

"We must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. That is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong, and those who seek our friendship will find it honor-

able. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength, and the just can be strong in the defense of justice."

Thank you, and good night to all of you.

The Failure of our Foreign Policy

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE DOES NOT MEAN PEACE

By BARRY GOLDWATER, *Senator from Arizona*

Delivered over Television, Philadelphia, Pa., October 21, 1964

GOOD EVENING, MY fellow Americans. Before doing anything else I want to call your attention to two headlines in this week's news. "Kremlin shift hints harder line." "Brezhnev hints at improved links with Peking."

These tell a story which seems to contradict the story you heard from President Johnson last Sunday evening. That is why I am here tonight.

I come before you this evening to discuss two events of great importance to the security of this nation and the free world.

As you all know, Khrushchev has been thrown out of the Government of the Soviet Union and the dictatorship of that country has been put into the hands of new leaders.

As you also know, a nuclear explosion took place in Red China within hours of this change in government.

These are momentous events. They present both a challenge and an opportunity to this country. You deserve a straight and honest explanation from each candidate for the Presidency on how he proposes to meet this challenge and exploit this opportunity.

I have said many times, and I repeat it again tonight, that every President owes it to the American people to take them into his full confidence when critical decisions confront the nation. This is particularly true when national security is at stake. We cannot afford—and let me stress that—we simply cannot afford any security risks.

Now what is the significance of these events in the Communist world?

First, the Communist threat to our security has become grave. The dissension in Communist ranks, brought on by a clash of personalities, is being repaired. Red China and the Soviet Union seem to be patching up their differences, and we must look forward to being faced by a more unified Communist movement.

Second, the foreign policy of the present Administration—based on a belief that there are "good" and "bad" Communists—has been an utter failure. It has failed to halt the march of Communism and the testing of nuclear weapons and the spread of nuclear power through the Communist world. This policy, if I may call it that, has instead helped the Communist world through a time of troubles and allowed it to emerge as a greater threat than ever to the freedom of the West.

Third, these events have laid bare—for all to see—the real meaning of "peaceful co-existence." By this slogan the Communists simply mean, "We won't hurt you if you peacefully surrender to us."

Now let's see why these conclusions are so clear. Over the last several years we have all read about the troubles besetting the Communist world. There were grave economic difficulties everywhere—in the Soviet Union, in its European satellites, in Red China and its satellites, in Cuba—everywhere. Beyond that, Mao Tse-tung, the dictator of Red China, was quarreling with Khrushchev, the dictator of the Soviet Union. They were

quarreling over who would be the big boss of the entire Communist movement and what would be the best way to bury us.

Meanwhile, the Communist countries of Eastern Europe were becoming restless and were demanding more independence.

Khrushchev decided that the best way to get out of trouble and to stay on top was to get the West to bail him out. And so he dusted off the old slogan of "peaceful co-existence" and worked it on the leaders of the present Administration with a soft sell. And they fell for it.

Khrushchev, we were being told, was a "good" Communist—one who was concerned, as we were, with finding a peaceful resolution of the conflict between Communist aggression and Western resistance. Only last Sunday Lyndon Johnson paid tribute to him as a man of "good sense and sober judgement."

We were also being told that standing against Khrushchev were the "bad" Communists—namely, his personal enemies in Red China. Why were they "bad"? Because they openly admitted that Communism could not conquer the world without fighting wars against the free nations.

Never mind that Khrushchev vowed to bury us. Never mind that the only difference between "good" and "bad" Communists is a disagreement on how to bury us. Khrushchev thought we would simply surrender without putting up a fight, while the Chinese and some other Communists thought some fighting would be necessary.

But never mind those things. This Administration embarked on the dangerous policy of being nice to the "good" Communists. If their economy fails, sell them wheat at bargain prices. If they are short of cash, give them credit. If they promise not to blow up any more nuclear bombs, sign a treaty giving our solemn and faithful word not to do the same. If they object to our armaments program, cut it back unilaterally. If our pursuit of national interest in Cuba makes them nervous, promise never to rock the boat as long as Communism reigns.

In these and other ways we actively helped Khrushchev over his difficult times. We helped this man who did not hesitate to remind us that he intended to bury us. Listen, for example to what he said last July:

"Of course, when I say that we are against war, I mean aggressive, predatory wars. But there are other wars, wars of national liberation: such wars are just and sacred. We support the peoples who take up arms and uphold their independence and freedom, and we support them not only in words but by concrete deeds."

In other words, it's all right to kill our boys in Vietnam, or Cuba, or the Congo, or anywhere people are being "liberated" by Communism. Do you think for a moment that the United States is not also marked for Communist "liberation"?

And let's just see what the Communists really mean by

"peaceful coexistence." Here's what an official journal of the international Communist movement says:

"Peaceful coexistence, being a form of the class struggle between capitalism and Socialism, provides, as the events of recent years have shown, a favorable climate for the revolutionary struggles of all peoples. It is in the conditions of peaceful coexistence that the colonial system of imperialism has disintegrated, that the Socialist revolution has triumphed in Cuba, and that the working class and democratic movements have grown in the capitalist countries. Peaceful coexistence, then, does not signify 'accommodation' with imperialism, 'reconciliation' between the oppressed and the oppressors, or 'co-existence of ideologies' but the future development of the class struggle—economic, political and ideological."

Mark these words well. This is what the Communists really mean by "peaceful coexistence." They do not mean "peace." "Peaceful coexistence" is simply the Communist strategy for world conquest. Communists may sometimes disagree about the best tactics for carrying out this strategy, but they all agree on the strategy.

Now the only thing any reasonable man can conclude is that the present Administration has made the mistake of thinking that "peaceful coexistence" is the same as "peace." And it has made the mistake of trying to distinguish different kinds of Communism and of supporting some and not others. It has ignored the fact that all Communists agree on the same goal—a Communist-dominated world. And so this Administration chose Khrushchev as the "good" Communist who should be supported. But some months ago it began to be clear that Khrushchev was not doing so well, even with help from the United States.

Khrushchev pushed his tactical differences with the Chinese leaders too far last summer. His call for a conference of all Communist parties gave those parties an opportunity to disapprove of him and his tactics. Such objections came out in the open in the testament supposedly left by Togliatti, the leader of the Italian Communist party, who died during a visit to the Soviet Union last July. Finally—just a little over a week ago—the French Communist party flatly refused to attend the conference and declared its support for the greater independence of parties.

While this opposition was growing outside the Soviet Union, interesting changes in party and government were taking place inside as well. Khrushchev's self-appointed successor, Frol Kozlov, disappeared. They said only that he had suffered a stroke. A man named Brezhnev gradually took his place in the party organization, moving from his ceremonial post as head of state. Some old Communists, such as Suslov, who prosecuted the case against Khrushchev, remained in power. Men little known in the West, such as Panomorov, seemed to have increasing influence. Mikoyan, the hardy perennial of the Soviet scene, and Kosygin, a relative newcomer who was to take Khrushchev's place in the Government, shifted about in their positions. New men rose up in the party and Government structure—men like Ustinov, who has been connected with the armament industry. There were other organizational changes and counter-changes.

Soviet and Chinese party emissaries met in a conference in East Germany. Rumors flew of an imminent nuclear explosion in Red China, and these were given credence by our own Secretary of State.

In short, there were many signs that something was afoot.

Yet this Administration was caught completely by surprise when Khrushchev was deposed. Last Sunday on television, the Secretary of State confirmed the fact that the Administration was caught flat-footed by Khrushchev's fall.

The Administration was undoubtedly caught even more by

surprise when the leaders of Red China immediately congratulated the new rulers of the Soviet Union and forecast a new era of friendly relations between the two countries. Here is what their message said:

"On learning that Comrade Brezhnev has been elected first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union and that Comrade Kosygin has been appointed chairman of the Council of Ministers, we extend you our warm greetings.

"It is our sincere wish that the fraternal Soviet people will achieve new successes in their constructive work in all fields and in the struggle for the defense of world peace.

"The Chinese Communist party, the Chinese Government, and the Chinese people rejoice at every progress made by the great Soviet Union, the Communist party of the Soviet Union, and the Soviet people on their road of advance.

"The recent successful launching and landing of the Soviet spaceship represented another great achievement of the working people of the Soviet Union. We wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to convey our sincere congratulations to you, and through you to the great Soviet people.

"The Chinese and Soviet parties and the two countries unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

"May the fraternal, unbreakable friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples continuously develop.

"May the Chinese and Soviet peoples win one victory after another in their common struggle against imperialism headed by the United States and for the defense of world peace."

Can you imagine a stronger message of friendship and declaration of unity? And remember this was sent by the four top leaders of Red China—the chairman of the party, the President, the head of the armed forces, and the Prime Minister. And here is the response given this week by Brezhnev, the new Communist leader.

"Our party will strive for the strengthening of the unity of the great community of the fraternal Socialist countries on a fully equal footing and on the basis of correct combination of the common interests of the Socialist community with the interests of the people of each country, the development of an all-sided cooperation between the Socialist states, in our common struggle for peace and socialism."

Where is the Chinese-Soviet rift today? Can we even be sure that the Soviet Union did not take a hand in the nuclear explosion? What does the test ban treaty mean now—if it ever meant anything? You may recall that I warned of the possibility, when the test-ban treaty was before the Senate, that the Soviets might easily evade the treaty by conducting their tests in Red China. Surely nothing prevents them from doing so.

So where do we stand?

Every sign before us now says that our policy toward the Communists has been a failure. It was bad enough to make a fatal mistake about Nikita Khrushchev. It was bad enough to have a foreign policy—if we may call it that—based on a choice between "good" and "bad" Communists. It was bad enough to count on personal diplomacy to solve the problems of a clash of systems.

But worst of all was the insane policy of strengthening an enemy who has sworn to bury us.

We are now brought face to face with reality. We must now confront an enemy reunified and strengthened by our policy of aid.

This Administration once faced an enemy plagued with disunity and trouble, and it followed a policy that brought back unity and greater strength.

This Administration once had friends in the free world who

were unified in purpose and strength, and it followed a policy that tore them asunder. This Administration has lived in the world of empty wishes and slogans.

It is now time for this nation to move forward into the world of reality and good sense. And I pledge to you that I will lead you back to sanity in our foreign relations.

Here are the three things we must do immediately in establishing a sensible policy toward Communism.

First, we must rebuild our once grand alliance. And we must start with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Here in these 15 countries rests more than two-thirds of the world's productive capacity. Here live 470 million intelligent and able people. The economic power of our North Atlantic allies, taken together, equals our own.

Here are the elements of power in the free world. Here are all the elements we need, already in being—just waiting to be put in use in ending the Communist threat.

Only one thing is missing, but it means everything. That one thing is unity—unity in cause, unity in purpose and unity in action. In its place we have disunity and disarray, brought to the free world by four years of drift, deception, defeat.

How can we create unity out of chaos? It will not be easy, but it can be done by a bold and joint attack on the roots of the problem.

I have already pledged that one of my first acts as President will be to initiate a call for a North Atlantic conclave. That conclave will have a single purpose—to create a North Atlantic community unified in spirit, purpose and action.

As the first move, I will name a blue ribbon delegation of American citizens to meet with the delegates from other NATO nations to plan the conclave. Those great statesmen of this nation who helped build NATO should join in leading the American delegation.

Only through such a bold venture can we create a climate of true friendship and partnership. We must reclaim our friends and reassure them of our own friendship through concrete deeds. We must treat them as genuine partners in the pursuit of freedom.

The second thing we must do is to recognize that Communism is our enemy—the whole of Communism, not just some faction of the movement. After all, we spend \$50 billion a year to defend ourselves against the "good" Communists—so-called by this Administration. We must understand the

nature, aim and strategy of the international Communist movement. We must never let the zigs and zags in tactics take our eyes off the ultimate strategy, which is plainly and simply a blueprint for world revolution and world conquest.

The third thing to do is to confront Communism with a firm policy of resistance. We must move as quickly as possible to rebuild a policy of strength and resolution with the overriding goal of promoting our national interests. This is the only policy Communist leaders understand and respect. We will keep the peace if—and only if—we take a firm stand against Communist aggression; if—and only if—we insist on concrete concessions and safeguards every step of the way toward a lasting peace.

Of course we must act prudently and cautiously. Of course we must make responsible use of our great power.

But let us never again fall into the trap of thinking that weakness means prudence, or that inaction means caution. These are the truly irresponsible policies. These are the policies that have led this Administration down the road to failure and our nation to the brink of disaster.

We face a challenge and an opportunity. Before us lies a new team in control of the Soviet Union. There will be days and months and perhaps even years of jockeying for power. We cannot see the final outcome.

But what we do now—in the immediate future—will play a major role in shaping the future of freedom throughout the world. If we have the will and wisdom to show the Communist leaders that we firmly intend to protect and promote our interests, we will blunt the thrust of Communist aggression. We will deny success to their ambitions for expansion. We will cause the Communist leaders to look inward to their own internal problems and to work out solutions—solutions that can be found only through relaxing the totalitarian despotism that now reigns in the Communist world. Then we can have a real hope for lasting peace.

My fellow Americans, you have a clear choice to make. You may continue the bankrupt policy of this Administration—a policy of drift and deception. This can only lead to defeat, to an ultimate choice between total war or total surrender.

Or you can strike out once again on the path of peace through strength and resolution. This is the only responsible course, the only course to peace and freedom.

I have faith in the choice you will make. And with your help and with God's blessing I will take up the task of leadership.

Peaceful Co-existence

SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE

By LEONID I. BREZHNEV, *First Secretary of the Soviet Communist party*

Delivered at a reception in Red Square, Moscow, Russia, October 19, 1964

THE WORKING people of the Soviet Union have accomplished another outstanding scientific, engineering and human exploit. An new, powerful Soviet rocket for the first time in the world launched into outer space a multi-seat ship in which a close-knit team of people—Soviet people—were working.

Comrades, specialists of various fields of knowledge traveled to outer space together: an engineer, a scientist and a doctor, who implemented an extensive program of scientific work.

The whole world knows the glorious names of our cosmonauts—Comrades Gagarin, Titov, Nikolayev, Popovich, Niko-

layeva-Tereshkova and Bykovsky. Now a new worthy replenishment has joined this famous family. It now includes the crew of the Voskhod spaceship—Vladimir Mikhailovich Komarov, Konstantin Petrovich Feoktistov, Boris Borisovich Yegorov.

And now they are here, amid us in Moscow's Red Square. All Soviet people warmly greet you, our glorious hero cosmonauts. The entire planet is applauding you.

Comrade Komarov was the first man in the world to pilot a multi-seat spaceship and together with his comrades conducted an important scientific investigation. Comrade Feok-