

HUMPHREY SPEECH

United Nations Association of Minnesota  
May 14, 1969

GREENWOOD:

There is a man who has stood for all of the ideals of "America First" and has been a great and devoted public servant. He is a firm believer in the United Nations. You all know who he is and I would like to introduce to you Professor Hubert Humphrey, former Vice President of the United States.

HUMPHREY:

Thank you my good friend, Hal Greenwood, and our beloved friend, Rabbi Minda, and Mr. Otto. I miss our friend, Gladys Brooks, who's out doing some campaigning. She wasn't elected as readily as some of the rest of us here tonight. And my good friend, Congressman John Blatnik, who honors us with his presence. It is good to see you here. And I want to join with this audience tonight to pay a very special tribute to a truly selfless man, one that I have known better than 25 years as having dedicated his entire life to the cause of just and enduring peace through the U.N. In great personal sacrifice he has gone from one end of the country to the other, and particularly the Midwest, to speak up for the U.N. and all that it means. That's York Langton that you people honor tonight.

Let me also say how happy Muriel and I are to be here tonight. We find ourselves sort of shuttling back and forth between Washington and Minnesota. We are not quite sure yet where we are beginning to make some progress. I remember so well when we were very young we wanted to know if we hoped we could have a nice place to live, and now we have three wonderful places to live and I find myself living out of a suitcase most of the time. Such is life and its contradictions.

I am sure you know how pleased I am to be here. We have been a busy couple today. I spent my six hours at Macalester at lectures and have been over to the State legislature. This morning we got up at 6:00 to get a 7:20 plane to come out here. I was on educational television last night trying to raise \$100,000 to keep WETA, our educational station in Washington alive. I'm happy to tell you, my

republican friends that I sold a republican pink elephant for \$400 on auction, and I am happy to tell you, my fellow democrats, I sold a book autographed by Harry Truman for \$425. I am also happy to tell all of those who feel any affiliation to the United Kingdom that I sold a British rhododendron that had pink leaves and bright pink edges that they said was worth \$25 for I think \$47.50. So you see, inflation is under way, Hal.

I was so pleased to see how you elect people here tonight. Wish I had known about this sooner. In fact, I had sort of the same idea but Hal never let me in here. He kept me outside when we dedicated the building. If I had gotten on the inside I would have known how these things are managed. I might add, it's good to get elected and get a commercial at the same time. I notice that Midwest Federal and Prudential both did very well from this platform tonight. May I also say a word tonight in behalf of the University of Minnesota and Macalester College and Encyclopedia Britannica for which I work.

Well, it's a kind of special evening and I am in somewhat of a quandry about what to do about it because tonight our President is addressing this nation on what I am sure will be a topic of great interest and tremendous importance to all of us. I trust that the radio and TV facilities of our community will see that there is a repeat of the program so you will not miss his message. I have no way of knowing, since I do not conduct a spy operation, just exactly what's in that message, but one thing I am sure of is that the President of the U.S. is deeply concerned about the peace and deeply concerned about the method of obtaining peace. And as a realist he understands his difficulties because peace is an elusive force in this world and I find that those traveling the journey of peace sometimes find a lonely road, so he will obviously need your help, your support and your prayers.

But this meeting tonight is for a very special purpose --

support for a great organization dedicated to the cause of just and enduring peace. The charter of the U.N. represents the best that man has been able to evolve in terms of secular activity for the cause of peace and tonight I want to share some very serious thoughts with you about it.

I do not take this occasion lightly. There is so much happening these days that leaves us in confusion that I thought it might be well that we try to sort out a few thoughts tonight together and make this more than just a festive occasion, although I know you have had that and I am sorry I missed some of it, but it is hard to spread one's time as much as one would like.

I want to talk to you about not only this annual meeting and what it means and the flag raising ceremony and what it means. Hal, I want to compliment you on this great business of yours and your willingness to display these flags for the U.N., which is the highest form of patriotism, with the flag of the United States, one recognizing our independence and one recognizing our interdependence. Because in the day and age in which we live there is no independence without an understanding of dependence amongst people and nations. That's real 20th Century patriotism.

I have a sort of special interest in the U.N., not only because I lived at the time of its inception and at the time it became a reality I was the mayor of this city, but also because some eleven years later I served as a delegate to the United Nations by appointment of the President of the United States, President Eisenhower. I was there from 1956 through 1957. I was there at the time of the crises in Hungary and Poland and East Germany and Berlin. I was there at the time of the struggle in the Middle East and you may recall so well those dark and difficult and tragic days. And yet with all of these trials the U.N. has had to fact it has not only survived, it has grown in stature and grown in meaning.

Tonight, therefore I would like to talk about the U.N.'s ultimate purpose, that is peace. Not just the word, but the hard



work kind of peace. Some of you have heard me say, in days of considerable tension in the country, that the scriptures remind us "Blessed are the peace makers" -- not just the talkers, not just the walkers and not even just the demonstrators, but the workers, the makers of peace and the ones that understand that peace is more than the absence of conflict. It means, in that famous Hebrew word, Rabbi, "Shalom," more than the absence of conflict, it means a kind of fulfillment, a sense of harmony, a sense of community that should come to all of us. Whether we like it or not, Americans will continue to have a national responsibility for preserving world peace during the next decade and maybe longer than that. There is no escape so we must buckle down. But the question is how?? How will we fulfill that responsibility? How we fulfill that responsibility I can tell you will change because we face some new conditions and this is the message I try to bring to college campuses and to audiences young and old. We must understand that this is almost the 25th year since the end of World War II. A world that has changed so much by the impact of technology, science, communication, mobility of people, new nations, the sense of nationalism, even perhaps that of internationalism, and we, therefore, as a nation, must understand that our responsibility, while the responsibility doesn't change, how we fulfill our responsibility for change.

Now we face, for example, two new conditions above all I would say more than, though the tragic events in Czechoslovakia remind us -- oh, how they remind us -- that the cold war is not yet over. It is giving way and its central role on the world stage is changing to a global movement towards individual freedom and human emancipation. If there is one word that comes to my mind tonight that characterizes the time in which we live which many of you look upon as perilous and dangerous, it is emancipation. All over the world people are seeking their identity -- ethnic groups, individuals, national groups, wherever you may be, without exception.

Only yesterday I spent time with one of the leading specialists in this nation on the Soviet Union. Within that powerful nation with the many autonomous republics as they call them are the fermenting forces of national identity you don't read much about, but is there. All through Africa we see the same thing amongst the many peoples and tribes. Even as I was in England and you see the nationalist movements in England, Scotland and Wales, there is a kind of feeling that people are so tired of the bigness that has ripped us and they want a sense of individual identity.

There is another new condition that is upon us -- the Communist countries no longer post a monolithic threat. They are different. Even communism, that has sought to force a science of unanimity, a oneness, has broken out like a patch of different kinds of vegetation. There are different communist forces today -- different in China, different in Yugoslavia, different in Romania, Hungary and the Soviet Union. It is no longer what we used to talk about, and I wonder if our thinking is up to date, particularly when we continue to use the same old words. There is a new chance and this is another new condition to accelerate our efforts towards the control of the arms race.

New nations are moving into a period when they look more towards self-development and less towards ideological conflict. They want to be something, not merely to be tagged as something. Western Europe and Japan are strong once again and want to be able to stand on their own feet and want to have a voice and a very loud and strong voice in what happens in this world. And above all there is a new generation in the U.S. and in other industrial countries as well as developing countries and that new generation rejects openly and stridently the premises of war and the diplomacy of power politics. They want to see more emphasis put on human and personal values -- such simple and fundamental things as having enough to eat, being able to learn, and, hopefully, living free of fear. Now it is for our generation in this room tonight to help this new

generation realize the hopes of a world free from tyrannies, of the folly and futility of war, and the madness and ugliness of separation.

It is now time for this country, as you have heard me say before, to fashion a new strategy for peace. That's why this high office of the presidency is so important -- it is there you can be the architect. Now there will be no peace for any American or for any people of this earth until nations stop piling up these weapons all around the world. Just to put it directly, we must halt the spread of nuclear terror before it halts humanity itself.

I have devoted much of my life to these ends, first as chairman of the senate subcommittee on disarmaments for many years, as the sponsor of the arms control and disarmament agency, as an active senate supporter and the sponsor of the nuclear test ban treaty between ourselves and the Soviet Union and other nations, and then as vice president who helped in the negotiation of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. In the recent campaign I stressed the urgency as I do tonight, because it is not a bi-partisan matter, of bringing the strategic nuclear arms race under control -- first to halt and then, hopefully, to turn it back. In those months of last fall I preached, as you may recall, the prompt ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty which was designed to stop the production of nuclear weapons themselves. That treaty has now been ratified and I submit that while it went practically unnoticed it is possibly the greatest single step towards peace since the end of World War II.

But now we are at another crossroad, so to speak, in our national life. Now the Congress must decide whether or not to authorize and approve the money (and it runs into billions) for the initial deployment of the safeguard, as it is called, anti-ballistic missile system. I am well aware there are different points of view about this matter, but it is a subject that I think requires intellectual ventilation, but this debate is on the first round in a number of basic decisions on military spending Congress



must make this year. And when you read the press of military spending do not indulge in a conspiratorial attitude about your military. They are not demons; they do not seek war; they have a job to do and they follow a policy that was laid down by the Congress of the President of the United States. I advised a class of my students this afternoon on this very subject, that while it is very interesting to debate the ABM, which I oppose, you are only really talking about the fine crust on the top of the iceberg. You're not really talking about the whole structure of military involvement. Your military does what your commitments require and if you talk about reducing military spending then you must ask yourself some questions. You must take into consideration four separate factors. First, what are your commitments? Do you need them? How many are out of date? How many are obsolete? How many should you maintain? Secondly, what contingencies must you prepare for to fulfill those commitments? Thirdly, what forces do you need to be able to meet the contingencies, and, finally, what weapons do you need for those forces?

Now what we are discussing thus far in public print, over radio and TV and in Congress is the fourth and least important. We are discussing a weapon, a plane, a weapon system, rather than asking ourselves to review the entire national security posture of this country which will require thoughtful and even life and death consideration. I want you to think about that. Now I say that the next six months will be critical in determining whether or not we can take the first steps in slowing down the arms race and maybe redirecting significant sums of money from the works of war to the works of peace. For this reason our new strategy for peace must begin with prompt negotiation under our initiative with the Soviet Union over the reduction of offensive and defensive strategic weapons. Now I have no illusions about the difficult nature of these negotiations. I believe I know as many leaders of the Soviet Union as any living American and I have spent hours in discussion

with them. It is not easy. But it is necessary. When responsible leaders of great nations approach the vital security interests they do so with great caution and I know that our leaders will not agree to endangering our national security. And by the way, I made the same assumption about the Soviet leaders and I also assume the Soviet leaders would not lightly enter into these talks with us, so if we can get the discussions under way there is hope. It will take time. We must consistently keep that in mind.

Now one fact that is certain above all else, the accelerating arms race not only jeopardizes the peace of the world, but it encourages nations, and many nations very poor, to pour tens of billions of dollars into the arms race, dollars that bring no more security and put us again in the slippery ?? to a nuclear war and dollars urgently needed for economical and social development here at home and abroad.

Now a crucial element for fashioning the strategy for peace will be the improvement of the status for peace because peace is like a mighty cathedral. It must have the design of the master architect and the labors of many and it must have many underpinnings. We must, in particular, make the U.N. an instrument for controlling conflict, and it has thus far not been able to do this too well. The U.S. cannot play the role of global policeman. The American people don't want it and the rest of the world won't accept it. And we know better today than yesterday that the illusion of American impotence, in Dr. Brogan's phrase, is an illusion.

By the way, I spent a very pleasant afternoon last week with Dr. Dennis Brogan, one of the great political scientists of the 20th century. I talked him, I think, into coming to Minnesota to pay us a visit. I forgot to tell Muriel that. Nice to have a chance to tell you tonight, dear.

But the alternative now to American peace keeping, which you do not want and which the world would not accept, cannot be no peace keeping -- it must be peace keeping by the U.N. or by regional



organizations following within the proposals of the charter of the U.N. The basis of a new world peace keeping system must be commitment to non-interference in the interior affairs of other countries. This policy will only work if it is respected by all states, large and small, and if there is an effective instrument in the U.N. to serve the interests of individual nations but of peace itself. Now a policy of mutual non-interference is not just an ideal. It is the only way to preserve peace in this world, but it will work only if the pledges of non-interference are backed up by United Nations forces which can patrol borders and supervise, if need be, free elections. So I say, with all of the shortcomings, U.N. peace keeping efforts have brought some practical results -- not what I would have liked, not what we would have hoped for, but at least some achievement in Cypress and in the Congo and in Kashmir. Do you remember only three or four years ago in the Congo when it was said Africa would explode because of it. Mrs. Humphrey and I were there just two years ago with President Mahuto ? where we saw the village of the Organization of the African States and where we saw a nation once again, (and my friend, Cecil Newman, was with us on that trip, and Hal was there -- how could I forget my good friend who has those great pictures), it was an exciting experience to see a nation that had been preserved. The peace keeping capacity can be enlarged only if the members will earmark and train units of their armed forces for international peace keeping assignments. I won't go into the details of that except to say our country must be willing to help and, above all, to call for a U.N. peace keeping fund and be willing to pay for it right here to help the U.N. launch emergency operations right away. To put it to you directly, if you want peace we must be prepared to pay for it. And quit arguing about the check because there is nothing more costly than violence and war.

Some months ago when I was speaking to this nation I called for a new San Francisco conference to rededicate the U.N. on its

25th anniversary and to seek new ways of making it work for peace, especially in the international areas of peace keeping. I propose again, before this audience, that a commission for peace, composed of leading American citizens, be appointed as to develop specific proposals for that new San Francisco conference and to work with similar commissions from other member nations to plan for the 25th anniversary. You know we plan for the geophysical year, we plan for the U.N. Dumbarton Oaks Conference. The U.N. is now coming into its maturity. It has left its adolescence and it needs to grow up and it needs a whole new look which the 25th anniversary preparatory commission and Americans throughout the world could give to it. I must add that the U.N. needs not just to be a fire department, but a better means of fire prevention. Here in the U.S. we have learned the value of fact finders and mediators. Some of my friends are here tonight from the labor movement and from industry. We know that we have to mobilize behind a reasonable settlement of disputes; therefore, I urge the U.N. to establish a permanent panel of highly skilled fact finders and mediators to apply themselves to disputes that threaten world peace. These are the initiatives I want our country to take. This is what we need by seizing the moral leadership rather than demonstrating to the world that we know how to produce a better space capsule or a better bomb or a better bomber. What we really need is to demonstrate to the world that we have a better idea and we know how to think.

The next element may be more important as was emphasized here tonight in the new strategy for peace must be a global estimate in economical development. My fellow Americans, we are today contributing 4/10s of 1% of our gross national product to foreign aid. Ten years ago we contributed 3% and we are richer than we ever were. I saw the projections of the U.S. and China for the year 2000, which are frightening. The most conservative projections for this country is a per capita income of \$11,000 per person, and it surely is within the realm of possibility, and the most optimistic projection for China was \$300 per person. In that kind of a world, as that

beloved peasant, Pope John, said "In a world of constant want there is no need," and his successor, Pope Paul, said "Development is the new name for peace." But you see, that is hard work. How much easier it is to parade and to talk and to condemn and to criticize and to hope and to pray. The hard day by day, block by block, stone by stone, building of this beautiful mighty cathedral for peace. It will take generations but you have to start.

I have visited many of these new nations, in fact I believe we visited four continents in the years of my vice presidency and 32 countries, and during my years in the senate I visited many more. I have talked to their leaders and visited with the people. I believe I know a little bit about the hopes and the..TAPE CHANGE. There is no place to hide. Television, transistors, the photograph, the printed word has made it impossible to be a hypocrite for long. You are exposed. And whether we like it or not we have no other choice. We either proceed with the responsibility of development or we suffer the tragedy of defeat and disaster. The time has come, therefore, for a new approach in world development. I know you do not want the citizens of the country to pay the bill alone. We have learned that national burdens can be lifted if international burdens can be shared. We need not merely a new level of effort, but greater emphasis upon multi-national and international cooperation. This will be the new philosophy of capital assistance of foreign aid where we can help nations to develop without facing what has been called the temptation to do good, the temptation to insist that not only virtue be done -- and we are strong on that -- but even more significantly that our particular version of virtue be implemented in our particular way. Those days are over. This world is not ours. We are but part of it. The final element, therefore, in that new strategy for peace should be new efforts to promote international understanding throughout the use of existing developments in education and in communication and technology, including the communication satellite itself because through those



satellites man cannot only transmit between central ground stations, but he will be able to broadcast directly from village to home radios to TV receivers.

Fifteen years from now if I am still permitted to be a teacher I will be able to have in the classroom lectures from any university in the world by simply touching a button with instantaneous language translation into the tongue of the host. We will hear the great names of the world. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the educators of today who are really forward looking say that the young man of the year 2000 will have his Ph.D. at the age of 18, not 25. The only question is, with all the information will he have the judgment. That will only come as he has that sense of self-discipline and responsibility. I have proposed reciprocal TV and radio exchanges with other countries -- it is not new -- including countries of Eastern Europe. We intend to visit Eastern Europe this year if things work out. I intend to visit with the leaders and the people because I believe the peace of the world depends upon the relationship between ourselves and the Soviet Union, not that we embrace their ideology, but we recognize that there is at least one common denominator that should unite all sane and sensible people -- the desire to survive. And the only race that's really important is the human race. Maybe we ought to concentrate a little of attention on that -- just people. Other countries may have difficulty with some of these proposals, such as an open exchange of radio and TV, but we in America have an open society and I think we ought to lead the way and not wait for others.

I have spoken to you tonight of several aspects of the conduct of our future foreign policies. None of these things will, of course, be effective unless we as a people make the decision that America must continue to play an active role in the world at large. We should not, despite our frustrations and problems at home and abroad, draw back within ourselves and this is what I worry about. Over these past few years we have come to regard our wealth and power

almost with guilt. But I believe we should regard our wealth and power as blessings, not something to be cast aside, but as an active instrument of human betterment. No people has had so much and had the opportunity to do so much. Turn within ourselves, self-indulgence, to turn aside, to deny the brotherhood of man itself in face of rapid and tumultuous change would be to leave ourselves the helpless victims of history rather than its progenitors. So I call on this nation to stay at this business of international responsibility. It is costly, difficult, frustrating and sometimes almost maddening, but it doesn't approach the trials and tragedy of war. I ask America not to become disillusioned about the troubles that they find in the world, but to see the enormous possibilities. This will require something that America has always found difficult -- patience. Persevering patience. It has been said that we are a nation not of long distance runners but of sprinters and there is some truth in that in this year 24 of the nuclear age; that's a good place to start dating history because the nuclear age, the advent of the nuclear weapon, changed all of history. We must finally learn peace will never be a short run gain but always a marathon so our new strategy for peace will succeed only if we can inspire a new generation of Americans, get them to understand that there is no instant salvation. This new generation must understand the nation's politics at home and abroad. Our search for a new strategy for peace will succeed only when we find an honorable end to a tragic war. The President addresses himself to that issue tonight. Therefore, our first priority as a nation must be to find some way honorably, without casting aside the lives and wellbeing of the peoples of South Viet Nam to end that war, to dare to take the first steps. You see I believe in risk. We have taken many a risk on the battlefield. We are doing it tonight. We have to be willing to take the risks for peace whatever the risks must be. I will never forget that message of June 1963 at American University because I had talked to President Kennedy about it before

he even delivered it. He said "Let's examine our attitude towards peace itself. Too many think it is unreal. But that is a dangerous defeatist attitude which leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable, that mankind is doomed and that we are ripped by forces we cannot control. We need not accept that view. Our problems are manmade, therefore, they can be solved by man and man can be as big as he wants." Those words still ring true these days, still cry out for American initiative which will give credence to our statements that peace is possible -- initiative in Paris, initiative in the Middle East, initiative in beginning arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union and in revitalizing the peace keeping machinery of the U.N. and doing our share in concern with others to promote economical and social development around the world. All of these things can be done with such little sacrifice and yet with such glory. These are the initiatives that I think will be our new strategy for peace. That's why we are assembled here tonight -- not to join another organization, you already belong to too many. If we are here only for the festive occasion and write it off as just a night out on the town. But I think we are here for something better -- the politics of the people, not the angry politics of a violent few, but the thoughtful politics of the great majority of the American people who want to reason together and think anew about the world that is changing and the world that can be saved.

Thank you very much.



000608

✓ you forgot to  
✓ Shadup Brooks  
✓ Cong Blatnik  
✓ Hal Greenwood  
✓ Rabbi Minda  
REMARKS motto  
Dreams Easy Election  
THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY + ms H.

UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

MAY 14, 1969

Midwest Federal Savings

(Like your Election  
Procedures)

(Commercial  
motto prudent)

It is a great privilege to participate in the annual  
meeting and flag-raising ceremonial dinner of the United  
Nations Association of Minnesota. (Deleg. to U.N. 1956-57)

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

Whether we like it or not, Americans will continue to  
have major responsibility for preserving world peace during  
the next decade. But how we fulfill that responsibility will  
change.

- 2 -

Today we face new conditions:

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

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

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

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

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

- 3 -

-- And a new generation in the United States and other industrial countries rejects the old premises of war and diplomacy. *Power Politics* They want to see more emphasis placed on human and personal values -- having enough to eat . . . being able to learn . . . living free of fear.

↳ It is for our generation to help them realize their hopes -- of a world free from the tyrannies of war and oppression.

↳ It is, in short, time for this country to fashion a new strategy for peace.

\* \* \*

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



- 4 -

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

...and as ~~principal~~ <sup>nuclear</sup> Senate supporter of the Test Ban Treaty. + The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

In the Presidential campaign, I stressed the urgency of bringing the strategic nuclear arms race under control... and I ~~disagreed vehemently with Mr. Nixon when he called~~

~~for U.S. superiority over the Soviet Union in nuclear~~

and I urged ~~armaments and when he opposed~~ prompt ratification of the

nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

That Treaty  
has now been ratified. It is a  
major step on the road to peace.

- 5 -

~~Today~~ <sup>Now</sup> the Congress of ~~the United States~~ must decide whether or not to approve money for the initial deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system. But this debate is only the first round in a number of basic decisions over military spending that Congress must make this year.

↳ In other words, the next six months will be critical in determining whether or not we can take the first steps in slowing down the arms race, as well as redirecting significant sums of money from works of war to works of peace.

↳ For this reason our new strategy for peace must begin with prompt negotiations with the Soviet Union over the reduction of offensive and defensive strategic weapons.

✓ I have no illusions about the difficult nature of these  
negotiations. ✓ When responsible leaders of great nations  
approach their vital security interests, they do so with great  
caution. ✓ I know our leaders will not agree to anything that  
endangers our national security. And I make the same  
assumption about the Soviet leaders.

✓ But I also assume that the Soviet leaders would not  
lightly enter into these talks with us.

- 7 -

∟ We must believe, until their actions demonstrate otherwise, that the Soviets understand the compelling reasons for ending the nuclear arms spiral -- a process which is not only expensive and dangerous, but one which has become meaningless in terms of securing for either side a decisive military advantage.



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

\* \* \*

2 A crucial element in fashioning a new strategy for peace will be the improvement of the institutions for peace.

2 We must, in particular, make the U.N. the instrument for controlling conflict it has so far failed to be..

↳ The United States cannot play the role of global gendarme.

↳ The American people don't want it, and the rest of the world

won't accept it. ↳ We know better today than yesterday that

'the illusion of American omnipotence -- in Dr. Brogan's phrase, "is an illusion."

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

-10-

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

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

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

- II -

But The peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations can be enlarged only if its members will earmark and train units of their armed forces for international peacekeeping assignments.

↳ To aid in this effort, the United States should be prepared:

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

--to launch a new effort to resolve the United Nations financial and constitutional crisis;

--to call for a United Nations peacekeeping fund, ~~beginning with twenty million dollars~~, to help the United Nations to launch emergency operations without delay. ↳ If we want peace -- we, and all nations -- must be prepared to pay for it. !



- 12 -

As I did <sup>last fall in the</sup> ~~in the~~ campaign, I call for a new San

Francisco conference to rededicate the United Nations on its 25th anniversary, and to seek new ways of making it work for peace -- especially in the area of international peacekeeping.

↳ I propose further that a commission for peace composed of leading American citizens be appointed to develop specific proposals for a new San Francisco conference and to work with similar commissions from other member nations to plan for the 25th anniversary conference.

↳ United Nations peacekeeping must go hand in hand with United States peacekeeping. ↳ The United Nations needs not just a fire department, but a better means of fire prevention.

-13-

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

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

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

*where constant war  
no peace*

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

-14-

As President Kennedy once said: "If we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich." *That applies here at home and abroad.*

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

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

-15-

↳ The final element in our new strategy for peace should be new efforts to promote international understanding through the use of exciting developments in communications technology -- including the communications satellite.

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

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

not  
new.

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



-16-

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

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

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

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

- 17 -

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

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

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

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

↳ But in year 24 of the nuclear age, we must finally learn that peace will never be a short-run game, but always a marathon.

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

And our search for a new strategy for peace will succeed only when we find an honorable end to a tragic war. (Pres. Nixon ~~there~~)

Our first priority as a nation must be to end the war in Vietnam.

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

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

- 19 -

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

These days cry out for American initiatives which will give credence to our statements that peace is possible -- initiatives in Paris at the Vietnam peace talks, in beginning arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union, in revitalizing the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations, in doing our share in concert with others to promote economic and social development around the world.

These initiatives will be our new strategy for peace.

# # #





# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



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