  
military pressure are <sup>now</sup> simply illusory.

The North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong, in particular,  
have suffered grievous manpower losses in the past year.  
Indeed, it is estimated that at least 75% of the Viet Cong have  
gone through battle casualties and defections.

~~Since we stopped bombing the North, there is evidence  
that the North Vietnamese are less interested in the war.  
Morale has sagged badly. The death rate from battle is high.  
There is reason to believe that the North Vietnamese people  
are asking why their forces remain in South Vietnam when  
no one is attacking the North.~~

~~There are now factors that~~  
could well be  
Our reduction of U.S. forces by 25,000 men is the first  
step that would stop the killing -- if we have the imagination  
and skill to seize this opportunity in the Paris negotiations

One fact is now patently clear:

(12)

- 12

~~In other words, to a greater degree than has been true~~

*In short,*

~~in recent years,~~ the conditions appear ripe for serious

consideration by both sides of an immediate ceasefire. And even though it is a guerrilla war, I believe both sides have sufficient communication and discipline among their forces to achieve adherence to a ceasefire order if, and this is crucial, both sides see it in their interest to observe the ceasefire.

Second, as the key to unlocking the present political stalemate in Paris, we should propose that free elections, open to all political groups in South Vietnam, be held at the earliest possible date after the ceasefire, and that these elections be supervised by a representative Electoral Commission composed of the major political factions within South Vietnam, plus international representatives.

The Electoral Commission would have jurisdiction over only the administration of the elections, leaving the normal day-to-day duties of running the country to the present government. Throughout the pre and post-election period, phased withdrawals of foreign troops could go forward toward the goal of having all such troops out of the country when the newly-elected government took office.

Third, we should propose the establishment of an International Peacekeeping Corps to oversee the ceasefire, the withdrawal of all outside military forces, and the elections.

The Corps would establish listening posts in province capitals and district towns to receive reports of any violations and make recommendations for their solution by majority rule, rather than the unanimity which has weakened the present International Control Commission. It would be essential, moreover, that the Corps be sufficiently large to cover the several hundred listening posts required for effective monitoring.

Following the election, the International Peacekeeping Corps would remain on duty until it had established iron-clad assurances of protection of minorities against reprisals and to prevent the killing or imprisonment of political opponents by those who won the election.

~~Once elected, the new South Vietnamese government would, hopefully, devote substantial and immediate attention to inaugurating the long overdue and oft-postponed sweeping land-reform program. The South Vietnamese people must have a visible and personal stake in the success of their new government; land reform is the most direct and significant way to begin building these loyalties.~~

(15)

\* \* \*

[This <sup>period</sup> ~~of~~ transition ~~is the~~ is also characterized by the urgent necessity to decelerate the <sup>spiraling</sup> nuclear arms race.

[We must appreciate the urgency of ~~both nations are successful now~~

~~and this means within the next few months~~

~~the~~ freezing the strategic nuclear balance between the Soviet Union and the United States at its <sup>present</sup> levels, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> then ~~to~~ beginning to roll ~~back~~ back the levels of <sup>weaponry</sup> in each country.

[For unless we succeed now -- and this means within the next few months --

both nations will be ~~caught up in a race~~ <sup>of</sup> fully committed to an entirely new generation of nuclear weapons that will cost hundreds of billions of dollars, and be meaningless in securing <sup>for</sup> either side any significant military advantage.

~~It~~ It can be predicted, further, that as this military spending accelerates, our urgent domestic needs will continue to be neglected and our efforts to mobilize the country in eradicating ~~the~~ poverty and deprivation will fall woefully short of need.

Therefore, high on my list of <sup>priorities</sup> is the need to ~~start~~ begin discussions promptly, and I mean promptly, with the Soviets directed toward the mutual reduction of both offensive and defensive nuclear weapons.

<sup>Solving</sup> To wait for Congress to act on the issue of the anti-ballistic missile -- a weapons system I steadfastly oppose -- is neither necessary nor desirable. The fact is: it is later than we think. The <sup>news</sup> ~~story~~ this past week of the continued testing by both the Soviet and the U.S. of ~~the~~ MIRV (multiple <sup>independently</sup> targeted re-entry <sup>vehicles</sup>) surely dramatizes this fact.

(In these circumstances there can be only one)

~~The time to negotiate is now. If the negotiations are successful, we will be spared the costs of these new weapons and the~~

<sup>prudent</sup> prudent course of action: ~~beginning~~ to begin arms ~~control~~ control negotiations now.

\* \* \* \*

(17)

FR ~~about this~~

All ~~of~~ these imperatives I have  
discussed today ~~flow~~ flow from the ~~fundamental~~  
new realities of <sup>world</sup> power and authority we must  
face in this ~~of~~ age of transition.

When we talk of <sup>new initiatives to end the</sup> ~~ending the~~ ~~war~~  
in Vietnam - or of the urgency for arms control  
talks with the Soviets - ~~these~~ we are  
not ~~discussing~~ proposing action that would  
weaken this country, or would leave this  
country vulnerable to foreign aggression.

To the contrary, there are precisely  
the kind of steps which now must be  
taken to increase the total security of  
the United States -- a security that can be  
~~now only be found in a world more~~  
~~stable world~~ realized only in a world  
stabilized against the threat of nuclear  
<sup>annihilation</sup> ~~annihilation~~ ... <sup>and in</sup> a world made more secure  
through new ~~commitments~~ multi-national  
efforts against starvation, poverty and ~~the~~  
disease.

No sane human being <sup>seriously</sup> can talk about

(18)

The country withdrawing from the world arena. This is hardly the issue in a world ~~made more compact and more~~ ~~society-related through advances~~ ~~advances~~ in communication and ~~that~~ becomes more compact and more interrelated every day.

What we are talking about is the kind of world in which we <sup>necessarily</sup> ~~necessarily~~ will live. And on this subject, I respectfully suggest, there is an urgent need in this country for free and open discussion -- a <sup>national</sup> debate, where all sides refrain from questioning the motives, loyalty, or patriotism of the others.

In this spirit I am confident that America will find its way through this age of transition . . . and that there will emerge -- gradually, painfully, and haltingly -- a new structure of international order to replace the old.

And in this spirit, I ~~offer~~ <sup>have</sup> ~~made~~ offered this suggestion this afternoon.

# #

It can be predicted, further, that as this military spending accelerates, our urgent domestic needs will continue to be neglected and our efforts to mobilize the country in eradicating poverty and deprivation will fall woefully short of need.

Therefore, high on my list of priorities is the need to *with the Soviets* begin discussions promptly, and I mean promptly, ~~with the Soviets~~ directed toward the mutual reductions of both *strategic* offensive and defensive nuclear weapons.

To wait for Congress to act on the issue of the Safeguard *whose deployment* anti-ballistic missile -- a weapon<sup>s</sup> system, I steadfastly oppose -- is neither necessary nor desirable. The fact is, it is later than we *precious months have already been lost.* think. The news stories this past week of the continued testing *by* of both the Soviets and the U. S. of MIRV ( multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles) surely dramatizes *the urgency* of the present situation. We have also ~~received~~ *new* witnessed a ~~deluge~~ deluge of allegedly ~~some~~ *sound* evidence pointing to dramatic Soviet breakthroughs in *the strategic strategic* weaponry.

(over)

~~I say this is not the time to~~

In these circumstances, there can be only one <sup>responsible</sup> ~~prudent~~ Council of action -- ~~and that~~ it is surely not that of ~~the~~ frightening or stampeding the ~~Congress~~ American people or the Congress on these exceedingly delicate issues. It surely is to begin arms control negotiations now -- ~~carefully~~ ~~proceed~~ knowing full well that we will ~~do~~ <sup>open to</sup> nothing ~~to~~ that would endanger this country's military security, but also knowing that we must ~~seize~~ <sup>seize</sup> without every opportunity to spare mankind the terrible dangers of the nuclear arms race.

~~Otherwise we must avoid continuing  
down the step by step toward  
nuclear destruction~~ -15-

In these circumstances there can be only one prudent  
course of action: <sup>that of beginning</sup> to begin arms control negotiations now.

\* \* \* \*

All these imperatives I have discussed today flow from the  
new realities of world power and authority we must face in this  
age of transition.

When we talk of new initiatives to end the war in Vietnam -  
or of the urgency for arms control talks with the Soviets - we are  
not proposing action that would weaken this country, or would  
leave this country vulnerable to foreign aggression.

To the contrary, these are precisely the kind of steps which  
now must be taken to increase the total security of the United  
States -- a security that can be realized only in a world  
stabilized against the threat of nuclear annihilation... ~~and~~  
in a world made more secure through new multi-national efforts  
against starvation, poverty and disease. . . *in a world  
where the level of danger has been  
markedly reduced.*

*I call upon President Nixon to give us  
~~the~~ this chance ~~to~~ -- what may well be  
our last chance -- to halt the nuclear arms race  
before it kills humanity.*

To speak about ~~the~~ arms control negotiations is not to talk of unilateral disarmament but rather it is to emphasize this ~~to~~ planet's ~~best~~ hope for mutual survival.

No sane human being can seriously talk about ~~the~~ <sup>this</sup> country

withdrawing from the world arena. This is hardly the issue in a world that becomes more compact and more interrelated <sup>every day</sup> ~~and in~~ <sup>-- and in</sup> ~~a world which will continue to~~ <sup>every day</sup> ~~need for many decades American resources,~~ <sup>technology, leadership,</sup> and concern.

What we are talking about is the kind of world in which we all necessarily will live. And on this subject, I respectfully suggest, there is an urgent need in this country for free and open discussion -- a national debate where all sides refrain from questioning the motive, loyalty or patriotism of the others.

In this spirit I am confident that America will find its way through this age of transition... and that there will emerge -- gradually, painfully, and haltingly -- new structures of international order to replace the old. <sup>Tomorrow as in the yesterday, America must represent</sup> And in this spirit, I have offered these suggestions.

~~this afternoon.~~

hope and humanity

# # #



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)