

Mr President -

REMARKS

Mr. Sect. Gen
Mr. LaBerton

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS

NEW YORK CITY

OCTOBER 5, 1965

35 minutes
to fly up
40 minutes
in town

paper unit

Congressman
Hayes
U.S. Representative

once again

I am happy ~~to be able~~ to welcome you ~~here~~ today
to the United States on behalf of the President, ^{of the U.S.} I am
particularly happy to do so as a fellow NATO Parliamentarian
who has attended your meetings in the past, has always
followed your activities with the keenest interest, and is
looking forward to conversations with a number of old
friends in this distinguished group.

The tradition, in opening such international meetings,
is for someone from the host country to greet the delegates
with general and benign expressions of good will.

I would like to do more than that. *the Times call for more.*

For you are leaders in developing political thinking + Public

Opinion in your countries. You are the men and women who provide ^{the} legislation to ^{support and implement} ~~back up~~ needed policies. You are

key figures in advancing the common interests of our

Atlantic partnership. *It is in this understanding*

that I would like to share with you some thoughts about the future of that partnership.

Its object is to strengthen peace. This is surely the supreme task of our age. In the nuclear era, there can be no alternative to peace.

Peace will not be secured merely by putting out fires, ~~as they occur~~. We must build a world in which ~~these fires~~ they will be less likely to break out in the first place.

Pop Paul VI eloquent Plea for Peace

Yes Peace is Positive — Peace is Dynamic
Peace is building Peace is life.

This means trying to build the kind of world order envisaged in the UN Charter: one in which ^{people}~~men~~ everywhere can enjoy more of the good things of life, in which emerging countries can maintain and strengthen their freedom, in which aggression can be deterred and the root causes of tension and conflict can be effectively addressed.

∟ The Atlantic countries have a unique responsibility in building such a world. Their resources and talents are essential to the task.

∟ But even these resources and talents will only suffice if they are concerted. No one of us is strong enough to meet the needs of the day alone. That is the meaning of Atlantic partnership.

∟ An effective partnership must be based on the concept of equality: equality of effort, and equality of responsibility.

↳ It is to such a partnership that my country is dedicated. As President Johnson said a few months ago, "none of us has sought, or will seek, domination over others."

↳ To fulfill the promise of this partnership, we must be ready to break new ground, as did the statesmen who first constructed the ^{Nato} alliance.

↳ They met the essential need in building a better world: They prevented war. ↳ Since NATO was created, the territorial integrity of each of its members has been maintained. ↳ For almost a generation, aggression in Europe has been deterred. ^{JP} But NATO has been more than a shield of protection. It has been a wellspring of confidence and security giving impetus to prosperity and progress, to economic growth and political cooperation.

↳ We must make sure that it stays this way. We must maintain and strengthen NATO, in the face of a Soviet military presence which changes but does not wither. ↳ We must preserve the structure of joint defense on which NATO's success has rested. (It is the close integration of effort that distinguishes NATO from all previous alliances. ↳ But, we must adapt that structure to changing circumstances. #

↳ Other needs for common action also emerge as we move into the third decade of the post-war era.

↳ It is to three of these great needs that I would speak today.

First ↳ We must ^{*coordinate*} ~~concert about~~ our actions in the great continents to the South: Latin America, Africa and Asia. We must help these peoples achieve the peace, the freedom, and the progress that they seek.

This calls for action to coordinate and increase the Atlantic nations' aid to developing countries. In this task we must take full advantage of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD.

∠ It calls for action to expand world trade. This means that we cannot afford to let the Kennedy Round *fail* *or fail*.

∠ It calls for action to enlarge world monetary reserves to meet the most pressing requirements of both developing and industrialized areas.

∠ Whether action is taken in each of these fields will depend, in good part, on how seriously your countries and mine address ^{*ourselves to*} these tasks. For it is our resources and our skills that are ^{*mainly*} ~~in good part~~ involved.

< The needs of emerging countries continue to grow.
As in ^{the case of} Europe after World War II, their security as well as their growth must be assured, if they are not to become a focus of ever widening conflict.

< All of us have a stake in that security. The Atlantic nations cannot survive as an island of stability in a world of chaos.

< The threats to this security may be subtle or indirect; *but* that does not make them any less real.

< A better world cannot be built by turning away from the difficult and dangerous business of meeting these threats.

< This is ^{our} common business, because all our interests are at stake.

and < Political consultation should be the means of

discharging common business -- the means of arriving at common action.

∠ Such consultation, in its quiet way, is gradually becoming a habit in the alliance. There are now few subjects of international importance which are not discussed, day in and day out, by the North Atlantic Council.

∠ More needs to be done. The practice of bringing together the senior officials who have responsibility in home governments has been successful in the OECD.

It may prove increasingly rewarding in NATO.

∠ Intimate and continuing concert of action is also fostered by parliamentary meetings such as this. The proposal for an Atlantic Assembly, which has been approved by this group, looks to the same end. I hope it can be fulfilled.

But let us be clear: Consultation will not be assured by ^{new and} effective mechanisms, alone.

< The responsibilities and burdens of common effort go hand in hand. < Consultation will be effective in the degree that it looks to action. Common decisions will come most readily to those countries willing to share in the effort that these decisions govern.

2 < I turn now to a second area in which joint action is needed: averting spread of nuclear weapons under national control.

< There will be no security for any of our countries if the authority to let loose these weapons proliferates.

< There are three ways in which the Atlantic nations can -- and must -- act together to avert this peril.

~~The Problem of Nuclear Proliferation is not merely one of dissemination of such weapons, but more specifically one of self acquisition~~

first ~~first~~ we must assure that Atlantic nuclear arrangements offer our European partners an effective alternative to national systems of deterrence.

It is natural that European countries, with new strength and confidence, should wish to play a larger role in their own defense.

My country is ready to join with them in effective action to this end.

There will be continuing discussion of such action among interested nations in the period ahead.

Second - \angle We must also consider how best to meet the concerns of key non-nuclear countries outside the Atlantic area -- concerns which might otherwise move these countries to consider national deterrence.

The problem and danger of nuclear proliferation is not merely one of dissemination, but more significantly one of Self Acquisition. ~~There is also the real danger.~~

Last October President Johnson said, in speaking of the first Chinese Communist nuclear explosion: "The nations that do not seek nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our sure support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

I hope that interested Atlantic nations can work together -- in the United Nations, in disarmament negotiations, and elsewhere -- in seeking ways to fulfill this pledge.

finally
Partnership approach We must ~~also~~ continue to seek a common approach -- *a* to arms negotiations with the USSR.

In the recent Geneva Conference a large measure of Western agreement was reached on a proposed non-proliferation treaty. We hope that the Soviet Union will, over time, reconsider its abrupt rejection of this proposal.

At this same Conference, ~~the~~ key nuclear capable countries made clear that reductions in existing nuclear armaments could play an important part in encouraging and ensuring non-proliferation. Ambassador Goldberg has recently laid before the United Nations American proposals for freezing and reducing nuclear capabilities.

In seeking to reduce armaments, as in other areas of negotiation with the USSR, Western unity will be essential, if there is to be any chance of success.

Atlantic nations that come together to share in nuclear defense should share, no less, in the search for prudent ways of limiting the burdens and dangers of that defense.

But defense of the status quo is not good enough as a purpose of Atlantic action. In trying to build a better world we must seek peacefully to erode the tragic and unnecessary division of Europe.

↳ The nations of Eastern Europe are finding new paths.

↳ Closer contacts between these nations and the Atlantic world can best be sought on a basis of common understanding in the West. ~~and mutual respect for that East and West~~

↳ The effort to develop such ~~closer~~ contacts is not directed against any nation, least of all the Soviet Union.

↳ We seek to end existing divisions in Europe, not to create new ones.

↳ The most grievous of these existing divisions is the enforced partition of Germany. ↳ The German people, like any other, must be allowed to choose and shape its own future. The need is to afford the German people that choice, while meeting the security concerns of all with a stake in European peace.

↳ I have spoken of fields in which action is required.

There is the need, as well, for our alliance to more greatly develop our cooperation in such fields as outer space. For we must together insure that space will be a source of man's peaceful progress and not a threat to that progress.

Σ In each of these things, the key to success will be common effort *and understanding - a Partnership*.

Atlantic nations which mount such effort will have done much to carry forward the purpose of their partnership: creating a better world *- a more peaceful world.*

⌞ If we fail and fall apart, future generations may well look back on our time as we look back on the period between the wars: an interlude in which men forgot the harsh lessons of disaster, and thus lost the chance to build anew.

The need is clear.

It is for each of us here to help decide whether it will be met. The Nuclear Age - The Space Age - is characterized by common dangers and common hopes. It is the Age of Interdependence in which ~~war is~~ as JFK said.
"mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind"

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY BEFORE
THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS, NEW YORK CITY,
OCTOBER 5, 1965

I am happy to be able to welcome you here today to the United States on behalf of the President. I am particularly happy to do so as a fellow NATO Parliamentarian who has attended your meetings in the past, has always followed your activities with the keenest interest, and is looking forward to conversations with a number of old friends in this distinguished group.

The tradition, in opening such international meetings, is for someone from the host country to greet the delegates with general and benign expressions of good will.

I would like to do more than that.

For you are leaders in developing political thinking in your countries. You are the men and women who provide legislation to back up needed policies. You are key figures in advancing the common interests of our Atlantic partnership.

I would like to share with you some thoughts about the future of that partnership.

Its object is to strengthen peace. This is surely the supreme task of our age. In the nuclear era, there can be no alternative.

Peace will not be secured merely by putting out fires, as they occur. We must build a world in which they will be less likely to break out in the first place.

This means trying to build the kind of world order envisaged in the UN Charter: one in which men everywhere can enjoy more of the good things of life, in which emerging countries can maintain and strengthen their freedom, in which aggression can be deterred and the root causes of tension and conflict can be effectively addressed.

The Atlantic countries have a unique responsibility in building such a world. Their resources and talents are essential to the task.

But even these resources and talents will only suffice if they are concerted. No one of us is strong enough to meet the needs of the day alone. That is the meaning of Atlantic partnership.

An effective partnership must be based on the concept of equality: equality of effort, and equality of responsibility.

It is to such a partnership that my country is dedicated. As President Johnson said a few months ago, "none of us has sought, or will seek, domination over others."

To fulfill the promise of this partnership, we must be ready to break new ground, as did the statesmen who first constructed the alliance.

They met the essential need in building a better world: They prevented war. Since NATO was created, the territorial integrity of each of its members has been maintained. For almost a generation, aggression in Europe has been deterred. But NATO has been more than a shield of protection. It has been a wellspring of confidence and security giving impetus to prosperity and progress, to economic growth and political cooperation.

We must make sure that it stays this way. We must maintain and strengthen NATO, in the face of a Soviet military presence which changes but does not wither. We must preserve the structure of joint defense on which NATO's success has rested. It is the close integration of effort that distinguishes NATO from all previous alliances. But we must adapt that structure to changing circumstances.

Other needs for common action also emerge as we move into the third decade of the post-war era.

It is to three of these great needs that I would speak today.

We must concert about our actions in the great continents to the South: Latin America, Africa and Asia. We must help these peoples achieve the peace, the freedom, and the progress that they seek.

This calls for action to coordinate and increase the Atlantic nations' aid to developing countries. In this task we must take full advantage of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD.

It calls for action to expand world trade. This means that we cannot afford to let the Kennedy Round fail.

It calls for action to enlarge world monetary reserves to meet the most pressing requirements of both developing and industrialized areas.

Whether action is taken in each of these fields will depend, in good part, on how seriously your countries and mine address these tasks. For it is our resources and our skills that are in good part involved.

The needs of emerging countries continue to grow. As in Europe after World War II, their security as well as their growth must be assured, if they are not to become a focus of ever widening conflict.

All of us have a stake in that security. The Atlantic nations cannot survive as an island of stability in a world of chaos.

The threats to this security may be subtle or indirect; that does not make them any less real.

A better world cannot be built by turning away from the difficult and dangerous business of meeting these threats.

This is common business, because all our interests are at stake.

Political consultation should be the means of discharging common business -- the means of arriving at common action.

Such consultation, in its quiet way, is gradually becoming a habit in the alliance. There are now few subjects of international importance which are not discussed, day in and day out, by the North Atlantic Council.

More needs to be done. The practice of bringing together the senior officials who have responsibility in home governments has been successful in the OECD. It may prove increasingly rewarding in NATO.

Intimate and continuing concert of action is also fostered by parliamentary meetings such as this. The proposal for an Atlantic Assembly, which has been approved by this group, looks to the same end. I hope it can be fulfilled.

But let us be clear: Consultation will not be assured by effective mechanisms, alone.

The responsibilities and burdens of common effort go hand in hand. Consultation will be effective in the degree that it looks to action. Common decisions will come most readily to those countries willing to share in the effort that these decisions govern.

I turn now to a second area in which joint action is needed: averting spread of nuclear weapons under national control.

There will be no security for any of our countries if the authority to let loose these weapons proliferates.

There are three ways in which the Atlantic nations can -- and must -- act together to avert this peril.

First, we must assure that Atlantic nuclear arrangements offer our European partners an effective alternative to national systems of deterrence.

It is natural that European countries, with new strength and confidence, should wish to play a larger role in their own defense.

My country is ready to join with them in effective action to this end.

There will be continuing discussion of such action among interested nations in the period ahead.

We must also consider how best to meet the concerns of key non-nuclear countries outside the Atlantic area -- concerns which might otherwise move these countries to consider national deterrence.

Last October President Johnson said, in speaking of the first Chinese Communist nuclear explosion: "The nations that do not seek nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our sure support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

I hope that interested Atlantic nations can work together -- in the United Nations, in disarmament negotiations, and elsewhere -- in seeking ways to fulfill this pledge.

We must also continue to seek a common approach to arms negotiations with the USSR.

In the recent Geneva Conference a large measure of Western agreement was reached on a proposed non-proliferation treaty. We hope that the Soviet Union will, over time, reconsider its abrupt rejection of this proposal.

At this same Conference, key nuclear capable countries made clear that reductions in existing nuclear armaments could play an important part in encouraging and ensuring non-proliferation. Ambassador Goldberg has recently laid before the United Nations American proposals for freezing and reducing nuclear capabilities.

In seeking to reduce armaments, as in other areas of negotiation with the USSR,

Western unity will be essential, if there is to be any chance of success. Atlantic nations that come together to share in nuclear defense should share, no less, in the search for prudent ways of limiting the burdens and dangers of that defense.

But defense of the status quo is not good enough as a purpose of Atlantic action. In trying to build a better world we must seek peacefully to erode the tragic and unnecessary division of Europe.

The nations of Eastern Europe are finding new paths. Closer contacts between these nations and the Atlantic world can best be sought on a basis of common understanding in the West.

The effort to develop such closer contacts is not directed against any nation, least of all the Soviet Union. We seek to end existing divisions in Europe, not to create new ones.

The most grievous of these existing divisions is the enforced partition of Germany. The German people, like any other, must be allowed to choose and shape its own future. The need is to afford the German people that choice, while meeting the security concerns of all with a stake in European peace.

I have spoken of fields in which action is required.

There is the need, as well, for our alliance to more greatly develop our cooperation in such fields as outer space. For we must together insure that space will be a source of man's peaceful progress and not a threat to that progress.

In each of these things, the key to success will be common effort.

Atlantic nations which mount such effort will have done much to carry forward the purpose of their partnership: creating a better world.

If we fail and fall apart, future generations may well look back on our time as we look back on the period between the wars: an interlude in which men forgot the harsh lessons

of disaster, and thus lost the chance to build anew.

The need is clear.

It is for each of us here to help decide whether it will be met.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
BEFORE THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS,
PARK SHERATON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1965
AT 10:30 A.M., E.D.T.

I am happy to be able to welcome you here today to the United States on behalf of the President. I am particularly happy to do so as a fellow NATO Parliamentarian who has attended your meetings in the past, has always followed your activities with the keenest interest, and is looking forward to conversations with a number of old friends in this distinguished group.

The tradition, in opening such international meetings, is for someone from the host country to greet the delegates with general and benign expressions of good will.

I would like to do more than that.

For you are leaders in developing political thinking in your countries. You are the men and women who provide legislation to back up needed policies. You are key figures in advancing the common interests of our Atlantic partnership.

I would like to share with you some thoughts about the future of that partnership.

Its object is to strengthen peace. This is surely the supreme task of our age. In the nuclear era, there can be no alternative.

Peace will not be secured merely by putting out fires, as they occur. We must build a world in which they will be less likely to break out in the first place.

This means trying to build the kind of world order envisaged in the UN Charter: one in which men everywhere can enjoy more of the good things

things of life, in which emerging countries can maintain and strengthen their freedom, in which aggression can be deterred and the root causes of tension and conflict can be effectively addressed.

The Atlantic countries have a unique responsibility in building such a world. Their resources and talents are essential to the task.

But even these resources and talents will only suffice if they are concerted. No one of us is strong enough to meet the needs of the day alone. That is the meaning of Atlantic partnership.

An effective partnership must be based on the concept of equality: equality of effort, and equality of responsibility.

It is to such a partnership that my country is dedicated. As President Johnson said a few months ago, "none of us has sought, or will seek, domination over others."

To fulfill the promise of this partnership, we must be ready to break new ground, as did the statesmen who first constructed the alliance.

They met the essential need in building a better world: They prevented war. Since NATO was created, the territorial integrity of each of its members has been maintained. For almost a generation, aggression in Europe has been deterred. But NATO has been more than a shield of protection. It has been a wellspring of confidence and security giving impetus to prosperity and progress, to economic growth and political cooperation.

We must make sure that it stays this way. We must maintain and strengthen NATO, in the face of a Soviet military presence which changes but does not wither. We must preserve the structure of joint defense on which NATO's success has rested. It is the close integration of effort that distinguishes NATO from all previous alliances. But we must

adapt

adapt that structure to changing circumstances.

Other needs for common action also emerge as we move into the third decade of the post-war era.

It is to three of these great needs that I would speak today.

We must concert about our actions in the great continents to the South: Latin America, Africa and Asia. We must help these peoples achieve the peace, the freedom, and the progress that they seek.

This calls for action to coordinate and increase the Atlantic nations' aid to developing countries. In this task we must take full advantage of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD.

It calls for action to expand world trade. This means that we cannot afford to let the Kennedy Round fail.

It calls for action to enlarge world monetary reserves to meet the most pressing requirements of both developing and industrialized areas.

Whether action is taken in each of these fields will depend, in good part, on how seriously your countries and mine address these tasks. For it is our resources and our skills that are in good part involved.

The needs of emerging countries continue to grow. As in Europe after World War II, their security as well as their growth must be assured, if they are not to become a focus of ever widening conflict.

All of us have a stake in that security. The Atlantic nations cannot survive as an island of stability in a world of chaos.

The threats to this security may be subtle or indirect; that does not make them any less real.

A better world cannot be built by turning away from the difficult and dangerous business of meeting these threats.

This is common business, because all our interests are at stake.

Political consultation should be the means of discharging common business -- the means of arriving at common action.

Such

Such consultation, in its quiet way, is gradually becoming a habit in the alliance. There are now few subjects of international importance which are not discussed, day in and day out, by the North Atlantic Council.

More needs to be done. The practice of bringing together the senior officials who have responsibility in home governments has been successful in the OECD. It may prove increasingly rewarding in NATO.

Intimate and continuing concert of action is also fostered by parliamentary meetings such as this. The proposal for an Atlantic Assembly, which has been approved by this group, looks to the same end. I hope it can be fulfilled.

But let us be clear: Consultation will not be assured by effective mechanisms, alone.

The responsibilities and burdens of common effort go hand in hand. Consultation will be effective in the degree that it looks to action. Common decisions will come most readily to those countries willing to share in the effort that these decisions govern.

I turn now to a second area in which joint action is needed: averting spread of nuclear weapons under national control.

There will be no security for any of our countries if the authority to let loose these weapons proliferates.

There are three ways in which the Atlantic nations can -- and must -- act together to avert this peril.

First, we must assure that Atlantic nuclear arrangements offer our European partners an effective alternative to national systems of deterrence.

It is natural that European countries, with new strength and confidence, should wish to play a larger role in their own defense.

My country

My country is ready to join with them in effective action to this end.

There will be continuing discussion of such action among interested nations in the period ahead.

We must also consider how best to meet the concerns of key non-nuclear countries outside the Atlantic area -- concerns which might otherwise move these countries to consider national deterrence.

Last October President Johnson said, in speaking of the first Chinese Communist nuclear explosion: "The nations that do not seek nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our sure support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

I hope that interested Atlantic nations can work together -- in the United Nations, in disarmament negotiations, and elsewhere -- in seeking ways to fulfill this pledge.

We must also continue to seek a common approach to arms negotiations with the USSR.

In the recent Geneva Conference a large measure of Western agreement was reached on a proposed non-proliferation treaty. We hope that the Soviet Union will, over time, reconsider its abrupt rejection of this proposal.

At this same Conference, key nuclear capable countries made clear that reductions in existing nuclear armaments could play an important part in encouraging and ensuring non-proliferation. Ambassador Goldberg has recently laid before the United Nations American proposals for freezing and reducing nuclear capabilities.

In seeking to reduce armaments, as in other areas of negotiation with the USSR, Western unity will be essential, if there is to be any chance of success. Atlantic nations that come together to share in nuclear defense should share, no less, in the search for prudent ways of limiting

of limiting the burdens and dangers of that defense.

But defense of the status quo is not good enough as a purpose of Atlantic action. In trying to build a better world we must seek peacefully to erode the tragic and unnecessary division of Europe.

The nations of Eastern Europe are finding new paths. Closer contacts between these nations and the Atlantic world can best be sought on a basis of common understanding in the West.

The effort to develop such closer contacts is not directed against any nation, least of all the Soviet Union. We seek to end existing divisions in Europe, not to create new ones.

The most grievous of these existing divisions is the enforced partition of Germany. The German people, like any other, must be allowed to choose and shape its own future. The need is to afford the German people that choice, while meeting the security concerns of all with a stake in European peace.

I have spoken of fields in which action is required.

There is need, as well, for our alliance to more greatly develop our cooperation in such fields as outer space. For we must together insure that space will be a source of man's peaceful progress and not a threat to that progress.

In each of these things, the key to success will be common effort.

Atlantic nations which mount such effort will have done much to carry forward the purpose of their partnership: creating a better world.

If we fail and fall apart, future generations may well look back on our time as we look back on the period between the wars: an interlude in which men forgot the harsh lessons of disaster, and thus lost the chance to build anew.

The need is clear.

It is for each of us here to help decide whether it will be met.

10-5-65

The Future of NATO: Areas of Common Effort

Address by Vice President Humphrey¹

I am happy to be able to welcome you here today to the United States on behalf of the President. I am particularly happy to do so as a fellow NATO Parliamentarian who has attended your meetings in the past, has always followed your activities with the keenest interest, and is looking forward to conversations with a number of old friends in this distinguished group.

The tradition, in opening such international meetings, is for someone from the host country to greet the delegates with general and benign expressions of good will. I would like to do more than that. For you are leaders in developing political thinking in your countries. You are the men and women who provide legislation to back up needed policies. You are key figures in advancing the common interests of our Atlantic partnership.

¹ Made before the annual meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians at New York, N.Y., on Oct. 5.

I would like to share with you thoughts about the future of that partnership.

Its object is to strengthen peace. That surely the supreme task of our age. In the nuclear era there can be no alternative.

Peace will not be secured merely by putting out fires as they occur. We must build a world in which they will be less likely to break out in the first place. This means building the kind of world order envisaged in the U.N. Charter—one in which men everywhere can enjoy more of the things of life, in which emerging countries can maintain and strengthen their freedom in which aggression can be deterred and root causes of tension and conflict can be effectively addressed.

The Atlantic countries have a unique responsibility in building such a world. Their resources and talents are essential to the task. But even these resources and talents will only suffice if they are concentrated

DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN VOL. LIII, NO. 1374 PUBLICATION 7931 OCTOBER 25, 1965

The Department of State Bulletin, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The Bulletin includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department.

as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

The Bulletin is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Govern-

ment Printing Office, Washington 20402. PRICE: 52 issues, domestic foreign \$15; single copy 30 cents.

Use of funds for printing of the Bulletin approved by the Director, Bureau of the Budget (January 1965).

NOTE: Contents of this publication not copyrighted and items contained may be reprinted. Citation of the Department of State Bulletin as the source be appreciated. The Bulletin is in the Readers' Guide to Periodicals.

is strong enough to meet the
challenge. That is the meaning
of partnership.

Partnership must be based on
equality—equality of effort
and responsibility. It is to such
partnership that my country is dedicated.
Kennedy said a few months
ago it is as sought—or will seek—
as any other.

On the basis of this partnership,
we need to break new ground, as
men who first constructed the
world. They met the essential need in
our world: They prevented
war. NATO was created, the carrier
of peace of each of its members has
been changed. The almost a generation
of peace in Europe has been restored.

NATO has been more than a shield
against war. It has been a wellspring of
peace and security giving impetus to
economic and progress, to economic
and technical cooperation.

We must be sure that it stays this
way. We must maintain and strengthen
NATO. The fear of Soviet military pres-
sures does not wither. We
strengthen the structure of NATO. We
must ensure NATO's success has rested
on the integration of effort that
strengthens NATO from all previous dif-
ferences. We must adapt that structure to
new circumstances.

Reasons for common action also
exist. We have had the three decades of
peace. This is one of those great
moments when we speak today.

Peace of Southern Hemisphere

We must support our actions in the
South. We must support the South—Latin Amer-
ica and Asia. We must meet these
challenges. We must meet the freedom and
peace that they seek.

We must act to coordinate and in-
tegrate nations' aid to develop-
ment. In this task we must take full

advantage of the Development Assistance
Committee of the OECD (Organization for
Economic Cooperation and Development).

It calls for action to expand world trade.
This means that we cannot afford to let
the Kennedy Round fail.

It calls for action to enlarge world mon-
etary reserves to meet the most pressing
requirements of both developing and indus-
trialized areas.

Whether action is taken in each of these
fields will depend, in good part, on how
seriously your countries and mine address
these tasks. For it is our resources and our
skills that are in good part involved.

The needs of emerging countries continue
to grow. As in Europe after World War II,
their security as well as their growth must
be assured if they are not to become a focus
of ever-widening conflict.

All of us have a stake in that security.
The Atlantic nations cannot survive as ex-
ponents of stability in a world of chaos. The
threats to this security may be subtle or
indirect, but they are not less real.

Arriving at Common Action

A better world cannot be built by turning
away from the difficult and dangerous busi-
ness of meeting these needs. This is com-
mon business, because all our interests are
at stake.

Political consultation should be the means
of discharging common business—the means
of arriving at common action. Such consul-
tation, in its truest way, is gradually becom-
ing a habit in the Atlantic. There are now
few subjects of international importance
which are not discussed, say it and say out,
by the North Atlantic Council.

More needs to be done. The practice of
bringing together the senior officials who
have responsibility in home governments
has been successful in the OECD. It may
prove increasingly rewarding in NATO.

Intimate and continuing concert of action
is also fostered by parliamentary meetings
such as this. The proposal for an Atlantic
Assembly, which has been approved by this

group, looks to the same end. I hope it can be fulfilled.

But let us be clear. Consultation will not be assured by effective mechanisms alone. The responsibilities and burdens of common effort go hand in hand. Consultation will be effective in the degree that it looks to action. Common decisions will come most readily to those countries willing to share in the effort that these decisions govern.

Averting Spread of Nuclear Weapons

I turn now to a second area in which joint action is needed—averting spread of nuclear weapons under national control. There will be no security for any of our countries if the authority to let loose these weapons proliferates.

There are three ways in which the Atlantic nations can—and must—act together to avert this peril:

First, we must assure that Atlantic nuclear arrangements offer our European partners an effective alternative to national systems of deterrence. It is natural that European countries, with new strength and confidence, should wish to play a larger role in their own defense. My country is ready to join with them in effective action to this end. There will be continuing discussion of such action among interested nations in the period ahead.

We must also consider how best to meet the concerns of key nonnuclear countries outside the Atlantic area—concerns which might otherwise move these countries to consider national deterrence.

Last October President Johnson said, in speaking of the first Chinese Communist nuclear explosion, "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."³ I hope that interested Atlantic nations can work together—in the United Nations, in disarmament negotiations, and elsewhere—in seeking ways to fulfill this pledge.

Common Approach to Arms Negotiations

We must also continue to seek a common approach to arms negotiations with the U.S.S.R. In the recent Geneva conference a large measure of Western agreement was reached on a proposed nonproliferation treaty.⁴ We hope that the Soviet Union will, over time, reconsider its abrupt rejection of this proposal.

At this same conference key nuclear-capable countries made clear that reductions in existing nuclear armaments could play an important part in encouraging and insuring nonproliferation. Ambassador Goldberg recently laid before the United Nations American proposals for freezing and reducing nuclear capabilities.⁵

In seeking to reduce armaments, and in other areas of negotiation with the U.S.S.R., Western unity will be essential if there is to be any chance of success. Atlantic nations that come together to share in mutual defense should share, no less, in the search for prudent ways of limiting the burdens and dangers of that defense.

But defense of the *status quo* is not enough as a purpose of Atlantic action. Trying to build a better world we must seek peacefully to erode the tragic and unnecessary division of Europe.

The nations of Eastern Europe are finding new paths. Closer contacts between these nations and the Atlantic world must best be sought on a basis of common understanding in the West. The effort to develop such closer contacts is not directed against any nation, least of all the Soviet Union. We seek to end existing divisions in Europe not to create new ones.

The most grievous of these existing divisions is the enforced partition of Germany. The German people, like any other, must be allowed to choose and shape its own future. The need is to afford the German people that choice, while meeting the security concerns of all with a stake in European peace.

³ *Ibid.*, Nov. 2, 1964, p. 610.

⁴ For text of a U.S. draft treaty, see *ibid.*, 20, 1965, p. 474.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Oct. 11, 1965, p. 578.

have spoken of fields in which action is needed. There is need, as well, for our alliance to greatly develop our cooperation in fields as outer space. For we must to insure that space will be a source of peaceful progress and not a threat to progress.

In each of these things the key to success is common effort. Atlantic nations must mount such effort will have done to carry forward the purpose of their membership—creating a better world.

If we fail and fall apart, future generations may well look back on our time as we look back on the period between the wars: a period in which men forgot the harsh lessons of disaster and thus lost the chance to build anew.

The need is clear. It is for each of us here to decide whether it will be met.

Dr. Hall Discusses U.S. Relations with Europe on BBC

Following is the transcript of an interview of Under Secretary Hall by Alistair Cooke, editor of the *London Economist*, made in Washington on October 2 and broadcast on BBC radio on October 3.

See also 113 dated October 6

A. Mr. Hall, I am very glad to have this chance to talk to you in the middle of your own preoccupations, and in particular to ask you about problems affecting Europe in particular. I think later on we are going to have a word with Mr. [W. Averell] Harriman in a later program.

A. Good.

A. What I would like to take up with you at all is the whole position of East-West relations as they affect Europe. I know many people in Western Europe have been looking for the coming together of the United

India and China, but it does seem to us that if China is now regarded as the one disturbing and dissatisfied power in the world, it is a very good thing that Moscow and Washington should see their common interest.

But, of course, how does this leave Europe? And there is a certain feeling and perhaps a certain fear in Western Europe that from now on America's main interest and its main initiative will be directed toward Moscow, and just possibly at the expense of some of the European interests that the United States has supported through thick and thin in the past 10 or 15 years.

What is your reaction to this kind of European fear?

A. Mr. Burnet, I think that you have to be very careful in making any large generalizations about the degree of cooperation or the degree of common interest which the United States and the Soviet Union may have. In the last few weeks, for example, in the case of the subcontinent we have each found it desirable in our own individual national interests to follow courses which have been roughly parallel in the Security Council of the United Nations in trying to bring about a cease-fire.¹ On the other hand, in Southeast Asia the Soviet Union is actively supporting the regime in North Viet-Nam whereas the United States is, of course, giving full support to the South Vietnamese in their struggle against the aggressions from the North.

Q. Yes.

A. I mention this because there are areas, as there have been in the past, for example, in the case of the limited test ban agreement, where we can find a common interest which could result in some constructive initiative being supported by both sides, but we have also vast areas of disagreement, and I am sure that we are going to continue to have for a very considerable period to come



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