The original documents are located in Box 26, folder "State Department - Kissinger Speeches and Statements (2)" of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

The Secretary of State

APR 2 3 1976

Speech

April 16, 1976
Phoenix, Ariz.

Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Media Services

A STRONG FOREIGN POLICY FOR A CONFIDENT AMERICA

Secretary Henry A. Kissinger before the Downtown Rotary Club.

I am happy to be here in the great Southwest, where the freshness and vitality of the American spirit are so evident.

In recent years we have seen opinion on foreign policy in this country swing back and forth erratically—from peace demonstrations to calls for confrontation; from antimilitarism to concern for a strong defense; from over-involvement to a new isolationism; from enthusiasm to disillusionment; and back again.

Today some would have Americans believe that the issue is between those who are optimistic and those who are pessimistic about America.

But that is *not* the problem before us. The real issue is whether we understand the complexities and the opportunities that are before us.

Winston Churchill once said: "When danger is far off, we may think of our weakness; when it is near, we must not forget our strength." A period of thermonuclear peril and global upheaval is not the moment to forget our success, our unequalled reserves of military and economic power, or the decisive advantages we enjoy as a free people with a free productive system.

In this Bicentennial year it is time to remind ourselves that an effective foreign policy must reflect the values and permanent interests of our Nation and not the fashionable trends of the moment. These values and interests antedate this election year and must be maintained beyond it.

I am here to tell you that America remains—and will remain—the most powerful nation in the world.

I am here to tell you that the President and his Administration have founded their policies on a fundamental faith in America's vast strength and potential for greatness.

We see challenging trends but we are confident that they can be mastered. We see dangers but we are certain that they can be overcome.

The optimist is not one who pretends that challenges do not exist—that is escapism. The true optimist has faith in his nation; he believes that challenges are to be mastered—not avoided. He is willing to trust the intelligence of the public for he knows that Americans can understand and deal with complexity. He knows that Americans have always regarded challenge not as a cause for despair but as a call to action, a stimulus to achievement, and a priceless chance to shape the future.

The Founding Fathers, the pioneers who opened up this vast land, the men and women who built the greatest and freest and most productive society in history—they were people of confidence and hope. Those of us today who truly have faith in America will live up to that tradition.

To oversimplify, to substitute brittle rhetoric for hard thinking is not confidence in America. To offer slogans instead of answers is to show little faith in the American people.

The task of foreign policy is to understand our reality—to perceive the challenges to our interests and principles. It is to devise means for

meeting those challenges. And it is to persevere toward our goals unafraid and unswayed by the passions of the moment.

Government in a free society has the obligation to tell the people the truth, without sugar-coating or resorting to scare tactics. The real issue before our country now is not between optimists and pessimists but between those who support a strong American leadership in the world and those who believe that America cannot, or should not, play such a role.

The Administration has made its choice. Our policy is based on the conviction that without America's determination there can be no security; without our dedication there can be no progress; and without our example there can be no freedom.

America's Response to Challenge

In the inevitable self-criticism of a democracy, we must take care not to create an impression of impatience or uncertainty. We must never forget the great achievements of American foreign policy over three decades of involvement in world affairs.

The United States took the lead in helping Europe and Japan recover from devastation and join us in alliances that are the pillars of global stability. We opposed aggression; we mediated conflicts. We created the international economic institutions that expanded trade and prosperity worldwide. We became the world's leader in technology, in agricultural productivity, in economic enterprise. We led the world's struggle against famine, disease, and natural disaster; we promoted education and economic development in every quarter of the globe; we welcomed refugees from oppression to our shores.

And amid all the turmoil of recent years at home, our foreign policy has seen one of its most fruitful periods. Today:

- We are at peace.
- We are the world's strongest nation militarily and economically; our technological superiority is unquestioned, continuing, and growing.
- Our alliances are cooperating more closely than at any time in many years.
- We have begun to forge more rational and long-term relations with potential adversaries. Our new relationship with China is growing, durable, and a positive factor in the world scene. With the Soviet Union we have resolved some conflicts, such as Berlin, and slowed some aspects of the arms race.
- For the first time in 30 years we have helped the countries of the Middle East take significant steps toward peace.
- We have been leaders in shaping new economic relations between the industrial world and developing world.

This is a record of which we can be proud and on which we should seek to build. So let us not delude ourselves with fairy tales of America being second best and forever taken in by wily foreigners.

Americans have nothing to fear from competition—for in almost every area of rivalry *we* have the advantage. Americans know we have the capacity, if we have the will, to maintain freedom and peace. They understand too that our strength is essential for peace but also that peace must be something better than a precarious balance of terror.

Therefore our foreign policy is designed to further three principal objectives:

- To strengthen the unity of the great industrial democracies and our alliances;
- To maintain the global balance of power and to build on this foundation a lasting peace; and
- To fashion between the industrial world and the developing nations positive and reliable economic relations to insure mutual prosperity.

Let me discuss these in turn.

The Challenge of Democracy

Our first priority is our relationship with the great industrial democracies.

There is no doubt that freedom today is under serious challenge. Democratic societies are in a numerical minority in the world and, within many of them, antidemocratic forces are gaining in strength.

The dangers are real but so is our collective capacity to respond. We and our allies account for 65 percent of the world's production and 70 percent of its trade; we are the world's most indus-

trialized and urbanized societies; it is we who are the pioneers of the modern age; we who have the experience, the intellectual creativity, and the resources to lead attempts to solve the economic and social problems facing this shrinking planet. There is no reason for us to falter. Many of the challenges to the industrial democracies are of their own making. Therefore they can be mastered with confidence, vision, and creativity.

We are by nature a self-critical people and never more so than in our election year. This causes us sometimes to take for granted the solid achievements of the recent past.

- Faced with an oil embargo and an energy crisis the United States took the lead in establishing—together with the other industrial democracies—a new institution: the International Energy Agency. This cooperative enterprise will enable the industrial democracies to support each other in case of another embargo. It has established common conservation policies and common policies for the development of alternative sources of energy. A great challenge has brought forth a cooperative and vital response.
- Faced with global recession the heads of Government of the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan met to concert their economic policies. They stimulated fresh approaches to reinforce each others' programs for recovery, trade, and energy. They agreed on monetary reform which over time may usher in a period of unparalleled economic progress. Most fundamentally they symbolized their political cohesion and shared moral values.
- Faced with the growth of Soviet power we have strengthened the defenses of our alliances with new programs of planning, consultation, modernization, and standardization.
- And faced with the need to fashion more balanced partnerships we have intensified our consultations and our collaboration.

These are not the actions of governments uncertain of their future. They reflect the conviction that no force in the world can match the voluntary association of free peoples. Our relations with the industrial democracies have never been stronger and our unity never more effective. With economic recovery well underway we will be even stronger—individually and collectively.

Together with the other industrial democracies we face, with confidence, a vast agenda.

- The United States is determined to protect our Nation's security and that of our friends and allies; we will do our part to maintain the global balance that has preserved peace and freedom for three decades.
- Together we will foster economic progress and social justice in our societies, for the principles of freedom and human dignity which we cherish must rest on a firm foundation of responsiveness to the needs of our peoples.
- We will intensify collaboration on the great new issues of our time—the economic, political, and social challenges of global interdependence; the easing of tensions between East and West; and the forging of cooperation between developed and developing countries.
- The United States has encouraged and welcomed those of its allies that moved from dictatorship toward democracy. For the same reason we will continue to warn against those who would turn over a major share in Western democratic governments to Communist parties suddenly seeking respectability. We would do our allies no favor if we encouraged wishful thinking that the advent of Communist parties into power will not represent a watershed in our relations. The basic reality is that our people will not accept the same close and confidential relationship with Western countries where Communist parties have been granted a major share in government.
- We will stand for the cause of liberty and independence around the world for if we do not champion our own cause, no one else will do it for us.
- We will never forget that the democratic nations hold in trust humanity's highest principles and aspirations and that they thus bear a grave responsiblity.

The Challenge of Peace

Time and again in this century Americans have fought for peace. No people knows better than we the meaning of that responsibility—especially in an age shadowed by the menace of

nuclear cataclysm. When war would threaten the life of literally every American there is no higher duty than the dedicated search for peace.

But peace is far more than the mere absence of war. We will never make—in the name of peace—agreements that jeopardize our values and interests or the values and interests of our friends. We know, too, that the mere desire for peace is not enough. Since the days of Thucydides statesmen have recognized that peace with justice comes only ". . . where the pressure of necessity is equal; for the powerful exact what they can, and the weak grant what they must." There can be no security without an equilibrium, and no safety without a balance of power.

Since the dawn of the nuclear age the world's fears of catastrophe and its hopes for peace have hinged centrally upon the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. When two superpowers have the capacity to destroy mankind in a matter of hours, there can be no greater imperative than managing the relationship between them with wisdom and restraint.

The growth of the Soviet Union to superpower status was inevitable given its industrial and technological base. Nothing we could have done would have prevented it; nothing we do now will make it go away. What we can do—together with our friends—is to maintain our strength and our considerable advantages and demonstrate our determination to prevent the irresponsible use of Soviet power. At the same time we must strive to go beyond a balance of force to shape a safer and more durable relationship of coexistence. Peace thus requres a dual policy. And we have worked hard at both these tasks.

We have kept our strategic forces sufficient to deter attack and maintain the nuclear balance. And because we know that the perception of power can be almost as important as the reality, we have made certain that other nations recognize the adequacy of our strength.

Nevertheless the strategic arms competition takes place in unprecedented conditions. As late as the end of World War II every increase in destructive power was strategically useful. Today additions to the nuclear arsenals of either side do not automatically lead to political or military advantage. Indeed at current and foreseeable levels of nuclear arms it becomes increasingly dangerous to invoke them. In no crisis since 1962 have the strategic arsenals of the two sides determined the outcome.

The tendency toward stalemate inherent in the nuclear arms race produces new requirements for our national defense. Under the umbrella of strategic standoff, increasing attention must be given to regional defense. For it is in peripheral areas where a military imbalance can be turned into a geopolitical change that could, in time, affect the global balance. This is why we are expanding our Army from 13 to 16 divisions, developing a new generation of fighter aircraft, and accelerating our naval construction; and it is why we must spend what is necessary to meet the new overall requirements.

In assessing current debates and charges it is important that the public understand the long-range nature of modern military planning. Because of the long leadtimes in the development of new weapons, the forces in being today reflect decisions taken in the 1960's; the decisions we make today will not affect our forces until at least the early 1980's. This imposes upon us the need for careful long-range planning and analysis of needs. With modern weapons national defense cannot be assured by quick fixes. Not every category of weapon is as useful for us as it is for our adversaries and vice versa. We must and we shall maintain a steady course, mindful that what we decide today will affect the security of Americans for decades.

At the same time we must look beyond security to a safer, more durable pattern of coexistence. A balance of terror constantly contested is an unsatisfactory foundation for our security. We shall defend the global balance with vigilance, but at the same time we shall continue to search for new patterns of restraint, of communication, and of cooperation. Only when the rights of nations are respected—when accommodation takes the place of force—can man's energies be devoted to the realization of its higher aspirations.

To check—and ultimately to reverse—the nuclear spiral, we have sought and achieved important arms control agreements with the Soviet Union. The Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement of 1972 halted the Soviet numerical buildup, and the Vladivostok agreement places an equal ceiling

on strategic forces of both sides. When this ceiling is translated into a formal agreement we shall have reduced the danger of nuclear cataclysm. At the same time we will be able to devote the priorities in our planning to regional defense where the needs are greatest.

In the past week we have achieved a new agreement which will limit the size of peaceful nuclear explosions and—for the first time—allow the United States to conduct on-site inspections on Soviet territory. This is a principle which we have sought to establish throughout the postwar period. Its achievement is not only a significant symbol but an important practical step to bring greater discipline to the nuclear age.

In addition to arms control we have engaged the Soviet Union in efforts to resolve concrete political problems. For example the Berlin agreement of 1971 was a negotiated solution to a perennial problem that had threatened major war on at least three occasions in 20 years. And we have also reached agreement on many bilateral projects that are based strictly on mutual benefit and can help moderate Soviet behavior.

We must see these achievements in perspective. We cannot relax our vigilance. We must not believe that the conflict of two generations can be quickly overcome. For the foreseeable future we and the Soviet Union will remain ideological adversaries. But we have an obligation to explore all honorable roads to reduction of tensions and a relationship based on coexistence rather than on tests of strength. We cannot stop trying, for we owe our children a better world than we found.

These then are the realities of our policy toward the Soviet Union.

- We have the military, diplomatic, and economic capacity to prevent the use of Soviet power for unilateral advantage or political expansion.
- We shall maintain the strategic and conventional forces needed to protect our security, and we shall muster the political will to insure that local situations are not exploited for unilateral gain which could undermine global stability.
- We will never tolerate a shift in the strategic balance against us, whether by violations of agreements already concluded, by making unwise new agreements, or by neglect of our own programs.
- At the same time we must recognize that sovereign states of roughly equal power cannot impose unacceptable conditions on each other and ultimately must deal with each other by compromise.
- We shall pursue the two strands of our policy toward the Soviet Union—firmness in the face of pressure and readiness to work on the basis of strict reciprocity for a more cooperative world. This is an obligation we have to our people, to our future, and to mankind.

The Challenge of Prosperity

In recent years no issue has demanded more of our attention than the prospects of the world economy. This Nation has unrivaled economic strength, but in an interdependent world we must work with others if our economy is to thrive.

The facts of interdependence were brought home to us dramatically by the oil embargo of 1973. It accelerated inflation and produced the largest unemployment, as well as the most severe recession, of the postwar period. It is estimated to have cost us upward of $10 billion in lost production.

The global economy is now a single system; interdependence can strain it or enhance it. For the first time in history humanity's age-old dream of a just, stable, and prosperous world for all is a realistic possibility.

American policy has been designed to serve our interests in a global context of cooperation. For our Nation's prosperity requires a healthy and cooperative world environment. The price and supply of energy and raw materials, the conditions of trade and investment, the protection of the environment, international law to govern the use of the oceans and space—these are all issues on which our prosperity and progress depend.

As the world's strongest power the United States could best survive an era of economic warfare. At home we are leading the recovery from the most difficult economic period since the 1930's—a performance which stands in sharp contrast to those economies based on rigid principles of planning, on labor extracted by compulsion, or capital formed through inadequate compensation

of labor. Abroad our technological innovation, global business expertise, and commercial dynamism have reinforced American interests and spread prosperity to every part of our planet. It is America that is the engine of the global economy; we to whom the developing nations address their claims and their complaints—for they know that our open economic system more than any other fosters the prospects for growth and widening opportunity for all.

But while we are prepared to defend our economic interests unilaterally, we know too that nations will prosper together or they will suffer together.

This is why the United States has taken the lead in advancing the vision of an open, growing, and cooperative world economy. It was the United States that called for and helped launch the World Food Conference in 1974 where we offered concrete proposals to improve world food production; we offer every human being security against hunger. At the special session of the United Nations last September and at the Conference on International Economic Cooperation now underway in Paris, we have set forth a wide range of practical initiatives which address all the key global economic issues—raw materials, development, finance, and—most important—energy. A week ago [April 8] I presented the Law of the Sea Conference in New York with new American proposals designed to move this historic negotiation to a successful conclusion this year. This would be a major diplomatic event with far-reaching implications for security and commerce, for food and energy, for raw materials and research, and for international law and cooperation. Later this month I will attend the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development where we will continue to demonstrate American leadership on the broad range of relations between North and South.

These U.S. initiatives have substantially improved the international atmosphere and laid the foundations for progress on one of the great endeavors of the modern era—the construction of a truly just and cooperative international economy.

These are the realities of the global economic challenge.

- Today *all* national economies are sustained by the global economic system; interdependence is not a slogan but a reality and goes to the heart of the international order. Prosperity and justice underpin every society's ability to achieve its national goals.
- Since we are the single greatest concentration of economic wealth and power, global prosperity and our own well-being depend crucially on this country's leadership. What is asked of us now is not so much our resources but our creativity and vision in helping the world organize equitable patterns of economic relations.
- The United States will not be pressured, nor will we yield to blackmail or threats. Those who indulge in unrealistic proposals, one-sided bloc voting, appeals to stale ideologies of confrontation or resentment will only block cooperative progress.
- Here, too, we will pursue a dual policy; we will resist pressures, but we are prepared to participate constructively in cooperative efforts based on mutual respect.

The American Responsibility

Thus the challenges we face are great and complex.

But the record shows that we have responded—with confidence and with success. Ours is not the record of a tired nation but of a vibrant people for whom frontiers have always denoted a challenge, not a limit. We are not weak; we have no intention of letting others determine our future. America has the strength, resilience, and purpose to meet the modern era on its own terms. We are determined to help shape an international environment which, more than ever before in history, improves the lives and reflects the values of our people.

So let us stop disparaging our strength, either moral or material, because if we do friends of America grow uncertain, enemies become bold, and a world yearning for leadership loses hope.

Let us tell our people and the world the truth: America will continue to meet the challenges of its time. America and its allies possess the greatest economic and military power the world has ever seen.

We have the courage and the self-confidence

to prevent nuclear war. We have the vision and the spirit to help shape a more peaceful, more stable world.

We have the resources, the technology, the skill, and the organizing genius to build a world economic system together with all nations—developing and developed alike. And this will fufill the aspirations of all peoples for dignity and well-being.

It is in this spirit that next week I shall go to Africa where I will carry America's message of hope, social justice, aspiration for human dignity, the rule of the majority, and cooperation. And I shall also warn against foreign intervention—direct or surrogate—that would block all hope for progress.

But we can realize our historic responsibility only as a united and confident people. Our greatest foreign policy need is to end our divisions and self-denigration—to recall that we have permanent interests and values that we must nurture and defend, to recapture the sense that we are all engaged in a common enterprise.

We remain the world's strongest nation, but we no longer have the overwhelming global predominance of previous decades. Today we must lead, not by our power alone but by our wisdom, boldness, vision, and perseverance. We must be a steadfast friend to those who would be our friend; we must be a determined opponent of those who would be our enemy. We must maintain simultaneously our defenses, our alliances, our principles, and our commitment to a cooperative world. And I have every confidence in our ability to do so.

In this Bicentennial year we honor our Founding Fathers for many things—but most of all for their faith in the American people on whom the success of the American experiment has always depended. They were dreamers who believed in the future and the Nation they had created. They were optimists, because they believed that free men of courage could shape their destiny. And in the end they were realists, because they were right.

At its foundation America was, because of its promise, the hope of the world. Today it remains, because of what it has become, the best hope of all mankind.

This generation of Americans, like every generation before it, will shape its destiny and in helping the world will help itself. For what we—and the world around us—shall be is in our hands. And like those Americans who have gone before us, we shall not fail.

The Secretary of State

Speech

June 6, 1976
Santo Domingo

Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Media Services

STRENGTHENING THE HEMISPHERIC BOND

Secretary Henry A. Kissinger at a luncheon hosted by President Joaquin Balaguer.

I appreciate very much the warm welcome you have given me.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to visit the Dominican Republic. This beautiful island holds a special meaning for all the peoples of the Americas. For here culminated the most momentous voyage of discovery in all human history and here began the modern history of our hemisphere.

A great chronicler of Columbus' voyages, the late Samuel Eliot Morison, pointed out that the most remarkable aspect of Columbus' enterprise was its incredible faith in its ultimate success. The journey that ended on your shores was, above all, the product of spiritual courage, of a daring to search for an objective whose very existence could only be proven through faith. Belief in the future is the very symbol and meaning of the Americas—the bold readiness to encounter the future and the confident faith that human exertion, when directed by principle and liberty, guarantees progress. With all our differences ours has always been the hemisphere in which a frontier has always been a challenge and not a limit—where man came to find dignity and human fulfillment.

It was in a spirit of commitment to our unique hemispheric bond, with a readiness for shared endeavor and faith in the success of our common future, that I visited Latin America four months ago. And it is in this spirit that I begin my second trip to Latin America this year here in the Dominican Republic—to continue the work we began in February, to strengthen by consultations and concrete proposals the impetus of improving relations between the United States and the nations of Latin America, and to help make our hemisphere a model of what interdependent nations can achieve by cooperative effort. To reach that lofty objective, we will need faith; and if I may put it in terms which will be familiar to you, we will also need hope and occasionally a good bit of charity toward each other.

The United States has always regarded its relationship with Latin America as a central element in its national life—not solely as a matter of foreign policy, for too much of our history derives from Spanish-speaking settlers and too many of our citizens are of Latin origin, for such a relationship to be characterized as "foreign."

The sources of our special bond are manifold: The epic of discovery and settlement; our peoples' struggles for national independence; our common interest in shielding our countries from external intrusion; our work together to build international structures for cooperation and economic progress; our commitment to human dignity; and above all our deep cultural and personal ties.

The depth of these bonds goes beyond institutions; they penetrate the soul. The United States has always felt with Latin America a special intimacy and close friendship. Today, when our countries are deeply involved in world affairs, even when our perceptions and interests are not always identical, we continue to draw upon a particular warmth in our personal relationships and an exceptional respect and regard for each other's views and concerns.

The partnership in our hemisphere—shaped by history, tradition, and common interest—was formalized, by and large, in a series of treaties and impelled by organizational machinery, dedicated to peace and security. This shared commitment, given form in the Organization of American States [OAS], is still indispensable to our partnership.

Today the evolution of the hemisphere and the world impel us to expand the range of our concerns beyond the traditional agenda of security and peace. It is fortunate that our relationship is so

deep that it can comfortably accommodate the broad range of human preoccupations.

We have come to understand that, while we must remain strong in our dedication to the peace and security of this hemisphere, we are at the same time challenged by a new agenda of development issues. The growing role of the nations of this hemisphere in the global economy and in world forums dealing with development issues and their unique position as the most developed of the developing nations provide an unprecedented opportunity to shape the problems of independence.

To reflect these new perceptions, I pledged last February that the United States would:

- Take special cognizance of the distinctive requirements of the more industrialized economies of Latin America and of the region as a whole—in the context of our efforts to help shape a more equitable international order;
- Assist directly the neediest nations in the hemisphere afflicted by poverty and natural disaster;
- Support Latin American regional and subregional efforts to organize for cooperation and integration;
- Negotiate on the basis of parity and dignity our specific differences with each and every state to solve problems before they become conflicts;
- Enforce our commitment to collective security and to maintain regional integrity against attempts to undermine solidarity, threaten independence, or export violence; and
- Work to modernize the inter-American system to respond to the needs of our times and give direction to our common action.

Since February the United States has worked hard to make progress in each of these areas. We have introduced trade, investment, and technology proposals of special relevance to the countries of this hemisphere at global forums in Paris and Nairobi. We have responded to the courageous efforts of the Guatemalan people to recover from the earthquake that devastated their land. We have provided fresh support to subregional cooperation in Central America and are exploring ways of relating more effectively to the Andean Pact. And we have not only intensified bilateral efforts with several countries but have made a special effort to prepare for the current meeting of the OAS General Assembly, which provides a unique opportunity to review our progress together and give it common direction.

I look forward to discussing these and other recent global and regional events with my colleagues at the General Assembly, and I shall be putting forward additional proposals on a number of key issues to further our efforts on a multilateral regional basis as well.

A major element in this second trip is that it builds naturally on the first: In February I was not only able to state our aims but to listen to, and gain some understanding of, your concerns—concerns over trade, the transfer of technology, and regional cooperation. The proposals we plan to present at Santiago reflect that understanding and respond to those concerns—and thus represent concrete steps in our longstanding partnership.

Two subjects that are high on the international agenda are especially relevant—trade and technology.

Trade

The United States is fully aware that trade is the indispensable engine of growth for the nations of the hemisphere and that the United States, and the other developed countries, are the most significant trading partners of the region. Trade is the source of most of Latin America's foreign exchange and so is essential if Latin America is to acquire the imported capital goods which are vital to future industrialization. But trade is, at the same time, the most serious point of national vulnerability to external circumstance. Cycles of boom and bust, fueled by abrupt fluctuations in the prices of commodities like sugar and coffee, tin and copper, have plagued the development struggle in the Americas for decades.

We are dedicated to the search for effective solutions to the problems of international commodity marketing, as I made clear in my statement to the UNCTAD IV in Nairobi a few weeks ago. And we are, as recent decisions by President Ford under the Trade Act have shown, equally dedicated to a more liberal global trading system in which Latin America will have greater opportunity to expand its earnings from nontraditional manufactured export sales.

In February I pledged that the United States would support Latin America's drive for broadened participation in the international economy as a means to assure stable growth. During this visit, at the General Assembly, I shall:

- Make clear our determination to administer our Trade Act in ways constantly more favorable to Latin America's exports;
- Announce our willingness to explore with Latin America ways in which, through our own trade policies, we can offer incentives for more liberal trade and greater integration in Latin America;
- State our willingness next month at the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva to consider special safeguards treatment for certain developing countries and in other ways to press the trade interests of Latin America at the Geneva conference;
- Explore several means of expanding Western Hemisphere commodity production and exports; and
- Propose a new inter-American consultative mechanism on trade so that the inter-American system shall enjoy, for the first time, an open, continuing forum for dialogue on this, the most significant economic relationship of the nations of this hemisphere.

Technology

Economic development, in the end, means simply the expansion of output and the improvement in efficiency of the workers, the farms, and the factories of our nations. In today's world it is impossible to conceive of any long-term growth in a nation which is without modern technology—the capability of exploiting the insights and discoveries of the modern scientific method for the betterment of man's conditions. Latin America's development aspirations turn on technology; but, as I emphasized during my visit in February, it must be technology compatible with the conditions of Latin America, nurtured by Latin Americans in Latin American institutions and capable of thrusting the economies of Latin America into the competitive forefront of the world's markets.

At the General Assembly this time, I shall:

- Announce measures to expand Latin America's access to our own National Technical Information Service;
- Detail an increased U.S. assistance program for the coming year for the development of indigenous technology capability within Latin America;
- Announce that we are opening a technology exchange service for Latin America, to service requests for information about public and privately owned technology in the United States;
- Indicate that we are prepared to mount a pilot program of practical technology exchanges between private Latin American and U.S. companies; and
- In general elaborate for Latin America the technology initiatives which I suggested in Nairobi recently and those which were approved in the technology resolution at UNCTAD IV.

These steps, which we are prepared to refine and implement in consultation with the other countries of the hemisphere, will not only increase the prosperity of our individual countries; they will increase their capacity to define and maximize the benefits of international cooperation and progress. Above all they should strengthen the spirit of cooperation and partnership.

Human Rights

The origins of our hemispheric traditions and the values of our civilization tell us, however, that material progress is not sufficient for the human personality. We of the Americas have a special obligation to ourselves and the world to maintain and advance international standards of justice and freedom.

In February I stated our conviction that basic human rights must be preserved, cherished, and defended in this hemisphere—for if they cannot be preserved, cherished, and defended here where the rights and promise of the individual have played such a prominent historic role, then they are in jeopardy everywhere.

During this trip I shall stress that the struggle for human dignity is central, both to national development and to international cooperation, and I shall propose a strengthened role for the Inter-American Human Rights Commission.

Our Inter-American System

We have many forms of cooperation; our bilateral and global interactions are increasing constantly. To give them an added regional dimension, no organization is more important than the Organization of American States.

Last February I pledged that we would work to modernize the inter-American system to respond to the needs of our times and give direction to our common action. During my current trip I shall urge that we increase the frequency of our consultations through the General Assembly and eliminate those other elements of the OAS structure that have become anachronistic, and I shall propose that these reforms of the OAS be considered by a special intergovernmental working group on the charter.

Over the course of the next year, these steps should lead to a more flexible and responsive instrument of cooperation between the United States and the countries of Latin America and help bring the drawn-out reform debate to a successful conclusion.

These proposals will be offered as sincere, serious attempts to respond to Latin American suggestions.

History has proven time and again how difficult it is for those living in an age of revolutionary

change to perceive the forces taking shape around them, much less exercise influence over their direction and impact. I believe that we here in this hemisphere, because of our partnership of shared endeavor and straightforward consultation, are closer than any other group of nations to understanding the problems we face, more able to discuss them in the spirit of a long tradition of cooperation, and more willing to take the necessary steps to master our common destiny. With good will and firm commitment we can make a record of progess in this hemisphere on the crucial issues of an interdependent world which will be a model and an inspiration to nations everywhere.

The peoples of the Americas, who pioneered these unexplored continents and built nations under conditions of great adversity, know that progress does not come easily. But we know as well that cooperative and committed effort—and faith in the future—are the surest means to progress.

Mr. President, the year 1976 has a special meaning for both of us. In the United States it is a Bicentennial year of renewed dedication to our ideals. For you it is a year of homage to a great Dominican leader—Juan Pablo Duarte. Like Jefferson and Bolivar, Juarez and Lincoln, Duarte has given the Americas a legacy of love of mankind and country.

You, Mr. President, a distinguished historian and a scholar of Duarte, have had an opportunity which was tragically denied to him. For nearly 10 years, you have been allowed to direct the fortunes of your country—to lead it away from political and economic unrest toward peace, prosperity, and liberty.

During the first four years of this decade alone, the people of the Dominican Republic enjoyed a real annual increase in per capita income of nearly 8 percent, one of the highest rates of progress not just in this hemisphere but the world. This growth has enabled you to resist subsequent dislocations in the global economy and to make great strides in institutional development and culture as well.

In less fortunate times, when stability and confidence were threatened, you addressed a message to the young people of your country. You reminded them of the ideals and aspirations of Duarte and of their obligations as inheritors of his hope. You said:

. . . To chaos and to lack of confidence by some in our own future, we can offer in return political security in the present and in the future; to ignorant narrowness, we can offer our abundant confidence, our faith in progress, our permanent commitment to national conciliation and concord.

This is also a message to the hemisphere. It is a message of indomitable faith in the future worthy of the heritage and the proud achievement of this hemisphere.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you to join me as I propose a toast on behalf of the President and people of the United States to His Excellency, Dr. Joaquin Balaguer, President of the Dominican Republic; to the enduring friendship between our two countries; to the prosperity and well-being of the Dominican people; and to the voyage to the future upon which we in the Americas have embarked and which will lead us to a new world of peace, dignity, justice, and progress for all our peoples.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, U.S.A.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
STA-501

The Secretary of State

Speech

June 8, 1976
Santiago, Chile

Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Media Services

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Secretary Henry A. Kissinger before the 6th Regular General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS).

One of the most compelling issues of our time, and one which calls for the concerted action of all responsible peoples and nations, is the necessity to protect and extend the fundamental rights of humanity.

The precious common heritage of our Western Hemisphere is the conviction that human beings are the subjects, not the objects, of public policy; that citizens must not become mere instruments of the state.

This is the conviction that brought millions to the Americas. It inspired our peoples to fight for their independence. It is the commitment that has made political freedom and individual dignity the constant and cherished ideal of the Americas and the envy of nations elsewhere. It is the ultimate proof that our countries are linked by more than geography and the impersonal forces of history.

Respect for the rights of man is written into the founding documents of every nation of our hemisphere. It has long been part of the common speech and daily lives of our citizens. And today, more than ever, the successful advance of our societies requires the full and free dedication of the talent, energy, and creative thought of men and women who are free from fear of repression.

The modern age has brought undreamed-of benefits to mankind—in medicine, in technological advance, and in human communication. But it has spawned plagues as well—in the form of new tools of oppression as well as of civil strife. In an era characterized by terrorism, by bitter ideological contention, by weakened bonds of social cohesion, and by the yearning for order even at the expense of liberty, the result all too often has been the violation of fundamental standards of humane conduct.

The obscene and atrocious acts systematically employed to devalue, debase, and destroy human life during World War II vividly and ineradicably impressed the responsible peoples of the world with the enormity of the challenge to human rights. It was precisely to end such abuses and to provide moral authority in international affairs that a new system was forged after that war—globally in the United Nations and regionally in a strengthened inter-American system.

The shortcomings of our efforts in an age which continues to be scarred by forces of intimidation, terror, and brutality fostered sometimes from outside national territories and sometimes from inside have made it dramatically clear that basic human rights must be preserved, cherished, and defended if peace and prosperity are to be more than hollow technical achievements. For technological progress without social justice mocks humanity; national unity without freedom is sterile; nationalism without a consciousness of human community—which means a shared concern for human rights—refines instruments of oppression.

We in the Americas must increase our international support for the principles of justice, freedom, and human dignity—for the organized concern of the community of nations remains one of the most potent weapons in the struggle against the degradation of human values.

Human Rights Challenge in the Americas

The ultimate vitality and virtue of our societies spring from the instinctive sense of human dignity and respect for the rights of others that have long distinguished the immensely varied peoples and lands of this hemisphere. The genius of our inter-American heritage is based on the fundamental democratic principles of human and national dignity, justice, popular participation, and free cooperation among different peoples and social systems.

The observance of these essential principles of civility cannot be taken for granted even in the most tranquil of times. In periods of stress and uncertainty, when pressures on established authority grow and nations feel their very existence is tenuous, the practice of human rights becomes far more difficult.

The central problem of government has always been to strike a just and effective balance between freedom and authority. When freedom degenerates into anarchy, the human personality becomes subject to arbitrary, brutal, and capricious forces. When the demand for order overrides all other considerations, man becomes a means and not an end, a tool of impersonal machinery. Clearly some forms of human suffering are intolerable no matter what pressures nations may face or feel. Beyond that all societies have an obligation to enable their people to fulfill their potentialities and live a life of dignity and self-respect.

As we address this challenge in practice, we must recognize that our efforts must engage the serious commitment of our societies. As a source of dynamism, strength, and inspiration, verbal posturings and self-righteous rhetoric are not enough. Human rights are the very essence of a meaningful life, and human dignity is the ultimate purpose of government. No government can ignore terrorism and survive, but it is equally true that a government that tramples on the rights of its citizens denies the purpose of its existence.

In recent years and even days, our newspapers have carried stories of kidnappings, ambushes, bombings, and assassinations. Terrorism and the denial of civility have become so widespread, political subversions so intertwined with official and unofficial abuse, and so confused with oppression and base criminality, that the protection of individual rights and the preservation of human dignity have become sources of deep concern—and worse—sometimes of demoralization and indifference.

No country, no people—for that matter no political system—can claim a perfect record in the field of human rights. But precisely because our societies in the Americas have been dedicated to freedom since they emerged from the colonial era, our shortcomings are more apparent and more significant. And let us face facts: Respect for the dignity of man is declining in too many countries of the hemisphere. There are several states where fundamental standards of humane behavior are not observed. All of us have a responsibility in this regard, for the Americas cannot be true to themselves unless they rededicate themselves to belief in the worth of the individual and to the defense of those individual rights which that concept entails. Our nations must sustain both a common commitment to the human rights of individuals and practical support for the institutions and procedures necessary to insure those rights.

The rights of man have been authoritatively identified both in the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the OAS's American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. There will, of course, always be differences of view as to the precise extent of the obligations of government. But there are standards below which no government can fall without offending fundamental values—such as genocide, officially tolerated torture, mass imprisonment or murder, or comprehensive denials of basic rights to racial, religious, political, or ethnic groups. Any government engaging in such practices must face adverse international judgment.

The international community has created important institutions to deal with the challenge of human rights. We here are all participants in some of them—the United Nations, the International Court of Justice, the OAS, and the two Human Rights Commissions of the United Nations and OAS. In Europe an even more developed international institutional structure provides other useful precedents for our effort.

Procedures alone cannot solve the problem, but they can keep it at the forefront of our consciousness and they can provide certain minimum protection for the human personality. International law and experience have enabled the development of specific procedures to distinguish reasonable from arbitrary government action on, for example, the question of detention. These involve access to courts, counsel, and families; prompt release or charge; and, if the latter, fair and public trial. Where such procedures are followed, the risk and incidence of unintentional government error, of officially sanctioned torture, of prolonged arbitrary deprivation of liberty, are drastically reduced. Other important procedures are habeas corpus or amparo, judicial appeal, and impartial review of administrative actions. And there are the procedures available at the international level—appeal to, and investigation and recommendations by, established independent bodies such as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, an integral part of the OAS and a symbol of our dedication to the dignity of man.

The Inter-American Commission has built an impressive record of sustained, independent, and highly professional work since its establishment in 1960. Its importance as a primary procedural alternative in dealing with the recurrent human rights problem of this hemisphere is considerable.

The United States believes this Commission is one of the most important bodies of the Organization of American States. At the same time it is a role which touches upon the most sensitive aspects of the national policies of each of the member governments. We must insure that the Commission functions so that it cannot be manipulated for international politics in the name of human rights. We must also see to it that the Commission becomes an increasingly vital instrument of hemispheric cooperation in defense of human rights. The Commission deserves the support of the Assembly in strengthening further its independence, even-handedness, and constructive potential.

Reports of the OAS Human Rights Commission

We have all read the two reports submitted to this General Assembly by the Commission. They are sobering documents for they provide serious evidence of violations of elemental international standards of human rights.

In its annual report on human rights in the hemisphere, the Commission cites the rise of violence and speaks of the need to maintain order and protect citizens against armed attack. But it also upholds the defense of individual rights as a primordial function of the law and describes case after case of serious governmental actions in derogation of such rights.

A second report is devoted exclusively to the situation in Chile. We note the Commission's statement that the Government of Chile has cooperated with the Commission, and the Commission's conclusion that the infringement of certain fundamental rights in Chile has undergone a quantitative reduction since the last report. We must also point out that Chile has filed a comprehensive and responsive answer that sets forth a number of hopeful prospects which we hope will soon be fully implemented.

Nevertheless the Commission has asserted that violations continue to occur, and this is a matter of bilateral as well as international attention. In the United States concern is widespread in the executive branch, in the press, and in the Congress, which has taken the extraordinary step of enacting specific statutory limits on U.S. military and economic aid to Chile.

The condition of human rights as assessed by the OAS Human Rights Commission has impaired our relationship with Chile and will continue to do so. We wish this relationship to be close, and all friends of Chile hope that obstacles raised by conditions alleged in the report will soon be removed.

At the same time the Commission should not focus on some problem areas to the neglect of others. The cause of human dignity is not served by those who hypocritically manipulate concerns with human rights to further their political preferences, nor by those who single out for human rights condemnation only those countries with whose political views they disagree.

We are persuaded that the OAS Commission, however, has avoided such temptations.

The Commission has worked and reported widely. Its survey of human rights in Cuba is ample evidence of that. Though the report was completed too late for formal consideration at this General Assembly, an initial review confirms our worst fears of Cuban behavior. We should commend the Commission for its efforts—in spite of the total lack of cooperation of the Cuban authorities—to unearth the truth that many Cuban political prisoners have been victims of inhuman treatment. We urge the Commission to continue its efforts to determine the truth about the state of human rights in Cuba.

In our view the record of the Commission this year in all these respects demonstrates that it deserves the support of the Assembly in strengthening further its independence, even-handedness, and constructive potential.

We can use the occasion of this General Assembly to emphasize that the protection of human rights is an obligation not simply of particular countries whose practices have come to public attention. Rather, it is an obligation assumed by all the nations of the Americas as part of their participation in the hemispheric system.

To this end the United States proposes that the Assembly broaden the Commission's mandate so that instead of waiting for complaints, it can report regularly on the status of human rights throughout the hemisphere.

Through adopting this proposal the nations of the Americas would make plain our common commitment to human rights, increase the reliable information available to us, and offer more effective recommendations to governments about how best to improve human rights. In support of such a broadened effort, we propose that the budget and staff of the Commission be enlarged. By strengthening the contribution of this body, we can deepen our dedication to the special qualities of rich promise that make our hemisphere a standard-bearer for freedom-loving people in every quarter of the globe.

At the same time we should also consider ways to strengthen the inter-American system in terms of protection against terrorism, kidnapping, and other forms of violent threats to the human personality, especially those inspired from the outside.

Necessity for Concern and Concrete Action

It is a tragedy that the forces of change in our century—a time of unparalleled human achievement—have also visited upon many individuals around the world a new dimension of intimidation and suffering.

The standard of individual liberty of conscience and expression is the proudest heritage of our civilization. It summons all nations. But this hemisphere, which for centuries has been the hope of all mankind, has a special requirement for dedicated commitment.

Let us then turn to the great task before us. All we do in the world—in our search for peace, for greater political cooperation, for a fair and flourishing economic system—is meaningful only if linked to the defense of the fundamental freedoms which permit the fullest expression of mankind's creativity. No nations of the globe have a greater responsibility. No nations can make a greater contribution to the future. Let us look deeply within ourselves to find the essence of our human condition. And let us carry forward the great enterprise of liberty for which this hemisphere has been—and will again be—the honored symbol everywhere.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, U.S.A.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
STA-501

The Secretary of State

Speech

June 9, 1976
Santiago, Chile

Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Media Services

HEMISPHERIC COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

Secretary Henry A. Kissinger before the 6th Regular General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS).

For two centuries the peoples of this hemisphere have been forging a record of cooperation and accomplishment of which we can be proud. It is a record which gives good cause for the confidence we bring to the tasks we face today. But of greater importance is the truly special relationship we have achieved. The ties of friendship, mutual regard, and high respect that we have forged here set this hemisphere apart. The bond between the American republics is unmatched in the world today in both depth and potential.

First, we have maintained the awareness that our destinies are linked—a recognition of the reality that we are bound by more than geography and common historical experience. We are as diverse as any association of nations, yet this special relationship is known to us all, almost instinctively.

Second, ours is a hemisphere of peace. In no other region of the world has international conflict been so rare, nor peaceful and effective cooperation so natural to the fabric of our relationships.

Third, we work together with a unique spirit of mutual respect. I personally am immensely grateful for the warm and serious relationships I have enjoyed with my colleagues and other Western Hemisphere leaders. I am convinced that this sense of personal *amistad* can play a decisive role in the affairs of mankind, and nowhere more so than in our hemisphere.

Fourth, we share the conviction that there is much to do and that working together for concrete progress is the surest way to get it done. Even our criticism presumes the feasibility of cooperation.

Fifth, we respect each other's independence. We accept the principle that each nation is—and must be—in charge of its own future. Each chooses its mode of development; each determines its own policies. But we know that our capacity to achieve our national goals increases as we work together.

Sixth, despite the differences among our political systems, our peoples share a common aspiration for the fulfillment of individual human dignity. This is the heritage of our hemisphere and the ideal toward which all our governments have an obligation to strive.

Finally, and of immediate importance, we are achieving a new and productive balance—based on real interests—in our relations within the Americas, within other groupings, and with the rest of the world. All of us have ties outside the hemisphere. But our interests elsewhere do not impede our hemispheric effort. Our traditions of independence and diversity have served us well.

This is both a strength and a challenge to us now as this Assembly takes up the issue of development.

The United States is dedicated to cooperate in development throughout the world. But as we seek to make progress in all our global development efforts, we recognize close and special ties to the nations of the Americas. We regard the concerns of this hemisphere as our first priority.

It is for this reason that we support the suggestions which have been made for a special assembly of the OAS to be devoted to hemispheric cooperation for development. Such an assembly should deal with concrete problems capable of practical solutions. To this end the United States proposes that a preparatory meeting of experts be held in advance of the special assembly.

But we do not intend to delay our efforts while we await the processes of international institutions and conferences. The U.S. Administration will begin now:

- First, to give special attention to the economic concerns of Latin America in every area in which our executive branch possesses the power of discretionary decision;
- Second, to undertake detailed consultations with Latin American nations to coordinate our positions on all economic issues of concern to the hemisphere prior to the consideration of those issues in major international forums;
- Third, to consider special arrangements in the hemisphere in economic areas of particular concern to Latin America, such as the transfer and development of technology;
- In addition, we will put forth every effort to bring about the amendment of the U.S. Trade Act to eliminate the automatic exclusion of Ecuador and Venezuela from the generalized system of preferences.

The United States is prepared to proceed in these four areas whatever may occur in other development forums. But this Assembly offers an excellent opportunity to advance our joint progress. The United States believes that there are three major issues that this Assembly should address—commodities, trade, and technology. These involve:

- More stable and beneficial conditions for the production and marketing of primary commodities upon which the economic aspirations of so many countries in Latin America rely;
- Expansion of the trade opportunities and capabilities that are an essential part of the development strategies of all countries in the hemisphere; and
- Improved arrangements for the development, acquisition, and utilization of higher technology to speed the modernization of the hemisphere.

Let me address each of these issues in turn.

Commodities

Most of our members depend heavily on the production and export of primary commodities for essential earnings. Yet production and export of these resources are vulnerable to the cycles of scarcity and glut, underinvestment and overcapacity that disrupt economic conditions in both the developing and the industrial world.

At the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD] last month, we joined in the common commitment to search for concrete, practical solutions in the interests of both producers and consumers.

Despite reservations about some aspects of the final resolution at Nairobi, the United States believes that the final commodities resolution of the Conference represented a major advance in the dialogue between North and South; we will participate in the major preparatory conferences on individual commodities and in the preparatory conference on financing.

One key element, however, is missing from the final catalogue of Nairobi's proposals—machinery to spur the flow of new investment for resource production in the developing countries. The United States made a proposal aimed at that problem—an International Resources Bank [IRB]. A resolution to study the IRB was rejected by a vote that can best be described as accidental. Ninety nations abstained or were absent. Those nations of Latin America that reject such self-defeating tactics can make a special contribution to insure that the progress of all is not defeated by the sterile and outmoded confrontational tactics of a few.

As a contribution to the commitment we undertook at Nairobi to deal comprehensively with commodities problems, the United States proposes that the nations of the hemisphere undertake a three-part program to secure the contribution of commodities to development in this hemisphere.

First, I propose that we establish a regional consultative mechanism on commodities. This mechanism could well be under the aegis of the OAS. It should bring together experts with operational responsibilities and experience. The inter-American commodities mechanism could precede—or at least supplement—those established with a global mandate, where we are prepared to exchange views regularly and in depth on the state of commodities markets of most interest to us—including coffee, grains, meat, and the minerals produced in this hemisphere. Our objective will be to concert our information on production and demand in order to make the best possible use of our investment resources. These consultations will provide us an early-warning system to identify problems in advance and enable us to take appropriate corrective action nationally, regionally, or through worldwide organizations.

Second, I propose we give particular attention to global solutions for commodities important to one or more countries of the hemisphere. The United States has signed the Coffee and Tin Agreements; it is crucial to the coffee- and tin-producing countries of this hemisphere that those agreements be implemented in a fashion that will most appropriately contribute to their development.

In Nairobi, and at other forums, the United States proposed that we examine on a global basis other commodities of particular importance to Latin America—bauxite, iron ore, and copper. I suggest that we in the hemisphere have a special role to play in considering how these steps might be taken and in identifying other high priority subjects for global commodity discussions.

Third, I propose that the consultative group take a new look at the problem of insuring adequate investment in commodities in this hemisphere under circumstances that respect the sovereignty of producers and provide incentive for investment. We should examine all reasonable proposals, especially those which would help to assure effective resource development financing. If global solutions are not possible, we are willing to consider regional mechanisms.

Trade

Trade has been an engine of growth for all countries; and for many developing countries—above all those in Latin America—it is an essential vehicle of development. Recognizing the importance of trade to sustained growth, the United States has taken, within our global trade policy, a number of initiatives of particular significance to Latin America. We have reduced trade barriers, especially those affecting processed goods; provided preferential access to our market for many exports of developing countries; worked in the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva for reduction of barriers, giving priority to tropical products; and recognized in our general trade policy the special needs of developing countries.

Today, at this Assembly, we can begin to consider ways in which our commitment to trade cooperation can contribute to economic progress in our hemisphere. The United States sees three key areas which this Organization could usefully address:

- The need to provide opportunities for developing countries to expand and diversify exports of manufactured and semiprocessed goods;
- The need to promote the hemisphere's trade position through the multilateral trade negotiations at Geneva; and
- The need for effective regional and subregional economic integration.

Let me turn to each of these three points.

No single element is more important to Latin America's trade opportunities than the health of the U.S. economy. I can confirm to you today that our economy is in full recovery, with prospects brighter than they have been for years.

The preferences system contained in the U.S. Trade Act has been in effect since January. It gives Latin American countries duty-free entry on more than $1 billion worth of its exports to the United States. Even more important, it provides vast opportunities for Latin America to diversify into new product areas in its exports to the United States.

In addition to the effort we will undertake to end the exclusion of Ecuador and Venezuela from

the benefits of the U.S. Trade Act, President Ford has asked me to state today that:

- He will make every effort to add to the preferences system products that are of direct interest to Latin America;
- The executive branch will bend every effort to accommodate the export interests of Latin America in all matters in which we have statutory discretion. President Ford's recent choice of adjustment assistance rather than import restrictions in response to the petition of the U.S. footwear industry clearly demonstrates the commitment of the U.S. Government to a liberal trade policy and the use of the Trade Act to expand trade in the hemisphere;
- The President will direct the U.S. Department of Commerce to respond positively to requests from your governments for assistance in the development of export promotion programs. The Department of Commerce will make available technical advice on promotion techniques and personnel training to help develop new markets for Latin American exports worldwide.

The United States believes that the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva warrant the special attention of Latin America. Our view is that the international codes on subsidies and countervailing duties and on safeguard actions now being negotiated should recognize the special conditions facing developing countries. To this end:

- The United States will seek agreement at Geneva that the code on countervailing duties and subsidies now being negotiated should contain special rules to permit developing countries to assist their exports under agreed criteria for an appropriate time linked to specific development objectives.
- The United States next month will propose that the safeguards code under negotiation in Geneva grant special treatment to developing countries that are minor suppliers or new entrants in a developed-country market during the period that safeguards are in effect.
- The United States will send a trade policy team to Latin America shortly to identify ways to promote increased hemisphere trade through the Geneva negotiations; we are prepared to intensify consultations in Geneva and Washington with Latin American delegations to explore both general issues and positions for specific meetings.

Finally, the United States supports the concept and practice of regional and subregional economic integration as a means of magnifying the positive impact of trade on development. Expanded trade, based on the development of industries that will be able to compete successfully within and outside the integration area, will strengthen the growth process of participating countries. We seek means to support the far-reaching integration plans that have been drawn up in the hemisphere—for the Andean group, the Caribbean community, the Central American Common Market, and the Latin American Free Trade Area.

We are ready to support responsible efforts to further integration. The administration of U.S. trade laws and the improvement of our preferences system on matters such as rules of origin are two possible incentives to greater Latin American integration. We welcome your views as to a further U.S. role toward enhancing the momentum of economic integration in Latin America.

We are not persuaded, however, that we have fully exploited all the possibilities of how best to provide expanded trade opportunities to Latin America. We know that the issue is complex and that it involves not only expanded access to the markets of the United States but also measures to enhance opportunities for Latin American products in Europe and Japan—and throughout Latin America itself.

Some permanent, expert forum is necessary. We, therefore, propose that within the OAS there be established a special inter-American commission for trade cooperation. If the suggestion for a special general assembly on cooperation for development prospers, we think that assembly should set guidelines for the functioning of the commission. We see the commission as an opportunity, in major part through the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva, to bring together those policy-level officials most familiar with the actual trade problems and opportunities for trade creation under a firm mandate to seek innovative means of cooperating to expand exports—expanding, in short, on a regular and long-term basis the catalogue of trade expansion proposals I have elaborated above.

Technology

Technology is basic to economic development. It is technology that enables us to master the raw gifts of nature and transform them into the products needed for the well-being of our peoples.

But technology is not evenly distributed. There are impediments to its development, to its transfer, and, most importantly, to its effective utilization. The United States believes that technology should become a prime subject of hemispheric cooperation. The countries in this region have reached stages of development that enable them to adapt and create modern technologies. Our potential thus matches the urgency of practical needs.

At this point, what are the new directions we should take together? We have three proposals. The United States believes we in the hemisphere should:

First, take immediate advantage of promising global initiatives. To seek maximum benefit from the U.N. Conference on Science and Development set for 1979, we propose that the nations here today undertake preparatory consultations on that subject in the Economic Commission for Latin America, whose meeting has been prescribed as a regional forum within the Conference program. We will enlist the experience and resources of leading U.S. technology institutions in this hemispheric preparatory effort.

Second, increase public and private contacts on research, development, and the application of technology. To this end the United States will:

- Open a technology exchange service for Latin America to provide information on U.S. laws and regulations relating to technology flows and to sources of public and private technology;
- Explore cooperative ventures in which small and medium-sized U.S. firms would provide practical technologies to individual Latin American firms, along with the management expertise needed to select, adapt, and exploit those technologies; and
- Expand and strengthen Latin America's access to the National Technical Information Service and other facilities of the technology information network of the U.S. Government, which covers 90 percent of the technical information that flows from the $20 billion of research that the U.S. Government sponsors annually.

Third, develop new regional and subregional structures of consultation and cooperation on problems of technology. To this end, the United States proposes:

- That we establish a consultative group under the OAS to address and provide recommendations on information problems that Latin America faces in acquiring technology;
- That the OAS, in line with the UNCTAD IV consensus, establish a regional center on technology. The center would facilitate cooperative research and development activities, drawing on both public and private sources. It could stimulate exchanges of qualified technical personnel. And it could begin to attack the problem of incentives to the thousands of technologically trained Latin Americans now living abroad to return to and serve with their own countries. In the view of the United States, such a center should be a cooperative enterprise requiring commitment and contributions in funds, technological resources, and personnel from all of the countries that take part. To get us underway I propose that we convene a group of experts to examine the need, feasibility, characteristics, and role of an inter-American technology center and report to us before the next OAS General Assembly.

Importance of Cooperative Development

Economic development is a central concern of all nations today. The community of nations has become, irrevocably, a single global economy. We know that peace and progress will rest fundamentally on our ability to forge patterns of economic cooperation that are fair, productive, and open to all.

We in this hemisphere have a special opportunity and responsibility to advance the recent favorable mood, and the practical achievements, in cooperation between the developed and developing

nations. We start from a firmer foundation today; our prospects for working together are brighter than ever before—more so in this hemisphere than in any other region of the world. We should have reason for confidence in our ability to advance our own people's well-being, while simultaneously contributing to a more prosperous world. It is in this sense that I have sought today to advance our practical progress in important areas.

The United States stands ready to give its sister republics in the hemisphere special attention in the great task of cooperation for development. We shall make a major effort to prepare for the special session on development. We shall listen to your proposals, work with you in a serious and cooperative spirit of friendship, and commit ourselves to carry on the great heritage of the Americas as we go forward together.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, U.S.A.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
STA-501

Third Class Bulk Rt.

MR RON NESSEN
PRESS SECRETARY
THE WHITE HOUSE
STOP 27

The Secretary of State

Speech

June 11, 1976
Mexico City

Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Media Services

THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO: INDEPENDENCE AND INTERDEPENDENCE

Secretary Henry A. Kissinger at a dinner in honor of President Luis Echeverria.

I want to begin by saying that it gives me the greatest satisfaction to be able tonight to reciprocate to my Mexican friends a small measure of the hospitality which this great and beautiful country has so warmly extended to me on so many occasions in the past. I spent my honeymoon here; I have deep professional and personal ties to Mexico.

I have never come to this land without sensing deeply both the glory of Mexico's ancient past and its dynamism today—the thousands of years of civilization that culminated in the panorama of splendor that so awed the first conquistadors and, now, the vibrant course of modern Mexico, whose struggle for political and economic independence, dignity, and social justice has won for it the admiration of the community of nations, as well as a growing role of leadership in international affairs.

The impact which Mexico is making on our interdependent world, as all of us here know, is attributable in large part to the boundless energy and broad vision of President Luis Echeverria. He is an inspirational leader. I have had the privilege of working with him for nearly six years. He will be remembered in history for his great contributions to peace, progress, and justice.

Tonight I want to discuss two great tasks which are deep and permanent concerns of our two nations. Both bear the personal mark of President Echeverria:

- The global challenge of helping to construct a new and peaceful international order offering justice and prosperity to all peoples; and
- The state of the special, indeed unique, bond between the United States and Mexico.

The United States respects and values Mexico's role on the world scene. We also cherish our close historical, practical, and personal ties as neighbors. There is no conflict between these realities. Indeed they offer our two nations a precious advantage as we approach together the great issues of our time.

Mexico and the United States are independent and self-confident nations. We are mature enough to encounter the trials of our era without crises of identity and without allowing differences permanently to divide us. We are serious enough to disagree without rancor; creative enough to cooperate without threatening each other's independence. In this we are truly at the frontiers of Western civilization. As North American nations we are irrevocably linked by geography, history, interest, and principle. We need sign no documents to insure our kinship of thought and action as free and friendly peoples. We have a relationship all the more special for being unwritten.

Global Challenge of Peace, Prosperity, Justice

History has presented this generation with two great and unique challenges: The imperative of peace in the nuclear age; and the need to give purpose to peace by helping to shape a new structure of international relations that speaks to the positive aspirations of all peoples. Every nation has a stake in, and a responsibility for, the problem of global peace. Each has its special circumstances and its special role.

The United States, uniquely among the free nations of the world, bears a heavy responsibility to maintain the balance of stability upon which world peace depends. This is why we are committed to oppose the forces of intimidation and oppression whenever they threaten the global equilibrium. But we know, as Mexico knows, that peace is tenuous and progress is fragile without a curb, and eventually an end, to the arms race. This is why we have embarked on the difficult and complex negotiations to limit strategic arms—to reduce these arms and to ease the economic burden of the arms race.

Mexico, whose voice is heard by all the major groupings of the world's nations, also bears a responsibility for peace. Mexico has been among the staunchest proponents of disarmament and the use of national resources for development rather than the accumulation of arms. Mexico was the leader in negotiating the Treaty of Tlatelolco establishing a nuclear weapons-free zone in Latin America. And Mexico has raised its voice in support of the dignity, security, and self-determination of nations threatened by external intervention.

But the ultimate purpose of nations is to look beyond a peace that rests exclusively on a precarious balance of power to a new era of international economic cooperation. We must offer our children the hope of a better future by mastering the great economic and social challenge of building a new, equitable, and productive relationship among all nations, and particularly those of North and South.

The problem of economic development is not merely a technical, but a profoundly political and moral, issue. It is not possible to build a world community which is divided between the rich and the poor. If we are to live in a world of peace and justice, all nations must have the consciousness that the world community listens to their concerns.

This is why we attach such importance to the dialogue now taking place between the developed and developing nations. For beyond the technical solutions we may reach, the spirit we help engender can contribute to a world of peace and to a sense of community. This is why we are disturbed by attitudes of confrontation and concerned by those who seek gains through technical majorities. It is the essence of an effective international structure today, in our interdependent world, that solutions cannot be imposed by one group on another, but that a consensus must be established in which all share. By continuing to grow in strength and international participation, Mexico, and indeed all the nations of Latin America, can in important respects act as a bridge between the different groups that exist in the world today.

The United States has accepted the challenge of an interdependent world. We are committed to the cause of cooperation on an equal basis between all nations, whatever their stage of development. We have pursued this course at the Seventh Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly; at the Conference on International Economic Cooperation; at Kingston, Jamaica, in January; at Nairobi, Kenya, last month. There have been setbacks of course, but we believe a new and positive atmosphere has been created, and we join with your President in the view that the serious and responsible nations of the world now have an unprecedented opportunity to advance mankind's age-old dreams of a better life.

The United States knows that while our specific approaches to these problems may differ, Mexico shares our aspirations for a better world of peace and prosperity. Mexico has used its growing international influence to focus on the great global efforts to secure peace and enhance the quality of human life. Mexico's example is proud and compelling, not only for the peoples of the Americas but for all who value peace, prosperity, and justice.

Mexico's economic growth and progess have made it a vital force in international affairs. Mexico had a major influence on the course of the Seventh U.N. Special Session and is an active participant in all international efforts to accelerate development through a fair and cooperative global economic system. Mexico's energetic promotion of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States—which you yourself inspired, Mr. President—itself symbolizes the need for a new awareness that interdependence is not a slogan but a reality. And since the Revolution of 1910, Mexico has presented the international community with the example of a proudly independent nation committed to progress and social justice. Today Mexico's voice is heard and heeded in the leading councils of the world.

It is my profound conviction that Mexico and the United States together have a priceless advantage upon which to base common efforts in virtually every major area of human and international concern. Mexico's history, economic growth, institutional stability, and political imagination enable it to bring independent new dimensions to the global cooperation so essential to our shared hopes for a less divided and more prosperous world.

• The United States believes that the universal search for an enduring structure of peace for all peoples is possible only if it is based upon the free commitment of strong, stable, and responsible nations. Mexico's growing national strength and development and deepening participation in global councils strengthens the voice of this hemisphere and has given a special projection to the nations of North America in the vital debates of our time on such matters as disarmament and global security.

• The higher stage of economic progress that Mexico has attained has brought it into the company of economies which are vulnerable to global inflation, to sudden fluctuations in world patterns of supply and demand, to important technological change, and to investment capital shortages. At the same time our economies are among the world's most open and flexible. We can respond to change quickly and effectively. We have the opportunity and the responsibility and the will to shape the course of economic events rather than to acquiesce in the stale determinism that paralyzes so many nations of the world. In the key areas of finance and technology, investment and trade, the United States and Mexico, and with us the other nations of the hemisphere, have outstripped the world as a whole. Our habits of practical cooperation give us a head start. The efforts we take together can thus make a special and positive contribution to the course of development around the world.

• Beyond peace and prosperity lies a deeper universal aspiration for dignity and justice. Our two countries are both committed to the rule of law and extending the reach of international law in world affairs. This is most urgently needed with regard to the last great frontiers of our planet—the oceans. They are the common heritage of mankind, but they can become arenas for conflict if not governed by law. The differences between us on the issues involved have led to tensions, but they are issues which nations everywhere will have to solve. Our two nations have a special advantage and thus a special responsibility to reach agreement on our differences in the context of a rapid and successful conclusion to the Law of the Sea Conference this year. We have agreed to urgent consultations on this important issue.

• We have as well an obligation to the deeper sources of our common humanity. No peoples have been more dedicated to the cause of human dignity and liberty than ours. The struggle to secure the peace or to widen prosperity ultimately will have no meaning unless the peoples of the world can pursue their aspirations without fear, in societies which foster the fundamental rights of mankind. At the General Assembly of the Organization of American States in Santiago earlier this week, I reaffirmed the unequivocal commitment of the United States to the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. The United States endorsed the reports presented there by the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, whose powers we proposed be broadened. We did so in the recognition that the precious heritage of our Western Hemisphere is the conviction that human beings are the subjects, not the objects, of public policy; that citizens must not be the mere instruments of the state. The traditions of our two countries and our heritage as free American republics place upon us a special trust to defend and carry forward the principle that progess is sterile unless it enhances the areas of human freedom.

These are some of the great global challenges we both face. Let me turn now to the bilateral process through which we shape our progress as friends and partners.

Bilateral Bond

The imperatives of the relationship of Mexico and the United States are not to be found in words but in geography. Our shared destiny is literally written in stone. But the special relationship we have today represents, as well, an achievement of human will and responsibility.

The work we are doing together serves not only to strengthen our own ties; it is a demonstration to the world that two nations can resolve, in a reasoned and responsible manner, problems of acute sensitivity in areas touching upon national sovereignty, economic advantage, and human concern.

Let me briefly review the record of shared effort we have compiled and the work yet before us in each of these three areas.

First, how many nations of the world could accept as natural and comfortable an undefended boundary of nearly 2,000 miles? Our active day-to-day cooperation along our border is a rare phenomenon. Through the years, our joint International Boundary and Water Commission has solved major problems of shifting boundaries, flood control, and water distribution. The solution of the Chamizal and other territorial issues; the resolution of the problem of Colorado River salinity; and the coordination of air traffic control along our border have all been approached cordially, persistently, and constructively. This is a record of which we can be proud, and on which we can build as we take up further aspects of cooperation along the border, such as widened cooperation on search and rescue operations and problems affecting the environment.

Second, we have acted and are acting with mutual respect and great responsibility on issues of substantial economic interest, such as the desire of Mexican workers to seek employment in the United States and of Mexican exporters to sell in our country's markets. After decades of relatively satisfactory accommodation to the question of undocumented workers, we now face a number of new issues requiring mutual study and heightened cooperation—and that must take into account the legitimate concerns both of the people of the United States and the human rights of Mexican citizens.

We share Mexico's concern over your large trade deficit in 1975. The economic recovery in the United States and the continuation of the forward-looking attitude which now informs U.S. trade policy will serve, I am confident, to bring our trade accounts closer into balance. Even more important, the U.S. Trade Act's generalized system of preferences will expand Mexico's access to our market. Indeed Mexico, with over a half-billion dollars worth of exports eligible for duty-free treatment, should be the primary beneficiary of our new tariff system which gives products of developing countries competitive advantage over products of developed nations.

Third, both our nations have acted with heart and with vision on matters of deep human concern. We have combined our efforts with increasing success against the international narcotics trade, which has victimized so many citizens of both our countries. The effort of the Mexican Government to stop the production and trafficking of dangerous drugs in Mexico can stand as a model for the world. We are proud to be able to support you in your increasingly effective program of narcotics control. A related issue now before us concerns the need to prosecute narcotics violators to the full extent of the law while at the same time insuring the observance of their legal and human rights. We have had useful talks about improving the situation of nationals of our two nations imprisoned in the other country.

And, more positively, we have strengthened the cultural relations between our two nations. We share deep ethnic, linguistic, intellectual, and historical ties. Mexico's early recognition of the importance of preserving a nation's cultural heritage has inspired similar efforts around the world and won the admiration of the millions who experience first hand, as I shall tomorrow, the glories of your Mayan past. The treaty on the protection of cultural property between the United States and Mexico has been in force since 1970 and has proven effective. We are proud to assist Mexico's efforts to defend its cultural patrimony as a sustaining value for future generations.

As we look to the future we are witnessing a growth of balanced, two-way exchanges which range across the spectrum of intellectual and cultural life, from the arts to the humanities to technology. While increasing numbers of Mexicans are studying in the United States, more U.S. students are studying at Mexican universities than in any other nation. Each of us is developing a greater appreciation of the creative experience and achievement of the other—in science, music, literature, and the visual arts. We are prepared to move ahead even more vigorously to promote cultural exchange and cultural understanding, recognizing that they are powerful forces affecting the quality and tone of the future course of our relationship.

All these are issues of immediate and direct concern to our two nations. But they are also variations on the large themes of sovereignty, economic interest, and human concern that affect nations everywhere. Our struggles and our successes in dealing effectively and creatively with our own interdependence is relevant to the rest of the increasingly interdependent world in which we live. In a period when mankind faces international problems which are not only complex but fraught with ultimate risks, it is unrealistic as well as unwise to expect easy solutions. What we can and must seek to bring about is an atmosphere in bilateral, regional, and global relations in which problems are addressed positively and constructively; in which divergent views are expressed openly and freely, without wounding and sterile rhetoric; and in which the objective is an effort to solve problems pragmatically, not aggravate them ideologically.

Our long record of experience together makes clear that cooperative effort serves us both much better than recrimination or unilateral action. Although our differences over the years of our respective independence as nations have at times been enormous, in this last half century we have done as much to achieve a positive atmosphere of cooperation as any two nations in the world. The United States and Mexico are engaged today by preference as well as necessity.

In the future as in the past our success will be founded upon a fundamental continuity of purpose, of effort, of policy. That continuity is reflected today in your forward-looking "Plan Basico" and, in the United States, by the permanent interests of our foreign policy in maintaining global peace while building for a new era of economic cooperation and human justice. With this continuity and in this spirit we can continue to provide an example to the world of the way neighbors ought to conduct themselves; not only geographic neighbors such as we, but all nations—for on this shrinking planet all peoples are neighbors.

Mr. President, friends: A short distance from my office in the Department of State in Washington is a statue of Benito Juarez on which are engraved his words, "Peace is respect for the rights of others." But Benito Juarez also knew that the mere absence of war is not enough. The relations of states today must have an economic and a moral dimension as well. In the hearts of men and women, peace means an abiding sense of security and freedom from external intimidation; it also means the hope of widening economic opportunity; and it means conditions which foster the growth of social justice for all. These are values and causes which Mexicans and Americans hold in common and hold dear and which you, Mr. President, have done so much to promote.

I ask you to join me tonight in a toast to these values we share; to the distinguished President of Mexico, our good friend, Luis Echeverria; to the United Mexican States; and to the permanent and productive friendship of the people of Mexico and the United States. *Viva Mexico.*

The Department of State BULLETIN

Published weekly, the *Department of State Bulletin* provides information on developments in foreign relations and on the work of the Department and Foreign Service. It contains statements and addresses made by the President, the Secretary of State, the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, and other principal officers of the government, together with selected press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department. Information is included on treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party.

How To Obtain

The *Bulletin* is available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402: 52 issues, domestic $42.50; foreign $53.15, single copy 85¢. A sample copy for prospective subscribers may be obtained without charge from the Office of Media Services, Room 4831, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

ENTER MY SUBSCRIPTION TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN (DSB)

@ $42.50 Add $10.65 for foreign mailing. No additional postage is required for mailing within the United States, its possessions, Canada, Mexico, and all Central and South American countries except Argentina, Brazil, Belize, French Guiana, Guyana, and Surinam. For shipments to all other foreign countries include additional postage as quoted for each periodical or subscription service. Prices are subject to change without notice.

Send Subscription to:

NAME—FIRST, LAST

COMPANY NAME OR ADDITIONAL ADDRESS LINE

STREET ADDRESS

CITY | STATE | ZIP CODE

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

☐ Remittance Enclosed (Make checks payable to Superintendent of Documents)

☐ Charge to my Deposit Account No. .....

MAIL ORDER FORM TO:
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government
Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1976 O-209-016

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, U.S.A.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
STA-501

MR RON NESSEN
PRESS SECRETARY
THE WHITE HOUSE
STOP 27

The Secretary of State

Statement

June 17, 1976
Washington, D.C.

Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Media Services

LATIN AMERICA, EUROPE, AND AFRICA

Secretary Henry A. Kissinger before the House International Relations Committee.

I am happy to be able to report to this committee on our foreign policy with regard to three important areas which I have recently visited—Latin America, Western Europe, and Africa.

I believe that our relations with Latin America and with Western Europe are stronger and more promising than they have been in a decade. In Africa we have responded to a dangerously deteriorating situation with a policy that offers hope for southern Africa to undergo peaceful change with justice without submitting to external intervention, and opportunities for progress in the rest of Africa without following radical doctrines.

Let me take up with you our policy toward each of these areas.

Latin America

In March I reported to you on the vast changes evident to me during my trip to Latin America in February. These changes are opening the way to a new constructive relationship between the United States and Latin America. The quality of that relationship was evident at the meeting of the Organization of American States [OAS] General Assembly in Santiago, from which I have just returned. The atmosphere—of mutual respect and perceived common interest—was better at the 1976 OAS General Assembly than at any other inter-American meeting I have ever attended.

Ours is a special relationship in this hemisphere. The unique experience we share in the Americas—the finding and opening of new continents, the forging of nations free from colonial domination, the shared human and moral principles of the New World—creates special ties for the United States and Latin America.

As in all families there are periods of creativity and times of stress. Ours is no exception. The United States has passed through a variety of phases in its relationship to Latin America. Not all have been productive in recent years. Sometimes when we were active, when we attempted to organize massive transfers of resources to meet Latin American development needs directly, we were seen as attempting to dominate the hemisphere. When our policies were otherwise, when we were less involved in Latin American problems and more inclined to let Latin American nations work out their own solutions alone, we were looked upon as neglecting our obligations.

The 1930's, the 1940's, and even the 1950's were decades in which this nation indulged in the pretense of tutelage. In the 1960's the Alliance for Progress rallied the energies and enthusiasms of people throughout the Americas to the development effort. But by 1969 its promises had begun to fade. Thus even as Latin America began to realize its own maturity and experience a period of massive growth, and with it greater self-respect, the United States moved into a period of lower profile, which we maintained until the inauguration of the new dialogue in 1974.

That period drew to a close with the meeting at Tlatelolco, in Mexico, in which we began a process of dialogue with the hemisphere once again. At the outset, admittedly, the dialogue had a character of inquiring into what the United States could do for Latin America. But it became obvious that, as a result of the major changes and considerable progress in Latin America during the 1960's and early 1970's, we were now able to deal with the major nations of Latin America with a new mutuality of respect and equality of sovereignty quite impossible 20 years ago or even 10.

In the last two years we have built steadily on this new relationship. We have taken advantage of it to put forward new initiatives, in the political and the economic area, which we could not have considered a decade or more ago. The culmination of this new policy effort was the meeting at Santiago last week.

The constructive attitude in Santiago and the remarkably good tone to our relationships throughout the hemisphere are attributable in great part to three factors:

- The United States, since the inauguration of the new dialogue early in 1974, is again active as an equal partner in inter-American councils;
- We have a coherent policy that addresses the entire catalogue of hemispheric issues; and
- We have a vision of the future of our relationship.

It is that, I believe, which has reassured Latin America that the political relationship with the United States—the basic solidarity of the Western Hemisphere—is again increasingly vital.

With our political and moral relationship once again sound, we have a basis for cooperation with Latin America in the area of most pressing concern—that of economic development. The countries of Latin America are among the most developed of the developing nations, and have been growing rapidly. Latin America has quintupled its collective gross product since 1950. At this rate, in 10 years Latin America will have attained the economic strength which Europe had in 1960. Its economies, furthermore, are increasingly important in world commodity, mineral, and energy markets and in trade in manufactured goods. Success in the struggle for development of the poorer countries of the world, when it comes, will come first in Latin America. For this reason we must focus our attention and our energies there.

To address the changing nature of our relationship with Latin America and to deal with the expanding range of our common concerns, I set forth in Latin America last February six elements of our policy. I said the United States would:

- Take special cognizance of the distinctive requirements of the more industrialized economies of Latin America and of the region as a whole, in the context of our efforts to help shape a more equitable international order;
- Assist directly the neediest nations in the hemisphere afflicted by poverty and natural disaster;
- Support Latin American regional and subregional efforts to organize for cooperation and integration;
- Negotiate on the basis of parity and dignity our specific differences with each and every state, to solve problems before they become conflicts;
- Enforce our commitment to collective security and to maintain regional integrity against attempts to undermine solidarity, threaten independence, or export violence; and
- Work to modernize the inter-American system to respond to the needs of our times and give direction to our common action.

Since February, in furtherance of these objectives, the United States has introduced trade, investment, and technology proposals of special relevance to this hemisphere at the Conference on International Economic Cooperation [CIEC] in Paris and at the fourth U.N. Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD IV] in Nairobi. We responded to the efforts of the Guatemalan people to recover from the earthquake that devastated their land. We have provided fresh support to subregional cooperation in Central America and are exploring ways of relating more effectively to the Andean Pact. And at last week's General Assembly of the Organization of American States at Santiago we advanced our common interests in three important areas: cooperation for development; reform of the inter-American system; and human rights.

To speed cooperation for development in the Americas, we stressed three major topics for action: commodities, trade, and technology.

The economic aspirations of most countries in Latin America depend upon stable conditions for the production and marketing of primary commodities. At Santiago we proposed a three-point program designed to: improve regional consultations on commodities markets; derive greater hemispheric benefits from global commodity arrangements; and improve resource financing, either on a global or regional basis.

To expand trade opportunities and capabilities we offered proposals to help developing nations expand and diversify exports of manufactured and semiprocessed goods; promote the hemisphere's trade position through the Geneva negotiations; and support needed regional and subregional economic integration.

And we proposed a number of new ideas to stimulate the development, acquisition, and utilization of technology in the modernization of the hemisphere.

To improve the inter-American system, we circulated proposals—the most far-reaching the United States has ever put forward—which would simplify the organization by strengthening the foreign ministers' meetings in the periodic General Assemblies; eliminate the standing councils; open the OAS to wider membership in the hemisphere, particularly the new states of the Caribbean; and increase the Latins' share of the budget. Such steps, we believe, could lead to a leaner, more flexible and responsive organization which could better promote the mutual security, economic progress, and human rights of the Americas.

And on the centrally important issue of human rights, I addressed the special responsibility of our nations to preserve, cherish, and defend fundamental human values—for if such values cannot be preserved, cherished, and defended in this hemisphere, where the rights and the promise of the individual have played such a historic role, then they are in jeopardy everywhere. At Santiago, the United States reaffirmed our unequivocal commitment to the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. We endorsed the reports presented there by the Inter-American Human Rights Commission: its annual report which cites the rise of violence and terror in many nations of Latin America; its report on Chile; and its report, submitted too late for official consideration by the OAS Assembly, concerning the inhuman treatment of political prisoners in Cuba and the refusal of Cuba to cooperate with the Commission.

The United States emphasized our belief that the protection of human rights in the hemisphere is an obligation of every nation and not simply of particular nations whose practices have come to public attention or whose ideology, on whichever side of the political spectrum, is unpopular. The contrast between the respective treatment of the human rights commission's work by the Governments of Chile and Cuba demonstrates the importance of this principle. The Government of Chile cooperated with the Commission; the Government of Cuba did not. The Government of Chile did nothing to prevent widespread publication in that country of information about the Commission's report and about the OAS discussion of the issue. Needless to say, there has been nothing comparable in the government-controlled media in Cuba. Most important, the Commission noted a quantitative improvement in the situation in Chile since its last report.

For these reasons, I believe we can best enhance the prospects for further human rights progress in Chile by continuing a balanced policy by working in the area of human rights and by assisting that government to meet the economic problems before it. We have made it clear to the Government of Chile that the condition of human rights in that country impairs our relationship. Actions which would further undermine our relationship could eliminate the practical possibilities for betterment of economic conditions.

Mr. Chairman, our efforts in Latin America over the past several months have considerably advanced our practical progress and provided a firm foundation of policy for the years ahead. We have moved into a new phase of profound interest, active initiatives, and comprehensive proposals for altering the inter-American relationship, a phase which is more compatible with the new cooperative spirit in the hemisphere. We have come to the end of a critical era and are marking the beginning of a new one. The United States can now deal with Latin America in a new spirit. We need not hold back on major initiatives for fear of inspiring old notions of paternalism. With consultation and cooperation, our hopes of meeting the challenges of economic and social progress in an age of inter-

dependence, and of building a sound and beneficial relationship between developed and developing nations, are brightest and most promising here in this hemisphere.

Let me turn briefly now to Europe.

Europe

In late May I attended the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] Ministers' meeting in Oslo and held a series of meetings with European leaders.

I do not need to rehearse at length to this committee why the countries of Western Europe are important to the United States and to all our international endeavors. Throughout the postwar period we have recognized that the security of Western Europe is inseparable from our own. Our economies are inextricably linked; we have had repeated demonstrations that economic performance on one side of the Atlantic will in time affect both. Most of all, these are the peoples who share our most fundamental cultural and political heritage and its values, and they share our vision of the kind of world we want to live in.

While cooperating in a defensive alliance which for durability and vitality is probably unique in the history of sovereign states, the Atlantic nations also have been coordinating efforts gradually to improve relations with regimes in Eastern Europe whose values and aims are very different from our own. We have recognized from the outset that this difficult undertaking could only proceed from a basis of Western strength and cohesion.

Now with the growth of Soviet military power; with a proliferation of potentially explosive regional tensions; with the emergence of new power centers based on control of vital economic resources; with growing demands for redistribution of the world's wealth; and with common economic and social problems ahead, it is more important than ever that our consultations with our closest allies be constant and our cooperation constant. This does not mean that the Atlantic states will see all problems in identical ways or always adopt identical policies. It does mean that only by understanding one another's interests and perspectives can we maintain that essential harmony in our policies which will enable us to deal constructively both with the Communist world and with the demands of the developing states.

Three years ago the United States called for a reaffirmation of European-American solidarity. We believed that it was imperative to reaffirm the central place of Western unity in all that we were about to do.

Over the course of these last few years I believe that the West has achieved an extraordinary cohesion and resolve. It is a sign of strength that doctrinal disputes over redefining our relationship or the modes of our consultation have given way to concerted attacks on the actual problems before us. Economic, security, and political issues have crowded upon us, and we have responded together in the solidarity displayed by the Western countries:

- In the declaration at the NATO summit in May 1975;
- In improving cooperation on defense issues;
- In unified positions before and during the Helsinki summit in July 1975;
- In the Vienna negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions;
- In continuing allied consultations on SALT;
- In intensified political consultations in refusing to bow to the temptation of protectionism in trade;
- In the network of common energy institutions created rapidly in response to the challenge of the oil cartel;
- In the Rambouillet economic summit of last November; and
- In the continuing series of multilateral negotiations with the developing countries in both new and old international forums.

At the NATO meeting last month there was firm agreement that our common security rests on the foundation of Western solidarity and strength, and that continuing defense efforts will be necessary to counter Soviet assertiveness and induce restraint in Soviet behavior. There was broad agreement that efforts to seek stability and improvements in East-West relations should continue, but that such efforts too must be based on a clear foundation of military strength and resolve. I was, in addition, struck by the growing appreciation among all NATO members that military, economic, and political developments around the globe can have the most direct impact on the security and prosperity of the North Atlantic states.

At the May meeting we discussed and found basic agreement on a wide range of issues: the importance of peaceful evolution in Africa; the centrality of our commitment to the security of Europe; the importance we attach to implementation of the Helsinki final act; the need for close consultations on Strategic Arms Limitation Talks [SALT]; the necessity to continue efforts toward mutual and balanced force reductions; the situation in the Mediterranean; the high-level attention we should give to the question of military standardization; and most important, our continuing commitment to shared values, the basic cement that has held our alliance together for nearly 30 years.

My bilateral visits to Norway, the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden, and Luxembourg, and the London meeting of the Central Treaty Organization [CENTO] Foreign Ministers considerably furthered, I believe, the process of strengthened ties between America and Western Europe. In Norway we discussed that country's growing role as a major oil producer and the importance of close consultations on the complicated question of international exploitation of the considerable resources of the Svalbard, or Spitsbergen, Archipelago.

In Germany we reaffirmed our shared views on East-West relations and the need to approach this subject from a foundation of strength. I believe that U.S.-German relations have never been better.

Swedish-American relations over the past decade have not always been friendly. While we cannot hope to wholly reconcile all our different perspectives, I believe that our talks helped each side better understand the conditions under which the other must conduct its foreign policy. Our relations with Sweden have improved significantly over the past year, and I expressed the hope in Stockholm that this process will continue.

The importance and prestige of Luxembourg in Europe far exceed its size. My discussions with Prime Minister Thorn dealt primarily with international issues, on which I found it valuable to hear the views of an ally that presents a European point of view in an impartial, effective manner. And at CENTO I conveyed our continued support for the alliance and for peace and stability in the treaty region.

Today Europe's role on global issues is strong and effective. Europe's interest in the Far East, in the Middle East, and in Africa is growing and welcome to us. Prime Minister Callaghan's initiatives for a negotiated settlement in Rhodesia based on majority rule, President Giscard's proposal for a Western fund for coordinated assistance to African economic development, and Chancellor Schmidt's initiatives in the economic field are examples of creative European statesmanship which the United States welcomes and respects. We gain, and the world gains, from Europe's counsel and long experience in a global framework.

At the NATO meeting in Oslo we took up issues of security; next week I will return to Europe to attend the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] meeting where we will work to strengthen cooperation among the industrialized countries of the West and on our approach to the developing nations.

In a few days' time, President Ford will meet at Puerto Rico with his colleagues, the heads of government of Britain, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, and Japan, in what is now becoming a regular process of economic discussions at the highest political level. These meetings are symbolic of how far we have come in the last few years in consolidating cooperation among the industrial democracies and extending it into new spheres of common endeavor. They also demonstrate the understanding we share that the complexities of modern global management require above all a determined effort by our governments to prove that we have the ability to meet new challenges.

This kind of cooperation is the cornerstone of American foreign policy. It has been so for 30 years. It will continue to be so.

Africa

Finally, let me discuss briefly what we are trying to do in our African policy.

Our aims are:

- To avoid a race war which would have inevitably tragic consequences for all concerned;
- To do all we can to prevent foreign intervention in what must remain an African problem;
- To promote peaceful cooperation among the communities in southern Africa; and

• To prevent the radicalization of Africa.

In 1974 President Ford ordered a review of our policy toward Africa. As part of this effort I announced one year ago that I would visit Africa in the spring of 1976. Last September I set forth the fundamental elements of our policy toward Africa to members of the Organization of African Unity assembled in New York for the United Nations.

I said then that America had three major concerns:

• That the African continent be free of great-power rivalry or conflict;
• That all of the continent should have the right of self-determination; and
• That Africa attain prosperity for its people and become a strong participant in the global economic order—an economic partner with a growing stake in the international system.

Late last year the situation in Africa took on a new and serious dimension. For the first time since the colonial era was largely brought to an end in the early 1960's, external interventions had begun to control and direct an essentially African problem.

In the hope of halting a dangerously escalating situation in Angola, we undertook—until halted by the impact of our domestic debate—a wide range of diplomatic and other activity pointing toward a cessation of foreign intervention and a negotiated African solution.

By the first months of this year Soviet-Cuban intervention had contributed to an increasingly dangerous situation turning the political evolution away from African aspirations and toward great-power confrontation.

• The Soviets and Cubans had imposed their solution on Angola. Their forces were entrenched there. The danger was real that African states seeing the Soviet and Cuban presence on the scene might be driven in a radical direction.
• With the end of the Portuguese era in Africa, pressure was building on Rhodesia, regarded by Africans as the last major vestige of colonialism. Events in Angola encouraged radicals to press for a military solution in Rhodesia.
• With radical influence on the rise, and with immense outside military strength apparently behind the radicals, even moderate and responsible African leaders—firm proponents of peaceful change—began to conclude there was no alternative but to embrace the cause of violence. By March of this year, guerrilla actions took on ever larger dimensions.
• We saw ahead the prospect of war, fed and perhaps conducted by outside forces; we were concerned about a continent politically embittered and economically estranged from the West; and we saw ahead a process of radicalization which would place severe strains on our allies in Europe and Japan.
• There was no prospect of successfully shaping events in the absence of positive programs of our own for Africa.

It was for these reasons that President Ford determined that an African trip which had long been planned as part of an unfolding process of policy development had a compelling focus and urgency. We had these aims:

• To provide moderate African leaders with an enlightened alternative to the grim prospects so rapidly taking shape before them—prospects which threatened African unity and independence, indicated growing violence, and widening economic distress;
• To work for a solution that would permit all of the communities in Africa, black or white, to coexist on the basis of justice and dignity;
• To give friendly and moderate African governments the perception that their aspirations could be achieved without resort to massive violence or bloodshed; and that their hopes for prosperity and opportunity can best be realized through association with the West; and
• To promote solutions based on majority rule and minority rights which would enable diverse communities to live side by side.

In short we sought to show that there was a moderate and peaceful road open to fulfill African aspirations and that America could be counted on to cooperate constructively in the attainment of these objectives.

My trip addressed the three major issues facing Africa: Whether the urgent problems of southern Africa will be solved by negotiation or by war; whether Africa's economic development will take place on the basis of self-respect and open opportunity, or through perpetual relief or the radical regimentation of societies; and whether the course of African unity and self-determination will once again be distorted by massive extracontinental interference.

I believe that the 10-point policy we set forth in Lusaka, Zambia, in late April and the other proposals we made in Africa to enhance self-sustaining economic growth make up a platform which moderate Africans can support and which serves interests we share—for peace, justice, and progress and for an Africa free from outside interests:

• The possibility for a negotiated settlement in Rhodesia and Namibia has been enhanced. Time is running out and formidable barriers remain. But if continued responsible efforts are made by all sides, the burning questions of southern Africa still can be solved without immense loss of life, suffering, and bitterness and with giving each community an opportunity for a dignified life.
• African hopes for independence and the integrity of their continent have been raised. Big-power intervention can only undermine unity, set African against African and heighten the risk of conflict. Our policy on this clearly accords with African concerns as reflected in the suspicion and apprehension with which influential African leaders have regarded the large Cuban presence in Angola. We may now be seeing the results of that concern, and our clear position, as we receive an increasing number of reports that Cuban troops may begin to leave. However, we do not yet have clear evidence that this process is underway in any meaningful fashion. We will be carefully watching the pace and extent of any Cuban withdrawals.
• Our African policy is thus an important element in our overall international effort to help build a structure of relations which fosters peace, widening prosperity, and fundamental human dignity.

Mr. Chairman, Africa is of immense size, strategically located, with governments of substantial significance in numbers and growing in influence in the councils of the world. The interdependence of America and our allies with Africa is increasingly obvious. In the past months we have seen a major international crisis develop in this important area of the world and we have moved to deal with it. We have taken the initiative to offer a peaceful road to the future. We have told much of the world that America continues to have a positive vision and will play a crucial and responsible role in the world.

I believe that our policy initiatives were necessary; that they can be effective; that they are beneficial to the interests of the United States; and I believe that they are right.

But the new beginning in our African policy will require dedication and effort on our part if it is to come to a positive fruition. The Administration is determined to follow through on our initiatives and the promising beginnings that have been made. We look to the Congress for encouragement and for active support in this crucial enterprise.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, U.S.A.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
STA-501

MR RON NESSEN
PRESS SECRETARY
THE WHITE HOUSE
STOP 27

Kissen f.y.i.

Sixth General Assembly of the ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

SECRETARY KISSINGER

Human Rights

Cooperation for Development

OAS Reform

JOINT REPORT: U.S. and Panama

---

and

Secretary Kissinger's Statement

at the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America

Santiago, Chile

June 1976

Sixth General Assembly
of the
ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

SECRETARY KISSINGER

Human Rights

Cooperation for Development

OAS Reform

JOINT REPORT: U.S. and Panama

---

and

Secretary Kissinger's Statement

at the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America

Santiago, Chile

June 1976

INTRODUCTION

As a result of vast change and considerable progress in Latin America in the 1960's and early seventies, the way was opened for an increasingly constructive relationship between the United States and Latin America—based on a new mutuality of respect and equality of sovereignty.

In the two years since the inauguration of the New Dialogue in 1974, the United States has sought to build steadily on this opportunity by advancing initiatives to address coherently the entire catalogue of hemispheric issues. An important step in this effort was the visit by Secretary of State Kissinger to Latin America in February of this year (Department of State Publication 8848).

A further milestone in this new policy effort came at the General Assembly of the Organization of American States held in Santiago, Chile from June 7 to 10, 1976. At that meeting, Secretary Kissinger presented proposals to advance common hemispheric interests in three key areas of concern: human rights, cooperation for development, and reform of the OAS system. Together, these proposals represent a new spirit in inter-American policy matters—one in which the United States no longer need refrain from offering major initiatives for fear of inspiring old notions of paternalism. It is a spirit which instead is marked by consultation, cooperation, and brighter prospects for building stronger and more mutually beneficial relations in the Western Hemisphere.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Secretary Kissinger on June 8, 1976.

One of the most compelling issues of our time, and one which calls for the concerted action of all responsible peoples and nations, is the necessity to protect and extend the fundamental rights of humanity.

The precious common heritage of our Western Hemisphere is the conviction that human beings are the subjects, not the objects, of public policy; that citizens must not become mere instruments of the state.

This is the conviction that brought millions to the Americas. It inspired our peoples to fight for their independence. It is the commitment that has made political freedom and individual dignity the constant and cherished ideal of the Americas and the envy of nations elsewhere. It is the ultimate proof that our countries are linked by more than geography and the impersonal forces of history.

Respect for the rights of man is written into the founding documents of every nation of our hemisphere. It has long been part of the common speech and daily lives of our citizens. And today, more than ever, the successful advance of our societies requires the full and free dedication of the talent, energy, and creative thought of men and women who are free from fear of repression.

The modern age has brought undreamed-of benefits to mankind—in medicine, in technological advance, and in human communication. But it has spawned plagues as well—in the form of new tools of oppression as well as of civil strife. In an era characterized by terrorism, by bitter ideological contention, by weakened bonds of social cohesion, and by the yearning for order even at the expense of liberty, the result all too often has been the violation of fundamental standards of humane conduct.

The obscene and atrocious acts systematically employed to devalue, debase, and destroy human life during World War II vividly and ineradicably impressed the responsible peoples of the world with the enormity of the challenge to human rights. It was precisely to end such abuses and to provide moral authority in international affairs that a new system was forged after that war—globally in the United Nations and regionally in a strengthened inter-American system.

The shortcomings of our efforts in an age which continues to be scarred by forces of intimi-

dation, terror, and brutality fostered sometimes from outside national territories and sometimes from inside have made it dramatically clear that basic human rights must be preserved, cherished, and defended if peace and prosperity are to be more than hollow technical achievements. For technological progress without social justice mocks humanity; national unity without freedom is sterile; nationalism without a consciousness of human community—which means a shared concern for human rights—refines instruments of oppression.

We in the Americas must increase our international support for the principles of justice, freedom, and human dignity—for the organized concern of the community of nations remains one of the most potent weapons in the struggle against the degradation of human values.

Human Rights Challenge in the Americas

The ultimate vitality and virtue of our societies spring from the instinctive sense of human dignity and respect for the rights of others that have long distinguished the immensely varied peoples and lands of this hemisphere. The genius of our inter-American heritage is based on the fundamental democratic principles of human and national dignity, justice, popular participation, and free cooperation among different peoples and social systems.

The observance of these essential principles of civility cannot be taken for granted even in the most tranquil of times. In periods of stress and uncertainty, when pressures on established authority grow and nations feel their very existence is tenuous, the practice of human rights becomes far more difficult.

The central problem of government has always been to strike a just and effective balance between freedom and authority. When freedom degenerates into anarchy, the human personality becomes subject to arbitrary, brutal, and capricious forces. When the demand for order overrides all other considerations, man becomes a means and not an end, a tool of impersonal machinery. Clearly some forms of human suffering are intolerable no matter what pressures nations may face or feel. Beyond that all societies have an obligation to enable their people to fulfill their potentialities and live a life of dignity and self-respect.

As we address this challenge in practice, we must recognize that our efforts must engage the serious commitment of our societies. As a source of dynamism, strength, and inspiration, verbal posturings and self-righteous rhetoric are not enough. Human rights are the very essence of a meaningful life, and human dignity is the ultimate purpose of government. No government can ignore terrorism and survive, but it is equally true that a government that tramples on the rights of its citizens denies the purpose of its existence.

In recent years and even days, our newspapers have carried stories of kidnappings, ambushes, bombings, and assassinations. Terrorism and the denial of civility have become so widespread, political subversions so intertwined with official and unofficial abuse, and so confused with oppression and base criminality, that the protection of individual rights and the preservation of human dignity have become sources of deep concern—and worse—sometimes of demoralization and indifference.

No country, no people—for that matter no political system—can claim a perfect record in the field of human rights. But precisely because our societies in the Americas have been dedicated to freedom since they emerged from the colonial era, our shortcomings are more apparent and more significant. And let us face facts: Respect for the dignity of man is declining in too many countries of the hemisphere. There are several states where fundamental standards of humane behavior are not observed. All of us have a responsibility in this regard, for the Americas cannot be true to themselves unless they rededicate themselves to belief in the worth of the individual and to the defense of those individual rights which that concept entails. Our nations must sustain both a common commitment to the human rights of individuals and practical support for the institutions and procedures necessary to insure those rights.

The rights of man have been authoritatively identified both in the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the OAS's American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. There will, of course, always be differences of view as to the precise extent of the obligations of government. But there are standards below which no government can fall without offending fundamental values—such as genocide, officially tolerated torture, mass imprisonment or murder, or comprehensive denials of basic rights to racial, religious, political, or ethnic groups. Any government engaging in such practices must face adverse international judgment.

The international community has created important institutions to deal with the challenge of human rights. We here are all participants in some of them—the United Nations, the International Court of Justice, the OAS, and the two Human Rights Commissions of the United Nations and the OAS. In Europe an even more developed international institutional structure provides other useful precedents for our effort.

Procedures alone cannot solve the problem, but they can keep it at the forefront of our consciousness and they can provide certain minimum protection for the human personality. International law and experience have enabled the development of specific procedures to distinguish reasonable from arbitrary government action on, for example, the question of detention. These involve access to courts, counsel, and families; prompt release or charge; and, if the latter, fair and public trial. Where such procedures are followed, the risk and incidence of unintentional government error, of officially sanctioned torture, of prolonged arbitrary deprivation of liberty, are drastically reduced. Other important procedures are habeas corpus or amparo, judicial appeal, and impartial review of administrative actions. And then there are the procedures available at the international level—appeal to, and investigations and recommendations by, established independent bodies such as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, an integral part of the OAS and a symbol of our dedication to the dignity of man.

The Inter-American Commission has built an impressive record of sustained, independent, and highly professional work since its establishment in 1960. Its importance as a primary procedural alternative in dealing with the recurrent human rights problems of this hemisphere is considerable.

The United States believes this Commission is one of the most important bodies of the Organization of American States. At the same time it has a role which touches upon the most sensitive aspects of the national policies of each of the member governments. We must insure that the Commission functions so that it cannot be manipulated for international politics in the name of human rights. We must also see to it that the Commission becomes an increasingly vital instrument of hemispheric cooperation in defense of human rights. The Commission deserves the support of the Assembly in strengthening further its independence, even-handedness, and constructive potential.

Reports of the OAS Human Rights Commission

We have all read the two reports submitted to this General Assembly by the Commission. They are sobering documents for they provide serious evidence of violations of elemental international standards of human rights.

In its annual report on human rights in the hemisphere, the Commission cites the rise of violence and speaks of the need to maintain order and protect citizens against armed attack. But it also upholds the defense of individual rights as a primordial function of the law and describes case after case of serious governmental actions in derogation of such rights.

A second report is devoted exclusively to the situation in Chile. We note the Commission's statement that the Government of Chile has cooperated with the Commission, and the Commission's conclusion that the infringement of certain fundamental rights in Chile has undergone a quantitative reduction since the last report. We must also point out that Chile has filed a comprehensive and responsive answer that sets forth a number of hopeful prospects which we hope will soon be fully implemented.

Nevertheless the Commission has asserted that violations continue to occur, and this is a matter of bilateral as well as international attention. In the United States concern is widespread in the executive branch, in the press, and in the Congress, which has taken the extraordinary step of enacting specific statutory limits on U.S. military and economic aid to Chile.

The condition of human rights as assessed by the OAS Human Rights Commission has impaired our relationship with Chile and will continue to do so. We wish this relationship to be close, and all friends of Chile hope that obstacles raised by conditions alleged in the report will soon be removed.

At the same time the Commission should not focus on some problem areas to the neglect of others. The cause of human dignity is not served

by those who hypocritically manipulate concerns with human rights to further their political preferences, nor by those who single out for human rights condemnation only those countries with whose political views they disagree.

We are persuaded that the OAS Commission, however, has avoided such temptations.

The Commission has worked and reported widely. Its survey of human rights in Cuba is ample evidence of that. Though the report was completed too late for formal consideration at this General Assembly, an initial review confirms our worst fears of Cuban behavior. We should commend the Commission for its efforts—in spite of the total lack of cooperation of the Cuban authorities—to unearth the truth that many Cuban political prisoners have been victims of inhuman treatment. We urge the Commission to continue its efforts to determine the truth about the state of human rights in Cuba.

In our view the record of the Commission this year in all these respects demonstrates that it deserves the support of the Assembly in strengthening further its independence, even-handedness, and constructive potential.

We can use the occasion of this General Assembly to emphasize that the protection of human rights is an obligation not simply of particular countries whose practices have come to public attention. Rather, it is an obligation assumed by all the nations of the Americas as part of their participation in the hemispheric system.

To this end the United States proposes that the Assembly broaden the Commission's mandate so that instead of waiting for complaints, it can report regularly on the status of human rights throughout the hemisphere.

Through adopting this proposal the nations of the Americas would make plain our common commitment to human rights, increase the reliable information available to us, and offer more effective recommendations to governments about how best to improve human rights. In support of such a broadened effort, we propose that the budget and staff of the Commission be enlarged. By strengthening the contribution of this body, we can deepen our dedication to the special qualities of rich promise that make our hemisphere a standard-bearer for freedom-loving people in every quarter of the globe.

At the same time we should also consider ways to strengthen the inter-American system in terms of protection against terrorism, kidnapping, and other forms of violent threats to the human personality, especially those inspired from the outside.

Necessity for Concern and Concrete Action

It is a tragedy that the forces of change in our century—a time of unparalleled human achievement—have also visited upon many individuals around the world a new dimension of intimidation and suffering.

The standard of individual liberty of conscience and expression is the proudest heritage of our civilization. It summons all nations. But this hemisphere, which for centuries has been the hope of all mankind, has a special requirement for dedicated commitment.

Let us then turn to the great task before us. All we do in the world—in our search for peace, for greater political cooperation, for a fair and flourishing economic system—is meaningful only if linked to the defense of the fundamental freedoms which permit the fullest expression of mankind's creativity. No nations of the globe have a greater responsibility. No nations can make a greater contribution to the future. Let us look deeply within ourselves to find the essence of our human condition. And let us carry forward the great enterprise of liberty for which this hemisphere has been—and will again be—the honored symbol everywhere.

COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

Secretary Kissinger on June 9, 1976.

For two centuries the peoples of this hemisphere have been forging a record of cooperation and accomplishment of which we can be proud. It is a record which gives good cause for the confidence we bring to the tasks we face today. But of greater importance is the truly special relationship we have achieved. The ties of friendship, mutual regard, and high respect that we have forged here set this hemisphere apart. The bond between the American republics is unmatched in the world today in both depth and potential.

First, we have maintained the awareness that our destinies are linked—a recognition of the reality that we are bound by more than geography and common historical experience. We are as diverse as any association of nations, yet this special relationship is known to us all, almost instinctively.

Second, ours is a hemisphere of peace. In no other region of the world has international conflict been so rare, or peaceful and effective cooperation so natural to the fabric of our relationships.

Third, we work together with a unique spirit of mutual respect. I personally am immensely grateful for the warm and serious relationships I have enjoyed with my colleagues and other Western Hemisphere leaders. I am convinced that this sense of personal *amistad* can play a decisive role in the affairs of mankind, and nowhere more so than in our hemisphere.

Fourth, we share the conviction that there is much to do and that working together for concrete progress is the surest way to get it done. Even our criticism presumes the feasibility of cooperation.

Fifth, we respect each other's independence. We accept the principle that each nation is—and must be—in charge of its own future. Each chooses its mode of development; each determines its own policies. But we know that our capacity to achieve our national goals increases as we work together.

Sixth, despite the differences among our political systems, our peoples share a common aspiration for the fulfillment of individual human dignity. This is the heritage of our hemisphere and the ideal toward which all our governments have an obligation to strive.

Finally, and of immediate importance, we are achieving a new and productive balance—based on real interests—in our relations within the Americas,

within other groupings, and with the rest of the world. All of us have ties outside the hemisphere. But our interests elsewhere do not impede our hemispheric efforts. Our traditions of independence and diversity have served us well.

This is both a strength and a challenge to us now as this Assembly takes up the issue of development.

The United States is dedicated to cooperate in development throughout the world. But as we seek to make progress in all our global development efforts, we recognize close and special ties to the nations of the Americas. We regard the concerns of this hemisphere as our first priority.

It is for this reason that we support the suggestions which have been made for a special assembly of the OAS to be devoted to hemispheric cooperation for development. Such an assembly should deal with concrete problems capable of practical solutions. To this end the United States proposes that a preparatory meeting of experts be held in advance of the special assembly.

But we do not intend to delay our efforts while we await the processes of international institutions and conferences. The U.S. Administration will begin now:

- First, to give special attention to the economic concerns of Latin America in every area in which our executive branch possesses the power of discretionary decision;
- Second, to undertake detailed consultations with Latin American nations to coordinate our positions on all economic issues of concern to the hemisphere prior to the consideration of those issues in major international forums;
- Third, to consider special arrangements in the hemisphere in economic areas of particular concern to Latin America, such as the transfer and development of technology;
- In addition, we will put forth every effort to bring about the amendment of the U.S. Trade Act to eliminate the automatic exclusion of Ecuador and Venezuela from the generalized system of preferences.

The United States is prepared to proceed in these four areas whatever may occur in other development forums. But this Assembly offers an excellent opportunity to advance our joint progress. The United States believes that there are three major issues that this Assembly should address—commodities, trade, and technology. These involve:

- More stable and beneficial conditions for the production and marketing of primary commodities upon which the economic aspirations of so many countries in Latin America rely;
- Expansion of the trade opportunities and capabilities that are an essential part of the development strategies of all countries in the hemisphere; and
- Improved arrangements for the development, acquisition, and utilization of higher technology to speed the modernization of the hemisphere.

Let me address each of these issues in turn.

Commodities

Most of our members depend heavily on the production and export of primary commodities for essential earnings. Yet production and export of these resources are vulnerable to the cycles of scarcity and glut, underinvestment and overcapacity that disrupt economic conditions in both the developing and the industrial world.

At the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD] last month, we joined in the common commitment to search for concrete, practical solutions in the interests of both producers and consumers.

Despite reservations about some aspects of the final resolution at Nairobi, the United States believes that the final commodities resolution of the Conference represented a major advance in the dialogue between North and South; we will participate in the major preparatory conferences on individual commodities and in the preparatory conference on financing.

One key element, however, is missing from the final catalogue of Nairobi's proposals—machinery to spur the flow of new investment for resource production in the developing countries. The United States made a proposal aimed at that problem—an International Resources Bank [IRB]. A resolution to study the IRB was rejected by a vote that can best be described as accidental. Ninety nations abstained or were absent. Those nations of Latin America that reject such self-defeating tactics can make a special contribution to insure that the progress of all is not defeated by the sterile and outmoded confrontational tactics of a few.

As a contribution to the commitment we undertook at Nairobi to deal comprehensively with commodities problems, the United States proposes that the nations of the hemisphere undertake a three-part program to secure the contribution of commodities to development in this hemisphere.

First, I propose that we establish a regional consultative mechanism on commodities. This mechanism could well be under the aegis of the OAS. It should bring together experts with operational responsibilities and experience. The inter-American commodities mechanism could precede—or at least supplement—those established with a global mandate, where we are prepared to exchange views regularly and in depth on the state of commodities markets of most interest to us—including coffee, grains, meat, and the minerals produced in this hemisphere. Our objective will be to concert our information on production and demand in order to make the best possible use of our investment resources. These consultations will provide us with an early-warning system to identify problems in advance and enable us to take appropriate corrective action nationally, regionally, or through worldwide organizations.

Second, I propose we give particular attention to global solutions for commodities important to one or more countries of the hemisphere. The United States has signed the Coffee and Tin Agreements; it is crucial to the coffee- and tin-producing countries of this hemisphere that those agreements be implemented in a fashion that will most appropriately contribute to their development.

In Nairobi, and at other forums, the United States proposed that we examine on a global basis other commodities of particular importance to Latin America—bauxite, iron ore, and copper. I suggest that we in the hemisphere have a special role to play in considering how these steps might be taken and in identifying other high priority subjects for global commodity discussions.

Third, I propose that the consultative group take a new look at the problem of insuring adequate investment in commodities in this hemisphere under circumstances that respect the sovereignty of producers and provide incentive for investment. We should examine all reasonable proposals, especially those which would help to assure effective resource development financing. If global solutions are not possible, we are willing to consider regional mechanisms.

Trade

Trade has been an engine of growth for all countries; and for many developing countries—above all those in Latin America—it is an essential vehicle of development. Recognizing the importance of trade to sustained growth, the United States has taken, within our global trade policy, a number of initiatives of particular significance to Latin America. We have reduced trade barriers, especially those affecting processed goods; provided preferential access to our market for many exports of developing countries; worked in the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva for reduction of barriers, giving priority to tropical products; and recognized in our general trade policy the special needs of developing countries.

Today, at this Assembly, we can begin to consider ways in which our commitment to trade cooperation can contribute to economic progress in our hemisphere. The United States sees three key areas which this Organization could usefully address:

- The need to provide opportunities for developing countries to expand and diversify exports of manufactured and semiprocessed goods;
- The need to promote the hemisphere's trade position through the multilateral trade negotiations at Geneva; and
- The need for effective regional and subregional economic integration.

Let me turn to each of these three points.

No single element is more important to Latin America's trade opportunities than the health of the U.S. economy. I can confirm to you today that our economy is in full recovery, with prospects brighter than they have been for years.

The preferences system contained in the U.S. Trade Act has been in effect since January. It gives Latin American countries duty-free entry on more than $1 billion worth of their exports to the United States. Even more important, it provides vast op-

portunities for Latin America to diversify into new product areas in its exports to the United States.

In addition to the effort we will undertake to end the exclusion of Ecuador and Venezuela from the benefits of the U.S. Trade Act, President Ford has asked me to state today that:

- He will make every effort to add to the preferences system products that are of direct interest to Latin America;
- The executive branch will bend every effort to accommodate the export interests of Latin America in all matters in which we have statutory discretion. President Ford's recent choice of adjustment assistance rather than import restrictions in response to the petition of the U.S. footwear industry clearly demonstrates the commitment of the U.S. Government to a liberal trade policy and the use of the Trade Act to expand trade in the hemisphere;
- The President will direct the U.S. Department of Commerce to respond positively to requests from your governments for assistance in the development of export promotion programs. The Department of Commerce will make available technical advice on promotion techniques and personnel training to help develop new markets for Latin American exports worldwide.

The United States believes that the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva warrant the special attention of Latin America. Our view is that the international codes on subsidies and countervailing duties and on safeguard actions now being negotiated should recognize the special conditions facing developing countries. To this end:

- The United States will seek agreement at Geneva that the code on countervailing duties and subsidies now being negotiated should contain special rules to permit developing countries to assist their exports under agreed criteria for an appropriate time linked to specific development objectives.
- The United States next month will propose that the safeguards code under negotiation in Geneva grant special treatment to developing countries that are minor suppliers or new entrants in a developed-country market during the period that safeguards are in effect.
- The United States will send a trade policy team to Latin America shortly to identify ways to promote increased hemisphere trade through the Geneva negotiations; we are prepared to intensify consultations in Geneva and Washington with Latin American delegations to explore both general issues and positions for specific meetings.

Finally, the United States supports the concept and practice of regional and subregional economic integration as a means of magnifying the positive impact of trade on development. Expanded trade, based on the development of industries that will be able to compete successfully within and outside the integration area, will strengthen the growth process of participating countries. We seek means to support the far-reaching integration plans that have been drawn up in the hemisphere—for the Andean group, the Caribbean community, the Central American Common Market, and the Latin American Free Trade Area.

We are ready to support responsible efforts to further integration. The administration of U.S. trade laws and the improvement of our preferences system on matters such as rules of origin are two possible incentives to greater Latin American integration. We welcome your views as to a further U.S. role toward enhancing the momentum of economic integration in Latin America.

We are not persuaded, however, that we have fully exploited all the possibilities of how best to provide expanded trade opportunities to Latin America. We know that the issue is complex and that it involves not only expanded access to the markets of the United States but also measures to enhance opportunities for Latin American products in Europe and Japan—and throughout Latin America itself.

Some permanent, expert forum is necessary. We, therefore, propose that within the OAS there be established a special inter-American commission for trade cooperation. If the suggestion for a special assembly on cooperation for development prospers, we think that assembly should set guidelines for the functioning of the commission. We see the commission as an opportunity, in major part through the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva, to bring together those policy-level officials most familiar with the actual trade problems and opportunities for trade creation under a firm mandate to seek innovative means of cooperating to expand exports—expanding, in short, on a regular and long-term basis the catalogue of trade expansion proposals I have elaborated above.

Technology

Technology is basic to economic development. It is technology that enables us to master the raw gifts of nature and transform them into the products needed for the well-being of our peoples.

But technology is not evenly distributed. There are impediments to its development, to its transfer, and, most importantly, to its effective utilization. The United States believes that technology should become a prime subject of hemispheric cooperation. The countries in this region have reached stages of development that enable them to adapt and create modern technologies. Our potential thus matches the urgency of practical needs.

At this point, what are the new directions we should take together? We have three proposals. The United States believes we in the hemisphere should:

First, take immediate advantage of promising global initiatives. To seek maximum benefit from the U.N. Conference on Science and Development set for 1979, we propose that the nations here today undertake preparatory consultations on that subject in the Economic Commission for Latin America, whose meeting has been prescribed as a regional forum within the Conference program. We will enlist the experience and resources of leading U.S. technology institutions in this hemispheric preparatory effort.

Second, increase public and private contacts on research, development, and the application of technology. To this end the United States will:

- Open a technology exchange service for Latin America to provide information on U.S. laws and regulations relating to technology flows and to sources of public and private technology;
- Explore cooperative ventures in which small and medium-sized U.S. firms would provide practical technologies to individual Latin American firms, along with the management expertise needed to select, adapt, and exploit those technologies; and
- Expand and strengthen Latin America's access to the National Technical Information Service and other facilities of the technology information network of the U.S. Government, which covers 90 percent of the technical information that flows from the $20 billion worth of research that the U.S. Government sponsors annually.

Third, develop new regional and subregional structures of consultation and cooperation on problems of technology. To this end, the United States proposes:

- That we establish a consultative group under the OAS to address and provide recommendations on information problems that Latin America faces in acquiring technology;
- That the OAS, in line with the UNCTAD IV consensus, establish a regional center on technology. The center would facilitate cooperative research and development activities, drawing on both public and private sources. It could stimulate exchanges of qualified technical personnel. And it could begin to attack the problem of incentives to the thousands of technologically trained Latin Americans now living abroad to return to and serve with their own countries. In the view of the United States, such a center should be a cooperative enterprise requiring commitment and contributions in funds, technological resources, and personnel from all of the countries that take part. To get us underway I propose that we convene a group of experts to examine the need, feasibility, characteristics, and role of an inter-American technology center and report to us before the next OAS General Assembly.

Importance of Cooperative Development

Economic development is a central concern of all nations today. The community of nations has become, irrevocably, a single global economy. We know that peace and progress will rest fundamentally on our ability to forge patterns of economic cooperation that are fair, productive, and open to all.

We in this hemisphere have a special opportunity and responsibility to advance the recent favorable mood, and the practical achievements, in cooperation between the developed and developing

nations. We start from a firmer foundation today; our prospects for working together are brighter than ever before—more so in this hemisphere than in any other region of the world. We should have reason for confidence in our ability to advance our own people's well-being, while simultaneously contributing to a more prosperous world. It is in this sense that I have sought today to advance our practical progress in important areas.

The United States stands ready to give its sister republics in the hemisphere special attention in the great task of cooperation for development. We shall make a major effort to prepare for the special assembly on development. We shall listen to your proposals, work with you in a serious and cooperative spirit of friendship, and commit ourselves to carry on the great heritage of the Americas as we go forward together.

OAS REFORM

Secretary Kissinger's statement distributed by the U.S. Delegation June 11, 1976.

The Organization of American States is the cornerstone of the inter-American system, the oldest institution of regional cooperation in the world. Its member states have exceptional ties of respect and a common heritage, and a considerable stake in maintaining those ties for the future.

The inter-American system pioneered the principles of nonintervention and collective security among cooperating sovereign states. Because the Americas also have enormous vitality and achievement, we have a major opportunity and obligation to continue to provide an example and impetus to the global search for better ways to mediate the common destiny of mankind.

Many ask, why think of OAS reform? Why, some wonder, does our Secretary General [Alejandro Orfila] refer to an "identity crisis" in his latest annual report?

The answer lies in the fact that the pace and complexity of the international and domestic changes of the recent past have made the organization as it is presently constituted less effective as an instrument of our respective foreign policies, and less significant to the real issues on the new inter-American agenda than our minimum efforts deserve.

This Hemisphere is unique; there is no other grouping like it in the world. We have indeed a special relationship. The fundamental purpose of the OAS must be to continue to nurture and strengthen our fundamental, shared values. We must have an organization that reflects our permanent and irrevocable engagement to work together and maintain our continent as a Hemisphere of peace, cooperation, and development.

The United States is committed to the OAS. We have pledged to make it a continually more effective instrument for action in pursuit of the common goals of prosperity and human dignity.

It was to that end that the member states agreed three years ago to an effort to reform, restructure, and modernize the OAS. The results of that effort are disappointing. A proposed new draft of the charter of the OAS has emerged from the permanent council. I regret to say that it is one

that our Government could neither sign nor recommend that our Senate ratify. It includes prescriptive and hortatory statements of general principle which are as poorly defined as they are ominous. No effort is made in the new charter draft to come to grips with the need to modernize or improve the structure of the organization. We believe the real shortcomings of the OAS have yet to be adequately addressed.

We propose a new effort to reform, modernize, and restructure the organization. We think that effort should concentrate, not on words, but on three major substantive issues: structure, membership, and finance.

Structure

The United States would like to advance four points as possible guidelines for the future effort, in the interest of modernization of the organization. The purposes of the organization should be stated simply and clearly in the new charter. Those purposes should be:

- The promotion of cooperation for development;
- The maintenance of the peace and security of our region; and
- The preservation of our common tradition of respect for human dignity and the rights of the individual.

The structure of the organization serving these goals should be flexible. We should write a constitutive document for the organization which will serve us well into the future. That an organization finds it necessary to rewrite its charter every 5 to 10 years does not speak well for that organization's sense of its role or function. We are now in an age of great change. Our efforts in the coming years to achieve the three basic goals of the organization will take place under rapidly changing circumstances. Thus, flexibility and adaptability must be the key considerations guiding the reform effort. We should not hamstring ourselves with a charter brimfull of the details of the day, with procedural minutiae, or with regulatory prescriptions hindering our ability to meet contingencies.

The governance of the organization should be in the hands of the Ministers. Over the years, the proliferation of functions assigned haphazardly to the OAS has produced an overelaborated organization that is ponderous and unresponsive. Instead of closer and more frequent contact between Foreign Ministers in ways that truly reflect our foreign policies as we are attempting to manage them from our respective capitals, we find ourselves insulated from each other by a plethora of councils and committees with conflicting mandates and a cumbersome permanent bureaucracy.

To strengthen communication, we must cut through the existing organizational underbrush and replace it with a structure capable of responding to the authentic foreign policies of our governments, as expressed directly by Foreign Ministers, and of relating concretely to our institutions and the needs of our peoples. Particularly, the three council system has not fulfilled the hopes which led to its adoption in 1967.

The General Assembly, as the central pillar of the inter-American system, might well be convened more frequently, perhaps twice a year, with special additional sessions to consider our common concerns, particularly the great challenges of cooperation for development. As contacts at the Ministerial level intensify, the need for an elaborate structure of councils will disappear. Our encounters at the General Assembly will offer sufficient opportunities to set organizational policy.

This is all the organizational superstructure we really need. A leaner, more responsive organization would be serviced by a smaller expert Secretariat responsive to the guidelines established by the General Assembly and the functional committees the General Assembly may create.

We should improve the OAS mechanisms for promoting respect for human rights in the Americas.

Membership

To insure that the OAS represents all of the peoples of our region, we should open up the organization to the newly independent states and those which may become independent, both on the continent and in the Caribbean. Although these questions of membership require further study, we believe Article 8 of the present charter, which automatically excludes certain states, is an anachronism and should be removed.

Financing

A serious effort to reform the Organization of American States should include a review of present provisions for its financing.

You are all aware of the critical attention the Congress of the United States has focused on the proportion of the organization's cost the United States is now bearing. Obviously, this has been a factor in recent U.S. budget cuts affecting the OAS. We do not claim that the United States is paying too much, or more than its fair share of the cost in terms of our relative ability to pay. It is only that it is wrong and damaging for an organization of two dozen—soon to be 25—sovereign states, whose purpose is to advance the interests of each, to be so heavily dependent on the contributions of a single member. It places the organization in a vulnerable position, and projects a false image of the OAS.

It is important to find some basis for OAS financing that will, over time, reduce the U.S. share of the assessed costs while insuring that the activities of the OAS in the vital development assistance field are not weakened.

The United States is committed to the Organization of American States. We know that it provides an institutional base which will continue to be vital to our common progress. In these years of great change, the nations of the world have seen fresh proof of an old truth—that the most durable and responsive institutions are those which bear a lighter burden of bureaucratic machinery and whose procedures permit the flexibility required for swift and imaginative action.

We believe our proposals can help bring the drawn-out reform debate to a successful conclusion over the course of the next year. And we believe this is the kind of organization we can and must have if we in the Americas are to fulfill our promise and our responsibility to advance international cooperation in an era of interdependence.

PANAMA CANAL

Joint Report of the Republic of Panama and the United States June 9, 1976.

For the past 12 years, with the support of the OAS, Panama and the United States have maintained an active negotiating process with respect to the new regime for the Panama Canal. By virtue of the Joint Declaration of April 3, 1964, both countries pledged their word to work out a new treaty—a treaty new not only in its date of entry into force, but also in the mentality which it will reflect; that is, it will be in accord with the evolution experienced by the international community.

We are negotiating because both countries feel the need to build a new relationship which gives full regard to the aspirations of the Panamanian people, the interests of both nations, and the principles and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations. And we are negotiating in deference to the unanimous views of our sister republics in the Western Hemisphere.

We are working on the basis that every negotiation concerning an old problem is a transaction toward new formulas of justice, and that progress can only be achieved when a spirit of compromise between the parties exists as a result of their understanding of new realities—above all, when they seek a balancing of interests within a reasonable period of time.

The negotiating process has confirmed the dedication of both parties to the eight principles agreed on by their authorized representatives on February 7, 1974 [Secretary Kissinger and Foreign Minister Tack of Panama]. The two countries reported to this Assembly last year that significant progress had been made in this process of balancing the interests of both parties in accordance with the eight principles. We are pleased to report that during the past year the parties have made further significant progress on the highly complex issues before them.

Differences remain between the two parties on important issues—the period of duration of the new treaty, and arrangements in the land and water areas comprising the Panama Canal Zone.

The Republic of Panama and the United States are anxious to complete these negotiations as soon as possible and recognize that the other nations represented in this Assembly share that desire. But we have recognized that the complexity of the issues remaining before us requires the most

careful and painstaking negotiating efforts if we are to achieve a treaty which is truly just and equitable—a treaty which will balance the respective interests of both countries and those of the other nations of the Hemisphere and the world in such a way as to definitely eliminate the potential for causes of conflict in the future. It is in this sense that both Governments are in agreement with the concept expressed by General Torrijos that we are not simply seeking any new treaty—we are seeking a treaty that will fully meet our common goals in the future and be seen by our sister republics as reflecting a new era of cooperation in the Americas. The United States and the Republic of Panama reiterate their commitment to continue their most serious efforts to achieve such a treaty as promptly as possible.

The negotiation offers both peoples a peaceful alternative for the solution of a prolonged disagreement between them, and both Governments are convinced that it is their responsibility to explore to the utmost this path which offers such real possibilities for a satisfactory agreement which will cement on solid foundations the friendship and cooperation between our two countries.

If we continue the serious work presently being carried out and if we maintain the reciprocal good will of both missions toward reaching a solution to the pending problems, we cherish the hope that soon we will be able to advise you that a treaty has been agreed upon—a treaty which not only all America, but the entire world, awaits as an effective contribution to consolidate peace and friendship among all peoples.

U.N. ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA

Statement by Henry A. Kissinger at the Headquarters of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America [ECLA], June 9, 1976.

Mr. Secretary [Executive Secretary Enrique Iglesias], I appreciate very much the complimentary remarks that you have made and I would like you and your distinguished staff to know that while it is a meeting of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States that brings me to Santiago at this time, I value this opportunity to meet with you and to visit this renowned fountainhead of ideas.

You have much of which to be proud. You, Mr. Secretary, with all your well-known energy and wisdom have followed and successfully built upon the work of your very capable predecessors, Prebisch, Mayobre, and Quintana. These men, like you, were well known within and beyond our Hemisphere as statesmen. My colleagues and I have great respect for the work you have done and for the tremendous accomplishments of the Economic Commission for Latin America. This center of study and action has done much to ignite the consciences of men everywhere to take on the challenges of economic development. Your approach is progressive and, especially because it is non-political, it is effective.

As is only to be expected, we have at times not seen eye-to-eye with regard to certain problems or the prescriptions for dealing with them. But we have avoided ideological postures: our thinking, and I believe yours, have evolved. In the process we have moved closer together with respect to many, if not most, essentials. We have listened and learned as this institution has led the movement for economic integration among the developing countries of this Hemisphere. We have worked together on trade and development, and we have agreed with your shift in emphasis from import-substitution to export-oriented strategies.

The problem of economic development is not primarily a technical issue. It is profoundly a political and moral issue. It is not possible to build a world community which is divided between the rich and the poor. If we are to live in a world of peace and justice, all nations must have a sense of participation, and all nations must have the con-

sciousness that the world community either takes into account their concerns—or at least listens to their concerns.

This is why we attach such extreme importance to the dialogue that is now taking place between the developed and developing nations, for regardless of the technical solutions we find, the spirit we can help engender can contribute to a world of peace and to a sense of community. And this is why we are concerned when there are attitudes of confrontation or technical majorities, because it is the essence of an international structure that solutions cannot be imposed by one group on another, but that a consensus must be established in which all share. The nations of Latin America have a very special role to play in this process. They are among the most developed of the developing nations, or among the least developed of the developed nations. They belong to the Organization of American States and they are tied to us, a country which has a great concern with security and global equilibrium. But they are also a part of other groupings of the so-called Third World, and they can, therefore, in important respects act as a bridge between the views of the different groups that exist in the world today.

In the field of development, the United States has offered important proposals for dealing with current international economic difficulties. At the Seventh Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly we put forth suggestions and agreement was reached on a number of measures designed to enhance economic security and to cope with the cycles that in the past have devastated export earnings and undermined development, and we dealt with other issues relating to trade, technology, and capital flows.

In Nairobi, we advocated a comprehensive plan for addressing major commodity issues and set forth additional proposals for dealing with technology and other requirements for development.

Our proposal for the establishment of an International Resources Bank failed for reasons of an accidental majority. But I cannot scold every forum that I meet on this topic. I think we have made our point. The more fundamental problem I would like to put to this distinguished group is how to relate these general proposals for global development which are important to the special requirements of the Western Hemisphere. My colleagues and I are doing a great deal of thinking on how, in a global context of development, we can at the same time reflect the special ties and the special values, and the particular institutions that have grown up in this Hemisphere—how we can avoid being caught between the extremes of dogmatic globalism and dogmatic regionalism. We favor regional integration of the Western Hemisphere or of the nations of Latin America either in sub-regional groupings or in regional groupings, and we are going to give very serious study to how, within a global framework, we can spur the very special concerns for development of our old friends and associates in the Hemisphere.

Today, at the meeting of the OAS General Assembly, I made some specific proposals of what can be done within the framework of existing legislation and within the discretion that our Executive has, but I also pointed out that at the Special Session on Development that has been proposed by several members at the General Assembly and that we assume will take place next spring, the United States will be prepared to address the more fundamental questions that I'm putting to my friends here: how to relate the global concerns for development with the regional concerns of the Western Hemisphere, because it would be wrong to waste the traditions of cooperation and the special relationships that have grown up in this Hemisphere. I am providing your Executive Secretary with a copy of the paper in which we made a series of comments and recommendations regarding cooperation for development, and I hope that ECLA will find that it can play a role with regard to some of the arrangements we suggested on vital issues; for example, on technology for development. We hope also that you will not feel yourself confined to the proposals that we have made, and will feel free to offer your own suggestions. In looking at the record, the danger that you will feel yourself confined by our proposals is minimal.

The nations of this Hemisphere are bound by historical and other special ties and interests. The United States consequently supported and has been interested in the work of ECLA since its

founding in 1948. I would also like to reciprocate the very warm words of the Secretary General [U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim]* whose dedication to the cause of peace we admire and whose indefatigable efforts in all areas of world problems we support. I wish you and the Executive Secretary the very best as you carry on your important work, and I would like to thank you for this very warm reception I have had here.

**As conveyed by Roberto Guyer, personal representative of the Secretary General.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 8866

Inter-American Series 111
Released June 1976
Office of Media Services
Bureau of Public Affairs

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, U.S.A.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
STA-501

Third Class Bulk Rt.