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Excerpts from a Speech by Rep. Gerald R. Ford before the Lowell Rotary Club

We have turned the corner into a new era in foreign affairs.

We are embarked on a foreign policy program that can provide the framework for a durable peace. We are pursuing a policy that contains great promise and hope for future generations.

I am speaking of the foreign policy doctrine enunciated by President Nixon when he said we will help those of our friends who are willing to help themselves.

The Monroe Doctrine said to Europe, "Stay out of the western hemisphere." The Truman Doctrine said to the Soviet Union, "Stay out of countries that want to remain non-Communist." The Nixon Doctrine says, "The nations of each part of the world should assume the primary responsibility for their own well-being; and we will help them do that."

The Monroe, Truman and Nixon Doctrines were enunciated at a critical turning point in our history. The Monroe and Truman Doctrines were right for their time; the Nixon Doctrine is right for our time.

The Nixon Doctrine says: "We shall be faithful to our treaty commitments, but we shall reduce our involvement and our presence in other nations' affairs."

Our Vietnam policy corresponds with the Nixon Doctrine. It is part and parcel of it. It fits into a special niche in the general framework of our new foreign policy.

Today there is much talk about reordering our priorities. We are doing just that—domestically and in foreign affairs.

One of the priorities high on everyone's list is getting American manpower and dollar commitments out of the war in Southeast Asia. Where there is disagreement, it involves the speed and circumstances under which we should withdraw.

When President Nixon took office he was faced with three alternatives in Vietnam. The first was further escalation of the war in an effort to "win it." The second choice was immediate withdrawal. The third choice was to attempt to build up the ability of the South Vietnamese to maintain their own defense while American forces in Vietnam were withdrawn over a period of months.

The President chose the middle course, a policy of Vietnamizing the war, a policy which would not write off the previous investment of American lives and treasure.
in Vietnam but would end the U.S. ground combat role in Southeast Asia.

The policy of Vietnamization involved the ability of the North Vietnamese to frustrate the plan. This is why the United States was forced to make a sweep of the Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia even while a policy of winding down the war was being followed in Vietnam.

The fighting in South Vietnam has dropped to a very low level. American casualties are at the lowest point in four years. We have withdrawn 110,000 men from Vietnam and will withdraw another 150,000 by next spring, bringing the total withdrawals to 260,000. We have also reaffirmed our proposals for a negotiated peace in Vietnam and have named a new chief negotiator with fresh instructions.

As for Vietnamization, it is not just a word. Those who wanted us to pull our immediately are being proved wrong even while they continue with their calls for "peace now and never mind the price."

The Cambodian Operation was a tremendous success despite the domestic furor it caused. The Communists lost vast stores of supplies, a fact which is reflected in the current low level of fighting in Vietnam. And now the Communists see a marshaling of South Vietnamese, Cambodian and Thai forces to resist the reestablishment of Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia while U.S. air power continues to interdict their supply routes.

Events in Cambodia have not widened the war. It has been an Indochina War ever since the Communists violated the neutrality of Laos and Cambodia to pursue their designs on South Vietnam. What has been widened is the commitment of the people of Cambodia and Thailand to resist a threat to their own security which had been tolerated too long.

We have seen the meaning of the Nixon Doctrine spelled out dramatically. It is more than just words. A serious threat to the safe withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam has been overcome. Nations which must accept more responsibility for their own survival under the Nixon Doctrine have shown a willingness to do exactly that.

The Nixon Doctrine also is working in the Middle East. While the cease-fire there is only a first step toward peace and a tenuous one at that, it is a highly important first step. And it came as a result of Nixon Administration initiative. Now we must work terribly hard to bring about a peace agreement—an agreement which is fair and lasting.

What all of these developments mean is that we have adopted a foreign policy with a new sense of purpose—a steadfast spirit that is carrying us toward stability in the Far East and throughout the World.
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