

February 17, 1965. NYC: Pacem in Terris.

For drafts and other information see Box 910 (23.E.5.7B), Foreign Affairs General Files: "Set 2. By Subject: Pacem in Terris Conference."

Also see corresponding speech/appearance file.

- Mr. Sen. General - look, so well
- Mr. President
- Ambassador Stevenson
- Mr. Paul Hoffman

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT

John F. Kennedy
Lyndon B. Johnson

Hubert H. Humphrey

before the

PACEM IN TERRIS Conference

New York City

February 17, 1965

Peace On Earth

↳ The Scripture tells us to "Pursue peace" - and mankind has since the beginning of time condemned the horrors of war.

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

↳ Yet men of peace of every kind and every land remember well the year 1963. For in that fateful year a venerable apostle

of peace left our world, leaving behind a legacy which will
endure for years to come. Generations of men -- young and old
alike -- will remember the final testament of that gentle
peasant Pope, Pope John XXIII, the encyclical Pacem in Terris,
in which he left to men of all faiths, ~~holding many~~
concepts of peace, an outline for peace ~~which~~
can be accepted by all ~~men~~ of goodwill.

And, if our generation can heed the parting plea of the
man whose work we honor at this Conference, generations yet
to come may hope to live in a world where, in the words of the
late President Kennedy, "the strong are just, the weak secure
and the peace preserved."

It is a privilege and an honor to participate in this
Conference dedicated to exploring the meaning and the message
of Pacem in Terris. It is particularly fitting that this convoca-
tion meet at the beginning of "International Cooperation Year."

~~Perhaps we here can give our imagination and~~
~~I am confident that your deliberations here will advance our~~
~~and may the hope and the promise of this year~~
~~world along the road to "peace on earth" as described in~~

be realized &

~~Pope John~~

The encyclical ~~John~~ ^{the} XXIII ~~was~~ ^{gave} to the world ~~was~~

a public philosophy for a nuclear era. Comprehensive in
scope, his message expounded a political philosophy governing
relations between the individual and the state, ~~relations~~
between ^{the} states, and ~~relations~~ between an individual state
and the world organizations,

Pacem in Terris continues and completes the social
philosophy which the Pope had ^{outlined} ~~given~~ a year earlier in his
encyclical ^{Ma-gist-ra} Mater et Magistra, ~~in which~~ ^{therein} he elaborated the
principles of ~~social~~ justice which should guide the social
^{within the state.} order. In Pacem in Terris he extended this philosophy to
the world, concentrating now on relations between ^{the} states
and the role of the world community,

This encyclical represents not a utopian blueprint
for world peace, presupposing a sudden change in the nature
of man. Rather, it represents a call to action to leaders

of nations, presupposing only a gradual change in human institutions. It is not confined to elaborating the abstract virtues of peace but looks to the building of a world community governed by institutions capable of preserving peace.

The Pope outlined principles which can guide the actions of ~~all~~ all men regardless of color, creed or political affiliation -- but it is ^{the} ~~the~~ statesmen ^{the leaders} - ^{who must} decide how these principles are to be applied. The challenge to this Conference is to provide ^{to our} ~~statesmen~~ ^{our leaders} - ~~with~~ further guidelines for applying the philosophy of Pacem in Terris to the problems confronting our world.

~~to the statesmen~~

~~I would like to direct my remarks principally to the questions of relations between states and to that of a world~~

~~community~~ ^h Pope John's preoccupation -- and our preoccupation today -- is with an amelioration of international ^{tensions}

~~was~~ created and aggravated by ~~the~~ the

existence of modern nuclear weapons. The leaders of the

world must understand - as he understood - that since that

day at Alamogordo when man acquired the power to obliterate

himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face.

And the vision of it ^{should} sober ~~all~~ all men, ~~and~~ ^{it} demands of them

a keener perception of mutual interests and a higher order

of responsibility. Under these conditions mankind must

concentrate on the problems that unite us rather than on

those which divide us.

~~_____~~ The issues of war and peace

are the concern of all. Statesmen, - who bear a heavier

responsibility than others - cannot ignore the implications

for the survival of mankind of new discoveries in technology,

biology, nuclear physics and space. In this nuclear age the

deliberate initiation of full-scale war as an instrument of

national policy has become folly ~~of~~ ^{yo} madness.

There may have been a time⁶ when war was

~~originally~~ ^{serve} a means to protect national interests.

Today war

can assure the death of a nation, the decimation of a continent. ~~It is madness to imagine that.~~

↳ Nuclear power has placed into the hands of men the power to destroy all that man has created. ~~Only~~ ^R responsible

statesmen ~~who persevere~~ ^{know} that perseverance in the pursuit

of peace is not cowardice, but courage! ~~that~~ ^R restraint in

the use of forces is not weakness, but wisdom! ~~our present~~

~~present international rivalries from leading to an~~

~~in a world~~

↳ The confrontation between the United States and the

Soviet Union over Cuba in the autumn of 1962 undoubtedly

weighed heavily in the Pope's thinking and lent urgency to his

concern to halt the nuclear arms race. Addressing the

leaders of the world, he stated:

"Justice, right, reason, and humanity urgently

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

[This plea had special pertinence for the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, the principal nuclear powers.]

A few months later, President Kennedy demonstrated the US commitment to the goal of peace. In a speech at American University in June of 1963, he called for renewed efforts toward a "more practical, more attainable peace -- based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions -- on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the

interest of all concerned.ⁿ

The leaders of the Soviet Union responded favorably.

?
1
~~In October 1963,~~ ^{Quoted} ~~The U.S. and Soviet governments~~ ^{Union} signed a

treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer

space and under water. This treaty won respect throughout

the world. ~~For the United States and the Soviet Union~~

~~indeed~~ for all nations who signed it. It has inspired

hope for the future of mankind on this planet. And ~~members~~

~~of this world~~ ^{you} will recall that the man who first proposed

a test ban treaty ~~was made~~ in 1956 -- and who shares in the

credit for its accomplishment -- is the United States

Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai E.

Stevenson.

L The nuclear test ban was the first step in the path
toward a more enduring peace. "The longest journey begins
with a single step," President Johnson has said -- and that

single step has been taken.

Other steps have followed.

L We have resolved not to station weapons of mass
destruction in space. A United Nations resolution, jointly
sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union, called
on all countries to refrain from such action. It was
adopted by acclamation, ~~without a single dissenting~~

L This was a vital step toward preventing the extension
of the arms race into outer space.

L This year the United States is cutting back on the
production of fissionable materials. Great Britain and the
Soviet Union have announced cutbacks in their planned pro-
duction of fissionable materials for use in weapons, ~~as~~

~~President Johnson has stated that the race for large nuclear
stockpiles can be productive as well as harmful.~~

L The need for ^{instant} communication between the

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

The agenda for the future remains long. ~~measures needed to limit the dangers of the nuclear age are~~ *we need* measures designed to prevent war by miscalculation or accident.

We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of selected observation points. We must seek to restrict the nuclear arms race by preventing the transfer of nuclear weapons to the control of non-nuclear nations, by transferring fissionable materials from military to peaceful purposes, and by outlawing underground tests, with adequate inspection and enforcement.

The United States has offered a freeze on the production of aircraft and missiles used for delivering nuclear weapons. Such a freeze might open the door to reductions in nuclear strategic delivery vehicles.

~~The intention of~~ The United States ~~will~~ pursue every reasonable avenue toward agreement with the Soviet Union in limiting the nuclear arms race.

~~Johnson~~ President has made it clear that he will leave ~~nothing~~ undone, no mile untraveled, to further the pursuit of peace.

~~The~~ ~~in the~~ ~~1965~~ ~~we~~ must recognize that the next major step in controlling the nuclear arms race requires us to look beyond the narrow U.S.-Soviet competition of the past. ~~So~~ the explosion of a nuclear device by Communist China in 1964 has impressed upon us once again that the world of today is no longer the

bi-polar world of an earlier decade. *Nuclear Competition*

is no longer limited to two super-powers.

↳ The efforts of the United States and Europe to enable the nations of Europe to have a greater share in nuclear defense policy -- without encouraging the development of independent national nuclear deterrents -- constitute a recognition of this.

↳ In addition to Europe, we now have the problem of finding ways of preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East.

↳ With the explosion of the Chinese nuclear device ~~several months ago~~ several months ago -- and the prospect of others to follow -- it may be that the most immediate "next step" in controlling the nuclear arms race is the prevention of further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia.

With the
~~In view of the~~ evident determination of the present
Communist government of Mainland China to use ~~its~~ ^{its} limited
nuclear capability ~~to build up~~ for maximum political
and propaganda benefit, it is not surprising that other
modern Asian nations are tempted to build their own nuclear
deterrent. But the nations on the perimeter of Communist
China ~~are not alone~~ ^{will not stand alone.} President Johnson has ~~said~~ ^{said} —

"The nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons
can be sure that if they need our strong support against
some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

But, If the need for preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons is more immediate in Asia today, it is no less important in Latin America, Africa and the Near East.

L All of these areas are ripe for regional arms pacts which would prevent these countries from developing nuclear

weapons. Nuclear weapons would serve no useful purpose in preserving their security. The introduction of these

weapons would provoke a rivalry that would imperil the peace

of Latin America and Africa and intensify the present rivalries in the Near East. *L* It would endanger the precarious economies

of countries which already possess military forces too large for their security needs and too expensive to be maintained

without outside assistance.

L Such nuclear arms control agreements should naturally be initiated by the nations of the area. In Latin America, such an agreement has already been proposed. Should the

nations of Latin America, ~~the~~ Africa and the Near East through their own institutions or through the United Nations, take the initiative in establishing nuclear free zones, they will earn the appreciation of all nations, ~~the~~ the. Containment in these areas would represent a major step toward world peace.

II.

⌞ If nuclear rivalry is an obstacle to peace today, it is not the only one.

⌞ In Pacem in Terris John XXIII returned to a theme he had discussed in Mater et ^{Magistra} Magistra when he stated:

"Given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists." ⌋
control of nuclear weapons is a central issue in improving relations between East and West, accelerating the economic

development of new nations is essential to harmony between North and South.

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

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

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

~~2000~~ -- for our lot is their lot, our future their
future, our peace their peace. This planet is simply too
small for the insulation of the rich against turbulence
bred of injustice in any part of the world.

↳ The flow of foreign aid -- both capital and technical
assistance -- is indispensable to the narrowing of the gap
between rich nations and poor. Much has been done by
individual nations and by international organization.

↳ But more must be done -- both through foreign aid and by
enlarging their opportunities for trade -- to assist those
developing nations which are striving to bring to their
people the economic and social benefits of modern
civilization. ↳ The exact dimensions of the task and the
most effective way of fulfilling it are questions which
deserve ^{Priority} priority attention by the United Nations.

↳ If the arms race is a strain on the economy of rich

nations, it is an intolerable burden on that of poor nations.

For developing nations with a rapidly expanding population, primitive economic institutions, and little capital development, participation in ^{an} ~~nuclear~~ arms race is indefensible.

A pioneer statesman of the nuclear era, the late Senator Brien McMahon, proposed almost two decades ago that resources diverted from the arms race could be set aside to meet the unmet social and economic needs of mankind. His counsel remains valid today.

III

The man whom we honor today -- like his predecessors ~~before him~~ -- recognized that a secure peace depends on a stable world community. And a stable world community requires a viable international organization.

The strengthening of the existing world organization -- the United Nations -- is one of our most urgent tasks.

h Today we hear voices advocating abandonment of
the United Nations, withdrawal from the United Nations,

h They are misguided. They would abandon an imperfect
instrument for preserving world peace because they
dislike our imperfect world. ^{But} To abandon the U.N. -- or

to immobilize it through crippling restrictions or

failure to support it -- would only prove that our

generation has forgotten the lessons of ^{unwar and loss} half a century

of nationalism and isolationism. Let those who would

destroy the United Nations recall the international

anarchy that followed the ^{death} ~~end~~ of the League of Nations.

h In a nuclear era when anarchy can lead to annihilation,

the UN deserves the support of all nations -- large and

small, rich and poor. The heroes of the world community

are not those who withdraw when difficulties ensue -- not

those who can envision neither the prospect of success or

the consequence of failure -- but those who stand the heat of the battle -- the fight for world peace through the United Nations.

↳ ~~_____~~ The General Assembly is facing a recess while negotiations proceed in search of a solution to the present constitutional impasse.

↳ This is not a happy situation and it raises some political and legal problems for the UN's largest contributor as I am sure it does for other members.

There are several things to be noted about this crisis.

First, the United Nations will continue even though the General Assembly has been deadlocked by a refusal of certain members to meet their obligations. The Security Council is not affected -- nor are the operations of that diversified family of affiliated agencies in the UN system.

Second, the membership includes nations with radically different ideas about the proper role of international organizations in world affairs; yet none denies they have a role. The argument is not whether the General Assembly should continue to function but under what ground rules it should carry on.

Third, the United Nations has expanded rapidly and almost continuously for two decades now -- and in the course of it, the membership has more than doubled. In the meantime, the world environment in which it operates has undergone pervasive change. Under the circumstances, it would be surprising if the Organization did not face some awkward adjustments to new realities.

It may take time and patience and a high capacity to absorb frustration before the General Assembly gets

back on the track or selects a somewhat different road

ahead. But I am confident we meet in the hall of an international institution which is in the throes of growing pains -- not in the grip of a fatal disease.

Another aspect of the world organization that requires

immediate strengthening is the peacekeeping machinery of

the United Nations. Given the scope and the scale of

major power interests and commitments around the world --

we are required to assume that any armed conflict may bear

within it the seeds of a nuclear disaster.

So a workable peace system must be able to resolve

by non-violent means the kinds of disputes which in the

past have led to wars -- and to keep disruptive change

in non-violent channels.

Here we can begin to see ^{how} ~~just now~~ operational a peace

system must be -- to visualize peacekeeping machinery in

but

being and in action.

out

L In its most operational and visible form, peace-keeping in action is an armed patrol of soldiers of peace in blue berets -- standing between warring ethnic groups in Cyprus...men who patrol the Gaza Strip twenty-four hours a day for the eighth year running... those who, ~~inspect~~ repair breaches of the peace along the other frontiers of Israel...others who still stand watch along the ¹⁵ fifteen-year-old truce line in Kashmir... and still others who keep ^{watch} ~~are~~ on the armistice line along the Thirty-eighth Parallel in Korea.

h These units of operational peacekeeping machinery
were in place and in action ~~was~~ this morning and
they will be there when we go to bed tonight because there
is an international organization to deal with threats to
the peace; because there ~~are~~ established rules and procedures
for conducting the business of peacekeeping; because there was
~~is~~ a way to finance peacekeeping missions; and because
members made available personnel and equipment and transport
and other goods and services.

h the machinery of peace is much much more than
keeping an uneasy truce: it is the Security Council and the
General Assembly and the Secretariat; it is conference
machinery and voting procedures and Resolutions and
assessments; it is a mission of inquiry or observation --
and a single civilian moving anonymously from private
meeting to private meeting on a conciliation assignment.

Peacekeeping machinery is organization -- plus
people and resources -- designed and operated to sustain
a secure world order.

What we have so far is rudimentary -- even primitive --
machinery. It is not as extensive as it should be. It is
not as versatile as it should be. It is not as reliable as
it should be.

But it is machinery. It has proved to be workable
in practice when enough members in practice wanted it to work.

Clearly one of the requirements of a workable peace
system is to supplement, and complement and improve the
operational peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations.

Eventually we would hope that this machinery should
be in a position to seek the peaceful resolution of disputes
and incipient conflicts -- ideally by quiet conciliation --
if need be, by verbal confrontation before the bar of world

opinion - and in extremis by placing whatever kind of peacekeeping force is needed in a position between antagonists -- so that no sovereignty is without potential international protection and no nation need call upon other nations to help protect them from predatory neighbors.

L Today we recognize that this is not possible.

L The case of Vietnam is an example.

In 1954 the Geneva accords were ratified guaranteeing the independent status of South Vietnam. Today in Vietnam that freedom is endangered by the systematic attempt of foreign backed subversives to win control of the country,

L Today peace in Southeast Asia can be obtained if the violators will cease their aggression.

L Our policy is clear. We will continue to seek a return to the essentials of the Geneva accords of 1954. We will resist aggression. We will be faithful to a friend.

↳ We seek no wider war. We seek no dominion. Our goal in

Southeast Asia is today what it was in 1954 -- what it was

in 1962. Our goal is peace and freedom for the people of

Vietnam.

↳ An essential step for the strengthening of peacekeeping is the establishment of a flexible troop call-up system for future emergencies. The U.N. cannot do its peacekeeping job if there are long delays in getting its forces to world

Ord

trouble spots.

↳ The Secretary General's request that members maintain special U.N. peacekeeping contingents deserves the support of all, and I rejoice that some members have already responded -- Canada, the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and Iran.

↳ The U. S. will assist in this strengthening of the peacekeeping capacity by helping to train and equip contingents of *other nations* earmarked for U. N. use -- by transporting these units when necessary -- and by paying *our* fair share of the cost of peacekeeping operations.

↳ We hope others will do the same.

↳ It is, of course, the smaller countries which stand in the greatest need of international protection. But the great powers have an equal interest in effective peacekeeping machinery.

For the United States, the
~~For a nation of the United States~~ investment

in U. N. Peacekeeping is one of the best we can make,

↳ We do not aspire to any Pax Americana. We have no
desire to play the role of global gendarme. Although
we shall honor our commitments to assist friendly nations
in preserving their freedom, we have no desire to inter-
ject American troops into explosive local disputes.

↳ But disputes do occur; and if hostilities are to be
ended and the peace preserved, there must be some outside
force available to intervene. In many cases -- though not
in all -- a stable professional U. N. force can play that
role.

↳ Therefore, both the large powers and the small powers

have a common interest -- if for different reasons -- in
effective international peacekeeping machinery.

↳ This is why the current impasse in the General Assembly --
and the consequent paralysis in its ability to rise to an
emergency if need be -- is to be so deeply regretted.

IV

↳ I have dwelt briefly this evening on but three of the
foremost problems of peace -- nuclear competition, the gap
between rich nations and poor, and the need for building a
world community through the United Nations. ↳ In this Conference
you will explore others.

A year ago in addressing the United Nations, President
Johnson stated: "All that we have built in the wealth of nations,
and all that we plan to do toward a better life for all, will
be in vain if our feet should slip, or our vision falter, and
our hopes ended in another world-wide war. If there is one

commitment more than any other that I would like to leave
with you today, it is my unswerving commitment to the keeping
and to the strengthening of the peace."

Our commitment to strengthening the peace has not
weakened. We seek a just and lasting peace -- a peace that
is more than a pause between wars. But our knowledge of our-
selves tells us that we can expect no sudden epidemic of
peace, that we have far to go before the "greatness of our
institutions" matches the "grandeur of our intentions". ^{yes,} The
pursuit of peace is a ~~radical~~ process. *not a miracle,*

Peace is too important to be the exclusive concern
of the great powers. It requires the attention of all --
small nations and large, old nations and new.

The pursuit of peace resembles the building of a great
cathedral. It is the work of generations. In concept it
requires a master architect; in execution, the labors of many.

L The pursuit of peace requires time -- but we must use time as a tool and not as a couch. We must be prepared to profit from the vision of peace left by great men who came our way.

L We honor Pope John XXIII ~~on this occasion~~ not because he demonstrated that perfect peace can be achieved in a our time. We honor him because he raised our hopes and exalted our vision.

L He realized that the hopes and expectations aroused could not all be satisfied in the immediate future. What can be accomplished in a limited time will always fall short of expectations.

L This should not discourage us. What is important is that we be prepared to give some evidence that progress toward peace is being made, that some of the unsolved problems of peace can be met in the future.

L This is the vision which Pope John left us in his

encyclical Pacem in Terris.

"Without vision the people perish," says the ~~Sacred Scripture~~.

It is the duty of our generation to convert this vision
of peace into reality. | ~~_____~~
 .

*This Century will not be
remembered for its warriors
but its Peace Makers.*

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT

Hubert H. Humphrey

before the

PACEM IN TERRIS Conference

New York City

February 17, 1965

Peace on Earth

The Scripture tells us to "Pursue peace" - and mankind has since the beginning of time condemned the horrors of war. If discord and strife, wars and the threat of wars have persisted throughout history, it is perhaps as St. Augustine says: that men make war not because they love peace the less, but rather because they love their own kind of peace the more. Yet men of peace of every kind and every land remember well the year 1963. For in that fateful year a venerable apostle of peace left our world, leaving behind a legacy which will endure for years to come. Generations of men -- young and old alike -- will remember the final testament of that gentle peasant Pope, Pope John XXIII, the encyclical Pacem in Terris, in which he left to men of all faiths, to men holding many concepts of peace, an outline for peace in our world which can be accepted by all men of good will.

And if our generation can heed the parting plea of the man whose work we honor at this Conference, generations yet to come may hope to live in a world where in the words of the late President Kennedy "the strong are just, the weak secure and the peace preserved."

It is a privilege and an honor to participate in this Conference dedicated to exploring the meaning and the message of Pacem in Terris. It is particularly fitting that this convocation meet at the beginning of International Cooperation Year. I am confident that your deliberations here will advance our world along the road to "peace on earth" as described by Pope John.

The encyclical John XXIII presented to the world was a public philosophy for a nuclear era. Comprehensive in scope, his message expounded a political philosophy governing relations between the individual and the state, relations between states, and relations between an individual state and the world organizations.

Pacem in Terris continues and completes the social philosophy which the Pope had begun a year earlier in his encyclical Mater et Magistra, in which he elaborated the principles of social justice which should guide the social order. In Pacem in Terris he extended this philosophy to the world, concentrating now on relations between states and the role of the world community.

This encyclical represents not a utopian blueprint for world peace, presupposing a sudden change in the nature of men. Rather, it represents a call to action to leaders of nations, presupposing only a gradual change in human institutions. It is not confined to elaborating the abstract virtues of peace but looks to the building of a world community governed by institutions capable of preserving peace.

The Pope outlined principles which can guide the actions of men -- all men regardless of color, creed or political affiliation -- but it is up to statesmen to decide how these principles are to be applied. The challenge to this Conference is to provide statesmen with further guidelines for applying the philosophy of Pacem in Terris to the problems confronting our world in 1965.

I would like to direct my remarks principally to the questions of relations between states and to that of a world community. Pope John's preoccupation -- and our preoccupation today -- is with an amelioration of international relations in the light of the dangers to mankind posed by the existence of modern nuclear weapons. The leaders of the world must understand -- as he understood -- that since that day at Alamogordo when man acquired the power to obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face. And the vision of it has sobered all men and demanded of them a keener perception of mutual interests and a higher order of responsibility. Under these conditions mankind must concentrate on the problems that unite us rather than on those which divide us.

Pope John proclaimed that the issues of war and peace are the concern of all. Statesmen -- who bear a heavier responsibility than others -- cannot ignore the implications for the survival of mankind of new discoveries in technology, biology, nuclear physics and space. In this nuclear age the deliberate initiation of full-scale war as an instrument of national policy has become folly.

Originally a means to protect national interests, war today can assure the death of a nation, the decimation of a continent.

Nuclear power has placed into the hands of men the power to destroy all that man has created. Only responsible statesmen -- who perceive that perseverance in the pursuit of peace is not cowardice, but courage, that restraint in the use of forces is not weakness, but wisdom -- can prevent present international rivalries from leading to an incinerated world.

The confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union over Cuba in the autumn of 1962 undoubtedly weighed heavily in the Pope's thinking and lent urgency to his concern to halt the nuclear arms race. Addressing the leaders of the world, he stated:

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

This plea had special pertinence for the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, the principal nuclear powers.

A few months later, President Kennedy demonstrated the US commitment to the goal of peace. In a speech at American University in June of 1963, he called for renewed efforts toward a "more practical, more attainable peace -- based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions -- on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned."

The leaders of the Soviet Union responded favorably. In October 1963, the U.S. and Soviet governments signed a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. This treaty won respect throughout the world for the United States and the Soviet Union -- indeed for all nations who signed it. It has inspired hope for the future of mankind on this planet. And members of this audience will recall that the man who first proposed a test ban treaty way back in 1956 -- and who shares in the credit for its accomplishment -- is the United States Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson.

The nuclear test ban was the first step in the path toward a more enduring peace. "The longest journey begins with a single step,"

(MORE)

President Johnson has said -- and that single step has been taken.

Other steps have followed.

We have resolved not to station weapons of mass destruction in space. A United Nations resolution, jointly sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union, called on all countries to refrain from such action. It was adopted by acclamation -- without a single dissenting vote.

This was a vital step toward preventing the extension of the arms race into outer space.

This year the United States is cutting back on the production of fissionable materials. Great Britain and the Soviet Union have announced cutbacks in their planned production of fissionable materials for use in weapons. As President Johnson has stated, the race for large nuclear stockpiles can be provocative as well as wasteful.

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

The agenda for the future remains long. Among the measures needed to limit the dangers of the nuclear age are measures designed to prevent war by miscalculation or accident.

We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of selected observation points. We must seek to restrict the nuclear arms race by preventing the transfer of nuclear weapons to the control of non-nuclear nations; transferring fissionable materials from military to peaceful purposes, and by outlawing underground tests, with adequate inspection and enforcement. The United States has offered a freeze on the production of aircraft and missiles used for delivering nuclear weapons. Such a freeze might open the door to reductions in nuclear strategic delivery vehicles.

It is the intention of the United States Government to pursue every reasonable avenue toward agreement with the Soviet Union in limiting the nuclear arms race. And the President has made it clear that he will leave no thing undone, no mile untraveled to further the pursuit of peace.

(MORE)

Today in the year 1965 we must recognize that the next major step in controlling the nuclear arms race may require us to look beyond the narrow U.S. - Soviet competition to the past. For the explosion of a nuclear device by Communist China in 1964 has impressed upon us once again that the world of today is no longer the bi-polar world of an earlier decade. Nuclear competition is no longer limited to two super-powers.

The efforts of the United States and Europe to enable the nations of Europe to have a greater share in nuclear defense policy -- without encouraging the development of independent national nuclear deterrents -- constitute a recognition of this.

In addition to Europe, we now have the problem of finding ways of preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East.

With the explosion of the Chinese nuclear device several months ago -- and the prospect of others to follow -- it may be that the most immediate "next step" in controlling the nuclear arms race is the prevention of further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia.

In view of the evident determination of the present Communist government of Mainland China to use its limited nuclear capability it hopes to develop for maximum political and propaganda benefit, it is not surprising that other modern Asian nations are tempted to build their own nuclear deterrent.

But the nations on the perimeter of Communist China are not alone. As President Johnson has stated, "The nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

If the need for preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons is more immediate in Asia today, it is no less important in Latin America, Africa and the Near East. All of these areas are ripe for regional arms pacts which would prevent these countries from developing nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons would serve no useful purpose in preserving their security. The introduction of these weapons would provoke a rivalry that would imperil the peace of Latin America and Africa and intensify the present rivalries in the Near East. It would endanger the precarious economies of countries which already possess military forces too large for their

(MORE)

security needs and too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance.

Such nuclear arms control agreements should naturally be initiated by the nations of the area. In Latin America, such an agreement has already been proposed. Should the nations of Latin America, of Africa and the Near East through their own institutions or through the United Nations, take the initiative in establishing nuclear free zones, they will earn the appreciation of all nations of the world. Containment in these areas would represent a major step toward world peace.

If nuclear rivalry is an obstacle to peace today, it is not the only one.

In Pacem in Terris John XXIII returned to a theme he had discussed in Mater et Magistra when he stated: "Given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists." If control of nuclear weapons is a central issue in improving relations between East and West, accelerating the economic development of new nations is essential to harmony between North and South.

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

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

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

(MORE)

The flow of foreign aid -- both capital and technical assistance -- is indispensable to the narrowing of the gap between rich nations and poor. Much has been done by individual nations and by international organization. But more must be done -- both through foreign aid and by enlarging their opportunities for trade -- to assist those developing nations which are striving to bring to their people the economic and social benefits of modern civilization. The exact dimensions of the task and the most effective way of fulfilling it are questions which deserve further attention by the United Nations.

If the arms race is a strain on the economy of rich nations, it is an intolerable burden on that of poor nations. For developing nations with a rapidly expanding population, primitive economic institutions, and little capital development, participation in a nuclear arms race is indefensible.

A pioneer statesman of the nuclear era, the late Senator Brien McMahon, proposed almost two decades ago that resources diverted from the arms race could be set aside to meet the unmet social and economic needs of mankind. His counsel remains valid today.

-III-

The man whom we honor today -- like his predecessors -- recognized that a secure peace depends on a stable world community. And a stable world community requires a viable international organization.

The strengthening of the existing world organization -- the United Nations -- is one of our most urgent tasks.

Today we hear voices advocating abandonment of the United Nations, withdrawal from the United Nations. They are misguided. They would abandon an imperfect instrument for preserving world peace because they dislike our imperfect world. To abandon the U. N. -- or to immobilize it through crippling restrictions or failure to support it -- would only prove that our generation had forgotten the lessons of half a century of nationalism and isolationism. Let those who would destroy the United Nations recall the international anarchy that followed the demise of the League of Nations. In a nuclear era when anarchy can lead to annihilation, the United Nations deserves the support of all nations -- large and small, rich and poor. The heroes of the world community are not those who withdraw when difficulties ensue -- not those who can envision neither the prospect of success nor the consequence of failure -- but those who stand the heat of the battle -- the fight for world peace through the United Nations.

As everyone knows, the General Assembly has felt obliged to go into recess while negotiations proceed in search of a solution to the present constitutional impasse.

This is not a happy situation and it raises some political and legal problems for the UN's largest contributor as I am sure it does for other members. There are several things to be noted about this crisis.

First, the United Nations will continue even though the General Assembly has been deadlocked by a refusal of certain members to meet their obligations. The Security Council is not affected -- nor are the operations of that diversified family of affiliated agencies in the UN system.

Second, the membership includes nations with radically different ideas about the proper role of international organizations in world affairs; yet none denies they have a role. The argument is not whether the General Assembly should continue to function but under what ground rules it should carry on.

Third, the United Nations has expanded rapidly and almost continuously for two decades now -- and in the course of it the membership has more than doubled. In the meantime, the world environment in which it operates has undergone pervasive change. Under the circumstances, it would be surprising if the Organization did not face some awkward adjustments to new realities.

It may take time and patience and a high capacity to absorb frustration before the General Assembly gets back on the track or selects a somewhat different road ahead. But I am confident we meet in the hall of an institution which is in the throes of growing pains -- not in the grip of a fatal disease.

The flow of foreign aid -- both capital and technical assistance -- is indispensable to the narrowing of the gap between rich nations and poor. Another aspect of the world organization that requires immediate strengthening is the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations. Given the scope and the scale of major power interests and commitments around the world -- we are required to assume that any armed conflict may bear within it the seeds of a nuclear disaster.

So a workable peace system must be able to resolve by non-violent means the kinds of disputes which in the past have led to wars -- and to keep disruptive change in non-violent channels.

Here we can begin to see just how operational a peace system must be -- to visualize peacekeeping machinery in being and in action.

The man whom we honor today -- like his predecessors -- recognized that a secure peace depends on a stable world community. And a stable world community requires a viable international organization.

The strengthening of the existing world organization -- the United Nations -- is one of our most urgent tasks.

Today we hear voices advocating abandonment of the United Nations. They are misguided. They would abandon an important instrument for preserving world peace. They would like our important world. To abandon the U.N. -- or to immobilize it through crippling restrictions or failures to support it -- would only prove that our generation has forgotten the lessons of half a century of nationalism and isolationism. Let us be who would destroy the United Nations recall the international anarchy that followed the demise of the League of Nations. In a nuclear era when anarchy can lead to annihilation, the United Nations deserves the support of all nations -- large and small, rich and poor. The heroes of the world community are not those who withdraw when difficulties arise -- not those who can envision neither the prospect of success nor the consequences of failure -- but those who stand the heat of the battle -- the fight for world peace through the United Nations.

As everyone knows, the General Assembly has felt obliged to go into recess while negotiations proceed in search of a solution to the present constitutional impasse.

This is not a happy situation and it raises some political and legal problems for the U.N.'s largest contributor as I am sure it does for other members. There are several things to be noted about this crisis.

First, the United Nations will continue even though the General Assembly has been deadlocked by a refusal of certain members to meet their obligations. The Security Council is not affected -- nor are the operations of that diversified family of affiliated agencies in the UN system. Second, the membership includes nations with widely different ideas about the proper role of international organizations in world affairs; yet none doubts they have a role. The argument is not whether the General Assembly should continue to function but under what circumstances it should carry on. Third, the United Nations has expanded rapidly and almost continuously for two decades now -- and in the course of it the membership has more than doubled. In the meantime, the world environment in which it operates has undergone pervasive change. Under the circumstances, it would be surprising if the Organization did not face some fundamental adjustments to new realities. It may take time and patience and a high capacity to absorb frustration before the General Assembly gets back on the track or achieves a somewhat different road ahead. But I am confident we meet in the hall of an institution which is in the midst of growing pains -- not in the grip of a fatal disease.

In its most operational and visible form, peacekeeping in action is an armed patrol of soldiers of peace in blue berets -- standing between warring ethnic groups in Cyprus...men who patrol the Gaza Strip twenty-four hours a day for the eighth year running...those who jump in to repair breaches of the peace along the other frontiers of Israel ... others who still stand watch along the fifteen-year-old truce line in Kashmir... and still others who keep tabs on the armistice line along the 38th Parallel in Korea.

These units of operational peacekeeping machinery were in place and in action when we arose this morning and they will be there when we go to bed tonight because there was an international organization to deal with threats to the peace; because there were established rules and procedures for conducting the business of peacekeeping; because there was a way to finance peacekeeping missions; and because members made available personnel and equipment and transport and other goods and services.

But the machinery of peace is much more than keeping an uneasy truce: it is the Security Council and the General Assembly and the Secretariat; it is conference machinery and voting procedures and Resolutions and assessments; it is a mission of inquiry or observation -- and a single civilian moving anonymously from private meeting to private meeting on a conciliation assignment.

Peacekeeping machinery is organization -- plus people and resources -- designed and operated to sustain a secure world order.

What we have so far is rudimentary -- even primitive -- machinery. It is not as extensive as it should be. It is not as versatile as it should be. It is not as reliable as it should be.

But it is machinery. It has proved to be workable in practice when enough members in practice wanted it to work.

Clearly one of the requirements of a workable peace system is to supplement and complement and improve the operational peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations.

Eventually we would hope that this machinery would be in a position to seek the peaceful resolution of disputes and incipient conflicts -- ideally by quiet conciliation -- if need be by verbal confrontation before the bar of world opinion -- and in extremis by placing whatever kind of peacekeeping force is needed in a position between antagonists -- so that no sovereignty is without potential international protection and no nation need call upon other nations to help protect them from predatory neighbors. Today we recognize that this is not possible.

In 1954 the Geneva accords were ratified guaranteeing the independent status of South Vietnam. Today in Vietnam that freedom is endangered by the systematic attempt of foreign backed subversives to win control of the country. Today peace in Southeast Asia can be obtained if the violators will cease their aggression.

Our policy is clear. We will continue to seek a return to the essentials of the Geneva accords of 1954. We will resist aggression. We will be faithful to a friend. We seek no wider war. We seek no dominion. Our goal in Southeast Asia is today what it was in 1954 -- what it was in 1962. Our goal is peace and freedom for the people of Vietnam.

An essential step for the strengthening of peacekeeping is the establishment of a flexible troop call-up system for future emergencies. The U.N. cannot do its peacekeeping job if there are long delays in getting its forces to world trouble spots.

(MORE)

The Secretary General's request that members maintain special U.N. peacekeeping contingents deserves the support of all, and I rejoice that some members have already responded -- Canada, the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and Iran.

The U.S. will assist in this strengthening of the peacekeeping capacity by helping to train and equip contingents of other nations earmarked for U. N. use -- by transporting these units when necessary -- and by paying their fair share of the cost of peacekeeping operations. We hope others will do the same.

It is, of course, the smaller countries which stand in the greatest need of international protection. But the great powers have an equal interest in effective peacekeeping machinery.

For a nation like the United States, the investment in U.N. peacekeeping is one of the best we can make. We do not aspire to any Pax Americana. We have no desire to play the role of global gendarme. Although we shall honor our commitments to assist friendly nations in preserving their freedom, we have no desire to interject American troops into explosive local disputes.

But disputes do occur; and if hostilities are to be ended and the peace preserved, there must be some outside force available to intervene. In many cases -- though not in all -- a stable professional U.N. force can play that role.

Therefore both the large powers and the small powers have a common interest -- if for different reasons -- in effective international peacekeeping machinery.

This is why the current impasse in the General Assembly -- and the consequent paralysis in its ability to rise to an emergency if need be -- is to be so deeply regretted.

IV

I have dwelt briefly this evening on but three of the foremost problems of peace -- nuclear competition, the gap between rich nations and poor, and the need for building a world community through the United Nations. In this Conference you will explore others.

A year ago in addressing the United Nations, President Johnson stated: "All that we have built in the wealth of nations, and all that we plan to do toward a better life for all, will be in vain if our feet should slip, or our vision falter, and our hopes ended in another world-wide war. If there is one commitment more than any other that I would like to leave with you today, it is my unswerving commitment to the keeping and to the strengthening of the peace."

Our commitment to strengthening the peace has not weakened. We seek a peace that is more than a pause between wars. But our knowledge of ourselves tells us that we can expect no sudden epidemic of peace, that we have far to go before as President Johnson says the "greatness of our institutions" matches the "grandeur of our intentions". The pursuit of peace is a gradual process.

Peace is too important to be the exclusive concern of the great powers. It requires the attention of all -- small nations and large, old nations and new.

The pursuit of peace resembles the building of a great cathedral. It is the work of generations. In concept it requires a master architect; in execution, the labors of many.

The pursuit of peace requires time -- but we must use time as a tool and not as a couch. We must be prepared to profit from the vision of peace left by great men who came our way.

(MORE)

We honor Pope John XXIII on this occasion not because he demonstrated that perfect peace can be achieved in a short time. We honor him because he raised our hopes and exalted our vision.

He realized that the hopes and expectations aroused could not all be satisfied in the immediate future. What can be accomplished in a limited time will always fall short of expectations.

This should not discourage us. What is important is that we be prepared to give some evidence that progress toward peace is being made, that some of the unsolved problems of peace can be met in the future.

This is the vision which Pope John left us in his encyclical Pacem in Terris.

"Without vision the people perish," says the Scripture.

It is the duty of our generation to convert this vision of peace into reality.

###

Printed in Congressional Record, Apr. 22, 1965

pp. 7969-7972

PACEM IN TERRIS

VICE PRESIDENT SPEECH - UN

PACEM IN TERRIS

VICE PRESIDENT SPEECH - UN

Mr. Hoffman, Mr. President, Distinguished Secretary General - by the way I'm so happy to see you looking so well - and my good friend, the United States Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Your Excellencies and Ladies and Gentlemen....

This is a very thrilling moment for me, to speak in this great hall, to be permitted to share my thoughts with people from many lands, and to be in the presence of so many distinguished citizens of not only this country, but others, and noted Diplomats; what a rare opportunity for anyone.

Tonight I am privileged to open your discussions, and I am sure that you know that it will only be possible for me to scan the great agenda that is before you, to offer a few thoughts, none of which, I am confident, are new, but some which possibly need restating.

I note that the pursuit of peace is still a worthy occupation and one that gains the support and the attention of many, many people. This, the General Assembly Hall of the United Nations is still tonight

filled with people who would give their life.. their lives.. for peace; men and women of honor and of courage, and to be in such company is an inspiration. The scriptures tell us to pursue peace and mankind has, since the beginning of time, been engaged in that pursuit and has condemned the horrors of war. If discord and strife, wars, threat of wars have persisted throughout history it is, perhaps, as St. Augustine said that "men make war not because they love peace the less, but rather because they love their own kind of peace the more." Yet men of peace of every kind and of every land remember well the year 1963, for in that fateful year a venerable apostle of peace left our world, leaving behind a legacy which would endure for years to come. Generations of men and women, young and old, will remember the final testament of that gentle, peasant Pope, Pope John XXIII, the encyclical Pacem In Terris, in which he left to all men of all faiths, holding many concepts of peace, an outline for peace, which can, I truly believe, be accepted by all men of goodwill. And, if our generation can heed the parting plea of the man whose work we honor at this Conference, generations yet to come may hope to live in a world where, in the words of the late, beloved President Kennedy, "the strong are just,

the weak secure, and the peace preserved."

I can't help but think, my good friends, what a decade we've lived through, and the great names of this decade are, in the main, the names of peacemakers. The late and beloved Dag Hammarskjöld, that lady that captivated the hearts of humanity throughout the world, Eleanor Roosevelt, that young, brilliant, courageous President of this country, John Kennedy, that distinguished leader of a great nation, Prime Minister Nehru, and Pope John and others. These names and others stand before us as the apostles of peace of our time. Now, if our generation will remember this, and remember these names and their works, then possibly peace on earth will be more than a phrase and a dream - it can become a reality.

It's a privilege and a high honor to participate in this Conference, dedicated to exploring the meaning and the message of *Pacem In Terris*. It is particularly fitting that this Convocation meet at the beginning of the International Cooperation Year, so dedicated by the United Nations, and I must say that the hope and the promise of this year should be realized.

The Encyclical of Pope John XXIII gave to the world a public philosophy on peace for a nuclear era; comprehensive

in scope his message expounded a political philosophy governing relations between the individuals and the State, between the Nations or the States themselves, and between the individual State and the world organization. *Pacem In Terris* continues and completes the social philosophy which the beloved Pope had outlined a year earlier and in his Encyclical, *Mater Et Magister*. Therein he elaborated the principles of justice which should guide the social order within the State. In *Pacem In Terris* he extended this philosophy to the world, concentrating now on the relations between the States and the role of the world community.

This Encyclical represents not a Utopian blueprint for world peace, presupposing a sudden change in the nature of man. Rather it represents a call to action to the leaders of nations, presupposing only a gradual change in human institutions. Nor is it confined to elaborating the abstract virtues of peace, but looks to the building of a world community, governed by institutions capable of preserving peace. The Pope outlined principles which can guide actions of all men regardless of race or color, creed or political affiliation. But it is the Statesman, yes, those of us who are called the Leaders, who must decide how these principles are to be applied. Thus the challenge

to this Conference is to provide to our Statesmen and our Leaders further guidelines for applying the philosophy of Pacem In Terris to the problems confronting our world. I know I don't need to encourage you to be candid and objective, to think freely and to discuss fully these many complicated matters, but now, if ever, you have a supreme responsibility to do so.

Pope John's preoccupation, and our preoccupation today is with the lessening, the amelioration of international tensions, many of which created and aggravated by the existence of modern nuclear weapons. The Leaders of the world must understand, as he understood, that since that day at Alamogordo, when man acquired the power to obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face - an ugly one too, and a vision of this should sober all men. It demands of them a keener perception of mutual interests, and a higher order of responsibility. Under these conditions mankind must concentrate on those matters that unite us rather than on those that divide us. The issues of war and peace are not the concern of the few, or the rich or the mighty; they are the concern of all. Statesmen, who bear a heavier responsibility than others,

cannot ignore the implications for the survival of mankind, in new discoveries and technology, biology, chemistry, nuclear physics and space. In this nuclear age, the deliberate initiation of full-scale war as an instrument of national policy has become the worst of folly, yes, madness itself. There may have been a time, in the long distant past, when war was a means to protect or serve national interest. Today, war, nuclear war, can assure the death of a nation; the desolation of a continent; the destruction of all that we call civilization. Nuclear power has placed into the hands of modern man, power to destroy all than man has ever created, and responsible Statesmen know that perseverance in the pursuit of peace is not cowardice but rather courage. Restraint in the use of force is not weakness, but wisdom.

The confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union over Cuba in that Autumn of 1962, undoubtedly weighed heavily upon the Pope's thinking, as it did upon all of us, and lent urgency to his concern to halt the Nuclear Arms race. Addressing the leaders of this world he said:

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

His message did not go unheeded. A few months later President Kennedy demonstrated the United States commitment to the goal of peace. At a speech at American University in June of 1963, a memorable speech, our late President called for the renewed efforts towards a more practicable and a more attainable peace based not on a sudden revolution in human nature, but on the gradual evolution in human institutions - on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interests of all concerned. The leaders of the Soviet Union responded favorably, as did the leaders of Great Britain. The United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union signed a Treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in space and under water. This treaty won the respect of the world for all nations who have signed it. It has inspired hope for the future of mankind on this planet. Might I add that that Treaty is still open for new signatures. And you will recall that the man who first proposed a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1956, and who shares in the credit for its accomplishment to his everlasting honor, is the United States Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

The Nuclear Test Ban was the first step in the path

towards a more enduring peace. The longest journey begins with the single step, said President Johnson just the other evening, and that single step has been taken - that journey charted. And other steps have followed; we have resolved not to station weapons of mass destruction in space, right here in this great Assembly. A United Nations resolution, jointly sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union called on all countries to refrain from such action and it was adopted by acclamation. This was a vital step towards preventing the extension of the arms race into Outer Space. We seek to make the great Outer Space a laboratory, not a battlefield.

This year the United States is cutting back on the production of fissionable material. Great Britain and the Soviet Union have announced cutbacks in their planned production of fissionable material for use in weapons. The need for instant communication between the United States and the Soviet Union to avoid miscalculation which might lead to Nuclear War was proved during the Cuban Missile Crisis, and we learned a lesson. Since that time we have established what is commonly called

a "hotline" between Washington and Moscow, to avoid such dangerous miscalculation, but the agenda for the future remains long and demanding. We need measures to prevent war by miscalculation or just by plain accident. We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of selected observation points. We must seek to restrict the Nuclear Arms Race by preventing the transfer of nuclear weapons to the control of non-nuclear nations; by transferring fissionable materials from military to peaceful purposes and by outlawing underground nuclear tests with adequate inspection and enforcement. Now the United States has offered a "freeze" on the production of aircraft and missiles used for the delivering of nuclear weapons. This is a step in the right direction on the long journey. Such a "freeze" might even open the door to reductions in nuclear strategic delivery vehicles.

I am here to tell this great assembly tonight, on behalf of my nation, that the United States will pursue every reasonable avenue towards agreement with the Soviet Union, or any other country, in limiting the Nuclear Arms Race.

President Johnson has made it abundantly clear that

he will leave no thing undone, no mile untravelled, to further the pursuit of peace. We must recognize that the next major step in controlling the Nuclear Arms Race requires us to look beyond the narrow U.S./Soviet competition of the past. The explosion of a nuclear device by China in 1964 has impressed upon us once again that the world of today is no longer the buy-poor world of an earlier decade. Nuclear competition, my fellow human beings, is no longer limited to just a few, or to the two super powers. The efforts of the United States and Europe to enable the nations of Europe to have a greater share in nuclear defence policy, without encouraging the development of independent, national, nuclear deterrents, constitutes a recognition of this fact. In addition to Europe, however, we now have the problem of finding ways of preventing further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia, Latin-America, Africa and the Middle East. With the explosion of the Chinese nuclear device several months ago, and the prospect of others to follow soon, it may be that the most immediate next step in this pursuit of peace, in controlling the Nuclear Arms Race, is the prevention of further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia. Now with the evident determination of the present Communist Government in

mainland China to use its limited nuclear capability for maximum political and propaganda benefit, it is not surprising that other modern Asian nations are tempted to build their own nuclear deterrent. But the nations on the perimeter of Communist China should know, and must know, that they will not stand alone. President Johnson has said, and I quote him:

"..the nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail then they will have it."

But if the need for the preventing of the proliferation of nuclear weapons is more urgent and immediate in Asia today, and I think it is, and we must find ways and means to stop it, it is no less important in Latin America, Africa and above all, the Middle East.

All of these areas are ripe for regional arms pacts which would prevent any of these countries from developing nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons would serve no useful purpose in preserving their security; the introduction of these weapons would but provoke a rivalry that would imperil the peace of Latin-America, Africa, the Near East and indeed, intensify, the present rivalries. It would encourage the precarious .. no, it would endanger.. the precarious economies of countries which already possess military forces too large for their security needs and

too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance or interference. Such Nuclear Arms Control Agreements therefore, should naturally be initiated by the nations in the area. In Latin-America, I am happy to say, such an agreement has already been proposed. Should the nations of Latin-America, Africa, the Near East through their own institutions or the United Nations take the initiative in establishing Nuclear-Free Zones they will have earned the gratitude and the appreciation of all nations. Attainment in these areas, while not global, but regional, would represent a major step towards world peace.

If nuclear rivalry is an obstacle to peace today, and I think it is, it is not the only one. In *Pacem In Terris*, John XXIII returned to a theme that he had discussed in *Mater Et Magister*. You may recall that theme when he stated ..."given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists." So, if control of nuclear weapons is a central issue in improving relations between the East and the West, accelerating the economic development of new nations is essential to harmony between the North and South. In Latin-America and Asia and Africa another

threat to peace lies in the shocking inequality between privileged and impoverished; between the glittering capitols and festering slums; between booming industrial regions and primitive rural areas. I digress from my prepared remarks to say that this situation affects the peace and tranquility of our own communities right here in the United States of America, but I am humbly proud to say that it is national policy on the part of this government and its people to wage war against the poverty which inflicts some of our people. Surely we know that a real threat to peace in these areas is the revolutionary challenge of an unjust social order in which true peace, peace based on justice, is impossible. Now, those who have been more blessed with this world's goods must heed the Pope's plea to assist those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, from misery and hunger, who lack even the elementary rights of the human person. We must do this out of compassion for we are our brothers' keepers, and we also do it, or should do it, out of self interest, for our lot is their lot - our future their future - our peace their peace. This planet is simply too small for the insolation of the rich against the turbulent spread of injustice in any part of the world.

The flow of foreign aid, both capital and technical

assistance, is indispensable to the narrowing of the gap between the rich nations and poor. Much has been done, I know, by individual nations, surely as a former Member of the Congress of this nation and now as a Vice President I know that much has been done, but more must be done, both through foreign aid and by enlarging the opportunities of these developing nations for trade. To assist those developing nations which are striving to bring their people the economic and social benefits of modern civilization. The exact dimensions of this task and the most effective way of fulfilling it, are the very questions which preserve the priority attention of this Conference. May I say to the President of the United Nations and to every Delegate of that great Assembly, the attention of the United Nations itself.

Now if the Arms Race is a drain and a strain on the economy of the rich nations - and it is - then it is an intolerable burden on the economy of the poor nations. For developing nations, with a rapidly expanding population, with relative primitive economic institutions and little capital development, participation in an Arms Race is indefensible. It's not only bad politics, bad morals, but it is disastrous economics.

A pioneer statesman of the Nuclear Era, the late

Senator Brian McMahon of the State of Connecticut, proposed, almost two decades ago, that resources that could be diverted from the Arms Race, the savings that could be made, should be set aside to meet the unmet social and economic needs of mankind. His council remains valid today and is a challenge to every nation. The man whom we honor today, that beloved Peasant Pope, like his predecessors, recognized that a secure peace depends on a stable world community, and a stable world community requires a viable international organization. Nations throughout the centuries..yea, peoples throughout the centuries .. have sought their national identity and their nation independence. The only true guarantee to independence in this, the late half of the twentieth century, is responsible inter-dependence. The strengthening of the existing world organization, the United Nations, is one of our most urgent tasks. Today we hear voices advocating the abandonment of the United Nations, voices advocating withdrawal from the United Nations - they are misguided voices. They would abandon an imperfect instrument for preserving world peace because they dislike our imperfect world. But to abandon the United Nations or to immobilize it

through crippling restrictions or failure to support it would only prove that our generation has learned little or nothing and forgotten the lessons of two world wars, in this century, and apparently forgotten the tragedy of a half a century of nationalism and isolationism.

I hope that we are not that foolish .. that those who would destroy the United Nations recall the international anarchy that followed the death of the League of Nations. A nuclear era when anarchy can lead to annihilation the United Nations deserves the support of all nations, large and small, rich and poor; heroes of the world community are not those who withdraw when difficulties ensue, not those who can envision neither the prospect of success or the consequence of failure, but the heroes are those who stand the heat of the battle.... The fight for world peace through international law and the United Nations.

Now, the General Assembly is facing a Recess while negotiations proceed in search of a solution to the present constitutional impasse. I know this is not a happy situation and it raises some political problems for the U.N's largest contributor, as I'm sure it does for all other members. But there are several things to be noted about the crisis. First, the United Nations will continue

even though the General Assembly has been deadlocked by the refusal of certain members to meet their obligations. The Security Council is not affected, nor are the operations of that diversified family of affiliated agencies in the U.N. system, one of them inspired and given leadership by Mr. Hoffman.

Secondly, the membership of the United Nations includes nations with radically different ideas about the proper role of international organizations in world affairs. Yet none of these nations denies they have a role. The argument is not whether the General Assembly should continue to function but under what ground rules it should carry on, and let's keep that differentiation as to the dispute clearly in mind.

Third, the United Nations has expanded rapidly and almost continuously for two decades now, and in the course of it the membership has more than doubled. In the meantime the world environment in which it operates has undergone pervasive change. Under the circumstances it would be surprising if the organization did not face some awkward adjustments to new realities. Now it may take time, and patience, and a high capacity to absorb frustration - by the way, that's one of the qualities of character that great people need in these days - absorb frustration before the General Assembly gets

back on the track, or selects a somewhat different road ahead, but I am confident that we meet in the hall of an international institution which is in the throes of growing pains not in the grip of a fatal disease.

Another aspect of the world organization that requires immediate strengthening is the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations .. we must give attention to this. Given the scope and the scale of major power interest and commitments around the world we are required to assume that any armed conflict may bear within it the seeds of nuclear disaster. So a workable peace system must be able to resolve by non-violent means the kinds of disputes which, in the past, have led to tragic wars and to keep disruptive change in non-violent channels.

Here we can begin to see how operational a peace system must be; to visualize peace-keeping machinery in being and in action. In its most operational and visible form, peace-keeping in action is an armed patrol of soldiers of peace in blue berets standing between warring ethnic groups in Cyprus; men who patrol the Gaza strip twenty-four hours a day for the eighth year running; those who repair breaches of the peace along the frontiers of Israel. Others who still stand watch along the fifteen-

year old truce line in Kashmir, and still others who keep watch on the Armistice Line along the Thirty-Eighth Parallel in Korea. Might I ask this question tonight? What kind of a world would it be tonight if it were not for those soldiers of peace in blue berets? Think it over.

These units of operational peace-keeping machinery were in place and in action this morning and, thank goodness, they will be there when we go to bed tonight. And why? Because there is an international organization to deal with the threats to the peace; because there are established rules and procedures for conducting the business of peace-keeping; because there was a way to finance peace-keeping missions, and because members have made available personnel and equipment and transport and other goods and services. The machinery of peace therefore is much more than the keeping of an uneasy truce, it is the Security Council and the General Assembly and the Secretariat. It is the Conference machinery and voting procedures and resolutions and assessments, it is a mission of inquiry or observation or even a single civilian moving anonymously from private meeting to private meeting on a conciliation assignment. Peace-keeping machinery is organization, plus people and

and resources designed and operated to secure or to sustain a secure world order. What we have, so far, is elementary and rudimentary, even primitive machinery - it is not as extensive or developed as it should be, it is not as versatile as it should be, it is not as reliable as it should be, but it is machinery and it has proved to be workable in practice when enough members, in practice, wanted it to work.

Now clearly, one of the requirements of a workable peace system is to supplement, complement and improve the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations. Eventually we would hope that this machinery would be in a position to seek peaceful resolution of disputes and insipient conflicts, ideally by quiet conciliation - if need be, by verbal confrontation before the "Bar of World Opinion," and, in extremes, by placing whatever kind of peace-keeping force is needed in a position between antagonists so that no sovereignty is without potential, international protection, and no nation need call upon other nations to help protect them from predatory neighbours. Regrettably, today we recognize that this is not all possible. The case may well be in Vietnam, as an example. In 1954 the Geneva Accords were ratified, guaranteeing the independent status of

South Vietnam, establishing a line of division between north and south, the Seventeenth Parallel. Today in Vietnam that freedom is in danger by the systematic attempt of foreign-backed subversives to win control of the country. Today, peace in South-East Asia can be attained tonight if the violators will cease the aggression.

I speak tonight as an American. Our policy is clear; we will continue to seek a return to the essentials of the Geneva Accords of 1954. We will resist aggression there, as elsewhere, we will be faithful to a friend or an ally. We seek no wider war, we seek no dominion .. our goal in South-East Asia is today what it was in 1954, what it was when President Kennedy restated it in 1962, our goal is peace and it is freedom for the people of Vietnam. The essential step for the strengthening of peace is the establishment of flexible troop call-up systems for future emergencies. Let us learn from our troubles. The U.N. cannot do a peace-keeping job if there are long delays in getting its forces to world trouble spots. The Secretary-General's request that certain members, or that members maintain special U.N. peace-keeping contingents deserves the support of us all, and I rejoice that some members have

already responded. Canada, the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, Iran and possibly others. The U.S. will assist in this strengthening of the peace-keeping capacity by helping to train, if so desired, and equip contingents of other nations earmarked for U.N. use, by transporting these units when necessary and by paying our fair share of the cost of peace-keeping operations. We hope that others will do the same. It is, of course, the smaller countries which stand the greatest need of international protection, but the great powers, lest they forget, have an equal interest in effective peace-keeping machinery. For the United States the investment in U.N. peace-keeping is one of the best that we can ever make. We do not aspire to any Pox-Americana, we have no desire to play the role of global gendarme, although we shall honor our commitments to assist friendly nations in preserving their freedom we have no desire to interject American troops into explosive local disputes. But disputes do occur and if hostilities are to be ended and if peace is to be preserved there must be some outside force available to intervene. In many cases, though not in all, a reliable, stable U.N. force can and should play that role. Therefore, the large powers, and the small

powers have a common interest, if for different reasons, in effective, international peace-keeping machinery. That is why the current impasse in the General Assembly, and the consequent paralysis in its ability to rise to an emergency, if need be, is so deeply regrettable.

I have dwelt, this evening, on but three of the foremost problems of peace - you will speak of many more. Nuclear competition, the gap between the rich nations and the poor, and the need for building a world community through a strengthened United Nations.

A year ago, in addressing the United Nations, President Johnson said this to you: "All that we have built in the wealth of nations and all that we plan to do towards a better life for all, will be in vain if our feet should slip or our vision falter and our hopes ended in another world wide war. If there is one commitment, more than any other, that I would like to leave with you today", said our President, "it is my unswerving commitment to the keeping and the strengthening of peace."

Our commitment to strengthen peace has not weakened. We see a just and lasting peace, a peace that is more than a pause between wars. We believe that peace is dynamic and not static, that it is growing and not dying.

But our knowledge of ourself tells us that we can expect no sudden epidemic of peace; we have far to go before the greatness of our institution matches the grandeur of our intentions.

Yes, the pursuit of peace is a process, not a miracle, and it requires workers in the vineyards of peace, thinkers and planners of peace. Peace is too important to be just the exclusive concern of the great powers, it requires the attention of all; small nations and large, old nations and new. The pursuit of peace, to me, resembles the building of a great cathedral, it is the work of generations, and each generation has its obligation to add on to the beauty and the grandeur and the strength of that cathedral. In concept it requires a Master Architect, in execution the labors of many. Pursuit of peace requires time, but we must use time as a tool and not as a couch, we must be prepared to profit from the vision of peace left by the great men and women who came our way. Yes, we honor Pope John XXIII, not because he demonstrated that perfect peace can be achieved in our time. We honor him because he raised our hopes and exalted our vision. He realized that the hopes and the expectations aroused could not all be satisfied in the immediate future, that people need to live for another day. The politics of hope is

much better than the politics of despair. What can be accomplished in a limited time we know will always fall short of our expectations, but we must have the expectation and that sense of hope. The fact that we fall short of a goal - this should not discourage us - what is important is that we be prepared to give some sort of evidence in our day, with our lives, that progress towards peace is being made, and that some of the unsolved problems of peace in our time can be met now and in the future. This is the vision that this beloved apostle of peace left us in his Encyclical Pacem In Terris; this is what inspires men and women .. people long to live. The pursuit of peace and the pursuit of happiness, these are the dynamics of our time. Scripture says, "without vision the people perish". It is the duty, therefore, of our generation, to convert this vision of peace into reality, and if we do it this, the twentieth century, will not be remembered for its warriors, but if we can live through this twentieth century without destroying ourselves, this century will be remembered for its peacemakers.

Vital Speeches of the Day

REG. U. S. PAT. OFF.

VOL. XXXI

MARCH 15, 1965

NO.

Peace On Earth

A WORLD COMMUNITY THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS

By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States

Delivered at the Opening Ceremony of the Convocation on Pacem in Terris in the United Nations General Assembly, New York, N. Y., February 17, 1965

THE SCRIPTURE tells us to "pursue peace"—and mankind has since the beginning of time condemned the horrors of war. If discord and strife, wars and the threat of wars have persisted throughout history, it is perhaps as St. Augustine says: that men make war not because they love peace the less, but rather because they love their own kind of peace the more. Yet men of peace of every kind and every land remember well the year 1963. For in that fateful year a venerable apostle of peace left our world, leaving behind a legacy which will endure for years to come. Generations of men—young and old alike—will remember the final testament of that gentle peasant Pope, Pope John XXIII, the encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, in which he left to men of all faiths, to men holding many concepts of peace, an outline for peace in our world which can be accepted by all men of goodwill.

And if our generation can heed the parting plea of the man whose work we honor at this conference, generations yet to come may hope to live in a world where in the words of the late President Kennedy "the strong are just, the weak secure and the peace preserved."

It is a privilege and an honor to participate in this conference dedicated to exploring the meaning and the message of *Pacem in Terris*. It is particularly fitting that this convocation meet at the beginning of International Cooperation Year. I am confident that your deliberations here will advance our world along the road to "peace on earth" as described by Pope John.

The encyclical of John XXIII presented to the world a public philosophy for a nuclear era. Comprehensive in scope, his message expounded a political philosophy governing relations between the individual and the state, relations between states, and relations between an individual state and the world organizations.

Pacem in Terris continues and completes the social philosophy which the Pope had begun a year earlier in his

encyclical *Mater et Magistra*, in which he elaborated the principles of social justice which should guide the social order. In *Pacem in Terris* he extended this philosophy to the world, concentrating now on relations between states and the role of the world community.

This encyclical represents not a utopian blueprint for world peace, presupposing a sudden change in the nature of man. Rather, it represents a call to action to leaders of nations, presupposing only a gradual change in human institutions. It is not confined to elaborating the abstract virtues of peace; it looks to the building of a world community governed by institutions capable of preserving peace.

The Pope outlined principles which can guide the actions of men—all men regardless of color, creed or political affiliation—but it is up to statesmen to decide how these principles are to be applied. The challenge to this conference is to provide statesmen with further guidelines for applying the philosophy of *Pacem in Terris* to the problems confronting our world in 1965.

I would like to direct my remarks principally to the questions of relations between states and to that of a world community. Pope John's preoccupation—and our preoccupation today—is with an amelioration of international relations in the light of the dangers to mankind posed by the existence of modern nuclear weapons. The leaders of the world must understand—as he understood—that since that day at Alamo gordo when man acquired the power to obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face. And the vision of it has sobered all men and demanded of them a new perception of mutual interests and a higher order of responsibility. Under these conditions mankind must concentrate on the problems that unite us rather than on those which divide us.

Pope John proclaimed that the issues of war and peace

POLICY OF VITAL SPEECHES

The publishers of *Vital Speeches* believe that the important addresses of the recognized leaders of public opinion constitute the best expressions of contemporary thought in America, and that it is extremely important for the welfare of the nation that these speeches be permanently recorded and disseminated. The publishers have no axe to grind. *Vital Speeches* will be found authentic and constructive.

It is the policy of the publishers to cover both sides of public questions and to print all speeches in full. Where it is necessary to condense a speech because of unusual length or the use of extraneous matter it will be so stated when printing. They feel that it is only in the unedited and unexpurgated speech that the reader can best obtain the views of the speaker.

This material gives the reader the best thought of the best minds on current national problems. It also offers the student of public speaking examples of effective speech of today of those who have attained leadership in the fields of economics, politics, education, sociology, government, criminology, finance, law, taxation, health, labor, etc. Thus the student of public speaking obtains the finest text book material with a sound knowledge of public questions.

Subscribers are urged to call the Editor's attention to any speeches which have impressed them as outstanding so that copies may be secured for review.

VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY is published twice a month by the City News Publishing Co., (Inc. 1911), 1 Wolf's Lane, Pelham, N. Y. Telephone 914-738-1234. Thomas F. Daly, Jr., President and Treasurer, M. P. Daly, Vice-President, K. D. Hoey, Secretary.

Subscription Rates: \$3.00 a year. Two years \$15.00. Single copies 40 cents. (Special group rates to students for a period of 4 months: \$1.50 each for 10 or more; \$1.25 each for 25 or more. All to be sent to one address). Back issues, if available, 50 cents a copy. Microfilm editions \$4.00 per volume. On order under \$3.00, remittance must accompany order.

Vital Speeches is indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. An annual index is printed each November and distributed to all subscribers. Cumulative Index, Volumes 1-25, \$12.50 per copy. Volume Binders for *Vital Speeches* \$3.50. *Vital Speeches* will be found on file in thousands of public, college and high school libraries throughout the United States.

Re-entered as Second Class matter at the Post Office at Pelham, N. Y., and additional entry at Hanover, N. H., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

concern of all. Statesmen—who bear a heavier responsibility than others—cannot ignore the implications for the survival of mankind of new discoveries in technology, biology, nuclear power, and space. In this nuclear age the deliberate use of nuclear weapons as an instrument of national policy becomes a reality.

Originally a means to protect national interests, war today assures the death of a nation, the decimation of a continent. Nuclear power has placed into the hands of men the power to destroy all that man has created. Only responsible statesmen who perceive that perseverance in the pursuit of peace is cowardice, but courage, that restraint in the use of force is weakness, but wisdom—can prevent present international rivalries from leading to an incinerated world.

The confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union over Cuba in the autumn of 1962 undoubtedly weighed heavily in the Pope's thinking and lent urgency to his concern about the nuclear arms race. Addressing the leaders of the world, he stated:

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

This plea had special pertinence for the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, the principal nuclear powers.

A few months later, President Kennedy demonstrated the United States' commitment to the goal of peace. In a speech at the University of Chicago in June of 1963, he called for renewed efforts toward a "more practical, more attainable, more realistic"—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the best interest of all concerned."

The leaders of the Soviet Union responded favorably. In August, 1963, the United States and Soviet governments signed a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. This treaty won respect throughout the world for the United States and the Soviet Union—pledged for all nations who signed it. It has inspired hope for the future of mankind on this planet. And members of this generation will recall that the man who first proposed a test ban treaty way back in 1956—and who shares in the credit for its accomplishment—is the United States Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson.

The nuclear test ban was the first step in the path toward more enduring peace. "The longest journey begins with a single step," President Johnson has said—and that single step has been taken.

Other steps have followed.

We have resolved not to station weapons of mass destruction in space. A United Nations resolution, jointly sponsored by the United States and the Soviet Union, called on all countries to refrain from such action. It was adopted by acclamation—without a single dissenting vote.

This was a vital step toward preventing the extension of the nuclear arms race to outer space.

This year the United States is cutting back on the production of nuclear weapons materials. Great Britain and the Soviet Union have announced cutbacks in their planned production of nuclear weapons materials for use in weapons. As President Johnson stated, the race for large nuclear stockpiles can be provocative as well as wasteful.

The need for instant communication between the United

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

The agenda for the future remains long. Among the measures needed to limit the dangers of the nuclear age are measures designed to prevent war by miscalculation or accident.

We must seek agreements to obtain safeguards against surprise attacks, including a network of selected observation points. We must seek to restrict the nuclear arms race by preventing the transfer of nuclear weapons to the control of non-nuclear nations, by transferring fissionable materials from military to peaceful purposes, and by outlawing underground tests, with adequate inspection and enforcement.

The United States has offered a freeze on the production of aircraft and missiles used for delivering nuclear weapons. Such a freeze might open the door to reductions in nuclear strategic delivery vehicles.

It is the intention of the United States Government to pursue every reasonable avenue toward agreement with the Soviet Union in limiting the nuclear arms race. And the President has made it clear that he will leave no thing undone, no mile untraveled, to further the pursuit of peace.

Today in the year 1965 we must recognize that the next major step in controlling the nuclear arms race may require us to look beyond the narrow United States-Soviet competition in the past. For the explosion of a nuclear device by Communist China in 1964 has impressed upon us once again that the world of today is no longer the bi-polar world of an earlier decade. Nuclear competition is no longer limited to two super powers.

The efforts of the United States and Europe to enable the nations of Europe to have a greater share in nuclear defense policy—without encouraging the development of independent national nuclear deterrents—constitute a recognition of this.

In addition to Europe, we now have the problem of finding ways of preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East.

With the explosion of the Chinese nuclear device several months ago—and the prospect of others to follow—it may be that the most immediate "next step" in controlling the nuclear arms race is the prevention of further proliferation of nuclear weapons in Asia.

In view of the evident determination of the present communist government of mainland China to use the limited nuclear capability it hopes to develop for maximum political and propaganda benefit, it is not surprising that other modern Asian nations are tempted to build their own nuclear deterrent. But the nations on the perimeter of Communist China are not alone. As President Johnson has stated: "The nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

If the need for preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons is more immediate in Asia today, it is no less important in Latin America, Africa and the Near East. All of these areas are ripe for regional arms pacts which would prevent these countries from developing nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons would serve no useful purpose in preserving their security. The introduction of these weapons would provoke a rivalry that would imperil the peace of Latin America and Africa and intensify the present rivalries in the Near East. It would endanger the precarious economies of countries which already possess military forces too large for their security needs and too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance.

Such nuclear arms control agreements should naturally be initiated by the nations of the area. In Latin America, such an agreement has already been proposed. Should the nations of Latin America, of Africa and the Near East through their own institutions or through the United Nations, take the initiative in establishing nuclear free zones, they will earn the appreciation of all nations of the world. Containment in these areas would represent a major step toward world peace.

If nuclear rivalry is an obstacle to peace today, it is not the only one.

In *Pacem in Terris* John XXIII returned to a theme he had discussed in *Mater et Magistra* when he stated: "Given the growing interdependence among peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic inequality among them persists." If control of nuclear weapons is a central issue in improving relations between East and West, accelerating the economic development of new nations is essential to harmony between North and South.

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

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

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

The flow of foreign aid—both capital and technical assistance—is indispensable to the narrowing of the gap between rich nations and poor. Much has been done by individual nations and by international organizations. But more must be done—both through foreign aid and by enlarging their opportunities for trade—to assist those developing nations which are striving to bring to their people the economic and social benefits of modern civilization. The exact dimensions of the task and the most effective way of fulfilling it are questions which deserve further attention by the United Nations.

If the arms race is a strain on the economy of rich nations, it is an intolerable burden on that of poor nations. For developing nations with a rapidly expanding population, primitive economic institutions, and little capital development, participation in a nuclear arms race is indefensible.

A pioneer statesman of the nuclear era, the late Senator Brien McMahon proposed almost two decades ago that resources diverted from the arms race could be set aside to meet the unmet social and economic needs of mankind. His counsel remains valid today.

The man whom we honor today—like his predecessors—recognized that a secure peace depends on a stable world community. And a stable world community requires a viable international organization.

The strengthening of the existing world organization—the United Nations—is one of our most urgent tasks.

Today we hear voices advocating abandonment of the United Nations, withdrawal from the United Nations. They are misguided. They would abandon an imperfect instrument for preserving world peace because they dislike our imperfect world. To abandon the United Nations—or to immobilize it

through crippling restrictions or failure to support it—would only prove that our generation has forgotten the lessons half a century of nationalism and isolationism. Let those who would destroy the United Nations recall the international anarchy that followed the demise of the League of Nations. In a nuclear era when anarchy can lead to annihilation, the United Nations deserves the support of all nations—large and small, rich and poor. The heroes of the world community are not those who withdraw when difficulties ensue, but those who can envision neither the prospect of success nor the consequence of failure—but those who stand the heat of the battle—the fight for world peace through the United Nations.

As everyone knows, the General Assembly is facing a recession while negotiations proceed in search of a solution to the present constitutional impasse.

This is not a happy situation and it raises some political and legal problems for the United Nations' largest contributor as I am sure it does for other members. There are several things to be noted about this crisis.

First, the United Nations will continue even though the General Assembly has been deadlocked by a refusal of certain members to meet their obligations. The Security Council is not affected—nor are the operations of that diversified family of affiliated agencies in the United Nations system.

Second, the membership includes nations with radically different ideas about the proper role of international organizations in world affairs; yet none denies they have a role. The argument is not whether the General Assembly should continue to function but under what ground rules it should carry on.

Third, the United Nations has expanded rapidly and almost continuously for two decades now—and in the course of it the membership has more than doubled. In the meantime, the world environment in which it operates has undergone pervasive change. Under the circumstances, it would be surprising if the organization did not face some awkward adjustments to new realities.

It may take time and patience and a high capacity to absorb frustration before the General Assembly gets back on the track or selects a somewhat different road ahead. But I am confident we meet in the hall of an institution which is in the throes of growing pains—not in the grip of a fatal disease.

Another aspect of the world organization that requires immediate strengthening is the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations. Given the scope and the scale of major power interests and commitments around the world—we are required to assume that any armed conflict may bear within it the seeds of a nuclear disaster.

So a workable peace system must be able to resolve by non-violent means the kinds of disputes which in the past have led to wars—and to keep disruptive change in non-violent channels.

Here we can begin to see just how operational a peace system must be—to visualize peacekeeping machinery in being and in action.

In its most operational and visible form, peacekeeping in action is an armed patrol of soldiers of peace in blue berets—standing between warring ethnic groups in Cyprus . . . men who patrol the Gaza Strip twenty-four hours a day for the eighth year running . . . those who jump in to repair breaches of the peace along the other frontiers of Israel . . . others who still stand watch along the fifteen-year-old truce line in Kashmir . . . and still others who keep tabs on the armistice line along the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea.

These units of operational peacekeeping machinery were in place and in action when we arose this morning and they will



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