

LBJ Vows Stronger Alliance

Cautions France On Quitting NATO, Leaves Door Open

By Murrey Marder
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Johnson pledged yesterday "to preserve and to strengthen" the NATO Alliance without France, if necessary, with a place left open for her eventual return to full participation.

Mr. Johnson rejected every premise in President de Gaulle's decision to pull France out of the military structure of NATO, without mentioning the French leader. Mr. Johnson also cautioned that France may be endangering her own security by her action.

Speaks at State Department

The President's address, the first full United States response to the NATO withdrawal actions started by France on March 7, was delivered before an audience of Foreign Service officers at the State Department. It was in accord with last week's declaration by the United States and NATO's 13 other nations to maintain an "integrated and interdependent" military organization.

Mr. Johnson was deliberately calm and impersonal in his remarks. He broke no new ground. He privately had told de Gaulle much the same thing in a letter delivered two days ago. The primary audience the President was addressing yesterday, however, was not de Gaulle, but France itself and other European allies of the United States.

Sees Security at Stake

At stake in the maintenance of the 15-nation North Atlantic Treaty Organization, said the President, "is the design

of collective security protecting the entire Atlantic world" that is "woven through the history of the past 20 years."

This objective "transcends the personalities and issues of the moment," said Mr. Johnson.

To replace a pattern of "unity" with a course of "isolation," said the President, would be a return to "those national rivalries which so often led to the useless squandering of lives and treasure in war." That would deny the hope, the President said, "for the reconciliation of Western Europe with the people of Eastern Europe" and would shake the "political integrity" and the physical security that represent the Atlantic area's present stability.

NATO does have to adapt to "changing needs," said the President. See **PRESIDENT, A17, Col. 1**

Text of President's address.
Page A17.

President, but "consultation, not isolation, is the route to reform."

Mr. Johnson rejected de Gaulle's contention that the North Atlantic Treaty, signed in 1949, and the NATO military organization built upon it in later years, are different and separable.

De Gaulle has said France will continue to participate in the Treaty, but not in the NATO "integrated" military system. A French memorandum of March 12 to its allies called for: French withdrawal of its remaining forces under NATO command (primarily two divisions based in West Germany and aircraft units there equipped with American tactical nuclear weapons); eviction of NATO military headquarters from France, and the removal of United States and other Allied bases from France.

The Treaty "is more than a legal document," said President Johnson; "it is the foundation of a living institution . . . NATO . . . created to give meaning and reality to the Alliance commitments."

Mr. Johnson warned indirectly that the degree of mutual protection given to member nations by the NATO treaty will be diminished for France if she pulls out of the integrated NATO military command.

The lesson of two World Wars has been that aggressors feed on divided victims, said the President. "Old and narrow concepts of sovereignty" have been made even more obsolete by new technology, he said; a nation that seeks its security by trying "to prepare and plan alone, could still imperil her own security by creating a situation in which response would be too late and too diluted."

That was putting France on notice that, in a nuclear-missile age, her absence from a combined defense command ability to come to her defense.

But throughout Mr. Johnson's remarks there was implied recognition that de Gaulle is unlikely to be deflected from the course he has set for France. In effect, the President held a door open for a change of policy after de Gaulle.

Mr. Johnson said he is hopeful that no nation "will long remain withdrawn from the mutual affairs and obligations of the Atlantic," and promised that "a place of respect and responsibility will await any ally who decides to return to the common task."

Twice in his address the President employed quotations from a French advocate of pooled defense, Robert Schumann, a former French Premier and Foreign Minister.

One was a quotation, in the 1949 period when the Treaty was signed, that "liberation is not enough" to make Europe secure, but that it also requires defense to prevent attack.

In Paris, Information Secretary Yvon Bourges said that the French government is studying Mr. Johnson's letter to de Gaulle. De Gaulle presided at a Cabinet meeting which discussed NATO.

One French newspaper, *Le Figaro*, reported yesterday that the United States soon will announce the withdrawal of all American troops from France. Officials here denied that. They said the United States position continues to be that it is up to de Gaulle to state exactly what he intends to do. Until now, they maintain, he has set forth only "intentions," not specific plans.

American officials reiterated that, technically, most of the U.S.-French military agreements run for the life of the Treaty, meaning that they require a year's notice in 1969, when a member nation may withdraw; one year-to-year's notice to change, they said.

Text of President's Address

Following is the prepared text of President Johnson's speech on NATO problems at the State Department auditorium yesterday:

I am very pleased to address the Foreign Service Institute this morning and to meet with so many Americans preparing to serve abroad. As one who believes we cannot shorten our reach into the world, I am encouraged by the number and quality of those who are studying at the Institute. You have the gratitude of your countrymen and my own assurance of support.

We have come a long way from the day someone observed that: "Some diplomat no doubt will launch a heedless word and lurking war leap out."

That was more than half a century ago when diplomacy was often war by another name. Today your task is different. Those of you about to go abroad represent a continuity of purpose in a generation of change. That purpose is to build from reason and moderation a world order in which the fires of conflict yield to the fulfillment of man's oldest yearnings for himself and his family.

Your job, wherever you serve, is peace. That is the task facing all of us today.

The question, as always, is how? How do we, for example, maintain the security of the Atlantic community upon which so many of the world's hopes depend?

For the answer, we must begin with the gray dawn of the world of 1945, when Europe's cities lay in rubble, her farms devastated, her industries smashed, her people weary with war and death and defeat.

From that desolation has come abundance.

From that weakness has come power. From those ashes of holocaust has come the rebirth of a strong and vital community.

The Europe of today is a new Europe. In place of uncertainty, there is confidence; in place of decay, progress; in place of isolation, partnership; in place of war, peace.

If there is no single explanation for the difference between Europe then and Europe today, there is a pattern. It is a luminous design woven through the history of the past 20 years. It is the design of common action—of interdependent institutions serving the good of the European nations as though they were one. It is the design of collective security protecting the entire Atlantic world.

So I come this morning to speak to you of one important part of that design—I speak of a structure some of you have helped to build: the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

From Air of Crisis

Let me make clear in the beginning that we do not believe there is any righteousness in standing pat. If an organization is alive and vital—if it is to have meaning for all time as well as for any particular time—it must grow and respond and yield to change. Like our Constitution—which makes it the law of the land—the North Atlantic treaty is more than a legal document. It is the foundation of a living institution. That institution is NATO—the organization created to give meaning and reality to the alliance commitments.

The crowded months which immediately preceded and followed the conclusion of the North Atlantic treaty 17 years ago had produced an atmosphere of "crisis." It was a crisis born of deep fear: fear for Europe's economic and political vitality—fear of Communist aggression and Communist subversion.

Some say that new circumstances in the world today call for the dismantling of the Organization. Of course, NATO should adapt to the changing needs of the times. But we believe just as firmly that such change must be wrought by the member nations working with one another within the alliance. Consultation, not isolation, is the route to reform. We must not forget, in success and abundance, the lessons we learned in danger and isolation: that whatever the issue, we share one common danger: division—and one safety: unity.

What is our view of NATO today?

We see it not as an alliance to make war but an alliance to keep the peace. Through an era as turbulent as man has ever known—and under the constant threat of ultimate destruction—NATO has insured the security of the North Atlantic community. It has reinforced stability elsewhere in the world.

While NATO rests on the reality that we must fight together if war should come to the Atlantic area, it rests also on the reality that war will not come at all if we act together during peace. It was the Foreign Minister of France who, in 1949, insisted that to be truly secure, Europe needed not only help in resisting attack but help

on Problems of NATO

in preventing attack. "Liberation," he said, "is not enough."

The success of NATO has been measured by many yardsticks. The most significant to me is the most obvious: war has been deterred. Through the common organization, we have welded the military contributions of each of the 15 Allies into an effective instrument. So convincing was this instrument that potential aggressors took stock and counted as too high the price of satisfying their ambitions. It has been proved true that "one sword keeps another in the sheath."

War has been deterred not only because of our integrated military power, but also because of the political unity of purpose to which that power is bent. It is difficult to overstate the importance of the bonds of culture, of political institutions, traditions and values which form the bedrock of the Atlantic community. There is here a political integrity and an identity of interests that transcends the personalities and issues of the moment.

Threat to Stability

If our collective effort should falter—and our common determination be eroded—the foundation of the Atlantic's present stability would be shaken. It will deter no aggressor who knows his victims are too divided to decide and too unready to respond. That was the lesson of two world wars. Yet a nation—not by the action of her friends, but by her own decision to prepare and plan alone—could still imperil her own security by creating a situation in which response would be too late and too diluted. Every advance in the tech-

nology of war makes more unacceptable old and narrow concepts of sovereignty.

No one today can doubt the necessity of preventing war. It is our firm conviction that collective action through NATO is the best assurance that war will be deterred in the Atlantic world.

Look at the Atlantic Community through the eyes of those who in years past have yearned for conquest. The sight is sobering. Integrated commands, common plans, forces in being in advance of an emergency for use in emergency—all testify to a collective readiness and the integrity of collective purpose. To other eyes NATO can only be a clear warning of the folly of aggression.

NATO today must be shaped on the experience of the past. Reliance on independent action by separate forces—only loosely coordinated with joint forces and plans—twice led to world wars before 1945. But collective action has proved successful in deterring war since 1945—during 20 years of upheaval and grave danger.

We reject those experiences only at our own peril.

For its part, the United States is determined to join with 13 of her other allies to preserve and to strengthen the deterrent strength of NATO. We will urge that those principles of joint and common preparation be extended wherever they can be usefully applied in the Atlantic alliance.

We are hopeful that no member of the treaty will long remain withdrawn from the mutual affairs and obligations of the Atlantic. A place of respect and responsibility will await any ally who decides to return to the common task.

For the world is still full of peril for those who prize and cherish liberty—peril, and opportunity.

These bountiful lands washed by the Atlantic—this half-billion people unmatched in arms and industry—this cradle of common values and splendid visions—this measureless storehouse of wealth can enrich the life of an entire planet.

It is this strength—of ideas as well as arms, of peaceful purpose as well as power—that offers such hope for the reconciliation of Western Europe with the people of Eastern Europe. To surrender that strength by isolation from one another would be to dim the promise of that day when the men and women of all Europe shall again move freely among each other.

It is not a question of wealth alone.

Of Heart and Mind

It is a question of heart and mind. It is a willingness to leave forever those national rivalries which so often led to the useless squandering of lives and treasure in war.

It is a question of the deeper spirit of unity of which NATO is but a symbol. That unity was never better expressed than when, at the conclusion of the North Atlantic treaty in 1949, a great French leader declared that "Nations are more and more convinced that their fates are closely bound together—that their salvation and their welfare must rest upon the progressive application of human solidarity."

It is to the preservation of human solidarity that all our efforts must be directed. Let all of you, of the Foreign Service Institute, make it your task as well as mine.