

**DRAFT SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE  
10th ANNIVERSARY CEREMONY OF THE  
SIGNING OF THE UN CHARTER IN  
SAN FRANCISCO**

This, my second appearance before the United Nations, is for me, personally, a moment of tremendous importance.

Ten years ago today in this city, in this building, on this spot, there occurred an event charged with universal drama and hope.

Ten years ago today the Charter of the United Nations was signed by the \_\_\_\_\_ founding members, and into a shattered but hopeful world was born the international organization fashioned by most, if not all, of its founders to be the supreme instrument of world peace.

Yet, at that precise moment, two future events, or rather, one unknown event and one undisclosed program lurked unseen in the shadows of this building.

The unknown event was to change the whole world. Sixty-five (?) days later, the first atomic bomb burst over Hiroshima.

The undisclosed program was destined to undermine and almost destroy this organization, created, designed and articulated on the basic assumption that there would be peace in the world -- peace to be maintained, not a peace to be achieved. As we all know, that peace never came.

Thus the United Nations came into being in ignorance of the

Atomic Age and on the false assumption that there would immediately

-2-

be peace.

It is therefore a near miracle, in the face of these fundamental flaws, that the United Nations has endured as an effective world agent of peace.

And because of that near miracle, both my country and myself, its Chief Executive, wish to pay respectful and high tribute to you whose faith, and patience, and courage, and wisdom, has brought this organization through these first ten tumultuous and frequently terrifying years.

Now you face your second decade. But you face it with the cumulative experience of the first ten years as well as with the awful knowledge of nuclear weapons and the realization that peace still totters precariously on a perilous knife-edge.

But despite this somber knowledge, sufficiently grave to engender despair after ten long years of effort, there is a fascinating osmosis at work in the world today by which, through the invisible channels of communication of the human mind and spirit, the summer of 1955 has become once again a summer of high hopes for peace in the world.

And again, as it has unswervingly for 10 years, the American people and their Government, wish to proclaim their loyalty to the goals and methods incorporated in the charter of the United Nations.

I have therefore come here today, a sharer of this new hope, as an act of rededication to the proposition that peace

Approved For Release 2000/08/30 : CIA-RDP80-01446R000100170008-1

-3-

War.

It is a fact of the enduring logic of our national faith for me to say that although the word of America is pledged to defend this nation, its friends and its allies from aggression wherever it may appear, that the heart of America remains pledged to peace wherever it can honorably be found.

\*\*\*\*\*

A month from now I shall be talking with my colleagues at the Four-Power Conference. Whether at that time we will be able to come to the initial decisions required to start the long process of dismantling the terrible apparatus erected since 1945, I do not know. It will depend upon the one hand whether the limited, but real, degree of security, that the Free World has laboriously constructed is not thereby endangered, and it will depend on the other hand whether the realization of the free world's determination and ability to defend itself has at long last affected the political strategy as well as the political tactics of those who had hoped and planned otherwise.

The policy of the United States and therefore the course I shall pursue, is simple in purpose, and I feel that this is the time and this is the audience before which I should speak as clearly and simply as

-4-

As a member -- as a founding member -- of the United Nations what shall this Nation's purpose be? It will be to bring to life the fundamental principle of the United Nations Charter.

Let me go back 10 years. Cynics have described it as our age of innocence, but in innocence there is faith and, frequently, truth.

The Charter of the United Nations is based upon a simple principle. It is this: -- the pursuit of national security must be reconciled with the right of individual nations to develop the kind of political and economic systems they themselves choose. This is the crux of the matter. Here is where the world has gone astray since 1945.

Let me put this matter bluntly. We have seen in the past ten years a legitimate effort to protect Russian national security mixed with an illegitimate method, the method of imposition from the outside of a foreign, political and economic system. It is this method which has split the world. It is this method which has time after time brought us to the brink of war. It is this method which has denied the peoples of Russia and of vast sections of the world the security they seek and the standards of human welfare which are within their immediate grasp.

I realize fully that it would be ill-considered folly for me to propose or even insinuate that the roles should be reversed. Russia is entitled to national security just as much as the United States and I am prepared to consider any measures designed to increase the national



-6-

with strength and the right".

Now is the time therefore to set forth these principles in terms of the World as it is, and the World as it might be. Today I shall try to avoid the subtleties of diplomatic language in the hope that today's straight talk may be of assistance in our future, possibly more complicated and detailed discussions.

What are the visible obstacles to genuine peace in the World?

There are five:

1. the Division of Germany
2. the Iron Curtain
3. the stated determination of Communist China to conquer Formosa and the Government of Chiang-Kai-Shek.
4. The Atomic Arms Race
5. the over-all question of Armaments and Military Establishments.

The Division of Germany is unnatural and therefore dangerous, and therefore it will not endure. The problem that confronts us, all of us, is not just when, but how the inevitable reunification of Germany will take place.

Russia is apparently terrified at the prospect even of Germany's limited rearmament as a member of the Atlantic Defense Community. Let me reassure Russia on that score. Germany's twelve divisions will not attack Russia's one hundred and twelve. Nor will the soldiers of France or Great Britain or the United States or Belgium or Holland or Norway or Italy or Turkey or Greece or Denmark, etc., rush into such a preposterously imprudent fray. Their sole strength resides in their unity and that unity came into being and will continue to exist only for defense.

One and all they seek only security. They do not covet one acre of the Russian homeland nor do they desire to subjugate one single Russian citizen.

Their sense of security would be greatly enhanced if Germany were peacefully reunited as a result of free elections.

The greatest deterrent to outbreaks of passionate nationalism is a calm and strong spirit of sovereignty. All of Germany, not just part, is entitled to that spirit of sovereignty.

I am, therefore, prepared to propose to my colleagues at the forthcoming Four-Power Conference that all foreign troops be withdrawn from the German Federal Republic, from East Germany and from Berlin (excepting only the minimum essential guards for existing military installations) during a four-month period necessary to organize and carry out free all-German elections, under the supervision and control of the United Nations.



After these elections, a truly sovereign Germany will have the right to reinstate or deny foreign troops on its soil or to participate or not in the Western European Union. This freedom of choice in a sovereign and reunited Germany is something we and our British and French allies have already made explicitly clear over a year ago at the Berlin Conference.

Would a Germany united by peaceful rather than violent means be a menace to the security of Russia? I do not believe so-- if there is a will to achieve collective security under the principles of the United Nations. If there is patience; if there is a willingness to envisage new methods, a united and sovereign Germany organized into all of Europe, with all that this implies, will be a threat to no one.

More than that, I am aware from everything that I have seen and heard that the people of Germany know that their destiny lies in making a maximum constructive contribution to the emergence of a peaceful, productive and increasingly united European Continent.

Three months ago I would hardly have considered it productive even to mention the Iron Curtain. But with the sudden Russian reversal on the Austrian State Treaty, I sense the first real opportunity since that curtain dropped, and dangerously split Europe,

-11-

to persuade the keepers of the curtain that it is to their interest to raise it.

A split Germany is a menace to peace, how much greater a menace is the split of Europe itself. From Warsaw to Paris, from Budapest to Brussels, from Riga to Rome, all Europeans know that there will be no real peace and security in the world until the nations and peoples of Europe can move and trade and exchange freely the goods and ideas which are the product of a common culture, over the length and breadth of that great continent.

If history can teach us anything it teaches us that these people will once again be free. Here, as in the case of Germany, the question arises of when and how. Why can it not be now. Why can it not be peacefully and productively. The mighty Soviet Union has it within its power instantly to secure its own security through adherence to the United Nations Charter by giving these peoples the right to choose their own political and economic systems, thereby restoring their sovereignty in order to permit them to make their free and productive contributions to a peaceful and prosperous Europe and therefore to the security of Russia.

As sovereign nations they would have the right to choose the form of security they considered best adapted to their national interest,

whether it be alliance with West or the East or neutrality.

Then, at last, the picture of a genuine and not an artificial Europe would begin to emerge -- a geographical unit, culturally united, politically sovereign, economically viable and free from fear.

When political freedom and national sovereignty has been reestablished for all of Europe, if Russia desired a further guarantee of the peaceful and non-aggressive intentions of the Western European Union, I, for one, would gladly endorse the idea of a mutual non-aggression pact between WEU and Europe.

In Asia we are confronted with an extremely grave situation. On the Island of Formosa and on certain adjacent islands, resides a government recognized by my government, bound to it not only by recent treaties but by long association, and during World War III, by comradeship in arms.

Across a small body of water on the mainland of China is a political regime which came into power and has maintained itself in power by means abhorrent to every American. That regime, officially and unofficially, through propaganda and State pronouncements, has continued to assert its determination to attack, conquer, and liquidate the government on the Island of Formosa.

-13-

That regime participated militarily in the Korean War to the extent of close to a million armed men, after the aggressive North Korean forces had ceased to exist as a military entity. And today in Korea, as in Germany, as in Eastern Europe there exists an unnatural division between North and South Korea, existing only through the presence and arms of the Chinese Communist regime.

The fact that a number of our friends and allies has recognized this Chinese Communist regime in no way alters the American reality of the American position. Nor does it impair the relationship of this nation with these other nations, which for their own good and sufficient reasons have chosen to recognize the Chinese Communists.

There has been talk of "Cease Fire" negotiations. We have repeatedly said that we would be glad to participate in such talks. That offer still stands. But a cease-fire between Formosa and the mainland is not enough for peace in Asia. Tension continues to exist not because of any threats of Formosa against the mainland, but because of the mainland regime's proclaimed determination to conquer Formosa. Tension exists also because of the unnatural division of Korea.

The reunification of Korea and the renunciation of aggressive intentions against Formosa by the Chinese Communist regime, would constitute major steps in the relaxation of Asian tensions.

- 15 - (no page 14)

But behind all of this, for all its gravity and danger, lies something even more grave and more dangerous, the threat, the possibility of Atomic warfare. Unless we can resolve that dread problem we will have removed the small clouds but left the big one.

The simple essence of the control of Atomic armaments is that no system of control can provide real security unless it is operated under, and backed by, truly effective measures of mutual inspection.

In 1946 (?), when the United States put before the United Nations the plan for the limitation and control of Atomic weapons, that was a sincere, and at the time, effective plan. Recent plans have been distinguished more by cleverness than sincerity -- how to get the other fellow to disarm without giving up anything yourself. It is time once again to give up cleverness and return to the sincere approach.

At best this will be a formidable problem. Can effective measures of mutual inspection be reconciled with the freedom of nations to pursue their own political and economic life. This government believes that this reconciliation is possible and I shall put before the forthcoming conference specific measures to this end. I can assure you, here today, that we shall ask of the Russians no more than we are prepared to do ourselves.

- 16 -

But the thought of Atomic Warfare, dreadful and absolute as it sounds, is never-the-less no more than the most terrible weapon in the total arsenal of war. To be killed over the months by the thousands of on-rushing military hordes, armed for the full panoply of so-called conventional weapons, is only relatively a more cheerful prospect, than to be annihilated by the thousands in one thermo-nuclear instant. So, if genuine peace is to come to the world a solution must be found to the problem of general armament military establishments, as well as to Atomic warfare.

Here also we run into the problem of effective measures of mutual inspection; the problem of clever arithmetic vs. a genuine desire for mutually balanced, effective defense; and here again I shall lay before the forthcoming conference specific measures.

But I would be today guilty of less honesty than I am prepared to ask of others, if I did not also state a warning.

Assuming that the best happens; assuming that we move toward an effective system of armament control with satisfactory measures for mutual inspection; under no foreseeable circumstances can the United States ever again turn in on itself and leave its security in other hands. In the company of all other nations, large and small, who share our passionate belief in essential national

- 17 -

freedom, we will maintain eternal vigilance and never relax our insistence on the satisfactory enforcement of arrived-at provisions.

Although I have had to recite for you a long list of bad things, of dangerous things, that have happened since 1945, there has also been much that is good and wholesome and dynamically hopeful. These good things lend added reason and added urgency for all of us to capitalize on the psychological impact of this 10th Anniversary year and move forward toward peace with renewed vigor and increased speed.

When the war ended the Big Three represented virtually the only effective source of power and influence in the world. This is no longer the case. Power and influence have spread in many directions.

In free Asia, in the Middle East and in Africa new aspirations for independence, human dignity and economic progress, are not merely present but beginning to produce heartening results. We are witnessing in these areas a great revolutionary change, a peaceful revolution, which the United States views with hope and happy excitement, and with which the United States will continue to engage itself around the world in the many acts of effective partnership

- 18 -

called for by developing circumstances.

The Latin American nations, more advanced along the road to political and economic and social maturity, have become more than just Good Southern Neighbors, they are today hemispheric partners, with whom our policy of partnership for growth goes forward at an ever accelerating pace.

Power and influence have more than spread in many directions. Men in many nations have taken the measure of the world in which they find themselves, and they are asserting with conviction and confidence the policies they wish to see followed within their nations and on the world scene.

This trend, this force, this surge is becoming so great, so fast, that it is inconceivable that this second half of the century could go down in history as the age of satellite states.

The influence of the United States depends now, and will continue to depend increasingly on whether we are an effective force for peace, for individual material progress and, above all, for national independence and human dignity. This belief of the United States in these things is no new belief. It is as old as the nation and was set down in writing by our founding fathers before the United States was a nation.



- 19 -

It is in this spirit, with the full realization of these national responsibilities, with the all too complete knowledge of the dangers and difficulties ahead, and yet with complete confidence that the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, will in the end prevail throughout the world, that I will go to the forthcoming Four-Power Conference.

In April 1953 in my first public address on the subject of armaments I said: "This Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of savings achieved by disarmament, to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be to help other peoples to develop the undeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom."

This pledge remains unchanged. It is my fervent hope that the summer of 1955 will witness a change in the response to this appeal.

There is no price tag attached to this except the freedom of all nations.