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Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished guests and
my very dear friends:

When I met with you in January to report on the State
of the Union, I concentrated on two subjects which (I believed)
were uppermost in the minds of the American people -- the
recovery of our domestic economy and a specific program to
make the United States independent of foreign sources of energy.

I thank the Congress for the constructive action it
has taken in response to my economic recommendations, and I
look forward to your early approval of a comprehensive energy
program to meet our nation's long-range needs as well as any
emergency.

Tonight it is my purpose to review our relations with
the rest of the world, (not in an atmosphere of crisis and
calamity but) in the spirit of candor and consultation which
I have sought to maintain with my former colleagues and with
priority of my Presidency to sustain and strengthen the mutual trust and respect which must exist among Americans and their government if we are to deal with the challenges confronting us at home and abroad.

I need not remind you that the leadership of the United States of America, since the end of World War II, has sustained and advanced the security, well-being and freedom of millions of human beings, beside ourselves and, despite many mistakes and some setbacks, has made peace a real prospect for us and for all nations.

I know firsthand that Congress has been a full partner in the development and support of this American foreign policy which five Presidents before me have carried forward, with changes of course but not of destination.

The course which our country chooses in the world today has never been of greater significance -- for ourselves as
a nation and for the future of the international community.

We build from a strong foundation.

Our alliances with the great industrial democracies in Europe, North America and Japan remain strong, with a greater degree of consultation and equity than ever before.

With the Soviet Union we have moved across a broad front toward a more stable, if still competitive and adversary relationship.

We have begun to control the spiral of strategic nuclear armaments.

After two decades of mutual estrangement we have forged an opening with the People's Republic of China.

In the best American tradition we have committed our influence and good offices to help contain conflicts and settle disputes in many regions of the world -- often with success.

We have, for example, helped the parties of the Middle East take the first halting steps toward peaceful coexistence.

(MORE)
We have opened a new dialogue with Latin America looking toward a (more mature) hemispheric partnership.

We have exercised international leadership on the great new issues of interdependence, such as energy and food.

The American people can be proud of what their nation has achieved and helped others to achieve. But we have, all the same, suffered setbacks and disappointments in foreign policy. Sometimes events were uncontrollable; sometimes we imposed difficulties upon ourselves.

We live in a time of testing and a time of change. Our world — a world of economic uncertainty, political unrest, and threats to the peace — does not allow us the luxury of abdication or domestic discord.

Some 200 years ago a great American revolutionary, Samuel Adams, spoke words that can guide us now. He said "the necessity of the times, more than ever, calls for our
utmost circumspection, deliberation, fortitude and perseverance."

Those same qualities must guide us today. Our purpose is not to point the finger of blame, but to build upon our many successes, to repair damage where we find it, to recover our balance, and to move ahead as a united people. Tonight is a time for straight talk among friends about where we stand and where we’re going.

Indochina

A vast human tragedy has befallen our friends in Vietnam and Cambodia.

The chances for a lasting peace after the last American fight left the Vietnam peace accords rested on two central premises: First, that if necessary the United States would help sustain the terms of the Paris Accords we signed in 1973; and second, that the United States would provide adequate economic and military assistance to South Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese, from the moment they signed the Paris Peace Accords, systematically violated the cease-fire and
other provisions of the agreement — flagrantly disregarding the ban on infiltration of troops into the South, they increased their forces to the unprecedented level of 350,000.

In direct violation of the agreement, they sent in the most modern equipment in massive amounts. Meanwhile, they continued to receive large quantities of supplies and arms from their friends.

In this situation, America — torn as it was by a decade of war — was helpless to respond. We had deprived ourselves by law of the ability to enforce the agreement — thus giving North Vietnam assurance that it could violate that agreement with impunity. And we reduced our economic and arms aid to South Vietnam and demonstrated increasing reluctance to give sufficient support to a nation struggling for its independence.

Encouraged by these developments, the North Vietnamese in recent months began sending even their reserve divisions...
into South Vietnam. Eighteen Divisions, virtually their entire army, are now in South Vietnam. The Government of Vietnam, uncertain of further American assistance, hastily ordered a strategic withdrawal into more defensible enclaves. This extremely difficult maneuver, decided upon without consultations, was badly managed, and led to panic. The results are painfully obvious and profoundly moving.

In my first public comment on this tragic development, I called for a new sense of national unity and purpose in our present adversity. I said I would not engage in recriminations or attempts to assess blame, nor should any of us in times like these. The important thing is that we keep our nerve and our essential unity as a powerful but peace-loving nation.

In the same spirit I welcomed the statement of the distinguished Majority Leader of the United States Senate earlier this week that this is not the time for either the Executive or the Legislative Branch to begin pointing the finger.
agree with Senator Mansfield when he says: "If there is any blame to be attached, and there is a great deal, we must all share in it. None of us is guiltless. It is time for the Congress and the President to work together in the area of foreign as well as domestic policy."

I accept my good friend's wise conclusion: "Let us start afresh." He is correct in his assessment that "the people cry for leadership and that leadership can come from the President assuming the initiative and the Congress working with him in tandem."

I am prepared to work with the Congress and I am assuming the initiative. In the conduct of foreign affairs, Presidential initiative and Presidential freedom to act swiftly in emergencies are essential to our national interest. Our forefathers learned this painful lesson in our nation's infancy under the Articles of Confederation; it was one of the primary reasons for the writing of the Constitution and the creation of the President's office.
To prove that I mean what I say about accepting my share of the blame: I was, as you know, a principal party to the compromise between President Nixon and the House of Representatives in June of 1973 which forbid the use of American armed forces in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam after August 15 of that year.

No one regrets that action more than I do now. Together with subsequent reductions in military and economic assistance by the Congress, and other restrictions, the United States was stripped of any realistic ability to influence events in Vietnam.

This gave the clear signal to Hanoi that the Paris Accords could be violated with impunity. And North Vietnam has done so.

But let us start afresh. What are the options left to us today:

First, with respect to North Vietnam, I hereby call upon Hanoi -- and ask the Congress to join me in this call -- to cease military operations immediately and to honor the terms of the cease-fire agreement. The United States is urgently requesting the signatories of the Paris Conference to meet their
obligation to use their influence to halt the fighting and enforce the 1973 Accords. Diplomatic notes to this effect have been sent to all members of the Paris Conference, including the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

Second, with respect to South Vietnam, for whose right to exist as a free and independent nation more than 55,000 Americans shed their blood and gave their lives, under the leadership of three Presidents with the concurrence of Congress.

When I was asked at a news conference in California whether all this American sacrifice had been in vain, I was frankly stumped by the question. Perhaps I answered it imperfectly, but upon reflection, my answer is qualified "no." Individual sacrifice for others is never in vain as a moral virtue; but for a nation, its heavy cost requires a commensurate end result. Our commitment to freedom in Southeast Asia surely will not have been in vain if, even now, we admit past mistakes and act
The situation in South Vietnam and Cambodia, as I warned in ____, has now reached a critical phase requiring immediate and positive decisions by this government -- and I have made mine.

The options before us are few, and time is short. On the one hand, the United States can simply do nothing; let the government of South Vietnam save itself and what is left of its territory if it can, let those South Vietnamese civilians who have worked with us for a decade, and their families, save their lives if they can; in short, shut our eyes and wash our hands of the whole matter -- if we can. Or, on the other hand, undertake a far broader commitment, return with our troops and our tanks and our aircraft and our artillery, attempt to establish a defendable perimeter around Saigon; carry the war to the enemy, bomb Hanoi and re-mine its harbor, and when the situation is stabilized, start once again to negotiate a settlement and a withdrawal of U.S. involvement -- another
exchange of prisoners and another peace accord which would probably last no longer than the first.

I cannot seriously entertain either of these extreme options nor do I believe the Congress and the American people would do so.

There remains are two narrower options. First, stick with my standing request to the Congress to use all of the military assistance funds already authorized, an additional appropriation of $300,000,000 this year; plus increased funds for economic and humanitarian purposes. Or, increase my requests for both emergency military and humanitarian assistance to levels which the best military judgment might enable the South Vietnamese to halt the onrushing aggression, provide for the orderly removal of American and South Vietnamese civilians to places of safety, and permit some kind of negotiated political settlement between the North and South Vietnamese under the good offices of ourselves and other interested powers. (MORE)
There are very limited options. I cannot say with certainty that either will save the situation. It is still subject to unilateral decisions by the two Vietnamese governments as well as the brutal passions of panic and chaos we have already witnessed. But I will share with the Congress and the American people my considerations and conclusions in this difficult dilemma.

Firstly, I have received a full report from General Weyand, who just returned from Vietnam, indicating that the current military situation is critical, but that South Vietnam is planning to continue to defend itself with the resources available. However, he feels that if there is to be any chance of success in this defense plan, South Vietnam needs urgently an additional $722 million in military assistance from the United States.

Second, I must consider the safety of some 6,000 Americans who remain in Vietnam, primarily in the Saigon area, and their families, and of tens of thousands of South Vietnamese employees of the United States mission, American news agencies,
contractors and businesses for many years who, with their dependents, are already known to be marked for massacre by the North Vietnamese. Also on the purge lists are South Vietnamese intellectuals, professors and teachers, editors and opinion-leaders who have supported the South Vietnamese cause and the alliance with the United States, to whom we have a profound moral obligation. It may be argued that their own armed forces and their own government cannot protect them. But we would be haunted for years if we refused to try and help them find places of safety to the extent it lies within our power.

I have also reviewed the exchanges of communications between former President Nixon and President Thieu, made in the course of negotiations which led to the 1973 (?) withdrawal of American armed forces from South Vietnam, the return of American and Vietnamese prisoners of war, and the acceptance by Saigon of the Paris Peace Accords.

I must say to the Congress that in the eyes of the world the government of the United States is a continuous entity.
decisively to reaffirm our dedication to our finest principles.

It has been said that the United States is overextended; that we have too many commitments too far from home; that we must re-examine what our truly vital interests are and shape our strategy to conform to them. I find no fault with this as theory, but in the real world such a course can only be pursued carefully and in close coordination with solid progress toward overall reduction in worldwide tensions. [We are following such a policy, with hopeful progress at Vladivostok and elsewhere.]

But we cannot in the meantime abandon our allies while our adversaries support and encourage theirs. We cannot dismantle our defenses, our diplomacy or our intelligence capability while others increase and strengthen theirs. [Detente is a two-way street, and it takes both sides to make it safe and smooth for all nations who want to travel toward lasting peace and independence.]

(MORE)
It may be argued that Presidents change and that Congresses change, that we are not bound by the actions of our predecessors. But we are bound, at least in a moral sense, by the promises made in our country’s name upon which others have acted. If we fail to recognize this, no government on earth, ally or adversary, would do business with us knowing that we change our legislative and executive lineups every two or four years.

It is no great secret that the President of the United States at that time did make a commitment to continue military and economic assistance to South Vietnam at adequate levels and for a sufficient time following its acceptance of the Paris Accords to permit it to survive and become self-sustaining. Furthermore, those commitments clearly included an undertaking by the United States to support the integrity of the Paris Accords in the event of their violation by North Vietnam.

I doubt that these commitments are legally binding today under our law. But they bear heavily on our posture towards
the rest of the world, and particularly on our future relations
with the free nations of Asia — Thailand, Japan, the Philippines,
Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of China and
others. These nations must not think for a minute that the United
States is pulling out on them or intends to abandon them to
internal subversion or external aggression. I have therefore
concluded that the national interests of the United States and
the cause of world stability require that we continue to give
both military and humanitarian assistance to the South Vietnamese
government as long as it has any chance of maintaining public
order in the area under its control. The clinching reason
for my decision is the safety of those thousands of Americans
remaining in South Vietnam for whom we are jointly responsible.

Assistance to South Vietnam at this stage must be swift
and ample. Drift and indecision invite far deeper disaster.
The sums I had requested before the major North Vietnamese
offensive and the sudden South Vietnamese retreat are obviously inadequate. Half-hearted action would be worse than none. We must act together, decisively.

I am asking the Congress to approve, within a few days, the sum of $30 million in military assistance and $_____ for economic and humanitarian aid for South Vietnam. I ask the Congress to modify its restriction on the use of U.S. military forces in the Southeast Asia area to permit their limited deployment, if necessary, for the purposes of protecting American lives, and by land and air evacuation along with orderly humanitarian assistance and rescue of Vietnamese refugees whose lives may be endangered, to the maximum extent possible. I also ask the assistance of other nations and international organizations.

I believe that I have the authority to protect American lives under the Constitution but I ask the Congress, which shares the responsibility of safeguarding our national interests, to confirm it before the world as a demonstration of our determination and unity.
* Because of the urgency of the situation, (and to avoid prolonged decision debate in this country) I am ordering the complete Cong. to act on this request by 14 of Nov. not later than.
I hope that this authority will never need be used, but if necessary there will be no time for debate. But we would be rightly condemned if it suddenly proves necessary and is unavailable. Our fellow Americans and friendly South Vietnamese long faithful to us cannot be left stranded by the tactics of the enemy.

I will of course keep the Congress fully advised as this difficult situation develops.

In Cambodia the situation is equally tragic. The United States and the Cambodian Government have each made major efforts — over a long period and through many channels — to end that conflict. But because of their military successes, steady external support, and American legislative restrictions, the Communist side has shown no interest in negotiation, compromise, or a political solution.

And yet, for the past three months the beleaguered people of Phnom Penh have fought on, hoping against hope that the United States would not desert them, but instead provide the arms and ammunition they so badly need.

(MORE)
Several days ago I received a letter from the Acting President of Cambodia, a letter of appeal, and one which I would like to share with you in part.

"Dear Mr. President," he wrote. "As the American Congress reconvenes to reconsider your urgent request for supplemental assistance for the Khmer Republic, I appeal to you to convey to the American legislators our plea not to deny these vital resources to us, if a non-military solution is to emerge from this tragic 5 year old conflict."

"To find a peaceful end to the conflict we need time. I do not know how much time, but we all fully realize that the agony of the Khmer people cannot and must not go on much longer. However, for the immediate future, we need the rice to feed the hungry and the ammunition and weapons to defend ourselves against those who want to impose their will by force of arms. A denial by the American people of the means for us to carry on will leave us no alternative but inevitably abandoning our
search for a solution which will give our citizens some freedom of choice as to their future. For a number of years now the Cambodian people have placed their trust in America. I cannot believe that this confidence was misplaced and that suddenly America will deny us the means which might give us a chance to find an acceptable solution to our conflict."

While our past commitment to Cambodia was less firm than to South Vietnam, it seems to me our moral obligation is greater. Moreover, the integrity of nearby Cambodia takes on new importance with the immediate threat to Saigon. I renew on an equally urgent basis my request for $222 million for Cambodia, and ask Congress to act upon it in a matter of days. Otherwise, it may be too late.

Members of the Congress, my fellow Americans, this is a moment of tremendous tragedy for us and for Indochina. But it is also a time for national resolve. Let us put behind us the bitter divisions which have torn our country for so long.
Let us put an end to self-inflicted wounds. Let us remember that our national unity is our most priceless asset. Let us deny our adversaries the satisfaction of using Vietnam (once again) to pit American against American. Let us be neither hawks nor doves, but Eagles that soar high in strength and serenity.

Above all, let us keep events in Southeast Asia in their proper perspective. Millions of people elsewhere on this earth are watching us anxiously.

* * * * *

At this moment, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, this nation must present to the world a united front.

Let no potential adversary believe that our difficulties or our debates mean a slackening of our national will.
We will stand by our friends.

We will honor our commitments.

We will uphold our country's principles.

The American people know that our strength and authority have helped prevent a third World War for more than a generation. We will not shrink from this duty in the decades ahead.

Let me now review with you the basic elements of our foreign policy, speaking candidly about our strengths and our difficulties.

The Elements of Our Foreign Policy

The cornerstone of our policy, as always, is our strong and tested bond to our allies in Europe and Japan.

Our relations with Western Europe have never been stronger.

There are no peoples with whom America's destiny has been more closely linked. There are no peoples whose friendship and cooperation are more needed for the future. For none of the members of the Atlantic community can be secure, none
can prosper, none can progress unless all do so together. More than ever, these times demand our close collaboration in order to:

-- maintain the sure anchor of our common security in this time of international riptides;

-- work together on the promising negotiations with our potential adversaries;

-- pool our vision and our energies on the great new economic challenges that face us.

The Atlantic nations confront many decisions and complex negotiations. It is time to take stock, to concert our actions, to once again affirm our cohesion and our common destiny. I therefore call upon my colleagues, the other leaders of the Atlantic Alliance, to come together for a reaffirmation of principle, policy and progress at a Western Summit before July 1 of this year.

(MORE)
Before this NATO meeting, I earnestly ask Congress to weigh the broader consequences of past actions on the Cyprus question. Our foreign policy cannot be simply a collection of special economic or ethnic or ideological interests. There must be a concern for the overall action of our international posture. And there must be some recognition of the need for Executive flexibility in the conduct of our foreign policy negotiations.

(Against my warning and advice), our military assistance to an old and faithful ally -- Turkey -- has been cut off by action of the Congress.

We have imposed an embargo on military purchases by Turkey, and were refused to deliver items already paid for -- an unprecedented act against a friend. These moves, I know, were sincerely intended to influence Turkey in the Cyprus negotiations. Yet the result has been to block progress toward reconciliation, thereby prolonging the suffering on Cyprus; to erase our capacity to promote negotiations; and to enhance the danger of conflict.

I recognize immense human suffering on Cyprus.
To acclaim this mere
sell design for world press
and to assume our arts
industrial arts have coheren
the Executive must have

fail, briefly
Our relationship with Turkey is not a gift to Turkey; it is a clear and essential mutual interest. Turkey lies on the rim of the Soviet Union and at the gates to the Middle East. It is vital to the security of the eastern Mediterranean, the southern flank of Western Europe and the collective security of the Western Alliance. Yet as a result of our actions, this traditional friend is on the point of making serious decisions that could weaken its relationship with us and with NATO.

Whatever our judgment of Turkish policy in the Cyprus conflict, which we have been earnestly trying to mediate, it cannot be in the interest of America -- or Greece or Cyprus -- for us to deal with an ally in such a way. I can think of no better contribution to the just resolution of the Cyprus problem, and to the cohesion of the West, than an end to this self-defeating American action.

I therefore call upon the Congress to lift the American arms embargo against our Turkish ally by passing the bipartisan
Mansfield-Scott Bill, now before the Senate. I accept... and... indeed welcome -- the bill's requirement for monthly reports to the Congress on progress toward a Cyprus settlement.

I cannot as a matter of principle and law, as passed by Congress, use a provision, Section 614, to get around the Executive-Legislative confrontation before us.

Our relations with Japan are equally strong and vital as those with NATO. Our Security Treaty is the cornerstone of stability in the vast reaches of Asia and the Pacific, and a fundamental American interest. And our relations are crucial to our mutual prosperity. My warm welcome in Japan last November vividly symbolized for me the friendship and solidarity of this extraordinary partnership. Together we are working energetically on the multilateral agenda -- in trade and energy and food.

We will continue the process of strengthening our mutual security and prosperity when I meet with Prime Minister Miki. To strengthen this fine partnership, Kansai... we act... I shall speak before the Congress... shortly
within the next few months and the Emperor visits the United States this fall.

A vital element of our foreign policy is our relationship with the developing countries -- in Africa, South Asia and East Asia, and Latin America. Our friends there must know that America is a true and concerned friend, reliable in word and deed, to help ensure this common objective. I urge the Congress to reconsider one provision of the 1974 Trade Act which has had an unfortunate and unintended impact on our relations with Latin America, the area of the world with which we have the longest ties of friendship and cooperation. All members of OPEC were excluded from our generalized system of trade preferences. This punished two old American friends, Ecuador and Venezuela, as well as other OPEC nations such as Nigeria and Indonesia, which had not participated in last year's oil embargo. This exclusion has seriously complicated our new dialogue with our friends in this hemisphere.
I therefore call upon the Congress to provide the Executive with the authority to waive those restrictions of the Trade Act that discriminate against our traditional friends.

The interests of America as well as our allies are vitally affected by what happens in the Middle East. So long as that conflict continues, it threatens military crisis, the weakening of our alliances, the stability of the world economy, and confrontation among the nuclear superpowers. These are intolerable risks.

Because we are in a unique position to deal with a unique problem, we have at their request been engaged for the past year and a half in a peacemaking effort unparalleled in the history of the region and the history of the United States. We have pursued it with dedication and without illusions. The issues dividing the parties are vital to them and not amenable to easy or quick solutions.

Our policy has brought remarkable successes. Last year two major disengagement agreements were negotiated and
implemented with our help. For the first time in 30 years a
process of negotiation on the basic political issues was
begun—and is continuing.

Unfortunately, the latest efforts to reach a further
interim agreement between Israel and Egypt have been suspended.

The United States will not be discouraged by this temporary
setback. The momentum toward peace that has been achieved
over the last 18 months must and will be maintained. The
active role of the United States must and will be continued.
The drift toward war must and will be prevented.

I pledge the United States to a major effort for
peace in the Middle East—an effort which I know has the
solid support of the American people and their Congress. We
are now examining how best to proceed. We can assure you
here and now that the United States is prepared to move ahead
on whatever course looks most promising—a return to the
overall settlement or interim agreement, a step-by-step approach if that is feasible, or moving toward a
framework that we have agreed in principle to reexamine
at Geneva. We are prepared to explore new
forms.
a broad overall settlement if it is not. We will not, in any event, tolerate stagnation or a stalemate with all its attendant risks to peace and prosperity and our relations in and outside of the region. We will pursue the American national interest.

The national interest -- and national security -- require as well that we reduce the dangers of war. We shall strive to do so by continuing to improve relations with potential adversaries.

The United States and the Soviet Union share an interest in lessening tensions and building a more stable relationship. During this process we have never had any illusions. We know that we are dealing with a nation that reflects different principles and is our competitor in many parts of the globe. Through a combination of firmness and flexibility, this nation has in recent years laid the basis of a more reliable relationship based on mutual interest and mutual restraint. But we cannot expect the Soviet Union to
show restraint in the face of our weakness or irresolution that tempts it to seek advantages at our expense.

As long as I am President, America will maintain its strength, as a prerequisite for its alliances, and its principles -- so that we can build a more peaceful planet. So long as I am President, we will not be a leader to fish in troubled waters.

Central to U.S.-Soviet relations today is the critical negotiation to control strategic nuclear weapons. We hope to turn the Vladivostok agreements into a final agreement this year, perhaps at the time of the General Secretary's visit to the United States, and thus for the first time put a ceiling on the strategic arms race. This would make a turning point in postwar history and a crucial step in lifting from mankind the threat of nuclear war.

Our use of trade and economic sanctions as weapons to compel the internal conduct of other nations must also be seriously reexamined. However well-intentioned, however much the executive may cherish the goals they were designed to serve, the fact is that some of our recent actions in the economic earlier detente sentence.
field have been self-defeating. They have not achieved the objectives of the Congress: And they have damaged our foreign policy.

The Trade Act of 1974 prohibits most-favored nation treatment, credit and investment guarantees and commercial agreements with the Soviet Union, so long as the emigration policies of the USSR fail to meet certain specified criteria. The Soviet Union has rejected a trading relationship based on such legislation; it has therefore delayed putting into effect the important 1972 trade agreement between our two countries.

There should be no illusions about the nature of the Soviet system -- but there should also be no illusions about how to deal with it. Our belief in the right of peoples of the world freely to emigrate has been well demonstrated. This legislation, however, not only harmed our relations with the Soviet Union but also called into question the fate of those seeking to emigrate. The favorable trend, aided by our quiet diplomacy, by which emigration increased from 400 in 1968 to over 33,000 in 1973, has been seriously set back.
With the People's Republic of China we are firmly fixed on the course set forth in the Shanghai Communique. Stability in Asia and the world require our constructive communication with one-fourth of the human race. After two decades of mutual isolation and hostility, we have in recent years built a promising foundation. Certainly we will encounter some difficulties along the way. Deep differences in our philosophies and social systems will endure. But so should our mutual long-term interests and the goals to which our countries have jointly subscribed in Shanghai.

I will visit China later this year for the second time, and my first time as President, to reaffirm these interests and these goals.

New Challenges

The issues I have discussed are the traditional agenda of foreign policy. But a hallmark of our time is a vast new agenda of issues in an interdependent world. The United States -- with its economic power, its technology, its zest for fresh
-36-

horizons -- is the acknowledged world leader on many of these challenges. If this is a moment of uncertainty in the world, it is even more a moment of rare opportunity. -- We are summoned to meet one of man's most basic challenges -- hunger. At the World Food Conference last November in Rome, the United States outlined a comprehensive program to close the ominous gap between population growth and food production over the long-term. Our enormous productive capacity and our organizing ability are crucial to any hope in the world of accomplishing this task.

-- The old economic order -- in trade, finance, and raw materials -- is changing, and American leadership is needed in the creation of new institutions and practices for worldwide prosperity and progress.

-- The world's oceans, with their immense resources and strategic importance, must become areas of cooperation rather than conflict. American policy is directed to that end.
Technology must be harnessed to the service of mankind while protecting the environment; this is an arena for American leadership.

The interests and aspirations of the developed and developing nations must be reconciled in a new era, in a manner that is both realistic and humane, this is our goal in this new era.

Tonight I want to single out just one of the international issues of major import to our own domestic well-being --energy.

One of the biggest success stories in our foreign policy is our cooperative effort with other major energy-consuming nations. In little more than a year, together with our partners, we have created the International Energy Agency; we have negotiated an emergency sharing arrangement which protects us from the dangers of an embargo; we have created institutions of financial solidarity; we have launched major conservation efforts; and we have developed a massive program for the development of alternative sources of energy.

But the fate of all of these programs depends crucially
on what we do at home. I am confident the Congress will help me demonstrate we mean business about our energy.

Underlying any successful foreign policy of the United States is the strength and credibility of our defense posture.

We are strong and we are ready. We intend to remain so.

Improvement of relations with adversaries does not mean any relaxation of our national vigilance. On the contrary, it is the firm maintenance of both strength and vigilance that makes possible steady progress toward a safer world.

Certainly, this is not the time to cut back our defense capability. The national security budget I have submitted is the minimum amount the United States needs in this critical hour. The Congress will naturally want to review it carefully. But I ask that in addition to considering my requests item by item, Members bear in mind the signal their action on the defense budget as a whole will send to friends and foes alike.

I do not consider judgment that we cannot maintain a normal defense our nation's security and future security is peace.
Let neither adversary nor ally doubt our determination to maintain a defense second to none. None should be tempted to test our readiness or our resolve.

In a world where information is power, as essential as arms are, a vital element of our national security lies in our intelligence services. They are as essential to any nation's foreign policy in peace as in war, and we all know it. Americans can be proud of the important contributions and achievements of the intelligence services of this nation, largely unsung, since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947.

It is entirely proper that this system be subject to congressional review by the Congress. But a sensationalized public debate over legitimate intelligence activities is a disservice to our intelligence system to this nation. It ties our hands where our potential enemies operate with secrecy, skill and resources. Any investigation should be conducted with the maximum discretion and dispatch, lest this process dismantle or demoralize vital national institutions.
Further, Congress -- as it should -- it must organize itself to do so in a prudent way. It has been traditional for the Executive to consult with the Congress through specially-protected procedures that safeguard essential secrets. I will work with the leaders of the House and Senate to meet the needs of the long, foreign and confidential channel.

History is testing us today. We cannot afford indecision, disunity or disarray in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

It is my profound conviction that America must no longer hamstring itself on questions of national security. The Executive Branch has made its mistakes; the Congress has made its mistakes; some have been beyond our control and always will be. The remedies lie within our control. You and I were elected to correct the mistakes of the past. You and I can resolve here and now that this nation shall move ahead with wisdom, assurance, and national unity.
These procedures have been altered in such a way as to make the protection of the scene next to impossible.
Peace, prosperity, energy, food, the future of democracy. These are issues on which the United States can bring an old benefit to all mankind.

The world looks to us, again, for the vigor and vision that we have demonstrated so often before at great moments in our history.

This I believe:

My personal philosophy in foreign affairs is simple:

-- I see a confident America, secure in its strength and values -- and determined to maintain both.

-- I see a conciliatory America, extending its hand to allies and adversaries alike, forming bonds of cooperation to deal with the vast problems facing us all.

-- I see a compassionate America, its heart reaching out to orphans, to refugees and to all our fellow human beings afflicted by war and tyranny and hunger.

I ask the Congress and the American people to join me in these endeavors. Let us remove the obstacles in the way of further advance. Let us be proud of what we have done and of what we can do.
As President, entrusted by the Constitution with responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs, I renew the pledge I made last August: To work cooperatively with my colleagues in the Congress.

I ask that the Congress help to keep America's word good throughout the world and to assure that the national interest does not yield to special interests. We are one nation, one government, and we must have one foreign policy.

Americans have never shirked their duty and have never shrunk from challenge. The spirit of America is good — and strong. This is my faith, and it gives me courage. You and I, the Congress and the President, share a responsibility to the nation and to the American people. Together let us show the world what we are made of.
Effective foreign policy must rest upon the strength of our economy. When all is said and done the leadership and the persuasiveness of this country and the efficacy of its foreign policy initiatives rests upon our willingness and our ability to allocate the material resources required to implement our objectives.

The long and spectacular expansion in the productive capability of the U.S. economy enabled us to maintain a strong military deterrent based on both strategic and conventional military weaponry to provide a significant volume of both military and nonmilitary foreign aid and to administer to our other needs as well.

In recent years, however, the expansion in our productivity has laced and the strength of our industrial structure has been weakened. Inflation and other distortions have undercut the economic base from which the expansion in our economic productiveness and standards of living result. As a people, we have not chosen to cut into our standard of living in order to maintain our defense and foreign policy capabilities. Instead we have transferred resources out of defense and into other domestic programs. The result has been a rapid deterioration in our defense capability. In real terms defense expenditures have fallen by one third since 1968 and foreign aid has been drastically reduced.
Much of this reduction is the result of Congress's decision to shift our priorities towards domestic objectives and toward income redistribution and the resulting rapid expansion in our transfer programs. We have also placed an accelerated emphasis on environmental and safety programs.

This reorientation has caused a vast shift of resources away from productive uses in the private sector either directly through the federal budget or through the direct imposition of high costs upon the private sector via government regulation. We have gradually debilitated the growth potential in our economy, weakened the productive private sector, and undermined the availability of resources for the implementation of our vital foreign policy objectives. Defense policy cannot be viewed as a simple or a secondary appendage to our domestic priorities. Instead it is an essential precondition to the longer-term well-being of the United States. Effective defense policy will be more expensive if we are forced backward into isolation.

The implementation of our foreign policy goals requires the restoration and the maintenance of the viability of our free enterprise system. This can be done only if the Congress adopts much greater discipline and fiscal restraint which I
have been urging -- including restraint upon our runaway domestic transfer payment programs.

When we talk in terms of cutting defense expenditures and moving resources into enlarged domestic welfare programs we exhibit a distorted and much too narrow view of our priorities. Whether we talk about defense or about domestic welfare we have but one way to go. First we must restore and secure the strength of our domestic economy and this will enable us to restore our defense and foreign policy capability. Unless we do it is an illusion to consider expanding our domestic welfare.
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Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished guests and
my very dear friends:

When I met with you in January to report on the State
of the Union, I concentrated on two subjects which were uppermost
in the minds of the American people -- the recovery of our domestic
economy and a specific program to make the United States independent
of foreign sources of energy.

I thank the Congress for the action it has taken thus far in
response to my economic recommendations. I look forward to your
early approval of my comprehensive energy program to meet our
nation's long-range and emergency needs.

Tonight it is my purpose to review our relations with the
rest of the world, in the spirit of candor and consultation which
I have sought to maintain with my former colleagues and with
our countrymen from the time I took office. It is the first priority
of my Presidency to sustain and strengthen the mutual trust and
respect which must exist among Americans and their government
if we are to deal successfully with the challenges confronting us
at home and abroad.

The leadership of the United States of America, since the
end of World War II, has sustained and advanced the security, well-
being and freedom of millions of human beings beside ourselves.
Despite some mistakes and some setbacks, the United States has
made peace a real prospect for us and for all nations.

I know firsthand that Congress has been a full partner in
the development and support of the American foreign policy which
five Presidents before me have carried forward, with changes of
course but not of destination.

The course which our country chooses in the world today
has never been of greater significance -- for ourselves as
a nation and for the future of the international community.

We build from a strong foundation.

Our alliances with the great industrial democracies in Europe, North America and Japan remain strong, with a greater degree of consultation and equity than ever before.

With the Soviet Union we have moved across a broad front toward a more stable, if still competitive and adversary relationship.

We have begun to control the spiral of strategic nuclear armaments.

After two decades of mutual estrangement we have achieved an opening with the People's Republic of China.

In the best American tradition we have committed with striking success our influence and good offices to help contain conflicts and settle disputes in many regions of the world. We have, for example, helped the parties of the Middle East take the first steps toward living with one another in peace.
We have opened a new dialogue with Latin America looking toward a healthier hemispheric partnership.

We have exercised international leadership on the great new issues of interdependence, such as energy, food and environment.

The American people can be proud of what their nation has achieved and helped others to accomplish.

But we have, from time to time suffered setbacks and disappointments in foreign policy. Sometimes events were uncontrollable; sometimes we imposed difficulties upon ourselves.

We live in a time of testing and a time of change. Our world -- a world of economic uncertainty, political unrest, and threats to the peace -- does not allow us the luxury of abdication or domestic discord.

[Some 200 years ago a great American revolutionary, Samuel Adams, spoke words that can guide us now. He said "the necessity of the times, more than ever, calls for our]
utmost circumspection, deliberation, fortitude and perseverance."

Those same qualities must guide us today. Our purpose is not to point the finger of blame; but to build upon our many successes; to repair damage where we find it; to recover our balance; to move ahead as a united people. Tonight is a time for straight talk among friends about where we stand, and where we're going.

Indochina

A vast human tragedy has befallen our friends in Vietnam and Cambodia.

Too often we talk of commitments as if they were lifeless legal documents. I need not recall the enormous sacrifices in blood, dedication and treasure that we made in Vietnam. Five American Presidents have engaged the United States in Indochina. Millions served, thousands died, and many more were wounded, imprisoned, or lost. Over $150 billion were appropriated for the conduct of that
war by the Congress of the United States. And after years of effort, we negotiated a settlement which made it possible for us to remove our forces with honor and bring home our prisoners, and for our South Vietnamese ally, with our material and moral support, to maintain its security and rebuild after two decades of war.

The chances for an enduring peace after the last American fighting man left Vietnam in 1973 rested on two publicly stated premises: First, that if necessary the United States would help sustain the terms of the Paris Accords we signed two years ago; and second, that the United States would provide adequate economic and military assistance to South Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese, from the moment they signed the Paris Peace Accords, systematically violated the cease-fire and
other provisions of the agreement. Flagrantly disregarding the
ban on infiltration of troops into the South, they increased their
forces to the unprecedented level of 350,000. In direct violation of
the agreement, they sent in the most modern equipment in massive
amounts. Meanwhile, they continued to receive large quantities
of supplies and arms from their friends.

In the face of this situation, the United States -- torn as it
was by the emotions of a decade of war -- was unable to respond.
We had deprived ourselves by law of the ability to enforce the
agreement -- thus giving North Vietnam assurance that it could
violate that agreement with impunity. Next we reduced our economic
and arms aid to South Vietnam. Finally we signalled our increasing
reluctance to give support to a nation struggling for its independence.

Encouraged by these developments, the North Vietnamese
in recent months began sending even their reserve divisions
into South Vietnam. Eighteen Divisions, virtually their entire army, are now in the south. The Government of South Vietnam, uncertain of further American assistance, hastily ordered a strategic withdrawal to more defensible positions. This extremely difficult maneuver, decided upon without consultations, was badly managed, and led to panic. The results are painfully obvious and profoundly moving.

In my first public comment on this tragic development, I called for a new sense of national unity and purpose. I said I would not engage in recriminations or attempts to assess blame, nor should any of us in times like these.

In the same spirit I welcomed the statement of the distinguished Majority Leader of the United States Senate earlier this week that:
"It is time for the Congress and the President to work together in the area of foreign as well as domestic policy."

Let us start afresh.

I am here to work with the Congress. In the conduct of foreign affairs, Presidential initiative and Presidential ability to act swiftly in emergencies are essential to our national interest. Our forefathers learned this painful lesson in our nation's infancy under the Articles of Confederation; it was one of the primary reasons for the writing of the Constitution and the creation of the office of President.
With respect to North Vietnam, I call upon Hanoi -- and
ask the Congress to join me in this call -- to cease military
operations immediately and to honor the terms of the cease-fire
agreement. The United States is urgently requesting the signatories
of the Paris Conference to meet their obligation to use their influence
to halt the fighting and enforce the 1973 Accords. Diplomatic notes
to this effect have been sent to all members of the Paris Conference,
including the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

The situation in South Vietnam and Cambodia has reached a
critical phase requiring immediate and positive decisions by this
government -- and I have made mine.

The options before us are few, and time is short.

On the one hand, the United States could do nothing: let the govern-
ment of South Vietnam save itself and what is left of its territory if it can,
let those South Vietnamese civilians who have worked with us for a decade,
and their families, save their lives if they can; in short, shut our

eyes and wash our hands of the whole matter -- if we can. Or,

on the other hand, I could ask Congress for authority to enforce

the Paris Accords with our troops and our tanks and our aircraft

and our artillery, and to carry the war to the enemy.
There are two narrower options. First, stick with my January request that the Congress appropriate $300,000,000 for military assistance for South Vietnam and seek additional funds for economic and humanitarian purposes. Or, increase my requests for both emergency military and humanitarian assistance to levels which by best estimates might enable the South Vietnamese to halt the onrushing aggression, permit the chance of a negotiated political settlement between the North and South Vietnamese, and, if the very worst were to happen, at least allow the orderly evacuation of Americans and threatened South Vietnamese to places of safety.

Let me now share with the Congress and the American people my conclusions:

I have received a full report from General Weyand, whom I sent to Vietnam to assess the situation for me. He advises that the current military situation is critical, but that South Vietnam is continuing to defend itself with the resources available. However, he
feels that if there is to be any chance of success for their defense
plan, South Vietnam needs urgently an additional $722 million in
military assistance from the United States.

I must, of course, consider the safety of some 6,000 Americans
who remain in Vietnam, and of tens of thousands of South Vietnamese
employees of the United States Government, of news agencies,
of contractors and businesses for many years who, with their
dependents, are already known to be marked for massacre by the
North Vietnamese. Also on the purge lists are South Vietnamese
intellectuals, professors and teachers, editors and opinion-leaders
who have supported the South Vietnamese cause and the alliance
with the United States, to whom we have a profound moral obligation.

It has been said that the United States is overextended;
that we have too many commitments too far from home; that we must
re-examine what our truly vital interests are and shape our strategy
to conform to them. I find no fault with this as theory, but in the
real world such a course can only be pursued carefully and in close
coordination with solid progress toward overall reduction in
worldwide tensions.

But we cannot in the meantime abandon our friends while our
adversaries support and encourage theirs. We cannot dismantle our
defenses, our diplomacy or our intelligence capability while others
increase and strengthen theirs.
These considerations bear heavily on our posture towards
the rest of the world, and particularly on our future relations with the
free nations of Asia. These nations must not think for a minute
that the United States is pulling out on them or intends to abandon
them to internal subversion or external aggression.

I have therefore concluded that the national interests of the
United States and the cause of world stability require that we continue
to give both military and humanitarian assistance to the South
Vietnamese government.

Assistance to South Vietnam at this stage must be swift
and adequate. Drift and indecision invite far deeper disaster.

The sums I had requested before the major North Vietnamese
offensive and the sudden South Vietnamese retreat are obviously inadequate. Half-hearted action would be worse than none. We must act together and decisively.

I am asking the Congress to approve the sum of $722 million for emergency military assistance and $______ for economic and humanitarian aid for South Vietnam.
I hope that this authority will never need to be used, but if it is needed there will be no time for debate.

Because of the urgency of the situation, I am asking the Congress to complete action on these measures not later than April 19.

In Cambodia the situation is equally tragic. The United States and the Cambodian Government have each made major efforts -- over a long period and through many channels -- to end that conflict. But because of their military successes, steady external support, and American legislative restrictions, the Communist side has shown no interest in negotiation, compromise, or a political solution.

And yet, for the past three months the beleaguered people of Phnom Penh have fought on, hoping against hope that the United States would not desert them, but instead provide the arms and ammunition they so badly need.
Several days ago I received a moving letter from the Acting President of Cambodia who succeeded Lon Nol.

"Dear Mr. President," he wrote. "As the American Congress reconvenes to reconsider your urgent request for supplemental assistance for the Khmer Republic, I appeal to you to convey to the American legislators our plea not to deny these vital resources to us, if a non-military solution is to emerge from this tragic 5 year old conflict."

"To find a peaceful end to the conflict we need time. I do not know how much time, but we all fully realize that the agony of the Khmer people cannot and must not go on much longer. However, for the immediate future, we need the rice to feed the hungry and the ammunition and weapons to defend ourselves against those who want to impose their will by force of arms. A denial by the American people of the means for us to carry on will leave us no alternative but inevitably abandoning our
search for a solution which will give our citizens some freedom of choice as to their future. For a number of years now the Cambodian people have placed their trust in America. I cannot believe that this confidence was misplaced and that suddenly America will deny us the means which might give us a chance to find an acceptable solution to our conflict."

This letter speaks for itself. I renew on a most urgent basis my January request for food and ammunition for the brave Cambodians. You have only a matter of days. Otherwise, it will be too late.

Members of the Congress, my fellow Americans, this moment of tragedy for Indochina is a time of trial for us. It is a time for national resolve.

Let us put an end to self-inflicted wounds. Let us remember that our national unity is a most priceless asset.
Let us deny our adversaries the satisfaction of using Vietnam once again to pit American against American. Let us be neither hawks nor doves, but Eagles that soar high in strength and courage.

Above all, let us keep events in Southeast Asia in their proper perspective. The security and progress of hundreds of millions everywhere depend importantly on us.

At this moment, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, this nation must present to the world a united front.

Let no potential adversary believe that our difficulties or our debates mean a slackening of our national will.
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