

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FOR THE PRESS

JUNE 14, 1966

NO. 144

CAUTION - FUTURE RELEASE

FOR RELEASE AT 1:30 P.M., E.D.T. (11:30 A.M., M.D.T.), TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1966. NOT TO BE PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED, QUOTED FROM, OR USED IN ANY WAY.

EXCERPTS FROM
ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE THE ROTARY INTERNATIONAL
DENVER, COLORADO
AT 11:30 A.M., M.D.T., TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1966

President Teenstra, members and guests of Rotary International:

It is a high privilege to meet with this renowned organization representing more than one hundred nations. For personal reasons, I considered your invitation a command. For I myself am an alumnus of the Atlanta Rotary Educational Loan Fund and have never forgotten that your interest in young people made a decisive difference in my own life.

As Secretary of State I have had many occasions to note with interest and respect what Rotary is contributing throughout the world. I think of your growing program of matched districts and clubs, with all that it can accomplish in improving international understanding and good will. I think of the Rotary Foundation and the more than 2,100 international fellowships for graduate work which it has provided for young men and women from more than 70 countries. And I think of your help to distressed families in many lands.

My compliments to you, Mr. President, a citizen of the Netherlands and the third European to hold your eminent office. I have read an article by you in which you described your "special brand of English as lying somewhere between the southern Texas drawl and the Oxford stutter." As an Oxford graduate serving a Texas President, I am intrigued by the possible implications of your remark.

Otherwise, Mr. President, I found your article altogether admirable. You noted that the people of the more than 100 countries which have Rotary Clubs differ in race, color, religion, political conviction, and many other respects. Yet, you said, they share "the same basic longings and desires."

desires." You said that, above all, "they want to live in a peaceful world in which it is good to live." You said that what binds Rotary together is "a unity of desire and a unity of purpose to serve society and to serve mankind, but a unity in diversity."

Diversity we shall have -- and along with it a considerable amount of turbulence and change for as long as we can see into the future. It becomes important for us to search for the unity and the simple guidelines of policy which can build order out of turbulence and direction amidst tumultuous events. We should not apologize for the simple, clear, unifying ideas which hold the peoples of the world together -- the peoples who as you put it, Mr. President, "want to live in a peaceful world in which it is good to live."

The goal is a world of independent nations, each with the institutions of its own choice, but cooperating to further their mutual interests and well-being a world free of aggression, fear, want, and discrimination on account of race, or religion, or for any other reason a world which recognizes the rule of law in which all men can live in peace and fraternal fellowship.

That is the kind of world sketched out in the Preamble and Articles One and Two of the United Nations Charter a document drafted while the flames of the most destructive war in history still raged while men were thinking hard about the tragic lessons of the past and how to avoid a holocaust in the future. It is not an accident that the principles of the Charter reflect so closely the aspirations of the American people, for we, with other like-minded people, took the lead in drafting it.

The commitment of the American people to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter does not arise only from a desire to serve

mankind

mankind although I believe that the American people have that desire. It is rooted in our deepest self-interest -- in our determination to preserve our nation and its way of life in the words of the Preamble of our Constitution, to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Two world wars taught us that we could not find security in isolation. And near the end of the second world war came nuclear weapons and intercontinental planes, soon followed by thermonuclear weapons and intercontinental rockets that can travel half way around the earth or further in a few minutes. These developments have made worthless older notions of security based on defenses or policies confined to the North American continent, or the Western Hemisphere, or the North Atlantic basin, or any other limited geographical areas. Stark realities compel us to be concerned with the entire world -- with all its earth, waters, and atmosphere, and even with the adjacent areas of space, as far as men can project vehicles and instruments capable of affecting the conditions of life on earth. Stark realities compel us to try to build a reliable peace, a decent world order based upon the principle, as you put it, Mr. President, of "unity in diversity."

Unhappily, the leaders of some nations envision a different sort of world order. Their goal -- openly proclaimed -- is a world of uniformity, at least in the essentials of political and economic organization. The conflict between their plans for mankind and a world order in which all peoples are free to choose their own institutions and their own governments is fundamental. It is the paramount issue of our time.

I should like to comment briefly on progress toward a decent world order, particularly in three areas of the world with which the United States has long had special ties of sentiment and interest: the Western Hemisphere,

Hemisphere, the North Atlantic Community, and the Western Pacific.

Over the last thirteen months the attention of the Western Hemisphere has been focused on the political crisis in the Dominican Republic. We felt when the crisis arose in April 1965 that the Dominican people would work out their own problems in their own way if they were given the chance to do so. We have worked very closely with the Organization of American States over the last year to give the Dominican people that chance.

The free and democratic election which took place in the Dominican Republic on June 1 is eloquent testimony to the constructive work done by the Dominican Provisional President Hector Garcia Godoy and the Organization of American States. But even more, it should be a cause for great satisfaction on the part of the Dominican people who went to the polls in an overwhelming number to vote their confidence in the democratic process. But while we may take satisfaction that the Dominican people have successfully completed one more step on the road to democratic government, we are sobered by the serious economic and social problems that the new government will face.

I will not bother you with detail. It is sufficient to note that by any test the needs are great, and social, economic and political growth will only proceed with the most vigorous effort by the Dominican Government and people. The Dominican people have tried during the last five years to find a formula to overcome the legacy left them by over three decades of Trujillo dictatorship. We have worked with Dominican leaders in both the public and private sectors to develop a dynamic economic and social program. We have laid a firm basis for continued cooperation with the Dominican people. Extremists of both the right and the left may make further attempts to disrupt the political life
of the

of the Dominican Republic. But there is now a reasonable basis to expect that the Dominican people can move forward on programs that will help remove the causes for political unrest. They have a new confidence and hope in their own future and deserve our sympathy and understanding.

Elsewhere in the Hemisphere we can note progress and a basis for quiet satisfaction. The great cooperative undertaking in economic and social development, the Alliance for Progress, is making solid gains in almost all of our neighboring countries. Costa Rica, Guatemala and Colombia have successfully held free elections. Our negotiations with Panama on a new Panama Canal Treaty and a possible sea level canal are progressing satisfactorily. Brazil has grappled responsibly with difficult and complex economic problems and is moving toward its Presidential elections in October. Broadly speaking, the Governments of the Hemisphere are seeking that combination of moderation, stability and progress which can best respond to the basic needs and wishes of their own peoples. The step-up in Communist subversive activities projected in Havana and the Tri-Continent Conference earlier this year has not intimidated the Hemisphere nor disrupted its peaceful processes. Castro's answer has repeatedly lost its appeal throughout the Hemisphere -- and possibly within Cuba itself. The prospect of economic and social progress under democratic institutions is stronger than ever.

I turn now to the North Atlantic Community. Last week I attended in Brussels the 37th Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the North Atlantic Alliance. It was one of the most important Ministerial meetings since the early days of NATO. For, it had to deal with the consequences of the decision of France to withdraw from the integrated
defense

defense system built with so much care, and to require NATO and American military installations and personnel to leave France.

The other 14 members of the Alliance had declared on March 18 their unanimous determination to preserve and improve NATO's integrated military organization. At Brussels, meeting first as 14 and then with France, they unanimously reaffirmed that determination and took the first steps in making the necessary readjustments. They agreed to transfer the various NATO military headquarters from France and to simplify in certain respects the command structure. They extended an invitation to the Benelux countries to provide a new home for SHAPE -- Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe. While France said it would be glad to have the Council itself remain in Paris, the 14 felt that keeping it there would pose some practical problems, and they agreed that it is important to have the political headquarters and the military headquarters not too far apart geographically. They deferred until October a decision on moving the Council.

All the NATO members, including France, agreed that the questions they must settle as a result of the French decisions, beyond those acted upon at Brussels, will be discussed first in the NATO Council, which may assign some questions to smaller groups. Problems that cannot be resolved through those channels will be taken up at the Ministerial level. And when the essential political decisions have been reached, the purely military arrangements will be taken up between the French High Command and the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

The deliberations

The deliberations at Brussels clearly showed that NATO continues to have vitality and that the other 14 consider that the decision of France must not interfere with their own unity in the measures needed to protect the safety and well-being of the North Atlantic community. Certainly the problems created by the French decision are complex and costly, and will require continuing effort over a considerable period of time.

Although the other members of NATO cannot be happy about the French decision, we all agreed not to indulge in recrimination but to continue to regard France as an ally -- as France says it is -- to try to work out some form of coordination between the NATO military structure and the French military forces, and to hope that in time France will decide to resume a full partnership in NATO's defense system.

All the members of NATO have observed with interest, and hope, signs of evolution in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union -- evolution toward national autonomy, less harsh internal discipline, and the restoration of somewhat more normal relations between the peoples of Eastern Europe and those of the West. There was some feeling that the danger of war has receded somewhat and that intensified efforts should be made to improve East-West relations and to solve the grave disputes left over from the Second World War.

If the outlook has improved in these respects, the strength and solidarity of NATO are largely responsible. And a strong NATO remains necessary as a base for further efforts to improve East-West relations.

When we think about reduced tensions, we must not forget that five years ago this month we were threatened with war if Allied forces were not withdrawn from Berlin, that 3 1/2 years ago the Soviet Union caused another grave crisis by introducing offensive weapons into Cuba, and that Soviet arms are going to North Viet-Nam to assist the Communist effort to seize South Viet-Nam by force.

In

In Europe, as the distinguished Prime Minister of Belgium, Paul Van den Boeynants, said in his welcome to the NATO Ministers: There exist beyond the Iron Curtain "130 divisions on a war footing supported by 6,000 aircraft and 700 missiles."

The facts of the world situation require that NATO remains strong and alert. They require that free nations not repeat the tragic errors of the past -- that they not make one-sided reductions in defense that tempt adversaries to resort once again to force or threats that they not impair the security which the members of NATO have achieved for themselves and other free nations by their collective exertions, including the investment of more than one trillion dollars in defense since 1947. The surest way to lose the peace is to destroy or weaken the instruments that are preserving the peace. And there is no prospect for resolving ultimately the problems that divide Europe if Western Europe is once again to break up into a large number of free wheeling independent states with each nation clawing for advantage at the expense of its neighbors.

These fundamentals are recognized by most of the responsible statesmen of the North Atlantic Community. At the same time they agree that every effort must be made to improve East-West relations and to solve or blunt East-West disputes, of which the most dangerous is the division of Berlin and Germany. East-West negotiations may proceed through various channels -- some bilateral, some multilateral. But the NATO ministers -- at least 14 -- agreed that there must be a common Western policy and that they have in the NATO Council a useful agency for exchanging information and ideas on improving East-West relations and for harmonizing initiatives. They directed their Permanent Representatives "to continue to examine closely the prospects of healthy developments in East-West relations." They also reaffirmed their continuous interest in progress toward disarmament, in particular, their "great concern over the problem of nuclear proliferation."

There

There is some feeling in Europe -- and elsewhere, including the United States -- that the war in Viet-Nam is an obstacle to a detente with the Soviet Union. The Soviet authorities say it is an obstacle. And, in some degree, it may be, from their viewpoint. For they are sensitive about the accusations of Peking that they are not militant enough and even that they are conspiring with the United States to "sell out" Hanoi.

But we are prepared to take further steps to improve East-West relations. I hope that the Congress will approve the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union and the broader authority in negotiating trade agreements with the Communist states requested by the President.

Most of the leaders of the Free World -- including our 13 full partners in NATO -- realize the indispensable role of the United States both in defending the peace and in making it more secure by negotiating agreements or reaching understandings on dangerous problems.

They are not disposed to accept a proposal to hold a conference on European security questions without the United States. They know that we have deep and vital interests in the sort of settlement that is achieved in Europe.

The basic purposes of American policy are the same in the Western Pacific as in the North Atlantic Community, the Western Hemisphere, and elsewhere: to establish peace by deterring or repelling aggression and to cooperate with other nations in improving the life of man. Compared with the North Atlantic basin, many of the nations in the Western Pacific -- especially the newer ones -- are still relatively weak. And the problem is further complicated by the virulent militancy of Asian communism -- an aggressive bellicosity which has caused serious trouble even within the Communist world.

We are

We are fighting in South Viet-Nam for three interlocking reasons: First, because Southeast Asia is very important to the security of the United States -- as has been determined by four successive Presidents of the United States, on the basis of careful analyses by their principal advisers, by the United States Senate in 1955 when it approved the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty with only one dissenting vote . . . and by both Houses of Congress through the Resolution they adopted in 1964 with only two negative votes. Secondly, we are fighting because we know from costly experience that aggression feeds on aggression and that the penalty for failing to repel aggression against South Viet-Nam almost certainly would be a larger war later on. Thirdly, and not least, we are fighting because we promised to, if necessary. We have mutual defense commitments to more than 40 other nations. These, supported by our military strength, are the backbone of world peace.

The prospects for peace would vanish if our friends -- and our adversaries -- should lose confidence in the integrity of our commitments.

We are not fighting alone. The largest share of the burden continues to be borne by the armed forces of the Republic of Viet-Nam. Gallant troops from the Republic of Korea, Australia, and New Zealand are fighting. And they will soon be joined by military engineers from the Philippines. Thailand, another of our loyal allies, is helping to guard the flank.

All of us would like to see more political stability in South Viet-Nam. But it is noteworthy that no important South Vietnamese political leader has defected to the Communist side.

In the

In the last 25 years, we have been through many trying experiences, many dark moments. But, with resolution and perserverance, we survived them and have gone on to achieve our objective in South Viet-Nam and Southeast Asia. That objective is peace -- a peace in which the people of South Viet-Nam and of the other independent states of Southeast Asia can live under governments and institutions of their own free choice.

The Communists appear to be relying on dissent within the United States or elsewhere in the Free World to cause a change in American policy. They will find that they are mistaken.

When Hanoi realizes that its aggression will not be allowed to succeed, there will be peace.

Before closing I shall mention briefly two other aspects of American policy. One is our assistance to developing countries in modernizing their economies and social systems. Mr. President, in your article from which I quoted earlier, you mentioned specifically three major needs: "education in the widest sense of the word; health, and food." Your thinking is in complete harmony with that of President Johnson and the United States Government. The major needs you cited are precisely those to which our new foreign aid program gives first priority.

I would emphasize also that the United States continues earnestly to seek agreements on the control and reduction of armaments. This is the anniversary of an historic event. Twenty years ago today, when we still had an atomic monopoly, we presented to the United Nations a plan to share our knowledge with the entire world under safeguards that would assure that atomic energy would be used only for peaceful purposes. The essentials of that highly constructive proposal won the support of all the members except the Soviet bloc. But for Communist opposition, the

race

race to produce weapons of almost unimaginable destructiveness would have been prevented. This is one of the tragic "might-have-beens" of recent history.

I hope those of you who come from other lands will pardon me if I say that I believe the American people can take some quiet satisfaction from what has been done in the last twenty or more years to preserve peace and build a decent world order. The United States does not ask for a foot of anybody else's territory or for any special privileges of any sort. Our only objective is a peaceful world that is safe for freedom, in which all men can enjoy the well-being and the priceless liberties which we have achieved and preserved and gradually expanded here in our continental home. We believe that our aspirations are shared by a great majority of mankind, including many millions behind the Iron and Bamboo curtains. And from that conviction springs our confidence, that with patience and determination, we can, together, construct a world order in which the human race can survive and thrive.

* * *