

SEPTEMBER 25, 1961

Office of the White House Press Secretary

-----  
(AS ACTUALLY DELIVERED)THE WHITE HOUSE

FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S  
ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS, DELIVERED  
AT 11:30 A.M., E.D.T., SEPTEMBER 25, 1961,  
NEW YORK CITY

Mr. President, honored delegates, ladies and gentlemen:

We meet in an hour of grief and challenge. Dag Hammarskjold is dead. But the United Nations lives. His tragedy is deep in our hearts, but the task for which he died is at the top of our agenda. A noble servant of peace is gone. But the quest for peace lies before us.

The problem is not the death of one man -- the problem is the life of this organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age -- or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die -- to enfeeble its vigor -- to cripple its powers -- we would condemn the future.

For in the development of this organization rests the only true alternative to war -- and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Unconditional war can no longer lead to unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great powers alone. For a nuclear disaster, spread by winds and waters and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war -- or war will put an end to mankind.

So let us here resolve that Dag Hammarskjold did not live -- or die -- in vain. Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace. And, as we build an international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war.

## II.

This will require new strength and new roles for the United Nations. For disarmament without checks is but a shadow -- and a community without law is but a shell. Already the United Nations has become both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Already it has provided -- in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa this year in the Congo -- a means of holding violence within bounds.

But the great question which confronted this body in 1945 is still before us -- whether man's cherished hopes for progress and peace are to be destroyed by terror and disruption -- whether the "foul winds of war" can be tamed in time to free the cooling winds of reason -- and whether the pledges of our Charter are to be fulfilled or defied: pledges to secure peace, progress, human rights and world law.

more

In this Hall, there are not three forces, but two. One is composed of those who are trying to build the kind of world described in Articles I and II of the Charter. The other, seeking a far different world, would undermine this organization in the process.

Today of all days our dedication to the Charter must be maintained. It must be strengthened first of all, by the selection of an outstanding civil servant to carry forward the responsibilities of the Secretary General -- a man endowed with both the wisdom and the power to make meaningful the moral force of the world community. The late Secretary General nurtured and sharpened the United Nations obligation to act. But he did not invent it. It was there in the Charter. It is still there in the Charter.

However difficult it may be to fill M. Hammarskjöld's place, it can better be filled by one man rather than by three. Even the three horses of the Troika did not have three drivers, all going in different directions. They had only one -- and so must the United Nations executive. To install a triumvirate, or any rotating authority, in the United Nations administrative offices would replace order with anarchy, action with paralysis, and confidence with confusion.

The Secretary General, in a very real sense, is the servant of the General Assembly. Diminish his authority and you diminish the authority of the only body where all nations, regardless of power, are equal and sovereign. Until all the powerful are just, the weak will be secure only in the strength of this Assembly.

Effective and independent executive action is not the same question as balanced representation. In view of the enormous change in membership in this body since its founding, the American delegation will join in any effort for the prompt review and revision of the composition of United Nations bodies.

But to give this organization three drivers -- to permit each great power to decide its own case -- would entrench the Cold War in the headquarters of peace. Whatever advantages such a plan may hold out to my own country, as one of the great powers, we reject it. For we far prefer world law, in the age of self-determination, to world war, in the age of mass extermination.

### III.

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or a cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons -- ten million times more powerful than anything the world has ever seen, and only minutes away from any target on Earth -- is a source of horror, and discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes -- for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness -- for in a spiraling arms race, a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

more



For 15 years this organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream -- it is a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race.

It is in this spirit that the recent Belgrade Conference -- recognizing that this is no longer a Soviet problem or an American problem, but a human problem -- endorsed a program of "general, complete and strictly an internationally controlled disarmament". It is in this same spirit that we in the United States have labored this year, with a new urgency, and with a new, now-statutory agency fully endorsed by the Congress, to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching yet realistic, so mutually balanced and beneficial, that it could be accepted by every nation. And it is in this spirit that we have presented with the agreement of the Soviet Union -- under the label both nations now accept of "general and complete disarmament" -- a new statement of newly-agreed principles for negotiation.

But we are well aware that all issues of principle are not settled -- and that principles alone are not enough. It is therefore our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race -- to advance together step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has been achieved. We invite them now to go beyond agreement in principle to reach agreement on actual plans.

The program to be presented to this assembly -- for general and complete disarmament under effective international control -- moves to bridge the gap between those who insist on a gradual approach and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machines of war. It would proceed through balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no state a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs -- not with the big powers alone, not with one's adversary or one's self -- but in an international organization within the framework of the United Nations. It would assure that indispensable condition of disarmament -- true inspection -- and apply it in stages proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would cover delivery systems as well as weapons. It would ultimately halt their production as well as their testing, their transfer as well as their possession. It would achieve, under the eye of an international disarmament organization, a steady reduction in forces, both nuclear and conventional, until it has abolished all armies and all weapons except those needed for internal order and a new United Nations Peace Force. And it starts that process now, today, even as the talks begin.

In short, general and complete disarmament must no longer be a slogan, used to resist the first steps. It is no longer to be a goal without means of achieving it, without means of verifying its progress, without means of keeping the peace. It is now a realistic plan, and a test -- a test of those only willing to talk and a test of those willing to act.

more

Such a plan would not bring a world free from conflict or greed -- but it would bring a world free from the terrors of mass destruction. It would not usher in the era of the super state -- but it would usher in an era in which no state could annihilate or be annihilated by another.

In 1945, this Nation proposed the Baruch Plan to internationalize the atom before other nations even possessed the bomb or demilitarized their troops. We proposed with our allies the Disarmament Plan of 1951 while still at war in Korea. And we make our proposals today, while building up our defenses over Berlin, not because we are inconsistent or insincere or intimidated, but because we know the rights of free men will prevail -- because while we are compelled against our will to rearm, we look confidently beyond Berlin to the kind of disarmed world we all prefer.

I therefore propose, on the basis of this Plan, that disarmament negotiations resume promptly, and continue without interruption until an entire program for general and complete disarmament has not only been agreed but has been actually achieved.

#### IV.

The logical place to begin is a treaty assuring the end of nuclear tests of all kinds, in every environment, under workable controls. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed such a treaty that is both reasonable, effective and ready for signature. We are still prepared to sign that treaty today.

We also proposed a mutual ban on atmospheric testing, without inspection or controls, in order to save the human race from the poison of radioactive fall out. We regret that that offer was not accepted.

For 15 years we have sought to make the atom an instrument of peaceful growth rather than of war. But for 15 years our concessions have been matched by obstruction, our patience by intransigence. And the pleas of mankind for peace have met with disregard.

Finally, as the explosions of others beclouded the skies, my country was left with no alternative but to act in the interests of its own and the Free World's security. We cannot endanger that security by refraining from testing while others improve their arsenals. Nor can we endanger it by another long, uninspected ban on testing. For three years we accepted those risks in our open society while seeking agreement on inspection. But this year, while we were negotiating in good faith in Geneva, others were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction.

Our tests are not polluting the atmosphere. Our deterrent weapons are guarded against accidental explosion or use. Our doctors and scientists stand ready to help any Nation measure and meet the hazards to health which inevitably result from the tests in the atmosphere.

more



But to halt the spread of these terrible weapons, to halt the contamination of the air, to halt the spiralling nuclear arms race, we remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement, our new Disarmament Program thus includes the following proposals:

-- First, signing the Test-Ban Treaty by all Nations. This can be done now. Test ban negotiations need not and should not await general disarmament.

-- Second, stopping the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons, and preventing their transfer to any nation now lacking in nuclear weapons.

-- Third, prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not own them.

-- Fourth, keeping nuclear weapons from seeding new battle-grounds in outer space.

-- Fifth, gradually destroying existing nuclear weapons and converting their materials to peaceful uses; and

-- Finally, halting the unlimited testing and production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, and gradually destroying them as well.

#### V.

To destroy arms, however, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy -- creating world-wide law and law enforcement as we outlaw world-wide war and weapons. In the world we seek, the United Nations Emergency Forces which have been hastily assembled, uncertainly supplied and inadequately financed will never be enough.

Therefore, the United States recommends that all member nations earmark special peace-keeping units in their armed forces -- to be on call of the United Nations -- to be specially trained and quickly available -- and with advance provision for financial and logistic support.

In addition, the American delegation will suggest a series of steps to improve the United Nation's machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes -- for on-the-spot fact-finding, mediation and adjudication -- for extending the rule of international law. For peace is not solely a matter of military or technical problems -- it is primarily a problem of politics and people. And unless man can match his strides in weaponry and technology with equal strides in social and political development, our great strength, like that of the dinosaur, will become incapable of proper control -- and like the dinosaur vanish from the earth.

#### VI.

As we extend the rule of law on earth, so must we also extend it to man's new domain: outer space.

All of us salute the brave cosmonauts of the Soviet Union. The new horizons of outer space must not be driven by the old bitter concepts of imperialism and sovereign claims. The cold reaches of the universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war.

more

To this end, we shall urge proposals extending the United Nations Charter to the limits of man's exploration in the Universe, reserving outer space for peaceful use, prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies, and opening the mysteries and benefits of space to every nation. We shall further propose cooperative efforts between all nations in weather prediction and eventually in weather control. We shall propose, finally, a global system of communications satellites linking the whole world in telegraph and telephone and radio and television. The day need not be far away when such a system will televise the proceedings of this body to every corner of the world for the benefit of peace.

#### VII.

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities that face our fellow men. Political sovereignty is but a mockery without the means of meeting poverty and illiteracy and disease. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future holds no hope.

That is why my Nation -- which has freely shared its capital and its technology to help others help themselves -- now proposes officially designating this decade of the 1960's as the United Nations Decade of Development. Under the framework of that Resolution, the United Nations' existing efforts in promoting economic growth can be expanded and coordinated. Regional surveys and training institutes can now pool the talents of many. New research, technical assistance and pilot projects can unlock the wealth of less developed lands and untapped waters. And development can become a cooperative and not a competitive enterprise -- to enable all nations, however diverse in their systems and beliefs, to become in fact as well as in law free and equal nations.

#### VIII.

My Country favors a world of free and equal states. We agree with those who say that colonialism is a key issue in this Assembly. But let the full facts of that issue be discussed in full.

On the one hand is the fact that, since the close of World War II, a people world-wide declaration of independence has transformed nearly 1 billion/ and 9 million square miles into 42 free and independent states. Less than 2 percent of the world's population now lives in "dependent" territories.

I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. Those problems will be solved, with patience, good will and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in such matters, my Country intends to be a participant and not merely an observer, in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing tide of self-determination, which runs so strong, has our sympathy and our support.

But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light -- or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My Nation was once a colony -- and we know what colonialism means; the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, their class or their color.



and that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not reached the communist empire where a population far larger than that officially termed "dependent" lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions -- under a system which knows only one party and one belief-- which suppresses free debate, and free elections, and free newspapers, and free books and free trade unions -- and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full -- and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe.

## IX

Finally, as President of the United States, I consider it my duty to report to this Assembly on two threats to the peace which are not on your crowded agenda, but which causes us, and most of you, the deepest concern.

The first threat on which I wish to report is widely misunderstood: the smoldering coals of war in Southeast Asia. South Vietnam is already under attack -- sometimes by a single assassin, sometimes by a band of guerrillas, recently by full battalions. The peaceful borders of Burma, Cambodia and India have been repeatedly violated. And the peaceful people of Laos are in danger of losing the independence they gained not so long ago.

No one can call these "wars of liberation". For these are free countries living under governments. Nor are these aggressions any less real because men are knifed in their homes and not shot in the fields of battle.

The very simple question confronting the world community is whether measures can be devised to protect the small and weak from such tactics. For if they are successful in Laos and South Vietnam, the gates will be opened wide.

The United States seeks for itself no base, no territory, no special position in this area of any kind. We support a truly neutral and independent Laos, its people free from outside interference, living at peace with themselves and with their neighbors, assured that their territory will not be used for attacks on others, and under a government comparable (as Mr. Krushchev and I agreed at Vienna) to Cambodia and Burma.

But now the negotiations over Laos are reaching a crucial stage. The ceasefire is at best precarious. The rainy season is coming to an end. Laotian territory is being used to infiltrate South Vietnam. The world community must recognize -- all those who are involved -- that this potent threat to Laotian peace and freedom is indivisible from all other threats to their own.

Secondly, I wish to report to you on the crisis over Germany and Berlin. This is not the time or the place for immoderate tones, but the world community is entitled to know the very simple issues as we see them. If there is a crisis it is because an existing peace is under threat -- because an existing island of free people is under pressure -- because solemn agreements are being treated with indifference. Established international rights are being threatened with unilateral usurpation. Peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks.

more



One recalls the order of the Czar in Pushkin's Boris Godunov: "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced in by barriers. . . That not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow to fly."

It is absurd to allege that we are threatening a war merely to prevent the Soviet Union and East Germany from signing a so-called "treaty" of peace. The Western Allies are not concerned with any paper arrangement the Soviets may wish to make with a regime of their own creation, on territory occupied by their own troops and governed by their own agents. No such action can affect either our rights or our responsibilities.

If there is a dangerous crisis in Berlin -- and there is -- it is because of threats against the vital interests and the deep commitments of the Western Powers, and the freedom of West Berlin. We cannot yield these interests. We cannot fail these commitments. We cannot surrender the freedom of these people for whom we are responsible. A "peace treaty" which carried with it the provisions which destroy the peace would be a fraud. A "free city" which was not genuinely free would suffocate freedom and would be an infamy.

For a city or a people to be truly free, they must have the secure right, without economic, political or police pressure, to make their own choice and to live their own lives. And as I have said before, if anyone doubts the extent to which our presence is desired by the people of West Berlin, we are ready to have that question submitted to a free vote in all Berlin and, if possible, among all the German people.

The elementary fact about this crisis is that it is unnecessary. The elementary tools for a peaceful settlement are to be found in the charter. Under its law, agreements are to be kept, unless changed by all those who made them. Established rights are to be respected. The political disposition of peoples should rest upon their own wishes, freely expressed in plebiscites or free elections. If there are legal problems, they can be solved by legal means. If there is a threat of force, it must be rejected. If there is desire for change, it must be a subject for negotiation and if there is negotiation, it must be rooted in mutual respect and concern for the rights of others.

The Western Powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligations and their access to the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens. This generation learned from bitter experience that either brandishing or yielding to threats can only lead to war. But firmness and reason can lead to the kind of peaceful solution in which my country profoundly believes.

We are committed to no rigid formula. We see no perfect solution. We recognize that troops and tanks can, for a time, keep a nation divided against its will, however unwise that policy may seem to us. But we believe a peaceful agreement is possible which protects the freedom of West Berlin and allied presence and access, while recognizing the historic and legitimate interests of others in assuring European security.

The possibilities of negotiation are now being explored; it is too early to report what the prospects may be. For our part, we would be glad to report at the appropriate time that a solution has been found. For there is no need for a crisis over Berlin, threatening the peace -- and if those who created this crisis desire peace, there will be peace and freedom in Berlin.



## XI.

The events and decisions of the next ten months may well decide the fate of man for the next ten thousand years. There will be no avoiding those events. There will be no appeal from these decisions. And we in this hall shall be remembered either as part of the generation that turned this planet into a flaming funeral pyre or the generation that met its vow "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

In the endeavor to meet that vow, I pledge you every effort this nation possesses. I pledge you that we shall neither commit nor provoke aggression -- that we shall neither flee nor invoke the threat of force -- that we shall never negotiate out of fear, we shall never fear to negotiate.

Terror is not a new weapon. Throughout history it has been used by those who could not prevail, either by persuasion or example. But inevitably they fail -- either because men are not afraid to die for a life worth living -- or because the terrorists themselves came to realize that free men can not be frightened by threats, and that aggression would meet its own response. And it is in the light of that history that every nation today should know, be he friend or foe, that the United States has both the will and the weapons to join free men in standing up to their responsibilities.

But I come here today to look across this world of threats to the world of peace. In that search we cannot expect any final triumph -- for new problems will always arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems -- for conformity is the jailor of freedom, and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by contrivance, by fiat or even by the wishes of all.

But however close we sometimes seem to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. For he does not stand alone. If we all can persevere -- if we can in every land and office look beyond our own shores and ambitions -- then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

Ladies and gentlemen of this assembly -- the decision is ours. Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose -- or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet -- or together we shall perish in its flames. Save it we can -- and save it we must -- and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind and, as peace makers, the eternal blessing of God.

# # # # #

Sixteen and one-quarter years ago the "peoples of the United Nations," weary of war, vowed in deputized assembly "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." Hopes ran high and trust ran deep; and this august body became the world's first great sentinel of peace.

But the passage of years brought vast and drastic changes -- some good, some evil. Old empires disappeared -- but a new empire arose. Direct aggression diminished -- but indirect aggression and subversion took its place. The earth was newly shrunk by science, but newly split by an iron curtain of secrecy. The wonders of technology brought new blessings of life and new vehicles of death. The coalitions faces, the causes, the ~~conditions~~ all changed in this period, and sometimes changed again.

And now as never before the United Nations itself is on trial -- its members, its values, its solemn oaths of commitment. For we are pledged to "live together in peace," and that peace is now menaced by the unilateral and unlawful acts of one member. We are pledged to securing "fundamental human rights", and those rights are now denied millions behind barbed wire and stone walls. We are pledged to "respect...international law," and that law is now defied in actions that not only break the word of men but sow the seeds of war.

Those very leaders who so often addressed this Assembly on self-determination choice and free ~~voice~~ have now ended even the free choice of flight for the imprisoned millions of Eastern Berlin and Germany. Those who so often warned of the dangers of nuclear tests are now polluting our air with a poison for unborn generations. Those who so often preached ~~of~~ disarmament now boast of bombs too big for any purpose other than mass extermination. Those who professed interest in the farms and cultures of other peoples now threaten to turn orange groves into wasteland and monuments into rubble. And those who once spoke of peaceful competition and coexistence now expose every nation on earth, including their own, to the risk of thermonuclear homicide.



That is why today, after sixteen years of effort, the great question confronting this body is whether our cherished hopes for peace and progress and freedom are to be destroyed by ~~these~~ tactics of terror and disruption -- whether contempt for the views of mankind shall raise us to the heights of the depths challenge or sink us to new ~~degrees~~ of despair -- whether aggression is to be rewarded with indifference, and intimidation with fear and submission -- and, above all, whether the "foul winds of war" can be leashed in time to free the cooling winds of reason.

My country has never started a war; and we never will. We have helped to finish some -- and, if we must again, we are prepared to resist force with whatever force is needed. The current tensions and mistrust are neither the work nor the wish of the American people. But in the face of threats and arms, free men do not seek a refuge in fear but take confidence in their courage and strength.

Terror ~~is~~ <sup>employed</sup> is not a new weapon. Throughout history it has been ~~used~~ by those employers who could not prevail through persuasion or example. But ultimately its ~~uses~~ failed -- because they misjudged the strength of the free human spirit. And that is why the Soviet Union's current strategy of nuclear blackmail, of labelling one nation hostage for another, can only succeed in ~~re~~unifying all free men as never before, in opening their eyes and in stiffening their will. For all free men are equally brave and equally unwilling to surrender their values at the point of a pistol -- or missile. And however loudly some may talk of their weapons, the quiet fact is that the balance of power has not shifted, and the United States possesses both the will and the weapons to protect free men from aggression. No friend of freedom need be frightened out of either his wits or his responsibilities -- for he should know that no aggressor would dare to risk the consequences of his own irresponsible acts.

Thus the world's security is indivisible -- and so is the world's freedom. The cause of free choice in Africa and Asia is tied to free choice in West Berlin. Those who believe in self-determination are well-advised to be <sup>wary</sup> ~~warned~~ of a system in which there is only one party and one truth -- which suppresses free debate, free elections, free newspapers and books and trade unions -- and which builds a wall to keep freedom a stranger and its own citizens prisoners.



But the basic reason why every nation must be concerned with the current crisis is because every nation's life is at stake. A nuclear disaster would engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. From that disaster, there would be no appeal and ~~there~~ there would be no escape. All of us stand, in short, on a frontier of danger that encircles the world. Either we all work together to save that world -- or we all expire in its flames.

## II.

Today that frontier of danger runs through the illegally and abnormally divided city of Berlin. That city has been made the focal-point of crisis by the deliberate attempt of one state to force its will on others. International rights and agreements have been threatened with unilateral usurpation. A peaceful setting has been made explosive by barbed wire and tanks. Peace<sup>ful</sup>~~able~~ movements have been blocked by force.

absurd  
It is ~~preposterous~~ to allege that the Berlin crisis arises out of a desire to end abnormality. For what could be more abnormal than to imitate the orders issued by the Czar in Pushkin's Boris Gudonov: "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced by barriers ... that not a single soul o'er pass ~~over~~ the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow fly."?

absurd  
And it is equally ~~preposterous~~ to allege that this crisis arises out of Western ~~bitter~~ opposition to the Soviet Union's making any paper arrangement it wishes to make with an artificial East German regime, created on territory occupied by Soviet troops and governed by Soviet puppets.

On the contrary, our concern and our commitment is to the free people of West Berlin to their continued freedom and our continued access to maintain that freedom. The sealing off of East Berlin did not affect that access or freedom. But I would urge the Soviet Union, as it weighs the wisdom and permanency of this move, to consider whether frustrating the long-range hopes of the German people for regaining peacefully their traditional and normal ties might not lead to dangerous frustrations, tensions and nationalistic pressures. History tells us

that no city, no nation, no continent can be forever divided in this artificial and painful fashion.

And if this move is aimed at frightening the brave people of West Berlin, they have made it clear that they cannot be cowed into flight or surrender. They retain every reason to be confident in their friends and in their future. If tensions can be relaxed and agreements reached, West Berlin could well become a symbol of all European unity and growth -- possibly as the new headquarters for the Economic Commission for Europe, now located in Geneva and confining its aid to ~~Western~~ Western Europe only. But if new agreements cannot be reached, and old agreements are rendered null and void by Soviet violations, then the Western Powers will be free to take whatever steps are necessary in cooperation with the Federal Republic of Germany, to <sup>assure</sup> ~~accord~~ West Berlin the status and role its continued freedom deserves.

But this is not, let me stress, a simple matter of one city, or one-half a city. It is not merely a dispute over law, or real estate. It is not wholly a big power contest. At stake in West Berlin today is the integrity of the West's word to those who seek our protection. At stake in West Berlin today is the sanctity of international agreements and rights. And, most important of all, at stake in West Berlin today is the basic principle of self-determination -- the long-accepted right of the people of that city to choose their own future.



To underscore that right and their choice, I ask this body to sponsor a free plebiscite in West Berlin, enabling its citizens to express their preference for future status. And if self-determination is a valid principle on both sides of a stone wall, the people of East Berlin should be invited to join in this plebiscite as well.

Perhaps they will be denied that right. Perhaps self-determination can be denied by force to those who lack it -- as happened in Hungary. But it can never be easily taken from those now free to enjoy it -- for it will never be traded away, and it will never be surrendered short of war.

If the Communists are not intent on extending their empire to West Berlin, there will be no war. If they do not seek to impose their will on others in defiance of settled rights and commitments, there will be no war. But the Western powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligation and their access to the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens.

Nor can we be driven out by a world-wide campaign of threats and intimidation. That campaign is designed to cause the timid and the weak to advocate our in Berlin. pursuing a course of appeasement. But this world organization was founded in the wake of a devastating war that followed successive acts of such appeasement, inviting each one ~~limiting~~ another until a group of ruthless dictators misjudged the ability and the willingness of freemen to resist domination. This time we are determined that history shall not repeat itself. The ambitions may be the same -- the tactics of intimidation may be the same. But the weapons of war are very different indeed -- and so are our unity and spirit.

If there are moderates in the Communist world who have been arguing that then intimidation does not produce results, /our standing firm on Berlin will strengthen their hand -- and at the same time strengthen the chances for peace, in Asia, the Middle East and all over the world.

Appeasement can only lead to war. But standing firm can lead to the kind of peaceful solution in which my country profoundly believes. We trust that the Soviets will refrain from further unilateral actions that hamper negotiations; and we believe both sides oppose a hasty meeting which appears to be the last resort and then fails -- with dangerous consequences -- for lack of preparation. But we shall be ready, at the proper time and in the proper form, to exchange and explore precise and reasonable proposals which respect vital the ~~united~~ interests of all concerned.

We are committed to no rigid formula. But we believe a peaceful solution is possible which protects the freedom of West Berlin and Western access thereto, while recognizing legitimate Soviet apprehensions over a rearmed and revitalized ~~remobilized~~ Germany with an uncertain Eastern frontier. There is no need for war over Berlin -- and if the West is prepared to resist force, and the Soviets are prepared to talk sense, there will be no war over Berlin.

### III

But why, in this thermonuclear age, should war even be a possibility? It is no longer a rational course for either side. It is no longer a means of settling disputes. It can no longer lead to a meaningful victory. The time has come to foreclose this possibility forever by the reduction and destruction of arms.

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or a cause of world tensions. The mere existence of deadly nuclear weapons -- ten million times more destructive than anything the world has ever known, and only minutes away from any target on earth -- is a source of horror, suspicion and discord. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes -- for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. ~~Any~~ And men no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness -- for in a spiralling arms race, a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its armaments increase.



The risks inherent in disarmament cannot compare to the risks inherent today. Every man, woman and child on earth now lives daily under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slightest thread, capable of being cut at any moment by irrational or uninformed miscalculation. We must abolish these weapons before they abolish us. Mankind must put an end to war -- or war will end mankind.

For 15 years this organization has sought these ends. Now the time for deliberations and delays has passed. Disarmament is no longer a subject to be debated. It is a problem to be solved -- not some day, but now -- not as an ideal or a dream, but as a practical matter of life or death.

in  
It is in this spirit that we ~~as~~ the United States have labored this year to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching yet realistic, so balanced and so mutually beneficial that it would be acceptable to every nation. And it is in this spirit that we announce today our readiness to accept and implement the goal first described by the Soviet Union as "general and complete disarmament."

The program we will present to this Assembly will bridge the gap between those who insist on a step-by-step approach and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It places the responsibility for inspection and control where it belongs -- not with the big powers, not with one's adversary or one's self -- but here in this organization. It builds up the international capacity to keep peace as it dismantles the national capacity to wage war. It proceeds through balanced and safeguarded stages which give no state a military advantage over another. It will achieve, under inspection by an International Disarmament Organization, an end to all armies and weapons, other than those needed for internal order and a UN Peace Force. And it starts that process now, even as the talks begin.

I propose that, on this basis and under instructions from this body, disarmament negotiations resume promptly and continue without interruption until complete and general disarmament has actually been achieved.

I propose further that we begin now not merely to negotiate but to disarm.

IV.

The logical place to begin disarming is a treaty halting nuclear tests. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed to the Soviets a treaty that is reasonable, effective and ready for signature. We would be prepared to ~~join in such a ban today~~ sign it today.

We have proposed to the Soviets a mutual self-enforceable ban on atmospheric <sup>ing</sup> tests, to save mankind from further hazards to health. We would be prepared to join in such a ban today.

For 15 years we have sought to control the atom, to channel its power for constructive ends. But for 15 years the Soviet Union has sabotaged every parley, rejected every offer, ignored every UN mandate, reversed its own agreements, and walked out of its own meetings. Our concessions have been matched by obstruction. Patience has been rewarded with intransigence. And the pleas of mankind have been met with contemptuous disregard.

While we were negotiating in good faith, while they were stalling against inspection, the Soviets, we now know, were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction that have already increased radioactivity by <sup>3000</sup> ~~300~~% in some regions,

The pitiless frequency of these tests is part of this same world-wide policy of nuclear build-up and terror; and my country was left no alternative but to act in the interests of free world security. We are the stronger nuclear power -- and we propose to stay stronger. Our tests have been free from fall-out. Our doctors and scientists stand ready to help any nation -- I repeat, any nation -- guard against the dangers of Soviet fall-out. Our weapons are defensive, second-strike, deterrent weapons, not aggressive by nature, and we have learned ways to prevent their accidental explosion or use. <sup>Thus nuclear</sup> Our arsenal is a boon, not a <sup>menace</sup> ~~menace~~, to world peace.

But to halt the spread of <sup>these terrible</sup> ~~nuclear~~ weapons, the contamination of the air, and <sup>still</sup> the spiralling arms race, we are <sup>new</sup> prepared to seek new avenues of agreement. Despite the Soviet record of duplicity, our <sup>new</sup> disarmament program contains this new package of proposals to end the nuclear arms race:

-- signing of the test-ban treaty by all nations;

-- stopping all development, production and transfer of nuclear weapons and



fissionable materials designed for weapons;

-- prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not now own them; and

-- gradually destroying, or converting to peaceful use, under international control, existing weapons delivery systems,

All of this can be undertaken promptly. The nuclear threat would diminish. Men everywhere could breathe easier. But we are willing to go still further, to show we are in earnest.

On the day these negotiations resume, the United States will turn over to the United Nations 300 kilograms of weapons grade fissionable material -- more than all the destructive power of all previous wars combined -- to be withheld from weapons use, and to be reserved for peaceful applications -- provided that on the same day the Soviet Union transfers 200 such kilograms in similar fashion. We shall continue to deposit 300 kilograms<sup>s</sup> to their 200 kilograms<sup>s</sup>, under the same conditions, for each month the negotiations continue. And upon conclusion of otherwise any agreement in the field of disarmament, nuclear or ~~thermonuclear~~, we will agree, if the Soviets agree, to the UN's utilization of this material for peaceful purposes.

In short, let us start disarming now. Let us see who is willing to talk, and who is willing to act.

#### V.

Once the current crisis over Berlin is relieved, we are prepared to make the same offer with 30 medium jet bombers capable of delivering nuclear bombs, upon the deposit of 30 similar bombers from the Soviet Union, and continue to deposit them at the rate of 1 a day up to 365 days, all such bombers to be destroyed when any disarmament agreement is signed.

There ~~is~~ <sup>are</sup> no conditions attached to this offer. It requires no inspection. It needs no troika. It requires only that the Soviet Union be equally earnest about starting disarmament now, without even waiting for the first stage of our plan. Time is running out. And the only way to begin is to begin.

For years the Soviets have talked of general and complete disarmament --

but only as a slogan to prevent real progress. They offered no realistic means of achieving it, no means of verifying progress toward it, no means of keeping the peace in place of arms. They have offered only the troika, the veto and the hundred-megaton bomb.  
~~walk out,~~

Now they will have a chance to consider an actual plan for achieving general complete and ~~comprehensive~~ disarmament. The offers to deposit fissionable material and bombers are only a start. <sup>an</sup> At ~~the~~ initial stage, force levels will be limited to 2.1 million men. Gradually the production and testing of missiles and bombers and other weapons will be discontinued, and their shipments halted. All states shall reaffirm their obligations to refrain from force, to avoid indirect aggression and subversion, and to abide by world law and the new peace-keeping machinery. Inspection will be proportionate <sup>ate</sup> to the stage of disarmament, with a minimum <sup>on</sup> intrusion ~~in~~ internal affairs. Observation and notification of military movements would reduce the risk of surprise attack and accidental war. And still other steps and stages would bring the world finally to its goal of complete and final disarmament, to a world in which only the UN Peace Force retained enough arms and men to settle disputes and in which no state could seriously threaten or be threatened by another.

It would not be a world without differences or <sup>greed</sup> ~~goals~~ -- but it would be a world without arms. It would not usher in world government -- but it would mean the <sup>Then</sup> end of war. ~~Then~~ every nation would be free to divert its resources to more beneficial ends. The current arms budget of my nation alone, for example, could build new hospitals, schools, libraries, highways and clinics in every state of the United States and every country of the world; and still have enough left over to eradicate malaria, typhoid, smallpox, yellow fever and leprosy from the face of the earth forever.

This nation proposed the disarming of its northern frontier when still at odds over Canada. We proposed with our allies the disarmament plan of 1951 while still at war in Korea. And we make this proposal today not because we are frightened over Berlin, but because we are confident our rights there will prevail -- because, while we are compelled against our will to rearm, we ~~are~~ looking beyond Berlin to the kind of disarmed world we all prefer.



VI

The key to our plan for disarming the world community is our proposal for peace-keeping machinery. Disarmament without controls is but a shadow. A community without institutions is but a shell. As we destroy the obsolete means for settling disputes, we must strengthen the modern means for settling disputes -- the United Nations.

We intend to support and strengthen the United Nations. It is both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Repeatedly in the Middle East, in Africa, in Korea, on the great sub-continent of India, it has provided a means of holding violence within bounds. Now that role must be strengthened.

It will not be strengthened by a troika, in which each great power decides its own case. Whatever problems or adjustments a troika or condominium would enable my nation to avoid, we find the prospects of world law far less frightening than the prospects of nuclear war. For a troika permits no guarantee of peace, no equality of large and small nations, only paralysis, secrecy and the entrenchment of the cold war in the ~~hands of one~~ headquarters ~~for~~ <sup>of</sup> peace.

We believe in the impartiality and integrity of the UN Executive Secretariat, and we think those qualities have been proven. We may not always agree with its actions. We may even sometimes wish its civil servants were less free from national bias. But we know that any effort to undermine the UN, its capacity to act, its Charter or its career service, is an attack on the rights and hopes of man. We cannot let this organization die or fade away -- for to do so would damn the future.

On the contrary, the UN must be strengthened. It must be "dynamic," as its late Secretary General said, to meet new conditions. UN emergency forces <sup>in</sup> which are ~~un~~properly trained, hastily assembled and uncertainly supplied and financed are not enough for the disarmament we propose.

<sup>recommends</sup> Therefore, the United States ~~proposes~~ that each member nation earmark special units in its armed forces for service in the United Nations Peace Force -- <sup>provision</sup> to be specially trained and quickly available -- and further, that ~~promise~~ be made in advance for financial and logistic support of any future UN action. At the

same time, we will suggest a series of steps to improve the UN's machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes -- for fact-finding, mediation and adjudication -- for extending the rule of international law, and clarifying its basic principles. For peace is not solely a military or technical problem -- it is a problem of politics and people as well.

## VII

As the rule of law replaces the rule of arms on earth, so must it also be extended to man's new domain: outer space.

All of us salute the brave cosmonauts of the Soviet Union whose gallant heights pioneered in mankind's most daring adventure. Outer space is the new horizon of world science and hope -- it can also open new horizons in world cooperation. It must not be torn asunder by the old bitter concepts of imperialism, cold war and rivalry. .

To this end, we shall urge adoption by this Assembly of a resolution reserving outer space for peaceful use, prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies, and opening its mysteries and benefits to every nation. We shall further propose cooperative efforts in weather prediction and eventually weather control -- and a global system of communications satellites, linking the whole world in telegraph, telephone, radio and television. The day need not be far off when the proceedings of this body can be telecast directly to every corner of the world.



VIII

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities facing our own fellow-men. A world-wide declaration of independence <sup>has</sup> ~~is~~ transformed nearly 1 billion people and 9 million square miles into 41 free and independent states, leaving less than 2% of the world's population in officially dependent territories -- less than half the number now living in Eastern Europe under Soviet domination. But liberated states are not enough, unless <sup>are</sup> ~~the~~ the minds and bodies of their people ~~must be~~ liberated from the degradations of poverty, illiteracy and disease. Their sovereignty is but a mockery without the means to meet their needs. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future <sup>no</sup> ~~not~~ holds ~~any~~ hope.

That is why my nation has freely shared its capital and its technology -- to bolster political independence with economic independence -- to encourage that climate of dignity in which liberty and justice prevail -- and to close the gap between rich and poor which holds back a world of free and equal states.

<sup>a world of free and equal states,</sup>  
We in the United States seek ~~only independent nations,~~ not satellites. For we started the fight for independence, We proclaimed the role of self-determination. We created a working federal democracy. And we have harbored no territorial <sup>suppressed</sup> ~~ambitions,~~ <sup>created</sup> ~~approved supported~~ no colonies, ~~initiated~~ no satellites on our borders and extended our sympathies to every fight for freedom.

It is on this basis, may I add, that we support a truly neutral and independent Laos, comparable (as Mr. Khrushchev and I agreed at Vienna) to Cambodia and Burma. The negotiations over Laos are reaching a crucial stage. The cease-fire <sup>South</sup> is growing precarious. Laotian territory is being used to infiltrate/Vietnam. I ask the world community to watch this ~~world~~ threat to world peace, ~~despite~~ ~~the most dramatic dangers in Berlin.~~

For all the new and developing nations of Southeast Asia and elsewhere, this should not be a time of fear. It is our wish that it be a Decade of Development. And we are therefore proposing the designation by this body of 1963 as an International Development Year, to be coordinated by the Special Fund of the UN

and to symbolize our common determination to promote sound and widespread growth.

The IDY would be more than a symbol. It would be a launching pad for a decade of cooperative advance -- opening up new sources of ~~every~~ energy from the sun and new sources of food from the seas -- combining our knowledge and talents in regional institutes and training programs -- and expanding the combined efforts technical assistance ~~programs~~ of the existing UN agencies.

### IX

As we discuss these goals,  
All free nations/regret and resent the forces of discord and violence that must hold back this kind of progress. We want to get on with our work -- with the building of a world community that knows neither war nor despair. We realize that this cannot be done overnight, or by some one dramatic move -- that it cannot be done by the ~~first~~ fiat of one nation or even the wishes of all. We do not expect all nations to adopt like systems -- for conformity is the jailor of freedom, and the enemy of growth. Nor do we expect in this task any final victory -- for new problems will always arise.  
do

But we/say: let us begin. The time is short. Our agenda is long. We need not fear the threats of force -- for united we have force enough to prevail. We need not despair of fighting poverty -- for united we are rich enough to ~~some~~ only own succeed. If/each of us, as trustees for all mankind, can but look beyond our ~~own~~ shores and our own ambitions -- submerge the cold war, outlive it and bury it before it buries us -- then we can permit the tide of human progress to drive out the tides of war.  
endeavor

In that ~~effort~~ I pledge you every effort this nation possesses. I pledge you that we shall neither commit nor provoke aggression -- that we shall never negotiate out of fear or ever fear to negotiate.

For we know as you know that the events of the next ten months ~~very~~ may well decide history for the next ten thousand years. For better or worse, those decisions are ours to make -- and we shall be remembered either as the generation that turned this planet into a shambles of death, or the generation that met its pledge "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".



I have come today to pledge our help to your efforts to meet that pledge,  
in freedom and honor -- to call a truce to terror -- to find a peace that endures --  
and to build a world in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the  
peace preserved forever.



The problem is not the death of one man -- the problem is the life of this organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age -- or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die -- to enfeeble its vigor -- to cripple its powers -- we would condemn the future.



Deep

2

Slow

For in the development of this organization rests the only-true alternative to war -- and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Unconditional war can no longer lead to unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer ~~be~~ of concern to ~~the~~ great powers alone.... For a nuclear disaster, spread by winds and waters and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war -- or war will put an end to mankind.

So let us here resolve that Dag Hammarskjöld did not live -- or die -- in vain. Let-us-call-a-truce-to-terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace.

Deep

3

Star

And, as we build an international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war.

II.

This will require new strength, and new roles, for a new United Nations. For disarmament without checks is but a shadow -- and a community without law is but a shell. ... Already the United Nations has become both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Already it has provided -- in the Middle East, in Africa, <sup>in India and</sup> ~~in Asia~~ <sup>today in the Congo</sup> -- a means of holding <sup>his</sup> violence within bounds.

But the great question which confronted this body in 1945 is still before us -- whether man's cherished hopes for progress and freedom are to be destroyed



Deep

4

Slow

by tactics of terror and disruption -- whether the "foul~~ly~~ winds of war" can be tamed in time to free the cooling winds of reason, -- and whether the pledges of our charter are to be fulfilled or defied: pledges to secure peace, progress, human rights and respect for world law.

In this Hall there are not three forces, ~~but~~ only two. One is composed of those who are trying to build the kind of world described in Articles I and II of the Charter. The other, seeking a <sup>very</sup> different world, would undermine this organization in the process.

Today of all days our dedication to that charter must be strengthened.

Deerp

5

Slaw

It must be strengthened, first of all, by the selection of an outstanding civil servant to carry forward the responsibilities of the Secretary General -- a man endowed with both the wisdom and the power to make meaningful the moral force of the world community. The late Secretary General nurtured and sharpened the United Nations' obligation to act. But he did not invent it. It was there in the Charter. It is still there in the Charter.

However difficult it will be to fill Mr. Hammarskjold's place, it can better be filled by one man, than by three. Even the three horses of the troika did not have three drivers, all going in different directions. They



Deep

6

Slow

had only one -- and so must the UN executive. To install a triumvirate, or any panel or rotating authority, in the United Nations administrative offices, would replace order with anarchy, action with paralysis, and confidence with gross confusion.

The Secretary General, in a very real sense, is the servant of this Assembly. Diminish his authority--and you diminish the authority of the only body where all nations, regardless of power, are equal-and-sovereign. Until all the powerful are just, the weak will be secure only in the strength of this Assembly.

Effective and independent executive action is not the same question as

Deerp

7

Slu

balanced representation. In view of the enormous change in the membership of this body since its founding, the American Delegation will join in any effort for the prompt review and revision of the composition of <sup>UN</sup>~~United Nations~~ bodies.

But to give this organization three drivers -- to permit each great power <sup>IN</sup>~~to~~ effect to decide its own case -- would entrench the cold war in the headquarters of peace. Whatever advantages such a plan <sup>MAY</sup> hold out to my country, as one of the great powers, ... we reject it. For we far prefer world law, in the age of self-determination, to world war, in the age of mass extermination.



(quietly)

Deep

8

Sean

III.

.....Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when it may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation or madness. The weapons of war must be abolished, before they abolish us.

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons -- ten million times more destructive than anything the world has ever known, and only minutes away from

Deer

9

Slow

any target on earth -- is a source of horror, of discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes -- for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness -- for in a spiralling arms race, a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

For 15 years this organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream --. it is a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament, pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race.



It is in this spirit that the recent Belgrade Conference -- recognizing that this is no longer a Soviet problem or an American problem, but a human problem -- endorsed a program of "general, complete and strictly and internationally controlled disarmament". It is in this same spirit that we in the United States have labored this year, with a new urgency, and with a new, now-statutory agency...fully endorsed by the Congress, to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching yet realistic, so mutually balanced and beneficial, that it could be accepted by every nation. And it is in this spirit that



Deep

Slow

11

we have presented <sup>WITH The Agreement of</sup> ~~to~~ the Soviet Union -- under the label both nations now accept of "general and complete disarmament" -- a <sup>new</sup> statement of newly-agreed principles for negotiation.

But we are well aware that all issues of principle are not settled -- and that principles alone are not enough. It is therefore our intention... to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an

Deep

12

Slow

arms race, but to a peace race -- to advance with us step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has actually been achieved. We invite them now, to go beyond agreement in principle to reach agreement on actual plans.

The program to be presented to this Assembly -- for general and complete disarmament under effective international control -- moves to bridge the gap between those who insist on a gradual approach, and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machines of war. It would proceed through balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no



Deef

13

Shw

state a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs -- not with the big powers alone, not with one's adversary or one's self -- but in an international organization within the framework of the UN, ~~itself~~. It would assure that indispensable condition of disarmament -- true inspection -- <sup>AND APPLY IT</sup> in stages proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would cover delivery systems as well as weapons. It would ultimately halt their production as well as their testing, their transfer as well as their possession. It would achieve, under the eye of an International Disarmament Organization, a steady reduction in forces, both nuclear and

conventional, until it has abolished all armies and all weapons, except those needed for internal order and a new United Nations Peace Force. And it starts that process now, today, even as the talks begin.

In short, general and complete disarmament must no longer be a mere slogan, used to resist the first steps. It is no longer to be a goal without means of achieving it, without means of verifying its progress, without means of keeping the peace. It is now a realistic plan, and a test -- a test of who is only willing to talk and who is also willing to act.

Such a plan would not bring a world free from conflict or greed -- but it



Deaf

15

Shaw

would bring a world free from the terrors of mass destruction. It would not usher in the era of the super-state -- but it would usher in an era in which no state could annihilate or be annihilated by another. ....

In 1945, this nation proposed the Baruch plan to internationalize the atom before other nations even possessed the bomb or demobilized their troops. We proposed with our allies the disarmament plan of 1951 while still at war in Korea. And we make our proposals today, while building up our defenses over Berlin, not because we are inconsistent or insincere or intimidated,...but because we know the rights of free men will prevail -- because, while we are compelled

against our will to rearm, we look confidently beyond Berlin...to the kind of disarmed world we all prefer.

I--therefore propose, on the basis of this plan, that disarmament negotiations resume promptly, and continue without interruption until an entire program for complete and general disarmament has not only been agreed upon... but actually achieved. ....

#### IV.

The logical place to begin is a treaty assuring the end of nuclear tests, of all kinds, in every environment, under workable controls. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed <sup>SUCH</sup> a treaty that is reasonable, effective and ready for signature. We are still



Deaf

17

Slaw

prepared to sign that treaty today.

We also proposed a mutual ban on atmospheric testing, without inspection or controls, in order to save the human race from the poison of radioactive fall-out. We regret that that offer was not accepted.

For 15 years, we have sought to make the atom an instrument of peaceful growth instead of war. But for 15 years, our concessions have been matched by obstruction. Our patience has been rewarded with intransigence. And the pleas of mankind have been met with disregard.

Finally, as the explosions of others beclouded the skies, my country was left no alternative but to act in the interests

of its own and the free world's security. We cannot endanger that security by refraining from testing while others improve their arsenal. Nor can we endanger it by another long, uninspected ban on testing. For three years we accepted those risks, while seeking agreement on inspection. But this year, while we were negotiating in good faith at Geneva, others were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction.

Our tests are not polluting the atmosphere. Our deterrent weapons are guarded against accidental explosion or use. Our doctors and scientists stand ready to help any nation measure and meet the hazards to health which



Deeph

19

Slav

result from the tests of others.

But to halt the spread of these terrible weapons, to halt the contamination of the air, to halt the spiralling nuclear arms race,, we remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement. Our new disarmament program thus includes the following proposals:

-- First, signing the test-ban treaty, by all nations. This can be done now. Test ban negotiations need not and should not await general disarmament talks.

-- Second, stopping the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons,, and preventing their transfer to any nation now lacking nuclear weapons,

-- Third, prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not now own them.

-- Fourth, keeping nuclear weapons from seeding new battlegrounds in outer space.

-- Fifth, gradually destroying existing nuclear weapons, and converting their materials to peaceful uses; and

-- Finally, halting the unlimited testing and production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, and gradually destroying them as well.

#### V.

To destroy arms, however, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy -- creating world-wide law and



Deep

Shaw

law enforcement as we outlaw world-wide war and weapons. In the world we seek, United Nations emergency forces which have been hastily assembled, uncertainly supplied, and inadequately financed, will never be enough.

Therefore, the United States recommends that all member nations earmark special peace-keeping units in their armed forces -- to be on call to the United Nations -- to be specially trained and quickly available -- and with advance provision for financial and logistic support.

In addition, the American Delegation will suggest a series of steps to improve the United Nations' machinery for the

peaceful settlement of disputes -- for on-the-spot fact-finding, mediation and adjudication -- for extending the rule of international law.... For peace is not solely a military or technical problem -- it is primarily a problem of politics and people. And unless man can match his strides in weaponry and technology with equal strides in social and political development, our great strength, like that of the dinosaur, will become incapable of proper control -- and man, like the dinosaur, will decline and disappear.

## VI.

As we extend the rule of law on earth, so must we also extend it to



man's new domain:....outer space.

All of us salute the brave cosmonauts of the Soviet Union. The new horizons of outer space must not be riven by the old bitter concepts of imperialism and sovereign claims. The cold reaches of <sup>the</sup> universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war.

To this end, we shall urge proposals extending the United Nations Charter to the limits of man's exploration in the universe...reserving outer space for peaceful use...prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies...and opening the mysteries and benefits of space to every nation. We

shall further propose cooperative efforts in weather prediction, and eventually weather control. We shall propose, finally, a global system of communications satellites, linking the whole world in telegraph, telephone, radio and television. The day need not be far away, when such a system will televise the proceedings of this body to every corner of the world.

VII.

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities that face our own fellow-men. Political sovereignty is but a mockery, without the means to meet poverty, illiteracy and disease. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future holds no hope.



Slow

Down

- -

Slow

Down

Deep

25

That is why my nation -- which has freely shared its capital and its technology to help others help themselves -- now proposes officially designating this decade of the 1960's as the UN Decade of Development.

Under the framework of that resolution, the UN's existing efforts in promoting economic growth can be expanded and coordinated. Regional surveys and training institutes can pool the talents of many. New research, technical assistance and pilot projects can unlock the wealth of less-developed lands and untapped waters. And development can become a cooperative, not a competitive enterprise -- to enable

Slaw

26

all nations, however diverse in their systems and beliefs, to become..in fact as well as law..both free and equal states.

#### VIII

My country favors a world of free and equal states. We agree with those who say that colonialism is a key issue in this Assembly. But let the full facts of that issue be discussed in full.

On the one hand is the fact that, since the close of ~~the~~ World War II, a world-wide "declaration of independence" has transformed nearly 1 billion people and 9 million square miles into 42 free and independent states. Less than 2% of the world's population now lives in "dependent" territories.



Slow

27

Deep.

I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. Those problems will be solved, with patience, goodwill and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in such matters, my country intends to be a participant, not merely an observer, in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing tide of self-determination has our sympathy and our support.

But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light -- or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My nation was once a

colony -- and we know what colonialism means: the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, class or color.

And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire, where a population... far larger than that officially termed "dependent"... lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions -- under a system which knows only one party and one belief -- which supresses free debate, free elections, free newspapers, books and trade unions -- and which builds



Deep

29

Shaw

a wall...to keep truth a stranger and  
its own citizens prisoners. <sup>so</sup> Let us  
debate colonialism in full -- and apply  
the principle of free choice and the  
practice of free plebiscites in every  
part of the globe.....

IX.

(Quietly)

~~FINAL~~

As President of the United States,  
I consider it my duty to report to this  
Assembly on two threats to the peace  
which are not on your crowded agenda,  
but which cause us, and most of you,  
the deepest concern.

The first threat on which I wish  
to report is widely mis-understood: the  
smoldering coals of war in Southeast  
Asia. South Vietnam is already under  
attack -- sometimes by a single assassin,

sometimes by a band of guerrillas, recently by full battalions. The peaceful borders of Burma, Cambodia and India have been repeatedly violated. And the peaceful people of Laos are in danger of losing the independence they gained so short a time ago.

No one can call these "wars of liberation". For these are free countries living under governments of their own choosing. Nor are these aggressions any less real, because men are knifed in their homes, and not shot in the field of battle.

The very simple question confronting the world community is whether measures can be devised to protect the



small and the weak from such tactics. For if they are successful in Laos and South Vietnam, the gates will be open. . . . .

The United States seeks for itself no base, no territory, no special position in this area of any kind. We support a truly neutral and independent Laos, its people free from outside interference, living at peace with themselves and their neighbors, assured that their territory will not be used for attacks on others, <sup>AND UNDER</sup> ~~AND~~ <sup>A GOVERNMENT</sup> comparable (as Mr. Khrushchev and I agreed at Vienna) to Cambodia and Burma.

But now the negotiations over Laos are reaching a crucial stage. . . . The cease-fire is at best precarious. . . . .

Laotian territory is being used to infiltrate South Vietnam... The world community must recognize; that this potent threat to Laotian peace and freedom is indivisible from all other threats to their own.

X.

Secondly, I wish to report to you on the crisis over Germany and Berlin. This is not the time or the place for immoderate tones...but the world community is entitled to know the very simple issues as we see them. If there is a crisis...it is because an existing peace is under threat -- because an existing island of free people is under pressure -- because solemn agreements are being treated with



Deef

Jls

contempt. Established international rights are being threatened with unilateral usurpation. Peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks.

(quietly) One recalls the order of the Czar, in Pushkin's Boris Godunov: "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced by barriers ... that not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run, or a crow fly".

It is absurd to allege that we are threatening a war merely to prevent the Soviet Union and East Germany from signing a so-called "treaty" of peace. The Western Allies are not concerned with any paper arrangement the Soviets wish to make, with <sup>A</sup> ~~an artificial~~ regime

of their own creation, on territory occupied by their own troops, and governed by their own agents. No such action can affect either our rights or our responsibilities.

If there is a dangerous crisis in Berlin -- and there is! -- it is because of threats against the vital interests and the deep commitments of the Western Powers, and the freedom of West Berlin.

... We cannot yield these interests. ... We cannot fail these commitments. We cannot surrender the freedom of people for whom we are responsible. A "peace treaty" which would destroy the peace... would be a fraud. A "free city" which would suffocate freedom... would be an infamy.



Slow

DOWN

35

For a city or a people to be truly free, they must have the secure right, without economic, political or police pressure, to make their own choice and to live their own lives. And as I have said before, if anyone doubts the extent to which our presence is desired by the people of West Berlin, we are ready to have that question submitted to a free vote in all Berlin and, if possible, among all the German people.

The elementary fact about this crisis is that it is unnecessary!

The elementary tools for a peaceful settlement are found in the Charter. Under its law, agreements are to be kept, unless changed by all those who made them. Established rights are to

be respected. The political disposition of peoples should rest upon their wishes, freely expressed in plebiscites or free elections. If there are legal problems, they can be solved by legal means. If there is a threat of force, it must be rejected. If there is desire for change, it must be subject to negotiation. And if there is negotiation, it must be rooted in mutual respect and concern for the rights of others.

The Western Powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligations, and their access, to the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens. This generation



learned...from bitter experience...that either brandishing or yielding to threats...can only lead to war. But firmness and reason can lead to the kind of peaceful solution in which my country profoundly believes.

We are committed to no rigid formula. We see no perfect solution. We recognize that troops and tanks can, for a time, keep a nation divided against its will, however unwise that policy may be. But we believe a peaceful agreement is possible which protects the freedom of West Berlin, and allied presence and access, while recognizing the historic and legitimate interests of others...in assuring European security.

The possibilities of negotiation are now being explored: it is too <sup>a</sup> early to report what the prospects may be. For our part, we <sup>would</sup> ~~will~~ be glad to report at the appropriate time that a solution has been found. For ~~there is~~ no need for a crisis over Berlin -- and if those who created this crisis desire peace, there will always be peace in Berlin. ....

## XI.

.....The events and decisions of the next ten months may well decide the fate of man for the next ten thousand years. There will be no avoiding those events. There will be no appeal from those decisions. And we shall be remembered, ...

(UPRY  
QUIETLY  
AND  
SLOW)



either as the generation that turned this planet into a flaming <sup>funeral</sup> pyre... or the generation that met its vow "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

In the endeavor to meet that vow, I pledge you every effort this nation possesses. I pledge you that we shall neither commit nor provoke aggression -- that we shall neither flee nor invoke the threat of force -- that we shall never negotiate out of fear... and never fear to negotiate.

Terror is not a new weapon. Throughout history it has been used by those who could not prevail through persuasion or example. But inevitably they fail -- either because men are

not afraid to die for a life worth living  
 -- or because the terrorists themselves  
<sup>come to</sup> realize ~~that~~ <sup>CAN</sup> that free men ~~could~~ not be  
 frightened by threats, and ~~that~~  
 aggression would <sup>Meet ITS own response,</sup> ~~be punished with even~~  
~~more terrible consequences.~~ And it is  
 in the light of that history that every  
 nation today should know, be he friend  
 or foe, that the United States has both  
the will and the weapons to join free men  
in standing up to their responsibilities.  
 = But we are here to <sup>seek</sup> look across this  
 world of threats...to the world of peace.  
 In that search <sup>for peace</sup> ~~we~~ cannot expect any  
 final triumph --for new problems will  
 always arise. We cannot expect all  
 nations to adopt like systems -- for



conformity is the jailor of freedom,  
and the enemy of growth. Nor can we  
expect to reach our goal by contrivance,  
by fiat or even by the wishes of all.

But however close we sometimes  
seem, to that dark and final abyss, let  
no man of peace and freedom despair.

*slow -* For he does not stand alone! If we all  
can persevere -- if we can in every  
land and office look beyond our own shores  
and ambitions -- then surely the age  
will dawn, in which the strong are just  
and the weak secure and the peace pre-  
served forever.

*QUIETLY* } Ladies and Gentlemen of this  
assembly -- the decision is ours.  
Never have the nations of the world had  
so much to lose -- or so much to gain.

Together we shall save our  
planet -- or together we shall perish  
in its flames. Save it we can -- and  
save it we must -- and then shall we  
earn the eternal thanks of man, <sup>and AS peace makers,</sup> ~~and~~  
the eternal blessing of God.

- - - - -



## I

We meet in an hour of grief and challenge. Dag Hammarskjöld is dead. But the United Nations lives on. A noble servant of peace is gone. But the quest for peace lies before us.

The problem is not the death of one man -- the problem is the life of this organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age -- *do you not see winds - which influence, in the face, and not as a* or ~~disintegrate away to a farce~~. For us here to let it die -- to enfeeble its vigor -- to cripple its powers -- would be to <sup>condemn</sup> damn the future.

For in the development of this organization rests the only true alternative to war -- and war is no longer a rational alternative. Unconditional war can no longer lead to an unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer be of concern to great powers alone. A nuclear disaster, spread by winds and waters and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war -- or war will put an end to mankind.

So let us here resolve that Dag Hammarskjöld did not live -- or die -- in vain. Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace. And let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war as we build an international capacity to keep peace.

## II

This requires, as the late Secretary-General has said, a "dynamic" United Nations. Disarming the world community, as we shall propose, requires strengthened institutions of peace. *to provide a mechanism to resolve* For disarmament without verification is but a shadow -- and a community without institutions is but a shell. Already the United Nations has become both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Already it has provided -- in the Middle East, in Africa, in Asia -- a means of holding violence within bounds.

*these disputes were when wars were once fought*

without influence  
force  
or respect

is gone with the winds - without influence, without  
force, without respect

condemn

to provide a mechanism to resolve

Those disputes over which  
wars were once fought



with the power to  
make means for the world  
peace for  
best currency

In case where something  
has been done

-2-

Now that role must be strengthened, not diluted. It must be strengthened,  
first of all, by the selection of a new Secretary General -- a man with the wisdom  
of a sage, the patience of a saint and the integrity of a Hammarskjold. The  
impartiality of the Secretariat, and the independence of its career service,  
are too proven and too successful to be changed or challenged now. The late  
Secretary General nurtured and sharpened the UN's obligation to act, but he  
did not invent it. It was there in the Charter. It is still in the Charter, and  
will outlive us all.

7.

And however large Mr. Hammarskjold's shoes will be to fill, they can  
better be filled by one man than by three. Even the three horses of the  
literary troika had only one driver, going in one direction. And so must we.  
To install a triumvirate in the UN (or any of its parts) would replace order  
with anarchy, action with paralysis and equality with the most flagrant kind of  
favoritism. This is a far different question than the matter of balanced  
representation in the organs of this body. In view of the enormous change in  
the membership of this body since its founding, it is a time for a sober look  
at the composition of the various UN bodies and Secretariat. But to install  
a troika -- to permit each great power in effect to decide its own case  
would entrench the cold war in the headquarters of peace. Although a  
troika might enable my own country, Iceland as a great power, to avoid  
some painful problems or adjustments, we reject it. For we regard progress  
toward world law in the age of self-determination far less forbidding than  
the prospect of world war in the age of mass extermination.

plus in  
a loan  
to the  
UN

as before  
one  
any  
way  
the  
comes  
comes

III.

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day  
when it may no longer be habitable. Every many woman and child lives  
under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads,  
capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation or madness.  
The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

+ his suggestion as well as the way  
to lead the world - for the strong  
only has the smallest value can meet  
equality and if the suggestion is a loan  
with the largest  
the free I think  
the donor  
for the last  
more



- 3 -

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons -- ten million times more destructive than anything the world has ever known, and only minutes away from any target on earth -- is a source of horror, discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes -- for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness -- for in a spiralling arms race, a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

For 15 years this organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now the time for deliberations and delays has passed. Disarmament is no longer a subject to be debated. It is a problem to be solved -- not some day, but now -- not as an ideal or a dream, but as a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in the arms race.

It is in this spirit that we in the United States have labored this year, with a new agency and urgency, to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching yet realistic, so balanced and mutually beneficial, that it would be acceptable to every nation. And it is in this spirit that we have presented to the Soviet Union -- under their own label of "general and complete disarmament" -- an agreed statement of principles. But we are fully aware of the fact that principles are not enough -- and that this is no longer a Soviet problem or an American problem, but a human problem. It is thus our intention to challenge the Soviets, on sobering not to an arms race, but to a peace race -- to match us step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament is actually achieved. We challenge them to go beyond agreement in principle and agree on a concrete program.

The plan of action to be presented to this Assembly moves to bridge the gap between those who insist on a gradual approach and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machines of war. It would proceed through





It serves the powerful

If the  
moral  
price of  
the world  
community  
becomes  
merely a  
broker -  
attempting to  
determine  
with a  
careful eye  
the half  
way point  
between  
preparation  
of each -  
rather

comp  
than  
for any

rather than  
an independent  
judgment  
based on  
principle  
then that  
opinion  
becomes so  
large the most  
powerful price  
is the world

*holding*  
means of achieving it, without means of verifying its progress, without  
*quitting*

means of keeping the peace. It is now to become a realistic program, free  
*cut,*  
from the trolley, [free from the veto and free from the threat of a hundred-megaton  
*Scylla*  
bomb.  
*St. Louis*

Our plan would not achieve a world without conflict or greed -- but  
it would be a world without national arms. It would not usher in the era of  
the super-state -- but it would usher in an era in which no state could seriously  
*identity*  
threaten or be threatened by another.

This nation proposed the dismantling of its northern frontier when  
still at odds with Britain over Canada. We proposed with our allies the  
disarmament plan of 1951 while still at war in Korea. And we make our proposals  
today while building up our defenses over Berlin, not because we are inconsistent  
or insincere or intimidated, but because we know the rights of free men will  
prevail -- because, while we are compelled against our will to rearm, we  
look confidently beyond Berlin to the kind of disarmed world we all prefer.





balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no state a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs -- not with the big powers alone, not with one's adversary or one's self -- but here in an international organization within the framework of the UN itself. It would make the indispensable condition of true inspection proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would halt the production as well as the testing of weapons, their transfer as well as their possession. It would achieve, under the eye of an International Disarmament Organization, a steady reduction in forces, both nuclear and conventional, until it has abolished all armies and weapons except those needed for internal order and a UN Peace Force. And it starts that process now, today, even as the talks begin.

In short, general and complete disarmament is no longer to be a slogan that holds back progress. <sup>It must be</sup> It is no longer to be a goal without any

*Draft of Speech to U.N.  
Sept 25, 1961*

The test of statesmanship is to think and act in terms of the next generation, as well as the current crisis. All of us must now meet that test.

I therefore propose, on the basis of this plan and under instructions from this body, that disarmament negotiations resume promptly and continue without interruption until complete and general disarmament has actually been achieved.

#### IV

I propose further that we begin now -- today -- not merely to negotiate but to disarm.

The logical place to begin disarming is a treaty assuring the end of nuclear tests. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed a treaty that is reasonable, effective and ready for signature. We are still prepared to sign that treaty today.

We have also proposed a mutual self-enforceable ban on atmospheric testing, to save the human race from the poison of radioactive fall-out. [We are still prepared to join in such a ban today.]

For 15 years we have sought to control the atom, to channel its power for constructive ends. But for 15 years every parley has been sabotaged, our every offer has been rejected, every UN mandate has been ignored, by a power willing to reverse its own agreements and walk out of its own meetings. Our concessions have been matched by obstruction. Our patience has been rewarded with intransigence. And the pleas of mankind have been met with contemptuous disregard.

While we were negotiating in good faith at Geneva, others were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction that have already increased radioactivity by 3,000% in some regions.

But, say I - with D.O.D. & some State support. We had a Sept. 9 dead line. It seems weak to make the offer again. At a minimum we'd need British consent to do it again. after they have had 16 free tests.





My country was left no alternative but to act in the interests of its own and the Free World's security. We are the stronger nuclear power -- and we propose to stay stronger. Our tests are not polluting the atmosphere. Our deterrent weapons -- and they are deterrent, not aggressive -- are guarded against accidental explosion or use. Our doctors and scientists stand ready to help any nation -- I repeat, any nation -- guard against the dangers of Soviet fall-out.

But to halt the spread of these terrible weapons, the contamination of the air, and the spiralling arms race <sup>in nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles</sup> we are still prepared to seek new avenues of agreement. Our new disarmament program contains these proposals to <sup>contain and</sup> end the nuclear arms race:

- signing the test-ban treaty, by all nations;
- <sup>stopping</sup> ~~stopping~~ the production and <sup>limiting the</sup> ~~transfer~~ of fissionable materials for use in weapons;
- prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not now own them; and
- gradually destroying, or converting to peaceful use, under international control, existing nuclear weapons materials and ~~delivery systems~~.

<sup>keeping nuclear weapons from reaching a new battle ground in outer space</sup>  
All of this can be undertaken promptly. The nuclear threat would diminish. Men everywhere could breathe easier. <sup>achieve safety</sup> But we are willing to begin even earlier -- even before agreement on such measures is reached -- to show we are sincere, and to test the sincerity of the Soviet Union.

On the day disarmament negotiations resume, the United States will turn over to the International Atomic Energy Agency under the United Nations 300 kilograms of weapons grade fissionable material -- capable of unleashing more than all the destructive power of all previous wars combined -- to be withheld from weapons use, and to be reserved for peaceful application -- provided that on the same day the Soviet Union transfers 200 such kilograms in similar fashion. We shall continue to deposit 300 kilograms to their



United Nations -- such forces to be specially trained and quickly available. Further, I propose that provision be made in advance for financial and logistic support of any future UN action. In addition, we will suggest a series of steps to improve the UN's machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes -- for fact-finding, mediation and adjudication -- for extending the rule and administration of international law, and clarifying its basic principles. For peace is not solely a military or technical problem -- it is a problem of politics and people as well.

## VI

As the rule of law replaces the rule of arms on earth, so must it also extend to man's new domain: outer space.

All of us salute the brave cosmonauts of the Soviet Union whose gallant flights pioneered in mankind's most daring adventure. Outer space is the new horizon of world science and hope -- it can also open new horizons in world cooperation. It must not be riven by the old bitter concepts of imperialism and cold war.



*The old border  
between the  
two oceans of the world has  
been*



200 kilograms, under the same conditions, for each month the negotiations continue up to two years. And upon conclusion of any agreement in the field of disarmament, nuclear or otherwise, we will agree, if the Soviets agree, to the UN's utilization of this material for peaceful purposes.

In short, let us start disarming now. Let us see who is only willing to talk, and who is also willing to act. The only way to begin is to begin.

V

To disarm, moreover, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy -- creating world-wide law and law enforcement as we outlaw world-wide war and weapons. In the world we seek, UN emergency forces which have been hastily assembled, uncertainly supplied and inadequately financed will not be enough.

Therefore, the United States recommends that each member nation earmark special peace-keeping units in its armed forces on call to the

To this end, we shall urge adoption by this Assembly of a resolution reserving outer space for peaceful use, prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies, and opening its mysteries and benefits to every nation. We shall further propose cooperative efforts in weather prediction and eventually weather control -- and, finally, a global system of communications satellites, linking the whole world in telegraph, telephone, radio and television. The day need not be far off when the proceedings of this body can be broadcast and telecast directly to every corner of the world.

#### VII.

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities facing our own fellow-men. It has been said that a key issue in this Assembly will be colonialism. Let that issue be discussed in full. For colonialism is not only the exploitation of new nations by old -- or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My nation was once a colony -- and we know what colonialism means: the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their color or income.

Since the close of the World War II, a world-wide declaration of independence has transformed nearly 1 billion people and 9 million square miles into 41 free and independent states. Less than 2% of the world's population now lives in officially dependent territories. The tide of self-determination is running high. But that tide has not yet reached the Communist empire, where several times that many are imprisoned under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free elections -- in a system which knows only one party and one belief -- which suppresses free debate, free elections, free newspapers and books and trade unions -- and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. If colonialism is the key issue, let us hold a free plebiscite and offer a free choice everywhere.





I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. These problems will be solved, with patience, goodwill and determination. My country intends to be an active participant, not a mere observer, in the movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That movement has our sympathy and our support. But I would stress to this Assembly that liberated states are not enough unless the minds and bodies of people are liberated from the degradations of poverty, illiteracy and disease. Political sovereignty is a mockery without the means to meet their needs. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future holds no hope.

That is why my nation has freely shared its capital and its technology -- to bolster political independence with economic independence -- to encourage that climate of dignity in which liberty and justice prevail -- and to close the gap between rich and poor, by helping others to help themselves, to learn to grow out of their own resources.

And that is why we ask this organization and its members to join in making this a decade of development -- the turning-point in man's long effort to cast off from all his fellow-men the bonds of massive misery. Individually, our divergent and diluted efforts may fail. But united, we have the talent and resources to win this war for human dignity -- to help both individuals and nations to stand up straight -- and in which all the developing nations, however diverse in their systems and beliefs, can become in fact as well as law both free and equal states.

### VIII

We in the United States believe in a world of free and equal states, not satellites and colonies. For we started the fight for independence. We proclaimed the role of self-determination. We created a working federal democracy. And we have always looked with favor on the flowering of freedom in any other land.



It is on this basis that we support a truly neutral and independent Laos, comparable (as Mr. Khrushchev and I agreed at Vienna) to Cambodia and Burma. The people of Laos ask no more than the chance to live in peace among themselves and with their neighbors. They have no wish to be set one against another. They do not wish their territory violated to disturb the peace of others.

But now the negotiations over Laos are reaching a crucial stage. The cease-fire is growing precarious. Laotian territory is being used to infiltrate South Vietnam. I ask the world community -- for the sake of its own peace and freedom, for the United States seeks no special position in Laos -- to watch vigilantly this potent threat to peace. For it is indivisible from all other similar threats.

IX.

It is this crescendo of threats -- to the freedom of some and the security of others -- that now obstruct the road to peace. We must get on with our long-range goals -- get on with building better lives for our heirs -- but current crises drain our time and our efforts. We cannot ~~but~~ strengthen the UN tomorrow if it is torn apart today. We cannot bequeath a better world if we leave it in a shambles. As delegates to the United Nations, we are here as trustees of all mankind -- and we cannot ignore the threats to mankind's very existence. We cannot ignore our solemn oath of commitment.

We are pledged to "live together in peace," and that peace is now being menaced by unilateral and unlawful acts. We are pledged to securing "fundamental human rights", and those rights are now denied millions behind barbed wire and concrete walls. We are pledged to "respect ... international law," and that law is now being daily defied.

Sixteen and one-quarter years ago, as a young reporter, I watched the birth of this organization. Hopes ran high and trust ran deep, as this august body became the world's great new sentinel of peace.





But the passage of years brought vast and drastic changes -- some good, some evil. Old empires disappeared -- but new empires arose. Direct aggression diminished -- but indirect aggression and subversion took its place. The earth was newly shrunk by science, but newly split by an iron curtain of secrecy. The wonders of technology brought new blessings of life but also new vehicles of death.

And now, after sixteen years of effort, the great question confronting this body is whether mankind's cherished hopes for peace and progress and freedom are to be destroyed by tactics of terror and disruption -- whether contempt by a few for the views of mankind shall raise us to the heights of the challenge or sink us to new depths of despair -- whether aggression is to be rewarded with indifference, and intimidation with submission -- and, above all, whether the "foul winds of war" can be leashed in time to free the cooling winds of reason.

Terror is not a new weapon. Throughout history it has been employed by those who could not prevail through persuasion or example. But inevitably these terrorists fail -- because they misjudge the strength of the free human spirit. And that is why the <sup>have who perceive</sup> Soviet Union's current strategy of nuclear blackmail, of labelling one nation hostage for another, of threatening modern orgage groves and ancient monuments, can only succeed in unifying all free men as never before, in opening their eyes and in stiffening their will. For in the face of threats and arms, free men do not seek a refuge in fear but take confidence in courage and strength. And however loudly some may talk of their weapons <sup>the power has in state gives armament</sup> the quiet fact is that the balance of power has not shifted. <sup>and men are adequate.</sup>

The force which has deterred for many years has continued to grow in strength. The Soviet Union knows that the United States has the will and the weapons to join free men in defense against aggression. Together the friends of freedom can stand up to their responsibilities with firm hearts. For it is not likely that any aggressor, despite his threats, will bring on his own nation the terrible consequences of his own irresponsible acts.



and you  
are going  
to look at  
our own  
domestic  
situation  
and see  
how far  
we have  
come  
in the  
last  
few  
years  
and  
how  
much  
we  
have  
done  
in  
the  
last  
few  
years  
and  
how  
much  
we  
have  
done  
in  
the  
last  
few  
years

X.

Today this campaign of terror is focussed on the illegally and abnormally divided city of Berlin -- not because it is itself a cause of tension, but because one state is deliberately attempting to force its will on others. International agreements have been flouted. International rights have been threatened with unilateral usurpation. A peaceful setting has been made sinister by barbed wire and vicious threats. Peaceful movement has been blocked by force.

It is absurd to allege that the Berlin crisis arises out of a desire to end abnormality. For what could be more abnormal than to imitate the orders issued by the Czar in Pushkin's Boris Gudonov. "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced by barriers... that not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow fly."?

And it is equally absurd to allege that war is threatened by the signing of a so-called "treaty" of peace. Until the Soviet Government is ready to



face the need for serious efforts to bring all Germans together in self-

determination, the problem of East Germany -- the failure of the puppets

of Canton -- the widespread discontent -- the millions of refugees and now

would-be refugees -- all these are Soviet responsibilities. The Western

*may*

Allies are not content with any paper arrangement the Soviets wish to make

*our arguments*

with an artificial regime of their own creation, on territory occupied by

*but*

their own troops and governed by their own agents. No such action can affect

*not*

either our rights or our responsibilities; nor can it shift the responsibility

for their failure in East Berlin and East Germany to Western shoulders.

But if the Soviet and East German leaders should act upon an insignificant

and fraudulent treaty in any manner that threatens our rights in West

Berlin -- our presence, our access and the continued freedom of its

citizens -- then this becomes more than an East German matter. It puts in

question the integrity of freedom's word to those who seek our protection. It

puts in question the sanctity of international agreements and rights. And,

most important of all, it puts in question the basic principle of self-determination

the long-accepted right of the people of West Berlin to choose their own future.

To call a city a "free city" does not make it free -- just as the signing

of a so-called "peace treaty" does not in itself bring peace. The people of

Eastern Europe have already seen how the Soviets define the word "free".  
*And the so-called peace treaty with the Soviets defines the word "free".*

For a city or a people to be truly free, they must have a chance, without

economic, political or police pressure, to make their own choice and to live

their own lives. The people of West Berlin have that freedom today. They

shall continue to have it. And as I have said before, if anyone doubts the

extent to which our presence is desired by the people of West Berlin, compared

to East German feelings about their regime, we are ready to have that question

submitted to a free vote in Berlin and, if possible, among all the German people.

*And we shall submit to the world's*  
The people of West Berlin have already made it clear that they cannot be

cowed into flight or surrender. Even the sealing off of their neighbors did

not cause them to panic -- although I would urge the Soviet Union, as it weighs

the wisdom and permanency of that move, to consider whether blocking the

long-range hopes of the German people -- in Berlin and elsewhere -- for regaining



peacefully their traditional ties might not lead to dangerous frustrations, tensions and nationalistic pressures. History tells us that no city, no nation, no continent can be forever divided in this artificial and painful fashion.

Nevertheless the West Berliners themselves retain every reason to be confident in their friends and in their future. If tensions can be relaxed and agreements reached, West Berlin could well become a symbol of all European unity and growth -- possibly as the new headquarters for the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, now located in Geneva, and concerned with economic growth on both sides of the Iron-cement curtain. This could pave the way for further interest and use of the City.

But if new agreements cannot be reached, and old agreements are rendered impotent by Soviet violations, then the Western Powers will be free to take whatever steps are necessary in cooperation with the Federal Republic of Germany and its allies to assure West Berlin the status and role its continued freedom deserves.

For one thing is certain. Self-determination can perhaps be denied by

force to those who lack it -- as happened in Hungary. But it can be easily taken from those now free to enjoy it -- for it will never be traded away, and it will never be surrendered short of war.

If the Communists are not intent on extending their empire to West Berlin, there will be no war. If they do not seek to impose their will on others in defiance of settled rights and commitments, there will be no war. But the Western powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligation and their access to the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens. This generation learned from bitter experience that appeasing the threats of ruthless and ambitious dictators can only lead to war. But reasoned firmness can lead to the kind of peaceful solution in which my country profoundly believes.

We trust that the Soviets will refrain from further unilateral actions that hamper negotiations; and we believe both sides oppose a hasty meeting which



appears to be the last resort and then fails -- with dangerous consequences -- for lack of preparation. But we are ready, at the proper time and in the proper forum, to exchange and explore precise and reasonable proposals which respect the vital interests of all concerned.

We are committed to no rigid formula. We see no perfect solution.

We recognize that troops and tanks can, for a time, keep a nation divided against its will, however unwise that policy may be. But we believe a peaceful agreement is possible which protects the freedom of West Berlin and allied presence and access, while recognizing historic Soviet concerns over European security. There is no need for war over Berlin -- and if the West is prepared to resist force, and the Soviets are prepared to talk sense, there will be no war over Berlin.



XI.

The events and decisions of the next ten months may well decide history for the next ten thousand years. There will be no escape from these events and there will be no appeal from those decisions -- and we shall be remembered either as the generation that turned this planet into a flaming pyre or the generation that met its vow<sup>2</sup> to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war<sup>4</sup>.

In the endeavor to meet that vow, I pledge you every effort this nation possesses. I pledge you that we shall neither commit nor provoke aggression that we shall neither flee nor threaten the use of force -- that we shall never negotiate out of fear and never fear to negotiate.

In this search for a better world, we cannot expect any ~~vast~~ final victory -- for new problems will always arise. We cannot expect all nations to adopt like systems -- for conformity is the jailer of freedom, and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal overnight or by some one dramatic move -- or by the fiat of one nation or even the wishes of all.

But we do say: let us begin. The time is short. Our agenda is long. If we can in every continent and corner look beyond our own shores and ambitions -- if we can submerge the cold war, outlive it and bury it before it buries us -- then we can permit the tide of human progress to drive out <sup>begin to flow</sup> the tides of war.

I have come today to pledge our help to the United Nations and all its members -- to seek the rule of law -- to find a peace that endures -- and to build a world in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved forever.

