

# Excerpts From Nixon's Talk

Following are excerpts from President Nixon's commencement address yesterday at the United States Naval Academy, as recorded by The New York Times through the facilities of ABC News:

Slowly and carefully over the past five years we have worked with the Soviet Union to resolve concrete problems that could deteriorate into military confrontation. And upon these bridges we are erecting a series of tangible economic and cultural exchanges that will bind us more closely together.

Over the past five years we have reached more agreements with the Soviet Union than in the entire postwar period preceding that—and this is a record in which all Americans can take pride.

In keeping with our efforts to bring America's foreign policy into line with modern realities, we have also sought to normalize our relations with the People's Republic of China, where one-fourth of all the people in the world live—a country with which we shared nothing but confrontation and distrust during a quarter-century of cold war.

We have also succeeded in ending our military involvement in Vietnam in a manner which gave meaning to the heavy sacrifices we had made and which greatly enhanced the preservation of freedom and stability in Southeast Asia.

One result is that today the 20 million people of South Vietnam are free to govern themselves and they are able to defend themselves. An even more important result is that we have proved again that America's word is America's bond.

## 'Unique and Essential'

America's unique and essential contribution to peace is nowhere better demonstrated than in the Middle East. The hate and distrust that has for so long poisoned the relationship between Arabs and Israelis has led to war four times in the last 40 years, and the toll of death and human suffering was immense, while the tension made the Middle East a world tinderbox that could easily draw the United States and the Soviet Union into military confrontation.

The need for a stable solution among the regional parties as well as between the great powers was overwhelmingly urgent.

The October war of last year, while tragic, also presented a unique opportunity. Because for the first time it was clear to us and clear to the moderate leaders of the Arab world that a positive American role was indispensable to achieving a permanent settlement in the Middle East. And it was for this reason that I sent Secretary of State Kissinger to the Middle East to offer our good offices in the process of negotiation.

The results, which reflect more than anything else the vision and statesmanship of the leaders of both sides, have been encouraging: An agreement to separate military forces has been implemented on the Egyptian-Israeli front, and now a similar accord is being negotiated between Israel and Syria.

For the first time in a generation we are witnessing the beginning of a dialogue between the Arab states and Israel. Now, the road to a just and lasting and permanent peace in the Mideast is still long and difficult and lies before us. But what seemed to be an insurmountable roadblock on that road has now been removed, and we are determined to stay on course until we have reached our goal of a permanent peace in that area.

The role of Secretary Kissinger in this process has presented a testimony to both his remarkable diplomatic capabilities and the soundness and integrity of our belief that a lasting structure of peace can and must be created.

## 'Dangerous Misunderstanding'

In surveying the results of our foreign policy it is ironic to observe that its achievements now threaten to make us victims of our success. In particular, a dangerous misunderstanding has arisen as to just what détente is and what it is not.

Until very recently the pursuit of détente was not a problem for us in America. We were so engaged in trying to slift international tides away from confrontation toward negotiation that people were generally agreed that the overriding consideration was the establishment of a pattern of peaceful international conduct.

But now that so much progress has been made, some take it for granted. Eloquent speeches are now being made, or appeals are now being made for the United States through its foreign policy to transform the internal as well as the international behavior of other countries, and especially that of the Soviet Union.

This issue affects not only our relation with the Soviet Union but also our posture towards many nations whose internal systems we totally disagree with, as they do with ours.

Our foreign policy, therefore, must respect our ideals and it must reflect our purposes. We can never, as Americans, acquiesce in the suppression of human liberties. We must do all that we reasonably can to promote justice, and for this reason we continue to adhere firmly to certain principles not only in appropriate international forums but also in our private exchanges with other governments where this can be effective.

But we must recognize that we are more faithful to our ideals by being con-

cerned with results, and we achieve more results through diplomatic action than through hundreds of eloquent speeches. But there are limits to what we can do, and we must ask ourselves some very hard questions — questions which I know members of this class have asked themselves many times.

## The Price of Change

What is our capability to change the domestic structure of other nations? Would a slowdown or reversal of détente help or hurt the positive evolution of other social systems? What price in terms of renewed conflict are we willing to pay to bring pressure to bear for humane causes?

Not by our choice but by our capability, our primary concern in foreign policy must be to help influence the international conduct of nations in the world arena. We would not welcome the intervention of other countries in our domestic affairs and we cannot expect them to be cooperative when we seek to intervene directly in theirs. We cannot gear our foreign policy to transformation of other societies. In the nuclear age our first responsibility must be the prevention of a war that could destroy all society. We must never lose sight of this fundamental truth of modern international life.

Peace between nations with totally different systems is also a high moral objective.

The concepts of national security, partnership, negotiation with adversaries, are the central pillars of the structure of peace that this Administration has outlined as its objective.

If a structure of peace is to endure it must reflect the contributions and reconcile the aspirations of nations. It must be cemented by the shared goals of coexistence and the shared practice of accommodation. It must liberate every nation to realize its destiny free from the threat of war and it must promote social justice and human dignity.

The structure of peace of which I speak will make possible an era of cooperation in which all nations will apply their separate talents and resources to the solution of problems that beset all mankind—the problems of energy, and famine, disease and suffering—problems as old as human history itself.

My trip to the Middle East next week will provide an opportunity to explore with the leaders of the nations I shall visit ways in which we can continue our progress toward permanent peace in that area. And then later this month, on June 27, I will again journey to Moscow to meet with General Secretary Brezhnev to explore further avenues, further prospects for a lasting peace not only between the Soviet Union and the United States but among all nations.