THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXIV • No. 1916 • March 15, 1976

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETI

VOL. LXXIV, No. 1916
March 15, 1976

The Department of State BULLETI a weekly publication issued by t Office of Media Services, Bureau Public Affairs, provides the public a interested agencies of the governm with information on developments the field of U.S. foreign relations a on the work of the Department a the Foreign Service.

The BULLETIN includes selec press releases on foreign policy, issu by the White House and the Depa ment, and statements, addres and news conferences of the Presid and the Secretary of State and ot officers of the Department, as well special articles on various phases international affairs and the functi of the Department. Information included concerning treaties and in national agreements to which United States is or may becom party and on treaties of general in national interest.

Publications of the Department State, United Nations documents, legislative material in the field international relations are also lis

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

PRICE:

52 issues plus semiannual indexes,
domestic $42.50, foreign $53.15
Single copy 85 cents

The Secretary of State has determined that the publication of this periodical is necessary in the transaction of the public business required by law of this Department. Use of funds for printing this periodical has been approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget through January 31, 1981.

The Americas in a Changing World

Address by Secretary Kissinger [1]

I am most pleased to be here today, at the nvitation of President Pérez. This sympo- ium is symbolic of the effort of our two ations to strengthen our ties and to consult n issues of deep concern to our two peoples. come here not merely to demonstrate my ountry's interest in its relationships with ou but to address with you the global chal- nges to our common future.

The Western Hemisphere has for centuries ymbolized man's readiness to grasp his own estiny. When I placed a wreath at the tomb Simón Bolívar yesterday, I recalled the epth of his faith and wonder at the future the Americas. Today, more than a century ter, the promise of our hemisphere is more ive than ever—and more important to each our countries and to the world.

Today I want to discuss with you the chal- nges that history has posed to our hemi- heric friendship, the efforts we have made the recent period to address these chal- nges, and the compelling responsibility we ce today and tomorrow.

I have come to this continent because the nited States believes that Latin America is a special place in our foreign policy.

This belief is the product of history. We on our national independence together in e same era. We confronted the similar chal- nges of pioneer peoples developing the re- urces of bountiful unexplored continents. e shaped democratic institutions and urred economic growth, conscious that we nefited greatly from our relationship with ch other. We have long shared a common interest in shielding our hemisphere from the intrusion of others. We led the world in building international organizations to serve our cooperative endeavors for both collective security and economic progress.

The United States has always felt with Latin America a special intimacy, a special bond of collaboration, even in the periods of our isolation from world affairs. Even now, when our countries are major participants in world affairs, when our perceptions of contemporary issues are not always identical, there remains a particular warmth in the personal relationships among our leaders and a special readiness to consider the views of our neighbors. On many issues of U.S. policy—economic, political, or security—the American people and Congress give special consideration to our hemispheric ties.

The problem we face today is that history, and indeed the very growth and success we have all achieved, have complicated our relationship. What used to be a simple perception of hemispheric uniqueness, and a self-contained exclusive relationship, has become enmeshed in the wider concerns we all now have in the rest of the world.

—The United States is conscious of a global responsibility to maintain the world balance of power, to help resolve the age-old political conflicts that undermine peace, and to help shape a new international order encompassing the interests and aspirations of the 150 nations that now comprise our planet. And so our vision now reaches beyond the Western Hemisphere. We have major alliances with the Atlantic community and Japan, as well as this hemisphere; we

[1] Made before the U.S.-Venezuelan Symposium II Macuto, Venezuela, on Feb. 17.

have growing ties of friendship with many nations. In a nuclear age, we have an inescapable responsibility to manage and stabilize our relations with the major Communist powers and to try to build a safe and more constructive future. The problem of peace in this generation means for us, the United States, a permanent involvement in world affairs in all their dimensions—maintaining security, promoting a healthy trade and monetary system and economic development, and creating a stable and just and universal system of political relations.

—At the same time, Latin American nations have grown in power and influence and become major forces in their own right on the world scene. This is one of the most striking events of this era. Your economies are among the most advanced of the developing world. But your role is not a product of economic strength alone; its roots are deeper: your traditions of personal and national dignity, concern for legal principle, and your history of peace. Your sense of regional identity has become more important—to you—and to the world. We accept and respect these developments, and the new organizations, like SELA [Latin American Economic System], which now speak to your own collective interests. We trust that they will not be used for confrontation; for that could complicate our relations and hinder solutions to problems. We are confident that the increased sense of Latin American identity, and the institutions which serve it, can be a constructive and vital force for cooperation on a wider basis. This will be our attitude toward these institutions.

—The countries of Latin America have done more than grow internally and strengthen their regional associations. They have established new ties outside the hemisphere—trade relations with the European Community and Japan and a growing sense of solidarity with developing nations in Africa and Asia. Such global involvement is inevitable; inevitably also, it creates new and conflicting pressures on more traditional friendships.

—The challenge of economic development has become a worldwide concern and is being addressed on a global, and not simply hem spheric, basis. Venezuela is now cochairma of the Conference on International Economi Cooperation (CIEC) and has discharged th responsibility with great wisdom. Similarl the energies of the United States are increas ingly focused on international organizatio and issues of global scope. We have mad major and comprehensive proposals to th U.N. General Assembly special session, th World Food Conference, and the Conferenc on International Economic Cooperation. R cent events have taught us all that glob prosperity is indivisible; no nation can pro per alone.

—Finally, the United States continues i this era to feel a special concern for its hem spheric relations. Our profound conviction that if we cannot help to solve the burnir issues of peace and progress with those wi whom we have such longstanding ties sentiment and experience of collaboratio we have little hope of helping to solve the elsewhere. To put it positively, we fe strongly that our cooperation as equals this hemisphere can be a model for cooper tion in the world arena.

The challenge we face is that we must re oncile these distinct but intersecting dime sions of concern. We must define anew t nature and purposes of our hemisphe condition. We must understand its meani and its promise. We must adapt it to o new global condition. We must summon develop it, and use it for our comm objectives.

The United States values its bilateral t with your countries, without any intenti of pursuing them in order to break up yo regional solidarity. We want to preser our hemispheric ties and adapt them to t moral imperatives of this era—without h gemony, free of complexes, aimed at a bett future.

All the nations of the hemisphere are m ture countries. The variety of intersecti relationships and concerns reflects the vit ity of our nations and the increasingly i portant roles we play in the world. We in t Americas are granted by history a uniq opportunity to help fashion what your F

ign Minister has called a "new equilibrium" among all nations.

Dialogue and Progress

The experience of our recent past has much to teach us.

During the early 1960's, the Alliance for Progress stimulated great expectations of rapid development. The enthusiasm with which our countries embraced the Alliance Charter clearly exceeded our collective perseverance and understated the magnitude of the challenge. But great human and financial resources were mobilized; new institutions were created that remain basic instruments for cooperation. And ultimately the Alliance left an even greater moral imprint. By the end of the 1960's, internal development and social change had become an imperative for all governments in Latin America, regardless of political coloration. The United States is proud of its contribution.

In this decade, this hemisphere has been swept up in the tides of the global economy that now have an increasing significance to our national plans and expectations.

At Viña del Mar in 1969, the nations of Latin America staked out a new agenda of issues reflecting what we have since come to call interdependence—the conditions of world trade, multinational corporations, and technology transfer—as well as more traditional issues such as economic assistance. In the spirit of inter-American cooperation, the United States attempted to respond. My government endorsed, and worked for, measures to improve Latin America's access to our markets and those of other industrial countries, to improve the flow of private capital, to reform the inter-American system, and to assure consideration for Latin American concerns in international forums.

Less than a month after becoming Secretary of State in 1973, I called for a new dialogue between Latin America and the United States to reinvigorate our relations by addressing together the new challenges of an interdependent world. I believed that in the past the United States had too often sought to decide unilaterally what should be done about inter-American relations. I felt that Latin America must have a stake in our policies if those policies were to be successful. I said that we were ready to listen to all Latin American concerns in any forum.

Latin America chose to conduct the dialogue on a strictly multilateral basis, presenting common positions to the United States. First in Bogotá, then in Mexico City, the agenda of issues that had been set out in Viña del Mar was updated to account for changed circumstances and new concerns. At Tlatelolco, and again in Washington, I joined my fellow Foreign Ministers in informal meetings, supplementing our regular encounters in the OAS and United Nations. A thorough and heartening dialogue took place. For the next 12 months, U.S. and Latin American representatives met in a continuous series of political and technical discussions. These meetings were interrupted almost precisely a year ago in reaction to certain provisions of the U.S. Trade Act of 1974, the very act that implemented the system of generalized preferences first proposed in Viña del Mar.

All of us have something to learn from this experience.

First, we can now see that the new dialogue, as it was conducted, only partially met the psychological requirements of our modern relationship.

The United States was prepared to work with the other nations of the hemisphere to improve and perfect the undeniable community that has existed under the name of the inter-American system for almost a century. Yet the explicitness of our approach to the concept of community led many in Latin America to think that the United States wanted to maintain or create a relationship of hegemony. This misunderstanding obscured the reality that the hemisphere was in transition, between dependence and interdependence, between consolidation and political growth, and that the old community based on exclusivity was being transformed into a more open community based on mutual interests and problem solving.

The Latin American nations still seemed to think that the United States, with its

great strengths and responsibilities, could act unilaterally to resolve all issues, that any compromise was surrender, that Latin America should propose and the United States should respond. The United States, on the other hand, looked upon dialogue as a prolonged process of give-and-take in which progress would come incrementally as our representatives analyzed the problems and negotiated solutions.

Latin America demanded quick results: each meeting became a deadline by which time the United States had to show "results" or be judged lacking. But as economic difficulties beset us all in a period of world recession, it became obvious that if Latin American aspirations were expressed to the people of the United States in terms of categorical and propagandistic demands, they could not elicit a sufficiently positive response.

Both sides oversimplified the nature of the problem: the Latin American nations did not always perceive that the issues were among the most difficult that the international community has faced because they go to the heart of the structure and interaction of entire societies. The United States did not sufficiently take into account that Latin America had experienced years of frustration in which lofty promises by the United States had been undone by the gradualism of the American political system, which responds less to abstract commitments than to concrete problems. Hence the charge of neglect on one side and the occasional feeling on the other side of being besieged with demands.

But if the new dialogue has not yet yielded results, it nevertheless expresses a constructive mode of dealing with our problems and realizing the aspirations of the hemisphere. The United States is prepared to make a major effort to invigorate our hemispheric ties. My trip here underlines that purpose.

We have learned something basic about the hemisphere itself. In the past, both the United States and Latin America have acted as if the problems of the hemisphere could be solved exclusively within the hemisphere. Today, the Americas—North and South—recognize that they require a global as well a regional vision if they are to resolve the problems. For the United States a homogeneous policy toward an entity called "Latin America" presents new problems, in terms both of global concerns and of the real diversity of Latin America. Nor can the burden of adjustment to a new hemispheric equilibrium be borne wholly by the United States. We are prepared to make a major contribution, and we are willing to cooperate fully with Latin American regional institutions that come into being to this end.

Both sides need a new approach. The United States is prepared to give more systematic consideration to Latin America's quest for regional identity. On the other hand, Latin America must overcome its overapprehensions about our policies. In the past whenever we emphasized the regional aspect of our relationships, we have been accused of forcing problems into an inter-American system which we dominated; when we emphasized the bilateral mode, we were accused of a policy of divide and rule. Each side must understand the problems and purposes of the other.

We thus all know our challenge. We must now turn it into our opportunity. As far as the United States is concerned, we are prepared to make a major effort to build upon our historic ties a cooperative effort to construct a better future.

Interdependence and Our Common Future

Where do we go from here? What is the answer? Wherein lies the purpose of our relationship in the modern era?

Our starting point must be to recognize that an era of interdependence makes collaborative endeavor more, not less, important to any country that wishes to preserve control over its own national destiny.

We in this hemisphere won our glory in fighting for national independence and defending it in the face of foreign threats; we have built societies embodying the tradition of democracy; we have dedicated our human energies to the development of our natur

resources, with impressive results.

Yet even as we celebrate our birth as nations and our centuries of achievement, we encounter a new challenge to our independence. It comes not from foreign armies, but from gaps and strains revealed within the very international economic system that each of our nations, in its own way, has done much to create.

Since the Enlightenment, which produced the faith in reason and progress that inspired our revolutions, we have all believed that the growth of a global economy would nurture a world community bringing universal advancement. Yet now we find that the international system of production—which still has the potential to provide material progress for all—has become subject to uncertainties and inefficiencies and international conflicts.

Nowhere is this challenge more vivid than in Latin America. With the higher stage of development that your economies have reached has come the awareness of greater vulnerability to fluctuations in export earnings, to increases in the costs of imports, and to the ebb and flow of private capital. Yet your more complex and more open economies can also respond more vigorously to, and profit more readily from, positive trends in the world economic system.

Interdependence for the Americas is therefore a positive force and an opportunity. We must manage it, harness it, and develop it for our common benefit.

Our economic dilemmas give rise, in our times, to political imperatives. Rapidly changing external events affect all our peoples profoundly—their livelihoods, their material standards, their hopes for the future, and most fundamentally, their confidence that our systems of government can successfully encounter the challenges before us. And the requirement for action is political will.

Our societies derive their strength from the consent and dedication of our peoples. Can our democratic system cope with the strains of social change and the frustrations of what is inevitably a long historical process? Can nations find the wisest path in an era when our problems are too vast to be solved by any nation acting alone? Will we succumb to the temptation of unilateral actions advantageous in their appearance but not their reality? Can we reconcile our diversity and the imperative of our collaboration?

I believe we have every cause for optimism. The requirements of interdependence make patent the genius of our special hemispheric traditions, our values, and our institutions. Pluralism and respect for the rights of others are indispensable to the harmony of the international order. For to seek to impose radical changes without the consent of all those who would be affected is to ignore political reality. Equally, to deny a voice to any who are members of the international community is to insure that even positive achievement will ultimately be rejected.

Therefore the traditions of this hemisphere—democracy, justice, human and national dignity, and free cooperation—are precisely the qualities needed in the era of global interdependence. National unity without freedom is sterile; technological progress without social justice is corrupt; nationalism without a consciousness of the human community is a negative force.

Therefore our permanent quest for progress in this hemisphere must take into account global as well as regional realities. It must reflect the differing interests of each country. And our global efforts respectively must draw on the vitality of our own relationships as a source of dynamism, strength, and inspiration.

The United States has attempted to make a constructive contribution in this context.

Last September in New York, addressing the Latin American Foreign Ministers attending the U.N. General Assembly, I pointed out that several of our initiatives before the seventh special session had been designed to be particularly relevant to Latin American concerns. And I pledged that in the necessary negotiations in other forums, and in all aspects of our relations, we would remember that each Latin American country was different and we would be responsive to the distinctive national interests of our friends in the hemisphere.

My New York comments raised contradictory speculations. The explicit introduction of global considerations into our Latin American policy was variously interpreted as implying either that the United States denied the existence of a special relationship with Latin America or that it sought to build on that relationship to constitute a new bloc in world affairs. The recognition of the uniqueness of each country, and particularly my statement that no "single formula" could encompass our desire for warm and productive relations with each nation in the hemisphere, were interpreted by some to imply that the United States was about to embark on a new crusade to maintain its power through a policy of special bilateral deals designed to divide the countries of Latin America against one another and preclude their ties with countries outside the hemisphere.

These speculations reflect the suspicions and uncertainties of a fluid global environment. They reflect problems we must jointly overcome. They do *not* reflect U.S. policy.

The fundamental interests of the United States require an active and constructive role of leadership in the task of building peace and promoting economic advance. In this hemisphere the legacy of our history is a tradition of civilized cooperation, a habit of interdependence, that is a sturdy foundation on which to seek to build a more just international order. And it is absurd to attempt to create a broader world community by tearing down close cooperative relations that have already existed in our part of the globe.

Therefore the United States remains committed to our *common* pledge at Tlatelolco to seek "a new, vigorous spirit of inter-American solidarity." [2] This must mean today not an artificial unanimity or unrealistic pleas for unilateral action. As we agreed at Tlatelolco, interdependence has become a physical and moral imperative: it is a reality of mutual dependence and a necessity of cooperation on common problems. To face real problems, we must now deal effectively among ourselves; we must identify our real needs and priorities—given the hemisphere's diversity, th can often be achieved bilaterally and su regionally better than regionally.

In this spirit of working solidarity, t United States pledges itself:

—*To take special cognizance of the distin tive requirements of the more industrializ economies of Latin America, and of the r gion as a whole,* in our efforts to build a mo equitable international order. We believe t major Latin American countries need co cessional foreign assistance less than th need support for their drive to participate the international economy on a more equ footing with the industrialized nations. help overcome fluctuations in export ear ings and continued import and debt-servici needs, we have secured a development sec rity facility in the IMF [International Mor tary Fund] and a substantial increase in cess to IMF resources. To facilitate access long-term development capital on commerc terms, we have proposed a new internatio investment trust and have begun a progr of technical assistance to countries enteri established capital markets.

In a similar vein, we support expand capitalization of international financial ins tutions such as the International Finar Corporation and the Inter-American Devel ment Bank. A U.S. contribution of $2 billion to a new multi-year replenishment the Inter-American Development Bank now before the U.S. Congress. Presid Ford has given his full support.

To promote the growth and market sta ity of commodities of importance to La America, we favor producer-consumer operation in specific commodities and a duction in the barriers to increased proce ing of raw materials in exporting countri

We are prepared to undertake other pra cal steps:

The nations of Latin America have sho considerable interest in the transfer of m ern technology. We support this, in princi and in practice. The challenge here, as el where, is to develop mechanisms to achi practical results. It may be that SELA c turn to this question and suggest the me

[2] For text of the Declaration of Tlatelolco, see BULLETIN of Mar. 18, 1974, p. 262.

which we could cooperate. We are prepared to respond positively.

In addition we must recognize that the private sector, private initiative, and private capital can play important roles in the development and application of new scientific and technological advances to local needs and conditions. The degree to which private capital is prepared to devote its considerable resources of talent and knowledge to this task will depend on the climate for its participation. It is for this reason that we state again our willingness to discuss codes of conduct which can provide guidelines for the behavior of transnational enterprises. No subject is more sensitive or more vital—for the private sector has played the critical role in bringing about growth; its resources exceed by far those now available for governmental aid. Yet for it to be effective the proper environment must be created. This is a major test for our cooperative efforts.

To increase trading opportunities we now admit many industrial products of developing countries to enter the United States without duty. And we favor special and differentiated treatment in the multilateral trade negotiations through concentration on products of interest to Latin America. This is already apparent in the talks we have had on tropical products. On all such multilateral issues we are prepared to have prior consultation with the nations of Latin America.

—*To maintain direct assistance to the neediest nations in this hemisphere* still oppressed by poverty and natural disaster. The great bulk of our bilateral concessional assistance to Latin America—nearly $300 million annually—is now allocated to the region's poorest nations to meet basic needs in health, education, and agriculture. At this moment, the United States has joined other countries in a massive response to the devastating earthquake in Guatemala. In addition we continue to support expansion of multilateral concessional assistance through the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank and the soft-loan windows of other international financial institutions active in Latin America. These activities, supplemented by new programs in agricultural development and to assist balance-of-payments shortfalls, make an important contribution to our common responsibility toward the neediest.

In this regard let me mention the critical problem of food—which is especially important to Latin America, where food production over recent years has barely kept pace with population.

Following my proposal of a year ago, the Inter-American Development Bank established the International Group for Agricultural Development in Latin America. This hemispheric agricultural consultative group will consist of major donors and all Latin American nations and focus on overcoming constraints to agricultural growth and rural development in the hemisphere. The first meeting is scheduled for May in Mexico, and preparatory work will begin next week.

The United States attaches great importance to this effort. It is crucial if Latin America is to fulfill its potential as a food-surplus region. It can be another powerful example of how inter-American cooperation can show the way toward solving mankind's most urgent problems.

—*To support Latin American regional and subregional efforts to organize for cooperation and integration.* The United States has provided technical and financial assistance to the movement of regional and subregional integration, including the development banks of the Andean Pact, the Central American Common Market, and the Caribbean Common Market. We are eager to assist these integration movements and others that may arise in the future. In addition, we see in SELA a new possibility for cooperation among the nations of Latin America on common regional problems and projects. We welcome SELA and will support its efforts at mutual cooperation as its members may deem appropriate.

—*To negotiate on the basis of parity and dignity our specific differences with each and every state, both bilaterally and, where appropriate, multilaterally.* We intend to solve problems before they become conflicts. We stand ready to consult with other governments over investment disputes when those

disputes threaten relations between our governments. As you all know, the United States and Panama are continuing to move forward in their historic negotiations on a Panama Canal treaty to establish a reliable long-term relationship between our two nations. In the interim between now and the final Law of the Sea Conference, we will continue to attempt to find solutions to issues relating to fisheries and the seas which have complicated our relations in the past. It is the earnest hope of my country that within a year a Treaty of Caracas will be signed on the law of the sea.

—*To enforce our commitment to mutual security* and the Bolivarian ideal of regional integrity against those who would seek to undermine solidarity, threaten independence, or export violence. Last July at San José the nations of the Americas agreed upon revisions to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, the Rio Treaty. In so doing, they reaffirmed their commitment to take collective action against aggression—whether it comes from without or within the hemisphere. The United States regards this treaty as a solemn international obligation. We are resolved to carry out the commitment it places upon us.

—*To work to modernize the inter-American system* to respond to the needs of our times, to give direction to our common actions. The member states have already taken a major step forward in revising and reaffirming the Rio Treaty. In the months ahead, the OAS will be considering the report of its special committee on reform. More is at stake than the text of the charter; the member states are also beginning to focus on the structure and processes of the organization itself. The United States believes that the OAS has an important future of service to the hemisphere. We stand ready to work with others to modernize and strengthen it, to make it a more effective instrument for regional cooperation.

The application of these principles is a matter of common concern. We have had a special relationship for 150 years and more; the very intimacy of our ties imposes upc us the duty of rigorous and responsible sel assessment. We should set ourselves co crete deadlines—to complete the proce before the end of this year.

We should use the months ahead constru tively and productively. It is time that all us in the hemisphere put aside slogans a turn from rhetoric to resolve. Let us go b yond the debate whether the United Stat is patronizing or neglecting or seeking dominate its neighbors. Let us not dispu whether the Latin American nations a being unreasonable or peremptory or see ing to line up against their northern partn

Instead, let us focus on our goals and t need for common effort and get down serious business. Many forums and forms a available. I propose that we identify the mc fruitful areas for our common effort and s ourselves the goal of major accomplishme this year. At the OAS meeting in June, can review where we stand and discuss wh further needs to be done. At the last Gene Assembly we adopted the informal style the new dialogue, successfully, to facilit open and frank discussions of major issu I propose that we do so again and that concentrate, at this next ministerial meeti on the nature of our fundamental relati ship.

Our common problems are real enough common response will give living reality the heritage and promise of the hemisph and the enduring truth that the nations this hemisphere do indeed have—and continue to have—a special relationship.

The United States and Venezuela

The ties between the United States Venezuela illustrate the sound foundat upon which we can build. Our democrac our economic strength, our tradition of tr and working together, give us hope; it is duty to go forward together. This is strong desire of my country.

We have set an example together. collaboration is traditional, extensive, int sive, and—patently—mutually beneficial.

Venezuela is a country at peace in a continent at peace. Its considerable energies can happily be directed toward the highest aspirations of human well-being in the spirit of its democratic ideals. Now those ideals have been given new strength by the acquisition of new prosperity and power.

Last December in Paris, 27 nations gathered in the Conference on International Economic Cooperation, a milestone in the world's struggle to manage the challenges of interdependence.

Decisions in CIEC are to be taken by consensus rather than by majority vote. The structure of the conference reflects the diversity of nations. It is not a club of the powerful: the developing countries as well as the industrialized participate on a fully equal basis. It is representative, but not so unwieldy as to frustrate all practical action. It is a tribute to common sense and to the strength of our collective commitment to achieve real solutions and real progress for our peoples and for the world.

Appropriately, Venezuela—whose leaders have long projected a vision of greater democracy among nations as well as within their own country—is now cochairman of CIEC.

Since the early days of our nation when Francisco de Miranda befriended George Washington, Venezuela's and the United States' struggle for liberty, national dignity, and progress have been intertwined. Only a few miles up this coast at Puerto Cabello, there is a monument to 10 North Americans who lost their lives in the first attempt by Miranda to win Venezuelan independence. And Henry Clay, whose statue stands in Caracas, expressed the enduring wish of my nation when he wrote to Simón Bolívar in 1828:

> . . . the interest which was inspired in this country by the arduous struggles of South America, arose principally from the hope, that, along with its independence, would be established free institutions, insuring all the blessings of civil liberty.

We have a right to be proud, for these hopes are a living reality. Few societies have transformed themselves so profoundly and so rapidly as our two countries. And those transformations have been neither aimless nor ideological, but the dynamic product of institutions created by free peoples.

Venezuela and the United States have built an economic relationship that is sturdy and valuable to both sides—and is increasingly so. Venezuela has for decades been an important and reliable supplier of energy to the United States—through World War II and the recent oil embargo. The U.S. private sector has participated actively in the dynamic growth of the Venezuelan economy.

We recognize that we often have differing perspectives and differing interests. At times the fervor of our respective convictions has led us to disagree even when our interests basically coincided. Venezuela and the United States can debate without confrontation. We can discuss without rancor, as friends. And most importantly, we can pursue our respective goals with a dignity born of mutual respect.

Like a masterpiece by Soto or Otero, our relationship is therefore a shimmering and changing pattern of reality. My discussions with your distinguished President Carlos Andrés Pérez and Foreign Minister Escovar have convinced me that the farsighted prophecy of the Liberator speaks for both our countries. Bolívar envisioned a world "imbibing the American principles and seeing the effects of liberty on the prosperity of the American peoples. . . ."

We have it in our power to transform such a world from a dream into a practical reality. All great achievements began as dreams. With realism, reason, and the will to work together, we can insure that the dreams of Bolívar and Jefferson, of Miranda and Washington, will endure—for our two countries, for the hemisphere, and for all mankind.

The challenge for both our nations now is to draw new inspiration from the long tradition that unites us, to bring into harmony the diverse roles we are destined to play in world affairs. There is little we can accomplish apart; there are tremendous things we can achieve together.

Brazil and the United States: The Global Challenge

Toast by Secretary Kissinger [1]

At such a moment, I must begin by expressing how much I regret that my dear friend Ambassador Araujo Castro is not with us here tonight.[2] He contributed so much to the friendship between Brazil and the United States that has brought us to this occasion. He was a diplomat of insight and a man of humanity. He served his country well. I shall miss his counsel.

Some of you may have wondered, as my staff certainly did, whether I would ever get here. But I never doubted for a minute that I would one day be sitting at this table with my good friend Foreign Minister Silveira. I was much too afraid of his sardonic comments to let him down again.

Antonio, our conversations and exchanges have demonstrated to me why the skill of Brazilian diplomacy commands such extraordinary respect in international affairs. My only criticism is that applying their own high standards and the superior subtlety of the Latin mind they sometimes give us too much credit for complexity.

There has never been any doubt in my mind that Brazil's diplomats speak for a nation of greatness—a people taking their place in the front rank of nations, a country of continental proportions with a heart as massive as its geography, a nation now playing a role in the world commensurate with its great history and its even greater promise. My country welcomes Brazil's new role in world affairs.

It is for this reason, Mr. Minister, that I am so pleased to have the opportunity to say something about how our two nations may face together in the years to come the issues of our complex modern world and how the institution of consultation which we shall establish here during my visit will, I am confident, give meaning and strength and permanence to our cooperation.

Mr. Minister, our two nations have much to accomplish together. We both are vitally concerned and involved in the world's response to the fundamental challenges with which history has confronted this generation—building a new and peaceful international order and insuring justice and prosperity for all peoples.

Today the United States and Brazil together face a complex and changing world. The international order of previous centuries has broken down under the pressures of two World Wars and the inexorable process of decolonization. The bipolar order of the last generation has eroded. The industrial nations of the West now deal with each other on a new and more equal basis of cooperation and shared initiative; the Communist world has fragmented and is beset with economic difficulties even as the Soviet Union emerges as a military superpower. And around the globe new voices awaken our humane concern for the fate of our fellow men throughout our shrinking planet.

The traditional association of our two nations, and the warm friendship that continually has inspired it, are among our most precious resources. At the same time, our bilateral relations must now be infused with a global vision and planned to encompass a worldwide sweep. We have only begun to

---

[1] Given at a dinner at Brasilia on Feb. 19 hosted by Foreign Minister Antonio Francisco Azeredo da Silveira (text from press release 82).

[2] Brazilian Ambassador to the United States João Augusto de Araujo Castro died at Washington on Dec. 9, 1975.

realize the potential of vigorous collaboration with the major nations of the West in shaping international order in the era before us.

At the core of my country's concerns is the imperative of world peace.

At the core of Brazil's concerns are the new issues of global interdependence.

These two central tasks of our time provide Brazil and the United States each with a special role and responsibility and new possibilities of cooperation.

The Challenge of Peace and Prosperity

The United States today is confronted by one challenge unprecedented in its own history and another challenge unprecedented in the history of the world. The United States has finally come to recognize that it is permanently and irrevocably involved in world affairs outside the Western Hemisphere. At the same time, the catastrophic nature of nuclear war imposes upon us a necessity that transcends traditional concepts of diplomacy and balance of power: to shape a world order that finds a stability in self-restraint, peace in justice, and progress in global cooperation.

Not all nations may choose a global responsibility, but every nation has a vital stake in its success.

The United States, uniquely among the nations of the free world, bears a heavy responsibility to maintain the global balance of power and to resist expansionism.

All nations which value independence must recognize and oppose attempts to upset the global equilibrium on which the dignity and security of nations depends. Peace cannot survive attempts to exploit turbulent local situations for unilateral political or military advantage. We cannot accept the dispatch of large expeditionary forces and vast amounts of war materiel to impose solutions in local conflicts on faraway continents. Nor can we be indifferent if a nation of this hemisphere makes it a systematic practice to intervene to exacerbate such conflicts around the globe. The United States is determined, as a matter of principle, to resist such dangerous and irresponsible actions.

At the same time we shall never forget that the world cannot rely indefinitely on a peace that rests exclusively on the precarious balance of power, on a stability based on pressure or threats of mutual extermination. Our people and the people of the world demand something better. Overcoming the problem of nuclear war is the moral imperative of our age. Our ultimate purpose is to look beyond the crises of the moment to shape a structure of international relations that offers our children the hope of a better and less cataclysmic future. We will never settle for the uneasy equilibrium of an armed truce. We shall never cease striving for a peace in which future generations will know that theirs is an era of true reconciliation.

There will be and can be no condominium with the other nuclear superpower. On the contrary, the people of my country will never forget that our ties with our friends and allies are the foundation of the edifice we seek to build. As we meet the responsibilities of security, the energies of all nations are freed for the positive endeavors of human betterment. All nations therefore have a stake in peace. For in today's world, peace is global; the breakdown of order on this shrinking planet ultimately affects the hopes and dreams and well-being of us all.

With solidarity in their commitment to peace, all countries are summoned to make their unique and necessary contribution to the realization of the positive aspirations of all mankind.

The Challenge of Interdependence

For these are the new goals toward which the nations of the world are turning—and among the most impressive, this great country. Brazil, emerging on the world scene, stands astride the great international challenge of our time: the gap between the developed and developing worlds. Brazil, which is itself both industrial and developing, mirrors the world in its vastness, diversity, and potential. Brazil has brought to the great task of economic and social advance, to the uplifting of its people, not only its staggering resources but a boundless energy.

And Brazil also begins with strong ties of

friendship with the nations of Latin America, with the great industrial powers, and with the aspiring nations of the Third World. In Latin America, Brazil's significant political and economic role has long been recognized. With the industrial nations, Brazil has been an advocate of needed change in the institutions and practices of the global economic system. With the developing countries, Brazil has worked for a greater voice and participation for all in the open economic system that has fostered progress for a generation and spread it to the far corners of the world.

Thus, in today's interdependent world the traditional motto of Brazil's flag—Order and Progress—takes on new meaning.

The United States, for its part, also has accepted the challenge of cooperation on an equal basis between all nations—industrial and developing, North and South, rich and poor alike.

At the U.N. General Assembly special session on development, my government set forth a comprehensive program of measures to improve security against economic cycles and natural disasters, to stimulate growth, to improve the conditions of trade, particularly in key commodities which are central to developing economies, and to address urgently the special needs of the poorest nations. We are convinced that in the last analysis it is justice that insures tranquillity; it is hope that inspires men to the fulfillment of their age-old dreams.

We were encouraged to see at that special session that the shrill idiom of the North-South debate has begun to give way to more rational discourse and an enduring sense that we are in fact a world community. Appeals to outmoded ideologies are giving way to the study of practical proposals. Your Foreign Minister has always advocated this. Brazil, he has said, is not beguiled by the "illusion of formal and rhetorical victories in international forums," but is interested in practical progress.

My country shares that commitment.

The U.S. and Brazil in an Interdependent World

Mr. Minister: My country shares with yours the conviction that our efforts together can now make a decisive contribution to a new era of progress for the world. It is a prospect worthy of our peoples. Therefore we shall nurture our ties with you—in this hemisphere and in the world. Ours will not be a relationship of automatic unanimity, but of equality, mutual respect, and common endeavor in a host of areas.

We are already playing important roles together in a variety of international forums—in the Conference on International Economic Cooperation, in the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva, in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Our recent past demonstrates that we, and the world, have much to gain by our working together in this way.

—At Kingston in January, Brazil and the United States were prominent in achieving the far-reaching reform of the International Monetary Fund that was adopted by broad consensus. By these new measures, the monetary reserves of the developing world will increase appreciably and the prospects for world economic growth be enhanced.

—The United States and Brazil each have a vital stake in the outcome of the Law of the Sea Conference. I am hopeful that we will see a successful conclusion of this historic global negotiation this year. Brazil's voice is vital in those deliberations, and we are in close touch.

—Finally, and most recently, in London Brazil and the United States successfully composed our differences and helped to negotiate a commodity agreement—on coffee—that serves the interests of consumers and producers alike. President Ford has decided that the United States will sign the International Coffee Agreement. My government supports it, and I am confident that our Congress will endorse it.

But whatever the successes of the immediate past, the need for us to find common ground is more urgent than ever. No coun-

try—not even countries as vast as the United States and Brazil—can hope to impose unilateral solutions on the problems now on the world's agenda.

National trade policies, in particular, have created recurring difficulties. To some extent these problems are cyclical—reflecting the temporary global economic downturns, as well as a growing awareness in the United States of the long-term possibilities of Brazilian growth and competitive capacity.

The United States is determined to overcome these difficulties; we are prepared to make every effort to do so through multilateral arrangements and commitments. We believe that both our countries must achieve mutual solutions to these trade issues and build upon them toward a new period of international economic cooperation.

Trade is only one of the many issues which summon our two nations to a higher level of collaboration and cooperation. This is the reason, Mr. Minister, why I am honored to have the opportunity shortly to execute with you our new formal agreement establishing a mechanism of regular consultations between our two countries at the ministerial level. The mechanism that we establish will engage us in the kind of intimate and intensive deliberations on major world and bilateral issues which the scope of our respective international interests and responsibilities requires.

We have long been improving our consultations, in keeping with the growing significance of our relationship. Fifteen months ago we instituted consultations on the planning staff level. Last July we established an Economic Consultative Group with a special subgroup on trade. We now cap these efforts with a demonstration and institutionalization of political will.

Our new procedure of consultation will not guarantee automatic solutions. But as we address the bilateral issues between us, and the issues in major international negotiations in which our nations are called upon to participate, our exchange of views takes on new and serious importance. Our consultation will strengthen the efficacy of our cooperation toward common objectives. Our joint efforts could well mean the difference that insures success in world councils of the future.

—This mechanism will serve us well in the search for solutions to the trade problems which have emerged between us. One of the fundamental principles of U.S. foreign policy has been support for the drive of the more industrialized countries of Latin America—foremost among them Brazil—to compete on a more equal footing in the global arena. The contradictions generated by export subsidies in Brazil and countervailing duties in the United States must not be allowed to become serious, divisive issues. They must be addressed by both sides in the light of the fundamental political requirements of our total relationship and of the cooperative international order that we both seek to build. To this end, we will discuss a binding international commitment on the issues of subsidies and countervailing duties to be ultimately negotiated at Geneva under the authority of the Trade Act of 1974.

—In addition, our consultation can be employed to explore ways of coordinating the policies of our governments to promote the fullest dedication of private and public resources to the transfer of scientific and technological advances in the interests of Brazil's long-term development.

—We also foresee that our consultations might reach as well into the areas of energy, space, and ocean resources development—all of which hold out immense promise of benefits for all mankind.

We shall bring to the table in these consultations the full range of political considerations—the basic character of our bilateral relations with Brazil and our links with the hemisphere and the world. We shall be prepared to consult on all major events of international significance. For it is, in the end, the deeper spirit of our political understanding which gives ultimate purpose and value

to all we may undertake on these technical issues.

We conceive of this consultation not as a process in which one side states claims and the other side defends an established position but, rather, as a true exchange reflecting our equality, our world perspectives, and the benefits that both sides will surely gain from common endeavor. Neither side can nor should prescribe to the other what its basic stance toward the rest of the world should be. But each side will surely benefit from knowing fully the views of the other and is likely to give them weight.

History suggests that the relations of the United States with Latin America are often characterized more by high-sounding principles than by practical concrete action. Let us insure in this instance that the consultative machinery which we are establishing between our nations becomes, in reality, a continuing basis for cooperative efforts of real meaning to our peoples. For, even with the best intentions, principles are not translated into reality unless governments on a regular basis assign themselves concrete and specific tasks which engage the interests and will of their citizens. In this manner we shall discover the form and the promise of our future relationship.

Mr. Foreign Minister, I first visited Brazil over a decade ago. I was struck by the unbounded confidence and breadth of vision of the people I met. These reminded me of the moral strengths that marked the earlier generations that built the United States. And I could only conclude that your nation like mine, was destined for greatness.

Nowhere can one sense more deeply the creative spirit of the Americas than in Brasilia. Here, where once there was only solitude, now stands this exciting cosmopolitan world capital.

In the Old World a frontier was a boundary; in the New World it was and always will be an opportunity. This is a hemisphere of promise and discovery, summoning forth the true spirit and courage of a people.

Our hope and dynamism, the vibrancy and industry of the diverse peoples that make up our nations, our common struggle against nature, want, and oppression—all these are the elements of a matchless epic of world history. They are the guarantee that our endeavor, which has achieved so much in the past, can be even more fruitful as we work together on the frontiers of the future. What we elect to do together can have vast meaning to a world that yearns for a fresh demonstration of what strong and free nations working together with a vision of global responsibility can accomplish.

We welcome Brazil to her rightful share of role of international leadership. May we strengthen our collaboration in the pursuit of a more secure, prosperous, and just world.

Gentlemen, I ask you to rise and join me in a toast to the President of Brazil, General Ernesto Geisel, to my colleague and friend Foreign Minister Silveira, and to the permanent friendship of the peoples of Brazil and the United States.

Secretary Kissinger Visits Six Latin American Countries

Secretary Kissinger visited Venezuela February 16–18, Peru February 18–19, Brazil February 19–22, Colombia February 22–23, Costa Rica February 23–24, and Guatemala February 24. Following are remarks, toasts, and news conferences by Secretary Kissinger, together with the texts of a U.S.-Venezuela joint press release and a U.S.-Brazil memorandum of understanding.

ARRIVAL, CARACAS, FEBRUARY 16

Press release 66 dated February 16

Since with respect to the art of oratory, the United States is an underdeveloped country, I take the liberty of reading some of my remarks.

It is a great pleasure for me to be here in Venezuela, the nation that gave freedom and hope to the people of this continent through the leadership of its most distinguished son, Simón Bolívar. And it is particularly appropriate, therefore, that it should be here that I have the first opportunity to reaffirm in South America the very special ties between the United States and the nations of this hemisphere.

Our two nations have much in common, not only in the form of our national heroes, but also in what they represent for mankind—human freedom, dignity, and equality under law. The strong historical friendship and cooperation between Venezuela and the United States reflect the common interest of our people and the mutual esteem in which we hold democracy.

Although we face some issues today over which we may disagree, I am confident that we can, through patience and mutual trust, resolve these differences to the satisfaction of our two sovereign nations. I look forward to talks with your esteemed President, Carlos Andrés Pérez, as well as the opportunity to continue the cordial and constructive discussions I've had in Washington with your distinguished Foreign Minister and your Minister of State for International Economic Affairs.

I fully subscribe to the view so eloquently enunciated by President Pérez that we must create a world of cooperation and avoid the dangerous confrontations that arise from a world hobbled by injustice and contradictions. The nations of this hemisphere, which with all their differences have so many common ties, can make a major contribution to a world of peace and progress and justice. It is in this spirit that I come to Venezuela today.

Thank you for your warm welcome.

NEWS CONFERENCE, CARACAS, FEBRUARY 17

Press release 72 dated February 18

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said during the course of the meeting at La Guzmanía, the Presidential mansion, that one of the purposes of your trip to Latin America and the result thereof would be to propose to the U.S. Congress the elimination of the discriminatory clause in the Trade Act that negatively affects Venezuela and Ecuador. What specifically do you propose to tell Congress so that Congress may accept your suggestion?

The second question is that you announced that the type of activity that Cuba has engaged in in the case of Angola is something that could not take place. However, Cuba has just approved a new Constitution wherein it supports the struggle for independence of other countries. What do you propose to do in this respect?

Secretary Kissinger: With respect to the first question, the Administration has repeatedly emphasized to the Congress that it opposes the discriminatory aspects of the Trade Act as they apply to Venezuela and Ecuador; and several amendments have been introduced, including one by Senator Bentsen from Texas in the Senate which we understand is being considered these days by the Senate Finance Committee, to remove this particular discriminatory aspect.

When I return, I will of course report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to the House International Relations Committee, and I will emphasize in strong terms to both of them the unfortunate impact that these discriminatory pieces of legislation have had on our relationship in Latin America. Of course it occurs occasionally that the Congress does not see things my own way, though it is hard for me to conceive. But we think with respect to these discriminatory laws that the prevalent mood in the Congress agrees with the position that I have advanced here.

Second, with respect to Cuba, I do not know what the meaning of that phrase is in the Cuban Constitution. Cuba has every right to support politically and ideologically whatever it chooses. However, I am convinced that once the American people understand that Cuba assumes the right to intervene militarily in the affairs of other parts of the world, we will not stand idly by. This is a matter which we have brought before the American public—which we will continue to bring before the American public and before the Congress.

Q. I would like to ask you what are the reasons for the delay in the efforts to establish a relationship with Latin America on the part of the United States. Why has this delay been so extended? Is it that the United States can concern itself only when it has more time on its hands than it needs for its other pressing matters, or is there any specific reason for this attention span?

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, there has not been a delay, in that as soon as I became Secretary of State I proposed, within a month, what came to be called the new dialogue, and a series of meetings took place between the Foreign Ministers of the Western Hemisphere and then a series of meetings of working groups which were interrupted last year as a result of actions which were not the decision of our Administration, but were the result of the interplay of a congressional act and the reaction of Latin American countries particularly Ecuador and Venezuela, which refused to attend the meeting which was scheduled for Buenos Aires. This was one reason why I did not take a trip which had been scheduled for a meeting of Foreign Ministers.

And then there were two other events last year that created a crisis which unfortunately had to be dealt with urgently. One was a critical situation, or a need for rapid negotiations, in the Middle East which caused me to postpone a trip; and then the other was the collapse of Viet-Nam, which also was not foreseen. I regretted it profoundly, and stayed in close contact with my colleagues in the Western Hemisphere. It is sometimes the case that urgent problems take precedence over important problems, but it does not mean that there is any lack of interest or lack of concern in our relationships.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I am the correspondent for Prensa Latina. My question is: Does the inclusion of a visit [to Brazil] in the course of your present trip to Latin America mean that the U.S. Administration continues to believe in President Nixon's statement that wherever Brazil leans or goes, the rest of Latin America might follow; or are you going down there to ask them for an explanation of what the relationship may have been with the "Frente de Liberación de Angola"

Secretary Kissinger: With respect to the first part of your question, we consider Brazil an extremely important country, a great country with which we maintain friendly relations.

What the impact is on other Latin American countries is for other Latin American countries to decide, and we believe that there are many authentic leaders in Latin America, and the United States will not a

point one Latin American country as the leader of Latin America. This is up to the countries of Latin America to decide in working out their own internal relationships. We believe we can have friendly and constructive and close relations with many of the countries of Latin America.

Secondly, with respect to the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola], the United States has stated repeatedly that our opposition was not to the MPLA. The United States has stated repeatedly that we are prepared to work with any authentic African movement or any government that emerges out of authentic African governmental processes. We recognized immediately the FRELIMO [Front for the Liberation of Mozambique] in Mozambique which, in its orientation, is substantially parallel to that of the MPLA.

Our objection in Angola was the massive introduction of thousands of Cuban soldiers and massive introduction of Soviet military equipment, which had the practical consequence of imposing a minority government on a country by foreign arms and foreign expeditionary forces sent from thousands of miles away. As far as the MPLA is concerned, in its African manifestation, we have repeatedly stated that we could work with it.

Now, I am obviously not going to Brazil or to any other country on this trip to call them to account for actions they have a right to take in the sovereign exercise of their foreign policy. Therefore this is not an issue which I will raise. I am not here to discuss the past. I am here to discuss the future.

Q. There has been speculation, Dr. Kissinger, regarding the talks held with President Pérez, that you discussed the possibility or the need of exploiting and developing the Orinoco Tar Basin in exchange for technology.

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, let me say that the very extensive talks I had with your President were extremely helpful to me in understanding the problems of Venezuela and in understanding the possibilities that exist for Western Hemisphere cooperation. We discussed a wide variety of subjects.

The President raised with me the issue of the tar belt and described to me the plans he has for analyzing how it can contribute to Venezuelan development. He did not ask me for my opinion on the subject, and he simply described his own development plans with respect to this, and I listened to it with interest and pointed out that we had similar possibilities and we were developing—we were looking into the problem of technology for ourselves. But there was no discussion whatsoever about an exchange of technology between Venezuela and the United States or any conditions placed on how Venezuela should go about developing its own national resources.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the people of the Americas have been following with interest and have been alert to the progress of the conversations that are being held between the United States and Panama. How do you see these conversations at present? What do you see as the outcome?

Secretary Kissinger: We are engaged in very serious negotiations to see whether a mutually satisfactory new treaty can be negotiated. These negotiations are taking place, and they are making progress, and they will be conducted with great seriousness by the United States, as they have been also by the Government of Panama.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there is a report in the Venezuelan press that you asked President Pérez if he would lower the price of Venezuelan oil in a way similar to that which Iran has done. Was that subject raised in your discussions at all?

Secretary Kissinger: That subject did not come up. The question of energy was discussed, not with specific reference to Venezuela's oil prices but with respect to the general problem of the relation of energy to other aspects of the international economy, such as is being discussed at the Paris Conference.

Q. There are views that have been expressed through the media in Venezuela and have also been reflected in communications

through the news agencies regarding the extraordinary security precautions taken on the occasion of the visit of the Secretary of State to Venezuela. My question is: Could you explain to us whether you had, through the U.S. Department of State, any information or news regarding the possibility of an attempt on your life? Or has this display of U.S. security agents been simply a demonstration of friendship toward Latin American countries?

Secretary Kissinger: I never look at information about the security situation, so I am not familiar with any particular information with respect to security. I also do not control the number of security agents that accompany me. I suppose they feel that I am easily lonely and therefore try to prevent my usual melancholy from expressing itself—I will probably live to regret this. Let's make this the last question.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, it is known that once the strength and skill of the Cuban army became apparent in Angola that American Ambassadors were asked to consult with their foreign governments. Does that mean that some kind of joint policy or agreement is being worked out with reference to future military interventions like Cuba, should there be any?

Secretary Kissinger: We are not in the process at this moment of organizing a joint policy with respect to any future Cuban move. We are stating, however, the view of our Administration that this is an unacceptable mode of behavior, and we state this view in response to questions. We are not volunteering it, and we are not asking any government to take any specific action at this moment.

Q. Mr. Secretary, according to cables originating from Washington, you are quoted as stating that countries receiving U.S. aid would have to agree with the United States in international forums. Should that be considered simply a notice or a threat?

Secretary Kissinger: It may be that you have your Harvard professors confused, but we are not buying votes in the United Nations. Our attitude toward countries will have to be determined by their overall relations to us and not by each individual vote in the United Nations.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, my country, Ecuador, is one that has been claiming a 200-mile territorial sea together with Peru and Chile in order to develop our fisheries and other natural resources in the sea. It is my understanding that the Congress of the United States is in the process of approving a similar law to protect a similar 200-mile area along the coast of the United States. The second question that I have is: If the United States should approve such a law, providing for 200 miles, would this mean the end of the presence of tuna boats fishing along our coastal borders?

Secretary Kissinger: With respect to the 200-mile zone, the United States, in the Law of the Sea Conference, supports a 200-mile economic zone—not territorial sea, but a 200-mile economic zone—and we hope that we can delay congressional action on this matter until we can determine what will happen at the Law of the Sea Conference that is beginning in the middle of March. I do not want to speculate what our fishermen will do.

The principle of the economic zone is that countries can regulate the fishing by licenses and other means. It does not mean that they are necessarily excluded. The strong hope of our Administration is that there will be an international agreement which is equally applicable to all countries rather than a series of unilateral laws with different shades of interpretation.

U.S.-VENEZUELA JOINT PRESS RELEASE, FEBRUARY 18

Press release 73 dated February 18

CARACAS—The United States expressed its deep commitment to seek a new, vigorous spirit of inter-American solidarity, believing that the common experience and aspirations of the nations of the Americas provide a

unique advantage, and that hemispheric cooperation is central to the effort to build a greater world community.

To build upon the special strength of hemisphere cooperation in addressing the new global challenges of interdependence, Venezuela and the United States agreed today to new and closer cooperation in energy research, educational development, and control of smuggling and unlawful use of dangerous drugs. The two countries also agreed to begin discussions looking toward the negotiation of a science and technology agreement.

Foreign Minister Ramon Escovar Salom and U.S. Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger announced that Venezuela had accepted the United States invitation to send a team of highly qualified energy experts to survey in depth United States research in energy technology—coal, nuclear, solar, oil shale extraction, geothermal, and wind.

In January 1975, the then Secretary of Interior Rogers Morton proposed in Boston at the first U.S.-Venezuelan symposium on bilateral relations that Venezuela share the benefits of advanced United States research in energy technology in view of the strong and mutual interests of both in the energy field. The officials said that the forthcoming trip of the Venezuelan energy experts would be the first step in implementing what has become known in Venezuela as "the Morton offer."

The two Ministers further agreed to undertake new programs in the area of educational development and planning, consisting of a high-level exchange of scholars and cooperative research projects. The Venezuelan Foreign Minister informed the Secretary of State of the Scholarship Fund which Venezuela has placed at the disposal of Latin American and Caribbean countries.

The Ministers discussed details of a bilateral narcotics agreement to provide for intensified cooperative efforts to stem the unlawful use of and smuggling of narcotics and dangerous drugs. It is expected that this agreement will be signed in the near future.

Drawing upon their close bond as nations committed to democracy, Venezuela and the United States affirm their belief that the institutions and processes of democracy are essential if mankind's future is to be enhanced by freedom, equal justice and human dignity.

TOAST, LIMA, FEBRUARY 18 [1]

Although this is my first visit to Peru, I feel I am among old friends. In September 1973, Miguel Angel de la Flor was the first Foreign Minister I met after becoming Secretary of State. Since then Miguel Angel and I have seen each other regularly at the United Nations, at the OAS, in Mexico, and most recently in Paris, where Peru was elected cochairman of the Raw Materials Commission of the Conference on International Economic Cooperation.

Once I admired his uniform, suspecting that he wore it to intimidate me. Miguel replied he would make a special exception for me, as a civilian, to join his legion—to join him at the head of the greater battle facing mankind: the struggle against poverty and underdevelopment.

Mr. Minister: The United States this year celebrates its bicentennial; Peru is the cradle of civilization in South America. Yet it is only relatively recently that both our countries have found themselves deeply engaged in world affairs. And it is still more recently that we have begun to understand that the conduct of foreign policy in the world is a challenge as multifaceted and unending as it is inescapable.

The United States fully accepts the awesome responsibilities that inevitably befall it as the strongest free nation of the world. We see ourselves as the defender of democracy and the independence of smaller nations against aggression. We see ourselves, together with the other nuclear superpower, as obligated to maintain global stability and to seek realistic ways to reduce international tensions.

[1] Given at a dinner hosted by the Peruvian Foreign Minister (text from press release 79 dated Feb. 19).

But our responsibilities do not end with the control of nuclear weapons or the containment of East-West conflicts. Our vital interests and security—and our highest moral convictions—are directly affected by the evolving relationship between North and South, rich and poor, industrialized and developing. We are therefore committed, in our own enlightened self-interest, to foster a new and more progressive international system—based on coexistence and cooperation —to replace the colonial and bipolar orders that successively have been eroded by history.

I have come to Peru convinced that the nations of Latin America and the United States are essential participants in the task that history has assigned to this generation. Unlike most other nations in the world, we of the Americas share a common experience. This palace was built when our countries were both colonies. We both won our independence in revolutions which took place in the early part of the modern era. Unlike most other nations, we shared a civility of peace and of mutual respect long before the present evolution of the world's division into industrialized and developing nations. Therefore we start as friends.

Since Peru's revolutionary process began —and continuing now under the leadership of President Morales Bermudez—Peru has brought fresh vision to many contemporary international issues. That projection, like our own, derives from the recognition that international realities are no less essential to the formulation of national policy and to the attainment of national well-being than domestic realities.

Peru has chosen a nonaligned path. The United States accepts nonalignment as a legitimate national course. Indeed, our global interest is well served by a world of thriving independent states, secure in their national destinies against the hegemonial designs of any nation.

Yet too often nations which chose nonalignment to shield themselves from the pressures of powerful global blocs have tended to form a rigid, ideological, confrontationist bloc of their own. The variety of the world's nations is too great, and our common problems too urgent, for such outmoded practices; they only deepen our divisions and impair our mutual progress.

I am confident that our common dedication to cooperation, already implicit in our respective efforts to reform the inter-American system and to bring the Law of the Sea Conference to a useful conclusion this year, will intensify in the future.

My discussions here today enable me to better appreciate Peru's drive to shape an interdependent world that gives full scope to independence. This afternoon I saw many signs of the greatness of the rich civilization that flourished in this land before the European conquest. And through my friendship with your Foreign Minister, I have come to appreciate the aspirations and the new dynamism of revolutionary Peru.

I can therefore understand why Peru has elected not to model itself on other nations but to draw on its own strengths in seeking fulfillment of its national destiny. Inspired by its unique past and the genius of its people, Peru has chosen its own path that is neither capitalist nor Communist. Rather, recalling Tupac Amaru, Peru is struggling to fulfill what Basadre has called the "promise of Peruvian history."

The United States, itself committed to the ideal of equality of opportunity, is fully sympathetic with Peru's struggle to create a social democracy attuned to the needs of all its people. Though we differ—in ideology, in culture, in income and wealth, in governmental structure—our two nations can nonetheless cooperate to achieve goals they hold in common.

Indeed, the partnership of two strong countries is the most fruitful partnership of all.

For such cooperation to be meaningful, there must first be understanding. We must respect each other's perspectives, each other's necessities, each other's seriousness. This is not a theoretical consideration. Our legal and political requirements have come into conflict a number of times since your revo-

lutionary process began. Not without effort —on both sides—we have managed to surmount most of these conflicts.

If we do not continue to seek to compose difficulties between us honorably and to mutual advantage, if our realism gives way to passion, we run the risk of deceiving ourselves and losing what we seek to achieve for our peoples. There is common ground on the basis of equality. There can be shared success on the basis of solutions to common problems. The United States, for its part, will spare no effort to resolve any differences that arise on the basis of dignity, equality, and mutual respect.

The United States today approaches the world, and this hemisphere, not with the impulse to overwhelm problems with resources or to disguise differences with assistance programs, but with patience, maturity, compassion, and a willingness to identify genuine mutualities of interest.

Diversity and disagreement are features of a world of independent nations. But the interdependence of our security and economic progress makes our working together also a practical necessity. We have never lost respect for each other or a dedication to solve problems cooperatively, and we must never do so.

The people of the United States are profoundly convinced that the world's future is at stake. The talents and energy of our people have given us the means for material progress that can all but eradicate famine, poverty, disease, and—as we proved together in facing the 1970 earthquake—alleviate the dreadful consequences of natural disaster. History will judge us cruelly if we fail to draw from these blessings the greatest possible human benefit. To paraphrase an ancient Quechua saying, "Even the stones would cry." Not our power, but our wisdom, is challenged.

Peru, it is clear even on this brief visit, has committed itself with determination to build a better life for its own people. Its leadership within the Third World demonstrates concern that transcends its own borders. At times the fervor of those convictions has conflicted with some of ours, even when our fundamental interests have not.

Despite the unique role that each of us plays, my visit convinces me more than ever that our shared goals can dominate our differences. It is up to us to translate our people's ideals into concrete achievements through negotiation, not confrontation; through common effort, not discord.

Ladies and gentlemen, I propose a toast to the greatness of Peru, to our respect and understanding for each other, and to the greatness of what we can achieve together.

NEWS CONFERENCE, LIMA, FEBRUARY 19

Press release 80 dated February 19

Secretary Kissinger: May I make the following suggestions. Could we have the first group of questions from the Peruvian journalists, and then we will take some from the American journalists.

Before we take any questions, I would like to repeat what I have already said earlier and what I am going to say again tonight. I would like to express my appreciation to the President and the Government of Peru for the very warm and cordial reception that I have received and for the very constructive and useful talks we have had.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, recent news items from Washington, D.C., report that President Ford has instructed the reorganization of the CIA. Does this mean a restructuring of U.S. security policies and also a commitment of no further interference in other countries' affairs?

Secretary Kissinger: The reorganization that was ordered by the President indicates that the President wants to deal with two problems: how to make sure that there is even greater executive control over intelligence operations and also how to regulate the relationships between the intelligence organizations and the Congress with respect to the activities of the CIA. The charges that

have been made have been sensationalized and in many parts are inaccurate.

Q. The United States has adopted measures against the Government of Peru, among them the refusal to sell arms, weapons; restrictions on trade; economic boycotts in international credit organizations; and others. With respect to each and every one of these points, I would like to know whether Secretary Kissinger has during the course of the day brought up any solutions as an expression of U.S. good will in terms of our bilateral relations.

Secretary Kissinger: I believe that the question is based on a misapprehension. The United States has not engaged in a policy of pressure against the Government in Peru.

As I stated at the airport, as I will have occasion to repeat again, the United States supports the objectives of the Peruvian revolution and is willing to cooperate with any country that pursues an authentic national path toward development. We think that in a world that requires peace and progress, the ability of countries that may have different views about their internal organizations to cooperate on the basis of equality is essential.

With respect to specifics, the United States in fact sold, I believe, close to 70 million dollars' worth of military equipment to Peru in the last year and a half. There are no bans at this moment on any of our facilities.

The difficulty is that there are certain legislative requirements, some of which the Administration has not favored, which go into effect if certain measures are taken in other countries. We are making very great efforts to avoid having to resort to these legislative mandates, and they are at this moment not in effect. The policy of the Administration toward Peru is to seek a mode of cooperation and to work together in the Western Hemisphere and bilaterally on constructive programs.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, your visit has created great expectation and interest, especially regarding the motivational reason for it. Can it be considered a preamble for better relations between the United States and Latin America?

Secretary Kissinger: My motivations are generally not as complicated as the subtlety of the Latin mind seems to believe, but basically my visit here is to underline the importance the United States attaches to the relationships within the Western Hemisphere as well as to relations with Peru. We are prepared to work together with the countries of the hemisphere either bilaterally or in existing forums on common solutions to common problems. What we should avoid is to make too many rhetorical declarations and to work out some concrete programs which can engage the day-to-day activity of our governments, so that we do not exhaust ourselves in formal declarations, and begin to get to work on our common problems.

Q. Dr. Kissinger, several countries have reported in Latin America, and also some charges have originated in the Congress of the United States, which accuse the Government of the United States of overthrowing the Allende government. What is your response to this question, Dr. Kissinger?

Secretary Kissinger: My recollection is that the committee of Congress that was looking into this question specifically stated that the U.S. Government did not overthrow the Allende government and that corresponds to the fact the United States has an interest in maintaining the democratic institutions in Chile but it did not feed or encourage the coup that overthrew Allende.

Q. The fact, Mr. Secretary, that the intelligence services of the United States have supported the FNLA [National Front for the Liberation of Angola] and—the Holden Roberto movement—and the activities in Angola have produced, we would like to know whether the U.S. Government feels that the cooperation or presence of the racist government of Pretoria is one that has produced reactions amongst the U.S. black community and other progressive groups in the United States?

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, there are a number of totally wrong assumptions in that question. The United States was in favor of an African solution to the problem of Angola. The United States did not support any military action in Angola until a massive Soviet and Cuban intervention had already taken place, in which case we responded to requests of several African governments for their support.

The United States has formally proposed on a number of occasions that all foreign intervention in South Africa should immediately cease, that all foreign governments should stop supplying arms in Angola, and that the various groups in Angola should negotiate among each other their own solution to this problem.

The United States had no interest in Angola except to keep it free of great-power competition. And it was the massive intervention of the Soviet Union which sent in more arms into Angola than all other foreign governments have sent into all of the rest of Africa during the course of the year and a large expeditionary force from this hemisphere.

The United States opposed South African intervention as well as all other foreign intervention. And the U.S. interest was to keep Africa free of great-power rivalry.

As far as the black population in the United States is concerned, we are certain that it looks at our foreign policy from a national point of view and that there will be different points of view within the black population, as there are in the rest of the population, but that there is not a unified position.

Q. Secretary Kissinger, you have said that you have not decided whether to attend the OAS conference in Chile in June. Could you tell us, please, on what basis you will make your decision and whether that has anything to do with the situation regarding human rights in Chile?

Secretary Kissinger: My basic plan is to join my colleagues of the Western Hemisphere at the annual meeting of the Ministerial Council of the OAS, as has been traditional. I have not yet made my final schedule for June, because it is a month of many conflicting international meetings, but I am in the process of attempting to work it out. With respect to the human rights question in Chile and elsewhere, the United States has consistently supported a greater degree of human rights, and we have made our views known.

Q. My question has reference to what you said in Business Week in December—that the aid of the United States in food has importance for moral and humanitarian reasons.[2] *I understand that in 1973 the National Security Council, which you head, ordered a comprehensive study of the food policy of the United States and the political implications of the dependence of Third World countries on the United States as a supplier of food. The Washington Post last year said that the food aid program exists as an arm of Kissinger's foreign policy. Whether that is true or not I don't know—that is Mr. Dan Morgan's statement. My question is, can the food aid program of the United States be an arm of foreign policy and at the same time a humanitarian and a moral policy?*

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, the President heads the National Security Council, and not his Assistant for National Security. The role of the Assistant for National Security is to make sure that all the choices are presented to the President and all the agencies are always present at the meetings of the National Security Council so that they can see very easily whether all the choices are properly presented. But this is a technical bureaucratic point.

In terms of substance, in my first speech after I became Secretary of State, I proposed a World Food Conference, which then took place the following year. I am convinced that the United States, as the greatest exporter of food in the world, has a special responsibility to use its surpluses to demonstrate the

[2] For an interview with Secretary Kissinger published in the Jan. 13, 1975, issue of Business Week, see BULLETIN of Jan. 27, 1975, p. 97.

importance of interdependence and to use them in a way that is constructive and that helps bring about a better and more progressive world.

Secondly, the surpluses of the United States, great as they are, can make only a relatively small difference to the world food problem, and therefore I have consistently supported an increase in the food aid of the United States, of which over 70 percent is not given on the basis of any administrative discretion.

But we have strongly supported programs to build up world food reserves in order to cushion the effects of emergencies, cooperative programs to increase world food production—because as I said, the total gap between consumption and production is about 25 million tons; the United States can contribute at most 6–7 million tons to meet this shortfall.

We have supported within the Western Hemisphere the creation of a special agricultural group. All of these efforts are an attempt to deal with one of the profound human and social problems of our time and are not related to any short-term political goals. Indeed, they cannot be related to any short-term political goals, because they will take many years to take effect. But we do have the overwhelming problem of interdependence and the use of scarce resources for the benefit of mankind, and we hope that the United States will discharge its obligations in a responsible and, above all, a humane manner.

REMARKS FOLLOWING SIGNING MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING, BRASILIA, FEBRUARY 21

Press release 88 dated February 21

Of the many international undertakings that I have signed as Secretary of State, none has given me greater pleasure than this agreement today which my very good friend Antonio [Brazilian Foreign Minister Antonio F. Azeredo da Silveira] and I have been discussing for two years. In the charmingly persistent and conciliatorily clear manner of Brazilian diplomacy, Antonio has insisted to me in the two years that I have known him that the United States must pay greater attention to Latin America and also that the relations between Brazil and the United States can be of very great significance to the peace and progress of the entire world.

We share the sentiment because in the world today we have the problem of how to prevent conflict and we have the problem of how to bring about progress. And it is important whether they will be solved by those who respect the individual and who base their policies on concerns for the human personality or whether they will be solved by those who believe in impersonal forces and who carry out their programs without love and without hatred—simply in pursuance of an abstract bureaucratic conception.

There is no country in which human qualities are more pronounced, in which the human personality is more expressive, than this great country that I have had the honor to visit for the last few days. And there are no two peoples whose concern for human dignity and for the basic values of man is more profound in the day-to-day lives of their people than Brazil and the United States. So what we are committing ourselves to is not just a series of technical understandings but an expression of confidence in the individual human spirit.

In relations between the United States and Brazil and in the relations between the United States and Latin America, there have often been high-sounding declarations. We are determined that this document which we have signed today shall be put into immediate practice. Its test will be whether in the months ahead we can make concrete progress on the specific issues that concern our people, the hemisphere, and the world.

The Foreign Minister has already referred to some of the groups that are already in existence. We have decided yesterday to form immediately another group dealing with energy and a second one dealing with scientific and technical cooperation. Minister [of Mines and Energy Shigeaki] Ueki and some experts have kindly accepted our invitation to visit Washington in the very near

ture to discuss a very broad agenda. Sec- ary [of the Treasury William E.] Simon coming here this spring, and we are plan- ng a meeting of the overall commission fore too many months have passed.

I am extremely satisfied with the talks we ve had here, which cover the entire range our relationships, with special emphasis the problems of development and eco- mic growth for our countries, for the misphere and in a local framework. What are doing here is not an exclusive ar- gement, but something that we are pre- ed to do, each of us, with other nations similar objectives as well.

have been deeply moved, Mr. Foreign nister, not only by the extraordinary tech- al competence of my counterparts here— ause I have become used to that—but by friendship, matter-of-factness, absence complexities, and extraordinary human ds with which all conversations from a sident on have been discussed and con- ted. So we leave here not simply with a tical determination that this relationship ll be deepened but with a human neces- that these contacts will grow more and e profound.

great deal of the credit for this belongs he persistence, subtlety, and charm of my nd and colleague the Brazilian Foreign ister, who makes his approaches to us n so painless that I told him yesterday discussions tend to reduce themselves he rate at which we yield to his pro- als. But I want to emphasize that I leave silia with the warmest of feelings, that ok forward to frequent and regular con- s with the Foreign Minister and with his agues.

etween two countries of this size, one of ch is growing with enormous rapidity, erences are from time to time absolutely itable. This document will not remove differences, but it will strengthen our rmination that they will be overcome the attitude that our friendship and ed objectives must always guide our sions in specific cases. This is the deter- ation with which I return to Washing- and we have reaffirmed it to ourselves on several occasions since my arrival here. It remains for me only to thank the Government of Brazil, my friends in the Government of Brazil, for the manner in which the talks have been prepared, for the extraordinary kindnesses that have been shown to us, and for the great human warmth so characteristic of Brazil but also so particular to our friendship.

U.S.-BRAZIL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Press release 87 dated February 21

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING CONCERNING CONSULTATIONS ON MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST

The Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil and the Government of the United States of America:

Inspired by the long tradition of friendship and cooperation between their two peoples;

Reaffirming the need to give wider expression to the solidarity of the Western World and the benefits to be derived from a constructive interpretation of the concept of interdependence among all nations;

Recognizing the responsibility of their two countries to pursue their shared goal of a just and enduring solution to international problems;

Convinced of the importance to the sound development of their respective policies of close and frequent consultations on matters of common interest;

And believing that these considerations call for the establishment of a flexible mechanism permitting open and active communication at the cabinet level, have arrived at the following understanding:

1. The two Governments will normally hold consultations semi-annually, on the full range of foreign policy matters including any specific issue that may be raised by either side. Economic, political, security, cultural, legal, educational and technological subjects, whether bilateral or multilateral, may be discussed within the political framework afforded by the consultations.

2. These consultations will normally be held alternately in Brazil and in the United States on dates to be mutually determined. Special meetings may be called by mutual agreement.

3. The consultations will be conducted by the Minister of Foreign Relations on the part of the Federative Republic of Brazil and by the Secretary of State on the part of the United States of America. The Chairman of the meeting will be the chief of the delegation of the host country.

4. Each delegation will be composed of such other high-ranking officials, including cabinet members,

as may be appropriate to the agenda to be discussed.

5. After review of matters of common interest by the delegations, the chiefs of the delegations may propose to their respective governments measures deemed pertinent and appropriate.

6. By joint decision, study groups or working groups may be established to examine particular questions of current interest or to help carry forward special projects.

7. Each party will establish such internal arrangements as it deems appropriate to follow through on the agreed conclusions and recommendations that may arise from the consultations.

8. In addition to these consultations at the cabinet level, consultations will be carried forward on an on-going basis through normal diplomatic channels. These channels will be used for the preparation of a mutually acceptable agenda for the consultations.

9. The foregoing arrangements will complement and in no way replace or detract from the existing channels for transacting business.

10. This memorandum will come into operation upon signature by the Foreign Minister of the Federative Republic of Brazil and of the Secretary of State of the United States of America.

Signed in duplicate at Brasilia this twenty-first day of February, 1976, in the Portuguese and English languages.

For the Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil:

ANTONIO F. AZEREDO DA SILVEIRA

For the Government of the United States of America:

HENRY A. KISSINGER

NEWS CONFERENCE, BRASILIA, FEBRUARY 21

Press release 89 dated February 21

Q. Mr. Secretary, in some of your recent speeches, mainly the one in California and the speech you made here yesterday at the Foreign Office, you said that actions along the lines of the Cuban action in Angola would no longer be tolerated. At the same time there seems to be no indication on Capitol Hill as to any change regarding a more active participation of the United States. How do you explain that?

Secretary Kissinger: First of all, I want to emphasize what I have said at various other stops. My trip to Latin America was planned long before the Angolan adventure by Cuba. I am not here to line up support f the American position with respect to Cul I am here to strengthen the relationship l tween the United States and Latin Amer and between the United States and Bra: And the other issue is incidental to it.

Secondly, when the issue of Angola w discussed in the U.S. Congress, it was d cussed within the context of the local si ation in an African country, within the c text of the debate going on in America ab how the United States should act in si ations, whether by covert or by overt mea One reason for the repeated statements the President and myself is to explain to t American people what is involved and bring about a clearer understanding of t potential global implications of what we discussing, and we believe that this und standing is growing.

And we believe that, in a democracy, national leaders, we have no choice except bring home our convictions to the Ameri people. And as I said in my San Franci speech, I am confident that once the Am ican people understand what is at issue, t will act, as they have always acted, with determination that is necessary.

Q. Now that the situation in Angola ready is defined, what would be lacking the U.S. government to recognize the MP as the government of all Angola?

Secretary Kissinger: The United St has repeatedly stated that its objections events in Angola were not related to MPLA as an African organization, but to massive introduction of outside forces s ing to impose one group over the other. ' United States remains concerned about presence of massive numbers of Cuban fo —and Soviet technicians, in much sma numbers—in Angola. We will watch eve including the actions of other African c tries that are most immediately concer and we will take our decisions in the ligh the actions of the authorities in Angola of the views of other countries with w we have been closely associated.

Q. In Europe they call you a new Fo

dles. They also say that you are trying to vive in the world the policy of the "big ek." I would like to know whether you ree or not with this and whether you give e the reasons for your answer.

Secretary Kissinger: I am being variously iticized for being too hard on the Com- mist countries and being too soft on the mmunist countries. There are those in nerica who claim that we are being too nciliatory to the Soviet Union and there e those in America and in Europe who say are not conciliatory enough.

Our problem is we are living in a world ich is quite novel for many Americans, in it we now have to have a permanent en- gement in international affairs and that o, for the first time in our history, we ve to deal with a country of roughly equal ength, in the Soviet Union—so that for first time in American history we have to nduct diplomacy of a permanent balanc- , continuous character. This creates cer- n psychological resentments against the rld so different from our historical expe- nce.

And it is therefore no surprise that those o were very comfortable with the cold r and who had become very familiar with id divisions and rhetorical declarations— t they should be uncomfortable. And it is o not surprising that those who believe t, simply, declarations for peace unre- ed to any concept of equilibrium can ad- nce matters, too, should be uncomfortable. Those critics in Europe to whom you refer generally those who want us to support entry into the governments of their ntries of the Communist party. Now, I nk that the United States has never vol- eered an opinion on that subject, but en we are asked our opinion on whether believe that the participation of Commu- t parties in certain governments in rope will not have considerable effect, we bound to state the truth.

And the truth is that the participation of mmunist parties in European govern- nts will bring about a new situation, ether or not these Communist parties claim to be, or are in fact, somewhat inde- pendent of Moscow; because I can think of many governments that are independent of Moscow that nevertheless pursue policies quite different from those of the moral and political community that now, to a consider- able extent, exists in the North Atlantic.

Up to now it has never been an initiative by the United States. We state that such an event will change the character of the rela- tionship not because we wish it, but because this is a fact.

But beyond this particular question which you raise, it is a fundamental question of how we can bring about a new approach to international relations in the face of the traditional polarization between two groups: one that believes that all you need to end the problem of communism is to strike a rhetor- ical bellicose stand; another group who be- lieves that all you need to bring about peace is to strike a rhetorical pacific stance. And this is the nature of our debate.

Q. My question, to some extent, repeats that of my colleague, but I will ask anyway, because I would like to obtain a more ex- plicit answer if possible. You stated Thurs- day, on the question of the Soviet-Cuban intervention in Angola, that the United States had decided, as a question of principle, to resist such dangerous and irresponsible actions. Should it be understood that the United States will resist the next Soviet- Cuban intervention in Africa militarily or that the United States will vehemently pro- test with words only and will call a new Helsinki Conference aiming in sanctifying the inviolability of the borders established by the Soviet Union and Cuba in Africa?

Secretary Kissinger: Of course, I just want the questioner to know that I understood the sarcasm of the question. But, first of all, I would like to make clear that the Helsinki declaration dealt exclusively with Europe. Secondly, and before I get to the specific question, the United States has pursued a two-pronged policy. It has attempted to mod- erate potentially aggressive conduct by establishing certain international codes or

principles to which nations should adhere. But we have never had any illusions that simple declarations of objectives can be a substitute for geopolitical inequalities. And therefore, side by side with attempting to bring about a more conciliatory world, we have done our utmost to make sure that the world in which we live, which is not fully conciliatory, does not provide temptations for aggression.

And again I would like to call your attention to the fact that if you look at the nature of our debate in America you will find that the concerns are expressed on both of these points, on both the point of attempting to resist and on the point of trying to create a new environment.

We do believe that we cannot stand for expansionism. But we also believe that a constant attempt to balance forces will sooner or later lead to a confrontation, and therefore we want to move to a new set of arrangements. And Helsinki should be seen in that context, without illusion.

Now, with respect to your specific question, I think you will understand that it would not be appropriate for a Secretary of State to describe exactly what we would do in circumstances that have not yet arisen, that cannot be foretold. But it would be our determination to do what is effective, and not to have a post mortem on a failure, but to do what is necessary to prevent the success of another similar effort.

Q. In the text of your speech which the American Embassy has distributed, it was said that the United States would sign the International Coffee Agreement. In your speech at the dinner at Itamaraty you omitted this point. Why?

Secretary Kissinger: The American press that is traveling with me will tell you that in almost every speech I sometimes omit a paragraph or two in order to shorten the delivery. In this particular case, in order to be perfectly frank, while I wanted to convey to the Brazilian Government that we will sign this agreement, I thought perhaps it was not specifically delicate at such a meeting to give the impression that our relati ship depended on coffee, and as if the pol of this country exhausted itself in the s of one agricultural commodity. And, the fore, while we will sign the agreement, wh the President has made this decision, a while the printed text of my speech is official expression of American policy a will be carried out, I thought it was perh somewhat more politic not to read that pa graph as if something which we consider wider importance could be summed up i traditional export of Brazil.

But in any case, what we have—what in the text of our policy, and the Presid has already, I believe, transmitted his tentions of signing this agreement—or very soon—to the Congress.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you explain u you did not inform your good friend M ister Azeredo da Silveira before November about the presence of Cuban soldiers in gola? Isn't this exchange of informatio usual practice in the relations am friends?

Secretary Kissinger: Foreign Minis Silveira and I are engaging in a very act correspondence, and we make an effor think on the whole successful, of inform each other of major events. We do not ne sarily ask for Brazilian support on ev thing that we do.

With respect to the Cuban interventio Angola, the full extent of it did not bec apparent to us until the second half of O ber. We were aware of some hundreds Cubans—Cuban advisers—earlier, but that time we thought it was still within context of an essentially African struggl that is to say, where various African t tions might ask for outside support t might be significant, but not so important to dilute the essentially African nature the conflict.

It was only toward the end of Octo that, putting together various pieces of telligence, it became clear to us that we w not dealing with advisers, but with an peditionary force. And we then, given

fact that bureaucracies do not move with enormous rapidity, we then informed some of our closer friends of that fact. It is also important to remember that the Cuban intervention accelerated very rapidly. As late as the middle of December there were only about four to five thousand Cubans—I am talking about December now, the middle of December—there were only about four to five thousand Cubans in Angola. Today there are 11 to 12 thousand, so that a more-than-doubling of the Cuban force took place after the middle of December in Angola. So that the full character of the struggle, that is to say the fact that we were no longer dealing with foreign countries helping their friends, but with foreign countries imposing their friends on the rest of the country, was not really fully clear to us until just before we informed the Brazilian Foreign Minister.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you have singled out Brazil as the most important country in Latin America and on the verge of becoming a world power. How about human rights? Aren't you concerned with the matter?

Secretary Kissinger: It is not my obligation here publicly to discuss Brazilian domestic developments, but I had an opportunity yesterday in my conversations to learn from various Brazilian officials their ideas about the evolution of this country in the political field and their perception of the role of human rights in this respect.

Q. There is evidence that Brazil's trade balance cannot stand, without great trauma for the country, a general trade deficit—particularly with the United States—similar to that of last year. In view of this and of the multiplicity of forces which decide whether U.S. trade policy should be more or less protectionist, more or less liberal, we ask: When can we expect that the cooperation between Brazil and United States, which was restated today, will become more operative in terms of commercial efforts? Is there money involved in it?

During this weekend, the United States has adopted the policy of balancing its trade relations with Brazil, which have been extremely negative for our country. The United States invites Brazil to join slowly the club of the powerful. The invitation is also good for the club of the rich?

Secretary Kissinger: There is no question that when the economy of a country develops at the rate and at the scale of the Brazilian economy, that there will be occasional unevenness. There is also no question that from time to time this will conflict with established patterns in the United States. It would be insulting to you to pretend otherwise. The problem is not that there will not be misunderstandings, disagreements, and occasionally even conflicts. The question is whether there exists the political will to remove those.

With respect to the very last part of your question, I believe that it is Brazil's destiny, quite frankly, no matter what the United States does, to join the club of the rich. This may be painful to some theoreticians, but it is, in my personal judgment, unavoidable and to be desired. But in the interval until this occurs, a great deal depends on the wisdom of the policy of the United States.

Now, as you know, we have certain legislative requirements that are more or less automatically triggered in the case of particular events in other countries. We had extensive talks about the issue that you raised—the issue of the trade balance—which in part is also a temporary phenomenon until adjustments can be made in the Brazilian supplies of raw materials. But nevertheless it is real enough. We had extensive talks; the Brazilian side, if I may say so, was extraordinarily well prepared, and we approached it from the point of view not of being able to eliminate that imbalance immediately, but of reducing it and of preventing some American actions that have been sometimes harmful but, even more frequently, more irritating than they were harmful.

The Brazilian side came up with a number of general ideas that we think are extremely helpful and that we want to study in the United States. And that, if not those ideas, then some other ideas that will, in my judg-

ment, lead to a solution—hopefully lead to a solution—of some of the most irritating problems that have existed.

We are determined in any event to have our decisions in those matters guided by the overall principles that we have enunciated here, and we will begin immediately an examination in the United States of these particular issues. When your Ministers come to Washington, and when our Secretary of the Treasury comes here, we hope that significant progress can be made. From my point of view, I think we had very useful talks with your economic ministers yesterday afternoon that were conducted in a really constructive atmosphere on both sides.

Q. One of the most irritating points in economic relations between Brazil and the United States recently has been the U.S. surcharge on imports of shoes. And one of the options available to you to get rid of this and to circumvent the Trade Act legislation is to go to Geneva and to negotiate; although this wouldn't have great economic impact, it would have considerable symbolic impact in improving U.S.-Brazilian relations. Do you intend to do that?

Secretary Kissinger: You know the problem of countervailing duties is triggered according to our law by the complaints of the private sector and is not an action that is usually originated, in fact it is never originated, by the government. We are concerned here with a specific provision of the American law. But we are prepared to discuss with Brazil the general question of the nature of subsidies and their relationship to countervailing duties. We are at the very beginning of this process of discussion, and our economic agencies in Washington must obviously have an opportunity to study it and to participate in those discussions. So all I will say is that we discuss various approaches to this issue that may offer some hope that this particular irritation can be eased if not eliminated.

Q. What do you think are the implications and what do you think will be the repercussions of the Congress' decision to cut off military aid to Chile?

Secretary Kissinger: I think you can appreciate that I am conducting extensive enough public discussions with the Congress in the United States not to feel the absolute necessity to conduct them also in Brasilia. My understanding is that, so far, this has been only a vote of the Senate and has not been a congressional action. I will have the opportunity when I return to have further discussions with congressional leaders, so I will reserve judgment until I have an opportunity to explore it.

Q. In your dealings with the governments of Latin America and your attempts to establish a new relationship with them, you will inevitably be dealing with a number of governments that are subject to accusations that they do violate human rights. Without regard to the specifics of the host country do you plan any initiative to demonstrate to the peoples of these countries that have such grievances that their rights are being violated, that the United States sympathizes with their aspirations?

Secretary Kissinger: We have stated our views on the human rights issue repeatedly and I have answered a question on that before. The United States supports the dignity and respect of the individual and democratic processes, and all governments understand our views in this.

Q. Mr. Secretary, if you'll take a non Latin-American question. Former President Nixon has just flown to China. Could you give us your appraisal of what his trip may mean for U.S.-China relations? Specifically is there any possibility that if President Nixon sees the new Prime Minister of China he will discuss with him his impressions of his visit [sic]?

Secretary Kissinger: I have been asked this question repeatedly in the United States. We were not consulted about the trip ahead of time, and we did not know about the trip until it was announced, so it did not represent an action by the United

States. If the Government of the People's Republic of China has invited former President Nixon, who has the historic merit of initiating that relationship, if the Government of the People's Republic of China invited him in order to underline the importance that they attach to the relationship, we are in favor of any act that stresses the significance either side attaches to the relationship, even if we did not know about the particular method that was chosen.

As far as talking to President Nixon after he returns, we will of course wish to learn about the nature of his discussions and about his impressions. The particular method that will be used to learn of these views we will decide after the former President has returned to the United States.

Q. [inaudible] have now all agreed to consult in advance on all matters of global political significance in the spirit of cooperation. One of the highest preoccupations of the United States is Cuban military adventures overseas. Is it logical to assume therefore that when these discussions or consultations occur, you will seek Brazil's support for your position about Cuba?

Secretary Kissinger: I want to stress, in the strongest possible terms, that my visit to this hemisphere is not to enlist support against Cuba. The visit to this hemisphere has been planned for a long time. The discussions about this consultative arrangement go back two years. They were started during a period when the United States was moving toward normalization of relations with Cuba and had repeatedly indicated its willingness to normalize relations with Cuba. And I do not want to turn our Western Hemisphere policy or our Brazilian policy into an obsession with a small Caribbean country.

If there are specific causes for concern about Cuba and if the United States feels that action is called for, we will undoubtedly discuss this matter with other interested Latin American states. And, of course, we will discuss such a matter with an old friend which sees things in these respects fairly parallel, as Brazil. But this is not the reason for this document we signed. This document was prepared before there was any concern with Cuba, and we do not need it to deal with Cuba.

TOAST, BOGOTA, FEBRUARY 23[3]

As I am coming to the end of my trip through South America, I would like to say how very moved I have been by the very warm and human reception that I have received everywhere, a reception which goes beyond what may be published in communiques or in press and formal statements but which represents the true relationship between Latin America and the United States. And in no country has the reception been more personal and warm than here in Colombia.

I had the privilege of staying in the home of your President and having discussions which were philosophical, relaxed, and which went to the heart of each problem in an atmosphere of substantial agreement and total cordiality.

As for your Foreign Minister, from the first time we met last year in the United States, I have entertained a very special admiration for him. In some respects we came to our present responsibilities by similar paths as authors, teachers, and historians. But when I saw how your Minister presided over the rhetorical extravaganza of the OAS General Assembly last May and thought about my own experience the year before in Atlanta, I knew he had qualities of patience and forbearance which I could never hope to emulate. With respect to the qualities of forbearance and patience, and I'm sure many others, my staff completely agrees with this judgment.

You are, Mr. Minister, by common consent one of the leaders in foreign relations in the Americas, and I am honored to be here by your side.

I want to tell you, Mr. Foreign Minister, how delighted I am to be here. The visit of

[3] Given at a dinner at the U.S. Ambassador's residence (text from press release 94 dated Feb. 24).

your President to the United States a few brief months ago was far more productive even than we had hoped it would be. The talks were expanded beyond what we had originally planned. And we decided then that we should renew our conversations at the earliest opportunity.

My visit here, Mr. Minister, is an effort built on the very considerable contribution which your President made by his earlier trip to the United States to the improvement in understanding between the United States and Latin America. In his statement to President Ford, with considerable perception and warmth, he talked about three themes: the significance of responsibility, of order, and of diversity in the affairs of nations.

I have given considerable thought to your President's statement since his trip to our country. He was right when he said that we share a commitment to these three principles. He was also right in stressing their importance to world peace and to the new, more just and more humane world order to which both Colombia and the United States are committed.

Permit me to add a few comments of my own about your President's important statement.

First, as to responsibility, both our nations are conscious of our broad responsibilities beyond our own hemisphere. In another century De Tocqueville remarked of my country, and perhaps of the New World in general, that "Expectancy is the keynote of American foreign policy; it consists much more in abstaining than in doing."

But we can no longer abstain. The United States is permanently and irrevocably engaged in the world. Our power confers upon us a dual responsibility:

—To maintain international security in an age when nuclear war could destroy civilization and

—To grasp the opportunity, which peace offers us all, to work together in a spirit of cooperation to build a world order which is more humane and just, one which takes full account of the dignity of each nation and the inalienable rights of each of our citizens.

The task we face today—indeed, the purpose of my trip—is to search out the leadership and the initiatives which will forge a common pact for bettering the condition of man. It is with this in mind that I have come to your country.

We, together with you and your neighbors in this hemisphere, begin the quest with a great advantage. This continent is a continent of peace. The nations of South America do not threaten each other. When states start down the road of pressure and threat —as some others have recently—it is a notable event in the history of the hemisphere, raising concern and the need for attention. This continent, unlike almost all the others, has not been historically preoccupied with international tensions and conflicts. It has been able to focus its energies on our positive responsibility of building a system of international cooperation. That sense of international responsibility is one of the treasures of our hemisphere tradition.

Order, as your President wisely said, is our second common commitment.

A peaceful and progressive world system depends, in the first instance, on law and on the settled practice of nations. For it is only under law that nations can pursue policies of restraint and conciliation and expect that others will do likewise and so reconcile their political and economic interests for the common progress of mankind.

Colombia is the nation of Santander, who said "if arms have given us our independence, laws will give us our liberty." It was Santander who renounced his soldierly honors to build schools, libraries, and museums —the foundations of Colombia's distinctive modern culture.

When President Lopez visited Washington, he expressed the hope that our two countries "will find a sense of partnership within a legal system based on impersonal and abstract rules within which there will always be the right to dissent." There is no better formula to guide our efforts in revitalizing the inter-American system. True to its own tradition of respect for international law and orderly process among na

ons, Colombia has been in the forefront of forts first to create, and now to revitalize, e Organization of American States. The nited States will strongly support Colom-a's efforts to make the OAS a more effective strument of our common will.

There are other areas where we can col-borate as well:

—*Commodities.* Neither Colombia nor the nited States felt an immediate need for a ffee agreement. Yet both of us shared a ng-range interest in working out an agree-ent that would provide equity to producers d consumers alike. We have succeeded.

—*Law of the Sea Negotiations.* No nation the hemisphere has played a more active d constructive role than Colombia. We ll work closely with you over the next few nths for a historic multilateral agreement establish a progressive regime of law for e world's oceans, seas, and deep seabeds. issue is more important for the long-term sibility and cooperative progress of nations.

—*Narcotics.* Our nations have a common erest in the control of illegal trafficking drugs. Your country's cooperation in this tical area has been central to the inter-tional effort to curb the flow of dangerous ugs across international boundaries. For s, you have the gratitude of the people my country.

—*Human Rights.* We are both democra-s. We share the common conviction that e instruments, and ends, of all our policies e the human beings who are our citizens, d not some blind force of history. And we erefore know that the ultimate vitality and tue of our civilization is the extent to ich its governments are responsive to the se of human dignity and respect. Under e American Declaration on the Rights and ties of Man, the United States and Colom-a are committed to nurture political and man rights everywhere. We will continue work with you in the common effort to and the writ of justice and human de-cy, not only in this hemisphere but roughout the world.

The last of the themes your President struck in Washington was that of diversity.

There is no simple formula for a hemisphere policy, no single solution to the problems of the Americas, no one slogan to encompass all the variety of our relationships and goals. The rich variety of this hemisphere is always a striking experience for any visitor from the United States. I have seen it this week. It is palpable. My country understands it, accepts it, and welcomes it. Indeed, the United States knows as well as any nation that from diversity in this hemisphere can come both creativity and strength, if we will bend our common will to the task which is ahead.

For our part, we shall move to vitalize our policy throughout the Americas and foster our hemispheric ties. We will also continue to make a special effort to strengthen our bilateral ties with each American state. We are prepared to this end to develop special consultative procedures with each nation of the Americas, if it is desired, adapted to the character and intensity of our differing relationships.

We count Colombia as a nation to which we have very special links: our common dedication to democracy, our commitment to the cause of human rights, the civility of our mutual discourse, and our firm dedication to a new and more just international order.

Mr. Minister: There is much work to be done to construct the kind of peaceful and cooperative world for which we all yearn. You and we have a great part to play. Colombia has undertaken, and you, Mr. Minister, are carrying out, *responsibilities* of statesmanship and leadership in this hemisphere. You are in the forefront of the effort to construct a new *order.* And Colombia's unique spirit and voice exemplify the richness of this hemisphere and of the creative possibilities of a world of *diversity.*

Mr. Minister, in proposing a toast to your health and success, I offer a toast to Colombia, its people, and to our joint efforts to work together on all the issues challenging our modern world.

ARRIVAL, SAN JOSE, FEBRUARY 23

Press release 96 dated February 24

As you know, Mr. Foreign Minister, tomorrow we start our electoral campaign in the United States, and it is a lucky thing for our candidates that you are not eligible.

Ladies and gentlemen, you will have seen what your Foreign Minister has put me through at our repeated meetings. It has been my experience at meetings of Foreign Ministers of the Western Hemisphere to deliver a speech to which the Foreign Minister of Costa Rica replied and no matter what I try to do his eloquence far outshown mine. This time he has put me into a more difficult position. He has spoken first.

Mr. Foreign Minister, I feel indeed, as you stated in your conclusion, that I am visiting a friend, visiting a personal friend, and I am visiting a fellow democracy, which, whatever the difference is in scale, shares our values, supports common purposes, and has the courage to stand for its convictions in bilateral relations, in hemispheric forums, and in international organizations. Not least, as a member of the Security Council, Costa Rica has proved that a nation of strong convictions and fundamental human principles can play an important role in the world regardless of what those might say who calculate only by technical and impersonal factors.

In your eloquent remarks you called attention to the principal problems of the contemporary world, which are to prevent aggression, to build the peace, and to create a more progressive relationship among states. Democracies do not have to be afraid, nor do they have to apologize for searching every avenue toward peace, but neither should they delude themselves and close their eyes in the face of aggression. And also, the free countries have to work together to build a better world. And the nations of the Western Hemisphere, sharing a similar history, united by common ideals, and inspired by those of them that have led the way toward respect for human dignity, have a special opportunity to achieve this.

Mr. Foreign Minister, you and I discussed this meeting here in Costa Rica nearly a ye ago, and you suggested that we invite re resentatives from the other Central Ame can Republics to join us. It was a fortuna idea and a happy end to my visit to Lat America.

I want you to know what a great perso joy it is for me to see you, how moved I w by your eloquent remarks, and how much look forward to spending time with you a getting to know your President and yo country.

Thank you.

TOAST, SAN JOSE, FEBRUARY 24 [4]

The opportunity I have had for discussio with President Oduber and Foreign Minist Facio, and my bilateral meetings today wi my colleagues from the Central Americ nations and Panama, are a fitting culmi tion of my Latin American trip.

Here in Central America, I know I am my way home. For the history and dreams this region have long been interwoven wi those of my country. Our past provides a heritage of considerable achievement a a precious advantage to us as we engage t future. We have the responsibility to bu upon the positive record of our cooperat for the benefit of each of our peoples and the advancement of mankind.

For a decade, Central America has b a region of progress. Industrialization, ag cultural diversification, new institutions, a above all, a growing confidence of purp have brought your countries to a new thre old of development.

You are proving yourselves pioneers the processes of international cooperation. the Central American Common Market y have shown the world how nations can co bine their efforts to promote more rapid e nomic development and international pea You have begun to construct durable Cent American institutions—technological, edu

[4] Given at a luncheon hosted by President Dan Oduber Quiros of Costa Rica (text from press rele 100).

onal, legal, and cultural—all of which help lower the barriers between nations. Your mmitment to a new treaty will provide esh impulse to your integration and can a model for others around the world.

Yet your nations—as well as any on earth know that success is fragile in the modern orld. You know that national independence quires constant vigilance and solidarity th others who share your commitment to lf-determination. Your economies know the pact of external circumstances over which u have little influence; your societies feel e pressures of population growth and of pid urbanization. One of your nations has t its soldiers to help keep the peace in a gional conflict halfway around the world ich threatens international stability. Two your countries know the anguish here in e isthmus of a still-unresolved war. Such nflicts arouse the concern of others—as is ays the case wherever peace breaks down. e role of the OAS in encouraging a solun has been an impressive example of the ue of our inter-American system.

Most tragically, three times in the past ee years Central America has been struck natural disaster. Hurricanes have brought fering in Honduras; earthquakes have aged Nicaragua; and today our hearts pained by the terrible calamity which struck our friends in Guatemala.

he United States knows the obstacles u face. We welcome, and we pledge our port for, your continued progress and inration. My country respects what you e achieved and the uniqueness and sovignty of each of your countries.

Ve are all serious people. We have difences of perspective and interest, and we continue to have them; for differences inevitable when responsible and sovern nations committed to the well-being of ir citizens confront the difficulties of an nterdependent world. But we also know that time has come to resolve, in a fair and ure way, the problems of the past and them behind us as we look to our common ure.

he negotiations now underway to modernize the relationship between my country and Panama are just such an effort. My country is determined to continue those negotiations in good faith to our ultimate objective of a new relationship which respects the national interests of both the United States and Panama.

The United States will also continue to cooperate in the development efforts in Central America. Our bilateral assistance programs here are among the largest in the hemisphere. As you seek to fulfill the aspirations of your people for a better life, you may depend upon the friendship and support of my country.

The United States will be a steady friend —not only in moments of catastrophe but over the long term in your struggle for development. Responding to the tragedy in Guatemala, President Ford has asked Congress to authorize a new grant of $25 million so that we can move beyond relief of the immediate emergency to the difficult process of rebuilding. And our established development aid programs will continue as well—in Guatemala and throughout the region, particularly to assist your efforts to help the rural poor.

As we increasingly dedicate ourselves to human betterment, we cannot neglect the reality that no nation can hope to advance if it is not secure. Our collective security is the bedrock of our relations. Last July, here in San José, the countries of this hemisphere successfully completed the modernization of the Rio Treaty—a visible symbol of our determination to maintain and strengthen this relationship.

I assure you that the United States remains dedicated to the principle of collective security. Recent events have shown that foreign adventurism is not dead; expeditionary forces may still be sent across the oceans to intervene in, and impose their will upon, the domestic affairs of other countries. The United States will not tolerate a challenge to the solemn treaty principle of nonintervention in this hemisphere.

I prepare now to go to Guatemala, where I shall extend the sympathy and the admi-

ration of the United States for the Guatemalan people at this time of great suffering. I then shall return to my own country.

This will be the last prepared statement I will make during my trip. This visit has been enormously valuable to me. I have learned much, and I return to my country with a deeper understanding of the strengths and difficulties, aspirations and conflicts, glories and anguish of the hemisphere:

—In Venezuela, I saw and heard of the growing sense of common destiny and solidarity within Latin America. I made clear that we welcomed this and that we were prepared to work with new Latin American institutions of cooperation.

—In Peru, I learned something of the creative diversity of the hemisphere. Our policy, I said, is to respect the sovereignty of each Latin American state, to conciliate differences before they become conflicts, and to support the authentic development efforts of the nations of the hemisphere.

—In Brazil, I came face to face with the reality that a number of nations of the Americas are emerging onto the world scene, with broadened international interests and international responsibilities. As a demonstration that we are prepared to develop new machinery of consultation with these nations, adapted to the special circumstances of our relations with each, I signed a new and formal memorandum of agreement on consultation with Brazil. I pointed out that we are prepared to enter into similar arrangements with other states if they so desire. And I stressed that, in enhancing our bilateral relationships with the nations of the Americas, we would not diminish the momentum toward integration and solidarity within Latin America or our willingness to work with Latin American institutions and organizations.

—In Colombia yesterday, the Foreign Minister put forward a suggestion for what could become a new element in our inter-American relationship. He proposed that we explore the possibility of arrangements between the United States and the nations of Latin America to expand trade within t hemisphere as a central mission and purpo of the inter-American system. The Unit States is prepared to look carefully at t imaginative suggestion. We shall set up task force immediately to study its ran fications. For his part, the Colombi Foreign Minister will begin consultation wi other Latin American countries. At the sa time, the United States will be discussi this proposal with him and with you a other Latin American nations. All of us w then be able to advance concrete and prac cal ideas for discussion at the General A sembly meeting of the Organization American States.

—Finally, in Costa Rica, I have seen a other example of democracy at work a reaffirmed once again, as I have elsewhe the importance of our inter-American co mitment to human rights and the dign of man.

My trip has strengthened my deep c viction that our common reality is our c ative diversity; that our task is to fo our geographical and historical bonds i shared purpose and endeavor; and that common responsibility is to build upon t special bond to make cooperation and pr ress in this hemisphere a model and a c tribution to a new era of internatic achievement.

The United States regards its hemisph ties and responsibilities with a special riousness. In a spirit of solidarity, we h pledged ourselves:

—To respond to the special economic ne of the more industrialized nations of hemisphere;

—To assist the efforts of the need nations to advance themselves;

—To support Latin American regional subregional efforts to organize for coop tion and integration;

—To negotiate our differences with nation or nations, on the basis of mutual spect and sovereign equality, either bi erally or multilaterally;

—To maintain our firm commitment to mutual security against any who would undermine our common effort, threaten independence, or export violence; and

—To modernize and strengthen our inter-American system.

These are the pledges we make. We shall spare no effort to turn them into concrete programs in the months ahead. We should—together—set ourselves an agenda for action. I firmly believe that if all nations of the Americas can commit themselves anew to responsible cooperation in these areas, we shall together be responsive to the deepest needs as well as to the highest aspirations of all mankind:

—Peace is both possible and the indispensable precondition of all our hopes for the future.

—The global economy must both grow and be fair, bringing benefit and opportunity to all peoples.

—Basic human rights must be preserved, cherished, and defended if peace and prosperity are to be more than hollow achievements. The responsibilities of men and nations in this era require, more than ever, the full and free dedication of the talent, energy, creative thought, and action of men and women, free from fear and repression, to the tasks of our time.

—The essential political requirement for progress in all these areas of common concern is the readiness of nations to consult and cooperate with each other on the basis of sovereign equality, mutual respect, and the commitment to our common success.

These, then, are the tasks before us and the principles by which we are guided. It is up to us, as individuals and as nations, whether we shall build upon the progress we have made and turn the decade ahead into one of mankind's great eras of achievement.

On my trip, I have seen much of the promise, the emergent power, and the moral force of this hemisphere. I have learned from it. I have explained some of the goals and concerns of my country. And I have confirmed my own longstanding conviction that the modern challenges of economic and social progress and relations between developed and developing countries have more possibility of being met successfully in this hemisphere than in any other part of the world.

Therefore I propose a toast: To the distinguished Foreign Ministers of the Central American Republics; to the progress of your nations; and to the cooperative effort to achieve peace and well-being for the peoples of this hemisphere and for all mankind.

NEWS CONFERENCE, SAN JOSE, FEBRUARY 24

Press release 99 dated February 25

Secretary Kissinger: Ladies and gentlemen, I simply would like to express my very deep appreciation to the President and Foreign Minister of Costa Rica for the very warm reception we have had here and for arranging the meeting with my colleagues from the Central American Republics, who also have had the courtesy of coming to the airport to see me off.

I am extremely pleased with the meetings that we have had, and I think it was a very fitting end to my trip through Latin America, which I am confident will lead to the strengthening of ties in the Western Hemisphere.

Now I would like to take some questions, but I would like first to take some questions from the Costa Rican press or other Central American journalists present, and then after we have taken some of those, I will recognize one or two of the North American contingent, who are here to prove—to demonstrate the intensity with which we conduct our internal debates.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the committee investigating the overthrow of the Allende regime in Chile has indicated that you were instrumental in this process during the Nixon Administration. Given the results of some of

the findings of this committee, we would like to ask what is your opinion with regard to the concept of self-determination of peoples?

Secretary Kissinger: As I have had occasion to point out repeatedly in the United States, several of the congressional committees get carried away in their findings when they deal with personalities. In any event, the Senate committee specifically found that the United States did not generate the overthrow of the Allende government. My own view is that countries should determine their own future free of foreign military intervention.

Q. The Senate has vetoed any participation or intervention on the part of the United States in the military area in the events in Angola. I would like to ask you, sir, what is your opinion with regard to the role of the Senate in the conduct of international policy, and how does this affect the Ford Administration in this area?

Secretary Kissinger: I do not think it is appropriate for me in a foreign country to engage in a debate over the Senate. I will say, however, that what the United States was concerned about in Angola was the massive intervention of a Cuban expeditionary force and the dispatch of large quantities of Soviet equipment which have transformed what was a minority faction in Angola into the dominant faction. So that what we are seeing here is the imposition by foreign force of a minority group as the Government of Angola. We did not oppose any of the groups in Angola as long as they reached their objectives by African methods or within an African context.

Secondly, we did not ask for American military intervention but rather for money to support black African countries that were concerned about the Cuban adventure. We believe that a mistake was made, and we are now calling the attention of the American people and of other countries to the global consequences of these developments.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in the efforts to reform the OAS Charter the United States has taken a position contrary to the concept of introducing into a reformed charter the matter of economic security of the Latin American countries. In your speech in Caracas announcing a new path in relations with Latin America, can we take this to mean that there has been a change of heart on the part of the United States and that the United States now would approve of incorporating the concept in a new treaty of the economic security of these nations?

Secretary Kissinger: Our objection has been that the phrase "collective economic security" is a very vague and loaded phrase which can be used for different purposes by different countries. Our general approach to all these issues, as was expressed at the seventh special session of the General Assembly, is to deal with concrete problems in a constructive and cooperative manner.

With respect to the relationship with Latin America I offered in Caracas—and I reiterated it again here today—cooperation on transfer of technology, cooperation on a code of multinational cooperation, assistance to the hemisphere. I call again attention today to my colleagues from the Central American Republics to the important proposa made by the Colombian Foreign Ministe yesterday for a special study of trade rela tions within the Western Hemisphere. Al these concrete measures we are prepared t take, but we are not prepared to accep general slogans that can be used in unpre dictable manners.

Last question from the Latin side an then I will take two questions from th North American side.

Q. Mr. Secretary, it was once said durin the Nixon Administration that where Brazi goes, so goes the rest of Latin America. D you think that Brazil as a country is the bes example, as a nation, for Latin America And the second question, by what means d you think that the American Governmen could bring about arrangements whereb the Latin American governments could re

eive more revenues or more equitable rices for the commodity exports upon which hey depend particularly in the case of the ore needy nations?

Secretary Kissinger: With respect to razil or any other country, the United tates will not or cannot appoint any one ountry as the leader of Latin America. The nited States is prepared to have special nsultative arrangements with any nation of ie Western Hemisphere where our relation-ips have reached a level of complexity or tensity where such relationships are neces-ry. But even when we have these special nsultative arrangements, they are not eant to the exclusion of hemispheric ties, nd they are not intended to confer a special sition of leadership on any one country. econdly, I have spoken at every stop about ie basic principles which govern the U.S. nduct in the Western Hemisphere and the asic values for which the United States ands, which include respect for human ghts and for the dignity of the individual. With respect to commodities, the United tates has declared its willingness to have se-by-case commodity studies and has al-ady agreed to sign the coffee agreement id signed the tin agreement, and we are epared to have discussions on other mmodities.

Q. Mr. Secretary, Rabbi Baruch [Korff], ho is well known in the United States as friend of President Nixon, said today con-rning Mr. Nixon's visit to China: "I don't ink he really wanted to go now, but the hinese wanted the trip to coincide with the urth anniversary of his visit, and the State epartment viewed this as a unique oppor-nity to learn about the political ferment in hina." Did you or any official of the State epartment in any way give Mr. Nixon this npression or in any way urge him to go to hina?

Secretary Kissinger: I will say three ings. One, it is not a particularly elevating xperience to be forced to exhibit our domes-tic torments before foreign audiences at every stop. Two, I did not know, nor did anyone else in the Department of State until an hour before the announcement was made, of President Nixon's planned trip to the People's Republic of China. Three, we welcomed the statement by the Acting Premier of the People's Republic of China reaffirming their continued interest in the principles of the Shanghai communique and in the process of normalization of relations with the United States.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I wonder if I might just follow that up by this point. It has been suggested that you did see Mr. Nixon just before he announced that the trip would take place. Is it possible that anything you might have said would give him the impression that it would be useful for the United States for him to go?

Secretary Kissinger: No, it is not possible, and I have discussed this at a press conference in Washington. We will take one more question on the American Civil War.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said that your Latin American tour is not an anti-Cuba campaign, and you have also said that Cuba has behaved responsibly in the hemisphere in recent years. Yet today you seemed to bring the specter of Cuban intervention in Latin America. Do you have any indication that the Castro Government is going to renew its activities in this area, or was it just rhetoric?

Secretary Kissinger: I called attention to the principle of collective security, in which no group of nations is more interested than the Republics of Central America, each of whom is individually weak with respect to outside intervention, and each of whom is dependent on the principle of any specific indication—of any specific action that is being planned, but it is to make clear what the U.S. attitude is for contingencies that might arise, but have not yet occurred.

I am afraid I am already late for my plane and I want to thank you all very much for the reception I have had here.

DEPARTURE, GUATEMALA, FEBRUARY 24

Press release 102 dated February 24

Secretary Kissinger: When one sees a catastrophe of the scale that has affected Guatemala, one does not deal with a political problem, but with a human problem; and what concerns us now is how we can give expression to our concern, to our sympathy, and to the tremendous needs that have suddenly arisen in this country.

What we have seen in this country has been very moving, but the President showed me pictures of a catastrophe far transcending what is possible to observe in the city, and he has also described to me the efforts that are being made by the Government of Guatemala and by the people of Guatemala to build a better future.

As far as the United States is concerned, we will do our utmost to respond to the courage of the people of Guatemala. I have been very impressed by the insistence of the President in his private talks as well as in the remarks he made here, that this problem will be solved primarily by the people and the Government of Guatemala and that it is not in the first instance for outsiders.

I am happy that starting tomorrow an American engineer battalion will arrive here to work on the road between Guatemala City and El Rancho. We have agreed that we would study your immediate needs prior to the rainy season and then longer term needs during the course of this year. I will be discussing this with President Ford when I see him tomorrow, but the major message that I would like to bring to you is not one of material assistance, but of the dedication of the Americans that I have been privileged to meet here who have reached out to be of assistance and to have been privileged to assist Guatemala in its hour of need. And this reflects the spirit of friendship and human sympathy between our two peoples. And I will bring back to the United States the steadfastness and dedication of your leaders and of the people that I have had an opportunity to observe here.

Thank you very much.

I will be pleased to take two or three questions, but we must be brief, because w must get back to the United States at reasonable hour, and we'll take them onl from the Guatemalan press.

Q. What is the estimate of the sum th United States will give?

Secretary Kissinger: As you know, th President has just requested $25 million i emergency aid, and our regular aid is course continuing, and several projects wi be going forward within the next few day But what we will do is, our Ambassado working with your planning group, will d velop within the next two weeks a propos to send to Washington. In the meantime will be taking up the problem with Preside Ford and our officials, and we will have better estimate of the amount that can discussed after these studies are complete

Q. What is the U.S. position on Belize?

Secretary Kissinger: Your President and had an opportunity to discuss this, and I h previously in the day discussed it with yo Foreign Minister. The United States is good friend of Guatemala and is also a go friend of Great Britain. We will do our be to bring about an amicable solution since would hope very much that two close frien of the United States not drive matters to point of confrontation. But it is in this spi that we will keep in touch with both sid during their negotiations and do what bo sides agree might be helpful.

Q. Are there any conditions to assure t help you promise is channeled properly?

Secretary Kissinger: There are no poli cal conditions of any kind attached to wh ever assistance has been given or will given. There will be technical discussio between our Embassy and Guatemalan ficials in order to determine where the U aid could be most useful in the program self-help that your President has describ But the United States is assisting in a spi of friendship and cooperation and will atta no conditions of any kind.

Guatemala Disaster Relief Act Transmitted to the Congress

Message From President Ford [1]

To the Congress of the United States:

On February 4th a devastating earthquake truck Guatemala. That earthquake, together with its aftershocks, has left over 22,000 ead, more than 75,000 injured, and one illion homeless.

The United States has a special responsiility to help meet the urgent needs in Guatemala. Immediate aid has already been extended by U.S. agencies, both public and rivate, including:

—Emergency shelters, medical supplies nd food provided by the Agency for International Development.

—Transportation and medical facilities rovided by the Department of Defense.

—Food distribution, medical services, and her disaster relief activities provided by merous private voluntary agencies.

Last week I dispatched my Special Coornator for International Disaster Assistance -AID Administrator Daniel Parker—to uatemala for a firsthand review of the sitation. He has now reported to me and to ongressional Committees on the extent of mage and need. Both the Senate and the ouse of Representatives have passed resolons expressing sympathy for the people of uatemala in their hour of distress and urg- development of a comprehensive U.S. sponse. The Secretary of State will visit e Republic of Guatemala on February 24 to press further our support for the people of uatemala.

I am now proposing urgent and specific tion to turn these expressions of sympathy to tangible assistance. The proposed $25 illion "Guatemala Disaster Relief Act of 976" which I am sending herewith represents an immediate humanitarian response of e United States to the victims of this tragedy who have been injured or have lost their relatives, their homes and possessions, and in many cases their very means of existence.

This legislation, and the ensuing appropriation, will enable us to respond to the human tragedy in Guatemala. Our response will reflect America's concern for the people of Guatemala.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1976.*

[1] Transmitted on Feb. 19 (text from White House ess release).

International Coffee Agreement To Be Signed by the United States

Department Statement [1]

As Secretary Kissinger announced in Brasilia February 19, the President has authorized U.S. signature of the International Coffee Agreement, 1976. The agreement is open for signature at U.N. Headquarters in New York. Our Ambassador to the United Nations will be instructed to sign the agreement shortly.

The International Coffee Agreement, 1976, is the outgrowth of nearly a year of negotiations between 43 exporting countries and 18 importing countries at the International Coffee Organization in London. All the exporting countries are developing countries, and coffee is the largest nonpetroleum export from the developing world. In 1974, world coffee exports amounted to over $4 billion, and U.S. imports of coffee totaled $1.5 billion.

The purpose of the new agreement is to help provide a stable flow of coffee onto the market. It will encourage producers to restore adequate production levels. It contains no fixed price objectives and will not raise prices above long-term market trends.

The major operating mechanism of the new International Coffee Agreement is a provision for export quotas whenever supplies are in surplus. However, unlike previous coffee agreements, the mechanism is automati-

[1] Issued on Feb. 20 (text from press release 85).

cally suspended when prices rise sharply.

The current situation in coffee markets is one of record high prices. This situation resulted from a disastrous frost in the coffee-growing regions of Brazil which severely damaged or destroyed over half of the estimated 2.9 billion coffee trees in that country. Over half a billion trees have already been uprooted in Brazil. Moreover, the frost came at a time when world coffee stocks were relatively low. Since the frost, markets have been further troubled by events in other major coffee-producing countries, such as the civil war in Angola, serious floods in Colombia, and the disruption of internal transportation in Guatemala by the earthquake.

Because prices are so high, the agreement will enter into force on October 1, 1976, with quotas in suspense. We expect they will remain in suspense until the late 1970's, when the coffee trees now being planted in Brazil and elsewhere yield their first fruit. In the meantime, there will be no interference with the free flow of available coffee to the market.

On the contrary, in the immediate future the agreement will provide producers additional incentives to supply available coffee to member consuming-country markets. Export performance during the next two years will be a significant factor in the eventual calculation of individual exporting-country quotas. This and other features of the new agreement will tend to exert a dampening effect on prices.

The agreement will enter into force October 1, 1976, for a period of six years. During the third year of the agreement, each member must specify its intention to continue participation or it automatically ceases to participate on October 1, 1979. Thus, the United States and other members have an opportunity to review their continued participation at the midpoint.

Since the negotiations ended in December 1975, the Administration has conducted a rigorous interagency review of its provisions and concluded that it is a substantial improvement over earlier coffee agreements and is consistent with our interests as coffee consumers. After signature, the President will submit the agreement to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification and wil subsequently request implementing legisla tion from both Houses of Congress throug September 30, 1979.

U.S.-Israel Income Tax Convention Transmitted to the Senate

Message From President Ford[1]

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for Senate advice ar consent to ratification, the Convention signe at Washington on November 20, 1975, b tween the Government of the United Stat of America and the Government of the Sta of Israel with respect to taxes on incom Also I desire to withdraw from the Sena the Convention for the avoidance of doub taxation and prevention of fiscal evasion wi respect to taxes on income between the Go ernment of the United States of Ameri and the Government of Israel which w signed at Washington on June 29, 19 (Executive F, 89th Congress, 1st Sessio

There is no convention on this subje presently in force between the United Stat and Israel.

The Convention signed on November 1975, is similar in many essential respe to other recent United States income t treaties.

I also transmit, for the information of t Senate, the report of the Department State with respect to the Convention.

Conventions such as this one are an i portant element in promoting closer econor cooperation between the United States a other countries. I urge the Senate to favorably on this Convention at an early d and to give its advice and consent ratification.

GERALD R. FORD

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 1976.*

[1] Transmitted on Feb. 11 (text from White Ho press release); also printed as S. Ex. C, 94th Co 1st sess., which includes the texts of the conven and the report of the Department of State.

ongressional Documents elating to Foreign Policy

4th Congress, 1st Session

ıe Persian Gulf. 1975: The Continuing Debate on Arms Sales. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on International Relations. June 10–July 29, 1975. 261 pp.

S. Policy Toward Southern Africa. Hearings before the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. June 11–July 29, 1975. 527 pp.

reign Assistance Authorization: Arms Sales Issues. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. June 17–December 5, 1975. 670 pp.

onomic Aid Allocations for Syria and Compliance With Section 901 of the Foreign Assistance Act. Hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on International Relations. June 25, 1975. 44 pp.

ıclear Proliferation: Future U.S. Foreign Policy Implications. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs of the House Committee on International Relations. October 21–November 5, 1975. 506 pp.

mmonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Hearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on H.J. Res. 549, To approve the covenant to establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in political union with the United States of America, and for other purposes. November 5, 1975. 201 pp.

S. Trade Embargo of Vietnam: Church Views. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Trade and Commerce of the House Committee on International Relations. November 17, 1975. 47 pp.

ıman Rights in Haiti. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the House Committee on International Relations. November 18, 1975. 137 pp.

ia in a New Era: Implications for Future U.S. Policy. Report of a study mission to Asia, August 1–13, 1975, conducted by Representative Lester L. Wolff. Submitted to the House Committee on International Relations. December 8, 1975. 75 pp.

ıx Convention With the U.S.S.R. Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to accompany Ex. T, 93–1. S. Ex. Rept. 19. December 11, 1975. 38 pp.

ederal Ocean Program. Message from the President of the United States transmitting the 1974 Annual Report on the Federal Ocean Program. H. Doc. 94–321. December 11, 1975. 151 pp.

ackground Information on the Use of U.S. Armed Forces in Foreign Countries. 1975 Revision. Prepared by the Foreign Affairs Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, for the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs of the House Committee on International Relations. 84 pp.

International Telecommunication Convention and Revised Telegraph, Telephone, and Radio Regulations. Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to accompany Ex. J, 93–2; Ex. E, 93–2; Ex. G, 94–1. S. Ex. Rept. 94–22. January 16, 1976. 17 pp.

94th Congress, 2d Session

Crisis on Cyprus—1976: Crucial Year for Peace. A staff report prepared for the use of the Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. January 19, 1976. 104 pp.

East-West Foreign Trade Board Third Quarterly Report. Communication from the Chairman of the Board transmitting the Board's third quarterly report on trade between the United States and nonmarket economies, pursuant to section 411(c) of the Trade Act of 1974. H. Doc. 94–335. January 19, 1976. 37 pp.

International Finance. Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, covering the period July 1, 1974–June 30, 1975. H. Doc. 94–348. 304 pp.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Atomic Energy

Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as amended. Done at New York October 26, 1956. Entered into force July 29, 1957. TIAS 3873, 5284, 7668.

Acceptance deposited: Qatar, February 27, 1976.

Maritime Matters

Amendment of article VII of the convention on facilitation of international maritime traffic, 1965 (TIAS 6251). Adopted at London November 19, 1973.[1]

Acceptance deposited: Belgium, January 13, 1976.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and further extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 7988). Done at Washington March 25, 1975. Entered into force June 19, 1975, with respect to certain provisions and July 1, 1975, with respect to other provisions.

Acceptance deposited: Japan, February 20, 1976.

[1] Not in force.

Protocol modifying and further extending the food aid convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 7988). Done at Washington March 25, 1975. Entered into force June 19, 1975, with respect to certain provisions, and July 1, 1975, with respect to other provisions.
Acceptance deposited: Japan (with reservation). February 20, 1976.

BILATERAL

Austria

Agreement amending the interim agreement of November 6, 1973 (TIAS 7751), concerning acceptance of transatlantic air traffic organized and operated pursuant to advance charter (TGC or ABC) rules. Effected by exchange of letters at Vienna December 10 and 22, 1975. Entered into force December 22, 1975.

Ecuador

Agreement on mapping, charting and geodesy. Signed at Quito February 19, 1976. Entered into force February 19, 1976.

India

Agreement modifying the agreement of August 6, 1974 (TIAS 7915; 25 UST 2383), relating to trade in cotton textiles. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington January 20 and 22, 1976. Entered into force January 22, 1976.

Ireland

Agreement extending the agreement of June 28 and 29, 1973 (TIAS 7662), relating to travel group charter flights and advance booking charter flights. Effected by exchange of letters at Dublin December 23, 1975, and January 9, 1976. Entered into force January 9, 1976.

Pakistan

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of August 7, 1975. Effected by exchange of notes at Islamabad February 5, 1976. Entered into force February 5, 1976.

United Kingdom

Agreement concerning a U.S. naval support facility on Diego Garcia, British Indian Ocean Territory, with plan, related notes, and supplementary arrangements. Effected by exchange of notes at London February 25, 1976. Entered into force February 25, 1976.

Agreement relating to the construction, maintenance and operation of a limited naval communications facility on Diego Garcia, with plan. Effected by exchange of notes at London October 24, 1972. Entered into force October 24, 1972. TIAS 7481.
Terminated: February 25, 1976.

PUBLICATIONS

GPO Sales Publications

Publications may be ordered by catalog or stock number from the Superintendent of Documents, U Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 204 A 25-percent discount is made on orders for 100 more copies of any one publication mailed to t same address. Remittances, payable to the Super tendent of Documents, must accompany orde Prices shown below, which include domestic posta are subject to change.

Background Notes: Short, factual summaries wh describe the people, history, government, econor and foreign relations of each country. Each conta a map, a list of principal government officials a U.S. diplomatic and consular officers, and a readi list. (A complete set of all Background Notes c rently in stock—at least 140—$21.80; 1-year s scription service for approximately 77 updated new Notes—$23.10; plastic binder—$1.50.) Sin copies of those listed below are available at 30¢ ea

Albania	Cat. No. S1.123:AL1	
	Pub. 8217	4 pp.
Bulgaria	Cat. No. S1.123:B87	
	Pub. 7882	6 pp.
Central African Republic . .	Cat. No. S1.123:C33	
	Pub. 7970	6 pp.
Ethiopia	Cat. No. S1.123:ET3	
	Pub. 7785	4 pp.
San Marino	Cat. No. S1.123:SA5	
	Pub. 8661	4 pp.
Korea, Republic of	Cat. No. S1.123:K84	
	Pub. 7782	6 pp.

Environmental Warfare—Questions and Answ Pamphlet by the U.S. Arms Control and Disar ment Agency containing information on envir mental warfare such as definitions of terms, sta of the draft convention banning use of environmer modification techniques for hostile purposes, the vironmental effects of nuclear warfare, etc. Pub. 10 pp. 40¢. (Stock No. 002–000–00053–9).

Trade—Meat Imports. Agreement with Pana TIAS 8112. 7 pp. 30¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8112).

Trade—Meat Imports. Agreement with New Zeala TIAS 8113. 8 pp. 30¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8113).

Agricultural Commodities. Agreement with Bang desh amending the agreement of October 4, 1974, amended. TIAS 8114. 5 pp. 25¢. (Cat. No. S9. 8114).

Name Index

Checklist of Department of State Press Releases: February 23–29

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of Press Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

No.	Date	Subject
*91	2/24	Department announces hearings on consumer representation plan, Feb. 25.
*92	2/24	U.S.-Japan Joint Planning and Coordination Committee for Cooperation in Environmental Protection, Feb. 26–27.
*93	2/24	Kissinger: departure, Rio de Janeiro, Feb. 22.
94	2/24	Kissinger: toast, Bogotá, Feb. 23.
*95	2/24	Kissinger: departure, Bogotá, Feb. 23.
96	2/24	Kissinger: arrival, San José, Feb. 23.
*97	2/24	Secretary's Advisory Committee on Private International Law, Study Group on Maritime Bills of Lading, Mar. 26.
*98	2/24	Shipping Coordinating Committee, Committee on Ocean Dumping, Mar. 25.
99	2/25	Kissinger: news conference, San José, Feb. 24.
100	2/24	Kissinger: toast, San José.
*101	2/24	Kissinger: arrival, Guatemala.
102	2/24	Kissinger: departure, Guatemala.
*103	2/25	Broadcast executives from 12 nations to participate in 53-day radio project beginning Feb. 29.
†104	2/27	1976 "Treaties in Force" released.
*105	2/27	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

* Not printed.
† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.