

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF SEN. BOB DOLE, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN, AT THE  
MISSOURI STATE CONVENTION, SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI, MAY 27, 1972, 7:00 P.M., CDT

Let us take a moment to look at the record of that leadership to see how it stacks up against the issues the Democrats seem determined to run on.

In foreign affairs, for example, the President in his inaugural predicted that "the times are on the side of peace." And during his Administration he has strived to make that prediction come true.

And he has met with no little success.

In the Middle East, a cease-fire negotiated at American initiative was agreed to in 1970. It was supposed to last for only ninety days. Yet today it is still in effect.

In Berlin, we reached an historic agreement on the status of that troubled city.

Treaties have been signed preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear nations and preventing the use of the ocean floor as a base from which to launch these weapons of mass destruction.

We are eliminating our arsenals of biological weapons and agreements have been reached with other nations so that they will do the same.

HISTORIC SUMMIT

This Administration, like all Administrations, has made some mistakes. But this week, in Moscow as earlier in Peking, as in so many instances since 1969, it has made history.

By his visit to Moscow, in fact, the President has made agreements with the Soviet leaders that can change the trend of the times and improve the chances for lasting peace and reduce world tensions.

This week, in Moscow, the President has given added credence to his 1969 inaugural statement that "the times are on the side of peace." The several new agreements made with the Russians in the last week of talks, capped by the

-2-

Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement signed yesterday, mark the most dramatic steps yet taken in the transition from the era of confrontation to the era of negotiation that the President seeks.

The SALT accords are a long and dramatic step forward for lasting peace among the world's two great military powers, and a move that therefore enhances the global prospects for peace as has no other such agreement in the post-war nuclear age.

While it would be premature to claim that the agreements have put an end once and for all, to the arms race and to the chances for war between the great powers, it cannot be denied that the accords represent an historic turn in events, away from the trends of the past 25 years, away from the tendency toward never-ending arms races and ever-<sup>b</sup>gurgoning weapons development.

They represent a long step in the direction of peace, and they presage further progress towards the generation of peace that forms so fond and fervent a hope of all Americans and of all people of goodwill throughout the world.

#### ERA OF NEGOTIATION DAWNING

The very fact that the agreements themselves <sup>were signed,</sup> apart from their subject, is cause for hope. For three years, representatives of the Soviet Union and of the United States have labored in Vienna and in Helsinki to work out its terms. Their success in SALT, along with the numerous other agreements reached on health and environmental research, on space exploration and naval procedures on the high seas all demonstrate that the era of negotiation is more than just a dream, more than just a hope. We are watching it become reality.

In a world of rapid change, for a time the impression was widely shared that we were in the grips of forces of change <sup>e</sup> beyond our control. The pace of change continues, but the SALT agreements of yesterday -- and the leadership of this President which were so essential in bringing them about -- are proving



as the President said at the start of this eventful year, that we can be the "masters of change" if only we will be; that we can direct it on a course we choose if we apply intelligence and imagination to the challenges which change represents.

And the greatest challenge of change in the seventies, is the challenge of transforming a world of hostilities and confrontation into a world where competition is peaceful and where, at long last, peace may finally prevail.

What the agreements may mean in the long run we cannot know for sure.

The President is covering new ground with his visit to Moscow.

But the suspicion is -- my suspicion at least -- that the visit to Moscow, following the trip to China and other encouraging signs in international relations, may just prove the President right in what he said in his inaugural: "The times are on the side of peace."

#### DEMO PROMISE -- GOP RECORD

It has begun to look like "peace" is going to shape up as one of the major issues in this political campaign. We have candidates from the Democrat party billing themselves as peace candidates. But if we run simply on the record, rather than on rhetoric, if we talk about what has been done in the past three and a half years, by this Republican President -- yes, in Vietnam, and all over the world to bring about a reduction of tensions -- there is little the Democrats could promise that can top what Richard Nixon has already done and is now doing to win the peace for future generations.

And that is the way in which the American people must view the issues -- the way in which we must encourage them to view the issues -- in this election campaign.

And it is this question of leadership potential, not just in foreign affairs but across the spectrum of American life and public interest -- that must concern us as Republicans and as citizens.

#### GOP HAS ADVANTAGE

We Republicans have an advantage in this campaign. Just having a candidate we can all agree on is an advantage over the divided opposition party. But even more important than that, we have a candidate whose principles we can all agree to. There is only one thing the Democrats can agree on, only one thing McGovern

~~2~~ 4

and Humphrey and Kennedy and Muskie, before he gave up, have in common. And that is their curious willingness to find fault without first finding alternatives, to criticize without first proposing something better, to speak, in other words, without first thinking.

There is probably nothing more politically hazardous this year than predicting the future of American politics. The experts in the media who were confidently predicting a White House in Senator Muskie's future as recently as February can and do testify to that. In fact, the dismal failure of so many of their earlier predictions to stand the test of the primaries has caused many of the best-known pundits to make a new prediction -- that nothing is predictable any more in American politics.

DEMO FUTURE IN DANGER

I think that is an oversimplification. And I predict that many observers will come to agree with me as the year progresses. For I believe that we may be witnessing this year the final disintegration of the Democrat party as we have known it during this century.

(MORE)



~~X~~ 5

It is an axiom of American politics that this country is essentially a two-party country and will remain so. Our history demonstrates that. But political parties have expired before in this country and the Democrat Party may well be about to join the Federalists and the Whigs and numerous smaller parties on history's discard shelf.

For there is nothing magical about the origins and strengths of our major political parties. They are created by the people to represent their interests within the government of the United States and within their state and local governments. And the same people who created a political party can abandon it -- when it ceases to represent them.

Thus, in spite of the registration figures which show most people considering themselves to be Democrats, I believe that many nominal Democrats are about to abandon their erstwhile party in droves.

#### FOUR EVENTS CITED

Let me cite the events of this year which lead me to that conclusion. First, we find today that of the three major candidates for the Democrat Presidential nomination, the candidate with the most votes in the primaries has the fewest delegates to the convention.

Second, the Washington Star reported yesterday that of the delegates already chosen, almost 40 percent -- 38.8 percent, to be exact -- are being challenged before the credentials committee.

Third, many of the delegates already chosen have publicly proclaimed their intention to vote for a candidate other than the one they are bound to by state law.

And fourth, the Democrat party is faced this year with the possibility of defections not to one splinter party, but to two.

This is not a picture of a broadly representative political party preparing to contest for the presidency. It is a picture of a party "cannibalizing" itself,"

56

with a variety of factional chieftains battling to see who stays out of the pot.

#### DEMOS TROUBLES RUN DEEP

While many observers may discount these symptoms of disintegration as "growing pains" brought on by new delegate selection methods in the Democrat Party this year, I think the causes are much too deep to be dismissed as "procedural." The causes are a changing electorate which is sophisticated enough to discount the rhetoric of promise which has often sufficed in the past and the failure of the Democrat Party as an institution to adapt to the needs of this changing electorate. It is no longer good enough to call for peace and offer economic nostrums while failing to take the necessary actions to create peace and prosperity. What the people of America want are programs -- and they are not getting those programs from any of the candidates currently vying for the Democrat presidential nomination. But they are getting action from President Nixon.

This should have begun to dawn on Democrat leaders many years ago, for by the simple arithmetic of party registration figures, neither President Eisenhower nor President Nixon ought to have been elected.

But they were elected -- and President Nixon will be elected again -- because the voters choose candidates with rational programs and proven records of success. One looks in vain for potential candidates within the Democrat Party who meet either of those criteria.

Richard Nixon has brought this country a long way.

#### OPPORTUNITY '72

By our actions here at this convention and in the campaign months ahead, we can help him to get that time. We can help by giving him our share of the support he needs and deserves so that he can win the second term he needs and deserves.

~~\*~~ 7

We have come far under Richard Nixon -- further toward achieving the goals of this country -- a full generation of peace and prosperity without war -- than under any other President in this century.

How much greater, then, might our progress be in Richard Nixon's second term?

That is anybody's guess, but it is also everybody's opportunity -- everybody here -- to win for Richard Nixon and the country, the chance to find out.

###

- 10. \_\_\_\_\_**